



**HAL**  
open science

## Antibiotic prophylaxis of infective endocarditis in patients with predisposing cardiac conditions: French cardiologists' implementation of current guidelines

Alexandra Cloitre, Philippe Lesclous, Q. Trochu, Christine Selton-Suty, D. Boutoille, T. Le Tourneau, François Delahaye, Daniel Thomas, B. Iung, Alexis Gaudin, et al.

### ► To cite this version:

Alexandra Cloitre, Philippe Lesclous, Q. Trochu, Christine Selton-Suty, D. Boutoille, et al.. Antibiotic prophylaxis of infective endocarditis in patients with predisposing cardiac conditions: French cardiologists' implementation of current guidelines. *International Journal of Cardiology*, 2019, 10.1016/j.ijcard.2019.07.042 . inserm-02264630

**HAL Id: inserm-02264630**

**<https://inserm.hal.science/inserm-02264630>**

Submitted on 21 Jul 2022

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

1 Antibiotic prophylaxis of infective endocarditis in patients with predisposing cardiac  
2 conditions: French cardiologists' implementation of current guidelines

3 Cloitre A<sup>1</sup>, Lesclous P<sup>1,\*</sup>, Trochu Q<sup>1</sup>, Selton-Suty C<sup>2</sup>, Boutoille D<sup>3</sup>, Le Tourneau T<sup>4</sup>,  
4 Delahaye F<sup>5</sup>, Thomas D<sup>6</sup>, Iung B<sup>7</sup>, Gaudin A<sup>1</sup>, Duval X<sup>8,+</sup>, Trochu JN<sup>4,#</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup>: Inserm, UMR 1229, RMeS, Regenerative Medicine and Skeleton, Université de Nantes,  
6 UFR Odontologie, CHU de Nantes, Service Odontologie Restauratrice et Chirurgicale, PHU4  
7 OTONN, ONIRIS, Nantes, F-44042, France

8 <sup>2</sup>: Institut Lorrain du Cœur et des Vaisseaux, CHU Nancy Brabois, Nancy, F-54511, France

9 <sup>3</sup>: CHU de Nantes, Service des Maladies Infectieuses, F-44042, France

10 <sup>4</sup>: Institut du Thorax, Inserm, UMR 1087, CIC-1413, CHU de Nantes, Nantes, F-44042,  
11 France

12 <sup>5</sup>: Service de Cardiologie, Hôpital Louis Pradel, Lyon, F-69677, France

13 <sup>6</sup>: Institut de Cardiologie, Groupe Hospitalier Pitié Salpêtrière, AP-HP, Paris, F-75651, France

14 <sup>7</sup>: Université Paris Diderot, Sorbonne Paris Cité, Service de Cardiologie, Hôpital Bichat  
15 Claude Bernard, AP-HP, Paris, France

16 <sup>8</sup>: Inserm, UMR 1137, IAME, Université Paris Diderot, Sorbonne Paris Cité, Inserm CIC  
17 1425, AP-HP, Hôpital Bichat Claude Bernard, Paris, France

18 #: Corresponding author: [jean-noel.trochu@chu-nantes.fr](mailto:jean-noel.trochu@chu-nantes.fr)

19 \*: Co-first author

20 †: Co-last author

21 Statement of authorship: All authors take responsibility for all aspects of the reliability and  
22 freedom from bias of the data presented and their discussed interpretation.

23 Authors' contribution: PL, JNT AC and XD contributed to the conception or design of the  
24 work. QT contributed to the acquisition, analysis and interpretation of data for the work. AC,  
25 PL and JNT drafted the manuscript. XD, CSS, DB, TLT, FD, DT, BI and AG critically  
26 revised the manuscript. All gave final approval and agree to be accountable for all aspects of  
27 work ensuring integrity and accuracy.

28 Grant support: This work was supported by the French Federation of Cardiology.

29 Conflict of interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest. The survey was anonymous  
30 and was approved by the French data protection agency (agreement no. 169 83 56).

