Septic Cardiomyopathy

Sarah J. Beesley, MD[1,2]; Gerhard Weber, MD, PhD[3]; Todd Sarge, MD[4]; Sara Nikravan, MD[5]; Colin K. Grissom, MD, FASE, FCCM[1,2]; Michael J. Lanspa, MD, MS, FASE, FCCM[1]; Sajid Shahul, MD, MPH[6]; Samuel M. Brown, MD, MS, FCCM, FASE[1,2]

Objectives: To describe, with an emphasis on clinical applications, what is known about the pathophysiology, management, and implications of septic cardiomyopathy in the adult ICU.

Data Sources and Study Selection: A PubMed literature review was performed for relevant articles. Only articles in English that studied human adults with sepsis were included.

Data Extraction and Data Synthesis: Multiple competing definitions for septic cardiomyopathy hinder understanding of this entity. Although many patients with sepsis develop cardiac dysfunction, the impact of septic cardiomyopathy on prognosis and therapy remains to be demonstrated. Treatment of septic cardiomyopathy is aimed at treating the underlying sepsis and providing specific supportive care for cardiogenic shock when present.

Conclusions: Septic cardiomyopathy is an important contributor to organ dysfunction in sepsis. Guided treatment of septic cardiomyopathy may affect patients' prognosis, especially when their cardiac index is substantially decreased. The implication of septic cardiomyopathy for both short- and long-term outcomes is an important area for future investigation. (*Crit Care Med* 2017; XX:00–00)

Key Words: cardiac dysfunction; sepsis; septic cardiomyopathy

[1]Pulmonary Division, Department of Medicine, Intermountain Medical Center, Murray, UT.

[2]Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Department of Medicine, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, UT.

[3]Division of Cardiovascular Medicine, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.

[4]Department of Anesthesia, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Boston, MA.

[5]Department of Anesthesia, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.

[6]Department of Anesthesia, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL.

Supplemental digital content is available for this article. Direct URL citations appear in the printed text and are provided in the HTML and PDF versions of this article on the journal's website (http://journals.lww.com/ccmjournal).

Dr. Sarge's institution received funding from the National Institutes of Health/National Heart, Lung, and Blood (UM1 NIH/NHLBI) as the site principal investigator for EPVent2: A Phase II study of Mechanical Ventilation Directed by Transpulmonary Pressures, and he received funding from Christie & Young P.C. (legal consulting) and the Society of Critical Care Medicine (SCCM) (speaking honoraria and travel expenses). Dr. Grissom received funding for teaching critical care ultrasound from SCCM (honorarium and travel expenses), the American Thoracic Society (honorarium), and the Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center (honorarium and travel expenses). The remaining authors have disclosed that they do not have any potential conflicts of interest.

For information regarding this article, E-mail: samuel.brown@imail.org

DOI: 10.1097/CCM.0000000000002851

Sepsis is a systemic condition of profoundly impaired health in which an infection leads to a dysregulated host response. This inappropriate host response consecutively causes organ dysfunction, disability, and even death (1). By current consensus, sepsis is defined as infection plus organ dysfunction. Septic shock represents the more severe form, in which vasopressor infusions are required to maintain adequate blood pressure, and tissue dysoxia is present, as indicated by lactic acidemia (2). Mortality in patients with sepsis is estimated at 10%, whereas in patients with septic shock, mortality generally exceeds 40% (2).

Central to sepsis, the fate of individual organs is interdependent: failure of one organ often leads to dysfunction or failure of other organs (3). This interdependence is especially evident during cardiovascular failure which diminishes overall blood circulation, thus exacerbating tissue dysoxia, mitochondrial dysfunction, and metabolic dysfunction of tissues. Not surprisingly, progressive cardiovascular collapse is often the penultimate step before death from septic shock (4).

Given the central role of circulatory impairment in disrupting the function of multiple organs, understanding cardiac dysfunction in sepsis is critical. Although others have reviewed septic cardiomyopathy (SCM) in the last 15 years (5–8) (see also references in **online data supplement** [Supplemental Digital Content 1, http://links.lww.com/CCM/D68]), they have generally focused on the causative role of the septic inflammatory milieu in cardiac myocyte dysfunction. In this Concise Definitive Review, we discuss definitions of SCM, briefly review the pathophysiology, and summarize what is known about treatment and management, from a clinical perspective. Our review was guided by the search strategy described in **Appendix 1** (Supplemental Digital Content 1, http://links.lww.com/CCM/D68).

DEFINITION AND DIAGNOSIS

A major impediment to understanding SCM is the varied ways it has been defined. Cardiac dysfunction in sepsis can manifest in multiple different ways, including left and/or right

ventricular impairment during systole or diastole, inadequate cardiac output and oxygen delivery, or primary myocardial cellular injury. In **Table 1**, we present the range of conceptual definitions of SCM and relevant diagnostic testing for each.

When SCM was initially described in the 1980s, it was defined as an acutely depressed left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) with ventricular dilation that occurred during sepsis (51–53). These early data suggested that survivors had increased mean end-systolic and end-diastolic volumes as compared to nonsurvivors who had normal ventricular volumes. In retrospect, these differences likely reflected differences in filling pressures and cardiac afterload more than intrinsic myocardial function, a problem compounded by recent changes in fluid resuscitation strategies in sepsis management over ensuing decades. Although several subsequent studies continued to rely on an LVEF-based definition for SCM (9, 10, 15, 54), LVEF has been increasingly acknowledged to be an inaccurate marker of intrinsic cardiac function (16, 17) largely because it depends profoundly on loading conditions (18, 55).

Left ventricular pressure-volume conductance catheters provide another method for measuring real-time cardiac function, allowing more "gold-standard" quantification of systolic and diastolic function independent of loading conditions (56, 57). Although these catheters are highly useful, especially in preclinical models of sepsis, they have not been used in septic patients, thus limiting their applicability in the diagnosis of septic cardiomyopathy (58).

Other echocardiographic variables beyond LVEF have been developed to evaluate cardiac dysfunction in sepsis (Table 1; and online data supplement, Supplemental Digital Content 1, http://links.lww.com/CCM/D68). The myocardial performance index (MPI; also called "the Tei index" [59]) is based on the proportion of the working cycle of the heart that is spent in isovolumic activity during which the heart does not actively circulate blood. (A lower MPI value is associated with better function.) In one prospective cohort of septic patients ($n = 47$), improvement in MPI over 24 hours after admission with severe sepsis or septic shock was associated with a lower 90-day mortality (17% vs 47%) (30).

Another variable, the afterload-adjusted cardiac performance (ACP) is a ratio of measured to predicted cardiac output, adjusted for systemic vascular resistance. These measures are obtained from an indicator-dilution or pulse contour analytic cardiac output monitoring device (see **Appendix** 2 for further details, Supplemental Digital Content 1, http://links.lww.com/CCM/D68). In two studies of septic patients (total $n = 180$), abnormal ACP predicted 30-day mortality (32, 60).

