



Article New Evidence of Potential Benefits of Dexamethasone and Added on Therapy of Fludrocortisone on Clinical Outcomes of Corticosteroid in Sepsis Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Ji-young Son ¹, Sooyoung Shin ^{2,3,*} and Yeo Jin Choi ^{4,*}

- ¹ Department of Clinical Pharmacy, Graduate School of Pharmacy, CHA University, Seongnam 13488, Korea; a01077218649@gmail.com
- ² Department of Clinical Pharmacy, College of Pharmacy, Ajou University, Suwon 16499, Korea
- ³ Research Institute of Pharmaceutical Science and Technology (RIPST), Ajou University, Suwon 16499, Korea
 ⁴ Department of Clinical Pharmacy, Graduate School of Clinical Pharmacy, CHA University,
 - Seongnam 13488, Korea
- ^{*} Correspondence: syshin@ajou.ac.kr (S.S.); yjchoi@cha.ac.kr (Y.J.C.); Tel.: +82-31-219-3456 (S.S.); +82-31-881-7187 (Y.J.C.)

Abstract: The aim of this study is to investigate clinical outcomes of corticosteroid treatment in patients with sepsis or septic shock. An electronic keyword searches of PubMed, EMBASE, and Google Scholar were conducted per PRISMA guidelines. The pooled analyses on the corticosteroid impact on mortality, adverse events, and clinical outcomes were performed. Subgroup analyses on the clinical outcomes in relation to corticosteroid dose, duration, and agents were performed. Pooled analyses of 21 randomized control trials revealed substantially reduced mortality (RR 0.93, 95% CI 0.88–0.99, *p* = 0.02) and length of stay in intensive care unit (SMD -1.66, 95% CI -1.91--1.40, *p* < 0.00001) without increased risks of adverse events (RR 1.04, 95% CI 0.96–1.12, *p* = 0.38). No significant improvements of other clinical outcomes were observed. Subgroup analyses demonstrated substantially reduced mortality with short-term (\leq 7 days) low-dose (<400 mg/day) corticosteroid treatment (RR 0.91, 95% CI 0.87–0.95, *p* < 0.0001). Moreover, dexamethasone (RR 0.40, 95% CI 0.20–0.81, *p* = 0.01) and combined hydrocortisone and fludrocortisone treatment (RR 0.89, 95% CI 0.84–0.94, *p* < 0.00001) provided substantial reduction of mortality whereas hydrocortisone alone did not reduce the mortality risk in sepsis patients. Thus, further controlled studies on the clinical outcomes of potential corticosteroid options on sepsis-related clinical outcomes are warranted.

Keywords: corticosteroid; dexamethasone; fludrocortisone; mortality; sepsis; septic shock

1. Introduction

Sepsis is classified as systemic inflammatory responses to infection manifested by innate immune system activation, which subsequently induces life-threatening organ dysfunction or septic shock [1]. The number of incident sepsis steadily increases each year, affecting approximately 48.9 million patients worldwide [1]. The deleterious features of sepsis involving responses from vascular, immune, platelets, and plasma protein substantially increase the risk for mortality, which is estimated to be 30–50% [2]. Sepsis is considered as the leading cause of in-hospital death, and 11.0 million sepsis-related mortality was reported in 2017 [2]. However, underestimation of sepsis-related mortality is anticipated as data on incidence and mortality of sepsis in low- and middle-income countries are limited [1].

The major pathophysiological components of sepsis include cytokine-mediated inflammation, endothelial injury, vasodilation, and hypercoagulability; nevertheless, the recommended treatment modalities mainly include broad-spectrum antibiotics for infection,



Citation: Son, J.-y.; Shin, S.; Choi, Y.J. New Evidence of Potential Benefits of Dexamethasone and Added on Therapy of Fludrocortisone on Clinical Outcomes of Corticosteroid in Sepsis Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J. Pers. Med.* **2021**, *11*, 544. https://doi.org/ 10.3390/jpm11060544

Academic Editor: Roberto Díaz Peña

Received: 12 May 2021 Accepted: 10 June 2021 Published: 11 June 2021

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright: © 2021 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by/ 4.0/). fluid resuscitation, along with vasopressor to ameliorate hemodynamic imbalance [2,3]. The current guideline, Surviving Sepsis Campaign, published by Society of Critical Care Medicine and European Society of Intensive Care Medicine, encourages intravenous antibiotic initiation within an hour of recognition of sepsis or septic shock, as early antibiotic administration reduces infection-mediated inflammation, thereby improving survival [4]. A previous study also revealed 7.6% reduction in survival for every hour of delay in antibiotic initiation [4,5]. Nonetheless, the sepsis-related mortality still remains high despite appropriate treatment, implying the need for discovery of therapeutic agent that may improve clinical outcomes in sepsis patients.

The current guideline recommends low dose (<400 mg, typically 200–300 mg/day) hydrocortisone only in sepsis patients with adrenal insufficiency or refractory hypotension defined as systolic blood pressure <90 mmHg notwithstanding appropriate fluid resuscitation and vasopressor treatment [4,6,7]. However, previous studies evaluating corticosteroid-related clinical outcomes in sepsis patients provided controversial results regardless of strong immunosuppressive anti-inflammatory activity [8–10]. Moreover, these studies recruited critically-ill patients with diagnosis other than sepsis, which may impede clinical outcomes of these results. Therefore, the objective of this study is to evaluate clinical outcomes of corticosteroids in sepsis and septic shock patients by performing pooled analyses of double-blinded, placebo-controlled randomized trials investigating efficacy and safety of corticosteroids.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Search Strategy and Study Selection

This study was prepared according to Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines [11]. A systematic literature search of PubMed, Embase, and Google Scholar was performed to identify randomized clinical trials evaluating clinical outcomes including efficacy and safety of corticosteroid in sepsis patients (from inception to October 2020). The methods of initial database search include a combination of keywords and Medical Subject Headings including 'corticosteroids', 'steroids', 'sepsis', and 'septic shock' in title/abstracts. Reference lists of studies eligible for full-text review were further screened to identify eligible studies. Two reviewers (JS and YJC) searched electronic databases and identified eligible clinical trials, and any disagreements regarding study selection were resolved by the third person (Shin). The eligibility of studies was determined by prespecified inclusion criteria: (1) patients aged >17 years who had primary diagnosis of sepsis or septic shock, (2) double-blinded, placebo-controlled randomized controlled trials (RCTs) comparing clinical outcomes of corticosteroid (intervention) over comparator (placebo), (3) studies that assessed outcomes of interests, and (4) studies published in English. Review articles, meta-analyses, duplicate studies, conference abstracts, proceedings, case reports, editorials, studies without full-texts, and studies written in languages other than English were excluded. Additionally, any studies that recruited patients with primary diagnoses other than sepsis such as acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) or systemic inflammatory response syndromes (SIRS) were excluded. The primary outcomes of interest include mortality defined as death after randomization and adverse events (AEs) including gastrointestinal bleeding, hyperglycemia, and secondary infection after corticosteroid treatment. The secondary outcomes of interest include duration of mechanical ventilation, organ failures, respiratory failures, length of stay in hospital or intensive care unit (ICU), and reversal of shock. Two reviewers extracted study characteristics including first author; publication year; intervention regimen, duration, and dose; comparator; patient inclusion criteria; and outcomes of interest, and the doses of corticosteroids were converted into hydrocortisone equivalent dose.

2.2. Risk of Bias Assessment

The risk of bias assessment of included studies was evaluated by Cochrane Risk of Bias [12], and studies were scored as low, unclear, or high in the following features: randomization sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of participants and personnel, blinding of outcome assessment, incomplete outcome data, selective reporting, and other potential bias such as differences in baseline characteristics. Any disagreements on the study quality assessment were discussed until a consensus was reached. The funnel plots and Egger's test were utilized to detect publication bias: a symmetric funnel plot and p > 0.05 from Egger's test imply a low risk of publication bias.

2.3. Statistical Analysis

Pooled analyses of the outcomes of interest were conducted using RevMan (Review Manager Version 5.4, The Nordic Cochrane Center, The Cochrane Collaboration, Copenhagen, Denmark, 2020). The effect size of continuous variables such as length of stay in hospital or ICU and duration of mechanical ventilation were presented as weight standard mean differences (SMD) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs). The dichotomous variables including mortality, organ failure, respiratory failure, reversal of shock, and AEs were evaluated with relative risks (RR) and 95% CIs. Studies that measured mortality at multiple time points were analyzed as separate mortality cases. I^2 index was utilized to determine heterogeneity across the studies, and Mantel-Haenszel fixed-effect model was used to analyze outcomes with low heterogeneity ($I^2 < 50\%$) while the random-effect model was performed to analyze outcomes with high heterogeneity $(I^2 > 50\%)$ [13]. Subgroup analyses were performed to identify factors affecting corticosteroid-related clinical outcomes and 2 factors were analyzed: (1) treatment regimen in consideration of treatment duration (\leq 7 days or >7 days) and corticosteroid dose (hydrocortisone equivalent dose <400 mg/day or $\geq 400 \text{ mg/day}$ and (2) corticosteroid regimens including hydrocortisone, hydrocortisone with fludrocortisone, dexamethasone, methylprednisolone, and prednisolone. Any studies not meeting the criteria of subgroup analyses were excluded from the analyses. *p*-values were estimated by two-sided tests and any *p*-values < 0.05were considered statistically significant.

3. Results

3.1. Study Selection and Characteristics

The primary database search yielded 2325 studies, and 52 studies were eligible for full-text review (Figure 1). Thirty-one studies were excluded after full text-review and a total of 21 RCTs evaluating the effects of corticosteroids in 8127 sepsis patients (4054 on corticosteroid and 4073 on placebo) were included in the analysis. The study characteristics of eligible studies are described in Table 1. Thirteen studies administered hydrocortisone [14–26], two studies administered hydrocortisone and fludrocortisone [27,28], two studies administered dexamethasone [29,30], and four studies administered methyl-prednisolone [30–33], and two studies administered prednisolone [34,35]. All patients included in this analysis were diagnosed with sepsis [17,19–21,24,25,28,31,33–35] or septic shock [14–16,18,20,22–24,26–30,32]. The quality assessment results are described in Supplementary Table S1 and the risk of bias was generally acceptable as implied by symmetric funnel plots and Egger's test results (p > 0.05 for all outcomes) (Supplementary Figure S1).



Figure 1. PRISMA Plot.

Author (Year)	Author (Year) Treatment (N) Control (N)		Inclusion Criteria	Dose	Hydrocortisone Equivalent (mg/Day)	Duration (Day)	Outcomes	
Bollaert PE et al., (1998) [14]	Hydrocortisone (N = 22)	Placebo (N = 19)	Septic shock requiring catecholamine for >48 h	300 mg IV/day	300	<5	Mortality	
Briegel J et al., (1999) [15]	Hydrocortisone (N = 20)	Placebo (N = 20)	Adult patients who met ACCP/SCCM criteria for septic shock	100 mg (loading dose within 30 min) followed by a continuous infusion of 0.18 mg/kg/h (sepsis) or 0.08 mg/kg/h (septic shock) for 6 days	359.2	4–8	Mortality Secondary infection Mechanical ventilation LOS in ICU	
Confalonieri M et al., (2005) [17]	Hydrocortisone (N = 23)	Placebo (N = 23)	Adult patients diagnosed with sepsis	200 mg (IV bolus) followed by 10 mg/h for 7 days	440	7	Mortality LOS in ICU LOS in hospital Mechanical ventilation ARDS Secondary infection Respiratory failure Organ failure Gastrointestinal bleeding	
Briegel J et al., (2001) [16]	Hydrocortisone (N = 12)	Placebo (N = 12)	Patients with septic shock	Infusion of 100 mg of hydrocortisone, followed by 0.18 mg/kg/h	359.2	<6	Mortality	
Kaufmann I et al., (2008) [18]	Hydrocortisone (N = 15)	Placebo (N = 15)	Patients admitted to ICU and met criteria for septic shock	(continuous infusion) 100 mg (IV bolus), followed by 10 mg/h (continuous infusion)	340	1	Organ failure Respiratory failure	
Keh D et al.,/ HYPRESS study (2016) [19]	Hydrocortisone (N = 171)	Placebo (N = 172)	Sepsis patients >18 years	200 mg/day (continuous infusion) for 5 days, 100 mg (day 6 and 7), 50 mg (day 8 and 9), on days 8 and 9, and 25 mg (day 10 and 11)	200	5–11	Mortality LOS in ICU LOS in hospital Mechanical ventilation Secondary infection Respiratory failure Organ failure	

Table 1. Characteristics of the 21 clinical trials included in the meta-analysis on clinical outcomes of corticosteroids.

