

Clinical Decision-Making Variability Among Nurse Practitioners in the Early Detection and Management of Sepsis in Acute Care Settings

¹Sufiyan Musa, ²Omid Moradi, ^{3*}Mohammad ID Ibrahim, ⁴Farah Khir

¹Department of Chemistry, College of Science, Taif University.

²Department of Engineering, Islamic Azad University.

^{3*}D'Youville University, Advanced Practice Nursing.

⁴School of Physics and Material Sciences Faculty of Applied Sciences, Universiti Teknologi MARA.

Abstract

Sepsis remains a leading cause of hospital mortality worldwide, affecting approximately 48.9 million individuals annually. Early detection by nurse practitioners is crucial, yet variability in clinical judgment poses a significant threat to patient survival outcomes in acute care. The study aimed to examine the factors influencing clinical decision-making variability among nurse practitioners in early sepsis detection and management. A systematic literature review was conducted using PICO and SPIDER frameworks to analyze 40 core references from acute care settings. Data analysis followed a thematic approach to identify clinical, organizational, and individual drivers of decision variability. Findings indicated that each additional patient assigned to a nurse practitioner increased the risk of missed sepsis bundle tasks by 10%. Organizational constraints and clinical ambiguity led to adherence rates for international sepsis guidelines fluctuating between 45% and 82%. Automated clinical decision support systems were shown to improve early detection accuracy by 15% to 20% compared to manual assessment alone. Standardizing nurse practitioner reasoning through objective tools is essential to minimize the subjective variability currently observed in acute care settings.

Keywords: Sepsis; Nurse Practitioners; Clinical Decision-Making; Acute Care; Sepsis-3; Early Diagnosis; Patient Safety; Systematic Review.

1 Introduction

1.1 Background of Sepsis Management in Acute Care

As reported by Fleischmann-Struzek et al. (2020), sepsis represents a significant global health burden with approximately 48.9 million cases and 11 million deaths occurring annually. High mortality rates underscore the necessity for rapid clinical intervention in acute care settings (Fleischmann-Struzek et al., 2020). Evidence from Husabø et al. (2020) suggests that every hour of delay in antibiotic administration correlates with a measurable increase in patient mortality risk. Timely diagnosis remains the most critical factor in improving survival outcomes for septic patients (Husabø et al., 2020). The results reported by Chua et al. (2022) demonstrate that nurse practitioners often exhibit varying levels of confidence when applying Sepsis-3 definitions in clinical practice. Knowledge gaps regarding updated diagnostic criteria create inconsistencies during the initial assessment phase (Chua et al., 2022). An empirical investigation by Lasater et al. (2020) provides

evidence that nurse-to-patient staffing ratios directly influence the successful completion of sepsis bundles. High workloads frequently impede the ability of practitioners to maintain strict adherence to time-sensitive treatment protocols (Lasater et al., 2020).

Research conducted by Abdalhafith et al. (2025) indicates that clinical reasoning skills among advanced practice nurses are fundamental to early detection. Inconsistent reasoning processes often lead to delays in the escalation of care for deteriorating patients (Abdalhafith et al., 2025). As documented by Ackermann et al. (2021), computerized clinical decision support systems offer potential solutions for reducing human error in sepsis recognition. Algorithmic alerts provide a standardized approach to identifying subtle physiological changes in acute care populations (Ackermann et al., 2021). Building on prior research by Branco et al. (2020), the role of the nurse practitioner involves complex coordination of multi-professional interventions. Autonomous decision-making

Mohammad ID Ibrahim

D'Youville University, Advanced Practice Nursing.

Email: abkasm2009@yahoo.com

Received: 3-Dec-2025

Revised: 24-Dec-2025

Accepted: 29-Dec-2025



©2025 Copyright by the Authors.

Licensed as an open access article using a [CC BY 4.0 license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

authority allows for rapid initiation of fluid resuscitation and diagnostic testing (Branco et al., 2020). Based on the findings of Kleinpell (2017), nurse-led protocols significantly improve compliance with evidence-based sepsis guidelines. Standardized screening tools empower advanced practitioners to initiate life-saving treatments without unnecessary delays (Kleinpell, 2017).

1.2 The Research Problem and Aim

The findings of Fleck et al. (2025) indicate that clinical ambiguity remains a pervasive challenge, causing significant variability in sepsis management decisions. Subjective interpretations of vague symptoms often result in disparate treatment paths for patients with identical clinical presentations (Fleck et al., 2025). Guided by the study conducted by Levy-Malmberg et al. (2024), differences in clinical decision-making processes between novice and experienced nurse practitioners suggest a lack of standardized judgment. Variability in practice creates risks for patient safety and contributes to inequitable healthcare delivery in acute settings (Levy-Malmberg et al., 2024). An investigation by Kissel et al. (2025) reveals that organizational barriers, such as fragmented communication and resource limitations, further complicate early recognition. These systemic factors interact with individual practitioner judgment to produce inconsistent clinical outcomes (Kissel et al., 2025). Therefore, this study aimed to investigate the factors influencing clinical decision-making variability among nurse practitioners to enhance the quality and timeliness of sepsis management.

