Contents lists available at ScienceDirect



Journal of Microbiology, Immunology and Infection

Journal homepage: http://www.e-jmii.com



Original Article

Staphylococcus lugdunensis Infective Endocarditis: A Literature Review and Analysis of Risk Factors

Po-Yen Liu^a, Yung-Feng Huang^a*, Chia-Wan Tang^a, Ying-Yao Chen^a, Kai-Sheng Hsieh^a, Luo-Ping Ger^b, Yao-Shen Chen^c, Yung-Ching Liu^d

^aDepartment of Pediatrics, Kaohsiung Veterans General Hospital, Kaohsiung, Taiwan.

^bDepartment of Medical Education and Research, Kaohsiung Veterans General Hospital, Kaohsiung, Taiwan.

^cSection of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, Kaohsiung Veterans General Hospital, Kaohsiung, Taiwan.

^dSection of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, Taipei Medical University-Shuang Ho Hospital, Taipei, Taiwan.

BACKGROUND/PURPOSE: Infective endocarditis caused by *Staphylococcus lugdunensis* is a rare disease. Since its first description in 1988, there have only been a few reports of this disease and the causative organism. These publications were primarily case reports and brief case series. We conducted a literature review to identify the nature of the disease and its risk factors.

METHODS: We retrospectively reviewed the cases reported between 1988 and 2008 by searching the relevant literature using the keywords "endocarditis" and "*Staphylococcus lugdunensis*" in the Medline database. All cases included met the definition of the modified Duke criteria.

RESULTS: For the period 1988–2008, 67 cases from 27 articles were reviewed. The mean age of individuals was 53.9 years. Left-sided valvular endocarditis represented 52 (82.5%) of cases and native-valve endocarditis was evident in 48 (78.7%) of cases. A large proportion (82%) of 50 *S. lugdunensis* strains were susceptible to penicillin. Valve replacement operations were performed in 42 (66.7%) patients and the mortality rate was 38.8%. Univariate analysis showed a higher mortality rate in patients aged more than 50 years, those treated before 1995, those treated with antibiotics alone, and those with growth not detected by echocardiography. Medical treatment alone was the independent risk factor for mortality by multivariate analysis. **CONCLUSION:** *S. lugdunensis* endocarditis led to substantial morbidity and mortality. Detailed microbiological identification, echocardiography evaluation, and valve replacement may improve the clinical outcome of individuals with *S. lugdunensis* endocarditis.

KEYWORDS: infective endocarditis, risk factors, Staphylococcus lugdunensis

Introduction

*Corresponding author. 386 Dazhong 1st Road, Zuoying District, Kaohsiung 813, Taiwan.

E-mail: yfhuang@vghks.gov.tw

Article History: Received: Apr 30, 2009 Revised: Jun 20, 2009 Accepted: Aug 25, 2009 *Staphylococcus lugdunensis* is a species of coagulase-negative staphylococci (CoNS), which was first described by Freney et al in 1988. *S. lugdunensis* is differentiated from other CoNS by its ability to produce ornithine decarboxylase and pyrrolidonyl arylamidase (PYR). It is commonly found on the human skin and is a rare contaminant in culture. Since its first identification, many publications have recognized its

pathogenic role in the infections of multiple systems including infective endocarditis (IE), osteomyelitis, septic arthritis, brain abscess, urinary tract infections and soft tissue infections.¹⁻⁴

The first case of IE caused by *S. lugdunensis* was described in 1988.⁵ Since then, only a few case reports and brief case series have been published regarding IE caused by *S. lugdunensis*. Most of these reports revealed that IE caused by *S. lugdunensis* could be very aggressive and that mortality was high. These characteristics of *S. lugdunensis* IE differed largely from other CoNS IE.

A 16-year-old girl without remarkable past history was admitted to our hospital because of right flank pain and fever. *S. lugdunensis* was isolated in two separate sets of blood cultures. Echocardiography showed vegetation at the mitral valve, therefore surgery was performed and the outcome was fair without complications.

To provide more insight into the clinical presentations and to evaluate prognostic factors associated with the mortality of this disease, we have extensively reviewed the literature including our one recent case that was treated successfully.

Methods

We conducted a systematic Medline review covering the period January 1, 1988 through to June 30, 2008. The search terms used were "endocarditis" and "*Staphylococcus lugdunensis*". The searches focused on peer-reviewed articles published in English. After locating the bibliographic references, we retrieved the abstracts of all selected articles. Two clinicians read the abstracts and complete articles independently and, by consensus, decided upon the articles to be included in the study.

The retrieved articles were included in this study if the case reported met the modified Duke criteria of IE with isolates of *S. lugdunensis*.⁶ These articles must contain specific information regarding clinical, microbiological, therapy and outcome variables. For each patient reported, the following variables were recorded: demographic data (age and sex), clinical data (year of diagnosis, portal of entry, sites and types of involved valves and initial echocardiography findings), microbiological data (susceptibility of *S. lugdunensis*), therapy (antimicrobial treatment with or without surgery), and outcome (death or recovery).

Statistical analysis

Statistics Package for Social Science version 10.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA) was used for statistical analyses. Mean, standard deviation, median and range were calculated for continuous variables. We used χ^2 test and Fisher's exact test to determine any significant differences between groups with categorical variables. Univariate analyses were conducted to determine the association between potential risk factors and mortality. Variables that were significant in the univariate analysis were included in the multiple factors analysis. A multiple logistic regression model was used to identify those variables independently associated with the risk for mortality. The level of significance for all statistical tests was $p \leq 0.05$.

Results

A total of 67 cases of *S. lugdunensis* IE were included. In our comprehensive review of the literature from 1988 to 2008, 66 cases were identified from 27 articles.^{5–7,28} One case was recently treated successfully from our hospital. All of the 67 cases met the modified Duke criteria. None of the patients were injection drug users.

