# Can we identify the risk factors for SIRS/sepsis after percutaneous nephrolithotomy? A meta-analysis and literature review

DRAGOŞ PUIA<sup>1,2</sup>, ŞTEFAN GHEORGHINCĂ<sup>3</sup>, GEORGE DANIEL RADAVOI<sup>4,5</sup>, VIOREL JINGA<sup>4,5</sup> and CĂTĂLIN PRICOP<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Urology, Grigore T. Popa University of Medicine and Pharmacy, 700115 Iași; <sup>2</sup>Department of Urology,

C. I. Parhon Hospital, 700503 Iași; <sup>3</sup>Department of Urology, Neamț Emergency

County Hospital, 610136 Piatra Neamt; <sup>4</sup>Department of Urology,

Carol Davila University of Medicine and Pharmacy, 020021 Bucharest; <sup>5</sup>Department of Urology,

Prof. Dr. Theodor Burghele Clinical Hospital, 050653 Bucharest, Romania

Received September 6, 2022; Accepted January 10, 2023

DOI: 10.3892/etm.2023.11809

Abstract. With the increase in percutaneous interventions such as percutaneous nephrolithotomy (PCNL) for renal lithiasis, infectious complications are becoming more frequent. The present study performed a systematic Medline and Embase databases search, using the following words: 'PCNL' [MeSH Terms] AND ['sepsis' (All Fields) OR 'PCNL' (All Fields)] AND ['septic shock' (All Fields)] AND ['urosepsis' (MeSH Terms) OR 'Systemic inflammatory response syndrome (SIRS)' (All Fields)]. Because of the technological advances in endourology, articles published between 2012 and 2022 were searched. Of the 1,403 results of the search, only 18 articles, representing 7,507 patients in which PCNL was performed, met the criteria to be included in the analysis. All authors applied antibiotic prophylaxis to all patients and, in some cases, the infection was treated preoperatively in those with positive urine cultures. According to the analysis of the present study, the operative time has been significantly longer in patients who developed SIRS/sepsis post-operatively (P=0.0001) with the highest heterogeneity (I<sup>2</sup>=91%) compared with other factors. Patients with a positive preoperative urine culture had a significantly higher risk of developing SIRS/sepsis following PCNL (P=0.00001), OD=2.92 (1.82, 4.68) and there was also a high degree of heterogeneity (I<sup>2</sup>=80%). Performing a multi-tract PCNL also increased the incidence of postoperative SIRS/sepsis (P=0.00001), OD=2.64 (1.78, 3.93) and the heterogeneity was a little smaller (I<sup>2</sup>=67%). Diabetes mellitus (P=0.004), OD=1.50 (1.14, 1.98), I<sup>2</sup>=27% and preoperative pyuria (P=0.002), OD=1.75 (1.23, 2.49), I<sup>2</sup>=20%, were other

*Correspondence to:* Dr Ştefan Gheorghincă, Department of Urology, Neamţ Emergency County Hospital, 1-3 Traian Bulevardul, 610136 Piatra Neamt, Romania E-mail: colectionarulc@yahoo.com

*Key words:* percutaneous nephrolithotomy, pyuria, risk factor, sepsis, urine culture

factors that significantly influenced postoperative evolution. A total of two factors analyzed, body mass index and patient's age, did not influence the outcome, P=0.45,  $I^2=58\%$  and P=0.98,  $I^2=63\%$ .

# Introduction

As the prevalence of kidney stone disease rises, a number of patients will need a minimally invasive procedure to remove kidney stones. In the 1970s, percutaneous nephrolithotomy (PCNL) was introduced as a less invasive option for kidney stone removal and it underwent additional development in the following years (1). However, extracorporeal shock wave lithotripsy was introduced in the early 1980s, decreasing PCNL frequency. Recent years have seen a redefining of the function of PCNL for treating urolithiasis, as clinical experience with ESWL has highlighted its limits (1). Nowadays, PCNL is a ubiquitous technique. In a recent survey by Jiang *et al* (2), ~80.5% of urologists in China practice PCNL and 96.2% said they like to perform it. According to the European Association of Urology, PCNL is recommended as the first-line treatment for kidney stones >2 cm and/or staghorn stones (3).

Technical advances have led to a significant reduction in the morbidity and mortality of this surgical technique. However, PCNL is not a risk-free intervention. According to Sharma et al (4), the rate of complications varies considerably, being between 3-83%. The most common are bleeding, pneumothorax, hydro/hemothorax, urinary fistula, pleural effusion and urosepsis. Although postoperative fever can be encountered in  $\leq 30\%$  of patients who undergo PCNL, urosepsis is diagnosed, according to Michel et al (5), in 0.9-4.7%. A number of authors have studied the factors that could favor the appearance of sepsis following PCNL, but the results are inconclusive. Postoperative infection is a common complication that, if untreated, can result in septic shock. According to Yang et al (6), the fatality rate for urinary septic shock can range from 25-60%, advances rapidly and is challenging to treat. There is currently no standard recommendation for the risk factors connected to postoperative infection. Preoperative urine culture positivity, stone bacterial culture positivity, stone

burden, female gender, elderly gender, diabetes mellitus and urinary tract obstruction are the key factors that lead to postoperative infection (6). The purpose of the present study was to analyze the data from the literature to date to help clinicians manage the risks of PCNL so that they become minimal.

#### Materials and methods

The present study performed this meta-analysis using Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) 2020 reporting guidelines (7). A systematic Medline (https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/) and Embase (https://www.embase.com/) databases search was performed, using the following words: 'PCNL' [MeSH Terms] AND ['sepsis' (All Fields) OR 'PCNL' (All Fields)] AND ['septic shock' (All Fields)] AND ['urosepsis' (MeSH Terms) OR 'Systemic inflammatory response syndrome (SIRS)' (All Fields)].

*Inclusion criteria*. Due to the technological advances in endourology, the present study searched articles published between 2012 and 2022. Non-English language articles and those for which the full text was unavailable were excluded. The leading search, as well as screening for eligibility of titles, abstracts and full-text articles, was completed independently by two authors and any discrepancies were solved by consensus.

The present study selected studies with a control group (non-SIRS/sepsis) and analyzed elements that favored the appearance of sepsis after urological maneuvers. These have been patients' age, diabetes mellitus, preoperative pyuria, positive preoperative urine culture, operative time-minutes, multitract and body mass index (BMI).

Statistical analysis. Heterogeneity in PCNL's infectious complications outcome rate was assessed using I<sup>2</sup> statistics. Review Manager (RevMan), Version 5.4.1, and The Cochrane Collaboration, 2020, (both Cochrane) were used to calculate the individual odds ratios (OR), P-value and personal and pooled mean differences with corresponding 95% confidence interval (CI). A P-value <0.05 has been considered statistically significant. The mean difference was used to compare the outcomes following PCNL from the infectious complications point of view. While random-effect models are considered less statistically powerful, they may produce more logical estimates if absolute heterogeneity exists. Furthermore, random-effects models may overestimate the extent of error variance, whereas fixed-effects models may underestimate it. Due to the heterogeneity of the included studies, a fixed effect size would be very implausible. Therefore, a standard random effect model was applied. Considering that all of the included studies were observational, the risk of bias was assessed using the Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment scale.

# Results

Of the 1,403 results of the search, only 18 articles were selected. The flowchart of selection is shown in Fig. 1. The chosen studies, published between 2014 and 2022, included a

total of 7,507 patients on which PCNL was performed. Details of the included studies are shown in Table I.

All authors applied antibiotic prophylaxis to all patients and in some cases, the infection was treated preoperatively in those with positive urine cultures. According to the analysis of the present study, the operative time has been significantly longer in patients who developed SIRS/sepsis post-operatively (P=0.0001) with the highest heterogeneity  $(I^2=91\%)$  compared with other factors. Patients with a positive preoperative urine culture have a significantly higher risk of developing SIRS/ sepsis following PCNL (P=0.00001), OD=2.92 (1.82, 4.68) and there is also a high degree of heterogeneity ( $I^2=80\%$ ). Performing a multi-tract PCNL also increases the incidence of postoperative SIRS/sepsis (P=0.00001), OD=2.64 (1.78, 3.93) and the heterogeneity was a little smaller ( $I^2=67\%$ ). Diabetes mellitus (P=0.004), OD=1.50 (1.14, 1.98),  $I^2=27\%$  and preoperative pyuria (P=0.002), OD=1.75 [1.23, 2.49], I<sup>2</sup>=20%, as shown in Fig. 2, were other factors that significantly influenced postoperative evolution. However, BMI and patient's age did not influence the outcome; P=0.45,  $I^2=58\%$  and P=0.98,  $I^{2=}63\%$ , as shown in Fig. 3. Non-randomized study quality evaluation is an essential key part of a comprehensive meta-analysis of non-randomized research. Poor research might have a negative effect on the estimation of the overall effect. As the present meta-analysis included non-randomized studies, the Newcastle-Ottawa scale was used to assess the risk of bias. The Newcastle-Ottawa scale consists of eight criteria divided into three categories: Selection, comparability and outcome and exposure. Several answer alternatives are offered for each issue. A star system is employed to provide a semi-quantitative evaluation of study quality, the only exception being the comparability item, which permits the allocation of two stars, with the highest quality papers receiving a maximum of one star for each item. The risk of bias total score, assessed by the Newcastle-Ottawa scale, varied between five and eight, the mean risk of bias being 6.16, resulting in an average level of study quality, as seen in Table II.

#### Discussions

PCNL is an increasingly widespread intervention that increases the incidence of complications. According to Ghani *et al* (26), sepsis following PCNL rose from 1.2% in 1999 to 2.4% in 2009 in the United States. Although not very common, postoperative urosepsis can be a life-threatening complication of PCNL.

Aging brings changes that can influence patients' immunity. A low-grade inflammatory condition characterizes elderly patients. According to Aiello *et al* (27), this situation is responsible for increased oxidative stressors and pro-inflammatory cytokines. Furthermore, in these patients, a decrease in peripheral naive T and B cells is found (28). According to Bajaj *et al* (28), neutrophils are involved in the immune response to bacterial aggression. They present an alteration of neutrophil extracellular traps, one of the mechanisms involved in the fight against pathogens. In addition, there is a reduction in phagocytosis and a lowered intracellular killing activity (28). In an animal model, an impairment of the migration of neutrophils was observed, despite a high level of chemokines (29). Other authors have

		Number of	Analyzed	
Author, year	Factor studied	patients	outcome	(Refs.)
Amier et al, 2022	B,D,E,F	171	Sepsis	(8)
Chen et al, 2019	A,B,C,D,E,F	802	Sepsis	(9)
Chhetri et al, 2018	A,C,D,E,F	97	Sepsis	(10)
He et al, 2018	A,B,C,D,E,G	1,030	SIRS	(11)
Koras <i>et al</i> , 2015	A,D,E,F,G	303	SIRS	(12)
Kumar <i>et al</i> , 2021	B,D,E,F	320	SIRS	(13)
Liu et al, 2020	A,B,D,E,F	303	SIRS	(14)
Liu et al, 2021	A,C,D,F,G	241	Sepsis	(15)
Lorenzo Soriano et al, 2019	A,B,D,E,F,G	203	SIRS	(16)
Rashid and Fakhulddin, 2016	A,D,E,	60	Sepsis	(17)
Tabei et al, 2016	A,B,C,D,E,F,G	370	SIRS	(18)
Tang <i>et al</i> , 2021	A,B,C,D,E,F,G	758	SIRS + Sepsis	(19)
Teh and Tham, 2021	B,C,D,F	425	Sepsis	(20)
Wang <i>et al</i> , 2020	A,D,E,F,G	843	Sepsis	(21)
Wei et al, 2015	A,B,E,F,G	411	SIRS	(22)
Xu et al, 2022	A,B,C,D,E,F,G	220	SIRS	(23)
Yang <i>et al</i> , 2017	A,B,E	164	SIRS	(24)
Zhu et al, 2020	A,B,C,D,E,F,G	786	Sepsis	(25)

#### Table I. Characteristics of included studies.

A, age; B, diabetes mellitus; C, pyuria; D, positive preoperative urine culture; E, operative time-minutes; F, multitract; G, body mass index.



Figure 1. PRISMA flowchart of the study selection. PRISMA, Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses; PCNL, percutaneous nephrolithotomy.

suggested that age-related alteration of hormonal status could be responsible. According to Hao *et al* (30), lower estrogen levels in women predispose them to infections, adding other factors such as poor perineal hygiene and menopause, making the incidence of urosepsis double in women. Understanding the surgical risk of PCNL in elderly patients is necessary, given the rise in life expectancy and the number of elderly individuals undergoing surgery. The results from the present study showed that, when conducted by a skilled surgeon and with compensated comorbidities, PCNL can be reasonably safe and efficiently performed on elderly patients.

A positive bladder urine culture before surgery will lead to better antibiotic prophylaxis, although a complete obstruction of the collecting system can lead to a sterile bladder urine culture. For this reason, some authors suggested that the renal pelvis urine culture could be more reliable for making preoperative prophylaxis. In a cohort of 138 patients, Dogan et al (31) noted that 10.1% of patients with previous sterile bladder urine cultures had positive renal pelvis urine cultures. Also, in a group of 122 patients, Walton-Diaz et al (32), bladder urine cultures were negative in all patients who developed infectious complications following PCNL. Of these, 57.1% had positive renal pelvis urine culture. For this reason, the authors recommend pelvic urine culture, especially in high-risk patients, because bladder urine culture is a poor predictor of the infectious complications outcome. However, the analysis results of the present study told a different story.

On the other hand, to get the renal pelvis urine culture, placing a needle in the collecting system is necessary. After obtaining the urine, the urologist can perform the intervention simultaneously or place a drainage tube until the result is available after ~48 h. The presence of a nephrostomy tube before PCNL is a debatable factor. In a cohort of 217 patients, Aghdas *et al* (33) noticed a higher incidence of postoperative fever in those who had a nephrostomy placed preoperatively. However, according to Benson *et al* (34), it has a protective role. There is no clear explanation for this situation. Although the tube will drain the infected urine, it would act as a foreign