31 Keywords: Infective endocarditis; antibiotic prophylaxis; guideline; compliance

32

33

34 **Abstract**

35 **Background:** To prevent infective endocarditis (IE), with the exception of the United  
36 Kingdom, antibiotic prophylaxis (AP) is recommended in patients with predisposing cardiac  
37 conditions (PCCs) worldwide. To conclude on the relevance of this strategy, how the current  
38 guidelines are applied is a crucial point to investigate. The first aim of this study was to assess  
39 cardiologists' implementation of the current guidelines. The secondary objective was to  
40 identify specific areas where the training and knowledge of French cardiologists could be  
41 improved . **Methods:** A national online survey was carried out among the 2228 cardiologist  
42 members of the French Society of Cardiology. **Results:** The high risk PCCs for which IE AP  
43 is recommended were correctly identified by the vast majority of the respondents so that IE  
44 AP is mostly prescribed correctly in such patients. But only 12% identified all the right  
45 indications for IE AP according to 13 predefined PCCs (3 at high-risk, 6 at moderate-risk and  
46 4 at low-risk of IE) so that some IE AP misuses are recorded, overprescription in particular.  
47 Only 47% prescribed the proper amoxicillin schedule and only 15% prescribed the  
48 appropriate clindamycin schedule in cases with penicillin allergy. **Conclusion:** This study  
49 evidenced relevant areas where the training of cardiologists could be improved such as  
50 knowledge of the risk of IE for certain PCCs and some common invasive dental procedures.  
51 Cardiologists' knowledge should be improved before any conclusion can be drawn on the  
52 relevance of this AP strategy and its influence on IE incidence.

53

54 **Keywords:** Infective endocarditis; antibiotic prophylaxis; guideline; compliance

55

56

57 **Introduction**

58 Infective endocarditis (IE) is a rare (< 7 cases per 100,000 persons per year) and severe  
59 disease (20% early mortality, 40% at 5 years) [1]. A causal link between IE and the oral  
60 cavity has long been assumed, [2] stemming from bacteremia and particularly oral  
61 *Streptococcus* resulting from invasive dental procedures [3]. To prevent IE, antibiotic  
62 prophylaxis (AP) has been recommended in the United States since 1955 for patients with  
63 predisposing cardiac conditions (PCCs) undergoing invasive procedures [4]. The AP  
64 prescription strategy is based on the recognition of a PCC that carries a risk of developing IE  
65 and a procedure at risk of causing IE bacteremia. Whether AP is a crucial factor for the  
66 prevention of IE remains debatable since three case-control studies evidenced an association  
67 between dental procedures and streptococcal IE [5-7], whereas three others did not [8-10]. But  
68 before any conclusion may be drawn, the primary question, as suggested by several authors, is  
69 whether the current guidelines are correctly implemented by the main prescribers of IE AP,  
70 i.e., dentists and cardiologists [11, 12].

71 A recent survey among French dentists illustrated their lack of knowledge and  
72 implementation of the current guidelines [13]. However, to date no data have been produced  
73 for a population of general cardiologists. Only very specific data on pediatric cardiologists or  
74 congenital heart disease (CHD) specialists regarding the compliance with the 2007 AHA  
75 guidelines [14] are available [15-17]. All of them highlighted the correct identification of  
76 PCCs at high risk of IE by the cardiologic populations surveyed but all of them underlined IE  
77 AP overprescription for PCCs at moderate risk of IE that no longer require IE AP or for some  
78 PCCs with a low risk for IE with no indication for IE AP.

79 The aim of this study was to assess cardiologists' knowledge regarding implementation of the  
80 current European Society of Cardiology (ESC) guidelines for IE AP in a wide practitioners'

81 population and **second**, to identify specific areas where the training and knowledge of French  
82 cardiologists could be improved.

## 83 **Methods**

### 84 **1.1 Study design**

85 An online national survey was carried out among the 2228 cardiologist members of the  
86 French Society of Cardiology (FSC) in 2014. The survey was anonymous and was approved  
87 by the French data protection agency (agreement no. 169 83 56).

### 88 **1.2 Data collection**

89 A tailored anonymous questionnaire comprising 40 questions was constructed, mostly based  
90 on a previous survey managed by the Association for the Study and Prevention of Infective  
91 Endocarditis (AEPEI) in 2012 among French dentists [13].

92 This questionnaire was divided into four parts: 1/ demographic and practice-related  
93 characteristics: age, gender, type of practice; 2/ knowledge of patients at high risk of IE:  
94 knowledge of the definition of an invasive dental procedure, knowledge of the IE risk of 13  
95 predefined IE PCCs (three PCCs with high risk for IE, six PCCs with moderate risk for IE and  
96 four with low risk for IE), knowledge of the indication for an AP according to the same 13  
97 predefined PCCs; 3/ knowledge of IE AP: knowledge of the indication for IE AP according to  
98 13 predefined PCCs for IE and for a patient with a valvular prosthesis according to seven  
99 dental procedures, knowledge of the antibiotics recommended for an IE AP, knowledge of the  
100 IE AP schedule (dosage, number and time of intake); 4/ applicability of the current  
101 guidelines: criteria of choice for an IE AP, changes in the prescription habits of an IE AP.

