



## Središnja medicinska knjižnica

**Gornik I., Vujaklija A., Lukić E., Madžarac G., Gašparović V. (2010)**  
***Hyperglycaemia in critical illness is a risk factor for later development of type II diabetes mellitus. Acta Diabetologica, 47 (Suppl. 1). pp. 27-33. ISSN 0940-5429***

<http://www.springer.com/journal/592/>

<http://www.springerlink.com/content/0940-5429/>

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00592-009-0115-6>

<http://medlib.mef.hr/1430>

University of Zagreb Medical School Repository

<http://medlib.mef.hr/>

Editorial Manager(tm) for Acta Diabetologica  
Manuscript Draft

Manuscript Number: ACDI-D-08-00106R1

Title: Hyperglycaemia in critical illness is a risk factor for later development of type II diabetes mellitus

Article Type: Original Article

Corresponding Author: Dr Ivan Gornik, MD PhD

Corresponding Author's Institution: University Hospital Rebro

First Author: Ivan Gornik, MD PhD

Order of Authors: Ivan Gornik, MD PhD; Ana Vujaklija, MD; Olga Gornik, PhD; Edita Lukic; Goran Madžarac; Vladimir Gašparović, MD, PhD

Abstract: Hyperglycaemia caused by stress and inflammation is common during critical illness. We hypothesised that a latent glucose metabolism disturbance contributes to development of hyperglycaemia and that those patients have increased risk for diabetes.

We included patients with sepsis, acute coronary syndrome and acute heart failure with no history of impaired glucose metabolism and divided them in the hyperglycaemia group (glucose  $\geq 7.8$  mmol/l) and normoglycaemia group. Patients were followed for five years.

Follow-up was completed for 115 patients in the normoglycaemia group, of which 4 (3.5%) developed type 2 diabetes. In the hyperglycaemia group 51 patients finished follow-up and 8 (15.7%) developed type 2 diabetes. Relative risk in five-year period for patients with hyperglycaemia was 4.51 for development of type 2 diabetes.

Patients with hyperglycaemia during critical illness who are not diagnosed with diabetes before or during the hospitalization should be considered a population at increased risk for developing diabetes.

Response to Reviewers: see attached file with responses.

**Hyperglycaemia in critical illness is a risk factor for later development of type II  
diabetes mellitus**

Ivan Gornik<sup>1\*</sup>, Ana Vujaklija<sup>1</sup>, Edita Lukić<sup>2</sup>, Goran Madžarac<sup>2</sup>, Vladimir Gašparović<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Intensive Care Medicine, University Hospital Centre Rebro, Kispaticeva 12,  
Zagreb 10000, Croatia

<sup>2</sup> University of Zagreb Medical School, Salata 2, Zagreb, 10000, Croatia

\* Corresponding author:

Ivan Gornik, MD, PhD  
University Hospital Rebro  
Department of Medicine, Medical ICU  
Kišpatičeva 12  
Zagreb 10000  
Croatia  
Phone: +385 91 520322  
Fax: +385 1 2667 479  
Email: ivan.gornik@gmail.com

## Abstract

Hyperglycaemia caused by stress and inflammation is common during critical illness. We hypothesised that a latent glucose metabolism disturbance contributes to development of hyperglycaemia and that those patients have increased risk for diabetes.

We included patients with sepsis, acute coronary syndrome and acute heart failure with no history of impaired glucose metabolism and divided them in the hyperglycaemia group (glucose  $\geq 7.8$  mmol/l) and normoglycaemia group. Patients were followed for five years.

Follow-up was completed for 115 patients in the normoglycaemia group, of which 4 (3.5%) developed type 2 diabetes. In the hyperglycaemia group 51 patients finished follow-up and 8 (15.7%) developed type 2 diabetes. Relative risk in five-year period for patients with hyperglycaemia was 4.51 for development of type 2 diabetes.

Patients with hyperglycaemia during critical illness who are not diagnosed with diabetes before or during the hospitalization should be considered a population at increased risk for developing diabetes.

