

1 **MANUSCRIPT**

2 Full Title:

3 Cognitive impairment is a risk factor for long-term outcomes in septic patients: A
4 retrospective observational study

5 Short Title:

6 Cognitive impairment as a long-term outcome in sepsis patients

7

8 Hiroyuki Koami*, Yuichiro Sakamoto, Yutaro Furukawa, Kosuke Mouri, Ayaka Matsuoka,

9 Kota Shinada, Kento Nakayama, Sachiko Iwanaga, Shogo Narumi, Mayuko Koba

10 Department of Emergency and Critical Care Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Saga University,

11 Saga, Japan

12

13 Department of Emergency and Critical Care Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Saga University,

14 Saga City, Saga, 849-8501 Japan

15

16 *Corresponding author:

17 E-mail: hkoami@cc.saga-u.ac.jp (HK)

18

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

19 Abstract

20 The importance of long-term outcomes after sepsis has been increasingly emphasized in
21 recent years; however, little is known about the relationship between pre-sepsis patient
22 characteristics and long-term outcomes. This study examined the impact of patient
23 characteristics pre-admission, specifically physical, cognitive, and emotional disorders, on
24 long-term clinical outcomes of sepsis. From August 2014 to July 2016, this study included
25 adult patients admitted to our hospital with a diagnosis of sepsis who were followed up for
26 one year. These 76 patients were classified as Survivors (n=31) or Deceased (n=45), based
27 on their one-year outcomes. In this single-center, retrospective study, 59% of sepsis patients
28 died within one year. Multiple logistic regression models employing significant parameters
29 from univariate analysis revealed that cognitive impairment (CI) is an independent risk factor
30 for 1-year outcome [OR 0.184, 95% CI 0.047-0.722, P=0.0152]. Furthermore, through
31 another univariate analysis and a log-rank test between the CI group and the Control group,
32 created by reclassifying the same 76 patients, CI was significantly associated with a lower 1-
33 year survival rate (25.0% vs 50.0%, P=0.03, log-rank P=0.0332). The composite outcome of
34 either death or being bedridden at the point of discharge was also significantly higher in the
35 CI group than the Control group (100.0% vs 75.0%, P=0.0028). These results indicate that
36 pre-septic CI is a reliable, independent predictor of poor long-term clinical outcomes for

37 sepsis patients.

38

39 Introduction

40 Sepsis is a pressing societal issue with a global impact [1]. The Surviving Sepsis Campaign
41 Guidelines (SSCG), launched in 2004, have significantly enhanced awareness of sepsis and
42 have improved the quality of sepsis care [2]. Recent estimates suggest that 31.5 million cases
43 of sepsis occur globally each year, including 19.4 million cases of severe sepsis and 5.3 million
44 possible deaths, primarily in high-income countries[1].

45 Although numerous publications indicate that advances in multidisciplinary sepsis
46 treatment have increased survival rates, sepsis constitutes an ongoing public health issue,
47 rather than just an acute, severe illness [3, 4]. Among sepsis patients who survive until
48 hospital discharge, as many as one-third will be dead within a year [5, 6]. Aggregated reports
49 of observational studies documenting multiple endpoints reveal 1-year mortality rates ranging
50 from 21.5-71.9% [7]. Moreover, deaths from sepsis continue to be reported, even several
51 years after discharge from the hospital [8]. Given the above, the validity of 28-day mortality
52 as an endpoint for clinical sepsis studies seems unwise [7].

53 As for long-term prognosis, not only death from sepsis, but also persistent disabilities such
54 as physical impairment, cognitive impairment, and mental health problems are challenging
55 [5]. Elderly survivors of critical care have a high risk of developing dementia within three
56 years after discharge from the ICU [9]. Septic events can be a turning point for older patients,

57 causing functional and cognitive impairments that impact independent daily living. This can
58 result in additional functional limitations, re-admission to the ICU, and poor outcomes [10].
59 Several recent studies suggest that cognitive impairment increases by 16.7 to 33.3% during
60 hospital stays following sepsis [10-12]. In addition, patients with cognitive impairment and
61 ADL dependence have shorter survival rates [13].

62 Despite the wealth of data on post-septic cognitive impairment and its association with
63 clinical outcomes, there are few reports regarding the correlation between pre-septic cognitive
64 impairment and long-term outcomes. In the present study, we retrospectively collected
65 comprehensive data on pre-admission patient characteristics, including cognitive, physical,
66 and emotional disorders, and investigated relationships between such characteristics and
67 long-term clinical outcomes of sepsis.

68 **Materials and Methods**

69 **Study design and patients**

70 This retrospective observational study was conducted at Saga University Hospital, in Japan.
71 Patients aged 18 years or older who were admitted to the hospital with sepsis between August
72 2014 and July 2016, and whose one-year outcome was confirmed, were included in this study.
73 Patients who developed sepsis after hospital admission or whose one-year outcome could not

74 be confirmed were excluded from the study. All cases were categorized into two groups based
75 on their one-year outcome: Survivors (n=31) and Deceased (n=45). The same patients were
76 also reclassified into a group manifesting cognitive impairment (CI) and a normal, Control
77 group.

78

79 **Variables related to patient characteristics and medical** 80 **history**

81 Patient data, including age, percentage of patients over 65 years old, sex, prior
82 hospitalizations, transfer cases, and past medical problems were recorded, including
83 conditions such as such as hypertension, arrhythmia, cardiovascular disease, peripheral
84 vascular disease, cerebrovascular disease, diabetes mellitus, gastrointestinal and hepatobiliary
85 disease, hyperlipidemia, malignancy, chronic respiratory disease, and chronic kidney disease.