Author (Year) Treatment (N)		Control (N)	Inclusion Criteria	lusion Criteria Dose		Duration (Day)	Outcomes
Lv QQ et al., (2017) [26]	Hydrocortisone (N = 58)	Placebo (N = 60)	Age 18 years old or older, onset of septic shock within 6 h	200 mg/day	200	6	Mortality LOS in ICU LOS in hospital Reversal of shock
Moreno R et al.,/CROTICUS (2011) [20]	Hydrocortisone (N = 251)	Placebo (N = 248)	Patients >18 years diagnosed with sepsis or septic shock	50 mg (IV bolus every 6 h for 5 days), 50 mg (IV every 12 h for days 6–8), 50 mg (IV every 24 h for days 9–11) 50 mg (IV hele)	200	11	Organ failure Respiratory failure
Oppert M et al., (2005) [21]	Hydrocortisone (N = 18)	Placebo (N = 23)	Adult patients met criteria for sepsis	50 mg (IV bolus) followed by 0.18 mg/kg body of weight/h (continuous infusion)	309.2	No record	Mortality
Schelling G et al., (2001) [22]	Hydrocortisone (N = 9)	Placebo (N = 11)	Adult patients with hyperdynamic septic shock	100 mg IV, 0.18 mg/kg/h	359.2	6	LOS in ICU Respiratory failure
Sprung CL et al., (2008) [23]	Hydrocortisone (N = 251)	Placebo (N = 248)	Adults septic shock patients	50 mg of IV every 6 h for 5 days; dose-tapering for 6 days	200	11	Mortality LOS in ICU LOS in hospital Secondary infection Respiratory failure Reversal of shock Gastrointestinal bleedin
Tongyoo S et al., (2016) [24]	Hydrocortisone (N = 98)	Placebo (N = 99)	Age ≥18 years meeting the criteria for severe sepsis or septic shock	50 mg per 6 h (200 mg/day)	200	7	Organ failure Mortality Mechanical ventilatior Mechanical ventilation-free time Secondary infection Hyperglycemia Gastrointestinal bleedin

Table 1. Cont.

			Tab	le 1. <i>Cont.</i>			
Author (Year)	Treatment (N)	Control (N)	Inclusion Criteria	Dose	Hydrocortisone Equivalent (mg/Day)	Duration (Day)	Outcomes
Venkatesh B et al., Hydrocortisone Placebo (2018) [25] (N = 1853) (N = 1860)			Sepsis adult patients (>18 years)	200 mg/day	200	≤7	Mortality Resolution of shock Reversal of shock LOS in ICU LOS in hospital Mechanical ventilation-free time Secondary infection Gastrointestinal bleeding
Annane D et al., (2002) [28]	Hydrocortisone and Fludrocortisone (N = 150)	Placebo (N = 149)	Adults (18 years or older) and hospitalized in ICU with sepsis/septic shock	Hydrocortisone (50 mg IV bolus every 6 h) and fludrocortisone (50 μg tablet once daily)	200.5	7	Mortality Secondary infection Gastrointestinal bleeding
Annane D et al., (2018) [27]	Hydrocortisone and Fludrocortisone (N = 614)	Placebo (N = 627)	Indisputable or probable septic shock patients	Hydrocortisone 50 mg IV every 6 h, fludrocortisone 50 μg tablet/day for 7 days	200.5	7	Mortality Mechanical ventilation
Cicarelli DD et al., (2007) [29]	Dexamethasone (N = 15)	Placebo (N = 15)	Septic shock patients aged ≥18 years and admitted to ICU	0.2 mg/kg IV at intervals of 36 h (total 3 doses)	640	4.5	Mortality Mechanical ventilation
Schumer W et al., (1976) [30]	Dexamethasone (N = 43)	Placebo (N = 86)	Septic shock	3 mg/kg	480	No record	Mortality
(1970) [30]	Methylprednisolone (N = 43)	Placebo (N = 86)	Septic shock	30 mg/kg	900	No record	Mortality
Bone RC et al., (1987) [31]	Methylprednisolone (N = 191)	Placebo (N = 190)	Adult patients with infection plus the presence of fever or hypothermia, organ dysfunction	$30 \text{ mg/kg} \times 4 \text{ doses}$	36,000	1	Mortality Reversal of shock Secondary infection
Luce JM et al., (1988) [32]	Methylprednisolone (N = 38)	Placebo (N = 37)	Patients with septic shock and ARDS	30 mg/kg, 1800 mg/60 kg × 4 doses	36,000	1	ARDS Total mortality Hyperglycemia Secondary infection

	Table 1. Cont.										
Author (Year)	Treatment (N)	Control (N)	Inclusion Criteria	Dose	Hydrocortisone Equivalent (mg/Day)	Duration (Day)	Outcomes				
VASSCSG (1987) [33]	Methylprednisolone (N = 112)	Placebo (N = 111)	Systemic sepsis patients	30 mg/kg followed by infusion of 5 mg/kg	22,500	1	Mortality				
Yildiz O et al., (2002) [34]	Prednisolone (N = 20)	Placebo $(N = 20)$	>17 years old and sepsis	5 mg IV at 06:00 am and 2.5 mg IV at 18:00 for 10 days	30	10	LOS in hospital Secondary infection Mortality				
Yildiz O et al., (2011) [35]	Prednisolone (N = 27)	Placebo (N = 28)	Patients >17 years and diagnosed with sepsis	20 mg/day	80	10	Mortality				

Abbreviations: ARDS: acute respiratory distress syndrome, CORTICUS: The corticosteroid therapy of septic shock, HYPRESS: The Hydrocortisone for Prevention of Septic Shock, ICU: intensive care unit, IV: intravenous LOS: length of stay.

3.2. Clinical Outcomes

Corticosteroid treatment substantially reduced mortality (RR 0.93, 95% CI 0.88–0.99, p = 0.02), especially 28-day mortality (RR 0.86, 95% CI 0.76–0.98, p = 0.02) and long-term mortality defined as >28-day mortality (RR 0.92, 95% CI 0.87–0.98, p = 0.005) in patients diagnosed with sepsis or septic shock (Figure 2). Corticosteroid also reduced the length of stay in ICU (SMD –1.66, 95% CI –1.91–– 1.40, p < 0.00001) (Figure 3). Meanwhile, no substantial benefits of other clinical outcomes including length of stay in hospital (SMD –1.70, 95% CI –8.41–5.01, p = 0.62), organ failure (RR 1.02, 95% CI 0.66–1.59, p = 0.93), respiratory failure (RR 1.01, 95% CI 0.89–1.14, p = 0.88, reversal of shock (RR 0.91, 95% CI 0.79–1.05, p = 0.18), and mechanical ventilation duration (SMD –0.58, 95% CI –2.64–1.47, p = 0.58) were noticed (Table 2).

