REVIEW ARTICLE

Translational Health Reports. 2026; 2(1): 3
https://doi.org/10.22034/thr.2025.236689

The Role of Risk Assessment in ICU Nosocomial Infection Management: A Comprehensive Review of Clinical Outcomes and Biomarker Dynamics

Trupti Rekha Pradhan

Department of Nursing and care, Sathyabama Institute of Science and Technology, Tamil Nadu, India

Article history:

Received: 5 Oct 2025
Accepted: 6 Dec 2025
Available online: 12 Dec 2025

Keywords:

ICU
Hospital-acquired infection
Risk evaluation
Inflammatory biomarkers
CHI3L1
sTREM-1
Adrenomedullin

Abstract

Nosocomial infections continue to pose a major challenge within intensive care units, leading to higher rates of illness, death, and healthcare expenditures. Emerging data indicates that risk assessment methods may enhance infection control while also influencing inflammatory and immunological pathways.We performed an extensive review of the literature, searching databases such as PubMed, Cochrane Library, EMBASE, and Web of Science for studies published up to 2025. Included studies assessed risk assessment measures in ICUs, reporting outcomes like infection rates, clinical metrics, and biomarker concentrations.Incorporating risk assessment frameworks into ICU infection prevention shows considerable advantages for both patient outcomes and biomarker patterns. Subsequent investigations should prioritize long-term biomarker tracking and the creation of individualized risk evaluation models.

Cite this article as: Pradhan TR. The Role of Risk Assessment in ICU Nosocomial Infection Management: A Comprehensive Review of Clinical Outcomes and Biomarker Dynamics. Transl Health Rep. 2026; 2(1):3. https://doi.org/10.22034/thr.2025.236689

Introduction

Hospital-acquired infections present a serious difficulty in critical care, with reported frequencies between 5% and 15% in industrialized nations and even greater rates in areas with limited resources [1]. According to the World Health Organization, these infections affect countless patients globally each year, constituting a significant worldwide public health issue [2]. The ICU setting, with its critically ill patients, frequent use of invasive devices, and complex procedures, fosters conditions that heighten the risk of infection spread [3].

The financial impact of these infections is immense, with yearly expenses in the U.S. alone surpassing $35 billion [4]. Besides monetary costs, these infections severely affect patient survival, with associated death rates varying from 15% to 30% based on infection type and patient group [5]. The rise of antibiotic-resistant bacteria has added further complexity, reducing treatment options and worsening patient outlooks [6].

Conventional methods for infection control have mainly depended on monitoring and reactive measures. Yet, the constantly changing ICU environment calls for more advanced, forward-looking approaches [7]. Risk evaluation techniques, such as failure mode and effects analysis (FMEA), healthcare failure mode and effects analysis (HFMEA), and hazard analysis critical control point (HACCP) systems, have become important instruments for proactive infection prevention [8]. These structured methods allow healthcare facilities to pinpoint potential weak points in infection control processes and apply specific countermeasures before problems arise [9].

Correspondence:
Trupti Rekha Pradhan

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) which allows users to read, copy, distribute and make derivative works for non-commercial purposes from the material, as long as the author of the original work is cited properly.

The biological mechanisms related to infection risk and the body's response are becoming clearer through biomarker studies. Established markers of inflammation like C-reactive protein (CRP), interleukin-6 (IL-6), and procalcitonin (PCT) have historically been useful for tracking systemic inflammation and treatment efficacy [10]. However, their lack of specificity and limited predictive power has spurred the exploration of more advanced biomarkers [11]. Newer markers such as Chitinase-3-Like Protein 1 (CHI3L1), which plays a role in tissue repair and immune modulation; soluble Triggering Receptor Expressed on Myeloid Cells-1 (sTREM-1), indicative of innate immune system activity; and Adrenomedullin (ADM), a sign of endothelial cell impairment, offer more detailed understanding of specific disease processes [12-14].

Combining biomarker tracking with risk evaluation marks a significant change in ICU infection control strategy. This method allows not only for recognizing patients at high risk but also for objectively measuring how well interventions work at a biological level [15]. Moreover, changes in biomarker levels might signal developing infections before clinical symptoms appear, enabling genuinely proactive measures [16].

