

The incidence of catheter-related bloodstream infections in different central venous access devices: a network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

Jinjuan Li^{1,2}, Yunrui Jin³, Yinchun Liu^{4*}, Mei Ju^{1*}

¹Department of Nursing, The Affiliated Hospital, Southwest Medical University, Luzhou, Sichuan province, China

²Department of Medicine, Guang'an Vocational and Technical College, Guang'an, Sichuan province, China

³Department of Rehabilitation, Chongqing Orthopedic Hospital of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Chongqing, China

⁴Department of Osteoarthritis, Chongqing Orthopedic Hospital of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Chongqing, China

Submitted: 3 June 2024; **Accepted:** 28 July 2024

Online publication: 5 August 2024

Arch Med Sci 2025; 21 (4): 1405–1413

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5114/aoms/191725>

Copyright © 2024 Termedia & Banach

*Corresponding authors:

Mei Ju

Department of Nursing

The Affiliated Hospital

Southwest Medical

University, Luzhou

Sichuan province, China

E-mail: 593576753@qq.com

Yinchun Liu

Department of

Osteoarthritis

Chongqing Orthopedic

Hospital of Traditional

Chinese Medicine

Chongqing, China

E-mail: 13996259326@163.

com

Abstract

Introduction: Direct paired meta-analyses and network meta-analysis were conducted to compare the incidence of catheter-associated bloodstream infections (CRBSIs) in different types of central venous access devices (CVADs).

Material and methods: The PubMed, EMBASE, Web of Science, Cochrane, CNKI and CBM databases were systematically searched from inception to May 31, 2024 for randomized controlled trials (RCTs) comparing the incidence of CRBSIs across various types of CVADs. Literature screening, data extraction, and risk bias evaluation were all independently conducted by two individuals. Direct paired meta-analyses and network meta-analysis were performed using RevMan 5.3 and Stata 14.0 software, respectively.

Results: A total of five studies were included. Paired meta-analyses revealed that the incidence of CRBSIs was lower in the peripherally inserted central catheter (PICC) group compared to the central venous catheter (CVC) group (RR = 0.23, 95% CI (0.13–0.43), $p < 0.00001$). The incidence of CRBSIs in the PICC group was observed to be lower compared to that in the totally implantable venous access port (TIVAP) group (RR = 0.45, 95% CI (0.23–0.87), $p = 0.02$). Descriptive analysis revealed a higher incidence of CRBSIs in the CVC group compared to the TIVAP group (RR = 2.97, 95% CI (1.65–5.17), $p = 0.0002$). The network meta-analysis revealed a significantly lower incidence of CRBSIs in the PICC group compared to the CVC group. However, no statistically significant differences were observed in other comparisons. Based on the cumulative ranking curve test, the incidence of CRBSIs in various CVADs was ranked as follows: PICCs (97.20%) > TIVAPs (50.00%) > CVCs (2.80%).

Conclusions: The available evidence suggests that PICCs exhibit the lowest incidence of CVADs, followed by TIVAPs. Therefore, PICCs should be prioritized when selecting CVADs.

Key words: catheter-related bloodstream infections, central venous access devices, network meta-analysis, peripherally inserted central venous catheters, totally implantable venous access ports, central venous catheters.

Introduction

Central vein access devices (CVADs) are catheters equipped with catheter tips positioned in the central vein [1]. Currently, the commonly employed CVADs in clinical practice encompass central venous catheters (CVCs), peripherally inserted central catheters (PICCs) and totally implantable venous access ports (TIVAPs) [2]. CVADs are extensively utilized in critically ill patients and cancer patients necessitating multiple chemotherapy regimens [3]. The clinical application of CVADs has led to an increasing prominence of complications, including catheter thrombosis, puncture site bleeding, catheter slippage, and catheter-related bloodstream infections (CRBSIs) [4]. The occurrence of CRBSIs represents a significant and consequential complication [5]. CRBSIs are defined as the occurrence of bacteremia or fungemia within 48 h of intravascular catheter insertion or withdrawal, accompanied by infection manifestations such as fever (greater than 38°C), chill or hypotension, and absence of any other identifiable source of infection apart from vascular catheter-associated infection [6, 7]. The occurrence of CRBSIs not only impacts patient prognosis but also significantly elevates mortality rates and hospitalization costs [8]. Treatment expenses for CRBSIs range from \$32,000 to \$69,332 [9–11]. Furthermore, patients with CRBSIs face a 2.71-fold higher risk of mortality compared to those without this condition [12].

