Estimating Ten-Year Trends in Septic Shock Incidence and Mortality in United States Academic Medical Centers Using Clinical Data

Sameer S. Kadri, MD; Chanu Rhee, MD, MPH; Jeffrey R. Strich, MD; Megan K. Morales, MD; Samuel Hohmann, PhD; Jonathan Menchaca, BA; Anthony F. Suffredini, MD; Robert L. Danner, MD; and Michael Klompas, MD, MPH

BACKGROUND: Reports that septic shock incidence is rising and mortality rates declining may be confounded by improving recognition of sepsis and changing coding practices. We compared trends in septic shock incidence and mortality in academic hospitals using clinical vs claims data.

METHODS: We identified all patients with concurrent blood cultures, antibiotics, and vasopressors for $\geq$ two consecutive days, and all patients with *International Classification of Diseases*, 9th edition (ICD-9) codes for septic shock, at 27 academic hospitals from 2005 to 2014. We compared annual incidence and mortality trends. We reviewed 967 records from three hospitals to estimate the accuracy of each method.

RESULTS: Of 6.5 million adult hospitalizations, 99,312 (1.5%) were flagged by clinical criteria, 82,350 (1.3%) by ICD-9 codes, and 44,651 (0.7%) by both. Sensitivity for clinical criteria was higher than claims (74.8% vs 48.3%; $P < .01$), whereas positive predictive value was comparable (83% vs 89%; $P = .23$). Septic shock incidence, based on clinical criteria, rose from 12.8 to 18.6 cases per 1,000 hospitalizations (average, 4.9% increase/y; 95% CI, 4.0%-5.9%), while mortality declined from 54.9% to 50.7% (average, 0.6% decline/y; 95% CI, 0.4%-0.8%). In contrast, septic shock incidence, based on ICD-9 codes, increased from 6.7 to 19.3 per 1,000 hospitalizations (19.8% increase/y; 95% CI, 16.6%-20.9%), while mortality decreased from 48.3% to 39.3% (1.2% decline/y; 95% CI, 0.9%-1.6%).

CONCLUSIONS: A clinical surveillance definition based on concurrent vasopressors, blood cultures, and antibiotics accurately identifies septic shock hospitalizations and suggests that the incidence of patients receiving treatment for septic shock has risen and mortality rates have fallen, but less dramatically than estimated on the basis of ICD-9 codes.

CHEST 2017; 151(2):278-285

KEY WORDS: epidemiology; incidence; mortality; sepsis; septic shock; trends

FOR EDITORIAL COMMENT SEE PAGE 247

ABBREVIATIONS: BWH = Brigham and Women's Hospital; CDB/RM = Clinical Database/Resource Manager; EHR = electronic health record; GUH = MedStar Georgetown University Hospital; ICD-9 = *International Classification of Diseases*, 9th edition; MGH = Massachusetts General Hospital; UHC = University HealthSystem Consortium

AFFILIATIONS: From the Critical Care Medicine Department (Drs Kadri, Suffredini, and Danner), Clinical Center, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD; the Department of Medicine (Dr Kadri),

Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA; the Department of Population Medicine (Drs Rhee and Klompas; and Mr Menchaca), Harvard Medical School/Harvard Pilgrim Health Care Institute, Boston, MA; the Division of Infectious Diseases (Drs Rhee and Klompas), Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA; the Department of Internal Medicine (Dr Strich), Georgetown University Hospital, Washington, DC; the Division of Clinical Research (Dr Strich), National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD; the Division of Infectious Diseases

Septic shock is the most severe form of sepsis and accounts for much of its morbidity and mortality.¹ Tracking trends in septic shock incidence and outcomes is critical to informing the allocation of health-care resources and interpreting the impact of sepsis prevention and treatment initiatives. However, it remains unclear whether claims-based reports of dramatic rises in sepsis and septic shock incidence and declining case fatality rates reflect more infections, better recognition, more aggressive treatment, and/or more comprehensive coding.²⁻⁴

