

# Pre-Operative Fluid Resuscitation in the Emergency General Surgery Septic Patient: Does it Really Matter?

Benjamin J Moran (✉ [moranben@einstein.edu](mailto:moranben@einstein.edu))

Einstein Medical Center Philadelphia

Erin Major

University of Maryland Medical Center

Joseph A Kufera

University of Maryland Medical Center

Samuel A Tisherman

University of Maryland Medical Center

Jose Diaz

University of Maryland Medical Center

---

## Research Article

**Keywords:** Emergency General Surgery, Abdominal Sepsis, Fluid Resuscitation, Source Control, Pre-operative Resuscitation

**Posted Date:** February 12th, 2021

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-156082/v1>

**License:**  This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

---

**Version of Record:** A version of this preprint was published at BMC Emergency Medicine on July 22nd, 2021. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12873-021-00479-3>.

# Abstract

**Objective:** Emergency general surgery (EGS) patients presenting with sepsis remain a challenge. The Surviving Sepsis Campaign recommends a 30 mL/kg fluid bolus in these patients, but recent studies suggest an association between large volume crystalloid resuscitation and increased mortality. The optimal amount of pre-operative fluid resuscitation prior to source control in patients with intra-abdominal sepsis is unknown. This study aims to determine if increasing volume of resuscitation prior to surgical source control is associated with worsening outcomes.

**Methods:** We conducted an 8-year retrospective chart review of EGS patients undergoing surgery for abdominal sepsis within 24 hours of admission. Patients in hemorrhagic shock and those with outside hospital index surgeries were excluded. We grouped patients by increasing pre-operative resuscitation volume in 10 ml/kg intervals up to >70 ml/kg and later grouped them into <30ml/kg or  $\geq$ 30ml/kg. A relative risk regression model compared amounts of fluid administration. Mortality was the primary outcome measure. Secondary outcomes were time to operation, ventilator days, and length of stay (LOS). Groups were compared by quick Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (qSOFA) and SOFA scoring systems.

**Results:** Of the 301 patients included, the mean age was 55, 51% were male, 257 (85%) survived to discharge. With increasing fluid per kg (<10 to <70ml/kg), there was an increasing mortality per decile, 8.8% versus 31.6% ( $p=0.004$ ). Patients who received <30 mL/kg had lower mortality (11.3 vs 21%) than those who received >30 ml/kg ( $p=0.02$ ). These groups had median qSOFA scores (1.0 vs. 1.0,  $p=0.06$ ). There were no differences in time to operation (6.1 vs 4.9 hours  $p=0.11$ ), ventilator days (1 vs 3,  $p=0.08$ ), or hospital LOS (8 vs 9 days,  $p=0.57$ ). Relative risk regression correcting for age and physiologic factors showed no significant differences in mortality between the fluid groups.

**Conclusions:** Greater pre-operative resuscitation volumes were initially associated with significantly higher mortality, despite similar organ failure scores. However, fluid volumes were not associated with mortality following adjustment for other physiologic factors in a regression model. The amount of pre-operative volume resuscitation was not associated with differences in time to operation, ventilator days, ICU or hospital LOS.

## Background

Emergency General Surgery (EGS) patients presenting with urgent need of source control and signs of sepsis remain a clinical challenge. These patients require adequate resuscitation to tolerate the induction of general anesthesia however cannot undergo prolonged resuscitation as they need urgent source control to prevent further deterioration. Despite this being a longstanding problem in surgery, no true optimum amount of pre-operative resuscitation has been defined. There are a variety of recommendations outlining the amount of proper pre-operative resuscitation in this septic patient population however no true guidelines have been established.

The Surviving Sepsis Campaign and the most recent international consensus for sepsis and septic shock (sepsis-3) define sepsis as a life-threatening organ dysfunction caused by a dysregulated host response to infection, with septic shock being a subset of sepsis with circulatory and cellular/metabolic dysfunction (1, 2). Fluid resuscitation in sepsis changed in 2001, with the implementation of early goal directed therapy, with sequential fluid boluses to achieve a desired central venous pressure and has subsequently evolved throughout the years(3). In the latest rendition, the Surviving Sepsis Campaign guidelines recommends a treatment bundle in patients with hypotension, elevated lactate, and signs of sepsis which includes at least 30 mL/kg of IV crystalloid, broad spectrum antibiotics and vasopressor use to maintain mean arterial pressure greater than 65 (1, 4, 5). Conversely, recent reports have shown increasing mortality high fluid administration and positive fluid balances(6–8). The World Society of Emergency Surgery recommends prompt diagnosis of sepsis, with adequate resuscitation and total amount of initial resuscitation defined by clinical response without specific fluid goals, except for optimizing tissue perfusion (9). The optimal amount of pre-operative fluid resuscitation prior to source control is unknown. This study aims to determine if a certain volume of resuscitation prior to surgical source control in septic patients is associated with worsening outcomes.