86

87 **Clinical scores and blood sampling**

88 We calculated several clinical scores as follows: the systemic inflammatory response
89 syndrome (SIRS) score [14], the Japanese association for acute medicine (JAAM)
90 disseminated intravascular coagulation (DIC) score [15], the acute physiology and chronic

91 health evaluation (APACHE) II score , the sequential organ failure assessment (SOFA) score,
92 and the quick SOFA (qSOFA) score [16]. SOFA scores were computed for each organ
93 component, in addition to the total score. Organ failure was further defined as a score of 2 or
94 more for a given organ. Evaluations were also conducted on the number of organ failures and
95 on serum lactate levels.

96

97 **Sepsis management in our hospital and clinical outcomes**

98 During the study period, sepsis was diagnosed and treated based on the Sepsis-2 definition
99 [17]. Therefore, to compare data using the current definition of sepsis-3 [16], we also
100 assessed sepsis occurrence according to sepsis-3 criteria. Additionally, data were collected on
101 infection sources, pathogenic bacteria, and results of blood cultures. Sepsis treatments were
102 performed by emergency physicians and critical care physicians at the facility. However, there
103 is no institutional protocol for managing sepsis at this hospital. This study documents various
104 treatments administered during each hospital stay, including antibiotics, antifungal and
105 antiviral agents, mechanical ventilation, renal replacement therapy, anti-disseminated
106 intravascular coagulation (DIC) therapy, catecholamines, steroids, insulin use, transfusions,
107 and surgical interventions.

108

109 **Indicators for comprehensive functional assessment**

110 Upon admission to and discharge from Saga University Hospital, patients or their relatives
111 are interviewed by nurses for a comprehensive functional assessment. This assessment
112 comprises various indices, such as “pre-admission indicators on activity of daily living and
113 cognitive-emotional functions”, as well as “pre-admission levels of bed-ridden degree
114 (“Netakiri” index).” The former encompasses basic difficulties with activities of daily living
115 (ADL), such as required assistance with toileting and moving about the residence, as well as
116 instrumental ADL difficulties, such as an inability leave the ward for examinations or to go to
117 the store alone. Other factors contributing to the condition include lethargy, cognitive
118 impairment such as memory problems, an inability to engage in simple conversations, and
119 emotional disturbances such as depression. The Netakiri index classifies independence into
120 four categories: “Rank J (independent in daily life)”, “Rank A (independent indoors, but needs
121 support when going out)”, “Rank B (needs support even indoors)”, and “Rank C (in bed all
122 day)”. The Barthel Index was also utilized to measure post-discharge indicators. This index
123 consists of 10 domains, such as feeding, wheelchair-to-bed mobility, personal toilet, getting
124 on and off the toilet, self-bathing, walking on level surfaces, stair-climbing, dressing, and
125 bowel and bladder control.

126

127 **Variables in clinical outcomes**

128 In this study, we collected clinical outcome data, including lengths of hospital stays,
129 transfers to other hospitals, hospital mortality, and one-year survival rates. The composite
130 outcome of death or tendency to be bedridden (Rank B or C of Netakiri index) at discharge
131 was defined and evaluated for correlation with cognitive impairment and control.

132

133 **Statistical analysis**

134 Data access for this study was initiated on February 6, 2018. Only HK, the person in charge
135 of data analysis, had access to information that could identify individual participants after data
136 collection. After anonymization, other authors also used these data. To evaluate factors
137 associated with long-term outcomes, patients were categorized based on death within a year
138 and were subjected to univariate analysis. The median (interquartile range; IQR) was used to
139 represent continuous variables, whereas numbers (percentages) were employed for
140 categorical/nominal variables in both groups. The Mann-Whitney U test was utilized for
141 continuous variables, whereas the Chi-square test and Fisher's exact test were applied to
142 categorical variables. Statistical significance was defined as $p < 0.05$.

143 Logistic regression analysis was conducted to identify predictors of one-year survival, utilizing
144 cognitive impairment as well as factors that showed significant differences in the univariate

145 analysis. Several models were created, and odds ratios were calculated. Finally, we constructed
146 Kaplan-Meier curves to analyze presence or absence of cognitive impairment and conducted
147 log-rank tests. All statistical analyses were performed utilizing JMP® Pro 16.1.0 software (SAS
148 Institute, Cary, NC, USA).

149

150 Results

151 During the two-year observational period, our hospital diagnosed 125 patients with sepsis
152 (Fig 1). Of these patients, 83 were initially hospitalized for sepsis, and 42 were diagnosed with
153 sepsis after being hospitalized for another medical condition. After excluding 7 patients whose
154 1-year outcomes were unknown, the present study enrolled 76 patients. All participants were
155 categorized as survivors (N=31) or deceased (N=45) 1-year after discharge.

156

157 **Fig 1. Flow diagram of the present study.**

158 During the study period, 125 adult patients with sepsis were identified. After excluding 42 patients who were
159 diagnosed after admission, as well as 7 patients whose 1-year outcome was unknown, 76 patients (31 survivors
160 and 45 deceased) were enrolled.

161

162 Table 1 presents results of univariate analyses of factors related to patient characteristics
163 and clinical scores associated with 1-year outcomes. Survivors included significantly fewer

164 males (S: 35.5% vs. D: 80.0%, $P < 0.0001$); however, there were no significant differences with
165 regard to age, percentage of older patients, history of hospitalization within 1-year, or
166 transfers to other institutions. The arrhythmia ratio was significantly lower among survivors
167 than deceased patients in terms of past medical history (3.2 % vs. 26.7 %, $P = 0.01$). Other
168 medical conditions, however, were statistically equivalent in both groups. While some clinical
169 scores, including SIRS, JAAM DIC, and qSOFA, were the same in both groups, the median
170 values of the APACHEII score (18 vs. 22, $P = 0.02$) and the total SOFA score (5 vs. 8,
171 $P < 0.0001$) were considerably lower among survivors than among deceased patients. SOFA
172 scores for each organ of survivors were significantly lower in the central nervous system
173 (CNS)(1 vs. 2, $P = 0.002$), respiratory system (1 vs. 2, $P = 0.01$), and liver (0 vs. 0, $P = 0.04$),
174 respectively. Additionally, the proportion of failure for each organ was significantly lower in
175 the CNS (16.1% vs. 53.3%, $P = 0.0016$), respiratory system (22.6% vs. 51.1%, $P = 0.01$), and
176 coagulation system (19.4% vs. 51.1%, $P = 0.005$) of survivors compared to deceased patients.
177 Consequently, the incidence of organ failure was significantly lower among survivors (1 vs. 3,
178 $P < 0.0001$).