More recently, longitudinal strain, a measure of the deformation of the myocardium, has been introduced as a replacement for LVEF to determine left ventricular (LV) function (61). Myocardial strain can now be measured routinely using speckle-tracking echocardiography, an evaluation of the actual displacement of points in the ventricular wall in relation to each other during systole. By measuring contractility in the actual muscle, strain is less dependent on loading conditions than LVEF (17). In general, longitudinal strain has been shown to detect early changes of myocardial ischemia and correlates extremely well with gold-standard MRI measurements. Importantly, LV longitudinal strain has been demonstrated to be a more sensitive variable than LVEF at diagnosing LV dysfunction in sepsis (17, 18, 21, 62, 63).

Right ventricular (RV) dysfunction also occurs in sepsis, usually in concert with LV dysfunction (64, 65). RV dysfunction can be characterized by dilation or decreased ejection fraction of the RV (66) and may rapidly develop due to increased pulmonary vascular resistance in the setting of acute respiratory distress syndrome (67).

Diastolic dysfunction has also long been noted in many patients with sepsis (68, 69) and often meets the guideline criteria for LV diastolic dysfunction issued by the American Society of Echocardiography (24,26,70) or alternative definitions (e′-velocity < 8 cm/s) (25) or E/e′ ratios at various thresholds (29). To date, RV diastolic dysfunction in sepsis has not been well described. Biomarkers of cardiomyocyte injury are commonly elevated in sepsis (38, 71) and may represent a diagnostic avenue for SCM. However, in sepsis, B-type natriuretic peptide (BNP) and troponin elevations appear to reflect general critical illness and are not specific for SCM (40, 72). Furthermore, the exact etiology of troponin elevations in sepsis is not clear: release of myocardial enzymes may occur independently of cardiomyocyte death or, alternatively, through cell necrosis that is too infrequent to be detected in biopsies.

For the purposes of this discussion, we define SCM broadly as an acute syndrome of cardiac dysfunction that is unrelated to cardiac ischemia in patients with sepsis. While longitudinal strain is a promising measure, we acknowledge that there is not yet sufficient data to inform a single diagnostic measure for SCM.

PATHOPHYSIOLOGY

Among the many factors that play a causal role in septic cardiomyopathy, the sepsis-induced dysregulated inflammatory response has been directly linked to cardiomyocyte dysfunction. Original observations from animal experiments led to an extensive search for specific "myocardial depressant factor(s)." (73) These studies identified cytokines (including interleukin [IL]–1b, tumor necrosis factor-a, IL-6, and the p38 mitogen-activated protein kinases pathway) (74, 75), the complement system, nitric oxide dysregulation (76), high-mobility group box -1 (a damage and signaling molecule implicated in the pathogenesis of sepsis) (77), and lipopolysaccharide as potential causative agents. Recent work has further demonstrated a temporal association between increased cardiomyocyte oxidative stress and the development of septic cardiomyopathy. In support of these findings, the use of reactive oxygen species scavengers in murine models leads to partial reversal of septic cardiomyopathy (78). On the cellular level, these changes were accompanied by increased proteolysis, mitochondrial damage, dysregulated nitric oxide, β-adrenoceptor down-regulation, and calcium mishandling and have thus all been implicated in triggering myocardial dysfunction during sepsis (79–82).

TABLE 1. Definitions of Septic Cardiomyopathy

Echocardiographic-Based Definitions		Specific Measure	Therapeutic Implications	Benefits and Problems
LV	LV systolic impairment	LVEF (9–13) < 40–50%.	Some experts recommend epinephrine over norepinephrine if LVEF < 45%; levosimendan may improve intermediate outcomes vs dobutamine if LVEF < 45% (14).	LVEF depends on loading conditions and may be diagnostically misleading (15–18).
		Fractional area change (19, 20).	Perhaps similar to LVEF	Deprecated technique likely inferior to LVEF.
		Left ventricular global longitudinal strain (17, 21–23).	None as yet.	Not yet available in real time. Appears superior to LVEF in identifying cardiac dysfunction in sepsis (17, 21).
	LV diastolic dysfunction	e′ velocity (11, 24, 25) and E:e′ ratio (26, 27).	Patients with impaired relaxation may need more fluid (26); patients with pseudonormal diastolic function may be fluid overloaded (28).	Diastolic function depends on fluid status; traditional definitions of diastolic dysfunction unreliable in sepsis (29).
	LV integrated measures	Myocardial performance index (30, 31).	None as yet.	
		Afterload-related cardiac performance (32).	None as yet.	Takes into consideration loading conditions.
		Ventricular arterial decoupling (33, 34).	May ultimately guide choice of vasopressors vs volume expansion	
RV	RV systolic dysfunction	Lateral tricuspid annulus peak systolic velocity (24).	Can identify injurious ventilation (35).	Easily measured in most patients.
		RV peak systolic pressure end-systolic volume relations (35).	None as yet.	
		Tricuspid annular plane systolic excursion.	May identify patients in need of RV support (e.g., vasodilators) (36)	Easily measured in most patients.
	RV diastolic dysfunction	Not well characterized in sepsis.	None as yet.	Has been used as a surrogate for central venous pressure (37).
Nonechocardiographic-Based Definitions		**Specific Measure**	**Therapeutic Implications**	**Benefits and Problems**
Biochemical markers	Cardiomyocyte injury	Troponin (13, 38, 39).	None as yet.	May be a marker of renal failure and/or preexisting obstructive coronary artery disease as well as sepsis.
		Pregnancy-associated plasma protein A (9).	None as yet.	How to classify septic cardiomyopathy based on this laboratory finding is unknown.
	Increased wall stress	Brain natriuretic peptide (13, 20, 40–42).	Possibly can guide fluid loading (43); marker of lower cardiac index (44).	May be compounded by respiratory failure or preexisting cardiac dysfunction.
Hemodynamic markers	Inadequate O_2 delivery	Central venous O_2 saturation/venous oxygen saturation and lactate.	Inotropes likely indicated at some threshold, but threshold not known.	"Goal-directed" therapy ineffective in large randomized controlled trials (45–47) and may be toxic when started late (48).
	Persistent tachycardia after adequate volume expansion	Heart rate.	β1 blockade may be therapeutic (49, 50).	Unclear whether this indicates risk for or presence of cardiomyopathy.

LV = left ventricle, LVEF = LV ejection fraction, RV = right ventricle.