The recently updated consensus definition for septic shock now includes requirements for vasopressor-dependent hypotension.⁵ A standardized definition based on vasopressor administration and suspected infection could

facilitate measurements of incidence and mortality in clinically treated septic shock, using electronic health record (EHR) data. EHR-based algorithms for sepsis have been validated on the basis of large clinical data repositories and may be more resistant to changes in diagnosis and coding practices over time than claims data.⁶⁻⁸

We examined 10-year trends in septic shock incidence and mortality at 27 US academic medical centers, using EHR clinical data vs claims data. We hypothesized that a clinical surveillance definition based on concurrent vasopressors, antibiotics, and blood cultures could provide an objective and consistent method for tracking septic shock trends over time, and that changes in incidence and mortality calculated using this definition would be less dramatic than those suggested by claims-based analyses.

Methods
Study Design

This was a retrospective cohort study using data from the University HealthSystem Consortium (UHC). The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at Partners Healthcare (Boston, MA) (Protocol #2012P002136) and MedStar Georgetown University Hospital (Washington, DC) (Protocol #2014-1298). The study was exempt from institutional review board review at the National Institutes of Health Clinical Center, as National Institutes of Health investigators had access only to de-identified data.

Data Source and Population

The UHC is a collaborative of 120 academic medical centers with 300 affiliated hospitals. The UHC Clinical Database/Resource Manager (CDB/RM) combines patient encounter level and line-item transactional detail from all hospitals (see e-Appendix 1 for additional details). The CDB/RM is used for quality improvement and research purposes, including prior epidemiological studies of sepsis and trends in antibiotic use.⁹⁻¹¹ We included all adults hospitalized from January 1, 2005, through December 31, 2014 at all 27 UHC academic medical centers with continuous reporting of

pharmacy data during this time period. We compared characteristics of these academic teaching hospitals with all US teaching hospitals reporting membership in the Council of Teaching Hospitals and Health Systems in the 2014 American Hospital Association database to assess generalizability.

Septic Shock Surveillance Definition

Our clinical surveillance definition required evidence of shock (as evidenced by vasopressors) and concurrent presumed infection (blood culture orders and ≥ 4 days of antibiotics or antifungals) (Table 1). We required two consecutive days of vasopressors rather than one to increase specificity for true shock by reducing potential false positives from vasopressors administered for transient hypotension. We also hoped to mitigate the effect of any changes in thresholds for using vasopressors over time by focusing on patients with persistent shock. We did, however, perform a sensitivity analysis with a definition requiring only 1 day of vasopressors to see how this affected performance and trends. Additional sensitivity analyses were also conducted using definitions requiring longer durations of antibiotic/antifungal use (7 days), changing the center of the surveillance period from the first vasopressor day to the first blood culture day, and varying the surveillance period from ± 1 day

(Dr Morales), Georgetown University Hospital, Washington, DC; the University HealthSystem Consortium (Dr Hohmann), Chicago, IL; and the Department of Health Systems Management (Dr Hohmann), Rush University, Chicago, IL.

Drs Kadri and Rhee are co-first authors who contributed equally to this manuscript.

These findings were presented in abstract form (Abstract 1022) at the 2016 Society of Critical Care Medicine Conference, February 20-24, 2016, Orlando, FL.

FUNDING/SUPPORT: This research was funded in part by National Institutes of Health Intramural funds. Dr Rhee received support from the National Institutes of Health [T32 AI007061].

CORRESPONDENCE TO: Chanu Rhee, MD, MPH, Department of Population Medicine, Harvard Medical School and Harvard Pilgrim Health Care Institute, 401 Park Dr, Ste 401, Boston, MA 02215; e-mail: crheel@partners.org

Copyright © 2016 American College of Chest Physicians. Published by Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chest.2016.07.010>

TABLE 1] Septic Shock Clinical Surveillance Definition

Shock
• Vasopressors (day 0 of surveillance window) administered on two or more consecutive calendar days, or 1 day if death occurs on day 0 or day +1
Presumed infection
• Blood culture order on day -2 to day +2
• New parenteral antibiotic or antifungal medication administered on day -2 to day +2
• Any systemic antibiotic or antifungal medication (oral or parenteral) administered for an additional 3 days, or until 1 day prior to death if death occurs before 4 days have elapsed

"New" antibiotic = antibiotic not given in the prior two calendar days; vasopressor = any parenteral administration of norepinephrine, epinephrine, dopamine, phenylephrine, or vasopressin.

to ± 3 days. For comparison, we identified patients with primary or secondary *International Classification of Diseases*, 9th edition (ICD-9) diagnosis codes for septic shock (785.52). Last, we also examined hospitalizations with either the septic shock ICD-9 code or clinical surveillance criteria.

