International Journal of Computational and Experimental Science and ENgineering
(IJCESEN)
Vol. 10-No.4 (2024) pp. 2353-2362
http://www.ijcesen.com

ISSN: 2149-9144
Research Article

The Role of Nursing, Emergency Medicine, and Laboratory Services in the Early Detection and Management of Sepsis in Emergency Settings

Sami Ali Mohammed Alamri[1], Abdulmajeed Farahan Alenazi[2], Eissa Abdulmonam Eissa Altamimi[3], Najah Farhan Aqeel Alshammri[4], Huda Falah Munawer Aljuhani[5], Sahar Abdullah Mohammad Assiri[6], Abeer Rahil Aleia Alruwaili[7], Fahad Eid Bani Alreshidi[8], Mohammad Mohamoud Ramadan Ghabban[9], Emad Ibrahim Mohammed Alsharif[10]

[1]Emergency Medicine Consultant – Ministry of Health – Taif – Makkah Region – Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
* **Corresponding Author Email:** SAlamri62@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-0050

[2]Emergency Medicine Consultant – Prince Abdulaziz bin Musaed Hospital – Arar – Northern Borders – Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Email: Majeed.alenazi91@gmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-9850

[3]Nursing Technician – Hail Health Cluster – Hail – Hail Region – Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Email: a0502001020@gmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-8850

[4]Nursing Technician – General Baqaa Hospital – Baqaa – Hail Region – Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Email: nfalshammri@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-6850

[5]Nursing Technician – General Baqaa Hospital – Baqaa – Hail Region – Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Email: huda900h@gamil.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-5850

[6]Nursing Technician – Ministry of Health – Khamis Mushait – Asir Region – Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Email: saaassiri@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-4850

[7]Nursing Technician – Prince Mutaib bin Abdulaziz Hospital – Sakaka – Al-Jouf Region – Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Email: aalroely@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-3850

[8]Nursing Technician – Prince Mutaib bin Abdulaziz Hospital – Sakaka – Al-Jouf Region – Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Email: aalroely@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-2850

[9]Laboratory Technician – Alwajh General Hospital – Alwajh – Tabuk Region – Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Email: Mghabban@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-1850

[10]Laboratory Technician – Alwajh General Hospital – Alwajh – Tabuk Region – Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Email: eialsharif@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-0850

Article Info:

DOI: 10.22399/ijcesen.3953
Received : 07 November 2024
Accepted : 26 December 2024

Keywords

Sepsis,
emergency settings,
nursing,
emergency medicine,
laboratory services,
early detection,

Abstract:

Sepsis is a life-threatening condition that arises when the body's response to infection leads to organ dysfunction. In emergency settings, the timely identification and management of sepsis are crucial for improving patient outcomes. Nursing professionals play a vital role in the early detection of sepsis by conducting comprehensive assessments, monitoring vital signs, and recognizing the signs and symptoms of infection. Their ability to communicate critical findings to the emergency medicine team is essential for initiating prompt interventions. Emergency medicine practitioners are responsible for implementing evidence-based protocols designed to manage sepsis effectively, including the administration of intravenous fluids, broad-spectrum antibiotics, and monitoring for signs of organ failure. The collaboration between nursing and emergency medicine teams is pivotal in ensuring that patients at risk of or suffering from sepsis receive rapid and appropriate care. Laboratory services further enhance the early detection and management of sepsis in emergency settings.

Rapid diagnostic testing, including blood cultures and biomarkers such as procalcitonin, aids healthcare providers in confirming the presence of infection and determining its severity. Timely laboratory results empower clinicians to make informed decisions regarding treatment strategies, which can significantly impact patient survival rates. By integrating nursing expertise, emergency medicine protocols, and laboratory capabilities, healthcare facilities can improve the overall response to sepsis, leading to better patient outcomes and reducing mortality associated with this critical condition. This multidisciplinary approach ensures that all aspects of patient care are addressed, fostering a seamless continuum from assessment to treatment.

1. Introduction

Sepsis, defined as a life-threatening organ dysfunction caused by a dysregulated host response to infection, remains a formidable global health challenge and a leading cause of morbidity and mortality worldwide [1]. It represents a clinical syndrome that transcends individual diseases, acting as a final common pathway for severe infections. The progression from infection to sepsis, severe sepsis, and septic shock is often insidious and rapid, creating a narrow therapeutic window where timely intervention is paramount. Each hour of delay in the administration of appropriate antimicrobial therapy has been consistently associated with a significant increase in mortality [2]. Consequently, the emergency department (ED) serves as the critical frontline in the battle against sepsis; it is the primary point of entry for the majority of patients with severe infections and the arena where the trajectory of their illness—toward recovery or deterioration—is largely determined.

The recognition and initial management of sepsis in the chaotic environment of the ED are exceptionally complex. Patients often present with non-specific signs and symptoms that can mimic other conditions, such as non-infectious inflammatory states, heart failure, or pulmonary embolism. The classic systemic inflammatory response syndrome (SIRS) criteria—though foundational in early sepsis awareness campaigns—have proven to be highly sensitive but non-specific, leading to over-triage and potential resource misallocation [3]. The subsequent development of more specific criteria, such as the Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (SOFA) and its rapid ED counterpart, the quick SOFA (qSOFA), aimed to improve the prediction of poor outcomes, yet their implementation has sparked debate regarding sensitivity in the pre-hospital and very early ED settings [4, 5].