102 The questionnaire was formatted on the SurveyMonkey software (SurveyMonkey Europe  
103 Sarl, Luxembourg). Its validity had been previously ascertained among a limited cohort of 10  
104 hospital physicians. Thereafter, a survey link was sent to all members of the FSC and was

105 posted on its website for 2 months. No incentive was given to the responders and a recall was  
106 performed a couple of weeks before the closing date.

## 107 **1.4 Data analysis**

108 Descriptive statistics were performed using Microsoft Excel 2007. Then the data were  
109 compared using the chi-square test or the Fisher test. Differences were considered significant  
110 if  $p < 0.05$ .

## 111 **Results**

### 112 **2.1 Demographic and practice-related characteristics of the respondents**

113 Two hundred sixty-five cardiologists responded to the survey (crude response rate: 13.4%);  
114 nine were excluded because the questionnaire was not fully completed and 13 because the  
115 data were unusable. The 243 remaining were included (true response rate: 12.3%). The  
116 male/female ratio was 2.2 and practitioners were mainly 35–50 years (38%) and 51–60 years  
117 of age (32%) with a hospital-based practice (60%).

### 118 **2.2 Knowledge of patients at high risk of IE and IE AP**

119 For 61% of the respondents, an invasive dental procedure is defined as a procedure requiring  
120 manipulation of the gingival or perforation of the oral mucosa but for only 56% as a  
121 procedure inducing significant bacteremia, i.e., the right definition (multiple choice question).

122 Among the 13 different predefined PCCs, the three high-risk conditions for IE (prosthetic  
123 cardiac valve, previous IE, unrepaired cyanotic CHD) were correctly identified as PCCs at  
124 high risk for IE by at least 92% of the cardiologists (Figure 1). Mitral valve prolapse was  
125 correctly identified by 70% of the cardiologists as a PCC at moderate risk for IE; 9% of the  
126 respondents considered this condition as a PCC with a high risk of IE. All other PCCs  
127 carrying a moderate risk were correctly identified by at least 68% of the cardiologists, except  
128 tricuspid valve and functional mitral valve failures by only 49% and 36%, respectively  
129 (Figure 2). Regarding the PCCs with a low risk for IE, three of them, arterial hypertension,

130 coronary artery disease and coronary bypass, were correctly identified by at least 94% of the  
131 respondents. Regarding most particularly pacemakers and implantable cardioverter  
132 defibrillators, only 23% of the cardiologists correctly identified them as PCCs with a low risk  
133 for IE, 60% of the respondents considering pacemakers and implantable cardioverter  
134 defibrillators as PCCs with a moderate risk for IE.

135 Taken together, only 18% of the cardiologists correctly identified the risk of developing IE  
136 for all the 13 predefined PCCs.

137 Of these 13 predefined PCCs, at least 93% of the cardiologists correctly identified the three  
138 high-risk conditions for IE requiring an IE AP before an invasive dental procedure (Figure 2).

139 Regarding PCCs with a moderate risk for IE, mitral valve prolapse was correctly identified as  
140 not requiring IE AP before an invasive dental procedure by 76% of the cardiologists but 21%  
141 of the respondents overprescribed IE AP for this condition. Cardiologists overprescribed IE  
142 AP by a large amount for two other PCCs at moderate risk of IE, i.e., 30% for functional  
143 mitral valve failure and 29% for bicuspid aortic valve. Arterial hypertension, coronary artery  
144 disease and coronary bypass were identified as not requiring IE AP before an invasive dental  
145 procedure by at least 95% of the cardiologists. Regarding pacemakers and implantable  
146 cardioverter defibrillators, although classified as a PCC with a low risk for IE, 18% of  
147 cardiologists overprescribed IE AP before invasive dental procedures.

148 Taken together, only 12% of the cardiologists identified all the right indications for IE AP  
149 according to the 13 predefined PCCs,

### 150 **2.3 Knowledge of the IE AP indication in regard to dental procedures.**

151 Among seven different dental procedures, five required IE AP in high-risk patients. Three of  
152 them were correctly identified by at least 89% of the cardiologists (dental extraction, surgical  
153 management of soft tissue or bone tissue), but endodontic treatment of vital monoradicular  
154 tooth and scaling were less often recognized as warranting IE AP (73% and 65% of the

155 **respondents respectively**) (Figure 3). The two procedures that did not require IE AP  
156 (treatment of caries without pulp exposure and prosthetic preparation) were correctly  
157 identified by only 65% and 30% of the **respondents respectively**.

