Septic shock resuscitation in the first hour

Nicholas Simpson[a], *Francois Lamontagne*[b,c], *and Manu Shankar-Hari*[d,e]

Purpose of review
We reviewed the recent advances in the initial approach to resuscitation of sepsis and septic shock patients.

Recent findings
Sepsis and septic shock are life-threatening emergencies. Two key interventions in the first hour include timely antibiotic therapy and resuscitation. Before any laboratory results, the need for resuscitation is considered if a patient with suspected infection has low blood pressure (BP) or impaired peripheral circulation found at clinical examination. Until now, this early resuscitation in sepsis and septic shock was supported by improvements in outcome seen with goal-directed therapy. However, three recent, goal-directed therapy trials failed to replicate the originally reported mortality reductions, prompting a debate on how this early resuscitation should be performed. As resuscitation is often focussed on macrociculatory goals such as optimizing central venous pressure, the discordance between microcirculatory and macrocirculatory optimization during resuscitation is a potential argument for the lack of outcome benefit in the newer trials. Vasoactive drug dose and large volume resuscitation-associated-positive fluid balance, are independently associated with worse clinical outcomes in critically ill sepsis and septic shock patients. As lower BP targets and restricted volume resuscitation are feasible and well tolerated, should we consider a lower BP target to reduce the adverse effects of catecholamine' and excess resuscitation fluids. Evidence guiding fluids, vasopressor, and inotrope selection remains limited.

Summary
Though the early resuscitation of sepsis and septic shock is key to improving outcomes, ideal resuscitation targets are elusive. Distinction should be drawn between microcirculatory and macrocirculatory changes, and corresponding targets. Common components of resuscitation bundles such as large volume resuscitation and high-dose vasopressors may not be universally beneficial. Microcirculatory targets, individualized resuscitation goals, and reassessment of completed trials using the updated septic shock criteria should be focus areas for future research.

Keywords
microcirculation, resuscitation, sepsis, septic shock

INTRODUCTION

Sepsis is defined as life-threatening organ dysfunction caused by a dysregulated host response to infection [1▪▪]. In this context, the organ dysfunction is identified clinically by an increase in the Sequential (Sepsis-related) Organ Failure Assessment score of 2 points or more [1▪▪,2]. Septic shock is defined as a subset of sepsis in which particularly profound circulatory, cellular, and metabolic abnormalities are associated with a greater risk of mortality than with sepsis alone [1▪▪]. The clinical criteria for identifying septic shock patients is a vasopressor requirement to maintain a mean arterial pressure (MAP) of 65 mmHg or greater and serum lactate level greater than 2 mmol/l (>18 mg/dl) in the absence of hypovolemia [3]. Resuscitation is the key intervention for treating macro and microcirculatory abnormalities commonly observed in sepsis and septic shock patients [4] and resuscitation also forms part of the 3-h and 6-h bundles proposed in the Surviving Sepsis Campaign guidelines [5]. In this review, we discuss sepsis-related microcirculation and macrocirculation abnormalities, resuscitation goals in guidelines, microcirculation as a focus of early

[a]Intensive Care Unit, Barwon Health, University Hospital Geelong, Geelong, Victoria, Australia, [b]Centre de Recherche du CHU de Sherbrooke, [c]Faculté de Médecine et des Sciences de la Santé, University of Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, Québec, Canada, [d]St Thomas' Hospital, Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust and [e]School of Immunology & Microbial Sciences, Kings College London, London, UK

Correspondence to Manu Shankar-Hari, MSc, PhD, FRCA, FFICM, St Thomas' Hospital, Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust, 1st Floor, East Wing, London SE1 7EH, UK. Tel: +44 20 7188 8769; fax: +44 20 7188 2284; e-mail: manu.shankar-hari@kcl.ac.uk

Curr Opin Crit Care 2017, 23:000–000
DOI:10.1097/MCC.0000000000000460

1070-5295 Copyright © 2017 Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. All rights reserved.

Copyright © 2017 Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. Unauthorized reproduction of this article is prohibited.

