PublisherInfo				
PublisherName	:	BioMed Central		
PublisherLocation		London		
PublisherImprintName	:	BioMed Central		

Review: Immunotherapy

ArticleInfo			
ArticleID	:	4146	
ArticleDOI	:	10.1186/ccf-1999-942	
ArticleCitationID	:	942	
ArticleSequenceNumber	:	83	
ArticleCategory	:	Paper Report	
ArticleFirstPage	:	1	
ArticleLastPage	:	2	
ArticleHistory	:	RegistrationDate: 1999–7–8OnlineDate: 1999–7–8	
ArticleCopyright	:	Current Science Ltd1999	
ArticleGrants	:		
ArticleContext	:	130541111	

Keywords

Immunomodulatory therapy, sepsis, septic shock, SIRS, steroids

Comments

Immunomodulatory therapies aimed at reducing the systemic inflammatoryresponse to sepsis have repeatedly been shown in clinical trials to have noeffect on mortality in the critically ill. This excellent review examines the reasons for this failure especially when preclinical animal experiments showed benefits from these strategies.

The definitions for sepsis used for entry into clinical trials arequestioned, especially when no microbiological distinctions are made betweendifferent types of sepsis. The measurement of inflammatory mediators(against which these therapies are aimed) are similarly ignored and examples given where immunomodulatory therapy has been given to large numbers of patients who never showed elevated levels of the inflammatory mediator.

The pathophysiology of the inflammatory response is considered and thevalidity of transposing results from septic animal models into the humanclinical environment questioned. The role of corticosteroids, anti-endotoxin, interleukin-1 receptor antagonist, and anti-tumour necrosisfactor therapies in sepsis are reviewed. Perhaps insufficient doses of thesetherapies are being used with the result that the mediator of interest isnot blocked, or else this mediator may just not be clinically important indetermining outcome.

References

1. Abraham E: Why immunomodulatory therapies have not worked in sepsis. Intensive Care Med. 1999, 25: 556-566.