

BMJ Open Towards definitions of critical illness and critical care using concept analysis

Raphael Kazidule Kayambankadzanja, ^{1,2} Carl Otto Schell ^{3,4,5}
 Martin Gerdin Wärnberg ^{3,6} Thomas Tamras ⁷ Hedi Mollazadegan,⁸
 Mats Holmberg ^{4,9,10} Helle Molsted Alvesson ³ Tim Baker ^{3,11,12}

To cite: Kayambankadzanja, RK, Schell CO, Gerdin Wärnberg M, *et al.* Towards definitions of critical illness and critical care using concept analysis. *BMJ Open* 2022;**12**:e060972. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2022-060972

► Prepublication history and additional supplemental material for this paper are available online. To view these files, please visit the journal online (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2022-060972>).

Received 12 January 2022
 Accepted 18 July 2022

ABSTRACT

Objective As ‘critical illness’ and ‘critical care’ lack consensus definitions, this study aimed to explore how the concepts’ are used, describe their defining attributes, and propose potential definitions.

Design and methods We used the Walker and Avant approach to concept analysis. The uses and definitions of the concepts were identified through a scoping review of the literature and an online survey of 114 global clinical experts. We used the Arksey and O’Malley framework for scoping reviews and searched in PubMed and Web of Science with a strategy including terms around critical illness/care and definitions/etymologies limited to publications in English between 1 January 2008 and 1 January 2020. The experts were selected through purposive sampling and snowballing, with 36.8% in Africa, 25.4% in Europe, 22.8% in North America, 10.5% in Asia, 2.6% in South America and 1.8% in Australia. They worked with anaesthesia or intensive care 59.1%, emergency care 15.8%, medicine 9.5%, paediatrics 5.5%, surgery 4.7%, obstetrics and gynaecology 1.6% and other specialties 3.9%. Through content analysis of the data, we extracted codes, categories and themes to determine the concepts’ defining attributes and we proposed potential definitions. To assist understanding, we developed model, related and contrary cases concerning the concepts, we identified antecedents and consequences to the concepts, and defined empirical referents.

Results Nine and 13 articles were included in the scoping reviews of critical illness and critical care, respectively. A total of 48 codes, 14 categories and 4 themes were identified in the uses and definitions of critical illness and 60 codes, 13 categories and 5 themes for critical care. The defining attributes of critical illness were a high risk of imminent death; vital organ dysfunction; requirement for care to avoid death; and potential reversibility. The defining attributes of critical care were the identification, monitoring and treatment of critical illness; vital organ support; initial and sustained care; any care of critical illness; and specialised human and physical resources. The defining attributes led to our proposed definitions of critical illness as, ‘a state of ill health with vital organ dysfunction, a high risk of imminent death if care is not provided and the potential for reversibility’, and of critical care as, ‘the identification, monitoring and treatment of patients with critical illness through the initial and sustained support of vital organ functions.’

Conclusion The concepts critical illness and critical care lack consensus definitions and have varied uses. Through

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

- ⇒ This concept analysis is the first study to systematically describe the uses and definitions of the concepts *critical illness* and *critical care*.
- ⇒ The study uses a scoping review of the literature and input from over 100 clinical experts from diverse settings globally to identify the defining attributes and provide proposed definitions of the concepts.
- ⇒ Some uses and definitions of the concepts in languages other than English, in unpublished grey literature and from clinical experts not included in the study may have been missed.
- ⇒ As current usage of the concepts is diverse, the proposed definitions may not be universally accepted and are aimed to stimulate further discussion.

concept analysis of uses and definitions in the literature and among experts, we have identified the defining attributes of the concepts and proposed definitions that could aid clinical practice, research and policy-making.

INTRODUCTION

The concepts *critical illness* and *critical care* are commonly used in healthcare. In PubMed, both concepts are Medical Subject Headings terms, and searches for ‘critical illness’ or ‘critical care’ return 40 000 and 220 000 articles, respectively. While it may seem evident that the concepts concern patients with very serious illness and their care, there is a lack of consensus around their precise definitions.

Critical illness is a concept concerning a patient’s condition that is distinct from the disease diagnosis. It has been argued that clinical practice is overly guided by diagnoses rather than prognoses.¹ We postulate that the lack of consensus around prognostic concepts such as critical illness may be one factor in this and could cause problems for clinical practice, research and policy-making. For the clinician, discordant interpretations of when a patient is critically ill could lead to differing clinical assessments and treatments despite similar states: for example, Doctor A interprets Patient B’s low blood oxygen



© Author(s) (or their employer(s)) 2022. Re-use permitted under CC BY-NC. No commercial re-use. See rights and permissions. Published by BMJ.

For numbered affiliations see end of article.

