Lactate Clearance: Still a Resuscitation Target, Still Misunderstood

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Published 9 November 2026 · Edited by Mara Voss

For decades, lactate levels have served as a biochemical beacon in critical care, guiding resuscitation efforts in conditions ranging from sepsis to trauma. The premise is straightforward: elevated lactate indicates tissue hypoperfusion and anaerobic metabolism, and its reduction signals successful resuscitation. But the simplicity of this concept often masks a complex physiological reality, leading to persistent misinterpretations of lactate clearance as a resuscitation target.

Clinicians frequently focus on the absolute value or a rapid percentage decrease, overlooking the dynamic relationship of lactate production, utilization, and clearance that dictates its trajectory. A deeper understanding of these mechanisms is essential for effective patient management, moving beyond a simplistic 'lower is better' approach.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: Lactate clearance remains a valid resuscitation target, but its interpretation requires a comprehensive understanding of its metabolic pathways and the patient's overall clinical picture.
- The Data: While specific numeric targets are not universally established, a sustained reduction in lactate levels over time correlates with improved outcomes in various shock states.
- The Action: Clinicians should integrate lactate kinetics with other markers of tissue perfusion and organ function, avoiding isolated reliance on lactate values for resuscitation decisions.

The measurement of blood lactate has become a cornerstone of critical care assessment, particularly in patients presenting with shock states. Initial lactate levels often correlate with disease severity and mortality risk, making it a valuable prognostic indicator. The rationale for targeting lactate clearance during resuscitation stems from the idea that resolving tissue hypoxia and restoring aerobic metabolism should lead to a decrease in circulating lactate. This physiological principle underpins many guideline recommendations for early goal-directed therapy in conditions like septic shock. Patients presenting with various forms of shock, including septic, cardiogenic, and hypovolemic shock, frequently exhibit hyperlactatemia. The initial assessment typically involves measuring arterial or venous lactate levels upon admission and then serially monitoring these levels to gauge the effectiveness of interventions. The goal is often to achieve a specific percentage reduction in lactate over a defined period, such as 20% clearance every two hours, or to normalize lactate levels entirely. But the interpretation of these targets requires careful consideration of the underlying pathophysiology and the limitations of lactate as a sole biomarker.

The Dual Nature of Lactate Metabolism

Lactate, often viewed solely as a marker of anaerobic metabolism, is in fact an important intermediate in cellular energy production and a significant fuel source. It is continuously produced by various tissues, even under aerobic conditions, through glycolysis. Red blood cells, skeletal muscle, and the skin are major producers. The liver and kidneys are the primary organs responsible for lactate clearance, converting it back to glucose via the Cori cycle or oxidizing it for energy. The heart also readily utilizes lactate as a fuel, particularly during periods of stress. This intricate metabolic dance means that elevated lactate can result from either increased production due to tissue hypoperfusion (Type A hyperlactatemia) or impaired clearance, even with adequate perfusion (Type B hyperlactatemia), or a combination of both.

Type A hyperlactatemia, the more commonly understood form, arises from an imbalance between oxygen supply and demand at the cellular level. This leads to a shift towards anaerobic glycolysis, producing pyruvate that is then converted to lactate in the absence of sufficient oxygen to enter the Krebs cycle. Conditions such as severe sepsis, cardiogenic shock, and hemorrhagic shock are classic examples where this mechanism predominates. Resuscitation efforts in these scenarios aim to improve oxygen delivery through fluid administration, vasopressors, inotropes, and sometimes blood transfusions, thereby reversing the anaerobic state and reducing lactate production.

Beyond Hypoperfusion: Other Causes of Hyperlactatemia

But lactate elevation is not always synonymous with inadequate oxygen delivery. Type B hyperlactatemia encompasses a range of conditions where lactate levels rise due to factors other than tissue hypoxia. This can include impaired hepatic clearance, as seen in severe liver dysfunction or cirrhosis, where the liver's capacity to metabolize lactate is compromised. Renal failure can also contribute, though to a lesser extent, as the kidneys play a secondary role in lactate clearance. Certain medications, such as metformin, epinephrine, and some antiretrovirals, can interfere with mitochondrial function or increase glycolysis, leading to elevated lactate levels without systemic hypoperfusion. Even vigorous exercise can transiently increase lactate due to high glycolytic flux in muscles, a physiological response that quickly resolves. Endocrine disorders, particularly severe stress states, can also contribute. Catecholamine surges, common in critical illness, stimulate beta-adrenergic receptors, enhancing glycolysis and lactate production. This 'stress lactatemia' can occur even in well-perfused patients and complicates the interpretation of lactate as a pure marker of hypoperfusion. Distinguishing between Type A and Type B hyperlactatemia is essential for guiding appropriate therapy. Treating impaired clearance with more fluids or vasopressors, for instance, would be ineffective and potentially harmful.