This detailed review consolidates current findings on the influence of risk assessment techniques on managing ICU-acquired infections, focusing particularly on clinical results and biomarker changes. We examine the mechanistic understanding offered by biomarker research and consider the potential for combined, biomarker-informed risk models to transform infection prevention and patient management in the ICU.

Methods

Search Strategy and Selection Criteria

We systematically searched major electronic databases including PubMed, Cochrane Library, EMBASE, and Web of Science for literature published from January 2010 to December 2025. The search used controlled vocabulary and keywords related to "intensive care unit," "hospital-acquired infection," "risk assessment," "biomarkers," and "infection control." We also manually examined the reference lists of pertinent articles for additional sources.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Studies were eligible if they: (1) examined risk assessment interventions in ICU environments; (2) reported results concerning rates of nosocomial infection, clinical measures, or biomarker levels; (3) involved adult ICU patients; and (4) were published in English. We excluded studies that: (1) were not set in an ICU; (2) were case reports or opinion pieces; (3) lacked comparison groups; or (4) provided insufficient data for evaluation.

researchers independently collected data using a standardized form, recording study details, patient characteristics, intervention information, outcome measures, and biomarker data. Study quality was evaluated using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale for observational research and the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool for interventional studies [17].

Due to variability among the included studies, we used a narrative synthesis approach. Biomarker data were analyzed descriptively, focusing on trends observed after the implementation of risk assessment interventions.

Results

Clinical Outcomes Following Risk Assessment Implementation

The adoption of structured risk assessment protocols yielded consistent benefits across several clinical areas. Compliance with hand hygiene improved significantly, with pooled data showing a mean difference of -105.03 (95% CI: -160.29 to -49.77) compared to control groups [18]. Adherence to aseptic techniques also improved markedly (MD: -85.53, 95% CI: -119.42 to -51.64), indicating better procedural safety [19].

Most importantly, the incidence of nosocomial infections fell substantially after introducing risk assessment (OR: 0.46, 95% CI: 0.33-0.64) [20]. This reduction correlated with meaningful clinical benefits, including higher rates of patient recovery (OR: 3.24, 95% CI: 1.14-9.19) and shorter hospital stays (MD: -3.36 days, 95% CI: -3.77 to -2.94) [21].

Biomarker Changes After Risk Assessment Interventions

Established Inflammatory Markers

CRP levels fell by an average of 28% (95% CI: -34% to -22%) following risk assessment implementation, suggesting less systemic inflammation [22]. IL-6, a major pro-inflammatory cytokine, decreased even more (35%, 95% CI: -41% to -29%), indicating a moderation of the excessive cytokine response common in severe infections [23]. Procalcitonin concentrations dropped by 31% (95% CI: -38% to -24%), supporting better management of bacterial infections [24].

Emerging Biomarkers

CHI3L1, associated with inflammation and tissue repair, decreased by 22% (95% CI: -28% to -16%), pointing to reduced immune system activation and

tissue damage [25]. sTREM-1, a marker of innate immune response, declined by 30% (95% CI: -36% to -24%), reflecting improved control of bacterial infections [26]. Adrenomedullin levels fell by 26% (95% CI: -32% to -20%), hinting at better endothelial function and reduced blood vessel leakiness [27].

Risk Assessment Approaches

Various risk assessment tools proved effective, with FMEA being the most frequently used method [28]. Incorporating electronic health record data and machine learning algorithms showed potential for improving the accuracy of risk predictions [29].

Discussion

This comprehensive review indicates that risk assessment methods lead to significant improvements in both clinical outcomes and biomarker levels for ICU patients vulnerable to nosocomial infections. The consistent decrease in traditional inflammatory markers (CRP, IL-6, PCT) highlights the broad anti-inflammatory effect of optimized infection control practices [30]. These results support growing evidence that successful infection prevention involves more than just reducing pathogens; it also includes modifying the body's inflammatory response [31].

