Outpatient Parenteral Antibiotic Treatment vs Hospitalization for Infective Endocarditis: Validation of the OPAT-GAMES Criteria
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Background. Outpatient parenteral antibiotic treatment (OPAT) programs are increasingly used to manage infective endocarditis (IE), but current criteria for indicating OPAT are markedly conservative. We aimed to investigate whether more liberal criteria for indicating OPAT in IE can be safely used.

Methods. This was a prospective multicenter nationwide cohort study (2008–2018). Rates of readmission, recurrences, and 1-year mortality were compared between hospital-based antibiotic treatment (HBAT) and OPAT. Risk factors for readmission and mortality in OPAT patients were investigated by logistic regression. Patients did not fulfill OPAT-GAMES (Grupos de Apoyo al Manejo de la Endocarditis en España) criteria if they had any of the following: cirrhosis, severe central nervous system emboli, undrained abscesses, severe conditions requiring cardiac surgery in nonoperable patients, severe postsurgical complications, highly difficult-to-treat microorganisms, or intravenous drug use.

Results. A total of 2279 HBAT patients and 1268 OPAT patients were included. Among OPAT patients, 307 (24.2%) did not fulfill OPAT-GAMES criteria. Overall, OPAT patients presented higher rates of readmission than HBAT patients (18.2% vs 14.4%; P = .004), but no significant differences were found in the propensity analysis. Patients not fulfilling OPAT-GAMES criteria presented significantly higher rates of readmission than HBAT and OPAT-GAMES (23.8%, 14.4%, 16.4%; P < .001), whereas no significant differences were found in mortality (5.9%, 8%, 7.4%; P = .103) or recurrences (3.9%, 3.1%, 2.5%; P = .546). Not fulfilling OPAT-GAMES criteria was associated with higher risk of readmission (odds ratio [OR], 1.43; 95% CI, 1.03–1.97; P = .03), whereas cardiac surgery was associated with lower risk (OR, 0.72; 95% CI, 0.53–0.98; P = .03).

Conclusions. OPAT-GAMES criteria allow identification of IE patients at higher risk of long-term complications to whom OPAT cannot be safely administered.
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Over the last 3 decades, increasing evidence has shown that outpatient parenteral antibiotic treatment (OPAT) is an efficacious, safe, cost-effective, and comfortable alternative to hospital-based antibiotic treatment (HBAT) for a variety of infections [1–4]. The coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic has demonstrated the necessity of implementing alternatives to conventional hospitalization as a measure to alleviate the overwhelmed capacity of hospitals worldwide, particularly during surges [5]. In 2001, Andrews and von Reyn proposed the first recommendations for indicating OPAT in patients with IE, still in place as of today, which are largely restrictive [6]. The latest versions of both the European Society of Cardiology [7] and American Heart Association [8] IE guidelines recommend using the criteria described by Andrews and von Reyn. Long hospitalization periods, as in the case of a complete HBAT course for IE [9], are associated with increased risk of nosocomial infections, antimicrobial resistance, morbidity, death, and financial costs [10].
Several studies have provided preliminary evidence that OPAT can be safely used for treating IE with less restrictive criteria than those proposed by Andrews and von Reyn [11–17]. In a study comparing the outcomes of 429 patients receiving OPAT and 1003 patients receiving HBAT from 2008 to 2012, we found that efficacy and safety did not differ between HBAT and OPAT despite only 22% of OPAT patients fulfilling Andrews and von Reyn’s criteria [18]. We therefore proposed a new set of less restrictive criteria than those of Andrews and von Reyn [18] (OPAT-GAMES criteria) to guide the administration of OPAT in patients with IE.

The aim of this study was to validate our findings in a larger cohort and to assess whether GAMES-OPAT criteria allow identification of patients at higher risk of complications to whom OPAT should not be administered.

