

# Peripheral intravenous catheter non-infectious complications in adults: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Nicole Marsh<sup>1,2,3</sup>  | Joan Webster<sup>1,2</sup> | Amanda J. Ullman<sup>1,2,3</sup> | Gabor Mihala<sup>2,4,5</sup> | Marie Cooke<sup>2,3</sup>  | Vineet Chopra<sup>2,6</sup> | Claire M. Rickard<sup>1,2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Nursing and Midwifery Research Centre, Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia

<sup>2</sup>Alliance for Vascular Access Teaching and Research, Menzies Health Institute Queensland, Griffith University, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia

<sup>3</sup>School of Nursing and Midwifery, Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia

<sup>4</sup>School of Medicine, Griffith University, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia

<sup>5</sup>Centre for Applied Health Economics, Menzies Health Institute Queensland, Griffith University, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia

<sup>6</sup>Division of Hospital Medicine, Department of Medicine, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA

## Correspondence

Nicole Marsh, Nursing and Midwifery Research Centre, Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital, Butterfield St, Herston, Queensland, 4029 Australia.  
Email: nicole.marsh@health.qld.gov.au

## Abstract

**Aims:** The aim of this systematic review and meta-analysis was to summarize and quantify peripheral intravenous catheter-related complications.

**Design:** This systematic review is reported by means of the Cochrane process for randomized controlled trials and the Meta-analysis of Observation Studies in Epidemiology for cohort studies.

**Data sources:** The Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, PubMed, CINAHL and EMBASE databases, clinical trial registries such as ClinicalTrials.gov and the reference list of included studies were searched from 2000 -April 2019.

**Review Methods:** Using a purpose designed data extraction tool, two authors independently identified studies for full review, data extraction and quality assessment. Dichotomous outcomes were pooled after Freeman-Tukey double arcsine transformation using random-effects meta-analysis; estimates of heterogeneity were taken from inverse-variance fixed-effect models.

**Results:** Seventy observational studies and 33 randomized controlled trials were included (76,977 catheters). Peripheral intravenous catheter-related complications were as follows: phlebitis (with definition) 19.3%, phlebitis (without definition) 4.5%, infiltration/extravasation 13.7%, occlusion 8%, leakage 7.3%, pain 6.4% and dislodgement 6.0%. Subgroup analysis found infiltration/extravasation for emergency department-inserted catheters was significantly higher (25.2%;  $p = .022$ ) than for those inserted in other departments and pain was significantly higher ( $p < .001$ ) in countries with developing economies compared with developed economies.

**Conclusion:** Peripheral intravenous catheter complications are unacceptably common worldwide. This review suggests substantial and multi-specialty efforts are needed to address the sequelae associated with complications. The potential benefits for patients and health services are considerable if complications are reduced.

**Impact:** Peripheral intravenous complications interrupt important treatment which can be distressing for patients and result in longer hospital stays with increased healthcare costs. This review found phlebitis and infiltration are the most prevalent reason for catheter failure. These results provide nurses with a strong evidence base for the development of effective interventions for practice which are vital for preventing poor outcomes for patients with peripheral intravenous catheters.

**KEYWORDS**

catheterization, catheter obstruction, extravasation, infiltration, MESH: Catheters, Indwelling, nurse, nursing, phlebitis, thrombophlebitis

## 1 | INTRODUCTION

Peripheral intravenous catheters (PVCs) are the most common vascular access devices (VAD) with annual sales of approximately 2 billion each year (Rickard, 2017). They are the preferred VAD for the short-term delivery of intravascular fluids, medications, blood products and contrast media (Dougherty, 2008b; Sabri et al., 2012) and up to 70% of hospitalized patients require at least one PVC per hospital admission (Zingg & Pittet, 2009). However, for such an important device PVCs remain highly susceptible to complications resulting in catheter failure, which has been reported in individual studies to be as high as 69% (Marsh et al., 2015), but worldwide literature has never been systematically synthesized which may lead to an underappreciation of these rates. Failed PVCs require treatment of the minor or serious complication and typically the insertion of a new catheter, which is commonly upsetting and painful for the patient (Cooke et al., 2018; Helm et al., 2015; Larsen et al., 2017). PVC failure places burden on health-care budgets associated with additional staff time and products; delays time to sensitive treatments such as chemotherapy or antibiotics increasing the risk of preventable harm; and repeated PVC insertions can cause venous access depletion, potentiating need for central venous access devices with their higher risk of significant complications and cost (Hawes, 2007). While attempts have been made to synthesize infection outcomes in PVCs (Maki et al., 2006; Mermel, 2017), these are rare, and no similar attempt has been made to comprehensively understand the burden of non-infectious complications.