Operative time	SIR	6/Sepsi	s	Non S	RS/Sepsi	5	St	d. Mean Difference			Std. Mean I	Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD T	otal Wei	ght	IV, Random, 95% C	I Year		IV, Rando	m, 95% Cl
Koras et al. Wei et al	151.7	39.1	23	116.6	38.1	280 6. 266 7	2% 1%	0.92 [0.49, 1.35]	2014			
Rachid et al.	106.67	11.54	3	75.5	20.8	57 3.	1%	1.50 [0.30, 2.69]	2016			<u> </u>
Tabei et al.	123.3	43	61	126.5	40.3	309 6.	9%	-0.08 [-0.35, 0.20]	2016		-	-
Yang et al.	133.41	52.47	45	133.75	53.9	119 6.	6% 2%	-0.01 [-0.35, 0.34]	2017			
Chen et al.	109.9	28.6	19	98.1	35.7	783 6.	1%	0.33 [-0.12, 0.79]	2018		-	
Zhu et al.	113.3	30.6	23	89.6	23.4	763 6.	3%	1.00 [0.58, 1.42]	2019			
Lorenzo Soriano et al.	120.9	45.4	30	120.5	43.5	173 6.	4%	0.01 [-0.38, 0.40]	2019		-	
vvangetal. Liuetal	115.97	45.34	88	47.58	8.25	621 6. 215 7	∠% 0%	2.20 [1.77, 2.64]	2020			·
Kumar et al.	60.51	13.76	64	43.72	11.13	256 6.	8%	1.43 [1.14, 1.73]	2021			
Tang et al.(shock)	123.8	45.2	42	119.3	27.4	716 6.	7%	0.16 [-0.15, 0.47]	2021		+	-
Tang et al.(SIRS)	125.8	41.2	97	118.7	26.2	661 7.	1%	0.25 [0.04, 0.46]	2021			<u> </u>
Amier et al. Yu et al	152	45.33	29	126	44.07	142 6. 130 6	4% 0%	0.58 [0.18, 0.99]	2022			
Au or ui.	102	00	0.	00	00	100 0.	070	0.01 [0.00, 0.00]	LOLL			
Total (95% CI)			778		5	791 100.	0%	0.61 [0.34, 0.88]			.	. ▲
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.2 Test for overall effect: 7 =	16; Chi* =	< 0.000	3, df = 1	5 (P < 0.)	00001); I*	= 91%				-2	-1 0	1 2
rest for overall effect. Z -	4.37 (F	~ 0.000	,,,								SIRS/Sepsis	Non SIRS/Sepsis
Positive urine c	ulture	•										
	SIRS	/Sepsi	sN	on SIRS	/Sepsis			Odds Ratio			Odds	Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Even	ts To	otal	Events	Tota	Weight	t M-	H, Random, 95% C	l Year		M-H, Rand	lom, 95% Cl
Koras et al.	_	6	23	27	280	6.6%	•	3.31 [1.20, 9.10]	2014			
Tabei et al.	5	51	61	240	309	7.7%	,	1.47 [0.71, 3.04]	2016			
Rachid et al.		0	3	5	57	1.9%	· .	1.36 [0.06, 29.99]	2016			·
Chnetri et al.		2	10	150	91	2.0%		50.82 [1.94, 009.08]	2018			·
Zhu et al	1	6	23	110	763	7.0%		13 57 [5 46 33 74]	2010			
Liu et al	3	5	88	60	215	8.5%	, ,	1.71 [1.01, 2.87]	2020			<b></b>
Wang et al.		3	22	82	821	5.7%	,	1.42 [0.41, 4.91]	2020			
Tang et al.(SIRS)	3	57	97	98	661	8.6%	,	3.54 [2.23, 5.63]	2021			
Tang et al.(shock)	1	8	42	117	716	8.0%	•	3.84 [2.02, 7.30]	2021			
Liu et al.	2	8	41	74	200	7.7%	•	3.67 [1.79, 7.52]	2021			
i en et al. Kumar et al		9	16	98	409	6.6%	•	4.08 [1.48, 11.24]	2021			
rumaretal. Xuetal	2	. <del>J</del>	04 81	36 17	256	0.2% 8.0%		0.39 [0.21 0.75]	2021			-
Amier et al.	2	7	29	21	142	6.7%	,	1.83 [0.70, 4.83]	2022		-	<b>—</b>
						5.1 /						
Total (95% CI)		e	15		5784	100.0%		2.92 [1.82, 4.68]				•
Total events	28	2		1194								
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.61; C	hi² = 69	9.08, df	= 14 (P	< 0.0000	l); l² = 80	%			0.01	0.1	1 10 10
l est for overall effect:	Z = 4.4	5 (P < l	1.0000	)						Non	SIRS/Sepsis	SIRS/Sepsis
Multitue of												
Multitact	S	IRS/Se	psis	Non \$	SIRS/Sep	sis		Odds Ratio			Odds	Ratio
Study or Subgroup	E	vents	Tota	Eve	nts .	Fotal W	eight	M-H, Random, 9	5% CI		M-H, Ranc	lom, 95% Cl
Amier et al.		3	29	)	11	142	4.7%	1.37 [0.36,	5.27]			
Chen et al.		6	19		78	783	6.1%	4.17 [1.54, 1	1.29]			
Chnetri et al.		6	t 00		16	91	1.6%	59.48 [3.19, 110	8.83			
Kumar et al		30	64	•	24	220	8.1%	0.20 [3.41, 1	6 001			<u> </u>
Liu ot ol		55	04		21	200	5.8%	3.03 [4.00, 1	0.33			<b></b>
		- H	88		я	210		1678158	4 851			
Liu et al.		6 10	88 41		9 26	200	7.0%	1.67 [U.58, 2.16 [0.95.	4.85]			<u> </u>
Liu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et a	al.	6 10 5	88 41 30	•	9 26 11	200 173	7.0% 5.5%	1.67 [0.58, 2.16 [0.95, 2.95 [0.94,	4.85] 4.92] 9.19]			<u> </u>
Liu et al Liu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et a Tabei et al.	al.	6 10 5 7	88 41 30 61	)	9 26 11 15	200 173 309	7.0% 5.5% 6.4%	1.67 [0.58, 2.16 [0.95, 2.95 [0.94, 2.54 [0.99,	4.85] 4.92] 9.19] 6.52]			
Liu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et a Tabei et al. Tang et al.(shock)	al.	6 10 5 7 5	88 41 30 61 42		9 26 11 15 53	200 173 309 716	7.0% 5.5% 6.4% 6.2%	1.67 [0.58, 2.16 [0.95, 2.95 [0.94, 2.54 [0.99, 1.69 [0.64,	4.85] 4.92] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48]		_	
Liu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et a Tabei et al. Tang et al.(shock) Tang et al.(SIRS)	al.	6 10 5 7 5 12	88 41 30 61 42 97		9 26 11 15 53 46	215 200 173 309 716 661	7.0% 5.5% 6.4% 6.2% 7.8%	1.67 [0.58, 2.16 [0.95, 2.95 [0.94, 2.54 [0.99, 1.69 [0.64, 1.89 [0.96,	4.85] 4.92] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71]		_	
Liu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et a Tabei et al. Tang et al.(shock) Tang et al.(SIRS) Teh et al.	al.	6 10 5 7 5 12 7	88 41 30 61 42 97 15		9 26 11 15 53 46 50	215 200 173 309 716 661 331	7.0% 5.5% 6.4% 6.2% 7.8% 5.8%	1.67 [0.58, 2.16 [0.95, 2.95 [0.94, 2.54 [0.99, 1.69 [0.64, 1.89 [0.96, 4.92 [1.71, 1	4.85] 4.92] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 4.17]		_	
Liu et al. Liu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et a Tabei et al. Tang et al.(SIRS) Teh et al. Wang et al.	al.	6 10 5 7 5 12 7 5	88 41 30 61 42 97 15 22		9 26 11 15 53 46 50 92 22	215 200 173 309 716 661 331 821 266	7.0% 5.5% 6.4% 6.2% 7.8% 5.8% 6.0%	1.67 [0.58, 2.16 [0.95, 2.95 [0.94, 2.54 [0.99, 1.69 [0.64, 1.89 [0.96, 4.92 [1.71, 1 2.33 [0.84, 1.40 [0.50]	4.85] 4.92] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 4.17] 6.47]		-	
Liu et al. Liu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et a Tabei et al. Tang et al.(sIRS) Tang et al.(SIRS) Teh et al. Wang et al. Vuel et al.	al.	6 10 5 7 5 12 7 5 14 13	88 41 30 61 42 97 15 22 145 81		9 26 11 15 53 46 50 92 22 24	215 200 173 309 716 661 331 821 266 139	7.0% 5.5% 6.4% 6.2% 7.8% 5.8% 6.0% 7.6% 7.4%	1.67 [0.58, 2.16 [0.95, 2.95 [0.94, 2.54 [0.99, 1.69 [0.64, 1.89 [0.96, 4.92 [1.71, 1 2.33 [0.84, 1.19 [0.59, 0.92 [0.44]	4.85] 4.92] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 4.17] 6.47] 2.39] 1.92]		-	
Liu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et a Tabei et al. Tang et al.(shock) Tang et al.(SIRS) Teh et al. Wang et al. Wei et al. Xu et al. Zhu et al	al.	6 10 5 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 5	88 41 30 61 42 97 15 22 145 81 23		9 26 11 15 53 46 50 92 22 24 87	215 200 173 309 716 661 331 821 266 139 763	7.0% 5.5% 6.4% 6.2% 7.8% 5.8% 6.0% 7.6% 7.4% 6.0%	1.67 (0.58, 2.16 [0.95, 2.95 [0.94, 2.54 [0.99, 1.69 [0.64, 1.89 [0.96, 4.92 [1.71, 1 2.33 [0.84, 1.19 [0.59, 0.92 [0.44, 2.16 [0.78,	4.85] 4.92] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 4.17] 6.47] 2.39] 1.92] 5.96]		-	
Liu et al. Liu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et a Tang et al.(shock) Tang et al.(SIRS) Teh et al. Wang et al. Wei et al. Xu et al. Zhu et al.	al.	6 10 5 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 5	88 41 30 61 42 97 15 22 145 81 23		9 26 11 15 53 46 50 92 22 24 87	213 200 173 309 716 661 331 821 266 139 763	7.0% 5.5% 6.4% 6.2% 7.8% 5.8% 6.0% 7.6% 7.4% 6.0%	1.67 (0.58, 2.16 [0.95, 2.95 [0.94, 2.54 [0.99, 1.69 [0.84, 1.89 [0.96, 4.92 [1.71, 1 2.33 [0.84, 1.19 [0.59, 0.92 [0.44, 2.16 [0.78,	4.85] 4.92] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 4.17] 6.47] 2.39] 1.92] 5.96]		-	
Liu et al. Liu et al. Tabei et al. Tang et al.(shock) Tang et al.(shRS) Teh et al. Wang et al. Wu et al. Xu et al. Zhu et al. Total (95% CI)	al.	6 10 5 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 5	88 41 30 61 42 97 15 22 145 81 23 846		9 26 11 15 53 46 50 92 22 24 87	213 200 173 309 716 661 331 821 266 139 763 5086 10	7.0% 5.5% 6.4% 6.2% 7.8% 5.8% 6.0% 7.6% 7.4% 6.0%	1.67 (0.58, 2.16 (0.95, 2.95 (0.94, 2.54 (0.99, 1.69 (0.64, 1.89 (0.96, 4.92 [1.71, 1 2.33 [0.84, 1.19 (0.59, 0.92 [0.44, 2.16 (0.78, 2.64 [1.78,	4.85] 4.92] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 4.17] 6.47] 2.39] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93]		-	
Liu et al. Liu et al. Tang et al.(shock) Tang et al.(shock) Tang et al.(SiRS) Teh et al. Wang et al. Wei et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Total (95% CI) Total events	al.	6 10 5 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 5	88 41 30 61 42 97 15 22 145 81 23 846		9 26 11 15 53 46 50 92 22 24 87	213 200 173 309 716 661 331 821 266 139 763 5086 10	7.0% 5.5% 6.4% 6.2% 7.8% 5.8% 6.0% 7.6% 7.6% 7.4% 6.0%	1.67 (U.58, 2.16 (0.95, 2.95 (0.94, 2.54 (0.99, 1.69 (0.64, 1.89 (0.96, 4.92 [1.71, 1 2.33 (0.84, 1.19 (0.59, 0.92 [0.44, 2.16 [0.78, 2.64 [1.78,	4.85] 4.92] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 4.17] 6.47] 2.39] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93]		-	
Live et al Live et al. Tabei et al. Tang et al. (shock) Tang et al. (shock) Tang et al. (SIRS) Teh et al. Wei et al. Xu et al. Xu et al. Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau'	al. = 0.41;	6 10 5 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 5 173 Chi <sup>2</sup> =	88 41 30 61 42 97 15 22 145 81 23 846 45.44,	df = 15	9 26 11 15 53 46 50 92 22 24 87 (P < 0.00	213 200 173 309 716 661 331 821 266 139 763 6086 10 01);   <sup>2</sup> = 1	7.0% 5.5% 6.4% 6.2% 7.8% 5.8% 6.0% 7.6% 7.6% 7.4% 6.0%	1.67 (1.38) 2.16 (10.95, 2.95 (10.94, 2.54 (10.99, 1.68 (10.96, 4.92 (1.71, 1 2.33 (10.94, 1.18 (10.59, 0.92 (10.44, 2.16 (10.78, 2.64 (1.78,	4.85] 4.92] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 4.17] 6.47] 2.39] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93]	H		• • • • • •
Liu et al Liu et al Tabei et al. Tang et al.(shock) Tang et al.(shock) Tang et al.(shock) Teh et al. Wai et al. Xu et al. Zhu et al. Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneily: Tau <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect	al. = 0.41; t: Z = 4	6 10 5 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 5 173 Chi <sup>2</sup> =	88 41 30 61 42 97 15 22 145 81 23 846 45.44, < 0.000	f df = 15 001)	9 26 11 15 53 46 50 92 22 24 87 591 (P < 0.00	213 200 173 309 716 661 331 821 266 139 763 5086 10 01);   <sup>2</sup> = 0	7.0% 5.5% 6.4% 6.2% 7.8% 5.8% 6.0% 7.6% 7.4% 6.0%	1.67 (13.88 2.16 [0.95, 2.95 [0.94, 2.54 [0.99, 1.68 [0.64, 4.92 [1.71, 1 2.33 [0.84, 1.19 [0.59, 0.92 [0.44, 2.16 [0.78, 2.64 [1.78,	4.85] 4.92] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 4.17] 6.47] 2.39] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93]	0.02 0	  1 SIRS/Sepsis	10 SIRS/Sepsis
Liu et al. Liu et al. Tabei et al. Tang et al.(shock) Tang et al.(shiCS) Teh et al. Wang et al. Wei et al. Xu et al. Zhu et al. Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effec <b>Diabetes</b>	al. = 0.41; t: Z = 4	6 10 5 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 5 173 Chi <sup>2</sup> = .80 (P	88 41 30 61 42 97 15 22 145 81 23 846 45.44, < 0.000	df = 15 001)	9 26 11 15 53 46 50 92 22 24 87 (P < 0.00 (P < 0.00)	210 200 173 309 716 661 331 821 266 139 763 5086 10 01);   <sup>2</sup> = 0	5.5% 5.5% 6.4% 6.2% 7.8% 5.8% 6.0% 7.6% 7.4% 6.0%	1.67 (U.38, 2.16 (D.95, 2.95 (D.94, 2.54 (D.99, 1.68 (D.64, 1.88 (D.96, 4.92 (1.71, 1 2.33 (D.84, 1.19 (D.59, 0.92 (D.44, 2.16 (D.78, 2.64 (1.78,	4.85] 4.92] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 4.17] 6.47] 2.39] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93]	0.02 0.	1 SIRS/Sepsis	Non SIRS/Sepsis
Liu et al. Liu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Tabei et al. Tang et al. (shock). Tang et al. (slRS) Teh et al. Waig et al. Waig et al. Xu et al. Zhu et al. Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneily: Tau <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effec <b>Diabetes</b> Study or Subgroup	al. = 0.41; t: Z = 4 SIR3 Ever	6 10 5 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 173 Chi <sup>2</sup> = .80 (P	88 41 30 61 42 97 15 22 145 81 23 846 45.44, < 0.000 is Motal	df = 15 001) Ion SIRS Events	9 26 11 15 53 46 50 92 22 24 87 (P < 0.00 (P < 0.00) 5/Sepsis Tota	210 200 173 309 716 661 331 821 266 139 763 5086 10 01);   <sup>2</sup> = 1	5.5% 5.5% 6.4% 6.2% 7.8% 5.8% 6.0% 7.6% 7.4% 6.0% 00.0%	1.67 (13.8) 2.95 (10.95, 2.95 (10.94, 2.95 (10.94, 2.95 (10.94, 1.88 (10.96, 4.92 [1.71, 1. 2.33 (10.84, 1.33 (10.84, 1.33 (10.84, 2.16 (10.78, 2.64 [1.78, 0.04ds Ratio H, Random, 95% C	4.85] 4.92] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 4.47] 2.39] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93]	H-0.02 0.	1 SIRS/Sepsis Odds M-H, Rad	1 10 5 Non SIRS/Sepsis
Liu et al Liu et al Lorenzo Soriano et al Tabei et al. Tang et al. (shock) Tang et al. (shock) Tang et al. Wang et al. Wang et al. Xu et al. Zhu et al. Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>a</sup> Test for overall effec <b>Diabetes</b> Study or Subgroup Wei et al.	al. = 0.41; t: Z = 4 SIR: Ever	6 10 5 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 173 Chi <sup>2</sup> = .80 (P 5/Seps 5/Seps 515 T 34	88 41 30 61 42 97 145 81 22 23 846 45.44, < 0.000 is Notal 145	df = 15 001) Ion SIRS <u>Events</u> 40	9 26 11 15 53 46 50 92 22 24 87 (P < 0.00 (P < 0.00 (C) 5/Sepsis <u>Tota</u> 266	$\frac{2}{3}$ 200 173 309 716 661 331 821 266 139 763 5086 10 01); $ ^2 = 0$ 1 Weight 1 4.5%	7.0% 5.5% 6.4% 6.2% 7.8% 5.8% 6.0% 7.6% 7.6% 7.6% 0.0% 6.0% 0.0%	1.67 (10.38, 2.16 [0.95, 2.95 [0.94, 2.54 [0.99, 1.69 [0.64, 1.89 [0.96, 4.92 [1.71, 1 2.33 [0.84, 1.18 [0.59, 0.92 [0.44, 2.16 [0.78, 2.64 [1.78, 0.64 [1.78, 0.64 [1.78, 1.73 [1.04, 2.88]	4.85] 4.92] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 6.47] 4.17] 6.47] 5.96] 3.93] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93]	H-0.02 0.	1 SIRS/Sepsis Odds M-H, Rand	Non SIRS/Sepsis Ratio om, 95% Cl
Liu et al. Liu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Tabei et al. Tang et al.(shock) Tang et al.(shock) Tang et al. Wai et al. Xiu et al. Zhu et al. Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneily: Tau <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effec <b>Diabetes</b> <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Wei et al.	al. = 0.41; t: Z = 4 SIR: Ever	6 10 5 7 5 12 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 5 7 14 13 5 5 7 6 7 8 0 (P 5 5 5 80 (P 5 5 5 5 7 8 7 5 12 7 5 12 7 5 12 7 5 5 12 7 5 5 12 7 5 5 7 5 5 7 5 5 7 5 5 7 5 5 7 5 5 7 5 5 7 7 5 5 7 5 5 7 5 5 7 5 5 7 5 5 7 5 5 7 7 5 5 7 5 5 7 5 5 7 5 5 7 5 5 7 5 5 7 5 5 7 5 5 7 5 5 7 5 5 7 5 5 7 5 5 7 5 5 5 7 5 5 7 5 5 5 7 5 5 7 5 5 7 5 5 7 5 5 7 7 5 5 5 7 5 5 5 7 7 5 5 5 7 7 5 5 5 7 7 5 5 7 7 5 5 5 7 7 5 5 5 7 7 5 5 5 7 7 5 5 5 5 7 7 5 5 5 7 7 7 5 5 5 5 5 7 5 7 7 5 5 7 7 5 5 5 5 5 7 7 5 5 5 7 5 5 5 7 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 7 5 7 5 5 5 7 5	88 41 30 61 42 97 15 22 145 81 23 846 45.44, < 0.000 is M otal 145 3	df = 15 001) Ion SIRS <u>Events</u> 40 7	9 26 11 15 53 46 50 92 22 24 87 691 (P < 0.00 5/Sepsis 70ta 25 57	213 200 173 309 716 661 331 821 266 139 763 5086 10 01); l <sup>2</sup> = 0 <u>I Weight</u> 5 14.5% ' 1.1%	1000         1000           5.5%         6.4%           6.4%         6.4%           6.4%         6.4%           6.4%         6.4%           6.4%         6.2%           7.8%         5.8%           6.0%         7.6%           7.4%         6.0%           6.0%         6.0%           6.7%         6.0%           5.5%         6.0%	1.67 (13.88 2.16 [10.95, 2.95 [10.94, 2.54 [10.99, 1.68 [10.94, 4.92 [1.71, 1 2.33 [10.84, 1.19 [10.59, 0.92 [1.74, 1 2.33 [10.84, 1.19 [10.59, 0.92 [1.74, 2.64 [1.78, 2.64 [1.78, 0.64 [1.78, 1.73 [1.04, 2.88] 3.57 [10.29, 44.72]	4.85 4.92] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 4.17] 6.6.47] 2.39] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93]	0.02 0	1 SIRS/Sepsis Odds M-H, Rand	1 10 for the second sec
Liu et al Liu et al Lorenzo Soriano et al Tabei et al. Tang et al.(shock) Tang et al.(shiCS) Teh et al. Xu et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effec <b>Diabetes</b> Study or Subgroup Wei et al. Tabei et al. Tabei et al.	= 0.41; t: Z = 4 SiR4 Ever	6 10 5 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 5 7 14 13 5 7 14 13 5 5 (Chi <sup>2</sup> = 8.0 (P	88 41 30 61 42 97 15 22 145 846 45.44, < 0.000 is M otal 145 3 61	df = 15 001) 100n SIRS <u>Events</u> 40 7 46	9 26 11 15 53 46 50 92 22 24 87 591 (P < 0.00) 5/Sepsis 57 300 57 300	213 213 200 173 309 716 661 331 821 266 139 763 5086 10 01);   <sup>2</sup> = 0 1 Weight 5 14.5% 1.1% 8.3%	1000         1000           5.5%         6.4%           6.4%         6.4%           6.4%         6.4%           5.8%         6.0%           7.6%         7.4%           6.0%         0.0%           5.7%         10.0%           5.5%         10.0%	1.67 (13.88 2.16 [10.95, 2.95 [10.94, 2.95 [10.94, 2.95 [10.94, 1.88 [10.96, 4.92 [1.71, 1 2.33 [0.84, 1.18 [10.96, 0.92 [0.44, 2.16 [0.78, 2.64 [1.78, 0.045 Ratio H, Random, 95% C 1.73 [1.04, 2.88] 0.86 [0.39, 1.33]	4.85] 4.92] 9.19] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 4.17] 6.47] 2.39] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93]	0.02 0	1 SIRS/Sepsis Odds M-H, Rand	The second secon
Liu et al Liu et al Lorenzo Soriano et al Tabei et al. Tang et al. (shock) Tang et al. (shock) Tang et al. Wei et al. Xu et al. Xu et al. Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effec <b>Diabetes</b> <b>Study or Subgroup</b> Wei et al. Rachid et al. Tabei et al. Chon et el.	al. = 0.41; t: Z = 4 SIR4 Ever	6 10 5 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 5 7 5 14 13 5 7 5 14 13 5 5 (P- Chi <sup>2</sup> = 8.0 (P- 5)/Steps 5/Steps 13 4 1 8 5	88 41 300 61 42 97 15 22 145 22 145 846 45.44, < 0.000 is M 61 145 3 61 45	df = 15 001) Ion SIRS <u>Events</u> 40 7 46 9 7	9 9 26 11 15 53 46 50 92 22 24 87 (P < 0.00 (P < 0.00 55 55 50 92 22 24 87 (P < 0.00 55 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	213 213 200 173 309 716 661 331 821 266 139 763 5086 10 01); l <sup>2</sup> = 0 1 Weight 5 14.5% 1.1% 8 .3% 4 .8% 4 .8%	7.0% 5.5% 6.4% 6.2% 7.8% 5.8% 6.0% 7.6% 7.4% 6.0% 0.0% 5.7%	1.67 (13.88 2.16 [10.95, 2.95 [10.94, 2.54 [10.96, 4.92 [1.71, 1 2.33 [10.84, 1.18 [10.96, 0.92 [1.71, 1 2.33 [10.84, 2.16 [1.78, 0.92 [0.44, 2.16 [1.78, 2.64 [1.78, 1.73 [1.04, 2.88] 3.57 [1.29, 4.72] 0.68 [10.39, 1.93] 1.53 [10.48, 4.83] 0.51 [10.29, 4.72]	4.85] 4.92] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 4.17] 6.47] 2.39] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] 1 Year 2015 2016 2016 2016	0.02 0.	1 SIRS/Sepsis Odds M-H, Rand	Non SIRS/Sepsis
Liu et al. Liu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Tabei et al. Tang et al.(shock) Tang et al.(shock) Tang et al. Wei et al. Xu et al. Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneily: Tau <sup>a</sup> Test for overall effec <b>Diabetes</b> <b>Study or Subgroup</b> Wei et al. Tabi et al. Tabi et al. Chen et al. Corpor Soriano et al.	al. t: Z = 4 SIR3 Ever	6 10 5 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 14 13 14 13 14 13 14 13 14 13 14 13 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 13 14 13 14 13 14 13 14 13 14 13 14 13 14 13 14 13 14 13 14 14 13 14 13 14 14 13 14 14 13 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14	88 41 300 61 42 97 15 22 145 81 22 846 45.44, < 0.000 is M 61 45 3 61 45 3 61 45 3 97 30	df = 1 ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) (	9 9 26 11 15 53 46 50 92 22 24 87 591 (P < 0.000 5/Sepsis Tota 266 57 300 3/Sepsis 115 783 115 783 115 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 1	$\frac{2}{100}$ $\frac{2}{173}$ $\frac{3}{309}$ $\frac{7}{16}$ $\frac{6}{661}$ $\frac{3}{331}$ $\frac{8}{21}$ $\frac{1}{39}$ $\frac{7}{63}$ $\frac{1}{39}$ $\frac{1}{7}$ $\frac{1}{39}$ $\frac{1}{$	1000000000000000000000000000000000000	1.67 (13.88 2.16 [10.95, 2.95 [10.94, 2.54 [10.99, 1.68 [10.84, 4.92 [1.71, 1 2.33 [10.84, 1.33 [10.84, 2.64 [1.78, 2.64 [1.78, 2.64 [1.78, 1.73 [10.42, 2.88] 3.57 [0.29, 44.72] 0.86 [0.39, 1.93] 1.53 [10.48, 4.83] 0.51 [10.77, 3.77]	4.85] 4.92] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 4.17] 6.47] 2.39] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] 1.92] 5.96] 2.015 2.016 2.016 2.016 2.017 2.018	0.02 0	1 SIRS/Sepsis Odds M-H, Rand	1 10 5 Non SIRS/Sepsis
Liu et al. Liu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Tang et al. (shock) Tang et al. (shock) Tang et al. Wang et al. Xu et al. Zhu et al. Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneily: Tau <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effec <b>Diabetes</b> <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Wei et al. Tachi et al. Tabei et al. Yang et al. Chen et al. Chen et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Zhu et al.	al. t: Z = 4 SIR3 Ever	6 10 5 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 14 13 14 13 14 13 14 13 14 13 14 13 14 13 14 14 14 13 14 13 14 13 14 13 14 13 14 13 14 13 14 13 14 13 14 14 13 14 14 13 14 14 14 13 14 14 13 14 14 13 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14	88 41 300 61 42 97 15 22 145 81 23 846 45.44, < 0.000 is M otal 145 3 61 45 19 30 223	df = 15 (df = 15 (001) (001 SIR53 (Events) 40 7 7 46 9 9 77 23 3 115	9 9 26 11 15 53 46 50 92 22 24 87 (P < 0.00 591 (P < 0.00 5/Sepsis Tota 226 57 3/05 57 57 57 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	210 217 200 173 309 661 331 821 2266 139 763 5086 10 01);   <sup>2</sup> = 0 1 Weight 5 14.5% 1.1% 8.3% 4.8% 4.8% 5 .3% 5 .3% 1.1% 5 .3% 5 .3%	t M-	1.67 (1.38, 2.16 [0.95, 2.95 [0.94, 2.95 [0.94, 1.68 [0.64, 4.92 [1.71, 1 2.33 [0.84, 1.18 [0.96, 4.92 [1.71, 1 2.33 [0.84, 1.19 [0.59, 0.92 [0.44, 2.16 [0.78, 2.64 [1.78, 0.64 [1.78, 0.66 [0.39, 1.33] 1.53 [0.48, 4.83] 1.53 [0.48, 4.83] 0.51 [0.07, 3.87] 1.00 [0.32, 3.14]	4.85] 4.92] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 4.17] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 4.17] 5.96] 3.93] 2015 2016 2016 2016 2016 2017 2018 2019 2019	0.02 0	1 SIRS/Sepsis Odds M-H, Rand	■ 10 5% Cl
Liu et al Liu et al Lorenzo Soriano et al. Tarbei et al. Tang et al. (shock). Tang et al. (shock). Tang et al. Wei et al. Xu et al. Xu et al. Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effec <b>Diabetes</b> <b>Study or Subgroup</b> Wei et al. Yang et al. Chen et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Zhu et al.	al. = 0.41; t: Z = 4 SIR: Ever	6 10 5 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 14 13 5 14 17 14 13 5 14 17 14 13 5 14 17 14 13 5 14 17 17 18 18 17 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18	88 41 300 61 42 97 15 222 145 81 23 846 45.44, < 0.000 is M otal 145 61 45 19 30 223 88	df = 15 (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4)	9 26 11 15 53 46 50 92 22 24 87 (P < 0.00 591 (P < 0.00 5/Sepsis 57 300 51 115 57 300 57 763 215 763 215	2 10 2 17 2 200 173 309 716 661 331 821 266 139 763 5086 10 01); I <sup>2</sup> = ( Weight 1.1% 8.3% 1.1% 8.4.8% 1.7% 4.8% 1.7% 4.8% 7.7%	t M-	1.67 (13.88 2.16 [0.95, 2.95 [0.94, 2.54 [0.99, 1.69 [0.64, 1.89 [0.64, 4.92 [1.71, 1 2.33 [0.84, 1.18 [0.59, 0.92 [0.44, 2.16 [0.78, 2.64 [1.78, 2.64 [1.78, 3.57 [0.29, 4.72] 0.68 [0.39, 1.93] 1.53 [0.42, 4.83] 0.51 [0.07, 3.87] 1.00 [0.32, 3.14] 3.01 [1.25, 7.25]	4.85] 4.92] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 4.17] 6.47] 2.39] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] 2.016 2.016 2.016 2.017 2.018 2.019	0.02 0	1 SIRS/Sepsis Odds M-H, Rand	Aatio om, 95% Cl
Liu et al. Liu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Tabei et al. Tang et al.(shock) Tang et al.(shock) Tang et al. Wei et al. Xu et al. Zhu et al. Total (95% CI) Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneily: Tau <sup>a</sup> Test for overall effec <b>Diabetes</b> <b>Study or Subgroup</b> Wei et al. Tabei et al. Chen et al. Zhu et al. Liu et al.	al. t: Z = 4 SIR4 Ever	6 10 5 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 5 5 5 5 12 7 5 14 13 5 5 5 5 14 13 5 5 5 14 13 5 5 14 13 5 5 14 13 5 5 5 14 13 5 5 5 14 13 5 5 5 14 13 5 5 5 14 13 5 5 5 14 13 5 5 5 5 5 14 13 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	888 41 30 61 42 97 15 22 145 81 23 846 45,44, < 0.000 is M 61 145 3 61 45 19 30 23 888 816	( df = 15 ) lon SIRS <u>Events</u> 40 9 77 723 115 27 21 08	9 22 11 15 53 46 50 92 22 22 48 7 59 1 (V < 0.00 59 59 1 (V < 0.00 59 59 1 (V < 0.00 59 59 1 (V < 0.00 59 59 59 59 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	2 10 2 10 2 00 173 309 200 173 309 661 331 266 139 266 139 266 139 266 10 821 266 10 821 266 10 821 266 10 821 266 10 821 266 10 821 266 10 821 266 10 821 266 10 821 266 10 821 266 10 821 266 10 821 266 10 821 266 10 821 266 10 83 10 83 10 83 10 83 10 83 10 83 10 83 10 83 10 83 10 83 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	5.5% 6.4% 6.2% 7.8% 6.2% 7.8% 6.0% 7.6% 7.6% 7.6% 7.6% 7.6% 7.6% 7.6% 7.6% 5.5% 6.0% 0.0% 5.5% 6.0% 6.2% 7.8% 6.2% 7.8% 6.2% 7.8% 6.2% 7.8% 6.2% 7.8% 6.2% 7.8% 6.2% 7.8% 6.2% 7.8% 6.0% 7.8%	1.67 (13.8) 2.16 [0.95, 2.95 [0.94, 2.54 [0.99, 1.68 [0.64, 4.92 [1.71, 1 2.33 [0.64, 1.23 [0.64, 1.19 [0.59, 0.92 [0.44, 2.16 [0.78, 2.64 [1.78, 0.64 [1.78, 1.73 [1.04, 2.88] 3.57 [0.29, 44.72] 0.86 [0.39, 1.93] 1.53 [0.48, 4.83] 0.51 [0.73, 3.71] 1.53 [0.48, 4.83] 0.51 [0.73, 3.71] 1.50 [0.48, 4.83]	4.85] 4.92] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 4.17] 6.47] 2.39] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] 1.92] 2015 2016 2016 2016 2016 2016 2019 2019 2019 2020 2022	0.02 0	1 SIRS/Sepsis Odds M-H, Rand	Actio