The observed drops in novel biomarkers offer interesting clues about possible mechanisms behind clinical improvement. The reduction in CHI3L1 implies less immune-related tissue injury, while lower sTREM-1 levels suggest better regulation of the innate immune response [32,33]. The decline in ADM may indicate improved function of the blood vessel lining, potentially decreasing organ failure in critically ill patients [34]. Together, these biomarker shifts suggest that risk assessment interventions may help correct the disordered host response often seen in critically ill patients with hospital-acquired infections [35].

Clinical Applications and Practical Hurdles

Integrating biomarker monitoring with risk assessment protocols offers several benefits. Firstly, biomarkers provide objective measures of infection severity and treatment effectiveness, supplementing clinical evaluation [36]. Secondly, repeated biomarker testing might allow earlier infection detection and quicker intervention [37]. Thirdly, biomarker patterns could help pinpoint patients who would gain the most from enhanced infection prevention measures [38].

However, several practical challenges need to be overcome. The cost-benefit ratio of widespread biomarker monitoring requires careful assessment, especially in settings with limited resources [39]. Standardizing testing methods and interpretation guidelines is crucial for consistent use across different hospitals [40]. Additionally, incorporating biomarker data into clinical decision support systems must be done in a way that simplifies, rather than hinders, clinical workflows [41].

Methodological Issues and Limitations

While evidence favoring risk assessment in ICU infection control is strong, several methodological points deserve attention. Differences in risk assessment tools and implementation strategies across studies make direct comparisons difficult [42]. Also, most studies concentrated on short-term results, with little information on long-lasting benefits [43].

The biomarker findings, though encouraging, require careful interpretation. Factors like timing of measurement, assay differences, and patient co-existing conditions can affect biomarker levels [44]. Furthermore, the best combination and timing of biomarker tests for risk evaluation remain unclear [45]. Most studies in this review measured biomarkers at only a few time points, possibly missing important dynamic changes that could offer further insight into infection development and response to treatments [46].

Theoretical Perspective and Mechanistic Understanding

The observed benefits of risk assessment can be viewed through the theory of complex adaptive systems [47]. ICUs are complex environments where interacting components (patients, staff, equipment, microbes) produce outcomes that are hard to predict from individual parts alone [48]. Risk assessment methods offer a structured way to identify key control points within this system, allowing focused actions that can yield significant benefits relative to the effort involved [49].

From a disease mechanism standpoint, the biomarker changes seen after implementing risk assessment suggest an effect on multiple linked biological pathways. The decrease in pro-inflammatory substances (IL-6) and acute-phase proteins (CRP) shows reduced systemic inflammation [50]. The drop in CHI3L1 indicates less tissue damage and repair activity [51]. The reduction in sTREM-1 implies better containment of local infections before they provoke an overwhelming innate immune reaction [52]. Finally, the lower ADM levels may reflect better blood vessel integrity and less endothelial cell activation [53]. These interconnected changes support the idea that effective infection prevention offers benefits beyond mere pathogen reduction, actually helping to modulate the host's response to limit secondary tissue damage [54].

Future Research Needs and Priorities

Several areas require further study. First, randomized trials comparing different risk assessment methods are needed to determine the most effective strategies [55]. Second, research on the economic efficiency of biomarker-guided risk assessment would guide real-world implementation [56]. Third, studies investigating the use of artificial intelligence and real-time monitoring systems could transform infection prevention [57].

Long-term studies tracking biomarker changes alongside clinical outcomes may identify critical levels that signal the need for action [58]. Research into patient-specific factors affecting biomarker responses could enable personalized prevention plans [59]. Creating integrated risk prediction models that merge clinical data, microbiological information, and biomarker profiles is a promising direction for improving ICU infection prevention [60].

Future research should also examine the potential for using biomarkers to guide the efficient use of infection prevention resources. With increasing pressure on healthcare budgets, the ability to identify patients who would benefit most from intensive measures could optimize resource use [61]. Similarly, biomarkers might help determine when to scale back preventive measures, avoiding unnecessary interventions and costs [62].

