# National Institute for Health and Care Excellence

# Diagnostics consultation document

## Procalcitonin testing for diagnosing and monitoring sepsis (ADVIA Centaur BRAHMS PCT assay, BRAHMS PCT Sensitive Kryptor assay, Elecsys BRAHMS PCT assay, LIAISON BRAHMS PCT assay and VIDAS BRAHMS PCT assay)

The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) is producing guidance on using procalcitonin testing in the NHS in England. The Diagnostics Advisory Committee has considered the evidence submitted and the views of expert advisers.

**This document has been prepared for public consultation.** It summarises the evidence and views that have been considered, and sets out the draft recommendations made by the Committee. NICE invites comments from registered stakeholders, healthcare professionals and the public. This document should be read along with the evidence base (the diagnostics assessment report), which is available from http://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/indevelopment/gid-dt21/documents.

The Advisory Committee is interested in receiving comments on the following:

- Has all of the relevant evidence been taken into account?

- Are the summaries of clinical and cost effectiveness reasonable interpretations of the evidence?

- Are the provisional recommendations sound, and a suitable basis for guidance to the NHS?

**Equality issues**

NICE is committed to promoting equality of opportunity, eliminating unlawful discrimination and fostering good relations between people with particular protected characteristics and others. Please let us know if you think that the preliminary recommendations may need changing in order to meet these aims. In particular, please tell us if the preliminary recommendations:

- could have a different impact on people protected by the equality

Diagnostics consultation document: Procalcitonin testing for diagnosing and monitoring sepsis (ADVIA Centaur BRAHMS PCT assay, BRAHMS PCT Sensitive Kryptor assay, Elecsys BRAHMS PCT assay, LIAISON BRAHMS PCT assay and VIDAS BRAHMS PCT assay)

Issue date: June 2015

legislation than on the wider population, for example by making it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access the technology

- could have any adverse impact on people with a particular disability or disabilities.

**Note that this document is not NICE's final guidance on procalcitonin testing. The recommendations in section 1 may change after consultation.**

After consultation, the Committee will meet again to consider the evidence, this document and comments from the consultation. After considering these comments, the Committee will prepare its final recommendations, which will be the basis for NICE's guidance on the use of the technology in the NHS in England.

For further details, see the 'Diagnostics assessment programme manual' (available at https://www.nice.org.uk/about/what-we-do/our-programmes/nice-guidance/nice-diagnostics-guidance).

**Key dates:**

Closing date for comments: 24 June 2015

Second Diagnostics Advisory Committee meeting: 30 June 2015

# 1 Provisional recommendation

1.1 The procalcitonin tests (ADVIA Centaur BRAHMS PCT assay, BRAHMS PCT Sensitive Kryptor assay, Elecsys BRAHMS PCT assay, LIAISON BRAHMS PCT assay or VIDAS BRAHMS PCT assay) are recommended for use only in research for guiding decisions to:

- stop antibiotic treatment in people with confirmed or highly suspected sepsis in the intensive care unit or
- start and stop antibiotic treatment in people with suspected bacterial infection presenting to the emergency department.

# 2 The technologies

2.1 Procalcitonin is involved in maintaining calcium levels in the blood and is an indirect biomarker of infection. It is released into the circulation in response to pro-inflammatory stimuli, especially those that are bacterial in origin. Procalcitonin testing may be used to help clinicians to diagnose bacterial infection (that can cause sepsis) and guide decisions on starting antibiotic treatment. Procalcitonin levels are usually low in people with viral infections, chronic inflammatory disorders or autoimmune processes.

2.2 Thermo Fisher Scientific has a patent for the use of procalcitonin as a biomarker for sepsis. However, other companies have also licensed the use of procalcitonin and its antibodies. All commercial quantitative BRAHMS PCT assays use the same 'sandwich ELISA' principle to quantify procalcitonin by forming antibody–procalcitonin–antibody complexes. The main difference between these assays is the mechanism of detection of these complexes.

2.3 Five procalcitonin assays were identified during scoping as relevant to this assessment: the BRAHMS PCT Sensitive Kryptor assay (Thermo Fisher Scientific), the VIDAS BRAHMS PCT assay (bioMerieux), the ADVIA Centaur BRAHMS PCT assay (Siemens Healthcare Diagnostics), the Elecsys BRAHMS PCT assay (Roche Diagnostics), and the LIAISON BRAHMS PCT assay (DiaSorin). These assays have all been standardised using the BRAHMS PCT LIA assay (the original manual procalcitonin assay that is not in widespread use in the UK).

# 3 Clinical need and practice

## *The problem addressed*

3.1 The purpose of this assessment is to evaluate the clinical and cost effectiveness of using procalcitonin testing with standard clinical practice to guide antibiotic treatment in the following populations:

- Adults and children with confirmed or highly suspected sepsis in intensive care settings.
- Adults and children with suspected bacterial infection presenting to the emergency department.

3.2 Infections, such as pneumonia, may be caused by bacteria or viruses. Bacterial infections can be treated with antibiotics, whereas antibiotic treatment is inappropriate for viral infections. Many patients, especially children, are treated with antibiotics without the causative agent being known. Common side effects of antibiotics include mild stomach upset and diarrhoea. Less commonly, people may have an allergic reaction to an antibiotic. Furthermore, over-use of broad-spectrum antibiotics contributes to the development and spread of antimicrobial resistance. Therefore, rapid and accurate determination of the presence or absence of bacterial infection is important to reduce unnecessary exposure to antibiotics.

3.3 Sepsis is a common and serious problem among patients being treated in intensive care units. Bacteria are the most common cause of sepsis, but systemic viral and fungal infections can also occur. Symptoms of sepsis include fever or a very low body temperature, rapid breathing and altered mental status, such as reduced alertness or confusion. These symptoms also occur with systemic inflammatory response syndrome, a life-threatening condition which can be caused by the body's overreaction to an

infection or a non-infectious event such as trauma or burns. Clinicians must be able to rapidly distinguish between infectious and non-infectious causes of systemic inflammatory response syndrome, as well as between different agents of infection, in order to guide appropriate therapy.

3.4 Severe sepsis is one of the most common reasons for admission to an intensive care unit. It has a mortality rate of 40% to 60%, which increases by about 8% for every hour of delay in starting appropriate antibiotic treatment. Therefore broad-spectrum, high-potency antibiotics are widely used in intensive care units. It is important for clinicians to be able to monitor the progression of sepsis and the response to antibiotic treatment so that broad-spectrum antibiotic treatment can be narrowed or reduced (de-escalated) as soon as possible.

3.5 The Department of Health has set out actions to slow the development and spread of antimicrobial resistance in the UK Five Year Antimicrobial Resistance Strategy 2013 to 2018. One aim of the strategy is to conserve and steward the effectiveness of existing antimicrobials by ensuring antibiotics are used responsibly and less often. Rapid and accurate determination of the presence or absence of bacterial infection is important to guide appropriate antibiotic therapy and to reduce unnecessary exposure to antibiotics.

## The condition

3.6 The most common type of bacterial infection to present to the emergency department is respiratory tract infection. Lower respiratory tract infection includes: acute bronchitis; acute exacerbations of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease or asthma; and pneumonia. It is a major cause of sepsis in children and adults. In addition to the lungs, the most common sites of bacterial

infection leading to sepsis are the urinary tract, abdomen and pelvis. Sepsis can also result from skin infections (such as cellulitis), post-surgical infections and infections of the nervous system (such as meningitis or encephalitis).

3.7     Sepsis is the presence of systemic inflammatory response syndrome in addition to a documented or presumed infection. Untreated sepsis can progress to severe sepsis, resulting in sepsis-induced organ dysfunction. That is, when the body's response to infection interferes with the functioning of vital organs, such as the heart, kidneys, lungs or liver. Severe sepsis can progress to multiple organ failure causing septic shock.

3.8     Septic shock is defined as sepsis-induced hypotension (low blood pressure) that continues despite adequate fluid resuscitation. Septic shock prevents organs from getting enough oxygenated blood. Complications of septic shock can include respiratory failure, heart failure, kidney injury or failure, abnormal blood clotting, and death.

## *The diagnostic and care pathways*

3.9     A diagnosis of sepsis, according to the Surviving Sepsis Campaign guidelines should be based on infection, documented or suspected, plus some of the following criteria:

- General variables: temperature above 38.3°C or below 36°C; heart rate greater than 90 beats per minute; rapid breathing; altered mental status; significant oedema; and high blood sugar in the absence of diabetes.
- Inflammatory variables: low or high white blood cell count or more than 10% immature forms; raised plasma C-reactive protein; and raised plasma procalcitonin.