The role of nursing in sepsis management is foundational and multifaceted. Emergency nurses are typically the first healthcare professionals to perform a comprehensive patient assessment. Their astute clinical judgment in identifying subtle changes in vital signs, mental status, or overall appearance can trigger the sepsis protocol long before a physician's detailed evaluation is complete. The concept of "nursing intuition," often a synthesis of experience and pattern recognition, is a critical early warning system [6]. Beyond detection, nurses are the primary implementers of the Sepsis Resuscitation Bundle, as outlined by the Surviving Sepsis Campaign guidelines [7]. This includes obtaining vascular access, drawing blood cultures before antibiotic administration, initiating fluid boluses, and commencing vasopressor support in critical situations. The fidelity and timeliness with which these nursing-driven interventions are executed directly influence patient outcomes, making nursing care a direct determinant of survival.

Emergency physicians, in turn, bear the responsibility of synthesizing the clinical picture. They integrate the nursing assessment with their own history and physical examination to formulate a differential diagnosis and risk stratification. Their role extends beyond initial recognition to include orchestrating the diagnostic workup, interpreting complex clinical data, making definitive therapeutic decisions (e.g., antibiotic selection, need for central venous access or intensive care unit admission), and managing complications. The physician’s ability to rapidly prioritize sepsis in their differential, especially in a crowded ED, is crucial. Furthermore, they are responsible for communicating the severity of the illness to patients and their families and coordinating with consultants, such as intensivists and infectious disease specialists. The evolution of evidence-based protocols, such as the 1-hour bundle, has placed immense pressure on emergency physicians to make rapid, high-consequence decisions, highlighting the need for efficient systems and reliable support services [8].

The contribution of laboratory services, while often occurring behind the scenes, is equally vital. The early diagnosis of sepsis and the assessment of organ dysfunction rely heavily on rapid and accurate laboratory testing. Key biomarkers provide objective evidence to support or refute clinical suspicion. Blood cultures remain the gold standard for identifying the causative pathogen and guiding targeted antibiotic therapy, while lactate levels have emerged as a critical indicator of tissue hypoperfusion and a key metric for guiding resuscitation [9]. The turnaround time (TAT) for these critical tests is a major factor in the speed of diagnosis and treatment initiation. Delays in laboratory processing can directly translate into delays in therapy. Moreover, emerging biomarkers, such as procalcitonin (PCT), show promise in distinguishing bacterial sepsis from other inflammatory conditions and in guiding the duration of antibiotic therapy, potentially aiding antimicrobial stewardship efforts in the ED [10]. The laboratory's role in providing serial data to track response to treatment further cements its position as an active partner in patient management.

Despite the clear importance of each discipline, the greatest challenge and opportunity lie in their integration. Fragmented communication, unclear protocols, and logistical bottlenecks between triage, bedside care, physician evaluation, and lab processing can cripple the sepsis response. The effectiveness of the entire system hinges on a well-rehearsed, multidisciplinary approach. Studies have consistently shown that the implementation of standardized sepsis screening tools embedded in electronic health records, coupled with nurse-driven alert systems and predefined order sets, can significantly reduce time-to-antibiotics and improve bundle compliance [11]. Therefore, researching not only the individual contributions of each service but, more importantly, the mechanisms that optimize their collaboration is essential.

1.1 Sepsis Epidemiology:

Sepsis represents a profound global public health crisis, characterized by its high incidence, staggering mortality, and substantial long-term morbidity for survivors. It is a leading cause of death worldwide, with a burden that rivals that of acute myocardial infarction [10]. Quantifying the true incidence of sepsis has been historically challenging due to variations in definition, coding practices, and surveillance methods. However, major studies have illuminated its devastating scope. A seminal study estimated that in 2017, there were 48.9 million incident cases of sepsis globally and 11.0 million sepsis-related deaths, accounting for approximately 19.7% of all global deaths [11]. This figure starkly highlighted sepsis as a potentially greater threat than previously recognized. In high-income countries, the age-standardized incidence of sepsis is estimated to be higher, but the mortality rate is significantly lower compared to low- and middle-income countries, underscoring disparities in healthcare access and resources [11].

Within the United States, a landmark analysis using clinical data from electronic health records provided a more precise picture than earlier administrative code-based studies. It estimated that sepsis affected at least 1.7 million adults annually and was responsible for approximately 270,000 deaths [12]. This translates to one death every two minutes. The economic burden is equally staggering, with sepsis care costing U.S. hospitals tens of billions of dollars annually and representing a leading cause of inpatient costs [13]. The epidemiology of sepsis also reveals important risk factors. Populations at highest risk include the very young, the elderly, individuals with compromised immune systems (e.g., from chemotherapy, chronic diseases, or transplants), and those with chronic comorbidities such as diabetes, chronic kidney disease, and COPD [14]. The ED, by its nature as a point of access for acute illness across all demographics, invariably encounters a high volume of patients within these vulnerable groups, making it a crucial surveillance and intervention point.