## Methods

A retrospective review was conducted of a prospectively collected acute care surgery registry at the University of Maryland Medical Center and R Adams Cowley Shock Trauma Center from May 2011 to July 2018.

Patients requiring urgent surgery within 24 hours of admission for surgical source control of intra-abdominal infection were included and only the index admission was included for each patient. Patients undergoing surgery for trauma, hemorrhagic shock, or had their index surgery at an outside hospital were excluded. All patients were resuscitated either prior to transport to our facility, at our University Hospital, or experienced a combination of resuscitation at both locations. The total amount of pre-operative crystalloid fluid resuscitation was recorded. Patients who needed blood transfusions or colloid resuscitation were excluded.

### Figure 1: Study Design, Inclusion/Exclusion

The patients were grouped by increasing volume of resuscitation, in 10 mL/kg intervals, up to greater than 70mL/kg prior to operation. The subjects were later dichotomized into less than or greater than or equal to 30 mL/kg. The electronic medical record (Epic) was reviewed for additional data points. Data collected included presenting vital signs, vasopressor use, height, weight, laboratory values (total bilirubin, creatinine, lactate, platelet count, PaO<sub>2</sub>) and fractional inspired oxygen requirement. Groups were stratified by quick Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (qSOFA) and standard SOFA scoring systems (10, 11).

Mortality was the primary outcome measure for both groupings. Secondary outcomes were measured in the greater or less than 30 mL/kg groups, including time to operation or source control, ventilator days,

intensive care unit length of stay, and total hospital length of stay.

Bivariate analysis was used to determine mortality per increasing 10ml/kg of fluid with Mantel-Haenszel chi-square analysis to determine significance for the trend. Chi-square and Fisher's exact tests were used to compare non-ordinal categorical factors between groups. Continuous data were presented in terms of medians and the interquartile range (IQR; 25th -75th percentile) and were compared between groups using the Wilcoxon rank-sum test. Multivariable Poisson regression models were fit to determine the association between fluid level and mortality, with and without adjustment by additional covariates. The relationship of each independent variable with mortality was estimated by the relative risk and its 95% confidence interval.

Permission to conduct this study was obtained from the University of Maryland, Baltimore, Institutional Review Board. As this was a study collected from a previously collected database, the need for written, informed consent was waived by the Institutional Review Board of the University of Maryland. As human subjects were involved, this study protocol was performed in accordance with the relevant guidelines set by the University of Maryland.

## Results

In 7 years, 301 patients met our inclusion criteria for the study (Figure 1, Table 1). Of the patients included, 152 (50.5%) were male, had a median age of 55 (IQR 41-69) years and had a BMI of 29.1 (24.2-36.9) kg/m<sup>2</sup>. Median preoperative vital signs included a mean arterial pressure of 86.5 mmHg (74-98.5), systolic blood pressure of 121 mmHg (106-137), heart rate of 97 beats/min (84-114), respiratory rate of 18 breaths/min (16-23), and a temperature of 98.4 °F (98.1-99.3). Median preoperative lab values included lactate 1.8 mmol/L (1.3-2.9), creatinine 1.1 mg/dL (0.8-1.8), platelet 230 x10<sup>3</sup>/mcL (158-311), bilirubin 0.9 mg/dL (0.6-1.5), and a PaO<sub>2</sub> 130 mmHg (95-175). These patients presented with median SOFA scores of 2 (0-8), and qSOFA scores of 1 (0-2).

The cohort received a median pre-operative fluid resuscitation volume of 19.0 ml/kg (9.3-35.3), and 85 (28%) required pre-operative vasopressor use. All required an urgent operation, within 24 hours, with a median time to the OR of 5.8 hours (3.3-12.6). Post operatively, these patients experienced average ventilator days of 2 (0-7), intensive care length of stay of 3 d (0-12), and total hospital length of stay 9 d (3-20). Overall mortality was 14.6% (44 patients).