Validation by Medical Record Review

We examined the accuracy of the clinical surveillance definition and the ICD-9 septic shock code relative to medical record review at three academic hospitals: Massachusetts General Hospital (MGH) and Brigham and Women's Hospital (BWH) in Boston, Massachusetts, and MedStar Georgetown University Hospital (GUH) in Washington, DC. Chart reviews were performed at MGH and BWH as previously described.⁸ Briefly, the charts of 1,000 patients hospitalized from 2003 to 2012 with at least one blood culture ordered were randomly selected for review by an intensivist using a structured data abstraction form, and assessed for sepsis or septic shock. Septic shock was defined as vasopressor-dependent refractory hypotension caused by suspected or confirmed infection in the absence of a clear alternative explanation for hypotension.^{12,13} Seven hundred of these hospitalizations from 2006 to 2012 that matched CDB/RM records were used for the current analysis. A second intensivist reviewed a subset of 60 records to measure concordance using the κ statistic. At GUH, two internal medicine physicians reviewed 267 hospitalizations from 2009 to 2014 with any vasopressor order. Both physicians reviewed 30 randomly selected

charts and a κ statistic was calculated; differences were reconciled between the reviewers and a final classification agreed on.

Incidence, Mortality, and Coding Trends

We calculated annual incidence and in-hospital mortality of patients meeting the clinical and ICD-9-based definitions for 2005-2014. We also analyzed the combined outcome of in-hospital mortality and discharge to hospice. We calculated the annual proportion of patients meeting the clinical surveillance definition and who received an ICD-9 code for septic shock to estimate whether the likelihood of diagnosing septic shock has changed over time.

Statistical Analyses

Exact 95% binomial CIs were calculated for pooled sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value, and negative predictive value for the surveillance definitions and ICD-9 codes relative to chart review. Ten-year trends were assessed by fitting time series models with linear trends to the observed annual rates. The 10-year fitted percent change for incidence was calculated as the ratio between the fitted absolute annual change multiplied by 10 and the observed baseline incidence rate in 2005. Trends from clinical data and ICD-9 codes were compared via z score by dividing the difference between each slope by the square root of the sum of the variance of each fitted trend line. We considered $P < .05$ to be statistically significant and used two-sided tests. All analyses were performed with SAS version 9.4 (SAS Institute).

Results

From 2005 to 2014, there were 6,526,636 adult hospitalizations in the 27 study hospitals. Overall, 99,312 (1.5%) hospitalizations met the clinical criteria for septic shock, 82,350 (1.3%) had ICD-9 codes for septic shock, and 44,651 (0.7%) had both. The case-selection process is presented as a flowchart in [Figure 1](#). Patients identified by both methods were similar in terms of age and comorbidities, but those identified on the basis of clinical criteria alone had longer hospital and ICU lengths of stay and higher hospital mortality rates than those identified by claims alone ([Table 2](#)). The characteristics of study hospitals mirrored those reported for all US academic hospitals ([Table 3](#)).

Accuracy of Clinical Surveillance Definition vs Claims Code for Septic Shock

The accuracy of the clinical surveillance definition vs the ICD-9 code for septic shock is summarized in [Table 4](#). At MGH and BWH, there were 54 clinician-confirmed cases of septic shock among the 700 reviewed hospitalizations with blood culture draws. At GUH, 93 of the 267 hospitalized patients administered vasopressors had confirmed septic shock. Agreement between the two reviewers at MGH and BWH and between the two reviewers at GUH was good (κ , 0.80 and 0.73, respectively). Of the 93 patients with confirmed septic shock at GUH, 91 (97.8%) had at least one blood culture drawn during hospitalization. The

pooled sensitivity for clinician-confirmed septic shock was higher for the clinical surveillance definition than for ICD-9 codes (74.8% vs 48.3%; $P < .01$). The clinical definition also had excellent specificity, albeit slightly lower than ICD-9 codes (97.2% vs 98.9%; $P = .01$). Positive predictive values were comparable and high for both the clinical definition and for ICD-9 codes

Figure 1 – Flowchart for cohort derivation. ICD-9 = International Classification of Diseases, 9th edition.