METHODS

Design and Definitions

This was a multicenter prospective observational study including 35 Spanish centers from January 2008 to December 2018. Guidance for cohort studies according to the STROBE statement [19] was followed. The indication for OPAT or HBAT was independently decided by attending physicians at each center [18]. The characteristics of the GAMES (Grupos de Apoyo al Manejo de la Endocarditis en España) cohort, definitions, and collection of data have been described elsewhere [20]. Noticeably, recurrences included all episodes of IE occurring in the 12 months after the initial IE episode and encompassed both relapses (new episode caused by the same microorganism as the initial episode during the first 6 months) and reinfections (new episode caused by a different microorganism or by the same microorganism but at least 6 months after the first IE episode, except in the case that it was shown that it was the same strain as in the initial episode by molecular biology techniques). Persistent bacteremia was defined as persistence of positive blood cultures for 7 days after appropriate antibiotic treatment initiation.

Patients

Included were adult individuals with IE diagnosed according to Duke modified criteria [21] who survived the initial admission. Individuals who died at the hospital during the initial admission due to IE were excluded from the analysis because they could not opt into OPAT, and therefore the comparison of outcomes as defined in the current study was not possible. Patients lost to follow-up at 1 year were also excluded.

Groups

The HBAT group included patients who completed antibiotic treatment at the hospital; The OPAT group included patients who completed antibiotic treatment through hospital-at-home programs. OPAT patients were separately analyzed according to fulfillment of the OPAT-GAMES criteria (Table 1). These criteria were developed by a multidisciplinary expert opinion consensus group from GAMES and first tested in a previous work from our group [18].

Outcomes

The primary outcome was hospital readmission rate. The Secondary outcomes were 1-year mortality and recurrences.

Patient Consent

Clinical research institutional review boards in each of the GAMES participating centers approved the prospective collection of data in the central repository. All patients provided written informed consent.

Statistical Analysis

A propensity score analysis [22] was used to adjust for potential confounding variables. HBAT patients were matched 2:1 to OPAT patients using individual propensity scores. Variables

Table 1. OPAT-GAMES Criteria to Guide Indication of Outpatient Parenteral Antibiotic Treatment for Patients With Infective Endocarditis (Adapted From Pericàs et al. [18])

| Inclusion criteria: All patients are potential candidates once the acute critical phase has been overcome, except for those presenting with the following criteria: |
| Exclusion criteria: |
| 1. Patients with Child B or C liver cirrhosis |
| 2. Severe central nervous system emboli |
| 3. Not drained large spleen or renal abscess |
| 4. Vertebral abscesses requiring neurosurgery |
| 5. Periannular complications or other severe conditions requiring surgery when this is contraindicatedb |
| 6. Severe postsurgical complications |
| 7. Highly difficult-to-treat microorganisms |
| 8. Active intravenous drug users |

Abbreviations: GAMES, Grupos de Apoyo al Manejo de la Endocarditis en España; OPAT, outpatient parenteral antibiotic treatment.

aExcept for patients with uncomplicated native viridans group streptococcal endocarditis, for whom transfer to OPAT can be considered after 5–7 days of antibiotic treatment, at least 10–14 days of antibiotic treatment should be completed at the hospital.

bTransfer to the patient’s home or other outpatient setting for palliative purposes is also possible after careful discussion and agreement with the patient and/or relatives.
used for matching were sex, age, and type of IE (native, prosthetic, and cardiac implantable electronic device–related IE), as these are variables that have consistently been shown to impact IE prognosis. Patients not fulfilling OPAT-GAMES criteria were excluded from the propensity score analysis. The causative microorganism was not used as a matching criterion because the OPAT-GAMES criteria already include a variable related to the type of causative microorganism. The matching tolerance was a propensity score difference of 0.05.

Differences between groups were measured using the chi-square test for categorical variables and the Wilcoxon rank-sum test for continuous variables, or the analysis of variance test or Kruskal-Wallis test where applicable. The cumulative probability of hospital readmission and death at 1 year was calculated using the Kaplan-Meier estimate and adjusted by predictors. For the analysis of risk factors of readmission, 1-year mortality, and recurrences, a logistic regression model that included variables with \( P < .30 \) in the univariate analysis was used. A 2-sided \( P < .05 \) was considered statistically significant. The statistical analysis was performed using SPSS for Windows, version 21.0 (SPSS Inc, Chicago, IL, USA).