Correspondence to

Dr Tim Baker; Tim.Baker@ki.se

level as critical illness, triggers an alarm and admits the patient to an intensive care unit (ICU), only for Doctor C to reverse the decision and discharge the patient as she interprets the illness as non-critical. For the researcher, it could be difficult to design a study or interpret findings: for example, studies into the effect of dexamethasone for critical COVID-19, or of another treatment for all patients with critical illness, require clear eligibility criteria and translating the findings to another patient group requires that the groups have similar clinical conditions. For the policy-maker, prioritising programmes and investments designed to improve care for very sick patients relies on comparisons between similar groups and clearly defined interventions.

Even quantifying the total global burden of critical illness has been challenging due to the lack of an agreed definition.² Proxies have been used instead, for example, summing up syndromes considered to comprise critical illness such as sepsis and acute lung injury—resulting in estimates of up to 45 million critical illness cases each year.² Low-income and middle-income countries are suspected to have the highest burden,³ but the lack of a definition has hampered comparisons across settings.⁴

Studying the care for critically ill patients has also been problematic. Studies have focused on care provided in hospital locations such as in intensive care or emergency units, which exclude both the care provided in hospitals lacking such units, and the care of critically ill patients in general hospital wards.^{5–7} In the COVID-19 pandemic, there have been great efforts to describe, scale-up and improve care for critically ill patients throughout the world,^{5,7} and a lack of agreement around the concept of critical care has hampered these efforts.^{8,9}

These examples illustrate how important *concepts* are as the building blocks of theories and communication. Ideally, concepts are clearly defined and their uses well described for unambiguous communication and an understanding about exactly what is being described or explained.¹⁰ *Concept analysis* is a method for investigating how concepts are used and understood. Concept analyses have been conducted in diverse fields such as in teamwork,¹¹ postoperative recovery¹² and bioterrorism preparedness,¹³ all with the aim of providing basic conceptual understanding and facilitating communication. In this paper, we have used concept analysis, following the stepwise approach described by Walker and Avant.¹⁰ The first two steps in the approach are to choose the concept and determine the aim of the analysis. Our chosen concepts are *critical illness* and *critical care* and our aims are to explore the uses and definitions of the concepts in published sources and by global clinical experts, leading to a description of the defining attributes of the concepts and to proposed definitions.

METHODS

Concepts are the basic building blocks in theory construction, research and communication. A concept analysis

aims to define the concept's attributes and facilitate decisions about which phenomena match the concept, and which do not. In this study, Walker and Avant's method for concept analysis was chosen as a systematic approach used previously in similar studies.¹⁰ The approach consists of eight steps: (1) select the concept; (2) determine the aim of analysis; (3) identify all uses of the concept that you can discover; (4) determine the defining attributes; (5) identify a model case; (6) identify borderline, related, contrary, invented and illegitimate cases; (7) identify antecedents and consequences; (8) define empirical referents. In this paper, steps 1 and 2 are described in the Introduction section, step 3 in the Method section and steps 4–8 in the Results section. Thus, the continuation of this article addresses steps 3–8 in Walker and Avant's method.¹⁰

Step 3: identifying the uses of the concepts

We identified the uses of the concepts of critical illness and critical care through a scoping review of the literature and a web-based survey of global experts.

Scoping review

We used the Arksey and O'Malley framework for scoping reviews.¹⁴ Relevant studies published in English between 1 January 2008 and 1 January 2020 were identified in the PubMed and Web of Science databases. We began the search in 2018 and deemed that articles published prior to 2008 were more than 10 years old and would have less relevance. To include publications that were not found through the database searches, we hand-searched publication lists and grey literature of intensive care medicine and emergency medicine societies. Duplicates were removed using the software Rayyan.¹⁵ The publications were examined through title, then abstract review and lastly by full-text review. The scoping review protocols were published in advance on the www.protocols.io database.

Critical illness

The search strategy used the terms *terminolog**, *etymolog**, *nomenclatur**, *OR definition**, *AND emergency*, *critical**, *acute**, *OR sever**, *AND ill OR illness*. A total of 9323 articles were identified using these critical illness terms in the databases and an additional two articles were identified through hand searching. Of these, 1126 articles were identified as duplicates and the remaining 8199 articles were screened by title and abstract review by two of the authors (TT and HM). Eight thousand one hundred sixty-eight articles were excluded as they did not concern critical illness, were not written in English or were not available in full text online, leaving 31 articles for inclusion for full-text review. In the full-text review, 22 articles were excluded as they did not define critical illness, and so 9 articles were included in the analysis (figure 1 and online supplemental table 1).




Figure 1 Study flow chart.

Critical care

The search strategy used the terms terminolog*, etymolog*, nomenclatur*, OR definition*, AND critical care, intensive care, emergency care, OR acute care. A total of 7286 articles were identified using these critical care terms in the databases and an additional 6 articles were identified through hand searching. Of these, 1964 were identified as duplicates and the remaining 5322 articles were screened by title and abstract review by two of the authors (TT and HM). Five thousand two hundred sixty-nine articles were excluded as they were not concerning critical care, not written in English or not available in full text online, leaving 59 articles for inclusion for full-text review. In the full-text review, 46 articles were excluded as they did not define critical care and so 13 articles were included in the analysis (figure 1 and online supplemental table 2).

