

LETTER



Sepsis, a call for inclusion in the work plan of the European Center for Disease Prevention and Control

Evangelos J. Giamarellos-Bourboulis^{1,6*}  on behalf of the European Sepsis Alliance (ESA), Annelies S. Zinkernagel² on behalf of the European Society of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases (ESCMID), Edoardo De Robertis³ on behalf of the European Society of Anesthesiology and Intensive Care (ESAIC), Élie Azoulay⁴ on behalf of the European Society for Intensive Care Medicine (ESICM), Daniele De Luca⁵ on behalf of the European Society for Pediatric and Neonatal Intensive Care (ESPNIC)

© 2023 The Author(s)

Dear Editor,

Sepsis is a devastating condition resulting from our bodies' dysregulated immune system response to infections, which can lead to organ failure, death, or sometimes life-long disability. Common infections with bacterial, fungal and viral diseases or as a consequence of injury, can cause sepsis. In addition, emerging infectious diseases either directly cause sepsis or predispose to sepsis. In the case of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), 52% of hospitalized patients in the wards and 78% of hospitalized patients in an intensive care unit meet the Sepsis-3 definitions [1]. Sepsis affects all age groups, the highest incidence is seen at the extremes of age, neonates and young children [2], and the elderly.

Each year, sepsis affects close to 50 million people globally, of whom 11 million die and more than half suffer long-term consequences such as physical or mental disabilities.

In the European Union (EU), estimates extrapolated from a Swedish study of 2015 suggest that more than 3 million people suffer from sepsis each year resulting in

680,000 deaths [3]. The incidence of sepsis is only second to cancer (2,681,958 cases with 1,261,722 deaths) [4]. Across EU countries, stroke accounted for 375,000 deaths in 2017 [5]. In 2016, 542,700 were due to coronary diseases, including heart attacks [6]. Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) is another well-known health threat and priority for health authorities: each year more than 670,000 infections are due to bacteria resistant to antibiotics and approximately 33,000 people die as a direct consequence [7]. However, many studies indicate that the number of deaths due to sepsis as well as the burden of post-sepsis morbidity and resultant costs for health care systems are grossly underestimated, also due to a lack of accurate data collection.

Costs of sepsis and benefits of quality improvement initiatives

Sepsis is a huge burden for European health systems and society. It is estimated, for example, that the average cost of treatment for a single patient in France amounts to about € 16,000 [8], but severe sequelae can potentially raise costs to € 2,267,251 per patient in children with sepsis and amputations [9]. The cost of care in the intensive care unit (ICU) in Greece exceeds € 27,000 per patient [10]. The burden of sepsis persists through the years because of very frequent sequelae, which mimic those of long-COVID symptoms [11] so far observed. A recent study in Germany revealed that three out of four sepsis survivors have new physical, cognitive, or

*Correspondence: egiamarel@med.uoa.gr

⁶ 4th Department of Internal Medicine, ATTIKON University General Hospital, 124 62 Athens, Greece
Full author information is available at the end of the article

The members of the institutional author group are processed under acknowledgements.

psychological diagnoses that require multidisciplinary healthcare support, and 32% become newly dependent on chronic nursing care. As a result, the direct costs for a 3-year follow-up for sepsis survivors amounts to € 6.8 billion per year in Germany alone [12]. The York Health Economics group estimated the physical burden of sepsis to be as high as £15.6 billion across the United Kingdom with direct cost of the National Health Service over 2 billion [13]. According to an analysis run in Sweden, sepsis quality improvement programs have enormous potential to be very cost effective, because the initial cost increase (e.g., new processes, new recruitment, and routine patient follow-up) will be offset by shorter hospital stay and reduced readmission frequency [14]. These estimates are supported from the evaluation of other sepsis programs in non-European high-income healthcare settings. Studies from Australia [15] and Canada [16] both underline the large burden of sepsis and the significant benefits from initial investments in quality improvement programs. In Australia, the Australian Commission of Safety and Quality in Healthcare recently defined standards for sepsis care [17], which form part of regulatory requirements for hospital accreditation. These figures are far higher than the cost of cancer reported to range between 37,000 and 42,000 USD for colon cancer resection and breast cancer treatment [18, 19].