The ability to reliably detect and study sepsis is contingent upon a clear and clinically useful definition. The conceptualization of sepsis has evolved significantly over the past three decades, reflecting advances in the understanding of its pathophysiology. For years, the framework established by the 1991 and 2001 consensus conferences, which centered on the Systemic Inflammatory Response Syndrome (SIRS), was the standard. SIRS was defined by the presence of two or more simple clinical criteria: tachycardia, tachypnea, fever or hypothermia, and leukocytosis or leukopenia [15]. While this definition was easy to apply and raised awareness, its lack of specificity became a major limitation. The SIRS criteria can be triggered by a multitude of non-infectious insults, such as trauma, pancreatitis, or burns, leading to over-diagnosis and potentially unnecessary antibiotic use [16].

To address these shortcomings, the Third International Consensus Definitions for Sepsis and Septic Shock (Sepsis-3) were published in 2016. This paradigm shift moved away from SIRS and redefined sepsis as "life-threatening organ dysfunction caused by a dysregulated host response to infection" [17]. This new definition emphasizes the primacy of organ injury over the generalized inflammatory response. Operationally, Sepsis-3 recommends using an increase in the Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (SOFA) score of 2 points or more to identify organ dysfunction in patients with suspected infection. The SOFA score provides a more nuanced assessment of dysfunction across six organ systems (respiratory, coagulation, liver, cardiovascular, central nervous system, and renal) [17].

For the emergency setting, where comprehensive laboratory data needed for a full SOFA score may not be immediately available, the Sepsis-3 task force introduced the quick SOFA (qSOFA) tool as a bedside screening prompt. A qSOFA score of 2 or more (based on altered mental status, systolic blood pressure ≤100 mm Hg, or respiratory rate ≥22/min) suggests a higher risk of a poor outcome and should trigger closer monitoring and further investigation for organ dysfunction [17]. However, the implementation of qSOFA has been contentious. While its specificity for predicting mortality is good, its sensitivity is relatively low, meaning it may miss a significant number of patients with sepsis, particularly in its earliest stages [18]. This ongoing debate underscores the complex challenge faced by ED clinicians: balancing the need for a highly sensitive screening tool to avoid missed cases with the need for specificity to allocate resources efficiently. In practice, many institutions have adopted hybrid models that incorporate elements of both SIRS and qSOFA to maximize early detection.

The driving force behind the intense focus on sepsis in the ED is the robust and consistent evidence demonstrating that time to appropriate therapy is a critical determinant of survival. The pathophysiology of sepsis involves a cascade of events including endothelial damage, microvascular thrombosis, and distributive shock, leading to tissue hypoperfusion and irreversible organ damage. Early intervention aims to break this cycle before it becomes self-sustaining.

The foundational study by Kumar et al. demonstrated a linear relationship between the delay in effective antimicrobial administration and mortality in patients with septic shock. Each hour of delay after the onset of hypotension was associated with an average decrease in survival of 7.6% [2]. This powerful finding established the concept of the "golden hour" in sepsis management, akin to trauma care. Subsequent research has reinforced this principle, showing that bundle-based care, which packages several evidence-based interventions into a single, time-sensitive protocol, improves outcomes. The Surviving Sepsis Campaign's guidelines have evolved to emphasize this urgency, most notably with the introduction of the "1-Hour Bundle," which recommends completing a set of key steps—including measuring lactate, obtaining blood cultures, administering broad-spectrum antibiotics, and starting fluid resuscitation—within the first hour of recognition [7, 19].

The rationale for this bundled, rapid approach is multifactorial. Early antibiotics source control are essential to reduce the pathogen load. Early fluid resuscitation aims to restore intravascular volume and improve cardiac preload, thereby increasing oxygen delivery to hypoperfused tissues. The measurement of lactate, a marker of cellular hypoxia, serves both as a sensitive indicator of severity and a guide to the adequacy of resuscitation [9]. The synergy of these interventions, delivered promptly, is greater than the sum of their parts. Delays at any point in this chain—from initial nursing assessment to physician diagnosis to laboratory turnaround time for critical tests like lactate—can accumulate, shrinking the window for effective intervention and irrevocably altering the patient's prognosis [20].

2. Role of Nursing in Sepsis Screening and Initial Assessment

The sepsis detection process begins at the moment of patient arrival, most often at the triage desk. This initial, brief encounter is a critical juncture where nurses must rapidly sort patients based on acuity, making split-second decisions that can alter clinical trajectories. The implementation of nurse-initiated sepsis screening tools at triage has been a cornerstone of quality improvement efforts aimed at standardizing this early recognition. These tools, often integrated into the electronic health record (EHR), prompt the nurse to assess for specific clinical criteria related to infection and organ dysfunction. Commonly used parameters include elements of the Systemic Inflammatory Response Syndrome (SIRS) criteria due to their high sensitivity, combined with risk factors for severe illness and markers of organ dysfunction, such as a history of an immunocompromised state or an altered mental status [21].

The efficacy of such tools is well-documented. Studies have shown that the implementation of a mandatory nursing sepsis screening protocol at triage can significantly reduce the time to physician diagnosis, antibiotic administration, and completion of the sepsis resuscitation bundle [22]. For instance, a nurse noting a high respiratory rate, fever, and a history of urinary symptoms can trigger a "sepsis alert," which mobilizes resources and prioritizes the patient for physician evaluation and laboratory testing, including a lactate level. This systematic approach helps to overcome the cognitive biases and distractions inherent in a busy ED, ensuring that subtle signs of sepsis are not overlooked amidst a crowded waiting room. However, the success of these tools is entirely dependent on nursing vigilance and clinical judgment; they are aids to, not replacements for, critical thinking.