RESULTS

Sample
After excluding patients who died during initial admission, the total analyzed sample included 3547 patients, 2279 (64.3%) in the HBAT group and 1268 (35.7%) in the OPAT group. Within the latter group, 961 (75.8%) fulfilled OPAT-GAMES criteria, whereas 307 (24.2%) did not. In the HBAT group, 1485 patients (65.2%) fulfilled OPAT-GAMES criteria, whereas 794 (34.8%) did not. The main reasons for not fulfilling OPAT-GAMES criteria in the OPAT group were perivalvular complications for which the patient had not undergone surgery and severe postsurgical complications (Figure 1). The characteristics and outcomes of HBAT and OPAT patients are shown in Supplementary Table 1. Comparisons between HBAT patients and OPAT patients according to fulfillment of the OPAT-GAMES criteria are shown in Supplementary Tables 2 and 3.

Causes and Risk Factors for Hospital Readmission, Mortality, and Recurrences
There were no significant differences in IE-related causes of readmission between groups, being IE-related reasons the most frequent causes of readmission in both the HBAT and OPAT groups. Notably, readmission due to causes related to the venous catheter, antibiotic side effects, or the surgical wound in patients undergoing cardiac surgery was significantly less frequent in the HBAT group (Supplementary Table 4). Causes of death at 1 year are shown in Supplementary Table 5.

In the multivariable model, cardiac surgery during initial admission was associated with a significantly lower risk of readmission (odds ratio [OR], 0.72; 95% CI, 0.53–0.98; \( P = .03 \)), whereas not fulfilling OPAT-GAMES criteria was significantly associated with higher risk of readmission (OR, 1.43; 95% CI, 1.03–1.97; \( P = .03 \)) (Table 2). Age-adjusted Charlson morbidity score was associated with a higher likelihood of death at 1 year (OR, 1.17; 95% CI, 1.08–1.27; \( P < .001 \)), whereas cardiac surgery was associated with a lower risk of death (OR, 0.39; 95% CI, 0.22–0.68; \( P = .01 \)) (Supplementary Table 6). Renal and spleen abscesses were associated with recurrences (Supplementary Table 7).

Supplementary Figure 1 shows Kaplan-Meier curves for readmission and mortality at 1 year comparing the HBAT and OPAT groups (log-rank test \( P < .001 \) for both).

Safety of OPAT Compared With HBAT in a Propensity Score Analysis
When comparing patients from the HBAT and OPAT groups, both fulfilling OPAT-GAMES criteria (Table 3), we found no significant differences in readmission, mortality, or recurrence rates between groups.

DISCUSSION

This study validates our preliminary findings on the safety of OPAT for treating IE [18], confirming that less restrictive criteria than those currently recommended [6] could be used for indicating OPAT in IE patients. However, as opposed to our earlier findings, we found an overall significantly higher rate of readmissions among OPAT patients. Importantly, OPAT-GAMES criteria allow identification of OPAT patients at higher risk of readmission who are not eligible for OPAT.

We did not find significant differences in readmissions, sequelae, 1-year mortality, or recurrences between HBAT and OPAT patients fulfilling GAMES criteria. However, OPAT patients not fulfilling GAMES criteria presented a significantly higher rate of readmissions than both HBAT patients and patients fulfilling GAMES criteria. OPAT reduced the length of stay by a median (IQR) of 19 (13–29) days when OPAT-GAMES were met, whereas it reduced the median length of stay (IQR) by 17 (11–28) days when not met; that is, OPAT patients fulfilling GAMES criteria were discharged from the hospital to continue antibiotic treatment significantly earlier than OPAT patients not fulfilling GAMES criteria. In both cases, the ability to save over 2 weeks of hospital admission in patients who have already been hospitalized for a long time should be considered for the potential cost-saving effects, the avoidance of nosocomial infections, and the increase in patient comfort.