Table 1 shows the overall characteristics of the cases reported. The mean age of cases was 53.9 years (range, 7-82 years). Forty-one (61.2%) cases involved males and 41 cases (61%) were older than 50 years. Forty-five (67.2%) cases were community-acquired with an unknown portal of entry. Thirty-six cases (65.5%) had co-morbidities. Native valve, prosthetic valve and pacemaker IE accounted for 80.6%, 11.9% and 7.5% of cases, respectively. Antimicrobial susceptibility reports were available in 50 patients, of which 82.0% (41 patients) were susceptible to penicillin. About 87% of IE cases occurred on the left side. Of the left-side lesions, mitral valve, aortic valve and both represented 40.3%, 32.8% and 11.9% of the total cases. Eight (11.9%) cases had multi-valvular involvement, and all multi-valvular lesions were on the left side. Eleven (16.4%) cases had the occurrence of embolization. Among 54 patients that received echocardiography examinations, vegetation could be detected in 42 (77.8%) cases. Forty-six (68.7%) cases received both antimicrobial therapy and surgery. The overall mortality rate of S. lugdunensis IE was 38.8%.

Table 2 shows the comparison between the dead and surviving cases with *S. lugdunensis* IE. The mortality rates

Characteristics n (%) Age (yr) 53.88±19.14 (7-82) Sex 41 (61.2) Female 26 (38.8) Portal of entry 26 (38.8) Known 22 (32.8) Unknown 45 (67.2) Comorbidity 45 (67.2) Yes 36 (65.5) No 19 (34.5) Location 22 (32.8) Lotation 22 (32.8) Mitral valve 27 (40.3) Actic valve 22 (32.8) Both 8 (11.9) Right-sided 5 (7.5) Tricuspid valve 4 (6.0) Pulmonary valve 1 (1.5) Pacemaker lead 4 (6.0) Vegetations on echocardiography Yes Yes 41 (82.0) No 20 (31.3) Outcome 21 (31.3) Yes 46 (68.7) No 21 (31.3) Outcome 24 (38.8) Recovered 41 (61.2) Death 26 (38.8) <td< th=""><th colspan="4">Table 1. Clinical characteristic of 67 cases of Staphylococcus<i>lugdunensis</i> infective endocarditis^a</th></td<>	Table 1. Clinical characteristic of 67 cases of Staphylococcus <i>lugdunensis</i> infective endocarditis ^a			
Age (yr) 53.88±19.14 (7-82) Sex 41 (61.2) Female 26 (38.8) Portal of entry 26 (38.8) Portal of entry 10 (61.2) Known 22 (32.8) Unknown 45 (67.2) Comorbidity 36 (65.5) No 19 (34.5) Location 22 (32.8) Left-sided 58 (86.6) Mitral valve 27 (40.3) Aortic valve 22 (32.8) Both 8 (11.9) Right-sided 5 (7.5) Tricuspid valve 4 (6.0) Pulmonary valve 1 (1.5) Pacemaker lead 4 (6.0) Vegetations on echocardiography 22 (27.8) No 12 (22.2) Penicillin susceptibility 24 (77.8) No 12 (22.2) Penicillin susceptibility 24 (6.0) Yes 41 (82.0) No 21 (31.3) Outcome 21 (31.3) Quetome 26 (38.8) Characteristics of valve 54 (80.6) Prosthetic valve 54	Characteristics	n (%)		
Sex Male 41 (61.2) Female 26 (38.8) Portal of entry Known Known 22 (32.8) Unknown 45 (67.2) Comorbidity Yes Yes 36 (65.5) No 19 (34.5) Location Image: Comorbidity Left-sided 58 (86.6) Mitral valve 27 (40.3) Aortic valve 22 (32.8) Both 8 (11.9) Right-sided 5 (7.5) Tricuspid valve 4 (6.0) Pulmonary valve 1 (1.5) Pacemaker lead 4 (6.0) Vegetations on echocardiography Yes Yes 42 (77.8) No 12 (22.2) Penicillin susceptibility Yes Yes 41 (82.0) No 9 (18.0) No 21 (31.3) Outcome 26 (38.8) Recovered 41 (61.2) Death 26 (38.8) Characteristics of valve	Age (yr)	53.88±19.14 (7-82)		
Male 41 (61.2) Female 26 (38.8) Portal of entry Known Known 22 (32.8) Unknown 45 (67.2) Comorbidity Yes Yes 36 (65.5) No 19 (34.5) Location 22 (32.8) Mitral valve 27 (40.3) Aortic valve 22 (32.8) Both 8 (11.9) Right-sided 5 (7.5) Tricuspid valve 4 (6.0) Pulmonary valve 1 (1.5) Pacemaker lead 4 (6.0) Vegetations on echocardiography Yes Yes 42 (77.8) No 12 (22.2) Penicillin susceptibility Yes Yes 41 (82.0) No 9 (18.0) Embolization Yes Yes 11 (16.4) No 21 (31.3) Outcome 26 (38.8) Characteristics of valve 44 (6.1.2) No 21 (31.3) Outcome<	Sex			
