

Online Resource 2. Factors in the up- and downgrading of the level of evidence

Factor	Consequence
<p><i>Limitations in study design or execution (risk of bias)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All studies at unclear risk of bias (as all studies were scored to be at unclear risk of bias due to lack of a gold standard for retrospective sepsis definition) - At least one study at high risk of bias 	<p>No up or downgrading</p> <p>↓ 1 level</p>
<p><i>Inconsistency of results</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No point estimates for multiple studies were computed 	<p>Not available</p>
<p><i>Indirectness of evidence</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All studies included adult patients with no relevant inclusion or exclusion criteria. Exclusion and inclusion criteria based on data availability were accepted - At least one study with considerable differences between patients included in the studies, such as specific subpopulations - All settings were binned, all studies were assessed when at least 2 studies examined the same target condition - All studies using a retrospective definition for sepsis, severe sepsis or septic shock 	<p>No up or downgrading</p> <p>↓ 1 level</p> <p>No up or downgrading</p> <p>↓ 1 level</p>
<p><i>Imprecision</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Confidence intervals are inconsistently reported. Due to the large sample size and narrow one sided confidence intervals (<0.02) when they were reported, there were no imprecision concerns for all studies 	<p>No up or downgrading</p>