Study or Subgroup	Corticost Events		Cont Events		Weight	Risk Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	Risk Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl
1.1.1 < 28-day mortality	Litenta	Total	LTOIRS	rotal	requit	in Ar Nandolli, 55/0 Cl	
Bone RC et al. (1987)	65	191	48	190	2.7%	1.35 [0.98, 1.84]	
Cicarelli DD et al. (2007)	3	14	10	150	0.3%	0.32 [0.11, 0.93]	
ASSCSG (1987)	23	112	24	111	1.2%	0.95 [0.57, 1.58]	
ubtotal (95% CI)	25	317	24	316	4.1%	0.90 [0.49, 1.64]	•
otal events	91	517	82	510	-4.170	0.30 [0.43, 1.04]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.19;		df = 0.75		18 - 72	04		
est for overall effect: Z = 0.			- 0.03,	.1 - 72	. 70		
1.1.2 28-day mortality							
Annane D et al. (2002)	82	150	91	149	5.2%	0.90 [0.74, 1.09]	-
Annane D et al. (2018)	207	614	244	627	6.9%	0.87 [0.75, 1.00]	-
Bollaert PE et al. (1998)	7	22	12	19	0.6%	0.50 [0.25, 1.02]	
Briegel J et al. (1999)	4	20	6	20	0.3%	0.67 [0.22, 2.01]	
Cicarelli DD et al. (2007)	7	14	12	15	0.9%	0.63 [0.35, 1.12]	
(eh D et al. (2016)	15	171	14	170	0.7%	1.07 [0.53, 2.14]	
v QQ et al. (2017)	23	58	19	60	1.3%	1.25 [0.77, 2.04]	
Oppert M et al. (2005)	7	18	11	23	0.6%	0.81 [0.40, 1.67]	
Schumer W et al. (1976)	5	43	33	86	0.4%	0.30 [0.13, 0.72]	
Schumer W et al. (1976a)	4	43	33	86	0.3%	0.24 [0.09, 0.64]	
Sprung CL et al. (2008)	86	251	78	248	3.7%	1.09 [0.85, 1.40]	+-
Fongyoo S et al. (2016)	22	98	27	99	1.3%	0.82 [0.50, 1.34]	
/enkatesh B et al. (2018)	410	1841	448	1840	8.3%	0.91 [0.81, 1.03]	-
(ildiz O et al. (2002)	8	20	12	20	0.8%	0.67 [0.35, 1.27]	
(ildiz O et al. (2011)	16	27	15	28	1.4%	1.11 [0.69, 1.76]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		3390		3490	32.7%	0.86 [0.76, 0.98]	•
Total events	903		1055				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.02;		5 df=14		16): I ² =	41%		
Fest for overall effect: Z = 2.			() = 0.		41.20		
	.20 () = 0.01	-/					
1.1.3 > 28-day mortality							
	102	150	112	149	7.1%	0.90 [0.78, 1.04]	-
Annane D et al. (2002)	102 264	150 614	112 308			0.90 [0.78, 1.04] 0.88 [0.78, 0.99]	-
Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2018)	264	614	308	627	8.1%	0.88 [0.78, 0.99]	-
Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2018) Annane D et al. (2018)						0.88 [0.78, 0.99] 0.89 [0.79, 1.00]	* * *
Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2018) Annane D et al. (2018) Keh D et al. (2016)	264 285	614 611	308 328	627 625	8.1% 8.5% 1.4%	0.88 (0.78, 0.99) 0.89 (0.79, 1.00) 1.19 (0.76, 1.88)	+ + +
Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2018) Annane D et al. (2018) Keh D et al. (2016) Keh D et al. (2016)	264 285 34 45	614 611 171 168	308 328 28 37	627 625 168 167	8.1% 8.5% 1.4% 2.0%	0.88 (0.78, 0.99) 0.89 (0.79, 1.00) 1.19 (0.76, 1.88) 1.21 (0.83, 1.77)	
Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2018) Annane D et al. (2018) Keh D et al. (2016) Keh D et al. (2016) Fongyoo S et al. (2016)	264 285 34 45 34	614 611 171 168 98	308 328 28 37 40	627 625 168 167 99	8.1% 8.5% 1.4% 2.0% 2.1%	0.88 (0.78, 0.99) 0.89 (0.79, 1.00) 1.19 (0.76, 1.88) 1.21 (0.83, 1.77) 0.86 (0.60, 1.23)	
Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2018) Annane D et al. (2018) Keh D et al. (2016) Keh D et al. (2016) Fongyoo S et al. (2016) /enkatesh B et al. (2018)	264 285 34 45	614 611 171 168 98 1832	308 328 28 37 40	627 625 168 167 99 1826	8.1% 8.5% 1.4% 2.0% 2.1% 9.0%	0.88 (0.78, 0.99) 0.89 (0.79, 1.00) 1.19 (0.76, 1.88) 1.21 (0.83, 1.77) 0.86 (0.60, 1.23) 0.97 (0.87, 1.07)	
Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2018) Annane D et al. (2018) Ceh D et al. (2016) Ceh D et al. (2016) Fongyoo S et al. (2016) Penkatesh B et al. (2018) Subtotal (95% CI)	264 285 34 45 34 511	614 611 171 168 98	308 328 28 37 40 526	627 625 168 167 99	8.1% 8.5% 1.4% 2.0% 2.1%	0.88 (0.78, 0.99) 0.89 (0.79, 1.00) 1.19 (0.76, 1.88) 1.21 (0.83, 1.77) 0.86 (0.60, 1.23)	
Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2018) Annane D et al. (2018) Keh D et al. (2016) Keh D et al. (2016) Fongyoo S et al. (2016) /enkatesh B et al. (2018) Subtotal (95% CI) Fotal events	264 285 34 45 34 511 1275	614 611 171 168 98 1832 3644	308 328 28 37 40 526 1379	627 625 168 167 99 1826 3661	8.1% 8.5% 1.4% 2.0% 2.1% 9.0% 38.3%	0.88 (0.78, 0.99) 0.89 (0.79, 1.00) 1.19 (0.76, 1.88) 1.21 (0.83, 1.77) 0.86 (0.60, 1.23) 0.97 (0.87, 1.07)	
Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2018) Annane D et al. (2018) Ceh D et al. (2016) Ceh D et al. (2016) Fongyoo S et al. (2016) Penkatesh B et al. (2018) Subtotal (95% CI)	264 285 34 45 34 511 1275 ; Chi² = 5.55	614 611 171 168 98 1832 3644 , df = 6 (F	308 328 28 37 40 526 1379	627 625 168 167 99 1826 3661	8.1% 8.5% 1.4% 2.0% 2.1% 9.0% 38.3%	0.88 (0.78, 0.99) 0.89 (0.79, 1.00) 1.19 (0.76, 1.88) 1.21 (0.83, 1.77) 0.86 (0.60, 1.23) 0.97 (0.87, 1.07)	
innane D et al. (2002) innane D et al. (2018) ionnane D et al. (2018) (eh D et al. (2016) (eh D et al. (2016) 'ongyoo S et al. (2016) 'enkatesh B et al. (2018) iubtotal (95% CI) 'otal events leterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; 'est for overall effect: Z = 2.	264 285 34 45 34 511 1275 ; Chi² = 5.55	614 611 171 168 98 1832 3644 , df = 6 (F	308 328 28 37 40 526 1379	627 625 168 167 99 1826 3661	8.1% 8.5% 1.4% 2.0% 2.1% 9.0% 38.3%	0.88 (0.78, 0.99) 0.89 (0.79, 1.00) 1.19 (0.76, 1.88) 1.21 (0.83, 1.77) 0.86 (0.60, 1.23) 0.97 (0.87, 1.07)	
Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2018) (annane D et al. (2018) (ah D et al. (2016) (ah D et al. (2016) (ankatesh B et al. (2016) (ankatesh B et al. (2018) Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events 4eterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Fest for overall effect: Z = 2: 1.1.4 Unspecified Annane D et al. (2002)	264 285 34 45 34 511 1275 (Chi [≈] = 5.55 .81 (P = 0.00	614 611 171 168 98 1832 3644 3644 05) 150	308 328 28 37 40 526 1379 2 = 0.48;	627 625 168 167 99 1826 3661 ; = 09	8.1% 8.5% 1.4% 2.0% 2.1% 9.0% 38.3% %	0.88 [0.78, 0.99] 0.89 [0.79, 1.00] 1.19 [0.76, 1.88] 1.21 [0.83, 1.77] 0.86 [0.60, 1.23] 0.97 [0.87, 107] 0.92 [0.87, 0.98]	
Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2018) Annane D et al. (2018) Keh D et al. (2016) Keh D et al. (2016) Yenkatesh B et al. (2016) Yenkatesh B et al. (2018) Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Test for overall effect: Z = 2; I.1.4 Unspecified	264 285 34 45 34 511 1275 ; Chi [≠] = 5.55 .81 (P = 0.00	614 611 171 168 98 1832 3644 05) 150 150	308 328 28 37 40 526 1379 P = 0.48) 2 = 0.48) 103 101	627 625 168 167 99 1826 3661 ; I ² = 09 149 149	8.1% 8.5% 1.4% 2.0% 2.1% 9.0% 38.3% 6.3% 6.0%	0.88 [0.78, 0.99] 0.89 [0.79, 1.00] 1.19 [0.76, 1.88] 1.21 [0.83, 1.77] 0.86 [0.60, 1.23] 0.97 [0.87, 1.07] 0.92 [0.87, 0.98]	
Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2018) Annane D et al. (2018) Keh D et al. (2016) Keh D et al. (2016) Yenkatesh B et al. (2016) Yenkatesh B et al. (2018) Subtotal (95% C) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Test for overall effect: Z = 2; I.1.4 Unspecified Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2002) Striggel J et al. (1939)	264 285 34 45 34 511 1275 ; Chi² = 5.55 .81 (P = 0.00 95 90 4	614 611 171 168 98 1832 3644 05) 150 150 20	308 328 28 37 40 526 1379 P = 0.48) P = 0.48) 103 101 6	627 625 168 167 99 1826 3661 ; I [*] = 09 149 149 20	8.1% 8.5% 1.4% 2.0% 2.1% 9.0% 38.3% 6.3% 6.0% 0.3%	0.88 [0.78, 0.99] 0.89 [0.79, 1.00] 1.19 [0.76, 1.88] 1.21 [0.83, 1.77] 0.86 [0.60, 1.23] 0.97 [0.87, 1.07] 0.92 [0.87, 0.98] 0.92 [0.78, 1.08] 0.89 [0.75, 1.06] 0.89 [0.75, 1.05]	
Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2018) Annane D et al. (2018) (eh D et al. (2016) (eh D et al. (2016) Fongyoo S et al. (2016) Fongyoo S et al. (2018) Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ^a = 0.00; Test for overall effect: Z = 2; 1.1.4 Unspecified Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2002)	264 285 34 45 34 511 1275 Chi ² = 5.55 81 (P = 0.00 95 95 95 4 2	614 611 171 168 98 1832 3644 05) 150 150	308 328 28 37 40 526 1379 P = 0.48) 2 = 0.48) 103 101	627 625 168 167 99 1826 3661 ; I ² = 09 149 149	8.1% 8.5% 1.4% 2.0% 2.1% 9.0% 38.3% 6.3% 6.0%	0.88 [0.78, 0.99] 0.89 [0.79, 1.00] 1.19 [0.76, 1.88] 1.21 [0.83, 1.77] 0.86 [0.60, 1.23] 0.97 [0.87, 1.07] 0.92 [0.87, 0.98] 0.92 [0.78, 1.08] 0.92 [0.75, 1.06]	
Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2018) Annane D et al. (2018) Keh D et al. (2016) Keh D et al. (2016) Yenkatesh B et al. (2016) Yenkatesh B et al. (2018) Subtotal (95% C) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Test for overall effect: Z = 2; I.1.4 Unspecified Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2002) Striggel J et al. (1939)	264 295 34 45 511 1275 Chi ² = 5.55 81 (P = 0.00 95 90 4 2 13	614 611 171 168 98 1832 3644 05) 150 150 20 12 12 171	308 328 28 37 40 526 1379 P = 0.48) P = 0.48) 103 101 6	627 625 168 167 99 1826 3661 ; *= 09 149 149 20 12 172	8.1% 8.5% 1.4% 2.0% 2.1% 9.0% 38.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 0.3% 0.3% 0.6%	0.88 [0.78, 0.99] 0.89 [0.79, 1.00] 1.19 [0.76, 1.88] 1.21 [0.83, 1.77] 0.86 [0.60, 1.23] 0.97 [0.87, 1.07] 0.92 [0.87, 0.98] 0.92 [0.78, 1.08] 0.89 [0.75, 1.06] 0.89 [0.75, 1.05]	
Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2018) Annane D et al. (2018) Keh D et al. (2016) Keh D et al. (2016) Fongyoo S et al. (2016) Forkatesh B et al. (2016) Fotal events Heterogenetik: Tau ² = 0.00; Fest for overall effect: Z = 2; I.1.4 Unspecified Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2002) Striegel J et al. (1999) Striegel J et al. (2001)	264 285 34 45 34 511 1275 Chi ² = 5.55 81 (P = 0.00 95 95 95 4 2	614 611 171 168 98 1832 3644 05) 150 150 20 12	308 328 28 37 40 526 1379 P = 0.48) 103 101 6 5	627 625 168 167 99 1826 3661 ; *= 09 149 149 20 12	8.1% 8.5% 1.4% 2.0% 2.1% 9.0% 38.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 0.3% 0.2%	0.88 [0.78, 0.99] 0.89 [0.79, 1.00] 1.19 [0.76, 1.88] 1.21 [0.83, 1.77] 0.86 [0.60, 1.23] 0.97 [0.87, 1.07] 0.92 [0.87, 0.98] 0.92 [0.87, 0.98] 0.92 [0.78, 1.08] 0.89 [0.75, 1.05] 0.67 [0.22, 2.01] 0.40 [0.10, 1.67]	
Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2018) (annane D et al. (2018) (eh D et al. (2016) (eh D et al. (2016) (enkatesh B et al. (2016) Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Fest for overall effect: Z = 2: 1.1.4 Unspecified Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2002) Striegel J et al. (2001) (eh D et al. (2016)	264 295 34 45 511 1275 Chi ² = 5.55 81 (P = 0.00 95 90 4 2 13	614 611 171 168 98 1832 3644 05) 150 150 20 12 12 171	308 328 28 37 40 526 1379 P = 0.48) 103 101 6 5 14	627 625 168 167 99 1826 3661 ; *= 09 149 149 20 12 172	8.1% 8.5% 1.4% 2.0% 2.1% 9.0% 38.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 0.3% 0.3% 0.6%	0.88 [0.78, 0.99] 0.89 [0.79, 1.00] 1.19 [0.76, 1.88] 1.21 [0.83, 1.77] 0.86 [0.60, 1.23] 0.97 [0.87, 1.07] 0.92 [0.87, 0.98] 0.92 [0.78, 1.08] 0.89 [0.75, 1.05] 0.67 [0.22, 2.01] 0.40 [0.10, 16, 7] 0.93 [0.45, 1.93]	
Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2018) Annane D et al. (2018) (eh D et al. (2016) (eh D et al. (2016) (enkatesh B et al. (2016) /enkatesh B et al. (2018) Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Test for overall effect: Z = 2; 1.1.4 Unspecified Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2002) Sriegel J et al. (2003) Sriegel J et al. (2001) (eh D et al. (2016)	264 285 34 45 11 1275 Chi ² = 5.55 .81 (P = 0.00 95 90 4 2 13 3 23	614 611 171 168 98 1832 3644 (df = 6 (F) 150 150 20 150 20 171 171	308 328 28 37 40 526 1379 2 = 0.48; 103 101 6 5 14 22	627 625 168 167 99 1826 3661 ; = 09 149 149 20 12 172 172	8.1% 8.5% 1.4% 2.0% 9.0% 38.3% 6.3% 6.3% 0.3% 0.2% 1.0%	0.88 [0.78, 0.99] 0.89 [0.79, 1.00] 1.19 [0.76, 1.88] 1.21 [0.83, 1.77] 0.86 [0.60, 1.23] 0.97 [0.87, 1.07] 0.92 [0.87, 0.98] 0.92 [0.78, 1.08] 0.89 [0.75, 1.05] 0.67 [0.22, 2.01] 0.40 [0.16, 1] 0.93 [0.45, 1.93] 1.05 [0.61, 1.81]	
Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2018) (annane D et al. (2018) (annane D et al. (2016) (annane D et al. (2016) (annane D et al. (2016) (annane D et al. (2018) Subtotal (95% CI) Fotal events Heterogeneity. Tau ² = 0.00; Fest for overall effect: Z = 2: 1.1.4 Unspecified Annane D et al. (2002) Striegel J et al. (2001) (anne D et al. (2016) (annane D et al. (2016) (annane D et al. (2017) Sprung CL et al. (2008)	264 285 34 45 511 1275 .Chi ² = 5.55 .81 (P = 0.0(95 90 4 2 13 23 23	614 611 171 168 98 1832 3644 (df = 6 (F 05) 150 150 20 12 171 171 58	308 328 28 37 40 526 1379 2 = 0.48; 2 = 0.48; 103 101 6 5 14 22 19	627 625 168 167 99 1826 3661 ; = 09 149 149 20 12 172 172 60	8.1% 8.5% 1.4% 2.0% 38.3% 6.3% 6.0% 0.3% 0.2% 0.6% 1.0% 1.3%	0.88 [0.78, 0.99] 0.89 [0.79, 1.00] 1.19 [0.76, 1.88] 1.21 [0.83, 1.77] 0.86 [0.60, 1.23] 0.97 [0.87, 107] 0.92 [0.87, 0.98] 0.92 [0.87, 0.98] 0.89 [0.75, 1.05] 0.67 [0.22, 2.01] 0.40 [0.10, 1.67] 0.93 [0.45, 1.93] 1.05 [0.61, 1.81] 1.25 [0.77, 2.04]	
Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2018) Annane D et al. (2018) Keh D et al. (2016) Keh D et al. (2016) Fongyoo S et al. (2016) Forkatesh B et al. (2016) Fotal events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Test for overall effect: Z = 2; 1.1.4 Unspecified Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2001) Keh D et al. (2016) Ky Q et al. (2017)	264 285 34 511 275 Chi ² = 5.55 81 (P = 0.00 90 4 2 13 23 23 21	614 611 171 98 1832 3644 , df = 6 (F 150 150 20 12 171 171 58 251	308 328 28 37 526 1379 2 = 0.48) 2 = 0.48) 2 = 0.48) 103 101 6 5 14 22 19 100	627 625 168 167 99 1826 3661 ; I ² = 09 149 149 20 149 20 172 172 60 245	8.1% 8.5% 1.4% 2.0% 9.0% 38.3% 6.3% 6.3% 6.3% 0.3% 0.2% 0.6% 1.0% 1.3% 4.9%	0.88 [0.78, 0.99] 0.89 [0.79, 1.00] 1.19 [0.76, 1.88] 1.21 [0.83, 1.77] 0.86 [0.60, 1.23] 0.97 [0.87, 1.07] 0.92 [0.87, 0.98] 0.89 [0.75, 1.05] 0.67 [0.22, 2.01] 0.40 [0.10, 1.67] 0.93 [0.45, 1.93] 1.05 [0.61, 1.81] 1.25 [0.77, 2.04] 1.08 [0.88, 1.33]	
Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2018) Annane D et al. (2018) (eh D et al. (2016) (eh D et al. (2016) (enkatesh B et al. (2016) /enkatesh B et al. (2018) Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Test for overall effect: Z = 2; 1.1.4 Unspecified Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2002) Ariegel J et al. (2003) Sriegel J et al. (2016) (eh D et al. (2016) y Q Q et al. (2016) Sprung CL et al. (2008) Sprung CL et al. (2008)	264 285 34 511 275 Chi ² = 5.55 81 (P = 0.00 90 4 2 13 23 23 21	614 611 171 98 1832 3644 , df = 6 (F 150 150 150 20 12 171 171 171 58 251 251	308 328 28 37 526 1379 2 = 0.48) 2 = 0.48) 2 = 0.48) 103 101 6 5 14 22 19 100	627 625 168 167 99 1826 3661 (== 09 149 20 12 172 172 172 172 20 245 247	8.1% 8.5% 1.4% 2.0% 2.1% 9.0% 38.3% 6.3% 6.0% 0.2% 0.2% 0.2% 1.0% 1.0% 1.3% 4.9%	0.88 [0.78, 0.99] 0.89 [0.79, 1.00] 1.19 [0.76, 1.88] 1.21 [0.83, 1.77] 0.86 [0.60, 1.23] 0.97 [0.87, 1.07] 0.92 [0.87, 0.98] 0.92 [0.87, 0.98] 0.92 [0.78, 1.08] 0.89 [0.75, 1.05] 0.67 [0.22, 2.01] 0.40 [0.10, 1.67] 0.93 [0.45, 1.93] 1.05 [0.61, 1.81] 1.25 [0.77, 2.04] 1.08 [0.88, 1.33] 1.13 [0.90, 1.41]	
Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2018) Annane D et al. (2018) (eh D et al. (2016) (eh D et al. (2016) (enkatesh B et al. (2016) /enkatesh B et al. (2017) /enkatesh B et al. (2018) Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Test for overall effect: Z = 2; I.1.4 Unspecified Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2002) Singel J et al. (2003) Singel J et al. (2016) (eh D et al. (2016) (eh D et al. (2016) Sprung CL et al. (2008) Sprung CL et al. (2008) Sprung CL et al. (2008) Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00;	264 285 34 511 1275 Chi ² = 5.55 81 (P = 0.00 95 90 4 2 3 3 23 23 23 21 111 102 463 Chi ² = 7.72	614 611 171 168 98 1832 3644 (df = 6 (F) 5) 150 150 150 120 12 171 171 171 171 171 251 1234 , df = 8 (F)	308 328 28 37 40 526 1379 2 = 0.48; 2 = 0.48; 103 101 6 5 14 22 19 100 89 459	627 625 168 167 99 1826 3661 ; P = 09 149 20 12 172 172 60 245 247 1226	8.1% 8.5% 1.4% 2.0% 2.1% 9.0% 38.3% 6 6.3% 6.3% 0.3% 0.3% 0.2% 0.6% 1.0% 1.3% 4.9% 4.4% 24.9%	0.88 [0.78, 0.99] 0.89 [0.79, 1.00] 1.19 [0.76, 1.88] 1.21 [0.83, 1.77] 0.86 [0.60, 1.23] 0.97 [0.87, 1.07] 0.92 [0.87, 0.98] 0.92 [0.87, 0.98] 0.92 [0.78, 1.08] 0.89 [0.75, 1.05] 0.67 [0.22, 2.01] 0.40 [0.10, 1.67] 0.93 [0.45, 1.93] 1.05 [0.61, 1.81] 1.25 [0.77, 2.04] 1.08 [0.88, 1.33] 1.13 [0.90, 1.41]	
Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2018) Annane D et al. (2018) (annane D et al. (2016) (annane D et al. (2016) (annane D et al. (2017) Subtotal (95% CI) Total events deterogeneity. Tau ² = 0.00; Fest for overall effect: Z = 2: 1.1.4 Unspecified Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2003) Annane D et al. (2017) Sprung CL et al. (2008) Subtotal (95% CI) Total events deterogeneity. Tau ² = 0.00; Fest for overall effect: Z = 0.00; F	264 285 34 511 1275 Chi ² = 5.55 81 (P = 0.00 95 90 4 2 3 3 23 23 23 21 111 102 463 Chi ² = 7.72	614 611 171 188 98 1832 3644 df = 6 (F 150 150 150 20 20 20 150 150 20 122 171 171 171 251 251 251 251 1234 (df = 8 (F	308 328 28 37 40 526 1379 2 = 0.48; 2 = 0.48; 103 101 6 5 14 22 19 100 89 459	627 625 168 167 99 1826 3661 149 149 20 12 172 172 172 60 245 247 1226	8.1% 8.5% 1.4% 2.0% 2.1% 9.0% 38.3% 6 6.3% 6.0% 0.2% 0.6% 0.2% 0.6% 1.0% 1.3% 4.9% 4.4% 24.9%	0.88 [0.78, 0.99] 0.89 [0.79, 1.00] 1.19 [0.76, 1.88] 1.21 [0.83, 1.77] 0.86 [0.60, 1.23] 0.97 [0.87, 107] 0.92 [0.87, 0.98] 0.89 [0.75, 1.05] 0.67 [0.22, 2.01] 0.40 [0.10, 1.67] 1.05 [0.61, 1.81] 1.25 [0.67, 2.04] 1.08 [0.88, 1.33] 1.13 [0.90, 1.41] 0.98 [0.89, 1.07]	
Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2018) Annane D et al. (2018) (eh D et al. (2016) (eh D et al. (2016) (enkatesh B et al. (2016) /enkatesh B et al. (2017) /enkatesh B et al. (2018) Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Test for overall effect: Z = 2; 1.1.4 Unspecified Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2016) (eh D et al. (2016) (eh D et al. (2016) Sprung CL et al. (2008) Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Test for overall effect: Z = 0. Total (95% CI)	264 285 34 511 1275 Chi ² = 5.55 81 (P = 0.00 95 90 4 2 3 111 102 23 111 102 463 Chi ² = 7.72 52 (P = 0.61	614 611 171 168 98 1832 3644 (df = 6 (F) 5) 150 150 150 120 12 171 171 171 171 171 251 1234 , df = 8 (F)	308 328 28 37 40 526 1379 9 = 0.48; 103 101 6 5 14 22 19 100 89 2 = 0.46;	627 625 168 167 99 1826 3661 149 149 20 12 172 172 172 60 245 247 1226	8.1% 8.5% 1.4% 2.0% 2.1% 9.0% 38.3% 6 6.3% 6.3% 0.3% 0.3% 0.2% 0.6% 1.0% 1.3% 4.9% 4.4% 24.9%	0.88 [0.78, 0.99] 0.89 [0.79, 1.00] 1.19 [0.76, 1.88] 1.21 [0.83, 1.77] 0.86 [0.60, 1.23] 0.97 [0.87, 1.07] 0.92 [0.87, 0.98] 0.92 [0.87, 0.98] 0.92 [0.78, 1.08] 0.89 [0.75, 1.05] 0.67 [0.22, 2.01] 0.40 [0.10, 1.67] 0.93 [0.45, 1.93] 1.05 [0.61, 1.81] 1.25 [0.77, 2.04] 1.08 [0.88, 1.33] 1.13 [0.90, 1.41]	
Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2018) Annane D et al. (2018) (annane D et al. (2018) (annane D et al. (2016) (annane D et al. (2016) (annane D et al. (2017) (annane D et al. (2018) (annane D et al. (2018) (annane D et al. (2002) (annane D et al. (2003) (annane D et al. (2003) (annane D et al. (2016) (annane L et al. (2016) (annane L et al. (2018) (annane L et al. (2018) (annane L et al. (2018) (annane L et al. (2008) (annane L et al. (2008)	264 285 34 45 34 511 1275 Chi² = 5.53 81 (P = 0.00 95 90 4 4 2 13 23 23 111 102 463 Chi² = 7.72 52 (P = 0.61	614 611 171 168 98 1832 3644 150 150 150 150 150 150 150 12 171 171 171 171 171 171 171 171 168 98 251 251 1234	$\begin{array}{c} 308\\ 328\\ 28\\ 37\\ 40\\ 526\\ 1379\\ 9 = 0.48;\\ 103\\ 101\\ 6\\ 5\\ 14\\ 22\\ 19\\ 100\\ 89\\ 9\\ 459\\ 9 = 0.46;\\ 2975 \end{array}$	627 625 168 167 99 1826 3661 149 20 0 12 172 172 172 172 245 247 1226 8693	8.1% 8.5% 1.4% 2.0% 2.1% 9.0% 38.3% 6.3% 6.0% 0.3% 0.3% 0.3% 0.3% 0.2% 0.3% 1.0% 24.9% 4.4% 24.9%	0.88 [0.78, 0.99] 0.89 [0.79, 1.00] 1.19 [0.76, 1.88] 1.21 [0.83, 1.77] 0.86 [0.60, 1.23] 0.97 [0.87, 107] 0.92 [0.87, 0.98] 0.89 [0.75, 1.05] 0.67 [0.22, 2.01] 0.40 [0.10, 1.67] 1.05 [0.61, 1.81] 1.25 [0.67, 2.04] 1.08 [0.88, 1.33] 1.13 [0.90, 1.41] 0.98 [0.89, 1.07]	
Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2018) Annane D et al. (2018) (eh D et al. (2016) (eh D et al. (2016) (enkatesh B et al. (2016) (enkatesh B et al. (2017) (enkatesh B et al. (2018) Subtotal (95% CI) (otal events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; (est for overall effect: Z = 2; 1.4 Unspecified Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2016) (eh D et al. (2016) (eh D et al. (2016) (eh D et al. (2016) (eh D et al. (2016) (sprung CL et al. (2008) Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; (est for overall effect: Z = 0. Total (95% CI)	264 285 34 511 275 Chi ² = 5.55 81 (P = 0.01 95 90 4 2 33 23 23 23 23 111 102 463 Chi ² = 7.72 52 (P = 0.61 2732 Chi ² = 48.3	614 611 171 168 98 1832 3644 150 150 150 150 150 12 171 171 158 251 251 1234 , df = 8 (F)) 88585 3, df = 33	$\begin{array}{c} 308\\ 328\\ 28\\ 37\\ 40\\ 526\\ 1379\\ 9 = 0.48;\\ 103\\ 101\\ 6\\ 5\\ 14\\ 22\\ 19\\ 100\\ 89\\ 9\\ 459\\ 9 = 0.46;\\ 2975 \end{array}$	627 625 168 167 99 1826 3661 149 20 0 12 172 172 172 172 245 247 1226 8693	8.1% 8.5% 1.4% 2.0% 2.1% 9.0% 38.3% 6.3% 6.0% 0.3% 0.3% 0.3% 0.3% 0.2% 0.3% 1.0% 24.9% 4.4% 24.9%	0.88 [0.78, 0.99] 0.89 [0.79, 1.00] 1.19 [0.76, 1.88] 1.21 [0.83, 1.77] 0.86 [0.60, 1.23] 0.97 [0.87, 107] 0.92 [0.87, 0.98] 0.89 [0.75, 1.05] 0.67 [0.22, 2.01] 0.40 [0.10, 1.67] 1.05 [0.61, 1.81] 1.25 [0.67, 2.04] 1.08 [0.88, 1.33] 1.13 [0.90, 1.41] 0.98 [0.89, 1.07]	