Female 26 (38.8) Portal of entry Known 22 (32.8) Unknown 45 (67.2) Comorbidity Yes 36 (65.5) No 19 (34.5) Location 22 (32.8) Location 27 (40.3) Aortic valve 22 (32.8) Both 8 (11.9) Right-sided 5 (7.5) Tricuspid valve 4 (6.0) Pulmonary valve 1 (1.5) Pacemaker lead 4 (6.0) Vegetations on echocardiography Yes Yes 42 (77.8) No 12 (22.2) Penicillin susceptibility Yes Yes 41 (82.0) No 9 (18.0) Embolization Yes Yes 11 (16.4) No 21 (31.3) Outcome 26 (38.8) Characteristics of valve 41 (61.2) Death 26 (38.8) Characteristics of valve 8 (11.9) Prosthetic valve 5 (7.5)	Male	41 (61.2)		
Portal of entry 22 (32.8) Unknown 45 (67.2) Comorbidity 45 (67.2) Yes 36 (65.5) No 19 (34.5) Location 22 (32.8) Location 22 (32.8) Mitral valve 27 (40.3) Aortic valve 22 (32.8) Both 8 (11.9) Right-sided 5 (7.5) Tricuspid valve 4 (6.0) Pulmonary valve 1 (1.5) Pacemaker lead 4 (6.0) Vegetations on echocardiography Yes Yes 42 (77.8) No 12 (22.2) Penicillin susceptibility Yes Yes 41 (82.0) No 9 (18.0) Embolization 21 (31.3) Surgery Yes Yes 46 (68.7) No 21 (31.3) Outcome 26 (38.8) Characteristics of valve \$4 (80.6) Prosthetic valve \$4 (80.6) Prosthetic valve \$4 (80.6) Prosthetic valve \$4 (80.6) <td>Female</td> <td>26 (38.8)</td>	Female	26 (38.8)		
Known 22 (32.8) Unknown 45 (67.2) Comorbidity 9 Yes 36 (65.5) No 19 (34.5) Location 27 (40.3) Left-sided 58 (86.6) Mitral valve 27 (40.3) Aortic valve 22 (32.8) Both 8 (11.9) Right-sided 5 (7.5) Tricuspid valve 4 (6.0) Pulmonary valve 1 (1.5) Pacemaker lead 4 (6.0) Vegetations on echocardiography Yes Yes 42 (77.8) No 12 (22.2) Penicillin susceptibility Yes Yes 41 (82.0) No 9 (18.0) Embolization Yes Yes 11 (16.4) No 56 (83.6) Surgery Yes Yes 46 (68.7) No 21 (31.3) Outcome 26 (38.8) Characteristics of valve Xet (80.6) Prosthetic valve 54 (80.6) Prosthetic valve 54 (80.6) <td>Portal of entry</td> <td></td>	Portal of entry			
Unknown 45 (67.2) Comorbidity 9 Yes 36 (65.5) No 19 (34.5) Location 19 (34.5) Location 27 (40.3) Aortic valve 22 (32.8) Both 8 (11.9) Right-sided 5 (7.5) Tricuspid valve 4 (6.0) Pulmonary valve 1 (1.5) Pacemaker lead 4 (6.0) Vegetations on echocardiography Yes Yes 42 (77.8) No 12 (22.2) Penicillin susceptibility Yes Yes 41 (82.0) No 9 (18.0) Embolization Yes Yes 11 (16.4) No 56 (83.6) Surgery Yes Yes 46 (68.7) No 21 (31.3) Outcome 26 (38.8) Characteristics of valve 54 (80.6) Prosthetic valve 54 (80.6) Prosthetic valve 8 (11.9) Pacemaker lead 5 (7.5) <td>Known</td> <td>22 (32.8)</td>	Known	22 (32.8)		
Comorbidity Yes 36 (65.5) No 19 (34.5) Location 19 (34.5) Location 27 (40.3) Aortic valve 22 (32.8) Both 8 (11.9) Right-sided 5 (7.5) Tricuspid valve 4 (6.0) Pulmonary valve 1 (1.5) Pacemaker lead 4 (6.0) Vegetations on echocardiography Yes Yes 42 (77.8) No 12 (22.2) Penicillin susceptibility Yes Yes 41 (82.0) No 9 (18.0) Embolization Yes Yes 11 (16.4) No 56 (83.6) Surgery Yes Yes 46 (68.7) No 21 (31.3) Outcome 21 (31.3) Characteristics of valve 54 (80.6) Prosthetic valve 54 (80.6) Prosthetic valve 54 (80.6) Prosthetic valve 8 (11.9) Pacemaker lead 5 (Unknown	45 (67.2)		
Yes 36 (65.5) 19 (34.5) Location 19 (34.5) Location 27 (40.3) Mitral valve 27 (40.3) Aortic valve 22 (32.8) Both 8 (11.9) Right-sided 5 (7.5) Tricuspid valve 4 (6.0) Pulmonary valve 1 (1.5) Pacemaker lead 4 (6.0) Vegetations on echocardiography Yes Yes 42 (77.8) No 12 (22.2) Penicillin susceptibility Yes Yes 41 (82.0) No 9 (18.0) Embolization Yes Yes 11 (16.4) No 26 (88.6) Surgery Yes Yes 46 (68.7) No 21 (31.3) Outcome 26 (38.8) Characteristics of valve 54 (80.6) Prosthetic valve 54 (80.6) Prosthetic valve 54 (80.5) Prosthetic valve 5 (7.5)	Comorbidity			
No 19 (34.5) Location 58 (86.6) Mitral valve 27 (40.3) Aortic valve 22 (32.8) Both 8 (11.9) Right-sided 5 (7.5) Tricuspid valve 4 (6.0) Pulmonary valve 1 (1.5) Pacemaker lead 4 (6.0) Vegetations on echocardiography Yes Yes 42 (77.8) No 12 (22.2) Penicillin susceptibility Yes Yes 41 (82.0) No 9 (18.0) Embolization Yes Yes 11 (16.4) No 26 (88.6) Surgery Yes Yes 46 (68.7) No 21 (31.3) Outcome 26 (38.8) Characteristics of valve 41 (61.2) Death 26 (38.8) Characteristics of valve 8 (11.9) Prosthetic valve 54 (80.6) Prosthetic valve 5 (7.5)	Yes	36 (65.5)		