While screening tools provide a necessary framework, the early identification of sepsis often relies on the nurse's ability to synthesize subtle, non-specific clues into a coherent picture of clinical deterioration. This process, often described as "nursing intuition," is actually a sophisticated form of pattern recognition and clinical reasoning developed through experience [6]. It involves detecting deviations from a patient's baseline that may not yet be captured by vital sign thresholds. A patient may have a "normal" blood pressure, but if it is significantly lower than their baseline, it could represent relative hypotension. Similarly, a nurse may note subtle changes in a patient's skin color (e.g., mottling), temperature (cool, clammy extremities signaling vasoconstriction), or mental status (agitation, lethargy, or confusion) that are profound indicators of hypoperfusion long before a lactate result returns [23].

This holistic assessment is particularly crucial for patients who do not clearly meet all screening criteria—the so-called "cryptic septic" patient. These individuals may present with vague symptoms, be immunocompromised without a robust febrile response, or be elderly, in whom sepsis can manifest atypically as falls or generalized weakness [24]. In these cases, the nurse's detailed history-taking from the patient and family regarding recent functional decline, and their careful physical examination, become the primary means of detection. The nurse's role in advocating for these patients, communicating their concerns to the physician using structured models like Situation-Background-Assessment-Recommendation (SBAR), is a vital component of preventing missed diagnoses [25].

Once sepsis is suspected, the nursing role rapidly transitions from detection to action. Nurses are the primary executors of the initial elements of the Surviving Sepsis Campaign's 1-hour bundle. The fidelity and speed with which they complete these tasks directly impact patient outcomes. Key nursing responsibilities include:

- **Obtaining Vascular Access:** Establishing reliable intravenous access, often requiring large-bore peripheral catheters or intraosseous access in critically ill patients, is the gateway to all subsequent therapies.
- **Blood Culture Collection:** Drawing blood cultures *before* antibiotic administration is critical for identifying the causative pathogen and guiding targeted therapy. Adherence to aseptic technique is essential to minimize contamination [26].
- **Administration of Broad-Spectrum Antibiotics:** Nurses are responsible for the safe and timely administration of antibiotics, a task that involves verifying the correct drug and dose, understanding administration protocols, and monitoring for immediate adverse reactions. Delays in antibiotic administration are frequently linked to logistical issues within the pharmacy-nursing workflow [27].
- **Initiation of Fluid Resuscitation:** The nurse is tasked with administering a crystalloid fluid bolus (e.g., 30 mL/kg) as ordered, a procedure that requires careful monitoring of the patient's respiratory status for signs of fluid overload, particularly in those with underlying heart failure [28].
- **Lactate Measurement and Monitoring:** While the order for a lactate level may come from a physician or protocol, the nurse is responsible for ensuring the blood sample is drawn and sent promptly. Furthermore, they are responsible for tracking serial lactates to gauge the effectiveness of resuscitation.

The coordination of these simultaneous tasks under time pressure requires exceptional organizational skill and the ability to prioritize dynamically as the patient's condition evolves.

Despite their pivotal role, emergency nurses face significant barriers to optimal sepsis care. ED overcrowding is a primary obstacle, leading to prolonged waiting times, hallway care, and increased nurse-to-patient ratios, which dilute the attention any single patient can receive [29]. This environment can impede the continuous monitoring necessary to detect early deterioration. Furthermore, "alert fatigue" is a growing concern; when EHR systems generate excessive numbers of sepsis alerts based on overly sensitive criteria, nurses may become desensitized, leading to the potential for ignoring a true positive case [30].

3. Emergency Physician's Role in Diagnosis and Resuscitation:

The physician's first critical task is to confirm or refute the diagnosis of sepsis. While a nursing screening alert provides a crucial trigger, the physician must integrate this information with a focused history, physical examination, and initial diagnostic results to determine the likelihood of infection and the presence of organ dysfunction. This process involves a rapid but thorough assessment to identify the source of infection, which is paramount for guiding antimicrobial therapy and planning for source control. The physical exam focuses on signs of systemic hypoperfusion (e.g., delayed capillary refill, cool extremities, altered mental status) as well as localized signs of infection [31].

A key tool for the physician in this initial phase is risk stratification. The physician must quickly determine the severity of the patient's condition to allocate appropriate resources and guide the aggressiveness of intervention. While screening tools like qSOFA are useful prompts, the physician's judgment often incorporates a broader clinical gestalt. The measurement of serum lactate level is a cornerstone of this stratification. A lactate level ≥ 2 mmol/L signifies cellular dysfunction and hypoperfusion, confirming the diagnosis of sepsis per Sepsis-3 definitions and identifying a patient at high risk for deterioration, even in the presence of normal blood pressure—a condition known as cryptic shock [32]. The physician uses this objective data point, along with clinical signs of shock (e.g., profound hypotension, anuria), to classify the patient as having sepsis, septic shock, or a less severe infection, thereby tailoring the intensity of the subsequent response.