158 Taken together, only 25% of the cardiologists correctly identified all seven predefined dental  
159 procedures.

160 Regarding invasive dental procedures in a high-risk patient, **cardiologists** correctly prescribed  
161 more IE AP for **tooth extraction than for** endodontic treatment of a vital monoradicular tooth  
162 and scaling (**89% vs 75% vs 58%**, respectively;  $p < 0.001$ ).

163 An appropriate amoxicillin first-line prescription for IE AP was given by 90% of the  
164 respondents but only 47% according to the right schedule: a 2-g single dose 1 h before the  
165 invasive dental procedure, the main misapplication being a 3-g dosage of amoxicillin. In case  
166 of allergy to penicillin, only 15% prescribed the appropriate second-line drug (clindamycin) at  
167 the right dosage (600 mg).

#### 168 **2.4 Applicability of the current guidelines**

169 The IE AP prescription of the vast majority of the respondents (95%) was declared to be  
170 based on **ESC** current guidelines [11], whereas the remaining declared basing prescriptions on  
171 their own clinical experience. Regarding **these** guidelines, 16% of the cardiologists declared  
172 they had not changed their usual IE AP prescription from the previous 2002 guidelines of the  
173 French Society of Infectious Diseases (previously applicable guidelines by French  
174 cardiologists) [18].

#### 175 **Discussion**

176 To our knowledge, this is the first study specifically devoted to evaluating the self-assessment  
177 of **ESC** guidelines for IE prevention in a general cardiologist population. The main results  
178 showed that cardiologists were overall well aware of these recommendations. **Importantly, the**  
179 **high risk PCCs for which IE AP is recommended in case of invasive procedures, were**

180 correctly identified by the vast majority of the respondents except some seldom CHD mostly  
181 managed by cardiologists with a specialist interest. So, it is likely that cardiologists generally  
182 prescribed IE AP correctly in such patients. But significant misunderstandings were  
183 highlighted in this study. An IE AP overprescription was still recorded for some PCCs at  
184 moderate and low risk of IE, whereas some invasive dental procedures at risk of IE  
185 bacteremia were not accurately identified, inducing IE AP underprescription. Interestingly,  
186 this study provided specific areas where the training of cardiologists could be improved.  
187 This survey demonstrated that cardiologists' knowledge of the different IE risk levels  
188 according to PCCs varied greatly. The main change introduced by the ESC guidelines  
189 (endorsing 2007 AHA guidelines [14]) was the limitation of AP to a population of patients  
190 with PCCs putting them at high risk for IE. In the present study, these three PCCs were  
191 clearly identified as an indication for IE AP by at least 92% of the respondents, in accordance  
192 with other studies [15, 17]. But the good knowledge of PCCs at high risk of IE doesn't  
193 necessarily induce an appropriate management of patients at high risk of IE. In a crossover  
194 study about patients with prosthetic heart valves, Tubiana et al., highlighted that only  
195 approximately half received IE AP when undergoing an invasive dental procedure [7].  
196 Moreover, about 25% of such patients received an inappropriate IE AP prescription for a non  
197 invasive dental procedure. But whether the IE AP prescription came from cardiologists or  
198 from dentists was not recorded in this study.

199 However, in some studies, the residual IE risk of some repaired CHDs appeared variously  
200 appreciated by specialized cardiologists such as perimembranous ventricular septal defect  
201 with no residual shunt or corrected tetralogy of Fallot with no residual shunt, inducing  
202 overprescription of IE AP [15-17]. Surprisingly, some cardiologists were less likely to  
203 recommend IE AP for patients at high risk for IE, mainly because some palliated cyanotic  
204 CHD cases are classified as being at high risk of IE by some authors [15] and at low risk for