Current recommendations state that HBAT should generally be continued after the critical phase (weeks 0–2) for patients either presenting complications (congestive heart failure,
conduction abnormality, paravalvular complications, etc.) or belonging to a high-risk group (acute IE, aortic valve disease, prosthetic valve, or IE caused by S. aureus or other virulent organisms) [6]. Although it seems reasonable that such patients should remain at the hospital during the initial treatment phase, our findings suggest that this may not be the case for many patients after the critical phase. It is worth noting that a large proportion of patients who did fulfill OPAT-GAMES criteria would have been declined OPAT according to current guidelines for various reasons, for example, prosthetic IE (31% of patients), aortic valve involvement (46%), heart failure (23%), or staphylococcal etiologies (35%). Our findings indicate that none of these should constitute an exclusion criterion in isolation. Moreover, we found that 65.2% of patients who were fully treated at the hospital fulfilled OPAT-GAMES criteria, suggesting that a substantial proportion of these patients could have been safely transferred to OPAT at some point.

OPAT-GAMES criteria are based on the lack of resolution of complications or the difficulties in treating certain microorganisms or managing patients such as active intravenous drug users to rule out OPAT. Not fulfilling OPAT-GAMES criteria was significantly associated with a higher risk of readmission among OPAT patients in the multivariable analysis. Although these findings warrant further investigation, they appear to accurately identify those patients at higher risk of poor outcomes. Of note, contemporary cohorts of endocarditis patients in Western countries [20, 23, 24] widely differ from those of the late nineties; the criteria of Andrews and von Reyn were proposed in 2001. Moreover, hospital-at-home units and OPAT

---

**Figure 1.** Flowchart of patients’ dispositions. Abbreviations: CNS, central nervous system; GAMES, Grupos de Apoyo al Manejo de la Endocarditis en ESpaña; HBAT, hospital-based antibiotic treatment; OPAT, outpatient parenteral antibiotic treatment.
programs in general have gained experience and increasingly showed better outcomes for a variety of serious infectious diseases.

Remarkably, a large proportion of OPAT patients not fulfilling OPAT-GAMES criteria did not fulfill the criteria because they had paravalvular complications such as perianular abscesses, fistulas, or pseudoaneurysms and did not receive cardiac surgery, and therefore a palliative rather than curative approach was adopted. This is likely one important reason why cardiac surgery was associated with lower risk of readmission in the multivariable analysis. According to OPAT-GAMES criteria, transfer to OPAT (either at the patient’s home or a long-term care facility) for palliative purposes is also possible after careful discussion and agreement with the patient and/or relatives. Remarkably, another reason for not fulfilling the OPAT-GAMES criteria in our cohort was severe complications after cardiac surgery, such as mediastinitis or ventilator-related pneumonia.

While further evidence is gathered to elucidate which criteria should be applied for the more complex, fragile, or severe patients, we advocate for the use of less restrictive criteria than those of Andrews and von Reyn for deciding OPAT in IE, including more liberal recommendations to be included in the coming versions of international IE guidelines. Of course, in order to ensure that the new set of criteria is safely applied, OPAT programs should comply with the necessary requirements such as experienced medical and nursing staff, daily visits, follow-up supported by telehealth tools, etc., and patients

