

1 Early high-sensitivity troponin elevation  
2 in predicting short-term mortality in  
3 sepsis: A protocol for a systematic  
4 review with meta-analysis

5

6 *Santiago Ferrière-Steinert<sup>1</sup>, Joaquín Valenzuela Jiménez<sup>1</sup>, Sebastián Heskia Araya<sup>1</sup>,*  
7 *Thomas Kouyoumdjian Carvajal<sup>1</sup>, José Ramos-Rojas<sup>2,3</sup>, Abraham I. J. Gajardo<sup>4,5\*</sup>*

8

9 <sup>1</sup> School of medicine, Faculty of medicine, Universidad de Chile, Santiago, Chile

10 <sup>2</sup> Epistemonikos Foundation, Santiago, Chile

11 <sup>3</sup> Carrera de odontología, Facultad de medicina Clínica Alemana Universidad del Desarrollo,  
12 Santiago de Chile

13 <sup>4</sup> Intensive Care Unit, Department of Internal Medicine, Hospital Clínico Universidad de  
14 Chile, Santiago Chile

15 <sup>5</sup> Program of Pathophysiology, Institute of Biomedical Science, Faculty of Medicine,  
16 Universidad de Chile, Santiago, Chile

17 \* Corresponding Author

18 E-mail: [ajj.gajardo@gmail.com](mailto:ajj.gajardo@gmail.com) (AIJG)

## 19 **Abstract**

20 **Background:** Sepsis is a common admission diagnosis in the intensive care unit (ICU). The  
21 Sepsis-3 consensus associates sepsis diagnosis with acute organ dysfunction. In these  
22 patients troponin elevation is a well-established phenomenon, but its clinical significance is  
23 not settled, as no systematic review has addressed the prognostic significance of the  
24 increasingly prevalent high-sensitivity troponin assays in acute organ dysfunction setting.

25 This study aims to clarify the association between early serum troponin levels in high-  
26 sensitivity assays with short-term mortality risk in septic patients with acute organ  
27 dysfunction.

28 **Methods:** We will systematically search PubMed, Scopus and Embase for original articles;  
29 additionally, a manual search will be carried out through relevant literature. Generally,  
30 studies will be deemed eligible for inclusion if they evaluate the association between high-  
31 sensitivity troponin in the first 24 hours of admission and ICU, 30-days, or In-hospital  
32 mortality; in patients with septic shock or sepsis related to acute organ dysfunction. Two  
33 reviewers will independently select studies and extract the data. A meta-analysis for  
34 mortality outcome will be performed for comparative data regarding two effect measures:  
35 Odd ratios and Standardized Mean differences.

36 **Discussion:** This study will provide further evidence about the role of high-sensitivity  
37 troponin assays in predicting mortality in septic patients; potentially helping to guide further  
38 research and yielding valuable information for patient assessment.

39 Conclusion about the certainty of evidence will be presented in a 'Summary of findings'  
40 table.

41 **PROSPERO registration:** (CRD42024468883)

42 **Key words:** systematic review; meta-analysis; prognostic factor; prognosis; troponin; high-  
43 sensitivity troponin; sepsis; septic shock; septic cardiomyopathy

## 44 **1. Background**

45 Sepsis is the most common mortality cause in Intensive Care Unit (ICU) patients in the  
46 United States. A fourth of patients diagnosed with sepsis will die within their hospitalization,  
47 rising to a half within the septic shock group (1). Furthermore, sepsis-related deaths have  
48 been on the rise in the US and worldwide (1–3), and are expected to continue to do so.

49 Sepsis definitions have varied throughout the years. Sepsis-3 consensus, agreed in 2016,  
50 defines sepsis as a life-threatening organ dysfunction (assessed by SOFA score) in behalf of  
51 an infection; disposing of the former category of *severe sepsis* while preserving *septic shock*  
52 (4). Thus, compared with previous sepsis definitions, patients diagnosed with sepsis-3  
53 criteria are exposed to an increased mortality and adverse events risk (5).

54 Sepsis is associated with complications and dysfunction of several systems (6). At the  
55 cardiac level, sepsis is well-documented to be associated with acute myocardial injury  
56 independent of coronary perfusion abnormality (7). This phenomenon is primarily attributed  
57 to inflammatory and cardio-depressant factors that act indirectly and directly on the  
58 cardiomyocyte (7,8). Furthermore, when the myocardial injury ensues in diastolic and/or  
59 systolic dysfunction, it is considered Septic Cardiomyopathy (7). Although there is no  
60 consensus on the criteria for this entity, commonly accepted cardinal features are: The  
61 absence of an underlying coronary etiology, the acute presentation, and the reversibility of  
62 the dysfunction (7–9).