Liu et al Liu et al Lorenzo Soriano et al. Tang et al.(shock) Tang et al.(shock) Tang et al.(shiCS) Teh et al. Xu et al. Zhu et al. Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneily: Tau' Test for overall effec Diabetes Study or Subgroup Wei et al. Rachid et al. Tabei et al. Yang et al. Chen et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Liu et al Teh et al.	al. t: Z = 4 SIR4 Ever	6 10 5 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 15 15 15 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16	886 41 30 61 42 97 7 5 22 145 846 45.44, < 0.000 is M 0 01 145 3 61 19 30 23 888 64 64 5 64 16 64	(1) (df = 15 ) (01) (01) (01) (01) (01) (01) (01) (0	9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	2 13 2 13 2 13 2 00 173 3 09 2 716 6 61 1 331 2 66 6 61 1 331 2 66 1 139 7 63 3 0086 1 0 0 1); I <sup>2</sup> = ( 1 4.5% 1 1.1% 8 .3% 4 .5% 5 .7% 5 .7	5.5% 6.4% 6.2% 7.8% 5.8% 5.8% 7.6% 7.6% 7.6% 7.6% 7.4% 6.0% 0.0% 57%	1.67 (1.38) 2.16 (10.95, 2.95 (10.94, 2.54 (10.99) 1.68 (10.84, 4.92 (1.71, 1 2.33 (10.84, 1.18 (10.96, 4.92 (1.71, 1 2.33 (10.84, 2.16 (1.78, 2.64 (1.78, 2.64 (1.78, 2.64 (1.78, 2.64 (1.78, 3.57 (10.29, 2.84, 1.73 (1.04, 2.88) 1.53 (1.04, 8.48) 1.53 (1.04, 8.48) 1.53 (1.04, 8.48) 1.53 (1.00, 73, 87] 1.00 (10.32, 3.14) 1.53 (1.25, 7.25) 0.66 (1.25, 1.24) 0.66 (1.25, 7.25) 0.66 (1.25, 1.24) 0.67 (1.25, 7.25) 0.67 (1.25, 7.25) 0.68 (1.25, 7.25) 0.69 (1.25, 1.24) 0.67 (1.25, 7.25) 0.67 (1.25, 7.25) 0.57 (1.25, 7.25) 0.57 (1.25, 7.2	4.85] 4.92] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 4.17] 6.47] 2.39] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] 1.92] 2015 2016 2016 2016 2016 2016 2017 2018 2019 2021 2021	0.02 0	1 SIRS/Sepsis Odds M-H, Rand	■ 10 58 Non SIRS/Sepsis
Liu et al Liu et al Lorenzo Soriano et al. Tarbei et al. Tang et al. (shock) Tang et al. (shock) Tang et al. Wei et al. Xu et al. Xu et al. Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effec <b>Diabetes</b> <b>Study or Subgroup</b> Wei et al. Yang et al. Chen et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Zhu et al. Liu et al Teh et al. Kumar et al. Tang et al.(SIRS) Tang et al.(SIRS)	al. t: Z = 4 SIRt Ever	6         10           5         7           5         12           7         5           14         13           5         14           13         5           100         12           8         5           1         8           7         6           18         7           6         18           20         0	886 41 30 61 42 97 7 5 22 145 846 45.44, < 0.000 is M 61 45 19 30 23 88 61 45 19 30 23 88 816 64 97 7	df = 15 (1001) lon SiRts Events 7 46 9 77 73 115 27 71 08 36 36 6 76 6 76 6 76 70 8 70 70 8 70 70 8 70 70 70 8 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70	9 26 11 15 53 46 50 92 22 24 87 <b>Tota</b> 266 591 <b>Tota</b> 266 57 57 266 57 763 27 266 57 266 57 27 26 26 27 27 27 28 28 28 29 29 29 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	2 13 2 13 2 13 2 13 2 13 2 200 1 73 3 30 9 3 30 9 3 30 9 3 31 3 31 3 31 3 31 3 31 2 66 6 61 1 33 1 39 1 39	5.5% 5.5% 6.4% 6.2% 7.8% 6.0% 6.0% 7.6% 7.4% 6.0% 0.0% 5.5% 6.0% 0.0%	1.67 (1.38, 2.16 [0.95, 2.95 [0.94, 2.54 [0.99, 1.69 [0.84, 1.89 [0.96, 4.92 [1.71, 1 2.33 [0.84, 1.18 [0.59, 0.92 [0.44, 2.16 [0.78, 2.64 [1.78, 2.64 [1.78, 3.57 [0.29, 4.72] 0.68 [0.39, 1.93] 1.53 [0.42, 2.88] 3.57 [0.29, 4.72] 0.68 [0.39, 1.93] 1.53 [0.48, 4.83] 0.51 [0.07, 3.87] 1.53 [0.48, 4.83] 0.51 [0.07, 3.87] 1.53 [0.54, 5.88] 2.39 [1.25, 4.58] 2.39 [1.25, 4.58] 2.13 [1.24, 3.65]	4.85] 4.92] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 6.47] 2.39] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] <b>Year</b> 2015 2016 2016 2016 2016 2017 2018 2019 2021 2021 2021 2021	0.02 0	1 SIRS/Sepsis Odds M-H, Rand	Aatio om, 95% Cl
Liu et al. Liu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Tabei et al. Tang et al.(shock) Tang et al.(shock) Tang et al. Wei et al. Xu et al. Zhu et al. Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneily: Tau <sup>a</sup> Test for overall effec <b>Diabetes</b> <b>Study or Subgroup</b> Wei et al. Chen et al. Chen et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Zhu et al. Liu et al Tang et al.(shock) Tang et al.(shock)	al. t: Z = 4 SIRt Ever	6 10 5 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 15 12 12 12 13 15 12 12 13 15 12 13 13 13 15 14 13 15 14 13 15 14 13 15 14 13 15 14 13 15 14 13 15 14 13 15 14 13 15 14 13 15 14 13 15 14 13 15 14 13 15 14 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 13 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 15 14 15 15 15 14 15 15 14 13 15 14 15 15 14 15 15 14 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 14 13 15 14 13 15 14 15 15 14 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15	864 41 30 61 42 97 15 22 21 45 846 45 19 30 30 22 3 846 45 19 30 30 22 3 88 61 45 19 30 30 22 3 88 61 64 97 22 20	( df = 15 ) (001)	9 9 26 11 15 53 46 50 92 22 24 87 70 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	2 10 2 10 2 10 2 00 173 309 2716 661 331 331 3661 139 763 3086 10 139 763 3086 10 139 763 3086 10 139 821 4.5% 5.7% 4.5% 7.4% 5.7% 1.7% 4.5% 7.4% 5.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.3%	5.5% 5.5% 6.4% 6.2% 5.8% 6.0% 7.8% 5.8% 6.0% 7.6% 7.4% 6.0% 6.0% 6.0% 7.4% 6.0% 6.0% 6.0% 6.2% 5.5% 5.5% 6.4% 5.5% 5.5% 6.4% 5.5% 6.4% 5.5% 5.5% 6.4% 5.5% 5.5% 6.4% 5.5% 5.5% 6.4% 5.5% 5.5% 6.4% 5.5% 6.4% 5.5% 6.4% 5.5% 6.4% 5.5% 6.4% 5.5% 6.4% 5.5% 6.4% 5.5% 6.4% 5.5% 6.4% 5.5% 6.4% 5.5% 6.4% 5.5% 6.4% 5.5% 6.4% 5.5% 6.4% 5.5% 6.4% 5.5% 6.4% 5.5% 6.4% 5.5% 6.4% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 6.4% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5.5% 5	1.67 (13.88 2.16 [10.95, 2.95 [10.94, 2.54 [10.96, 4.92 [1.71, 1 2.33 [10.84, 1.18 [10.96, 4.92 [1.71, 1 2.33 [10.84, 1.19 [10.99, 0.92 [1.74, 1 2.33 [10.84, 2.64 [1.78, 2.64 [1.78, 2.64 [1.78, 1.73 [10.42, 2.88] 3.57 [0.29, 44.72] 0.86 [0.39, 1.93] 1.53 [0.48, 4.83] 0.51 [10.77, 3.87] 1.53 [0.48, 4.83] 0.51 [10.77, 3.77] 1.53 [0.48, 4.83] 0.51 [10.77, 3.77] 1.53 [0.48, 4.83] 0.51 [1.26, 7.25] 0.60 [0.25, 1.44] 3.13 [1.24, 3.65] 1.53 [0.99, 4.71] 2.39 [1.26, 4.58] 1.53 [0.99, 4.71] 2.39 [1.26, 4.58] 1.55 [0.90, 4.20]	4.85] 4.92] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 6.47] 2.39] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] 1.92] 2016 2016 2016 2017 2019 2020 2021 2021 2021 2021 2021	0.02 0	1 SIRS/Sepsis Odds M-H, Rand	1 10 5 Non SIRS/Sepsis
Liu et al. Liu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Tange et al. (shock) Tang et al. (shock) Tang et al. Wang et al. Wai et al. Zhu et al. Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneily: Tau <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effec <b>Diabetes</b> Study or Subgroup Wei et al. Rachid et al. Tabei et al. Chen et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Zhu et al. Liu et al. Tah et al. Kumar et al. Kumar et al. Kumar et al. Kumar et al. Kumar et al. Kumar et al.	al. = 0.41; t: Z = 4 SiR4 Ever	6 10 5 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 5 173 = = 173 = 14 13 5 S/Seps S/Seps 14 8 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 12 14 13 5 12 14 13 5 14 13 5 12 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 14 13 5 14 14 13 5 14 14 13 5 14 14 13 5 14 14 13 5 14 14 13 5 14 14 13 5 14 14 13 5 14 14 15 16 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 17 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18	884 41 30 61 42 97 15 22 14 8 8 45 23 846 45 19 30 30 23 88 61 45 19 30 23 88 61 64 97 42 29 81	( df = 15 i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	9 9 9 9 115 156 115 156 115 156 115 156 115 156 115 156 115 115	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ $	t M-	1.67 (13.8 2.16 [0.95, 2.95 [0.94, 2.54 [0.99, 1.68 [0.64, 4.92 [1.71, 1 2.33 [0.84, 1.19 [0.59, 0.92 [0.44, 2.16 [0.78, 2.64 [1.78, 2.64 [1.78, 2.64 [1.78, 3.57 [0.29, 44.72] 0.86 [0.39, 1.93] 1.53 [0.48, 4.83] 0.51 [0.73, 37] 1.53 [0.59, 4.71] 2.39 [1.24, 3.65] 1.35 [0.59, 0.420] 1.37 [0.36, 5.27] 0.68 [0.27, 1.71]	4.85] 4.92] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 4.17] 6.47] 2.39] 5.96] 3.93] 2015 2016 2016 2016 2016 2016 2016 2019 2020 2021 2021 2021 2021 2022	0.02 0	1 SIRS/Sepsis Odds M-H, Rand	Atio
Liu et al Liu et al Liu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Tang et al. (shock). Tang et al. (SIRS) Teh et al. Wei et al. Xu et al. Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effec <b>Diabetes</b> Study or Subgroup Wei et al. Rachid et al. Zhu et al. Tabei et al. Zhu et al. Tabei et al. Zhu et al. Tang et al. (SIRS) Tang et al. (shock) Amier et al. Xu et al.	al. = 0.41; t: Z = 4 SiRt Ever	6 10 5 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 5 173 2 14 13 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	866 41 30 61 97 15 22 24 81 23 846 45.44, < 0.00 is <b>N</b> 0 tal 145 3 61 19 30 23 88 64 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45	df = 15 i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	2 10 2 10 2 10 2 10 2 00 173 309 7 16 6 61 8 21 8 21 8 21 8 21 2 66 1 39 7 63 1 39 1 39 7 63 1 39 1	t M-	1.67 (13.8) 2.16 (10.95, 2.95 (10.94, 2.54 (10.99, 1.69 [0.64, 1.89 [0.64, 4.92 [1.71, 1 2.33 [0.84, 1.18 [10.59, 0.92 [0.44, 2.16 [0.78, 2.64 [1.78, 2.64 [1.78, 2.64 [1.78, 3.57 [0.29, 4.72] 0.68 [0.39, 1.93] 1.53 [0.29, 4.72] 0.68 [0.39, 1.93] 1.53 [0.29, 4.72] 1.00 [0.32, 3.14] 3.01 [1.25, 7.25] 0.60 [0.22, 1.44] 1.67 [0.59, 4.71] 1.95 [0.59, 4.20] 1.37 [1.04, 2.88] 2.13 [1.24, 3.65] 2.13 [1.24, 3.65] 2.14 [1.24, 3.65] 2.15 [1.24, 3.65]	4.85] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 4.17] 6.47] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] <b>1 Year</b> 2015 2016 2016 2017 2018 2019 2019 2020 2021 2022 2022	0.02 0	1 SIRS/Sepsis Odds M-H, Rand	Aatio om, 95% Cl
Liu et al. Liu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Tapei et al. Tang et al. (shock) Tang et al. (shock) Tang et al. Wei et al. Xu et al. Zhu et al. Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> Test for overail effec <b>Diabetes</b> <b>Study or Subgroup</b> Wei et al. Rachid et al. Yang et al. Chen et al. Liu et al. Tang et al. (SIRS) Tang et al. (SIRS)	= 0,41; t: Z = 4 SIR3 Ever	6 10 5 7 5 12 7 5 12 7 5 12 7 5 12 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 12 7 5 14 13 5 5 14 13 5 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 18 5 14 18 5 14 8 7 6 18 12 2 3 7 23 7 7 23 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	864 41 30 61 97 15 22 24 81 23 846 45.44, < 0.000 is <b>N</b> 0 0 145 3 61 45 30 30 30 30 88 81 64 42 29 81 16 64 42 29 81	( {	9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	2 10 2 10 2 10 2 00 173 309 7 16 661 661 821 821 821 139 763 763 763 763 763 763 763 763	t M-	1.67 (1.38, 2.16 [0.95, 2.95 [0.94, 2.54 [0.99, 1.69 [0.84, 1.89 [0.96, 4.922 [1.71, 1 2.33 [0.84, 1.19 [0.59, 0.92 [0.44, 2.16 [0.78, 2.64 [1.78, 2.64 [1.78, 1.73 [1.04, 2.88] 3.57 [0.29, 4.72] 0.86 [0.39, 193] 0.51 [0.29, 4.73] 0.68 [0.39, 193] 0.51 [0.07, 3.87] 0.60 [0.25, 1.44] 1.53 [0.14, 3.65 2.7] 0.68 [0.27, 1.71] 1.50 [1.14, 1.98]	4.85] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 4.17] 6.47] 2.39] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] 1 Year 2015 2016 2016 2016 2016 2016 2012 2021 2022 2022 2022	<u>-</u>	1 SIRS/Sepsis Odds M-H, Rand	■ 10 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50
Liu et al. Liu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Tabei et al. Tang et al.(shock) Tang et al.(shock) Tang et al. Wei et al. Xu et al. Zhu et al. Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneily: Tau <sup>a</sup> Test for overall effec <b>Diabetes</b> <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Wei et al. Chen et al. Chen et al. Liu et al. Liu et al. Zhu et al. Liu et al. Zhu et al. Surg et al.(SiRS) Tang et al.(SiRS) Tang et al.(shock) Aminer et al. Xu et al. Total (95% Cl) Total events	al. = 0.41; t: Z = 4 SIR4 Even	6 10 5 7 5 12 7 5 12 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 12 14 13 5 12 13 5 12 14 13 5 12 14 13 5 14 14 13 5 12 14 13 5 12 14 13 5 12 14 13 5 12 14 13 5 14 13 5 12 14 13 5 12 14 13 5 14 14 13 5 14 14 13 5 14 14 13 5 13 14 14 13 5 13 14 14 15 15 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16	866 41 30 61 42 22 21 45 846 45.44, < 0.000 is h 0 145 3 61 45 30 22 23 888 61 45 97 42 22 888 64 97 742 22 23 888 64 97 742 22 23 887 64 97 742 22 23 887 64 97 75 887 80 75 887 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80	( df = 15 <u>Events</u> 40 76 40 77 23 115 27 77 108 36 9 9 77 73 108 36 8 8 8 8 11 17 5 76 6 80 8 8 11 17 7 6 80 8 8 11 7 7 8 8 8 8 11 7 8 7 8 8 8 8 8 8	9 9 26 11 15 53 46 50 92 22 24 87 0 0 57 591 (P < 0.00 57 591 (P < 0.00 57 57 306 57 306 57 17 58 50 59 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	213 200 173 309 716 661 661 821 821 821 821 139 763 109 763 109 763 109 763 109 763 109 763 109 763 109 765 109 107 109 107 109 107 109 107 107 107 107 107 107 107 107	t M- 5.5% 6.2% 7.8% 6.0% 7.6% 7.6% 7.6% 6.0% 0.0% 5.5% 5.5% 6.0% 0.0% 5.5% 6.4% 6.2% 7.6% 6.2% 7.6% 6.2% 7.6% 6.2% 7.8% 6.2% 7.8% 6.2% 7.8% 6.2% 7.8% 6.2% 7.8% 6.2% 7.6% 6.2% 7.6% 6.2% 7.6% 6.2% 7.6% 6.2% 7.6% 6.2% 7.6% 6.2% 7.6% 6.2% 7.6%	1.67 (13.8 2.16 [0.95, 2.95 [0.94, 2.54 [0.99, 1.68 [0.64, 4.92 [1.71, 1 2.33 [0.64, 1.23 [0.64, 1.23 [0.64, 2.64 [1.78, 2.64 [1.78, 2.64 [1.78, 2.64 [1.78, 2.64 [1.78, 1.73 [1.04, 2.88] 3.57 [0.29, 44.72] 0.86 [0.39, 1.93] 1.53 [0.48, 4.83] 0.51 [0.73, 8.71] 2.30 [1.25, 4.72] 0.68 [0.22, 1.41] 3.01 [1.25, 7.25] 0.60 [0.25, 1.44] 3.13 [1.24, 3.65] 1.57 [0.96, 4.71] 2.39 [1.24, 3.65] 1.57 [0.96, 4.71] 2.39 [1.24, 3.65] 1.57 [0.96, 2.71] 1.50 [1.14, 1.98]	4.85] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 4.47] 2.39] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] 1.92] 2.015 2.016 2.016 2.016 2.016 2.017 2.018 2.019 2.021 2.021 2.021 2.022 2.022	0.02 0	1 SIRS/Sepsis Odds M-H, Rand	Actio
Liu et al Liu et al Lorenzo Soriano et al. Tarbei et al. Tang et al. (shock). Tang et al. (shock). Tang et al. (SIRS) Teh et al. Xu et al. Zhu et al. Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneily: Tau <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Wei et al. Rachid et al. Tabei et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Chen et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Zhu et al. Tang et al. (SIRS) Tang et al. (shock) Amier et al. Xu et al. Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneily: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect:	10.07; Cr Z = 2.89	ь 10 5 7 5 12 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 15 14 13 15 14 13 15 14 13 15 14 13 15 14 13 15 14 13 15 14 13 15 14 13 15 14 13 15 14 13 15 14 13 15 16 16 16 17 16 16 17 16 16 17 16 16 17 16 16 17 16 16 17 16 16 17 16 16 17 16 16 17 17 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18	886 41 30 61 42 97 16 22 23 846 45,44, < 0.000 is N 00tal 145 3 61 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45	df = 15 001) 100 SIR Events 40 7 46 9 9 9 7 108 88 11 17 680 = 13 (P =	9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	2 10 2 10 2 10 2 00 173 309 716 661 821 821 821 821 821 821 821 82	<pre>control control c</pre>	1.67 (1.38, 2.16 [0.95, 2.95 [0.94, 2.54 [0.99, 1.69 [0.64, 1.89 [0.96, 4.922 [1.71, 1 2.33 [0.84, 1.19 [0.59, 0.92 [0.44, 2.16 [0.78, 2.64 [1.78, 2.64 [1.78, 2.64 [1.78, 0.92 [0.44, 2.16 [0.78, 2.64 [1.78, 0.95% CC 1.73 [1.04, 2.88] 3.57 [0.29, 4.72] 0.68 [0.39, 1.93] 1.53 [0.48, 4.83] 0.61 [0.07, 3.87] 1.00 [0.22, 3.14] 1.67 [0.59, 4.71] 1.50 [1.24, 3.65] 2.13 [1.24, 3.65] 2.14, 1.98]	4.85] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 4.47] 6.47] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] 2016 2016 2016 2016 2017 2018 2019 2021 2021 2021 2022	0.02 0	1 SIRS/Sepsis Odds M-H, Rand	■ 10 500 ■ 100
Liu et al. Liu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Tange et al. (shock) Tang et al. (shock) Tang et al. (shock) Tang et al. Wei et al. Xu et al. Zhu et al. Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effec <b>Diabetes</b> <b>Study or Subgroup</b> Wei et al. Yang et al. Chen et al. Zhu et al. Liu et al. Tabei et al. Xurg et al. Chen et al. Zhu et al. Liu et al. Tang et al. (SiRS) Tang et al. (SiRS)	al. = 0.41; t: Z = 4 SiRt Ever 1 0.07; Cr Z = 2.89	ь 5 10 5 7 5 12 7 5 12 7 5 12 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 12 7 5 14 13 5 5 5 5 5 5 12 7 5 14 13 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	886 41 42 41 42 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 145 846 45 145 30 23 888 16 64 97 42 297 145 846 61 23 846 61 25 846 61 145 25 846 61 145 145 846 61 145 145 145 846 61 145 145 145 145 145 145 145 14	df = 15 3001) lon SIRS <u>Events</u> 40 7 7 46 9 9 77 7 88 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 11 17 6 80 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 11 17	9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	213 200 173 309 716 661 661 821 821 139 763 763 763 763 763 763 763 763 763 763	t M- 5.5% 6.2% 7.8% 6.0% 7.6% 6.0% 6.0% 6.0% 6.0% 6.0% 6.0% 6.0% 6.0% 6.0% 6.0% 6.0% 6.0% 6.0% 6.4% 6.4% 6.4% 6.4% 6.4% 6.2% 6.2% 6.2% 6.2% 6.2% 6.2% 6.2% 6.2% 6.2% 6.2% 6.2% 6.2% 6.2% 6.2% 6.2% 6.0% 6.2% 6.0%	1.67 (1.38, 2.16 (10.95, 2.95 (10.94, 2.54 (10.99, 1.69 [0.84, 1.69 [0.84, 1.69 [0.84, 1.18 (10.96, 3.23 (10.84, 1.18 [0.59, 0.92 [0.44, 2.16 [0.78, 2.64 [1.78, 2.64 [1.78, 2.64 [1.78, 3.57 [0.29, 4.472] 0.86 [0.39, 1.83] 1.53 [0.48, 4.83] 0.51 [0.29, 4.472] 0.86 [0.39, 1.83] 1.53 [0.48, 4.83] 0.51 [0.29, 4.472] 2.39 [1.26, 4.58] 2.31 [1.24, 3.65] 2.13 [1.24, 3.65] 2.13 [1.24, 3.65] 2.13 [1.24, 3.65] 2.13 [0.56, 5.27] 0.68 [0.27, 1.71] 1.50 [1.14, 1.98]	4.85] 9.19] 6.52] 9.19] 6.52] 9.19] 6.52] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] 1.92] 2015 2016 2017 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 2021 2022 2022 2022	0.02 0	1 SIRS/Sepsis Odds M-H, Rand	
Liu et al. Liu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Tapei et al. (shock) Tang et al. (shock) Tang et al. (shock) Teh et al. Xu et al. Zhu et al. Total (95% CI) Total ovents Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effec <b>Diabetes</b> <b>Study or Subgroup</b> Wei et al. Rachid et al. Tabe et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Zhu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Xuarr et al. Xuarr et al. Xuarr et al. Xuarr et al. Xu et al. Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: 2	1 1.0.07; Cr 2 = 2.89 3 SIRS.	ь 10 5 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 5 14 13 5 5 14 13 5 5 14 13 5 5 14 13 5 5 14 13 5 5 14 13 5 5 5 14 13 5 5 5 5 14 13 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	866 41 30 61 42 97 16 222 145 84 45.44,0 45.44,0 3 61 3 61 3 61 3 61 3 888 64 97 72,3 81 64 97 743 72, df = 743 72, df = 743	( df = 15 )001) lon SIRS <u>Events</u> 40 7 7 46 6 9 77 7 3 3 6 8 8 8 8 8 11 17 7 8 8 8 8 11 17 7 6 80 6 8 11 17 7 8 8 8 11 17 7 8 8 8 8 11 17 7 8 7 7 7 8 7 8	9 9 26 111 15 53 46 50 92 22 24 87 (P < 0.00 57 59 57 50 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57	213 200 173 309 716 661 821 266 133 763 763 763 763 763 763 763 763 763 7	t M- 5.5% 6.2% 7.8% 6.0% 7.6% 6.0% 6.0% 6.0% 6.0% 6.0% 6.0% 6.0% 6.0% 6.0% 6.0% 6.0% 6.0% 6.4% 6.4% 6.4% 6.4% 6.4% 6.4% 6.4% 6.2% 6.2% 6.4% 7.8% 6.2% 6.2% 6.4% 7.8% 6.2% 6.2% 7.8% 6.0% 6.2% 7.6% 6.0% 6.0% 7.6% 6.0% 7.6% 6.0% 6.0% 7.6% 6.0% 6.0% 7.6% 6.0% 6.0% 7.6% 6.0% 6.0% 7.6% 6.0%	1.67 (13.8) 2.16 (19.5, 2.95 (19.4), 2.54 (19.9), 1.69 (19.4), 4.92 (1.71, 1 2.33 (19.4), 1.69 (19.4), 4.92 (1.71, 1 2.33 (19.4), 2.64 (1.78, 2.64 (1.78, 2.64 (1.78, 2.64 (1.78, 1.73 (10.4, 2.88) 3.57 (10.29, 44.72) 0.66 (10.39, 1.93) 1.53 (10.48, 4.83) 0.51 (10.7, 3.87) 1.53 (1.44, 4.83) 0.51 (1.25, 1.24) 0.66 (10.25, 1.44) 1.67 (10.59, 4.71) 2.39 (1.24, 4.85) 1.53 (1.44, 4.83) 1.53 (1.44, 4.85) 1.55 (1.14, 1.98]	4.85] 9.19] 6.52] 9.19] 6.52] 9.19] 6.52] 3.71] 4.47] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] 9.2015 2016 2016 2016 2017 2018 2019 2021 2022 2022 2022	0.02 0	1 SIRS/Sepsis Odds M-H, Rand	1         10         50           Non SIRS/Sepsis         50           10         50         50           10         51         50           10         51         50           10         51         50           10         51         50           10         51         50           10         51         50           10         51         50           10         51         50           10         51         50           10         51         50
Liu et al. Liu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Tange et al. (SIRS) Tang et al. (SIRS) Teh et al. Wei et al. Xu et al. Zhu et al. Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneily: Tau <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effec <b>Diabetes</b> Study or Subgroup Wei et al. Rachid et al. Tabei et al. Zhu et al. Chen et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Zhu et al. Liu et al. Tabei et al. Chen et al. Liu et al. Tang et al. (SIRS) Tang et al. (SIRS) Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = <b>Pyuria</b> Study or Subgroup	al. = 0.41; t: Z = 4 SIR3 Even 1 0.07; Cr Z = 2.69 SIRSJ Even	ь 5 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 5 173 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 173 5 14 13 5 173 5 14 13 5 173 5 16 173 5 173 173 5 173 173 173 173 173 173 173 173	886 41 42 97 15 22 145 846 45.44, < 0.000 is № 0 0 19 30 19 30 19 30 19 30 64 97 42 23 88 19 30 61 19 30 61 19 30 61 19 30 61 19 30 61 19 74 23 846 64 23 846 64 23 846 64 23 846 64 23 846 64 23 846 64 23 846 64 23 846 64 23 846 64 23 846 64 23 846 64 23 846 64 23 846 64 23 846 64 23 846 64 23 846 64 23 846 64 23 23 846 64 23 23 886 64 89 77 15 74 23 886 64 74 23 886 64 74 23 886 64 74 23 886 64 74 23 886 64 847 19 742 23 886 64 847 742 23 886 64 847 742 23 881 886 64 847 742 23 881 881 886 64 89 77 72 29 81 19 30 881 881 881 886 881 886 887 887 887 887 887 887 887	( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )	9 9 26 111 15 53 46 50 92 22 4 87 0 (P < 0.00 5/Sepsis Tota 173 306 57 266 67 173 306 57 266 67 173 306 255 67 177 265 67 177 27 265 67 177 27 265 67 177 27 265 67 177 27 265 67 177 27 265 67 177 255 177 255 177 177 255 177 255 177 177 255 177 177 255 177 177 177 177 177 177 177 1	213 200 173 309 716 661 661 821 266 133 763 3086 10 01); P = ( 139 763 3086 10 01); P = ( 14.5% 1.1% 9 331 821 331 821 139 763 006 10 01); P = ( 14.5% 1.1% 9 3,5% 1.1% 9 3,5% 1.3% 9 3,5% 1.3% 9 3,5% 1.3% 9 3,5% 1.3% 9 3,5% 1.3% 9 3,5% 1.3% 9 3,5% 1.3% 9 3,5% 1.3% 9 3,5% 1.3% 9 3,5% 1.3% 9 3,5% 1.3% 9 3,5% 1.3% 9 3,5% 1.3% 9 3,5% 1.3% 9 3,5% 1.3% 1.3% 1.3% 1.3% 1.3% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5	5.5% 6.2% 7.8% 7.8% 7.8% 7.6% 7.4% 6.0% 5.8% 6.0% 5.8% 6.0% M-1	1.67 (13.8) 2.16 (10.95, 2.95 (10.94, 2.95 (10.94, 2.95 (10.94, 4.92 (1.71, 1 2.33 (10.84, 1.13 (10.95, 0.92 (1.44, 2.16 (10.78, 2.64 (1.78, 2.64 (1.78, 2.64 (1.78, 2.64 (1.78, 3.57 (10.29, 2.14) 1.73 (1.04, 2.88) 3.57 (10.29, 4.47.2) 0.86 (10.39, 1.93) 1.53 (1.48, 4.83) 0.51 (10.7, 3.87) 1.53 (0.48, 4.83) 0.51 (10.7, 3.87) 0.68 (0.27, 1.71) 1.50 (1.14, 1.98] 0.68 (0.27, 1.71) 1.50 (1.14, 1.98]	4.85] 9.19] 6.52] 9.19] 6.52] 9.19] 6.52] 9.19] 6.52] 1.92] 5.96] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] 1.92] 5.96] 2015 2016 2016 2016 2017 2018 2019 2021 2021 2021 2021 2021 2022 2022 2022	0.02 0	1 SIRS/Sepsis Odds M-H, Rand	
Liu et al. Liu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Tang et al. (shock). Tang et al. (shock). Tang et al. (shick). Tang et al. (SIRS) Total events Au et al. Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect <b>Diabetes</b> Study or Subgroup Wei et al. Rachid et al. Tabei et al. Chen et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Zhu et al. Liu et al. Tang et al. (SIRS) Tang et al. (SIRS) Tabei et al.	al. = 0.41; t: Z = 4 SIR3 Ever 1 0.07; CP Z = 2.89 SIR53 S SIR53 S SIR53 S SIR53	ь 5 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 5 173 5 14 13 5 173 1 1 3 4 1 8 5 1 4 8 5 1 4 8 5 1 4 8 5 1 4 8 5 1 4 8 5 1 4 8 5 1 4 8 5 1 4 8 5 1 4 8 5 1 4 8 5 1 4 8 5 1 4 8 5 7 6 18 1 4 8 5 7 6 18 1 7 6 18 1 7 6 18 1 7 6 18 1 7 7 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	86         84           41         30           61         42           97         16           42         97           145         44           846         61           45.44,         <0.000	df = 15 (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4)	9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	213 200 173 309 716 661 331 821 821 821 763 3086 10 01); I <sup>2</sup> = ( 1 821 339 763 3086 10 01); I <sup>2</sup> = ( 1 821 3086 10 01); I <sup>2</sup> = ( 1 823 139 763 3086 10 01); I <sup>2</sup> = ( 1 824 139 763 3086 10 01); I <sup>2</sup> = ( 1 825 139 763 3086 10 01); I <sup>2</sup> = ( 1 827 14,5%) 13,5% 14,5% 10,0% 14,5% 10,5% 14,5%1	MI-           Mail           Mail	1.67 (1.9.8 2.16 (10.95, 2.95 (10.94, 2.54 (10.99, 1.69 (10.84, 1.69 (10.84, 1.69 (10.84, 1.69 (10.84, 1.18 (10.96, 2.33 (10.84, 2.16 (10.78, 2.64 [1.78, 2.64 [1.	4.85] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 6.47] 2.39] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] 1.923 2.015 2016 2017 2019 2020 2021 2021 2022 2022 2022	0.02 0	1 SIRS/Sepsis Odds M-H, Rand	Aatio Non SIRS/Sepsis Aatio om, 95% Cl a a a a a a a a a a a a a