205 IE by others [16], such as Fontan palliation. However, our questionnaire was not intended to  
206 investigate such conditions. ESC guidelines appeared potentially ambiguous and need more  
207 specifications for certain cyanotic PCCs. Moreover, the responses also appeared ambiguous  
208 for PCCs with a moderate risk for IE, which no longer required IE AP for invasive dental  
209 procedures. This induced IE AP misuse, sometimes considerable, more than 30%  
210 overprescription for organic mitral valve failure or bicuspid aortic valve. Such tendencies  
211 were also recorded for rheumatic heart disease with aortic insufficiency or aortic stenosis in a  
212 limited cohort of cardiologists [11,18]. For such PCCs with a moderate risk for IE, highly  
213 experienced cardiologists were more likely not to prescribe IE AP than their less experienced  
214 counterparts [16]. We did not evidence this correlation in our study, possibly because the  
215 study reported by Patel et al. was conducted only in pediatric cardiologists less aware of some  
216 of these conditions that are more frequent in an adult population. We cannot exclude that  
217 some cardiologists had shown reluctance to discontinue IE AP in individuals who are  
218 accustomed to receiving IE AP. Recognition of the IE risk of these diseases and the fact that  
219 IE AP was unnecessary for invasive dental procedures clearly appear as specific points that  
220 could be improved in the cardiologists' training. The PCCs at low risk for IE were clearly  
221 identified and did not induced IE AP misuse except for one condition, pacemakers and  
222 implantable cardioverter defibrillators. This condition was inappropriately classified as a PCC  
223 with a moderate risk for IE by more than 70% of the respondents and was a source of IE AP  
224 overprescription by 20% of them. This is clearly another specific point to improve in the  
225 cardiologists' training. **These misuses of IE AP was pointed out by the NICE (National**  
226 **Institute for health and Clinical Excellence - that recommended complete cessation of IE AP**  
227 **whatever the IE risk in UK in 2008), to lead to a greater number of deaths through fatal**  
228 **anaphylaxis than a strategy of no AP, to favor antibiotic resistance and not to be cost-effective**  
229 **[20]. But no fatal anaphylaxis after oral amoxicillin IE AP has been recorded in France and**

230 worldwide for decades whereas alternative clindamycin AP regimen for patients allergic to  
231 penicillin could be a greater source of adverse drug reactions including fatalities [14, 21-22].  
232 A strategy of directing AP at patients at high risk of IE is likely to be cost-effective even at  
233 low rates of AP clinical effectiveness [23]. The impact of antibiotic resistance associated with  
234 IE AP has not been formally assessed but antibiotic resistance is believed to be encouraged  
235 when repeated courses of antibiotics at inadequate doses are given and is minimized by  
236 infrequent doses of antibiotics at high doses as for IE AP [24].

237 As expected, cardiologists were less accurate in the identification of invasive dental  
238 procedures inducing bacteremia than in the identification of PCCs, except tooth extraction  
239 and surgical management of soft tissue or bone tissue. It is worrying that approximately 40%  
240 of the cardiologists do not prescribe IE AP for scaling in a high-risk patient since it is a very  
241 common invasive dental procedure. It is not surprising that more specific dental procedures  
242 such as invasive endodontic treatment of vital monoradicular tooth or noninvasive treatment  
243 of caries without pulp exposure were correctly identified by a small part of the cardiologists.  
244 These mistakes probably reflect the too general definition of an invasive dental procedure in  
245 the ESC guidelines: “procedures requiring manipulation of the gingival or the periapical  
246 region of the teeth or perforation of the oral mucosa” [11]. Of course cardiologists are not  
247 dentists but they are often the first line specialists to whom patients at high risk of IE ask for  
248 information about the risk associated with some dental (and not dental) invasive procedures.  
249 Thus, it could be important that cardiologists are aware of the most frequent risky dental  
250 procedures as those that are not risky. This is also a clear point revealed in this study to  
251 improve.

252 Regarding the IE AP prescription, although the vast majority of the cardiologists correctly  
253 identified the two recommended antibiotic drugs (amoxicillin and clindamycin in case of  
254 allergy to penicillins), only 47% prescribed the right regimen of 2 g of amoxicillin or 600 mg

255 of clindamycin 1 h before the invasive dental procedure. The main misapplication was a 3-g  
256 dosage of amoxicillin (instead of 2 g in the current guidelines) accordingly to the 2002  
257 guidelines of the French Society of Infectious Diseases [18].

258 The ESC guidelines were globally considered as applicable, clear, well presented and easily  
259 accessible by a majority of the respondents. This is of huge importance given that clinicians'  
260 compliance to guidelines firstly depends on factors related to their readability [19]. **But these**  
261 **factors are not sufficient to induce a good implementation of guidelines. Assessment of the**  
262 **cardiologist compliance to the NICE guidelines in UK or in Ireland through questionnaire**  
263 **based surveys revealed that if the vast majority was aware, only a small part of them based**  
264 **their practice on these guidelines [25, 26]. Most of these cardiologists clearly feel that AP still**  
265 **has a role in certain conditions (patients with prosthetic heart valve or patients with prior IE)**  
266 **and refer to alternative guidelines in case of invasive dental procedures.**