**Table 1:** Demographics, Vitals, Laboratory Values, Scoring systems, interventions and outcomes.

Variable	Median	Lower Quartile	Upper Quartile
Age (yr)	55	41	69
BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	29.1	24.2	36.9
HR (beats/min)	97	84	114
MAP (mmHg)	86.5	74	98.5
SBP (mmHg)	121	106	137
RR (breath/min)	18	16	23
Temp (°F)	98.4	98.1	99.3
FiO <sub>2</sub> (%)	40	40	50
Bili (mg/dL)	0.9	0.6	1.5
Creatinine (mg/dL)	1.1	0.8	1.8
Lactate (mmol/L)	1.8	1.3	2.9
Plt (x10 <sup>3</sup> /mcL)	230	158	311
PaO <sub>2</sub> (mmHg)	130	95	175
SOFA	2	0	8
qSOFA	1	0	2
Time to OR (hour)	5.8	3.3	12.6
Fluids/Kg (mL/Kg)	19.0	9.3	35.3
Ventilator Days	2	0	7
ICU LOS (day)	3	0	12
LOS (day)	9	3	20

BMI – body mass index, MAP – mean arterial pressure, SBP – systolic blood pressure, FiO<sub>2</sub> – fractional inspired oxygen, PaO<sub>2</sub> – partial pressure of oxygen, SOFA – sequential organ failure assessment score, qSOFA – quick sequential organ failure assessment score.

Patients were grouped based upon pre-operative fluid volume in 10 mL/kg groups, up to greater or equal than 70 mL/kg (Figure 2). For fluid resuscitation, 80 patients (27%) received less than 10 mL/kg, 72 (24%) received 10-<20 mL/kg, 51 (17%) received 20-<30mL/kg, 36 (12%) received 30-<40 mL/kg, 20 (7%) received 40-<50 mL/kg, 10 (3%) received 50-<60mL/kg, 13 (4%) received 60-<70mL/kg, and 19 (6%) received greater than or equal to 70 mL/kg. Chi-square analysis indicated a significant trend of increasing mortality as fluids per kg increased, p=0.004. Percent mortality and totals in each group is demonstrated by table 2.

**Figure 2:** Percent Mortality with increasing 10ml/kg fluid resuscitation.

**Table 2:** Percent Mortality with increasing 10ml/kg fluid resuscitation

Fluids per Kg by Mortality			
Fluid per Kg	Survived	Died	Total
< 10 mL/kg	73 (91.3%)	7 (8.8%)	80
10-<20 mL/kg	62 (86.1%)	10 (13.9%)	72
20-<30 mL/kg	45 (88.2%)	6 (11.8%)	51
30-<40 mL/kg	29 (80.6%)	7 (19.4%)	36
40-<50 mL/kg	18 (90.0%)	2 (10.0%)	20
50-<60 mL/kg	9 (90.0%)	1 (10.0%)	10
60-<70 mL/kg	8 (61.5%)	5 (38.5%)	13
70+ mL/kg	13 (68.4%)	6 (31.6%)	19
<b>Total</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>301</b>
Statistic	DF	Value	Prob
<b>Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square</b>	1	8.4864	0.0036

There was no significant correlation between time to operative source control and mortality (p=0.08, Figure 3)

**Figure 3:** Mortality with Time to Operative Source Control

Patients were additionally grouped into less than and greater than or equal to 30 mL/kg of fluid resuscitation. There were 203 patients (67%) who received less than 30 mL/kg of fluid, and 98 patients (33%) who received greater than or equal to 30 mL/kg (Table 3). These patient groups were similar in age and gender. Each group had similar presenting heart rates, medians 96 and 101 (p=0.21), however, had significant differences in mean arterial pressure, 88 mmHg vs 82 mmHg (p<0.001), SBP, 124 mmHg vs 113 mmHg (p=0.001) and initial lactate, 1.8 vs 2.3 (p=0.002). These groups scored similar on qSOFA, 1 vs 1 (p=0.06). The patients in the <30mL/kg group received significantly less fluid, with median fluid/kg 12.9 vs 46.9 (p<0.001). Despite more resuscitation, patients ≥30mL/kg more frequently required vasopressors 37% vs 24% (p=0.02).

