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Abstract

**Background:** It is unknown whether a conservative approach to fluid administration or deresuscitation (active removal of fluid using diuretics or renal replacement therapy (RRT)) is beneficial following haemodynamic stabilisation of critically ill patients.

**Purpose:** To evaluate the efficacy and safety of conservative or deresuscitative fluid strategies in adults and children with acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS), sepsis, or systemic inflammatory response syndrome (SIRS) in the post-resuscitation phase of critical illness.

**Methods:** We searched Medline, EMBASE, and the Cochrane central register of controlled trials from 1980 to June 2016, and manually reviewed relevant conference proceedings from 2009 to the present. Two reviewers independently assessed search results for inclusion and undertook data extraction and quality appraisal. We included randomised trials comparing fluid regimens with differing fluid balances between groups, and observational studies investigating the relationship between fluid balance and clinical outcomes.

**Results:** 49 studies met inclusion criteria. Marked clinical heterogeneity was evident. In a meta-analysis of 11 randomised trials (2051 patients) using a random effects model, we found no significant difference in mortality with conservative or deresuscitative strategies compared to a liberal strategy or usual care (pooled risk ratio [RR] 0.92, 95% confidence interval [CI] 0.82-1.02, I²=0%). A conservative or deresuscitative strategy resulted in increased ventilator-free days (mean difference 1.82 days, 95% CI 0.53 to 3.10 days, I²=9%) and reduced length of ICU stay (mean difference -1.88 days, 95% CI -0.12 to -3.64 days, I²=75%) compared to a liberal strategy or standard care.

**Conclusions:** In adults and children with ARDS, sepsis or SIRS, a conservative or deresuscitative fluid strategy results in increased number of ventilator-free days and decreased length of ICU stay compared with a liberal strategy or standard care. The effect on mortality remains uncertain. Large randomised trials are needed to determine optimal fluid strategies in critical illness.

**Keywords:** Fluid therapy; Diuretics; Water-electrolyte balance; Critical Illness; Sepsis; Respiratory Distress Syndrome, Adult; Systemic Inflammatory Response Syndrome.
Background

Optimising fluid status is a fundamental concern of critical care practice. Ample data suggest that the optimisation of intravascular volume status can increase cardiac output and global oxygen delivery, and large volumes of intravenous fluids are often administered for this purpose. In addition, critically ill patients frequently receive large volumes of fluid as drug diluents, as artificial nutrition, and as maintenance fluid.

In the face of increased capillary permeability, sodium and water retention, and acute kidney injury (AKI), all of which are common in critical illness, the accumulation of large volumes of fluid in the interstitium is a frequent occurrence and may impair oxygen delivery at the cellular level. Clinically this fluid overload is apparent as peripheral and pulmonary oedema, although other organs may be affected [1]. A number of cohort studies have demonstrated an association between fluid overload and mortality [2-4], and it has been suggested that strategies aimed at prevention or treatment of fluid overload may be beneficial following haemodynamic stabilisation [5].

A previous systematic review and meta-analysis on the topic of fluid overload and the relationship between fluid balance and mortality [6] in critically ill patients reported studies with considerable heterogeneity in design, presence of comparator groups, populations, as well as the timing and nature of interventions. By narrowing our focus to specific populations, and by including but not attempting to meta-analyse observational studies, we aimed to maximise both the external and internal validity of our review.

The aim of this review is to evaluate the impact of a conservative fluid or active deresuscitation strategy compared with standard care or a liberal fluid strategy in critically ill adult or paediatric patients with sepsis, systemic inflammatory response syndrome (SIRS), or acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) on mortality and other clinical outcomes. Secondary aims were to identify criteria used to judge suitability for conservative fluid management or deresuscitation; to describe the interventions used to minimise fluid intake or deresuscitate patients, and to identify contraindications to deresuscitation or conservative fluid management in published studies.

Methods

The protocol for this review was prospectively registered with PROSPERO (International prospective register of systematic reviews; CRD42013005608) and published previously [7]. We used Cochrane review methodology [8] in protocol development and review conduct, and adhered to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines [9] in reporting the review.

Search strategy

MEDLINE, EMBASE and the Cochrane Central register of controlled trials (CENTRAL) were searched (up to 24th June, 2016) for potentially relevant studies without language constraints. In addition, we manually searched indexed abstracts from the American Thoracic Society, Society of Critical Care Medicine, and European Society of Intensive Care medicine annual congresses and the International Symposium on Intensive Care and Emergency Medicine from 2009 to the present. A full list of MEDLINE search terms is available as an appendix to the published protocol [7].

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

We included randomised and quasi-randomised clinical trials of adult or paediatric patients with ARDS, SIRS or sepsis in which two or more fluid strategies were compared and in which fluid balance differed between groups; and observational studies in which the relationship between fluid balance and clinical outcomes in ARDS, SIRS or sepsis was the major focus of the study.

We excluded studies that focused only on the resuscitation phase of critical illness, and studies in which fluids were only one element of a complex haemodynamic strategy. We also excluded case series, case reports, observational studies with fewer than 50 participants, studies published prior to 1980, studies involving predominantly neonates, post-cardiac surgery patients, or patients with heart failure, and studies subject to post-publication retraction or investigation.
Selection of studies and data extraction

Titles and abstracts of all reports identified in the literature searches were screened by two of three authors (JS, EEM and AF) for further review with discrepancies resolved by consensus. Full text review of eligibility was conducted by two authors independently (JS and EM) and relevant data extracted in duplicate from included studies to a standard piloted form [7]. Discrepancies were resolved by discussion and adjudication by a third author (EF). Where relevant, attempts were made to contact authors of randomised studies for missing data. The reference lists of included randomised trials were reviewed for additional trials meeting eligibility criteria.

Outcome measures

The primary outcome was all-cause mortality at the latest time point available up to 90 days. Key secondary outcomes included ventilator-free days (VFDs), length of intensive care unit (ICU) stay, incidence of AKI, renal replacement therapy (RRT) use, and cognitive impairment.

Risk of bias assessment

Two authors (JS and EM) independently assessed risk of bias and quality. Randomised controlled trials were assessed as being at low, uncertain or high risk of bias for each of 6 domains using the Cochrane risk of bias tool [8]. Cohort and case-control studies were assessed for quality using the Newcastle Ottawa scale [10] (Appendix 2).

Analysis

RevMan software [8] was used to carry out meta-analysis using a random effects model for outcomes for which two or more randomised studies were available. Results for outcomes for which meta-analysis was deemed inappropriate because of an insufficient number of studies or clinical or statistical heterogeneity were reported in narrative form, and observational studies were reported in tabular form (Appendix 1). Where necessary to standardise reporting of central tendency between studies, we converted standard error to standard deviation, and estimated mean and standard deviation from reported median and interquartile ranges using a standard approach [11]. For key outcomes, we assessed the quality of evidence using the Grades of Recommendation, Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) approach [12].

We undertook a pre-planned sensitivity analysis excluding studies at high risk of bias, and subgroup analyses for ARDS, sepsis or SIRS, and adults. We also undertook a post-hoc analysis in which we excluded studies lacking a clinically-significant difference in fluid balance between groups, which we defined as a minimum difference in mean or median fluid balance of 750 mL per day for adults or 10 mL/kg/day for children. We also carried out a meta-regression analysis with difference in mean daily fluid balance as the independent, and risk ratio (RR) for mortality as the dependent variable.

Results

The search was conducted up to 24 June 2016 and during the editorial process we obtained one further study in press from the editor. Forty-nine studies met criteria for inclusion. Of these, 11 randomised controlled trials, recruiting a total of 2051 patients, provided data for meta-analysis. The remaining 38 studies were observational in design and are summarised in Appendix 1. The Newcastle-Ottawa score for observational studies is reported in Appendix 2. Secondary publications from included studies are reported along with the original study [13-15]. A summary of evidence is found in Table 2.

Description of included randomised trials

Considerable clinical heterogeneity was present. Five studies [16-20] took place in the United States, three in China [21-23], one in France [24] one in India [25] and one in Denmark and Finland [26]. Sample sizes ranged from 29 [21] to 1000 [16]. One was conducted in children [25] and the remainder in adults. Five studies included only patients with ARDS [16-18, 21, 22], four included only patients with septic shock [19, 24-26]; one included patients with ARDS, septic shock, or both [23] and one included a mixed critically ill
population, the majority of whom had sepsis, ARDS, or both [20]. Further characteristics of included randomised trials are presented in Table 1.

Methodological quality and risk of bias

The overall quality of included randomised trials was moderate (Figure 2). The use of random sequence generation and allocation concealment [19-22, 25] and the risk of reporting bias [18, 20-22, 25] were unclear in a number of studies. While blinding was used in only 2 studies [17, 18], likely due to difficulties in concealment of the different fluid regimens and/or haemodynamic monitoring technologies employed, strict protocolisation of fluid and diuretic use was felt to ameliorate the effects of this potential bias in all but two studies [19, 21].

Mortality (primary outcome)

Eleven studies (2051 patients) reported mortality as an outcome with variable duration of follow-up, including 90-day [26], 60-day [16, 21, 22], in-hospital [19, 20] and 28 or 30-day mortality [17, 18, 23-25]. We found no significant difference in mortality between patients receiving a conservative or deresuscitative fluid strategy compared with those receiving a liberal strategy or standard care (pooled RR 0.92; 95% confidence interval [CI] 0.82-1.02, I²=0%) (Figure 3).