**Key words:** hyperglycaemia, critical illness, type 2 diabetes mellitus, risk factor

## Introduction

1  
2 Hyperglycaemia during critical illness is a common occurrence and has lately been put in  
3  
4 focus after recent studies had shown that tight glycaemic control can be associated with better  
5  
6 outcomes in intensive care unit (ICU) patients [1-4]. Hyperglycaemia may occur in patients  
7  
8 with established diagnosis of diabetes, in patients with previously unrecognised diabetes, but  
9  
10 in many cases in patients with normal glucose metabolism before and after the acute disease.  
11  
12 The mechanisms leading to increase in blood glucose during critical illness are complex and  
13  
14 are a part of stress reaction and inflammatory response. Stress is associated with activation of  
15  
16 hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis with consequent release of cortisol, but stress response is  
17  
18 also associated with increase in secretion of other hormones that can induce hyperglycaemia:  
19  
20 catecholamines, glucagon and growth hormone [5, 6]. Proinflammatory cytokines such as  
21  
22 interleukin-1 (IL-1) and tumor necrosis factor alpha (TNF- $\alpha$ ) cause hyperglycaemia and  
23  
24 peripheral insulin resistance by promoting the same counter-regulatory hormones, but also by  
25  
26 altering insulin receptor signalling [7-11]. In muscle and fat cells insulin resistance decreases  
27  
28 glucose uptake, while in hepatocytes it causes ongoing gluconeogenesis despite  
29  
30 hyperglycaemia and increased insulin release. Despite hyperglycaemia and peripheral insulin  
31  
32 resistance insulin concentrations may be normal or even decreased [12-14], due to  
33  
34 suppression of pancreatic beta-cells caused by proinflammatory cytokines and stimulation of  
35  
36 alpha receptors by catecholamines [12, 15]. These endocrine and metabolic changes are  
37  
38 physiologic responses to stress and disease and probably occur in all patients, but evident  
39  
40 hyperglycaemia is not present in all critically ill patients. It is associated with severity of  
41  
42 illness, and has been associated with unfavourable outcomes in several acute conditions [1, 2,  
43  
44 16, 17]. Nevertheless, all patients with severe infections, severe myocardial infarction or other  
45  
46 critical illnesses do not develop hyperglycaemia and some will have hyperglycaemia even in  
47  
48 milder disease.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 Our hypothesis was that hyperglycaemia of critical illness occurs not only as a marker of  
2 disease severity, but also as a marker of a latent disturbance in glucose metabolism, and that it  
3  
4 may be associated with increased risk of developing overt disorder of glucose metabolism in  
5  
6  
7 the period following critical illness.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Patients and methods

This was a single centre study that included patients admitted to the Medical ICU, University Hospital Rebro during three years (Jan 2000 – Dec 2002).

Adult patients who were hospitalised in our ICU with negative history for disorders of glucose metabolism [diabetes mellitus (DM), impaired fasting glucose (IFG) or impaired glucose tolerance (IGT)] and who were discharged from the hospital alive were considered for inclusion. To enable better congruence of groups and comparison of results, we have selected only the three most frequent admission diagnoses associated with critical care hyperglycaemia in our ICU: sepsis (including severe sepsis and septic shock), acute coronary syndrome (acute myocardial infarction and unstable angina) and acute heart failure (without acute ischemia).

Two groups of patients were formed: hyperglycaemia group and normoglycaemia group.

Patients were included in the normoglycaemia group if their venous blood glucose (random measurements) during the whole ICU stay never exceeded 7.7 mmol/l, while the patients who had hyperglycaemia (random venous blood glucose  $\geq 7.8$  mmol/l) on at least two occasions formed the hyperglycaemia group. Patients with only one hyperglycaemic episode were excluded to prevent possible measurement errors. We also excluded patients who were receiving corticosteroid treatment during or two months before the ICU admission and those with an endocrine disorder that may alter glucose metabolism. Absence of hyperglycaemia was confirmed before hospital discharge to rule out patients with previously unrecognised diabetes or impaired glucose metabolism, and if the diagnosis of IFG, IGT or DM was established, the patient was excluded from the study. Other exclusion criteria were: disseminated malignant disease, end-stage chronic disease or any other acute or chronic condition that was expected to cause early fatality and hinder follow-up. Patients who were unwilling to participate were, also excluded from the study.

