Polymicrobial Infective Endocarditis: Clinical Features and Prognosis
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Abstract: To describe the profile of left-sided polymicrobial endocarditis (PE) and to compare it with monomicrobial endocarditis (ME).

Among 1011 episodes of left-sided endocarditis consecutively diagnosed in 3 tertiary centers, between January 1, 1996 and December 31, 2014, 60 were polymicrobial (5.9%), 821 monomicrobial (81.7%), and in 123 no microorganism was detected (12.2%). Seven patients (0.7%) were excluded from the analysis because contamination of biologic tissue could not be discarded. The authors described the clinical, microbiologic, echocardiographic, and outcome of patients with PE and compared it with ME.

Mean age was 64 years SD 16 years, 67% were men and 30% nosocomial. Diabetes mellitus (35%) were the most frequent comorbidities, fever (67%) and heart failure (43%) the most common symptoms at admission. Prosthetic valves (50%) were the most frequent infection location and coagulase-negative Staphylococci (48%) and enterococci (37%) the leading etiologies. The most repeated combination was coagulase-negative Staphylococci with enterococci (n = 9). Polymicrobial endocarditis appeared more frequently in patients with underlying disease (70% versus 56%, P = 0.036), mostly diabetics (35% versus 24%, P = 0.044) with previous cardiac surgery (15% versus 8% P = 0.049) and prosthetic valves (50% versus 37%, P = 0.038). Coagulase-negative Staphylococci, enterococci, Gram-negative bacilli, anaerobes, and fungi were more frequent in PE. No differences on age, sex, symptoms, need of surgery, and in-hospital mortality were detected.

Polymicrobial endocarditis represents 5.9% of episodes of left-sided endocarditis in our series. Despite relevant demographic and microbiologic differences between PE and ME, short-term outcome is similar.

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, the causative microorganism is identified in roughly 90% of the episodes of infectious endocarditis (IE). The isolation of more than one microorganism in patients with IE is quite uncommon, ranging from 1% to 6.8%. Theoretically, polymicrobial infective diseases are associated with a worse clinical course and prognosis than monomicrobial diseases. In the case of IE, this hypothesis remains unsettled, because scanty information is available in the literature. Besides, no comparison between polymicrobial endocarditis (PE) and monomicrobial endocarditis (ME) has been undertaken.

Our purpose has been to analyze the clinical, microbiologic, and echocardiographic profile and the outcomes of patients with left-sided PE. We also aimed to compare them with that of patients with ME to establish whether the isolation of more than one pathogen is related to worse prognosis.

METHODS

Study Population

Since January 1, 1996 to December 31, 2014, all patients with a final diagnosis of IE admitted in three tertiary centers were included in an ongoing multipurpose database. We used the Duke criteria until 2002 and the modified Duke criteria thereafter. All participant hospitals followed a standardized protocol, in which every patient underwent at least 1 physical examination, electrocardiogram, blood analysis, urine analysis, set of 3 blood cultures, and transthoracic and transesophageal echocardiography. We filled a standardized case report form with 26 epidemiological, 72 clinical, 26 laboratory, 6 electrocardiographic, 27 microbiologic, and 68 echocardiographic variables for every patient. The protocol conformed to the ethical guidelines of the 1975 Declaration of Helsinki and was approved by the local ethical committees.

To establish the causative microorganism of each episode of IE, we combined both the information of the blood cultures and that obtained from the cultures of biologic infective tissues (ie, explanted valves or prosthesis, embolic material, etc). Patients were divided into 3 groups depending on the number of causative microorganisms: PE (2 or more microorganisms); ME (one); and unknown microorganism (zero). Patients in whom coagulase-negative Staphylococci or other common skin contaminants grew up in the cultures of a biologic infected tissue and not in the blood cultures were excluded from the analysis because contamination could not be ruled out. The main characteristics of PE were compared with those of ME.