### 1.1 | Background

Peripheral intravenous catheters fail for several reasons, but over the last two decades phlebitis has been the focus of PVC complications and failure (Higginson & Parry, 2011; Ray-Barruel et al., 2014). Phlebitis is the irritation or inflammation of a vein wall and categorized as mechanical (related to the action of the PVC in the vein), chemical (related to infusates or medication) and bacterial (related to contamination at the insertion site, intravenous solution or tubing) (Macklin, 2003; Marsh, et al., 2015). When associated with thrombus formation, it is referred to as thrombophlebitis (McCallum & Higgins, 2012; Ray-Barruel et al., 2014; Zingg & Pittet, 2009).

PVCs also fail from infiltration and extravasation; the inadvertent leakage of a solution into surrounding tissues (Dychter et al., 2012). These injuries may occur if the catheter pierces the vessel wall during insertion; if it moves partially or completely outside the vein during the delivery of intravenous (IV) fluids; or if the vessel wall does not seal around the catheter (Dougherty, 2008a). PVC-associated infiltration and extravasation injuries can be severe, with remedial surgery, life-long scarring and functional deficit resulting

(Maly et al., 2018). Another frequently reported PVC-related complication is partial or complete catheter occlusion which is the inability to infuse fluids or medications through a previously functioning catheter (Helm et al., 2015).

In addition to these different types of PVC-related complications, pain is the most common patient-reported symptom associated with phlebitis, which may also signify failure from infiltration or occlusion (Campbell & Bowden, 2011; Dychter et al., 2012; Ray-Barruel et al., 2014). Patients report a strong association with pain when recalling their PVC failure (Cooke et al., 2018; Larsen et al., 2017). Finally, PVCs can fail from catheter dislodgement. As a PVC remains partially external to the body it requires fixation to the skin. If inadequately secured, movement of the catheter in and out of the vein is possible. This pistoning action may lead to partial or complete dislodgement (Campbell & Bowden, 2011) and irritate or damage the internal blood vessel wall.

Currently, government guidelines on the prevention of PVC complications, such as epic3 from England; the Guidelines for the Prevention of Intravascular Catheter-Related Infections, from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), United States of America (USA); and a 2016 Expert Consensus Document on Prevention, Diagnosis and Treatment of Short-Term Peripheral Venous Catheter-Related Infections in Adults, from Spain; are limited to an infection focus (Capdevila et al., 2016; Loveday et al., 2014; O'Grady et al., 2011). This may indicate an underappreciation of the scale and burden of non-infectious complications. With a large volume of PVCs used every year, a systematic analysis of non-infectious complications may encourage guideline update committees to expand these guidelines to focus on all complications.

To stimulate quality and safety improvement initiatives and to improve the clinical practice of nurses placing and maintaining PVCs, so that patients receive the best possible quality of care, it is valuable to benchmark local PVC complication rates with other healthcare facilities. This can be achieved by comparing local PVC data with international failure and complication rates. Our objective was to quantify the worldwide incidence of PVC complications to highlight the substantial problem of PVC failure and encourage multi-specialty efforts to address catheter failure and its sequelae of treatment disruption, increased health costs and poor patient experiences and outcomes.

## 2 | THE REVIEW

### 2.1 | Aims

The aim of this review was to quantify the worldwide incidence of PVC-related complications. Specifically, to answer these questions:

1. What is the worldwide incidence of PVC-related complications?
2. What are the most frequently reported complications?
3. Are there significantly higher rates of complications in emergency departments (EDs) compared with other hospital areas and countries with developing economies compared with countries with developed economies?