1 The follow-up time had to be at least five years, during which, the onset of fasting  
2 hyperglycaemia, glucose intolerance or diabetes mellitus was noted. We have concluded the  
3  
4 follow up on April 1<sup>st</sup> 2008.  
5  
6  
7  
8

9 *Definitions*

10 Impaired fasting glucose (IFG), impaired glucose tolerance (IGT) and diabetes mellitus (DM)  
11  
12 were defined according to the ADA criteria [18].  
13  
14

15 Sepsis, severe sepsis and septic shock were defined according to the usual criteria [19].  
16  
17

18 Acute coronary syndrome, unstable angina and myocardial infarction were defined according  
19  
20 to the ACC/AHA criteria [20, 21]  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 *Statistical analyses*

27 MedCalc™ v. 7.2.1.0 statistical software was used for all statistical analyses. Categorical data  
28  
29 are presented as absolute and relative frequencies, continuous variables as median with inter-  
30  
31 quartile range (IQR). Since the distribution of data of the continuous variables did not always  
32  
33 follow normal distribution, Wilcoxon's test was chosen for group comparisons of continuous  
34  
35 variables. Chi squared test for categorical variables. Statistical significance was set at  $P < 0.05$ .  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 *Conflict of interest*

44 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



## Results

1  
2 During the three inclusion years there were 1154 admissions to our ICU, 685 (59.3 %) with  
3  
4 the selected diagnoses (sepsis, acute coronary syndrome and acute heart failure), 553 with no  
5  
6 history of hyperglycaemia or diabetes mellitus prior to the admission. Of those, 511 (92.4 %)  
7  
8 were discharged from the hospital alive and were considered for inclusion in the study. We  
9  
10 have excluded 91 patients because of terminal illness (see exclusion criteria), and another 89  
11  
12 patients who had refused to be included in the study.  
13  
14

15  
16 Of the remaining 331 patients, 168 were normoglycaemic during the whole ICU stay and 135  
17  
18 had two episodes of hyperglycaemia. Only one hyperglycaemic episode was present in 28  
19  
20 patients who were excluded to rule out errors in measurement.  
21  
22

23  
24 We have excluded 26 patients from the hyperglycaemia group, since previously undiagnosed  
25  
26 diabetes or impaired glucose metabolism (IFG or IGT) was established during the  
27  
28 hospitalisation. We also excluded 19 patients who had been receiving corticosteroid therapy  
29  
30 from the hyperglycaemia group.  
31  
32

33  
34 Finally, we initiated follow-up for 168 patients in the normoglycaemia group and 90 patients  
35  
36 in the hyperglycaemia group. The two groups were well matched: there were no significant  
37  
38 differences between the two groups in age, sex distribution, family history of diabetes, body  
39  
40 mass index or cholesterol levels (Table 1). Patients in the hyperglycaemia group had higher  
41  
42 serum triglyceride concentrations than those in normoglycaemia group (median 1.9 vs. 1.4  
43  
44 respectively;  $P=0.045$ ).  
45  
46