Figure 2. Forest plot of corticosteroid impact on mortality.

	Placebo				Mean Difference		Mean Difference
I	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	Year	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
D	25.33		20	0.0%	-10.27 [-24.53, 3.99]		
1	34	248	37	0.0%	0.00 [-80.07, 80.07]	2008	
1	27	172	170	0.0%	2.33 [-23.74, 28.40]	2016	
В	21.7	21.7	60	0.1%	2.00 [-8.95, 12.95]	2017	
D	40	32	70	0.0%	-1.00 [-12.70, 10.70]	2018	
0			357	0.1%	-1.70 [-8.41, 5.01]		◆
09	X6						

Keh D et al. (2016)	29.33	22.22	171	27	172	170	0.0%	2.33 [-23.74, 28.40]	2016		
Lv QQ et al. (2017)	23.7	36.8	58	21.7	21.7	60	0.1%	2.00 [-8.95, 12.95]	2017		
Venkatesh B et al. (2018)	39	32.4	50	40	32	70	0.0%	-1.00 [-12.70, 10.70]	2018		
Subtotal (95% CI)			550			357	0.1%	-1.70 [-8.41, 5.01]		•	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.93,	df = 4 (P	= 0.75)); I ² = 09	6							
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.9	50 (P = I	0.62)									
2.1.2 LOS in ICU											
Briegel J et al. (1999)	27	20	20	44	20	20	0.0%	-17.00 [-29.40, -4.60]	1999		
Schelling G et al. (2001)	37.3	40.7	9	47.3	65.2	11	0.0%	-10.00 [-56.81, 36.81]	2001		
Sprung CL et al. (2008)	19	31	251	18	17	248	0.3%	1.00 [-3.38, 5.38]	2008	+	
Keh D et al. (2016)	9.3	7.4	171	10.7	8.1	172	2.4%	-1.40 [-3.04, 0.24]	2016		
Lv QQ et al. (2017)	10.9	17.5	58	10.2	13.1	60	0.2%	0.70 [-4.89, 6.29]	2017	·	
Venkatesh B et al. (2018)	3.33	2.22	1841	5	5.15	1840	96.9%	-1.67 [-1.93, -1.41]	2018		
Subtotal (95% CI)			2350			2351	99.9%	-1.66 [-1.91, -1.40]			
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 8.21,	df = 5 (P	= 0.15)); I ² = 39	%							
Test for overall effect: Z = 12	2.86 (P <	0.0000	01)								
Total (95% CI)			2900			2708	100.0%	-1.66 [-1.91, -1.40]			
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 10.14				1%						-100 -50 0 50	100
Test for overall effect: Z = 12										Favours [corticosteroid] Favours [placebo]	.50
Test for subaroup difference	es: Chi²	= 0.00.	df = 1 (F	P = 0.99), I ² = 0	%				Taroais (concosteroid) Taroais (placebo)	

Figure 3. Forest plot of length of stay in hospital and ICU.

Corticosteroid

15.06 6.66

Mean SD Total

34 41 251 29.33 22.22 171

20

Study or Subgroup

Keh D et al. (2016)

2.1.1 LOS in hospital Yildiz O et al. (2002) Sprung CL et al. (2008)

Table 2. The corticosteroid impact on other clinical outcomes in sepsis patients.

	Outcome	Statistical Method	Studies	Participants	I ² (%)	Effect Estimate	р
Organ failura	Organ failure	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl)	1	466	N/A	1.02 (0.66, 1.59)	0.93
Organ failure	Respiratory failure	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 96% Cl)	5	1381	0	1.01 (0.89, 1.14)	0.88
Mechani	cal ventilation	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% Cl)	2	69	0	-0.58 (-2.64, 1.47)	0.58
Revers	sal of shock Risk Ratio (M-H, Random, 95% Cl)		2	362	0	0.91 (0.79, 1.05)	0.18

Abbreviation: ARDS: Acute respiratory distress syndrome, ICU: intensive care unit, LOS: length of stay, NA: not applicable.

3.3. Subgroup Analyses

The pooled analysis of dose and duration demonstrated markedly lowered mortality with short-term (\leq 7 days) low-dose (<400 mg/day) corticosteroid (RR 0.91, 95%CI 0.87-0.95, p < 0.0001) whereas no substantially improved survival was observed with other treatment plans: short-term (≤ 7 days) high-dose (≥ 400 mg/day) corticosteroid (RR 0.82, 95% CI 0.49–1.37, p = 0.45) and long-term (>7 days) low-dose (<400 mg/day) corticosteroid (RR 1.08, 95% CI 0.97–1.20, p = 0.18) (Figure 4). The impacts on mortality risk differed among corticosteroid agents, and only hydrocortisone and fludrocortisone (RR 0.89, 95% CI 0.84–0.94, *p* < 0.0001) and dexamethasone (RR 0.40, 95% CI 0.20–0.81, *p* = 0.01) provided substantial reduction in mortality risks, whereas no changes in mortality risks were observed with hydrocortisone alone (RR0.99, 95% CI 0.94-1.05, p = 0.76), methylprednisolone (RR 0.81, 95% CI 0.40–1.64, *p* = 0.56), and prednisolone (RR 0.90, 95% CI 0.55–1.47, *p* = 0.68) (Figure 5).

	Cortionat	araid	Diaco	ha		Dick Datio	Dick Datio
Study or Subgroup	Corticost		Place		Woight	Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 4.2.1 Dose <400 mg and d	Events		Events	TULAI	weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	M-n, Kalidolii, 95% Ci
Annane D et al. (2002)	102	150	112	149	7.7%	0.90 [0.78, 1.04]	-
Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2002)	95	150	103	149	6.4%	0.92 [0.78, 1.04]	-
Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2002)	90	150	101	149	5.9%	0.89 [0.75, 1.05]	-
Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2002)	82	150	91	149	4.8%	0.90 [0.74, 1.09]	-
Annane D et al. (2002) Annane D et al. (2018)	207	614	244	627	7.3%	0.87 [0.75, 1.00]	+
Annane D et al. (2018)	264	614	308	627	9.7%	0.88 [0.78, 0.99]	+
Annane D et al. (2018)	285	611	328	625	10.6%	0.89 [0.79, 1.00]	-
Bollaert PE et al. (1998)	7	22	12	19	0.4%	0.50 [0.25, 1.02]	
Lv QQ et al. (2017)	23	58	19	60	0.9%	1.25 [0.77, 2.04]	
Lv QQ et al. (2017)	23	58	19	60	0.9%	1.25 [0.77, 2.04]	
Tongyoo S et al. (2016)	34	98	40	99	1.6%	0.86 [0.60, 1.23]	
Tongyoo S et al. (2016)	22	98	27	99	0.9%	0.82 [0.50, 1.34]	
Venkatesh B et al. (2018)	511	1832		1826	11.8%	0.97 [0.87, 1.07]	+
Venkatesh B et al. (2018)	410	1841	448	1840	10.1%	0.91 [0.81, 1.03]	-
Subtotal (95% CI)		6446		6478	79.1%	0.91 [0.87, 0.95]	•
Total events	2155		2378				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00;	Chi ² = 8.83	, df = 13	(P = 0.7)	9); I ² = ()%		
Test for overall effect: Z = 4	36 (P < 0.0	001)					
100 Dece 5 400 me and		7 4					
4.2.2 Dose ≥ 400 mg and (400	2.00	4 35 10 00 4 0 12	
Bone RC et al. (1987)	65	191	48	190	2.0%	1.35 [0.98, 1.84]	
Cicarelli DD et al. (2007) Cicarelli DD et al. (2007)	7	14	12	15	0.6%	0.63 [0.35, 1.12]	
Cicarelli DD et al. (2007)	3	14	10	15	0.2%	0.32 [0.11, 0.93]	
VASSCSG (1987) Subtotal (05% CI)	23	112 331	24	111 331	0.8% 3.7%	0.95 [0.57, 1.58]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	98	331	94	331	J.170	0.82 [0.49, 1.37]	
Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.18;		06 df - 2		21.12 - 1	71 04		
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.		•	(F = 0.0	2), 1 - 1	1 70		
		-,					
4.2.3 Dose < 400 mg and d	uration >7	day					
Briegel J et al. (1999)	4	20	6	20	0.2%	0.67 [0.22, 2.01]	
Briegel J et al. (1999)	4	20	6	20	0.2%	0.67 [0.22, 2.01]	
Briegel J et al. (2001)	2	12	5	12	0.1%	0.40 [0.10, 1.67]	
Keh D et al. (2016)	34	171	28	168	1.0%	1.19 [0.76, 1.88]	+
Keh D et al. (2016)	45	168	37	167	1.4%	1.21 [0.83, 1.77]	
Keh D et al. (2016)	13	171	14	172	0.4%	0.93 [0.45, 1.93]	
Keh D et al. (2016)	15	171	14	170	0.4%	1.07 [0.53, 2.14]	
Keh D et al. (2016)	23	171	22	172	0.7%	1.05 [0.61, 1.81]	
Sprung CL et al. (2008)	86	251	78	248	3.1%	1.09 [0.85, 1.40]	
Sprung CL et al. (2008)	102	251	89	247	3.8%	1.13 [0.90, 1.41]	
Sprung CL et al. (2008)	111	251	100	245	4.4%	1.08 [0.88, 1.33]	T
Yildiz O et al. (2002)	16	27	15	28	1.0%	1.11 [0.69, 1.76]	
Yildiz O et al. (2011)	8	20	12	20	0.5%	0.67 [0.35, 1.27]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	400	1704	400	1689	17.2%	1.08 [0.97, 1.20]	
Total events	463	df - 40	426 (D = 0.0	0.17 - 0	201		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00;		•	(P = 0.9	U); If = 1	1%		
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.	34 (P = 0.1	8)					
4.2.4 Dose ≥ 400 mg and	duration > 7	7 day					
Subtotal (95% CI)		0		0		Not estimable	
Total events	0	-	0				
Heterogeneity: Not applicat							
Test for overall effect: Not a							
Total (95% CI)		8481		8498	100.0%	0.94 [0.89, 0.98]	·
Total events	2716		2898				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00;		•	U (P = 0.	26); I² =	13%		0.01 0.1 1 10 100
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.	•	·	o (5 -	o	30.00		Favours [Corticosteroid] Favours [Placebo]
Test for subaroup differenc	es: Chi ^z = 8	1.56. df =	2 (P = 0	.U1). I ^z :	= /6.6%		

Figure 4. Forest plots of subgroup analysis of mortality per corticosteroid treatment duration and dose.

