



This is a repository copy of *Infective Endocarditis After Invasive Medical and Surgical Procedures*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:  
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/132535/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Thornhill, M.H. [orcid.org/0000-0003-0681-4083](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0681-4083), Dayer, M.J. and Cahill, T.J. (2018) Infective Endocarditis After Invasive Medical and Surgical Procedures. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*, 71 (24). pp. 2753-2755. ISSN 0735-1097

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2018.03.533>

---

**Reuse**

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) licence. This licence only allows you to download this work and share it with others as long as you credit the authors, but you can't change the article in any way or use it commercially. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



[eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk)  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

# **Infective endocarditis after invasive medical and surgical procedures**

## **Author names with degrees**

Martin H Thornhill, MBBS, BDS, PhD<sup>1</sup>, Mark J Dayer, PhD FRCP<sup>2</sup>, Thomas J Cahill, MBBS, MRCP, DPhil<sup>3</sup>.

## **Author affiliations**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Medicine, Surgery & Pathology, University of Sheffield School of Clinical Dentistry, Sheffield, UK; <sup>2</sup>Department of Cardiology, Taunton and Somerset NHS Foundation Trust, Musgrove Park, Taunton, UK; <sup>3</sup>Oxford Heart Centre, Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Oxford, UK;

## **Brief title (120 characters or less incl spaces)**

Infective endocarditis after invasive procedures

## **Complete contact information for corresponding author**

Professor Martin Thornhill  
Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Medicine, Surgery & Pathology  
University of Sheffield School of Clinical Dentistry  
Sheffield  
UK

Tel: +44 751-555-2925  
Email: m.thornhill@sheffield.ac.uk

## **Conflict/disclosure statement for all authors**

None to declare

## **Keywords**

Infective endocarditis, Invasive medical procedures, Antibiotic prophylaxis

The incidence of infective endocarditis, a life-threatening disease characterized by a focus of infection within the heart, is rising.(1-3) It is increasingly acquired in the healthcare setting, with at least 25% of cases occurring after a hospital or outpatient medical exposure.(4) In parallel, nosocomial staphylococci have replaced oral streptococci as the most common causative pathogen. Despite advances in management, for example dedicated infective endocarditis teams, multimodality imaging for identification of complications, and early definitive surgery for selected patients, in-hospital mortality remains approximately 20%.(5-7)

Given the challenges of treating infective endocarditis, disease prevention is of fundamental importance. Development of strategies for prophylaxis of infective endocarditis has been frustrated, however, by a lack of high-quality evidence on specific triggers for the disease.(8) The necessary precursor to formation of an infected vegetation is bacteremia.(9) A range of invasive procedures, for example dental extraction or colonoscopy, cause a subclinical, transient bacteremia.(10,11) From the 1950s onwards, this led to burgeoning use of antibiotic prophylaxis to reduce the incidence of bacteremia after dental and medical procedures. Indeed, prior to 2007, US and European guidelines recommended antibiotic prophylaxis before a wide range of invasive medical procedures (Table 1).(12,13) However, a lack of definitive evidence for a link between these procedures and infective endocarditis, or for efficacy of antibiotic prophylaxis, have led to restriction in its use to high-risk patients undergoing invasive dental procedures in recent US and European guidelines.(5,6,14)

In this issue of the *Journal* an important study by Janszky *et al* reopens the debate on the role of invasive medical procedures as a trigger for infective endocarditis.(15) Using the Swedish National Patient Register, the authors analyzed the frequency of invasive medical or surgical procedures in the 12-week period before a diagnosis of infective endocarditis, in comparison to an equivalent control period one year earlier. This ‘case-crossover’ study is an established design for examining the effect of a putative transient risk factor. As each patient acts as their own control, it has the strength of controlling for other potential confounders which are stable over time. The authors identified a total of 7013 cases of infective endocarditis from 1998 to 2011 inclusive. Dental procedures were not analyzed, as the majority are not performed in hospital and were not therefore captured in the dataset.