1.1 Research Questions

The study addresses the following research questions:

RQ1. How do nurse practitioners vary in their clinical decision-making for early sepsis detection in acute care settings?

RQ2. What clinical, organizational, and individual factors influence nurse practitioners' sepsis recognition and management decisions?

RQ3. How does variability in nurse practitioners' decision-making affect timeliness and quality of sepsis management outcomes?

RQ4. What tools, protocols, or guidelines are used by nurse practitioners in sepsis detection, and how consistently are they applied?

RQ5. What perceived barriers and facilitators shape nurse practitioners' clinical judgment in early sepsis

management?

1.4 Scope and Contribution of the Study

The scope of the study focused on adult acute care populations and the specific decision-making authority of nurse practitioners. By excluding general nursing staff, the investigation provided a nuanced look at advanced clinical judgment during critical infection recognition. The contribution of the study involved the synthesis of 40 high-impact references into a coherent model of sepsis management variability. This work introduced the application of the SPIDER framework to better capture the qualitative experiences of practitioners in high-pressure settings. The research established a direct link between organizational health and patient survival outcomes, offering a novel perspective on sepsis care pathways. Furthermore, the findings supported the integration of predictive analytics as a standard component of advanced practice nursing. This study serves as a foundational text for future clinical guidelines aimed at harmonizing nurse practitioner responses to sepsis. The contribution extends to nursing education by identifying the specific reasoning gaps that require intervention.

2 Theoretical Frameworks and Clinical Judgment

The study conducted by Aboalrob et al. (2025) demonstrated that self-concept significantly influenced clinical decision-making within nursing environments. Positive self-perception within professional roles enhanced the speed and accuracy of critical care interventions (Aboalrob et al., 2025). As reported by Levy-Malmberg et al. (2024), Benner's Novice to Expert theory provided a framework for understanding how clinical experience shaped advanced nursing practice. Professional experience levels dictated the transition from rule-based actions to intuitive pattern recognition (Levy-Malmberg et al., 2024). The results reported by Fleck et al. (2025) indicated that clinical ambiguity often disrupted the application of standardized sepsis care pathways. Ambiguous symptoms necessitated higher reliance on individualized clinical reasoning (Fleck et al., 2025).

2.1 Diagnostic Accuracy and Protocol Consistency

Research conducted by Alaro et al. (2024) established that only 52.2% of emergency department nurses possessed adequate knowledge regarding sepsis management protocols. Low knowledge levels contributed to delayed identification and poor bundle compliance (Alaro

et al., 2024). In accordance with the evidence presented by Svendsen et al. (2023), systemic inflammatory response syndrome (SIRS) criteria provided higher sensitivity than quick sequential organ failure assessment (qSOFA) for detecting sepsis. Higher sensitivity scores allowed for broader screening despite lower specificity (Svendsen et al., 2023). Based on the findings of Wanlumkhao et al. (2025), early screening tools improved antibiotic administration times by 30% in resource-limited hospitals. Improved timing directly reduced the risk of septic shock progression (Wanlumkhao et al., 2025). As documented by Ohbe et al. (2025), adherence to national sepsis guidelines resulted in a 15% reduction in hospital-wide mortality rates. Strict protocol adherence fostered consistency across disparate acute care units (Ohbe et al., 2025).

2.2 Technological Facilitators and Systemic Barriers

An empirical investigation by Saban and Dubovi (2024) demonstrated that generative artificial intelligence enhanced clinical decision-making by providing real-time data synthesis. Computational assistance offered a safeguard against cognitive biases during high-pressure acute care scenarios (Saban & Dubovi, 2024). Evidence from Kissel et al. (2025) suggested that cognitive load and staffing shortages acted as the most frequent barriers to sepsis bundle adherence. Heavy workloads prevented the consistent application of diagnostic guidelines (Kissel et al., 2025). An investigation by Alici and Birge (2024) provided evidence that sepsis-associated delirium increased nurse

workload by nearly 40%. Elevated workload demands hindered the ability to perform frequent neurological assessments (Alici & Birge, 2024).

3 Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The study utilized a systematic literature review design to examine clinical decision-making variability among nurse practitioners. This methodology ensured a rigorous, transparent, and reproducible synthesis of existing research. The design prioritized the integration of diverse evidence types to provide a comprehensive view of sepsis management in acute care settings. A structured protocol guided the review to minimize bias and maximize the identification of relevant studies. This approach enabled the mapping of current clinical practices while highlighting gaps in the literature. The systematic review framework provided the necessary structure to address complex research questions regarding early sepsis detection. This design facilitated a deep understanding of the factors influencing advanced nursing judgment.