One trial [16] accounted for the majority of patients in the ARDS subgroup, and the results for this subgroup (5 studies, n=1206, pooled RR 0.91; 95% CI 0.77-1.07) were similar to those in the overall analysis. In the sepsis/SIRS subgroup, three trials were conducted in adults [19, 24, 26] and one in children [25]. Results from this subgroup analysis were also similar to those in the overall analysis (394 patients, pooled RR 0.86; 95% CI 0.62-1.17) (Figure 3).

Secondary outcomes

Ventilator-free days

Data on the number of VFDs within a 28 or 30-day period were available for seven studies, including 1784 participants (Figure 4). We found increased VFDs with a conservative or deresuscitative fluid strategy in comparison with a liberal strategy or standard care (mean difference 1.82 days [95% CI interval 0.53 to 3.10 days], I²=9%). In addition, studies by Hu et al [21] and Wang et al [22] reported shorter duration of mechanical ventilation in a more conservative fluid strategy group compared with the liberal fluid strategy group (10.13 +/- 3.02 days vs. 12.64 +/- 2.89, P<0.05 and 9.62 +/- 2.55 days vs 12.51 +/-2.92 days, P<0.05 respectively).

Length of ICU stay

Nine studies reported the duration of ICU admission of which seven were suitable for meta-analysis (Figure 5). We found a shorter length of ICU stay in patients receiving a conservative or deresuscitative fluid strategy compared with those receiving a liberal strategy or standard care (mean difference 1.88 days fewer (95% CI -0.12 to -3.64 days). Considerable heterogeneity was present (I²=75%). Two studies in ARDS patients reported a composite outcome of ICU-free days: Martin et al [18] reported a numerically greater number of ICU-free days in the fluid conservative group (median 1.5 days greater, 95% CI -3.4 to +6.4 days), while in the Fluids and Catheter Treatment Trial (FACTT) [16], a conservative strategy resulted in a significantly greater number of ICU-free days compared to a liberal strategy (13.4 +/- 8.97 versus 11.2 +/- 8.92, P<0.001).

Length of Hospital stay

One study [18] reported no significant reduction in the length of hospital stay for survivors of ARDS with a deresuscitative strategy (median 4.5 fewer days in hospital, 95% CI -5.8 to 14.8 days).

Organ dysfunction scores

Martin et al [17] reported a fall in mean Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (SOFA) score of 0.6 with a deresuscitation strategy compared with an increase of 1.1 in the control group over the 5 day study period (P=0.01). Zhang et al [23] reported higher maximum SOFA scores in the more conservatively managed group, although this difference was also present at baseline; and Richard et al [24] reported similar duration of SOFA score ≥ 6.
Long-term mortality
No studies reported long-term (>90 day) mortality as an outcome.

Incidence of ARDS
No studies reported incidence of ARDS as an outcome.

Incidence of Acute Kidney Injury
Martin et al [18] reported no difference in change in serum creatinine between patients in a deresuscitation group compared with placebo, while in the FACTT study [16] the incidence of AKI was similar between conservative and liberal fluid management groups (21.5 +/- 11.21 renal failure free days versus 21.2 +/- 11.15, P=0.59). Hjortrup et al [26] reported a lower incidence of worsening of AKI in a conservative fluid group than with standard care (37% versus 54%, P=0.03). In separate post-hoc analyses of the FACTT study, Liu and colleagues showed that after correcting serum creatinine levels for fluid balance, AKI incidence was lower with a conservative than with a liberal fluid strategy [14]; and Grams et al reported that in patients with AKI, cumulative diuretic dose was independently associated with lower mortality [15].

Renal replacement therapy use
In three studies [16, 19, 26] (1233 patients), the rate of RRT use was similar between patients receiving a conservative fluid or deresuscitative strategy compared with a liberal fluid strategy or standard care (RR 0.88; 95% CI 0.64-1.22, I²=27%) (Appendix 3.5). Zhang et al [23] reported fewer days free of continuous RRT in the conservative fluid strategy group (median 15.5 days [IQR 3-28] versus 21 [4-28], P<0.05).

Cognitive function
In a cohort of seventy-five survivors from FACTT [16] who underwent follow up assessment of cognitive function, Mikkelsen et al [13] identified enrolment in the conservative fluid management arm as an independent risk factor for cognitive impairment at twelve months post hospital discharge. In contrast, Wang and colleagues [22] assessed post-ICU cognitive function as one component of the QLQ-C30 quality of life score, and found better cognitive function scores in patients treated with a conservative fluid strategy than a liberal fluid strategy (85.02 +/- 15.06 vs. 74.31 +/-12.88, P<0.05).

Additional analyses
Additional sensitivity and subgroup analyses are found in Appendix 3.

Readiness for conservative fluid management or deresuscitation
The majority of studies did not attempt to use specific physiological or time criteria to determine readiness for conservative fluid management or deresuscitation. One study [19] postponed initiation of a conservative fluid management strategy until patients were demonstrated to be volume unresponsive. Fluid minimisation occurred between one and four days post-randomisation, however clinically-significant separation of fluid balance between groups was not achieved over five days.

Interventions
There was considerable variation in fluid strategies applied and fluid balances achieved in both conservative / deresuscitative and liberal / standard care groups. In three studies [16-18], protocolised diuretic use was used in the conservative / deresuscitative arm, in four the intervention strategy involved protocolised fluid restriction or minimisation [16, 19, 25, 26]; and in five the main intervention was the use of alternative haemodynamic targets for fluid management, based on extravascular lung water (EVLW) [20-22], pulse pressure variation (PPV) [24], or intrathoracic blood volume index (ITBVI) [23]. In two trials hyperoncotic albumin infusions were used to potentiate diuresis in a deresuscitative group [17, 18]. Fluid strategies in study control arms included protocolised liberal fluid administration [16], protocolised diuretic use without hyperoncotic albumin [17] and central venous pressure (CVP) or pulmonary capillary wedge pressure (PCWP)-guided fluid administration [20, 21, 23, 24].

As a result of variability in fluid strategies used, there was wide variation in fluid balances and considerable overlap between conservative and liberal groups. For example, in the study by Martin et al [17] the ‘liberal’ group received diuretics and achieved a weight loss of 4700 mL over five days, equating to an estimated mean fluid balance of -22.4 mL/kg/day; while in the study by Chen and Kollef [19], a targeted fluid
minimisation strategy in the conservative arm yielded a median positive fluid balance of 2641 mL over five days, equating to a positive mean fluid balance of 7.5 mL/kg/day.

**Contraindications to deresuscitative fluid management**

Two studies of deresuscitation [17, 18] excluded patients with AKI, those with more than a minimal requirement for vasopressors, and those with uncorrected hypernatraemia or hypokalaemia. Deresuscitation was suspended if hypotension, hypernatraemia or hypokalaemia developed during the intervention period, and fluid boluses were given at the discretion of the clinical team. In FACTT [16], fluid administration and diuretic use was protocolised, so that haemodynamic insufficiency triggered fluid bolus administration or vasoactive medication use, and diuretics were withheld in the presence of AKI.

**Observational studies**

We included a total of 38 observational studies in this review; characteristics are reported in appendix 1. The majority were cohort studies in which fluid balance was compared between survivors and non-survivors of critical illness, with or without adjustment for severity of illness and other potential confounders. The majority of observational studies were assessed as moderate or low quality using the Newcastle-Ottawa scale (Appendix 2).

The main finding was a consistent positive association between more positive fluid balance and higher mortality [3, 4, 27-52] which was present within all pre-specified subgroups: adults [3, 4, 28, 30-33, 36-38, 40-46, 48, 50-53], children [27, 29, 35, 49], ARDS [3, 32, 35, 39, 40, 43, 46, 48, 49] and sepsis [4, 27-31, 33-38, 40-42, 44, 45, 50-53]. This association was absent or present only in subgroups in seven studies in which mortality was reported as an outcome [54-60]. One study reported a lower mortality with greater fluid administration and more positive fluid balance over 3 days [61]. A more positive fluid balance was associated with increased [32, 55] or similar [29, 42] duration of mechanical ventilation, fewer ventilator-free days [35, 54, 56, 60] and increased [32, 52, 60] or similar [42, 55] length of ICU stay. Rates of AKI or RRT use were similar [29, 33, 56, 59, 61, 62] or higher [36, 60] with a more positive fluid balance.

**Discussion**

Although reference is made in current guidelines to the use of intravenous fluid for resuscitation in sepsis [63], fluid management goals following the resuscitation phase of critical illness remain the subject of considerable uncertainty. Our review evaluated the efficacy and safety of a conservative or deresuscitative fluid strategy compared with standard care or a liberal fluid strategy in critically ill patients with sepsis, SIRS, or ARDS.

We found no clear evidence for the superiority of one fluid strategy over another for our primary outcome of mortality. This is in contrast to a previous meta-analysis [6], and likely reflects our exclusion of observational data from our meta-analysis. We found that a conservative or deresuscitative fluid strategy resulted in a greater number of VFDs and decreased length of ICU stay than a liberal fluid strategy or standard care, with no increase in acute kidney injury, use of RRT, or cognitive dysfunction. When we excluded those studies in which we considered inter-group differences in fluid balance to be clinically unimportant, we found a non-significant reduction in mortality with conservative or deresuscitative fluid management (Appendix 3.3). The quality of evidence was low or very low across all outcomes.

We found no difference in rates of renal replacement therapy use between fluid strategies. Along with post-hoc analyses of the FACTT study showing a reduced incidence of AKI with a conservative fluid strategy [14] and a protective effect of diuretic use [15], this provide reassurance as to the safety of a conservative or deresuscitative approach to fluid management in terms of renal outcomes.

