Prophylaxis of Infective Endocarditis in Dentistry: Analysis of the Situation After Almost a Decade of Clinical Practice Guidelines. Response

Análisis de la situación de la profilaxis de la endocarditis infecciosa en odontología tras casi una década de guías de práctica clínica. Respuesta

To the Editor,

We appreciate the interest and comments of Silva Conde et al. regarding our article.[1] In fact, they published an article in 2012 in *Revista Española de Cardiología* on how closely dentists followed the recommendations on infectious endocarditis (IE) prophylaxis.[2] Their results were similar to those of our study, carried out 6 years later.[1] Indeed, we cited their study in a previous article in which we compared IE prophylaxis approaches in different healthcare professionals (dentists, primary care physicians, and cardiologists) in Cordoba.[3]

Prophylaxis should be avoided in patients with no indication (those with atrial fibrillation, stents, or coronary artery bypass grafting). However, in other situations such as native valve disease or mitral prolapse, we believe that caution should be exercised, as several very recent studies[4,5] indicate a high risk of IE in these conditions. In one Spanish study,[5] the incidence of *Streptococcus viridans* IE was higher in patients with a bicuspid aortic valve and mitral prolapse than in those with conditions considered moderate or high risk. Another study also reported a high incidence of IE after invasive procedures (transfusions, coronary surgery, bronchoscopy, dialysis),[4] which contradicts current recommendations.

In conclusion, we should avoid misuse of antibiotics in situations that are clearly no-risk, but exercise caution in light of the new evidence that the risk of IE in moderate-risk cardiac disease (essentially valve disease and congenital heart disease) may be higher than previously thought.

Paula Anguita,[a,b] Juan C. Castillo,[a] Manuela Herrera,[c] and Manuel Anguita[a,b,*]

[a]*Servicio de Cardiología, Hospital Universitario Reina Sofía, Córdoba, Spain*
[b]*Instituto Cardiodental, Córdoba, Spain*
[c]*Facultad de Odontología, Universidad de Sevilla, Sevilla, Spain*

*Corresponding author:
E-mail address: manuelanguita@secardiologia.es (M. Anguita).

Available online 5 October 2018

REFERENCES

1. Anguita P, Anguita M, Castillo JC, Gámez P, Bonilla V, Herrera M. Are dentists in our environment correctly following recommended guidelines for prophylaxis of infective endocarditis? *Rev Esp Cardiol.* 2019;72:86–88.
2. Torres F, Renilla A, Flórez JP, Secades S, Benito EM, de la Hera JM. Knowledge of infective endocarditis prophylaxis among Spanish dentists. *Rev Esp Cardiol.* 2012;65:1134–1135.
3. Castillo F, Castillo JC, Anguita P, Roldán R, Gámez P, Anguita M. Do we follow recomendations on infective endocarditis prophylaxis? Differences between health professionals involved. *Aten Primaria.* 2017;49:198–200.
4. Janzky I, Gemes K, Ahnve S, Asgeirsson H, Moller J. Invasive procedures associated with development of infective endocarditis. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2018. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.JACC.2018.03.532
5. Zefri-Reiriz I, deAlarcon A, Muñoz P, et al. Infective endocarditis in patients with bicuspid aortic valve or mitral valve prolapse. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2018;71:2731–2740.

SEE RELATED CONTENT:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rec.2018.07.013

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rec.2018.07.018
1885-5857/

Use of Oral Anticoagulation for Patients With Atrial Fibrillation and End-stage Renal Disease: What Is Needed Nowadays?

Anticoagulación oral en pacientes con fibrilación auricular e insuficiencia renal terminal: ¿qué es lo más apropiado?

To the Editor,

Patients with atrial fibrillation (AF) and end-stage renal disease (ESRD) are at greater risk for stroke. However, it remains controversial whether anticoagulation is of benefit in these patients due to the high bleeding risk. In *Revista Española de Cardiología*, Mahmood and Lip published an article on anticoagulation therapy in AF patients with ESRD.[1] Some points should be further discussed.

The CHA_2DS_2-VAS_C score is broadly used for predicting the risk of ischemic stroke in patients with AF. However, it has not been validated in patients with ESRD and AF. Other proposed risk score algorithms that include chronic kidney disease in the model, such as the R_2CHADS_2 score, have shown no added value.[2] Recently, Chao et al.[3] reported that the CHA_2DS_2-VAS_C score was useful in predicting ischemic stroke in AF patients with ESRD. However, the authors suggested that anticoagulant therapy may be suitable for these patients when CHA_2DS_2-VAS_C score ≥ 6, due to the greater risk of bleeding. Based on these studies, there is a need to develop a specific scoring system for anticoagulation in AF patients with ESRD. If the CHA_2DS_2-VAS_C score is used, the cutpoint for recommendation of anticoagulation in ESRD should be further evaluated.

The article by Mahmood and Lip states that there is more evidence supporting warfarin for its use in AF patients with ESRD. However, observational studies have shown that the use of warfarin was not associated with a reduction in stroke risk or mortality in AF patients with ESRD, but with greater bleeding risk.[4] The lack of data on quality of warfarin anticoagulation (eg, time in therapeutic range) may be a potential confounder in such observational studies. However, in real-world clinical practice, the target of time in therapeutic range is hard to achieve in patients with ESRD. Currently, given the lack of clear evidence, the European Heart Rhythm Association does not provide any recommendations,[5] whereas the Kidney Disease: Improving Global Outcomes (KDIGO) consensus[6] caution against the routine use of any oral anticoagulation therapy in AF patients with ESRD. Given the lack of randomized control trials, anticoagulation therapy (using warfarin or any nonvitamin K antagonist oral anticoagulants) for AF patients with ESRD is still a matter of debate.

Nowadays, apixaban is approved for use in AF patients with ESRD by the Food and Drug Administration, but not in other contexts. A retrospective cohort study showed that there was no difference in the risks of stroke between apixaban and warfarin, but apixaban was associated with a lower risk of major bleeding.[7] As mentioned in the article by Mahmood and Lip, 2 ongoing randomized control trials,[4] the RENAL-AF and AXADIA study, are evaluating the safety and efficacy of apixaban vs warfarin or phenprocoumon, respectively.