179

180 **Table 1. Patient characteristics and clinical scores of survivors and deceased patients.**

	Survivors	Deceased	P value
--	-----------	----------	---------

	(n=31)	(n=45)	
Age, y/o, median (IQR)	77 (57-84)	74 (66-81)	0.90
Age>65, n (%)	20 (64.5)	36 (80.0)	0.13
Male, n (%)	11 (35.5)	36 (80.0)	<0.0001
Hospitalization within 1 year, n (%)	11 (35.5)	17 (37.8)	0.84
Transfer cases, n (%)	17 (54.8)	25 (55.6)	0.95

Hypertension, n (%)	16 (51.6)	21 (46.7)	0.67
Arrhythmia, n (%)	1 (3.2)	12 (26.7)	0.01
Cardiovascular disease, n (%)	7 (22.6)	14 (31.1)	0.41
Peripheral vascular disease, n (%)	2 (6.5)	5 (11.1)	0.69
Cerebrovascular disease, n (%)	9 (29.0)	12 (26.7)	0.051
Past			
Diabetes mellitus, n (%)	9 (29.0)	13 (28.9)	0.99
medical			
Gastrointestinal and hepatobiliary	10 (32.3)	11 (24.4)	0.45
history			
disease, n (%)			
Hyperlipidemia, n (%)	6 (19.4)	5 (11.1)	0.34
Malignancy, n (%)	7 (22.6)	14 (31.1)	0.41
Chronic respiratory disease, n (%)	4 (12.9)	7 (15.6)	1.00
Chronic kidney disease, n (%)	6 (19.4)	7 (15.6)	0.67

SIRS score		3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 3)	0.09
JAAM DIC score		4 (2, 6)	4 (2, 7)	0.46
qSOFA score		2 (1, 3)	2 (1, 3)	0.53
APACHEII score		18 (16, 22)	22 (18, 30)	0.02
SOFA score	Total	5 (3, 8)	8 (6, 11)	<0.0001
	CNS	1 (0, 1)	2 (1, 3)	0.002
	CNS \geq 2, n (%)	5 (16.1)	24 (53.3)	0.0016
	Respiration	1 (0, 1)	2 (1, 3)	0.01
	Respiration \geq 2, n (%)	7 (22.6)	23 (51.1)	0.01
	Cardiovascular	0 (0, 3)	0 (0, 3)	0.17
	Cardiovascular \geq 2, n (%)	9 (29.0)	19 (42.2)	0.24
	Renal	1 (0, 2)	2 (1, 2)	0.34
	Renal \geq 2, n (%)	12 (38.7)	24 (53.3)	0.21
	Liver	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 1)	0.04
	Liver \geq 2, n (%)	4 (12.9)	10 (22.2)	0.38
	Coagulation	0 (0, 1)	2 (0, 2)	0.08
	Coagulation \geq 2, n (%)	6 (19.4)	23 (51.1)	0.005
No of Organ Failure		1 (1, 2)	3 (2, 4)	<0.0001

Lactate, mmol/L	3.1 (2.2, 5.0)	5.1 (2.0, 7.1)	0.09
-----------------	----------------	----------------	------

181 The median (IQR) was used to represent continuous variables, whereas number (%) was used for
182 categorical/nominal variables in both groups. The Mann-Whitney U test was utilized for continuous variables,
183 whereas Chi-square and Fisher's exact tests were applied for categorical variables. Statistical significance was
184 defined as $p < 0.05$.

185 S: survivor; D: deceased; IQR: interquartile range; SIRS: systemic inflammatory response syndrome; JAAM:
186 Japanese association for acute medicine; DIC: disseminated intravascular coagulation; qSOFA: quick
187 sequential organ failure assessment; APACHE: acute physiology and chronic health evaluation; CNS: central
188 nervous system.

189

190 Table 2 provides an overview of parameters related to infections. In regard to sepsis-2,
191 survivors had significantly fewer severe cases, such as septic shock ($p=0.02$). Of 76 septic
192 patients with Sepsis-2, 53 patients (69.7%) were diagnosed based on the sepsis-3 definition,
193 with 20 survivors and 33 deceased patients diagnosed with sepsis and septic shock. A similar
194 trend was observed using the sepsis-3-based classification; however, no significant difference
195 was found. Furthermore, there was statistical equality among sources of infection, pathogenic
196 bacteria, and the number of positive blood cultures.

197

198 **Table 2. Indicators on infections and sepsis.**

		S group (n=31)	NS group (n=45)	p value
Sepsis-2 definition	Sepsis, n (%)	11 (35.5)	5 (11.1)	0.02
	Severe sepsis, n (%)	8 (25.8)	11 (24.4)	
	Septic shock, n (%)	12 (38.7)	29 (64.4)	
Sepsis-3 definition	Sepsis, n (%)	8/20 (40.0)	9/33 (27.3)	0.39
	Septic shock, n (%)	12/20 (60.0)	24/33 (72.7)	
Infection sources	Respiratory, n (%)	2 (6.5)	13 (28.9)	0.10
	Urinary, n (%)	10 (32.3)	7 (15.6)	
	Abdominal, n (%)	9 (29.0)	10 (22.2)	
	Soft tissue, n (%)	4 (12.9)	8 (17.8)	
	Others, n (%)	6 (19.4)	7 (15.6)	
Pathogenic bacteria	Gram-positive, n (%)	13 (41.9)	21 (46.7)	0.47
	Gram-negative, n (%)	12 (38.7)	17 (37.8)	
	Mixed-type, n (%)	1 (3.2)	4 (8.9)	
	Not detected, n (%)	5 (16.1)	3 (6.7)	
Positive blood culture, n (%)		4 (15.4)	9 (21.4)	0.54

199 Number (%) was used as categorical/nominal variables in both groups. Chi-square and Fisher's exact tests

200 were applied for categorical variables. Statistical significance was defined as $p < 0.05$.