63 Cardiac troponins are widely used in the diagnosis of acute coronary syndrome and other  
64 cardiac pathologies presenting with myocardial injury (10), including sepsis. High-sensitivity  
65 cardiac troponin assays (hs-cTn) are usually defined by their capacity to detect troponin in at

66 least 50% of healthy individuals (10,11). In recent years hs-cTn have increasingly replaced  
67 conventional assays since they have both a lower limit of detection, and a lower and  
68 categorically defined normality cut-off. Thus, a hs-cTn level above the 99th percentile for the  
69 healthy population allows for a precise differentiation between *normal* and *elevated* groups  
70 (11).

71 Troponin elevation in septic patients is well-established but debated as a prognostic risk  
72 factor for clinical outcomes (7,12). Three meta-analyses have been published on the issue  
73 (13–15), all showed a significant association of troponin elevation with increased mortality,  
74 but suffer from many problems of published data on troponin and mortality in sepsis: Lack of  
75 strict or similar criteria for sepsis diagnosis, heterogeneity of sampling time, usage of  
76 conventional rather than hs-cTn essays, and absence of controlling of confounders (7).  
77 Moreover, the emergence and consolidation of Sepsis-3 definition, and the rise of hs-cTn  
78 assays could impact on the stratification of patients, modifying the prognostic association of  
79 the biomarkers with mortality risk (16). Consequently, it is currently unknown if elevation in  
80 hs-cTn levels is associated with mortality risk in patients with sepsis by Sepsis-3 consensus.  
81 This study aims to assess the association of early high-sensitivity serum troponin levels with  
82 short-term mortality in patients admitted to ICU because of sepsis with acute organ  
83 dysfunction.

84

## 85 **1. Methods**

### 86 **2.1. Registration**

87 The protocol was registered on the International Prospective Register of Systematic reviews  
88 (CRD42024468883). This protocol aligns with Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic

89 review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) statement (17), and follows Riley’s guide  
90 for systematic review of prognostic factors (18). Deviations from protocol will be recognized  
91 in the final article.

## 92 **2.2. Literature search**

93 With the help of a knowledgeable librarian a search strategy was created: Pubmed, Scopus  
94 and Embase will be searched for primary articles published in English and involving humans,  
95 with no date restrictions. The prepared search strings combine free text and  
96 MeSH/EMTREE terms for all words related to troponin and sepsis (see Table 1). No  
97 additional filters besides the ones described in the strings will be utilized.

98 **Table 1. Search strings utilized**

Pubmed string	((("troponin i"[MeSH Terms]) OR ("troponin"[MeSH Terms])) OR ("troponin c"[MeSH Terms]) OR ("troponin t"[MeSH Terms]) OR ("troponin*"[All Fields]) AND ((humans[Filter]))) AND (((("sepsis"[MeSH Terms]) OR ("shock, septic"[MeSH Terms])) OR (Systemic Inflammatory Response Syndrome[MeSH Terms]) AND ((humans[Filter])))
SCOPUS string	( TITLE-ABS-KEY ( troponin ) AND TITLE ( ( sepsis ) OR ( septic AND shock ) ) AND KEY ( ( sepsis ) OR ( septic AND shock ) ) )
EMBASE string	'sepsis'/exp/mj AND troponin* AND [humans]/lim

99

100 Subsequently, we will manually scrutinize references of included studies and previous  
101 reviews on the topic to retrieve missing pertinent papers.

102 Searches will be re-run just before the final analyses to check for new studies that meet the  
103 inclusion criteria.

### 104 **2.3. Study selection**

105 In accordance to CHARMS guidance (19), the research question was formulated with the  
106 Population/Index prognostic factor/Comparator prognostic factors/Outcome/Timing/Setting  
107 (PICOTS) system, a modified version of the traditional PICO, where the *P* and *O* remains the  
108 same as the original, but the *I* stands for *Index prognostic factors* and *C* for other prognostic  
109 factors that can be considered as *Comparators* (18). (See table 2 for details on the defined  
110 scope of the systematic review). For the determination of inclusion and exclusion criteria  
111 table 3 was constructed.