Evidence must be met by political will in Europe

The staggering data of the burden of sepsis collide with the limited action undertaken so far by relevant authorities to tackle such an evident but underestimated global health threat.

In 2017, the World Health Assembly approved resolution 70.7, urging World Health Organization member states to prioritize sepsis in their national health systems. After almost 5 years, the uptake of the recommendations has been limited, although several countries have started implementing awareness and quality improvement measures across Europe, as highlighted in a recent report from the European Sepsis Alliance [20]. EU institutions can support member states to implement the resolution by introducing harmonized and systematic approaches to measure and monitor the burden of sepsis, facilitating the exchange of good practices and providing common guidelines on prevention and treatment.

In order to better understand the impact of what is the most preventable cause of death and disability in Europe, more accurate data collection on the incidence of sepsis is needed. In this context, the undersigning organizations believe that a greater role should be played by the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) in coordinating member states' monitoring and data collection and in establishing a common minimum data set.

Such a data set should be applicable to neonatal, pediatric, and adult patients to capture the true burden across the life span. In this framework, the interoperability of existing national or regional datasets should be facilitated to better understand the epidemiology of sepsis and its links with antimicrobial resistance and COVID-19. Better understanding, improved monitoring, detection and treatment of sepsis across all age groups would bring invaluable benefits to European citizens, European health systems and the economy at large.

Sepsis surveillance programs have the potential to save lives and improve patient outcomes. However, some barriers hamper their implementation, such as the lack of standardized definitions (implementing Sepsis-3 definition uniformly across different healthcare settings can still be challenging), data availability and quality, limited resources, and interdisciplinary collaboration. Effective management of sepsis is the result of collaboration between specialties.

We are aware of the difficulties in developing a surveillance definition for sepsis that is sensible and specific enough, and feasible. Since such a surveillance may require intense patient-based activities, exploring the development and validation of semiautomatic procedures would be helpful. Despite the fact that an etiological diagnosis cannot be achieved in a substantial proportion of patients with sepsis, including the causative microorganism (when available) in reporting and coding is a must. The European Sepsis Care Survey recently revealed one of the weaknesses of European health systems, which is the delay of microbiological services to deliver blood culture results. Improvement of microbiological diagnosis is crucial for sepsis treatment [21].

As for any health problem, the quality and interpretation of surveillance data must be adequate. In the case of sepsis, an overdiagnosis of sepsis cases may unintentionally promote the overuse of broad-spectrum antibiotics. To avoid this, adequate training of local staff and quality control for data collection, and balanced analysis of the results are critical. These challenges do not mean that an adequate surveillance for sepsis cannot be achieved. On the contrary, the recent advances in our understanding of sepsis and in technical developments provide a good opportunity to develop innovative surveillance methods to be applied.

Sepsis can and must be integrated in the extension of the ECDC mandate

European institutions have recently agreed on an extension of the ECDC mandate, following the demand for a coordinated response to communicable disease outbreaks, triggered by the pandemic. The revised mandate strengthens the powers of ECDC and increases the scope

of its work with the aim to support the European Commission and EU member states in epidemiological surveillance, preparedness and response planning to health threats, reporting and auditing. The analysis of the incidence of sepsis in 2020 showed that 1.6 million incident cases were reported in Central and Eastern Europe and 1.3 million incidence cases in Western Europe [22].

This desired improvement in the EU's response capacity to cross-border health threats is a much needed measure, as the pandemic has put lack of coordination and limitations in resources under the spotlight. However, it remains unclear why a major global and European health threat such as sepsis still falls outside the scope of ECDC's work. Notwithstanding the limitation in budget and resources compared to similar authorities in other regions of the world, the importance of sepsis and the intercorrelation with infectious diseases is not yet reflected in the work of the European body in charge of monitoring and surveilling their development, spread and burden. In fact, sepsis quality improvement programs are expected to be cost saving for the health care systems [23] and can leverage from the experience on successful ECDC programs on preventing nosocomial infections. The lack of focus and of specific resources is a common trait encountered in global advocacy for sepsis. In the vast majorities of cases, competent authorities lack specific departments or programs, with few exceptions such as the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) in the United States (US). This shortcoming does not help to prevent sepsis from affecting around 50 million people every year.