KEY POINTS

- The Surviving Sepsis Campaign guidelines provide a framework for managing sepsis patients.
- Early antibiotic therapy and fluid resuscitation are major interventions in sepsis patients.
- Emerging evidence suggests discordance between macrocirculatory and microcirculatory optimization following resuscitation.
- As resuscitation-associated-positive fluid balance and high-dose vasopressors are associated with adverse outcomes in sepsis and septic shock, trials of fluid restriction, and lower BP targets are ongoing.

resuscitation, and emerging evidence on fluids, vasoactive active drugs, and adjuvants targeted during resuscitation in sepsis and septic shock.

MICROCIRCULATION AND MACROCIRCULATION ABNORMALITIES ARE COMMON IN SEPSIS AND SEPTIC SHOCK

Microcirculation refers to circulation within the blood vessels less than 100–150 μm in diameter (such as arterioles, capillaries, venules, and lymphatics) and the associated cells such as endothelium, smooth muscle, erythrocytes, leukocytes, and platelets. The tools required to measure microcirculatory flow directly are not routinely available. Notwithstanding, tissue perfusion-based markers [6] such as lactate, mixed/central venous oxygen saturation ($ScvO_2$), and central venous–arterial partial pressure of carbon dioxide difference (δPCO_2) [7,8], constitute indirect markers of adequate global microcirculation. Microcirculation could also be assessed to understand the homogeneity in blood flow by assessing number of patent capillaries, referred to as functional capillary density.

In sepsis, the microcirculation is profoundly altered because of local and systemic host responses. In health, the endothelium acts as continuous and anticoagulant barrier between circulating blood and tissue. In sepsis, the endothelial barrier is disrupted resulting in enhanced coagulation, extravasation of fluids, and ahdesion of activated leukocytes creating a vicious cycle. This perpetuates inflammation, coagulopathy, and endothelial injury [9▪▪]. The associated impaired vascular smooth muscle tone, relative hypovolemia, and a reduction in the functional capillary density results in a heterogeneous combination of microcirculatory units that have lost their ability to regulate vascular tone. Constricted arterioles coexist with vasodilated units. These changes result in inefficient microcirculation creating an oxygen partial pressure gap evidenced by the reduced capillary oxygen partial pressure, increased venous oxygen partial pressure, and impaired mitochondrial oxygen extraction [10▪▪,11].

The circulation in larger blood vessels is referred to as macrocirculation. Indicators of macrocirculation include central venous pressure (CVP), pulmonary wedge pressure, arterial blood pressure (BP), cardiac output (CO), arterial oxygen content and delivery. Similar to microcirculatory changes, the macrocirculation abnormalities in sepsis are also heterogeneous. In addition, there is an acute reversible myocardial depression affecting both ventricles, with altered myocytes and gene expression abnormalities suggestive of impaired sarcomere contraction and impaired excitation–contraction coupling [12,13].

EARLY RESUSCITATION IN SEPSIS AND SEPTIC SHOCK

In 2001, Rivers *et al.* [14] reported a 263 patient single-centre randomized controlled trial (RCT) of early goal-directed therapy (EGDT) versus standard care for patients with severe sepsis or septic shock that showed 16% absolute reduction in in-hospital mortality with EGDT. This EGDT consisted of first achieving the macrocirculation goals ($CVP \geq 8$–12 mmHg, $MAP \geq 65$ mmHg), followed by the microcirculation target of $ScvO_2 \geq 70\%$. The interventions to achieve these macrocirculation goals were fluids and vasopressors and those for microcirculation goals were red blood transfusion to haemoglobin more than 10 g/l and/or inotropic agents to improve CO. The key differences between the EGDT arm and usual care arm in term of interventions administered between 0 and 6 h were – significantly greater volume of fluids, red blood cells, and inotropic agents. This trial formed the basis for the resuscitation goals in the previous Surviving Sepsis Campaign guidelines [15]. Goals during the first 6 h of resuscitation: $CVP = 8$–12; MAP at least 65 mmHg; urine output at least 0.5 ml/kg/h and $ScvO_2$ superior vena cava or mixed venous oxygen saturation ≥ 70 or 65%, respectively.

