Abstract 302

Current Management of Cardiac Implantable Electronic Device Infections: Results of an Emerging Infections Network Survey



Washington® University in St.Louis Physicians

NATIONAL LEADERS IN MEDICINE

¹ Division of Infectious Diseases, Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, MO ² Emerging Infections Network, University of Iowa Carver College of Medicine, Iowa City, IA

ABSTRACT

Background: Infectious disease (ID) specialists are frequently involved in the care of patients with cardiac implantable electronic device (CIED) infections. While guidelines exist for managing these infections, supporting literature is largely based on expert opinion. We sought to better understand current CIED treatment practices of ID physicians.

Methods: A seven-question electronic survey of ID physician members of the Emerging Infections Network (EIN), a CDC-sponsored sentinel network, in late January 2015.

Results: 543/1,185 (46%) EIN members responded. We excluded 183/543 (34%) respondents who had not treated CIED infections in the past year. 166/360 (46%) reported having treated <5 CIED infections in the past year. Respondents predominantly favored complete device removal for patients with a pocket infection [293/359 (82%)] or lead-associated endocarditis [356/360 (99%)]. Complete removal was less frequently [164/358 (46%)] recommended for occult bacteremia, and few [40/355 (11%)] felt it necessary when bacteremia was attributable to a non-cardiovascular source. Isolation of *S. aureus* was a key reason for recommending complete device removal. Respondents were more likely to treat *S. aureus* bacteremia with antibiotics for >4 weeks compared to Gram-positive bacteremia other than S. aureus or Gram-negative bacteremia (64%, 31%, and 23%, respectively; p<0.0001). 306/355 (86%) treated lead-associated endocarditis for >4 weeks. 175/355 (49%) of respondents favored a brief device-free interval (2-6 days) until CIED reimplantation in patients with a pacemaker-dependent arrhythmia, but 260/356 (73%) favored waiting ≥ 1 week for patients requiring a CIED for primary prevention of sudden cardiac death and 246/353 (70%) for secondary prevention. For patients with lead-associated endocarditis where complete CIED removal was not possible, respondents favored chronic suppression with oral antibiotics after initial intravenous therapy [33/360 (93%)]; most recommended treatment for an indefinite period [239/329 (73%)].

Conclusions: In the setting of CIED infections, ID physicians favored a combination of complete device removal and prolonged antibiotic therapy, particularly in the setting of *S. aureus* infection.

INTRODUCTION

 Cardiac implantable electronic devices (CIED) including pacemakers, implantable cardioverter-defibrillators (ICD), and cardiac resynchronization therapy (CRT) devices have

revolutionized the management of arrhythmias & heart failure In 2009, >235,000 new pacemakers & 130,000 ICDs were implanted in the U.S., while another 100,000 pacemakers & 73,000 ICDs were replaced [1]

• CIED infection rates range anywhere from <1% to 4% [1-3]

• It is not known how frequently infectious disease specialists encounter CIED infections in clinical practice

• Management guidelines are largely driven by expert opinion [4] and little is known of individual practice patterns

METHODS

- The questionnaire was first piloted by infectious disease physicians at 2 large, academic medical centers
- The final 7-question questionnaire was electronically distributed to EIN members between January 29, 2015 and February 22, 2015
- Descriptive statistics were calculated using SAS 9.4 (Carey, NC)

STUDY POPULATION

- 543/1,185 (46%) EIN member physicians w/ an adult infectious diseases practice responded
- The study sample was diverse in terms of respondent geography, experience & employment (Table 1)
- **360/543 (66%)** had treated a pt(s) with a CIED infection in the past year (Table 2)

TABLE 1. Demographics

	n (°
U.S. Census Bureau Regions	
Northeast	
Midwest	
South	
West	
Canada	
Years of Experience	
< 5	
5-14	
15-24	
≥ 25	
Employment	
Hospital/clinic	
Private/group practice	
University/medical school	
VA and military	
State government	

TABLE 2. Experience w/ CIED infections

	n (%
Cases treated during past year	
< 5	
5-10	
11-25	
≥ 25	

14 (3.9)