Mortality was significantly lower in patients who received less fluid, 11% vs 21% (p=0.02). Median Ventilatory days (1 vs 3), ICU LOS (2 vs 4) and hospital LOS (8 vs 9) were all lower with fewer fluids, however the differences were not statistically significant.

**Table 3:** < 30 mL/kg vs ≥ 30 mL/kg. Reported as standard deviations unless otherwise stated.

	<30ml/kg (n=203)	≥30ml/kg (n=98)	
	Median (IQR)	Median (IQR)	p-value
Age	55 (41-68)	56 (44-71)	0.46
Male, n (%)	106 (52%)	46 (47%)	0.39
HR	96 (82-112)	101 (85-118)	0.21
MAP	88 (75-102)	82 (70-93)	<0.001
SBP	124 (109-140)	113 (102-129)	0.001
Lactate (n=166/81)	1.8 (1.2-2.6)	2.3 (1.5-4.4)	0.002
Total Fluids	12.9 (4.7-20.0)	46.9 (37.8-64.7)	<0.001
Preoperative Vasopressor	49 (24%)	36 (37%)	0.02
Time to OR (Hours)	6.1 (3.5-12.2)	4.9 (2.7-13.1)	0.11
Sofa	2 (0-7)	3 (1-10)	0.05
qSOFA	1 (0-1)	1 (0-2)	0.06
LOS (d)	8 (3-19)	9 (3-23)	0.57
ICU LOS (d)	2 (0-11)	4 (0-13)	0.22
Ventilator Days	1 (0-6)	3 (0-7)	0.08
Mortality	23 (11%)	21 (21%)	0.02

Further analyses compared patients who survived versus non-survivors (table 4). Survivors had a significantly lower average age 53 vs 65 ( $p<0.001$ ) and presented with lower SOFA 2.0 vs 10.5, ( $p<0.001$ ) and qSOFA (1.0 vs 2.0,  $p<0.001$ ) scores. Survivors presented with better vital signs, including higher MAP (90 mmHg vs 72 mmHg,  $p<0.001$ ), lower heart rates (96 bpm vs 105 bpm,  $p=0.02$ ) and a lower respiratory rate (18 vs 22 breaths per minute,  $p=0.005$ ). Survivors had better baseline physiology and renal function with a lower lactate (1.7 vs 3.2 mmol/L,  $p<0.001$ ) and creatinine (1.0 vs 2.0 mg/dl,  $p<0.001$ ). Patients who survived required on average lower volumes of fluid per kilogram (17.8 vs 27.4 mL/kg,  $p=0.007$ ) and only 21% of survivors compared with 68% of non-survivors required pre-operative vasopressors ( $p<0.001$ ). Lastly, non-survivors tended to have operative source control quicker than survivors (4.1 hours vs 6.2 hours,  $p=0.06$ ).

**Table 4:** Comparison of variables of survivors vs non-survivors, expressed as medians and interquartile range, except otherwise noted.

Survivors vs Non-Survivors			
	Survived (n=257)	Died (n=44)	p-value
<b>Demographics</b>			
Age (years)	53 (38-67)	65 (58-72)	<0.001
<b>Vitals</b>			
HR (beats/minute)	96 (83-112)	105 (93-122)	0.02
MAP (mmHg)	90 (76-101)	72 (66-79)	<0.001
SBP (mmHg)	123 (109-139)	106 (91-116)	<0.001
RR (breaths/minute)	18 (16-22)	22 (18-29)	0.005
Temp (°F)	98.4 (98.1-99.3)	98.1 (96.6-99.9)	0.24
<b>Laboratory Values</b>			
Bilirubin (mg/dL)	0.9 (0.6-1.4)	1.5 (1.1-2.5)	<0.001
Creatinine (mg/dL)	1.0 (0.8-1.4)	2.0 (1.4-3.2)	<0.001
Lactate (mmol/L)	1.7 (1.2-2.6)	3.2 (1.8-6.9)	<0.001
Platelet (x10 <sup>3</sup> /mCL)	240 (175-314)	167 (97-283)	0.001
<b>Scoring Systems</b>			
SOFA	2.0 (0-6)	10.5(6-14)	<0.001
qSOFA	1.0 (0-1)	2.0 (1-3)	<0.001
<b>Interventions</b>			
Pre-op Vasopressor	55 (21%)	30 (68%)	<0.001
Time to OR (hours)	6.2 (3.3-13.0)	4.1 (3.3-7.6)	0.06
Fluids per Kg (mL/kg)	17.8 (8.6-32.7)	27.4 (14.3-59.6)	0.007