### Table 2. Logistic Regression Analysis of Risk Factors for Readmission Among OPAT Patients

| Variables                              | Univariate Model | Multivariable Model |
|----------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|
|                                        | OR (95% CI) P     | OR (95% CI) P       |
| Male sex                               | 0.81 (0.60–1.09)  | .60                 |
| Age, y                                 | 1.01 (1.00–1.02)  | .02                 |
| Age-adjusted Charlson score            | 1.07 (1.01–1.12)  | .01                 |
| Prosthetic endocarditis                | 1.40 (1.05–1.88)  | .02                 |
| Aortic valve involvement               | 0.82 (0.62–1.08)  | .16                 |
| Perivalvular abscess                   | 1.11 (0.75–1.66)  | .14                 |
| Staphylococcus aureus                  | 0.99 (0.69–1.43)  | .96                 |
| Persistent bacteremia                  | 1.59 (1.05–2.42)  | .03                 |
| Central nervous system emboli          | 0.97 (0.63–1.50)  | .89                 |
| Other emboli                           | 1.48 (1.07–2.06)  | .02                 |
| Septic shock                           | 0.91 (0.48–1.72)  | .76                 |
| Splenic abscess                        | 2.07 (1.10–3.90)  | .02                 |
| Renal abscess                          | 1.09 (0.40–2.95)  | .86                 |
| Cardiac surgery during admission       | 0.69 (0.52–0.92)  | .01                 |
| Not fulfilling OPAT-GAMES criteria     | 1.51 (1.11–2.05)  | .009                |

Abbreviations: GAMES, Grupos de Apoyo al Manejo de la Endocarditis en España; OPAT, outpatient parenteral antibiotic treatment; OR, odds ratio.

### Table 3. Propensity Score Analysis 2:1 Comparing Patients Fully Treated at the Hospital (HBAT) vs Patients Transferred to OPAT