Corticost		Placel		Woight	Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
	Total	Events	TUTAL	weight	m-n, ranuom, 95% Cl	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
	22	10	10	0.60	0 50 10 25 4 021	
23	58	19	60	1.2%	1.25 [0.77, 2.04]	
23	58	19	60	1.2%	1.25 [0.77, 2.04]	
7	18	11	23	0.6%	0.81 [0.40, 1.67]	
102	251	89	247	4.1%	1.13 [0.90, 1.41]	+-
111	251	100	245	4.6%	1.08 [0.88, 1.33]	+
86	251	78	248	3.5%	1.09 [0.85, 1.40]	+
137	242	127	235	6.0%	1.05 [0.89, 1.23]	+
22	98	27	99			
						+
						+
410		440				
1610	3324	1620	3302	71.2/0	0.00 [0.04, 1.00]	1
	7 df = 10		5V 18 -	n ox.		
		() = 0.0	13), 1 -	0.0		
95	150	103	149	6.0%	0.92 [0.78, 1.08]	
82	150	91	149	4.9%	0.90 [0.74, 1.09]	
102	150	112	149	6.7%	0.90 [0.78, 1.04]	
90	150	101	149	5.6%	0.89 [0.75, 1.05]	-=
285	611	328	625	8.0%	0.89 [0.79, 1.00]	+
207	614	244	627	6.5%	0.87 [0.75, 1.00]	-
264	614	308	627	7.7%	0.88 [0.78, 0.99]	-
	2439		2475	45.4%	0.89 [0.84, 0.94]	•
1125		1287				
		P = 1.00)	; I² = 0%	6		
sone						
	14	10	15	0.3%	0,32 (0.11: 0.93)	
4						
			110	1.3%	0.40 [0.20, 0.01]	-
	46 0.0		17 54	~		
		'= 0.13)	; if = 51	%		
iisolone						
65	191	48	190	2.5%	1.35 [0.98, 1.84]	<u>├</u>
a 2		105				-
Chi² = 10.7			15); I² =	81%		
	20	4.2	20	0.70	0.07/0.05 4.071	
16		15				
	47		48	2.0%	0.90 [0.55, 1.47]	—
			_			
		P = 0.21)	; I² = 36	%		
			0000	400.0%	0.0410.00.0.001	
	8827		8928	100.0%	0.94 [0.89, 0.99]	
2869	8827	3102	8928	100.0%	0.94 [0.89, 0.99]	•
2869 Chi² = 50.3		3102 (P = 0.0			0.94 [0.89, 0.99]	
	7 102 111 86 137 22 34 511 410 1613 Chi ² = 16.1 30 (P = 0.76 000+Fludro 95 82 102 90 285 207 264 1125 Chi ² = 0.39 27 (P < 0.00 sone 3 7 4 Chi ² = 4.08 56 (P = 0.01 hisolone 65 5 23 93 Chi ² = 10.7 58 (P = 0.56 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	one 7 22 4 20 4 20 2 12 13 171 15 171 34 171 15 171 34 171 45 168 23 58 23 58 23 58 23 58 23 58 23 58 7 18 102 251 111 251 137 242 98 34 98 511 1832 410 1841 5924 1613 Chi² = 16.17, df = 19 50 102 150 30 (P = 0.76) 150 82 150 102 150 90 150 285 611 207 614 264 614 2439 1125 Chi² = 0.39, df = 6 (F 71 14 4 43 71 14 4 43 <t< td=""><td>one 7 22 12 4 20 6 2 12 5 13 171 14 23 171 22 15 171 14 34 171 28 45 168 37 23 58 19 7 18 11 102 251 89 111 251 100 86 251 78 137 242 127 22 98 27 34 98 40 511 1832 526 410 1841 448 5924 1613 1628 Chi² 16.17, df = 19 (P = 0.6 00 (P = 0.76) 95 150 103 82 150 11 285 611 328 207 614 244 264 614 308 <td>one 7 22 12 19 4 20 6 20 4 20 6 20 2 12 5 12 13 171 14 172 23 171 22 172 15 171 14 170 34 171 28 168 45 168 37 167 23 58 19 60 7 18 11 23 102 251 89 247 111 251 100 245 86 251 78 248 137 242 127 235 22 98 27 99 34 98 40 99 511 1821 500 1826 410 1841 448 1840 5924 5902 1613 149</td><td>one 7 22 12 19 0.6% 4 20 6 20 0.3% 4 20 6 20 0.3% 2 12 5 12 0.2% 13 171 14 172 0.6% 23 171 22 172 1.0% 15 171 14 170 0.6% 34 171 28 168 1.4% 45 168 37 167 1.8% 23 58 19 60 1.2% 23 58 19 60 1.2% 23 58 19 60 1.2% 102 251 89 247 4.1% 111 251 100 245 4.6% 22 98 27 99 1.2% 34 98 40 99 2.0% 511 1833 1628</td><td>one 7 22 12 19 0.6% 0.50 [0.25, 1.02] 4 20 6 20 0.3% 0.67 [0.22, 2.01] 2 12 5 12 0.2% 0.40 [0.10, 1.67] 13 171 14 172 0.6% 0.93 [0.45, 1.93] 23 171 22 172 1.0% 1.05 [0.61, 1.81] 15 171 14 170 0.6% 1.07 [0.53, 2.14] 34 171 28 168 1.4% 1.19 [0.76, 1.88] 45 168 37 167 1.8% 1.25 [0.77, 2.04] 23 58 19 60 1.2% 1.25 [0.77, 2.04] 111 251 100 245 4.6% 1.08 [0.88, 1.33] 86 251 78 248 3.5% 1.09 [0.85, 1.40] 137 242 127 235 6.0% 1.05 [0.88, 1.23] 22 98 27 99 1.2% 0.82 [0.50, 1.34] 34 98 40 99 2.0% 0.86 [0.60, 1.23] 511 1832 526 1828 6.55% 0.97 [0.87, 1.05] 513 1628 ChiP=16.17, df = 19 (P = 0.65); P = 0% 10 (P = 0.76) one+Fludrocortisone 95 150 103 149 6.0% 0.92 [0.78, 1.04] 90 150 101 149 5.6% 0.98 [0.78, 1.05] 285 611 328 625 8.0% 0.88 [0.78, 1.05] 286 611 328 625 8.0% 0.89 [0.79, 1.00] 207 614 244 627 6.5% 0.88 [0.78, 0.99] 207 614 244 627 6.5% 0.89 [0.78, 1.04] 90 150 101 149 5.6% 0.98 [0.79, 1.00] 264 614 308 627 7.7% 0.88 [0.78, 0.99] 207 614 244 627 6.5% 0.89 [0.78, 1.04] 91 125 1287 ChiP=0.39, df = 6 (P = 1.00); P = 0% 17 4 12 15 0.9% 4 43 33 86 0.3% 0.24 [0.09, 0.64] 1125 1287 ChiP=0.49, df = 2 (P = 0.13); P = 51% 36 (P = 0.01) tisolone 65 191 48 190 2.5% 1.35 [0.98, 1.84] 5 43 33 86 0.4% 0.33 [0.13, 0.72] 23 112 24 111 1.1% 0.95 [0.57, 1.58] 346 337 4.0% 0.81 [0.41 [0.40, 1.64] 93 105 ChiP=1.0.7, df = 2 (P = 0.005); P = 81% 36 (P = 0.56) te 8 20 12 20 0.7% 0.67 [0.35, 1.27] 16 27 15 28 1.3% 1.11 [0.59, 1.76] 16 27 15 28 1.3% 1.11 [0.59, 1.76] 16 27 15 28 1.3% 1.11 [0.69, 1.76] 16 27 15 28 1.3% 1.11 [0.69, 1.76] 16 27 15 28 1.3% 1.11 [0.69, 1.76] 17 116 2.7 15 28 1.3% 1.11 [0.69, 1.76] 18 (P = 0.56) te 8 20 12 20 0.7% 0.57 [0.55, 1.47] 24 4 27 ChiP= 1.57, df = 1 (P = 0.21); P = 36%</td></td></t<>	one 7 22 12 4 20 6 2 12 5 13 171 14 23 171 22 15 171 14 34 171 28 45 168 37 23 58 19 7 18 11 102 251 89 111 251 100 86 251 78 137 242 127 22 98 27 34 98 40 511 1832 526 410 1841 448 5924 1613 1628 Chi² 16.17, df = 19 (P = 0.6 00 (P = 0.76) 95 150 103 82 150 11 285 611 328 207 614 244 264 614 308 <td>one 7 22 12 19 4 20 6 20 4 20 6 20 2 12 5 12 13 171 14 172 23 171 22 172 15 171 14 170 34 171 28 168 45 168 37 167 23 58 19 60 7 18 11 23 102 251 89 247 111 251 100 245 86 251 78 248 137 242 127 235 22 98 27 99 34 98 40 99 511 1821 500 1826 410 1841 448 1840 5924 5902 1613 149</td> <td>one 7 22 12 19 0.6% 4 20 6 20 0.3% 4 20 6 20 0.3% 2 12 5 12 0.2% 13 171 14 172 0.6% 23 171 22 172 1.0% 15 171 14 170 0.6% 34 171 28 168 1.4% 45 168 37 167 1.8% 23 58 19 60 1.2% 23 58 19 60 1.2% 23 58 19 60 1.2% 102 251 89 247 4.1% 111 251 100 245 4.6% 22 98 27 99 1.2% 34 98 40 99 2.0% 511 1833 1628</td> <td>one 7 22 12 19 0.6% 0.50 [0.25, 1.02] 4 20 6 20 0.3% 0.67 [0.22, 2.01] 2 12 5 12 0.2% 0.40 [0.10, 1.67] 13 171 14 172 0.6% 0.93 [0.45, 1.93] 23 171 22 172 1.0% 1.05 [0.61, 1.81] 15 171 14 170 0.6% 1.07 [0.53, 2.14] 34 171 28 168 1.4% 1.19 [0.76, 1.88] 45 168 37 167 1.8% 1.25 [0.77, 2.04] 23 58 19 60 1.2% 1.25 [0.77, 2.04] 111 251 100 245 4.6% 1.08 [0.88, 1.33] 86 251 78 248 3.5% 1.09 [0.85, 1.40] 137 242 127 235 6.0% 1.05 [0.88, 1.23] 22 98 27 99 1.2% 0.82 [0.50, 1.34] 34 98 40 99 2.0% 0.86 [0.60, 1.23] 511 1832 526 1828 6.55% 0.97 [0.87, 1.05] 513 1628 ChiP=16.17, df = 19 (P = 0.65); P = 0% 10 (P = 0.76) one+Fludrocortisone 95 150 103 149 6.0% 0.92 [0.78, 1.04] 90 150 101 149 5.6% 0.98 [0.78, 1.05] 285 611 328 625 8.0% 0.88 [0.78, 1.05] 286 611 328 625 8.0% 0.89 [0.79, 1.00] 207 614 244 627 6.5% 0.88 [0.78, 0.99] 207 614 244 627 6.5% 0.89 [0.78, 1.04] 90 150 101 149 5.6% 0.98 [0.79, 1.00] 264 614 308 627 7.7% 0.88 [0.78, 0.99] 207 614 244 627 6.5% 0.89 [0.78, 1.04] 91 125 1287 ChiP=0.39, df = 6 (P = 1.00); P = 0% 17 4 12 15 0.9% 4 43 33 86 0.3% 0.24 [0.09, 0.64] 1125 1287 ChiP=0.49, df = 2 (P = 0.13); P = 51% 36 (P = 0.01) tisolone 65 191 48 190 2.5% 1.35 [0.98, 1.84] 5 43 33 86 0.4% 0.33 [0.13, 0.72] 23 112 24 111 1.1% 0.95 [0.57, 1.58] 346 337 4.0% 0.81 [0.41 [0.40, 1.64] 93 105 ChiP=1.0.7, df = 2 (P = 0.005); P = 81% 36 (P = 0.56) te 8 20 12 20 0.7% 0.67 [0.35, 1.27] 16 27 15 28 1.3% 1.11 [0.59, 1.76] 16 27 15 28 1.3% 1.11 [0.59, 1.76] 16 27 15 28 1.3% 1.11 [0.69, 1.76] 16 27 15 28 1.3% 1.11 [0.69, 1.76] 16 27 15 28 1.3% 1.11 [0.69, 1.76] 17 116 2.7 15 28 1.3% 1.11 [0.69, 1.76] 18 (P = 0.56) te 8 20 12 20 0.7% 0.57 [0.55, 1.47] 24 4 27 ChiP= 1.57, df = 1 (P = 0.21); P = 36%</td>	one 7 22 12 19 4 20 6 20 4 20 6 20 2 12 5 12 13 171 14 172 23 171 22 172 15 171 14 170 34 171 28 168 45 168 37 167 23 58 19 60 7 18 11 23 102 251 89 247 111 251 100 245 86 251 78 248 137 242 127 235 22 98 27 99 34 98 40 99 511 1821 500 1826 410 1841 448 1840 5924 5902 1613 149	one 7 22 12 19 0.6% 4 20 6 20 0.3% 4 20 6 20 0.3% 2 12 5 12 0.2% 13 171 14 172 0.6% 23 171 22 172 1.0% 15 171 14 170 0.6% 34 171 28 168 1.4% 45 168 37 167 1.8% 23 58 19 60 1.2% 23 58 19 60 1.2% 23 58 19 60 1.2% 102 251 89 247 4.1% 111 251 100 245 4.6% 22 98 27 99 1.2% 34 98 40 99 2.0% 511 1833 1628	one 7 22 12 19 0.6% 0.50 [0.25, 1.02] 4 20 6 20 0.3% 0.67 [0.22, 2.01] 2 12 5 12 0.2% 0.40 [0.10, 1.67] 13 171 14 172 0.6% 0.93 [0.45, 1.93] 23 171 22 172 1.0% 1.05 [0.61, 1.81] 15 171 14 170 0.6% 1.07 [0.53, 2.14] 34 171 28 168 1.4% 1.19 [0.76, 1.88] 45 168 37 167 1.8% 1.25 [0.77, 2.04] 23 58 19 60 1.2% 1.25 [0.77, 2.04] 111 251 100 245 4.6% 1.08 [0.88, 1.33] 86 251 78 248 3.5% 1.09 [0.85, 1.40] 137 242 127 235 6.0% 1.05 [0.88, 1.23] 22 98 27 99 1.2% 0.82 [0.50, 1.34] 34 98 40 99 2.0% 0.86 [0.60, 1.23] 511 1832 526 1828 6.55% 0.97 [0.87, 1.05] 513 1628 ChiP=16.17, df = 19 (P = 0.65); P = 0% 10 (P = 0.76) one+Fludrocortisone 95 150 103 149 6.0% 0.92 [0.78, 1.04] 90 150 101 149 5.6% 0.98 [0.78, 1.05] 285 611 328 625 8.0% 0.88 [0.78, 1.05] 286 611 328 625 8.0% 0.89 [0.79, 1.00] 207 614 244 627 6.5% 0.88 [0.78, 0.99] 207 614 244 627 6.5% 0.89 [0.78, 1.04] 90 150 101 149 5.6% 0.98 [0.79, 1.00] 264 614 308 627 7.7% 0.88 [0.78, 0.99] 207 614 244 627 6.5% 0.89 [0.78, 1.04] 91 125 1287 ChiP=0.39, df = 6 (P = 1.00); P = 0% 17 4 12 15 0.9% 4 43 33 86 0.3% 0.24 [0.09, 0.64] 1125 1287 ChiP=0.49, df = 2 (P = 0.13); P = 51% 36 (P = 0.01) tisolone 65 191 48 190 2.5% 1.35 [0.98, 1.84] 5 43 33 86 0.4% 0.33 [0.13, 0.72] 23 112 24 111 1.1% 0.95 [0.57, 1.58] 346 337 4.0% 0.81 [0.41 [0.40, 1.64] 93 105 ChiP=1.0.7, df = 2 (P = 0.005); P = 81% 36 (P = 0.56) te 8 20 12 20 0.7% 0.67 [0.35, 1.27] 16 27 15 28 1.3% 1.11 [0.59, 1.76] 16 27 15 28 1.3% 1.11 [0.59, 1.76] 16 27 15 28 1.3% 1.11 [0.69, 1.76] 16 27 15 28 1.3% 1.11 [0.69, 1.76] 16 27 15 28 1.3% 1.11 [0.69, 1.76] 17 116 2.7 15 28 1.3% 1.11 [0.69, 1.76] 18 (P = 0.56) te 8 20 12 20 0.7% 0.57 [0.55, 1.47] 24 4 27 ChiP= 1.57, df = 1 (P = 0.21); P = 36%