Expert survey

The survey used open-ended questions to gather information about the experts' definitions of critical illness and critical care, and how they see the relationship of the concepts to connected concepts in order to provide context. The survey included the questions: (1) *How would you define critical illness?* (2) *How would you define critical care?* (3) *Do critical care and intensive care differ? If yes, in what way?* (4) *Do critical care and emergency care differ and if yes, in what way?* (5) *Do critical care and acute care differ and if yes, in what way?*

The inclusion criterion for an expert to be invited to participate in the survey was experience in any medical specialty that includes care of patients with acute, severe illness. Experts were identified from a stakeholder mapping of global critical care done by one of the authors (TB, unpublished), and those known to the researchers to be global experts in the field of critical care. Purposive sampling was used to invite experts with the aim of including 100 experts with a balance between specialties, geographical locations, health worker cadres and gender. In total 146 experts were invited to take part, and 114 completed the survey (78% response rate) (figure 1 and table 1).

Step 4: analysis and determining the defining attributes

All the definitions and usages of critical illness and critical care from the scoping reviews and the expert survey were charted and analysed using a content analysis based on methods developed by Erlingsson and Brysiewicz.¹⁶ First, the data from any parts of the literature and from the expert survey that concerned the uses or definitions of the concepts were extracted. The data were coded, and the codes analysed iteratively by the study team. Repeated and redundant codes were removed and similar codes were arranged into categories. The data were revisited when new categories arose or when diverse opinions with contrasting attributes were identified. Through the process, themes emerged that captured the defining attributes of the concepts. Using the defining attributes,

Table 1 Characteristics of the experts who participated in the survey

Variable	Frequency (%)
All	114
Gender	
Male	80 (70.2)
Female	34 (29.8)
Continent	
Africa	42 (36.8)
Europe	29 (25.4)
North America	26 (22.8)
Asia	12 (10.5)
South America	3 (2.6)
Australia	2 (1.8)
Cadres*	
Physician	93 (53.1)
Researcher	62 (35.4)
Nurse	12 (6.9)
Policy-maker	5 (2.9)
Other	3 (1.7)
Specialty*	
Anaesthesia/intensive care	75 (59.1)
Emergency care	20 (15.8)
Medicine	12 (9.5)
Paediatrics	7 (5.5)
Surgery	6 (4.7)
Obstetrics and gynaecology	2 (1.6)
Other	5 (3.9)

*As the experts were asked to select all that apply, the sum may exceed 100%.

definitions of the concepts were constructed by the research team to be coherent and useful.

Steps 5–8: presenting a model case, related and contrary cases, identifying antecedents and consequences, and defining empirical referents

The model cases, related and contrary cases were developed by the researchers to provide examples to illustrate the defining attributes of the concepts that emerged from the concept analysis. Model cases were developed to be clinically realistic and to include all the defining attributes. Related cases were developed that include some, but not all, of the defining attributes, and contrary cases that are clearly ‘not the concept’, containing none of the defining attributes. For simplicity in this study, we limited our cases to examples of patients with respiratory disease. Antecedents and consequences were identified as events that occur prior to the occurrence of each concept and as the outcomes of each concept, respectively. Empirical

referents were identified as phenomena that demonstrate the occurrence of each concept ‘in real life’.

Ethical considerations

Informed consent was provided by all of the experts. The Research Ethics Committee of the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine approved the study (reference number 22661).

Patient and public involvement

None.

RESULTS

The results relate to steps 4–8 in the Walker and Avant approach, as steps 1–3 have been described in the Introduction and Methods.

Critical illness

Step 4: the defining attributes

A total of 48 codes were identified from the uses and definitions of critical illness from the scoping review and expert survey. The codes were analysed into 14 categories and 4 themes. (table 2). The themes represent the defining attributes of critical illness: *high risk of imminent death*; *vital organ dysfunction*; *requirement for care to avoid death*; and *potential reversibility* (figure 2).

Proposed operational definition

The proposed definition for critical illness is ‘Critical illness is a state of ill health with vital organ dysfunction, a high risk of imminent death if care is not provided and the potential for reversibility.’

Cases

Step 5: a model case of critical illness (a case including all the defining attributes)

A woman has a viral pneumonia. She is breathless and hypoxic with a low oxygen level in her blood (oxygen saturation) of 74%. Her lungs are dysfunctional, and she has a life-threatening condition that is likely to lead to her death in the next few hours. She requires care to support her lungs (oxygen therapy) and if she receives that care, she has a chance of recovery.