Definition of Terms

The episode of endocarditis was considered polymicrobial when 2 or more microorganisms were cultured in at least 3 blood samples or isolated from infected tissues simultaneously or
consecutively within 7 days of the initial positive blood culture without evidence of other clinical infectious foci. Antibiotic treatment and indications of surgery followed the recommendations of the current European guidelines in every moment throughout the study period. Urgent surgery was defined as that performed before the finalization of the antibiotic treatment. If the signs and symptoms of the IE started after 48 hours from the hospital admission or in the first 3 days after discharge or up to 30 days after an operation, the episode was considered as nosocomial. We have analyzed possible predisposing events as situations with theoretical risk of bacteremia occurring within the previous 2 months of the beginning of the disease. Chronic renal disease was defined as a decrease of glomerular filtration rate below 60 ml/min/1.73 m² for at least 3 months. Early prosthetic valve endocarditis was defined as occurring less than 1 year after surgery. Other definitions used in this study have been already described in previous works.10

Statistics
Categorical variables are reported as frequency (n) and percentages. Continuous variables as mean ± standard deviation or median and interquartile range (IQR). Normal distribution of quantitative variables was verified with the Kolmogorov−Smirnov test. Qualitative variables were compared with the χ² test and Fisher exact test. Continuous variables were compared with Student t test or its equivalent for nonparametric tests, Mann−Whitney U test, for variables that were not normally distributed. Data were analyzed using the SPSS V 15.0 software package (SPSS, Chicago, IL).

RESULTS
Epidemiological Features of Polymicrobial Endocarditis
From January 1, 1996 to December 31, 2014, 1195 episodes of definite IE were diagnosed. Of them, 1011 were left-sided (85%) and formed our study group: 60 were polymicrobial (5.9%), 821 monomicrobial (81.2%), and in 123 patients no microorganism was detected (12.1%). Seven patients (0.7%) were excluded from the analysis because contamination of biologic infected tissues in 7 (12%) and with the combination of both in 17 (28%). Three microorganisms were isolated in 6 patients and 2 in the rest. Coagulase-negative *Staphylococci*, enterococci, Gram-negative bacilli and *Staphylococcus aureus* were the predominant pathogens. The microbiologic profile of PE is represented in Figure 1. The most frequent combinations of microorganisms were: coagulase-negative *Staphylococci* plus enterococci (n = 9, 15%), coagulase-negative *Staphylococci* plus Gram-negative bacilli (n = 5, 8%) and coagulase-negative *Staphylococci* plus *Streptococcus viridans* (n = 5, 8%). A total of 60% of staphylococcal strains were methicillin resistant and there were no streptococcal strains resistant to penicillin.

Clinical and Echocardiographic Profile of Polymicrobial Endocarditis
Time of evolution of symptoms to diagnosis was 46 days (IQR 7–61). The most frequent initial symptoms at admission were fever (n = 40; 67%), dyspnea (n = 27; 48%), and shivering (n = 23; 41%). During hospitalization 60% developed heart failure, 45% renal failure, 28% persistent infection, 20% stroke, and 13% cardiogenic shock.

Polymicrobial endocarditis affected native valves in 30 patients (19 mitral, 16 aortic) and prostheses in 30 (16 mechanical mitral prostheses, 8 mechanical aortic, 5 aortic bioprostheses, and 3 mitral bioprostheses). Early-onset prosthetic valve endocarditis occurred in 11 patients (37%) and late onset in 19 patients (63%). There were 12 multivalvular episodes. Transeophageal echocardiograms revealed valvar vegetations in 48 patients (80%) (diameter 18.4 ± 3.5 × 7.3 ± 4.1 mm; area 0.40 ± 0.6 cm²), at least one perianular complication in 13 (22%) (5 abscesses, 8 pseudoaneurysms, and 2 fistulas), and moderate or severe valvular regurgitation in 40 (67%).

Microbiologic Profile of Polymicrobial Endocarditis
The diagnosis of PE was performed according to the results of blood cultures or serology in 36 patients (60%), with cultures of biologic infected tissues in 7 (12%) and with the combination of both in 17 (28%). Three microorganisms were isolated in 6 patients and 2 in the rest. Coagulase-negative *Staphylococci*, enterococci, Gram-negative bacilli and *Staphylococcus aureus* were the predominant pathogens. The microbiologic profile of PE is presented in Figure 1. The most frequent combinations of microorganisms were: coagulase-negative *Staphylococci* plus enterococci (n = 9, 15%), coagulase-negative *Staphylococci* plus Gram-negative bacilli (n = 5, 8%) and coagulase-negative *Staphylococci* plus *Streptococcus viridans* (n = 5, 8%). A total of 60% of staphylococcal strains were methicillin resistant and there were no streptococcal strains resistant to penicillin.