The most time-sensitive and consequential aspect of the emergency physician's role is the execution and management of the Surviving Sepsis Campaign's Hour-1 Bundle [19]. The physician is responsible for authorizing and directing each component of this bundle, making critical decisions at each step:

- **Antimicrobial Therapy:** The selection of appropriate empiric broad-spectrum antibiotics is perhaps the physician's most significant decision. This choice must be guided by knowledge of local antibiograms, the suspected source of infection (e.g., community-acquired pneumonia vs. urosepsis vs. intra-abdominal infection), patient allergies, and individual risk factors for multidrug-resistant organisms [33]. The goal is to administer agents that will cover all likely pathogens within the first hour of recognition. Delays in ordering or inappropriate antibiotic selection are strongly associated with increased mortality [2].
- **Fluid Resuscitation:** The physician orders the initial fluid bolus (crystalloid, 30 mL/kg) for patients with hypotension or lactate ≥ 4 mmol/L. However, their role extends beyond a simple order. They must continuously reassess the patient's response to fluids, guided by dynamic parameters such as repeat lactate measurements, improvement in blood pressure, mental status, and urine output. The physician must also be vigilant for signs of fluid overload, particularly in patients with pre-existing cardiac or renal failure, and be prepared to transition to vasopressor support if the patient does not respond adequately to initial volume expansion [34].
- **Vasopressor Initiation:** In cases of septic shock where hypotension persists despite adequate fluid resuscitation, the physician must initiate vasopressors to maintain a target mean arterial pressure (MAP) of ≥ 65 mm Hg. The standard of care is to begin vasopressor infusion through a large-bore peripheral intravenous line without delay, rather than waiting for central venous access, which can cause dangerous treatment delays [35]. The physician titrates the vasopressor dose to the MAP goal while arranging for central line placement for long-term management.

Beyond initial resuscitation, the emergency physician is responsible for initiating investigations and interventions aimed at source control. This involves identifying and definitively managing the anatomic site of infection. For example, this may entail ordering a computed tomography (CT) scan to identify an abscess or necrotizing soft tissue infection, performing a lumbar puncture for suspected meningitis, or consulting a surgeon for a patient with a perforated viscus [36]. Timely source control is a critical determinant of outcome, as persistent foci of infection will continue to drive the septic response despite optimal medical management.

The physician also oversees a range of adjunctive therapies. This includes ensuring adequate glycemic control, as hyperglycemia is common in sepsis and associated with worse outcomes, though tight control is not recommended [37]. They must also manage coagulopathies and consider the need for stress-dose corticosteroids in patients with refractory shock, though their use remains controversial and is typically reserved for specific cases [38]. Furthermore, the physician plays a key role in effective communication with the patient and family, explaining the critical nature of the illness, the treatment plan, and establishing realistic goals of care, especially in patients with significant comorbidities.

The final critical responsibility of the emergency physician is determining the appropriate disposition for the septic patient. This decision has profound implications for the continuity and intensity of care. Patients in septic shock or with significant organ dysfunction will require admission to an intensive care unit (ICU). The physician must initiate the ICU consultation early, providing a clear handoff of the patient's history, resuscitation status, and ongoing needs [39]. For patients with less severe sepsis, admission to a monitored floor bed may be appropriate. The disposition decision is dynamic; a patient who initially appears stable may deteriorate rapidly, requiring the physician to continuously re-evaluate and upgrade the care plan.

4. Contribution of Laboratory Services

While the clinical acumen of the bedside team is paramount, the definitive diagnosis, risk stratification, and management of sepsis are deeply reliant on the objective data provided by the clinical laboratory. Functioning as the "diagnostic engine" of the emergency department (ED), laboratory services transform clinical suspicion into quantifiable, actionable information. The laboratory's role extends far beyond passive testing; it is an active partner in the sepsis response chain, with the speed and accuracy of its results directly influencing therapeutic timelines and patient outcomes.

The laboratory provides a panel of tests that are essential for each stage of sepsis management: diagnosis, risk stratification, and monitoring response.