Location Left-sided 58 (86.6) Mitral valve 27 (40.3) Aortic valve 22 (32.8) Both 8 (11.9) Right-sided 5 (7.5) Tricuspid valve 4 (6.0) Pulmonary valve 1 (1.5) Pacemaker lead 4 (6.0) Vegetations on echocardiography Yes Yes 42 (77.8) No 12 (22.2) Penicillin susceptibility Yes Yes 41 (82.0) No 9 (18.0) Embolization Yes Yes 11 (16.4) No 56 (83.6) Surgery Yes Yes 46 (68.7) No 21 (31.3) Outcome 26 (38.8) Characteristics of valve 54 (80.6) Prosthetic valve 54 (80.6) Prosthetic valve 8 (11.9) Pacemaker lead 5 (7.5)	No	19 (34.5)		
Left-sided 58 (86.6) Mitral valve 27 (40.3) Aortic valve 22 (32.8) Both 8 (11.9) Right-sided 5 (7.5) Tricuspid valve 4 (6.0) Pulmonary valve 1 (1.5) Pacemaker lead 4 (6.0) Vegetations on echocardiography Yes Yes 42 (77.8) No 12 (22.2) Penicillin susceptibility Yes Yes 41 (82.0) No 9 (18.0) Embolization Yes Yes 11 (16.4) No 56 (83.6) Surgery Yes Yes 46 (68.7) No 21 (31.3) Outcome 26 (38.8) Characteristics of valve 54 (80.6) Prosthetic valve 54 (80.6) Prosthetic valve 8 (11.9) Pacemaker lead 5 (7.5)	Location			
Mitral valve 27 (40.3) Aortic valve 22 (32.8) Both 8 (11.9) Right-sided 5 (7.5) Tricuspid valve 4 (6.0) Pulmonary valve 1 (1.5) Pacemaker lead 4 (6.0) Vegetations on echocardiography Yes Yes 42 (77.8) No 12 (22.2) Penicillin susceptibility Yes Yes 41 (82.0) No 9 (18.0) Embolization 111 (16.4) No 56 (83.6) Surgery 46 (68.7) No 21 (31.3) Outcome 41 (61.2) Death 26 (38.8) Characteristics of valve 8 (11.9) Native valve 54 (80.6) Prosthetic valve 8 (11.9) Pacemaker lead 5 (7.5)	Left-sided	58 (86.6)		
Aortic valve $22 (32.8)$ Both $8 (11.9)$ Right-sided $5 (7.5)$ Tricuspid valve $4 (6.0)$ Pulmonary valve $1 (1.5)$ Pacemaker lead $4 (6.0)$ Vegetations on echocardiographyYesYes $42 (77.8)$ No $12 (22.2)$ Penicillin susceptibilityYesYes $41 (82.0)$ No $9 (18.0)$ Embolization yes Yes $11 (16.4)$ No $56 (83.6)$ SurgeryYesYes $46 (68.7)$ No $21 (31.3)$ Outcome $41 (61.2)$ Death $26 (38.8)$ Characteristics of valve $41 (1.9)$ Pacemaker lead $5 (7.5)$	Mitral valve	27 (40.3)		
Both8 (11.9)Right-sided5 (7.5)Tricuspid valve4 (6.0)Pulmonary valve1 (1.5)Pacemaker lead4 (6.0)Vegetations on echocardiographyYesYes42 (77.8)No12 (22.2)Penicillin susceptibilityYesYes41 (82.0)No9 (18.0)EmbolizationYesYes11 (16.4)No56 (83.6)SurgeryYesYes46 (68.7)No21 (31.3)Outcome41 (61.2)Recovered41 (61.2)Death26 (38.8)Characteristics of valve8 (11.9)Prosthetic valve8 (11.9)Pacemaker lead5 (7.5)	Aortic valve	22 (32.8)		
Right-sided 5 (7.5) Tricuspid valve 4 (6.0) Pulmonary valve 1 (1.5) Pacemaker lead 4 (6.0) Vegetations on echocardiography Yes Yes 42 (77.8) No 12 (22.2) Penicillin susceptibility Yes Yes 41 (82.0) No 9 (18.0) Embolization Yes Yes 11 (16.4) No 56 (83.6) Surgery Yes Yes 46 (68.7) No 21 (31.3) Outcome 41 (61.2) Death 26 (38.8) Characteristics of valve 54 (80.6) Prosthetic valve 8 (11.9) Pacemaker lead 5 (7.5)	Both	8 (11.9)		
Tricuspid valve 4 (6.0) Pulmonary valve 1 (1.5) Pacemaker lead 4 (6.0) Vegetations on echocardiography 4 (6.0) Vegetations on echocardiography 4 (6.0) Yes 42 (77.8) No 12 (22.2) Penicillin susceptibility 41 (82.0) No 9 (18.0) Embolization 9 (18.0) Yes 11 (16.4) No 56 (83.6) Surgery 46 (68.7) Yes 46 (68.7) No 21 (31.3) Outcome 41 (61.2) Death 26 (38.8) Characteristics of valve 54 (80.6) Prosthetic valve 54 (80.1) Prosthetic valve 8 (11.9) Pacemaker lead 5 (7.5)	Right-sided	5 (7.5)		
Pulmonary valve 1 (1.5) Pacemaker lead 4 (6.0) Vegetations on echocardiography Yes Yes 42 (77.8) No 12 (22.2) Penicillin susceptibility Yes Yes 41 (82.0) No 9 (18.0) Embolization Yes Yes 11 (16.4) No 56 (83.6) Surgery Yes Yes 46 (68.7) No 21 (31.3) Outcome 41 (61.2) Death 26 (38.8) Characteristics of valve 54 (80.6) Prosthetic valve 54 (80.7) Pacemaker lead 5 (7.5)	Tricuspid valve	4 (6.0)		