Treatment and Outcome of Polymicrobial Endocarditis
Surgery was performed in 39 patients (65%): urgent in 19 (49%) and elective in 20 (51%). The main indications for urgent surgery were severe valvular dysfunction (45%), heart failure (42%) and persistent infection (42%). Patients received 3.1 ± 0.8 antibiotics for a median of 10 ± 5.7 weeks. Distribution of antibiotics was as follows: glycopeptides (65%), aminoglycosides (60%), penicillins (53%), cephalosporins (25%), carbapenems (10%), and fluoroquinolones (8%). Hospital stay was 49 ± 30 days and total in-hospital mortality 33% (n = 20). Principal causes of death were: uncontrolled infection (25%), heart failure (20%), and hemodynamic instability during extracorporeal circulation (20%).
|                                    | PE (n = 60) | ME (n = 821) | P      |
|------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|--------|
| Mean age, years; mean ± SD         | 64 ± 16     | 64 ± 14     | 0.132  |
| Men, n (%)                         | 40 (67)     | 529 (64)    | 0.727  |
| **Origin**                         |             |             |        |
| Nosocomial, n (%)                  | 18 (30)     | 215 (26)    | 0.518  |
| Not nosocomial                     | 42 (70)     | 606 (74)    |        |
| Community acquired, n (%)          | 34 (81)     | 554 (91)    | 0.046  |
| Healthcare related, n (%)          | 8 (19)      | 52 (9)      |        |
| **Previous Heart Disease**         |             |             |        |
| Rheumatic valve disease, n (%)     | 5 (8)       | 84 (10)     | 0.638  |
| Pre-existing prosthetic valve, n (%)| 30 (50)    | 302 (37)    | 0.041  |
| Degenerative valve disease, n (%)  | 12 (20)     | 143 (17)    | 0.612  |
| Previous endocarditis, n (%)       | 5 (8)       | 51 (6)      | 0.579  |
| Congenital heart disease, n (%)    | 2 (3)       | 34 (4)      | 0.999  |
| **Predisposing Events**            |             |             |        |
| Local infection, n (%)             | 7 (12)      | 97 (12)     | 0.973  |
| Intravenous catheters, n (%)       | 10 (17)     | 110 (13)    | 0.476  |
| Dental manipulation, n (%)         | 3 (5)       | 47 (6)      | 0.999  |
| Urogenital manipulation, n (%)*    | 4 (7)       | 27 (3)      | 0.154  |
| Previous cardiac surgery, n (%)†   | 9 (15)      | 62 (8)      | 0.049  |
| Previous noncardiac surgery, n (%) | 3 (5)       | 49 (6)      | 0.999  |
| Intravenous drug use, n (%)        | 1 (2)       | 25 (3)      | 0.999  |
| **Underlying disease**             |             |             |        |
| Diabetes mellitus, n (%)           | 21 (35)     | 192 (24)    | 0.044  |
| Chronic renal insufficiency, n (%) | 10 (17)    | 112 (14)    | 0.485  |
| Cancer, n (%)                      | 7 (12)      | 86 (11)     | 0.774  |
| HIV, n (%)                         | 1 (2)       | 16 (2)      | 0.999  |
| **Symptoms at Admission**          |             |             |        |
| Time symptoms to diagnosis, days, median (IQR) | 46 (7–61) | 37 (5–40) | 0.427  |
| New murmur, n (%)                  | 29 (50)     | 371 (46)    | 0.547  |
| Shivering, n (%)                   | 23 (41)     | 325 (42)    | 0.843  |
| Fever, n (%)                       | 40 (67)     | 591 (73)    | 0.307  |
| Dyspnea, n (%)                     | 27 (48)     | 331 (41)    | 0.301  |
| Heart failure, n (%)               | 26 (43)     | 324 (40)    | 0.575  |
| Renal insufficiency, n (%)         | 8 (14)      | 157 (19)    | 0.309  |
| Septic shock, n (%)                | 1 (2)       | 58 (7)      | 0.172  |
| Stroke, n (%)                      | 9 (15)      | 93 (11)     | 0.401  |
| Cutaneous manifestations           | 5 (9)       | 82 (10)     | 0.370  |
| **Symptoms During Hospitalization**|             |             |        |
| Fever, n (%)                       | 47 (78)     | 695 (85)    | 0.156  |
| Heart failure, n (%)               | 36 (60)     | 480 (59)    | 0.858  |
| Renal insufficiency, n (%)         | 27 (45)     | 336 (41)    | 0.562  |
| Cardiogenic shock, n (%)           | 8 (13)      | 134 (16)    | 0.531  |
| Septic shock, n (%)                | 4 (9)       | 106 (19)    | 0.106  |
| Persistent infection, n (%)        | 12 (28)     | 168 (31)    | 0.723  |
| Stroke, n (%)                      | 12 (20)     | 145 (18)    | 0.664  |
| **Location**                       |             |             |        |
| Native, n (%)                      | 30 (50)     | 521 (64)    | 0.038  |
| Mitral, n (%)                      | 19 (32)     | 336 (41)    | 0.158  |
| Aortic, n (%)                      | 16 (27)     | 303 (37)    | 0.111  |
| Prosthetic, n (%)                  | 30 (50)     | 300 (37)    | 0.038  |
| Mechanic mitral, n (%)             | 16 (27)     | 155 (19)    | 0.141  |
| Mechanic aortic, n (%)             | 8 (13)      | 99 (12)     | 0.770  |
| Mitral bioprosthesis, n (%)        | 3 (5)       | 12 (2)      | 0.076  |
| Aortic bioprosthesis, n (%)        | 5 (8)       | 70 (9)      | 0.959  |
| Early onset, n (%)                 | 11 (37)     | 105 (35)    | 0.876  |
| Late onset, n (%)                  | 19 (63)     | 193 (65)    |        |
| Multivalvular                      | 12 (20)     | 191 (23)    | 0.562  |