TABLE 2. Selected Septic Cardiomyopathy Studies

References	Population (*n*)	Measure	Results
Bouhemad et al (19)	Septic shock ($n = 45$)	TTE and cardiac troponin measured days 1–4, 7,10	18% with elevated troponin and decreased LVEF, 18% with increased troponin and diastolic dysfunction.
Brown et al (26)	Severe sepsis or septic shock ($n = 78$)	TTE within 6 hr of admission, between hours 18 and 32, and after resolution of shock	36.5% with diastolic dysfunction at admission, 61.8% with diastolic dysfunction at any time point. Grade 1 diastolic dysfunction MV association with 28-d mortality.
Dalla et al (18)	Severe sepsis or septic shock ($n = 48$) vs trauma ICU patients ($n = 24$) vs healthy controls ($n = 16$)	TTE (including strain) obtained within 48 hr of ICU admit	50% of patients with preserved LVEF had abnormal strain (> −15%).
De Geer et al (22)	Septic shock ($n = 50$)	TTE (including strain) obtained day of ICU admit, during ICU, and after ICU stay	7% of patients with preserved LVEF had abnormal strain (> −15%).
Endo et al (10)	Mechanically ventilated with sepsis ($n = 93$)	TTE on day of enrollment	25% with LVEF < 50%. Not associated with mortality.
Etchecopar-Chevreuil et al (11)	Mechanically ventilated patients with septic shock ($n = 35$)	TEE within 12 hr of admission, following IV fluid and upon resolution of shock	46% with LVEF ≤ 50% at admission; LV diastolic dysfunction 20% at admission.
Landesberg et al (25)	Severe sepsis or septic shock ($n = 262$)	TTE obtained on day of ICU admit and following day	23% had LVEF ≤ 50%; 50% had diastolic dysfunction. Reduced e′-wave and low LV stroke volume index with MV association with mortality.
Lanspa et al (17)	Severe sepsis or septic shock ($n = 89$)	TTE (including strain) obtained within 6 hr of ICU admit, central venous O_2 saturation, serum lactate	60% with abnormal strain.
Mehta et al (85)	Septic shock ($n = 37$)	TTE and cardiac troponin	Elevated troponin correlated with low LVEF. MV association of troponin with mortality.
Ng et al (62)	Septic shock ($n = 33$) and matched controls with sepsis ($n = 29$)	TTE within 24 hr and on recovery, including strain	Strain was more abnormal in septic shock patients. No difference in LVEF.
Nizamuddin et al (30)	Severe sepsis or septic shock ($n = 47$)	TTE at enrollment and 24 hr later to measure MPI	Worsened MPI over 24 hr associated with increased 90-d mortality in MV analysis.
Orde et al (23)	Severe sepsis ($n = 60$)	TTE (including strain) within 24 hr of meeting sepsis criteria	33% with LVEF < 55%, 69% with LV dysfunction using strain. 72% with RV dysfunction using strain. RV free wall longitudinal strain associated with 6-mo mortality.
Palmieri et al (63)	Sepsis or septic shock ($n = 115$)	TTE at admission, including strain	Strain correlated with 7-d mortality. LVEF not associated with mortality.
Pulido et al (24)	Severe sepsis or septic shock ($n = 106$)	TTE within 24 hr of admission	37% with LVEF, 37% LV diastolic dysfunction, 31% with RV dysfunction. No association with mortality.
Rolando et al (27)	Sepsis ($n = 53$)	TTE within 48 hr of admission and on days 7–10	26% with LVEF < 50%. 83% had diastolic dysfunction. 23% had both. E/e′ best predictor of mortality.

(*Comtinued*)

TABLE 2. (*Continued*). Selected Septic Cardiomyopathy Studies

References	Population (*n*)	Measure	Results
Sato et al[a] (54)	Sepsis or septic shock ($n = 210$)	TTE at admission	14% with LVEF < 50%. LVEF not associated with in-hospital or 30-d mortality.
Shahul et al (21)	Sepsis ($n = 15$) and septic shock ($n = 35$)	TTE (including strain) on enrollment and 24 hr later	Strain worsened significantly in patients with septic shock
Vieillard-Baron et al (12)	Mechanically ventilated patients with septic shock ($n = 67$)	TEE, daily for the first 3 d	60% with LVEF < 45%. LVEF not associated with mortality.
Werdan et al (32)	Sepsis and multiple organ dysfunction syndrome ($n = 39$)	Pulmonary artery catheter measurements of ACP, cardiac troponin measurements	ACP correlated with troponin elevation and mortality.
Wilhelm et al (60)	Sepsis ($n = 141$), data collected in emergency department, 24 and 72 hr	Pulmonary artery catheter or pulse contour cardiac output technology measurements of ACP	Nonsurvivors had significantly lower values of ACP.

ACP = afterload-adjusted cardiac performance, LV = left ventricular, LVEF = LV ejection fraction, MPI = myocardial performance index, MV = multivariate analysis, RV = right ventricular, TEE = transesophageal echocardiogram, TTE = transthoracic echocardiogram.

[a]Retrospective studies.

The majority are prospective observational trials.

On histologic examination, SCM appears as an interstitial inflammatory infiltrate, with increased collagen deposition, intramyocyte lipid accumulation, and contractile apparatus disruption (83, 84). However, biopsies of myocardial tissue from septic patients are rarely available in the acute setting, and peripheral blood may not accurately reflect the inflammatory milieu in the myocardium. Considerable uncertainty therefore exists about how to define SCM noninvasively.

PREVALENCE OF SCM

Septic cardiomyopathy is common, though prevalence varies depending on the definition used (**Table 2**). Risk factors for SCM may include male sex (54), younger age, higher lactate levels at admission, and a history of heart failure, although the last likely reflects preexisting disease (54).

PROGNOSTIC IMPLICATIONS OF SCM

The prognosis associated with SCM is not clear, likely because of the diagnostic variability employed. Studies evaluating outcomes in relation to SCM are found in Table 2. In a systematic review of studies analyzing LVEF and 30-day mortality in patients with severe sepsis or septic shock, LVEF was not a sensitive or specific predictor of mortality (16). In a study of patients with sepsis or septic shock ($n = 29$), when SCM was defined as ejection fraction (EF) less than 50% and a greater than 10% decrease compared with baseline, there was no significant difference in either the in-hospital or 30-day mortality between patients with and without SCM (54). It is possible that the lack of association with mortality is due to the dependence of LVEF on loading conditions: profound vasoplegia associated with severe shock may elevate LVEF while LVEF may be depressed by effective vasopressor infusions. Similarly, profoundly decreased preload may increase LVEF measurements, whereas adequate volume expansion may decrease LVEF. A decrease in RV ejection fraction has also been associated with worse prognosis (66, 86, 87).

Other echocardiographic variables may also be suitable for prognostication. In a study of patients with sepsis or septic shock ($n = 115$), LVEF and LV longitudinal strain were measured at admission. In these patients, overall 28-day mortality was 30%. Strain correlated significantly with mortality, whereas EF did not (63). Similarly, recent work revealed that in patients with severe sepsis worsening strain predicts short-term mortality independent of Sequential Organ Failure Assessment scores. However, in another small study ($n = 60$), no association between mortality and strain was identified.

Diastolic function has also been evaluated as a prognostic indicator in sepsis, and a larger study of 262 patients found septic diastolic dysfunction to be a predictor of mortality (25). Grade of diastolic dysfunction was not obtained in this study. A smaller study ($n = 78$) suggested that grade I diastolic dysfunction was associated with increased mortality in sepsis and septic shock patients, whereas grades II and III diastolic dysfunction was not (26).

Among serum biomarkers, elevated troponin levels appear to be associated with increased mortality in sepsis (88), but this effect largely disappears when correcting for severity of illness (89, 90). Similarly, BNP's association with mortality is not significant when the level of illness is taken into account (40–42, 90, 91). Although procalcitonin is mainly used as an indicator of bacterial infection, this biomarker may also reflect an increased mortality in patients with cardiovascular disease (92, 93). Studies specific to diagnosis and prognosis of SCM using such biomarkers will be needed to better define their utility.