## 2.2 | Design

This study was conducted using standard methods for a systematic literature review and meta-analysis. It is reported by means of the Cochrane process (Higgins, 2011) for randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and the Meta-analysis of Observation Studies in Epidemiology (Moose guidelines) for cohort studies (Stroup et al., 2000). The study was registered with the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews and will be published in two parts: non-infectious PVC complications; and infectious PVC complications. ([https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display\\_record.php?RecordID=43722](https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?RecordID=43722)).

## 2.3 | Search methods

A systematic search for relevant RCTs and cohort studies that reported PVC-related complications in adults were conducted in the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL; the Cochrane Library), PubMed, CINAHL and EMBASE on the 30 April 2019. The search strategy developed in collaboration with a health librarian and included appropriate Medical subject heading (MeSH) terms including: Catheterization; Peripheral; Catheter Obstruction; Phlebitis; and Thrombophlebitis. Our search was restricted to full text, published articles written in English.

Randomized controlled trials and cohort studies (prospective or retrospective) that investigated PVC complications in adults, since the year 2000 were eligible. This time frame was selected as it reflects the use of modern PVC polyurethane materials. For intervention studies, if both the intervention and control groups received treatments consistent with international guidelines or standards than we combined intervention and control group data, otherwise only control group data were used (Infusion Nurses Society, 2016; Loveday et al., 2014). We excluded qualitative research, case studies and non-peer-reviewed publications.

## 2.4 | Search outcomes

The outcomes addressed in this systematic review of catheter-related complications included: (1) phlebitis with a definition outlined by the study author; (2) phlebitis without a predefined definition outlined by the study author; (3) occlusion as defined by the study author and including the inability to infuse intravenous therapy; (4) infiltration or extravasation as defined by the study author and including IV fluids/vesicant therapy moving into surrounding tissue; (5)

dislodgement or accidental removal as the partial or complete migration of the PVC from the vein; (6) leakage as the leakage of fluid from the insertion site; and (7) pain as defined by the study author and related to the PVC.


The systematic search of databases identified 17,731 articles. A flowchart (Figure 1) formatted in accordance with the Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) (Moher et al., 2009) identified the reasons for study inclusion and exclusion. After duplicates were removed and titles and abstracts screened, 132 full-text articles were assessed for study inclusion. After the review of full-text articles a further 29 articles were excluded as they: included different types of VADs (Renard et al., 2010; Thamby, 2007; Yilmaz et al., 2007); were point-prevalence audits (Brady et al., 2016; Chiu et al., 2015; do Rego Furtado, 2011; Malach et al., 2006; Powell et al., 2008); did not provide per PVC data (Jackson, 2012; Karadeniz et al., 2003; Norton et al., 2013; Roszell & Jones, 2010); had different outcome definitions (Aulagnier et al., 2014; Coomarasamy et al., 2014; Dunda et al., 2015; Gregg et al., 2010; Holder et al., 2017; Kagel & Rayan, 2004; Mahmoud et al., 2017; Mee-Marquet et al., 2007; Oto et al., 2011; Prunet et al., 2008; Smith, 2006); reported vascular access procedures (Benham et al., 2007; Chukhraev et al., 2000; Ortiz et al., 2014); were secondary analyses or commentaries on data already included (Danski et al., 2015; Lanbeck et al., 2003; Myrianthefs et al., 2005). Additional information was provided from authors for nine studies (Bugden et al., 2016; Forni et al., 2012; Keogh et al., 2016; Marsh, et al., 2018; Rickard et al., 2010, 2012; Van Donk, 2009; Webster et al., 2007, 2008).

## 2.5 | Quality assessment

Quality assessment for RCTs was conducted using the 'Risk of Bias' tool from the Cochrane Handbook of Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Higgins, 2011). Quality and risk of bias for cohort studies were measured using the following STROBE elements (The STrengthening the Reporting of OBservational studies in Epidemiology statement: Guidelines for reporting observational studies): clear study objective; population defined; sample size justification; and outcome measures defined and reliable (Vandenbroucke et al., 2014; Von Elm et al., 2014).