201 S: survivor; D: deceased.

202

203 Pre-admission comprehensive functional assessment indices are shown in Table 3.

204 Survivors had significantly lower rates of ADL difficulties (25.8% vs. 48.9%, p=0.04) and

205 cognitive impairment (22.6% vs. 46.7%, P=0.03) compared to patients who later deceased.

206 The two groups were statistically similar in terms of IADL difficulties, decreased motivation,

207 emotional disturbance, and Netakiri index.

208

209 **Table 3. Comprehensive functional assessment indices before admission.**

		S group	NS group	P value
		(n=31)	(n=45)	
Pre-admission indicators on the ADL and cognitive-emotional functions	ADL difficulties, n (%)	8 (25.8)	22 (48.9)	0.04
	IADL difficulties, n (%)	20 (64.5)	33 (73.3)	0.41
	Decreased motivation, n (%)	0 (0.0)	4 (8.9)	0.14
	Cognitive impairment, n (%)	7 (22.6)	21 (46.7)	0.03
	Emotional disturbance, n (%)	1 (3.2)	2 (4.4)	1.00
Pre-admission	Rank J, n (%)	10 (32.3)	11 (24.4)	
Levels of bed-ridden degree (“Netakiri”	Rank A, n (%)	14 (45.2)	13 (28.9)	0.13
	Rank B, n (%)	5 (16.1)	10 (22.2)	

 index) Rank C, n (%) 2 (6.5) 11 (24.4)

210 Number (%) was used for categorical/nominal variables in both groups. Chi-square and Fisher’s exact tests
 211 were applied for categorical variables. Statistical significance was defined as $p < 0.05$.

212 S: survivor; D: deceased; ADL: activities of daily living; IADL: instrumental activities of daily living.

213

214 Table 4 provides treatment and clinical outcomes. Survivors had significantly lower rates
 215 of treatment history with catecholamines (51.6% vs. 84.4%, $p=0.002$) and steroids (25.8%
 216 vs. 51.1%, $p=0.03$) than patients who later deceased. No significant differences were found
 217 in other treatments irrespective of 1-year outcome. Survivors showed significant
 218 improvements in clinical outcomes compared to the control group, with longer hospital stays
 219 (28 days vs. 12 days, $p=0.0006$), lower hospital mortality (0.0% vs. 62.2%, $P<0.0001$), and
 220 longer survival time within one year (365 days vs. 15 days, $p<0.0001$).

221

222 **Table 4. Treatments and clinical outcomes.**

	S group (n=31)	NS group (n=45)	P value
Antibiotics, n (%)	31 (100.0)	45 (100.0)	---
Antifungal agents, n (%)	3 (9.7)	6 (13.3)	0.73
Antiviral agents, n (%)	1 (3.2)	1 (2.2)	1.00
Mechanical ventilation, n (%)	11 (35.5)	26 (57.8)	0.06

Renal replacement therapy, n (%)	15 (48.4)	16 (35.6)	0.26
Anti-DIC agents, n (%)	18 (58.1)	26 (57.8)	0.98
Catecholamines, n (%)	16 (51.6)	38 (84.4)	0.002
Steroids, n (%)	8 (25.8)	23 (51.1)	0.03
Insulin use, n (%)	8 (25.8)	11 (24.4)	0.89
Transfusions, n (%)	5 (16.1)	12 (26.7)	0.40
Surgical interventions, n (%)	12 (38.7)	13 (28.9)	0.37

Length of hospital stay, days	28 (15, 69)	12 (3, 24)	0.0006
Hospital mortality, n (%)	0 (0.0)	28 (62.2)	<0.0001
Transferred to the other hospital, n (%)	19 (65.5)	14 (82.4)	0.22
Survival days within 1 year, days	365 (365, 365)	15 (3, 77)	<0.0001

223 Median (IQR) was used to represent continuous variables, whereas number (%) was used for
 224 categorical/nominal variables in both groups. The Mann-Whitney U test was utilized for continuous variables,
 225 whereas Chi-square and Fisher's exact tests were applied for categorical variables. Statistical significance was
 226 defined as $p < 0.05$.

227 S: survivor; D: deceased; IQR: interquartile range; DIC: disseminated intravascular coagulation.

228

229 Next, we focused on cognitive impairment and developed several logistic regression
 230 models using factors that demonstrated significant differences through univariate analysis

231 (Table 5). Remarkably, cognitive impairment was an independent predictor of worse 1-year
 232 survival for all models. For example, in model 3, cognitive impairment was an independent
 233 predictor of a poor outcome after one year (odds ratio 0.184, 95% confidence interval 0.047-
 234 0.722, $p=0.0152$).

235

236 **Table 5. Univariate and multivariate analyses for predicting 1-year survival.**

	Univariate			Multivariate analysis								
	analysis			Model1			Model2			Model3		
	OR	95%CI	P value	OR	95%CI	P value	OR	95%CI	P value	OR	95%CI	P value
Male	0.138	0.049 –	0.0002	0.122	0.040 –	0.0002	0.127	0.040 –	0.0005	0.155	0.046 –	0.0026
		0.388			0.368			0.407			0.522	
Arrhythmia	0.092	0.011 –	0.0257									
		0.748										
APACHEII	0.928	0.866 –	0.0331									
		0.994										
Total	0.73	0.618 –	0.0002									
		0.864										
S	0.168	0.055 –	0.0019									
CNS \geq 2		0.517										
O												
F	0.279	0.100 –	0.0146									
Resp \geq 2		0.778										
A												
Coag \geq 2	0.23	0.079 –	0.0068				0.226	0.067 –	0.0171	0.225	0.062 –	0.0239
		0.666						0.767			0.821	
No of Organ	0.389	0.237 –	0.0002									
Failure		0.638										
Catecholamines	0.196	0.067 –	0.0029							0.2	0.052 –	0.0183
		0.573									0.761	
Steroids	0.333	0.123 –	0.0301									
		0.899										
ADL difficulties	0.364	0.135 –	0.0462									