The incidence of CRBSIs varies among different types of CVADs. In patients with PICCs, the reported incidence ranged from 0.46% to 13.4% [13–15], while in patients with CVCs, the reported incidence ranged from 1.88% to 23.53% [16–18], and the incidence of CRBSIs in TIVAPs patients ranged from 1.32% to 13.02% [13, 17, 19]. The incidence of CRBSIs was found to be higher in patients with TIVAPs compared to those with PICCs, as demonstrated by a meta-analysis [20]. A meta-analysis conducted by Chopra *et al.* revealed that PICCs had a lower risk of CRBSIs compared to CVCs [21]. Another meta-analysis conducted by Capozzi *et al.* [22] revealed no statistically significant difference in the incidence of CRBSIs between TIVAP and PICC patients. The literature included in these meta-analyses primarily consisted of retrospective studies, which are associated with numerous confounding factors. Consequently, there may be limitations regarding the reliability and accuracy of the data derived from these studies. Existing randomized controlled trials (RCTs) [23–26] or meta-analyses [20–22] have solely compared the incidence of CRBSIs between two types of these CVADs, failing to provide a comprehensive and clear comparison among various CVADs, thereby hindering optimal clinical decision-making.

While traditional paired meta-analyses are limited to comparing only two interventions, network meta-analysis enables simultaneous comparison

of multiple interventions and provides a quantitative ranking of different outcome measures based on the likelihood of advantages and disadvantages [27, 28]. In this study, a systematic review and network meta-analysis of RCTs were conducted on the incidence of CRBSIs in various types of CVADs, with the objective of providing an evidence-based foundation for selecting the most optimal CVADs (Supplementary Figure S1).

Material and methods

This network meta-analysis was conducted in accordance with the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) statement extension for network meta-analysis [29].

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Inclusion criteria

Type of study

Comparing the incidence of CRBSIs among different types of CVADs in RCTs.

Types of participants

Adult patients aged 18 years or older who were undergoing implantation of CVADs, including CVCs, PICCs, and TIVAPs.

Types of outcomes

Incidence of CRBSIs.

Exclusion criteria

- (1) Studies with unextractable or incomplete data;
- (2) Animal experiments;
- (3) Duplicate publications.

Search strategy

The incidence of CRBSIs in different types of CVADs was investigated through a comprehensive search of RCTs from PubMed, EMBASE, Web of Science, Cochrane, CNKI and CBM databases. MeSH terms were combined with free words to optimize the search strategy. Additionally, manual tracing of references in the included literature was conducted. The search period extended until May 31, 2024. The search terms included catheter-related bloodstream infection, central venous access device, central venous catheter, peripherally inserted central catheter, totally implantable venous access port, random*, etc.

Literature screening and data extraction

The literature was imported into the Endnote software for deduplication purposes. Two researchers independently screened the literature, and any disagreements were resolved through dis-

cussion with a third researcher. Initially, the titles of the literature were read to exclude obviously irrelevant studies. Subsequently, both abstracts and full texts were reviewed for further filtering. Relevant data including first author, publication date, study design type, study start time, sample size, catheter type, and number of CRBSI cases were extracted from the selected literature.

Risk of bias assessment

The quality of the literature was assessed by two researchers in accordance with the RCT bias risk assessment tool recommended by the Cochrane reviewers' handbook. The evaluation primarily encompassed seven aspects: random sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of both researchers and subjects, blind evaluation of outcomes, integrity of outcome data, selective reporting and other potential biases.