Step 6: a related case for critical illness (a case including some of the defining attributes but not the attribute of ‘imminently life-threatening’)

A man has a chest infection. He has a fever, is coughing up green sputum and feels short-of-breath when walking. He has an oxygen saturation of 91%. He has a serious condition, but it is not imminently life-threatening. He requires treatment, likely with antibiotics, but it is uncertain whether he requires any organ support such as oxygen. His condition is potentially reversible, and he can recover.

Table 2 Content analysis for the concept *critical illness*

Code	Category	Theme		
Severe illness	Severe illness	High risk of imminent death		
Process of increasing severity				
Imminent risk of death	High risk of imminent death			
Enough severity to lead to death rapidly				
Can kill within a short time				
Medical condition that results in short-term mortality				
Sudden onset illness or acute deterioration	Acute onset or deterioration			
Acute life-threatening illness				
An episode of acute illness	Life-threatening			
Increased risk of death				
Continuous threat to life and well-being				
Life-threatening or potentially life-threatening disease				
High probability of life-threatening deterioration				
Acutely life-threatening injury or illness				
At least one and often multiple organ dysfunction	Organ dysfunction or failure	Vital organ dysfunction		
Failure in one or more organ systems that needs support				
Haemodynamic instability, respiratory failure, seizure, disorders of consciousness				
Diseases with vital organ failures as complications	Threatened organ dysfunction			
Threatened organ failure				
Potential disturbances of vital organ functions				
Threatened end-organ damage	Vital signs derangements			
Deranged vital parameters				
Physiologic reserve is diminished, as manifested by abnormal vital signs	Treatment needed to avoid death	Requirement for care to avoid death		
NEWS2 \geq 7				
Associated with significant morbidities if untreated				
Decline in a patient's ability to survive on their own				
Conditions requiring rapid intervention to avert death or disability				
An illness which without rapid treatment would result in death or disability.				
Needs prompt and sustained intervention to avert death or lifelong disability				
If no intervention is made, death is certain				
Requiring minute-by-minute nursing and/or medical care			Requirement for immediate treatment	
Requires a rapid diagnosis and response to ensure good outcomes				
Illnesses where timely care can reduce the chances of death and disability				
Requires immediate intervention				
The illness needs close monitoring and prompt management	Requirement for organ support			
Treatment delays of hours or less make interventions less effective				
Requiring organ support				
Requiring vital organ support	Requires critical care			
Requiring intensified patient monitoring and organ support				
Critical care services	Need for specific care			
ICU admission				
Illness that results in need for more than standard of care	Need for specific care			
Acute disease that needs specific treatment alongside the disease itself				

Continued

Table 2 Continued

Code	Category	Theme
Some element of treatability	Reversible with treatment	Potential reversibility
Any treatable life-threatening reversible illness		
Reversible life-threatening organ failure	Potentially reversible	
Life-threatening situation, illness or disease that is potentially reversible		
Acute potentially reversible illness		
NEWS, National Early Warning Score.		

A contrary case for critical illness (a clear example of 'not the concept')


A woman has lung cancer. She is coughing up small amounts of blood but is able to walk to the hospital. She has an oxygen saturation of 94%. She is sick and she requires treatment. However, her illness is not imminently life-threatening, she has no dysfunctional vital organ and she does not require immediate care. Her condition may or may not be reversible.

Step 7: antecedents and consequences of critical illness

The antecedents of critical illness are the onset of illness, in mild or moderate form, with progressing severity. The consequences of critical illness are either recovery or death.

Step 8: empirical referents

There are an estimated 30–45 million cases of critical illness globally each year.² Many patients are cared for in hospitals with illnesses that are causing vital organ dysfunction and that are imminently life-threatening. There is much work done to identify patients with critical illness such as the use of single severely deranged vital signs,¹⁷ or compound scoring systems such as the National Early Warning Score and The Sequential Organ Failure Assessment score.^{18 19} In hospitals, the severity of patients' conditions can be assessed using tools such as the Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation²⁰ and the Simplified Acute Physiology Score.²¹

**Figure 2** The defining attributes of critical illness.

Critical care

Step 4: the defining attributes

A total of 60 codes were identified from the definitions of critical care from the scoping review and expert survey. The codes were analysed into 13 categories and 5 themes (table 3). The themes represent the concept's defining attributes: *identification, monitoring, and treatment of critical illness; vital organ support; initial and sustained care; any care of critical illness; and specialised human and physical resources* (figure 3).

Proposed operational definition of critical care

The proposed definition for critical care is "Critical care is the identification, monitoring, and treatment of patients with critical illness through the initial and sustained support of vital organ functions."

Cases

Step 5: a model case of critical care (a case including all the defining attributes)

A woman with a viral pneumonia is rapidly identified as critically ill when she arrives at the hospital. She is immediately admitted to a unit with supplies for managing critically ill patients and treatment is started. Nurses and doctors who have been trained in the care of critical illness monitor her regularly, and provide continuous care, titrating the treatments as needed. Continuous oxygen therapy is provided for her life-threatening hypoxia, supporting her respiratory dysfunction, until she has recovered and is no longer critically ill.