Between 2008 and 2014, three further multicentre RCTs compared EGDT with usual care, using a similar protocol to Rivers *et al.* [14] enrolling a total of 4211 patients, from the United States (Protocolized Care for Early Septic Shock), Australasia (Australasian Resuscitation in Sepsis Evaluation), and the United Kingdom (Protocolized Management in Sepsis) [16]. In addition to trial-level meta-analyses [16], the authors also harmonized

Copyright © 2017 Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. Unauthorized reproduction of this article is prohibited.

data from these three trials and reported an individual patient-level meta-analysis [17▪▪], to explore the overall average treatment effect and key predefined subgroups effects of EGDT compared with usual care. The 90-day mortality did not differ between the EGDT therapy (24.9%) and usual care (25.4%) groups with a nonsignificant adjusted odds ratio [95% confidence interval (CI)] of 0.97 (0.82–1.14). The EGDT treatment effect did not vary by severity of illness. Based on these results, the current Surviving Sepsis Campaign guidelines [5] strongly recommend administering at least 30 ml/kg of intravenous crystalloid fluids within the first 3 h, whilst acknowledging that this is based on low-quality of evidence. These guidelines also recommend a target MAP $\geq$ 65 mmHg and suggest guiding resuscitation to normalize lactate in patients with elevated lactate levels, which is a weak recommendation based on low-quality evidence, but addresses a microcirculation goal.

IS THERE A ROLE FOR TARGETING MICROCIRCULATION DURING EARLY RESUSCITATION?

The microcirculation goals addressed in RCTs include a reduction in serum lactate concentrations compared with either $ScvO_2$ in the emergency department (The LactATES trial [18]) or to usual care in the ICU [19]. The LactATES trial was a noninferiority RCT in 300 patients and compared the control group who received targeted resuscitation to meet thresholds of CVP, followed by MAP, and then ScvO2 of 70% or more to the lactate clearance group that had similar targeted thresholds in CVP, MAP, and then lactate clearance of 10% or more. This trial highlighted that lactate clearance is noninferior to $ScvO_2$-based resuscitation. Of note, a prespecified subgroup analysis from this trial highlighted that achievement of only the $ScvO_2$ goal was associated with a higher mortality compared with achievement of only the lactate clearance goal only (41 versus 8% and difference in proportion = 33%; 95% CI 9–55%). Although these underpowered subgroup analyses needs testing in RCTs prior to clinical adoption [20], it does highlight the value of studying lactate kinetics. In the ICU, Jansen *et al.* [19] evaluated a complex protocol to target a lactate clearance of 20% or more. Although, there was no difference in unadjusted mortality between the usual care arm and lactate clearance arm, the covariate adjusted OR was significantly lower in the lactate clearance arm. Patients in the lactate clearance arm received more fluids and, as stipulated by the experimental protocol, 42.5% received vasodilators during the first 8 h of resuscitation with the objective of 'opening' microcirculatory units. This approach challenges the more traditional goals of resuscitation (e.g. MAP of 65 mmHg). Vasopressors, which are commonly used to achieve MAP targets, could be reduced to the extent that minimal perfusion can be maintained at lower MAP values and, ultimately, administering vasodilators therapy could improve microcirculatory flow. However, although lactate clearance is undisputedly a favourable prognostic sign [21], high lactate levels are not specific for tissue dysoxia in sepsis and catecholamines' directly increase lactate levels via increased glycolysis [22]. Furthermore, the Surviving Sepsis Campaign guideline panel made a weak recommendation for lactate-guided resuscitation protocols, based on low-quality evidence, and did not address vasodilators, citing methodological limitations in the supporting literature.

Arteriovenous CO_2 gradients constitute another potential resuscitation target [23]. In theory, the difference between venous and arterial carbon dioxide blood content increases in proportion with the mismatch between CO and the CO_2 production of carbon dioxide. Elevated δPCO_2 gradients (the normal range is 2–6 mmHg) may indicate inadequate blood flow relative to metabolism before lactate levels rise. However, CO_2 metabolism is complex and the value of δPCO_2 gradients as resuscitation targets hinges on numerous assumptions. Moreover, the overall effects of resuscitation protocols guided by δPCO_2 gradients remain unknown. Finally, in a provocative study, Marik *et al.* [24] highlight the potential clinical benefits of combined early administration of intravenous vitamin C, together with corticosteroids and thiamine with biological plausibility arguments that point toward the microvasculature effects of this intervention. In summary, well designed and adequately powered experiments on the role of microvascular resuscitation in sepsis and septic shock patients are urgently needed.