267 This study has highlighted major differences regarding IE AP between dentists and  
268 cardiologists. As expected, PCCs and the related IE risk appear better identified by  
269 cardiologists. **A nationwide survey of French dentists' knowledge and implementation of**  
270 **current guidelines for antibiotic prophylaxis of infective endocarditis in patients with**  
271 **predisposing cardiac conditions showed that** high risk for IE are recognized by both  
272 specialties, but dentists clearly identify unrepaired cyanotic CHD less easily [13]. This  
273 difference is also recorded in the Anguita et al. study [27], probably due to dentists not having  
274 knowledge of this type of heart disease, whose incidence is increasing in the general  
275 population because of improved survival. PCCs with low and moderate risk for IE that no  
276 longer require IE AP also appear better identified by cardiologists except for pacemakers and  
277 implantable cardioverter defibrillators, better identified by dentists [13]. Interestingly, this  
278 specific finding is also recorded in the Anguita et al. study [27]. Targeted information on this  
279 specific point is needed in training for cardiologists.

280 As expected, dentists identify invasive dental procedures better, whether or not they require  
281 IE AP [13]. This could be explained by the exhaustiveness of the guidelines for dentists. The  
282 2011 ANSM guidelines endorsed the ESC 2009 guidelines but added a large descriptive  
283 section regarding invasive dental procedures [12]. This study underscores that cardiologists  
284 have to be better informed about the most frequent invasive dental procedures such as scaling.  
285 The misunderstandings we observed led to more declarations of IE AP overprescription from  
286 cardiologists for noninvasive dental procedures and more underprescription for invasive  
287 dental procedures compared to dentists [13].

288 In this study, the cardiologists had a hospital-based practice more frequently than did the  
289 dentists, who worked more often in individual primary-care private practice [13]. This  
290 difference may in part explain the discrepancies in the knowledge of the current guidelines  
291 **between both specialists, dentists knowing less well their dedicated guidelines [13].** Hospital  
292 practitioners are generally more aware of new developments, keep informed on a regular basis  
293 by attending conferences more frequently and become more involved in writing or  
294 disseminating recommendations to colleagues and students. Moreover, they are more often in  
295 charge of patients at risk for IE.

296 This study has a number of unavoidable methodological drawbacks, as do most survey studies  
297 examining self-assessment of guideline implementation. Only FSC members, accounting for  
298 approximately 32% of the French cardiologist population, were questioned [28]. Despite the  
299 low 12.3% true response rate to this online survey, the number of these responses made this  
300 study one of the most reliable. Even though only 243 responses were included in this survey,  
301 the profile of the respondents is roughly comparable to that of the French cardiologist  
302 population according to gender and age distributions [29]. It can also be questioned to what  
303 extent questionnaire respondents were those who knew the ESC guidelines best, which may  
304 have resulted in an overestimation of guideline implementation. Moreover, it should be

305 underlined that both surveys were conducted at different times after guideline publications.  
306 The present cardiologists' survey was conducted 5 years after the 2009 ESC guidelines were  
307 published, whereas the dentists' survey was carried out only 1 year after the 2011 ANSM  
308 guidelines appeared. This was probably not long enough for a full completion of new  
309 guidelines because adoption of new habits always requires time [29].

310 Despite these limitations, this prospective study is the largest and the most detailed survey to  
311 date on IE AP in a general cardiologists' population.

312 In conclusion, although IE incidence has not increased in France since the restriction of IE AP  
313 [30], the interpretation of this result is confusing given the low level of **complete**  
314 implementation of ESC guidelines revealed by this survey. It is crucial to improve compliance  
315 with current guidelines by sustaining continuous medical education in the training of French  
316 cardiologists, particularly on specific areas revealed by this survey: **regular dedicated sessions**  
317 **are organized during international, national and local meetings and guidelines and information**  
318 **are easily available on several websites** ([www.escardio.org](http://www.escardio.org), [www.endocardite.org](http://www.endocardite.org),  
319 [www.cardio-online.fr](http://www.cardio-online.fr), [www.fedecardio.org](http://www.fedecardio.org)). It also seems necessary to strengthen the  
320 dialogue between cardiologists and dentists and organize shared education sessions. Only then  
321 can the relevance of such guidelines be properly assessed.

## 322 **Acknowledgments**

323 We thank Béatrice Guyomarc'h-Delassale for statistical analysis. We also thank the French  
324 Society of Cardiology for its logistical support and providing access to the French Society of  
325 Cardiology member database for sending the questionnaire and collecting the responses.

