1	
2	
3	
4	Prophylaxis against infective endocarditis
5	
6	
7	
8	NICE guideline: short version
9	Draft for consultation, May 2015
10	
	If you wish to comment on this version of the guideline, please be aware that
	all the supporting information and evidence is contained in the 2015 guideline
	addendum.
11	
12	
12	

Contents

15	Int	roduction	3
16	Pa	tient-centred care	5
17	Stı	rength of recommendations	6
		odate information	
19	1	Recommendations	8
20	2	Research recommendations	10
21	3	Other information	11
22	4	Standing Committee and NICE staff	13

23

24 Introduction

25	Infective endocarditis is a rare condition with significant morbidity and
26	mortality. It may arise after bacteraemia in a person with a predisposing
27	cardiac lesion.
28	In the past, people at risk of infective endocarditis were given antibiotic
29	prophylaxis before dental and certain non-dental interventional procedures.
30	However, the British Society for Antimicrobial Chemotherapy <u>Guidelines for</u>
31	the prevention of endocarditis (2006) and the American Heart Association
32	guideline Prevention of infective endocarditis (2007) recommended changes
33	in clinical practice that aimed to limit the use of antibiotic prophylaxis in people
34	having these procedures.
35	In 2008 NICE published a guideline to give clear, evidence-based guidance
36	on best clinical practice for prophylaxis against infective endocarditis in people
37	having dental and certain non-dental interventional procedures. The guideline
38	recommended that people at risk of infective endocarditis having
39	interventional procedures (dental procedures, upper and lower respiratory
40	tract procedures, upper and lower gastrointestinal tract procedures,
41	genitourinary tract procedures) should not be offered antibiotic prophylaxis
42	against infective endocarditis. It also recommended which patients with pre-
43	existing cardiac lesions should be regarded as at risk. These
44	recommendations marked a further change from accepted practice.
45	The incidence of infective endocarditis has been shown to be increasing over
46	time. The reasons for this are not well understood. However, in 2014 the
47	Lancet published a paper that reported an increase in cases of infective
48	endocarditis from 2000 to 2013, which showed a higher rate of increase
49	following the publication of the NICE guideline (Incidence of infective
50	endocarditis in England, 2000-13 Dayer MJ et al). In light of this paper, NICE
51	felt it was important to assess any new evidence published since the 2008
52	NICE guideline.

53 Recommendations about medicines

- 54 The guideline will assume that prescribers will use a medicine's summary of
- product characteristics to inform decisions made with individual patients.

Patient-centred care

58	i his guideline offers best practice advice on antimicrobial prophylaxis against
59	infective endocarditis before an interventional procedure for adults and
60	children in primary dental care, primary medical care, secondary care and
61	care in community settings.
62	Patients and healthcare professionals have rights and responsibilities as set
63	out in the NHS Constitution for England – all NICE guidance is written to
64	reflect these. Treatment and care should take into account individual needs
65	and preferences. Patients should have the opportunity to make informed
66	decisions about their care and treatment, in partnership with their healthcare
67	professionals. If the patient is under 16, their family or carers should also be
68	given information and support to help the child or young person to make
69	decisions about their treatment. Healthcare professionals should follow the
70	Department of Health's advice on consent. If someone does not have capacity
71	to make decisions, healthcare professionals should follow the code of practice
72	that accompanies the Mental Capacity Act and the supplementary code of
73	practice on deprivation of liberty safeguards.
74	NICE has produced guidance on the components of good patient experience
75	in adult NHS services. All healthcare professionals should follow the
76	recommendations in Patient experience in adult NHS services.
77	If a young person is moving between paediatric and adult services, care
78	should be planned and managed according to the best practice guidance
79	described in the Department of Health's Transition: getting it right for young
80	people.
81	Adult and paediatric healthcare teams should work jointly to provide
82	assessment and services to young people at risk of infective endocarditis.
83	Management should be reviewed throughout the transition process, and there
84	should be clarity about who is the lead clinician to ensure continuity of care.