- Haemodynamic and tissue perfusion variables: low blood pressure; and raised blood lactate (a concentration of equal to or greater than 4 mmol per litre suggests tissue hypoperfusion).

- Organ dysfunction variables: low arterial blood oxygen; reduced urine output; increased creatinine levels (indicating impaired kidney function); coagulation abnormalities; absent bowel sounds; reduced platelet count; and raised plasma bilirubin levels.

3.10    The Surviving Sepsis Campaign guidelines make the following additional recommendations for diagnosing sepsis:

- Collect at least 2 sets of blood cultures (aerobic and anaerobic) before antimicrobial treatment if such cultures do not cause significant delay (more than 45 minutes) in the start of antimicrobial administration.

- Collect cultures from other sites that may be the source of infection, such as wounds, urine, cerebrospinal fluid, respiratory secretions or other body fluids, before antimicrobial treatment, if doing so does not cause significant delay in starting antimicrobial administration.

- Imaging studies, such as CT or X-ray, should be performed to confirm a potential source of infection.

3.11    The treatment of sepsis varies based on the initial infection, the organs affected and the extent of tissue damage. If sepsis is detected early enough it may be possible for patients to be treated with antibiotics in an outpatient setting. If sepsis is severe the patient is normally admitted to the intensive care unit and treated with empiric intravenous antibiotics (antibiotics selected based on experience without specific microbial information to support the decision).

3.12 The [Surviving Sepsis Campaign](#) guidelines make the following recommendations for managing sepsis:

- Initial resuscitation: carry out quantitative resuscitation of patients with sepsis-induced tissue hypoperfusion and meet target thresholds within the first 6 hours.
- Antimicrobial therapy: administer intravenous empiric antimicrobials within the first hour of diagnosing septic shock and severe sepsis. Assess antimicrobial treatment daily for potential de-escalation.
- Source control: make a rapid diagnosis of the specific site of infection and carry out source control measures.
- Other supportive therapy: may include intravenous fluid therapy, vasopressors and inotropes for prevention or correction of low blood pressure; administration of blood products; mechanical ventilation for sepsis-induced acute respiratory distress syndrome; sedation, analgesia and neuromuscular blockade; glucose control; renal replacement therapy; deep vein thrombosis prophylaxis; stress ulcer prophylaxis; and oral or enteral feeding.

3.13 NICE has published guidelines on the [diagnosis and management of community- and hospital-acquired pneumonia in adults](#).

# 4 The diagnostic tests

## *The intervention(s)*

### ADVIA Centaur BRAHMS PCT assay

4.1 The ADVIA Centaur BRAHMS PCT assay (Siemens Healthcare Diagnostics) is an automated chemiluminescent assay for the determination of procalcitonin in human serum and plasma. The assay principle combines a sandwich immunoassay with the

detection of light emission as the final step. It is indicated for use with the ADVIA Centaur/XP and ADVIA Centaur CP analysers. It has a measuring range of 0.02 to 75 nanograms per millilitre, a functional sensitivity of less than 0.05 nanograms per millilitre and an analytical sensitivity of less than 0.02 nanograms per millilitre. The time to result is 26 to 29 minutes, depending on the selected analyser.

**BRAHMS PCT Sensitive Kryptor assay**

4.2     The BRAHMS PCT Sensitive Kryptor assay (Thermo Fisher Scientific) is an automated immunofluorescent sandwich assay for the determination of procalcitonin in human serum and plasma. The measurement principle is based on TRACE™ Technology (Time-Resolved Amplified Cryptate Emission), which measures the signal that is emitted from an immunocomplex with time delay. It is indicated for use with the BRAHMS Kryptor, BRAHMS Kryptor compact and BRAHMS Kryptor compact PLUS analysers. The assay has a measuring range of 0.02 to 5000 nanograms per millilitre, a functional assay sensitivity of 0.06 nanograms per millilitre, and an analytical sensitivity of 0.02 nanograms per millilitre. The time to result is 19 minutes.

**Elecsys BRAHMS PCT assay**

4.3     The Elecsys BRAHMS PCT assay (Roche Diagnostics Limited) is an automated electrochemiluminescent immunoassay for the determination of procalcitonin in human serum and plasma. The assay principle combines a sandwich immunoassay with the detection of light emission by a photomultiplier. The assay is indicated for use on the Elecsys, Modular and Cobas e analysers. It has a measuring range of 0.02 to 100 nanograms per millilitre, a functional sensitivity of 0.06 nanograms per millilitre and an

analytical sensitivity of less than 0.02 nanograms per millilitre. The time to result is 18 minutes.

**LIAISON BRAHMS PCT assay**

4.4 The LIAISON BRAHMS PCT assay (DiaSorin) is a sandwich chemiluminescent immunoassay for the determination of procalcitonin in human serum and plasma. The assay principle combines a sandwich immunoassay with the detection of light emission by a photomultiplier. The assay is indicated for use with the LIAISON analyser. It has a measuring range of 0.1 to 500 nanograms per millilitre, a functional sensitivity of less than 0.24 nanograms per millilitre and an analytical sensitivity of less than 0.03 nanograms per millilitre.

**VIDAS BRAHMS PCT assay**

4.5 The VIDAS BRAHMS PCT assay (bioMerieux UK Ltd) is an automated enzyme-linked fluorescent assay for the determination of procalcitonin in human serum and plasma. The assay principle combines a sandwich immunoassay with a final fluorescent detection. It is indicated for use with the VIDAS and miniVIDAS analysers. It has a measuring range of 0.05 to 200 nanograms per millilitre, a functional detection limit of 0.09 nanograms per millilitre and an analytical detection limit of 0.05 nanograms per millilitre. The time to result is 20 minutes.

## *The comparator*

4.6 The comparator used in this assessment is treatment decisions based on standard clinical practice without procalcitonin testing.

# 5 Outcomes

The Diagnostics Advisory Committee (section 11) considered evidence from a number of sources (section 12).

## How outcomes were assessed

5.1    The External Assessment Group conducted a systematic review of the evidence on the clinical effectiveness of the use of procalcitonin testing with standard clinical practice to guide antibiotic therapy for:

- patients with confirmed or highly suspected sepsis in intensive care settings
- people presenting to the emergency department with suspected bacterial infection.

5.2    Studies were included in the review if they contained information on the following:

- Adults or children with confirmed or highly suspected sepsis, in whom antibiotic therapy is indicated, who are being treated in intensive care units; or, adults or children presenting to the emergency department with suspected bacterial infection.
- Treatment decisions based on standard clinical practice with laboratory procalcitonin testing (using any of the 5 tests described in sections 4.1– 4.5) compared with treatment decisions based on standard clinical practice without procalcitonin testing.
- At least 1 of the following outcomes:
  - antibiotic exposure (initiation/duration of antibiotic therapy)
  - resource use (number of hospital admissions, length of hospital or intensive care unit stay, costs)
  - adverse clinical outcomes (such as in-hospital mortality, condition-specific outcomes, antibiotic-related adverse events).

## Overview of included studies

5.3    In summary, 18 studies were included in the review; 8 studies were
       conducted in intensive care unit settings and 10 studies were
       conducted in emergency department settings.

5.4    Most of the included studies measured procalcitonin levels using
       the BRAHMS PCT Sensitive Kryptor assay. Two studies measured
       procalcitonin levels using the VIDAS BRAHMS PCT assay. The
       remaining 4 studies used quantitative procalcitonin assays, but did
       not specify the assay manufacturer.

5.5    There were 12 studies conducted in Europe (predominately
       Switzerland), 3 in China, and 1 in Brazil; no UK studies were
       identified. There were 2 studies (conference abstracts) that did not
       specify location.

5.6    The methodological quality of all included studies was appraised
       using the Cochrane risk of bias tool. Three studies were judged as
       having a high risk of bias and 1 as having a low risk of bias. All
       other studies were judged as having an unclear risk of bias
       because insufficient information was reported to make a judgement
       on 1 or more bias domains.

## Clinical effectiveness in intensive care unit settings

### Overview of studies

5.7    There were 8 randomised controlled trials that provided data on the
       effectiveness of using procalcitonin testing with standard clinical
       practice to guide antibiotic therapy in intensive care unit settings.
       All studies were conducted in adult populations. No studies
       conducted in paediatric intensive care unit settings met the
       inclusion criteria for the review.

5.8    There were 4 studies conducted in adults with confirmed or highly suspected sepsis, in whom antibiotic therapy was indicated. One study included adults being treated in an intensive care unit for suspected bacterial infection, or who developed sepsis during their stay. Two studies included adults being treated in intensive care unit settings who were considered to be at increased risk of developing sepsis (1 study in adults with acute pancreatitis and 1 study in adults with ventilator-associated pneumonia). The final study included adults who were being treated for suspected bacterial infections in intensive care unit settings.