A regression model measuring the unadjusted effect of binary fluid level on mortality on the cohort of 301 patients (Table 5) indicated that patients treated with 30 or more mL/kg were 1.89 times as likely to die than those treated with fluids below 30 mL/kg (95% CI 1.10-3.25, p=0.02). Upon adjustment by covariates (age, MAP, SBP, heart rate, lactate, creatinine and SOFA score), the amount of fluid administered was no longer statistically significant (p=0.59). Significant risk factors for mortality in the adjusted model included increasing age (p=0.001), increasing lactate (p<0.001), and increasing SOFA (p<0.001) levels. The inclusion of lactate in the latter model reduced the patient sample size in the model to 247. In a separate model without lactate (N=299), increasing age and SOFA remained as the only statistically significant risk factors for death.

**Table 5:** Relative risk regression model for mortality for those treated with <30 or ≥30 ml/kg, and adjusted for covariate risk factors.



<b>Relative Risks for Risk Factors of Mortality</b>				
<b>Effect of Fluid Volume 30+ ml/kg vs. &lt; 30 ml/kg</b>				
		95% CI for RR		
<b>Unadjusted Model (N=301)</b>	<b>RR</b>	<b>Lower</b>	<b>Upper</b>	<b>p-value</b>
30+ ml/kg vs. < 30 ml/kg	1.89	1.10	3.25	0.02
		95% CI for RR		
<b>Adjusted Model (N=247)</b>	<b>RR</b>	<b>Lower</b>	<b>Upper</b>	<b>p-value</b>
30+ ml/kg vs. < 30 ml/kg	1.15	0.69	1.92	0.59
Age (years)	1.03	1.01	1.05	0.001
MAP (mmHg)	0.99	0.97	1.02	0.63
SBP (mmHg)	1.00	0.98	1.02	0.77
Heart rate (beats/minute)	1.01	1.00	1.02	0.20
Lactate (mmol/L)	1.09	1.05	1.14	<0.001
Creatinine (mg/dL)	1.00	0.86	1.17	0.95
SOFA	1.13	1.07	1.19	<0.001

Similar results were found when analyzing the effect of increasing volume by 10 ml/kg intervals on mortality (Table 6). An unadjusted model indicated that mortality risk significantly increased by 14% for every 10 mL/kg increase in fluid volume (RR=1.14, 95% CI 1.07-1.21, p<0.001). Fluid volume was no longer significant (p=0.78) when adjusted by the covariates listed above, replaced by increasing age (p=0.002), lactate (p<0.001) and SOFA (p<0.001) levels as significant risk factors in a model with lactate and by increasing age and SOFA in a separate model without lactate.

**Table 6:** Relative risk regression model for mortality for those treated with increasing amounts of fluid by 10mL/kg and adjusted for covariate risk factors.

<b>Relative Risks for Risk Factors of Mortality</b>				
<b>Effect of Fluid Volume in Increasing 10 ml/kg Intervals</b>				
		95% CI for RR		
<b>Unadjusted Model (N=301)</b>	<b>RR</b>	<b>Lower</b>	<b>Upper</b>	<b>p-value</b>
10 ml/kg Increase in Fluid Volume	1.14	1.07	1.21	<0.001
		95% CI for RR		
<b>Adjusted Model (N=247)</b>	<b>RR</b>	<b>Lower</b>	<b>Upper</b>	<b>p-value</b>
10 ml/kg Increase in Fluid Volume	1.01	0.93	1.10	0.78
Age (years)	1.03	1.01	1.05	0.002
MAP (mmHg)	0.99	0.97	1.02	0.65
SBP (mmHg)	1.00	0.98	1.02	0.74
Heart rate (beats/minute)	1.01	1.00	1.02	0.20
Lactate (mmol/L)	1.10	1.05	1.15	<0.001
Creatinine (mg/dL)	1.02	0.88	1.17	0.83
SOFA	1.12	1.07	1.19	<0.001