Liu et al. Liu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Tapei et al. (shock) Tang et al. (shock) Teh et al. Xu et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneily: Tau <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effec <b>Diabetes</b> <b>Study or Subgroup</b> Wei et al. Zhu et al	1 1 0.07; Cr 2 = 2.89 SIRS, Event 5	ь 5 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 5 5 173 5 173 5 173 5 173 5 173 5 173 5 173 5 173 5 173 5 5 173 5 5 16 173 5 5 173 5 5 173 5 5 173 5 5 173 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	86         87           41         30           61         42           97         16           144         22           145         81           22         144           81         22           145         81           145         61           145         88           16         64           97         72, df =           7004         1           14         1           16         6	(df = 15 ) ) (on SIRS Events 40 7 46 9 77 7 46 88 8 8 36 6 7 6 8 8 8 8 11 17 5 7 08 3 115 5 7 08 3 16 7 6 8 8 8 8 11 17 7 9 77 7 3 10 8 3 10 9 77 7 3 10 8 3 10 9 77 7 3 10 8 7 10 9 77 7 3 10 8 7 10 9 77 7 7 10 8 7 10 9 77 7 7 10 8 8 7 10 9 77 7 7 10 8 8 7 10 9 77 7 7 10 8 8 7 10 9 77 7 7 10 8 8 7 8 7 10 9 7 7 7 10 8 8 8 8 7 8 7 9 7 7 7 10 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 9 7 7 7 10 8 8 8 8 8 8 9 7 7 7 7 10 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	9 9 26 11 53 53 46 50 99 22 24 87 70 10 10 10 26 67 57 50 306 57 10 11 77 8 306 57 26 66 61 71 11 57 306 66 61 71 11 50 99 22 24 87 99 22 24 87 99 20 24 87 99 20 24 87 99 20 24 87 99 20 24 87 99 20 24 87 99 20 24 87 99 20 24 87 99 20 24 87 99 20 24 87 99 20 24 87 99 20 24 87 99 20 24 87 90 20 24 87 90 20 24 87 90 20 24 87 90 20 26 90 20 20 26 90 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	213 200 173 309 716 661 661 821 821 821 139 763 763 763 763 763 763 763 763 763 763	5.5% 6.4% 5.5% 6.2% 7.8% 5.8% 6.0% 7.6% 7.4% 6.0% 10.0% 6.0% 10.0% 6.0% 10.0% 6.0% 10.0% 1	1.67 (0.38, 2.16 [0.95, 2.95 [0.94, 2.54 (0.99, 1.69 [0.84, 4.92 [1.71, 1 2.33 [0.84, 1.19 [0.59, 0.92 [0.44, 2.16 [0.78, 2.64 [1.78, 2.64 [1.78, 1.73 [1.04, 2.88] 3.57 [0.29, 44.72] 0.86 [0.39, 1.93] 1.53 [0.48, 4.83] 0.51 [0.07, 3.37] 1.53 [0.48, 4.83] 0.51 [0.07, 3.37] 0.66 [0.25, 1.44] 1.67 [0.59, 4.71] 2.39 [1.24, 3.65] 1.59 [0.94, 4.83] 0.51 [0.07, 3.57] 0.66 [0.25, 1.44] 1.57 [0.58, 4.71] 1.50 [1.14, 1.98] 0.51 [0.94, 2.52] 0.68 [0.27, 1.71] 1.50 [1.14, 1.98] 0.92 [0.26, 3.28] 0.92 [0.27, 289.12]	4.85] 4.482] 9.19] 6.52] 9.19] 6.52] 9.19] 6.52] 3.71] 4.17] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] 1.922] 5.96] 3.933] 1.922] 2.015 2.016 2.016 2.016 2.016 2.012 2.021 2.021 2.021 2.021 2.021 2.021 2.022 2.022 2.022 2.021	0.02 0	1 SIRS/Sepsis Odds M-H, Rand	■ 10 5% Ratio om, 95% Cl ■ 10 5% Ratio 0 10 5% 0 5%
Liu et al. Liu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Tang et al. (shock). Tang et al. (shock). Tang et al. (SIRS) Teh et al. Wei et al. Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneily: Tau <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effec <b>Diabetes</b> Study or Subgroup Wei et al. Rachid et al. Tabei et al. Chen et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Zhu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Zhu et al. Tang et al. (SIRS) Tang et al. (SIRS) Tabei et al. Chent et al. Chent et al. Chent et al. Chent et al. Chent et al. Chent et al.	al. = 0.41; t: Z = 4 SIR4 Even 1 0.07; Cr Z = 2.89 SIR5, Even 5	ь 5 7 5 10 5 7 5 14 13 5 173 = 173 = 185 = 185 = 185 = 185 = 185 = 185 = 185 = 185 = 185 = 185 = 185 = 185 = 185 = 185 = 185 = 185 = 185 = 185 = 185	86         86           41         30           61         42           97         16           62         22           144         846           45.44,         0.000           1145         3           61         145           361         61           45.88         66           64         97           223         88           166         64           97         22           88         16           64         97           22, df i         61           61         6           61         19           300         Nu           61         6           61         19           722, df i         19	( ( df = 15 )001) lon SIRE <u>Events</u> 40 7 7 46 6 80 7 7 46 6 80 8 8 8 115 277 115 277 115 277 115 277 115 277 115 277 115 277 115 277 115 277 213 285 295 295 295 295 295 295 295 295 295 29	9 9 26 11 15 53 46 50 92 22 24 87 (P < 0.00 (P < 0.00 57 591 (P < 0.00 57 57 306 57 77 37 57 300 57 300 57 300 57 300 57 300 57 300 57 300 57 300 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57	2 13 2 13 2 13 2 00 173 309 716 661 821 821 821 139 821 821 821 821 139 821 821 821 821 821 821 821 821	5.5% 6.4% 5.5% 6.2% 7.8% 5.8% 6.0% 7.8% 6.0% 0.0% 5.7.4% 6.0% 0.0% 5.5% 6.4% 1 1	1.67 (13.8) 2.16 (10.95, 2.95 (10.94, 2.54 (10.99, 1.68 (10.94, 4.92 (1.71, 1 2.33 (10.84, 1.13 (10.59, 0.92 (1.44, 2.16 (10.78, 2.64 (1.78, 2.64 (1.78, 2.64 (1.78, 2.64 (1.78, 2.64 (1.78, 1.73 (10.4, 2.88) 1.53 (1.64, 8.83) 0.51 (10.7, 3.37) 1.53 (0.48, 4.83) 0.51 (10.7, 3.57) 0.68 (0.27, 1.71) 1.59 (1.14, 1.98] 0.68 (0.27, 1.71) 1.50 (1.14, 1.98] 0.62 (0.27, 2.88) 12 0.52 (0.87, 2.88) 12 0.32 (1.16, 0.34) 0.32 (1.16, 0.34) 0.32 (1.16, 0.34) 0.32 (1.16, 0.34)	4.85] 4.92] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 4.17] 6.47] 2.39] 2.015 5.96] 3.93] 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2019 2021 2021 2021 2022 2022 2022 2022 2022 2022 2022	0.02 0	1 SIRS/Sepsis Odds M-H, Rand	10 50     10     10 50     10     10 50     10     10 50     10     10     10     10     10     10     10     10     10     10     10     10     10
Liu et al Liu et al Lorenzo Soriano et al. Tarbei et al. Tang et al. (shock) Tang et al. (shock) Tang et al. (SIRS) Teh et al. Xu et al. Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect <b>Diabetes</b> Study or Subgroup Wei et al. Rachid et al. Chen et al. Liu et al. Tabei et al. Chen et al. Liu et al. Tang et al.(SIRS) Tang et al.(SIRS) Tabei et al. Chen et al. Chen et al. Chen et al. Zu et al. Chen et al. Zu et al. Zu et al. Chen et al. Zu et al. Zu et al. Zu et al. Zu et al. Chen et al. Zu et al. Zu et al. Zu et al. Zu et al. Zu et al. Zu et al. Chen et al. Zu et a	al. = 0.41; t: Z = 4 SIR3 Ever 1 0.07; CP 5 SIR53 Even 5	ь 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	86         86           41         30           61         42           97         16           22         144           846         45           41         30           61         61           61         61           61         923	df = 15 (df = 15)) (df = 15 (df = 15)) (df = 15 (df = 15)) (df = 15))	9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	2 10 2 10 2 10 2 20 173 309 716 661 661 821 821 821 821 821 821 821 82	M-1	1.67 (1.9.8 2.16 (10.95, 2.95 (10.94, 2.54 (10.99, 1.69 (10.84, 1.69 (10.84, 1.69 (10.84, 1.18 (10.96, 4.92 (1.71, 1.23 (10.84, 1.18 (10.96, 0.92 (1.44, 2.16 (10.78, 2.64 (1.78, 2.64 (1.78, 2.64 (1.78, 1.73 (1.04, 2.88) 3.57 (10.29, 4.472) 0.68 (10.39, 9.193) 1.53 (10.42, 2.88) 3.57 (10.29, 4.472) 3.051 (10.27, 3.473) 1.53 (10.48, 4.28) 2.39 (1.25, 4.58) 2.13 (1.26, 5.27) 0.68 (10.27, 7.71) 1.50 (1.14, 1.98) 3.57 (1.15, 9.34) 2.37 (1.15, 9.	4.85] 4.82] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 6.47] 2.39] 5.96] 3.93] 1 Year 2015 5.96] 3.93] 1 Year 2016 2016 2017 2022 20	0.02 0	1 SIRS/Sepsis Odds M-H, Rand	Aatio om, 95% Cl
Liu et al. Liu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Tabei et al. Tang et al. (shock) Tang et al. (shock) Tang et al. Wei et al. Xu et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneily: Tau <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effec <b>Diabetes</b> <b>Study or Subgroup</b> Wei et al. Rachid et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Tang et al. (SirKS) Tang et	al. = 0.41; t: Z = 4 SIR3 Even 0.07; Ct Z = 2.89 SIR5 Even 5 5 1 1	ь 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	88         81           30         61           42         97           145         22           145         361           143         1145           301         23           88         61           64         45           100         88           16         64           97         42           29         81           742         29           81         64           61         61           193         61           193         61           193         72, df i           123         41	( df = 15 ) ) (on SIRS <u>Events</u> 40 7 7 46 9 9 77 7 108 36 6 8 8 8 8 11 17 7 7 0 8 8 11 17 5 9 9 7 7 7 108 8 36 6 6 8 11 17 7 7 7 509 1 9 7 7 7 509 1 9 7 7 7 108 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7	9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	2 13 2 13 2 13 2 00 173 309 7 16 661 661 821 821 821 821 139 763 0085 10 139 763 0085 10 139 763 0085 10 139 763 0085 10 139 763 0085 10 139 763 0085 10 139 763 0085 10 139 763 139 763 139 763 139 763 14.5% 7.4% 1.5% 13.7% 15.8%	M-I	1.67 (1.38, 2.16 [0.95, 2.95 [0.94, 2.56 [0.94, 2.56 [0.94, 4.922 [1.71, 1 2.33 [0.84, 1.39 [0.96, 4.922 [1.71, 1 2.33 [0.84, 2.16 [0.78, 2.64 [1.78, 2.64 [1.78, 1.73 [1.04, 2.88] 3.57 [0.29, 44.72] 0.86 [0.39, 1.93] 1.53 [0.48, 4.83] 0.51 [0.07, 3.37] 0.66 [0.29, 1.44] 1.53 [0.48, 4.83] 0.51 [0.07, 3.37] 0.66 [0.29, 1.44] 1.57 [0.59, 4.71] 2.39 [1.24, 3.65] 1.35 [0.46, 4.23] 0.66 [0.27, 1.71] 1.50 [1.14, 1.98] 0.92 [0.26, 3.29] 5.82 [0.87, 289, 12] 3.27 [1.15, 9.34] 0.92 [0.26, 3.29] 5.82 [0.87, 289, 12] 3.27 [1.15, 0.34] 1.75 [0.89, 3.45] 1.75 [0.89, 3.45] 1.75 [0.89, 3.45] 1.75 [0.89, 3.45]	4.85] 4.82] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 6.47] 2.39] 3.93] 1.922 5.96] 3.93] 1.922 2016 2016 2016 2016 2017 2022	0.02 0	1 SIRS/Sepsis Odds M-H, Rand	Auto 10 10 Non SIRS/Sepsis Ratio 00 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10
Liu et al. Liu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Tarbei et al. Tang et al. (shock). Tang et al. (shock). Tang et al. (shock). Wei et al. Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effec <b>Diabetes</b> Study or Subgroup Wei et al. Rachid et al. Tabei et al. Chen et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Zhu et al. Tang et al. (shock) Amier et al. Xuer et al. Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 1 Test for overall effect; 2 <b>Pyuria</b> Study or Subgroup Tabei et al. Chen et al. C	al. = 0.41; t: Z = 4 SIRS Even 5 5 5 1 1 1 4 4 1	ь 5 5 10 5 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 18 5 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18	88         88           41         30           61         42           97         16           846         45.44,           97         16           61         13           61         61           61         61           61         193           841         10           1145         11<	( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )	9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	2 13 2 13 2 13 2 00 173 309 716 661 821 821 821 139 821 821 821 821 821 821 821 821	5.5% 5.5% 6.2% 7.8% 6.0% 7.8% 6.0% 7.6% 6.0% 6.0% 6.0% 6.0% 6.0% 6.0% 6.0% 6	1.67 (13.8) 2.16 (10.95, 2.95 (10.94, 2.54 (10.99, 1.69 (0.64, 1.89 (0.96, 4.92 (1.71, 1 2.33 (10.84, 1.18) (1.96, 0.92 (0.44, 2.16 (0.78, 2.64 (1.78, 2.64 (1.78,	4.85] 4.492] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 2.39] 2.39] 2.39] 2.39] 2.39] 2.39] 3.93] 2.39] 2.015 2.015 2.016 2.017 2.012 2.021 2.022 2	0.02 0	1 SIRS/Sepsis Odds M-H, Rand	10 50     10     10 50     10     10     10 50     10     10     10     10     10     10     10     10     10     10     10     10     10     10     1
Liu et al. Liu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Tang et al. (shock) Tang et al. (shock) Tang et al. (shock) Tang et al. Wei et al. Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> Test for overal effect <b>Diabetes</b> <b>Study or Subgroup</b> Wei et al. Rachid et al. Tabei et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Chen et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Zhu et al. Tang et al.(SIRS) Tang et al.(SIRS) Tatei et al. Xu et al. Xu et al. Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 1 Test for overal effect: <b>Pyuria</b> <b>Study or Subgroup</b> <b>Tabei et al.</b> Chen et al. Chen et al. Zhu et al. Tang et al.(Shock) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 1 Test for overal effect: Tabei et al. Chen et al. Zhu et al. Tang et al.(Shock) Liu et al. Tang et al.(Shock)	al. = 0.41; t: Z = 4 SIR3 Ever 0.07; Cr Z = 2.89 SIR5, Even 5 5 1 1 1 4 4 2 2	ь 5 5 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	88         84           41         30           61         42           97         15           222         144           42         97           122         144           23         144           23         144           23         846           45.44,         < 0.000	df = 15 ddf = 15 301) ion SIRS <u>Events</u> 40 77 46 88 80 111 77 680 88 811 17 680 88 811 17 680 9 9 9 77 509 146 17 509 146 17 509 146 17 509 146 17 509 146 17 509 146 17 509 146 17 509 17 509 146 17 509 17 509 17 509 16 509 17 509 10 509 10 17 509 10 10 509 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	213 200 173 309 716 661 661 331 821 821 763 763 763 763 763 763 763 763 763 763	M-I	1.67 (13.8 2.16 [0.95, 2.95 [0.94, 2.54 [0.99, 1.69 [0.84, 1.69 [0.84, 1.69 [0.84, 1.69 [0.84, 1.18 [0.96, 4.92 [1.71, 1 2.33 [0.84, 1.18 [0.98, 0.92 [0.44, 2.16 [0.78, 2.64 [1.78, 2.64 [1.78, 0.92 [0.44, 2.16 [0.78, 1.73 [1.04, 2.88] 3.57 [0.29, 4.472] 0.68 [0.39, 1.93] 1.53 [0.48, 4.83] 0.51 [0.79, 3.77] 0.68 [0.22, 1.44] 1.57 [0.59, 4.71] 1.50 [1.14, 1.98] 0.51 [0.90, 4.20] 1.37 [0.36, 5.27] 0.68 [0.27, 1.71] 1.50 [1.14, 1.98] 0.52 [0.28, 3.28] 5.52 [0.87, 280.12] 0.52 [0.28, 3.28] 5.52 [0.87, 280.12] 0.52 [0.28, 3.28] 5.52 [0.87, 280.12] 0.52 [0.28, 3.28] 5.52 [0.87, 280.12] 1.55 [0.46, 27.16] 1.56 [1.64, 1.22, 2.65]	4.85] 4.492] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] 1.92] 2.015 2.016 2016 2017 2018 2019 2021 2022 20	0.02 0	1 SIRS/Sepsis Odds M-H, Rand	Aatio om, 95% Cl
Liu et al. Liu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Tabei et al. Tang et al. (shock) Tang et al. (shock) Tang et al. Wei et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneily: Tau <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effec <b>Diabetes</b> <b>Study or Subgroup</b> Wei et al. Rachid et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Tang et al. (ShrS) Tang et al. (ShrS) Tabei et al. Xu et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneily: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 1 Test for overall effect: <i>Z</i> <b>Pyuria</b> <b>Study or Subgroup</b> Tabei et al. Cheft et al. Chef	al. = 0.41; t: Z = 4 SIR3 Even 0.07; Cr Z = 2.89 SIR5 Even 1 1 4 1 2 2 6	ь 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	88         84           41         30           61         42           97         16           22         145           846         61           144         23           846         61           61         144           97         72, df i           61         19           7004)         Nu           61         1923           81         197           81         197	(c)	9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	2 13 2 13 2 13 2 00 173 309 7 16 661 661 821 821 139 763 2 666 139 763 2 666 139 763 2 666 10 139 763 2 666 10 139 763 2 666 139 763 2 666 139 763 2 666 139 763 2 666 139 763 2 666 139 763 2 666 139 763 2 666 139 763 2 666 139 763 2 666 14.5% 1.5% 9.6% 9.6% 9.6% 9.6% 2.9% 2.8% 2.9% 2.9% 2.9% 2.8% 2.9%	5.5% 5.5% 6.2% 7.8% 6.0% 7.4% 6.0% 10.0% 5.5% 6.0% 7.4% 6.0% 10.0% 5.5% 6.0% 11.0% 1	1.67 (10.38, 2.16 [0.95, 2.95 [0.94, 2.56 [0.94, 2.56 [0.94, 4.922 [1.71, 1 2.33 [0.84, 1.18 [0.96, 4.922 [1.71, 1 2.33 [0.84, 1.13 [0.40, 1.73 [1.04, 2.88] 3.57 [0.29, 44.72] 0.86 [0.39, 1.93] 1.73 [1.04, 2.88] 3.57 [0.29, 44.72] 0.86 [0.39, 1.93] 1.53 [0.48, 4.83] 0.51 [0.07, 3.37] 0.66 [0.25, 1.44] 1.57 [0.59, 4.71] 2.99 [1.26, 4.58] 0.66 [0.25, 1.44] 1.67 [0.59, 4.71] 2.13 [1.24, 3.65] 1.35 [0.46, 4.83] 0.51 [0.07, 3.37] 0.68 [0.27, 1.71] 1.50 [1.14, 1.98] 0.92 [0.26, 3.29] 5.82 [0.87, 289, 12] 3.27 [1.15, 0.34] 0.92 [0.26, 3.29] 5.82 [0.87, 289, 12] 3.27 [1.15, 0.34] 1.75 [0.89, 3.45] 0.92 [0.26, 2.29] 5.82 [0.87, 289, 12] 3.27 [1.15, 0.34] 1.53 [0.46, 2.7.16] 1.64 [1.02, 2.65] 0.24 [0.42, 47, 31] 3.53 [0.46, 27, 16] 1.64 [1.02, 2.65]	4.85] 4.492] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 2.39] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] <b>Year</b> 2015 5.96] 2016 2016 2016 2016 2017 2012 2021 2022 202	0.02 0	1 SIRS/Sepsis Odds M-H, Rand	Auto 10 10 Non SIRS/Sepsis Ratio 00 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10
Liu et al. Liu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Tang et al. (shock). Tang et al. (shock). Tang et al. (shock). Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect Diabetes Study or Subgroup Wei et al. Rachid et al. Tabei et al. Chen et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Zhu et al. Tang et al. (shock). Amier et al. Turag et al. (shock). Amier et al. Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =: Test for overall effect: 27 Pyuria Study or Subgroup Tabei et al. Chen et	al. = 0.41; t: Z = 4 SIR4 Event 5 5 5 5 1 1 1 4 4 2 6	ь 5 7 5 10 5 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 5 173 = 173 = 188 = 198 = 198 = 198 = 198 = 198 = 198 = 198 = 198 = 198 = 198 = 198 = 1	88         88           41         30           61         42           97         16           846         45           94         45           97         145           846         64           97         141           361         30           223         88           64         97           429         743           72, df         11           61         6           61         19           242         41           97         78           61         19           98         6           61         19           97         78	( ( df = 15 )001) ion SIR5 <u>Events</u> 40 7 7 46 6 80 7 7 46 8 8 8 8 11 17 7 8 8 8 8 8 11 17 7 8 8 8 8	9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	2 13 2 13 2 13 2 00 173 309 716 661 821 821 821 139 821 139 821 821 139 821 139 821 139 821 821 139 821 139 821 139 821 139 821 139 821 139 821 139 833 139 833 139 833 139 826 139 833 139 833 139 833 139 833 139 835 139 835 139 835 139 835 139 835 139 835 139 835 139 835 139 835 139 835 139 835 139 835 139 835 139 835 139 835 119 835 119 835 119 837 100 857 119 837 100 857 119 837 100 857 119 837 100 857 119 857 119 857 119 857 119 857 119 857 119 857 119 857 119 119 857 119 119 119 119 119 119 119 11	M-I	1.67 (13.8) 2.16 (10.95, 2.95 (10.94, 2.54 (10.99, 1.68 (10.94, 4.92 (1.71, 1 2.33 (10.84, 1.13 (10.59) 0.92 (1.44, 2.16 (10.78, 2.64 (1.78, 2.64 (1.78, 2.64 (1.78, 2.64 (1.78, 1.73 (10.4, 2.88) 3.57 (10.29, 44.72) 0.86 (10.39, 1.93) 1.53 (10.48, 4.83) 0.51 (10.7, 3.87) 1.53 (1.44, 4.83) 0.51 (10.7, 3.87) 1.53 (1.44, 4.83) 0.51 (10.7, 3.87) 1.53 (1.44, 4.83) 0.51 (1.59, 4.71) 2.39 (1.24, 3.65) 1.35 (1.24, 3.65) 1.35 (1.14, 1.98) 0.65 (1.14, 1.98) 0.65 (1.04, 2.71) 1.55 (1.14, 1.98) 0.62 (1.05, 3.47) 0.52 (1.08, 7.41) 1.55 (1.14, 1.98) 0.62 (1.08, 7.41) 1.55 (1.14, 1.98) 0.63 (1.62, 7.43) 1.55 (1.08, 7.41) 1.55 (1.14, 1.98) 0.63 (1.62, 7.43) 1.55 (1.00, 1.53, 1.87) 1.45 (1.02, 2.65) 1.00 (1.53, 1.87)	4.85] 4.82] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 2.39] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] 2015 2015 2016 2016 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 2021 2022 2022 2022 2022 2022 2022 2022 2022	0.02 0	1 SIRS/Sepsis Odds M-H, Rand	10 50     10     10 50     10     10 50     10     10 50     10     10     10     10     10     10     10     10     10     10     10     10     10
Liu et al. Liu et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Tarbei et al. Tang et al. (SIRS) Tah et al. Xuet al. Zhu et al. Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect <b>Diabetes</b> Study or Subgroup Wei et al. Rachid et al. Tabei et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Chen et al. Lorenzo Soriano et al. Zhu et al. Tang et al. (SIRS) Tang et al. (SIRS) Tang et al. Study or Subgroup Tabei et al. Chen et al. Tang et al.(SIRS) Xu et al. Tang et al.(SIRS) Xu et al. Tang et al.(SIRS) Xu et al. Chen e	al. = 0.41; t: Z = 4 SiR4 Ever 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	ь 5 5 5 12 7 5 14 13 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	88         84           41         30           66         42           97         15           222         144           22         144           22         144           22         144           23         145           30         23           88         64           97         42           29         81           145         30           23         88           16         64           97         42           29         81           61         61           61         61           78         11           88         86           84         86	df = 15 (df = 15)) (df = 15 (df = 15 (df = 15)) (df = 15 (df = 15)) (df	9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	2 200 173 3009 716 661 661 821 821 139 763 3086 10 01); l <sup>2</sup> = ( Weight 14.5% 1.3% 8.3% 1.4.5% 1.3% 8.3% 1.4.5% 1.3% 8.3% 1.4.5% 1.3% 8.3% 1.3% 1.3% 1.3% 8.3% 1.3% 1.3% 8.3% 1.3% 1.3% 8.3% 1.3% 8.3% 1.3% 8.3% 1.3% 8.3% 1.3% 8.3% 1.3% 8.3% 1.3% 8.3% 1.3% 8.3% 1.3% 8.3% 1.3% 8.3% 1.3% 8.3% 1.3% 8.3% 1.3% 8.3% 1.3% 8.3% 1.1% 1.3% 1.1% 1.1% 8.3% 1.1% 1.1% 1.3% 2.3% 2.5	S. 7.0%         M-1           5.5%         66.2%           6.0%         7.8%           6.0%         0.0%           5.5%         6           6.0%         0.0%           5.5%         6           6.0%         0.0%           6.0%         0.0%           6.0%         0.0%           6.0%         0.0%           6.0%         0.0%           6.0%         0.0%           6.0%         0.0%           6.0%         0.0%           6.0%         0.0%           6.0%         0.0%           7.4%         M-1           1         1	1.67 (13.8) 2.16 (10.95, 2.95 (10.94, 2.54 (10.99, 1.69 (10.84, 1.69 (10.84, 1.69 (10.84, 1.69 (10.84, 1.69 (10.84, 1.69 (10.84, 1.69 (10.84, 2.35 (10.84, 2.36 (10.44, 2.16 (10.78, 2.64 [1.78, 2.64 [1.78, 3.57 (10.29, 4.47] 3.51 (10.29, 4.47] 2.39 (12.6, 4.58] 2.13 (10.58, 4.71] 0.36 (10.27, 1.71] 1.35 (1.14, 1.98] 2.52 (10.24, 2.28) 5.52 (10.87, 280.12) 0.542 (10.87, 280.12) 5.52 (10.72, 2.55) 5.52 (10.72	4.85] 4.492] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] 1.92] 2.015 2.016 2017 2015 2016 2017 2015 2016 2017 2012 2022 20	0.02 0	1 SIRS/Sepsis Odds M-H, Rand	Auto Mon SIRS/Sepsis Ratio orn, 95% Cl 
Liu et al. Liu et al. Liu et al. Tarbei et al. Tang et al. (shock) Tang et al. (shock) Tang et al. (shock) Tang et al. Wei et al. Total (95% CI) Total ovents Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effec <b>Diabetes</b> <b>Study or Subgroup</b> Wei et al. Rachiù et al. Tabei et al. Zhu et al. Zhu et al. Chen et al. Zhu et al. Liu et al. Tabei et al. Chen et al. Zhu et al. Liu et al. Tabei et al. Study or Subgroup et al. (SIRS) Tang et al.(SIRS) Tang et al.(SIRS) Study or Subgroup Tabei et al. Chen et al. Zhu et al. Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 1 Tabei et al. Chen et al.	al. = 0.41; t: Z = 4 SIR3 Even 0.07; Cf Z = 2.89 SIR5J Even 1 1 1 4 4 1 2 4 0.06; Cl	6 6 10 5 7 5 12 7 5 12 7 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 5 14 13 5 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 5 14 13 33 1 14 8 7 6 18 7 6 18 7 6 18 7 32 12 9 33 7 32 17 12 9 33 7 32 17 12 19 37 32 7 32 17 19 37 32 7 32 7 32 7 32 7 32 7 32 7 32 7 32 7 32 7 32 7 32 7 7 32 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	88         61           30         61           42         97           145         22           145         33           61         64           61         61           61         61           61         61           61         88           86         .03. df	(df = 15 ) ) (df = 15 ) ) ) (df = 15 ) ) (df = 15 ) (df = 15 ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) )	9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	2 13 2 13 2 13 2 00 173 309 7 16 661 661 821 139 763 331 821 139 763 3086 10 001); P = ( Weight 1, 4, 5% 7, 4% 4, 5% 7, 4% 9, 6% 9, 6% 9, 0% 8, 20% 100, 0% 2, 0% 100, 0% 2, 0% 100, 0% 2, 0% 100,	M-I	1.67 (1.9.8 2.16 [0.95, 2.95 [0.94, 2.54 [0.99, 1.69 [0.84, 1.89 [0.96, 4.922 [1.71, 1 2.33 [0.84, 1.18 [0.96, 0.92 [0.44, 2.16 [0.78, 2.64 [1.78, 2.64 [1.78, 2.64 [1.78, 0.92 [0.44, 2.16 [0.78, 2.64 [1.78, 0.95 [0.29, 4.72] 0.86 [0.39, 95% CI 0.86 [0.39, 1.83] 1.53 [0.48, 4.83] 0.51 [0.29, 4.72] 0.60 [0.25, 1.44] 1.57 [0.59, 4.71] 2.39 [1.26, 4.58] 2.13 [1.24, 4.56] 2.13 [1.24, 4.56] 2.13 [1.24, 4.56] 1.37 [0.36, 5.27] 0.68 [0.27, 1.71] 1.50 [1.14, 1.98] Odds Ratio 4. Ratio 4. Ratio 5.42 [0.87, 289.12] 3.27 [1.60, 7.04] 1.55 [0.89, 3.45] 5.42 [0.87, 289.12] 3.27 [1.50, 7.04] 1.56 [2.40, 2.24, 47.31] 3.53 [0.46, 27.16] 1.54 [1.02, 2.26] 1.00 [0.53, 1.87] 1.75 [1.23, 2.49]	4.85] 4.492] 9.19] 6.52] 4.48] 3.71] 1.92] 5.96] 3.93] <b>Year</b> 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2021 2021 2022 2022 2022 2022 2022 2022 2022 2022 2022 2022 2022	0.02 0	1 SIRS/Sepsis Odds M-H, Rand	