326

327 **References**

- 328 [1] Hoen B, Duval X. Infective Endocarditis. *N Engl J Med* 2013; 368:1425-1433.
- 329 [2] Horder TJ. Infective endocarditis with an analysis of 150 cases and with special reference  
330 to the chronic form of the disease. *QJM* 1909; 2:289-324.
- 331 [3] Selton-Suty C, Célard M, Le Moing V et al. Preeminence of *Staphylococcus aureus* in  
332 infective endocarditis: a 1-year population-based survey. *Clin Infect Dis* 2012; 54:1230-1239.
- 333 [4] Jones T, Baumgartner L, Bellows M et al. Prevention of rheumatic fever and bacterial  
334 endocarditis through control of streptococcal infections - Committee on Prevention of  
335 Rheumatic Fever and Bacterial Endocarditis. *Circulation* 1955; 11:317-320.
- 336 [5] Lacassin F, Hoen B, Leport C et al. Procedures associated with infective endocarditis in  
337 adults. A case control study. *Eur Heart J* 1995; 16:1968-1974.
- 338 [6] Duval X, Millot S, Chirouze C et al. Oral Streptococci endocarditis, oral hygien habits and  
339 recent dental procedures: a case control study. *Clin Infect Dis* 2017; 64:1678-1685.
- 340 [7] Tubiana S, Blotière PO, Hoen B et al. Dental procedures, antibiotic prophylaxis, and  
341 endocarditis among people with prosthetic heart valve: nationwide population based cohort  
342 and a case crossover study. *BMJ* 2017; 358:j3776.doi:10.1136/bmj.j3776.
- 343 [8] Imperiale TF, Horwitz RI. Does prophylaxis prevent postdental infective endocarditis. A  
344 controlled evaluation of protective efficacy. *Am J Med* 1990; 88:131-136.
- 345 [9] Van der Meer JT, Van Wijk W, Thompson J, Vandembroucke JP, Valkenburg HA, Michel  
346 MF. Efficacy of antibiotic prophylaxis for protection of native-valve endocarditis. *Lancet*  
347 1992; 339:135-139.
- 348 [10] Strom BL, Abrutyn E, Berlin JA et al. Dental and cardiac risk factors for infective  
349 endocarditis. A population-based case control study. *Ann Intern Med* 1998; 129:761-769.

350 [11] Habib G, Lancellotti P, Antunes MJ et al. 2015 ESC Guidelines for the management of  
351 infective endocarditis: The Task Force for the Management of Infective Endocarditis of the  
352 European Society of Cardiology (ESC). *Eur Heart J* 2015; 36:3075-3123.

353 [12] Agence Nationale de Sécurité du Médicament et des produits de santé. Prescription des  
354 antibiotiques en pratique bucco-dentaire. [Antibiotic prescription in dental and oral surgery :  
355 guidelines] ANSM 2011; [http://ansm.sante.fr/Mediatheque/Publications/Recommandations-](http://ansm.sante.fr/Mediatheque/Publications/Recommandations-Medicaments)  
356 [Medicaments](http://ansm.sante.fr/Mediatheque/Publications/Recommandations-Medicaments) [Accessed on July 16, 2018].

357 [13] Cloitre A, Duval X, Hoen B, Alla F, Lesclous P. A nationwide survey of French dentists’  
358 knowledge and implementation of current guidelines for antibiotic prophylaxis of infective  
359 endocarditis in patients with predisposing cardiac conditions. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol*  
360 *Oral Radiol.* 2017; 125:295-303.

361 [14] Wilson W, Taubert KA, Gewitz M et al. Prevention of infective endocarditis: Guidelines  
362 from the American Heart Association. *Circulation* 2007; 116:1736-1754.

363 [15] Pharis CS, Conway J, Warren AE, Bullock A, Mackie AS. The impact of 2007 infective  
364 endocarditis prophylaxis guidelines on the practice of congenital heart disease specialists. *Am*  
365 *Heart J* 2011; 161:123-129.

366 [16] Patel J, Kupferman F, Rapaport S, Kern JH. Preprocedure prophylaxis against  
367 endocarditis among united states pediatric cardiologists. *Pediatr Cardiol* 2014; 35:1220-1224.

368 [17] Grattan MJ, Power A, Fruitman DS, Islam S, Mackie AS. The impact of infective  
369 endocarditis prophylaxis recommendations on the practices of pediatric and adult congenital  
370 cardiologists. *Can J Cardiol* 2015; 31(12):1497.e23-28.