112 **Table 2. PICOTS for the scope of the systematic review**

	Definition
Population	Adults diagnosed with sepsis with acute organ dysfunction
Index prognostic factor	High-sensitivity troponin levels in serum
Comparator	Studies with or without comparators will be included.
Timing	1. Troponin sampling upon admission or within the first 24 hours. 2. In-hospital or 30-days mortality
Outcome	All-cause mortality
Setting	Emergency department (ED) or Intensive Care Unit (UCI)

113 **Table 3. Inclusion and exclusion criteria for the systematic review**

	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria
<b>Population</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individuals &gt;18 years old of any gender and any ethnicity in any country</li> <li>Individuals that were diagnosed with sepsis or septic shock according to sepsis-3 criteria, or with Severe sepsis or Septic shock according to Sepsis-1 or Sepsis-2 criteria.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Studies with mixed or uniquely underaged samples</li> <li>Studies with <math>\leq 10</math> events (i.e. deaths) per study</li> <li>Sepsis is not the primary diagnosis.</li> <li>Letters to the Editor, Case reports, reviews, meta-analysis, and non-primary studies in general</li> <li>Studies restricted to a specific pathology (e.g studies focusing exclusively on COVID or Cancer patients)</li> <li>The paper refers to a sample already used by another paper in the corpus of studies</li> </ul>
<b>Index prognostic factor</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Studies explicitly declaring the utilization of any High-sensitivity cardiac troponin (cTnT, cTnI, or cTnC) essay</li> <li>If no explicit statement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Studies not publishing extractable numeric data on troponin measurements, who fail to answer attempts to be contacted.</li> <li>Studies explicitly declaring the utilization of non high-sensitivity essays</li> <li>If no statement is made on the LoD as well, studies with normal limit cutoff &gt; 20 ng/L will</li> </ul>

	<p>is made on the sensitivity, essays will be regarded as high-sensitivity if their declared Limit of Detection (LoD) is <math>\leq 5</math> ng/L</p>	<p>be excluded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Studies that fail to publish either the sensitivity of their essays, the Limit of Detection (LoD) or their normal cutoff value; and fail to answer contact attempts</li> </ul>
<b>Comparator</b>	Not applicable	Not applicable
<b>Outcome</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All-cause mortality reported through hospital reports or other validated source</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Studies that didn't report any form of association between the pertinent troponin levels and the pertinent mortality.</li> </ul>
<b>Timing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First troponin measurement within the first 24 hours of admission</li> <li>• Studies that include In-hospital mortality or follow-up mortality at most 30 days from admission.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Studies where the first reported troponin levels measurement occurred beyond the first 24 hours after admission.</li> </ul>
<b>Setting</b>	Patients in ICU or Emergency	Other settings, including non-clinical context (e.g.



	department (ED)	experimentation)
Language	English studies	No original English version could be obtained.
Publication status	Published studies, conferences or abstracts.	Other publication status, including retracted papers.  Published abstracts where no access to the cohort characteristics could be obtained after appropriate contact attempts.
Species	Human studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Animal studies</li> <li>• In vitro studies</li> </ul>

114 Based on this criteria, after deleting duplicates the corpus of studies will be scanned in  
115 Rayyan (20) by two independent reviewers, discrepancies will be solved by a third reviewer.  
116 Studies will be discarded based on 1 criterion only.

117 Studies will be first analyzed based on their title and abstract. Papers that pass this primary  
118 scrutiny, or whenever it seems insufficient, will be subject to full text assessment by the  
119 same reviewers for final selection.

120 Basically, interventional and observational primary studies will be deemed eligible if they  
121 reported some form of association between troponin levels and mortality in a general clinical  
122 context. We will only include studies that report on patients diagnosed either with sepsis by  
123 Sepsis-3 criteria (4), with Severe sepsis by Sepsis-1 or Sepsis-2 (21,22), or Septic shock by  
124 any of them (4,21,22). Selection will be restricted to studies that specify the utilization of any  
125 hs-cTn assay in the first 24 hours after hospital admission, or whose reported limit of  
126 detection we consider high-sensitivity (i.e. < 9 ng/L)(10). In the case that the latter  
127 information about the assays is omitted, we will exclude studies if they fail to meet a  
128 normality cutoff of 20 ng/L or lower, since they will be regarded as having a cutoff over the

129 99th percentile of the healthy population and therefore considered as non hs-cTn assay,  
130 based on European Society of Cardiology guidelines (10).

131 The study selection process will be reported using the PRISMA flowchart, providing a clear  
132 visual representation of the inclusion and exclusion criteria application (17).