FLUIDS

The theoretical goals of fluid administration during initial resuscitation of sepsis/septic shock include restoration of stressed intravascular volume and optimization of ventricular preload. The amount and type of fluid therapy remain contentious. Although fluid boluses may augment immediate haemodynamic parameters, concerns exist in regard to the transient nature of effect, the impact on the microcirculation and risk of iatrogenic complications [25–27]. There remains a similar lack of clarity around the most appropriate type of fluid to administer in the early phases of resuscitation in septic shock. Hydroxyethyl starch solutions are no longer

1070-5295 Copyright © 2017 Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. All rights reserved.

Copyright © 2017 Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. Unauthorized reproduction of this article is prohibited.

widely recommended based on a lack of overall benefit and potential harm [28]. Similarly, the potential efficacy signal in the sepsis subgroup for Albumin-based resuscitation could not be confirmed in a recent RCT [29]. In the absence of any clearly demonstrated benefit for colloids, initial crystalloid resuscitation is still recommended in the 2016 Surviving Sepsis guidelines, although concerns persist about the multiple potential side-effects of resuscitation with normal saline including renal, proinflammatory, anticoagulant, and acid–base associations. Balanced solutions have theoretical advantages, although a clear benefit is yet to be consistently demonstrated [12]. Whichever fluid and volume is chosen, with limited and conflicting evidence in the setting of septic shock, it is important that the therapeutic agent is considered a drug, and administered with such caution.

Large volumes of resuscitation fluids administered to septic shock patients result in a positive cumulative fluid balance. This increasing cumulative balance impairs microcirculation and is an independent risk factor for mortality in sepsis and septic shock patients [30,31]. Furthermore, in children with severe infection, when either saline or albumin fluid boluses were administered over and above the maintenance fluids, the 48-h mortality was significantly higher [32]. These observations resulted in a feasibility RCT of conservative versus liberal approach to fluid therapy in septic shock (CLASSIC trial). This trial highlighted feasibility for this approach with significantly lower cumulative resuscitation fluid in the ICU at day 5 after randomization and during the entire ICU stay in the restricted group versus the standard care group [mean differences −1.21 (95% CI −2.0 to −0.4); and −1.41 (95% CI −2.4 to −0.4); $P < 0.001$) without increasing the risk of adverse outcomes [33]. A initial approach involving passive leg raising to assess fluid responsiveness may reduce the total volume of fluid administered in sepsis and septic shock patients [34].

VASOPRESSORS AND INOTROPIC AGENTS

Vasopressors, like fluids, are an intuitive component of resuscitation bundles. In theory, vasopressors correct excessive vasodilatation at the root of the alleged pathological causal pathway. However, hypotension does not necessarily signify impaired organ perfusion and normal BP does not guarantee adequate tissue perfusion. By Poiseuille's law, the blood vessel's radius has a much more profound impact on flow than the pressure gradient. Because vasopressors induce vasoconstriction (i.e. reducing the radius of vessels), they may reduce organ perfusion despite achieving BP targets. In addition, vasopressors themselves may impair microcirculatory flow [35]. For example, clinicians may be inclined to attribute worsening signs of shock to the underlying illness and intensify therapy, unsuspecting of the fact that it is their intervention that is the culprit. Accordingly, when administering vasoactive agents, clinicians should consider iatrogenic complications in the differential diagnosis of any clinical deterioration. Recent studies raise concern regarding the overall safety of liberal vasopressor use in sepsis. Until adequately powered clinical trials ascertain the overall effects of more restrictive MAP targets, the overall benefit of currently recommended MAP targets hinges on scant evidence [36].