Pacemaker lead 4 (6.0) Vegetations on echocardiography Yes Yes 42 (77.8) No 12 (22.2) Penicillin susceptibility Yes Yes 41 (82.0) No 9 (18.0) Embolization Yes Yes 11 (16.4) No 56 (83.6) Surgery Yes Yes 46 (68.7) No 21 (31.3) Outcome 41 (61.2) Recovered 41 (61.2) Death 26 (38.8) Characteristics of valve 54 (80.6) Prosthetic valve 8 (11.9) Pacemaker lead 5 (7.5)	Pulmonary valve	1 (1.5)		
Vegetations on echocardiography 42 (77.8) No 12 (22.2) Penicillin susceptibility 9 Yes 41 (82.0) No 9 (18.0) Embolization 11 (16.4) Yes 11 (16.4) No 56 (83.6) Surgery 46 (68.7) Yes 46 (68.7) No 21 (31.3) Outcome 41 (61.2) Peath 26 (38.8) Characteristics of valve 54 (80.6) Prosthetic valve 8 (11.9) Pacemaker lead 5 (7.5)	Pacemaker lead	4 (6.0)		
Yes 42 (77.8) No 12 (22.2) Penicillin susceptibility 41 (82.0) Yes 41 (82.0) No 9 (18.0) Embolization 9 (18.0) Yes 11 (16.4) No 56 (83.6) Surgery Yes Yes 46 (68.7) No 21 (31.3) Outcome 26 (38.8) Characteristics of valve 54 (80.6) Prosthetic valve 54 (80.6) Prosthetic valve 8 (11.9) Pacemaker lead 5 (7.5)	Vegetations on echocardiography			
No 12 (22.2) Penicillin susceptibility 41 (82.0) Yes 41 (82.0) No 9 (18.0) Embolization 11 (16.4) Yes 11 (16.4) No 56 (83.6) Surgery Yes Yes 46 (68.7) No 21 (31.3) Outcome 21 (31.3) Outcome 41 (61.2) Death 26 (38.8) Characteristics of valve 54 (80.6) Prosthetic valve 8 (11.9) Pacemaker lead 5 (7.5)	Yes	42 (77.8)		
Penicillin susceptibility Yes 41 (82.0) No 9 (18.0) Embolization	No	12 (22.2)		
Yes 41 (82.0) No 9 (18.0) Embolization 11 (16.4) Yes 11 (16.4) No 56 (83.6) Surgery Yes Yes 46 (68.7) No 21 (31.3) Outcome 41 (61.2) Recovered 41 (61.2) Death 26 (38.8) Characteristics of valve 54 (80.6) Prosthetic valve 8 (11.9) Pacemaker lead 5 (7.5)	Penicillin susceptibility			
No 9 (18.0) Embolization 11 (16.4) Yes 11 (16.4) No 56 (83.6) Surgery 46 (68.7) Yes 46 (68.7) No 21 (31.3) Outcome 41 (61.2) Death 26 (38.8) Characteristics of valve 54 (80.6) Prosthetic valve 8 (11.9) Pacemaker lead 5 (7.5)	Yes	41 (82.0)		
Embolization Yes 11 (16.4) No 56 (83.6) Surgery 46 (68.7) Yes 46 (68.7) No 21 (31.3) Outcome 41 (61.2) Death 26 (38.8) Characteristics of valve 54 (80.6) Prosthetic valve 8 (11.9) Pacemaker lead 5 (7.5)	No	9 (18.0)		
Yes 11 (16.4) No 56 (83.6) Surgery 46 (68.7) Yes 46 (68.7) No 21 (31.3) Outcome 41 (61.2) Death 26 (38.8) Characteristics of valve 54 (80.6) Prosthetic valve 54 (11.9) Pacemaker lead 5 (7.5)	Embolization			
No 56 (83.6) Surgery 46 (68.7) Yes 46 (68.7) No 21 (31.3) Outcome 41 (61.2) Death 26 (38.8) Characteristics of valve 54 (80.6) Prosthetic valve 8 (11.9) Pacemaker lead 5 (7.5)	Yes	11 (16.4)		
SurgeryYes46 (68.7)No21 (31.3)Outcome21 (61.2)Recovered41 (61.2)Death26 (38.8)Characteristics of valve26 (38.6)Prosthetic valve54 (80.6)Prosthetic valve8 (11.9)Pacemaker lead5 (7.5)	No	56 (83.6)		
Yes46 (68.7)No21 (31.3)Outcome41 (61.2)Recovered41 (61.2)Death26 (38.8)Characteristics of valve26 (38.6)Prosthetic valve54 (80.6)Prosthetic valve8 (11.9)Pacemaker lead5 (7.5)	Surgery			
No21 (31.3)OutcomeRecoveredA1 (61.2)Death26 (38.8)Characteristics of valveNative valve54 (80.6)Prosthetic valve8 (11.9)Pacemaker lead5 (7.5)	Yes	46 (68.7)		
OutcomeRecovered41 (61.2)Death26 (38.8)Characteristics of valveNative valve54 (80.6)Prosthetic valve8 (11.9)Pacemaker lead5 (7.5)	No	21 (31.3)		
Recovered41 (61.2)Death26 (38.8)Characteristics of valveNative valve54 (80.6)Prosthetic valve8 (11.9)Pacemaker lead5 (7.5)	Outcome			
Death26 (38.8)Characteristics of valveNative valve54 (80.6)Prosthetic valve8 (11.9)Pacemaker lead5 (7.5)	Recovered	41 (61.2)		
Characteristics of valveNative valve54 (80.6)Prosthetic valve8 (11.9)Pacemaker lead5 (7.5)	Death	26 (38.8)		
Native valve54 (80.6)Prosthetic valve8 (11.9)Pacemaker lead5 (7.5)	Characteristics of valve			
Prosthetic valve8 (11.9)Pacemaker lead5 (7.5)	Native valve	54 (80.6)		
Pacemaker lead 5 (7.5)	Prosthetic valve	8 (11.9)		
	Pacemaker lead	5 (7.5)		