## 2.6 | Data abstraction

Titles and abstracts of studies were independently assessed by a minimum of two review authors (NM, JW, CMR) for study inclusion. When review authors (NM, JW, CMR) were named on a study or differences of opinion were not resolved by unanimity, a third author's (AJU) judgment was sought. In addition, the reference lists of retrieved articles were reviewed to identify any further studies for inclusion. Postscreening, full texts of potential eligible articles were retrieved.



**FIGURE 1** PRISMA flow chart of study selection [Colour figure can be viewed at [wileyonlinelibrary.com](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com)]

NM, JW and CRM independently extracted data using a purpose designed data extraction tool. Disagreement was resolved by a third author (AJU) whom also independently extracted data when NM or JW were named on included studies. In an attempt to collect missing data, the authors of included studies were contacted. Data abstracted included: author name, year of publication, country, clinical setting, patient information (age, gender), study design, number of participants and incidence (or rate/1,000 days) of PVC-related complications.

## 2.7 | Synthesis

Randomized controlled trials and cohort study outcomes deemed eligible for data synthesis were presented using descriptive statistics. Dichotomous outcomes were pooled after Freeman-Tukey double arcsine transformation using random-effects meta-analysis (DerSimonian and Laird method), with the estimate of heterogeneity taken from the inverse-variance fixed-effect model (metaprop command in Stata) (Nyaga et al., 2014). Continuous outcomes and their

Poisson confidence intervals were meta-analysed using random-effects models (DerSimonian and Laird method) with the estimate of heterogeneity taken from the Mantel-Haenszel model (metan command in Stata) (Harris et al., 2008). CI boundaries below zero were reported as zero. Heterogeneity between studies was assessed using the  $I^2$  statistic, categorized as low (<33%), moderate (34%–66%), or high (>64%) (Higgins, 2011). Analysis was with Stata 15 (Stata Corp, College Station, Texas, USA). Statistical significance was declared at  $p < .05$ .

Planned subgroup analyses compared PVC-related complications between: ED and other departments/all hospital and developed and developing economies (United Nations World classification (United Nations, 2016). Sensitivity analyses were conducted comparing pooled proportion of PVC-related complications between: retrospective and prospective studies; and studies with  $\geq 100$  participants compared with < 100 participants.

### 3 | RESULTS

#### 3.1 | Characteristics of included studies

A total of 76,977 participants from 33 RCTs and 70 cohort studies (64 prospective; six retrospective) were included in this systematic review. Study characteristics are represented in Table 1. For the analysis, we combined the intervention and control groups of four RCTs as both groups used similar practices recommended in international guidelines (Bridey et al., 2018; Haddad et al., 2006; Keogh et al., 2016; Tan et al., 2016). These include: 72 compared with 96-hr PVC resite (Haddad et al., 2006); forearm compared with hand insertions (Tan et al., 2016); ultrasound guided compared with landmark insertion (Bridey et al., 2018); and four routinely used PVC flushing practices (Keogh et al., 2016).

#### 3.2 | Quality assessment

Of the 33 RCTs included in this study, 23 (70%) had a low risk of bias for random sequence generation (Table S1). However, only 15/33 (45%) described their method of allocation concealment. Blinding of participants and personnel was not possible in all but one of the RCTs, nevertheless we did not consider this a potential bias. In all but three RCTs (82%) there was minimal or no information about the blinding of outcomes assessors and a low risk of bias for selective reporting in most included studies (97%). Reporting quality in 70 included cohort studies was mixed (Table S2). Outcome measures were defined in all but 16 studies, a clear objective or question was lacking in one study and only 11 studies provided sample size justification.

#### 3.3 | Synthesis of results

Table 2 displays the pooled proportion and incident rate (IR) per 1,000 catheter-days of PVC-related complications. Phlebitis was