Figure 2. Forest plot showing factors influencing the PCNL outcome (Diabetes mellitus, multitract PCNL, preoperative pyuria, operative time and positive preoperative urine culture). Black diamonds indicate study weight. Green squares indicate the overall result. Horizontal lines indicate the 95% confidence interval. CI, confidence interval; df, degrees of freedom; Random, random effects model; SD, standard deviation; PCNL, percutaneous nephrolithotomy; SIRS, Systemic inflammatory response syndrome.

Table II Newcastle-Ottawa scale of included studies					
	Table II. New	castle-Ottawa	scale of	included	studies.

Author, year	Selection	Comparability	Exposure	Total score	(Refs.)
Amier et al, 2022	****		***	7	(8)
Chen et al, 2019	***	*	**	6	(9)
Chhetri et al, 2018	**	*	***	6	(10)
He et al, 2018	****		**	6	(11)
Koras <i>et al</i> , 2015	***	*	*	5	(12)
Kumar <i>et al</i> , 2021	***		**	5	(13)
Liu et al, 2020	***	*	**	6	(14)
Liu et al, 2021	***	*	*	5	(15)
Lorenzo Soriano et al, 2019	***	*	***	7	(16)
Rashid and Fakhulddin, 2016	****		**	6	(17)
Tabei et al, 2016	***	*	**	6	(18)
Tang et al, 2021	***		***	6	(19)
Teh and Tham, 2021	***	*	****	8	(20)
Wang et al, 2020	****	*	**	7	(21)
Wei et al, 2015	***	*	***	7	(22)
Xu et al, 2022	***		**	5	(23)
Yang <i>et al</i> , 2017	***	*	***	7	(24)
Zhu et al, 2020	****		***	7	(25)