47  
48 During the five years of follow-up, 24 (14.3%) patients in the normoglycaemia group and  
49  
50 17 (18.8%) patients in the hyperglycaemia group died. There were 29 patients in the  
51  
52 normoglycaemia group and 22 in the hyperglycaemia group who discontinued their  
53  
54 assessments and did not enter the final analysis.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 Of 115 patients in the normoglycaemia group who finished follow-up 16 (13.9%) developed  
2 fasting hyperglycaemia or impaired glucose tolerance, while 4 (3.5%) were diagnosed as type  
3  
4 2 diabetes mellitus during the follow-up period. In the hyperglycaemia group 51 patients  
5  
6 finished follow-up period of which 14 (27.5%) developed IFG or IGT, while 8 (15.7%)  
7  
8 developed type 2 diabetes (Table 2). Chi-squared test showed this to be a statistically  
9  
10 significant difference (P=0.001). According to these results, patients with hyperglycaemia  
11  
12 (defined as glucose  $\geq 7.8$  mmol/l) during critical illness had a relative risk for developing IFG  
13  
14 or IGT of 1.97 (95% CI 1.04-3.73) and for developing type 2 diabetes a relative risk of 4.51  
15  
16 (95% CI 1.42-14.30).  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 When we evaluated the three inclusion diagnoses separately we found that the absolute and  
22  
23 relative risks for the onset of newly diagnosed impaired glucose metabolism and for type 2  
24  
25 diabetes were similar among the three subgroups (Table 2).  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Discussion

1  
2 Our results show increased risk for the onset of type 2 diabetes mellitus or impaired glucose  
3  
4 metabolism (IFG or IGT) in the group of patients who had hyperglycaemia during the ICU  
5  
6 stay. Patients in the two groups did not differ significantly in the classical risk factors, so the  
7  
8 higher risk in the hyperglycaemia group could be attributed to the (pre-existent) impairment  
9  
10 of glucose metabolism, which was latent before the acute illness. During acute illness the  
11  
12 hyperglycaemic mechanisms in stress and inflammatory response led to revealing of the  
13  
14 disorder with increased blood glucose concentrations which have returned to normal after the  
15  
16 insult was weighed down. Nevertheless, the metabolic impairment remained and in some  
17  
18 patients grew to overt impairment of glucose metabolism: IFG, IGT or even diabetes during  
19  
20 the years following the acute illness.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 The results are similar among the three diagnoses included in the study: sepsis, acute coronary  
27  
28 syndrome and acute heart failure. Although the mechanisms leading to hyperglycaemia in  
29  
30 those three pathophysiologically very different conditions are probably also different, patients  
31  
32 suffer comparable risks for development of DM, IFG or IGT. This supports the theory that  
33  
34 hyperglycaemia of acute illness is only triggered by stress and/or inflammation and that there  
35  
36 is an underlying condition co-responsible for the increase in glucose. Selection of three most  
37  
38 common diagnoses enabled better comparability of the groups and analysis of the results, but  
39  
40 limits the ability to draw generalised conclusions, for which we shall need studies on  
41  
42 unselected ICU populations (surgical and medical).  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 There is no universal consensus on the definition of hyperglycaemia during critical illness  
49  
50 [22]; different studies used different criteria. We have defined hyperglycaemia during critical  
51  
52 illness as venous blood glucose concentration  $>7.8$  mmol/l, which is a cut-off value in the  
53  
54 Recommendations of the American Heart Association [23] and a threshold for initiation of  
55  
56 insulin treatment for ICU patients recommended by the American college of endocrinology  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 [24-26]. We also used personal experience according to which almost all patients have some  
2 increase in blood glucose during critical illness, so a lower threshold would not be selective  
3  
4 enough. Higher threshold would probably have hither specificity for patients with an inherent  
5  
6 glucose metabolism disturbance, but smaller selectivity. The results themselves show that the  
7  
8 threshold was well chosen. Definitive verdict on the cut-off value for hyperglycaemia in  
9  
10 critical illness is still to be made, based on past and future studies.  
11

12  
13 Despite the three years of inclusion, this was a rather small study in which we were able to  
14  
15 finalise the follow-up in only 166 patients. Larger, multi-centre studies with longer follow-up  
16  
17 period will be needed to further substantiate our results. We feel that our results are sufficient  
18  
19 enough to suggest that the patients with hyperglycaemia during critical illness, who are  
20  
21 discharged from the hospital with normal glucose control, should be perceived as patients  
22  
23 with increased risk of developing impaired glucose metabolism or diabetes and should as such  
24  
25 be regularly monitored and treated appropriately. Change in dietary habits, weight reduction  
26  
27 and physical activity should be recommended to all. Regular follow-up should also be  
28  
29 initiated (at least once a year). In addition to fasting plasma glucose measurement and oral  
30  
31 glucose tolerance test which identify glucose metabolism disturbances, adiponectin could also  
32  
33 be measured to detect patients with higher risk of insulin intolerance and thus hither risk of  
34  
35 developing type II diabetes [27].  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## References