Lactate Clearance as a Target

Targeting lactate clearance in resuscitation protocols has shown benefit in various patient populations. The general principle is that a decrease in lactate over time indicates a reduction in the severity of the underlying insult and an improvement in tissue perfusion. For example, a sustained reduction in lactate levels, often defined as a 10-20% decrease every 2-4 hours, has been associated with improved survival in patients with septic shock. This approach encourages dynamic assessment and titration of therapies rather than static measurements.

But the specific targets and timeframes for lactate clearance are not universally standardized. Some protocols advocate for normalization of lactate, while others focus on a relative reduction. The challenge lies in the fact that the rate of lactate clearance can be influenced by multiple factors, including the severity of the initial insult, the patient's baseline metabolic state, and the presence of co-morbidities like liver or kidney disease. A patient with pre-existing liver dysfunction, for instance, may clear lactate more slowly even if tissue perfusion is restored, making a strict normalization target unrealistic

or misleading. The ECPR rewarming protocols, for example, often involve complex metabolic considerations that extend beyond simple lactate metrics.

Integrating Lactate with Other Hemodynamic Parameters

Reliance on lactate clearance in isolation can lead to therapeutic misdirection. A more comprehensive approach integrates lactate kinetics with other markers of tissue perfusion and organ function. These include mean arterial pressure (MAP), central venous pressure (CVP), urine output, skin perfusion, and mental status. For instance, a patient with persistently elevated lactate but improving MAP, urine output, and mental status might be experiencing Type B hyperlactatemia or a slower, but still effective, resolution of Type A. Conversely, a patient whose lactate is decreasing but who remains hypotensive and oliguric warrants further investigation into ongoing hypoperfusion.

The concept of 'resuscitation bundles' often incorporates lactate monitoring alongside other hemodynamic goals. These bundles aim to standardize initial management and ensure timely intervention. But even within these structured approaches, the interpretation of lactate requires clinical judgment. The haematocrit targets in certain conditions, for example, illustrate how specific physiological parameters must be balanced against the broader clinical picture.

The Catch: Limitations and Misinterpretations

The open-label nature of most resuscitation protocols means that blinding to lactate values is impossible, introducing potential for bias in how clinicians interpret and respond to the numbers. The trial was not powered to detect differences in specific subgroups of Type B hyperlactatemia, and that gap matters for refining treatment strategies. Lactate was tested only in mixed shock populations; whether benefits extend to specific, less common forms of shock remains unclear.

One common misinterpretation is the 'lactate paradox,' where lactate levels may initially rise or remain high despite apparent clinical improvement. This can occur if resuscitation efforts improve perfusion to previously ischemic areas, leading to a 'washout' of accumulated lactate into the systemic circulation. This transient increase does not necessarily signify worsening hypoperfusion but rather a redistribution phenomenon. Recognizing this dynamic is essential to avoid over-resuscitation or unnecessary escalation of therapy.

Another limitation is the potential for confounding factors. For example, patients receiving continuous renal replacement therapy (CRRT) may have altered lactate kinetics due to the removal of lactate by the dialysis circuit, making direct comparisons with non-CRRT patients problematic. Similarly, patients on vasopressors, particularly those with beta-adrenergic effects, can have increased lactate production independent of tissue hypoxia. These factors necessitate a careful review of the patient's entire clinical context, including medications, organ function, and ongoing interventions, when interpreting lactate trends. The adrenaline autoinjector adherence issue, while distinct, highlights how patient-specific factors can complicate even seemingly straightforward clinical guidelines.

Future Directions and Unanswered Questions

The field continues to explore more precise ways to utilize lactate. Research is ongoing into combining lactate with other biomarkers, such as central venous oxygen saturation (ScvO2) or capillary refill time, to provide a more holistic picture of tissue perfusion. The development of point-of-care lactate meters has made serial monitoring more accessible, but this accessibility also highlights the need for robust educational initiatives to ensure correct interpretation. The question remains: what is the optimal lactate clearance target for different shock etiologies, and how should these targets be adjusted for individual patient characteristics?

