
Objectives: Sepsis generates significant global acute illness burden. The international variations in sepsis epidemiology (illness burden) have implications for region specific health policy. We hypothesised that there have been changes over time in the sepsis definitional elements (infection and organ dysfunction), and these may have impacted on hospital mortality.

Design: Cohort study.

Setting: We evaluated a high quality, nationally representative, clinical ICU database including data from 181 adult ICUs in England.

Patients: Nine hundred sixty-seven thousand five hundred thirty-two consecutive adult ICU admissions from January 2000 to December 2012.

Interventions: None.

Measurements and Main Results: To address the proposed hypothesis, we evaluated a high quality, nationally representative, clinical, ICU database of 967,532 consecutive admissions to 181 adult ICUs in England, from January 2000 to December 2012, to identify sepsis cases in a robust and reproducible way. Multinomial logistic regression was used to report unadjusted trends in sep-

reported across ICU cohorts (3–6), with recent trended data indicating a decrease in mortality (7–9). However, interpretation of these data is challenging as it is likely that differences in the timing and trajectories of pre- and within hospital care, enhanced recognition (through campaigns such as the Surviving Sepsis Campaign (10) and the Sepsis Six in the United Kingdom [11]) and available ICU resources (the provision and use of ICU beds), will influence the characteristics of the sepsis population admitted to ICU (3, 12–16). Currently, no international consensus exists for standardised reporting the

and percentage. Admissions with unmeasured physiology were assumed not to have met the sepsis case definition. Data completeness exceeded 98% in all fields used for case selection, thus complete case analyses were used. All analyses were performed using Stata/SE Version 13.0 (StataCorp LP, College Station, TX).

RESULTS

Over the study period, 248,864 of the 967,532 admissions to adult general ICUs in England met the sepsis case definition. The proportion and numbers of sepsis admissions increased from 23.5% in 2000 to 25.2% in 2012 (Table Fig. 1, Supple-



57.7–58.4%) (Fig. C and D; S-Table-3, Supplemental Digital Content 1, <http://links.lww.com/CCM/B941>).

Adjusted Trends in Hospital Mortality by Infection and Organ Dysfunction

The adjusted trend for improvement in hospital mortality for sepsis admissions was significant (OR, 0.939; 95% CI, 0.934–0.945 per year; $p < 0.001$). Adjusted hospital mortality decreased significantly within each category of infection source and the rate of change over time varied significantly by infection source (respiratory, OR for risk category, 1, 0.947 [95% CI, 0.938–0.956] per year; cardiovascular, 0.937 [0.918–0.957] per year; gastrointestinal, 0.941 [0.933–0.950] per year; genitourinary, 0.938 [0.918–0.959] per year; musculoskeletal/dermatologic, 0.943 [0.925–0.962] per year; neurologic, 0.939 [0.919–0.960] per year; unknown, 0.919 [0.907–0.932]; all individual trends and test of homogeneity $p < 0.001$).

Adjusted hospital mortality also decreased significantly within each risk category but the rate of change was consistent across the risk categories (risk category 1, OR for respiratory source, 0.947 [95% CI, 0.938–0.956] per year; risk category 2, 0.947 [95% CI, 0.939–0.955] per year; risk category 3, 0.943 [95% CI, 0.935–0.950] per year; -5(e)3(r y)12(earTc 0 Tw 131K)-5(e)3(r)S0()JTJ 0.118 Tw T* [(0.947 [95% CI,)30(o)15

(f)-30(c)7(hTw (D)Tw nd ist)t taligTf 0 T2t ofear17;a[6 Tw T*SererD2(ear-5(e)3(33(rC)8e r)-8)9(e o)3(f)11(ies ht12(eap://16

Adjua0.9w(t 59lin]cTw15(w)o d) infy7((f)-30nt0(r)--ear2)-1(asculandj)4(ust)9(e)-2(d t)-6(r)12(e)3 nd J 0 Tw (-)oh ((r)t the r

as 12.1% for risk category 1; 15.8% for risk category 4) and between infection sources (such as 13.2% for respiratory infection; 12.3% for urinary infections), despite differences in baseline mortality (year 2000) in these sepsis definitional elements.

Relevance

Our study introduces the concept that differences in the contribution of each sepsis definitional element such as source of infection and type and number of organ dysfunctions potentially contributes to the international variation observed across

the overall incidence of sepsis may be underestimated (i.e., some admissions may develop sepsis after the first 24 hours in ICU). However, given the relatively low provision of ICU beds in England (higher threshold for admission) (23, 31) and with 80% of the study cohort having two or more organ dysfunctions in the first 24 hours, the impact would likely be minimal. Second, the ICUs contributing to the dataset varied over time, which we addressed in our sensitivity analyses. Third, the organ dysfunction assessment was cross sectional. Fourth, the dataset contains planned and unplanned ICU admissions, where the physiology-modified secondary to interventions such as fluid management that would not be similarly captured by the organ dysfunction assessment (32) that is a common limitation of large database based epidemiology reports (33). Finally, changes to the health care system and increasing awareness of sepsis could have influenced some of the observed improvements in outcome (34); however, assessment of effects of these changes was not the research question addressed by this study.