When discussing vasopressor therapy, the role of relative vasopressin deficiency and utility of vasopressin as a vasopressor in septic shock have to be considered [37]. In a trial of vasopressin versus norepinephrine and steroids versus placebo, using a factorial trial design, with renal failure free days as primary outcome, vasopressin compared with norepinephrine did not improve the number of kidney failure-free days [38]. The hypothesis from subgroup analyses from earlier vasopressin trials [39] is that patients with lower severity of illness may benefit the most. This hypothesis should be tested in the context of increasing vasopressin use in patients with septic shock [40]. The circulatory changes in sepsis could also be secondary to abnormalities in the renin–angiotensin system and exogenously administered exogenous angiotensin II could be an useful vasopressor in septic shock patients [41]. Recently, in patients with catecholamine resistant vasodilatory shock, angiotensin II administration was associated with improved BP, which was the primary outcome. In this trial, nearly 75% of patients the aetiology of catecholamine resistant vasodilatory state was septic shock, implying potential utility for angiotensin II in septic shock management, once mortality benefit is confirmed [42].

Levosimendan is a calcium-sensitizing drug that has multiple effects aside from positive inotropy, which are potentially beneficial in sepsis. For example, in a recent pilot RCT in 20 patients, levosimendan lowered the lactate/pyruvate ratio, which suggests beneficial effect on cellular metabolic alterations in septic shock [43]. However, a large superiority trial that tested the hypothesis that levosimendan would reduce the severity of organ dysfunction in adults with sepsis, in 516 adult patients with sepsis. In this trial, levosimendan compared to placebo was not associated with less severe organ dysfunction or lower mortality. Importantly, there was a higher risk of supraventricular

Copyright © 2017 Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. Unauthorized reproduction of this article is prohibited.

arrhythmias and weaning failure in the levosimendan-treated patients in this trial [44]. Given the lack of efficacy of levosimenden in cardiac surgical patients with impaired left ventricular function [45,46], further studies to enrich sepsis population that is likely to benefit from levosimenden is required prior to widespread clinical use.

CONCLUSION

Septic shock is common and carries a high risk of death. Early administration of antibiotics and targeted resuscitation remain the cornerstones of care. There is increasing evidence that some conventional approaches with large volume resuscitation and high-dose vasopressors may not be beneficial, or even potentially harmful. Distinction should be drawn between microcirculatory and macrocirculatory changes and resuscitation. Individualized resuscitation focused on microcirculation and lower BP targets may have theoretical advantages over macrocirculatory goals of care applied invariably to all patients. However, conclusive evidence will require adequately powered experiments.

Acknowledgements

All authors developed the outline. N.S. wrote the first draft. All authors contributed to the critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content.

Financial support and sponsorship

The work was supported by the National Institute for Health Research Clinician Scientist Award (CS-2016-16-011 for M.S-H.) and the Fonds de Recherche du Québec – Santé (33132 for F.L.).

M.S-H. is supported by the National Institute for Health Research Clinician Scientist Award (CS-2016-16-011). The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the National Institute for Health Research or the Department of Health. F.L. is supported by the Fonds de Recherche du Québec – Santé (33132).

Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES AND RECOMMENDED READING

Papers of particular interest, published within the annual period of review, have been highlighted as:

- ■ of special interest
- ■■ of outstanding interest

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.

The manuscript summarizes the updated sepsis and septic shock definitions.

2. Seymour CW, Liu VX, Iwashyna TJ, *et al.* Assessment of clinical criteria for sepsis: for the third international consensus definitions for sepsis and septic shock (sepsis-3). JAMA 2016; 315:762–774.
3. Shankar-Hari M, Phillips GS, Levy ML, *et al.* 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.
4. Angus DC, van der Poll T. Severe sepsis and septic shock. N Engl J Med 2013; 369:840–851.
5. Rhodes A, Evans LE, Alhazzani W, *et al.* Surviving sepsis campaign: international guidelines for management of sepsis and septic shock: 2016. Intensive Care Med 2017; 43:304–377.
6. Dünser MW, Takala J, Brunauer A, Bakker J. Re-thinking resuscitation: leaving blood pressure cosmetics behind and moving forward to permissive hypotension and a tissue perfusion-based approach. Crit Care 2013; 17:326.
7. van Beest P, Lont M, Holman N, *et al.* Central venous-arterial pCO2 difference as a tool in resuscitation of septic patients. Intensive Care Med 2013; 39:1034–1039.
8. Mekontso-Dessap A, Castelain V, Anguel N, *et al.* Combination of venoarterial PCO2 difference with arteriovenous O2 content difference to detect anaerobic metabolism in patients. Intensive Care Med 2002; 28:272–277.
9. Hotchkiss RS, Moldawer LL, Opal SM, *et al.* Sepsis and septic shock. Nat Rev
■■ Dis Primers 2016; 2:16045.