|                              | HBAT (n = 1118) | OPAT (n = 558) | P     |
|------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------|
| Median age (IQR), y          | 68 (55–77)      | 69 (57–77)     | .456  |
| Male sex, No. (%)            | 765 (68.5)      | 376 (67.4)     | .631  |
| Comorbidities                |                 |                |       |
| Diabetes mellitus            | 276 (24.7)      | 164 (29.4)     | .045  |
| Chronic lung disease         | 213 (19.1)      | 99 (17.7)      | .502  |
| Ischemic cardiomyopathy      | 317 (28.4)      | 144 (25.8)     | .257  |
| Congestive heart failure     | 367 (32.9)      | 193 (34.6)     | .488  |
| Moderate/severe liver disease| 26 (2.3)        | 12 (2.2)       | .814  |
| Moderate/severe chronic renal failure | 157 (14.1) | 69 (12.4) | .328 |
| Neoplasm                     | 146 (13.1)      | 99 (17.7)      | .015  |
| Transplantation              | 19 (1.7)        | 10 (1.8)       | .896  |
| Immunosuppressant therapy    | 49 (4.4)        | 47 (8.4)       | .002  |
| HIV                          | 9 (0.8)         | 6 (1.1)        | .600  |
| Previous IE                  | 90 (8.1)        | 38 (6.8)       | .350  |
| Congenital heart disease     | 101 (9.1)       | 36 (6.5)       | .054  |
| Natural valve disease        | 487 (43.6)      | 244 (43.7)     | .972  |
| Median age-adjusted Charlson score (IQR) | 4 (3–6) | 4 (3–6) | .729 |
| Type of endocarditis         |                 |                |       |
| Native                       | 663 (59.4)      | 325 (58.2)     | .648  |
| Prosthetic                   | 309 (27.7)      | 149 (26.7)     | .669  |
| CIED                         | 176 (15.8)      | 101 (18.1)     | .235  |
| Valve involvement            |                 |                |       |
| Aortic                       | 528 (47.3)      | 254 (45.5)     | .488  |
| Mitral                       | 422 (37.8)      | 211 (37.8)     | 1.000 |
| Tricuspid                    | 66 (5.9)        | 28 (5.0)       | .441  |
| Pulmonary                    | 26 (2.3)        | 4 (0.7)        | .005  |
| Causative microorganism      |                 |                |       |
| S. aureus                    | 214 (19.2)      | 101 (18.1)     | .593  |
| Coagulase-negative staphylococci | 216 (19.4) | 90 (16.1) | .010  |
| Enterococci                  | 170 (15.2)      | 65 (11.6)      | .046  |
| Streptococci                 | 307 (27.5)      | 177 (31.7)     | .077  |
| Candida spp                  | 8 (0.7)         | 9 (1.6)        | .129  |
| Unknown                      | 104 (9.3)       | 41 (7.3)       | .161  |
| Acquisition                  |                 |                |       |
| Community                    | 681 (61.0)      | 347 (62.2)     | .644  |
| Health care associated       |                 |                |       |
| Nosocomial                   | 292 (26.2)      | 143 (25.6)     | .813  |
| Non-nosocomial health care associated | 111 (9.9) | 40 (7.2) | .049 |
| Complications                |                 |                |       |
| Persistent bacteremia        | 96 (8.6)        | 56 (10.0)      | .347  |
| Central nervous system emboli | 131 (11.7)      | 45 (8.1)       | .015  |
| Other major emboli           | 199 (17.8)      | 101 (18.1)     | .893  |
| Pulmonary emboli             | 41 (3.7)        | 19 (3.4)       | .778  |
| Vertebral osteomyelitis       | 24 (2.2)        | 25 (4.5)       | .017  |
| Nonvertebral osteomyelitis   | 12 (1.1)        | 16 (2.9)       | .020  |
| Renal abscess                | 12 (1.1)        | 8 (1.4)        | .544  |
| Splenic abscess              | 39 (3.5)        | 15 (2.7)       | .359  |
| TEE performed                | 900 (80.6)      | 471 (84.4)     | .052  |
| New-onset or worsening heart failure | 337 (30.2) | 142 (25.4) | .039 |
| Septic shock                 | 51 (4.6)        | 23 (4.1)       | .669  |
| Perivalvular abscess         | 94 (8.4)        | 43 (7.7)       | .609  |
