Intensive Care Med
https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-018-5406-3

FOCUS EDITORIAL

Focus on sepsis: new concepts and findings in sepsis care

Jean-Francois Timsit[1,2*], Etienne Ruppe[2,3] and Ricard Ferrer[4,5]

Sepsis is a life-threatening organ dysfunction caused by a dysregulated host response to infection. It affects over 30 million people worldwide and represents one of the top causes of death. The Surviving Sepsis Campaign (SSC) guidelines undoubtedly improved the process of care and outcomes in the past decade. The last version of the guidelines was recently published in the journal [1]. As key messages, the Surviving Sepsis Campaign recommends "antimicrobial therapy in the first hour", and "aggressive fluid resuscitation during the first 24 h of management". Hypotensive patients with lactate level of 4 mMol/L or more should receive an immediate crystalloid of more than 30 mL/kg within 3 h and repeated bolus as needed.

Translation of the guidelines to resource-limited settings is hampered by the limited availability of skilled staff, equipment, and laboratory support, compounded by infrastructure and logistical challenges. Subsequently, recommendations relating to core elements of general supportive care for patients with sepsis in these settings have been developed [2]. However, evidence of their efficacy in resource-limited settings are lacking and may differ from trials conducted in other settings.

As a recent example, Andrews et al. [3] randomly assigned patients with sepsis and hypotension in Zambia to be treated using either (1) an early resuscitation protocol including intravenous fluid bolus administration with monitoring of jugular venous pressure, respiratory rate, and arterial oxygen saturation and treatment with vasopressors targeting mean arterial pressure ($\geq$65 mmHg) and blood transfusion (for patients with a hemoglobin level $<$7 g/dL), or (2) usual care in which treating clinicians determined hemodynamic management. Paradoxically the early resuscitation protocol increased hospital mortality from 34/103 (33%) to 51/106 patients (48.1%) [between-group difference, 15.1% (95% CI 2.0%–28.3%)].

Even in high income countries, gaps in the data frequently exist, leading to insufficient clarity on many elements of sepsis management and precluding recommendations on many topics (Table 1). In a retrospective analysis of a large multicenter US database, Marik et al. questioned the impact of a large fluid loading after initial resuscitation on prognosis [4]. They evaluated 35,135 patients with a diagnosis of severe sepsis or septic shock, and identified that a low volume resuscitation (1–4.99 L) was associated with a reduction in mortality of $-$0.7% per litre (95% CI $-$1.0%, $-$0.4% $p=0.02$). However, in patients receiving high volume resuscitation (5 to $\geq$9 L), the mortality increased by 2.3% (95% CI 2.0, 2.5%; $p=0.0003$) for each additional liter above 5 L. This result strongly questioned the dogma of an extra-large fluid loading during the first hours. Another large epidemiological study in the emergency department was not able to demonstrate a survival benefit of an increase of the amount of fluid received in case of severe sepsis and septic shock [5]. Finally, severe weight gain in patients with shock was independently associated with increased mortality in patients who survived the first 3 days [6].

These results altogether suggested that fluid overload is rapidly deleterious and that fluid loading after initial resuscitation should be lower than usually recommended, and guided not only on macrocirculatory, but also microcirculatory parameters.

In an attempt to determine priorities for research within the field of sepsis, the SSC created a new research committee which came up with a list of six questions to be answered in the near future [7], that were quite consistent with priorities set up by another recent

*Correspondence: Jean-Francois.timsit@aphp.fr
[1] Medical and Infectious Diseases ICU (MI2), APHP Hopital Bichat, 75018 Paris, France
Full author information is available at the end of the article

Table 1 Uncertainties in sepsis

1.	Optimal amount of initial fluids in sepsis-induced hypoperfusion
2.	Ideal clinical parameters and endpoints for volume resuscitation
3.	Time-to-initiation of empirical antibiotics in patients with sepsis without shock
4.	Role of rapid microbiological diagnostic tests in the management of sepsis
5.	Selection of patients for treatment with adjunctive therapies
6.	Efficacy and feasibility of treatment recommendations in resource-limited countries

international expert consensus [8]. Among the top six priorities, five included the ICU stay and included scoring/identification, appropriate therapy of infection, fluids and vasoactive agents, and adjunctive therapy.