Overview of pathophysiology of sepsis and septic shock.

10. Ince C, Mik EG. Microcirculatory and mitochondrial hypoxia in sepsis, shock,
■■ and resuscitation. J Appl Physiol (1985) 2016; 120:226–235.

Review summarizing the microcirculatory changes in sepsis.

11. Moore JP, Dyson A, Singer M, Fraser J. Microcirculatory dysfunction and resuscitation: why, when, and how. Br J Anaesth 2015; 115:366–375.
12. Matkovich SJ, Al Khiami B, Efimov IR, *et al.* Widespread down-regulation of cardiac mitochondrial and sarcomeric genes in patients with sepsis. Crit Care Med 2017; 45:407–414.
13. Takasu O, Gaut JP, Watanabe E, *et al.* Mechanisms of cardiac and renal dysfunction in patients dying of sepsis. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2013; 187:509–517.
14. Rivers E, Nguyen B, Havstad S, *et al.* Early goal-directed therapy in the treatment of severe sepsis and septic shock. N Engl J Med 2001; 345:1368–1377.
15. Dellinger RP, Levy MM, Rhodes A, *et al.* Surviving sepsis campaign: international guidelines for management of severe sepsis and septic shock: 2012. Crit Care Med 2013; 41:580–637.
16. Angus DC, Barnato AE, Bell D, *et al.* A systematic review and meta-analysis of early goal-directed therapy for septic shock: the ARISE, ProCESS and ProMISe investigators. Intensive Care Med 2015; 41:1549–1560.
17. Investigators P, Rowan KM, Angus DC, *et al.* Early, goal-directed therapy for
■■ septic shock: a patient-level meta-analysis. N Engl J Med 2017; 376:2223–2234.

Individual patient meta-analysis of EGDT trials highlighting the lack of efficacy in different sepsis and septic shock subsets.

18. Jones AE, Shapiro NI, Trzeciak S, *et al.,* Emergency Medicine Shock Research Network (EMShockNet) Investigators. Lactate clearance vs central venous oxygen saturation as goals of early sepsis therapy: a randomized clinical trial. JAMA 2010; 303:739–746.
19. Jansen TC, van Bommel J, Schoonderbeek FJ, *et al.,* LACTATE Study Group. Early lactate-guided therapy in intensive care unit patients: a multicenter, open-label, randomized controlled trial. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2010; 182:752–761.
20. Puskarich MA, Trzeciak S, Shapiro NI, *et al.,* Emergency Medicine Shock Research Network (EMSHOCKNET). Prognostic value and agreement of achieving lactate clearance or central venous oxygen saturation goals during early sepsis resuscitation. Acad Emerg Med 2012; 19:252–258.
21. Vincent JL, Quintairos ES, Couto L Jr, Taccone FS. The value of blood lactate kinetics in critically ill patients: a systematic review. Crit Care 2016; 20:257.
22. Adeva-Andany M, Lopez-Ojen M, Funcasta-Calderon R, *et al.* Comprehensive review on lactate metabolism in human health. Mitochondrion 2014; 17:76–100.
23. Mallat J, Lemyze M, Tronchon L, *et al.* Use of venous-to-arterial carbon dioxide tension difference to guide resuscitation therapy in septic shock. World J Crit Care Med 2016; 5:47–56.
24. Marik PE, Khangoora V, Rivera R, *et al.* Vitamin C, and thiamine for the treatment of severe sepsis and septic shock: a retrospective before-after study. Chest 2017; 151:1229–1238.
25. Byrne L, Van Haren F. Fluid resuscitation in human sepsis: time to rewrite history? Ann Intensive Care 2017; 7:4.
26. Marik PE, Linde-Zwirble WT, Bittner EA, *et al.* Fluid administration in severe sepsis and septic shock, patterns and outcomes: an analysis of a large national database. Intensive Care Med 2017; 43:625–632.
27. Seethala RR, Hou PC, Aisiku IP, *et al.* Early risk factors and the role of fluid administration in developing acute respiratory distress syndrome in septic patients. Ann Intensive Care 2017; 7:11.
28. Patel A, Pieper K, Myburgh JA, *et al.* Reanalysis of the crystalloid versus hydroxyethyl starch trial (CHEST). N Engl J Med 2017; 377:298–300.