5.9    There was 1 study that assessed the effectiveness of using procalcitonin testing with standard clinical practice to guide the start of antibiotic treatment. All of the other studies assessed the effectiveness of using procalcitonin testing with standard clinical practice to decide when to stop antibiotic treatment.

**Antibiotic duration**

5.10   There were 4 studies that reported data to allow the calculation of mean difference in the duration of antibiotic therapy between study arms. Two of these studies were conducted in patients with suspected or confirmed sepsis, 1 was conducted in patients with acute pancreatitis and 1 was conducted in patients with suspected bacterial infection and those who developed sepsis while in the intensive care unit. Three of these studies found that the addition of procalcitonin testing to standard clinical practice resulted in a statistically significant reduction in the mean duration of antibiotic therapy (Bouadma et al. 2010, Liu et al. 2013 and Qu et al. 2012). The fourth study found that the addition of procalcitonin testing to standard clinical practice was associated with a trend towards reduction in the duration of antibiotic therapy, which was not statistically significant (Nobre et al. 2008). The summary effect

estimate indicated that the use of procalcitonin testing in addition to standard clinical practice was associated with a statistically significant reduction in the duration of antibiotic therapy (weighted mean difference −3.19 days, 95% confidence interval [CI]: −5.44 to −0.95). However, between-study heterogeneity was high.

5.11    When the meta-analysis was restricted to the 2 studies conducted in populations with suspected or confirmed sepsis (Liu et al. 2013 and Nobre et al. 2008), the summary effect estimate still indicated that the addition of procalcitonin testing to standard clinical practice was associated with a statistically significant reduction in the duration of antibiotic therapy (weighted mean difference −1.20 days, 95% CI −1.33 to −1.07).

5.12    There were 3 further studies that reported median duration of antibiotic therapy. Two of these studies were conducted in people with suspected or confirmed sepsis, and found that the addition of procalcitonin testing to standard clinical practice had no statistically significant effect on the duration of antibiotic treatment (Annane et al. 2013 and Deliberato et al. 2013). The third study was conducted in adults with ventilator-associated pneumonia and found that the addition of procalcitonin testing to standard clinical practice was associated with a statistically significant reduction in the median duration of antibiotic therapy from 15 days to 10 days (Stolz et al. 2009).

**Duration of hospital stay**

5.13    There were 7 studies that reported lengths of hospital stay ranging from 11 to 27 days in the intervention groups (procalcitonin testing plus standard clinical practice) and from 11 days to 33 days in the control groups (standard clinical practice alone). Four of these studies reported data to allow the calculation of mean difference in the duration of hospital stay between study arms. Two of these

studies found that the addition of procalcitonin testing to standard clinical practice resulted in a statistically significant reduction in the mean duration of hospital stay (Liu et al. 2013 and Qu et al. 2012). One study found that addition of procalcitonin testing to standard clinical practice was associated with a trend towards reduction in the duration of hospital stay, which was not statistically significant (Nobre et al. 2008). The fourth study found that the addition of procalcitonin testing to standard clinical practice did not reduce the duration of hospital stay (Bouadma et al. 2010). The summary effect estimate indicated that the use of procalcitonin testing with standard clinical practice was associated with a statistically significant reduction in the duration of hospital stay (weighted mean difference −3.85 days, 95% CI −6.78 to −0.92). However, between-study heterogeneity was high.

5.14 Only 2 of the 4 studies were conducted in populations with suspected or confirmed sepsis (Liu et al. 2013 and Nobre et al. 2008). When the meta-analysis was restricted to the 2 studies, the summary effect estimate indicated that the addition of procalcitonin testing to standard clinical practice was associated with a greater reduction in duration of hospital stay (weighted mean difference −4.32 days, 95% CI −6.50 to −2.14).

5.15 There were 3 further studies that reported median duration of hospital stay. Of these, 2 were conducted in people with suspected or confirmed sepsis and 1 was conducted in people with ventilator-associated pneumonia. All found that the addition of a procalcitonin algorithm had no statistically significant effect on the duration of hospital stay (Annane et al. 2013, Deliberato et al. 2013 and Stolz et al. 2009).

**Duration of intensive care unit stay**

5.16    There were 6 studies that reported lengths of intensive care unit
        stay ranging from 3.5 to 22 days in the intervention groups
        (procalcitonin testing plus standard clinical practice) and from 3 to
        23 days in the control groups (standard clinical practice alone).
        Four of these studies reported data to allow the calculation of mean
        difference in the duration of intensive care unit stay between study
        arms. Two of these studies found that the addition of procalcitonin
        testing to standard clinical practice resulted in a statistically
        significant reduction in the mean duration of intensive care unit stay
        (Liu et al. 2013 and Qu et al. 2012). One study found that the
        addition of procalcitonin testing to standard clinical practice was
        associated with a trend towards reduction in the duration of
        intensive care unit stay, which was not statistically significant
        (Nobre et al. 2008). The fourth study found that the addition of
        procalcitonin testing to standard clinical practice did not reduce the
        duration of intensive care unit stay (Bouadma et al. 2010). The
        summary effect estimate indicated that the addition of procalcitonin
        testing to standard clinical practice was associated with a trend
        towards decreased duration of intensive care unit stay, which did
        not reach statistical significance (weighted mean difference
        −2.03 days, 95% CI −4.19 to 0.13). However, between-study
        heterogeneity was high.

5.17    As with previous outcomes, only 2 of the 4 studies were conducted
        in populations with suspected or confirmed sepsis (Liu et al. 2013
        and Nobre et al. 2008). When the meta-analysis was restricted to
        the 2 studies, the summary effect estimate indicated that the
        addition of procalcitonin testing to standard clinical practice was
        associated with a statistically significant reduction in the duration of
        intensive care unit stay (weighted mean difference −2.31 days,
        95% CI −3.97 to −0.65).

5.18     There were 2 further studies that reported median duration of intensive care unit stay. Both of these studies were conducted in people with suspected or confirmed sepsis and both found that the addition of procalcitonin testing to standard clinical practice had no statistically significant effect on the duration of intensive care unit stay (Annane et al. 2013 and Deliberato et al. 2013).

**Adverse clinical outcomes**

5.19     There were 5 studies that reported 28-day all-cause mortality (Bouadma et al. 2010, Liu et al. 2013, Nobre et al. 2008, Qu et al. 2012, and Stolz et al. 2009). All found no statistically significant difference in mortality rates between participants in the intervention group (procalcitonin testing plus standard clinical practice) and those in the control group (standard clinical practice alone). The summary relative risk was 0.98 (95% CI 0.76 to 1.27). This finding was consistent when the meta-analysis was restricted to studies conducted in people with suspected or confirmed sepsis (relative risk 1.07, 95% CI 0.54 to 2.12).

5.20     There was 1 study that reported mortality at 60 days and found no statistically significant difference between the intervention and control groups (relative risk 1.15, 95% CI 0.89 to 1.48; Bouadma et al. 2010). One further study reported mortality at 5 days and found no statistically significant difference between the intervention and control groups (relative risk 1.0, 95% CI 0.25 to 4.04; Annane et al. 2013).

5.21     There were 3 studies that reported intensive care unit mortality. All found no statistically significant difference in the intensive care unit mortality rate between the intervention and control groups (Annane et al. 2013, Deliberato et al. 2013 and Layios et al. 2012). The summary relative risk was 0.87 (95% CI 0.55 to 1.37). This finding was consistent when the meta-analysis was restricted to studies

conducted in people with suspected or confirmed sepsis (relative risk 0.59, 95% CI 0.27 to 1.28).

5.22    There were 4 studies that reported rates of infection relapse or recurrence. All found no statistically significant difference in the infection relapse or recurrence rate between the intervention and control groups (Bouadma et al. 2010, Deliberato et al. 2013, Liu et al. 2013 and Nobre et al. 2008). The summary relative risk was 1.37 (95% CI 0.77 to 2.44). This finding was consistent when the meta-analysis was restricted to the 3 studies conducted in people with suspected or confirmed sepsis (relative risk 1.89, 95% CI 0.47 to 7.59).

5.23    A variety of other general and disease-specific adverse clinical outcomes were reported by 1 or more studies. These included multi-drug-resistant infection, sepsis-related mortality, multiple organ dysfunction syndrome, ventilator-associated pneumonia-related clinical deterioration, duration of mechanical ventilation, and Sequential Organ Failure Assessment score at various time points. No study reported a statistically significant difference between the intervention and control groups for any adverse clinical outcome assessed. None of the studies reported antibiotic-related adverse events.