Some recent developments are targeting the adjunctive therapy. Several extracorporeal devices have been developed to remove endotoxin, cytokines and other sepsis mediators from the circulation. However, the studies evaluating these devices have been limited and heterogeneous; therefore, further research is warranted [9]. Another potentially interesting therapeutic target in sepsis might be the blood coagulation, in order to counteract excessive coagulation activation. In that perspective, thrombomodulin, which combines anticoagulant and anti-inflammatory effects, represents a promising therapeutic option [10]. Interestingly, in the different clinical trials that evaluate this drug, the rate of bleeding complications was generally relatively low, suggesting that despite major coagulation disorders, anticoagulation of patients with sepsis is quite safe. Thrombomodulin trials have so far allocated anticoagulant treatments to a selected subset of septic patients on the basis of coagulopathy criteria. Following encouraging results of a phase II trial, a larger Phase III study with 800 randomized patients (SCARLET trial, EudraCT number 2012-002251-42) was recently completed, and its results are pending.

In before-after studies, educational and training programs are able to improve the appropriateness of antimicrobial therapy in sepsis [11]. These initiatives clearly improved the process of care, but have not demonstrated any positive impact on outcome. The reduction of the time before initiation of antimicrobial therapy by means of a multifaceted intervention was tested in a cluster-randomized trial involving 4183 patients with sepsis or septic shock [12]. Although the risk of death increased by 2% per hour of delay of the antimicrobial therapy start, and by 1% per hour of delay of the source control, the intervention was not able to reduce neither the median time to antimicrobial therapy (1.5 vs. 2.0 h, $p = 0.41$), nor the mortality. One possible explanation is that immediate antimicrobial therapy may be instrumental in septic shock but of a lesser importance in sepsis, as suggested by two large epidemiological studies [5, 13]. The absence of benefit of early antimicrobial therapy may have been related with the diagnostic uncertainty regarding sepsis and the possible harm associated with unnecessary antibiotics such as toxic or allergic reactions and emergence of bacterial resistance.

The management of multidrug-resistant bacteria (MDRB) in the intensive care setting is more than ever challenging due to their sustained diffusion in healthcare settings and, for some of them, in the community setting [14]. The control of MDRB requires antibiotic stewardship programs that should include faster diagnostic spanning antibiotic resistance, in addition to pathogen identification, and a better assessment of pharmacokinetics parameters. New antibiotics active on MDRB (especially Gram-negative rods) are also urgently needed [15].

The resident microbes of the gut serve essential metabolic and immunomodulatory functions. Profound alterations of richness and diversity of the gut microbiota have been described in ICU patients largely due to antimicrobial exposure [16], but also to many other drugs including antiviral and antiprotozoan therapies [17]. These alterations may favor the emergence of pathogenic bacteria (so called pathobiota) and may contribute to immune dysregulation and multiple organ failure in sepsis.

In a recent cohort, Freedberg et al. showed that at admission in ICU, the intestinal dominance of *Enterococcus* as determined by 16S profiling was associated with a higher risk of infections and increased mortality [18]. In addition, they also observed that the detection of reads assigned to *Escherichia coli*, *Pseudomonas* spp., *Klebsiella* spp. and *Clostridium difficile* was associated with a higher risk of infections caused by those bacteria. While assessing the risk of infections caused by MDRB using clinical parameters remains unsatisfactory [19], the findings of Freedberg et al. suggest that considering specific microbiological traits of the patients could be of help.

Hence, the control and modulation of the intestinal microbiota is a promising approach. As an unaltered microbiota could be associated with a better outcome in ICU patients, some drugs aiming at preventing the impact of antibiotics on the intestinal microbiota could be made available in the coming years, such as gut-delivered active charcoal [20] or recombinant beta-lactamases.