Statistical analysis

Direct pairwise meta-analyses were performed using RevMan 5.3 software, and heterogeneity was tested. Risk ratio (RR) was employed as the effect size for the count data, with each effect size presented along with the 95% confidence interval (CI). Stata 14.0 software was utilized to perform network meta-analysis based on the frequency framework. Network evidence plots were drawn for comparison between each outcome measure intervention. In the case of a closed loop in the network evidence plots, node analysis was applied to test the inconsistency. If $p > 0.05$, a consistency model was used for analysis. The surface under the cumulative ranking curve (SUCRA) was used to rank outcome indicators ac-

cordingly. A "comparison-adjusted" funnel plot was employed to assess potential publication bias.

Results

Study selection, characteristics and risk of bias assessment

A preliminary search yielded 9626 relevant literatures sources, and after a gradual screening process (Figure 1), five studies [23–26, 30] were ultimately included. The included studies were published between 2014 and 2021 and all of them were RCTs. Two studies were conducted in China, while the remaining three originated from Sweden, Italy and the UK. The number of catheters involved ranged from 23 to 303. Table I presents the essential characteristics of the included literature sources. Four studies employed appropriate randomization methods, while one study had an unclear randomization approach. Three studies concealed their allocation scheme effectively, while it remained unclear in two other studies. Regarding blinding method, although the results were not explicitly stated, due to challenges in achieving double or triple blinding for CVAD placement evaluation purposes, this aspect was excluded from the scope of literature quality reference to enhance risk control within the articles. Other aspects exhibited low risk bias levels. The risk of bias in included studies is shown in Figure 2.

Pairwise meta-analyses

PICCs versus CVCs

Two studies compared the incidence of CRBSIs between the PICC group and the CVC group. The




Figure 1. Flow diagram of study inclusion

Table I. Characteristics of interventions of included studies

Study, year	Design	Region	Duration	PICCs		CVCs		TIVAPs	
				Sample	Event	Sample	Event	Sample	Event
Taxbro 2019	RCTs	Sweden	March 2013 to February 2017	198	4			201	16
Picardi 2019	RCTs	Italy	April 2015 to October 2017	46	2	47	11		
Moss 2021	RCTs	UK	November 2013 to February 2018	212	10	212	41	253	14
				199	7	303	49	147	8
Chen 2014	RCTs	China	March 2008 to June 2013	30	2			23	1
Lian 2016	RCTs	China	August 2012 to August 2015	80	2			80	0

PICCs – peripherally inserted central catheters, CVCs – central venous catheters, TIVAPs – totally implantable venous access ports, RCTs – randomized controlled trials.

heterogeneity test result was: $I^2 = 0\%$, $p = 0.74$; therefore a fixed-effect model was adopted. The meta-analysis demonstrated a statistically significantly lower incidence of CRBSIs in the PICC group compared to the CVC group (RR = 0.23, 95% CI (0.13–0.43), $p < 0.00001$) (Figure 3).

PICCs versus TIVAPs

Four studies compared the incidence of CRBSIs between the PICC group and the TIVAP group. The heterogeneity test result was: $I^2 = 0\%$, $p = 0.45$; therefore a fixed-effect model was adopted. The meta-analysis demonstrated a statistically significantly lower incidence of CRBSIs in the PICC group compared to the TIVAP group (RR = 0.45, 95% CI (0.23–0.87), $p = 0.02$) (Figure 4).



CVCs versus TIVAPs

One study compared the incidence of CRBSIs between patients with CVCs and those with TIVAPs. Descriptive analysis revealed a significantly higher incidence of CRBSIs in the CVC group compared to the TIVAP group (RR = 2.97, 95% CI (1.65–5.17), $p = 0.0002$).

Network meta-analysis

Evidence network diagram

The occurrence of CRBSIs was reported in five RCTs involving three types of CVADs. In the figure, each dot represents a specific CVAD, while the thickness of the line connecting two points indicates the corresponding sample size. A thicker solid line signifies a greater amount of direct comparative evidence, whereas a thinner line suggests less evidence in that regard. Notably, it

**Figure 2.** Risk of bias graph**Figure 3.** Forest plot of meta-analysis (peripherally inserted central catheters versus central venous catheters)

PICC – peripherally inserted central catheter, CVC – central venous catheter.