1. Benfield T, Jensen JS, and Nordestgaard BG (2007) Influence of diabetes and hyperglycaemia on infectious disease hospitalisation and outcome. *Diabetologia* 50:549-54.
2. Christiansen C, Toft P, Jorgensen HS et al (2004) Hyperglycaemia and mortality in critically ill patients. A prospective study. *Intensive Care Med* 30:1685-8.
3. van den Berghe G, Wouters P, Weekers F et al (2001) Intensive insulin therapy in the critically ill patients. *N Engl J Med* 345:1359-67.
4. Malmberg K, Norhammar A, Wedel H et al (1999) Glycometabolic state at admission: important risk marker of mortality in conventionally treated patients with diabetes mellitus and acute myocardial infarction: long-term results from the Diabetes and Insulin-Glucose Infusion in Acute Myocardial Infarction (DIGAMI) study. *Circulation* 99:2626-32.
5. Van den Berghe G (2002) Neuroendocrine pathobiology of chronic critical illness. *Crit Care Clin* 18:509-28.
6. Langouche L and Van den Berghe G (2006) The dynamic neuroendocrine response to critical illness. *Endocrinol Metab Clin North Am* 35:777-91, ix.
7. McCowen KC, Malhotra A, and Bistrian BR (2001) Stress-induced hyperglycemia. *Crit Care Clin* 17:107-24.
8. Grimble RF (2002) Inflammatory status and insulin resistance. *Curr Opin Clin Nutr Metab Care* 5:551-9.
9. Marette A (2002) Mediators of cytokine-induced insulin resistance in obesity and other inflammatory settings. *Curr Opin Clin Nutr Metab Care* 5:377-83.
10. Marik PE and Raghavan M (2004) Stress-hyperglycemia, insulin and immunomodulation in sepsis. *Intensive Care Med* 30:748-56.
11. Aljada A, Ghanim H, Assian E et al (2002) Tumor necrosis factor-alpha inhibits insulin-induced increase in endothelial nitric oxide synthase and reduces insulin receptor content and phosphorylation in human aortic endothelial cells. *Metabolism* 51:487-91.
12. Mizock BA (2001) Alterations in fuel metabolism in critical illness: hyperglycaemia. *Best Pract Res Clin Endocrinol Metab* 15:533-51.
13. Clowes GH, Jr., Martin H, Walji S et al (1978) Blood insulin responses to blood glucose levels in high output sepsis and septic shock. *Am J Surg* 135:577-83.
14. Dahn MS, Jacobs LA, Smith S et al (1985) The relationship of insulin production to glucose metabolism in severe sepsis. *Arch Surg* 120:166-72.
15. Mehta VK, Hao W, Brooks-Worrell BM et al (1994) Low-dose interleukin 1 and tumor necrosis factor individually stimulate insulin release but in combination cause suppression. *Eur J Endocrinol* 130:208-14.
16. Metso AJ and Murros K (2007) Hyperglycaemia and the outcome of stroke. *Brain* 130:e85; author reply e86.
17. Cubbon RM, Rajwani A, Abbas A et al (2007) Hyperglycaemia, in relation to sex, and mortality after acute coronary syndrome. *Eur J Cardiovasc Prev Rehabil* 14:666-71.
18. (2008) Diagnosis and classification of diabetes mellitus. *Diabetes Care* 31 Suppl 1:S55-60.
19. Levy MM, Fink MP, Marshall JC et al (2003) 2001 SCCM/ESICM/ACCP/ATS/SIS International Sepsis Definitions Conference. *Intensive Care Med* 29:530-8.
20. Pollack CV, Jr. and Braunwald E (2008) 2007 update to the ACC/AHA guidelines for the management of patients with unstable angina and non-ST-segment elevation

myocardial infarction: implications for emergency department practice. *Ann Emerg Med* 51:591-606.