^aData presented as mean \pm standard deviation (range) or n (%).

for native valve endocarditis, prosthetic valve endocarditis and pacemaker lead endocarditis were 34.6%, 75% and 20%, respectively. Upon univariate analysis, variables that had significant association with mortality included: age greater than 50 years, medical treatment alone, negative echocardiography findings and diagnosis before 1995. In the multivariate logistic regression analysis, medical treatment alone was an independent risk factor for mortality (odds ratio=4.79; 95% confidence interval=1.16–19.78) (Table 3).

Discussion

S. lugdunensis was first described in 1988 by Freney et al. *S. lugdunensis* is differentiated from other CoNS by the ability to produce ornithine decarboxylase and PYR. *S. lugdunensis* shares some properties with *S. aureus*. Both may express clumping factor and/or a thermostable DNase and have the same virulence determinants.²⁹ The colony morphology of *S. lugdunensis* also resembles *S. aureus* and may be accidentally identified as *S. aureus.*³⁰ Approximately 25% of clinical isolates of *S. lugdunensis* produce extracellular slime or glycocalyx, which plays an important role in bacterial colonization and interferes with the phagocytosisassociated activities of neutrophils.

According to the published reports, the clinical presentations of IE caused by CoNS were different from those caused by *S. aureus* in many ways.³¹⁻³³ Although *S. lugdunensis* is a CoNS, some reports have showed that the presentation of *S. lugdunensis* IE was more similar to *S. aureus* IE than to IE caused by other CoNS.³⁴⁻³⁶

In our study, *S. lugdunensis* IE usually developed in the cases aged above 50 years. Most patients acquired the infection in the community and the sites of entry were not identified. Most strains of *S. lugdunensis* isolated were sensitive to penicillin. *S. lugdunensis* usually invades the left-side valves with mitral or aortic valve involvement. Sometimes, both mitral and aortic valves could be involved simultaneously. The majority of cases were in the native valve, and IE caused by other CoNS were often hospital-acquired and related to indwelling devices.^{31,33} CoNS usually invaded prosthetics valves³⁷ and most CoNS were resistant to penicillin.³⁸ These were the characteristics of *S. lugdunensis* that differed from other CoNS.

In our review, 68.7% (46/67) of patients received valve replacement and the rate of surgery was higher than for

Table 2. Compansons between mortai	and surviving cases o	1 Staphylococcus lugauriensis IIII	lective endocarditis	
Variables	Total case, n	Mortal case, n (%)	OR (95% CI)	þ
Age (yr)				
≤50	41	20 (48.7)	1	0.040
>50	26	6 (23.1)	3.18 (1.06-9.53)	
Sex				
Male	41	18 (43.9)	1	0.320
Female	26	8 (30.9)	1.76 (0.63-4.96)	
Penicillin susceptible				
Yes	41	15 (36.6)	1	0.720
No	9	4 (44.4)	0.72 (0.17-3.11)	
Surgery				
Yes	46	12 (26.1)	1	0.003
No	21	14 (66.6)	5.67 (1.85-17.38)	
Location of vegetations				
Left-sided	57	24 (42.1)		
Right-sided	4	0(0)		
Pacemaker lead	5	1 (20.0)		
Type of infective valve				
Native valve	52	18 (34.6)		
Prosthetic valve	8	6 (75.0)		
Pacemaker lead	5	1 (20.0)		
Valvular replacement				
Yes				
No				
Source of infections				
Recognized	22	6 (27.3)	1	0.180
Unrecognized	45	20 (44.4)	2.13 (0.71-6.46)	
Vegetations on echocardiography				
Yes	42	10 (23.8)	1	0.040
No	17	12 (70.6)	4.49 (1.16-17.27)	
Diagnosis before 1995				
Yes	21	13 (62.0)	1	0.030
No	42	13 (31.0)	3.63 (1.21-10.86)	

			/ /	<i>c</i> .	
		a at the block a second	1		
			<i>IIIN/IIINDVICIC</i> IFI		1/1/22/20/11/10
		3 (1) JLAUIIVIULULUAS	102001101313 111		
	0	1 2	0		

OR=odds ratio; CI=confidence interval.

other pathogens. Four series showed that rates of valve replacement in IE caused by all pathogens ranged from 15% to 45%.³⁹⁻⁴² In a study of 912 consecutive IE cases between 1990 and 2003, significantly more patients with S. lugdunensis IE underwent surgery compared with those with S. aureus IE (70% vs. 37%); the surgical rate for S. epidermidis IE was similar to that for S. lugdunensis IE.² The mortality rate of S. lugdunensis IE was significantly higher than that for S. epidermidis IE.²

In one series, S. lugdunensis IE often caused valve destruction with abscess formation and progressed to congestive heart failure rapidly.² The antimicrobial treatment usually could not completely eradicate the infectious processes in most cases. Finally, surgical interventions with valve replacement were often needed in most cases reported. Our study showed that surgery was the only independent risk factor for mortality.

Table 3. Multivariate analysis of risk factors for mortality among 67 reported cases of *Staphylococcus lugdunensis* infective endocarditis

Variables	OR (95% CI)	þ
Medical treatment alone	4.79 (1.16–19.78)	0.02
Prosthetic valves	4.00 (0.55-29.32)	0.87
Negative echocardiography	0.84 (0.27-2.55)	0.33
finding		
Age > 50 yr	0.37 (0.10-1.42)	0.14
Diagnosis before 1995	0.23 (0.08-1.01)	0.07

OR=odds ratio; CI=confidence interval.

In our review, the mortality rate associated with *S. lugdunensis* IE was 38.8%. In a previous series, the overall mortality of IE ranged from 18.0% to 24.6%.^{39–42} In a study of 558 patients with *S. aureus* endocarditis from 2003, the mortality rate was 22.4%.⁴³ According to Whitener et al in 1993, the mortality rate of CoNS IE was 16%.³³ Compared with these results, the mortality of *S. lugdunensis* endocarditis appeared to be higher. Further analysis should be performed to verify this hypothesis.

Prosthetic valve endocarditis accounted for 11.9% of *S. lugdunensis* endocarditis cases. These patients often had greater comorbidity because of underlying cardiac problems. Deterioration of clinical conditions often delayed operations for valve replacement, and sometimes only conservative treatment was suggested. Overall, pacemaker lead endocarditis constituted 8.2% of *S. lugdunensis* endocarditis cases and the mortality rate was 20%. Removal of the bacteria with antimicrobial therapy was commonly used in these patients and mortality was low compared with other subgroups.