defined by authors in 70 studies. Forty-two studies used a phlebitis scale which included the: Infusion Therapy Standards of Practice, Phlebitis Scale (Atay et al., 2018; Boyce & Yee, 2012; Danski et al., 2015; Enes et al., 2016; Erdogan & Denat, 2016; Fakhri et al., 2012; Forni et al., 2012; Meng et al., 2018; Palefski & Stoddard, 2001; Tanabe et al., 2016; Urbanetto et al., 2017; Uslusoy & Mete, 2008; White, 2001; Zhu et al., 2016); the Visual Infusion Phlebitis (VIP) scale (Abolfotouh et al., 2014; Bonnici, 2012; Cicolini et al., 2014; do Rego Furtado, 2011; Günther et al., 2016; Kaur et al., 2011; Palese et al., 2016; Pasalioglu & Kaya, 2014; Saini et al., 2011; Singh et al., 2008), with two studies only reporting positive phlebitis if the VIP was two or higher (Bertolino et al., 2012; Gallant & Schultz, 2006); and a mixture of scales with a range of two to five grades for classifying phlebitis (Barker et al., 2004; Catney et al., 2001; Cicolini et al., 2009; Gupta et al., 2007; Johansson et al., 2008; Lanbeck et al., 2002; López et al., 2014; Miliani et al., 2017; Nishanth et al., 2009; Panadero et al., 2002; Salgueiro-Oliveira et al., 2012; Sarafzadeh et al., 2012; Tan et al., 2017; Taylor, 2003; Urbanetto et al., 2016; Zarate et al., 2008). Twenty-eight studies had varying definitions for phlebitis. For example eight studies required the presence of only one sign or symptom (e.g. pain, erythema) for phlebitis (Bausone-Gazda et al., 2010; Fujita & Namiki, 2008; Hirschmann et al., 2001; Karadağ & Görgülü, 2000; Mestre et al., 2013; Mestre Roca et al., 2012; Rickard et al., 2018; Ronen et al., 2017) and in comparison one included study required three or more signs and symptoms to be considered phlebitis (Dargin et al., 2010). The pooled proportion of phlebitis with and without a definition was 19.3% (95% CI 15.9–22.8) and 4.5% (95% CI 2.5–7.0) respectively. The IR of phlebitis with a definition was 39.5 [95% CI 29.1–49.9] per 1,000 catheter days (13 studies). Study heterogeneity was high ( $I^2 = 99\%$ ). Phlebitis was the most frequently reported outcome, as well as the most highly prevalent complication (Figure 2). Pooled infiltration/extravasation was 13.7% (CI 95% 11.1–16.5) and reported in 45 studies, constituting the second most common PVC complication, followed by occlusion (8.0%), leakage (7.3%), pain (6.4%) and dislodgement (6.4%).

Subgroup analyses are presented in Table S3. Due to unavailability of data, IR per 1,000 days was not included in this analysis. The pooled proportion of infiltration/extravasation for ED inserted PVCs was 25.2% (95% CI 14.2–38.2) which was significantly higher ( $p = .022$ ) than those inserted in other departments (12.3% (95% CI 9.7%–15.1%)). However, no difference was detected in other types of PVC-related complications in the ED compared with other areas. In developing economies, pooled phlebitis with a definition (28.8%, 95% CI 20.4–38.1; 25 studies) was significantly higher ( $p = .002$ ) than in developed economies (14.7%, 95% CI 11.4–18.3; 45 studies). Pain in developing economies, (11.0%, 95% CI 9.1–13.0; 4 studies) was also significantly higher ( $p < .001$ ) than in developed economies (5.6%, 95% CI 4.2–7.3; 14 studies).

The sensitivity analysis (Table S4) found no significant differences in PVC-related complication rates between small studies (<100 PVCs) and large studies (>100 PVCs), with the exception