## Discussion

This study represents one of the first studies examining the amount of pre-operative fluid resuscitation in patients who need urgent source control of intra-abdominal infection. We sought to answer the age old question, of how much resuscitation is needed prior to surgery. Our initial data analysis demonstrates

that increasing fluid resuscitation prior to source control was independently associated with a significant increase in mortality (Fig. 2). This study aligns with other reports showing an increase in mortality with increasing fluids (6–8, 12, 13) and others advocating for trials of decreasing fluid resuscitation (14, 15). This data differed when adjusting for covariates. In the unadjusted model, patients who received greater than 30ml/kg of volume had an increased mortality by 1.89 times, however when adjusting for covariates (age, MAP, SBP, heart rate, lactate, creatinine and SOFA score, Table 5) increasing fluid resuscitation was no longer associated with mortality in our multivariate model. This change in significance is likely the result of sicker and more physiologically deranged patients receiving and requiring more fluids for adequate pre-operative resuscitation.

Sicker patients require more fluid resuscitation, and we sought to compare how 'sick' each group was. In addition to the multivariate model, we separated our sample size into two groups, based on the Surviving Sepsis Campaign resuscitation guidelines of those who received < 30 mL/Kg or  $\geq$  30mL/kg. Both groups had similar demographics with respect to male/female (52% vs 47%) and similar age (55 vs 56). These groups were similar in qSOFA scores, however the presenting physiology differed. The patients who received more fluids had significantly greater severity of illness on admission, with lower MAP (82 vs 88), lower SBP (113 vs 124), and higher lactate (2.3 vs 1.8). Patients with worse physiology received more preoperative fluid resuscitation and required more vasopressors prior to the operating room. Interestingly, more fluids did not translate into delay to operative source control, as these patients had similar times to operation (4.9 vs 6.1 hours). When examining outcomes, patients who received more fluids tended to have increased ventilator days, ICU and hospital lengths of stay, though none of these comparisons were statistically significant. Patients who received more fluids had nearly double the mortality rate, 21% vs 11% ( $p = 0.02$ ).

Comparing survivors vs non-survivors, non-survivors were older and had greater severity of illness demonstrated by worse presenting physiology. Non-survivors were more tachycardic (105 vs 96 beats/min), tachypneic (22 vs 18 breaths/min), and hypotensive (SPB 106 vs 123 mmHg) compared to survivors. Physiology was deranged as well, with non-survivors on average having higher lactate, 3.2 vs 1.7, and baseline organ dysfunction, Cr 2.0 vs 1.0 mg/dl, bilirubin 1.5 vs 0.9 mg/dl. Severity of illness scores were worse in non-survivors, with presenting SOFA scores of 10.5 vs 2.0, and qSOFA scores of 2.0 vs 1.0. These findings align with the current knowledge that physiologically deranged patients, aka 'sicker', do worse (2, 9, 10, 16). Additionally, sicker patients often require more fluids, as was the case in our series.

The relative risk regression model, without adjusting for lactate we demonstrated significant increases in mortality with greater fluid administration (Table 5 and 6). However, when the model was adjusted for lactate, the only significant increases in mortality were increasing age, increasing lactate, and higher presenting SOFA scores (Table 5 and 6). Volume of resuscitation did not have a significant impact on mortality. This differs some recent reports showing high fluid administration and positive fluid balances increasing mortality (6–8). With respect to factors associated with worsening outcomes, our study aligns

with current reports and scoring systems that show increasing age, worse physiology and organ failure scores are associated with increased mortality (2, 9, 10, 16).

There were several limitations of this study. First of the 301 patients that met inclusion criteria, all patients were resuscitated either prior to transport to our facility, at our University Hospital, or by a combination of resuscitation at both locations. One limitation of our study, due to the retrospective nature of our study, was that there were no controls on the types of crystalloid fluid (normal saline, lactated ringers, or Plasma-Lyte) administration used for resuscitation. Additionally, patients had varying places of resuscitation, requiring resuscitation in outside emergency departments, outside hospitals, our university emergency room, or our university critical care resuscitation unit which may have impacted the total amount of fluid administration. Differences in outcome per type of fluid administered with relation to balanced vs normal saline were not recorded and may have impacted results as seen in the Balanced Crystalloids versus Saline in Critically Ill and Noncritically Ill adults (SMART) and Saline against Lactated Ringer's or Plasma-Lyte in the Emergency Department (SALT-ED) trials (17–19).