TABLE 2] Characteristics of Patients With Septic Shock, Identified by the Primary Clinical Surveillance Definition (2 Days of Vasopressors) and ICD-9 Codes in the 2005-2014 Cohort

Patient Characteristic	Septic Shock Surveillance Definition (n = 99,312)	ICD-9 Code for Septic Shock (n = 82,350)
Median age, mean (IQR), y	61 (50-71)	61 (51-72)
Charlson comorbidities, No. (%)		
Chronic pulmonary disease	23,974 (24.1)	20,065 (24.4)
Congestive heart disease	32,328 (32.6)	23,121 (28.1)
Dementia	481 (0.5)	626 (0.8)
Diabetes (with and without complications)	29,194 (29.4)	25,473 (30.9)
Malignancy (including leukemia and lymphoma)	16,574 (16.7)	16,323 (19.8)
Metastatic solid tumor	6,847 (6.9)	6,684 (8.1)
Moderate or severe liver disease	11,288 (11.4)	7,710 (9.4)
Renal disease	26,699 (26.9)	23,688 (28.8)
Median Charlson score (IQR)	3 (1-5)	3 (1-5)
Median hospital length of stay, d (IQR)	15 (6-28)	13 (6-25)
Median ICU length of stay, d (IQR)	8 (3-17)	5 (2-13)
Hospital mortality, No. (%)	51,507 (51.9)	34,665 (42.1)

ICD-9 = *International Classification of Diseases*, 9th edition; IQR = interquartile range.

(82.7% vs 88.8%; $P = .23$). On sensitivity analysis, the definition requiring only 1 day of vasopressors had higher sensitivity (88.4%) but lower positive predictive value (65.3%) than the definition requiring 2 days of vasopressors.

Trends

The incidence of septic shock, using clinical data, rose from 12.8 per 1,000 hospitalizations in 2005 to 18.6 in 2014 (average, 4.9% increase/y; 95% CI, 4.0%-5.9%;

$P < .01$ for linear trend), whereas the incidence of cases identified by ICD-9 codes increased from 6.7 to 19.3 per 1,000 hospitalizations over the same period (19.8% increase/y; 95% CI, 16.6%-20.9%; $P < .01$ for linear trend) (Fig 2). In-hospital mortality for septic shock identified by the clinical definition decreased from 54.9% in 2005 to 50.7% in 2014 (average decline of 0.60%/y; 95% CI, 0.40%-0.80%; $P = .01$ for linear trend) (Fig 3). In contrast, in-hospital mortality for cases identified by ICD-9 codes decreased from 48.3% to

TABLE 3] Characteristics of the 27 University HealthSystem Consortium Academic Medical Centers and US Academic Hospitals in 2014

Hospital Characteristic	UHC Cohort Hospitals (n = 27)	US Academic Hospitals ^a (n = 302)
Geographic region, No. (%)		
Northeast	9 (33.3)	91 (30.1)
Midwest and West	9 (33.3)	113 (37.4)
South	9 (33.3)	97 (32.1)
Other	0	1 (0.3)
AHA bed size, No. (%)		
Large	21 (77.8)	201 (66.6)
Medium	6 (22.2)	94 (31.1)
Small	0	7 (2.3)
Hospital beds, median (IQR)	544 (290-729)	505.5 (434-810.5)
Annual inpatient discharges, median (IQR)	28,207 (13,491-35,655)	23,455.5 (14,017-33,146)
Certified trauma center, No. (%)	23 (85.2)	203 (67.2)

AHA = American Hospital Association; UHC = United HealthSystems Consortium. See Table 2 legend for expansion of other abbreviation.