**TABLE 1** Characteristics of included studies

Author (year)	Country	Study design (sample size)	Retrospective (cohort)	Prospective (cohort)	RCT	Setting
Curran et al. (2000)	UK	Prospective (2,934)				Ward; theatre; other
Karadağ and Görgülü (2000)	Turkey	Prospective (255)				CCU
Catney et al. (2001)	USA	Prospective (411)				MED; SURG; surgical OPD
Hirschmann et al. (2001)	Austria	Prospective (1,132)				Wards, OT; OPD
Palefski and Stoddard (2001)	USA	Prospective (776)				Hospital wide; home infusion agency
White (2001)	USA	Prospective (305)				Hospital wide
Cornely et al. (2002)	Germany	Prospective (364)				Haematology; oncology; IDD
Creamer et al. (2002)	Ireland	Prospective (554)				MED; SURG
Lanbeck et al. (2002)	Sweden	Prospective (1,386)				IDD
Panadero et al. (2002)	Ireland	RCT (30)				Elective surgery
Niesen et al. (2003)	USA	RCT (35)				OB
Royer (2003)	USA	Prospective (146)				MED; SURG
Taylor (2003)	Australia	Prospective (275)				MED; SURG
Vandenbos et al. (2003)	France	Prospective (390)				ED
Barker et al. (2004)	UK	RCT (26)				MED; SURG
Grune et al. (2004)	Germany	Prospective (2,495)				MED; SURG; geriatrics, radiotherapy; neurology; orthopaedics; GYN; OB
Fujita et al. (2006)	Japan	Prospective (361)				SURG
Gallant and Schultz (2006)	USA	Prospective (789)				Cardiac Surgical unit; Cardiac set down unit
Haddad et al. (2006)	Lebanon	RCT (221)				Internal medicine/IDD; pneumology/gastroenterology department
Schears (2006)	USA	Prospective (15,004)				MED
Abbas et al. (2007)	UK	Prospective (86)				ED
Gupta et al. (2007)	India	RCT (35)				Cardiac surgery
Nassaji-Zavareh and Ghorbani (2007)	Iran	Prospective (300)				MED; SURG
Salles et al. (2007)	Brazil	Prospective (120)				SURG
Webster et al. (2007)	Australia	RCT (146)				MED; SURG
Dillon et al. (2008)	Ireland	Prospective (496)				MED; SURG
Fujita and Namiki (2008)	Japan	Prospective (368)				SURG
Johansson et al. (2008)	Sweden	Prospective (343)				MED; SURG; IDD
Periard et al. (2008)	Switzerland	RCT (29)				MED
Singh et al. (2008)	Nepal	Prospective (230)				MED; SURG; ICU; GYN; OB
Uslusoy and Mete (2008)	Turkey	Prospective (568)				SURG
Webster et al. (2008)	Australia	RCT (756)				MED; SURG
Zarate et al. (2008)	USA	Prospective (432)				ED
Cicolini et al. (2009)	Italy	Prospective (427)				MED; SURG
Lee et al. (2009)	Taiwan	Prospective (6,538)				MED; SURG
Martínez et al. (2009)	Spain	RCT (332)				IDD
McNeill et al. (2009)	USA	Prospective (80)				MED; SURG; ED; Radiology; Oncology; renal therapy
Nishanth et al. (2009)	India	RCT (21)				Major abdominal surgery
Van Donk et al. (2009)	Australia	RCT (161)				Hospital in the home
Adhikari et al. (2010)	USA	Retrospective (764)				ED
Bausone-Gazda et al. (2010)	USA	RCT (152)				Level 1 trauma centre

(Continues)