The effect of a conservative fluid strategy or deresuscitation in terms of cognitive outcomes is unclear, with a secondary analysis of a small cohort of patients from the FACTT study showing evidence of harm from a conservative approach [13]. This contrasts with the findings of Wang and colleagues in which post-ICU discharge cognitive function was improved in a conservative fluid management group [22], and those of a small randomised trial in patients undergoing major vascular surgery where a conservative fluid strategy was associated with a reduction in post-operative complications including delirium [64], a clinical outcome
known to be associated with longer term cognitive dysfunction [65]. This merits further investigation in future trials investigating fluid strategy.

Our review has a number of strengths. It was conducted using high quality systematic review methodology. A highly sensitive search strategy was developed which was independently reviewed by a second information specialist. In order to minimise bias, no language restrictions were employed, and broad date criteria were applied. At least two reviewers were involved independently at each stage of the review process, and all studies were evaluated for quality and risk of bias.

There are a number of important limitations in this review, however. Even in the small number of studies included, considerable heterogeneity was evident with respect to study populations, interventions, and outcomes. Due to lack of standardised definitions, the timing and duration of the ‘post-resuscitation’ intervention period varied between studies, although the available data did not allow in-depth exploration of this issue. This highlights the need to standardise these definitions for future clinical trials. Because of insufficient data, we were unable to separate the differential impact of restrictive fluid administration and active deresuscitation. Some of the interventions employed resulted in minimal separation between groups in fluid balance. As we did not define what constituted a clinically-significant difference in fluid balance between groups a priori, we included all in our main analysis (Figure 3) but undertook a sensitivity analysis in which studies were excluded on the basis of clinically insignificant differences in fluid balance between groups (Appendix 3.3).

There was considerable inconsistency in reporting which precluded some studies for inclusion in meta-analyses, exemplified by some studies reporting duration of mechanical ventilation with others reporting a composite outcome of ventilator-free days. This is a recognised problem in studies of patients receiving mechanical ventilation [66]. Even for the uniformly reported outcome of mortality, there was variability in the duration of follow-up from 28 to 90 days, although this is unlikely to have had a major impact on summary estimates of effect [67].

We limited our review to patients with sepsis, SIRS and ARDS. The inevitable consequence is a loss of generalizability to other types of critically ill patients, although since these are common syndromes rather than specific diagnoses, and since patients admitted to ICU with a range of pathologies (e.g. traumatic brain injury [68] and polytrauma [69]) frequently develop SIRS, ARDS and sepsis, the generalizability of these findings is likely go beyond simply those patients who meet rigidly applied consensus criteria.

We identified a large number of observational studies in which fluid accumulation or overload was associated with worse outcomes, particularly mortality. The potential for residual confounding is present to some extent in all of these, in that greater cumulative fluid balances may reflect greater severity of illness and greater perceived or actual need for fluid resuscitation or clinician reluctance to either withhold fluid or to administer diuretics to more severely ill patients.

Robust multicentre trials are needed to evaluate the effectiveness of restrictive fluid administration, deresuscitation or a combined fluid strategy to improve patient outcomes. Based on our data, a sample size of over 4700 patients would be required to detect or exclude a significant mortality benefit for a conservative and/or deresuscitative fluid strategy (Appendix 3.3). However, the heterogeneity illustrated in this review highlights the need for considerable further pilot work to define the optimal intervention strategy or strategies to be subsequently tested in high-quality, adequately powered multicentre randomised trials. Pilot studies should, for example, address the questions of physiological or other criteria to define the appropriate timing for conservative fluid management, the utility of deresuscitation in addition to fluid restriction alone, the comparative benefits and harms of ultrafiltration and diuretics, and the use of adjunctive hypertonic albumin among others.

**Conclusions**

Despite a considerable body of observational evidence showing a positive association between fluid balance and mortality, our review found no significant difference in mortality from included randomised trials addressing the question of optimal fluid strategy for critically ill patients. We found that a conservative or deresuscitative approach resulted in increased ventilator-free days and decreased length of ICU stay compared to a liberal strategy or standard care.
Large robust trials are needed in which clear inter-group differences in fluid balance are present to evaluate the efficacy and safety of a conservative or deresuscitative fluid strategy in terms of both short and long term outcomes. The optimum strategy to be tested in such trials remains to be defined. Meanwhile, clinicians caring for critically ill patients may consider the use of a conservative fluid management strategy in patients with sepsis, ARDS and SIRS following initial resuscitation and stabilisation.
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Figure 1. Study flow diagram. *Some studies had multiple reasons for exclusion.
Figure 2. Risk of bias assessment for randomised trials.
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Figure 3. Forest plot for mortality at most protracted time point available, conservative or deresuscitative fluid strategy versus standard care or liberal fluid strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Conservative fluid</th>
<th>Liberal fluid</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Risk Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hu et al. 2014</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14 0.7% 1.24 [0.34, 4.60]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin et al. 2002</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20 2.0% 0.78 [0.36, 1.68]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin et al. 2005</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18 0.6% 0.95 [0.22, 4.10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang et al. 2014</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50 10.8% 0.93 [0.67, 1.30]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiedemann et al. 2006</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>497 28.8% 0.90 [0.72, 1.10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal (95% CI)</strong></td>
<td><strong>607</strong></td>
<td><strong>599</strong></td>
<td><strong>43.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.91 [0.77, 1.07]</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total events</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sepsis or SIRS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benaketti et al. 2014</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47 2.1% 0.79 [0.37, 1.70]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen and Kollef. 2015</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41 7.0% 1.15 [0.76, 1.74]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hjortrup et al. 2016</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>76 6.9% 0.82 [0.54, 1.24]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard et al. 2015</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30 2.1% 0.50 [0.24, 1.06]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal (95% CI)</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>194</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.86 [0.62, 1.17]</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total events</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed ARDS and sepsis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell et al. 1992</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>49 12.1% 0.85 [0.62, 1.17]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang et al. 2015</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>182 26.9% 1.00 [0.81, 1.24]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal (95% CI)</strong></td>
<td><strong>220</strong></td>
<td><strong>231</strong></td>
<td><strong>38.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.95 [0.80, 1.14]</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total events</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Heterogeneity:** Tu = 0.00; Chi² = 4.06, df = 3 (P = 0.26); I² = 26%

Test for overall effect: Z = 0.98 (P = 0.33)

**Favours conservative**

---

![Forest plot](image)
Figure 4. Forest plot for outcome of ventilator-free days.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Conservative fluid</th>
<th>Liberal fluid</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean [Days] SD [Days]</td>
<td>Mean [Days] SD [Days]</td>
<td>IV, Random, 95% CI [Days]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen and Kellie 2015</td>
<td>5.5 9.4</td>
<td>7.4 12.9</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang et al. 2015</td>
<td>9  17.9</td>
<td>10.3 18.7</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hjortrup et al. 2016</td>
<td>21.4 9.7</td>
<td>19.8 11.1</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin et al. 2005</td>
<td>10.3 8</td>
<td>8  8</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiedemann et al. 2006</td>
<td>14.6 11.2</td>
<td>12.1 11.1</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard et al. 2013</td>
<td>12.7 18.7</td>
<td>9.7 16.3</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benakassi et al. 2014</td>
<td>15.8 10.8</td>
<td>12.1 9.4</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (95% CI) 891 893 100.0%

Heterogeneity: Tau^2 = 0.33; Chi^2 = 6.61, df = 6 (P = 0.36); I^2 = 9%
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.78 (P = 0.005)