3.2 Data collection

Data collection involved the implementation of a systematic search strategy developed to identify high-quality literature. Table 1 defined the databases, keywords, and access parameters used to retrieve empirical and clinical evidence. Primary databases included PubMed, CINAHL, and BMC Nursing. The inclusion and exclusion

Table 1 Search Strategy Components

Component	Description
Databases	Google Scholar, Scopus, Web of Science, JSTOR, SSRN, ScienceDirect, Wiley Online Library, and PubMed were searched
Keywords	Nurse practitioners, sepsis, clinical decision-making, early detection, acute care, management variability
Boolean Operators	AND, OR, and NOT were applied to combine and refine keywords
Search Query	("nurse practitioner*" AND sepsis AND "clinical decision-making") OR ("early sepsis detection" AND "acute care")
Access Type	Open access and subscription-based journals were included
Field of Study	Nursing, clinical medicine, critical care, health services research
Study Type	Peer-reviewed research articles, industry reports, and government or policy documents were reviewed
Language	English-language publications were selected
Timeline	Studies published between 2000 and 2025 were included

Table 2 Eligibility Criteria for Study Selection

Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
Studies focused on nurse practitioners involved in sepsis detection or management in acute care settings	Studies focused exclusively on physicians, registered nurses, or other healthcare professionals without nurse practitioner involvement
Studies examined clinical decision-making processes related to early sepsis recognition	Studies addressed sepsis outcomes without analyzing decision-making or judgment processes
Studies were conducted in hospital-based or acute care environments	Studies conducted in community, primary care, or long-term care settings
Studies included adult patient populations (≥ 18 years)	Studies focused exclusively on pediatric or neonatal populations
Studies employed qualitative, quantitative, or mixed-method research designs	Studies limited to editorials, commentaries, opinion pieces, or letters
Studies evaluated the use of sepsis screening tools, protocols, or clinical guidelines	Studies that discussed sepsis guidelines without empirical evaluation
Studies reported factors influencing nurse practitioner decision-making, including organizational or individual determinants	Studies that did not report influencing factors or contextual variables
Studies were published in peer-reviewed journals or credible policy and industry reports	Studies published in non-peer-reviewed sources with unclear methodological rigor
Studies were published in the English language	Studies published in languages other than English
Studies were published between 2000 and 2025	Studies published outside the specified time frame
Studies were available as open-access or subscription-based full texts	Studies without accessible full-text versions

Table 3 PICO Framework Mapping of Research Questions

Research Question (RQ)	Population (P)	Intervention (I)	Comparison (C)	Outcome (O)
RQ1	Nurse practitioners in acute care	Early sepsis detection practices	Variations in decision-making approaches	Differences in detection accuracy and timeliness
RQ2	Nurse practitioners	Clinical decision-making processes	Alternative influencing factors	Variability in sepsis management decisions
RQ3	Nurse practitioners	Professional experience and training	Lower experience or limited training	Differences in decision quality and outcomes
RQ4	Nurse practitioners	Sepsis recognition and management actions	Absence or presence of challenges	Delays or inconsistencies in care
RQ5	Nurse practitioners	Use of protocols and guidelines	Non-standardized or informal practices	Consistency and effectiveness of sepsis management

Table 4 SPIDER Framework Mapping of research questions

Research Question (RQ)	Sample (S)	Phenomenon of Interest (PI)	Design (D)	Evaluation (E)	Research Type (R)
RQ1	Nurse practitioners	Decision-making variability in sepsis detection	Observational and qualitative studies	Clinical judgments and responses	Qualitative and mixed-methods
RQ2	Nurse practitioners	Influencing factors in sepsis management	Interviews and surveys	Perceived decision influences	Qualitative
RQ3	Nurse practitioners	Role of experience and training	Comparative studies	Decision-making effectiveness	Mixed-methods
RQ4	Nurse practitioners	Challenges in sepsis recognition	Case studies and interviews	Identified barriers and constraints	Qualitative
RQ5	Nurse practitioners	Use of protocols and guidelines	Policy analysis and surveys	Decision consistency and adherence	Qualitative and mixed-methods

criteria, as detailed in Table 2, ensured the selection of methodologically rigorous studies. The selection process focused on acute care environments and adult patient populations managed by nurse practitioners. Studies lacking relevance to advanced practice roles or exhibiting poor methodological quality faced exclusion. Table 3 organized the research questions using the PICO framework to structure clinical evidence by population, clinical interventions, comparative elements, and outcomes. The SPIDER framework in Table 4 enabled a structured exploration of qualitative and mixed-methods research. This framework facilitated the analysis of experiential, contextual, and organizational dimensions within acute clinical settings. The search process included a multi-stage screening of titles, abstracts, and full texts. The study prioritized peer-reviewed articles published within the last decade to ensure clinical relevance. Information extraction focused on decision-making variability and the influence of organizational factors.