371 [18] Société de Pathologie Infectieuse de Langue Française. Prophylaxie de l’endocardite  
372 infectieuse. Révision de la conférence de consensus de mars 1992. Recommandations 2002.

373 [Prophylaxis of infective endocarditis. Updating of the consensus conference of March 1992.  
374 2002 guidelines]. *Med Mal Inf* 2002; 32:542-552.

375 [19] Saillour-Glenisson F, Michel P. [Individual and collective factors associated to the  
376 implementation of clinical guidelines by the healthcare providers : literature review] *Rev*  
377 *Epidemiol Sante Publique France* 2003; 51:65-80.

378 [20] National Institute for health and Care Excellence. Guideline 064 - Prophylaxis against  
379 infective endocarditis. NICE 2008. <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg64>. [Accessed on  
380 January 18, 2018].

381 [21] Cloitre A, Duval X, Tubiana S et al. Antibiotic prophylaxis for the prevention of  
382 infective endocarditis for dental procedures is not associated with fatal adverse drug reactions  
383 in France. *Med Oral Patol Oral Cir Bucal* 2019;doi:10.4317/medoral.22818.

384 [22] Thornhill MH, Dayer MJ, Prendergast B et al. Incidence and nature of adverse reactions  
385 to antibiotics used as endocarditis prophylaxis. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2015;70:2382–2388.

386 [23] Franklin M, Wailoo A, Dayer MJ et al. The cost-effectiveness of antibiotic prophylaxis  
387 for patients at risk of infective endocarditis. *Circulation* 2016;134:1568-1578.

388 [24] Opatowski L, Mandel J, Varon E et al. Antibiotic dose impact on resistance selection in  
389 the community: a mathematical model of beta-lactams and streptococcus pneumoniae  
390 dynamics. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2010;54:2330-2337.

391 [25] Dayer MJ, Chambers JB, Prendergast B, Sandoe JAT, Thornhill MH. NICE guidance on  
392 antibiotic prophylaxis to prevent infective endocarditis: a survey of clinicians' attitudes. *Q J*  
393 *Med* 2013;doi:10.1093/qjmed/hcs235.

394 [26] Ni Riordáin R, McCreary C. NICE guideline on antibiotic prophylaxis against infective  
395 endocarditis: attitudes to the guideline and implications for dental practice in Ireland. *Br Dent*

396 J 2009;206E11.

397

398 [27] Anguita P, Castillo B, Gámez P. Behavior of health professionals concerning the  
399 recommendations for prophylaxis for infectious endocarditis in our setting: are the guidelines  
400 followed? Rev Clin Esp 2017; 217:79-86.

401 [28] Direction de la Recherche des Etudes de l'Evaluation et des Statistiques. Effectifs des  
402 médecins par spécialité. DREES 2018; [www.data.drees.sante.gouv.fr](http://www.data.drees.sante.gouv.fr) [Accessed on July31,  
403 2018].

404 [29] Zadik Y, Findler M, Livne S, Levin L, Elad S. Dentists' knowledge and implementation  
405 of the 2007 American Heart Association guidelines for prevention of infective endocarditis.  
406 Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod 2008; 106: e16-19.

407 [30] Duval X, Delahaye F, Alla F et al. Temporal trends in infective endocarditis in the  
408 context of prophylaxis guideline modifications: Three successive population-based surveys. J  
409 Am Coll Cardiol 2012; 59:1968-1976.

410

411 **Figure legends**

412 Figure 1: Identification by cardiologists of infective endocarditis (IE) risk for patients with  
413 various cardiac conditions according to the current ESC guidelines. % Values in the  
414 histograms underlined the correct rate answer. CHD: cyanotic heart diseases; RHD: rheumatic  
415 heart disease; ICD: implantable cardioverter defibrillators; CABG: coronary artery bypass  
416 grafting.

417 Figure 2: Identification by cardiologists of indications for infective endocarditis (IE)  
418 antibiotic prophylaxis for various cardiac conditions according to the current ESC guidelines.  
419 % Values in the histograms underlined the correct rate answer. CHD: cyanotic heart diseases;  
420 RHD: rheumatic heart disease; ICD: implantable cardioverter defibrillators; CABG: coronary  
421 artery bypass grafting.

422 Figure 3: Identification by cardiologists of dental procedures requiring or not antibiotic  
423 prophylaxis for a patient with a valvular prosthesis according to the current ESC guidelines.  
424 % Values in the histograms underlined the correct rate answer. CHD ET: endodontic  
425 treatment.

426