The principal finding was that a long list of invasive medical procedures occurred more frequently in the 12-weeks preceding an infective endocarditis diagnosis than at other time points. Many of these procedures were among those previously recommended for antibiotic prophylaxis, but others were not.(12,13) Several procedures which are known to cause bacteremia were associated with significant risk: these included cytoscopy (RR 2.82, 95% CI 1.42 – 5.61), bronchoscopy (RR 16.00, 95% CI 2.12-120.65), chronic dialysis (RR 3.64, 95% CI 2.02 – 6.58), and colonoscopy (RR 2.82, 95% CI 1.42 – 5.61). Perhaps more surprisingly, there was also a significant association between relatively ‘sterile’ interventions such as bone marrow puncture (RR 4.67, 95% CI 1.34 – 16.24) or transfusion (RR 6.69, 95% CI 4.43 – 10.11).

How should these data be interpreted? At face value, the implication is that virtually any inpatient or outpatient invasive procedure may be a trigger for subsequent infective endocarditis. Whilst this may be correct, some caution is required. Firstly, observational data cannot establish causality. Despite the authors' efforts to avoid this, it is possible that some procedures were performed as part of the investigation of patients already suffering from infective endocarditis, but where the diagnosis had yet to be established. For example, anemia is a common presenting feature of infective endocarditis, and might lead to a blood transfusion and a bone marrow biopsy before the correct diagnosis is made. Alternatively, investigations may have been performed in patients as part of a work-up for cardiac surgery (e.g. coronary angiography), who went on to develop infective endocarditis as a post-operative complication. Invasive procedures could also be a surrogate marker of any acute illness, which might increase susceptibility to infective endocarditis but not be directly causative; patient-level data might refute these criticisms. Unfortunately, the study did not have access to information on the microbiology of cases: identifying flora from the oral cavity, gastrointestinal tract, skin etcetera, after procedures associated with these sites would have provided further support for their role in causing infective endocarditis.

Despite these criticisms, this work is by far the largest study to address the link between invasive medical procedures and subsequent infective endocarditis. It is the highest quality data available to support an association between invasive medical procedures and infective endocarditis, and mirrors the findings of a recent case-crossover study suggesting a possible increase in risk after invasive dental procedures.<sup>(16)</sup> Importantly, it will direct future research efforts towards clarifying precisely which procedures are associated with highest risk, in an unbiased manner,

and the mechanisms of healthcare-acquired infective endocarditis. Finally, whilst this is not a study of the role of antibiotic prophylaxis, the authors were able to estimate a number needed to prevent one case of endocarditis of 476, if prophylaxis was 100% effective. If the breadth of procedures associated with increased risk is confirmed by further studies, this will raise important questions for guideline committees about the benefits of recommending antibiotic prophylaxis prior to some of these procedures. However, broadening the scope of antibiotic prophylaxis to include all of these procedures is unlikely to be the solution. At least for those procedures where sterility should be easy to achieve and maintain, the solution is more likely to lay with improved sterile technique, infection control procedures and identifying systematic approaches for reducing healthcare-associated bacteremia rather than necessarily advocating antibiotic prophylaxis.

**Table 1: Historical and current recommendations for use of antibiotic prophylaxis in patients undergoing invasive medical and dental procedures alongside risk estimates for post-procedural infective endocarditis from Janszky *et al***

Procedure	Source				
	AHA 1997 (12)	ESC 2004 (13)	Current Recommendations AHA 2007 (14) ESC 2015 (6)	Janszky <i>et al.</i> 2018 (15)	
				Outpatient	Inpatient
<b>GI Procedures</b>					
Endoscopic oesophageal procedures (including TOE)	✓	✓	-	2.60 (1.25-5.39)	3.60 (1.34-9.70)
Upper GI Endoscopy with/without biopsy	Optional for HR	-	-	2.50 (1.59-3.94)	3.97 (2.68-5.88)
Lower GI Endoscopy with/without biopsy	Optional for HR	-	-	2.89 (1.35-6.17)	2.82 (1.42-5.61)
ERCP (Endoscopic Retrograde Cholangio-Pancreatography)	✓	✓	-	2.60 (1.25-5.39)	3.60 (1.34-9.70)
<b>GU Procedures</b>					
Endoscopic prostate procedures	✓	✓	-	-	-
Cystoscopy and endoscopic urological procedures	✓	✓	-	1.59 (0.98-2.58)	4.40 (1.67-11.62)
<b>Obstetric &amp; Gynaecological Procedures</b>					
Caesarian section	Optional for HR	If infection present	-	-	-
Vaginal delivery	Optional for HR	If infection present	-	-	-
Abortion/dilatation and curettage (D&C)	If infection present	If infection present	-	1.49 (1.17-1.90)	3.00 (1.81-4.98)
<b>Respiratory Procedures</b>					
Bronchoscopic procedures (esp. rigid)	✓	✓	-	5.00 (1.10-22.82)	16.00 (2.12-120.65)
<b>ENT Procedures</b>					
Tonsillectomy/adenoidectomy	✓	✓	-	1.49 (1.17-1.90)	2.33 (0.60-9.02)
<b>Dental Procedures</b>					
Dental extractions	✓	✓	✓	-	-
Dental scaling/gingival procedures	✓	✓	✓	-	-
Endodontic procedures	✓	✓	✓	-	-