		0.983																	
Cognitive	0.333	0.120	-	0.0358	0.272	0.084	-	0.0304	0.248	0.072	-	0.0271	0.184	0.047	-	0.0152			
impairment		0.930				0.884				0.854					0.722				

237 Logistic regression analysis was conducted to identify predictors of one-year survival, utilizing cognitive
 238 impairment as well as factors that showed significant differences in the univariate analysis. Several models
 239 were created, and odds ratios were calculated.

240 OR: odds ratio; CI: confidence interval; APACHE: acute physiology and chronic health evaluation; SOFA:
 241 sequential organ failure assessment; CNS: central nervous system; Resp: respiration; Coag: coagulation;
 242 ADL: activities of daily living.

243

244 Based on results of multivariate analysis, we conducted a univariate analysis of the
 245 cognitive impairment (CI) and Control groups (Table 6). The CI group exhibited a
 246 significantly higher proportion of patients over 65 years of age (CI group; 89.3% vs. Control
 247 group; 64.6%, $P=0.03$) and higher APACHEII scores (23 vs. 19, $p=0.008$) than the control
 248 group. Moreover, there were fewer patients who received renal replacement therapy (21.4%
 249 vs. 52.1%, $p=0.009$) or anti-DIC therapy (42.9% vs. 66.7%, $p=0.04$). Surprisingly, the 1-year
 250 survival rate of the CI group was significantly lower than that of the Control group (25.0% vs.
 251 50.0%, $p=0.03$). Cognitive impairment was linked to greater difficulties with ADL (64.3% vs.
 252 25.0%, $p=0.0007$) and IADL (96.4% vs. 54.2%, $p<0.0001$) before hospitalization and a
 253 significantly lower Barthel index upon discharge (0 vs. 45, $p=0.0001$). Furthermore, cognitive
 254 impairment was significantly related to being bedridden, as indicated by the Netakiri index,

255 both before admission and upon discharge. The CI group had a significantly higher
 256 occurrence of the composite outcome, consisting of death at discharge or bedridden status at
 257 discharge, compared to the Control group (100.0% vs. 75.0%, p=0.0028). The log-rank test
 258 revealed a significantly lower survival rate in the CI group as opposed to the Control group
 259 (p=0.0332) (Fig 2).

260

261 **Table 6. Univariate analysis for cognitive impairment between the CI and Control groups.**

	CI group (n=28)	Control group (n=48)	P value
Age > 65 years, n (%)	25 (89.3)	31 (64.6)	0.03
Male, n (%)	18 (64.3)	29 (60.4)	0.74
JAAM DIC score	4 (2, 6)	3 (2, 6)	0.30
APACHEII score	23 (20, 29)	19 (14, 23)	0.008
Total SOFA score	9 (5, 11)	6 (4, 9)	0.07
No of Organ Failure	3 (1, 3)	2 (1, 3)	0.11
Sepsis-2 based Septic shock, n (%)	16 (57.1)	25 (52.1)	0.67
Mechanical ventilation, n (%)	12 (42.9)	25 (52.1)	0.44
Renal replacement therapy, n (%)	6 (21.4)	25 (52.1)	0.009

Anti-DIC therapy, n (%)		12 (42.9)	32 (66.7)	0.04
Catecholamines, n (%)		19 (67.9)	35 (72.9)	0.64
Steroids, n (%)		11 (39.3)	20 (41.7)	0.84
Surgical interventions, n (%)		7 (25.0)	18 (37.5)	0.26

Length of hospital stay, days		15 (6, 33)	18 (8, 44)	0.35
Hospital mortality, n (%)		11 (39.3)	17 (35.4)	0.74
Survival days within 1 year, days		48 (9, 311)	323 (14, 365)	0.06
One-year survival rate, n (%)		7 (25.0)	24 (50.0)	0.03

	ADL difficulties, n (%)	18 (64.3)	12 (25.0)	0.0007
Pre-admission	IADL difficulties, n (%)	27 (96.4)	26 (54.2)	<0.0001
indicators on the	Decreased motivation, n	3 (10.7)	1 (2.1)	0.14
ADL and cognitive-	(%)			
emotional functions	Emotional disturbance, n	1 (3.6)	2 (4.2)	1.00
	(%)			

Barthel Index at	Total	0 (0, 13)	45 (25, 70)	0.0001
discharge				

“Netakiri” index at	Rank J, n (%)	2 (7.1)	19 (39.6)	0.0004
hospitalization	Rank A, n (%)	8 (28.6)	19 (39.6)	

	Rank B, n (%)	8 (28.6)	7 (14.6)	
	Rank C, n (%)	10 (35.7)	3 (6.3)	
	Rank J, n (%)	0 (0.0)	2 (6.5)	0.0008
“Netakiri” index at discharge	Rank A, n (%)	0 (0.0)	10 (32.3)	
	Rank B, n (%)	4 (23.5)	13 (41.9)	
	Rank C, n (%)	13 (76.5)	6 (19.4)	
	Hp-Dead or bedridden-tendency	28 (100.0)	36 (75.0)	0.0028
(composite outcome)				

262 Median (IQR) was used to represent continuous variables, whereas number (%) was used for
 263 categorical/nominal variables in both groups. The Mann-Whitney U test was utilized for continuous variables,
 264 whereas Chi-square and Fisher’s exact tests were applied for categorical variables. Statistical significance was
 265 defined as $p < 0.05$.