Future Research

Definitions are descriptions of illness and criteria provide the variables to identify a case (6). To-date, there are neither universally agreed standardized

highlighted in studies of sepsis epidemiology (7, 9, 25–30) namely, reliance on administrative/insurance claims data and use of either subjective sepsis codes (highly likely influenced by awareness campaigns, influential studies, and reimbursement formulae) or separate but asynchronous codes for infection and organ dysfunction, often coded at discharge.

Limitations

There are limitations to our study. First, our database was not primarily designed for ICU sepsis epidemiology, and therefore,

CONCLUSIONS

The characteristics of our sepsis ICU population changed over time and so did the impact of definitional elements on hospital mortality, which we propose preclude direct international comparisons of incidence and mortality. We illustrate a case for developing an international consensus on standardized reporting of sepsis epidemiology. This has important implications, both for health policy and benchmarking.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We thank both staff and patients in the ICUs participating in the Case Mix Programme. Dr. Shankar-Hari acknowledges the funding of NIHR Biomedical Research Centre at Kings Health Partners.

REFERENCES

1. 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
2. Adhikari NK, Fowler RA, Bhagwanjee S, et al: Critical care and the global burden of critical illness in adults. *Lancet* 2010; 376:1339–1346
3. Investigators: Assessment of the worldwide burden of critical illness: The intensive care over nations (ICON) audit. *Lancet Respir Med* 2014; 2:380–386
4. Fleischmann C, Scherag A, Adhikari NK, et al; International Forum of Acute Care Trialists: Assessment of global incidence and mortality of hospital-treated sepsis. Current estimates and limitations. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2016; 193:259–272
5. Mayr FB, Yende S, Angus DC: Epidemiology of severe sepsis. *Virulence* 2014; 5:4–11
6. Shankar-Hari M, Phillips GS, Levy ML, et al; Sepsis Definitions Task Force: Developing a new definition and assessing new clinical criteria for septic shock: For the third international consensus definitions for sepsis and septic shock (sepsis-3). *JAMA* 2016; 315:775–787
7. Gaieski DF, Edwards JM, Kallan MJ, et al: Benchmarking the incidence and mortality of severe sepsis in the United States. *Crit Care Med* 2013; 41:1167–1174
8. Kaukonen KM, Bailey M, Suzuki S, et al: Mortality related to severe sepsis and septic shock among critically ill patients in Australia and New Zealand, 2000-2012. *JAMA* 2014; 311:1308–1316
9. Stevenson EK, Rubenstein AR, Radin GT, et al: Two decades of mortality trends among patients with severe sepsis: A comparative meta-analysis. *Crit Care Med* 2014; 42:625–631
10. Dellinger RP, Levy MM, Rhodes A, et al; Surviving Sepsis Campaign Guidelines Committee including the Pediatric Subgroup: Surviving sepsis campaign: International guidelines for management of severe sepsis and septic shock: 2012. *Crit Care Med* 2013; 41:580–637
11. Daniels R, Nutbeam T, McNamara G, et al: The sepsis six and the severe sepsis resuscitation bundle: A prospective observational cohort study. *Emerg Med J* 2011; 28:507–512
12. Investigators: Sepsis in European intensive care units: Results of the SOAP study. *Crit Care Med* 2006; 34:344–353
13. Seymour CW, Rea TD, Kahn JM, et al: Severe sepsis in pre-hospital emergency care: Analysis of incidence, care, and outcome. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2012; 186:1264–1271

14. Iwashyna TJ, Angus DC: Declining case fatality rates for severe sepsis: Good data bring good news with ambiguous implications. *JAMA* 2014; 311:1295–1297
15. Levy MM, Rhodes A, Phillips GS, et al: Surviving sepsis campaign: Association between performance metrics and outcomes in a 7.5-year study. *Crit Care Med* 2015; 43:3–12
16. Young JD, Goldfrad C, Rowan K: Development and testing of a hierarchical method to code the reason for admission to intensive care units: The ICNARC Coding Method. *Intensive Care National Audit & Research Centre. Br J Anaesth* 2001; 87:543–548
17. Harrison DA, Brady AR, Rowan K: Case mix, outcome and length of stay for admissions to adult, general critical care units in England, Wales and Northern Ireland: The Intensive Care National Audit & Research Centre Case Mix Programme Database. *Crit Care* 2004; 8:R99–111
18. National Statistics Online: Available at: <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/hub/population/population-change/population-estimates/index.html>. Accessed September 2, 2015
19. Padkin A, Goldfrad C, Brady AR, et al: Epidemiology of severe sepsis occurring in the first 24 hrs in intensive care units in England, Wales, and Northern Ireland. *Crit Care Med* 2003; 31:2332–2338
20. Leligdowicz A, Dodek PM, Norena M, et al; Co-operative Antimicrobial Therapy of Septic Shock Database Research Group: Association between source of infection and hospital mortality in patients who have septic shock. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2014; 189:1204–1213
21. Prin M, Wunsch H: International comparisons of intensive care: Informing outcomes and improving standards. *Curr Opin Crit Care* 2012; 18:700–706
22. Sepsis: Ss?
23. Sepsis: Ss?
24. Sepsis: Ss?