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Author (year)	Country	Study design (sample size)	Retrospective (cohort) Prospective (cohort) RCT	Setting
Bolton (2010)	UK	Retrospective (1,000)		ED; elective and specialized divisions
Dargin et al. (2010)	USA	Prospective (75)		ED
Gregg et al. (2010)	USA	Retrospective (147)		ICU
Hasselberg et al. (2010)	Sweden	Prospective (413)		SURG
Rickard et al. (2010)	Australia	RCT (323)		MED; SURG
Chico-Padrón et al. (2011)	Spain	RCT (29)		SURG; CCU
Do Rego Furtado (2011)	Portugal	Prospective (286)		SURG
Kaur et al. (2011)	India	Prospective (200)		ED; surgical OPD
Saini et al. (2011)	India	Prospective (168)		ED; medical and surgical OPD
Ascoli et al. (2012)	USA	Retrospective (490)		Hospital wide
Bertolino et al. (2012)	Italy	RCT (363)		MED
Bonnici (2012)	Malta	Prospective (285)		MED
Boyce and Yee (2012)	USA	Prospective (24)		Progressive care; Medical and Surgical ICU
Elia et al. (2012)	Italy	RCT (50)		High dependency unit
Fakih et al. (2012)	USA	Prospective (4,434)		MED; SURG
Forni et al. (2012)	Italy	RCT (521)		Orthopaedic patients
Goransson and Johansson (2012)	Sweden	Prospective (83)		Pre-hospital emergency services
Mestre Roca et al. (2012)	Spain	Prospective (1,201)		MED; SURG; ICU
Rickard et al. (2012)	Australia	RCT (3,215)		MED; SURG
Salgueiro-Oliveira et al. (2012)	Portugal	Prospective (315)		MED
Sarafzadeh et al. (2012)	Iran	Prospective (320)		OT; paediatric*; internal disease; GYN; ED; IDD; ICU; CCU
Wang et al. (2012)	China	RCT (181)		Gastroenterology or hepatic disease
Fields et al. (2012)	USA	Retrospective (151)		ED
Mestre et al. (2013)	Spain	Prospective (2,145)		Hospital wide
Abolfotouh et al. (2014)	Saudi Arabia	Prospective (842)		MED; SURG; IDD
Cicolini et al. (2014)	Italy	Prospective (1,498)		MED; SURG
López et al. (2014)	Spain	RCT (599)		MED; SURG
Pasalioglu and Kaya (2014)	Turkey	Prospective (439)		IDD
Benaya et al. (2015)	Israel	Prospective (103)		MED
Marsh, et al. (2015)	Australia	RCT (21)		MED; SURG
Rojas-Sánchez et al. (2015)	Colombia	Prospective (198)		ED
Wang et al. (2015)	China	RCT (125)		Liver cirrhosis
Anderson (2016)	USA	Prospective (95)		MED; SURG; ICU; ED
Bugden et al. (2016)	Australia	RCT (190)		ED
Danski et al. (2015)	Brazil	RCT (79)		Clinical and surgical services
Enes et al. (2016)	Brazil	Prospective (122)		MED
Erdogan and Denat (2016)	Turkey	Prospective (347)		Neurosurgical clinic
Günther et al. (2016)	France	RCT (434)		Medical ICU
Keogh et al. (2016)	Australia	RCT (160)		MED; SURG
Palese et al. (2016)	Italy	Prospective (1,262)		ED
Tan et al. (2016)	Singapore	RCT (307)		OB
Tanabe et al. (2016)	Japan	Prospective (407)		Hospital wide
Urbanetto et al. (2016)	Brazil	Prospective (361)		Hospital wide

(Continues)



TABLE 1 (Continued)

Author (year)	Country	Study design (sample size)		Setting
		Retrospective (cohort)	Prospective (cohort) RCT	
Zhu et al. (2016)	China	Prospective (189)		ED
Miliani et al. (2017)	France	Prospective (815)		MED; SURG
Murayama et al. (2017)	Japan	Prospective (5,316)		MED; SURG
Ronen et al. (2017)	Israel	Prospective (789)		Head and neck surgery
Takahashi et al. (2017)	Japan	Prospective (200)		MED
Tan et al. (2017)	Singapore	Prospective (282)		MED; SURG
Urbanetto et al. (2017)	Brazil	Prospective (447)		Hospital wide
Xu et al. (2017)	China	RCT (317)		Hepatobiliary surgical
Atay et al. (2018)	Turkey	Prospective (532)		Hospital wide
Bahl et al. (2019)	USA	RCT (37)		ED
Bridey et al. (2018)	France	RCT (104)		ICU
Carr et al. (2018)	Australia	Prospective (391)		ED
Datar et al. (2018)	USA	Retrospective (277)		ICU
Marsh, et al. (2018)	Australia	Prospective (1578)		MED; SURG
Meng et al. (2018)	USA	Prospective (291)		Hospital wide
Pandurangadu et al. (2018)	USA	Prospective (86)		ED
Rickard et al. (2018)	Australia	RCT (845)		MED; SURG
Marsh, et al. (2018)	Australia	RCT (150)		MED; SURG
Marsh, et al. (2018)	Australia	RCT (50)		MED; SURG

Abbreviations: USA: United States of America; UK: United Kingdom; RCT: randomized controlled trial; MED: medical ward/unit; SURG: surgical ward/unit; OPD: outpatient department; CCU: cardiac coronary unit; ICU: intensive care unit; OT: operating theatre; IDD: infectious diseases department; ED: emergency department; OB: obstetrics; GYN: gynaecology.

of pooled phlebitis (with definition) which in small studies (38.1% (95% CI 21.8–55.9); 11 studies) was significantly higher ( $p = .008$ ) than in large studies (16.8% (95% CI 13.2–20.5); 59 studies). The pooled proportion of phlebitis (no definition) was also significantly

higher ( $p = .006$ ) in 10 prospective studies (5.5% (95% CI 2.8–8.9)) compared with two retrospective studies (1.8% (95% CI 0.8–3.0)). As was the pooled proportion of occlusion ( $p = .001$ ) and leaking ( $p = .042$ ).