Most isolates of *S. lugdunensis* (82%) were susceptible to penicillin. In studies by Auguera et al and Zinkernagel et al, most isolates of *S. lugdunensis* were susceptible to penicillin.² Unlike most CoNS, isolates of *S. lugdunensis* were also generally susceptible to multiple agents. In 2006, Hellbacher analyzed 39 isolates of *S. lugdunensis* and demonstrated that *S. lugdunensis* isolates were generally susceptible to most of the antibiotics currently used.³⁰ Despite the remarkable susceptibility to a wide array of antimicrobial agents, medical treatment alone was seldom successful and the majority of patients still received surgery for valve replacement.

Most microbiological laboratories do not routinely identify CoNS to the species level. Additionally, both *S. lugdunensis* and *S. aureus* could be positive in the latex agglutination test because they show similar colony morphology and produce clumping factor. Thus, *S. lugdunensis* might be misidentified as *S. aureus* in routine microbiological laboratory tests. Because of the enhanced virulence and destructive nature of *S. lugdunensis*, the prompt identification of this organism to the species level is essential whenever it is suspected. If a very aggressive form of *S. aureus* IE is encountered, the possibility of *S. lugdunensis* IE should also be considered. There are several biochemical tests able to identify *S. lugdunensis* easily. First, *S. lugdunensis* reveals a negative result in tube coagulase tests. Furthermore, *S. lugdunensis* can be positively differentiated from other CoNS due to positive PYR reaction and positive ornithine decarboxylase activity.

There are some limitations in this study. The main source of information was cases reported in the literature. There is potential for significant selection bias for higher severity, a more complicated course and poorer outcome so that these cases were more likely to be published. In addition, individual investigator's reports could not be standardized for patients' variables and a bias might exist. Some of the sickest patients who might be considered surgical candidates were excluded from surgical options, and certain subgroups of a small number of cases may produce type II errors.

Although uncommon, *S. lugdunensis* is a very aggressive and destructive pathogen with a major role in IE. Examination of the limited data available would suggest surgery appears to be the preferred choice of treatment. In the future, with more cases published from series reports, there should be sufficient cases for more detailed analysis, and hopefully the inherent bias of the analysis will be decreased.

References

- 1. Bellamy R, Barkham T. *Staphylococcus lugdunensis* infection sites: predominance of abscesses in the pelvic girdle region. *Clin Infect Dis* 2002;35:E32–4.
- Anguera I, Del Río A, Miró JM, Matínez-Lacasa X, Marco F, Gumá JR, et al. *Staphylococcus lugdunensis* infective endocarditis: description of 10 cases and analysis of native valve, prosthetic valve, and pacemaker lead endocarditis clinical profiles. *Heart* 2005;91:e10.
- 3. Haile DT, Hughes J, Vetter E, Kohner P, Snyder R, Patel R, et al. Frequency of isolation of *Staphylococcus lugdunensis* in consecutive urine cultures and relationship to urinary tract infection. *J Clin Microbiol* 2002;40:654–6.

- Kaabia N, Scauarda D, Lena G, Drancourt M. Molecular identification of *Staphylococcus lugdunensis* in a patient with meningitis. *J Clin Microbiol* 2002;40:1824–5.
- Smyth EG, Wright ED, Marples RR. New type of staphylococcal endocarditis. J Clin Pathol 1988;41:809–10.
- Li JS, Sexton DJ, Mick N, Nettles R, Fowler VG Jr, Ryan T, et al. Proposed modifications to the Duke criteria for the diagnosis of infective endocarditis. *Clin Infect Dis* 2000;30:633–8.
- 7. Etienne J, Pangon B, Leport C, Wolff M, Clair B, Perronne C, et al. *Staphylococcus lugdunensis* endocarditis. *Lancet* 1989;1:390.
- 8. Barker KF, O'Driscoll JC, Bhargava A. *Staphylococcus lugdunensis*. *J Clin Pathol* 1991;44:873-4.
- 9. Cormican MG, el Bouri K, Corbett-Feeney G, Flynn J, Daly K. *Staphylococcus lugdunensis* endocarditis. *J Infect* 1992;24:335–6.
- Sheppard M, Jankowski S. Staphylococcus lugdunensis endocarditis. J Infect 1992;25:116–7.
- 11. Shuttleworth R, Colby WD. *Staphylococcus lugdunensis* endocarditis. *J Clin Microbiol* 1992;30:1948–52.
- 12. Walsh B, Mounsey JP. *Staphylococcus lugdenensis* and endocarditis. *J Clin Pathol* 1990;43:171.
- 13. Kralovic SM, Melin-Aldana H, Smith KK, Linnemann CC Jr. Staphylococcus lugdunensis endocarditis after tooth extraction. Clin Infect Dis 1995;20:715-6.
- Koh TW, Brecker SJ, Layton CA. Successful treatment of *Staphylococcus lugdunensis* endocarditis complicated by multiple emboli: a case report and review of the literature. *Int J Cardiol* 1996; 55:193–7.
- Bobin S, Durand-Dubief A, Bouhour D, Kirkorian G, Vandenesch F, Etienne J, et al. Pacemaker endocarditis due to *Staphylococcus lugdunensis*: report of two cases. *Clin Infect Dis* 1999;28:404–5.
- Fervenza FC, Contreras GE, Garratt KN, Steckelberg JM. Staphylococcus lugdunensis endocarditis: a complication of vasectomy? Mayo Clin Proc 1999;74:1227–30.
- 17. Polenakovik H, Herchline T, Bacheller C, Bernstein J. *Staphylococcus lugdunensis* endocarditis after angiography. *Mayo Clin Proc* 2000;75:656–7.
- Farrag N, Lee P, Gunney R, Viagappan GM. Staphylococcus lugdunensis endocarditis. Postgrad Med J 2001;77:259–60.
- 19. Jones RM, Jackson MA, Ong C, Lofland GK. Endocarditis caused by *Staphylococcus lugdunensis*. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 2002;21:265–8.
- 20. Renzulli A, Della Corte A, Torella M, Dialetto G, Cotrufo M. Mitral and aortic valve endocarditis due to *Staphylococcus lugdunensis*. *Tex Heart Inst J* 2000;27:67–9.
- 21. Sotutu V, Carapetis J, Wilkinson J, Davis A, Curtis N. The "surreptitious Staphylococcus": *Staphylococcus lugdunensis* endocarditis in a child. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 2002;21:984–6.
- 22. Seenivasan MH, Yu VL. *Staphylococcus lugdunensis* endocarditis the hidden peril of coagulase-negative staphylococcus in blood cultures. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 2003;22:489–91.
- 23. Viganego F, Nazir TM, Lee CY, Hafner JP, Smith R. *Staphylococcus lugdunensis* endocarditis following lower extremity revascularization. *Int J Cardiol* 2007;116:e4–6.