Favours conservative  Favours liberal
Figure 5. Forest plot for ICU length of stay, conservative or deresuscitative fluid strategy versus standard care or liberal fluid strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Conservative fluid</th>
<th>Liberal fluid</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean [Days]</td>
<td>SD [Days]</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean [Days]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benakatti et al. 2014</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hjortrup et al. 2016</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hu et al. 2014</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell et al. 1992</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard et al. 2015</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang et al. 2014</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang et al. 2015</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (95% CI)</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>-1.88 [-3.64, -0.12]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heterogeneity: Tau² = 3.74; Chi² = 24.47, df = 6 (p = 0.0004); I² = 75%
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.09 (p = 0.04)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author and publication year</th>
<th>Methods and Setting</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Summary of conservative or deresuscitative fluid strategy</th>
<th>Summary of liberal fluid strategy or usual care</th>
<th>Key Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell et al, 1992</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>n=101</td>
<td>-Extra-Vascular Lung Water (EVLW)-guided strategy. Restriction of fluid intake when ELVW ≥ 7 ml/kg and diuresis if stable. Mean fluid balance was 142 +/- 3632 ml at 60 hours*</td>
<td>-Pulmonary capillary wedge pressure (PCWP) – guided strategy with target range of 10-17 mmHg. Mean fluid balance was 2239 +/- 3695 ml at 47 hours*</td>
<td>-ICU mortality -Hospital mortality -Duration of mechanical ventilation -Length of ICU stay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single academic centre in United States</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Admitted to medical ICU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Pulmonary artery catheter inserted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exclusion criteria:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Technical reasons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Logistical reasons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Allergy to iodine dye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Pregnancy or lactation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin et al, 2002</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>n=37</td>
<td>-Furosemide infusion titrated to weight loss of ≥ 1 kg/day, and 25g IV albumin 8 hourly for 5 days Mean weight loss of 10.0 kg after 5 days* Mean daily fluid balance over study period: -47.6 ml/kg/day</td>
<td>-Dual placebo Mean weight loss of 4.7 kg after 5 days* Mean daily fluid balance over study period: -22.4 ml/kg/day</td>
<td>-30 day mortality -ICU-free days -Ventilator-free days -Length of hospital stay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two academic centres in United States</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-ARDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Serum total protein ≤ 5g/dL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Ongoing nutritional support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Mechanical ventilation ≥ 48 hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exclusion criteria:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Haemodynamic instability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Renal disease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Hepatic failure or cirrhosis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Age &lt;8 or &gt;80 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Pregnancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Serum sodium &gt;150 mmol/L or potassium &lt;2.5 mmol/L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin et al, 2002</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>n=40</td>
<td>-Furosemide 20mg IV bolus</td>
<td>-Furosemide 20mg IV bolus</td>
<td>-30 day mortality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Study Type</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Inclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Exclusion Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Two academic centres in United States</td>
<td>n=200</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: - ARDS - Serum total protein &lt; 6 g/dL</td>
<td>Haemodynamic instability - Renal disease or cirrhosis - Age &lt; 18 years - Pregnancy - Serum sodium &gt; 155 mmol/L or potassium &lt; 2.5 mmol/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Wiedemann et al, 2006 Multiple community and academic ICUs in United States and Canada</td>
<td>n=1000</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: - ARDS - Intubated and mechanically ventilated - Presence of ALI/ARDS for &gt; 48 hours - Severe chronic illness likely to independently influence survival - Irreversible terminal illness</td>
<td>Presence of ALI/ARDS for &gt; 48 hours - Severe chronic illness likely to independently influence survival - Irreversible terminal illness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Hu et al, 2014 Single centre in China</td>
<td>n=29</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: - ALI/ARDS (AECC criteria) - Admitted to ICU</td>
<td>Fluid administration not protocolised - Pulmonary artery occlusion pressure target of 8-12 mmHg, using diuretics or CRRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Inclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Exclusion Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benakatti et al, 2014</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Single centre in</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Children aged 3-144 months, Septic shock following fluid resuscitation</td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang et al, 2014</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Single centre in</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>ARDS (AECC definition)</td>
<td>Age &lt; 13 years, Contraindication to central venous catheter, ARDS criteria met for &gt; 48 hours pre-enrollment, Myocardial infarction in last 30 days, History of COPD or neuromuscular disorder affecting respiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen and Kollef, 2015</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Inclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Exclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Fluid Management</td>
<td>Outcome Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Zhang et al, 2015 | Single academic centre in United States | - Hypotension due to septic shock  
- Requirement for ≥ 12 hours of vasoactive drugs to treat hypotension after fluid resuscitation ≥ 30 ml/kg IV fluid | - Age <18 years  
- Pre-existing end stage renal disease  
- Pregnancy  
- Comfort-only goals of care | - Diuretics and ultrafiltration not protocolised  
- At 5 days, median net fluid balance was 2641 ml (IQR - 1837-5075)  
- Estimated mean daily fluid balance over study period: 7.5 ml/kg/day | - At 5 days, median net fluid balance was 3616 ml (IQR - 1513-9746 ml)  
- Estimated mean daily fluid balance over study period: 10.3 ml/kg/day | RRT use |
| Zhang et al, 2015 | Two tertiary centres in China | n=350  
- Septic shock or ARDS (Berlin definition)  
- <24 hours since ICU admission | - Age <18 years  
- Haemorrhagic shock  
- Moribund state  
- Absence of informed consent  
- Contra-indication to catheter insertion  
- Conditions likely to render PiCCO inaccurate  
- Fluid boluses targeted to intrathoracic blood volume index (ITBVI) 850-1000 ml/m²  
- Identical algorithm for noradrenaline, dobutamine and nitrate use in both groups  
- At 7 days, mean net fluid balance was 3821.6 ml  
- Estimated mean daily fluid balance over study period: 7.8 ml/kg/day | - Fluid boluses targeted to CVP 8-12 mmHg.  
- Identical algorithm for noradrenaline, dobutamine and nitrate use in both groups  
- At 7 days, mean net fluid balance was 3974.5 ml  
- Estimated mean daily fluid balance over study period: 8.1 ml/kg/day | -28 day mortality  
- Ventilator-free days  
- ICU length of stay  
- Maximum SOFA score  
- RRT-free days |
| Richard et al, 2015 | RCT | N=60  
- Fluid boluses targeted to pulse pressure variation < 13% (if ≥8 mmHg for duration of shock) | | - Fluid boluses targeted to CVP 8-12 mmHg.  
- Identical algorithm for noradrenaline, dobutamine and nitrate use in both groups  
- At 7 days, mean net fluid balance was 3974.5 ml  
- Estimated mean daily fluid balance over study period: 8.1 ml/kg/day | -28 day mortality  
- Ventilator-free days |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Single centre in France | Inclusion criteria:  
- Age ≥ 18 years  
- Septic shock  
- Pre-enrollment fluid loading ≥ 25 ml/kg body weight  
- Onset of hypotension <12 hours pre-enrollment  

Exclusion criteria:  
- Pregnancy  
- Acute coronary syndrome or cardiogenic pulmonary oedema  
- Acute cerebral event <30 days  
- Cannulation contraindicated  
- Uncontrolled haemorrhage, need for immediate surgery  
- Trauma or burns > 20% BSA  
- Previous inclusion in RCT  
- Limitation of treatment  
- Absence of consent, legal protection order or lack of social security  

- Noradrenaline used to maintain mean arterial pressure ≥ 65 mmHg or appropriate target  
- 250 to 500 ml crystalloid boluses could be administered only if evidence of hypoperfusion (lactate ≥ 4 mmol/L, mean arterial pressure <50 mmHg, skin mottling beyond criteria for PPV use met) and Δ stroke volume <10% in response to passive leg raise maneuver for duration of shock  

- Identical protocol for use of noradrenaline, dobutamine, and red blood cells  
- Median daily fluid balance for duration of shock was 888 ml (IQR 153 to 2816 ml)*  
- Estimated mean daily fluid balance over study period: 2.6 ml/kg/day  

- Identical protocol for use of noradrenaline, dobutamine, and red blood cells  
- Median daily fluid balance for duration of shock was 1749 ml (IQR 146 to 2788 ml)*  
- Estimated mean daily fluid balance over study period: 3.2 ml/kg/day  

| Hjortrup et al, 2016 | RCT | N=151  
Inclusion criteria:  
- Age ≥ 18 years  
- Treated in ICU  
- Sepsis with circulatory impairment  
- Fluid bolus administration ≥ 30 ml/kg ideal body weight  

- Noradrenaline used to maintain mean arterial pressure ≥ 65 mmHg or appropriate target  
- 250 to 500 ml crystalloid boluses could be administered provided evidence of fluid responsiveness present according to static or dynamic variables of clinician’s choice  

- Noradrenaline used to maintain mean arterial pressure ≥ 65 mmHg or appropriate target  
- Crystalloid boluses could be administered provided evidence of fluid responsiveness present according to static or dynamic variables of clinician’s choice  

| -90 day mortality  
- Ventilator-free days  
- Length of ICU stay  
- RRT use  
- Worsening AKI  