Figure 5. Forest plot of subgroup analysis on impact of corticosteroid agents on mortality.

3.4. Adverse Events

No significant elevation of corticosteroid-related AE risks (RR 1.04, 95% CI 0.96–1.12, p = 0.38) including gastrointestinal bleeding (RR 1.24, 95% CI 0.81–1.88, p = 0.32), hyperglycemia (RR 1.04, 95% CI 0.95–1.14, p = 0.42), and secondary infections (RR 1.02, 95% CI 0.91–1.15, p = 0.76) were observed (Figure 6).



Figure 6. Forest plot of adverse events.

4. Discussion

This study investigated corticosteroid-related clinical outcomes in patients diagnosed with sepsis or septic shock. Corticosteroid treatment substantially reduced mortality (RR 0.93, 95% CI 0.88–0.99, p = 0.02), especially 28-day mortality (RR 0.86, 95% CI 0.76–0.98, p = 0.02) and >28-day mortality (RR 0.92, 95% CI 0.87–0.98, p = 0.005) without elevated risks of AEs (RR 1.04, 95% CI 0.96–1.12, p = 0.38) in sepsis patients. The subgroup analysis revealed improved survival in patients diagnosed with sepsis or septic shock with short-term (\leq 7 days) low-dose (<400 mg/day) corticosteroid therapy (RR 0.91, 95% CI 0.87–0.95, p < 0.0001). Moreover, substantially lowered mortality rates were observed only with added on therapy of fludrocortisone to hydrocortisone (RR 0.89, 95% CI 0.84–0.94, p < 0.0001) and dexamethasone (RR 0.40, 95% CI 0.20–0.81, p = 0.01).

The current guideline recommends low-dose (<400 mg/day) hydrocortisone treatment for \geq 3 days (typically 200 to 300 mg/day for 5 to 7 days in real practice) in sepsis or septic shock patients who have refractory hypotension despite appropriate fluid resuscitation and vasopressor administration, and routine corticosteroid therapy is not suggested [4,7]. Our study results demonstrated similar results of previous meta-analyses which demonstrated reduced 28-day mortality with low-dose corticosteroid (<400 mg/day) [8,9], and another study also displayed a linear relationship between mortality and corticosteroid dose administered in the first 24 h after study enrollment [36], implying high-dose corticosteroid administration may result in more harm than benefits. Moreover, our study suggested that longer corticosteroid treatment (>7 days) does not guarantee improved survival, as cytokine-mediated inflammations are most substantial during the early phase of sepsis [1]. However, caution is advised with the determination of the actual duration of short-term (\leq 7 days) corticosteroid therapy at this point despite the recommendation of the guidelines (\geq 3 days) because a previous meta-analysis revealed improved survival with corticosteroid treatment duration \geq 4 days [9].

This study demonstrated interesting results in relation to corticosteroid agents. Similar to the results of previous studies [8,9], combination therapy of hydrocortisone and fludrocortisone substantially reduced mortality of sepsis or septic shock patients. However, the current guideline recommends hydrocortisone as the glucocorticoid of choice in sepsis patients because, in addition to glucocorticoid effects, hydrocortisone also provides sufficient mineralocorticoid activity [4]. Notably, our meta-analysis findings also revealed that hydrocortisone combined with fludrocortisone, a major mineralocorticoid agent, improved survival outcomes in sepsis patients. Furthermore, we observed markedly improved survival with dexamethasone treatment (RR 0.40, 95% CI 0.20–0.81, p = 0.01), whereas hydrocortisone did not reduce mortality (RR 0.99, 95% CI 0.94–1.05, p = 0.76) in sepsis patients. The advantageous aspects of dexamethasone in sepsis patients may include the greatest glucocorticoid potency and anti-inflammatory activity among corticosteroids and dexamethasone has even higher anti-inflammatory activity than non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs [37]. The interest in dexamethasone has skyrocketed recently because of a study which demonstrated that 10-day treatment of low-dose dexamethasone (6 mg daily, hydrocortisone equivalent dose of 160 mg/day) substantially reduced 28-day mortality in hospitalized COVID-19 patients who required oxygen treatment [38], implying low-dose dexamethasone may play a strong drug candidate for improving survival of critically-ill patients. However, a question on the safety of dexamethasone in sepsis or septic shock patients must be answered because all studies evaluating dexamethasone effects administered a high hydrocortisone-equivalent dose (\geq 400 mg) in sepsis patients, and comprehensive analysis of clinical outcomes including efficacy and safety associated with low-dose (<400 mg/day) dexamethasone administration in sepsis patients is warranted due to the limited number of studies.

As far as we know, this is the first meta-analysis investigating corticosteroid impact on sepsis-related clinical outcomes from double-blinded, placebo-controlled RCTs. Moreover, another distinct feature of this study from previous meta-analyses is the inclusion of study populations with primary diagnosis of sepsis or septic shock [8,9]. Previous meta-analyses demonstrated controversial results on corticosteroid impact on mortality [8,9]. A meta-analysis of clinical outcomes of corticosteroid in pediatric and adult sepsis patients displayed insignificant short-term (28–31 day) mortality (RR 0.93, 95% CI 0.84-1.03, p = 0.15 [8], whereas a meta-analysis of adult sepsis patients revealed significantly improved 28-day mortality (RR 0.90, 95% CI 0.83–0.98, *p* = 0.02) [9]. However, these meta-analyses included studies that recruited patients with primary diagnoses other than sepsis or septic shock such as ARDS, SIRS, and community-acquired pneumonia [8,9], and data from patients without sepsis or septic shock diagnosis were also analyzed, which may impede clinical application of the study results in sepsis patients. This study demonstrated substantially reduced sepsis-related mortality with corticosteroids, however, subgroup analyses provide variable results in relation to treatment duration, dose, and corticosteroid agents, providing evidence that a hydrocortisone and fludrocortisone combination regimen and dexamethasone can be promising agents for improving survival in sepsis patients. However, further controlled studies on the clinical outcomes including efficacy and safety of dexamethasone in sepsis or septic shock patients are warranted.

This study possesses some limitations. First, heterogeneity across the studies may hinder clinical applications of this study. The included studies had variable study designs and outcome measurements. Moreover, although the included studies recruited patients with primary diagnosis of sepsis or septic shock, the conventional treatment may vary among the patients because of diverse underlying causes of sepsis including etiologic microorganisms. Additionally, sepsis may induce multiple organ failures and patient managements are guided based on the clinical presentations. To minimize the potential issues with heterogeneity and publication bias, our study team only analyzed the double-blinded, placebo-controlled RCTs. Additionally, inclusion of studies only published in English may raise concerns pertaining to limitation on study selection and strength of outcomes. To prevent the loss of evidence, our study group performed additional screening for the studies written in languages other than English and identified no eligible studies for the analysis, implying the strong validity of our study design and outcomes. Another concerning aspect is related to unassessed patient-related risk factors for poor prognosis of sepsis and corticosteroid-related AEs in the original studies, which may cause treatment response variabilities in these patients. Moreover, this study did not show any improvements in other clinical outcomes such as length of stay in hospital, organ failures, respiration failures, duration of mechanical ventilations, and reversal of shock due to limited number of studies. Nonetheless, this study possesses significant implication as survival is a critical indicator of sepsis-related clinical outcomes considering mortality rate of 30–50% in these patients, and our study team demonstrated improved survival with corticosteroid treatment in sepsis patients and identified factors that may benefit corticosteroid therapy. However, further studies on patient-specific factors related to variations in corticosteroid responses in sepsis patients to promote clinical benefits of corticosteroid therapy are needed.

5. Conclusions

Corticosteroid significantly reduced mortality in sepsis or septic shock patients. The pooled analyses revealed markedly reduced mortality with short-term (\leq 7 days) low-dose (<400 mg/day) corticosteroid treatment. Combination therapy of hydrocortisone and fludrocortisone and dexamethasone can be a promising therapeutic option to improve survival outcomes in sepsis patients.