Additionally, the timing and type of vasopressor used was not uniform throughout and varied by each treating physician which may have an impact on results (1, 20). Thirdly, there was no uniform protocol for operative intervention in these patients, and need for operative source control was determined by the attending surgeon which may have impacted times to operative intervention. Lastly, we did not collect time to antibiotic administration or presence of antibiotic administration, which may have contributed mortality in these septic patients (1, 16).

## Conclusion

In our cohort of patients, using an adjusted regression model, we did not find a significant association between the amount of pre-operative fluid resuscitation and mortality but observed significant increases in mortality with increased age, lactate levels, and SOFA scores. The amount of pre-operative volume resuscitation was not associated with differences in time to operative source control, ventilator days, ICU or total hospital LOS. Patients who died had deranged physiology and evidence of organ dysfunction on admission. In our series the amount of preoperative fluid resuscitation was not associated with mortality, showing that the total amount of preoperative fluid resuscitation does not impact mortality. This one of the first studies of its kind examining pre-operative fluid resuscitation, but further studies are needed to answer the question of what is the optimal amount of preoperative fluid resuscitation in the septic emergency surgery patient.

## Abbreviations

EGS - Emergency General Surgery (EGS)

ICU – Intensive Care Unit

SOFA – Sequential Organ Failure Assessment Score

qSOFA – Quick Sequential Organ Failure Assessment Score

IQR - interquartile range

BMI – body mass index

MAP – mean arterial pressure

SBP – systolic blood pressure

FiO<sub>2</sub> – fractional inspired oxygen

PaO<sub>2</sub> – partial pressure of oxygen

LOS – length of stay

## **Declarations**

### **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

This study was approved by the University of Maryland Internal Review board.

This was a study was a retrospective review of a previously collected database, the need for written, informed consent was waived by the Institutional Review Board of the University of Maryland.

### **Consent for Publication**

No individual personal data used. N/A.

### **Availability of data and materials**

The datasets analyzed during the current study are not available publicly, as they are part of a prospectively collected database. The de-identified dataset is available on request from the corresponding author.

### **Competing interests**

The authors declare that they have no competing interests

### **Funding**

There are no sources of funding for this project.

### **Authors' contributions:**

BM collected, analyzed and interpreted the data, and was a major contributor to the manuscript. BM wrote the manuscript. EM assisted in data collection. JK performed the statistical analysis of the data

and contributed to the manuscript. ST and JD contributed with the editing and evaluation of the manuscript.

### **Acknowledgements:**

N/A

### **Authors Information:**


BM holds board certifications in General Surgery and Surgical Critical Care from the American College of Surgeons. BM is a Acute Care, Trauma, and Surgical Critical Care Attending at Einstein Medical Center in Philadelphia, USA.

## **References**

1. Rhodes A, Evans LE, Alhazzani W, Levy MM, Antonelli M, Ferrer R, et al. Surviving Sepsis Campaign: International Guidelines for Management of Sepsis and Septic Shock: 2016. *Intensive Care Med.* 2017 Mar;43(3):304–77.
2. Singer M, Deutschman CS, Seymour CW, Shankar-Hari M, Annane D, Bauer M, et al. The Third International Consensus Definitions for Sepsis and Septic Shock (Sepsis-3). *JAMA.* 2016 Feb 23;315(8):801–10.
3. Rivers E, Nguyen B, Havstad S, Ressler J, Muzzin A, Knoblich B, et al. Early Goal-Directed Therapy in the Treatment of Severe Sepsis and Septic Shock. *N Engl J Med.* 2001 Nov 8;345(19):1368–77.
4. Levy MM, Evans LE, Rhodes A. The Surviving Sepsis Campaign Bundle: 2018 update. *Intensive Care Med.* 2018;44(6):925–8.
5. Rhodes A, Evans LE, Alhazzani W, Levy MM, Antonelli M, Ferrer R, et al. Surviving Sepsis Campaign: International Guidelines for Management of Sepsis and Septic Shock: 2016. *Crit Care Med.* 2017 Mar;45(3):486–552.
6. Acheampong A, Vincent J-L. A positive fluid balance is an independent prognostic factor in patients with sepsis. *Crit Care [Internet].* 2015 [cited 2020 Jan 28];19(1). Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4479078/>
7. Boyd JH, Forbes J, Nakada T, Walley KR, Russell JA. Fluid resuscitation in septic shock: a positive fluid balance and elevated central venous pressure are associated with increased mortality. *Crit Care Med.* 2011 Feb;39(2):259–65.
8. de Oliveira FSV, Freitas FGR, Ferreira EM, de Castro I, Bafi AT, de Azevedo LCP, et al. Positive fluid balance as a prognostic factor for mortality and acute kidney injury in severe sepsis and septic shock. *J Crit Care.* 2015 Feb;30(1):97–101.
9. Sartelli M, Chichom-Mefire A, Labricciosa FM, Hardcastle T, Abu-Zidan FM, Adesunkanmi AK, et al. The management of intra-abdominal infections from a global perspective: 2017 WSES guidelines for management of intra-abdominal infections. *World J Emerg Surg WJES.* 2017;12:29.