BMI									
Billi	SIR	S/Seps	sis	Non S	IRS/Se	psis		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl
He et al.	23.07	3.58	108	23.75	3.9	922	12.9%	-0.68 [-1.40, 0.04]	
Koras et al.	27.4	5.1	83	25.9	4.7	220	8.3%	1.50 [0.24, 2.76]	
Liu et al.	26.1	4.2	41	26.2	4	200	7.4%	-0.10 [-1.50, 1.30]	
Lorenzo Soriano et al.	28.5	7.9	30	26.8	6	173	2.4%	1.70 [-1.26, 4.66]	
Tabei et al.	23.6	5.03	61	23.9	4.47	309	7.6%	-0.30 [-1.66, 1.06]	
Tang et al.(shock)	22.6	2.8	42	22.9	2.9	716	11.4%	-0.30 [-1.17, 0.57]	
Tang et al.(SIRS)	22.5	3	97	22.9	2.9	661	13.7%	-0.40 [-1.04, 0.24]	
Wang et al.	25.1	3.4	22	24.3	2.6	821	7.2%	0.80 [-0.63, 2.23]	
Wei et al.	25.6	3.3	145	25.2	3.6	266	13.1%	0.40 [-0.29, 1.09]	+
Xu et al.	22.9	3.5	81	23.1	3.3	139	10.8%	-0.20 [-1.14, 0.74]	
Zhu et al.	26.6	4.4	23	23.8	4.3	763	5.2%	2.80 [0.98, 4.62]	
Total (95% CI)			733			5190	100.0%	0.19 [-0.30, 0.69]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0	.37; Chi <sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup> = 24.	02, df =	10 (P =	0.008);	l <sup>2</sup> = 58%	%		
Test for overall effect: Z	= 0.76 (	P = 0.4	45)	,	//				-4 -2 0 2 4
			,						Non SIRS/Sepsis SIRS/Sepsis