Figure 4. Forest plots showing the meta-analysis of catheter-related bloodstream infections (peripherally inserted central catheters versus totally implantable venous access ports)

PICC – peripherally inserted central catheter, TIVAP – totally implantable venous access port.




Figure 5. Evidence network plot

PICC – peripherally inserted central catheter, CVC – central venous catheter, TIVAP – totally implantable venous access port.




Figure 6. Network Meta analysis results

PICC – peripherally inserted central catheter, CVC – central venous catheter, TIVAP – totally implantable venous access port.

can be observed that PICCs exhibit both the largest number of relevant studies and sample size (Figure 5).

Inconsistency test

The inconsistency test was performed using node analysis, and the result indicated the absence of any significant inconsistencies ($p > 0.05$). This indicated that the findings from direct comparison align with those obtained through indirect comparison.

Network meta-analysis results of CRBSIs

The incidence of CRBSIs was significantly lower in the PICC group compared to the CVC group. No significant differences were observed in other comparisons (Figure 6). Based on SUCRA values, the ranking of three CVADs was as follows: PICCs (97.20%) > TIVAPs (50.00%) > CVCs (2.80%) (Figure 7).

Publication bias analysis

The findings revealed a non-uniform distribution of all study sites across both sides of the me-

dian line, indicating a lack of symmetry and suggesting potential publication bias (Figure 8).

Discussion

As an invasive procedure, CVADs are susceptible to complications [31]. CRBSIs represent a significant complication [32]. The presence of a venous indwelling catheter compromises the integrity of the skin, allowing pathogens to invade and proliferate along the catheter, leading to bloodstream infection or even systemic infection. This poses a serious threat to patient health, resulting in prolonged hospital stays, increased mortality rates, and escalated healthcare costs [31, 33–35]. Therefore, CRBSIs serve as a crucial indicator for nosocomial infection prevention and control and have garnered considerable attention in clinical practice. The incidence of CRBSIs varies depending on different infusion tools; thus, selecting appropriate CVADs is paramount when considering CRBSI occurrence.

The present study conducted a systematic analysis comparing the incidence of CRBSIs among PICCs, CVCs, and TIVAPs. Both direct pairwise meta-analyses and network meta-analysis results consistently demonstrated that the PICC group had a lower incidence of CRBSIs compared to the CVC group. From the perspective of SUCRA probability ranking, the PICC group ranks first. Previous meta-analyses have found a reduced risk of CRBSIs in PICCs compared to CVCs [21]. Another meta-analysis showed the same results [36]. This




Figure 7. Surface under the cumulative ranking of catheter-related bloodstream infections

PICC – peripherally inserted central catheter, CVC – central venous catheter, TIVAP – totally implantable venous access port.

difference in incidence of CRBSIs between the PICC group and the CVC group may be attributed to variations in puncture locations; predominantly the upper limbs for PICCs versus the neck and subclavicular region for CVCs. The skin on the upper limb is less prone to bacterial colonization, sweat accumulation, and oily secretions than that on the neck and subclavicular region, thereby contributing to higher incidence of CRBSIs observed in the CVC group [14].

The TIVAP group also exhibited a significantly lower incidence of CRBSIs than the CVC group, with a more pronounced disparity observed when compared to the PICC group. TIVAPs offer durable venous access and employ a closed intravenous infusion system, thereby mitigating complications, particularly those related to infection [37]. TIVAPs