Step 6: a related case of critical care (a case including some of the defining attributes but not the attribute of 'vital organ support')

Care in a hospital is provided to a man with a chest infection. A nurse assesses him at arrival to hospital. A doctor admits him to the ward, prescribes antibiotics and decides he is not critically ill and does not require support for any of his vital organs. After 4 days, the doctor discharges him from hospital.

A contrary case of critical care (a clear example of 'not the concept')

In the outpatient department, care is provided to a woman with lung cancer. A doctor and a nurse do some investigations and prescribe some medications. She is sent home with a follow-up appointment 2 weeks later.

Table 3 Content analysis for the concept *critical care*

Codes	Category	Theme		
Identifying and addressing critical illness	Identification and monitoring of critical illness	Identification, monitoring and treatment of critical illness		
Medical care with timely monitoring				
Appropriate monitoring of critical illness	Treatment of critical illness			
Management of critically ill patients				
Treat critical illness				
Care given to the critically ill				
Services required to stabilise critical illness				
Reduce the risk of death from a critical illness				
Care dedicated to patients with severe illness or potentially severe condition				
Managing life-threatening condition			Addressing life-threatening condition	
Preventing the occurrence of life-threatening conditions				
Treatment and management due to the threat of imminent deterioration				
Medical care required to reduce the risk to the patient's life				
Care to sustain cardiopulmonary functions	Supporting vital functions	Vital organ support		
Support the patient's haemodynamic or cardiorespiratory status				
Supportive care in critical illness to enable body's systems to continue functioning before definitive treatment can work				
Care of vital organ failure				
Focus of care on supporting vital organs until improvement				
Providing organ support			Organ support	
Main focus on organ-supporting treatment.				
Support of vital organ function, or reverse specific organ dysfunctions				
Supportive care for organs that are failing				
Provision of support to dysfunctional body systems	Timely care	Initial and sustained care		
Early management for saving and maintaining life				
Rapid and timely intervention that is administered in critical illness				
From admission until the course of illness ends, either in full recovery or death				
From home through to discharge from hospital				
From the time of first contact with healthcare services through to stabilisation	From start of critical illness until the patient is no longer critically ill			
To the point where the illness or injury is no longer acutely life-threatening				
Critical care could be over days to weeks				
Constant monitoring	Sustained care			
Irrespective of the location of the patient within the health system				
Anywhere in the emergency or inpatient setting	Any location	Any care of critical illness		
Any care provided to critically ill patients				
Can be specialised care but depends on the level of resources				

Continued

Table 3 Continued

Codes	Category	Theme
Usually located in an area with infrastructure to support these activities	Specific area	Specialised human and physical resources
Inside a healthcare facility, outside the emergency department		
High dependency care		
Care in ICU or critical care unit		
A place where equipment, staff and environment is ready to save patients with life-threatening disease		
Multidisciplinary care	Multidisciplinary and specialist staff	
Specially trained staff		
Essentially a team based and multiprofessional care		
Requires the grouping of special facilities and specially trained staff	High-intensity care	
Higher level of care than is available on a general ward		
Minute-by-minute nursing and/or medical care		
Advanced respiratory support/mechanical ventilation		
Nursing 24/7		
High nurse: patient ratio no lower than 1:2		
ICU, intensive care unit.		

Step 7: antecedents and consequences of critical care

The antecedents of critical care are the contact of the patient with the healthcare system and may include other care of a patient who has not deteriorated to the point of becoming critically ill. The consequences of critical care are either the patient's recovery or death.

Step 8: empirical referents

Many hospitals have wards or units for the provision of critical care, such as emergency units, high dependency units or ICUs.²² Critical care can also be provided in general wards, and a recent global consensus specified the care that should be included for all patients with critical illness in any hospital location.²³ Rapid Response Teams

or Medical Emergency Teams have been introduced into some hospitals, often consisting of staff from the ICU responding to calls from the wards when a critically ill patient has been identified, and providing either critical care on the ward, or transferring the patient to the ICU.²⁴

**Figure 3** The defining attributes of critical care.**DISCUSSION**

We have described how the concepts *critical illness* and *critical care* are used and defined in the literature and by a selection of global experts using a concept analysis approach.

Our proposed definition for critical illness of, “a state of ill health with vital organ dysfunction, a high risk of imminent death if care is not provided and the potential for reversibility”, is similar to those in some key publications. Chandrashekar *et al* state that, “Critical illness is any condition requiring support of failing vital organ systems without which survival would not be possible”.²⁵ Painter *et al* write that, “A critically ill or injured patient is defined as one who has an illness or injury impairing one or more vital organ systems such that there is a high probability of imminent or life-threatening deterioration in the patient's condition”.²⁶ Indeed, we found widespread agreement in the literature and expert sources that critical illness concerns the attributes ‘life-threatening illness’ and ‘organ dysfunction’.