The next generation of clinical trials needs to move beyond simple 'lactate-guided' versus 'non-lactate-guided' comparisons. Instead, they should focus on refining specific lactate clearance strategies, perhaps tailoring them to the predominant cause of hyperlactatemia or integrating them into more sophisticated, multi-modal monitoring approaches. This would provide the granularity needed to truly optimize resuscitation efforts and improve patient outcomes. Without this, lactate will remain a useful but frequently misread indicator.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

Clinicians must move past a simplistic view of lactate as merely a marker of hypoperfusion. Its kinetics are complex, influenced by production, utilization, and clearance, meaning a high value does not always equate to inadequate resuscitation. Understanding the difference between Type A and Type B hyperlactatemia is paramount; blindly pushing fluids or vasopressors for impaired clearance is futile and potentially harmful.

The emphasis should shift from chasing an arbitrary lactate number to integrating lactate trends with a comprehensive assessment of tissue perfusion, including clinical signs, urine output, and other hemodynamic parameters. A sustained reduction in lactate is generally favorable, but a transient rise or slow decline in specific contexts might not signal failure. This requires a more thorough clinical judgment, perhaps best supported by tools like the Oxford Handbook of Critical Care.

For industry, this means developing better diagnostic tools that can differentiate between the various causes of hyperlactatemia, rather than just providing a single lactate value. Such advancements would empower clinicians to tailor interventions more precisely, avoiding the 'one-size-fits-all' approach that can lead to suboptimal outcomes. The current reliance on broad lactate targets leaves too much room for misinterpretation.

Patients, particularly those in critical care settings, stand to benefit significantly from a more sophisticated understanding of lactate. Improved diagnostic precision and individualized resuscitation strategies could lead to fewer unnecessary interventions, reduced complications, and ultimately, better survival rates. It is about treating the patient, not just the number on the screen.

EDITORIAL & AI STANDARDS

AI tools are used to structure and summarise evidence from peer-reviewed primary sources. Articles that carry a signed Editor's take have been read in full by William Lopes. The others are not individually read by an editor, so check the cited source before relying on a figure.

REFERENCES

1. 1. Font MD, Thyagarajan B, Khanna AK. Sepsis and Septic Shock - Basics of diagnosis, pathophysiology and clinical decision making. Med Clin North Am. 2020;104(4):573-585. doi:10.1016/j.mcna.2020.02.011
2. 2. Sacha GL, Bauer SR. Optimizing Vasopressin Use and Initiation Timing in Septic Shock: A Narrative Review. Chest. 2023;164(5):1216-1227. doi:10.1016/j.chest.2023.07.009
3. 3. Angus DC, van der Poll T. Severe sepsis and septic shock. N Engl J Med. 2013;369(9):840-51. doi:10.1056/NEJMra1208623
4. 4. Long B, Gottlieb M. Emergency medicine updates: Management of sepsis and septic shock. Am J Emerg Med. 2025;90:179-191. doi:10.1016/j.ajem.2025.01.054
5.

5. Bauer M, Gerlach H, Vogelmann T, Preissing F, Stiefel J, Adam D. Mortality in sepsis and septic shock in Europe, North America and Australia between 2009 and 2019- results from a systematic review and meta-analysis. Crit Care. 2020;24(1):239. doi:10.1186/s13054-020-02950-2

6. 6. Srzi I, Nesek Adam V, Tunji Pejak D. SEPSIS DEFINITION: WHAT'S NEW IN THE TREATMENT GUIDELINES. Acta Clin Croat. 2022;61(Suppl 1):67-72. doi:10.20471/acc.2022.61.s1.11

LICENCE & RIGHTS

© 2026 The Life Science Feed. All rights reserved. This content is produced for medical education purposes. It may not be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted without prior written permission from The Life Science Feed.

MEDICAL DISCLAIMER

This content is intended for healthcare professionals only and does not constitute medical advice. Clinical decisions must be made by qualified practitioners based on individual patient circumstances.

FOLLOW THE LIFE SCIENCE FEED

Instagram @lifesciencefeed **LinkedIn** linkedin.com/company/thelifesciencefeed

thelifesciencefeed.com