86

Strength of recommendations

Guideline Committee makes a recommendation based on the trade-off between the benefits and harms of an intervention, taking into account quality of the underpinning evidence. For some interventions, the Guid Committee is confident that, given the information it has looked at, most patients would choose the intervention. The wording used in the recommendations in this guideline denotes the certainty with which the recommendation is made (the strength of the recommendation). For all recommendations, NICE expects that there is discussion with the patient about the risks and benefits of the interventions, and their value preferences. This discussion aims to help them to reach a fully informed decision (see also 'Patient-centred care'). Interventions that must (or must not) be used We usually use 'must' or 'must not' only if there is a legal duty to apply recommendation. Occasionally we use 'must' (or 'must not') if the consequences of not following the recommendation could be extremely serious or potentially life threatening. Interventions that should (or should not) be used — a 'still recommendation that an intervention should be used are made when confident that, for the vast majority of patients, an intervention will do not good than harm, and be cost effective. Similarly, we recommend that a intervention should not be used when we are confident that an intervention to be of benefit for most patients. Interventions that could be used Recommendations that an intervention could be used are made when the confident that an intervention will do more good than harm for most patients.		
between the benefits and harms of an intervention, taking into account quality of the underpinning evidence. For some interventions, the Guid Committee is confident that, given the information it has looked at, most patients would choose the intervention. The wording used in the recommendations in this guideline denotes the certainty with which the recommendation is made (the strength of the recommendation). For all recommendations, NICE expects that there is discussion with the patient about the risks and benefits of the interventions, and their value preferences. This discussion aims to help them to reach a fully informed decision (see also 'Patient-centred care'). Interventions that must (or must not) be used We usually use 'must' or 'must not' only if there is a legal duty to apply recommendation. Occasionally we use 'must' (or 'must not') if the consequences of not following the recommendation could be extremely serious or potentially life threatening. Interventions that should (or should not) be used — a 'stire recommendation that an intervention should be used are made when confident that, for the vast majority of patients, an intervention will do not good than harm, and be cost effective. Similarly, we recommend that a intervention should not be used when we are confident that an intervention not be of benefit for most patients. Interventions that could be used Recommendations that an intervention could be used are made when confident that an intervention will do more good than harm for most patients confident that an intervention will do more good than harm for most patients.	37	Some recommendations can be made with more certainty than others. The
quality of the underpinning evidence. For some interventions, the Guid Committee is confident that, given the information it has looked at, mos patients would choose the intervention. The wording used in the recommendations in this guideline denotes the certainty with which the recommendation is made (the strength of the recommendation). For all recommendations, NICE expects that there is discussion with th patient about the risks and benefits of the interventions, and their value preferences. This discussion aims to help them to reach a fully informed decision (see also 'Patient-centred care'). Interventions that must (or must not) be used We usually use 'must' or 'must not' only if there is a legal duty to apply recommendation. Occasionally we use 'must' (or 'must not') if the consequences of not following the recommendation could be extremely serious or potentially life threatening. Interventions that should (or should not) be used — a 'sti recommendation Recommendations that an intervention should be used are made when confident that, for the vast majority of patients, an intervention will do n good than harm, and be cost effective. Similarly, we recommend that a intervention should not be used when we are confident that an intervent not be of benefit for most patients. Interventions that could be used Recommendations that an intervention could be used are made when confident that an intervention will do more good than harm for most patients Recommendations that an intervention could be used are made when	38	Guideline Committee makes a recommendation based on the trade-off
Committee is confident that, given the information it has looked at, most patients would choose the intervention. The wording used in the recommendations in this guideline denotes the certainty with which the recommendation is made (the strength of the recommendation). For all recommendations, NICE expects that there is discussion with the patient about the risks and benefits of the interventions, and their value preferences. This discussion aims to help them to reach a fully informed decision (see also 'Patient-centred care'). Interventions that must (or must not) be used We usually use 'must' or 'must not' only if there is a legal duty to apply recommendation. Occasionally we use 'must' (or 'must not') if the consequences of not following the recommendation could be extremely serious or potentially life threatening. Interventions that should (or should not) be used — a 'stirecommendation Recommendations that an intervention should be used are made when confident that, for the vast majority of patients, an intervention will do not good than harm, and be cost effective. Similarly, we recommend that a intervention should not be used when we are confident that an intervention to be of benefit for most patients. Interventions that could be used Recommendations that an intervention could be used are made when confident that an intervention will do more good than harm for most patients.	39	between the benefits and harms of an intervention, taking into account the
patients would choose the intervention. The wording used in the recommendations in this guideline denotes the certainty with which the recommendation is made (the strength of the recommendation). For all recommendations, NICE expects that there is discussion with th patient about the risks and benefits of the interventions, and their value preferences. This discussion aims to help them to reach a fully informe decision (see also 'Patient-centred care'). Interventions that must (or must not) be used We usually use 'must' or 'must not' only if there is a legal duty to apply recommendation. Occasionally we use 'must' (or 'must not') if the consequences of not following the recommendation could be extremely serious or potentially life threatening. Interventions that should (or should not) be used — a 'sti recommendation Recommendations that an intervention should be used are made when confident that, for the vast majority of patients, an intervention will do n good than harm, and be cost effective. Similarly, we recommend that a intervention should not be used when we are confident that an interver not be of benefit for most patients. Interventions that could be used Recommendations that an intervention could be used are made when confident that an intervention will do more good than harm for most patients confident that an intervention will do more good than harm for most patients	90	quality of the underpinning evidence. For some interventions, the Guideline