* Urogenital manipulation includes urethral catheterization, urethral manipulation, or prostatic massage. † Previous cardiac surgery includes coronary surgery or valve surgery.
Comparison Between Polymicrobial and Monomicrobial Endocarditis

Demographic, clinical, echocardiographic, and outcome differences between PE and ME are depicted in Table 1. Polymicrobial endocarditis appeared more frequently in patients with underlying diseases (70% versus 56%, \( P = 0.04 \)), more often in diabetics (35% versus 24%, \( P = 0.04 \)). It was more frequently prosthetic (50% versus 37%, \( P = 0.04 \)), and healthcare related (19% versus 9%, \( P = 0.046 \)). No differences in other echocardiographic findings were found. Coagulase-negative Staphylococci, enterococci, Gram-negative bacilli, anaerobes, and fungi were more frequent in PE (Table 2). Among Staphylococcal species, methicillin resistance was more frequent (60% versus 39%, \( P = 0.028 \)) in PE. The number of antibiotics prescribed (3.1 \pm 0.8 versus 2.7 \pm 1, \( P = 0.002 \)) and the use of glycopeptides (65% versus 46%, \( P = 0.005 \)) were also higher in PE, but the

### TABLE 2. Comparison of the Microbiologic Profile Between Polymicrobial and Monomicrobial Endocarditis

|                  | PE (n = 60) | ME (n = 821) | \( P \)  |
|------------------|------------|-------------|--------|
| Number of microorganisms | 126        | 821         | <0.001 |
| Coagulase-negative Staphylococci, n (%) | 29 (48)    | 166 (20)    | <0.001 |
| Enterococci, n (%) | 22 (37)    | 109 (13)    | <0.001 |
| \(^1\)Gram-negative bacilli, n (%) | 15 (25)    | 35 (4)      | <0.001 |
| Viridans group streptococci, n (%) | 16 (27)    | 131 (16)    | 0.032  |
| Staphylococcus aureus, n (%) | 14 (23)    | 187 (23)    | 0.921  |
| \(^1\)Anaerobes, n (%) | 11 (18)    | 19 (2)      | <0.001 |
| Fungi, n (%)      | 5 (8)      | 16 (2)      | 0.011  |
| Other Streptococci, n (%) | 3 (5)      | 67 (8)      | 0.618  |
| Streptococcus bovis, n (%) | 3 (5)      | 49 (6)      | 0.999  |
| HACEK, n (%)      | 2 (3)      | 5 (1)       | 0.336  |
| \(^1\)Others, n (%) | 6 (10)     | 37 (5)      | 0.065  |
| Methicillin resistant Staphylococcal spp, n (%) | 18 (60)    | 131 (39)    | 0.028  |
| Penicillin resistant Streptococcal spp, n (%) | 0 (0)      | 2 (3)       | 0.999  |

\(^*\) Gram-negative bacilli: Serratia spp, Escherichia coli, Stenotrophomonas maltophilia, Enterobacter cloacae, Pseudomonas aeruginosa, Klebsiella pneumoniae, Acinetobacter spp.