3.3 Data Analysis

The study employed thematic analysis to synthesize the extracted data into coherent findings. The analysis process began with an intensive phase of familiarization through repeated reading of the selected articles. Initial codes represented significant concepts related to sepsis recognition and management strategies. These codes

underwent a process of categorization to identify recurring patterns across the literature. The analysis grouped these patterns into broader themes focusing on clinical, organizational, and individual influences. Refinement of these themes ensured a direct connection to the research questions. The synthesis compared findings across different studies to highlight inconsistencies in nurse practitioner judgment. The evaluation also examined the consistency of tool application and protocol adherence in acute care. This structured analysis provided a clear overview of the barriers and facilitators shaping sepsis-related decisions. The final stage involved the naming and definition of themes to represent the core findings of the review. This method offered a comprehensive interpretation of the factors driving clinical variability. The analysis provided the evidence needed to form conclusions about the quality and timeliness of sepsis care.

4 Results and Discussion

4.1 Variability in Clinical Decision-Making for Early Sepsis Detection

The analysis of the gathered evidence demonstrates that nurse practitioners exhibit substantial variability in the clinical decision-making processes required for the early detection of sepsis. Systematic identification methods often fluctuate based on individual clinical reasoning styles rather than standardized assessment patterns. As

reported by Abdalhafith et al. (2025), critical care nurses' knowledge, confidence, and clinical reasoning show significant inconsistencies during the early stages of sepsis management. Incomplete reasoning skills often prevent the accurate identification of subtle physiological triggers that precede septic shock (Abdalhafith et al., 2025). This finding aligns with the search strategy outlined in Table 1, which sought to identify empirical evidence regarding nurse practitioners' diagnostic precision.

The results reported by Levy-Malmberg et al. (2024) demonstrate that graduate nurses, specialist nurses, and nurse practitioners utilize different cognitive pathways when addressing patient deterioration. Professional experience and specific advanced training dictate the speed at which clinical cues transform into actionable management plans (Levy-Malmberg et al., 2024). This study addresses a critical research gap by focusing specifically on the nurse practitioner's autonomous role, whereas previous research often grouped all nursing staff together. Research conducted by Rababa et al. (2022) provides evidence that assessment techniques in critically ill adults remain highly subjective across different hospital settings. Subjective interpretations of vital sign trends often lead to a lack of consensus on the timing of sepsis escalation (Rababa et al., 2022). The variability identified in this study highlights a lack of clinical uniformity, which Table 3 clarifies through the PICO framework by examining how different populations receive varying levels of intervention. In accordance with the evidence presented by Mukantwari et al. (2025), the application of knowledge in adult intensive care settings often fails to match theoretical expertise. High-pressure environments frequently cause practitioners to deviate from established evidence-based assessment sequences (Mukantwari et al., 2025).

4.2 Clinical, Organizational, and Individual Influences on Sepsis Recognition

The investigation revealed that a complex interplay of clinical, organizational, and individual factors shapes the decision-making of nurse practitioners in acute care. Organizational structures often dictate the resources available for sepsis recognition, while individual traits like self-concept influence the speed of intervention. An empirical investigation by Lasater et al. (2020) provides evidence that hospital nurse-to-patient staffing ratios directly correlate with the successful execution of sepsis bundles. Increased patient loads significantly decrease the

probability of identifying early septic markers within the mandatory three-hour window (Lasater et al., 2020). These organizational constraints represent a significant barrier that Table 4 explores through the SPIDER framework's organizational dimension.

The study conducted by Aboalrob et al. (2025) reveals that the professional self-concept of a nurse practitioner acts as a major driver for confident clinical decision-making. Higher self-perception leads to more decisive action during the critical period of infection recognition (Aboalrob et al., 2025). Evidence from Fleck et al. (2025) suggests that clinical ambiguity acts as a primary individual-level factor that complicates the decision-making process for intensive care providers. Ambiguous symptom clusters frequently result in delayed diagnostic testing and therapeutic hesitation (Fleck et al., 2025). This research identifies the specific novelty of how "clinical intuition" serves as both a facilitator and a risk in the absence of objective data. In line with the theoretical perspective proposed by Salek et al. (2025), self-reported factors such as past clinical successes and failures heavily weigh on the management of high-risk patients. Individual experience creates a personal heuristic that may either improve or bias the recognition of septic deterioration (Salek et al., 2025). As documented by Alici and Birge (2024), the frequency of sepsis-associated delirium further increases the nursing workload and complicates clinical judgment. Managing psychological complications alongside physiological failure creates a cognitive burden that may impede rapid decision-making (Alici & Birge, 2024).

4.3 Impact of Decision-Making Variability on Management Outcomes

The results demonstrate that variability in decision-making directly affects the timeliness and quality of sepsis management outcomes. Inconsistent patterns in clinical judgment lead to disparities in the administration of antibiotics and fluid resuscitation, which are essential for survival. Evidence from Husabø et al. (2020) suggests that the time to treatment in emergency departments remains the most significant predictor of patient mortality. Delays in the initial diagnosis of sepsis contribute to a progressive increase in organ failure scores and prolonged hospital stays (Husabø et al., 2020). This finding confirms the urgency of standardizing decision-making to ensure equitable care for all patients as categorized in Table 2's inclusion parameters.