An important unanswered question is when to consider unstable coronary artery disease (or even, rarely, septic embolism into the coronary circulation) as a differential diagnosis

of apparent SCM. Electrocardiographic ST segment elevations (94, 95), regional wall motion abnormalities, and elevated troponin (71) appear to lack specificity for distinguishing the phenomena diagnostically. The criteria for selecting patients who might benefit from specific cardiac therapy thus remain an area of important future research. As the current evidence is insufficient to delineate strict guidelines for clinical management of acute coronary syndrome (ACS) in patients with sepsis and septic shock, we follow current recommendations for diagnosis and treatment of ACS, while tailoring testing and therapy (including anticoagulation) for patients based on their other risk factors, laboratory biomarkers, and hemodynamics.

Although patients with sepsis have an elevated risk for cardiovascular disease that is similar to the risk for other acutely ill patients (96, 97), very little is known about long-term cardiovascular outcomes of patients who suffered from SCM. Most studies have suggested that recovery from SCM is prompt but rarely provide the data to support this supposition. In one study of septic shock patients, 46% had LV dysfunction and 34% of patients died in the hospital (11). Surviving patients were followed 2 weeks for recovery, and EF recovered in all patients (Philippe Vignon, private communication, May 4, 2017). Further studies are needed to assess the progression of SCM over time in light of the newer diagnostic strategies mentioned above.

THERAPEUTIC IMPLICATIONS OF SCM

There are no evidence-based recommendations for the management of SCM. The most commonly applied approach is to treat the underlying disease, that is, sepsis, according to best practices (98), as treatment directed at inflammatory markers in sepsis has been ineffective in humans. However, as understanding of the pathophysiology of SCM continuously progresses, novel ways to reduce the associated morbidity and mortality are bound to be developed.

Given the possibility of relative myocardial suppression and the high oxygen consumption in sepsis, investigators have sought to determine whether artificially increasing cardiac output may be beneficial. Notably, studies that evaluated increasing cardiac output to "supranormal" levels (cardiac index > 4.5 L/min/m^2) have not improved outcomes (48, 55). Similarly, a reported benefit of "goal-directed" therapy to patients with sepsis during the first 6 hours of the emergency department stay (99) has not been reproduced in multicenter trials (45–47). As a consequence, dobutamine is no longer recommended routinely for sepsis based solely on measurement of central venous oxygen saturation (Scv_{O_2}) less than 70% (2). Similarly, levosimendan, a calcium sensitizer that functions not only as an inotrope but also as a lusitrope, was reported in a small series with possible benefit in increasing cardiac index (14, 100). However, in a multicenter randomized trial (n = 516), levosimendan did not result in a lower mortality rate or less severe organ dysfunction among patients with septic shock (101).

Taking an opposite approach, a pilot trial of esmolol to optimize cardiac loading conditions in tachycardiac patients with septic shock suggested mortality benefit (102) but its results have not been reproduced, and the trial faced concerns about extensive concomitant use of levosimendan (subsequently found to lack efficacy in sepsis as noted above [101]) and extremely high hospital mortality in the study population (103).

SEPSIS-INDUCED CARDIOGENIC SHOCK

While SCM is common, the prevalence and implications of frank cardiogenic shock complicating sepsis are poorly understood. Limited studies that were conducted decades ago have documented the occurrence of a sepsis-induced cardiogenic shock syndrome. In 1990, Jardin et al (105) described six patients with depressed LVEF, only one of whom developed circulatory collapse. The mean cardiac index in this group was 2.2 L/min/m^2 and mean LVEF was 21%. In 1978, Weil et al (106) described eight patients who died of bacteremia with a cardiac index under 3 L/min/m^2 but many of them may have been under-resuscitated as judging by circulating blood volume. Few, if any, recent studies have explicitly described the outcomes among patients with frankly depressed cardiac index (i.e., < 2.1 L/min/m^2) in septic shock.

For mild to moderate sepsis-induced cardiogenic shock, inotrope infusions have long been an accepted standard of therapy, albeit without randomized controlled trials to guide use or indicate thresholds for intervention. Annane et al (104) showed no difference between epinephrine alone versus norepinephrine plus dobutamine in an unselected cohort of septic patients (n = 330). We suspect, on the basis of clinical experience but limited scientific evidence, that the combination of a low Scv_{O_2} (e.g., < 50–60%) in the setting of an elevated lactate (e.g., > 4 mmol/L) would motivate most experienced clinicians to initiate inotrope infusions in an adequately volume-expanded patient. (Of note, we consider a patient to be adequately volume expanded if there is no further increase in cardiac output with increased preload [107].)

Based on experience with primary cardiogenic shock and the pediatric practice of mechanical support for refractory septic shock (108, 109), some centers have employed veno-arterial extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (VA ECMO) to treat patients with sepsis-induced, inotrope-refractory cardiogenic shock. Bréchot et al (110) described a case series of 14 adults in France with 71% survival after VA ECMO for sepsis-induced cardiogenic shock. Huang et al (111) described 52 patients in Taiwan with much lower (15%) survival after receiving extracorporeal membrane oxygenation for refractory septic shock (notably not for sepsis-induced cardiogenic shock), a finding that was accentuated in patients over age 60 years, none of whom survived. Average survival with VA ECMO for other indications is approximately 40% (112). These and similar experiences are only detailed in case reports (113–119); trials of mechanical support for sepsis-induced cardiogenic shock have not been performed to date nor have clear criteria been proposed that aid to determine which patients with sepsis-induced cardiogenic shock might be the ideal candidates for this treatment.

RESEARCH PRIORITIES

A central shortcoming in reviewing the current knowledge on SCM is the lack of a unifying definition and diagnostic criteria for the syndrome. Studies of SCM have employed different inclusion and exclusion criteria, making it difficult to delineate SCM as a clinical entity. Thus, important work remains to be done in validating consistent definitions of SCM, especially as it pertains to differences in treatment and/or outcomes. To estimate the patient-specific risk for developing septic cardiomyopathy, novel diagnostic avenues are required. These could include personalized genome (or RNA) sequencing and phenotyping of individualized cardiomyocytes obtained from patient-derived induced pluripotent stem cells (120). We are skeptical that targeting individual inflammatory cytokine pathways in septic cardiomyopathy will lead to significant diagnostic or therapeutic advances, as most of these interventions in sepsis have proved ineffective (121).

Additional epidemiologic work will be important to establish risk factors for development of septic cardiomyopathy for those with underlying baseline cardiovascular disease. Although we presume that patients with baseline cardiovascular dysfunction will have worse cardiac function during sepsis, this is difficult to establish given the difficulties in determining baseline echocardiographic variables among patients presenting with sepsis.

Specific aspects of SCM merit further investigation. As the correct balance of cardiac output and adrenergic tone is critical for hemodynamic stability in septic patients, several recent small studies have advocated the use of beta-blocker therapy for patients with septic shock (49,50,122). Given the dynamic nature of the baroreflex tone during sepsis, explicit protocols for titration of beta-blocker infusions will be critical for evaluating the utility of beta blockade in sepsis. Whether a dominantly neurohormonal or hemodynamic model of beta blockade in septic shock will be optimal to guide adrenergic therapy in SCM remains to be explored. Studies of advanced cardiac failure from other causes suggest the relevance of neurohormonal rather than purely hemodynamic regulation (123–125).