recommendations in this guideline denotes the certainty with which the recommendation is made (the strength of the recommendation). For all recommendations, NICE expects that there is discussion with the patient about the risks and benefits of the interventions, and their value preferences. This discussion aims to help them to reach a fully informed decision (see also 'Patient-centred care'). Interventions that must (or must not) be used We usually use 'must' or 'must not' only if there is a legal duty to apply recommendation. Occasionally we use 'must' (or 'must not') if the consequences of not following the recommendation could be extremely serious or potentially life threatening. Interventions that should (or should not) be used — a 'started recommendation Recommendation Recommendations that an intervention should be used are made when confident that, for the vast majority of patients, an intervention will do not good than harm, and be cost effective. Similarly, we recommend that a intervention should not be used when we are confident that an intervention to be of benefit for most patients. Interventions that could be used Recommendations that an intervention could be used are made when confident that an intervention will do more good than harm for most patients.	91	Committee is confident that, given the information it has looked at, most
recommendation is made (the strength of the recommendation). For all recommendations, NICE expects that there is discussion with the patient about the risks and benefits of the interventions, and their value preferences. This discussion aims to help them to reach a fully informed decision (see also 'Patient-centred care'). Interventions that must (or must not) be used We usually use 'must' or 'must not' only if there is a legal duty to apply recommendation. Occasionally we use 'must' (or 'must not') if the consequences of not following the recommendation could be extremely serious or potentially life threatening. Interventions that should (or should not) be used — a 'started recommendation Recommendation Recommendations that an intervention should be used are made when good than harm, and be cost effective. Similarly, we recommend that a intervention should not be used when we are confident that an intervention on the of benefit for most patients. Interventions that could be used Recommendations that an intervention could be used are made when confident that an intervention will do more good than harm for most patients.	92	patients would choose the intervention. The wording used in the
For all recommendations, NICE expects that there is discussion with the patient about the risks and benefits of the interventions, and their value preferences. This discussion aims to help them to reach a fully informed decision (see also 'Patient-centred care'). Interventions that must (or must not) be used We usually use 'must' or 'must not' only if there is a legal duty to apply recommendation. Occasionally we use 'must' (or 'must not') if the consequences of not following the recommendation could be extremely serious or potentially life threatening. Interventions that should (or should not) be used — a 'stare recommendation Recommendation Recommendations that an intervention should be used are made when good than harm, and be cost effective. Similarly, we recommend that a intervention should not be used when we are confident that an intervention to be of benefit for most patients. Interventions that could be used Recommendations that an intervention could be used are made when confident that an intervention will do more good than harm for most patients.	93	recommendations in this guideline denotes the certainty with which the
patient about the risks and benefits of the interventions, and their value preferences. This discussion aims to help them to reach a fully informed decision (see also 'Patient-centred care'). Interventions that must (or must not) be used We usually use 'must' or 'must not' only if there is a legal duty to apply recommendation. Occasionally we use 'must' (or 'must not') if the consequences of not following the recommendation could be extremely serious or potentially life threatening. Interventions that should (or should not) be used — a 'star recommendation Recommendation Recommendations that an intervention should be used are made when confident that, for the vast majority of patients, an intervention will do not good than harm, and be cost effective. Similarly, we recommend that a intervention should not be used when we are confident that an interver not be of benefit for most patients. Interventions that could be used Recommendations that an intervention could be used are made when confident that an intervention will do more good than harm for most patients.	94	recommendation is made (the strength of the recommendation).
preferences. This discussion aims to help them to reach a fully informed decision (see also 'Patient-centred care'). Interventions that must (or must not) be used We usually use 'must' or 'must not' only if there is a legal duty to apply recommendation. Occasionally we use 'must' (or 'must not') if the consequences of not following the recommendation could be extremely serious or potentially life threatening. Interventions that should (or should not) be used — a 'stire recommendation Recommendation Recommendations that an intervention should be used are made wher confident that, for the vast majority of patients, an intervention will do not good than harm, and be cost effective. Similarly, we recommend that a intervention should not be used when we are confident that an intervention to be of benefit for most patients. Interventions that could be used Recommendations that an intervention could be used are made when confident that an intervention will do more good than harm for most patients.	95	For all recommendations, NICE expects that there is discussion with the
100 We usually use 'must' or 'must not' only if there is a legal duty to apply recommendation. Occasionally we use 'must' (or 'must not') if the consequences of not following the recommendation could be extremely serious or potentially life threatening. 104 Interventions that should (or should not) be used – a 'star recommendation 105 Recommendation 106 Recommendation 107 Recommendation that an intervention should be used are made where confident that, for the vast majority of patients, an intervention will do not good than harm, and be cost effective. Similarly, we recommend that a intervention should not be used when we are confident that an intervention to be of benefit for most patients. 111 Interventions that could be used 112 Recommendations that an intervention could be used are made when confident that an intervention will do more good than harm for most patients.	96	patient about the risks and benefits of the interventions, and their values and
We usually use 'must' or 'must not' only if there is a legal duty to apply recommendation. Occasionally we use 'must' (or 'must not') if the consequences of not following the recommendation could be extremely serious or potentially life threatening. Interventions that should (or should not) be used – a 'stire recommendation Recommendation Recommendations that an intervention should be used are made where confident that, for the vast majority of patients, an intervention will do not good than harm, and be cost effective. Similarly, we recommend that a intervention should not be used when we are confident that an intervention to be of benefit for most patients. Interventions that could be used Recommendations that an intervention could be used are made when confident that an intervention will do more good than harm for most patients.	97	preferences. This discussion aims to help them to reach a fully informed