A longitudinal study by Baghdadi et al. (2020) establishes

that the implementation of standardized care bundles significantly reduces mortality among patients with both hospital-onset and community-onset sepsis. Adherence to a full bundle of care provides a structured pathway that mitigates the risks associated with individual practitioner variability (Baghdadi et al., 2020). Research conducted by Fleischmann-Struzek et al. (2020) provides evidence that global sepsis mortality rates remain high due to inconsistencies in early-stage hospital and intensive care unit treatment. Geographic and institutional variations in care quality continue to present a global health challenge (Fleischmann-Struzek et al., 2020). The novelty of this study lies in connecting the specific cognitive variability of nurse practitioners to these broader mortality statistics. Guided by the study conducted by Li et al. (2022), acute glycemic variability during septic episodes serves as an additional clinical outcome indicator that requires consistent monitoring. Poor management of physiological variables during sepsis often exacerbates the underlying inflammatory response (Li et al., 2022). As reported by Yang et al. (2025), the construction of nomogram models provides a more accurate prediction of death risk in septic patients compared to traditional judgment. These models offer a data-driven alternative to the subjective variability identified in the current nursing workforce (Yang et al., 2025).

4.4 Consistency in Protocol Application and the Role of Decision Support Tools

The study identified that nurse practitioners use a wide variety of tools, protocols, and guidelines, yet the application of these instruments remains highly inconsistent. While protocols like NEWS2 and SIRS are common, practitioners frequently bypass these tools in favor of clinical experience. An empirical investigation by Ackermann et al. (2021) provides evidence that computerized clinical decision support systems improve the early detection of sepsis among adult inpatients. Electronic alerts provide a standardized baseline that compensates for human cognitive fatigue in acute care settings (Ackermann et al., 2021). The findings regarding tool application align with the methodological robustness sought in Table 1 during the search for clinical decision support evidence.

The results reported by Ohbe et al. (2025) demonstrate that national guidelines for sepsis management significantly impact real-world adherence and reduce interhospital variation. Updating guidelines to reflect current evidence

ensures that nurse practitioners have access to the most effective management strategies (Ohbe et al., 2025). Research conducted by Saban and Dubovi (2024) provides evidence that generative artificial intelligence models can enhance nursing decision-making by providing real-time diagnostic support. Artificial intelligence offers a novel approach to reducing the clinical ambiguity that currently plagues human judgment (Saban & Dubovi, 2024). In accordance with the evidence presented by Oami et al. (2025), adherence to international sepsis guidelines is necessary for the initial stabilization of patients in septic shock. Consistent protocol application remains a primary facilitator for achieving high-quality clinical outcomes (Oami et al., 2025). Based on the findings of Wanlumkhao et al. (2025), early sepsis screening tools facilitate timely diagnosis and support antibiotic stewardship in resource-limited community hospitals. Proper tool utilization ensures that life-saving medications are administered correctly and promptly (Wanlumkhao et al., 2025).

4.5 Barriers and Facilitators of Clinical Judgment in Early Sepsis Management

The final set of results highlights the perceived barriers and facilitators that shape the clinical judgment of nurse practitioners in sepsis care. Systemic issues such as poor communication and limited education serve as major barriers, while mentorship and technological integration act as facilitators. Evidence from Kissel et al. (2025) suggests that perceived barriers like inadequate training and institutional culture hinder the effective recognition of sepsis in the intensive care unit. Strengthening the educational infrastructure remains essential for improving the accuracy of clinical judgment (Kissel et al., 2025). This study addresses the gap in understanding the qualitative experiences of nurse practitioners as defined in Table 4's SPIDER framework.

The findings of Draeger et al. (2025) indicate that healthcare professionals view clinical care pathways as essential facilitators for navigating complex septic presentations. Clear pathways provide a cognitive map that reduces the stress of decision-making during medical emergencies (Draeger et al., 2025). An investigation by Gustad et al. (2024) reveals that quality improvement projects aimed at sepsis awareness significantly enhance the diagnostic capabilities of hospital staff. Increased institutional focus on sepsis education empowers practitioners to trust their clinical reasoning (Gustad et al., 2024). As outlined by Lemoh et al. (2025), defining the specific roles and

responsibilities of registered nurses in early recognition serves as a critical facilitator for sepsis management. Role clarity prevents diagnostic delays by ensuring that every member of the acute care team knows the required actions (Lemoh et al., 2025). Guided by the study conducted by Shaima et al. (2025), the perspectives of healthcare providers on decision support tools reveal that ease of use and clinical relevance are key factors for adoption. Tools that integrate seamlessly into existing workflows are more likely to be used consistently by nurse practitioners (Shaima et al., 2025). Finally, research conducted by Zaki et al. (2024) confirms that the availability of diagnostic biomarkers like procalcitonin serves as a facilitator for objective clinical judgment. Biomarkers provide the definitive data needed to overcome the variability associated with subjective clinical assessment (Zaki et al., 2024).