To those policy makers who truly understand it, sepsis is today seen as a cross cutting healthcare problem, with touch points with a variety of other issues that are currently prioritized in the global healthcare agenda such as infection prevention and control (IPC), pandemic responsiveness, antimicrobial resistance, healthcare-acquired infections and patient safety. Placing sepsis as a core part of infection management strategies will provide opportunities to increase sepsis awareness on a variety of contexts thus reducing its burden on healthcare and rehabilitation systems. However, we are concerned that, unless prioritized by policy makers, it will not be afforded the focus, solutions and resources needed to tackle such a scourge.

With the revision of the ECDC mandate, the EU now has the opportunity to set new standards for sepsis care, through improved data collection and the development of European guidelines. Policy makers in Europe have realized the importance of preparedness and coordination to respond to future cross-border health threats across the continent. Any strategy aiming at tackling

communicable diseases cannot prescind from including sepsis prevention and treatment. In fact, management guidelines for COVID-19 have been directly developed from similar sepsis guidelines [24].

Sepsis should be considered by ECDC as one of those "special health issues" mentioned in the agreed text of its mandate, such as AMR and healthcare-associated infections (HAIs), because of its close interlink with these public health issues and with communicable diseases. AMR will hamper successful sepsis treatment. At the same time, effective quality improvement initiatives targeting recognition and treatment of sepsis need to go hand in hand with antimicrobial stewardship initiatives, and HAI prevention initiatives—in fact, these three priorities share substantial overlap which should be used to create synergisms. Early recognition and treatment would minimize the burden of HAIs, and sepsis surveillance would provide valuable data on the quality of care in Europe. It would also help assess, monitor and improve health systems' preparedness to respond to communicable disease outbreaks, treat them and assess clinical complications.

ECDC should also use its influence to include sepsis among the research priorities for EU-funded programs, and to include sepsis management in guidelines for the case management of communicable diseases. Finally, sepsis could act as an extremely valuable indicator for the capacity of health systems to diagnose, prevent and treat communicable diseases and their burden.

Author details

¹ 4th Department of Internal Medicine, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Medical School and Hellenic Institute for the Study of Sepsis, Athens, Greece. ² Department of Infectious Diseases and Hospital Epidemiology, University Hospital Zurich, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland. ³ Department of Medicine and Surgery, University of Perugia, Perugia, Italy. ⁴ Critical Care Department, Saint-Louis Hospital and Paris Cite University, Paris, France. ⁵ Department of Pediatrics, Stanford University, School of Medicine, Lucile Packard Children's, Pao Alto, CA, USA. ⁶ 4th Department of Internal Medicine, ATTIKON University General Hospital, 124 62 Athens, Greece.

Acknowledgements

Authors wish to acknowledge the contribution of the following collaborators: a) Antonio Artigas, Centro de Medicina Intensiva, Parc Tauli Hospital Universitari, Institut de Investigació i Innovació Parc Tauli (I3PT-CERCA) - CIBER de Enfermedades Respiratorias, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Sabadell, Spain; b) Luregn J Schlapbach, PhD, FCICM, Department of Intensive Care and Neonatology, and Children's Research Centre, University Children's Hospital Zurich Switzerland; Child Health Research Centre, The University of Queensland, Australia; c) Ron Daniels, Critical Care Department, University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation Trust, UK; d) Konrad Reinhart, ML, Department of Anaesthesiology and Operative Intensive Care Medicine (CCM, CVK), Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Germany, Corporate Member of Freie Universität Berlin, Humboldt- Universität zu Berlin, Germany; e) Jesús Rodríguez Baño, Infectious Diseases Division, Hospital Universitario Virgen Macarena Department of Medicina, University of Seville Biomedicine Institute of Seville CIBER de Enfermedades Infecciosas (CIBERINFEC); f) Kai Zacharowski, MD PhD ML FRCA FESAIC, Ambassador & Immediate Past-President European Society of Anaesthesiology & Intensive Care Director & Clinical Head, Department of Anesthesiology, Intensive Care Medicine & Pain Therapy, University Hospital Frankfurt, Goethe University; and g) Maurizio Cecconi,

Department of Biomedical Sciences, Humanitas University Pieve Emanuele, Milan, Italy Department of Anaesthesia and Intensive Care Medicine, IRCCS Humanitas Research Hospital, Rozzano, Milan, Italy.