represent an entirely implanted closed intravenous infusion device that remains subcutaneously placed within the human body [38]. This technology boasts advantages such as minimal risk of infection, enhanced quality of life convenience, simplified maintenance requirements, and prolonged service life [39]. Since a TIVAP is an intravenous infusion device that is completely implanted under the skin and has no exposed part, the entire device has less direct contact with the external environment, reducing the incidence of CRBSIs [40, 41]. However, the PICC catheter is exposed at the elbow, which requires regular dressing change and tube flushing, and skin colonizing bacteria can easily migrate into the blood vessels, resulting in the occurrence of CRBSIs [20, 23]. When using PICCs for infusion, blood drawing, tube flushing and other operations, there is a potential risk of introducing microorganisms into the catheter lumen. Notably, the manipulation of the catheter hub represents the most prevalent source of infection [20]. In direct comparison based on meta-analytical findings, the incidence of CRBSIs was observed to be lower in the PICC group compared to the TIVAP group, which is consistent with the findings of another meta-analysis [20]. The results of the network meta-analysis comparison showed no difference between the two. From the perspective of SUCRA probability ranking, the PICC group ranks ahead of the TIVAP group. In RCTs involving a large sample of solid tumors, the incidence of CRBSIs in TIVAPs was lower than in PICCs [30]. Conversely, in RCTs with a large sample size of




Figure 8. Publication bias

Note: Comparisons including only one study (when present) have been excluded.

blood tumors, the incidence of CRBSIs was higher in TIVAPs compared to PICCs [26]. Additionally, in RCTs focusing on long-term parenteral nutrition, the incidence of CRBSIs was higher in TIVAPs compared to PICCs [23, 24]. Infusion of parenteral nutrition with TIVAPs increases the risk of catheter-associated infections. This may be due to the fact that parenteral nutrition itself, both lipids and amino acids, are conducive to bacterial colonization and biofilm formation, or that the procedure required for parenteral nutrition infusion is more frequent [42–44]. For patients with solid tumors, TIVAPs may represent a preferable option.

Although the incidence of CRBSIs varies among different types of CVADs, it is crucial to consider other risk factors that contribute to the high risk of CRBSIs. Previous studies have demonstrated that diabetes, the use of antibiotics, a long-term indwelling urinary catheter (> 7 days), the use of antibiotics, advanced age (> 55 years), and a higher Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation (APACHE) score are high-risk factors for the development of CRBSIs [45]. Therefore, we recommend constructing relevant risk prediction models to identify high-risk groups for CRBSIs and implementing targeted interventions promptly, which will effectively reduce the incidence of CRBSI. In order to better control the occurrence of CRBSIs, we recommend the use of some effective measures, such as the use of antibacterial coating restraint tubes, and strict cleaning, disinfection and puncture procedures. When intravenous therapy teams or nurses perform standardized and standardized nursing work, the infection rate will be greatly reduced, from 25–33% to 4% on average, or even lower [46, 47]. The guidelines state that all healthcare workers inserting catheters should receive formal insertion training and strictly adhere to aseptic procedures [48].

Advantages. The present network meta-analysis represents the first attempt to compare the incidence of CRBSIs among three types of CVADs, yielding a relatively robust conclusion. First of all, in terms of incidence of CRBSIs, PICCs outperformed both CVCs and TIVAPs, thus demonstrating their potential clinical value and guiding significance. This study provides a scientific basis for the selection of PICCs, CVCs and TIVAPs catheters for CVADs. Furthermore, these findings offer valuable guidance for clinicians when making decisions regarding treatment options. Secondly, this study included five high-quality RCTs, ensuring its representativeness and credibility. Lastly, by employing network meta-analysis and SUCRA probability ranking techniques, this study enhances objectivity and comprehensiveness in its results while providing more accurate references for clinical practice.

Limitations. First of all, there are variations in the number of included studies across different CVADs. Some literature exhibits a limited number of CVADs and small sample sizes. Therefore, to ensure the reliability and objectivity of the conclusions, it is imperative to confirm their scientific nature through multi-center RCTs with large samples and high-quality collaboration. Secondly, although all included subjects were adult patients with CVAD placement, differences in regional medical expertise and hospital capabilities as well as variations in intervention programs' intensity may contribute to result heterogeneity. Third, the included studies were published in both Chinese and English literature; however, some publications might be incomplete. Fourth, CRBSIs are related to the catheter type, and other factors such as total parenteral nutrition, chemotherapy, and use of immunosuppression are also related, which may lead to certain bias in this meta-analysis.