## *Clinical effectiveness in emergency department settings*

### Overview of studies

5.24    There were 10 randomised controlled trials that provided data on the effectiveness of using procalcitonin testing with standard clinical practice to guide antibiotic therapy in emergency department settings. Two studies were conducted in children and the rest in adults. Most studies were conducted in people with respiratory presentations.

5.25    Of the adult studies, 2 were conducted in people with lower
        respiratory tract infection, 3 were conducted in people with
        community-acquired pneumonia, 1 included people with chronic
        obstructive pulmonary disease exacerbations, 1 included people
        with suspected asthma exacerbations, and 1 was conducted in
        people with urinary tract infection. Of studies conducted in children,
        1 included children with lower respiratory tract infection and 1
        included children with community-acquired pneumonia.

**Antibiotic initiation**

5.26    There were 7 studies, conducted in adults, that assessed the
        effectiveness of using procalcitonin testing with standard clinical
        practice to guide the start of antibiotic treatment. All of these
        studies found that the addition of procalcitonin testing to standard
        clinical practice was associated with a reduction in antibiotic use
        (relative risk 0.77, 95% CI 0.68 to 0.87; Christ-Crain et al. 2004,
        Christ-Crain et al. 2006, Roh et al. 2010, Roh et al. 2013, Schuetz
        et al. 2009, Stolz et al. 2007, and Tang et al. 2013).

5.27    There were 2 studies conducted in children that reported
        contradictory results for the proportion of patients in the intervention
        and control groups who had antibiotic treatment. The study
        conducted in children with community-acquired pneumonia found
        that the addition of procalcitonin testing to standard clinical practice
        to decide whether to start antibiotic treatment was associated with
        a statistically significant reduction in antibiotic use (relative risk
        0.85, 95% CI 0.79 to 0.91; Esposito et al. 2011). Subgroup
        analyses indicated that procalcitonin testing was associated with a
        greater reduction in antibiotic use for children with mild community-
        acquired pneumonia (relative risk 0.69, 95% CI 0.59 to 0.80) than
        for children with severe community-acquired pneumonia (relative
        risk 0.96, 95% CI 0.92 to 1.01).

5.28    The study conducted in children with lower respiratory tract
        infection (including community-acquired pneumonia and non-
        community acquired pneumonia) reported a trend towards
        increased antibiotic use when procalcitonin test results were added
        to standard clinical practice (relative risk 1.12, 95% CI 0.94 to 1.35;
        Baer et al. 2013). Subgroup analyses indicated that for children
        presenting with non-community acquired pneumonia, the addition
        of procalcitonin testing to standard clinical practice was associated
        with a statistically significant increase in antibiotic use (relative risk
        2.71, 95% CI 1.46 to 5.01). But for children presenting with
        community-acquired pneumonia the addition of procalcitonin testing
        was associated with a trend towards reduction in antibiotic use
        (relative risk 0.92, 95% CI 0.79 to 1.08). When data from the
        2 studies on children presenting with community-acquired
        pneumonia were combined the summary relative risk was 0.86
        (95% CI 0.80 to 0.93).

**Antibiotic duration**

5.29    There were 2 studies conducted in adults that reported data to
        allow the calculation of mean difference in the duration of antibiotic
        therapy between study arms. Both of these studies found that the
        addition of procalcitonin testing to standard clinical practice resulted
        in a statistically significant reduction in the mean duration of
        antibiotic therapy (Christ-Crain et al. 2004 and Christ-Crain et al.
        2006). The summary effect estimate indicated that the addition of
        procalcitonin testing to standard clinical practice was associated
        with reduction in the duration of antibiotic therapy, which did not
        reach statistical significance (weighted mean difference −4.49
        days, 95% CI −9.59 to 0.61). However, these studies included
        patients who did not have antibiotics in their estimates of mean
        duration. Therefore an additional meta-analysis was conducted,
        excluding participants who did not have antibiotic treatment. The

summary effect estimate for patients who had antibiotic treatment (that is, weighted mean difference conditional upon receipt of antibiotics) was 1.48 days (95% CI −13.64 to 16.59).

5.30    There were 4 studies, conducted in adults, that reported median duration of antibiotic therapy, or mean with no estimate of variance. The results of these studies were consistent with the 2 studies included in the meta-analysis, indicating that the addition of procalcitonin testing to standard clinical practice was associated with a reduction in the duration of antibiotic therapy (Drozdov et al. 2014, Roh et al. 2010, Roh et al. 2013, and Schuetz et al. 2009).

5.31    There was 1 study, conducted in children, that reported data on the duration of antibiotic therapy. This study found the addition of procalcitonin testing to standard clinical practice was associated with a statistically significant reduction in the duration of antibiotic therapy (mean difference −1.8 days, 95% CI −3.1 to −0.5; Baer et al. 2013).

**Duration of hospital stay**

5.32    There were 6 included studies in adults that reported duration of hospital stay ranging from 8 to 12 days in the intervention groups (procalcitonin testing plus standard clinical practice) and from 8 to 16 days in the control groups (standard clinical practice alone). Two of these studies reported data to allow the calculation of mean difference in the duration of hospital stay between study arms. Neither study found a statistically significant difference between groups (Christ-Crain et al. 2004 and Christ-Crain et al. 2006). The summary-effect estimate indicated that addition of procalcitonin testing to standard clinical practice was associated with a non-significant trend towards reduction in the duration of hospital stay (weighted mean difference −0.80 days, 95% CI −2.37 to 0.78).

5.33    There were 4 studies conducted in adults that reported median duration of hospital stay, or mean with no estimate of variance. Two of these studies, both conducted in people with community-acquired pneumonia, reported results indicating that addition of procalcitonin testing to standard clinical practice was associated with a reduction in the duration of hospital stay (mean duration 9.2 days and 14.6 days [Roh et al. 2010]; mean duration 14.6 days and 16 days [Roh et al. 2013]). The remaining 2 studies, (1 conducted in people with lower respiratory tract infection and 1 conducted in people with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease exacerbations) found that use of a procalcitonin algorithm did not affect the median duration of hospital stay (Schuetz et al. 2009 and Stolz et al. 2007).

5.34    Both studies conducted in children reported data to allow the calculation of mean difference in the duration of hospital stay between study arms. These studies reported lengths of hospital stay ranging from 2.5 to 5.0 days in the intervention groups (procalcitonin testing plus standard clinical practice) and from 2.3 to 5.9 days in the control groups (standard clinical practice alone). When data on children presenting with community-acquired pneumonia were combined the summary effect estimate indicated that the addition of procalcitonin testing to standard clinical practice was associated with a small reduction in the duration of hospital stay (weighted mean difference −0.74 days, 95% CI −1.17 to −0.31; Baer et al. 2013 and Esposito et al. 2011).

5.35    One study reported data on duration of intensive care unit stay. This study was conducted in adults with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease exacerbations. It reported no statistically significant difference in the mean duration of intensive care unit stay between the study groups (mean difference −0.40, 95% CI −1.06 to 0.26; Stolz et al. 2007).

**Adverse clinical outcomes**

5.36    There were 2 studies in adults that reported hospital re-admission rates. One study was in people with acute asthma exacerbations and the other was in people with urinary tract infection. Both studies found no statistically significant difference in re-admission rates between participants in the intervention group (decision to stop antibiotics based on procalcitonin test result plus clinical judgement) and those in the control group (decision to stop antibiotics based on clinical judgement alone) (Drozdov et al. 2014 and Tang et al. 2013).

5.37    There were 2 studies (1 in adults with acute asthma exacerbations and 1 in adults with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease exacerbations) that reported the rate of secondary emergency department visits. Both found no statistically significant difference between the intervention and control groups (Stolz et al. 2007 and Tang et al. 2013).

5.38    There were 6 studies conducted in adults that reported all-cause mortality at various time points, ranging from 14 days to 6 months (Christ-Crain et al. 2004, Christ-Crain et al. 2006, Drozdov et al. 2014, Roh et al. 2010, Roh et al. 2013, Schuetz et al. 2009, Stolz et al. 2007 and Tang et al. 2013). All studies reported no statistically significant difference in mortality rates between the intervention and control groups. The summary relative risk was 0.95 (95% CI 0.71 to 1.27). This finding was consistent when the meta-analysis was restricted to the 2 studies reporting mortality at 6 months (relative risk 0.85, 95% CI 0.46 to 1.59). Neither of the 2 studies conducted in children reported mortality data.

5.39    There were 4 studies conducted in adults that reported data on rates of admission to the intensive care unit. All studies found no statistically significant difference in intensive care unit admissions

between the intervention and control groups (summary relative risk 0.79, 95% CI 0.59 to 1.05; Stolz et al. 2007, Christ-Crain et al. 2004, Christ-Crain et al. 2006 and Schuetz et al. 2009). Neither of the 2 studies conducted in children reported any information on intensive care unit admissions.