^aDefined by membership in the Council of Teaching Hospitals and Health Systems in 2014.

TABLE 4] Performance of Clinical Surveillance Definitions and ICD-9 Codes for Identifying Medical Record Review-Confirmed Septic Shock

Surveillance Method	Sensitivity			Specificity			PPV			NPV		
	MGH and BWH	GUH	Overall ^a	MGH and BWH	GUH	Overall ^a	MGH and BWH	GUH	Overall ^a	MGH and BWH	GUH	Overall ^a
Clinical												
Two pressor days	41/54 (75.9%)	69/93 (74.2%)	110/147 (74.8%) [67.0%-81.6%]	637/646 (98.6%)	160/174 (92.0%)	797/820 (97.2%) [95.8%-98.2%]	41/52 (82.0%)	69/83 (83.1%)	110/133 (82.7%) [75.2%-88.7%]	637/650 (98.0%)	160/184 (87.0%)	797/834 (95.6%) [93.9%-96.9%]
One pressor day	47/54 (87.0%)	83/93 (89.2%)	130/147 (88.4%) [82.1%-93.1%]	610/646 (94.4%)	141/174 (81.0%)	751/820 (91.6%) [89.5%-93.4%]	47/83 (56.6%)	83/116 (71.6%)	130/199 (65.3%) [58.3%-71.9%]	610/617 (98.9%)	141/151 (93.4%)	751/768 (97.8%) [96.5%-98.7%]
ICD-9 code (785.52)	16/54 (29.6%)	55/93 (59.1%)	71/147 (48.3%) [40.0%-56.7%]	641/646 (99.2%)	170/174 (97.7%)	811/820 (98.9%) [97.9%-99.5%]	16/21 (76.2%)	55/59 (93.2%)	71/80 (88.8%) [79.7%-94.7%]	641/679 (94.4%)	170/208 (81.7%)	811/887 (91.4%) [89.4%-93.2%]

BWH = Brigham and Women's Hospital; GUH = Georgetown University Hospital; MGH = Massachusetts General Hospital; NPV = negative predictive value; PPV = positive predictive value. See Table 2 legend for expansion of other abbreviation.

^aPooled numbers include 95% CIs in brackets.

Figure 2 – Annual septic shock incidence trends based on the clinical surveillance definition vs ICD-9 codes, 2005-2014. See Figure 1 legend for expansion of abbreviation.

39.3% (1.22%/y decline; 95% CI, 0.90%-1.55%; $P < .01$). For the definition requiring 1 day of vasopressors, incidence increased from 23.0 to 35.3 (average, 5.4% increase/y; 95% CI, 4.5%-6.2%; $P < .01$) while mortality declined from 36.4% to 31.0% (average, 0.60%/y; 95% CI, 0.46%-0.74%; $P < .01$). All incidence and mortality trends from clinical data were significantly different from ICD-9-based trends ($P < .01$ for all comparisons).

Additional sensitivity analyses for definitions requiring 1 or 2 days of vasopressors and varying the required number of days of antibiotics, length of the surveillance window, or the center of the surveillance window to a blood culture order (rather than a vasopressor day), produced similar accuracy and 10-year trends (e-Table 1). When including patients on the basis of either primary surveillance criteria or septic shock codes, trends in incidence and mortality were intermediate between those seen with clinical criteria or septic shock codes alone, with incidence rising from 15.6 to 27.5 (8.1%/y; 95% CI, 6.4%-9.7%; $P < .01$ for linear trend) and mortality declining from 50.1% to 40.9% (1.2%/y; 95% CI, 0.9%-1.5%; $P < .01$). The annual proportion of patients meeting the primary clinical surveillance definition who also received an ICD-9 code for septic shock increased steadily from 29.7% in 2005 to 55.7% in 2014 (average, 2.9% increase/y; 95% CI, 2.4%-3.3%; $P < .01$ for linear trend).