We usually use 'must' or 'must not' only if there is a legal duty to apply recommendation. Occasionally we use 'must' (or 'must not') if the consequences of not following the recommendation could be extremely serious or potentially life threatening. Interventions that should (or should not) be used — a 'sture recommendation Recommendation Recommendations that an intervention should be used are made when confident that, for the vast majority of patients, an intervention will do not good than harm, and be cost effective. Similarly, we recommend that a intervention should not be used when we are confident that an intervention to be of benefit for most patients. Interventions that could be used Recommendations that an intervention could be used are made when confident that an intervention will do more good than harm for most patients.	98	decision (see also 'Patient-centred care').
recommendation. Occasionally we use 'must' (or 'must not') if the consequences of not following the recommendation could be extremely serious or potentially life threatening. Interventions that should (or should not) be used – a 'stu recommendation Recommendations that an intervention should be used are made when confident that, for the vast majority of patients, an intervention will do n good than harm, and be cost effective. Similarly, we recommend that a intervention should not be used when we are confident that an interven not be of benefit for most patients. Interventions that could be used Recommendations that an intervention could be used are made when confident that an intervention will do more good than harm for most patients.	99	Interventions that must (or must not) be used
consequences of not following the recommendation could be extremely serious or potentially life threatening. Interventions that should (or should not) be used – a 'start' recommendation Recommendations that an intervention should be used are made wher confident that, for the vast majority of patients, an intervention will do not good than harm, and be cost effective. Similarly, we recommend that a intervention should not be used when we are confident that an intervention to be of benefit for most patients. Interventions that could be used Recommendations that an intervention could be used are made when confident that an intervention will do more good than harm for most patients.	00	We usually use 'must' or 'must not' only if there is a legal duty to apply the
Interventions that should (or should not) be used – a 'state to recommendation Recommendations that an intervention should be used are made where confident that, for the vast majority of patients, an intervention will do not good than harm, and be cost effective. Similarly, we recommend that a intervention should not be used when we are confident that an intervention not be of benefit for most patients. Interventions that could be used Recommendations that an intervention could be used are made when confident that an intervention will do more good than harm for most patients.)1	recommendation. Occasionally we use 'must' (or 'must not') if the
Interventions that should (or should not) be used – a 'state 105 recommendation Recommendations that an intervention should be used are made where 107 confident that, for the vast majority of patients, an intervention will do not 108 good than harm, and be cost effective. Similarly, we recommend that a 109 intervention should not be used when we are confident that an intervention not be of benefit for most patients. Interventions that could be used Recommendations that an intervention could be used are made when 113 confident that an intervention will do more good than harm for most patients.)2	consequences of not following the recommendation could be extremely
recommendation Recommendations that an intervention should be used are made wher confident that, for the vast majority of patients, an intervention will do not good than harm, and be cost effective. Similarly, we recommend that a intervention should not be used when we are confident that an intervention not be of benefit for most patients. Interventions that could be used Recommendations that an intervention could be used are made when confident that an intervention will do more good than harm for most particularly.	03	serious or potentially life threatening.
Recommendations that an intervention should be used are made wher confident that, for the vast majority of patients, an intervention will do not good than harm, and be cost effective. Similarly, we recommend that a intervention should not be used when we are confident that an intervention not be of benefit for most patients. Interventions that could be used Recommendations that an intervention could be used are made when confident that an intervention will do more good than harm for most particularly.)4	Interventions that should (or should not) be used – a 'strong'
confident that, for the vast majority of patients, an intervention will do no good than harm, and be cost effective. Similarly, we recommend that a intervention should not be used when we are confident that an intervention not be of benefit for most patients. Interventions that could be used Recommendations that an intervention could be used are made when confident that an intervention will do more good than harm for most particular.)5	recommendation
good than harm, and be cost effective. Similarly, we recommend that a intervention should not be used when we are confident that an intervention not be of benefit for most patients. Interventions that could be used Recommendations that an intervention could be used are made when confident that an intervention will do more good than harm for most particular.)6	Recommendations that an intervention should be used are made when we are
intervention should not be used when we are confident that an intervention not be of benefit for most patients. Interventions that could be used Recommendations that an intervention could be used are made when confident that an intervention will do more good than harm for most particular.	07	confident that, for the vast majority of patients, an intervention will do more
 not be of benefit for most patients. <i>Interventions that could be used</i> Recommendations that an intervention could be used are made when confident that an intervention will do more good than harm for most part 	38	good than harm, and be cost effective. Similarly, we recommend that an
Interventions that could be used Recommendations that an intervention could be used are made when confident that an intervention will do more good than harm for most par)9	intervention should not be used when we are confident that an intervention will
Recommendations that an intervention could be used are made when confident that an intervention will do more good than harm for most particle.	10	not be of benefit for most patients.
confident that an intervention will do more good than harm for most par	11	Interventions that could be used
	12	Recommendations that an intervention could be used are made when we are
and be cost effective, but other options may be similarly cost effective.	13	confident that an intervention will do more good than harm for most patients,
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	14	and be cost effective, but other options may be similarly cost effective. The