## 133 **2.4. Data extraction**

134 Based on CHARMS-PF checklist (18) we designed a standardized data extraction form,  
135 containing the relevant characteristics of studies to be included (table 4). Data will be  
136 extracted by two reviewers. Types of reported associations suitable to be extracted for this  
137 table are: 1) “dose-response”: data reported as odds, risk, or hazard ratio per unit increase in  
138 exposure; 2) “category/quantile based”: numbers (ideally 2x2 tables) or ratios comparing  
139 groups as defined by quantiles or categories of exposure; 3) “means”: data reported as  
140 means or mean differences in exposure, comparing those presenting and not presenting the  
141 event (23). If a study presents more than one of these associations, we will extract all of  
142 them.

143 **Table 4. Data extraction form**

Article and Author	Year	Number of patients	Setting and country	Eligibility and recruiting methods (multicenter or monocenter )	Age	Male (%)	Study type	Exclud ed comor bidities	Sepsis/Septi c shock definition
--------------------------	------	--------------------------	---------------------------	--	-----	----------	---------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------

144

145

Shock (%)	Mortality (%)	Mortality time follow-up	Effect measure(s) with Standard Error(s)	Troponin type used and normality cutoff	Type of statistical analysis	Variables in multivariate analysis (if any)	Quality Score (QUIPS)
-----------	---------------	--------------------------	--	---	------------------------------	---	-----------------------

146

147 We will collect extracted effect measures together with their standard errors (SE). If SEs are  
 148 not explicitly available, we will derive them from metrics such SDs, exact p-values, or  
 149 confidence intervals (24). We will collect adjusted and unadjusted effect measures  
 150 separately. If many adjusted models are presented, we will extract the one which fits better  
 151 the core adjustment factors selected (see Risk of Bias section). If effect measures for  
 152 several time points are presented, we will prioritize ICU and 28-mortality (in that order) over  
 153 in-hospital mortality. If effect measures for several hs-cTn samples are presented, we will  
 154 prioritize the sample extracted closest to ED/ICU admission. Data only presented as figures  
 155 will be extracted with WebPlotDigitizer software (25).

156 Authors will be contacted to request critical missing or not reported data regarding  
 157 associations of interest. In case of no response, the article will be excluded from this study.

158 We will present a summarized version of this table in the final review.

## 159 **2.5. Risk of bias assessment**

160 Bearing in mind the prognostic nature of the review and taking into account previously  
 161 published meta-analysis (13–15), we can expect that mainly observational studies will be  
 162 included.

163 Two authors will independently assess the risk of bias (RoB) applying the QUIPS (quality in  
164 prognostic factor studies) tool (26), and then discuss together their assessments in order to  
165 decide the final score. In QUIPS RoB assessments are made within a set of 6 domains: (1)  
166 Study Participation, (2) Study Attrition, (3) Prognostic Factor Measurement, (4) Outcome  
167 Measurement, (5) Study Confounding and (6) Statistical Analysis and Reporting. We defined  
168 Study participation, Prognostic Factor Measurement and Study Confounding as the key  
169 domains for our assessment, and we specified criteria for each of these domains. For the  
170 confounder domain RoB evaluation, we will look for 3 core adjustment factors in each study:  
171 severity of sepsis, age, and comorbidities (any cardiac or renal).

172 Classification for each RoB item could be 'low', 'moderate', or 'high'. Moreover, this  
173 assessment will include an overall judgment concerning the total RoB quality of each study,  
174 which will be visualized in the review.

## 175 **2.5. Statistical analysis**

176 We will investigate the mortality outcome with two effect measures: Mortality risk and Mean  
177 difference in troponin distribution.

178 1) Regarding mortality risk analysis: Whenever feasible a 2x2 contingency table will be  
179 gathered from available data, with one axis for survivor vs non-survivor groups, and other for  
180 elevated vs normal troponin level group, according to the cut-off defined by every study for  
181 each specific hs-cTn assay. If the sample is divided into more than 2 groups or categories  
182 (e.g. quantiles) it will be dichotomized around the closest match to a normality cutoff of 15  
183 ng/L (27). We will add 0.5 to each cell in any table that contains one or more zero values  
184 (24). We will compute an Odds Ratio (OR) with its SE from this contingency table for each  
185 study. For studies not presenting sufficient data for a contingency table we will extract  
186 explicitly reported unadjusted ORs with their SEs. ORs from studies handling hs-cTn as a

187 continuous variable (i.e. dose-response) will be scaled to an OR per 50 ng/L of increment.