The percentage of patients meeting the clinical surveillance definition and who were discharged to hospice increased from 0.9% in 2005 to 3.0% in 2014 ($P < .01$ for linear trend). When examining the

Figure 3 – Annual septic shock in-hospital mortality trends based on the clinical surveillance definition vs ICD-9 codes, 2005-2014. See [Figure 1](#) legend for expansion of abbreviation.

combined outcome of in-hospital mortality and discharge to hospice, the apparent decline over time was attenuated for all surveillance methods. The rate of this combined outcome decreased from 55.9% to 53.7% for the primary clinical surveillance definition requiring 2 days of vasopressors (average, 0.35% decline/y; 95% CI, 0.18%-0.53%; $P = .25$ vs mortality trend alone), from 49.5% to 42.8% for ICD-9 codes (average, 0.98% decline/y; 95% CI, 0.71, 1.25%; $P = .07$ vs mortality trend), and from 37.6% to 34.2% for the definition requiring 1 day of vasopressors (average, 0.38% decline/y; 95% CI, 0.24%-0.52%; $P = .02$ vs mortality trend).

Discussion

The incidence of patients with discharge codes or clinical markers indicative of treated septic shock steadily rose during the 10-year surveillance period, and in-hospital mortality for this population declined. The magnitude of these trends was considerably less when using clinical data compared with claims codes. The mortality decline was further attenuated when accounting for discharges to hospice. The likelihood of patients treated concurrently with vasopressors and antibiotics, and who provided blood samples for culturing, being coded as having septic shock has increased steadily over time. These trends were consistent in a number of sensitivity analyses, including variations in the time window required between vasopressors, antibiotics, and blood culture orders, as

well as duration of antibiotics. Clinician record reviews suggested that clinical surveillance definitions for septic shock provide greater sensitivity and comparable positive predictive value than billing codes.

Our mortality estimates with the primary clinical surveillance definition are comparable, although higher, than the 42% mortality rate for the new consensus septic shock definition reported in the Surviving Sepsis Campaign database.⁶ The high overall mortality estimates (50%-55%) are likely due to the requirement for two or more consecutive days of vasopressor use rather than only 1 day (mortality estimates of 31%-36%). The definition requiring only 1 day of vasopressors had higher sensitivity for septic shock but lower specificity—likely due to the inclusion of patients who may have received vasopressor boluses (rather than infusions) for transient hypotension. Requiring 2 days of vasopressors maximized positive predictive value relative to chart review, while maintaining fairly good sensitivity.

Commonly cited reasons for a rise in sepsis incidence include aging of the population and greater use of invasive procedures and immunosuppressive therapies.^{14,15} Our study was not designed to investigate these factors, nor can we ascertain to what extent the residual increase measured by the clinical surveillance definition reflects a higher burden of septic shock vs more recognition and/or more aggressive treatment. Recommendations from the Surviving Sepsis Campaign since the mid-2000s have encouraged enhanced detection and early use of vasopressors for patients with refractory hypotension.^{16,17} This may account for some of the observed increase in patients treated for septic shock and the possible decline in mortality. In addition, some of the decrease in hospital mortality observed in our study can be attributed to a rise in the fraction of patients discharged to hospice. Not accounting for this evolving societal preference can exaggerate the overall impression of improving outcomes.¹⁸

The imperfect sensitivity of codes as well as our clinical surveillance definition suggests that both methods may still underestimate the true burden of septic shock. Given the high specificity of both septic shock codes and clinical surveillance criteria, combining both in a surveillance definition may allow better estimates of the point prevalence of septic shock. However, the observed discrepancy in the rate of rise in septic shock incidence generated by both methods, and the rising proportion of patients meeting the clinical definition and who were coded as having septic shock, indicate that claims-based

trends are confounded by more recognition and coding rather than by a true increase in disease rates. This phenomenon likely reflects rising awareness of the importance of sepsis, coupled with changing financial and policy incentives.^{2,3} More inclusive coding for sepsis/septic shock and organ dysfunction may also be exaggerating apparent declines in mortality.^{4,19}

Although improvements in documentation and coding are desirable goals, the changeability of coding in response to various incentives presents a challenge for longitudinal sepsis surveillance. Reliably assessing sepsis trends is critical, particularly in light of national performance improvement initiatives and quality metrics mandated by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Our prior work at two hospitals showed that a surveillance definition using EHR markers of presumed infection and concurrent organ dysfunction (vasopressors, initiation of mechanical ventilation, and/or changes in patients' baseline laboratory values) also had superior sensitivity, comparable positive predictive value, and better stability over time vs claims.⁸