However, we found diverse and varied usage of the concept concerning the attribute of reversibility and the interface between critical illness and the natural process of dying. Some uses included only illness that

was potentially reversible—these sources regarded that for critical illness there should be a possible chance of recovery. Without this, critical illness would be a concept that encompasses the dying process—everyone would be critically ill immediately before death—which would conflict with many clinical uses and understandings of the term. Others had a wider interpretation including all life-threatening illness and did not include reversibility in the definition as it is difficult to identify in the clinical setting, and the concept risks becoming context dependent (high-resource interventions may reverse some critical illness which would not be possible in low-resource healthcare). Our iterative content analysis method led to our interpretation that reversibility should be included as one of the defining attributes and to make a distinction between critical illness and illness at the end of life.²⁷ This conclusion should be seen as one possible interpretation that can stimulate further discussion.

It is hoped that the proposed definition of critical illness assists communication in the field. Previously, studies about critical illness have focused on patients in certain hospital units, or with diseases or syndromes as proxies for critical illness that exclude some critically ill patients.^{2–5} Our definition of critical illness is not diagnosis or syndrome specific and can be due to any underlying condition. The definition could facilitate the specification of clinical criteria for the identification of critical illness, estimates of the overall burden of critical illness, assessments of outcomes for patients with critical illness across centres and settings, and interventions to improve outcomes.

For critical care, there was greater diversity around its use and definition. There was widespread agreement that critical care included the attributes of, ‘care of critically ill patients’, and the ‘support of vital organs’. However, there were differing uses around the location of the care and the need for specialised resources. Some sources considered critical care to be only the care provided in certain locations (such as ICUs or critical care units) or to be care that is always highly specialised or resource intensive. The World Federation of Societies of Intensive and Critical Care Medicine have suggested that critical care is synonymous with intensive care and is, “a multidisciplinary and interprofessional specialty dedicated to the comprehensive management of patients having, or at risk of developing, acute, life-threatening organ dysfunction. [Critical care] uses an array of technologies that provide support of failing organ systems, particularly the lungs, cardiovascular system, and kidneys.”²² In contrast, other sources used critical care to be inclusive of any care for patients with critical illness, irrespective of location or resources. The Joint Faculty of Intensive Care Medicine of Ireland state that critical care units are those that, “provide life sustaining treatment for critically ill patients with acute organ dysfunction due to potentially reversible disease”,²⁸ and in Belgium, critical care beds have been defined as any beds “for patients with one or more organ functions compromised”⁴ Hirshon *et al* strike a balance

between these two contrasting views, “[Critical care is] the specialized care of patients whose conditions are life-threatening and who require comprehensive care and constant monitoring, usually in intensive care units.”²⁹

Our proposed definition of, “the identification, monitoring, and treatment of patients with critical illness through the initial and sustained support of vital organ functions”, aims to be inclusive. Critical care may include the use of specialised resources, but it is not a requirement. We see this as a strength in the definition, as it maintains a patient-centred rather than setting-dependent focus. Critical care when defined in this way can be provided anywhere, and does not have to be resource intensive—it includes both high-resource care in ICUs and lower resource care in other settings. Indeed, critical care can be provided in general wards, in small health facilities, in the community or in ambulances. High-resource intensive care may not be possible in low-resource settings, but such settings care for many critically ill patients who require critical care.^{6,30,31} The proposed definition focuses on supporting vital organ functions, emphasising that critical care’s primary focus is treating the critical condition of the patient rather than definitive care for the underlying condition.^{9,32} Critical care, as we have defined it, can be seen as a system of care of patients with critical illness throughout the course of their illness, from the time of their first contact with healthcare through to resolution of the critical illness or death. Critical care is part of the wider concept of acute care which also includes prehospital care, emergency care, trauma and surgery care, as well as inpatient care in medical, surgical, paediatric, obstetric and other wards.²⁹

The word ‘crisis’ is the root for the word critical and has its origin from the Greek word ‘krisis’ referring to a ‘turning point’ or ‘act of separation’, and later in English in a medical context when a crisis refers to the decisive point at which a patient either improves or deteriorates.³³ The concepts critical illness and critical care could be regarded as remaining true to these origins as they refer to the point in a patient’s ‘journey’ through their illness where they are so severely ill that the situation has become a crisis, and managing the crisis is necessary to direct the patient towards improvement rather than towards deterioration.