choice of intervention, and whether or not to have the intervention at all, is more likely to depend on the patient's values and preferences than for a strong recommendation, and so the healthcare professional should spend more time considering and discussing the options with the patient.

119

115

116

117

118

Update information

This guideline is an update of the NICE guideline on prophylaxis against infective endocarditis CG64 (published March 2008) and will replace it.

You are invited to comment on the recommendations in this guideline. These are marked as **[2015]** because the evidence has been reviewed but no change has been made to the recommended action.

The original NICE guideline and supporting documents are available here.

120

121

123	1	Recommendations
124	The follo	owing guidance is based on the best available evidence. The guideline
125	addend	um gives details of the methods and the evidence used.
126	1.1	List of all recommendations
127	Adults	and children with structural cardiac defects at risk of developing
128	infectiv	e endocarditis
129	1.1.1	Healthcare professionals should regard people with the following
130		cardiac conditions as being at risk of developing infective
131		endocarditis:
132		acquired valvular heart disease with stenosis or regurgitation
133		valve replacement
134		 structural congenital heart disease, including surgically corrected
135		or palliated structural conditions, but excluding isolated atrial
136		septal defect, fully repaired ventricular septal defect or fully
137		repaired patent ductus arteriosus, and closure devices that are
138		judged to be endothelialised
139		 previous infective endocarditis
140		hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. [2015]
141	Patient	advice
142	1.1.2	Healthcare professionals should offer people at risk of infective
143		endocarditis clear and consistent information about prevention,
144		including:
145		the benefits and risks of antibiotic prophylaxis, and an
146		explanation of why antibiotic prophylaxis is no longer routinely
147		recommended
148		 the importance of maintaining good oral health
149		 symptoms that may indicate infective endocarditis and when to
150		seek expert advice

151		 the risks of undergoing invasive procedures, including non-
152		medical procedures such as body piercing or tattooing. [2015]
153	Prophyla	xis against infective endocarditis
154	1.1.3	Antibiotic prophylaxis against infective endocarditis is not
155		recommended:
156		for people undergoing dental procedures
157		for people undergoing non-dental procedures at the following
158		sites ¹ :
159		 upper and lower gastrointestinal tract
160		 genitourinary tract; this includes urological, gynaecological
161		and obstetric procedures, and childbirth
162		 upper and lower respiratory tract; this includes ear, nose and
163		throat procedures and bronchoscopy. [2015]
164	1.1.4	Chlorhexidine mouthwash should not be offered as prophylaxis
165		against infective endocarditis to people at risk of infective
166		endocarditis undergoing dental procedures. [2015]
167	Infection	
168	1.1.5	Any episodes of infection in people at risk of infective endocarditis
169		should be investigated and treated promptly to reduce the risk of
170		endocarditis developing. [2015]
171	1.1.6	If a person at risk of infective endocarditis is receiving antimicrobial
172		therapy because they are undergoing a gastrointestinal or
173		genitourinary procedure at a site where there is a suspected
174		infection, the person should receive an antibiotic that covers
175		organisms that cause infective endocarditis. [2015]

_

¹ The evidence reviews for this guideline covered only procedures at the sites listed in this recommendation. Procedures at other sites are outside the scope of the guideline (see the scope for details).

176	2	Research recommendations
177	In 2008	, the Guideline Development Group made two recommendations for
178	researc	h (2.1 and 2.2 below), based on its review of evidence, to improve
179	NICE g	uidance and patient care in the future.
180	As part	of the 2015 update, the Standing Committee made an additional
181	researc	h recommendation on antibiotic prophylaxis against infective
182	endoca	rditis (2.3). Further details for this recommendation can be found in the
183	addend	<u>um</u> .
184	It is not	ed that infective endocarditis is a rare condition and that research in
185	this are	a in the UK would be facilitated by the availability of a national register
186	that cou	ald offer data into the 'case' arm of proposed case-control studies.
187	2.1	Cardiac conditions and infective endocarditis
188	What is	the risk of developing infective endocarditis in people with acquired
189	valvular	disease and structural congenital heart disease?
190	Such re	search should use a population-based cohort study design to allow
191	direct c	omparison between groups and allow estimation of both relative and
192	absolut	e risk.
193	2.2	Interventional procedures and infective endocarditis
194	What is	the frequency and level of bacteraemia caused by non-oral daily
195	activitie	s (for example, urination or defaecation)?
196	Such re	search should quantitatively determine the frequency and level of
197	bactera	emia.
198	2.3	Antibiotic prophylaxis against infective endocarditis
199	Does a	ntibiotic prophylaxis in those at risk of developing infective endocarditis
200	reduce	the incidence of infective endocarditis when given before a defined
201	interver	ntional procedure?
202	Why th	is is important