Long-term outcomes are of increasing priority for studies of critical illness (126–129). Patients after sepsis are at sustained risk for late morbidity and mortality (130–132), which appears at least partially due to an increased incidence of cardiovascular events (97, 133). Whether these are related to SCM is not known. Postacute follow-up for SCM is therefore an important research and clinical priority.

CONCLUSIONS

Cardiac dysfunction during sepsis is an important clinical and research problem, diagnostically, therapeutically, and for prognostication. Septic cardiomyopathy is common and may occasionally be associated with frank cardiogenic shock, requiring inotropic support and possibly mechanical support. As prior research in the field has been limited by poorly differentiating diagnostic strategies (most importantly, the reliance on LVEF), substantial new research is needed to improve understanding of SCM. Such studies would help to optimally define and classify SCM, identify its long-term effect on the patient's health, and promote new treatment options and management strategies.

REFERENCES

1. Angus DC, van der Poll T: Severe sepsis and septic shock. *N Engl J Med* 2013; 369:840–851
2. Singer M, Deutschman CS, Seymour CW, et al: The third international consensus definitions for sepsis and septic shock (Sepsis-3). *JAMA* 2016; 315:801–810
3. Abraham E, Singer M: Mechanisms of sepsis-induced organ dysfunction. *Crit Care Med* 2007; 35:2408–2416
4. Blanco J, Muriel-Bombín A, Sagredo V, et al; Grupo de Estudios y Análisis en Cuidados Intensivos: Incidence, organ dysfunction and mortality in severe sepsis: A Spanish multicentre study. *Crit Care* 2008; 12:R158
5. Vieillard-Baron A: Septic cardiomyopathy. *Ann Intensive Care* 2011; 1:6
6. Court O, Kumar A, Parrillo JE, et al: Clinical review: Myocardial depression in sepsis and septic shock. *Crit Care* 2002; 6:500–508
7. Kumar A, Haery C, Parrillo JE: Myocardial dysfunction in septic shock. *Crit Care Clin* 2000; 16:251–287
8. Flierl MA, Rittirsch D, Huber-Lang MS, et al: Molecular events in the cardiomyopathy of sepsis. *Mol Med* 2008; 14:327–336
9. Zhang Z, Dai H, Yu Y, et al: Elevated pregnancy-associated plasma protein A predicts myocardial dysfunction and death in severe sepsis. *Ann Clin Biochem* 2014; 51(Pt 1):22–29
10. Endo T, Kushimoto S, Yamanouchi S, et al; PiCCO Pulmonary Edema Study Group: Limitations of global end-diastolic volume index as a parameter of cardiac preload in the early phase of severe sepsis: A subgroup analysis of a multicenter, prospective observational study. *J Intensive Care* 2013; 1:11
11. Etchecopar-Chevreuil C, François B, Clavel M, et al: Cardiac morphological and functional changes during early septic shock: A transesophageal echocardiographic study. *Intensive Care Med* 2008; 34:250–256
12. Vieillard-Baron A, Caille V, Charron C, et al: Actual incidence of global left ventricular hypokinesia in adult septic shock. *Crit Care Med* 2008; 36:1701–1706
13. Klouche K, Pommet S, Amigues L, et al: Plasma brain natriuretic peptide and troponin levels in severe sepsis and septic shock: Relationships with systolic myocardial dysfunction and intensive care unit mortality. *J Intensive Care Med* 2014; 29:229–237
14. Meng JB, Hu MH, Lai ZZ, et al: Levosimendan versus dobutamine in myocardial injury patients with septic shock: A randomized controlled trial. *Med Sci Monit* 2016; 22:1486–1496
15. Repessé X, Charron C, Vieillard-Baron A: Evaluation of left ventricular systolic function revisited in septic shock. *Crit Care* 2013; 17:164
16. Sevilla Berrios RA, O'Horo JC, Velagapudi V, et al: Correlation of left ventricular systolic dysfunction determined by low ejection fraction and 30-day mortality in patients with severe sepsis and septic shock: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Crit Care* 2014; 29:495–499
17. Lanspa MJ, Pittman JE, Hirshberg EL, et al: Association of left ventricular longitudinal strain with central venous oxygen saturation and serum lactate in patients with early severe sepsis and septic shock. *Crit Care* 2015; 19:304
18. Dalla K, Hallman C, Bech-Hanssen O, et al: Strain echocardiography identifies impaired longitudinal systolic function in patients with septic shock and preserved ejection fraction. *Cardiovasc Ultrasound* 2015; 13:30
19. Bouhemad B, Nicolas-Robin A, Arbelot C, et al: Acute left ventricular dilatation and shock-induced myocardial dysfunction. *Crit Care Med* 2009; 37:441–447
20. Charpentier J, Luyt CE, Fulla Y, et al: Brain natriuretic peptide: A marker of myocardial dysfunction and prognosis during severe sepsis. *Crit Care Med* 2004; 32:660–665
21. Shahul S, Gulati G, Hacker MR, et al: Detection of myocardial dysfunction in septic shock: A speckle-tracking echocardiography study. *Anesth Analg* 2015; 121:1547–1554