21. Braunwald E, Antman EM, Beasley JW et al (2000) ACC/AHA guidelines for the management of patients with unstable angina and non-ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction. A report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines (Committee on the Management of Patients With Unstable Angina). *J Am Coll Cardiol* 36:970-1062.
22. Goran KP (2007) The consensus is clearly needed for the definition of stress hyperglycaemia in acute myocardial infarction. *Eur Heart J* 28:2042; author reply 2042-3.
23. Deedwania P, Kosiborod M, Barrett E et al (2008) Hyperglycemia and acute coronary syndrome: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association Diabetes Committee of the Council on Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Metabolism. *Circulation* 117:1610-9.
24. Inzucchi SE and Rosenstock J (2005) Counterpoint: Inpatient glucose management: a premature call to arms? *Diabetes Care* 28:976-9.
25. Bryer-Ash M and Garber AJ (2005) Point: Inpatient glucose management: the emperor finally has clothes. *Diabetes Care* 28:973-5.
26. Garber AJ, Moghissi ES, Bransome ED, Jr. et al (2004) American College of Endocrinology position statement on inpatient diabetes and metabolic control. *Endocr Pract* 10 Suppl 2:4-9.
27. Kadowaki T, Yamauchi T, Kubota N et al (2006) Adiponectin and adiponectin receptors in insulin resistance, diabetes, and the metabolic syndrome. *J Clin Invest* 116:1784-92.

1  
2 **Table 1. Characteristics of patients in normoglycaemia and hyperglycaemia groups.**

3  
4 Categorical data are presented as absolute and relative frequencies, continuous variables with  
5  
6 medians with interquartile range.  
7  
8  
9

Characteristic	Normoglycaemia group	Hyperglycaemia group	
N	168	90	
Age (years)	57 (48-65)	60 (48.5-65)	P=0.373
Sex (F/M)	79 (47.1%) / 89(52.9%)	41 (45.6%) / 49 (54.4)	P=0.925
family history of DM	19 (11.3%)	16 (17.7%)	P=0.209
BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	28.6 (25.8-35.9)	29.5 (27.1-34.1)	P=0.337
cholesterol (mmol/l)	5.0 (4.3-5.7)	5.6 (4.2-6.8)	P=0.339
triglycerides (mmol/l)	1.4 (1.1-1.9)	1.9 (1.3-2.4)	<b>P=0.045</b>

Table 2. Incidence of impaired fasting glucose (IFG), impaired glucose tolerance (IGT) and type 2 diabetes mellitus (DM) during the five years follow-up after hospitalisation in the ICU for the three most common diagnoses

	<b>Hyperglycaemia group</b>	<b>Normoglycaemia group</b>	<b>Relative risk</b>
<b><u>Finished follow-up</u></b>			
- sepsis*	26	66	
- ACS**	14	29	
- heart failure	11	20	
<b>all patients</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>115</b>	
<b><u>New IFG or IGT</u></b>			
- sepsis*	8 (30.8%)	9 (13.6%)	2.26 (95% CI 0.98-5.21)
- ACS**	4 (21.4%)	4 (13.8%)	2.07 (95% CI 0.60-7.09)
- heart failure	3 (27.2%)	3 (15.0%)	1.82 (95% CI 0.44-7.53)
<b>all patients</b>	<b>14 (27.5%)</b>	<b>16 (13.9%)</b>	<b>1.97 (95% CI 1.04-3.73)</b>
<b><u>New Type 2 DM</u></b>			
- sepsis*	4 (15.4%)	2 (3.0%)	5.07 (95% CI 0.98-26.05)
- ACS**	2 (14.3%)	1 (3.4%)	4.14 (95% CI 0.40-41.91)
- heart failure	2 (18.2%)	1 (5.0%)	3.63 (95% CI 0.37-35.72)
<b>all patients</b>	<b>8 (15.7%)</b>	<b>4 (3.5%)</b>	<b>4.51 (95% CI 1.42-14.30)</b>
<b><u>Remained normoglycaemic</u></b>			
- sepsis*	14 (53.8%)	55 (83.3%)	
- ACS**	8 (57.8%)	24 (82.8%)	
- heart failure	6 (54.6%)	16 (80%)	
<b>all patients</b>	<b>29 (56.8%)</b>	<b>95 (82.6%)</b>	

\* includes severe sepsis and septic shock

\*\* ACS - acute coronary syndrome (unstable angina and myocardial infarction)



Dear Editor, dear dr. Lauro,

Thank you for considering our manuscript.