Author details
[1] Medical and Infectious Diseases ICU (MI2), APHP Hopital Bichat, 75018 Paris, France. [2] U1137 IAME Inserm-Paris Diderot University, 75018 Paris, France. [3] Microbiological Department, APHP Hopital Bichat, 75018 Paris, France. [4] Intensive Care Department, Vall d'Hebron University Hospital, Barcelona, Spain. [5] Shock, Organ Dysfunction and Resuscitation Research Group, Vall d'Hebron Research Institute, Barcelona, Spain.

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflicts of interest
The authors declare that they have no conflict of interests.

Received: 23 September 2018 Accepted: 1 October 2018
Published online: 10 October 2018

References

1. Rhodes A, Evans LE, Alhazzani W, Levy MM, Antonelli M, Ferrer R, Kumar A, Sevransky JE, Sprung CL, Nunnally ME, Rochwerg B, Rubenfeld GD, Angus DC, Annane D, Beale RJ, Bellinghan GJ, Bernard GR, Chiche JD, Coopersmith C, De Backer DP, French CJ, Fujishima S, Gerlach H, Hidalgo JL, Hollenberg SM, Jones AE, Karnad DR, Kleinpell RM, Koh Y, Lisboa TC, Machado FR, Marini JJ, Marshall JC, Mazuski JE, McIntyre LA, McLean AS, Mehta S, Moreno RP, Myburgh J, Navalesi P, Nishida O, Osborn TM, Perner A, Plunkett CM, Ranieri M, Schorr CA, Seckel MA, Seymour CW, Shieh L, Shukri KA, Simpson SQ, Singer M, Thompson BT, Townsend SR, Van der Poll T, Vincent JL, Wiersinga WJ, Zimmerman JL, Dellinger RP (2017) Surviving sepsis campaign: international guidelines for management of sepsis and septic shock: 2016. Intensive Care Med 43:304–377
2. Mer M, Schultz MJ, Adhikari NK, European Society of Intensive Care Medicine Global Intensive Care Working G, the Mahidol-Oxford Research Unit BT (2017) Core elements of general supportive care for patients with sepsis and septic shock in resource-limited settings. Intensive Care Med 43:1690–1694
3. Andrews B, Semler MW, Muchemwa L, Kelly P, Lakhi S, Heimburger DC, Mabula C, Bwalya M, Bernard GR (2017) Effect of an early resuscitation protocol on in-hospital mortality among adults with sepsis and hypotension: a randomized clinical trial. JAMA 318:1233–1240
4. Marik PE, Linde-Zwirble WT, Bittner EA, Sahatjian J, Hansell D (2017) Fluid administration in severe sepsis and septic shock, patterns and outcomes: an analysis of a large national database. Intensive Care Med 43:625–632
5. Seymour CW, Gesten F, Prescott HC, Friedrich ME, Iwashyna TJ, Phillips GS, Lemeshow S, Osborn T, Terry KM, Levy MM (2017) Time to treatment and mortality during mandated emergency care for sepsis. New England J Med 376:2235–2244
6. Gros A, Dupuis C, Ruckly S, Lautrette A, Garrouste-Orgeas M, Gainnier M, Forel JM, Marcotte G, Azoulay E, Cohen Y, Schwebel C, Argaud L, de Montmollin E, Siami S, Goldgran-Toledano D, Darmon M, Timsit JF (2018) Association between body weight variation and survival and other adverse events in critically ill patients with shock: a multicenter cohort study of the outcomerea network. Crit Care Med 46:e981–e987
7. Coopersmith CM, De Backer D, Deutschman CS, Ferrer R, Lat I, Machado FR, Martin GS, Martin-Loeches I, Nunnally ME, Antonelli M, Evans LE, Hellman J, Jog S, Kesecioglu J, Levy MM, Rhodes A (2018) Surviving sepsis campaign: research priorities for sepsis and septic shock. Intensive Care Med 44:1400–1426
8. Perner A, Gordon AC, Angus DC, Lamontagne F, Machado F, Russell JA, Timsit JF, Marshall JC, Myburgh J, Shankar-Hari M, Singer M (2017) The intensive care medicine research agenda on septic shock. Intensive Care Med 43:1294–1305