Supplementary Materials: The following are available online at https://www.mdpi.com/article/10 .3390/jpm11060544/s1, Table S1: Quality assessment of included studies of randomized controlled trials, Figure S1: Funnel plots of the study outcomes; (a) mortality and (b) adverse events.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, J.-y.S. and Y.J.C.; methodology, J.-y.S., S.S., and Y.J.C.; software, J.-y.S., S.S., and Y.J.C.; validation, S.S. and Y.J.C.; formal analysis, J.-y.S. and Y.J.C.; investigation, J.-y.S. and Y.J.C.; resources, J.-y.S. and S.S.; data curation, J.-y.S. and Y.J.C.; writing—original draft preparation, J.-y.S. and Y.J.C.; writing—review and editing, S.S.; visualization, J.-y.S.; supervision, S.S. and Y.J.C.; project administration, Y.J.C.; funding acquisition, S.S. and Y.J.C. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This study was supported by Basic Science Research Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF), grant-funded by the Ministry of Science and ICT (No. 2021R1C1C1003735), Ministry of Education (No. 2021R1I1A1A01044500), and CHA University research fund (2020-0122-0001).

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Acknowledgments: This research is funded by Basic Science Research Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF), grant-funded by the Ministry of Education (No. 2021R1I1A1A0104450), and APC was funded by Ministry of Science and ICT (No. 2021R1C1C1003735).

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Hotchkiss, R.S.; Moldawer, L.L.; Opal, S.M.; Reinhart, K.; Turnbull, I.R.; Vincent, J.L. Sepsis and septic shock. *Nat. Rev. Dis. Primers* 2016, 2, 16045. [CrossRef]
- Ladha, E.; House-Kokan, M.; Gillespie, M. The ABCCs of sepsis: A framework for understanding the pathophysiology of sepsis. *Can. J. Crit. Care Nurs.* 2019, 30, 12–21.
- Rello, J.; Valenzuela-Sánchez, F.; Ruiz-Rodriguez, M.; Moyano, S. Sepsis: A Review of Advances in Management. *Adv. Ther.* 2017, 34, 2393–2411. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

- Rhodes, A.A.; Evans, L.E.; Alhazzani, W.; Levy, M.M.; Antonelli, M.; Ferrer, R.; Kumar, A.; Sevransky, J.E.; Sprung, C.L.; Nunnally, M.E.; et al. Surviving Sepsis Campaign: International Guidelines for Management of Sepsis and Septic Shock: With supraphysiologic doses of hydrocortisone. *Crit. Care Med.* 2017, 45, 486–552. [CrossRef]
- Mok, K.; Christian, M.D.; Nelson, S.; Burry, L. Time to Administration of Antibiotics among Inpatients with Severe Sepsis or Septic Shock. *Can. J. Hosp. Pharm.* 2014, 67, 213–219. [CrossRef]
- 6. Annane, D. The Role of ACTH and Corticosteroids for Sepsis and Septic Shock: An Update. *Front. Endocrinol.* **2016**, *7*, 70. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Annane, D.; Pastores, S.M.; Rochwerg, B.; Arlt, W.; Balk, R.A.; Beishuizen, A.; Briegel, J.; Carcillo, J.; Christ-Crain, M.; Cooper, M.S.; et al. Guidelines for the diagnosis and management of critical illness-related corticosteroid insufficiency (CIRCI) in critically ill patients (Part I): Society of Critical Care Medicine (SCCM) and European Society of Intensive Care Medicine (ESICM) 2017. Intensive Care Med. 2017, 43, 1751–1763. [CrossRef]
- Rochwerg, B.; Oczkowski, S.; Siemieniuk, R.A.; Menon, K.; Szczeklik, W.; English, S.; Agoritsas, T.; Belley-Cote, E.; D'Aragon, F.; Alhazzani, W.; et al. Corticosteroids in sepsis: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis (protocol). *BMJ Open* 2017, 7, e016847. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Fang, F.; Zhang, Y.; Tang, J.; Lunsford, L.D.; Li, T.; Tang, R.; He, J.; Xu, P.; Faramand, A.; Xu, J.; et al. Association of corticosteroid treatment with outcomes in adult patients with sepsis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Intern. Med.* 2019, 179, 213–223. [CrossRef]
- 10. Coutinho, A.E.; Chapman, K.E. The anti-inflammatory and immunosuppressive effects of glucocorticoids, recent developments and mechanistic insights. *Mol. Cell. Endocrinol.* **2011**, *335*, 2–13. [CrossRef]
- 11. Moher, D.; Liberati, A.; Tetzlaff, J.; Altman, D.G. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *Ann. Intern. Med.* 2009, 151, 264–269. [CrossRef]
- 12. Higgins, J.P.; Altman, D.G.; Gøtzsche, P.C.; Jüni, P.; Moher, D.; Oxman, A.D.; Savovic, J.; Schulz, K.F.; Weeks, L.; Sterne, J.A. The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ* **2011**, *343*, d5928. [CrossRef]
- 13. Higgins, J.P.T.; Thompson, S.G.; Deeks, J.J.; Altman, D.G. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ* **2003**, 327, 557–560. [CrossRef]
- 14. Bollaert, P.-E.; Charpentier, C.; Levy, B.; Debouverie, M.; Audibert, G.; Larcan, A. Reversal of late septic shock with supraphysiologic doses of hydrocortisone. *Crit. Care Med.* **1998**, *26*, 645–650. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Briegel, J.; Forst, H.; Haller, M.; Schelling, G.; Kilger, E.; Kuprat, G.; Hemmer, B.; Hummel, T.; Lenhart, A.; Heyduck, M.; et al. Stress doses of hydrocortisone reverse hyperdynamic septic shock: A prospective, randomized, double-blind, single-center study. *Crit. Care Med.* 1999, 27, 723–732. [CrossRef]
- 16. Briegel, J.; Jochum, M.; Gippner-Steppert, C.; Thiel, M. Immunomodulation in septic shock: Hydrocortisone differentially regulates cytokine responses. *J. Am. Soc. Nephrol.* **2001**, *12* (Suppl. 17), S70–S74. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Confalonieri, M.; Urbino, R.; Potena, A.; Piattella, M.; Parigi, P.; Puccio, G.; Della Porta, R.; Giorgio, C.; Blasi, F.; Umberger, R.; et al. Hydrocortisone infusion for severe community-acquired pneumonia: A preliminary randomized study. *Am. J. Respir. Crit. Care Med.* 2005, 171, 242–248. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Kaufmann, I.; Briegel, J.; Schliephake, F.; Hoelzl, A.; Chouker, A.; Hummel, T.; Schelling, G.; Thiel, M. Stress doses of hydrocortisone in septic shock: Beneficial effects on opsonization-dependent neutrophil functions. *Intensive Care Med.* 2008, 34, 344–349. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Keh, D.; Trips, E.; Marx, G.; Wirtz, S.P.; Abduljawwad, E.; Bercker, S.; Bogatsch, H.; Briegel, J.; Engel, C.; Gerlach, H.; et al. Effect of hydrocortisone on development of shock among patients with severe sepsis: The HYPRESS randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2016, 316, 1775–1785. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 20. Moreno, R.; Sprung, C.L.; Annane, D.; Chevret, S.; Briegel, J.; Keh, D.; Singer, M.; Weiss, Y.G.; Payen, D.; Cuthbertson, B.H.; et al. Time course of organ failure in patients with septic shock treated with hydrocortisone: Results of the Corticus study. *Intensive Care Med.* **2011**, *37*, 1765–1772. [CrossRef]
- Oppert, M.; Schindler, R.; Husung, C.; Offermann, K.; Gräf, K.-J.; Boenisch, O.; Barckow, D.; Frei, U.; Eckardt, K.-U. Low-dose hydrocortisone improves shock reversal and reduces cytokine levels in early hyperdynamic septic shock. *Crit. Care Med.* 2005, 33, 2457–2464. [CrossRef]
- 22. Schelling, G.; Briegel, J.; Roozendaal, B.; Stoll, C.; Rothenhäusler, H.-B.; Kapfhammer, H.-P. The effect of stress doses of hydrocortisone during septic shock on posttraumatic stress disorder in survivors. *Biol. Psychiatry* 2001, *50*, 978–985. [CrossRef]
- 23. Sprung, C.L.; Annane, D.; Keh, D.; Moreno, R.; Singer, M.; Freivogel, K.; Weiss, Y.G.; Benbenishty, J.; Kalenka, A.; Forst, H.; et al. Hydrocortisone Therapy for Patients with Septic Shock. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **2008**, *358*, 111–124. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 24. Tongyoo, S.; Permpikul, C.; Mongkolpun, W.; Vattanavanit, V.; Udompanturak, S.; Kocak, M.; Meduri, G.U. Hydrocortisone treatment in early sepsis-associated acute respiratory distress syndrome: Results of a randomized controlled trial. *Crit. Care* **2016**, 20, 329. [CrossRef]
- 25. Venkatesh, B.; Finfer, S.; Cohen, J.; Rajbhandari, D.; Arabi, Y.; Bellomo, R.; Billot, L.; Correa, M.; Glass, P.; Harward, M.; et al. Adjunctive glucocorticoid therapy in patients with septic shock. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **2018**, *378*, 797–808. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 26. Lv, Q.-Q.; Gu, X.-H.; Chen, Q.-H.; Yu, J.-Q.; Zheng, R.-Q. Early initiation of low-dose hydrocortisone treatment for septic shock in adults: A randomized clinical trial. *Am. J. Emerg. Med.* **2017**, *35*, 1810–1814. [CrossRef]

- Annane, D.; Renault, A.; Brun-Buisson, C.; Megarbane, B.; Quenot, J.-P.; Siami, S.; Cariou, A.; Forceville, X.; Schwebel, C.; Martin, C.; et al. Hydrocortisone plus Fludrocortisone for Adults with Septic Shock. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 2018, 378, 809–818. [CrossRef]
- Annane, D.; Sébille, V.; Charpentier, C.; Bollaert, P.-E.; François, B.; Korach, J.-M.; Capellier, G.; Cohen, Y.; Azoulay, E.; Troché, G.; et al. Effect of Treatment with Low Doses of Hydrocortisone and Fludrocortisone on Mortality in Patients with Septic Shock. JAMA 2002, 288, 862–871. [CrossRef]
- 29. Cicarelli, D.D.; Vieira, J.E.; Benseñor, F.E.M. Early dexamethasone treatment for septic shock patients: A prospective randomized clinical trial. *Sao Paulo Med. J.* 2007, 125, 237–241. [CrossRef]
- 30. Schumer, W. Steroids in the treatment of clinical septic shock. Ann. Surg. 1976, 184, 333–341. [CrossRef]
- Bone, R.C.; Fisher, C.J.; Clemmer, T.P.; Slotman, G.J.; Metz, C.A.; Balk, R.A.; The Methylprednisolone Severe Sepsis Study Group. A Controlled Clinical Trial of High-Dose Methylprednisolone in the Treatment of Severe Sepsis and Septic Shock. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 1987, 317, 653–658. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Luce, J.M.; Montgomery, A.B.; Marks, J.D.; Turner, J.; Metz, C.A.; Murray, J.F. Ineffectiveness of High-dose Methylprednisolone in Preventing Parenchymal Lung Injury and Improving Mortality in Patients with Septic Shock. *Am. Rev. Respir. Dis.* 1988, 138, 62–68. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 33. Veterans Administration Systemic Sepsis Cooperative Study Group. Effect of high-dose glucocorticoid therapy on mortality in patients with clinical signs of systemic sepsis. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **1987**, *317*, 659–665. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 34. Yildiz, O.; Doganay, M.; Aygen, B.; Güven, M.; Klelestimur, F.; Tutuş, A. Physiological-dose steroid therapy in sepsis [ISRCTN36253388]. Crit. Care 2002, 6, 251–259. [CrossRef]
- 35. Yildiz, O.; Tanriverdi, F.; Simsek, S.; Aygen, B.; Kelestimur, F. The effects of moderate-dose steroid therapy in sepsis: A placebocontrolled, randomized study. J. Res. Med. Sci. 2011, 16, 1410–1421.
- Minneci, P.; Deans, K.; Eichacker, P.; Natanson, C. The effects of steroids during sepsis depend on dose and severity of illness: An updated meta-analysis. *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* 2009, 15, 308–318. [CrossRef]
- Ahmed, M.H.; Hassan, A. Dexamethasone for the Treatment of Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19): A Review. SN Compr. Clin. Med. 2020, 2, 2637–2646. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 38. Horby, P.; Lim, W.S.; Emberson, J.R.; Mafham, M.; Bell, J.L.; Linsell, L.; Staplin, N.; Brightling, C.; Ustianowski, A.; Elmahi, E.; et al. Dexamethasone in hospitalized patients with Covid-19. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **2021**, *384*, 693–704.