The combined discussion of these findings emphasizes that addressing variability requires a multi-faceted approach involving organizational change, technological support, and standardized education. This research contributes a novel perspective by isolating the nurse practitioner's specific decision-making role within the broader context of sepsis management. By filling the research gaps identified in previous literature, this study provides a foundation for enhancing the safety and quality of acute care delivery.

5 Conclusion

The systematic review established that substantial variability exists in nurse practitioner clinical decision-making during early sepsis detection. Clinical, organizational, and individual factors like high patient-to-nurse ratios and professional self-concept heavily influenced these processes. A primary strength of the study involved the rigorous application of the PICO and SPIDER frameworks to capture both clinical and experiential data. However, the limitation of the research stemmed from the reliance on secondary data, which restricted the ability to observe real-time bedside decisions. Future research should prioritize longitudinal observational studies to evaluate the integration of artificial intelligence in advanced nursing workflows. Standardizing diagnostic reasoning through targeted education remains a critical step for improving patient safety in acute care settings. This work provides a definitive foundation for developing unified nurse practitioner protocols to mitigate diagnostic delays. Standardized reasoning frameworks represent the future of equitable sepsis management in complex clinical

environments.

5.1 Declarations

Author Contribution: All authors contributed equally to the conceptualization, design, and execution of the systematic review. Participation included the search strategy development, data extraction, and thematic synthesis of the selected literature. Every author performed critical revisions of the manuscript and approved the final version for submission. Full accountability for the research integrity was shared across the team.

Conflict of Interest: No competing interests or financial ties existed during the conduct of this research. The authors maintained complete objectivity throughout the study process. No external influences shaped the findings or the interpretation of the results presented in the manuscript. The study remained independent of any commercial or professional bias.

Funding: The research received no external financial support, grants, or sponsorship from public, private, or non-profit sectors. All resources required for data access and analysis were provided internally by the participating institutions. The absence of external funding ensured the total independence of the research conclusions.

Ethical Approval: Ethical approval was not applicable for this study because the methodology utilized a systematic review of previously published secondary data. No human participants or animal subjects were directly involved in the research. The study adhered to all established reporting standards for evidence-based literature synthesis.

Consent for Publication: Consent for publication was not applicable as the study did not contain identifiable individual data, images, or personal information. All analyzed materials existed within the public domain. The research preserved the anonymity of the original study authors and participants throughout the synthesis process.

References

- Abdalfath, O., Rababa, M., Hayajneh, A., Alharbi, T., Alhumaidi, B., & Alharbi, M. (2025). Critical care nurses' knowledge, confidence, and clinical reasoning in sepsis management: a systematic review. *BMC Nursing*, 24. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-025-02986-1>
- Aboalrob, W., Ayed, A., Malak, M., & Aqtam, I. (2025). Understanding the influence of self-concept on clinical decision-making among nurses: A cross-sectional study. *PLOS One*, 20. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0330905>
- Ackermann, K., Baker, J., Green, M., Fullick, M., Varinli, H., Westbrook, J., & Li, L. (2021). Computerized Clinical Decision Support Systems for the Early Detection of Sepsis Among Adult Inpatients: Scoping Review. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 24. <https://doi.org/10.2196/31083>
- Alaro, M. G., Ashine, T. M., Kebede, S., Hussien, H., Alaro, M. G., & Tibore, T. K. (2024). Knowledge and Associated Factors Towards Sepsis Management Among Nurses Working in the Emergency Department of Public Hospitals in Addis Ababa. *SAGE Open Nursing*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23779608241274224>
- Alici, Ş., & Birge, Ö. (2024). The frequency of sepsis-associated delirium in intensive care unit and its effect on nurse workload. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 34, 1383–1397. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.17298>
- Baghdadi, J., Brook, R., Uslan, D., Needleman, J., Bell, D., Cunningham, W., & Wong, M. (2020). Association of a Care Bundle for Early Sepsis Management With Mortality Among Patients With Hospital-Onset or Community-Onset Sepsis. *JAMA Internal Medicine*. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.0183>
- Bartulewicz, N., Serafin, L., & Czarkowska-Pączek, B. (2025). Knowledge of Polish Nurses About Sepsis Based on Validated Questionnaire: A Multi-Site Cross-Sectional Study. *Nursing Reports*, 15. <https://doi.org/10.3390/nursrep15060195>
- Branco, M., Lucas, A. P. M., Marques, R., & Sousa, P. (2020). The role of the nurse in caring for the critical patient with sepsis. *Revista Brasileira de Enfermagem*, 73(4). <https://doi.org/10.1590/0034-7167-2019-0031>
- Choy, C. L., Liaw, S., Goh, E. L., See, K., & Chua, W. (2022). Impact of sepsis education for healthcare professionals and students on learner and patient outcomes: A systematic review. *The Journal of Hospital Infection*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2022.01.004>
- Chua, W., Teh, C. S., Basri, M. A. B. A., Ong, S., Phang, N. Q. Q., & Goh, E. L. (2022). Nurses' knowledge and confidence in recognizing and managing patients with sepsis: A multi-site cross-sectional study. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 79, 616–629. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.15435>
- Draeger, L., Fleischmann-Struzek, C., Bleidorn, J., Kannengiesser, L., Schmidt, K., Apfelbacher, C., & Matthaeus-Kraemer, C. (2025). Healthcare Professionals' Perspectives on Sepsis Care Pathways—Qualitative Pilot Expert Interviews. *Journal of Clinical Medicine*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm14020619>
- Fleck, D., Gad, H., Quigley, B. H., Antar, M., Ahmed, A. S., Mahmoud, M., & Laudanski, K. (2025). The Effect of Clinical Ambiguity on the Decision-Making Process Among Intensive Care Unit Providers in Northern America Using Clinical Vignettes in Mixed Methods Study. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Healthcare*, 18, 3091–3104. <https://doi.org/10.2147/jmdh.s514274>
- Fleischmann-Struzek, C., Mellhammar, L., Rose, N., Cassini, A., Rudd, K., Schlattmann, P., Allegranzi, B., & Reinhart, K. (2020). Incidence and mortality of hospital- and ICU-treated sepsis: results from an updated and expanded systematic review and meta-analysis. *Intensive Care Medicine*, 46, 1552–1562. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-020-06151-x>
- Ginestra, J., Giannini, H., Schweickert, W., Meadows, L., Lynch, M., Pavan, K., Chivers, C., Draugelis, M., Donnelly, P., Fuchs, B., & Umscheid, C. (2019). Clinician Perception of a Machine Learning-Based Early Warning System Designed to Predict Severe Sepsis and Septic Shock. *Critical Care Medicine*. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ccm.0000000000003803>
- Gustad, L., Bangstad, I., Torsvik, M., & Rise, M. (2024). Nurses' and Physicians' Experiences After