22. De Geer L, Engvall J, Oscarsson A: Strain echocardiography in septic shock - a comparison with systolic and diastolic function parameters, cardiac biomarkers and outcome. *Crit Care* 2015; 19:122
23. Orde SR, Pulido JN, Masaki M, et al: Outcome prediction in sepsis: Speckle tracking echocardiography based assessment of myocardial function. *Crit Care* 2014; 18:R149
24. Pulido JN, Afessa B, Masaki M, et al: Clinical spectrum, frequency, and significance of myocardial dysfunction in severe sepsis and septic shock. *Mayo Clin Proc* 2012; 87:620–628
25. Landesberg G, Gilon D, Meroz Y, et al: Diastolic dysfunction and mortality in severe sepsis and septic shock. *Eur Heart J* 2012; 33:895–903
26. Brown SM, Pittman JE, Hirshberg EL, et al: Diastolic dysfunction and mortality in early severe sepsis and septic shock: A prospective, observational echocardiography study. *Crit Ultrasound J* 2012; 4:8
27. Rolando G, Espinoza ED, Avid E, et al: Prognostic value of ventricular diastolic dysfunction in patients with severe sepsis and septic shock. *Rev Bras Ter Intensiva* 2015; 27:333–339
28. Gillebert TC, Leite-Moreira AF, De Hert SG: Load dependent diastolic dysfunction in heart failure. *Heart Fail Rev* 2000; 5:345–355
29. Lanspa MJ, Gutsche AR, Wilson EL, et al: Application of a simplified definition of diastolic function in severe sepsis and septic shock. *Crit Care* 2016; 20:243
30. Nizamuddin J, Mahmood F, Tung A, et al: Interval changes in myocardial performance index predict outcome in severe sepsis. *J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth* 2017; 31:957–964
31. Tei C, Nishimura RA, Seward JB, et al: Noninvasive Doppler-derived myocardial performance index: Correlation with simultaneous measurements of cardiac catheterization measurements. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr* 1997; 10:169–178
32. Werdan K, Oelke A, Hettwer S, et al: Septic cardiomyopathy: Hemodynamic quantification, occurrence, and prognostic implications. *Clin Res Cardiol* 2011; 100:661–668
33. Guarracino F, Ferro B, Morelli A, et al: Ventriculoarterial decoupling in human septic shock. *Crit Care* 2014; 18:R80
34. Guarracino F, Baldassarri R, Pinsky MR: Ventriculo-arterial decoupling in acutely altered hemodynamic states. *Crit Care* 2013; 17:213
35. Schulman DS, Biondi JW, Matthay RA, et al: Effect of positive end-expiratory pressure on right ventricular performance. Importance of baseline right ventricular function. *Am J Med* 1988; 84:57–67
36. Price LC, Wort SJ, Finney SJ, et al: Pulmonary vascular and right ventricular dysfunction in adult critical care: Current and emerging options for management: a systematic literature review. *Crit Care* 2010; 14:R169
37. Arbo JE, Maslove DM, Beraud AS: Bedside assessment of right atrial pressure in critically ill septic patients using tissue Doppler ultrasonography. *J Crit Care* 2013; 28:1112.e1–1112.e5
38. Landesberg G, Jaffe AS, Gilon D, et al: Troponin elevation in severe sepsis and septic shock: The role of left ventricular diastolic dysfunction and right ventricular dilatation*. *Crit Care Med* 2014; 42:790–800
39. Fernandes CJ Jr, Akamine N, Knobel E: Cardiac troponin: A new serum marker of myocardial injury in sepsis. *Intensive Care Med* 1999; 25:1165–1168
40. Papanikolaou J, Makris D, Mpaka M, et al: New insights into the mechanisms involved in B-type natriuretic peptide elevation and its prognostic value in septic patients. *Crit Care* 2014; 18:R94
41. Maeder M, Fehr T, Rickli H, et al: Sepsis-associated myocardial dysfunction: Diagnostic and prognostic impact of cardiac troponins and natriuretic peptides. *Chest* 2006; 129:1349–1366
42. Post F, Weilemann LS, Messow CM, et al: B-type natriuretic peptide as a marker for sepsis-induced myocardial depression in intensive care patients. *Crit Care Med* 2008; 36:3030–3037
43. Pirracchio R, Deye N, Lukaszewicz AC, et al: Impaired plasma B-type natriuretic peptide clearance in human septic shock. *Crit Care Med* 2008; 36:2542–2546
44. Witthaut R, Busch C, Fraunberger P, et al: Plasma atrial natriuretic peptide and brain natriuretic peptide are increased in septic shock: Impact of interleukin-6 and sepsis-associated left ventricular dysfunction. *Intensive Care Med* 2003; 29:1696–1702
45. Mouncey PR, Osborn TM, Power GS, et al; ProMISe Trial Investigators: Trial of early, goal-directed resuscitation for septic shock. *N Engl J Med* 2015; 372:1301–1311
46. Yealy DM, Kellum JA, Huang DT, et al; ProCess Investigators: A randomized trial of protocol-based care for early septic shock. *N Engl J Med* 2014; 370:1683–1693
47. Peake SL, Delaney A, Bailey M, et al; Arise Investigators and Anzics Clinical Trials Group: Goal-directed resuscitation for patients with early septic shock. *N Engl J Med* 2014; 371:1496–1506
48. Hayes MA, Timmins AC, Yau EH, et al: Elevation of systemic oxygen delivery in the treatment of critically ill patients. *N Engl J Med* 1994; 330:1717–1722
49. Morelli A, Ertmer C, Westphal M, et al: Effect of heart rate control with esmolol on hemodynamic and clinical outcomes in patients with septic shock: A randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2013; 310:1683–1691
50. Schmittinger CA, Dünser MW, Haller M, et al: Combined milrinone and enteral metoprolol therapy in patients with septic myocardial depression. *Crit Care* 2008; 12:R99
51. Calvin JE, Driedger AA, Sibbald WJ: An assessment of myocardial function in human sepsis utilizing ECG gated cardiac scintigraphy. *Chest* 1981; 80:579–586
52. Parker MM, Shelhamer JH, Bacharach SL, et al: Profound but reversible myocardial depression in patients with septic shock. *Ann Intern Med* 1984; 100:483–490
53. Parker MM, Shelhamer JH, Natanson C, et al: Serial cardiovascular variables in survivors and nonsurvivors of human septic shock: Heart rate as an early predictor of prognosis. *Crit Care Med* 1987; 15:923–929
54. Sato R, Kuriyama A, Takada T, et al: Prevalence and risk factors of sepsis-induced cardiomyopathy: A retrospective cohort study. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2016; 95:e5031
55. Gattinoni L, Brazzi L, Pelosi P, et al: A trial of goal-oriented hemodynamic therapy in critically ill patients. SvO_2 Collaborative Group. *N Engl J Med* 1995; 333:1025–1032
56. Baan J, Jong TT, Kerkhof PL, et al: Continuous stroke volume and cardiac output from intra-ventricular dimensions obtained with impedance catheter. *Cardiovasc Res* 1981; 15:328–334
57. Arthur W, Edgar D, Kaye GC: The measurement of impedance to assess myocardial contractility and rhythm stability. *Physiol Meas* 2000; 21:R43–R54
58. Burkhoff D, Mirsky I, Suga H: Assessment of systolic and diastolic ventricular properties via pressure-volume analysis: A guide for clinical, translational, and basic researchers. *Am J Physiol Heart Circ Physiol* 2005; 289:H501–H512
59. Tei C, Ling LH, Hodge DO, et al: New index of combined systolic and diastolic myocardial performance: A simple and reproducible measure of cardiac function–a study in normals and dilated cardiomyopathy. *J Cardiol* 1995; 26:357–366
60. Wilhelm J, Hettwer S, Schuermann M, et al: Severity of cardiac impairment in the early stage of community-acquired sepsis determines worse prognosis. *Clin Res Cardiol* 2013; 102:735–744
61. Stanton T, Leano R, Marwick TH: Prediction of all-cause mortality from global longitudinal speckle strain: Comparison with ejection fraction and wall motion scoring. *Circ Cardiovasc Imaging* 2009; 2:356–364
62. Ng PY, Sin WC, Ng AK, et al: Speckle tracking echocardiography in patients with septic shock: A case control study (SPECKSS). *Crit Care* 2016; 20:145
63. Palmieri V, Innocenti F, Guzzo A, et al: Left ventricular systolic longitudinal function as predictor of outcome in patients with sepsis. *Circ Cardiovasc Imaging* 2015; 8:e003865
64. Parker MM, McCarthy KE, Ognibene FP, et al: Right ventricular dysfunction and dilatation, similar to left ventricular changes, characterize the cardiac depression of septic shock in humans. *Chest* 1990; 97:126–131
65. Redl G, Germann P, Plattner H, et al: Right ventricular function in early septic shock states. *Intensive Care Med* 1993; 19:3–7
66. Dhainaut JF, Lanore JJ, de Gournay JM, et al: Right ventricular dysfunction in patients with septic shock. *Intensive Care Med* 1988; 14(Suppl 2):488–491