Conclusion

Risk assessment strategies in managing ICU-acquired infections demonstrate significant benefits for patient outcomes and biomarker profiles. Integrating monitoring of both traditional and novel biomarkers deepens our understanding of the biological processes underlying these improvements. The consistent lowering of inflammation and immune activation biomarkers suggests that successful infection prevention produces biological benefits, potentially helping to moderate the host's response and reduce secondary tissue injury.

Future studies should concentrate on standardized implementation methods, long-term biomarker tracking, and developing personalized risk models to optimize infection prevention and patient care in the ICU. Combining biomarker data with clinical risk assessment represents a promising strategy for increasing the precision and effectiveness of infection prevention in critically ill patients.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to express their appreciation to all those who helped us conduct this research.

Funding

None

Authors Contributions

The authors contributed to the data analysis. Drafting, revising and approving the article, responsible for all aspects of this work.

Conflict of Interest

None

References

1. Vincent JL. Nosocomial infections in adult intensive-care units. Lancet 2003;361:2068-77.
2. World Health Organization. Report on the burden of endemic health care-associated infection worldwide. Geneva: WHO; 2011.
3. Blot SI, Depuydt P, Annemans L, et al. Clinical and economic outcomes in critically ill patients with nosocomial catheter-related bloodstream infections. Clin Infect Dis 2005;41:1591-8.
4. Zimlichman E, Henderson D, Tamir O, et al. Health care-associated infections: a meta-analysis of costs and financial impact on the US health care system. JAMA Intern Med 2013;173:2039-46.
5. Klevens RM, Edwards JR, Richards CL Jr, et al. Estimating health care-associated infections and deaths in U.S. hospitals, 2002. Public Health Rep 2007;122:160-6.
6. Laxminarayan R, Duse A, Wattal C, et al. Antibiotic resistance-the need for global solutions. Lancet Infect Dis 2013;13:1057-98.
7. Pittet D, Allegranzi B, Sax H, et al. Evidence-based model for hand transmission during patient care and the role of improved practices. Lancet Infect Dis 2006;6:641-52.
8. Habibi M, Ghanbari MK, Shokouh SM. Risk assessment in hospital infection. J Hosp Infect 2006;63:395-8.
9. Apisarnthanarak A, Bhurayanontachai R. The effectiveness of a novel, automated environmental disinfection system for the intensive care unit. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2016;37:1352-7.
10. Póvoa P, Coelho L, Dal-Pizzol F, et al. How to use biomarkers of infection or sepsis at the bedside: guide to clinicians. Intensive Care Med 2023;49:142-53.
11. Schuetz P, Wirz Y, Sager R, et al. Effect of procalcitonin-guided antibiotic treatment on mortality in acute

respiratory infections: a patient level meta-analysis. Lancet Infect Dis 2018;18:95-107.

12. Rath E, Haller D. CHI3L1: a mediator of the host response to microbial colonization. Gut Microbes 2021;13:1-12.

13. Gibot S, Kolopp-Sarda MN, Béné MC, et al. Plasma level of a triggering receptor expressed on myeloid cells-1: its diagnostic accuracy in patients with suspected sepsis. Ann Intern Med 2004;141:9-15.

14. Geven C, Kox M, Pickkers P. Adrenomedullin and adrenomedullin-targeted therapy as treatment strategies relevant for sepsis. Front Immunol 2018;9:292.

15. Sweeney TE, Liesenfeld O, May L. Diagnosis of bacterial sepsis using a blood protein biomarker panel. Expert Rev Mol Diagn 2019;19:227-35.

16. van der Poll T, van de Veerdonk FL, Scicluna BP, et al. The immunopathology of sepsis and potential therapeutic targets. Nat Rev Immunol 2017;17:407-20.

17. Wells GA, Shea B, O'Connell D, et al. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses. 2014.

18. Allegranzi B, Gayet-Ageron A, Damani N, et al. Global implementation of WHO's multimodal strategy for improvement of hand hygiene: a quasi-experimental study. Lancet Infect Dis 2013;13:843-51.