Strengths and limitations

To our knowledge, this is the first study attempting to describe the uses and definitions of the concepts *critical illness* and *critical care*, and to identify the defining attributes leading to proposed definitions of the concepts. A strength is the use of both a scoping review of the literature and the inclusion of over one hundred clinical experts as sources. The findings of the analysis should be seen as a first step towards consensus and we recognise that the use of concepts is fluid and changes over time.¹⁰ We were limited to including literature in English between 2008 and 2019 and to published studies and guidelines and we may have missed relevant publications



in other languages or in other grey literature. Our sample of experts was purposively selected and had global representation but was not perfectly symmetrical to continents, specialty, cadre or gender. There are many more experts than we were able to include, and we are likely to have missed experts who could have provided valuable contributions. Our proposed definitions, while based on a content analysis of scoping reviews and an expert survey, are the outputs of one possible interpretation of the data and may not be universally accepted. We hope our analysis and findings move the conversation forwards, providing input about how to communicate and collaborate around these vitally important concepts, and ultimately how to improve the care and outcomes for critically ill patients.

CONCLUSION

The concepts critical illness and critical care lack consensus definitions and are used in varied ways in the literature and among global experts. Through a concept analysis of scoping reviews and an expert survey we identify common themes in the uses and understandings of the concepts. We propose definitions for the concepts: “Critical illness is a state of ill health with vital organ dysfunction, a high risk of imminent death if care is not provided and the potential for reversibility” and “Critical care is the identification, monitoring, and treatment of patients with critical illness through the initial and sustained support of vital organ functions.” The proposed definitions could aid clinical practice, research and policy-making.

Author affiliations

- ¹Public Health, Kamuzu University of Health Sciences, Blantyre, Malawi
- ²Anaesthesia and Intensive Care, Queen Elizabeth Central Hospital, Blantyre, Malawi
- ³Global Public Health, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden
- ⁴Centre for Clinical Research Sörmland, Uppsala University, Eskilstuna, Sweden
- ⁵Internal Medicine, Nyköping Hospital, Nyköping, Sweden
- ⁶Perioperative Medicine and Intensive Care, Karolinska University Hospital, Stockholm, Sweden
- ⁷Internal Medicine, Södertälje Hospital, Stockholm, Sweden
- ⁸Addiction Medicine, Sankt Goran Hospital, Stockholm, Sweden
- ⁹Centre of Interprofessional Collaboration within Emergency care, Linnaeus University, Växjö, Sweden
- ¹⁰Health, Care and Social Welfare, Mälardalen University, Eskilstuna, Sweden
- ¹¹Clinical Research, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, UK
- ¹²Emergency Medicine, Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

Twitter Mats Holmberg @MatsHolmberg9

Acknowledgements We thank all the experts who participated in the study.

Contributors TB and COS designed the study. RKK, TT, HM and TB collected and analysed the data. COS, HMA, MH and MGW contributed to analysing the data. TB is responsible for the overall content as the guarantor. RKK and TB wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors critically reviewed the manuscript and approved the final version.

Funding The authors have not declared a specific grant for this research from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Competing interests None declared.

Patient and public involvement Patients and/or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of this research.

Patient consent for publication Not applicable.

Ethics approval This study was approved by London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (Reference number 22661). Participants gave informed consent to participate in the study before taking part.

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

Data availability statement Data are available upon reasonable request.

Supplemental material This content has been supplied by the author(s). It has not been vetted by BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) and may not have been peer-reviewed. Any opinions or recommendations discussed are solely those of the author(s) and are not endorsed by BMJ. BMJ disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance placed on the content. Where the content includes any translated material, BMJ does not warrant the accuracy and reliability of the translations (including but not limited to local regulations, clinical guidelines, terminology, drug names and drug dosages), and is not responsible for any error and/or omissions arising from translation and adaptation or otherwise.

Open access This is an open access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited, appropriate credit is given, any changes made indicated, and the use is non-commercial. See: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>.

ORCID iDs

- Raphael Kazidule Kayambankadzanja, <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2242-8975>
 Carl Otto Schell <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7904-1336>
 Martin Gerdin Wärnberg <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6069-4794>
 Thomas Tamras <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3131-8524>
 Mats Holmberg <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1878-0992>
 Helle Molsted Alvesson <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6109-7203>
 Tim Baker <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8727-7018>