Author contributions

EJG-B, ASZ, EDR, EA and DDL contributed equally to the first draft. All the others authors and study group members equally improved the paper with valuable input and reviewed the final version.

Funding

The cost of open-access publication is funded by the Hellenic Institute for the Study of Sepsis, Athens, Greece.

Data availability

Not applicable.

Code availability

Not applicable.

Declarations

Conflicts of interest

The authors do not have conflict of interest related to this manuscript. AA is Consultant and Scientific Advisor of Grifols, Lilly Foundation, Apeptico, Aerogen, Fabentech; invited speaker of Grifols, Aerogen, Abionic; receiver of restricted research grant from Grifols, Apeptico, Abionic, Loop Diagnostic. EDR receives honoraria from Baxter, Fresenius, Aspen, Fisher. EJG-B has received honoraria from Abbott CH, bioMérieux, Brahms GmbH, Fabentech, GSK, InflaRx GmbH, Sobi and XBiotech Inc; independent educational grants from Abbott CH, AxisShield, bioMérieux Inc, InflaRx GmbH, Johnson & Johnson, MSD, Novartis, Sobi and XBiotech Inc.; and funding from the Horizon2020 Marie Skłodowska-Curie International Training Network “the European Sepsis Academy” (granted to the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens), and the Horizon 2020 European Grants ImmunoSep and RISCinCOVID (granted to the Hellenic Institute for the Study of Sepsis) and the Horizon Health grant EPIC-CROWN-2 (granted to the Hellenic Institute for the Study of Sepsis). EA provides lectures for Alexion Sanofi Pfizer and Mindray.

Open Access

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License, which permits any non-commercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>.

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Received: 16 April 2023 Accepted: 1 June 2023