\(^1\) Anaerobes: Corynebacterium spp, Prevotella spp, Propionibacterium spp, Cellulomonas spp, Lactobacillus spp.

\(^*\) Others: Lysteria monocytogenes, Bacillus spp, Micrococcus spp, Leuconostoc spp, Coxiella burnetti, and Chlamydia pneumoniae.
duration of the antibiotic treatment was similar. No differences in the need of surgery (65% versus 59%, \( P = 0.39 \)) and mortality (33% versus 30%, \( P = 0.61 \)) were observed.

**DISCUSSION**

Polymicrobial diseases, which are recognized with increasing frequency, are acute and chronic diseases caused by various combinations of viruses, bacteria, fungi, and parasites.\(^{11}\) It is known that the presence of 1 microorganism can generate a niche for other pathogenic microorganisms to colonise.\(^{12,13}\) In the particular case of PE, scanty data is available, only case reports,\(^{11,14,15}\) small series,\(^{16–18}\) and a systematic review in 1991\(^{19}\) have been reported.

Our investigation, to our knowledge, is the first prospectively recruited series, which depicts the current characteristics of PE, and compares them with those of ME. Our results shed light on this topic, which has been systematically left out when IE has been analyzed.

Some important consequences can be drawn from the investigation herein presented: prevalence of PE in our series is higher than previously reported; coagulase-negative *Staphylococci*, *Enterococci*, Gram-negative bacilli, anaerobes, and fungi are more frequently encountered as causative pathogens in PE; staphylococcal strains were more frequently methicillin resistant in PE; but in spite of all these differences, the clinical profile and the prognosis are very similar. Any of these findings deserves a comment.

Epidemiology and incidence of PE has not been determined. In older studies, PE affects predominantly drug abusers and patients with valvular prosthesis,\(^{15–24}\) and the incidence was reported ranging from 1% in unselected populations to 6.8% in drug users,\(^{2,3}\) although nowadays it could be higher.\(^{18}\) Our work shows an incidence of 5.9% and only 1 patient was drug addict. This difference with previous older studies can be explained by 3 facts. First, the definition of PE used in our study. We not only considered the results of the blood cultures, but also the cultures of infected tissues related to the endocarditis, for example the valves, prosthesis or embolic material explanted during surgery. In fact, in 40% of our PE patients the diagnosis was performed taking into account these cultures. Other explanation might be the progressive improvement in the microbiologic techniques, which have incremented the sensitivity to detect microorganisms.\(^{25–27}\) Lastly, we have excluded right-sided endocarditis from our study. Our incidence would have been higher (6.6%) if 7 patients with coagulase-negative *Staphylococci* in the cultures of biologic material had been included, but as the possibility of contamination could not be ruled out, we decided to exclude them from the analysis.

Several reasons are behind the microbiologic profile of PE in our series. The high proportion of prosthetic episodes, the frequent association with underlying diseases, as diabetes mellitus, or the association with healthcare exposure can explain that coagulase-negative *Staphylococci* are the leading cause of PE, and the high proportion of methicillin resistant staphylococcal strains. In fact, they are the most common microorganisms isolated in early-onset prosthetic valve IE\(^{28}\) but also in blood cultures as result of contamination.\(^{29}\) Taking into account this last consideration, we only considered them as etiologic agents of the episode of IE when they were isolated in three consecutive blood cultures, excluding those cases with only isolation in biologic infected tissues. *Enterococci*, which are reportedly the third most common group of IE-causing pathogens,\(^{30}\) are the second main etiology of PE. They share with *staphylococci* a high capacity of adhering to the endocardium, fibrin, and platelets.\(^{31–37}\) Theoretically, synergy between these microorganisms may also favor the infective pattern herein found. Nevertheless, there is little clinical evidence that synergy is important to the pathogenesis of IE. It is noteworthy that anaerobes were cultured in almost 20% of PE, whereas in ME their prevalence was anecdotal. It is well known that polymicrobial infections usually involve anaerobes,\(^{38}\) and many mechanisms explaining this synergy have been proposed; inhibition phagocytosis of aerobes by leukocytes, provision of essential nutrients, such as vitamin K, succinate, and various growth factors, alteration of local environment, including reduction of the oxygen tension and lowering of redox potential and provision of substances toxic to the host that permit species of bacteria to flourish concurrently.