266 CI: cognitive impairment; JAAM: Japanese association for acute medicine; DIC: disseminated intravascular
 267 coagulation; APACHE: acute physiology and chronic health evaluation; SOFA: sequential organ failure
 268 assessment; ADL: activities of daily living; IADL: instrumental activities of daily living; Hp: hospital.

269

270 **Fig 2. Cognitive impairment and 1-year mortality.**

271 Survival analysis with the log-rank test demonstrated that the cognitive impairment group had significantly
 272 lower survival.

273

274 Discussion

275 This retrospective study revealed that within a year of hospitalization and treatment for
276 sepsis, 59% of patients died. Cognitive impairment was identified as an independent predictor
277 of unfavorable outcomes one year after sepsis. Sepsis patients with cognitive impairment were
278 more likely to be elderly, had greater clinical severity, and were also more likely to be
279 bedridden and physically impaired. Even if these patients could have been saved, they were
280 all left bedridden at discharge, and their one-year survival rate was only 25%.

281 In this study, 28 patients (36.8%) died during hospitalization, with a median hospital stay
282 of just 12 days, despite receiving intensive sepsis care. Our patient cohort exhibited greater
283 illness severity than the reported Japanese sepsis patient population, with a significantly
284 higher rate of organ support and about twice the mortality rate [18]. It is noteworthy that 17
285 (35.4%) of the 48 patients who were discharged alive from our hospital died within a year of
286 discharge. This suggests that mortality rates remain high throughout the first-year post-sepsis
287 onset, a similar level to that of the acute phase. Wang and colleagues reported an adjusted
288 hazard ratio of 13.07 for sepsis-related death in the first year following a sepsis event,
289 compared to those who had no sepsis [8]. This ratio remains 2-fold higher as much as five
290 years post-event. Moreover, a systematic review and meta-analysis of epidemiological studies
291 revealed a 1-year post-acute mortality rate of 16.1% for sepsis, although these studies showed

292 a high degree of heterogeneity, and a consensus has yet to be reached [6].

293 When interpreting clinical outcomes of sepsis, it is crucial to consider the diverse patient
294 characteristics associated with sepsis. In the present retrospective study, 56 (73.7%) of the 76
295 patients enrolled were elderly, and 60 (78.9%) were diagnosed with severe sepsis and septic
296 shock, based on the sepsis-2 definition. Additionally, there were fewer cases of respiratory
297 infections as sources of sepsis, but more cases of urinary tract and soft tissue infections
298 compared to recent reports from Japan [18, 19]. As we expected, sepsis severity was associated
299 with death within 1-year; however, it was surprising that infection sources, bacterial profiles,
300 and blood culture positivity were not related to long-term outcomes. This suggests that factors
301 other than sepsis severity may significantly affect long-term prognosis following sepsis. Post-
302 intensive care syndrome (PICS) has recently received considerable attention and could be a
303 prominent example of such factors. A single-center prospective study conducted in Japan
304 found that 70% of patients experienced PICS three months after contracting sepsis [20]. The
305 study identified Glasgow coma scale (GCS) on day 7 as an independent, reliable marker for
306 PICS, rather than any variables related to sepsis. We confirmed the potential impact of various
307 multidisciplinary treatments, including administration of catecholamines and steroids, as well
308 as ventilatory management, on long-term prognosis. However, we did not evaluate PICS in
309 our investigation, but we plan to explore further evidence in future studies.

310 The most significant finding of this study is that cognitive impairment prior to admission

311 is an independent predictor of 1-year mortality from sepsis. Little evidence was available
312 regarding the prevalence of cognitive impairment at the time of sepsis [10]. In a prospective
313 cohort study, Iwashyna et al. reported that 6.1% of patients who survived severe sepsis had
314 cognitive impairment before disease onset [10]. Upon admission to our emergency
315 department, 36.8% of patients enrolled in this study had cognitive impairment, which was
316 strongly associated with clinical outcome in sepsis, in contrast to previous reports. Sepsis
317 patients with cognitive impairment were not only older and clinically more severely ill, but
318 they were also significantly associated with poorer ADL and IADL. They tended to be
319 bedridden and had a lower Barthel indices at discharge. Interestingly, all septic patients with
320 cognitive impairment were also bedridden or deceased upon discharge. These results indicate
321 that cognitive impairment in sepsis patients increases the severity of both short-term and
322 long-term outcomes.

323 Furthermore, the issue of cognitive impairment after sepsis is a significant concern for
324 ICU patients. Iwasyna et al. reported that 16.7% of sepsis survivors had moderate to severe
325 cognitive impairment after severe sepsis [10]. A recent systematic review found that cognitive
326 impairment of sepsis survivors ranged from 12.5 to 21% [11]. Pathophysiological changes,
327 such as blood-brain barrier dysregulation, neuroinflammation, neurotransmitter dysfunction,
328 and neuronal loss are thought to be responsible for long-term cognitive impairments [21].
329 More recently, chronic conditions of sepsis-associated encephalopathy have been recognized,

330 including memory impairment, attention deficit, language impairment, and executive
331 dysfunction, which are present in more than half of sepsis survivors at the time of hospital
332 discharge [22].

333 In light of the above, early confirmation as well as post-sepsis follow-up may help to
334 improve long-term outcomes in sepsis patients. When patients with sepsis arrive at the
335 emergency department, it is crucial to assess not only their medical history, medications,
336 family history, and social problems, but also their physical limitations, cognitive impairment,
337 and emotional distress, especially in elderly patients. At the very least, our data suggest that
338 sepsis patients with cognitive impairment are highly prone to be bedridden or dead at hospital
339 discharge. Early rehabilitation is one of the few effective options to prevent patients from
340 becoming bedridden. Recent guidelines on rehabilitation for PICS indicate that cognitive
341 rehabilitation can prevent the onset of PICS and can reduce symptoms such as delirium,
342 attention deficit, memory impairment, executive dysfunction, and spatial cognitive
343 impairment [23]. Additionally, seamless cooperation between inpatient and outpatient
344 rehabilitation programs should not be overlooked. In the present study, the median length of
345 hospital stay was only 16 days, and sepsis patients stay in smaller community hospitals,
346 nursing facilities, or at home for more than 300 days. In the future, it is important for
347 communities to consider consistent rehabilitation for sepsis patients after discharge from the
348 hospital.