5.40    There were 2 studies, conducted in adults, that reported inconsistent results with respect to rates of infection relapse or recurrence. One study, in adults with urinary tract infection, found no statistically significant difference in relapse or recurrence rates between the intervention and control groups (Drozdov et al. 2014). The second study, in adults with lower respiratory tract infection, found that the addition of procalcitonin testing to standard clinical practice was associated with a statistically significant reduction in infection relapse or recurrence rates (relative risk 0.57, 95% CI 0.36 to 0.92; Schuetz et al. 2009). One study, conducted in children with community-acquired pneumonia, reported very low rates of infection relapse or recurrence and a non-significant trend towards lower rates in the intervention group (relative risk 0.23, 95% CI 0.04 to 1.34; Esposito et al. 2011).

5.41    There was 1 study, conducted in adults with lower respiratory tract infection, which reported numbers of participants experiencing antibiotic-related adverse events. This study found that the addition of procalcitonin testing to standard clinical practice was associated with a reduction in antibiotic-related adverse events (relative risk 0.71, 95% CI 0.58 to 0.86).

5.42    Both studies conducted in children reported numbers of participants experiencing antibiotic-related adverse events (Baer et al. 2013 and Esposito et al. 2011). When data on children with community-acquired pneumonia were combined, results indicated that the addition of procalcitonin testing to standard clinical practice was

associated with a non-significant reduction in antibiotic-related adverse events (relative risk 0.37, 95% CI 0.04 to 3.49). This finding was consistent when data for all participants in both studies were included in the meta-analysis (summary relative risk 0.40, 95% CI 0.06 to 2.78).

5.43    A variety of other general and disease-specific adverse clinical outcomes were reported by 1 or more studies. These included composite adverse outcome measures, need for steroids, need for mechanical ventilation, and complications from pneumonia. No study reported a statistically significant difference between the intervention and control groups for any adverse clinical outcome.

## Costs and cost effectiveness

### Systematic review of cost effectiveness evidence

5.44    The External Assessment Group conducted a search to identify existing economic evaluations of people with sepsis or bacterial infection having care in emergency departments or intensive care units. Two studies were considered eligible for inclusion in the systematic review.

5.45    There was 1 study (Michaelidis et al. 2013) that considered procalcitonin testing in 2 scenarios. The first analysis was based on adults with an acute respiratory tract infection presenting to an outpatient clinic and judged by their physicians to need an antibiotic prescription. The second analysis was based on adults with an acute respiratory tract infection presenting to an outpatient clinic before any decision to start antibiotic therapy. Procalcitonin-guided antibiotic therapy was both more costly and more effective than standard care alone. The incremental cost-effectiveness ratios were $118,828 and $575,249 per quality-adjusted life year (QALY) gained for the first and second analyses respectively.

5.46    The second study (Smith et al. 2013) considered the cost
        effectiveness of procalcitonin-guided antibiotic therapy in adults
        with community-acquired pneumonia in a hospital setting.
        Procalcitonin-guided antibiotic therapy was both more costly and
        more effective compared with standard care alone. For patients
        with low-risk community-acquired pneumonia, procalcitonin-guided
        antibiotic initiation is likely to be cost-effective if the maximum
        acceptable incremental cost effectiveness ratio (ICER) was
        $90,000 per QALY gained. For the same patients, procalcitonin-
        guided antibiotic initiation and monitoring is likely to be cost-
        effective if the maximum acceptable ICER was $40,000 per QALY
        gained. For patients with high-risk community-acquired pneumonia,
        procalcitonin-guided antibiotic initiation and monitoring is likely to
        be cost-effective if the maximum acceptable ICER was $170,000
        per QALY gained.

**Economic analysis**

5.47    The External Assessment Group developed a de novo economic
        model designed to assess the cost effectiveness of the addition of
        procalcitonin testing to standard clinical practice compared with
        standard clinical practice alone for:

- adults with confirmed or highly-suspected sepsis in an intensive
  care unit setting
- adults with suspected bacterial infection presenting to the
  emergency department
- children with suspected bacterial infection presenting to the
  emergency department.

5.48    Children with confirmed or highly-suspected sepsis in an intensive
        care unit setting were not considered because there was
        insufficient clinical evidence.

*Model structure*

5.49    There were 2 decision tree models constructed:

- one in the intensive care unit setting that incorporated discontinuation of antibiotics only
- one in the emergency department setting that incorporated both starting and stopping antibiotics.

5.50    The structures of both models start with a decision node that denotes the use of procalcitonin testing in addition to standard clinical practice or standard clinical practice alone. The key endpoints are:

- alive with antibiotic-related complications
- alive without antibiotic-related complications
- death.

5.51    The time horizon is 6 months (183 days), divided into an initial short-term (28 days) phase and a subsequent phase of 155 days. This time horizon was adopted to be consistent with the outcomes reported in the studies included in the clinical-effectiveness systematic review.

5.52    A 'lower clinical extreme' and a 'higher clinical extreme' were specified for each population and setting. For these 'clinical extremes', different baseline values were used for: mortality; duration of antibiotic therapy; probability of starting antibiotic treatment (emergency department setting only); length of hospital stay; and length of stay in an intensive care unit. The same relative risks and mean difference estimates were applied for both clinical extremes.

*Model inputs − all-cause mortality and adverse events*

5.53    The baseline probabilities and relative risks for all-cause mortality
        were taken from the systematic review of clinical effectiveness.
        Results from meta-analysis were used where possible. When a
        meta-analysis result was not available, data from the most
        plausible single source was chosen. Mortality rates for children
        presenting to the emergency department with suspected bacterial
        infection were not available from the systematic review. Therefore
        national background mortality rates were assumed, based on the
        expert opinion that mortality rates for children presenting to the
        emergency department are close to 0.

5.54    Antibiotic-related adverse events were incorporated in the
        economic model through the time on antibiotic treatment, using a
        disutility for having antibiotic treatment. Disease-specific
        complications were not included in the economic model and
        therefore were assumed to be equal for the intervention and control
        groups.

*Health state utilities*

5.55    Searches were undertaken to locate relevant utility value studies on
        adults and children with sepsis or bacterial infection presenting to,
        or being treated at, emergency departments and intensive care
        units.

5.56    For adults being treated in the intensive care unit, a utility of 0.53
        was used for the initial short-term phase, and a utility of 0.68 was
        used for the subsequent phase (Drabinski et al. 2001).

5.57    No utility values were identified for adults presenting to the
        emergency department with suspected infection. Therefore, utility
        values for adults presenting to primary care with lower respiratory

tract infection were used; 0.70 for the initial short-term phase and 0.86 for the subsequent phase (Oppong et al. 2013).

5.58    For children presenting to the emergency department, a constant base utility of 0.99 was assumed (utility for local infection; Bennett et al. 2000).

5.59    To incorporate antibiotic-related adverse events in adults being treated in the intensive care unit, a disutility of 0.046 for being on antibiotic treatment was used (Oppong et al. 2013).

*Costs and resource use*

5.60    Resource use consisted of duration of hospital stay (days), intensive care unit stay (days) and antibiotic treatment duration (days). The estimates were retrieved from studies identified in the systematic review of clinical effectiveness. Results from meta-analysis were used where possible. When a meta-analysis result was not available, data from the most plausible single source were chosen. Where necessary, data were identified through consultation with experts for unpublished data.

5.61    Cost data were drawn from routine NHS sources (for example, NHS reference costs and British National Formulary) and information provided by manufacturers of the procalcitonin tests.

5.62    An average unit price for the procalcitonin test was calculated to be £13.79, based on the list prices of the tests (excluding the VAT) and with no discounts assumed. Overhead costs including capital, service and maintenance, and calibration costs were included. These were calculated from the initial capital costs, the lifetime of the assay (assumed to be 5 years) and the average number of tests per day (assumed to be 272). A similar estimation was performed for the maintenance and calibration costs.

*Base-case analysis*

5.63    The following assumptions were applied in the base-case analysis:

- The duration of hospital stay retrieved from the systematic review of clinical effectiveness included days in hospital after infection relapse or recurrence.

- Relative risks for all-cause mortality for children presenting to the emergency department were assumed to be equal to those for adults presenting to the emergency department.

- There was no disutility for the hospital stay.

- The baseline utility for children presenting to the emergency department was constant over time.

- The disutility for being on antibiotic treatment was equal for all settings and populations.

- Procalcitonin testing used for starting antibiotics in the emergency department and stopping antibiotics in the intensive care unit was used to calculate the average number of tests per day.

- There were no costs associated with antibiotic-related adverse events.

- There were no differences in disease specific complications between the group with procalcitonin testing and the group without procalcitonin testing.