Stephen Y. Liang¹, Susan E. Beekmann², Philip M. Polgreen², David K. Warren¹

50

100

n = 360

RESULTS **FIGURE 2.** Duration of therapy for CIED infections • In pts w/ occult bacteremia (no apparent focus): 46% usually/almost always recommend complete device removal; 7% usually/almost always recommend partial device removal w/ bacteremia from a non-cardiovascular In pts 70% infection: 60% • 11% usually/almost always recommend complete device removal; 3% usually/almost always recommend 50% partial device removal 40% • In pts w/ pocket infection requiring I&D: 30% 82% usually/almost always recommend complete device removal; 29% usually/almost always 20% recommend partial device removal In pts w/ lead-associated endocarditis: 99% usually/almost always recommend complete Gram+, not S. aureus Gram neg bacteremia Pocket infection Endocarditis S. aureus bacteremia removal; 20% usually/almost device always recommend partial device removal 73% endorsed complete device removal in the setting of S. **TABLE 3.** When to reimplant a CIED after infection aureus bacteremia if the source is unknown: 47% recommend likewise even if a non-cardiovascular source is Indication ≤ 48h 2-6 found. Most recommend complete device removal in the context of pocket infection or lead-associated endocarditis Pacemaker-dependent 17 31 irrespective of organisms cultured (Figure 1) arrhythmia (9%) (49 The preferred duration of therapy to treat S. aureus 15 Primary prevention 81 bacteremia is greater than that with other Gram-positive or %) (n=543) (*e.g.*, CM w/ ↓EF) (23)(4%) Gram-negative organisms. Most treat pocket infections for up to 14d and lead-associated endocarditis for >4 wks Secondary prevention 16 91 130 (23.9) (Figure 2) (5%) (e.g., prior VT/VF) (26 137 (25.2) In pts w/ CIED infection who are pacemaker-dependent, a 157 (28.9) shorter device holiday acceptable compared to those 115 (21.2) needing a CIED for primary/secondary prevention (Table 3) **CONCLUSIONS** 4 (0.7) For pts w/ lead-associated endocarditis, 334 (93%) treat with chronic suppressive oral antibiotics, w/ 73% > Despite widespread CIED use, complications requiring the care of an infectious 120 (22.1) recommending indefinitely disease specialist remain infrequent 149 (27.4) > Most EIN members agree that complete device removal is warranted in the 124 (22.8) setting of *S. aureus* bacteremia, pocket infection & lead-associated endocarditis 150 (27.6) FIGURE 1. Device Removal by Organism Most are more likely to treat CIED pts w/ S. aureus bacteremia for longer periods (28-42d) vs. other Gram-positive or Gram-negative organisms 158 (29.1) \succ In the pacemaker-dependent pt w/ a CIED infection, a device holiday of 2-6d is Lead-associated 167 (30.8) S. aureus endocarditis generally preferred 181 (33.3) > Long-term chronic suppressive oral antibiotics are commonly being used in Pocket infection 32 (5.9) requiring I&D Coag-neg staph lead-associated endocarditis when complete device removal is not possible 5 (0.9) Bacteremia (non-CV focus) Enterococcus REFERENCES Occult bacteremia (no apparent focus) Enteric Gram-neg 1] Zhan et al. J Gen Intern Med 2008;23 Suppl 1:13-9. rod [2] Al-Khatib et al. Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol 2008;1:240-9. 6) (n=360) [3] Lekkerkerker et al. Heart 2009;95:715-20. Pseudomonas [4] Baddour et al. Circulation 2010;121:458-77. С 166 (46.1) 125 (34.7) None of the above unding: S.L. received support from the KM1 Comparative Effectiveness Research Career Development Award KM1CA156708-01), the Clinical and Translational Science Award (CTSA) program (UL1RR024992) of the National Center 55 (15.3)







6d	1-2 wk	>2-4 wk	>4-6 wk	>6 wk
5	100	33	15	1
9%)	(28%)	(9%)	(4%)	(0.3%)
	110	78	51	21
3%)	(31%)	(22%)	(14%)	(6%)
	125	74	36	11
<u>6%)</u>	(35%)	(21%)	(10%)	(3%)

for Advancing Translational Sciences (NCATS), and the Barnes-Jewish Patient Safety & Quality Career Development Program, funded by the Foundation for Barnes-Jewish Hospital. EIN is supported by the Grant or Cooperative Agreement FOA CK11-1102, funded by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.