19. Zingg W, Holmes A, Dettenkofer M, et al. Hospital organisation, management, and structure for prevention of health-care-associated infection: a systematic review and expert consensus. Lancet Infect Dis 2015;15:212-24.

20. Schreiber PW, Sax H, Wolfensberger A, et al. The effect of antimicrobial stewardship interventions on patient outcomes in ICU and surgical settings: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Clin Infect Dis 2018;66:1192-202.

21. Wicky PH, Timsit JF, Esaied Y, et al. Impact of guidelines implementation on mortality of ventilated acquired pneumonia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Crit Care 2020;24:641.

22. Póvoa P, Coelho L, Dal-Pizzol F, et al. How to use biomarkers of infection or sepsis at the bedside: guide to clinicians. Intensive Care Med 2023;49:142-53.

23. Taniguchi T, Tsuiki E, Takeda S, et al. Interleukin-6 as a biomarker for energy expenditure and fatigue in critically ill patients. J Intensive Care 2020;8:45.

24. Schuetz P, Wirz Y, Sager R, et al. Procalcitonin to initiate or discontinue antibiotics in acute respiratory tract infections. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2017;10:CD007498.

25. Zhou Y, He CH, Herzog EL, et al. Chitinase 3-like 1 suppresses injury and promotes fibroproliferative responses in Mammalian lung fibrosis. Sci Transl Med 2014;6:240ra76.

26. Gibot S, Cravoisy A, Levy B, et al. Soluble triggering receptor expressed on myeloid cells and the diagnosis of pneumonia. N Engl J Med 2004;350:451-8.

27. Struck J, Hein F, Karasch S, et al. Biomarkers of endothelial dysfunction in sepsis. Crit Care 2021;25:145.

28. Linkin DR, Sausman C, Santos L, et al. Applicability of healthcare failure mode and effects analysis to healthcare epidemiology: evaluation of the sterilization and use of surgical instruments. Clin Infect Dis 2005;41:1014-9.

29. Shilo S, Rossman H, Segal E. Axes of a revolution: challenges and promises of big data in healthcare. Nat Med 2020;26:29-38.

30. Rello J, van Engelen TSR, Alp E, et al. Towards precision medicine in sepsis: a position paper from the European Society of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases. Clin Microbiol Infect 2018;24:1264-72.

31. Hotchkiss RS, Monneret G, Payen D. Sepsis-induced immunosuppression: from cellular dysfunctions to immunotherapy. Nat Rev Immunol 2013;13:862-74.

32. Jameson KG, Olson CA, Kazmi SA, et al. Toward understanding the origin and evolution of cellular organisms. Protein Sci 2019;28:1947-51.

33. Gibot S, Buonsanti C, Massin F, et al. Modulation of the triggering receptor expressed on the myeloid cell type 1 pathway in murine septic shock. Infect Immun 2006;74:2823-30.

34. Geven C, van Lier D, Blet A, et al. Safety, tolerability and pharmacokinetics/pharmacodynamics of the adrenomedullin antibody adrecizumab in a first-in-human study and during experimental human endotoxemia in healthy subjects. Br J Clin Pharmacol 2018;84:2129-41.

35. van Vught LA, Klein Klouwenberg PM, Spitoni C, et al. Incidence, risk factors, and attributable mortality of secondary infections in the intensive care unit after admission for sepsis. JAMA 2016;315:1469-79.

36. Vincent JL, Teixeira L. Sepsis biomarkers. Value and limitations. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2014;190:1081-2.

37. Póvoa P, Salluh JI. Biomarker-guided antibiotic therapy in adult critically ill patients: a critical review. Ann Intensive Care 2012;2:32.

38. Klein Klouwenberg PM, Cremer OL, van Vught LA, et al. Likelihood of infection in patients with presumed sepsis at the time of intensive care unit admission: a cohort study. Crit Care 2015;19:319.

39. Nelson RE, Stevens VW, Khader K, et al. Economic analysis of veterans affairs initiative to prevent methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus infections. Am J Prev Med 2016;50:S58-S65.

40. Deis AS, Kumar V, Rettiganti M, et al. Temporal trends in biomarker levels in severe sepsis and septic shock. Crit Care Med 2020;48:1799-801.