In conclusion, the limited evidence suggests that the incidence of CRBSIs with PICCs is lowest, followed by TIVAPs. Therefore, when selecting CVADs, PICCs should be prioritized based on these findings, which offer valuable clinical guidance. However, it is important to interpret these results cautiously due to the limitations in the number and quality of included studies and literature. Further high-quality direct comparative randomized controlled trials are needed to provide more reliable references for clinical applications.

Acknowledgments

Jinjuan Li and Yunrui Jin have contributed equally to this work and are co-first authors.

Funding

The study was funded by Chongqing Science and Health Joint Medical Research Project (2022MSXM197) and Chongqing Science and Health Joint Traditional Chinese Medicine Research Project (2023MSXM152).

Ethical approval

Not applicable.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Yuen HLA, Weinkove R, Ullman A, et al. Central venous access device practice across haematology and oncology centres in Australia and New Zealand: a cross-sectional survey. *Int Med J* 2023; 53: 426-30.
2. Laguna JC, Cooksley T, Ahn S, et al. Catheter-related thrombosis (CRT) in patients with solid tumors: a narra-

- tive review and clinical guidance for daily care. *Supportive Care Cancer* 2022; 30: 8577-88.
3. Yeow M, Soh S, Yap R, et al. A systematic review and network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials on choice of central venous access device for delivery of chemotherapy. *J Vasc Surg* 2022; 10: 1184-91.
4. Cotogni P, Mussa B, Degiorgis C, De Francesco A, Pittiruti M. Comparative complication rates of 854 central venous access devices for home parenteral nutrition in cancer patients: a prospective study of over 169,000 catheter-days. *JPEN J Parent Enteral Nutrition* 2021; 45: 768-76.
5. Vashi PG, Virginkar N, Popiel B, Edwin P, Gupta D. Incidence of and factors associated with catheter-related bloodstream infection in patients with advanced solid tumors on home parenteral nutrition managed using a standardized catheter care protocol. *BMC Infect Dis* 2017; 17: 372.
6. Paquet F, Morlese J, Frenette C. Use of dry dressings for central venous access devices (CVADs) to decrease central line-associated blood stream infections (CLABSI) in a trauma intensive care unit (ICU). *Br J Nursing* 2021; 30: S37-42.
7. Foka M, Nicolaou E, Kyprianou T, et al. Prevention of central line-associated bloodstream infections through educational interventions in adult intensive care units: a systematic review. *Cureus* 2021; 13: e17293.
8. Lu H, Hou Y, Chen J, et al. Risk of catheter-related bloodstream infection associated with midline catheters compared with peripherally inserted central catheters: a meta-analysis. *Nursing Open* 2021; 8: 1292-300.
9. Rupp ME, Karnatak R. Intravascular catheter-related bloodstream infections. *Infect Dis Clin N Am* 2018; 32: 765-87.
10. Cai Y, Zhu M, Sun W, Cao X, Wu H. Study on the cost attributable to central venous catheter-related bloodstream infection and its influencing factors in a tertiary hospital in China. *Health Quality Life Outcomes* 2018; 16: 198.
11. Higuera F, Rangel-Frausto MS, Rosenthal VD, et al. Attributable cost and length of stay for patients with central venous catheter-associated bloodstream infection in Mexico City intensive care units: a prospective, matched analysis. *Infect Control Hospital Epidemiol* 2007; 28: 31-5.
12. Ziegler MJ, Pellegrini DC, Safdar N. Attributable mortality of central line associated bloodstream infection: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Infection* 2015; 43: 29-36.
13. Moureau N, Poole S, Murdock MA, Gray SM, Semba CP. Central venous catheters in home infusion care: outcomes analysis in 50,470 patients. *J Vasc Interv Radiol* 2002; 13: 1009-16.
14. Sakai T, Kohda K, Konuma Y, et al. A role for peripherally inserted central venous catheters in the prevention of catheter-related blood stream infections in patients with hematological malignancies. *Int J Hematol* 2014; 100: 592-8.