- There were no differences in long-term costs and effects between the group with procalcitonin testing and the group without procalcitonin testing.

5.64    Base-case analyses indicate that procalcitonin testing with standard clinical practice dominates standard clinical practice alone for all populations, that is, it was both cost-saving and more effective.

5.65    The cost savings ranged from £368 for children with suspected bacterial infection presenting to the emergency department (lower clinical extreme) to £3268 for adults with confirmed or highly-suspected sepsis in an intensive care unit setting (lower clinical extreme).

5.66    The use of procalcitonin testing with standard clinical practice resulted in only a small QALY gain compared with standard clinical practice alone. For adults with suspected bacterial infection presenting to the emergency department this was 0.005 for the lower and higher clinical extremes and for adults with confirmed or highly-suspected sepsis in the intensive care unit setting it was 0.001 for both clinical extremes. For children with suspected bacterial infection presenting to the emergency department, the QALY gains were less than 0.001 for both clinical extremes.

5.67    Procalcitonin testing with standard clinical practice always has a higher probability of being cost effective than standard clinical practice alone if the maximum acceptable ICER is between £0 to £60,000 per QALY gained. If the maximum acceptable ICER is £20,000 per QALY gained the probability of procalcitonin testing with standard clinical practice being cost effective compared with standard clinical practice alone is:

- 85% and 98% respectively for the lower and higher clinical extremes for children with suspected bacterial infection presenting to the emergency department.
- 88% for adults with suspected bacterial infection presenting to the emergency department (both clinical extremes).
- 97% and 95% respectively for the lower and higher clinical extremes for adults with confirmed or highly-suspected sepsis in an intensive care unit setting.

***Analysis of alternative scenarios***

5.68    The following scenario analyses were performed to assess the impact of assumptions on the estimated outcomes:

- assume no difference in mortality
- assume an increased cost of £50 per test
- assume no overhead costs for the tests
- alternative utility value for adults on the intensive care unit
- assume no disutility for being on antibiotic treatment
- assume no difference in duration of antibiotic treatment
- assume no difference in hospital stay (including intensive care unit stay)
- assume lower prices for hospital and intensive care unit stay
- assume that procalcitonin testing in the emergency department was solely used to start antibiotic treatment (not to stop antibiotic treatment).

5.69    The scenario analyses that assumed no difference in hospital stay had a substantial impact on all populations and settings. Treatment based on procalcitonin testing with standard clinical practice became more costly (incremental costs varied between £7 for adults in the intensive care unit and £25 for children in the emergency department) and remained more effective (QALY gain varied between less than 0.001 for children in the emergency department and 0.007 for adults in the intensive care unit) compared with standard clinical practice alone. For children presenting to the emergency department with suspected bacterial infection, this resulted in ICERs of £287,076 per QALY gained for the lower clinical extreme and £35,219 per QALY gained for the higher clinical extreme. For adults in both settings (and both clinical extremes), ICERs varied between £3390 and £3948 per QALY gained.

5.70    None of the other scenario analyses resulted in substantial changes to the base-case ICERs, and use of procalcitonin testing with standard clinical practice remained cost effective compared with standard clinical practice alone.

*One-way sensitivity analyses*

5.71    One-way sensitivity analyses were performed for all stochastic input parameters between the 95% confidence intervals.

5.72    The one-way sensitivity analysis on relative mortality risk for adults with suspected bacterial infection presenting to the emergency department resulted in substantial changes to the base-case ICERs. Analyses showed that when using the upper bound of the 95% confidence interval (1.590; base-case value 0.850) procalcitonin testing with standard clinical practice guided treatment was less costly (£772) and less effective (QALY loss 0.025) compared with standard clinical practice alone. This resulted in ICERs of £30,469 per QALY lost (lower clinical extreme) and £30,446 per QALY lost (higher clinical extreme).

5.73    None of the other one-way sensitivity analyses resulted in substantial changes to the base-case ICERs, and use of procalcitonin testing with standard clinical practice remained cost effective compared with standard clinical practice alone.

# 6      Considerations

6.1     The Diagnostics Advisory Committee reviewed the evidence available on the clinical and cost effectiveness of using procalcitonin testing with standard clinical practice to guide antibiotic therapy in the following populations: adults and children with confirmed or highly-suspected sepsis in intensive care settings; and adults and children with suspected bacterial infection presenting to the emergency department.

6.2    The Committee considered the role of procalcitonin and noted that it is a biomarker for bacterial infection. It noted that other biomarkers used in the diagnosis and monitoring of infection and sepsis, such as C-reactive protein and white blood cell count are inflammatory markers and are not specific to bacterial infection.

6.3    The Committee considered the equivalence of the 5 assays for procalcitonin testing which were included in the scope. It noted that the majority of studies measured procalcitonin levels using the BRAHMS PCT Sensitive Kryptor assay and 2 studies measured procalcitonin levels using the VIDAS BRAHMS PCT assay. No relevant studies were identified which used the ADVIA Centaur BRAHMS PCT assay, the Elecsys BRAHMS PCT assay, or the LIAISON BRAHMS PCT assay. The Committee heard from the manufacturers that they consider all assays to be comparable as they all use the same capture and detection antibodies in an immunoassay format. It also heard from the External Assessment Group that all assays have been standardised using the BRAHMS PCT LIA assay. The Committee noted that the Kryptor analyser is not widely available in NHS laboratories and therefore there may be a cost impact for laboratories in purchasing the Kryptor analyser. The Committee concluded that the procalcitonin assays could be considered technically comparable and noted that this meant NHS laboratories would have flexibility in the choice of analyser.

6.4    The Committee considered the quality of the studies included in the systematic review of clinical effectiveness. It noted that the External Assessment Group generally considered the studies to be at unclear risk of bias because insufficient information was reported in the publications. The Committee also noted that most studies included a small number of patients and reported low event numbers; they were not sufficiently powered to detect a difference

in outcomes between groups. In addition, several studies reported median results that could not be incorporated into the summary estimates and the economic model. The Committee concluded that these factors contributed to the uncertainty in clinical effectiveness.

6.5     The Committee considered the implications of adding procalcitonin testing to standard clinical practice in intensive care unit settings and in the emergency department. It noted that clinical outcome results, such as mortality, infection relapse or recurrence and re-admission rates, were not statistically significantly different between participants in the intervention groups (procalcitonin testing plus standard clinical practice) and those in the control groups (standard clinical practice alone). The Committee concluded that the use of procalcitonin testing with standard clinical practice is unlikely to result in worse clinical outcomes compared with standard clinical practice alone.

## Intensive care unit settings

6.6     The Committee considered the impact on resource use of adding procalcitonin testing to standard clinical practice in intensive care unit settings. The Committee noted that most studies found reductions in resource use when procalcitonin was added to standard clinical care. However, the Committee noted that studies included in the review were conducted in Switzerland, France, Belgium, Brazil and China; no UK studies were included. It further noted that many of the studies were conducted and published several years ago, and that clinical practice in terms of antibiotic stewardship has changed considerably in the last few years. The Committee therefore considered whether the results of these studies were generalisable to the NHS. The Committee heard from the External Assessment Group that many of the studies did not clearly report how treatment decisions were made in the control

arms. The Committee heard from clinical experts that where details of the control arm were reported, they did not reflect current standard clinical practice in the UK. The Committee also heard from clinical experts that in NHS intensive care units, antibiotic stewardship is considered daily during ward rounds that include microbiologists and intensivists (doctors who specialise in the care and treatment of patients in intensive care). Further, intensive care units are often at maximum occupancy so clinicians have to work efficiently to discharge patients who no longer need intensive care. The Committee therefore concluded that in the intensive care unit setting, the reductions in resource use reported in the included studies when procalcitonin was added to standard clinical practice were unlikely to be realised in the NHS.

6.7    The Committee considered the potential reasons for the reduction in resource use in intensive care unit settings reported in included studies. The Committee discussed whether the reductions were directly due to the use of procalcitonin, or whether the reductions may be due to the introduction of a clinical protocol which included use of a biomarker. It heard from clinical experts that in intensive care unit settings in the UK, protocols are used to guide care. The Committee noted that it was unclear if protocols were used to guide care in the control arms in the studies included in the systematic review, whereas the intervention arms included a procalcitonin algorithm with defined thresholds. The Committee concluded that in intensive care unit settings they could not be certain whether the reductions in resource use in the included studies were caused by use of procalcitonin or by use of a clinical protocol. Therefore, as clinical protocols are standard clinical practice in the NHS, the Committee also concluded that it is uncertain whether the potential reduction in resource in intensive care settings would be realised

from the introduction of procalcitonin testing into protocol-guided care.