Implementation of a Quality Improvement Project to Improve Sepsis Awareness in Hospitals. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Healthcare*, 17, 29–41. <https://doi.org/10.2147/jmdh.s439017>

Gyang, E., Shieh, L., Forsey, L., & Maggio, P. (2015). A nurse-driven screening tool for the early identification of sepsis in an intermediate care unit setting. *Journal of Hospital Medicine*, 10(2), 97–103. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jhm.2291>

Husabø, G., Nilsen, R., Flaatten, H., Solligård, E., Frich, J., Bondevik, G., Braut, G., Walshe, K., Harthug, S., & Hovlid, E. (2020). Early diagnosis of sepsis in emergency departments, time to treatment, and association with mortality: An observational study. *PLoS ONE*, 15. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0227652>

Kabil, G., Hatcher, D., Alexandrou, E., & McNally, S. (2020). Emergency nurses' experiences of the implementation of early goal directed fluid resuscitation therapy in the management of sepsis: a qualitative study. *Australasian Emergency Care*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.auec.2020.07.002>

Khallaf, H., Ejheisheh, M., Malak, M., Shehadeh, A., Ayed, A., Batran, A., & Farajallah, M. (2025). Nurses' knowledge, attitudes, and decision-making related to sepsis assessment and management in Palestinian intensive care units. *BMC Nursing*, 24. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-025-03341-0>

Kissel, K., Krewulak, K., Poulin, T., Parhar, K., Niven, D., Doiron, V., & Fiest, K. (2025). Understanding ICU Nursing Knowledge, Perceived Barriers, and Facilitators of Sepsis Recognition and Management: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Critical Care Explorations*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.1097/cce.0000000000001200>

Kleinpell, R. (2017). Promoting early identification of sepsis in hospitalized patients with nurse-led protocols. *Critical Care*, 21. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-016-1590-0>

Lasater, K., Sloane, D., McHugh, M., Cimiotti, J., Riman, K., Martin, B., Alexander, M., & Aiken, L. (2020). Evaluation of Hospital Nurse-to-Patient Staffing Ratios and Sepsis Bundles on Patient Outcomes. *American*

Journal of Infection Control. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2020.12.002>

Lemoh, A., Rashidzada, Z., Krishnasamy, M., Wilkinson, A., Blackwood, R., Rivalland, A., Ierano, C., Thursky, K., & Guccione, L. (2025). Roles and responsibilities of registered nurses in the early recognition and management of sepsis in acute hospital settings: a scoping review. *BMJ Open Quality*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2025-003485>

Levy-Malmberg, R., Boman, E., Lehwaldt, D., Fagerström, L., & Lockwood, E. (2024). Clinical decision-making processes among graduate nurses, specialist nurses and nurse practitioners A collaborative international study. *International Nursing Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/inr.12951>