Copyright © 2017 Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. Unauthorized reproduction of this article is prohibited.

29. Caironi P, Tognoni G, Masson S, *et al.,* ALBIOS Study Investigators. Albumin replacement in patients with severe sepsis or septic shock. N Engl J Med 2014; 370:1412–1421.
30. Sakr Y, Rubatto Birri PN, Kotfis K, *et al.,* Intensive Care Over Nations Investigators. Higher fluid balance increases the risk of death from sepsis: results from a large international audit. Crit Care Med 2017; 45:386–394.
31. Seymour CW, Gesten F, Prescott HC, *et al.* Time to treatment and mortality during mandated emergency care for sepsis. N Engl J Med 2017; 376: 2235–2244.
32. Maitland K, Kiguli S, Opoka RO, *et al.,* FEAST Trial Group. Mortality after fluid bolus in African children with severe infection. N Engl J Med 2011; 364:2483–2495.
33. Hjortrup PB, Haase N, Bundgaard H, *et al.,* CLASSIC Trial Group; Scandinavian Critical Care Trials Group. Restricting volumes of resuscitation fluid in adults with septic shock after initial management: the CLASSIC randomised, parallel-group, multicentre feasibility trial. Intensive Care Med 2016; 42:1695–1705.
34. Rameau A, de With E, Boerma EC. Passive leg raise testing effectively reduces fluid administration in septic shock after correction of non-compliance to test results. Ann Intensive Care 2017; 7:2.
35. Dubin A, Pozo MO, Casabella CA, *et al.* Increasing arterial blood pressure with norepinephrine does not improve microcirculatory blood flow: a prospective study. Crit Care 2009; 13:R92.
36. Lamontagne F, Marshall JC, Adhikari NK. Permissive hypotension during shock resuscitation: equipoise in all patients? Intensive Care Med 2017.
37. Russell JA, Lee T, Singer J, *et al.,* Vasopressin and septic shock trial (VASST) group. The septic shock 3.0 definition and trials: a vasopressin and septic shock trial experience. Crit Care Med 2017; 45:940–948.
38. Gordon AC, Mason AJ, Thirunavukkarasu N, *et al.,* VANISH Investigators. Effect of early vasopressin vs norepinephrine on kidney failure in patients with septic shock: the VANISH Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA 2016; 316:509–518.
39. Russell JA, Walley KR, Singer J, *et al.,* VASST Investigators. Vasopressin versus norepinephrine infusion in patients with septic shock. N Engl J Med 2008; 358:877–887.
40. Vail EA, Gershengorn HB, Hua M, *et al.* Epidemiology of vasopressin use for adults with septic shock. Ann Am Thorac Soc 2016; 13:1760–1767.
41. Correa TD, Takala J, Jakob SM. Angiotensin II in septic shock. Crit Care 2015; 19:98.
42. Khanna A, English SW, Wang XS, *et al.,* ATHOS-3 Investigators. Angiotensin II for the treatment of vasodilatory shock. N Engl J Med 2017; 377:419–430.
43. Hajjej Z, Meddeb B, Sellami W, *et al.* Effects of levosimendan on cellular metabolic alterations in patients with septic shock: a randomized controlled pilot study. Shock 2017; 48:307–312.
44. 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.
45. Landoni G, Lomivorotov VV, Alvaro G, *et al.,* CHEETAH Study Group. Levosimendan for hemodynamic support after cardiac surgery. N Engl J Med 2017; 376:2021–2031.
46. Mehta RH, Leimberger JD, van Diepen S, *et al.,* LEVO-CTS Investigators. Levosimendan in patients with left ventricular dysfunction undergoing cardiac surgery. N Engl J Med 2017; 376:2032–2042.

Copyright © 2017 Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. Unauthorized reproduction of this article is prohibited.