188 This magnitude was considered representative of the difference between the group usually  
189 referred to as “normal” compared to the “elevated” troponin level group –based on the  
190 reported troponin distributions of pertinent studies known to us and in accordance with our  
191 clinical expert (28–30).

192 Results from studies reporting Hazard Ratio (HR) or Relative Risk (RR) will be presented  
193 separately. Only if the event probability in the control group is  $<0.2$ , and the HR or RR are  
194 below 2.5, the effect measures will be interpreted as numerically equivalent to an OR and  
195 reported together with the other studies (31).

196 With these effect measures we will perform a structured quantitative analysis (meta-analysis)  
197 for the pooled unadjusted mortality effect.

198 ORs of adjusted (i.e. multivariate) regressions will be included in a separate model for the  
199 adjusted mortality effect regardless of the set of confounders controlled for. We will report  
200 variables incorporated in the regression for each study in a table.

201 2) For difference in troponin levels analysis: Studies presenting mean difference data in  
202 troponin level by survivor status will be meta-analyzed in a single model using Hedges’ g  
203 Standardized Mean Differences (SMD).

204 All models will be generated using R-4.3.1 package *metafor* (32), utilizing the random-effects  
205 model and the inverse variance weighting method (24).

206 Heterogeneity will be assessed and reported by I<sup>2</sup> statistic, where  $>50\%$  and a p-value  $<$   
207  $0.10$  are of concern and will be further explored (24).

208 Studies not presenting minimum data (e.g. missing SE) will be included in the narrative  
209 synthesis and compared to the results of the meta-analysis to the extent possible.

210 For the sake of replicability all formulas, raw data, and calculations shall be included either in  
211 the article itself or an online supplement.

## 212 **2.6. Subgroup and sensitivity analysis**

213 Models will undergo a comprehensive heterogeneity assessment. Since reviews of  
214 prognostic studies usually can result in high I<sup>2</sup> regardless of similar point estimates (33), we  
215 will favor visual inspection over statistical criteria.

216 If in any of the model's heterogeneity is deemed substantial, we will run the following  
217 Subgroup analysis:

- 218 **1. Subgroups by shock status:** To assess whether effect measures and  
219 heterogeneity is significantly dependent on the degree of organic dysfunction, we will  
220 proceed with a subgroup analysis between studies restricting inclusion criteria to  
221 septic shock only, versus studies that encompass patients with sepsis, severe sepsis  
222 and septic shock.
- 223 **2. Subgroup by type of troponin:** Despite the fact that troponin essays have longed  
224 being considered equivalent in the acute coronary syndrome setting (34), emergency  
225 evidence supports that hs-cTnT and hs-cTnI outcome prognostic value might differ in  
226 other scenarios (35,36). To assess if such a difference exists in this case, we will  
227 group studies by the declared essay type (i.e. hs-cTnI, hs-cTnT, hs-cTnC).
- 228 **3. Subgroup by type of association:** In order to assess whether heterogeneity may  
229 be due to the type of analysis employed to derive a dichotomous effect size, a  
230 subgroup analysis will be performed segregating studies reporting dose-response  
231 data (i.e. regressions handling hs-cTn as a continuous dependent variable) versus  
232 category/quantile-based data (i.e. contingency tables and/or regressions handling hs-

233 cTn as a dichotomous dependent variable). This subgrouping is not applicable for the  
234 SMD model.

235 Furthermore, to assess whether missing adjustment for relevant confounders might be  
236 impacting the heterogeneity and pooled effect size of the mortality adjusted model: We will  
237 undertake a sensitivity analysis, meta-analyzing only effect measures of studies adjusting for  
238 (at least) the 3 predefined core confounders.

239 To avoid p-value overreliance, the credibility of the differential effect of statistically significant  
240 Subgroup analysis will be critically appraised with the ICEMAN questionnaire (37).

241 If we suspect a small study effect in any model, we will run a sensitivity analysis with a fixed  
242 effect model.

## 243 **2.8. Publication bias**

244 For assessment of possible small-study effect, we will generate funnel plots for each model  
245 plotting the logarithm of the obtained odds ratios against their standard error (38).

246 We will visually inspect the plots for signs of publication bias (namely, asymmetry)(18,39). If  
247 more than 10 (for the sake of statistical power) studies are included in the model, we will run  
248 an Egger's test (40).