HR – high risk patients; ✓ - recommended; - not recommended

This table includes procedures for which antibiotic prophylaxis was previously recommended by the AHA or ESC and those for whom it is currently recommended. The risk of infective endocarditis after other invasive procedures was evaluated by Janszky *et al* and is shown in their manuscript.

## References

1. Dayer MJ, Jones S, Prendergast B, Baddour LM, Lockhart PB, Thornhill MH. Incidence of infective endocarditis in England, 2000–13: a secular trend, interrupted time-series analysis. *Lancet*;385:1219-1228.
2. Pant S, Patel NJ, Deshmukh A et al. Trends in Infective Endocarditis Incidence, Microbiology, and Valve Replacement in the United States From 2000 to 2011. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2015;65:2070-2076.
3. Olmos C, Vilacosta I, Fernández-Pérez C et al. The Evolving Nature of Infective Endocarditis in Spain: A Population-Based Study (2003 to 2014). *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2017;70:2795-2804.
4. Selton-Suty C, Célard M, Le Moing V et al. Preeminence of *Staphylococcus aureus* in Infective Endocarditis: A 1-Year Population-Based Survey. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2012;54:1230-1239.
5. Baddour LM, Wilson WR, Bayer AS et al. Infective Endocarditis in Adults: Diagnosis, Antimicrobial Therapy, and Management of Complications: A Scientific Statement for Healthcare Professionals From the American Heart Association. *Circulation* 2015;132:1435-86.
6. Habib G, Lancellotti P, Antunes MJ et al. 2015 ESC Guidelines for the management of infective endocarditis. *Euro Heart J* 2015;36:3075-128.
7. Slipczuk L, Codolosa JN, Davila CD et al. Infective Endocarditis Epidemiology Over Five Decades: A Systematic Review. *PLoS ONE* 2013;8:e82665.
8. Cahill TJ, Baddour LM, Habib G et al. Challenges in Infective Endocarditis. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2017;69:325-344.
9. Werdan K, Dietz S, Loffler B et al. Mechanisms of infective endocarditis: pathogen-host interaction and risk states. *Nat Rev Cardiol* 2014;11:35-50.
10. Low DE, Shoenuit JP, Kennedy JK et al. Prospective assessment of risk of bacteremia with colonoscopy and polypectomy. *Digestive Diseases and Sciences* 1987;32:1239-1243.
11. Cahill TJ, Harrison JL, Jewell P et al. Antibiotic prophylaxis for infective endocarditis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Heart* 2017.
12. Dajani AS, Taubert KA, Wilson W et al. Prevention of Bacterial Endocarditis. *Circulation* 1997;96:358.
13. Horstkotte D, Follath F, Gutschik E et al. Guidelines on Prevention, Diagnosis and Treatment of Infective Endocarditis Executive Summary The Task Force on Infective Endocarditis of the European Society of Cardiology. *Euro Heart J* 2004;25:267-276.



14. Wilson W, Taubert KA, Gewitz M et al. Prevention of Infective Endocarditis: Guidelines From the American Heart Association: A Guideline From the American Heart Association Rheumatic Fever, Endocarditis, and Kawasaki Disease Committee, Council on Cardiovascular Disease in the Young, and the Council on Clinical Cardiology, Council on Cardiovascular Surgery and Anesthesia, and the Quality of Care and Outcomes Research Interdisciplinary Working Group. *Circulation* 2007;116:1736-1754.
15. Janszky I, Gémes K, Ahnve S, Asgeirsson H, Möller J. Invasive medical and surgical procedures and triggering of infective endocarditis – a nationwide case-crossover study *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2018;X:X.
16. Tubiana S, Blotière P-O, Hoen B et al. Dental procedures, antibiotic prophylaxis, and endocarditis among people with prosthetic heart valves: nationwide population based cohort and a case crossover study. *BMJ* 2017;358.