15. Dong YR, Sang BL, Kim GW, Kim JH. A peripherally inserted central catheter is a safe and reliable alternative to short-term central venous catheter for the treatment of trauma patients. *J Trauma Injury* 2019; 32: 150-6.
16. Al Raiy B, Fakhri MG, Bryan-Nomides N, et al. Peripherally inserted central venous catheters in the acute care setting: a safe alternative to high-risk short-term central venous catheters. *Am J Infect Control* 2010; 38: 149-53.
17. Ross VM, Guenter P, Corrigan ML, et al. Central venous catheter infections in home parenteral nutrition patients: Outcomes from Sustain: American Society for Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition's National Patient Registry for Nutrition Care. *Am J Infect Control* 2016; 44: 1462-8.
18. Wong WY, Chan W, Ip SK, et al. Infection rate of hickman catheters versus peripherally inserted central venous catheters in oncology patients. *Hong Kong J Radiol* 2015; 18: 197-204.
19. Touré A, Vanhems P, Lombard-Bohas C, et al. Totally implantable central venous access port infections in patients with digestive cancer: incidence and risk factors. *Am J Infect Control* 2012; 40: 935-9.
20. Pu YL, Li ZS, Zhi XX, et al. Complications and costs of peripherally inserted central venous catheters compared with implantable port catheters for cancer patients: a meta-analysis. *Cancer Nursing* 2020; 43: 455-67.
21. Chopra V, O'Horo JC, Rogers MA, Maki DG, Safdar N. The risk of bloodstream infection associated with peripherally inserted central catheters compared with central venous catheters in adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Infect Control Hospital Epidemiol* 2013; 34: 908-18.
22. Capozzi VA, Monfardini L, Sozzi G, et al. Peripherally inserted central venous catheters (PICC) versus totally implantable venous access device (PORT) for chemotherapy administration: a meta-analysis on gynecological cancer patients. *Acta Biomed* 2021; 92: e2021257.
23. Chen S, Liang F, Huang X. The application of VAP and PICC for the older patients. *Chin General Pract Nurs* 2014; 17: 331-3.
24. Lian L, Huang J, Yu M. Application of implantable venous access ports and peripherally inserted central catheters in elderly inpatients. *Clin Med Engin* 2016; 23: 1409-10.
25. Picardi M, Della Pepa R, Cerchione C, et al. A frontline approach with peripherally inserted versus centrally inserted central venous catheters for remission induction chemotherapy phase of acute myeloid leukemia: a randomized comparison. *Clin Lymph Myeloma Leukemia* 2019; 19: e184-94.
26. Taxbro K, Hammarskjöld F, Thelin B, et al. Clinical impact of peripherally inserted central catheters vs implanted port catheters in patients with cancer: an open-label, randomised, two-centre trial. *Br J Anaesth* 2019; 122: 734-41.
27. Higgins JP, Welton NJ. Network meta-analysis: a norm for comparative effectiveness? *Lancet (London, England)* 2015; 386: 628-30.
28. Fu Q, Liao H, Li Z, Chen X, Zhang X, Di J. Preventive effects of 13 different drugs on colorectal cancer: a network meta-analysis. *Arch Med Sci* 2023; 19: 1428-45.
29. Hutton B, Salanti G, Caldwell DM, et al. The PRISMA extension statement for reporting of systematic reviews incorporating network meta-analyses of health care interventions: checklist and explanations. *Ann Intern Med* 2015; 162: 777-84.
30. Moss JG, Wu Q, Bodenham AR, et al. Central venous access devices for the delivery of systemic anticancer therapy (CAVA): a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet (London, England)* 2021; 398: 403-15.
31. Ray-Barruel G, Xu H, Marsh N, Cooke M, Rickard CM. Effectiveness of insertion and maintenance bundles in preventing peripheral intravenous catheter-related complications and bloodstream infection in hospital patients: a systematic review. *Infect Dis Health* 2019; 24: 152-68.
32. Wang H, Huang T, Jing J, et al. Effectiveness of different central venous catheters for catheter-related infections: a network meta-analysis. *J Hospital Infect* 2010; 76: 1-11.