REFERENCES

- 1 Croft P, Altman DG, Deeks JJ, *et al*. The science of clinical practice: disease diagnosis or patient prognosis? Evidence about “what is likely to happen” should shape clinical practice. *BMC Med* 2015;13:20.
- 2 Adhikari NKJ, Fowler RA, Bhagwanjee S, *et al*. Critical care and the global burden of critical illness in adults. *Lancet* 2010;376:1339–46.
- 3 Vukoja M, Riviello ED, Schultz MJ. Critical care outcomes in resource-limited settings. *Curr Opin Crit Care* 2018;24:421–7.
- 4 Wunsch H, Angus DC, Harrison DA, *et al*. Variation in critical care services across North America and Western Europe. *Crit Care Med* 2008;36:2787–8.
- 5 African COVID-19 Critical Care Outcomes Study (ACCCOS) Investigators. Patient care and clinical outcomes for patients with COVID-19 infection admitted to African high-care or intensive care units (ACCCOS): a multicentre, prospective, observational cohort study. *Lancet* 2021;397:1885–94.
- 6 Murthy S, Leligdowicz A, Adhikari NKJ. Intensive care unit capacity in low-income countries: a systematic review. *PLoS One* 2015;10:e0116949.
- 7 Arabi YM, Azoulay E, Al-Dorzi HM, *et al*. How the COVID-19 pandemic will change the future of critical care. *Intensive Care Med* 2021;47:282–91.
- 8 Hvarfner A, Al-Djaber A, Ekström H, *et al*. Oxygen provision to severely ill COVID-19 patients at the peak of the 2020 pandemic in a Swedish district hospital. *PLoS One* 2022;17:e0249984.
- 9 Baker T, Schell CO, Petersen DB, *et al*. Essential care of critical illness must not be forgotten in the COVID-19 pandemic. *The Lancet* 2020;395:1253–4.
- 10 Walker LO, Avant KC. *Strategies for theory construction in nursing*. 5th Edition. Pearson, 2011.
- 11 Xyrichis A, Ream E. Teamwork: a concept analysis. *J Adv Nurs* 2008;61:232–41.
- 12 Allvin R, Berg K, Idvall E, *et al*. Postoperative recovery: a concept analysis. *J Adv Nurs* 2007;57:552–8.
- 13 Rebmann T. Defining bioterrorism preparedness for nurses: concept analysis. *J Adv Nurs* 2006;54:623–32.
- 14 Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *Int J Soc Res Methodol* 2005;8:19–32.
- 15 Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, *et al*. Rayyan-a web and mobile APP for systematic reviews. *Syst Rev* 2016;5:210.
- 16 Erlingsson C, Brysiewicz P. A hands-on guide to doing content analysis. *Afr J Emerg Med* 2017;7:93–9.

- 17 Schell CO, Castegren M, Lugazia E, *et al.* Severely deranged vital signs as triggers for acute treatment modifications on an intensive care unit in a low-income country. *BMC Res Notes* 2015;8:313.
- 18 Seymour CW, Liu VX, Iwashyna TJ, *et al.* Assessment of clinical criteria for sepsis. *JAMA* 2016;315:762.
- 19 Smith GB, Redfern OC, Pimentel MAF, *et al.* The National early warning score 2 (NEWS2). *Clin Med* 2019;19:260.
- 20 Knaus WA, Draper EA, Wagner DP, *et al.* Apache II: a severity of disease classification system. *Crit Care Med* 1985;13:818–9.
- 21 Moreno RP, Metnitz PGH, Almeida E, *et al.* SAPS 3--From evaluation of the patient to evaluation of the intensive care unit. Part 2: Development of a prognostic model for hospital mortality at ICU admission. *Intensive Care Med* 2005;31:1345–55.
- 22 Marshall JC, Bosco L, Adhikari NK, *et al.* What is an intensive care unit? A report of the task force of the world Federation of societies of intensive and critical care medicine. *J Crit Care* 2017;37:270–6.
- 23 Schell CO, Khalid K, Wharton-Smith A, *et al.* Essential emergency and critical care: a consensus among global clinical experts. *BMJ Glob Health* 2021;6:e006585.
- 24 Maharaj R, Raffaele I, Wendon J. *Rapid response systems: a systematic review and meta-analysis*, 2015.
- 25 Chandrashekar M, Shivaraj BM, Krishna VP. A study on prognostic value of serum cortisol in determining the outcome in the critically ill patients. *Journal of Evolution of Medical and Dental Sciences* 2015;4.
- 26 Painter JR. Critical care in the surgical global period. *Chest* 2013;143:851–5.
- 27 Sallnow L, Smith R, Ahmedzai SH, *et al.* Report of the Lancet Commission on the value of death: bringing death back into life. *Lancet* 2022;399:837–84.
- 28 Joint Faculty of Intensive Care Medicine of Ireland. *National standards for adult critical care services 2011*, 2011.
- 29 Hirshon JM, Risko N, Calvillo EJB, *et al.* Health systems and services: the role of acute care. *Bull World Health Organ* 2013;91:386–8.
- 30 Prin M, Wunsch H. International comparisons of intensive care. *Curr Opin Crit Care* 2012;18:700–6.
- 31 Manda-Taylor L, Mndolo S, Baker T. Critical care in Malawi: the ethics of beneficence and justice. *Malawi Med J* 2017;29:268.
- 32 Schell CO, Gerdin Wärnberg M, Hvarfner A, *et al.* The global need for essential emergency and critical care. *Crit Care* 2018;22:284.
- 33 Merriam-Webster. Merriam Webster Dictionary [Internet], 2022. Available: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/crisis> [Accessed 11 Apr 2022].