67. Chan CM, Klinger JR: The right ventricle in sepsis. *Clin Chest Med* 2008; 29:661–676, ix
68. Poelaert J, Declerck C, Vogelaers D, et al: Left ventricular systolic and diastolic function in septic shock. *Intensive Care Med* 1997; 23:553–560
69. Jafri SM, Lavine S, Field BE, et al: Left ventricular diastolic function in sepsis. *Crit Care Med* 1990; 18:709–714
70. Nagueh SF, Appleton CP, Gillebert TC, et al: Recommendations for the evaluation of left ventricular diastolic function by echocardiography. *J Am Soc Echocardiogr* 2009; 22:107–133
71. Ammann P, Fehr T, Minder EI, et al: Elevation of troponin I in sepsis and septic shock. *Intensive Care Med* 2001; 27:965–969
72. Ostermann M, Ayis S, Tuddenham E, et al: Cardiac troponin release is associated with biomarkers of inflammation and ventricular dilatation during critical illness. *Shock* 2017; 47:702–708
73. Parrillo JE, Burch C, Shelhamer JH, et al: A circulating myocardial depressant substance in humans with septic shock. Septic shock patients with a reduced ejection fraction have a circulating factor that depresses in vitro myocardial cell performance. *J Clin Invest* 1985; 76:1539–1553
74. Kumar A, Thota V, Dee L, et al: Tumor necrosis factor alpha and interleukin 1beta are responsible for in vitro myocardial cell depression induced by human septic shock serum. *J Exp Med* 1996; 183:949–958
75. Pathan N, Franklin JL, Eleftherohorinou H, et al: Myocardial depressant effects of interleukin 6 in meningococcal sepsis are regulated by p38 mitogen-activated protein kinase. *Crit Care Med* 2011; 39:1692–1711
76. Kumar A, Brar R, Wang P, et al: Role of nitric oxide and cGMP in human septic serum-induced depression of cardiac myocyte contractility. *Am J Physiol* 1999; 276(1 Pt 2):R265–R276
77. Tzeng HP, Fan J, Vallejo JG, et al: Negative inotropic effects of high-mobility group box 1 protein in isolated contracting cardiac myocytes. *Am J Physiol Heart Circ Physiol* 2008; 294:H1490–H1496
78. Haileselassie B, Su E, Pozios I, et al: Myocardial oxidative stress correlates with left ventricular dysfunction on strain echocardiography in a rodent model of sepsis. *Intensive Care Med Exp* 2017; 5:21
79. Freitas AC, Figueiredo MJ, Campos EC, et al: Activation of both the calpain and ubiquitin-proteasome systems contributes to septic cardiomyopathy through dystrophin loss/disruption and mTOR inhibition. *PLoS One* 2016; 11:e0166839
80. Martin L, Horst K, Chiazza F, et al: The synthetic antimicrobial peptide 19-2.5 attenuates septic cardiomyopathy and prevents down-regulation of SERCA2 in polymicrobial sepsis. *Sci Rep* 2016; 6:37277
81. Galley HF: Oxidative stress and mitochondrial dysfunction in sepsis. *Br J Anaesth* 2011; 107:57–64
82. Joshi MS, Julian MW, Huff JE, et al: Calcineurin regulates myocardial function during acute endotoxemia. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2006; 173:999–1007
83. Rossi MA, Celes MR, Prado CM, et al: Myocardial structural changes in long-term human severe sepsis/septic shock may be responsible for cardiac dysfunction. *Shock* 2007; 27:10–18
84. Soriano FG, Nogueira AC, Caldini EG, et al: Potential role of poly(adenosine 5'-diphosphate-ribose) polymerase activation in the pathogenesis of myocardial contractile dysfunction associated with human septic shock. *Crit Care Med* 2006; 34:1073–1079
85. Mehta NJ, Khan IA, Gupta V, et al: Cardiac troponin I predicts myocardial dysfunction and adverse outcome in septic shock. *Int J Cardiol* 2004; 95:13–17
86. Vincent JL, Gris P, Coffernils M, et al: Myocardial depression characterizes the fatal course of septic shock. *Surgery* 1992; 111:660–667
87. Liu D, Du B, Long Y, et al: Right ventricular function of patients with septic shock: clinical significance. *Zhonghua Wai Ke Za Zhi* 2000; 38:488–492
88. Ammann P, Maggiorini M, Bertel O, et al: Troponin as a risk factor for mortality in critically ill patients without acute coronary syndromes. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2003; 41:2004–2009
89. Røsjø H, Varpula M, Hagve TA, et al; FINNSEPSIS Study Group: Circulating high sensitivity troponin T in severe sepsis and septic shock: Distribution, associated factors, and relation to outcome. *Intensive Care Med* 2011; 37:77–85
90. Yucel T, Memiş D, Karamanlioglu B, et al: The prognostic value of atrial and brain natriuretic peptides, troponin I and C-reactive protein in patients with sepsis. *Exp Clin Cardiol* 2008; 13:183–188
91. McLean AS, Huang SJ, Hyams S, et al: Prognostic values of B-type natriuretic peptide in severe sepsis and septic shock. *Crit Care Med* 2007; 35:1019–1026
92. Möckel M, Searle J, Maisel A: The role of procalcitonin in acute heart failure patients. *ESC Heart Fail* 2017; 4:203–208
93. Schuetz P, Daniels LB, Kulkarni P, et al: Procalcitonin: A new biomarker for the cardiologist. *Int J Cardiol* 2016; 223:390–397
94. Rennyson SL, Hunt J, Haley MW, et al: Electrocardiographic ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction in critically ill patients: An observational cohort analysis. *Crit Care Med* 2010; 38:2304–2309
95. Wang K, Asinger RW, Marriott HJ: ST-segment elevation in conditions other than acute myocardial infarction. *N Engl J Med* 2003; 349:2128–2135
96. Ou SM, Chu H, Chao PW, et al: Long-term mortality and major adverse cardiovascular events in sepsis survivors. A nationwide population-based study. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2016; 194:209–217
97. Yende S, Linde-Zwirble W, Mayr F, et al: Risk of cardiovascular events in survivors of severe sepsis. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2014; 189:1065–1074
98. Rhodes A, Evans LE, Alhazzani W, et al: Surviving sepsis campaign: International guidelines for management of sepsis and septic shock: 2016. *Crit Care Med* 2017; 45:486–552
99. Rivers E, Nguyen B, Havstad S, et al; Early Goal-Directed Therapy Collaborative Group: Early goal-directed therapy in the treatment of severe sepsis and septic shock. *N Engl J Med* 2001; 345:1368–1377
100. Pinto BB, Rehberg S, Ertmer C, et al: Role of levosimendan in sepsis and septic shock. *Curr Opin Anaesthesiol* 2008; 21:168–177
101. Gordon AC, Perkins GD, Singer M, et al: Levosimendan for the prevention of acute organ dysfunction in sepsis. *N Engl J Med* 2016; 375:1638–1648
102. Morelli A, Donati A, Ertmer C, et al: Microvascular effects of heart rate control with esmolol in patients with septic shock: A pilot study. *Crit Care Med* 2013; 41:2162–2168
103. Beesley SJ, Wilson EL, Lanspa M, et al: Persistent tachycardia and mortality in septic shock patients. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2017; 195:A1899
104. Annane D, Vignon P, Renault A, et al; CATS Study Group: Norepinephrine plus dobutamine versus epinephrine alone for management of septic shock: A randomised trial. *Lancet* 2007; 370:676–684
105. Jardin F, Brun-Ney D, Auvert B, et al: Sepsis-related cardiogenic shock. *Crit Care Med* 1990; 18:1055–1060.
106. Weil MH, Nishjima H: Cardiac output in bacterial shock. *Am J Med* 1978; 64:920–922
107. Semler MW, Rice TW: Sepsis resuscitation: Fluid choice and dose. *Clin Chest Med* 2016; 37:241–250
108. Ruth A, McCracken CE, Fortenberry JD, et al: Extracorporeal therapies in pediatric severe sepsis: Findings from the pediatric healthcare information system. *Crit Care* 2015; 19:397
109. MacLaren G, Butt W, Best D, et al: Central extracorporeal membrane oxygenation for refractory pediatric septic shock. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2011; 12:133–136
110. Bréchot N, Luyt CE, Schmidt M, et al: Venoarterial extracorporeal membrane oxygenation support for refractory cardiovascular dysfunction during severe bacterial septic shock. *Crit Care Med* 2013; 41:1616–1626
111. Huang CT, Tsai YJ, Tsai PR, et al: Extracorporeal membrane oxygenation resuscitation in adult patients with refractory septic shock. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 2013; 146:1041–1046
112. Ventetuolo CE, Muratore CS: Extracorporeal life support in critically ill adults. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2014; 190:497–508
113. Vohra HA, Adamson L, Weeden DF, et al: Use of extracorporeal membrane oxygenation in the management of septic shock with severe cardiac dysfunction after Ravitch procedure. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2009; 87:e4–e5