- 24. Van Hoovels L, De Munter P, Colaert J, Surmont I, Van Wijngaerden E, Peetermans WE, et al. Three cases of destructive native valve endocarditis caused by *Staphylococcus lugdunensis*. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 2005;24:149–52.
- 25. Gianella S, Ulrich S, Huttner B, Speich R. Conservative management of a brain abscess in a patient with *Staphylococcus lugdunensis* endocarditis. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 2006;25:476–8.
- 26. Kourbeti IS, Alegakis DE, Roditakis GE, Samonis G. *Staphylococcus lugdunensis* early prosthetic valve endocarditis in a young HIV positive patient. *Infection* 2007;35:40–2.
- 27. Takahashi N, Shimada T, Ishibashi Y, Yoshitomi H, Sugamori T, Sakane T, et al. The pitfall of coagulase-negative staphylococci A case of *Staphylococcus lugdunensis* endocarditis. *Int J Cardiol* 2009; 137:e15–7.
- Zinkernagel AS, Zinkernagel MS, Elzi MV, Genoni M, Gubler J, Zbinden R, et al. Significance of *Staphylococcus lugdunensis* Bacteremia: report of 28 Cases and Review of the Literature. *Infection* 2008;36:314–21.
- 29. Lambe DW Jr, Ferguson KP, Keplinger JL, Gemmell CG, Kalbfleisch JH. Pathogenicity of *Staphylococcus lugdunensis*, *Staphylococcus schleiferi*, and three other coagulase-negative staphylococci in a mouse model and possible virulence factors. *Can J Microbiol* 1990;36:455–63.
- Hellbacher C, Tornqvist E, Soderquist B. *Staphylococcus lugdunensis*: clinical spectrum, antibiotic susceptibility, and phenotypic and genotypic patterns of 39 isolates. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2006;12:43–9.
- 31. Huebner J, Goldmann DA. Coagulase-negative staphylococci: role as pathogens. *Annu Rev Med* 1999;50:223–36.
- 32. Fernandez Guerrero ML, Gonzalez Lopez JJ, Goyenechea A, Fraile J, de Gorgolas M. Endocarditis caused by *Staphylococcus aureus*: a reappraisal of the epidemiologic, clinical, and pathologic manifestations with analysis of factors determining outcome. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2009;88:1–22.
- 33. Whitener C, Caputo GM, Weitekamp MR, Karchmer AW. Endocarditis due to coagulase-negative staphylococci. Microbiologic, epidemiologic, and clinical considerations. *Infect Dis Clin North Am* 1993;7:81–96.
- 34. Stout RD, Li Y, Miller AR, Lambe DW Jr. Staphylococcal glycocalyx activates macrophage prostaglandin E2 and interleukin 1 production and modulates tumor necrosis factor alpha and nitric oxide production. *Infect Immun* 1994;62:4160–6.
- Lambe DW Jr, Jeffery C, Ferguson KP, Cooper MD. Examination of the glycocalyx of four species of Staphylococcus by transmission electron microscopy and image analysis. *Microbios* 1994;78: 133–43.
- 36. Donvito B, Etienne J, Denoroy L, Greenland T, Benito Y, Vandenesch F. Synergistic hemolytic activity of Staphylococcus lugdunensis is mediated by three peptides encoded by a non-agr genetic locus. *Infect Immun* 1997;65:95–100.
- von Eiff C, Proctor RA, Peters G. Coagulase-negative staphylococci. Pathogens have major role in nosocomial infections. *Postgrad Med* 2001;110:63–4, 69–70, 73–6.

- Huang SY, Tang RB, Chen SJ, Chung RL. Coagulase-negative staphylococcal bacteremia in critically ill children: risk factors and antimicrobial susceptibility. *J Microbiol Immunol Infect* 2003; 36:51–5.
- 39. Chu J, Wilkins G, Williams M. Review of 65 cases of infective endocarditis in Dunedin Public Hospital. *NZ Med J* 2004;117: U1021.
- 40. Ferreiros E, Nacinovich F, Casabé JH, Modenesi JC, Swieszkowski S, Cortes C, et al. Epidemiologic, clinical, and microbiologic profile of infective endocarditis in Argentina: a national survey.

The Endocarditis Infecciosa en la Republica Argentina-2 (EIRA-2) Study. *Am Heart J* 2006;151:545–52.

- 41. Krcmery V, Gogová M, Ondrusová A, Buckova E, Doczeova A, Mrazova M, et al. Etiology and risk factors of 339 cases of infective endocarditis: report from a 10-year national prospective survey in the Slovak Republic. J Chemother 2003;15:579–83.
- 42. Sandre RM, Shafran SD. Infective endocarditis: review of 135 cases over 9 years. *Clin Infect Dis* 1996;22:276–86.
- 43. Petti CA, Fowler VG Jr. *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteremia and endocarditis. *Cardiol Clin* 2003;21:219–33vii.