- **Lactate: The Cornerstone of Perfusion Assessment:** Serum lactate has evolved from a marker of anaerobic metabolism in shock states to a central diagnostic and prognostic criterion in sepsis. Hyperlactatemia (≥2 mmol/L) indicates tissue hypoperfusion and cellular hypoxia, even in the absence of overt hypotension, identifying patients with "cryptic shock" who are at high risk for rapid deterioration [32]. Its primary utility lies in its power for risk stratification; a lactate level >4 mmol/L is associated with a mortality rate exceeding 25% and triggers the most aggressive resuscitation protocols [40]. Furthermore, serial lactate measurements are used to guide therapy. The concept of "lactate clearance," defined as a percentage decrease in lactate levels over time (e.g., a 10-20% decrease at 2-6 hours), has been proposed as a dynamic indicator of effective resuscitation and is associated with improved survival [41]. The laboratory's ability to provide a rapid and accurate lactate measurement is, therefore, a direct determinant of the speed and intensity of the clinical response.
- **Procalcitonin: Differentiating Inflammation and Guiding Therapy:** Procalcitonin (PCT), the prohormone of calcitonin, has emerged as a more specific biomarker for bacterial sepsis compared to traditional markers like C-reactive protein (CRP) or white blood cell count. PCT levels rise significantly in response to systemic bacterial infections but remain low in viral infections and non-infectious inflammatory states [42]. This characteristic makes PCT a valuable tool for the emergency physician in distinguishing bacterial sepsis from other conditions that can present similarly, such as acute exacerbations of COPD or non-infectious pancreatitis, thereby aiding in antimicrobial stewardship by potentially reducing unnecessary antibiotic use [43]. Beyond diagnosis, serial PCT measurements can guide the duration of antibiotic therapy. Evidence-based algorithms suggest that a significant drop in PCT levels can support the safe discontinuation of antibiotics, reducing the risks of resistance and side effects [44].
- **Microbiological Cultures: The Gold Standard for Pathogen Identification:** Blood cultures remain the definitive method for identifying the causative pathogen in sepsis. While results are not available for 24-48 hours, their importance cannot be overstated. A positive culture allows for de-escalation from broad-spectrum to targeted antibiotic therapy, which is a cornerstone of antimicrobial stewardship [45]. The laboratory's role is critical not only in incubating and identifying organisms but also in performing rapid antimicrobial susceptibility testing to guide optimal treatment. The pre-analytical phase, involving the nurse's technique in drawing cultures, is vital, as contamination can lead to misinterpretation and inappropriate therapy [26].

In sepsis management, the value of a laboratory result is intrinsically linked to the speed with which it is delivered. A lactate result that returns in 20 minutes is clinically actionable; the same result returning in 90 minutes may be too late to influence the critical first hour of care. Therefore, laboratory TAT is not merely an operational metric but a key clinical performance indicator directly linked to patient outcomes. Studies have consistently shown that reducing TAT for critical tests like lactate is associated with decreased time to antibiotic administration and improved bundle compliance [46].

To achieve this, laboratories serving EDs have implemented several strategies. **Point-of-Care Testing (POCT)** represents the most significant advancement, bringing the analyzer to the patient's bedside. POCT for lactate allows nurses or physicians to obtain a result within minutes, drastically shortening the diagnostic loop and enabling immediate clinical decisions [47]. Central laboratories have also optimized their workflows by creating **"stat" pathways** for sepsis-related tests, prioritizing them over routine samples, and utilizing **automated track systems and advanced analyzers** to minimize processing and analysis time. Effective communication of critical results, often through direct alerting systems within the

Electronic Health Record (EHR), ensures that abnormal findings are acted upon immediately by the clinical team [48].

The future of laboratory medicine in sepsis lies in the development of even faster and more informative diagnostic tools. **Molecular diagnostics**, such as multiplex polymerase chain reaction (PCR) panels that can identify a wide range of bacterial and fungal pathogens along with key resistance genes directly from blood samples in a matter of hours, are becoming more widespread. These technologies promise to dramatically shorten the time to pathogen identification, allowing for earlier targeted therapy [49]. Furthermore, research is ongoing into novel biomarkers and host-response signatures that can more accurately predict sepsis onset and prognosis, potentially moving the field toward even earlier and more precise intervention.

5. Conclusion

The early detection and management of sepsis in the emergency setting represent a complex clinical challenge that no single healthcare discipline can overcome in isolation. This study has delineated the critical, interdependent roles of nursing, emergency medicine, and laboratory services, demonstrating that optimal patient outcomes are not merely the sum of individual efforts but the product of their seamless integration. The emergency nurse acts as the essential vanguard, leveraging systematic screening and astute clinical judgment to trigger the response. The emergency physician functions as the conductor, synthesizing information to diagnose, risk-stratify, and orchestrate complex resuscitation efforts. Simultaneously, the laboratory serves as the indispensable diagnostic engine, providing the objective data—from lactate to procalcitonin—that confirms suspicion, guides therapy, and monitors progress with ever-increasing speed.

The efficacy of this triad hinges on the deliberate engineering of collaboration through structured communication frameworks like SBAR, nurse-driven protocols that empower frontline action, and health information technology that provides a shared platform for alerting and task management. However, these systems are fragile. They are vulnerable to the pervasive challenges of ED overcrowding, alert fatigue, and workflow disruption. Therefore, sustaining improvement requires more than protocols and technology; it demands a foundational culture of psychological safety, mutual respect, and continuous interdisciplinary training.

Ultimately, the battle against sepsis in the emergency department is won not by individual expertise alone, but by the strength of the system that unites that expertise into a coordinated, reliable whole. The goal must be to transform the emergency care environment into a high-reliability organization where the seamless interplay between assessment, diagnosis, and data becomes the unwavering standard. Future efforts should focus on refining collaborative tools, measuring and optimizing the human factors that underpin teamwork, and fostering a culture where every team member is empowered to act decisively in the race against time. The survival of the septic patient depends on this unwavering, unified front.

Author Statements:

- **Ethical approval:** The conducted research is not related to either human or animal use.
- **Conflict of interest:** The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper
- **Acknowledgement:** The authors declare that they have nobody or no-company to acknowledge.
- **Author contributions:** The authors declare that they have equal right on this paper.
- **Funding information:** The authors declare that there is no funding to be acknowledged.
- **Data availability statement:** The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

References

[1] Singer M, Deutschman CS, Seymour CW, et al. The Third International Consensus Definitions for Sepsis and Septic Shock (Sepsis-3). JAMA. 2016;315(8):801-810.