There is limited evidence about the effectiveness of antibiotic prophylaxis in
reducing the incidence of infective endocarditis in people at risk of developing
infective endocarditis. The current evidence includes very limited data from
observational studies with inconclusive findings. The study should be a
randomised controlled trial with long-term follow-up comparing antibiotic
prophylaxis with no antibiotic prophylaxis in adults and children with
underlying structural cardiac defects undergoing interventional procedures.
Outcomes should include the incidence infective endocarditis in those
receiving prophylaxis compared to those not, and the incidence of adverse
effects including anaphylaxis.

3 Other information

3.1 Scope and how this guideline was developed

The <u>scope</u> for the 2008 guideline covers the original recommendations. These recommendations were not changed after reviewing new evidence on prophylaxis against infective endocarditis.

How this guideline was developed

The 2008 guideline was developed by the NICE Internal Clinical Guidelines Programme. The Internal Clinical Guidelines Programme worked with a Guideline Development Group, comprising healthcare professionals (including consultants, GPs and nurses), patients and carers, and technical staff, which reviewed the evidence and drafted the recommendations. The recommendations were finalised after public consultation.

NICE's Clinical Guidelines Update Programme updated this guideline in 2015. This guideline was updated using a Standing Committee of healthcare professionals, methodologists and lay members from a range of disciplines and localities, as well as topic experts.

The methods and processes for developing NICE guidelines can be found here.

219

220

3.2 Related NICE guidance

See the <u>cardiovascular conditions: general and other</u> page on the NICE website for related NICE guidance.

224	4	Standing Committee and NICE staff
225	4.1	Standing Committee
226	Membe	ers of Standing Committee A and the topic experts for the 2015 update
227	are liste	ed on the NICE website.
228	For the	composition of the previous Guideline Development Group, see the
229	full guic	<u>deline</u> .
230	4.2	Clinical Guidelines Update Team
231	Philip /	Alderson
232	Clinical	Adviser
233	Emma	Banks
234	Co-ordi	nator
235	Paul C	rosland
236	Health	Economist
237	Nicole	Elliott
238	Associa	ate Director
239	Sarah (Glover
240	Informa	ation Specialist
241	Cheryl	Hookway
242	Technic	cal Analyst
243	Rebeco	ca Parsons
244	Project	Manager
245	Charlo	tte Purves
246	Adminis	strator
247	Nitara	Prasannan
248	Technic	cal Analyst

249	Toni Tan
250	Technical Adviser
251	4.3 NICE project team
252	Mark Baker
253	Clinical Adviser
254	Christine Carson
255	Guideline Lead
256	Louise Shires
257	Guideline Commissioning Manager
258	Joy Carvill
259	Guideline Coordinator
260	Jessica Fielding
261	Public Involvement Adviser
262	Beth Shaw
263	Technical Lead
264	Catharine Baden-Daintree
265	Editor
266	4.4 Declarations of interests
267	The following members of the Standing Committee made declarations of
268	interest. All other members of the Committee stated that they had no interests
269	to declare.

Committee member	Interest declared	Type of interest	Decision taken
Damien Longson	Family member employee of NICE.	Personal family non-specific	Declare and participate
Damien Longson	Director of Research & Innovation, Manchester Mental Health & Social Care NHS Trust.	Personal non- specific financial	Declare and participate
Catherine Briggs	Husband is a consultant anaesthetist at the University Hospital of South Manchester.	Personal family non-specific	Declare and participate
Catherine Briggs	Member of the Royal College of Surgeons, the Royal College of General Practitioners, the Faculty of Sexual and Reproductive Health and the BMA.	Personal non- specific financial	Declare and participate
John Cape	Trustee of the Anna Freud Centre, a child and family mental health charity which applies for and receives grants from the Department of Health and the National Institute for Health Research.	Personal non- specific non- financial	Declare and participate
John Cape	Member of British Psychological Society and British Association for Behavioural & Cognitive Psychotherapists who seek to influence policy towards psychology and psychological therapies.	Personal non- specific non- financial	Declare and participate
John Cape	Clinical Services Lead half-day a week to Big Health, a digital health company that has one commercial product; an online CBT self-help programme for insomnia with online support.	Personal non- specific financial	Declare and participate
Alun Davies	Research grant funding – commercial: Vascular Insights; Acergy Ltd; Firstkind; URGO laboratoire; Sapheon Inc (terminated 2013). All administered by Imperial College London as Sponsor and Professor Davies as CI.	Personal non- specific financial	Declare and participate
Alun Davies	Research grant funding – non- commercial: National Institute for Health Research, British Heart Foundation, Royal College of Surgeons, Circulation Foundation,	Personal non- specific financial	Declare and participate