9. Pickkers P, Payen D (2017) What's new in the extracorporeal treatment of sepsis? Intensive Care Med 43:1498–1500
10. Meziani F, Gando S, Vincent JL (2017) Should all patients with sepsis receive anticoagulation? Yes. Intensive Care Med 43:452–454
11. Ferrer R, Martinez ML, Goma G, Suarez D, Alvarez-Rocha L, de la Torre MV, Gonzalez G, Zaragoza R, Borges M, Blanco J, Herrejon EP, Artigas A (2018) Improved empirical antibiotic treatment of sepsis after an educational intervention: the ABISS-edusepsis study. Crit Care (Lond Engl) 22:167
12. Bloos F, Ruddel H, Thomas-Ruddel D, Schwarzkopf D, Pausch C, Harbarth S, Schreiber T, Grundling M, Marshall J, Simon P, Levy MM, Weiss M, Weyland A, Gerlach H, Schurholz T, Engel C, Matthaus-Kramer C, Scheer C, Bach F, Riessen R, Poidinger B, Dey K, Weiler N, Meier-Hellmann A, Haberle HH, Wobker G, Kaisers UX, Reinhart K (2017) Effect of a multifaceted educational intervention for anti-infectious measures on sepsis mortality: a cluster randomized trial. Intensive Care Med 43:1602–1612
13. Liu VX, Fielding-Singh V, Greene JD, Baker JM, Iwashyna TJ, Bhattacharya J, Escobar GJ (2017) The timing of early antibiotics and hospital mortality in sepsis. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 196:856–863
14. Bassetti M, Poulakou G, Ruppe E, Bouza E, Van Hal SJ, Brink A (2017) Antimicrobial resistance in the next 30 years, humankind, bugs and drugs: a visionary approach. Intensive Care Med 43:1464–1475
15. Kollef MH, Bassetti M, Francois B, Burnham J, Dimopoulos G, Garnacho-Montero J, Lipman J, Luyt CE, Nicolau DP, Postma MJ, Torres A, Welte T, Wunderink RG (2017) The intensive care medicine research agenda on multidrug-resistant bacteria, antibiotics, and stewardship. Intensive Care Med 43:1187–1197
16. Lankelma JM, van Vught LA, Belzer C, Schultz MJ, van der Poll T, de Vos WM, Wiersinga WJ (2017) Critically ill patients demonstrate large interpersonal variation in intestinal microbiota dysregulation: a pilot study. Intensive Care Med 43:59–68
17. Maier L, Pruteanu M, Kuhn M, Zeller G, Telzerow A, Anderson EE, Brochado AR, Fernandez KC, Dose H, Mori H, Patil KR, Bork P, Typas A (2018) Extensive impact of non-antibiotic drugs on human gut bacteria. Nature 555:623–628
18. Freedberg DE, Zhou MJ, Cohen ME, Annavajhala MK, Khan S, Moscoso DI, Brooks C, Whittier S, Chong DH, Uhlemann AC, Abrams JA (2018) Pathogen colonization of the gastrointestinal microbiome at intensive care unit admission and risk for subsequent death or infection. Intensive Care Med 44(8):1203–1211
19. Barbier F, Bailly S, Schwebel C, Papazian L, Azoulay E, Kallel H, Siami S, Argaud L, Marcotte G, Misset B, Reignier J, Darmon M, Zahar JR, Goldgran-Toledano D, de Montmollin E, Souweine B, Mourvillier B, Timsit JF (2018) Infection-related ventilator-associated complications in ICU patients colonised with extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing Enterobacteriaceae. Intensive Care Med 44:616–626
20. de Gunzburg J, Ghozlane A, Ducher A, Le Chatelier E, Duval X, Ruppe E, Armand-Lefevre L, Sablier-Gallis F, Burdet C, Alavoine L, Chachaty E, Augustin V, Varastet M, Levenez F, Kennedy S, Pons N, Mentre F, Andremont A (2018) Protection of the human gut microbiome from antibiotics. J Infect Dis 217:628–636