Finally, it has to be emphasized that clinical characteristics of PE did not differ substantially from ME and more importantly, the presence of more than one pathogen in cultures does not adversely affect prognosis. A small retrospective investigation had already suggested a similar outcome of both groups of patients.\(^{39}\) In this regard, a recent prospective study in critically ill patients at an intensive coronary care unit further supports our results\(^{40}\) no differences in mortality were seen between 75 patients with polymicrobial bloodstream infection and 371 with monomicrobial. Therefore, from a practical standpoint, the management and the therapeutic strategy of patients with IE should be the same irrespective of whether the patient has PE or ME.

In conclusion, incidence of left-sided PE is higher than previously reported. Despite PE has a specific epidemiologic and microbiologic profile, its clinical course and prognosis are similar to that of ME.

**REFERENCES**

1. Murdoch DR, Corey GR, Hoen B, et al., International Collaboration on Endocarditis-Prospective Cohort Study (ICE-PCS) Investigators. Clinical presentation, etiology and outcome of infective endocarditis in the 21st century: the International Collaboration on Endocarditis-Prospective Cohort Study. *Arch Intern Med.* 2009;169:463–473.
2. Gagliardi J, Nettles R, McCarty D, et al. Native valve infective endocarditis in elderly and younger adult patients: comparison of clinical features and outcomes with use of the Duke criteria and the Duke endocarditis database. *Clin Infect Dis.* 1998;26:1165–1168.
3. Hecht S, Berger M. Right-sided endocarditis in intravenous drug users. *Ann Intern Med.* 1992;117:560–566.
4. Peters BM, Jabra-Rizk MA, O’May GA, et al. Polymicrobial interactions: impact on pathogenesis and human disease. *Clin Microbiol Rev.* 2012;25:193–213.
5. McKenzie FE. Case mortality in polymicrobial bloodstream infections. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2006;59:760–761.
6. Pamm M, Zhong D, Johnson Y, et al. Polymicrobial bloodstream infectious in the neonatal intensive care unit are associated with increased mortality: a case-control study. *BMC Infect Dis.* 2014;14:390.
7. Durack DT, Lukes AS, Bright DK. New criteria for the diagnosis of infective endocarditis: utilization of specific echocardiographic findings. *Circulation.* 1994;96:200–209.
8. Li JS, Sexton DJ, Mick N, et al. Proposed modifications to the Duke criteria for the diagnosis of infective endocarditis. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2000;30:633–638.
9. López J, Revilla A, Vilacosta I, et al. Age-dependent profile of left-sided infective endocarditis: a 3-center experience. *Circulation.* 2010;121:892–897.
10. López J, Revilla A, Vilacosta I, et al. Definition, clinical profile, microbiological spectrum and prognostic factors of early-onset prosthetic valve endocarditis. *Eur Heart J.* 2007;28:760–765.
11. Pigrau C, Buenaventura I, Tornos P, et al. Polymicrobial bacterial endocarditis in a patient with mitral prolapse. Med Clin (Barc). 1983;81:70–72.

12. Brodgen KA, Guthmiller JM, Taylor CE. Human polymicrobial infections. Lancet. 2005;365:21253–255.

13. Murray JL, Connel JL, Stacy A, et al. Mechanisms of synergy in polymicrobial infections. J Microbiol. 2014;52:188–199.

14. Díaz C, González J, Coto A, et al. Polymicrobial endocarditis: presentation of 3 cases. An Med Intern. 1994;11:142–144.

15. Pujadas R, Escribí E, Rossell F, et al. Polymicrobial endocarditis caused by Haemophilus influenzae and Streptococcus viridans. A chance association? Med Clin (Barc). 1984;83:116–118.

16. Cicalini S, Francavilla R, Massaroni K, et al. Polymicrobial infective endocarditis in Italy. Recent Prog Med. 2002;93:92–95.

17. Valencia ME, Enriquez A, Guine J, et al. Polymicrobial endocarditis: a clinical and evolutive study of 12 cases diagnosed during a 10-year period. Rev Clin Exp. 1997;4:245–247.

18. Saravolatz L, Burch K, Quinn E, et al. Polymicrobial infective endocarditis: an increasing clinical entity. Am Heart J. 1978;95:163–168.

