



This is a repository copy of *Antibiotic prophylaxis of endocarditis: a NICE mess.*

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/96643/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Chambers, J.B., Thornhill, M. orcid.org/0000-0003-0681-4083, Shanson, D. et al. (1 more author) (2016) Antibiotic prophylaxis of endocarditis: a NICE mess. *Lancet Infectious Diseases*, 16 (3). pp. 275-276. ISSN 1473-3099

Reuse

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

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 including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

Antibiotic prophylaxis of endocarditis: a NICE mess

John B Chambers¹

Martin Thornhill²

David Shanson³

Bernard Prendergast¹

¹Consultant Cardiologists, Cardiothoracic Centre, Guy's and St Thomas' Hospitals, London

²Professor of Translational Research in Dentistry, School of Clinical Dentistry, University of Sheffield

³Honorary Consultant Microbiologist at Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children, London

Correspondence: Prof JB Chambers, Cardiothoracic Centre, St Thomas' Hospital, London SE1 7EH. U.K. Tel: 44-(0)20-7188-1047 Fax: 44-(0)20-7188-0728 E-mail: john.chambers@gstt.nhs.uk

NICE guidance written in 2008, and revised in 2015 (1), no longer recommends antibiotic prophylaxis for infective endocarditis (IE) in patients at high-risk of IE having high-risk dental procedures. This remains different from every international guideline (2) including a 2015 European Society of Cardiology revision (3). The European guideline committee (3) considered, but rejected, the NICE view. How has this important difference in advice arisen and what are its implications?

The core NICE committee consists of the same individuals, regardless of the subject under review. Detailed experience of the clinical background may not be seen as critical in considering drug therapies or technologies for which data from randomised controlled trials exist. However, judging the advisability of antibiotic prophylaxis for IE requires the understanding of complex observational or case-matched clinical and animal studies. Arguably, this requires expertise and experience in the subject and is better suited to professional bodies than to NICE.

The NICE revision committee made a number of errors, stating, for example, that 'people with prosthetic valves do not appear to be at increased odds of developing IE than people without prosthetic valves based on two studies'. In fact, the two studies were not relevant to the question and the annual incidence of prosthetic valve IE is 0.3-1.2% (3), 10-120 times the estimate within the general population. Another error was to note 'the lack of data on side effects (including anaphylaxis) from antibiotic prophylaxis'. To date,

there have there been no reports in the world literature of fatal anaphylaxis after oral amoxicillin prophylaxis for IE (4,5).

NICE considered that there was no good evidence of significant bacteraemia following invasive dental procedures (1), but examined only studies that included negative pre-procedural blood cultures. However, most of these cultures were positive for skin commensals, not orally derived viridans streptococci. Viridans streptococci were very rare pre-procedure, but were isolated in 35-65% of blood cultures immediately following dental extraction in studies excluded by NICE (6). Furthermore, observational or case-control studies show that IE may be associated with some dental procedures, including extractions, deep-fillings and scaling (7,8). Of course, IE may also occur with bacteraemia associated with daily activities.

NICE also considered that there was no evidence for antibiotic prophylaxis being effective. Although there has been no randomised trial, a number of observational clinical studies show a benefit in high-risk groups (7,9) and animal data demonstrate that a single dose of amoxicillin can prevent streptococcal bacteraemia and IE (7,10). In a recent analysis (11), 277 prescriptions of antibiotic prophylaxis were needed to prevent one case of IE.

Numerous studies show a background increase in the incidence of IE (1). However, a recent study (11) showed that the slope of this increase rose in the UK in the years after introduction of the NICE guidance in March 2008. There has been subsequent debate about the timing of the change in slope

and whether the data are better fitted with a curve than a straight line, but there has been no disagreement about the existence of the change. The study was limited by the lack of microbiological information and it is surprising that IE-related mortality did not rise in parallel with incidence. However, the mortality of IE caused by oral streptococci is lower than IE caused by other organisms and a US study (11) has shown a rise in IE caused by Streptococci in the same time-period.

NICE guidance might appear to simplify dental practice. However, the nature of informed consent obliges dentists to make patients aware of the different guidelines, especially if a patient is at high clinical risk or has a particular concern about antibiotic prophylaxis or IE. The dentist would then need to let the patient make up his or her own mind whether or not to receive antibiotic prophylaxis. This process would therefore be significantly simpler if all guidelines were in agreement.

Conclusion

NICE is most effective when considering drug therapies or technologies for which randomised controlled trial data exist. Expert professional bodies might be expected to be more appropriate for complex clinical judgements, such as the advisability of antibiotic prophylaxis of IE. We suggest that the recently updated European Society of Cardiology guidance (3), remains clinically most appropriate.

REFERENCES

1. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence. Prophylaxis against infective endocarditis. Antimicrobial prophylaxis against infective endocarditis in adults and children undergoing interventional procedures. UR [http:// www.nice.org.uk/CG064](http://www.nice.org.uk/CG064) . March 2008. updated 2015 <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg64/evidence>
2. Nishimura RA, Carabello BA, Faxon DP et al. ACC/AHA guideline update on valvular heart disease: focused update on infective endocarditis. *Circulation* 2008; 118: 887-96.
3. Habib G, Lancellotti P, Antunes MJ et al. 2015 ESC Guidelines for the management of infective endocarditis. *Europ Heart J* Aug 29, 2015. Doi:10.1093/eurheartj/ehv319
4. Lee P, Shanson D. Results of a UK survey of fatal anaphylaxis after oral amoxicillin. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2007;60:1172-3.
5. Thornhill MH, Dayer MJ, Prendergast B, Baddour LM, Jones S, Lockhart PB. Incidence and nature of adverse reactions to antibiotics used as antibiotic prophylaxis. *J Antimicrob Chemo.* 2015 doi:10.1093/jac/dkv115
6. Shanson D, New British and American guidelines for the antibiotic prophylaxis of endocarditis : do the changes make sense? A critical review. *Current Opinion in Infectious Diseases* 2008;21:191-199.
7. Chambers J, Shanson D, Hall R, Venn G, Pepper J, McGurk M. Antibiotic prophylaxis of endocarditis: the rest of the world and NICE. *J Roy Soc Med* 2011; 104: 138-40.

8. Horstkotte D, Rosin H, Friedrichs W, Loogen F. Contribution for choosing the optimal prophylaxis of bacterial endocarditis. *Europ Heart J* 1987;8 (Suppl J):379-81.
9. Duval X, Alla F, Hoen B et al. Estimated risk of endocarditis in adults with predisposing cardiac conditions undergoing dental procedures with or without antibiotic prophylaxis. *Clin Infectious Dis* 2006;42:e102-7.
10. Berney P, Francioli P. Successful prophylaxis of experimental streptococcal endocarditis with single-dose amoxicillin administered after bacterial challenge. *J Infect Dis* 1990;161:281-5.
11. 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* 2014;385:1219–1228. DOI: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(14\)62007-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(14)62007-9)
12. Pant S, Patel NJ, Deshmukh A et al. Trends in infective endocarditis incidence, microbiology and valve replacement in the United States from 2000-2011. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2015;65:2070-6.