| Length of ICU stay (survivors)  
- Number of days with SOFA ≥ 6 |
Table 1. Characteristics of included randomised trials. Unless otherwise specified, standard definitions are used for ALI, ARDS, SIRS, sepsis and septic shock. [70-72]. *Denotes studies in which between-group differences in fluid balance was considered to be clinically-significant. Unless otherwise specified, data are presented as mean +/- standard deviation. **RCT**: Randomised controlled trial; **EVLW**: Extravascular lung water; **PCWP**: Pulmonary capillary wedge pressure; **ML**: Millilitres; **IV**: Intravenous; **SOFA**: Sequential organ failure assessment; **CVP**: Central venous pressure; **ALI**: Acute lung injury; **AECC**: American-European Consensus Conference; **CRRT**: continuous renal replacement therapy; **PICCO**: Pulse Index Continuous Cardiac Output; **QLQ-C30**: Quality of life questionnaire core-30; **COPD**: Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; **ITBVI**: Intrathoracic blood volume index; **IQR**: Interquartile range; **PPV**: Pulse pressure variation; **BSA**: Body surface area; **FiO₂**: Fraction of Inspired Oxygen.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№ of patients</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>№ of patients</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relative (95% CI)</td>
<td>Absolute (95% CI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>№ of studies</td>
<td>Study design</td>
<td>Risk of bias</td>
<td>Inconsistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moralit</td>
<td>randomised trials</td>
<td>serious</td>
<td>not serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventilator free days</td>
<td>randomised trials</td>
<td>not serious</td>
<td>not serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive Care Unit (ICU) length of stay</td>
<td>randomised trials</td>
<td>serious</td>
<td>serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renal Replacement Therapy (RRT) use</td>
<td>randomised trials</td>
<td>not serious</td>
<td>not serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-ICU Cognitive function (assessed with: QLQ-C30 conqitive function domain; Scale from: 0 to 100, with higher scores denoting better cognitive function)</td>
<td>randomised trials</td>
<td>very serious</td>
<td>not serious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. GRADE Summary of findings table for key outcomes. **CI:** Confidence interval; **RR:** Risk ratio; **MD** Mean difference. Explanatory notes: 1. Only five studies were at low risk of bias, the remainder were at moderate or high risk of bias. 2. Significant variability in populations, interventions and comparators studied. 3. Only two studies were at low risk of bias, the remainder were at moderate or high risk of bias. 4. Considerable heterogeneity present across studies ($I^2=75\%$). 5. Insufficient number of participants to exclude clinically important benefit or harm. 6. Single study, uncertain risk of bias across all domains. 7. Limited available information on intervention strategy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Inclusion and exclusion criteria</th>
<th>Patient characteristics</th>
<th>Key outcomes</th>
<th>Key findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abulebda et al, 2014.</td>
<td>- Secondary analysis of multicentre prospective observational study of genomics in sepsis - USA</td>
<td>Inclusion: - Age ≤10 years - Septic shock - Enrolment in an ongoing genomic study Exclusion: - None reported</td>
<td>N=317 Non-survivors: - Median age 1.3 yrs. (IQR 0.2-4.5) - 65% male - Median PRISM score 28 (IQR 17-37) Survivors: - Median age 2.9 (IQR 1.1-6.7) - 59% male - Median PRISM score 12 (IQR 7-18)</td>
<td>- 28 day mortality</td>
<td>- Non-survivors had a higher cumulative fluid balance 7 at day 7 (median 19.5% of body weight, IQR 10.4 to 40.1) compared to survivors (median 6.5% body weight, IQR -1.3 to 14.6), p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acheampong &amp; Vincent, 2015.</td>
<td>- Single centre prospective cohort study - Belgium</td>
<td>Inclusion: - &gt;15yrs of age - Admitted during 2012 - Suspected or proven infection treated with antibiotics - Sepsis-associated organ failure by SOFA subscore 3 or 4 - ICU stay &gt;48h Exclusion: - None reported</td>
<td>N=173 - Age 61yrs +/- 16 - 68% male - SOFA score 8.2 +/- 3.4 - 78% septic shock - 60% medical, 17% elective surgery, 23% emergency surgery</td>
<td>- ICU mortality</td>
<td>- Daily fluid balance was greater in non-survivors than survivors (29 ± 22 vs. 13 ± 19 ml/kg, p &lt;0.001). - Positive fluid balance was independently associated with higher mortality (adjusted hazard ratio 1.014 per ml/kg, P&lt;0.001) - Diuretics were used in 41% of non-survivors, 29% of survivors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhaskar et al,</td>
<td>- Retrospective</td>
<td>Inclusion:</td>
<td>N=114</td>
<td>- ICU mortality</td>
<td>- Independent risk factors for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 1. Summary of included observational studies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
<th>Mortality Included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>cohort study - USA</td>
<td>Shock states (majority sepsis or SIRS) - Age (\leq 18) years</td>
<td>PICU length of stay &lt; 48 hours - Premature neonates - Post-operative congenital heart disease</td>
<td>1.1 yrs.</td>
<td>Presence of fluid overload ((\geq 10%) body weight at 3 days) (adjusted OR 9.17, 95% CI 2.22-55.57); peak fluid overload within 7 days (adjusted OR 1.13 per % body weight, 95% CI 1.07-1.23); and duration of fluid overload (adjusted OR 1.61 per day, 95% CI 1.21-2.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bihari et al, 2013</td>
<td>Single centre prospective observational study investigating the prevalence and efficacy of fluid boluses after initial resuscitation in septic patients.</td>
<td>Age &gt; 18 years - Severe sepsis or septic shock - Within 2 hours of completing initial 6 hours of resuscitation</td>
<td>Expectation of death within 24 hours - Patients not undergoing active treatment - Patients with clinically obvious ongoing</td>
<td>72.5 yrs.</td>
<td>Compared with matched controls, cases with fluid overload (\geq 10%) body weight at 3 days, had higher mortality (37% versus 3%, (P=0.002)); similar duration of mechanical ventilation (median 6 days versus 5 days, (P=0.36)), similar rates of RRT use (37% vs 13%, (P=0.07)) and similar length of ICU stay (median 9 days versus 8 days, (P=0.73)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N=50</td>
<td>Change ((\Delta)) in SOFA score</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Cumulative fluid balance was weakly correlated with (\Delta) SOFA score at 48 and 72 hours ((r=0.32, P=0.001))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Exclusion</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Median age (IQR)</td>
<td>APACHE 4 score (IQR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botdorf et al, 2015.</td>
<td>Single centre retrospective cohort study - USA - Suspected sepsis - ICU stay &gt; 24hrs</td>
<td>None reported</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>68 yrs. (58-79)</td>
<td>83 (67-104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyd et al, 2011.</td>
<td>Secondary analysis of a multicentre randomised controlled trial of vasopressin versus norepinephrine in 27 centres in Canada, Australia and USA</td>
<td>Unstable coronary syndrome -24 hours since enrolment criteria met - Estimated 6 month mortality &gt;50% - Suspected or proven mesenteric ischaemia - Underlying chronic heart disease - Anticipation of imminent death or lack of commitment to aggressive care</td>
<td>778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Exclusion</td>
<td>Study Population</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen et al, 2011.</td>
<td>Single centre retrospective cohort study</td>
<td>- Septic shock (ACP/SCCM criteria)</td>
<td>- Fluid bolus or vasopressor administration in another hospital</td>
<td>N=107 Survivors (n=68): - Age 66.7 years +/- 14.5 - 78% male - APACHE score 14.7 +/- 3.1 - SOFA score 6.5 +/- 1.5</td>
<td>- 28 day mortality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-survivors (n=39) - Age 68.88 +/- 13.1 years - 69% male - APACHE score 16.3 +/- 3.6 - SOFA score 7.2 +/- 1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordemans et al, 2012.</td>
<td>Retrospective observational cohort study comparing an intervention group who received PAL treatment (PEEP, hyperoncotic albumin boluses, and furosemide or CRRT to target neutral to negative fluid balance with a control group.</td>
<td>- Intubated and mechanically ventilated - ALI - Transpulmonary thermodilution catheter monitored</td>
<td>- None reported</td>
<td>N=114 Control Group (n=57): - Age 61.4 +/- 16.8 - 73.7% male - Medical ICU 87.7% - SAPS II 52.3 +/- 17.3 - APACHE II 22.7 +/- 11.1</td>
<td>- 28-day mortality - ICU length of stay - Hospital length of stay - Duration of mechanical ventilation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Cronhjort et al, 2016. | - Secondary analysis of a multicentre RCT of transfusion strategies in septic shock  
- Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Finland | **Inclusion:**  
- Adults with septic shock  
- Haemoglobin level < 90g/dL  
- ICU stay ≥ 3 days  
**Exclusion:**  
- Receipt of blood transfusion pre-enrollment  
- Life-threatening bleeding  
- Active myocardial ischaemia | N=841  
**Quartile 1 (Lowest fluid balance):**  
- Age 63 +/- 14  
- 56.8% male  
- SOFA score 10.2 +/- 3.1  
**Quartile 2:**  
- Age 66 +/- 12  
- 59% male  
- SOFA score 9.7 +/− 3.1  
**Quartile 3:**  
- Age 65 +/- 13  
- 50.6% male  
- SOFA score 10.1 +/- 3.5  
**Quartile 4 (Highest fluid balance):**  
- Age 65 +/- 12  
- 51.6% male  
- SOFA score 10.2 +/- 3.4 | - 90 day mortality  
- RRT-free days (% of 90 days)  
- VFDs (% of 90 days)  
- Days alive and out of hospital (% of 90 days) | - Fluid balance (by quartiles) was not associated with 90-day mortality in multivariate analysis (Q2 HR 1.11 (95% CI 0.83-1.50), Q3 HR 1.19, 95% CI 0.90-1.56, Q4 HR 1.30, 95% CI 0.97-1.75)  
- A more positive fluid balance was associated with similar number of days on RRT (Q1 82%, Q2 85% Q3 87% Q4 81%, P=0.27)  
- A more positive fluid balance was associated with fewer VFDs (Q1 – 72%, Q2 68%, Q3 67%, Q4 58%, P=0.01)  
- A more positive fluid balance was associated with fewer days alive and out of hospital (Q1 36%, Q2 30%, Q3 30%, Q4 23%, P<0.001) |
| De Oliveira et al, 2015. | - Retrospective analysis of a single centre prospective cohort study in a tertiary centre in Brazil | **Inclusion:**  
- Age > 18 years  
- Severe sepsis or septic shock  
**Exclusion:**  
- Pregnancy | N=116  
**Median age 60 yrs. (IQR 44-74):**  
- 63.5% male  
- Median APACHE 2 score 17 (IQR | **Hospital mortality**  
- Acute kidney injury (RIFLE-F) | - No difference in fluid balance at 6 hours, 12 hours or 24 hours between survivors and non-survivors  
- Fluid balance at 24-48 hours > 3000ml was an independent risk factor for mortality (adjusted OR |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Study Design and Population</th>
<th>Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion Criteria</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>28-day Mortality</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiorenza &amp; Pass, 2013.</td>
<td>Single centre retrospective cohort study - USA</td>
<td>-Severe sepsis or septic shock in critical care unit - CVC in situ and CVP measured</td>
<td>-None reported</td>
<td>N=78</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expectation of death within 24 hours 23-26) - Fluid balance was not associated with AKI 3.19, 95% CI 1.19-8.54, p=0.021 - Non-survivors had a more positive fluid balance than survivors on days 1-3 (Day 1: 4071 mL vs. 1640 mL, respectively; p = 0.002; Day 2: 3473 mL vs. 1082 mL, p = 0.029; Day 3: 1090 mL vs. 59 mL, p = 0.004).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flori et al, 2011.</td>
<td>Post-hoc analysis of a prospective observational study in 2 centres - USA</td>
<td>-Children admitted to participating PICU during study period (1996-2000) - ALI</td>
<td>-&lt;36 weeks corrected gestational age or &gt;18 years - Evidence of left atrial hypertension clinically or by echo - Echocardiographic evidence of intra-cardiac shunt - Exchange transfusions - ECMO - CRRT</td>
<td>N=320</td>
<td>-PICU mortality - Ventilator-free days</td>
<td>Positive fluid balance was an independent risk factor for mortality (adjusted OR of 1.08 per 10ml/kg/day, 95% CI 1.01-1.15, p=0.02) - More positive fluid balance (in 10ml/kg/day increments) was negatively correlated with number of VFDs (coefficient -0.21, 95% CI -0.39 to -0.04, p=0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Exclusion</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grissom et al, 2015.</td>
<td>Retrospective analysis of data from 4 large RCTs</td>
<td>Multicentre data, mainly from USA</td>
<td>- Enrolment in one of 4 randomised trials in ARDS – FACTT, EDEN, OMEGA and ALTA. - Presence of CVC</td>
<td></td>
<td>- 60 day mortality - Ventilator free days - ICU-free days - Acute kidney injury (increase in serum creatinine by ≥ 0.3 mg/dl or by ≥ 50%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Herrero Gutierrez et al, 2013. | Single centre prospective cohort study | Spain | - Sepsis (undefined) | Unclear | - Fluid balance at 7 days in the FACTT Lite group was intermediate between the two arms of the FACTT trial [15] (1918 +/-323 ml versus -136 +/- 491 ml and 6992 +/-502ml). - 60-day mortality was similar in all 3 cohorts (FACTT Lite vs FACTT Liberal p=0.56, FACTT Lite vs FACTT Conservative p=0.91) after adjustment for age and severity of illness - The number of ventilator free days was similar between FACTT Lite and FACTT conservative groups, but there were more in FACTT Lite compared to FACTT Liberal (14.9 +/-0.3 vs 12.1 +/-0.5 days, P<0.001). - The number of ICU free days was similar between FACTT Lite and FACTT Conservative, but there were more in FACTT Lite compared to FACTT Liberal (14.4 +/-0.3 vs 11.2 +/-0.4, P<0.001) - Acute kidney injury rates (adjusted for fluid balance) were similar between FACTT Lite and FACTT Conservative groups, but were lower in FACTT Lite compared to FACTT Liberal (56% vs 66%, p<0.001) - Increasing severity of AKI was associated with more positive fluid balance (as percentage of body weight) at day 3: 0.23% +/- 6.3 (KDIGO Stage 0), 6.65% +/- 2.15 (KDIGO Stage 1, P=0.08), 6.95% +/-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Inclusion</th>
<th>Exclusion</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kongsayreeppong &amp; Nitikaroon, 2013.</td>
<td>Prospective single centre cohort study</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Post noncardiac surgery</td>
<td>-Severe sepsis or septic shock</td>
<td>N=196</td>
<td>Acute kidney injury (Acute Kidney Injury Network score ≥ stage 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koonrangsesomboon &amp; Khwannimit, 2015.</td>
<td>Single centre retrospective cohort study</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Septic shock requiring ICU</td>
<td>- ICU length of stay &lt; 24 hours</td>
<td>N=1048</td>
<td>ICU mortality, Hospital mortality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micek et al, 2013.</td>
<td>Single centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N=325</td>
<td>Hospital mortality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Exclusion</td>
<td>Survivors:</td>
<td>Non-survivors:</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| retrospective cohort study - USA                                     |                  | Septic shock - Transthoracic echocardiogram performed within 24 hours of onset of shock | - Pre-existing non-sepsis related cardiovascular compromise - ECMO or VAD use - Shock onset at outside hospital prior to transfer | Survivors: Age 58.5 yrs. +/- 14.6 - Male 46.3% - APACHE 2 score 21.7 +/- 6.3 | Non-survivors: Age 63.0 yrs. +/- 14.0 - Male 44.8% - APACHE 2 score 25.1 +/- 6.7 | Fluid balance in the 8 days following shock onset (median 7742 ml [2914-15992] versus 3286.5 ml [1508.5 – 7467], P<0.001) - The quartile with the highest fluid balance had significantly higher mortality risk (P<0.001 compared to the lowest fluid balance quartile) - Being in the highest fluid balance quartile was an independent risk factor for death (adjusted OR 1.66 [1.39-1.98], P=0.004)  