Patients age	SID	S/Sone	ie	Non		neie		Std. Maan Difference		Std. Moon Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	Year	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Koras et al.	40.2	9.7	23	46.8	12.6	280	5.9%	-0.53 [-0.96, -0.10]	2014	
Wei et al.	55.3	8.8	145	52.1	7.5	266	9.6%	0.40 [0.20, 0.60]	2015	
Rachid et al.	52.6	13.4	3	39.6	15.4	57	1.4%	0.84 [-0.33, 2.01]	2016	
Tabei et al.	54.2	16.42	61	57.4	12.52	309	8.3%	-0.24 [-0.52, 0.03]	2016	
Yang et al.	53.13	12.61	45	50.29	11.84	119	7.1%	0.23 [-0.11, 0.58]	2017	+
Chen et al.	57.4	9.1	19	51.8	12.3	783	5.5%	0.46 [0.00, 0.91]	2018	———
Chhetri et al.	27.2	5.22	6	34.78	12	91	2.4%	-0.64 [-1.47, 0.19]	2018	
Zhu et al.	57	13	23	55.4	14.6	763	6.0%	0.11 [-0.31, 0.52]	2019	
Lorenzo Soriano et al.	48.3	14.5	30	51	15.9	173	6.4%	-0.17 [-0.56, 0.22]	2019	
Liu et al	49.52	11.8	88	49.89	12.98	215	8.8%	-0.03 [-0.28, 0.22]	2020	-+-
Wang et al.	47.3	18.5	22	46.2	20.5	821	5.9%	0.05 [-0.37, 0.48]	2020	
Tang et al.(SIRS)	52.5	11.9	97	51.9	12.7	661	9.4%	0.05 [-0.17, 0.26]	2021	+
Tang et al.(shock)	53	14	42	52	12.5	716	7.7%	0.08 [-0.23, 0.39]	2021	
Liu et al.	55.4	10.9	41	57.3	9.7	200	7.2%	-0.19 [-0.53, 0.15]	2021	+
Xu et al.	54.4	12.3	81	56.5	9.6	139	8.3%	-0.20 [-0.47, 0.08]	2022	
Total (95% CI)			726			5593	100.0%	0.00 [-0.14, 0.15]		•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0	).05: Chi <sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup> = 37.8	2. df =	14 (P = (	).0006):	$l^2 = 63\%$	6		_	<u>    t   t   t   t   t   t   t   t   t </u>
Test for overall effect: Z	r = 0.02 (	P = 0.9	8)			,	-			-2 -1 0 1 2
	- 0.02 (	. 0.0	~,							SIRS/Sepsis Non SIRS/Sepsis

Figure 3. Forest plot showing factors that did not influence the PCNL outcome (BMI and patient's age). Black diamonds indicate study weight. Green squares indicate the overall result. Horizontal lines indicate the 95% confidence interval. PCNL, percutaneous nephrolithotomy; BMI, body mass index; CI, confidence interval; df, degrees of freedom; Random, random effects model; SD, standard deviation; SIRS, Systemic inflammatory response syndrome.

body, and the fast colonization of any urinary stent is well known. According to Verma *et al* (35), 43% of bladder catheters will be colonized after only five days and 20% will be with biofilm-forming bacteria.

A complex relationship exists between elevated BMI, kidney stones and urinary tract infections (UTIs). We are witnessing a concomitant increase in the prevalence of kidney stone disease and obesity. According to Poore et al (36), obesity in adults increased by 27.5% from 1980 to 2013. In women with an elevated BMI, there is a 1.30-fold increased risk for kidney stone development compared with those with a normal BMI. The explanation may be that obesity is associated with metabolic changes that favor stone formation. According to Taylor et al (37), urinary pH is more acidic in patients with greater BMI and urinary oxalate, sodium, uric acid and phosphate concentrations are higher. Similar findings were also reported by Ekeruo et al (38); the authors noticed that hyperoxaluria, hypercalciuria and hyperuricosuria are more commonly found in obese stone formers compared with a non-obese cohort. Although the present study analyzed the impact of BMI on infectious complications following PCNL, according to Poore et al (36), it seems that visceral obesity is the more predictive of kidney stone risk. However, it is more difficult to quantify because it requires imaging studies. In the present study, the BMI did not influence the infectious outcomes of PCNL, although some authors link obesity to a higher chance of developing UTI. In a cohort of 95,598 subjects, Semins et al (39) noticed that males with a BMI between 30.0-34.9 have a higher chance of developing UTI compared with patients with a BMI>50 (OR 1.59 vs. 2.35). A higher BMI does not influence PCNL outcome, not from the infection's point of view but overall. According to Ortiz et al (40), there is no significant difference in the stone-free rate, postoperative complication incidence, hemoglobin loss, or hospital stay.

Diabetes mellitus, obesity and arterial hypertension are essential elements of metabolic syndrome. Urinary abnormalities indicate a definite association between metabolic syndrome and kidney stones. According to Domingos et al (41), these patients have excessively acidic urine, high urinary calcium and oxalate levels and low urinary citrate. As in the case of patients with elevated BMI, there is a link between diabetes and UTI. According to Chiu et al (42), a UTI in a diabetic patient is 10 times more likely to progress to pyelonephritis. According to Murtha et al (43), one explanation is that the immunity to bacteria in the urinary tract is insulin-dependent. The authors proved in an animal model that insulin resistance leads to a suppression of urinary antimicrobial peptides suggesting that urinary sugar is not the essential element behind UTIs in these patients. In addition, elevated blood sugar influences resistance to UTIs. In diabetic patients, some immune alterations have been observed, such as an elevation in CD4+CD28null T-lymphocytes count, lower levels of serum complement factor 4 concentration and plasma zinc levels and also significantly lower PMNs chemotaxis (44,45). The results of the present study show that diabetes is a predisposing factor for postoperative infections. Considering that PCNL is an elective operation, it is assuming that the patient's blood sugar was within normal limits at the time of the intervention. However, an unbalanced history of diabetes may contribute to the unfavorable evolution. Future studies would help identify

the relationship between hemoglobin A1c and SIRS/sepsis following PCNL.

In patients with staghorn stones, surgical management can be complex. Performing multiple tracts, PCNL can increase the rate of complications and the period of hospitalization. In a cohort of 27 patients where multiple tract PCNL was performed, Liang et al (46) obtained a stone-free rate within three sessions in 88.9% of cases. The authors did not report significant blood loss, while postoperative fever was encountered in only 22.22% of cases. A group of 65 patients evaluated by Rashid et al (47), who underwent multiple tract PCNL, had a significant decrease in hemoglobin level, while serum creatinine remained relatively unchanged. In their cohort, 11% had a postoperative fever, while only 3% presented an infection that required additional antibiotics. In a much larger cohort of 773 patients with staghorn calculi in which PCNL was performed, of which 514 with multiple tracts, Desai et al (48) reported postoperative fever in up to 28.2% of patients.

Given the risk of infectious complications, a logical strategy would be to use antibiotic prophylaxis. However, it remains a debatable topic related to the categories of patients who would benefit the most and the treatment regimen, a single preoperative dose or treatment for several days. In a meta-analysis by Yu et al (1), which included 13 studies with a total of 1,549 patients, the results indicated that for those receiving prophylactic treatment for a few days compared with those receiving a single dose, the symptoms of sepsis were significantly lower as well as positive cultures in the renal pelvis. Moreover, according to Xu et al (23), optimal antibiotic prophylaxis in those with preoperative positive urine cultures should last at least seven days. Schnabel et al (49) compared 98 patients who received antibiotics one day preoperatively with 76 patients who did not receive prophylaxis. The authors found no significant differences in fever, grade 1-3 complications, or hospitalization. The authors considered that antibiotic prophylaxis might not be necessary in selected cases, such as those with negative urine culture, non-staghorn stones and no history of urinary tract infections. Some authors have tried to evaluate the role of the urine dipstick test before the PCNL. In a group of 806 patients, Xu et al (50) reported that positive urine dipstick infection prior to surgery strongly predicted SIRS. Paradoxically, extensive preoperative antibiotic use was linked to a greater risk of SIRS.

According to European Association of Urology recommendations, 2022 edition, the probability of infection during PCNL is high and antibiotic prophylaxis has been demonstrated to minimize the risk for infectious complications significantly with a single dosage being adequate (51). Antibiotic prophylaxis should be given even with a negative urine culture, according to American Urological Association Guidelines, which are regarded as a clinical principle (52). In this part, the American Urological Association panel makes the case that there is insufficient evidence to suggest giving patients with a negative urine culture one week of preventive antibiotics. In a recent survey that included over 3,000 Chinese urologists, Zhang et al (53) reported that antibiotic prophylaxis for 1-3 days before surgery was most often used regardless of whether the urine culture was positive or negative (54.5 vs. 65.5%). Cephalosporins are the most used antibiotic type, followed by quinolones. Considering that urine cultures are

not specific for the colonization status, He et al (54) compared two types of antibiotic regimens with the presence of white blood cells (WBC) and nitrites in urine. The authors showed that one 1.5 g dose of cefuroxime before PCNL compared with 3-day treatment statistically lowered the incidence of SIRS in patients with positive nitrites in urine but did not influence the outcome in patients with absent nitrites in urine. In the cohort studied by Xu et al (23), the urine culture result was unavailable before the procedure in some patients. In these cases, they received an empirical antibiotic prophylaxis 30 before the surgery and postoperatively, the antibiotic therapy was adjusted after obtaining the result. The authors evaluated the effects of antibiotic prophylaxis schemes. Although a more extended antibiotic prophylaxis was significantly associated with a better outcome, the administration of sensitive antibiotics did not prove a significant advantage over non-sensitive antibiotics.