Conducting surveillance for septic shock, compared with the entire spectrum of sepsis, is appealing as this is a more homogeneous group that can be identified by a simpler set of markers. Our surveillance definition, in its current form, contains variables that are widely available and can be easily extracted from many automated systems. Using clinical data for septic shock surveillance may mitigate surveillance bias due to transitions in coding systems and variations in coding practices, although clinical definitions may still be influenced by changes in clinical care patterns over time (such as thresholds for obtaining blood cultures or starting vasopressors).

Our study has several limitations. First, we used data from a convenience sample of academic medical centers, limiting generalizability. It is possible that the hospitals that participated in the UHC pharmacy database over the 10-year period may differ from other UHC hospitals. Future studies should examine the performance of the clinical surveillance definition in community as well as academic hospitals. Second, while charge data are not subject to the biases associated with coding practices, we were unable to confirm the accuracy of all components. Third, the adequacy of fluid resuscitation could not be

determined in the absence of specific time-stamped dosage information on bolus fluid administrations.^{20,21} Fourth, it is possible that the threshold for using vasopressors is decreasing over time as a result of international guidelines emphasizing timely vasopressor use for sepsis-associated hypotension.^{16,17,22} We required 2 days of vasopressors to mitigate the potential effect of a diminishing threshold for starting vasopressors. Similarly, trends could be confounded by variations over time in the standard practice for ordering blood cultures and prescribing antibiotics. Fifth, our data did not allow us to examine the duration of vasopressor therapy on an hour-by-hour basis, thereby allowing for the possibility of substantial heterogeneity between patients: vasopressor duration could range from several hours for an infusion started near midnight, to nearly 48 hours. Sixth, our surveillance definition closely matched the conceptual framework offered by the new consensus septic shock definition and reported death rates, but it did not include lactate testing. However, we believed this adjustment was necessary given that lactate testing rates have increased dramatically over time.²³ Requiring lactate testing in our surveillance definition would thus likely have increased false negatives in the earlier part of the 10-year surveillance period than in more recent years. Finally, our method enables reporting only on the "treated" incidence of septic shock among hospitalized patients. Our methodology could inflate incidence trends if more patients with sepsis are treated earlier with vasopressors.

In conclusion, a clinical surveillance definition based on concurrent charges for antibiotics, blood cultures, and ≥ 2 days of vasopressors provides greater sensitivity and comparable positive predictive value compared with medical claims data for identifying patients who receive treatment for septic shock. Applying this definition to 27 hospitals suggests the incidence of patients being treated for septic shock has risen and in-hospital mortality has declined during the 10-year surveillance period, but less dramatically than estimated using ICD-9 codes. The decrease in hospital mortality rates for patients with septic shock is partly accounted for by more patients being discharged to hospice. Surveillance based on clinical data may allow for more reliable estimates of septic shock burden and trends compared with administrative data.

Acknowledgments

Author contributions: C. R. had full access to all of the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis, and is guarantor of the content of this manuscript. S. S. K. and C. R. conceptualized and designed the study and contributed to data acquisition and analysis, data interpretation, and drafting of the manuscript. S. H., J. R. S., M. K. M., and J. M. contributed to data acquisition or analysis and editing of the manuscript for intellectual content. R. L. D., A. F. S., and M. K. provided study supervision, contributed to data interpretation, and provided critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content.

Financial/nonfinancial disclosures: None declared.

Role of sponsors: The sponsor had no role in the design of the study, the collection and analysis of the data, or the preparation of the manuscript.

Other contributions: The authors thank Kelly Byrne for assistance with formatting of the text, tables, and figures in this manuscript.

Additional information: The e-Appendix and e-Table can be found in the Supplemental Materials section of the online article.