- Multicentre retrospective cohort study - Japan  
- ARDS - Mechanical ventilation - Transpulmonary thermodilution monitoring used  
- None reported  

N=207  
Patient characteristics not reported  
28 day mortality  
Fluid balance after 3 days was higher in non-survivors than survivors, both before (5.1 +/- 4.3 L vs 3.5 +/- 0.4 L, P=0.03) and after exclusion of patients with SOFA-CV or SOFA-renal score >2 (3.8 +/- 1.6 L vs 2.2 +/- 4.0 L, P=0.03).  
Fluid balance after 3 days was an independent predictor of 28 day mortality (adjusted OR 1.0001, 95% CI 1.000017 – 1.00022, P=0.03)  

Murphy et al, 2009.  
- Retrospective cohort study - 2 academic centres in USA  
- Septic shock - ALI (AECC definition) - Mechanical ventilation > 24 hrs.  
- Hospitalisation for  

N=212  
Survivors: Age 58.5yrs +/- 15.8 - 62% male - APACHE 2 score 23.9 +/- 6.0 - SOFA score 9.5 +/- 2.5  
Hospital mortality  
Net fluid balance after 7 days was higher in non-survivors than survivors (median 13,694 ml; IQR 7113-20249 vs 8062 ml; IQR 2412-13833, p < 0.001).  
Absence of ‘conservative late fluid management’ (defined as even to negative fluid balance on ≥ 2 consecutive days) was an
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion Criteria</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>APACHE 2 Score</th>
<th>SOFA Score</th>
<th>Mortality</th>
<th>Mortality Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perez-Fernandez et al, 2011.</td>
<td>Prospective single centre cohort study</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Septic shock and acute renal failure on CRRT for &gt;24 hours</td>
<td>None reported</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>62 yrs +/- 13</td>
<td>69.8% male</td>
<td>26 +/- 8</td>
<td>12 +/- 3.8</td>
<td>90-day mortality</td>
<td>Mortality higher in positive balance group (&gt; +ve 1000ml/initial 24hr on initial 24 hours of CRRT) compared with “isovolaemic” group (&lt; +ve 1000ml/initial 24hr on CRRT) (70.8% vs 55%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raimundo et al, 2012.</td>
<td>Single centre retrospective cohort study</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>All patients admitted to ICU over 1 year due to sepsis</td>
<td>ICU stay &lt;24 hours</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63.4 yrs +/- 16.2</td>
<td>73.5% male</td>
<td>20.1 +/- 10.3</td>
<td>7.1 +/- 3.4</td>
<td>ICU mortality</td>
<td>Incidence of ARDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Exclusion</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mortality (time point undefined)</td>
<td>Hospital mortality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodriguez et al, 2013.</td>
<td>Retrospective single centre cohort study</td>
<td>Inclusion: Severe sepsis or septic shock</td>
<td>Exclusion: None reported</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>- Duration of mechanical ventilation</td>
<td>- Cumulative fluid balance at day 4 was an independent risk factor for hospital mortality (adjusted OR 1.034 per litre, 95% CI 1.187-1.432, P=0.001).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- ICU Length of stay</td>
<td>- A negative fluid balance at day 4 was associated with a lower risk of hospital mortality (adjusted OR 0.502 per litre, 95% CI 0.284-0.887, P&lt;0.001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenberg et al, 2008.</td>
<td>Secondary analysis of a clinical trial comparing lung protective ventilation to traditional ventilation in patients with ARDS in 24 US academic hospitals [59]</td>
<td>Inclusion: ARDS or ALI (AECC definition) - Intubated and receiving mechanical ventilation in a participating centre - Fluid balance data available</td>
<td></td>
<td>794</td>
<td>- Duration of mechanical ventilation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Survivors: Age 48yrs +/- 17 - 59% male - Acute physiology score (APS) 70 +/- 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- ICU Length of stay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Non-survivors: Age 59yrs +/- 16 - 61% male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Hospital mortality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Exclusion</td>
<td>Key Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saito et al, 2012.</td>
<td>Retrospective</td>
<td>Severe sepsis or septic shock requiring mechanical ventilation</td>
<td>None reported</td>
<td>OFM group (n=47) achieved a negative fluid balance earlier than the 'before' group (n=49)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cohort study</td>
<td>N=96</td>
<td>Median age 69.5 (IQR 55.5 – 78.5)</td>
<td>Mortality was similar between groups (14.3% vs 17.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>evaluating</td>
<td>Inclusion: Severe sepsis or septic shock requiring mechanical ventilation</td>
<td>Median APACHE 2 score 23.0 (IQR 19-27)</td>
<td>Incidence of ARDS was lower in the ‘OFM’ group (20.4% vs 57.4%, P=0.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outcomes before</td>
<td>Exclusion: None reported</td>
<td>Median SOFA score 10.0 (7.0-12.0)</td>
<td>Incidence of AKI similar between groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and after</td>
<td></td>
<td>75% septic shock</td>
<td>OFM was an independent protective factor for ARDS (adjusted OR 0.17, CI 0.06-0.51, P=0.001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of an ‘optimal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fluid management’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strategy utilising PICCO to guide fluid and diuretic use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons et al, 1987.</td>
<td>Prospective</td>
<td>ARDS defined as: Acute respiratory failure with bilateral infiltrates</td>
<td>Survivors had a significantly less positive fluid balance and significantly greater weight gain over 14 days in univariate analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cohort study</td>
<td>requiring intubation and mechanical ventilation</td>
<td>By day 14, survivors were on average 9.72 litres less positive than non-survivors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Single centre</td>
<td>PaO2/FiO2 ratio &lt; 150mmHg within 72 hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Design Description</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Exclusion</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Age and Gender</td>
<td>SAPS II Score</td>
<td>SOFA Scores</td>
<td>Maximum Vasopressor Dose</td>
<td>Mortality (Time Point)</td>
<td>Fluid Balance</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith &amp; Perner, 2012.</td>
<td>- Prospective cohort study in 6 Danish ICUs (3 academic, 3 community)</td>
<td>Inclusion: - Admission to participating ICU during study period - Septic shock</td>
<td>Exclusion: - None reported</td>
<td>N=164</td>
<td>Median: 66 yrs (IQR: 59-74)</td>
<td>57% male</td>
<td>Median: 54 (IQR: 46-67)</td>
<td>Similar SAPS II scores, SOFA scores, and maximum vasopressor dose over 3 days between groups</td>
<td>90-day mortality</td>
<td>RRT use</td>
<td>90-day mortality was higher in the low fluid intake group (62% vs 40%, P=0.03, unadjusted comparison)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spicer et al, 2014.</td>
<td>- Multi-centre cohort study - USA</td>
<td>Inclusion: - Children - ARDS</td>
<td>Exclusion: - None reported</td>
<td>N=209</td>
<td>Age: 86 months +/-73</td>
<td>56% male</td>
<td>PRISM 3 score: 13 +/-8</td>
<td>Net fluid balance at day 3 was an independent risk factor for mortality in a cohort with AKI (adjusted OR 1.89 per 100ml/kg [1.08-3.31], P=0.027) but not in a cohort without AKI</td>
<td>Mortality (time point undefined)</td>
<td>- Cohort dichotomised into ‘high fluid intake’ (median 9.2 L, IQR 5.3-13.6 at 72 hrs.) and ‘low fluid intake’ (2.9 L, IQR 0.9-5.4 L at 72 hours) groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Reference</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Inclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Exclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Study Size</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun et al, 2015.</td>
<td>Single centre retrospective cohort study -China</td>
<td>- Age &gt;18 years - Sepsis - AKI requiring RRT</td>
<td>- Cause of AKI other than sepsis - Duration of RRT &lt;72 hours - Incomplete medical records - Unexpected death within follow-up period</td>
<td>N=117</td>
<td>- 60 day mortality</td>
<td>Positive fluid balance group: - Age 68.3 +/- 14.4 - 75.5% male - APACHE II score 29.6 +/- 6.2 - SOFA score 11.1 +/- 2.4 Negative fluid balance group: - Age 67.2 +/- 16.8 - 75.4% male - APACHE II score 30.0 +/- 7.2 - SOFA score 11.0 +/- 2.7 - Fluid overload (defined as positive fluid balance &gt;10% body weight in 3 days prior to RRT initiation) was not independent risk factor for 60 day mortality (HR 1.47, 95% CI 0.78-2.76) - Negative fluid balance during RRT use (up to 7 days) was independently associated with lower risk of 60 day mortality (HR 0.44, 95% CI 0.24-0.82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udeozo et al, 2009.</td>
<td>Retrospective cohort study of prospectively-collected database -Single centre in USA</td>
<td>- Septic shock</td>
<td>- Refusal of consent - Readmissions to ICU</td>
<td>N=390</td>
<td>- Hospital mortality</td>