Published online: 01 August 2023

References

1. Karakike E, Giamarellos-Bourboulis EJ, Kyrianiou M, Fleischmann-Struzek C, Pletz MW, Netea MG, Reinhart K, Kyriazopoulou E (2021) Coronavirus disease 2019 as cause of viral sepsis: a systemic review and meta-analysis. *Crit Care Med* 49:2042–2057. <https://doi.org/10.1097/CCM.00000000000005195>
2. Fleischmann-Struzek C, Goldfarb DM, Schlattmann P, Schlapbach LJ, Reinhart K, Kissoon N (2018) The global burden of paediatric and neonatal sepsis: a systematic review (2018). *Lancet Respir Med* 6:223–230. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600\(18\)30063-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600(18)30063-8)
3. Mellhammar L, Wullt S, Lindberg Å, Lanbeck P, Christensson B, Linder A (2016) Sepsis Incidence: a population-based study. *Open Forum Infect Dis* 3:ofw207. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ofid/ofw207>
4. European Cancer Information System (ECIS). <https://ecis.jrc.ec.europa.eu/>
5. OECD/The King's Fund (2020) Is cardiovascular disease slowing improvements in life expectancy?: OECD and The King's Fund Workshop Proceedings. OECD Publishing, Paris. <https://doi.org/10.1787/47a04a11-en>
6. EUROSTAT <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-eurostat-news/-/edn-20200928-1>
7. ECDC, WHO. AMR surveillance in Europe 2022. <https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/Joint-WHO-ECDC-AMR-report-2022.pdf>
8. Dupuis C, Bouadma L, Ruckly S, Perozziello A, Van-Gysel D, Mageau A, Mourvillier B, de Montmollin E, Bailly S, Papin G, Sinnah F, Vinclair C, Abid S, Sonnevill R, Timsit JF (2020) Sepsis and septic shock in France: incidences, outcomes and costs of care. *Ann Intensive Care* 10:145. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13613-020-00760-x>
9. Bénard S, Wright C, Voisine J, Olivier CW, Gaudelus J (2016) Lifetime cost of meningococcal disease in France: scenarios of severe meningitis and septicemia with purpura fulminans. *J Infect Public Health* 9:339–347. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jiph.2015.10.016>
10. Tsaganos T, Raftogiannis M, Pratikaki M, Christodoulou S, Kotanidou A, Papadomichelakis E, Armaganidis A, Routsis C, Giamarellos-Bourboulis E (2016) Clarithromycin leads to long-term survival and cost benefit in ventilator-associated pneumonia and sepsis. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 60:3640–3646. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.02974-15>
11. European Society of Intensive Care Medicine (ESICM); Global Sepsis Alliance (GSA); Society of Critical Care Medicine (SCCM) (2021) Reducing the global burden of sepsis: a positive legacy for the COVID-19 pandemic? *Intensive Care Med* 47:733–736. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-021-06409-y>
12. Fleischmann-Struzek C, Rose N, Freytag A, Spoden M, Prescott HC, Schettler A, Wedekind L, Ditscheid B, Storch J, Born S, Schlatmann P, Güstner C, Reinhart K, Hartog CS (2021) Epidemiology and costs of postsepsis morbidity, nursing care dependency, and mortality in Germany, 2013 to 2017. *JAMA Netw Open* 4:e2134290. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.34290>
13. Hex N, Retzler J, Bartlett C, Arber M. The cost of sepsis care in the UK. Whitewater charitable trust. <https://sepsistrust.org/whitewater-charitable-trust-the-cost-of-sepsis-care-in-the-uk/>
14. Konsekvensbeskrivning för personcentrerat och sammanhållet vårdförlopp – Sepsis. 21 May 2021 <https://kunskaapsstyrningvard.se/download/18.7a95dc2f1818012627d1e44e/1655982720195/Vardforlopp-sepsis-konsekvensbeskrivning.pdf>
15. George Institute for Global Health. The cost of sepsis in Australia, September 2021. <https://cdn.georgeinstitute.org/sites/default/files/cost-of-sepsis-in-australian-report.pdf>
16. Khowaja AR, Willms AJ, Krause C, Carriere S, Ridout B, Kennedy C, Young E, Mitton C, Kissoon N, Sweet DD (2021) The return on investment of a province-wide quality improvement initiative for reducing in-hospital sepsis rates and mortality in British Columbia, Canada. *Crit Care Med* 50:e340–e350. <https://doi.org/10.1097/CCM.00000000000005353>
17. Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care. National sepsis program <https://www.safetyandquality.gov.au/our-work/partnering-consumers/national-sepsis-program>
18. Bastawrous AL, Shih IF, Li Y, Khalil M, Almaz B, Cleary RK (2023) Health-care expenditures are less for minimally invasive than open colectomy for colon cancer: a US commercial claims database analysis. *Surg Endosc*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00464-023-10104-y>
19. Cameron D, Kumar Sharma V, Biswas C, Clarke C, Chandiwana D, Pathak P (2023) Cost-effectiveness of ribociclib versus palbociclib in combination with an aromatase inhibitor as first-line treatment of postmenopausal women with HR+/HER2- advanced breast cancer: analysis based on final OS results of MONALEESA-2 and PALOMA-2. *J Med Econ* 26:357–365. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13696998.2023.2182051>
20. European Sepsis Alliance, European Sepsis Report 2021, September 2021. <https://www.europeansepsisalliance.org/news/2021/9/9/the-first-esa-european-sepsis-report>
21. European sepsis survey <https://www.europeansepsisalliance.org/europeansepsisurvey>

-
22. Rudd KE, Johnson SC, Agesa KM, Shackelford KA, Tsoi D, Kievlan DR, Colombara DV, Ikuta KS, Kissoon N, Finfer S, Fleischmann-Struzek C, Machado FR, Reinhart KK, Rowan K, Seymour CW, Watson RS, West TE, Marinho F, Hay SI, Lozano R, Lopez AD, Angus DC, Murray CJL, Naghavi M (2020) Global, regional, and national sepsis incidence and mortality, 1990–2017: analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study. *Lancet* 395:200–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(19\)32989-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(19)32989-7)
 23. Paoli CJ, Reynolds MA, Sinha M, Gitlin M, Crouser E (2018) Epidemiology and costs of sepsis in the United States-an analysis based on timing of diagnosis and severity level. *Crit Care Med* 46:1889–1897. <https://doi.org/10.1097/CCM.0000000000003342>
 24. Alhazzani W, Møller MH, Arabi YM, Loeb M, Gong MN, Fan E, Oczkowski S, Levy MM, Derde L, Dzierba A et al (2020) Surviving sepsis campaign: guidelines on the management of critically ill adults with Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Crit Care Med* 48:e440–e469. <https://doi.org/10.1097/CCM.0000000000004363>