[2] Kumar A, Roberts D, Wood KE, et al. Duration of hypotension before initiation of effective antimicrobial therapy is the critical determinant of survival in human septic shock. Crit Care Med. 2006;34(6):1589-1596.

[3]Kaukonen KM, Bailey M, Pilcher D, Cooper DJ, Bellomo R. Systemic inflammatory response syndrome criteria in defining severe sepsis. N Engl J Med. 2015;372(17):1629-1638.

[4] Freund Y, Lemachatti N, Krastinova E, et al. Prognostic Accuracy of Sepsis-3 Criteria for In-Hospital Mortality Among Patients With Suspected Infection Presenting to the Emergency Department. JAMA. 2017;317(3):301-308.

[5] Seymour CW, Liu VX, Iwashyna TJ, et al. Assessment of Clinical Criteria for Sepsis: For the Third International Consensus Definitions for Sepsis

and Septic Shock (Sepsis-3). JAMA. 2016;315(8):762-774.
[6] Odell M, Gerber K, Gager M. Nurse recognition and response to signs of clinical deterioration. Nurs Stand. 2019;34(6):45-50.
[7] Evans L, Rhodes A, Alhazzani W, et al. Surviving Sepsis Campaign: International Guidelines for Management of Sepsis and Septic Shock 2021. Crit Care Med. 2021;49(11):e1063-e1143.
[8] Levy MM, Evans LE, Rhodes A. The Surviving Sepsis Campaign Bundle: 2018 update. Intensive Care Med. 2018;44(6):925-928.
[9] Puskarich MA, Trzeciak S, Shapiro NI, et al. Outcomes of patients undergoing early sepsis resuscitation for cryptic shock compared with overt shock. Resuscitation. 2011;82(10):1289-1293.
[10] Schuetz P, Wirz Y, Sager R, et al. Procalcitonin to initiate or discontinue antibiotics in acute respiratory tract infections. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2017;10(10):CD007498.
[11] Burney M, Underwood J, McEvoy S, et al. Early detection and treatment of severe sepsis in the emergency department: identifying barriers to implementation of a protocol-based approach. J Emerg Nurs. 2012;38(6):512-517.
[12] Rhee C, Dantes R, Epstein L, et al. Incidence and Trends of Sepsis in US Hospitals Using Clinical vs Claims Data, 2009-2014. JAMA. 2017;318(13):1241-1249.
[13] Paoli CJ, Reynolds MA, Sinha M, Gitlin M, Crouser E. Epidemiology and Costs of Sepsis in the United States-An Analysis Based on Timing of Diagnosis and Severity Level. Crit Care Med. 2018;46(12):1889-1897.
[14] Gotts JE, Matthay MA. Sepsis: pathophysiology and clinical management. BMJ. 2016;353:i1585.
[15] Levy MM, Fink MP, Marshall JC, et al. 2001 SCCM/ESICM/ACCP/ATS/SIS International Sepsis Definitions Conference. Crit Care Med. 2003;31(4):1250-1256.
[16] Kaukonen KM, Bailey M, Pilcher D, Cooper DJ, Bellomo R. Systemic inflammatory response syndrome criteria in defining severe sepsis. N Engl J Med. 2015;372(17):1629-1638.
[17] Singer M, Deutschman CS, Seymour CW, et al. The Third International Consensus Definitions for Sepsis and Septic Shock (Sepsis-3). JAMA. 2016;315(8):801-810.
[18] Freund Y, Lemachatti N, Krastinova E, et al. Prognostic Accuracy of Sepsis-3 Criteria for In-Hospital Mortality Among Patients With Suspected Infection Presenting to the Emergency Department. JAMA. 2017;317(3):301-308.
[19] Levy MM, Evans LE, Rhodes A. The Surviving Sepsis Campaign Bundle: 2018 update. Intensive Care Med. 2018;44(6):925-928.
[20] Seymour CW, Gesten F, Prescott HC, et al. Time to Treatment and Mortality during Mandated Emergency Care for Sepsis. N Engl J Med. 2017;376(23):2235-2244.
[21] Bullock B, Benham MD. Bacterial Sepsis. [Updated 2023 May 29]. In: StatPearls [Internet]. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2024 Jan-. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK537054/
[22] Moore J, Coady K, Aitken LM. The impact of a nurse-led sepsis initiative on time to initial antibiotic administration and in-hospital mortality. Aust Crit Care. 2020;33(3):258-264.
[23] Odell M, Gerber K, Gager M. Nurse recognition and response to signs of clinical deterioration. Nurs Stand. 2019;34(6):45-50.
[24] Fok PT, Teja B, Ouyang B, et al. The Association Between Triage Nurse Clinical Experience and the Accuracy of Sepsis Recognition. Ann Emerg Med. 2022;80(4S):S19-S20.
[25] Beckett CD, Kipnis G. Collaborative communication: integrating SBAR to improve quality/patient safety outcomes. J Healthc Qual. 2009;31(5):19-28.
[26] Dawson S. Blood culture contaminants. J Hosp Infect. 2014;87(1):1-10.
[27] Weiss SL, Peters MJ, Alhazzani W, et al. Surviving Sepsis Campaign International Guidelines for the Management of Septic Shock and Sepsis-Associated Organ Dysfunction in Children. Pediatr Crit Care Med. 2020;21(2):e52-e106.
[28] Messmer AS, Zingg C, Müller M, Gerber JL, Schefold JC, Pfortmueller CA. Fluid Overload and Mortality in Adult Critical Care Patients-A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Observational Studies. Crit Care Med. 2020;48(12):1862-1870.
[29] Morley C, Unwin M, Peterson GM, Stankovich J, Kinsman L. Emergency department crowding: A systematic review of causes, consequences and solutions. PLoS One. 2018;13(8):e0203316.
[30] Wong A, Otles E, Donnelly JP, et al. External Validation of a Widely Implemented Proprietary Sepsis Prediction Model in Hospitalized Patients. JAMA Intern Med. 2021;181(8):1065-1070.
[31] Casserly B, Phillips GS, Schorr C, et al. Lactate measurements in sepsis-induced tissue hypoperfusion: results from the Surviving Sepsis Campaign database. Crit Care Med. 2015;43(3):567-573.
[32] Puskarich MA, Trzeciak S, Shapiro NI, et al. Prognostic value and agreement of achieving lactate clearance or central venous oxygen saturation goals during early sepsis resuscitation. Acad Emerg Med. 2012;19(3):252-258.
[33] Rhodes A, Evans LE, Alhazzani W, et al. Surviving Sepsis Campaign: International Guidelines for Management of Sepsis and Septic Shock 2016. Intensive Care Med. 2017;43(3):304-377.
[34] Marik PE, Linde-Zwirble WT, Bittner EA, Sahatjian J, Hansell D. Fluid administration in severe sepsis and septic shock: patterns and outcomes--an analysis of a large national database. Intensive Care Med. 2017;43(5):625-632.
[35] Loubani OM, Green RS. A systematic review of extravasation and local tissue injury from administration of vasopressors through peripheral intravenous catheters and central venous catheters. J Crit Care. 2015;30(3):653.e9-17.