## 249 **3. Discussion and Conclusions**

250 The prognostic significance of troponin for sepsis outcomes is not yet settled. Although  
251 previous works have consistently shown a significant association between troponin and  
252 mortality, there is a need for more research shedding light on the prognostic value of such  
253 biomarker for the most common current clinical setting in the ICU. This study will provide  
254 further evidence about the role of hs-cTn assays in predicting mortality in septic patients;

255 potentially helping to guide further research and yielding valuable information for patient  
256 assessment.

257 We will evaluate the certainty of evidence for each investigated outcome with the 'Grading of  
258 Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation' (GRADE) system guideline  
259 appropriate for synthesis of prognostic factors evidence (41,42). A "Summary of findings"  
260 table will communicate with standardized statements the certainty of this evidence

## 261 **Supporting information**

262 **S1 Checklist. PRISMA-P (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-**  
263 **Analysis Protocols) 2015 checklist: Recommended items to address in a systematic**  
264 **review protocol\*. (DOC1)**

## 265 **Author Contributions**

266 **Conceptualization:** *Santiago Ferrière-Steinert, Abraham I. J. Gajardo Cortez, José Ramos-*  
267 *Rojas*

268 **Formal analysis:** *Santiago Ferrière-Steinert, Joaquín Valenzuela Jiménez, Sebastián*  
269 *Heskia Araya, Thomas Kouyoumdjian Carvajal*

270 **Project administration:** *Santiago Ferrière-Steinert, Abraham I. J. Gajardo Cortez*

271 **Resources:** *Abraham I. J. Gajardo Cortez*

272 **Supervision:** *Abraham I. J. Gajardo Cortez*

273 **Validation:** *Santiago Ferrière-Steinert, Abraham I. J. Gajardo Cortez*

274 **Writing – original draft:** *Santiago Ferrière-Steinert, Joaquín Valenzuela Jiménez,*  
275 *Sebastián Heskia Araya, Thomas Kouyoumdjian*



276 **Writing – review & editing:** Abraham I. J. Gajardo Cortez, *José Ramos-Rojas*

277

278

## 279 **References**

- 280 1. Mayr FB, Yende S, Angus DC. Epidemiology of severe sepsis. Virulence. 2014 Jan  
281 1;5(1):4–11.
- 282 2. Martin GS, Mannino DM, Eaton S, Moss M. The epidemiology of sepsis in the United  
283 States from 1979 through 2000. N Engl J Med. 2003 Apr 17;348(16):1546–54.
- 284 3. Kumar G, Kumar N, Taneja A, Kaleekal T, Tarima S, McGinley E, et al. Nationwide  
285 trends of severe sepsis in the 21st century (2000-2007). Chest. 2011 Nov;140(5):1223–  
286 31.
- 287 4. Singer M, Deutschman CS, Seymour CW, Shankar-Hari M, Annane D, Bauer M, et al.  
288 The Third International Consensus Definitions for Sepsis and Septic Shock (Sepsis-3).  
289 JAMA. 2016 Feb 23;315(8):801–10.
- 290 5. Eriksson J, Eriksson M, Brattström O, Hellgren E, Friman O, Gidlöf A, et al. Comparison  
291 of the sepsis-2 and sepsis-3 definitions in severely injured trauma patients. Journal of  
292 Critical Care. 2019 Dec 1;54:125–9.
- 293 6. Font MD, Thyagarajan B, Khanna AK. Sepsis and Septic Shock - Basics of diagnosis,  
294 pathophysiology and clinical decision making. Med Clin North Am. 2020 Jul;104(4):573–  
295 85.

- 296 7. Ehrman RR, Sullivan AN, Favot MJ, Sherwin RL, Reynolds CA, Abidov A, et al.  
297 Pathophysiology, echocardiographic evaluation, biomarker findings, and prognostic  
298 implications of septic cardiomyopathy: a review of the literature. *Crit Care*. 2018  
299 Dec;22(1):112.
- 300 8. L'Heureux M, Sternberg M, Brath L, Turlington J, Kashiouris MG. Sepsis-Induced  
301 Cardiomyopathy: a Comprehensive Review. *Curr Cardiol Rep*. 2020;22(5):35.
- 302 9. Sato R, Nasu M. A review of sepsis-induced cardiomyopathy. *Journal of Intensive Care*.  
303 2015 Nov 11;3(1):48.
- 304 10. Collet JP, Thiele H, Barbato E, Barthélémy O, Bauersachs J, Bhatt DL, et al. 2020 ESC  
305 Guidelines for the management of acute coronary syndromes in patients presenting  
306 without persistent ST-segment elevation. *European Heart Journal*. 2021 Apr  
307 7;42(14):1289–367.
- 308 11. Twerenbold R, Jaffe A, Reichlin T, Reiter M, Mueller C. High-sensitive troponin T  
309 measurements: what do we gain and what are the challenges? *European Heart Journal*.  
310 2012 Mar 1;33(5):579–86.
- 311 12. The Septic Heart: Current Understanding of Molecular Mechanisms and Clinical  
312 Implications. *Chest*. 2019 Feb 1;155(2):427–37.
- 313 13. Sheyin O, Davies O, Duan W, Perez X. The prognostic significance of troponin elevation  
314 in patients with sepsis: a meta-analysis. *Heart Lung*. 2015;44(1):75–81.
- 315 14. Bessière F, Khenifer S, Dubourg J, Durieu I, Lega JC. Prognostic value of troponins in  
316 sepsis: a meta-analysis. *Intensive Care Med*. 2013 Jul;39(7):1181–9.