19. Baddour LM, Meyer J, Henry B. Polymicrobial infective endocarditis in the 1980s. Rev Infect Dis. 1991;13:963–970.

20. Netzer R, Zollinger E, Seiler C, et al. Infective endocarditis: clinical spectrum, presentation and outcome. An analysis of 212 cases 1980–1995. Heart. 2000;84:25–30.

21. Cooper G, Havlir D, Shalaes D, et al. Polymicrobial bacteremia in the late 1980s: predictors of outcome and review of the literature. Medicine. 1990;69:114–123.

22. Reuben A, Mush er D, Hamil R, et al. Polymicrobial bacteremia: clinical and microbiologic patterns. Rev Infect Dis. 1989;11:161–183.

23. Finland M, Barnes MW. Changing etiology of bacterial endocarditis in the antibacterial era: experiences at Boston City Hospital, 1933–1965. Ann Intern Med. 1970;72:341–348.

24. Crane L, Levine D, Zervos M, et al. Bacteremia in narcotic addicts at the Detroit medical center. Microbiology, epidemiology, risk factors and empiric therapy. Rev Infect Dis. 1986;8:364–373.

25. Breitkopf C, Hammel D, Scheld HH, et al. Impact of a molecular approach to improve the microbiological diagnosis of infective heart valve endocarditis. Circulation. 2005;111:1415–1421.

26. Marín M, Muñoz P, Sánchez M, et al., Group for the Management of Infective Endocarditis of The Gregorio Marañón Hospital. Molecular diagnosis of infective endocarditis by real-time broad-range polymerase chain reaction (PCR) and sequencing directly from heart valve tissue. Medicine (Baltimore). 2007;86:195–202.

27. Lang S. Getting to the heart of the problem: serological and molecular techniques in the diagnosis of infective endocarditis. Future Microbiol. 2008;3:341–349.

28. López J, Revilla A, Vilacosta I, et al. Definition, clinical profile, microbiological spectrum, and prognostic factors of early-onset prosthetic valve endocarditis. Eur Heart J. 2007;28:760–765.

29. Hall KK, Lyman JA. Updated review of blood culture contamination. Clin Microbiol Rev. 2006;19:788–802.

30. Chirouze C, Athan E, Alla F, et al., International Collaboration on Endocarditis Study Group. Enterococcal endocarditis in the beginning of the 21st century: analysis from the International Collaboration on Endocarditis-Prospective Cohort Study. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2013;19:1140–1147.

31. Lowy FD. Staphylococcus aureus infections. N Engl J Med. 1998;339:520–532.

32. Patti JM, McGavin MJ, Höök M. MSCRAMM-mediated adherence of microorganisms to host tissues. Annu Rev Microbiol. 1994;48:585–617.

33. Entenza JM, Foster TJ, Ni Eidhin D, et al. Contribution of clumping factor B to pathogenesis of experimental endocarditis due to Staphylococcus aureus. Infect Immun. 2000;68:5443–5446.

34. Dall LH, Herndon BL. Association of cell-adherent glyocalyx and endocarditis production by viridans group streptococci. J Clin Microbiol. 1990;28:1698–1700.

35. Dall LH, Herndon BL. Quantitative assay of glycoalyx produced by viridans group streptococci that cause endocarditis. J Clin Microbiol. 1989;27:2039–2041.

36. Coque TM, Patterson JE, Steckelberg JM, et al. Incidence of hemolysin, gelatinase, and aggregation substance among enterococci isolated from patients with endocarditis and other infections and from feces of hospitalized and community-based persons. J Infect Dis. 1995;171:1223–1229.

37. Rotstein O, Pruett T, Simmons R. Mechanisms of microbial synergy in polymicrobial infections. Rev Infect Dis. 1985;7:151–170.

38. Miele P, Kogulan P, Levy C, et al. Seven cases of surgical native valve endocarditis caused by coagulase-negative Staphylococci: an underappreciated disease. Am Heart J. 2001;142:571–576.

39. Fordham C, Levy BS, Arbe it RD, et al. Infective endocarditis: an analysis based on strict case definitions. Ann Intern Med. 1981;94:505–509.

40. Sancho S, Artero A, Zaragoza R, et al. Impact of nosocomial polymicrobial bloodstream infections on the outcome in critically ill patients. Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis. 2012;31:1791–1796.