[36]Marshall JC, al Naqbi A. Principles of source control in the management of sepsis. Crit Care Clin. 2009;25(4):753-768.
[37]Finfer S, Chittock DR, Su SY, et al. Intensive versus conventional glucose control in critically ill patients. N Engl J Med. 2009;360(13):1283-1297.
[38]Annane D, Renault A, Brun-Buisson C, et al. Hydrocortisone plus Fludrocortisone for Adults with Septic Shock. N Engl J Med. 2018;378(9):809-818.
[39]Riesenberg LA, Leitzsch J, Massucci JL, et al. Residents' and attending physicians' handoffs: a systematic review of the literature. Acad Med. 2009;84(12):1775-1787.
[40]Levy MM, Evans LE, Rhodes A. The Surviving Sepsis Campaign Bundle: 2018 update. Intensive Care Med. 2018;44(6):925-928.
[41]Jones AE, Shapiro NI, Trzeciak S, Arnold RC, Claremont HA, Kline JA; Emergency Medicine Shock Research Network (EMShockNet) Investigators. Lactate clearance vs central venous oxygen saturation as goals of early sepsis therapy: a randomized clinical trial. JAMA. 2010;303(8):739-746.
[42]Wacker C, Prkno A, Brunkhorst FM, Schlattmann P. Procalcitonin as a diagnostic marker for sepsis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet Infect Dis. 2013;13(5):426-435.
[43]Schuetz P, Wirz Y, Sager R, et al. Effect of procalcitonin-guided antibiotic treatment on mortality in acute respiratory tract infections: a patient level meta-analysis. Lancet Infect Dis. 2018;18(1):95-107.
[44]de Jong E, van Oers JA, Beishuizen A, et al. Efficacy and safety of procalcitonin guidance in reducing the duration of antibiotic treatment in critically ill patients: a randomised, controlled, open-label trial. Lancet Infect Dis. 2016;16(7):819-827.
[45]Tabah A, Bassetti M, Kollef MH, et al. Antimicrobial de-escalation in critically ill patients: a position statement from a task force of the European Society of Intensive Care Medicine (ESICM) and European Society of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases (ESCMID) Critically Ill Patients Study Group (ESGCIP). Intensive Care Med. 2020;46(2):245-265.
[46]Crowley K, Kline JA. The effect of emergency department lactate elevation on time to antibiotics in patients admitted with suspected infection. J Emerg Med. 2013;44(3):616-622.
[47]Byrne L, Van Hise S, McNamara R, et al. Point-of-care lactate testing for sepsis at emergency department triage: a pilot study. CJEM. 2020;22(2):202-207.
[48]Howanitz PJ, Steindel SJ, Heard NV. Laboratory critical values policies and procedures: a college of American pathologists Q-Probes study in 623 institutions. Arch Pathol Lab Med. 2002;126(6):663-669.
[49]Timbrook TT, Morton JB, McConeghy KW, Caffrey AR, Mylonakis E, LaPlante KL. The Effect of Molecular Rapid Diagnostic Testing on Clinical Outcomes in Bloodstream Infections: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. Clin Infect Dis. 2017;64(1):15-23.