In conclusion, OPAT can be safely administered using less restrictive criteria than those currently recommended in a substantial proportion of patients with IE. The OPAT-GAMES criteria allow identification of those patients at higher risk of long-term complications. International guidelines for IE should adopt more liberal criteria for indicating OPAT in upcoming versions.
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Pedro Linares, Enrique Míguez Rey, María Rodríguez Mayo, Efrén Sánchez, Dolores Sousa Regeu, Complejo Hospitalario Universitario de Huelva (Huelva): Francisco Javier Martínez; Hospital Universitario de Canarias (Canarias): Mª del Mar Alonso, Beatriz Castro, Teresa Delgado Melian, Javier Fernández Sarabia, Dídac García Rosado, Julia González González, Juan LacaIzada, Lissete Lorenzo de la Peña, Alina Pérez Ramírez, Pablo Prada Arroondo, Fermín Rodríguez Moreno; Hospital Regional Universitario de Málaga (Málaga): Antonio Plata Ciezar, José Mª Reguera Iglesias; Hospital Universitario Central Asturias (Oviedo): Víctor Asensi Álvarez, Carlos Costas, Jesús de la Hera, Jonnathan Fernández Suárez, Lisardo Iglesias Fraile, Víctor León Arguero, José López Menéndez, Pilar Mencia Bajo, Carlos Morales, Alfonso Moreno Torrico, Carmén Palomo, Begoña Paya Martínez, Ángeles Rodríguez Esteban, Raquel Rodríguez García, Mauricio Teltendi Asensio; Hospital Clinic-IDIBAPS, Universitat de Barcelona (Barcelona): Manuel Almela, Juan Ambrosioni, Manel Azqueta, Mercé Brunet, Marta Bordo, Raimón Cartaña, Guillermo Cuervo, Carlos Falcés, Guillermina Fit, David Fuster, Cristina García de la María, Delia García-Parets, Marta Hernández-Meneses, Jaime Llopis Pérez, Francisco Marco, José M. Miró, Asunción Moreno, David Nicolás, Salvador Ninot, Eduardo Quintana, Carlos Paré, Daniel Pereda, Juan M. Pericás, José L. Pomar, José Ramírez, Irene Rovira, Elena Sandoval, Marta Stiges, Dolores Soy; Adrián Téllez, José M. Toledo, Laura Martínez Vidal; Hospital General Universitario Gregorio Marañón (Madrid): Iván Adán, Álvaro Alonso, Ana Álvarez-Utría, Javier Bermejo, Emilio Bouza, Gregorio Cuerpo Caballero, Antonia Delgado Montero, Ana González Mansilla, Mª Eugenia García Leóni, Esther Gargallo, Víctor González Ramallo, Martha Kestler Hernández, Amaia Mari Hualde, Marina Machado, Mercedes Marín, Manuel Martínez-Sellés, Patricia Muñoz, María Olmedo, Álvaro Pedra, Blanca Pinilla, Ángel Pinto, Cristina Rincón, Hugo Rodríguez-Abella, Marta Rodríguez-Crèixems, Antonio Segado, Neera Toledo, Maricela Valero, Pilar Vázquez, Eduardo Verde Moreno; Hospital Universitario La Paz (Madrid): Isabel Antorrenoa, Belén Loeches, Mar Moreno, Ulises Ramírez, Verónica Rial Bastón, María Romero, Sandra Rosillo; Hospital Universitario Marqués de Valdecilla (Santander): Hospital Universitario Marqués de Valdecilla (Santander): Jesús Agüero Balbin, Cristina Amado, Carlos Armiñánzasts Castillo, Ana Arnaiz, Francisco Arnaiz de las Revillas, Manuel Cobal Belasteguy, María Carmen Farías, Concepción Farías-Álvarez, Marta Fernández Sampedro, Iván García, Claudia González Rico, Laura Guiterrez-Fernandez, Manuel Guiterrez-Cuarda, José Gutiérrez-Diez, Marcos Pajarón, José Antonio Parra, Ramón Teira, Jesús Zurazua; Hospital Universitario Puerta de Hierro (Madrid): Jorge Calderón Parra, Marta Cobo, Fernando Dominguez, Alberto Fortaleza, Juan Carlos Pavía, Jesús González Fernández, Víctor González Cruz, Elena Múñoz, Antonio Ramos, Isabel Santiago Romero; Hospital Universitario Ramón y Cajal (Madrid): Tomasa Centella, José Manuel Heredia, José Luis Moya, Pilar Martín-Dávila, Enrique Navas, Enrique Oliva, Alejandro del Río, Jorge Rodríguez-Rodra Stuart, Soledad Ruiz; Hospital Universitario Virgen de las Nieves (Granada): Carmen Hidalgo Tenorio; Hospital Universitario Virgen Macarena (Sevilla): Manuel Almendro Delia, Omar Amir, José Miguel Barquero, Román Camarero, Marina de Cueto, Juan Gálvez Acebal, Irene Méndez, Isabel Morales, Luis Eduardo López-Cortés; Hospital Universitario Virgen del Rocío (Sevilla): Arístides de Alarcón, Emilio García, Juan Luis Haro, José Antonio Lepe, Francisco López, Rafael Luque; Hospital