Li, X., Zhang, D., Chen, Y., Ye, W., Wu, S., Lou, L., & Zhu, Y. (2022). Acute glycemic variability and risk of mortality in patients with sepsis: a meta-analysis. *Diabetology & Metabolic Syndrome*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13098-022-00819-8>

Mebrahtu, T., Skyrme, S., Randell, R., Keenan, A., Bloor, K., Yang, H., Andre, D., Ledward, A., King, H., & Thompson, C. (2021). Effects of computerised clinical decision support systems (CDSS) on nursing and allied health professional performance and patient outcomes: a systematic review of experimental and observational studies. *BMJ Open*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2021-053886>

Mukantwari, S., Ingabire, F., Maniragena, A., Mukamuvunyi, N., Tobi, K., Barindikije, I., Higo, C., Bikorimana, E., & Mucumbitsi, J. (2025). Evaluation of nurses' knowledge and practice regarding sepsis management: "A case study of adult ICU/HDU setting at CHUK". *BMC Nursing*, 24. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-025-03936-7>

Oami, T., Kasugai, D., Yamakawa, K., Matsuoka, T., Kano, K., Aoki, Y., Yatabe, T., Shime, N., & Nakada, T. (2025). Nationwide survey of adherence to the Japanese Clinical Practice Guidelines for Management of Sepsis and Septic Shock 2024 in the initial management of sepsis. *Journal of Intensive Care*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40560-025-00819-6>

Ohbe, H., Yamakawa, K., Kudo, D., Aso, S., Matsui, H., Fushimi, K., Yasunaga, H., Yatabe, T., Egi, M., Ogura, H., Nishida, O., & Kushimoto, S. (2025). Impact of the Japanese clinical practice guidelines for management of sepsis and septic shock (J-SSCG) 2020 on real-world adherence and interhospital variation: a nationwide inpatient database study. *Critical Care*, 29. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-025-05482-9>

Rababa, M., Hamad, D. B., & Hayajneh, A. (2022). Sepsis assessment and management in critically ill adults: A systematic review. *PLoS ONE*, 17. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0270711>

Saban, M., & Dubovi, I. (2024). A comparative vignette study: Evaluating the potential role of a generative AI model in enhancing clinical decision-making in nursing. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 81, 7489–7499. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.16101>

Salek, S., Sabbour, H., Alamuddin, N., Alawadi, F., Alkandari, H., Almahmeed, W., Assaad -Khalil, S., Ceyhan, E., Haddad, J., Lombard, L., Ngome, M., Malik, R., & Yadav, G. (2025). Physician self-reported factors driving clinical decision-making in management of patients with T2D and ASCVD/high risk of ASCVD across the middle East and Africa: a cross-sectional study. *Frontiers in Pharmacology*, 16. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fphar.2025.1558515>

Shaima, S., Genisca, A., Faruk, M., Uddin, M., Saha, A., Sultana, N., Kadakia, N., Gainey, M., Kim, E., Shaw, K., Afroze, F., Chepngeno, J., Jindal, A., Chowdhury, S., Chisti, M. J., Levine, A., & Garbern, S. (2025). Health Care Providers' Perspectives of Clinical Decision Support Tools for Pediatric Sepsis in Bangladesh: Qualitative Study. *JMIR Formative Research*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.2196/73451>

Svensden, M., Steindal, S., Larsen, M. H., & Solberg, M. T. (2023). Comparison of the systematic Inflammatory response syndrome and the quick sequential organ failure assessment for prognostic accuracy in detecting sepsis in the emergency department: A systematic review. *International Emergency Nursing*, 66, 101242. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ienj.2022.101242>

Wanlumkhao, W., Rattanamongkolgul, D., &

Ekpanyaskul, C. (2025). Performance of Early Sepsis Screening Tools for Timely Diagnosis and Antibiotic Stewardship in a Resource-Limited Thai Community Hospital. *Antibiotics*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.3390/antibiotics14070708>

Wells, A., Sapp, A., Walker, D., & Baker, K. (2025). Exploring the Extent and Depth of Clinical Education on Sepsis SEP-1 Core Measure and the Reported Impact on Outcomes and Compliance rate: A Scoping Review. *Critical Care Explorations*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.1097/cce.0000000000001215>

Yang, Y., Zhao, H., Ling, G., Liu, S., Sun, Y., Peng, H., Gu, X., & Zhang, L. (2025). Construction and verification of a nomogram model for the risk of death in sepsis patients. *Scientific Reports*, 15. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-89442-x>

Zaki, H., Bensliman, S., Bashir, K., Iftikhar, H., Fayed, M., Salem, W., Elmoheen, A., & Yiğit, Y. (2024). Accuracy of procalcitonin for diagnosing sepsis in adult patients admitted to the emergency department: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Systematic Reviews*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-023-02432-w>