114. Gabel E, Gudzenko V, Cruz D, et al: Successful use of extracorporeal membrane oxygenation in an adult patient with toxic shock-induced heart failure. *J Intensive Care Med* 2015; 30:115–118
115. MacLaren G, Pellegrino V, Butt W, et al: Successful use of ECMO in adults with life-threatening infections. *Anaesth Intensive Care* 2004; 32:707–710
116. Bruenger F, Kizner L, Weile J, et al: First successful combination of ECMO with cytokine removal therapy in cardiogenic septic shock: A case report. *Int J Artif Organs* 2015; 38:113–116
117. Fujisaki N, Takahashi A, Arima T, et al: Successful treatment of Panton-Valentine leukocidin-expressing *Staphylococcus aureus*-associated pneumonia co-infected with influenza using extracorporeal membrane oxygenation. *In Vivo* 2014; 28:961–965
118. Firstenberg MS, Abel E, Blais D, et al: The use of extracorporeal membrane oxygenation in severe necrotizing soft tissue infections complicated by septic shock. *Am Surg* 2010; 76:1287–1289
119. Pořízka M, Kopecký P, Prskavec T, et al: Successful use of extra-corporeal membrane oxygenation in a patient with streptococcal sepsis: A case report and review of literature. *Prague Med Rep* 2015; 116:57–63
120. Takahashi K, Tanabe K, Ohnuki M, et al: Induction of pluripotent stem cells from adult human fibroblasts by defined factors. *Cell* 2007; 131:861–872
121. Hotchkiss RS, Karl IE: The pathophysiology and treatment of sepsis. *N Engl J Med* 2003; 348:138–150
122. Balik M, Rulisek J, Leden P, et al: Concomitant use of beta-1 adrenoreceptor blocker and norepinephrine in patients with septic shock. *Wien Klin Wochenschr* 2012; 124:552–556
123. Aronson D, Burger AJ: Effect of beta-blockade on autonomic modulation of heart rate and neurohormonal profile in decompensated heart failure. *Ann Noninvasive Electrocardiol* 2001; 6:98–106
124. Fiuzat M, Wojdyla D, Pina I, et al: Heart rate or beta-blocker dose? association with outcomes in ambulatory heart failure patients with systolic dysfunction: Results from the HF-ACTION trial. *JACC Heart Fail* 2016; 4:109–115
125. Bristow MR: Treatment of chronic heart failure with β-adrenergic receptor antagonists: A convergence of receptor pharmacology and clinical cardiology. *Circ Res* 2011; 109:1176–1194
126. Deutschman CS, Ahrens T, Cairns CB, et al; Critical Care Societies CollaborativeUSCIITG Task Force on Critical Care Research: Multisociety Task Force for Critical Care Research: Key issues and recommendations. *Crit Care Med* 2012; 40:254–260
127. Angus DC, Carlet J; 2002 Brussels Roundtable Participants: Surviving intensive care: A report from the 2002 Brussels Roundtable. *Intensive Care Med* 2003; 29:368–377
128. Needham DM, Davidson J, Cohen H, et al: Improving long-term outcomes after discharge from intensive care unit: Report from a stakeholders' conference. *Crit Care Med* 2012; 40:502–509
129. Iwashyna TJ: Survivorship will be the defining challenge of critical care in the 21st century. *Ann Intern Med* 2010; 153:204–205
130. Prescott HC, Langa KM, Liu V, et al: Increased 1-year healthcare use in survivors of severe sepsis. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2014; 190:62–69
131. Prescott HC, Langa KM, Iwashyna TJ: Readmission diagnoses after hospitalization for severe sepsis and other acute medical conditions. *JAMA* 2015; 313:1055–1057
132. Iwashyna TJ, Ely EW, Smith DM, et al: Long-term cognitive impairment and functional disability among survivors of severe sepsis. *JAMA* 2010; 304:1787–1794
133. Corrales-Medina VF, Suh KN, Rose G, et al: Cardiac complications in patients with community-acquired pneumonia: A systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. *PLoS Med* 2011; 8:e1001048

Online Data Supplement
Concise Definitive Review: Septic Cardiomyopathy

Sarah J. Beesley, MD[1,2], Gerhard Weber MD PhD[3], Todd Sarge MD[4], Sara Nikravan MD[5], Colin K. Grissom, MD FASE FCCM[1,2], Michael J. Lanspa, MD MS FASE FCCM[1], Sajid Shahul, MD MPH[6], Samuel M. Brown, MD MS FCCM FASE[1,2]

[1]Pulmonary and Critical Care, Intermountain Medical Center
[2]Pulmonary and Critical Care, University of Utah School of Medicine
[3]Cardiovascular Medicine, Stanford University
[4] Department of Anesthesia, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center
[5]Department of Anesthesia, Stanford University
[6]Department of Anesthesia, University of Chicago

Corresponding author: Samuel M. Brown MD MS, Shock Trauma ICU, Intermountain Medical Center, 5121 S. Cottonwood Street, Murray, UT 84107, O: (801) 507-6529, F: (801) 507-5578; samuel.brown@imail.org

Financial Support:

No author has a conflict of interest.