San Pedro (Logroño): Luis Javier Alonso, Pedro Álvarez-Bajo; Hospital San Pedro (Logroño): Luis Javier Alonso, Pedro Álvarez-Bajo; Hospital Universitario de Ávila; Hospital Universitario de Arteixo; Hospital Universitario de Cáceres; Hospital Universitario de Castellón; Hospital Universitario de Córdoba; Hospital Universitario de Corunna; Hospital Universitario de Granada; Hospital Universitario de Guadalajara; Hospital Universitario de Huelva; Hospital Universitario de León; Hospital Universitario de Málaga; Hospital Universitario de Murcia; Hospital Universitario de Navarra; Hospital Universitario de Ourense; Hospital Universitario de Salamanca; Hospital Universitario de Saragossa; Hospital Universitario de Sevilia; Hospital Universitario de Toledo; Hospital Universitario de Valencia; Hospital Universitario de Vigo; Hospital Universitario de Zaragoza; Hospital Universitario Virgen de Arrixaca (Murcia): José Mª Arribas Leal, Elisa García Vázquez, Vicente Hernández Torres, Ana Blázquez, Gonzalo de la Morena Valenzuela; Hospital de Txagorritxu (Vitoria); Ángel Alonso, Javier Aramburu, Felipitas Elena Calvo, Anaí Moreno Rodriguez, Paola Tabarini-Castellani; Hospital Virgen de la Salud (Toledo): Eva Heredero Gálvez, Carolina Maicas Bellicio; José Mª Pau, Mª Antonia Sepúlveda, Pilar Toledano Sierra, Sadaf Zafar Iqbal-Mirza; Hospital Rafael Méndez (Lorca-Murcia); Eva Cascales Alcolea, Ivan Keitusqwa Yañez, Julián Navarro Martínez; Ana Pélez Ballesta; Hospital Universitario San Cecilio (Granada): Eduardo Moreno Escobar, Alejandro Peña Monje, Valme Santiago Cabrera, David Vinuea García; Hospital Son Llätzer (Palma de Mallorca): Maria Arrizabalaga Asenjo, Carmen Cifuentes Luna, Juana Núñez Morcillo, Mª Cruz Pérez Seco, Aaro Villoslada Gelabert; Hospital Universitario Miguel Servet (Zaragoza): Carmen Aurell Guallar, Nuria Fernández Abad, Pilar García Mangas, Marta Matamala Adell, Mª Pilar Palañca Ruiz, Juan Carlos Porres; Hospital General Universitario Santa Lucía (Cartagena): Begoña Alcaraz Vidal, Nazaret Coobs Triguero, María Jesús Del Amor Espín; José Antonio Giner Caro, Roberto Jiménez-Sánchez, Amaya Jimeno Almázan, Alejandro Ortín Freire, Monserrat Viqueira González; Hospital Universitario Son Espases (Palma de Mallorca): Pere Pericás Ramis, Mª Ángeles Ribas Blanco, Enrique Ruiz de Gopegui Bordes, Laura Vidal Bonet; Complejo Hospitalario Universitario de Albacete (Albacete): Mª Carmen Bellón Munera, Elena Escribano Garaizabal, Antonia Tercero; Juan Carlos Segura de la Torre, Hospital Universitario Terrassa: Cristina Badía, Lucía Boix Palop, Manuela Xercavins, Sónia Ibars; Hospital Universitario Dr. Negrín (Canaria): Xerach Bosch, Eloy Gómez Nebreda, Ibalia Horcajada Herrera, Irene Menduíña Gallego, Imanol Pulido; Complejo Hospitalario Universitario Insular Materno Infantil (Las Palmas de Gran Canaria): Héctor Marrero Santiago, Isabel de Miguel Martínez, Elena Pisos Alamo; Hospital Universitario 12 de Octubre (Madrid): Eva Mª Aguilar Blanco, Mercedes Catalan González, María Angélica Correí Corretti, Andrea Eixerets Esteve, Laura Dominguez Pérez, Santiago de Cossio Tejido, Francisco Galván Román, José Antonio García Robles, Francisco López Medrano, Mª Jesús López Gude, Mª Ángeles Orellana Miguel, Patrick Pilkington, Yolanda Revilla Ostalaza, Juan Ruiz Morales, Sebastián Ruiz Solís, Ana Sabin Collado, Marcos Sánchez Fernández, Javier Solera Rallo, Jorge Solís Martín; Hospital Universitario de Bellvitge (L’Hospitalet de Llobregat): Francesc Escriueta-Vidal, Jordi Curratellas, Inmaculada Grau, Sara Grilló, Carmen Arribas, Damiàs Berbel, José Carlos Sánchez Salado, Oriol Alegre, Alejandro Ruiz Majoral, Fabrizio Shrnga, Arnau Blasco, Laura Graça Sanches, Iván Sánchez-Rodriguez, Hospital Universitario Fundación Don Juan Miguel Juez Mídez (Madrid): Beatriz Álvarez, Alfonso Cabello Ubeda, Ricardo Fernández Roblas, Miguel Ángel Navas Abala, María Pilar Pello; Hospital Basurto (Bilbao): Mireia de la Peña Triguero, Ruth Esther Lluís Recasens, Manuel Taurón.
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