- 317 15. Zheng P, Wang X, Guo T, Gao W, Huang Q, Yang J, et al. Cardiac troponin as a  
318 prognosticator of mortality in patients with sepsis: A systematic review and meta-  
319 analysis. *Immun Inflamm Dis*. 2023 Sep;11(9):e1014.
- 320 16. Røsjø H, Varpula M, Hagve TA, Karlsson S, Ruokonen E, Pettilä V, et al. Circulating  
321 high sensitivity troponin T in severe sepsis and septic shock: distribution, associated  
322 factors, and relation to outcome. *Intensive Care Med*. 2011 Jan;37(1):77–85.
- 323 17. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The  
324 PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*.  
325 2021 Mar 29;372:n71.
- 326 18. Riley RD, Moons KGM, Snell KIE, Ensor J, Hooft L, Altman DG, et al. A guide to  
327 systematic review and meta-analysis of prognostic factor studies. *BMJ*. 2019 Jan  
328 30;364:k4597.
- 329 19. Moons KGM, de Groot JAH, Bouwmeester W, Vergouwe Y, Mallett S, Altman DG, et al.  
330 Critical Appraisal and Data Extraction for Systematic Reviews of Prediction Modelling  
331 Studies: The CHARMS Checklist. *PLoS Med*. 2014 Oct 14;11(10):e1001744.
- 332 20. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, Elmagarmid A. Rayyan—a web and mobile app  
333 for systematic reviews. *Systematic Reviews*. 2016 Dec 5;5(1):210.
- 334 21. American College of Chest Physicians/Society of Critical Care Medicine Consensus  
335 Conference: Definitions for sepsis and organ failure and guidelines for the use of  
336 innovative therapies in sepsis. *Critical Care Medicine*. 1992 Jun;20(6):864.
- 337 22. Levy MM, Fink MP, Marshall JC, Abraham E, Angus D, Cook D, et al. 2001  
338 SCCM/ESICM/ACCP/ATS/SIS International Sepsis Definitions Conference. *Crit Care*  
339 *Med*. 2003 Apr;31(4):1250–6.

- 340 23. Bekkering GE, Harris RJ, Thomas S, Mayer AMB, Beynon R, Ness AR, et al. How Much  
341 of the Data Published in Observational Studies of the Association between Diet and  
342 Prostate or Bladder Cancer Is Usable for Meta-Analysis? *American Journal of*  
343 *Epidemiology*. 2008 May 1;167(9):1017–26.
- 344 24. Higgins JPT, Cochrane Collaboration, editors. *Cochrane handbook for systematic*  
345 *reviews of interventions*. Second edition. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell; 2020.  
346 (Cochrane book series).
- 347 25. Rohatgi A. Webplotdigitizer: Version 4.6 [Internet]. 2022. Available from:  
348 <https://automeris.io/WebPlotDigitizer>
- 349 26. Grooten WJA, Tseli E, Äng BO, Boersma K, Stålnacke BM, Gerdle B, et al. Elaborating  
350 on the assessment of the risk of bias in prognostic studies in pain rehabilitation using  
351 QUIPS—aspects of interrater agreement. *Diagnostic and Prognostic Research*. 2019  
352 Mar 7;3(1):5.
- 353 27. Hamling J, Lee P, Weitkunat R, Ambühl M. Facilitating meta-analyses by deriving  
354 relative effect and precision estimates for alternative comparisons from a set of  
355 estimates presented by exposure level or disease category. *Statistics in Medicine*. 2008  
356 Mar 30;27(7):954–70.
- 357 28. Xu KZ, Xu P, Li JJ, Zuo AF, Wang SB, Han F. Predictors and nomogram of in-hospital  
358 mortality in sepsis-induced myocardial injury: a retrospective cohort study. *BMC*  
359 *Anesthesiol*. 2023 Jul 7;23(1):230.
- 360 29. Vallabhajosyula S, Sakhuja A, Geske JB, Kumar M, Poterucha JT, Kashyap R, et al.  
361 Role of Admission Troponin-T and Serial Troponin-T Testing in Predicting Outcomes in  
362 Severe Sepsis and Septic Shock. *J Am Heart Assoc*. 2017 Sep 9;6(9):e005930.