6.8 The Committee noted that no studies were identified that were conducted in children with confirmed or highly-suspected sepsis in intensive care unit settings. It considered whether the data identified in an adult population could apply to children. It heard from clinical experts that a large proportion of children in paediatric intensive care units are younger than 1 year and are likely to have different care and resource needs. The Committee therefore concluded that data on adults in an intensive care unit should not be extrapolated to children.

## *Emergency department settings*

6.9 The Committee considered the impact on resource use of adding procalcitonin testing to standard clinical practice in the emergency department. As with the intensive care unit setting (section 6.6), the Committee noted that most studies found reductions in resource use when procalcitonin testing was added to standard clinical practice. It noted further that studies were conducted in Switzerland, China and Italy, and that more than half of included studies were published before 2012. The Committee heard from clinical experts that in the emergency department there is much more variation in clinical assessment and in the decision to give antibiotics, compared with the intensive care unit. The Committee heard further from clinical experts that for patients with suspected bacterial infection at low risk of sepsis, clinical assessment can be variable, and therefore the clinical benefits of adding procalcitonin to standard clinical practice are uncertain. The Committee also heard from clinical experts that severely ill patients at high risk of sepsis would have care according to a clinical protocol and in line with the Surviving Sepsis Campaign guidelines. The Committee

concluded it was uncertain whether the reductions in resource use found in studies conducted in other countries would be applicable to the NHS.

6.10 The Committee noted that the majority of the studies included in the systematic review of clinical effectiveness in an emergency department setting were conducted in people with suspected bacterial infection in the lungs. The Committee considered whether the data identified would be applicable for suspected bacterial infections in other sites. The Committee heard from clinical experts that for bacterial infections such as urinary tract infections, other tests are available which can be used to make a diagnosis. It also heard that lower respiratory tract infections are more difficult to diagnose compared with bacterial infections in other sites. The Committee concluded that the results from the systematic review could not be applied to patients with suspected bacterial infection outside of the lungs presenting to the emergency department.

6.11 The Committee noted that the studies conducted in emergency department settings included many patients who were sent home without antibiotics. This reduced the number of patients from whom resource use data could be gathered and therefore increased the uncertainty in the results, leading to fewer statistically significant reductions in resource use compared with studies conducted in intensive care units.

6.12 The Committee considered the heterogeneity of the populations in the emergency department studies and noted that they included a wide range of conditions (lower respiratory tract infections including community-acquired pneumonia, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease exacerbations, severe asthma exacerbations, urinary tract infection). The Committee noted that some studies reported conflicting results when analysing different subgroups of patients.

For example, the study by Esposito et al. (2011) found that using procalcitonin testing with standard clinical practice was associated with a greater reduction in antibiotic use for children with mild community-acquired pneumonia than for children with severe community-acquired pneumonia. The Committee discussed whether the benefits of procalcitonin testing in severely ill patients at high risk of sepsis might be different from the benefits in less severely ill patients. The Committee concluded that the heterogeneity in the populations resulted in a high-level uncertainty about the benefits of procalcitonin testing that would be realised in clinical practice. It considered that focused studies in explicitly-defined patient groups were needed to address this uncertainty.

6.13    The Committee noted that there were limited data on children presenting to the emergency department with suspected bacterial infection. It heard from clinical experts that over the last decade there has been a 28% increase in the number of children with suspected bacterial infection admitted to hospital following presentation to an emergency department because of an increased uncertainty and lack of confidence in clinical assessment. The Committee was concerned that without robust evidence the introduction of procalcitonin testing into standard clinical practice may not reduce the use of antibiotic therapy, but could potentially increase antibiotic exposure and hospital admissions.

6.14    The Committee considered trials in progress and noted that the 'Stop antibiotics on guidance of procalcitonin study' (SAPS) has recently been completed and results should be available soon. The Committee noted that this study is much larger than any of the studies included in the systematic review of clinical effectiveness (estimated 1800 patients). The Committee also considered an Australian study, published after the completion of the systematic review of clinical effectiveness (Shehabi et al. 2014), which found

that using procalcitonin testing with standard clinical care in adults in an intensive care unit did not significantly reduce the duration of antibiotics. The Committee noted that the control arm of this study included antimicrobial stewardship implemented by infectious diseases twice-weekly rounds, which is similar to standard clinical care in the UK. However, the Committee also heard from the External Assessment Group that this study used a lower threshold for determining discontinuation of antibiotics compared with the studies included in the systematic review (0.1 nanograms per millilitre and 2.5 nanograms per millilitre), which would likely impact on the results. The Committee requested further information on both of these studies to be available for discussion at the second Committee meeting.

6.15    The Committee considered the long-term outcomes that may occur following sepsis and noted that no evidence was identified on these long-term outcomes. It heard from a patient expert on the Committee that post-sepsis syndrome affects up to 50% of survivors, and constitutes: insomnia; nightmares, vivid hallucinations and panic attacks; disabling muscle and joint pains; extreme fatigue, poor concentration and decreased cognitive functioning; and loss of self-esteem. In some cases, post-sepsis syndrome can lead to post-traumatic stress disorder, which, without the correct support, can last for years. Additionally, survivors of sepsis may be more vulnerable to developing respiratory viral infections than the general population. The Committee concluded that future research should consider including long-term outcomes to more fully capture the impact of sepsis on patients.

6.16    The Committee considered the use of length of stay as an outcome measure in studies of procalcitonin. It noted that length of stay may be influenced by factors other than procalcitonin testing, such as differences in local protocols and preferences of treating clinicians.

The Committee concluded that measuring length of stay may not reliably capture the potential benefits of procalcitonin testing and future research should consider the use of different outcome measures.

6.17    The Committee considered the assumptions used in the economic model. Firstly, the Committee discussed the assumption that there were no differences in disease-specific complications between the intervention and control groups. It heard from the External Assessment Group that studies generally reported these complications as a compound outcome which could not be separated out, and that no statistically significant difference was found between the groups. The Committee concluded that the assumption was valid. Secondly, the Committee considered the assumption that a laboratory would perform 272 procalcitonin tests per day. The Committee considered that this might be an overestimate, especially for smaller hospital laboratories. The Committee heard from the External Assessment Group that this value was used to calculate the overhead costs per test, and that in sensitivity analyses varying the total test cost by 10 fold did not impact the cost-effectiveness results. The Committee requested clarification on the number of procalcitonin tests per day for discussion at the second meeting.

6.18    The Committee considered the time horizon used in the model. It noted that the time horizon used in the model is 6 months (183 days), divided into an initial short-term (28 days) phase and a subsequent phase lasting 155 days. It noted that this time horizon reflected the outcomes reported in the studies included in the systematic review of clinical effectiveness, which did not report data on long-term outcomes. The Committee concluded that the time horizon used was appropriate given the clinical data available.

6.19    The Committee considered the cost effectiveness of adding procalcitonin testing to standard clinical practice in intensive care unit settings and in the emergency department. It noted that in all scenarios assessed, procalcitonin testing with standard clinical practice dominated standard clinical practice alone, that is, it was more effective and less costly. However the Committee acknowledged that the change in quality-adjusted life years (QALYs) was extremely small. The Committee noted its earlier conclusion that the use of procalcitonin testing with standard clinical practice is unlikely to result in worse clinical outcomes compared with standard clinical practice alone (section 6.5). It therefore concluded that the QALYs for each group could be considered broadly equal, that is, the addition of procalcitonin to standard care does not result in a meaningful change in QALYs.

6.20    The Committee considered whether the cost savings generated through reductions in resource use are large enough to offset the additional cost of procalcitonin testing. It noted its earlier conclusion about the uncertainty of whether the reductions in resource use reported in the studies included in the systematic review would be realised in clinical practice in the NHS (sections 6.6, 6.7 and 6.9). The Committee therefore concluded that it is uncertain whether savings would be large enough in a UK setting to offset the cost of procalcitonin testing.

6.21    The Committee noted that procalcitonin testing is currently used with standard clinical care in a few centres in the UK to guide decisions on antibiotic treatment in emergency departments and intensive care units. The Committee acknowledged that the evidence suggests that the addition of procalcitonin testing to standard clinical care is unlikely to result in worse clinical outcomes (section 6.5). The Committee encourages centres currently using procalcitonin testing to take part in relevant research.

# 7 Proposed recommendation for further research

7.1 The Committee recommended that robust evidence is generated to demonstrate the impact of adding procalcitonin testing to standard clinical practice in the NHS, to guide the use of antibiotic therapy in people with confirmed or highly-suspected sepsis in intensive care units and in people with suspected bacterial infections presenting to the emergency department. The impact on resource use when procalcitonin testing is used in combination with protocol-driven clinical care in the NHS is of particular relevance. Focused studies in explicitly-defined patient groups and the collection of data for longer-term clinical outcomes of sepsis that contribute to post-sepsis syndromes, are encouraged.