33. Dreesen M, Foulon V, Spriet I, et al. Epidemiology of catheter-related infections in adult patients receiving home parenteral nutrition: a systematic review. *Clin Nutrition (Edinburgh, Scotland)* 2013; 32: 16-26.
34. Rockholt MM, Agrell T, Thorarinsdottir H, Kander T. Sustained low catheter related infection (CRI) incidence in an observational follow-up study of 9924 catheters using automated data scripts as quality assurance for central venous catheter (CVC) management. *Infect Prev Pract* 2023; 5: 100273.
35. Chong HY, Lai NM, Apisarnthanarak A, Chaiyakunapruk N. Comparative efficacy of antimicrobial central venous catheters in reducing catheter-related bloodstream infections in adults: abridged cochrane systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Clin Infect Dis* 2017; 64 (Suppl_2): S131-40.
36. Hon K, Bihari S, Holt A, Bersten A, Kulkarni H. Rate of catheter-related bloodstream infections between tunneled central venous catheters versus peripherally inserted central catheters in adult home parenteral nutrition: a meta-analysis. *JPEN J Parenteral Enteral Nutr* 2019; 43: 41-53.
37. He E, Ye K, Zheng H. Clinical effect and safety of venous access ports and peripherally inserted central catheters in patients receiving tumor chemotherapy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Palliat Med* 2021; 10: 9105-13.
38. Narita A, Takehara Y, Maruchi Y, et al. Usefulness of peripherally inserted central catheter port system (PICC-PORT) implantation in the sitting position: a new technique for cases unsuitable for conventional implantation. *Japan J Radiol* 2023; 41: 108-13.
39. Shao G, Zhou X, Zhang S, Wu S, Dong Y, Dong Z. Cost-utility analysis of centrally inserted totally implanted access port (PORT) vs. peripherally inserted central catheter (PICC) in the oncology chemotherapy. *Front Public Health* 2022; 10: 942175.
40. Liu B, Wu Z, Lin C, Li L, Kuang X. Applicability of TIVAP versus PICC in non-hematological malignancies patients: a meta-analysis and systematic review. *PLoS One* 2021; 16: e0255473.
41. Fang S, Yang J, Song L, Jiang Y, Liu Y. Comparison of three types of central venous catheters in patients with malignant tumor receiving chemotherapy. *Patient Preference Adherence* 2017; 11: 1197-204.
42. Okada S, Shiraishi A, Yamashiro Y, et al. A retrospective statistical analysis of the late complications associated with central venous port placements. *Japan J Radiol* 2015; 33: 21-5.
43. Touré A, Vanhems P, Lombard-Bohas C, Souquet JC, Lauverjat M, Chambrier C. Is diabetes a risk factor for central venous access port-related bloodstream infection in oncological patients? *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 2013; 32: 133-8.
44. Machado JD, Suen VM, Figueiredo JF, Marchini JS. Biofilms, infection, and parenteral nutrition therapy. *JPEN J Parent Enteral Nutr* 2009; 33: 397-403.
45. Wang D, Liu N, Shi Z, Ding N, Feng C, Zhao W. A meta-analysis of status and risk factors of central venous catheter-associated bloodstream infection in ICU patients. *Chin J General Pract* 2022; 20: 1954-9.
46. Pronovost P, Needham D, Berenholtz S, et al. An intervention to decrease catheter-related bloodstream infections in the ICU. *N Engl J Med* 2006; 355: 2725-32.
47. Dibb M, Lal S. Home Parenteral nutrition: vascular access and related complications. *Nutr Clin Pract* 2017; 32: 769-76.
48. WHO Guidelines Approved by the Guidelines Review Committee. Guidelines for the prevention of bloodstream infections and other infections associated with the use of intravascular catheters: Part 1: peripheral catheters. Geneva: World Health Organization© World Health Organization 2024.