	European Venous Forum.		
Alun Davies	Non-commercial: Attendance at numerous national and international meetings as an invited guest to lecture, where the organising groups receive funding from numerous sources including device and pharmaceutical manufacturers. Organising groups pay expenses and occasionally honoraria – the exact source of funding is often not known.	Personal non- specific financial	Declare and participate
Alison Eastwood	Member of an independent academic team at Centre for Review & Dissemination, University of York commissioned by NICE through NIHR to undertake technology assessment reviews.	Non- personal non- specific financial	Declare and participate
Sarah Fishburn	Organises workshops for physiotherapists treating pelvic girdle pain. Paid for this work.	Personal non- specific financial	Declare and participate
Sarah Fishburn	Receives payment and expenses from the Nursing and Midwifery Council as a lay panellist of the Fitness to Practise Investigating Committee.	Personal non- specific financial	Declare and participate
Sarah Fishburn	Lay reviewer with the Local Supervising Authority auditing supervision of midwives – receives payment and expenses for this work.	Personal non- specific financial	Declare and participate
Sarah Fishburn	Lay reviewer for the National Institute for Health Research; has reviewed a number of research proposals being considered for funding. Paid for carrying out these reviews.	Personal non- specific financial	Declare and participate
Sarah Fishburn	Chair of the Pelvic Partnership, a support group for women with pregnancy-related pelvic girdle pain. This is a voluntary position.	Personal non- specific financial	Declare and participate
Sarah Fishburn	Trained as a chartered physiotherapist and qualified in 1988 but have not been in clinical practice since 1997. Remains a non-practicing member of the Chartered Society of Physiotherapy.	Personal non- specific financial	Declare and participate
Sarah	Appointed by Mott MacDonald to carry out reviews as a lay reviewer	Personal non-	Declare and

Prophylaxis against infective endocarditis: NICE guideline short version DRAFT (May 2015) Page 16 of 21

Fishburn	on behalf to the Nursing and Midwifery Council of Local Supervising Authorities and Universities providing courses for nurses and midwives. This is paid work.	specific financial	participate
Jim Gray	Deputy Editor, Journal of Hospital Infection, funded by the Healthcare Infection Society (HIS pay the hospital for my time).	Personal financial non-specific	Declare and participate
Jim Gray	Co-investigator in 4 major trials (3 HTA-funded; 1 British Council funded). 2 trials are about antibiotic prophylaxis on obstetrics and gynaecology to prevent pelvic infections, 1 is comparing different suture materials and the 4th is a diagnostic test accuracy study for use in woman in labour.	Non- personal financial non- specific	Declare and participate
Jim Gray	Associate Editor, International Journal of Antimicrobial Agents.	Non- personal financial non- specific	Declare and participate
Jim Gray	Associate Editor Journal of Pediatric Infectious Diseases.	Non- personal financial non- specific	Declare and participate
Jim Gray	Expert Advisor, British National Formulary for Children.	Non- personal financial non- specific	Declare and participate
Jim Gray	My Department is in receipt of an Educational Grant from Pfizer Ltd to develop improved diagnosis of invasive fungal infections in immunocompromised children.	Non- personal financial non- specific	Declare and participate
Kath Nuttall	None		No action
Tilly Pillay	None		No action
Nick Screaton	Attended Thorax meeting – travel expenses paid.	Non- specific personal financial	Declare and participate
Nick Screaton	Clinical Commissioning Group stakeholder member.	Non- specific personal non- financial	Declare and participate
Nick Screaton	Senior Editor British Journal of	Non-	Declare and

	I =	1	1
	Radiology.	specific personal non- financial	participate
Nick Screaton	Advisory Editor Clinical Radiology.	Non- specific personal non- financial	Declare and participate
Nick Screaton	Chair East of England British Institute of Radiology.	Non- specific personal non- financial	Declare and participate
Nick Screaton	Director – Cambridge Clinical Imaging LTD.	Non- specific personal financial	Declare and participate
Nick Screaton	British Thoracic Society Bronchiectasis Guidelines Group.	Non- specific personal non- financial	Declare and participate
Nick Screaton	Specialised Imaging Clinical Commissioning Group stakeholder member.	Non- specific personal non- financial	Declare and participate
Lindsay Smith	None		Declare and participate
Philippa Williams	None		Declare and participate
Sophie Wilne	Recipient of NHS Innovation Challenge Award for clinical awareness campaign to reduce delays in diagnosis of brain tumours in children and young adults. Award will be used to develop the campaign.	Personal non- specific non- financial	Declare and participate
Sophie Wilne	Co-investigator for RFPB grant to undertake systematic reviews in childhood brain tumours.	Personal non- specific non- financial	Declare and participate
Sophie Wilne	Co-investigator for grant awards from charity to evaluate impact of brain tumour awareness campaign.	Personal non- specific non- financial	Declare and participate
Sophie Wilne	Funding for travel and accommodation from Novartis to	Personal non-	Declare and participate

