Protocolised Management In Sepsis (ProMISe): a multicentre randomised controlled trial of the clinical effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of early, goal-directed, protocolised resuscitation for emerging septic shock

Paul R Mouncey,¹ Tiffany M Osborn,² G Sarah Power,¹ David A Harrison,¹ M Zia Sadique,³ Richard D Grieve,³ Rahi Jahan,¹ Jermaine CK Tan,¹ Sheila E Harvey,¹ Derek Bell,^{4,5} Julian F Bion,⁶ Timothy J Coats,⁷ Mervyn Singer,⁸ J Duncan Young⁹ and Kathryn M Rowan^{1*}

- ¹Clinical Trials Unit, Intensive Care National Audit & Research Centre, London, UK ²Departments of Surgery and Emergency Medicine, Washington University, St Louis, MO, USA
- ³Department of Health Services Research and Policy, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK
- ⁴Faculty of Medicine, Imperial College London, London, UK
- ⁵Department of Acute Medicine, Chelsea and Westminster Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK
- ⁶Department of Intensive Care Medicine, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK
- ⁷Department of Cardiovascular Sciences, University of Leicester, Leicester, UK
 ⁸Bloomsbury Institute of Intensive Care Medicine, University College London, London, UK
- ⁹Nuffield Division of Anaesthetics, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

*Corresponding author

Declared competing interests of authors: Dr Tiffany M Osborn declares grants from ImaCor Inc. and Cheetah Medical during the trial.

Published November 2015 DOI: 10.3310/hta19970

Plain English summary

Protocolised Management In Sepsis (ProMISe)

Health Technology Assessment 2015; Vol. 19: No. 97 DOI: 10.3310/hta19970

NIHR Journals Library www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Plain English summary

What was the problem/question?

Sepsis is a severe infection in the blood which can damage important organs in the body, such as the heart and lungs. Patients who develop sepsis are at a high risk of dying. A research study in a US hospital emergency department found that patients with sepsis treated using a 6-hour structured treatment plan (compared with usual treatment) were more likely to survive and to spend less time in hospital.

The ProMISe (Protocolised Management In Sepsis) study wanted to find out if the 6-hour structured treatment plan would work in the UK, compared with usual treatment.

What did we do?

A total of 1260 patients from 56 hospitals across the country took part in the study. Patients were evenly split into two groups to receive either the 6-hour structured treatment plan or usual treatment. They were followed up for 1 year to see the long-term effects of receiving treatment.

What did we find?

There was no significant difference in the number of patients who died after 3 months or after 1 year of receiving either treatment. The costs of treatment (in hospital and after leaving hospital) were higher for patients who received the 6-hour structured treatment plan.

What does this mean?

The 6-hour structured treatment plan did not improve survival for patients with sepsis and was more expensive.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2015. This work was produced by Mouncey et al. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This issue may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts (or indeed, the full report) may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Health Technology Assessment

ISSN 1366-5278 (Print)

ISSN 2046-4924 (Online)

Impact factor: 5.116

Health Technology Assessment is indexed in MEDLINE, CINAHL, EMBASE, The Cochrane Library and the ISI Science Citation Index.

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (www.publicationethics.org/).

Editorial contact: nihredit@southampton.ac.uk

The full HTA archive is freely available to view online at www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hta. Print-on-demand copies can be purchased from the report pages of the NIHR Journals Library website: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Criteria for inclusion in the Health Technology Assessment journal

Reports are published in *Health Technology Assessment* (HTA) if (1) they have resulted from work for the HTA programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

Reviews in *Health Technology Assessment* are termed 'systematic' when the account of the search appraisal and synthesis methods (to minimise biases and random errors) would, in theory, permit the replication of the review by others.

HTA programme

The HTA programme, part of the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR), was set up in 1993. It produces high-quality research information on the effectiveness, costs and broader impact of health technologies for those who use, manage and provide care in the NHS. 'Health technologies' are broadly defined as all interventions used to promote health, prevent and treat disease, and improve rehabilitation and long-term care.

The journal is indexed in NHS Evidence via its abstracts included in MEDLINE and its Technology Assessment Reports inform National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance. HTA research is also an important source of evidence for National Screening Committee (NSC) policy decisions.

For more information about the HTA programme please visit the website: http://www.nets.nihr.ac.uk/programmes/hta

This report

The research reported in this issue of the journal was funded by the HTA programme as project number 07/37/47. The contractual start date was in April 2010. The draft report began editorial review in March 2015 and was accepted for publication in July 2015. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HTA editors and publisher have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' report and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the draft document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this report.

This report presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HTA programme or the Department of Health. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HTA programme or the Department of Health.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2015. This work was produced by Mouncey *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This issue may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts (or indeed, the full report) may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Published by the NIHR Journals Library (www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk), produced by Prepress Projects Ltd, Perth, Scotland (www.prepress-projects.co.uk).

Editor-in-Chief of *Health Technology Assessment* and NIHR Journals Library

Professor Tom Walley Director, NIHR Evaluation, Trials and Studies and Director of the HTA Programme, UK

NIHR Journals Library Editors

Professor Ken Stein Chair of HTA Editorial Board and Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

Professor Andree Le May Chair of NIHR Journals Library Editorial Group (EME, HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals)

Dr Martin Ashton-Key Consultant in Public Health Medicine/Consultant Advisor, NETSCC, UK

Professor Matthias Beck Chair in Public Sector Management and Subject Leader (Management Group), Queen's University Management School, Queen's University Belfast, UK

Professor Aileen Clarke Professor of Public Health and Health Services Research, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, UK

Dr Tessa Crilly Director, Crystal Blue Consulting Ltd, UK

Dr Peter Davidson Director of NETSCC, HTA, UK

Ms Tara Lamont Scientific Advisor, NETSCC, UK

Professor Elaine McColl Director, Newcastle Clinical Trials Unit, Institute of Health and Society, Newcastle University, UK

Professor William McGuire Professor of Child Health, Hull York Medical School, University of York, UK

Professor Geoffrey Meads Professor of Health Sciences Research, Health and Wellbeing Research and Development Group, University of Winchester, UK

Professor John Norrie Health Services Research Unit, University of Aberdeen, UK

Professor John Powell Consultant Clinical Adviser, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), UK

Professor James Raftery Professor of Health Technology Assessment, Wessex Institute, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, UK

Dr Rob Riemsma Reviews Manager, Kleijnen Systematic Reviews Ltd, UK

Professor Helen Roberts Professor of Child Health Research, UCL Institute of Child Health, UK

Professor Helen Snooks Professor of Health Services Research, Institute of Life Science, College of Medicine, Swansea University, UK

Professor Jim Thornton Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Nottingham, UK

Please visit the website for a list of members of the NIHR Journals Library Board: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/about/editors

Editorial contact: nihredit@southampton.ac.uk