10. Vincent JL, Moreno R, Takala J, Willatts S, De Mendonça A, Bruining H, et al. The SOFA (Sepsis-related Organ Failure Assessment) score to describe organ dysfunction/failure. On behalf of the Working Group on Sepsis-Related Problems of the European Society of Intensive Care Medicine. *Intensive Care Med.* 1996 Jul;22(7):707–10.
11. Seymour CW, Liu VX, Iwashyna TJ, Brunkhorst FM, Rea TD, Scherag A, et al. Assessment of Clinical Criteria for Sepsis: For the Third International Consensus Definitions for Sepsis and Septic Shock (Sepsis-3). *JAMA.* 2016 Feb 23;315(8):762–74.
12. Volume Overload: Prevalence, Risk Factors, and Functional Outcome in Survivors of Septic Shock. - PubMed - NCBI [Internet]. [cited 2020 Mar 21]. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26394090>
13. Brotfain E, Koyfman L, Toledano R, Borer A, Fucs L, Galante O, et al. Positive fluid balance as a major predictor of clinical outcome of patients with sepsis/septic shock after ICU discharge. *Am J Emerg Med.* 2016 Nov;34(11):2122–6.
14. Silversides JA, Fitzgerald E, Manickavasagam US, Lapinsky SE, Nisenbaum R, Hemmings N, et al. Deresuscitation of Patients With Iatrogenic Fluid Overload Is Associated With Reduced Mortality in Critical Illness. *Crit Care Med.* 2018;46(10):1600–7.
15. Macdonald SPJ, Keijzers G, Taylor DM, Kinnear F, Arendts G, Fatovich DM, et al. Restricted fluid resuscitation in suspected sepsis associated hypotension (REFRESH): a pilot randomised controlled trial. *Intensive Care Med.* 2018 Dec;44(12):2070–8.
16. Dellinger RP, Levy MM, Rhodes A, Annane D, Gerlach H, Opal SM, et al. Surviving sepsis campaign: international guidelines for management of severe sepsis and septic shock: 2012. *Crit Care Med.* 2013 Feb;41(2):580–637.
17. Semler MW, Self WH, Wanderer JP, Ehrenfeld JM, Wang L, Byrne DW, et al. Balanced Crystalloids versus Saline in Critically Ill Adults. *N Engl J Med.* 2018 Mar 1;378(9):829–39.
18. Self WH, Semler MW, Wanderer JP, Wang L, Byrne DW, Collins SP, et al. Balanced Crystalloids versus Saline in Noncritically Ill Adults. *N Engl J Med.* 2018 Mar 1;378(9):819–28.
19. Brown RM, Wang L, Coston TD, Krishnan NI, Casey JD, Wanderer JP, et al. Balanced Crystalloids versus Saline in Sepsis. A Secondary Analysis of the SMART Clinical Trial. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med.* 2019 Aug 27;200(12):1487–95.
20. Beck V, Chateau D, Bryson GL, Pisipati A, Zanotti S, Parrillo JE, et al. Timing of vasopressor initiation and mortality in septic shock: a cohort study. *Crit Care.* 2014;18(3):R97.

## Figures



**Figure 1**

Study Design, Inclusion/Exclusion




Figure 2

Percent Mortality with increasing 10ml/kg fluid resuscitation.






Figure 3

Mortality with Time to Operative Source Control