349 This study has several limitations. Its small sample size, single-center status, and
350 retrospective nature limit generalizability. In addition, most enrolled sepsis patients were
351 hospitalized based on the sepsis-2 definition. Therefore, results of this study may not be
352 applicable to sepsis-3 patients. All assessments of patient physical difficulties, cognitive
353 impairment, emotional problems, and the Netakiri index were performed by nurses without
354 officially certified assessment tools. This shows that there are limits to the objectivity of
355 assessors.

356

357 **Conclusions**

358 This retrospective study found that 59% of sepsis patients died within 1-year of release from
359 the hospital. Cognitive impairment was the most reliable independent predictor of poor
360 outcomes. Sepsis patients with cognitive impairment are likely to be bedridden or dead at
361 hospital discharge. Future research is warranted regarding early detection of cognitive
362 impairment and effectiveness of rehabilitation programs.

363

364 **Acknowledgments**

365 We thank Steven D. Aird (<https://www.sda-technical-editor.org>) for editing the manuscript.

366

367 **Author contributions**

368 Conceptualization: Hiroyuki Koami, Yutaro Furukawa, Yuichiro Sakamoto.

369 Data curation: Hiroyuki Koami.

370 Formal Analysis: Hiroyuki Koami.

371 Investigation: Hiroyuki Koami.

372 Methodology: Hiroyuki Koami.

373 Project Administration: Hiroyuki Koami, Yuichiro Sakamoto.

374 Supervision: Yuichiro Sakamoto.

375 Validation: Hiroyuki Koami, Ayaka Matsuoka, Kota Shinada.

376 Visualization: Hiroyuki Koami.

377 Writing-Original Draft Preparation: Hiroyuki Koami.

378 Writing-Review & Editing: Yutaro Furukawa, Kosuke Mouri, Ayaka Matsuoka, Kota Shinada,

379 Kento Nakayama, Sachiko Iwanaga, Shogo Narumi, Mayuko Koba, Yuichiro Sakamoto.

380

381 **Data Availability Statement**

382 Datasets generated and/or analyzed during the present study are not publicly available due to

383 ethical restrictions associated with personal information, but anonymized data are available

384 from the corresponding author on request.

385

386 **Conflict of interest statement**

387 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

388

389 **Disclosure**

390 Approval of the research protocol: This study was conducted in accordance with the
391 declaration of Helsinki (Fortaleza, Brazil, October 2013) and was approved by the ethics
392 committee of Saga University Hospital (protocol identification number; 2017-11-R-11).

393 Informed consent: The ethics committee waived the requirement for informed consent due
394 to the retrospective nature of the study.

395

396 **References**

397 1. Fleischmann C, Scherag A, Adhikari NK, Hartog CS, Tsaganos T, Schlattmann P, et al.
398 Assessment of Global Incidence and Mortality of Hospital-treated Sepsis. Current Estimates and
399 Limitations. American journal of respiratory and critical care medicine. 2016;193(3):259-72. doi:
400 10.1164/rccm.201504-0781OC. PubMed PMID: 26414292.

401 2. Dellinger RP, Carlet JM, Masur H, Gerlach H, Calandra T, Cohen J, et al. Surviving

- 402 Sepsis Campaign guidelines for management of severe sepsis and septic shock. *Intensive Care Med.*
403 2004;30(4):536-55. doi: 10.1007/s00134-004-2210-z. PubMed PMID: 14997291.
- 404 3. Angus DC, Carlet J, Brussels Roundtable P. Surviving intensive care: a report from the
405 2002 Brussels Roundtable. *Intensive Care Med.* 2003;29(3):368-77. Epub 20030121. doi:
406 10.1007/s00134-002-1624-8. PubMed PMID: 12536269.
- 407 4. Maley JH, Mikkelsen ME. Short-term Gains with Long-term Consequences: The
408 Evolving Story of Sepsis Survivorship. *Clinics in chest medicine.* 2016;37(2):367-80. Epub
409 20160310. doi: 10.1016/j.ccm.2016.01.017. PubMed PMID: 27229651.
- 410 5. Prescott HC, Angus DC. Enhancing Recovery From Sepsis: A Review. *JAMA : the*
411 *journal of the American Medical Association.* 2018;319(1):62-75. doi: 10.1001/jama.2017.17687.
412 PubMed PMID: 29297082; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5839473.
- 413 6. Shankar-Hari M, Ambler M, Mahalingasivam V, Jones A, Rowan K, Rubenfeld GD.
414 Evidence for a causal link between sepsis and long-term mortality: a systematic review of
415 epidemiologic studies. *Critical care.* 2016;20:101. Epub 20160413. doi: 10.1186/s13054-016-
416 1276-7. PubMed PMID: 27075205; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5831092.
- 417 7. Winters BD, Eberlein M, Leung J, Needham DM, Pronovost PJ, Sevransky JE. Long-
418 term mortality and quality of life in sepsis: a systematic review. *Crit Care Med.* 2010;38(5):1276-
419 83. doi: 10.1097/CCM.0b013e3181d8cc1d. PubMed PMID: 20308885.