# 8 Implementation

NICE will support this guidance through a range of activities to promote the recommendations for further research. The research proposed will be considered by the NICE Medical Technologies Evaluation Programme research facilitation team for the development of specific research trial protocols as appropriate. NICE will also incorporate the research recommendations in section 7 into its guidance research recommendations database (available on the [NICE website](#)) and highlight these recommendations to public research bodies.

# 9 Related NICE guidance

**Published**

- [Pneumonia: Diagnosis and management of community- and hospital-acquired pneumonia in adults](#) (2014) NICE guideline CG191
- [Intravenous fluid therapy in adults in hospital](#) (2013) NICE guideline CG174

- [Feverish illness in children: Assessment and initial management in children younger than 5 years](#) (2013) NICE guideline CG160

- [Neutropenic sepsis: Prevention and management of neutropenic sepsis in cancer patients](#) (2012) NICE guideline CG151

- [Antibiotics for early-onset neonatal infection: Antibiotics for the prevention and treatment of early-onset neonatal infection](#) (2012) NICE guideline CG149

- [Prevention and control of healthcare-associated infections: Quality improvement guide](#) (2011) NICE public health guidance 36

- [The management of bacterial meningitis and meningococcal septicaemia in children and young people younger than 16 years in primary and secondary care](#) (2010) NICE guideline CG102

- [Diarrhoea and vomiting caused by gastroenteritis: diagnosis, assessment and management in children younger than 5 years](#) (2009) NICE guideline CG84

- [Surgical site infection: Prevention and treatment of surgical site infection](#). (2008) NICE guideline CG74

- [Urinary tract infection in children: Diagnosis, treatment and long-term management](#) (2007) NICE guideline CG54

**Under development**

NICE is developing the following guidance (details available from [the NICE website](#)):

- Antimicrobial stewardship. NICE clinical guideline. Publication expected: July 2015.

- Intravenous fluids therapy in children. NICE clinical guideline. Publication expected: October 2015.

- Antimicrobial resistance: changing risk-related behaviours. NICE public health guidance. Publication expected: March 2016.

- Sepsis: The LightCycler SeptiFast Test MGRADE, SepsiTest and IRIDICA BAC BSI assay for rapidly identifying bloodstream bacteria and fungi. NICE diagnostics guidance. Publication expected: March 2016.
- Sepsis: the recognition, diagnosis and management of severe sepsis. NICE clinical guideline. Publication expected: July 2016.

# 10    Review

NICE updates the literature search at least every 3 years to ensure that relevant new evidence is identified. NICE will contact product sponsors and other stakeholders about issues that may affect the value of the diagnostic technology. NICE may review and update the guidance at any time if significant new evidence becomes available.

Adrian Newland

Chair, Diagnostics Advisory Committee

May 2015

# 11    Diagnostics Advisory Committee members and NICE project team

## *Diagnostics Advisory Committee*

The Diagnostics Advisory Committee is an independent committee consisting of 22 standing members and additional specialist members. A list of the Committee members who participated in this assessment appears below.

**Standing Committee members**

**Professor Adrian Newland**

Chair, Diagnostics Advisory Committee

**Dr Mark Kroese**

Vice Chair, Diagnostics Advisory Committee and Consultant in Public Health Medicine, PHG Foundation, Cambridge and UK Genetic Testing Network

**Professor Ron Akehurst**

Professor in Health Economics, School of Health and Related Research, University of Sheffield

**Professor Paul Collinson**

Consultant Chemical Pathologist and Professor of Cardiovascular Biomarkers, St George's Hospital, St George's University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust

**Dr Sue Crawford**

GP Principal, Chillington Health Centre

**Professor Ian A Cree**

Senior Clinical Advisor, National Institute for Health Research Evaluation Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, University of Southampton

**Professor Erika Denton**

National Clinical Director for Diagnostics, NHS England and Honorary

Professor of Radiology, University of East Anglia and Norfolk and Norwich University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust

**Dr Steve Edwards**

Head of Health Technology Assessment, BMJ Evidence Centre

**Mr David Evans**

Lay member

**Dr Simon Fleming**

Consultant in Clinical Biochemistry and Metabolic Medicine, Royal Cornwall Hospitals NHS Trust

**Mr John Hitchman**

Lay member

**Professor Chris Hyde**

Professor of Public Health and Clinical Epidemiology, Peninsula Technology Assessment Group

**Mr Matthew Lowry**

Director of Finance and Infrastructure, Doncaster and Bassetlaw Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust

**Dr Michael Messenger**

Deputy Director and Scientific Manager, National Institute for Health Research Diagnostic Evidence Co-operative, Leeds

**Dr Peter Naylor**

Chair, Wirral Clinical Commissioning Group

**Dr Dermot Neely**

Consultant in Clinical Biochemistry and Metabolic Medicine, Newcastle upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust

**Dr Richard Nicholas**

Consultant Neurologist and Honorary Senior Lecturer, Frimley Health NHS Foundation Trust

**Dr Gail Norbury**

Consultant Clinical Scientist, Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust

**Dr Diego Ossa**

Director of Market Access Europe, Novartis Molecular Diagnostics

**Dr Steve Thomas**

Consultant Vascular and Cardiac Radiologist, Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust

**Mr Paul Weinberger**

Chief Executive Officer, DiaSolve Ltd, London

**Specialist Committee members**

**Dr John Butler**

Consultant in Emergency and Critical Care Medicine, Central Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust

**Professor Enitan Carrol**

Consultant in Paediatric Infectious Diseases, Alder Hey Children's NHS Foundation Trust

**Dr Chris Chaloner**

Consultant in Laboratory Medicine (Paediatric Biochemistry), Central Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust

**Dr Paul Dark**

Consultant Intensive Care Medicine, Salford Royal NHS Foundation Trust

**Dr Jim Gray**

Consultant Microbiologist, Birmingham Children's Hospital NHS Foundation Trust

**Miss Stevie-Louise McGuiness**

Lay member

**Dr Marcus Peck**

Consultant in Anaesthesia and Intensive Care Medicine, Frimley  NHS Foundation Trust

**Dr Bob Phillips**

Senior Clinical Academic and Honorary Consultant in Paediatric and Adolescent Oncology, Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust

**Mr Suman Shrestha**

Advanced Critical Care Nurse Practitioner, Frimley Health NHS Foundation Trust

## *NICE project team*

Each diagnostics assessment is assigned to a team consisting of a Technical Analyst (who acts as the topic lead), a Technical Adviser and a Project Manager.

**Frances Nixon**

Topic Lead

**Sarah Byron**

Technical Adviser

**Robert Fernley**

Project Manager

# 12  Sources of evidence considered by the Committee

The diagnostics assessment report was prepared by Kleijnen Systematic Reviews Ltd in collaboration with Erasmus University Rotterdam and Maastricht University.

- Westwood ME, Ramaekers BLT, Whiting P, et al. Procalcitonin (PCT) testing to guide antibiotic therapy for the treatment of sepsis in intensive care settings and for suspected bacterial infection in emergency department settings: A systematic review and cost-effectiveness analysis. January 2015.

## *Registered stakeholders*

The following organisations accepted the invitation to participate in this assessment as registered stakeholders. They were invited to attend the scoping workshop and to comment on the diagnostics assessment report.

**Manufacturers/sponsors:**

- bioMerieux UK Ltd
- Roche Diagnostics
- Siemens Healthcare Diagnostics
- Thermo Fisher Scientific

**Professional/specialist and patient/carer groups:**

- British Infection Association
- Children's Cancer and Leukaemia Group
- Dudley Group NHS Foundation Trust
- Group B Strep Support
- Intensive Care Society
- Meningitis Research Foundation
- MRSA Action UK

Diagnostics consultation document: Procalcitonin testing for diagnosing and monitoring sepsis (ADVIA Centaur BRAHMS PCT assay, BRAHMS PCT Sensitive Kryptor assay, Elecsys BRAHMS PCT assay, LIAISON BRAHMS PCT assay and VIDAS BRAHMS PCT assay)

Issue date: June 2015

- Royal College of Nursing
- Royal College of Pathologists
- Royal College of Physicians
- UK Sepsis Trust

**Others**

- British In Vitro Diagnostics Association (BIVDA)
- Department of Health
- Department of Microbiology, North West London Hospitals NHS Trust and Ealing Hospital NHS Trust
- Healthcare Improvement Scotland
- Imperial College NHS Trust
- Imutest Limited
- Integrated Medicines Ltd
- Manchester Centre for Health Economics, The University of Manchester
- National Clinical Guidelines Centre
- NHS England
- Spectral Platforms
- Welsh Government