We have carefully considered the reviewer's comments and have made changes to the manuscript according to them.

Here are the responses to the reviewer's comments point by point

**Comment #1:**

The reviewer asks us to specify abbreviations when they are first mentioned in the text, anming "ICU" as an example.

Response:

We have added "intensive care unit" before the first appearing of "ICU" in the text. This section of the text (page #3, row#3) now reads:

intensive care unit (ICU)

**Comment #2:**

The reviewer askt that the text "Cushing's syndrome" and "of course," be deleted from the "Materials and methods" section.

Response:

The text "(e.g. Cushing's syndrome) " has been deleted from the manuscript (page 5, line 18)  
The text " of course," has been deleted from the manuscript (page 5, last row)

**Comment #3:**

The reviewer comments the presentation of results in the manuscript, asking that the data are presented as median with interquartile range.  
The reviewer also aks that we clarify the reason for using of Wilcoxon's test in the analysis of data.

Response:

In the manuscript, presentation of continuous variables is changed to median with interquartile range.

We have changed the text under "Statistical analyses section according to both comments and it now reads:

MedCalc<sup>TM</sup> v. 7.2.1.0 statistical software was used for all statistical analyses. Categorical data are presented as absolute and relative frequencies, continuous variables as median with inter-quartile range (IQR). Since the distribution of data of the continuous variables did not always follow the normal distribution, Wilcoxon's test was chosen for group comparisons of continuous variables. Chi squared test for categorical variables. Statistical significance was set at  $P < 0.05$ .

**Comment #4:**

The reviewer asks us to rewrite the beginning of the Results section to clarify it.

**Response:**

The first three paragraphs have been changed to make the beginning of the Results section more clear. The term “selected diagnoses” is clarified in the brackets. The three paragraphs now read:

During the three inclusion years there were 1154 admissions to our ICU, 685 (59.3 %) with the selected diagnoses (sepsis, acute coronary syndrome and acute heart failure), 553 with no history of hyperglycaemia or diabetes mellitus prior to the admission. Of those, 511 (92.4 %) were discharged from the hospital alive and were considered for inclusion in the study. We have excluded 91 patients because of terminal illness (see exclusion criteria), and another 89 patients who had refused to be included in the study.

Of the remaining 331 patients, 168 were normoglycaemic during the whole ICU stay and 135 had two episodes of hyperglycaemia. Only one hyperglycaemic episode was present in 28 patients who were excluded to rule out errors in measurement.

We have excluded 26 patients from the hyperglycaemia group, since previously undiagnosed diabetes or impaired glucose metabolism (IFG or IGT) was established during the hospitalisation. We also excluded 19 patients who had been receiving corticosteroid therapy from the hyperglycaemia group.

**Comment #4 cont.**

The final comment from the reviewer suggests commenting on alternatives to the use of glucose tolerance test

**Response:**

We have added a few sentences at the end of the Discussion section in which we comment on possible methods during follow-up. Adiponectin measurement is recommended as a method of identifying patients with higher risk for diabetes.

A reference [27] is added in the last sentence and in the reference list.

The end of the manuscript now reads:

... Change in dietary habits, weight reduction and physical activity should be recommended to all. Regular follow-up should also be initiated (at least once a year). In addition to fasting plasma glucose measurement and oral glucose tolerance test which identify glucose metabolism disturbances, adiponectin could also be measured to detect patients with higher risk of insulin intolerance and thus higher risk of developing type II diabetes [27].