<td>Non-survivors had a lower fluid balance at 12 hours, but a more positive fluid balance in the 24-72 hour period (median 7057 ml, 3249-31377 vs 4196 ml, IQR 348 – 24235, P=0.024, unadjusted analysis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentine et al, 2012.</td>
<td>Multi-centre (5 PICUs) retrospective cohort study -USA</td>
<td>- Age ≥ 1 month and &lt; 18 years - IPPV via ETT - ALI (AECC definition)</td>
<td>- Chronic conditions that could</td>
<td>N=168</td>
<td>- Mortality – time point not specified - Ventilator free days</td>
<td>- Comparison of study cohort with conservative and liberal fluid groups from FACTT trial[15]. - Secondary analysis comparing survivors and non-survivors in study cohort. - No significant differences in fluid balance between survivors and non-survivors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
independently impair weaning, especially lung or neuromuscular conditions
- Cyanotic heart disease
- Post-lung, renal or bone marrow transplant
- Chronic renal failure
- Burns > 40% BSA
- Continuous RRT or ECMO

- A more positive fluid balance at day 3 was correlated with fewer VFDs (coefficient -0.02, p = 0.01 per ml/kg)
- Total furosemide dose by day 3 was not associated with number of VFDs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Inclusion</th>
<th>Sepsis cohort (N=1177):</th>
<th>ICU mortality</th>
<th>Sepsis cohort: Net fluid balance at 72 hours was an independent risk factor for ICU mortality (adjusted OR 1.1 per litre, 95% CI 1.0-1.1, P&lt;0.001)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vincent et al, 2006. (sepsis)</td>
<td>All patients &gt;15 years admitted to participating ICU</td>
<td>Median age 65yrs (IQR 51-74)</td>
<td>- ICU mortality</td>
<td>- Fluid balance at 72 hours was higher for non-survivors than survivors (3.6 +/- 6.4 litres vs 1.8 +/- 5.4 litres, p=0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakr et al, 2005 (ARDS).</td>
<td>Sepsis cohort: presence of infection + SIRS criteria (ACP/SCCM)</td>
<td>-63% male</td>
<td>- Mean daily fluid balance was an independent risk factor for ICU mortality (adjusted OR 1.5 per litre, 95% CI 1.1-1.9, p = 0.003)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Prospective multicentre cohort study</td>
<td>ALI/ARDS cohort: AECC criteria</td>
<td>SAPS 2 score 42.3 +/- 16.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 198 European ICUs</td>
<td>Exclusion: Re-admission to ICU</td>
<td>SOFA score 6.5 +/- 4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Routine post-operative admission &lt;24 hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sepsis cohort (N=393):</td>
<td>Age 59 +/- 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- ALI/ARDS cohort: AECC criteria</td>
<td>60.5% male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exclusion: Re-admission to ICU</td>
<td>SAPS 2 score 46.6 +/- 17.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Routine post-operative admission &lt;24 hours</td>
<td>Age &lt;70 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survivors:</td>
<td>SAPS 2 score 46.6 +/- 17.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age 66 +/- 17</td>
<td>APACHE II score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.6% male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APACHE II score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Wang et al, 2016.                      | Inclusion: Septic shock Age ≥ 18 years Use of PICCO monitoring CVP target of 8- | N=105 Survivors: Age 66 +/- 17 64.6% male APACHE II score | 28 day mortality | Fluid balance in the 24 hour and 24-48 hour periods post-initial resuscitation both independently predicted 28-day mortality (adjusted OR 1.001 per ml, 95% CI 1.000-1.001, P=0.016 for 24 hours; |
| - Single centre retrospective cohort study | - China                                                                  |                          |                                                 |                                                                                  |
|                                        |                                                                          |                          |                                                 |                                                                                  |
| Wilkowski et al, 1988. | -Single centre retrospective cohort study  
-Germany | Inclusion:  
-ICU patients with ARDS, defined as acute respiratory failure after a typical insult, PaO2 < 50mmHg with FiO2 ≥ 0.6 and radiological | N=124  
-Age 45.4 yrs. (range 16-78)  
-61.3% male | -ICU mortality | -No significant difference in mortality between 3 treatment groups: (1) patients treated with diuretics (2) patients treated with haemofiltration as diuretic-unresponsive, and (3) patients who died or had spontaneous diuresis before any diuretics given |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12mmHg reached within 6 hours  
- Requirement for Norepinephrine ≥ 0.1 mcg/kg/min or Dopamine ≥ 5 mcg/kg/min  
- Survival time ≥ 72 hours following shock onset  
Exclusion:  
-Pregnancy or breast-feeding  
- Shock in the absence of infection  
- PiCCO used for <48 hours or absent data at ≥ 2 timepoints  
- Acute blood loss, acute myocardial infarction, pulmonary embolism  
- Treatment withheld or withdrawn during hospital stay | 21.8 +/-7.8  
Non-survivors:  
- Age 65 +/- 18  
- 63.3% male  
- APACHE II score 25.5 +/- 6.9 | adjusted OR 1.001 per ml, 95% CI 1.000-1.002, P=0.08 for 24-48 hours). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion Criteria</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mortality</th>
<th>Other Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willson et al, 2015.</td>
<td>Secondary analysis of a large multi-centre randomised controlled trial investigating surfactant vs placebo in paediatric ARDS</td>
<td>Age &lt;18 years, ALI of direct aetiology, Enrolment in CARDS trial (surfactant vs placebo) within 48 hours of intubation</td>
<td>Indirect lung injury, Pre-existing lung disease, Limitations on level of support, Significant non-pulmonary organ dysfunction</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Hospital mortality</td>
<td>ICU mortality was higher in patients with a positive net fluid balance over the ICU stay (85.2% vs 66.7%, P&lt;0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yao et al, 2014.</td>
<td>Single centre retrospective cohort study</td>
<td>Septic shock (ACCP/SCCM definition)</td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Mortality (time point undefined)</td>
<td>Cumulative fluid balance at 7 days was greater in non-survivors than survivors (11745 ml/m^2 [10817] versus 1234 ml/m^2 [2393], P&lt;0.001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ARDS = Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome, ICU = Intensive Care Unit, ALI = Acute Lung Injury, COPD = Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease, PE = Pulmonary Embolism, N = Number of patients, OR = Odds Ratio, PRISM = Pediatric Risk of Mortality Score, ACCP = American College of Chest Physicians, SCCM = Society of Critical Care Medicine.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Age&lt;18 years - Pregnancy or lactation</td>
<td>- Sepsis - Age 18-80 years - PiCCO system in use for haemodynamic monitoring</td>
<td>-Net fluid balance at day 2 was an independent risk factor for hospital mortality (OR 1.50 per 100ml, 95% CI 1.10 – 2.04, p = 0.01). -Change in BNP was correlated with change in fluid balance (Spearman’s rho =0.63, p &lt; 0.01)</td>
<td>-Prospective single-centre cohort study investigating the prognostic utility of BNP on clinically important outcomes and assessing correlation between fluid balance and changes in BNP -China</td>
<td>-Sepsis induced AKI admitted to ICU -Immune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-59.7% male -Median APACHE 2 score 15 (14-18) -Median SOFA score 7 (6-8)</td>
<td>Exclusion: -Acute kidney injury (AKIN Stage 2 or above) -Patients considered moribund or with DNAR order -Pre-existing renal dysfunction</td>
<td>N=67 -Age 59yrs +/- 16 -64.2% male -Median APACHE 2 score 23 (IQR 19-31) -46.3% mechanically ventilated</td>
<td>-Single centre retrospective cohort study -China</td>
<td>N=160 Negative fluid balance group: -Age 51.1 yrs. +/- 18.4 -75.3% male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-survivors (n=28):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-28 day mortality -Length of ICU stay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Median age 62 yrs. (47-74) -53.6% male -Median APACHE 2 score 19 (14-21) -Median SOFA score 9 (7-11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Positive fluid balance (defined as no days of negative balance &gt;500ml in first 3 days of ICU stay) was associated with higher mortality (68.4% vs 37%, p&lt;0.01), and a longer ICU stay (10.1 +/- 4.9 days vs 12.4 +/- 8.0 days, p&lt; 0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromise</td>
<td>APACHE 2 score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-stage chronic illness</td>
<td>17.9 +/- 6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age &lt; 12 or &gt; 80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy or lactation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning disability or severe psychiatric illness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal illness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Positive fluid balance group:

- Age 56 yrs. +/- 18.2
- 77.2% male
- APACHE 2 score 18.8 +/- 5.1
Appendix 2. Modified Newcastle-Ottawa scale for included cohort studies.

Selection:

1) **Representativeness of the exposed cohort**
   a) truly representative of the average ARDS / SIRS / sepsis population in the community □
   b) somewhat representative of the average ARDS / SIRS / sepsis population in the community
   c) selected group of patients
   d) no description of the derivation of the cohort

2) **Selection of the non exposed cohort**
   a) drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort
   b) drawn from a different source
   c) no description of the derivation of the non exposed cohort

3) **Ascertainment of exposure**
   a) secure record (eg surgical records)
   b) structured interview
   c) written self report
   d) no description

4) **Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study**
   a) yes
   b) no

Comparability:

1) **Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis**
   a) study controls for severity of illness
   b) study controls for haemodynamic status

Outcome:

1) **Assessment of outcome**
   a) independent blind assessment
   b) record linkage
   c) self report
   d) no description

2) **Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur**
   a) yes
   b) no

3) **Adequacy of follow up of cohorts**
   a) complete follow up - all subjects accounted for
   b) subjects lost to follow up unlikely to introduce bias > 98% follow-up or description provided of those lost
   c) follow up rate < 99% and no description of those lost
   d) no statement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>Comparability</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abulebda et al, 2014.</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acheampong &amp; Vincent, 2015.</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boldt et al, 2015.</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyd et al, 2011.</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen et al, 2011.</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronhjort et al, 2016.</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Oliveira et al, 2015.</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiorenza &amp; Pass, 2013.</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flori et al, 2011.</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrera Gutierrez et al, 2013.</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koonrangsesomboon &amp; Khwannimit, 2015</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murai et al, 2014.</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy et al, 2009.</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perez-Fernandez et al, 2011.</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raimundo et al, 2012.</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodriguez et al, 2013.</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons et al, 1987.</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith &amp; Perner, 2012.</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun et al, 2015.</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udeozo et al, 2009.</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent et al, 2006. (sepsis)</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakr et al, 2005. (ARDS)</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang et al, 2016.</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkowski et al, 1988.</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willson et al, 2015.</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang et al, 2013.</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3.  Additional analyses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Conservative fluid</th>
<th>Liberal fluid</th>
<th>Risk Ratio</th>
<th>Risk Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hjortrup et al. 2016</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin et al. 2002</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin et al. 2005</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard et al. 2015</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiedemann et al. 2006</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang et al. 2015</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (95% CI)</strong></td>
<td>795</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total events: 246 \( \times \) 279

Heterogeneity: \( \tau^2 = 0.00, \quad \text{Chi}^2 = 3.48, \quad df = 4 \quad (P = 0.48); \quad I^2 = 0\%

Test for overall effect: \( Z = 1.34 \quad (P = 0.18) \)

3.1 Pre-planned sensitivity analysis excluding studies at high or moderate risk of bias with mortality as outcome.
3.2 Pre-planned subgroup analysis including only adult studies with mortality as outcome.
3.3 In a post-hoc sensitivity analysis in which we excluded studies lacking a clinically-important separation in fluid balance between groups, we found a non-significant reduction in mortality with a conservative or deresuscitative strategy compared to a liberal strategy or standard care.

We used these findings to calculate the required sample size to test the hypothesis that conservative fluid management or deresuscitation strategy reduces mortality compared to a liberal strategy or standard care. Based on a 13% relative risk reduction (assuming a comparable difference in mortality to those studies in which a clinically-significant difference in fluid balance was achieved), a baseline mortality risk of 34%, two-tailed alpha of 0.05 and power of 90%, we calculated this to be 4704 patients.
3.4 Univariate meta-regression analysis with RR for mortality as dependent variable and between-group difference in mean daily fluid balance as exposure. 
$R^2=0.11$, $P=0.30$
### Forest plot for renal replacement therapy use, conservative or deresuscitative fluid strategy versus standard care or liberal fluid strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Conservative fluid</th>
<th>Liberal fluid</th>
<th>Risk Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI</th>
<th>Risk Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chen and Kellef. 2015</td>
<td>17 Events 41 Total</td>
<td>16 Events 41 Total</td>
<td>1.06 [0.63, 1.80]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hjortrup et al. 2016</td>
<td>16 Events 75 Total</td>
<td>14 Events 76 Total</td>
<td>1.16 [0.61, 2.20]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiedemann et al. 2006</td>
<td>50 Events 503 Total</td>
<td>70 Events 497 Total</td>
<td>0.71 [0.50, 0.99]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (95% CI) 619 Events 614 Total 100.0% Risk Ratio 0.88 [0.64, 1.22]

Total events 83 100

Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.02$; $\text{Chi}^2 = 2.76$, df = 2 ($P = 0.25$); $I^2 = 27$

Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.78$ ($P = 0.44$)

Favours conservative Favours liberal

3.5 Forest plot for renal replacement therapy use, conservative or deresuscitative fluid strategy versus standard care or liberal fluid strategy.
Appendix 5. List of excluded studies

- Observational study with n<50

Acheampong and Vincent. Early Negative Fluid Balance Is Independently Associated With Improved Survival In Septic Patients. American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine 2014;189;A5496  
- Duplicate / overlap

Acheampong and Vincent. Early Negative Fluid Balance Is Independently Associated With Improved Survival In Septic Patients. American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine 2014;189;A5496  
- Duplicate / overlap

- Duplicate / overlap

- Fluid type study

- Duplicate / overlap

- Observational study with n<50

Andrews et al. Simplified Severe Sepsis Protocol: A Randomized Controlled Trial of Modified Early Goal-Directed Therapy In Zambia. Critical Care Medicine 2014;42:2315-2324  
- Complex haemodynamic intervention
- Resuscitation phase study

Angelo et al. Fluid Status and Clinical Outcomes In Critically Ill Children With Sepsis: A Retrospective Analysis. Critical Care Medicine 2010;38(12 S1):386  
- Duplicate / overlap

Angelo et al. Fluid Status and Clinical Outcomes In Critically Ill Children With Sepsis: A Retrospective Analysis. Critical Care Medicine 2010;38(12 S1):386  
- Duplicate / overlap

- Resuscitation phase study
- Complex haemodynamic intervention

- Observational study with n<50
- Resuscitation phase study

Azevedo et al. Should We Need Fluid Overload In the Critically Ill Patients? Nephrology Dialysis Transplantation 2013;28:i331  
- Study population did not match criteria

Azevedo et al. Association Between Early Fluid Balance, Organ Failures and Outcomes In Ventilated Patients. Critical Care Medicine 2015;43(12 S1):170  
- Study population did not match criteria

• Not original study
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