	attend a conference on the management of tuberous sclerosis.	specific financial	
Topic expert	Interest declared	Type of interest	Decision
Richard Balmer	Co-author: Hollis A, Willcoxon F, Smith A, Balmer R. An investigation into dental anxiety amongst paediatric cardiology patients. International Journal of Paediatric Dentistry. Article first published online.	Specific personal non- financial	Declare and participate
Richard Balmer	Committee member (representing British Society of Paediatric Dentistry) on specialist advisory committee for paediatric dentistry.	Specific personal non- financial	Declare and participate
Mark Dayer (non-voting expert)	Fees and expenses paid as a member of an advisory board to RESMED (developers, manufacturers and distributors of medical equipment for sleep-disordered breathing and other respiratory disorders).	Non- specific personal financial	Declare and participate
Mark Dayer (non-voting expert)	Fees paid by Pfizer/Bristol-Myers Squibb, for presentations on the diagnosis and management of atrial fibrillation.	Non- specific personal financial	Declare and participate
Mark Dayer (non-voting expert)	Fees paid by Boehringer- Ingelheim, for presentations on the diagnosis and management of atrial fibrillation.	Non- specific personal financial	Declare and participate
Mark Dayer (non-voting expert)	Fee paid by Roche, for presentations on the diagnosis and management of heart failure.	Non- specific personal financial	Declare and participate
Mark Dayer (non-voting expert)	Expenses paid by Sorin for educational support to attend 'New Horizons in Heart Failure' conference in London.	Non- specific personal financial	Declare and participate
Mark Dayer (non-voting expert)	Commercial trial sponsored by Novartis (PARAGON: heart failure) undertaken by department.	Non- specific non- personal financial	Declare and participate
Mark Dayer (non-voting expert)	Commercial trial sponsored by Novartis (CANTOS: coronary artery disease) undertaken by	Non- specific non-	Declare and participate

	department.	personal financial	
Mark Dayer (non-voting expert)	Commercial trial sponsored by Boehringer-Ingelheim (GLORIA AF: atrial fibrillation) undertaken by department.	Non- specific non- personal financial	Declare and participate
Mark Dayer (non-voting expert)	Commercial trial sponsored by Bristol-Myers Squibb (AEGEAN: atrial fibrillation) undertaken by department.	Non- specific non- personal financial	Declare and participate
Mark Dayer (non-voting expert)	Commercial trial sponsored by Biotronik (MATRIX: device registry) undertaken by department.	Non- specific non- personal financial	Declare and participate
Mark Dayer (non-voting expert)	Commercial trial sponsored by AstraZeneca (TIGRIS: coronary artery disease) undertaken by department.	Non- specific non- personal financial	Declare and participate
Mark Dayer (non-voting expert)	Lead author of a publication in The Lancet that has in part led to the review of the PIE guideline.	Specific personal non- financial	Declare and leave prior to the recommendations being made (nonvoting expert)
Suzannah Power	None		Declare and participate
Craig Ramsay (non- voting expert)	None		Declare and leave (non-voting expert)
Jon Sandoe	Registration for 24th European Congress of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases in Barcelona provided by Abbott.	Specific personal financial	Declare and participate
Jon Sandoe	Accommodation/travel/subsistence for 24th European Congress of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases in Barcelona funded by Eumedica.	Specific personal financial	Declare and participate
Jon Sandoe	Honoraria paid by Astellas to a Leeds Charitable Trust Account for lecturing on the 7-point summary and implementation of AMR (antimicrobial resistance) Strategy.	Non- specific non- personal financial	Declare and participate
Jon Sandoe	Advisor board: Cubicin (medication used to treat serious bacterial infections).	Specific personal Non- financial	Declare and participate

Jon Sandoe	Chairman of the British Society for Antimicrobial Chemotherapy endocarditis working party.	Non- specific personal non- financial	Declare and participate
Jon Sandoe	Member of a British Heart Valve Society valve disease working party.	Non- specific personal non- financial	Declare and participate
Richard Watkin	Expenses paid to attend Medtronic sponsored EURO PCR meeting (technological advances in complex cardiovascular interventions).	Non- specific personal financial	Declare and participate
Richard Watkin	Expenses paid to attend 2015 Medtronic sponsored BCIS advanced coronary intervention meeting.	Personal financial non- specific	Declare and participate
Valentina Gallo	None		Declare and participate
Alison Loescher	None		Declare and participate

270