References

- Bone RC, Balk RA, Cerra FB, et al; ACCP/SCCM Consensus Conference Committee; American College of Chest Physicians/Society of Critical Care Medicine. Definitions for sepsis and organ failure and guidelines for the use of innovative therapies in sepsis. *Chest*. 1992;101(6):1644-1655. As cited in Tillotson GS. Introduction: sepsis. *Chest*. 2009;136(5 suppl):e28.
- Rhee C, Gohil S, Klompas M. Regulatory mandates for sepsis care—reasons for caution. *N Engl J Med*. 2014;370(18):1673-1676.
- Gohil SK, Cao C, Phelan M, et al. Impact of policies on the rise in sepsis incidence, 2000-2010. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2016;62(6):695-703.
- Rhee C, Murphy MV, Li L, et al. Comparison of trends in sepsis incidence and coding using administrative claims versus objective clinical data. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2015;60(1):88-95.
- 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(8):775-787.
- Singer M, Deutschman CS, Seymour CW, et al. The Third International Consensus Definitions for Sepsis and Septic Shock (Sepsis-3). *JAMA*. 2016;315(8):801-810.
- Lagu T, Lindenauer PK, Rothberg MB, et al. Development and validation of a model that uses enhanced administrative data to predict mortality in patients with sepsis. *Crit Care Med*. 2011;39(11):2425-2430.
- Rhee C, Kadri S, Huang SS, et al. Objective sepsis surveillance using electronic clinical data. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2016;37(2):163-171.
- Kadri SS, Hohmann SF, Orav EJ, et al. Tracking colistin-treated patients to monitor the incidence and outcome of carbapenem-resistant gram-negative infections. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2015;60(1):79-87.
- Page DB, Donnelly JP, Wang HE. Community-, healthcare-, and hospital-acquired severe sepsis hospitalizations in the University HealthSystem Consortium. *Crit Care Med*. 2015;43(9):1945-1951.
- Pakyz AL, MacDougall C, Oinonen M, Polk RE. Trends in antibacterial use in US academic health centers: 2002 to 2006. *Arch Intern Med*. 2008;168(20):2254-2260.
- Bone RC, Balk RA, Cerra FB, et al; ACCP/SCCM Consensus Conference Committee; American College of Chest Physicians/Society of Critical Care Medicine. Definitions for sepsis and organ failure and guidelines for the use of innovative therapies in sepsis. *Chest*. 1992;101(6):1644-1655.
- Levy MM, Fink MP, Marshall JC, et al. 2001 SCCM/ESICM/ACCP/ATS/SIS International Sepsis Definitions Conference. *Crit Care Med*. 2003;31(4):1250-1256.
- Martin GS. Sepsis, severe sepsis and septic shock: changes in incidence, pathogens and outcomes. *Expert Rev Anti Infect Ther*. 2012;10(6):701-706.
- Girard TD, Opal SM, Ely EW. Insights into severe sepsis in older patients: from epidemiology to evidence-based management. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2005;40(5):719-727.
- Dellinger RP, Levy MM, Carlet JM, et al. Surviving Sepsis Campaign: international guidelines for management of severe sepsis and septic shock: 2008. *Crit Care Med*. 2008;36(1):296-327.
- 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(2):580-637.
- Kumar G, Kumar N, Taneja A, et al. Nationwide trends of severe sepsis in the 21st century (2000-2007). *Chest*. 2011;140(5):1223-1231.
- Rhee C, Murphy MV, Li L, et al. Improving documentation and coding for acute organ dysfunction biases estimates of changing sepsis severity and burden: a retrospective study. *Crit Care*. 2015;19:338.
- Madhusudan P, Tirupakuzhi Vijayaraghavan BK, Cove ME. Fluid resuscitation in sepsis: reexamining the paradigm. *Biomed Res Int*. 2014;2014:984082.
- Hilton AK, Bellomo R. A critique of fluid bolus resuscitation in severe sepsis. *Crit Care*. 2012;16(1):302.
- Beck V, Chateau D, Bryson GL, et al. Timing of vasopressor initiation and mortality in septic shock: a cohort study. *Crit Care*. 2014;18(3):R97.
- Rhee C, Murphy MV, Li L, et al. Lactate testing in suspected sepsis: trends and predictors of failure to measure levels. *Crit Care Med*. 2015;43(8):1669-1676.