From the data of the present study, between 2017-2021, of the 463 cases in which PCNL was performed, 5.18% (n=24) developed postoperative sepsis/SIRS. Of these, 54.2% (n=13) were men and 45.8% (n=11) were women. The stone-free rate was 75% and the overall stone-free rate was 69.11%. The bladder preoperative urine culture was positive in 58.33%(n=14) of patients compared with 25.20% in the non-sepsis group. Also, the preoperative presence of urinary stents was noted more frequently in the sepsis/SIRS group (62.5% vs. 17.71%). The majority (93.33%) had JJ ureteral stents. In all cases, developing sepsis/SIRS symptoms led to a change in the postoperative antibiotic regimen (55).

The present meta-analysis has some limitations: First, the studies are somewhat heterogenous; the authors came from different continents, the number of patients varied from 60 to 1,030 and renal pelvic urine culture was not available in all cases. Also, the dilatation technique, balloon compared with telescopic/serial dilation, was not known in all studies. Another drawback of the meta-analysis is the need to evaluate the type of kidney stones according to the various scoring systems. Only one of the included studies reported that a higher STONE (Stone size, Tract length, Obstruction, Number of involved calices and Essence or stone density) score correlates significantly with sepsis/SIRS (19). From the present study authors' experience with the Guy stone score, it was also found that patients with the highest grade (IV) have significantly more preoperative positive urine culture and complications according to the Clavien scale and the lowest stone-free rate (56).

Despite this, the present meta-analysis has some strong points. All patients in the included studies underwent the same type of intervention. The outcomes are well defined, SIRS respectively sepsis, or quantified such as WBC, preoperative urine culture, or BMI. Thus, some elements are easy to compare, such as the operative time, which depends on several factors. According to Akman *et al* (56), some of these factors are the previous presence of hydronephrosis, stone characteristics and surgeon experience, which could not be evaluated in the present analysis. Further studies should evaluate supplemental sepsis indicators such as C-reactive protein, hemoglobin A1c or procalcitonin. Also, the type of PCNL technique (standard or miniPCNL) could be an influencing factor considering as, according to Jiao *et al* (57), there is no difference regarding postoperative fever between standard compared with miniPCNL. However, the operative time was significantly shorter in patients in which minPCNL and, according to the data of the present analysis, a longer operative time favors the development of SIRS/sepsis.

The present analysis showed that diabetes mellitus, multitract PCNL, pyuria, operative time and positive urine culture are factors that, if not controlled, favor the appearance of SIRS or urosepsis. In some high-risk patients, such as those with diabetes, a history of urinary tract infections, or positive urine cultures, antibiotic prophylaxis should be mandatory and performed for at least one week before surgery.

# Acknowledgments

Not applicable.

# Funding

No funding was received.

### Availability of data and materials

Data sharing is not applicable to this article, as no data sets were generated or analyzed during the current study.

# Authors' contributions

DP and CP were responsible for conceiving the study and DP was responsible for the methodology, formal analysis and software. Validation was performed by DP, CP and SG and investigation by GR and SG. Data curation was by SG, GR and VJ. DP, GR and SG wrote the original draft of the manuscript, which was reviewed and edited by VJ and CP. CP and VJ were responsible for visualization and supervision. Data authentication is not applicable. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

# Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable.

# Patient consent for publication

Not applicable.

## **Competing interests**

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

# References

- 1. Yu J, Guo B, Yu J, Chen T, Han X, Niu Q, Xu S, Guo Z, Shi Q, Peng X, *et al*: Antibiotic prophylaxis in perioperative period of percutaneous nephrolithotomy: A systematic review and meta-analysis of comparative studies. World J Urol 38: 1685-1700, 2020.
- 2. Jiang Y, Zhang J, Kang N, Niu Y, Li Z, Yu C and Zhang J: Current Trends in percutaneous nephrolithotomy in China: A spot survey. Risk Manag Health Policy 14: 2507-2515, 2021.
- Türk C, Petřík A, Sarica K, Seitz C, Skolarikos A, Straub M and Knoll T: EAU guidelines on interventional treatment for urolithiasis. Eur Urol 69: 475-482, 2016.

- 4. Sharma K, Sankhwar SN, Goel A, Singh V, Sharma P and Garg Y: Factors predicting infectious complications following percutaneous nephrolithotomy. Urol Ann 8: 434-438, 2016.
- Michel MS, Trojan L and Rassweiler JJ: Complications in percutaneous nephrolithotomy. Eur Urol 51: 899-906, 2007.
- 6. Yang Z, Lin D, Hong Y, Hu M, Cai W, Pan H, Li Q, Lin J and Ye L: The effect of preoperative urine culture and bacterial species on infection after percutaneous nephrolithotomy for patients with upper urinary tract stones. Sci Rep 12: 4833, 2022.
- Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, Shamseer L, Tetzlaff JM, Akl EA, Brennan SE, *et al*: The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 372: n71, 2021.
- Amier Y, Zhang Y, Zhang J, Yao W, Wang S, Wei C and Yu X: Analysis of preoperative risk factors for postoperative urosepsis after mini-percutaneous nephrolithotomy in patients with large kidney stones. J Endourol 36: 292-297, 2022.
   Chen D, Jiang C, Liang X, Zhong F, Huang J, Lin Y, Zhao Z,
- Chen D, Jiang C, Liang X, Zhong F, Huang J, Lin Y, Zhao Z, Duan X, Zeng G and Wu W: Early and rapid prediction of postoperative infections following percutaneous nephrolithotomy in patients with complex kidney stones. BJU Int 123: 1041-1047, 2019.
- Chhetri RK, Baral S and Thapa N: Prediction of infectious complications after percutaneous nephrolithotomy. J Soc Surg Nepal 21: 12-18, 2018.
   He Z, Tang F, Lei H, Chen Y and Zeng G: Risk factors for
- He Z, Tang F, Lei H, Chen Y and Zeng G: Risk factors for systemic inflammatory response syndrome after percutaneous nephrolithotomy. Prog Urol 28: 582-587, 2018.
   Koras O, Bozkurt IH, Yonguc T, Degirmenci T, Arslan B,
- Koras O, Bozkurt IH, Yonguc T, Degirmenci T, Arslan B, Gunlusoy B, Aydogdu O and Minareci S: Risk factors for postoperative infectious complications following percutaneous nephrolithotomy: A prospective clinical study. Urolithiasis 43: 55-60, 2015.
- Kumar GC, Devraj R, Sagar V, Chandraiah R, Prasad D and Ch R: Factors determining postoperative infectious complications of percutaneous nephrolithotomy: Experience from a single center. Int J Health Clin Res 4: 127-130, 2021.
- 14. Liu J, Zhou C, Gao W, Huang H, Jiang X and Zhang D: Does preoperative urine culture still play a role in predicting post-PCNL SIRS? A retrospective cohort study. Urolithiasis 48: 251-256, 2020.
- 15. Liu J, Yang Q, Lan J, Hong Y, Huang X and Yang B: Risk factors and prediction model of urosepsis in patients with diabetes after percutaneous nephrolithotomy. BMC Urol 21: 74, 2021.
- 16. Lorenzo Soriano L, Ordaz Jurado DG, Pérez Ardavín J, Budía Alba A, Bahílo Mateu P, Trassierra Villa M and López Acón D: Predictive factors of infectious complications in the postoperative of percutaneous nephrolithotomy. Actas Urol Esp (Engl Ed) 43: 131-136, 2019.
- Rashid AO and Fakhulddin SS: Risk factors for fever and sepsis after percutaneous nephrolithotomy. Asian J Urol 3: 82-87, 2016.
- Tabei T, Ito H, Usui K, Kuroda S, Kawahara T, Terao H, Fujikawa A, Makiyama K, Yao M and Matsuzaki J: Risk factors of systemic inflammation response syndrome after endoscopic combined intrarenal surgery in the modified Valdivia position. Int J Urol 23: 687-692, 2016.
- Tang Y, Zhang C, Mo C, Gui C, Luo J and Wu R: Predictive model for systemic infection after percutaneous nephrolithotomy and related factors analysis. Front Surg 8: 696463, 2021.
- Teh KY and Tham TM: Predictors of post-percutaneous nephrolithotomy sepsis: The Northern Malaysian experience. Urol Ann 13: 156-162, 2021.
- 21. Wang S, Yuan P, Peng E, Xia D, Xu H, Wang S, Ye Z and Chen Z: Risk factors for urosepsis after minimally invasive percutaneous nephrolithotomy in patients with preoperative urinary tract infection. Biomed Res Int 2020: 1354672, 2020.
- 22. Wei W, Leng J, Shao H and Wang W: Diabetes, a risk factor for both infectious and major complications after percutaneous nephrolithotomy. Int J Clin Exp Med 8: 16620-16626, 2015.
- 2013. Xu P, Zhang S, Zhang Y, Zeng T, Chen D, Wu W, Tiselius HG, Li S, Huang J, Zeng G and Wu W: Preoperative antibiotic therapy exceeding 7 days can minimize infectious complications after percutaneous nephrolithotomy in patients with positive urine culture. World J Urol 40: 193-199, 2022.
- 24. Yang T, Liu S, Hu J, Wang L and Jiang H: The evaluation of risk factors for postoperative infectious complications after percutaneous nephrolithotomy. Biomed Res Int 2017: 4832051, 2017.

- 25. Zhu Z, Cui Y, Zeng H, Li Y, Zeng F, Li Y, Chen Z and Hequn C: The evaluation of early predictive factors for urosepsis in patients with negative preoperative urine culture following mini-percutaneous nephrolithotomy. World J Urol 38: 2629-2636, 2020.
- 26. Ghani KR, Sammon JD, Bhojani N, Karakiewicz PI, Sun M, Sukumar S, Littleton R, Peabody JO, Menon M and Trinh QD: Trends in percutaneous nephrolithotomy use and outcomes in the United States. J Urol 190: 558-564, 2013.
- 27. Aiello A, Farzaneh F, Candore G, Caruso C, Davinelli S, Gambino CM, Ligotti ME, Zareian N and Accardi G: Immunosenescence and its hallmarks: how to oppose aging strategically? A review of potential options for therapeutic intervention. Front Immunol 10: 2247, 2019.
- Bajaj V, Gadi N, Spihlman AP, Wu SC, Choi CH and Moulton VR: Aging, immunity, and COVID-19: How age influences the host immune response to coronavirus infections? Front Physiol 11: 571416, 2021.
- 29. Zhou YY and Sun BW: Recent advances in neutrophil chemotaxis abnormalities during sepsis. Chin J Traumatol 25: 317-324, 2022.
- Hao Z, Wang J, Wang Q, Luan G and Qian B: Preoperative risk factors associated with urosepsis following percutaneous nephrolithotomy: A meta-analys. Int J Clin Exp Med 12: 9616-9628, 2019.
- 31. Dogan HS, Guliyev F, Cetinkaya YS, Sofikerim M, Ozden E and Sahin A: Importance of microbiological evaluation in management of infectious complications following percutaneous nephrolithotomy. Int Urol Nephrol 39: 737-742, 2007.
- 32. Walton-Diaz A, Vinay JI, Barahona J, Daels P, González M, Hidalgo JP, Palma C, Díaz P, Domenech A, Valenzuela R and Marchant F: Concordance of renal stone culture: PMUC, RPUC, RSC and post-PCNL sepsis-a non-randomized prospective observation cohort study. Int Urol Nephrol 49: 31-35, 2017.
- 33. Aghdas FS, Akhavizadegan H, Aryanpoor A, Inanloo H and Karbakhsh M: Fever after percutaneous nephrolithotomy: Contributing factors. Surg Infect (Larchmt) 7: 367-371, 2006.
- Benson AD, Juliano TM and Miller NL: Infectious outcomes of nephrostomy drainage before percutaneous nephrolithotomy compared to concurrent access. J Urol 192: 770-774, 2014.
- 35. Verma A, Bhani D, Tomar V, Bachhiwal R and Yadav S: Differences in bacterial colonization and biofilm formation property of uropathogens between the two most commonly used indwelling urinary catheters. J Clin Diagn Res 10: PC01-PC03, 2016.
- Poore W, Boyd CJ, Singh NP, Wood K, Gower B and Assimos DG: Obesity and its impact on kidney stone formation. Rev Urol 22: 17-23, 2020.
- Taylor EN, Stampfer MJ and Curhan GC: Obesity, weight gain, and the risk of kidney stones. JAMA 293: 455-462, 2005.
   Ekeruo WO, Tan YH, Young MD, Dahm P, Maloney ME,
- 38. Ekeruo WO, Tan YH, Young MD, Dahm P, Maloney ME, Mathias BJ, Albala DM and Preminger GM: Metabolic risk factors and the impact of medical therapy on the management of nephrolithiasis in obese patients. J Urol 172: 159-163, 2004.
- Semins MJ, Shore AD, Makary MA, Weiner J and Matlaga BR: The impact of obesity on urinary tract infection risk. Urology 79: 266-269, 2012.
- 40. Torrecilla Ortiz C, Meza Martínez AI, Vicens Morton AJ, Vila Reyes H, Colom Feixas S, Suarez Novo JF and Franco Miranda E: Obesity in percutaneous nephrolithotomy. Is body mass index really important? Urology 84: 538-543, 2014.
- 41. Domingos F and Serra A: Metabolic syndrome: A multifaceted risk factor for kidney stones. Scand J Urol 48: 414-419, 2014.
- 42. Chiu PF, Huang CH, Liou HH, Wu CL, Wang SC and Chang CC: Long-term renal outcomes of episodic urinary tract infection in diabetic patients. J Diabetes Complications 27: 41-43, 2013.
- 43. Murtha MJ, Eichler T, Bender K, Metheny J, Li B, Schwaderer AL, Mosquera C, James C, Schwartz L, Becknell B and Spencer JD: Insulin receptor signaling regulates renal collecting duct and intercalated cell antibacterial defenses. J Clin Invest 128: 5634-5646, 2018.
- 44. Giubilato S, Liuzzo G, Brugaletta S, Pitocco D, Graziani F, Smaldone C, Montone RA, Pazzano V, Pedicino D, Biasucci LM, et al: Expansion of CD4+CD28null T-lymphocytes in diabetic patients: exploring new pathogenetic mechanisms of increased cardiovascular risk in diabetes mellitus. Eur Heart J 32: 1214-1226, 2011.
- 45. Geerlings SE and Hoepelman AI: Immune dysfunction in patients with diabetes mellitus (DM). FEMS Immunol Med Microbiol 26: 259-265, 1999.

- 46. Liang T, Zhao C, Wu G, Tang B, Luo X, Lu S, Dong Y and Yang H: Multi-tract percutaneous nephrolithotomy combined with EMS lithotripsy for bilateral complex renal stones: Our experience. BMC Urol 17: 15, 2017.
- Rashid AO, Mahmood SN, Amin AK, Bapir R and Buchholz N: Multitract percutaneous nephrolithotomy in the management of staghorn stones. Afr J Urol 26: 74, 2020.
- Desai M, Jain P, Ganpule A, Sabnis R, Patel S and Shrivastav P: Developments in technique and technology: The effect on the results of percutaneous nephrolithotomy for staghorn calculi. BJU Int 104: 542-548, 2009.
   Schnabel MJ, Rosenhammer B, Steckermeier M, Fritsche HM,
- Schnabel MJ, Rosenhammer B, Steckermeier M, Fritsche HM, Burger M and Spachmann PJ: Miniaturized percutaneous nephrolithotomy without antibiotic prophylaxis: A single institution experience. Int Urol Nephrol 53: 1551-1556, 2021.
- experience. Int Urol Nephrol 53: 1551-1556, 2021.
  50. Xu P, Zhang S, Zhang Y, Zeng T, Chen D, Wu W, Tiselius HG, Li S, Huang J, Zeng G and Wu W: Enhanced antibiotic treatment based on positive urine dipstick infection test before percutaneous nephrolithotomy did not prevent postoperative infection in patients with negative urine culture. J Endourol 35: 1743-1749, 2021.
- with negative urine culture. J Endourol 35: 1743-1749, 2021.
  51. European Association of Urology (EAU): Guideline on urolithiasis. EAU, Arnhem, 2022. https://uroweb.org/guide-lines/urolithiasis. Accessed December 20, 2022.
- 52. Pearle MS, Goldfarb DS, Assimos DG, Curhan G, Denu-Ciocca CJ, Matlaga BR, Monga M, Penniston KL, Preminger GM, Turk TM, et al: Medical management of kidney stones: AUA guideline. J Urol 192: 316-324, 2014.
- 53. Zhang S, Li G, Qiao L, Lai D, He Z, An L, Xu P, Tiselius HG, Zeng G, Zheng J and Wu W: The antibiotic strategies during percutaneous nephrolithotomy in China revealed the gap between the reality and the urological guidelines. BMC Urol 22: 136, 2022.

- 54. He C, Chen H, Li Y, Zeng F, Cui Y and Chen Z: Antibiotic administration for negative midstream urine culture patients before percutaneous nephrolithotomy. Urolithiasis 49: 505-512, 2021.
- 55. Puia D, Radavoi GD, Proca TM, Puia A, Jinga V and Pricop C: Urinary tract infections in complicated kidney stones: Can they be correlated with Guy's stone score? J Pak Med Assoc 72: 1721-1725, 2022.
- 56. Akman T, Binbay M, Akcay M, Tekinarslan E, Kezer C, Ozgor F, Seyrek M and Muslumanoglu AY: Variables that influence operative time during percutaneous nephrolithotomy: An analysis of 1897 cases. J Endourol 25: 1269-1273, 2011.
- 57. Jiao B, Luo Z, Huang T, Zhang G and Yu J: A systematic review and meta-analysis of minimally invasive vs standard percutaneous nephrolithotomy in the surgical management of renal stones. Exp Ther Med 21: 213, 2021.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) License.