- 363 30. Vallabhajosyula S, Sakhuja A, Geske JB, Kumar M, Kashyap R, Kashani K, et al.  
364 Clinical profile and outcomes of acute cardiorenal syndrome type-5 in sepsis: An eight-  
365 year cohort study. PLoS One. 2018 Jan 9;13(1):e0190965.
- 366 31. Symons MJ, Moore DT. Hazard rate ratio and prospective epidemiological studies. J Clin  
367 Epidemiol. 2002 Sep;55(9):893–9.
- 368 32. Viechtbauer W. Conducting meta-analyses in R with the metafor package. Journal of  
369 Statistical Software. 2010;36(3):1–48.
- 370 33. Guyatt G, Zhao Y, Mayer M, Briel M, Mustafa R, Izcovich A, et al. GRADE guidance 36:  
371 updates to GRADE’s approach to addressing inconsistency. Journal of Clinical  
372 Epidemiology. 2023 Jun 1;158:70–83.
- 373 34. van der Linden N, Wildi K, Twerenbold R, Pickering JW, Than M, Cullen L, et al.  
374 Combining High-Sensitivity Cardiac Troponin I and Cardiac Troponin T in the Early  
375 Diagnosis of Acute Myocardial Infarction. Circulation. 2018 Sep 4;138(10):989–99.
- 376 35. American College of Cardiology [Internet]. [cited 2024 Jan 21]. Utility of High-Sensitivity  
377 Troponin T and I: Are They the Same? Available from: <https://www.acc.org/Latest-in-Cardiology/Articles/2019/11/21/07/26/http%3a%2f%2fwww.acc.org%2fLatest-in-Cardiology%2fArticles%2f2019%2f11%2f21%2f07%2f26%2fUtility-of-High-Sensitivity-Troponin-T-and-I>  
378  
379  
380
- 381 36. Willeit P, Welsh P, Evans JDW, Tschiderer L, Boachie C, Jukema JW, et al. High-  
382 Sensitivity Cardiac Troponin Concentration and Risk of First-Ever Cardiovascular  
383 Outcomes in 154,052 Participants. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2017 Aug 1;70(5):558–68.
- 384 37. Schandelmaier S, Briel M, Varadhan R, Schmid CH, Devasenapathy N, Hayward RA, et  
385 al. Development of the Instrument to assess the Credibility of Effect Modification

386 Analyses (ICEMAN) in randomized controlled trials and meta-analyses. CMAJ. 2020 Aug  
387 10;192(32):E901–6.

388 38. Sterne JA, Egger M. Funnel plots for detecting bias in meta-analysis: guidelines on  
389 choice of axis. J Clin Epidemiol. 2001 Oct;54(10):1046–55.

390 39. Sterne JAC, Sutton AJ, Ioannidis JPA, Terrin N, Jones DR, Lau J, et al.  
391 Recommendations for examining and interpreting funnel plot asymmetry in meta-  
392 analyses of randomised controlled trials. BMJ. 2011 Jul 22;343(jul22 1):d4002–d4002.

393 40. Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a  
394 simple, graphical test. BMJ. 1997 Sep 13;315(7109):629–34.

395 41. Foroutan F, Guyatt G, Zuk V, Vandvik PO, Alba AC, Mustafa R, et al. GRADE  
396 Guidelines 28: Use of GRADE for the assessment of evidence about prognostic factors:  
397 rating certainty in identification of groups of patients with different absolute risks. Journal  
398 of Clinical Epidemiology. 2020 May 1;121:62–70.

399 42. Iorio A, Spencer FA, Falavigna M, Alba C, Lang E, Burnand B, et al. Use of GRADE for  
400 assessment of evidence about prognosis: rating confidence in estimates of event rates  
401 in broad categories of patients. BMJ. 2015 Mar 16;350:h870.

402