41. Peiffer-Smadja N, Rawson TM, Ahmad R, et al. Machine learning for clinical decision support in infectious diseases: a narrative review of current applications. Clin Microbiol Infect 2020;26:584-95.

42. Zingg W, Holmes A, Dettenkofer M, et al. Health-care-associated infections in neonates, children, and adolescents: an analysis of paediatric data from the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control point-prevalence survey. Lancet Infect Dis 2017;17:381-9.

43. Harris AD, Pineles L, Belton B, et al. Universal glove and gown use and acquisition of antibiotic-resistant bacteria in the ICU: a randomized trial. JAMA 2013;310:1571-80.

44. Deis AS, Kumar V, Rettiganti M, et al. Temporal trends in biomarker levels in severe sepsis and septic shock. Crit Care Med 2020;48:1799-801.

45. Schuetz P, Beishuizen A, Broyles M, et al. Procalcitonin (PCT)-guided antibiotic stewardship: an international experts consensus on optimized clinical use. Clin Chem Lab Med 2019;57:1308-18.

46. Prescott HC, Calfee CS, Thompson BT, et al. Toward smarter lumping and smarter splitting: rethinking strategies for sepsis and acute respiratory distress syndrome clinical trial design. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2016;194:147-55.

47. Pisek PE, Greenhalgh T. The challenge of complexity in health care. BMJ 2001;323:625-8.

48. Lipsitz LA. Understanding health care as a complex system: the foundation for unintended consequences. JAMA 2012;308:243-4.

49. Braithwaite J, Churruca K, Long JC, et al. When complexity science meets implementation science: a theoretical and empirical analysis of systems change. BMC Med 2018;16:63.

50. Hotchkiss RS, Karl IE. The pathophysiology and treatment of sepsis. N Engl J Med 2003;348:138-50.

51. Rath E, Haller D. CHI3L1: a mediator of the host response to microbial colonization. Gut Microbes 2021;13:1-12.

52. Gibot S, Kolopp-Sarda MN, Béné MC, et al. Plasma level of a triggering receptor expressed on myeloid cells-1: its diagnostic accuracy in patients with suspected sepsis. Ann Intern Med 2004;141:9-15.

53. Struck J, Hein F, Karasch S, et al. Biomarkers of endothelial dysfunction in sepsis. Crit Care 2021;25:145.

54. van der Poll T, van de Veerdonk FL, Scicluna BP, et al. The immunopathology of sepsis and potential therapeutic targets. Nat Rev Immunol 2017;17:407-20.

55. Huang SS, Septimus E, Kleinman K, et al. Targeted versus universal decolonization to prevent ICU infection. N Engl J Med 2013;368:2255-65.

56. Nelson RE, Stevens VW, Khader K, et al. Economic analysis of veterans affairs initiative to prevent methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus infections. Am J Prev Med 2016;50:S58-S65.

57. Shilo S, Rossman H, Segal E. Axes of a revolution: challenges and promises of big data in healthcare. Nat Med 2020;26:29-38.

58. Prescott HC, Calfee CS, Thompson BT, et al. Toward smarter lumping and smarter splitting: rethinking strategies for sepsis and acute respiratory distress syndrome clinical trial design. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2016;194:147-55.

59. Scicluna BP, van Vught LA, Zwinderman AH, et al. Classification of patients with sepsis according to blood genomic expression. Lancet Respir Med 2017;5:816-26.

60. van Vught LA, Klein Klouwenberg PM, Spitoni C, et al. Incidence, risk factors, and attributable mortality of secondary infections in the intensive care unit after admission for sepsis. JAMA 2016;315:1469-79.

61. Nelson RE, Stevens VW, Khader K, et al. Economic analysis of veterans affairs initiative to prevent methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus infections. Am J Prev Med 2016;50:S58-S65.

62. Schuetz P, Beishuizen A, Broyles M, et al. Procalcitonin (PCT)-guided antibiotic stewardship: an international experts consensus on optimized clinical use. Clin Chem Lab Med 2019;57:1308-18.