- 420 8. Wang HE, Szychowski JM, Griffin R, Safford MM, Shapiro NI, Howard G. Long-term
421 mortality after community-acquired sepsis: a longitudinal population-based cohort study. *BMJ*
422 *open*. 2014;4(1):e004283. Epub 20140117. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2013-004283. PubMed PMID:
423 24441058; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3902401.
- 424 9. Guerra C, Hua M, Wunsch H. Risk of a Diagnosis of Dementia for Elderly Medicare
425 Beneficiaries after Intensive Care. *Anesthesiology*. 2015;123(5):1105-12. doi:
426 10.1097/ALN.0000000000000821. PubMed PMID: 26270938; PubMed Central PMCID:
427 PMC3902401.
- 428 10. Iwashyna TJ, Ely EW, Smith DM, Langa KM. Long-term cognitive impairment and
429 functional disability among survivors of severe sepsis. *JAMA : the journal of the American Medical*
430 *Association*. 2010;304(16):1787-94. doi: 10.1001/jama.2010.1553. PubMed PMID: 20978258;
431 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3345288.
- 432 11. Calsavara AJC, Nobre V, Barichello T, Teixeira AL. Post-sepsis cognitive impairment
433 and associated risk factors: A systematic review. *Australian critical care : official journal of the*
434 *Confederation of Australian Critical Care Nurses*. 2018;31(4):242-53. Epub 20170620. doi:
435 10.1016/j.aucc.2017.06.001. PubMed PMID: 28645546.
- 436 12. Needham DM, Colantuoni E, Dinglas VD, Hough CL, Wozniak AW, Jackson JC, et al.
437 Rosuvastatin versus placebo for delirium in intensive care and subsequent cognitive impairment

- 438 in patients with sepsis-associated acute respiratory distress syndrome: an ancillary study to a
439 randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Respir Med.* 2016;4(3):203-12. Epub 20160129. doi:
440 10.1016/S2213-2600(16)00005-9. PubMed PMID: 26832963; PubMed Central PMCID:
441 PMCPMC4792772.
- 442 13. Ehlenbach WJ, Gilmore-Bykovskiy A, Repplinger MD, Westergaard RP, Jacobs EA, Kind
443 AJH, et al. Sepsis Survivors Admitted to Skilled Nursing Facilities: Cognitive Impairment,
444 Activities of Daily Living Dependence, and Survival. *Crit Care Med.* 2018;46(1):37-44. doi:
445 10.1097/CCM.0000000000002755. PubMed PMID: 28991827; PubMed Central PMCID:
446 PMCPMC5858875.
- 447 14. Iba T, Nisio MD, Levy JH, Kitamura N, Thachil J. New criteria for sepsis-induced
448 coagulopathy (SIC) following the revised sepsis definition: a retrospective analysis of a nationwide
449 survey. *BMJ open.* 2017;7(9):e017046. Epub 2017/10/01. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-017046.
450 PubMed PMID: 28963294; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5623518.
- 451 15. Gando S, Iba T, Eguchi Y, Ohtomo Y, Okamoto K, Koseki K, et al. A multicenter,
452 prospective validation of disseminated intravascular coagulation diagnostic criteria for critically ill
453 patients: comparing current criteria. *Crit Care Med.* 2006;34(3):625-31. PubMed PMID:
454 16521260.
- 455 16. Singer M, Deutschman CS, Seymour CW, Shankar-Hari M, Annane D, Bauer M, et al.

- 456 The Third International Consensus Definitions for Sepsis and Septic Shock (Sepsis-3). JAMA :
457 the journal of the American Medical Association. 2016;315(8):801-10. doi:
458 10.1001/jama.2016.0287. PubMed PMID: 26903338.
- 459 17. Levy MM, Fink MP, Marshall JC, Abraham E, Angus D, Cook D, et al. 2001
460 SCCM/ESICM/ACCP/ATS/SIS International Sepsis Definitions Conference. Crit Care Med.
461 2003;31(4):1250-6. doi: 10.1097/01.CCM.0000050454.01978.3B. PubMed PMID: 12682500.
- 462 18. Imaeda T, Oami T, Takahashi N, Saito D, Higashi A, Nakada TA. Epidemiology of sepsis
463 in a Japanese administrative database. Acute Med Surg. 2023;10(1):e890. Epub 20231012. doi:
464 10.1002/ams2.890. PubMed PMID: 37841963; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC10570497.
- 465 19. Wada T, Yamakawa K, Kabata D, Abe T, Ogura H, Shiraishi A, et al. Age-related
466 differences in the survival benefit of the administration of antithrombin, recombinant human
467 thrombomodulin, or their combination in sepsis. Scientific reports. 2022;12(1):9304. Epub
468 20220603. doi: 10.1038/s41598-022-13346-3. PubMed PMID: 35660774; PubMed Central
469 PMCID: PMCPMC9166729.
- 470 20. Inoue S, Nakanishi N, Sugiyama J, Moriyama N, Miyazaki Y, Sugimoto T, et al.
471 Prevalence and Long-Term Prognosis of Post-Intensive Care Syndrome after Sepsis: A Single-
472 Center Prospective Observational Study. J Clin Med. 2022;11(18). Epub 20220906. doi:
473 10.3390/jcm11185257. PubMed PMID: 36142904; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC9505847.

- 474 21. Li Y, Ji M, Yang J. Current Understanding of Long-Term Cognitive Impairment After
475 Sepsis. *Front Immunol.* 2022;13:855006. Epub 20220506. doi: 10.3389/fimmu.2022.855006.
476 PubMed PMID: 35603184; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC9120941.
- 477 22. Chung HY, Wickel J, Brunkhorst FM, Geis C. Sepsis-Associated Encephalopathy: From
478 Delirium to Dementia? *J Clin Med.* 2020;9(3). Epub 20200305. doi: 10.3390/jcm9030703.
479 PubMed PMID: 32150970; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7141293.
- 480 23. Renner C, Jeitziner MM, Albert M, Brinkmann S, Diserens K, Dzialowski I, et al.
481 Guideline on multimodal rehabilitation for patients with post-intensive care syndrome. *Critical*
482 *care.* 2023;27(1):301. Epub 20230731. doi: 10.1186/s13054-023-04569-5. PubMed PMID:
483 37525219; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC10392009.
484





Figure 1



No. at risk

Cognitive
Impairment

28

14

10

8

8

8

8

Control

48

31

30

27

26

25

25

Figure 2