TABLE 2 Proportion and incidence rates of PVC complications in included studies

Event	Proportion of events reported					Incidence rate of events reported				
	Studies	PVCs	Outcomes	Pooled %	95% CI	Studies	Catheter-days	Outcomes	Pooled IR <sup>†</sup>	95% CI
Phlebitis with def.	70	46,559	6,428	19.3% <sup>¶,††</sup>	15.9–22.9	15	83,127	1,487	39.5% <sup>¶,††</sup>	29.1–49.9
Phlebitis no def.	12	17,410	540	4.5% <sup>¶,††</sup>	2.5–7.0	-	-	-	-	-
Infiltration/ extravasation	45	25,778	3,106	13.7% <sup>d,††</sup>	11.1–16.5	10	74,194	969	33.3% <sup>¶,††</sup>	23.6–43.1
Occlusion	35	19,012	1,534	8.0% <sup>¶,††</sup>	5.8–10.6	12	71,404	837	27.1% <sup>¶,††</sup>	18.3–36.0
Dislodgement	42	20,002	1,351	6.0% <sup>¶,††</sup>	4.8–7.2	17	83,672	845	19.9% <sup>¶,††</sup>	13.0–26.9
Leakage	18	9,376	525	7.3% <sup>¶,††</sup>	4.7–10.3	6	16,775	212	18.0% <sup>¶,††</sup>	9.4–26.5
Pain	26	18,602	1,075	6.4% <sup>¶,††</sup>	4.8–8.2	9	68,082	435	21.2% <sup>¶,††</sup>	11.3–31.2

Abbreviations: IR = incidence rate; PVC = peripheral venous device; def. = definition.

heterogeneity of studies: <sup>‡</sup> low (0%–33%)

effect-size test: <sup>††</sup> significant,

per 1,000 catheter days; CI = confidence interval<sup>†</sup>

moderate (34%–66%),<sup>§</sup>

high (64%–100%);<sup>¶</sup>

non-significant<sup>††</sup>






FIGURE 2 Proportion (%) of phlebitis with definition

## 4 | DISCUSSION

PVCs are the most frequently used vascular access device and have associated risk, yet this risk has never been systematically quantified across the body of evidence and this likely hinders efforts of policy makers and clinical leaders to improve PVC outcomes. Our systematic review provides nurses with the first, large scale understanding of the most commonly occurring complications that lead PVCs to failure. We identified phlebitis (with a definition) as the most frequently measured outcome and the most prevalent complication, affecting 6,428 (19.3%) catheters. The implication of this finding is that phlebitis is the primary target for improving PVC functionality and patient experience of PVCs. Phlebitis definitions varied and, in 12 studies, were not defined. Phlebitis rates in our included studies also varied widely from less than 1% (Bausone-Gazda et al., 2010; Gregg et al., 2010) up to 100% (Nishanth et al., 2009). This wide variation may be explained by knowing that at least 71 different phlebitis scales exist, with highly disparate criteria and minimal validation testing (Ray-Barruel et al., 2014). It has also been suggested that variable phlebitis rates could reflect overlapping complications, such as occlusion, infiltration and early signs of infection (Helm et al., 2015). Confusion surrounding a phlebitis definition suggests that phlebitis is an unhelpful term and future studies should instead focus on individual signs/symptoms such as pain (Rickard & Ray-Barruel, 2017).

PVC failure from infiltration and extravasation was almost 13% higher in PVCs inserted in the ED compared with other departments. This may be associated with high volume delivery of resuscitation fluids or the use of contrast for medical imaging (Crowley, 2012; Sebbane, 2013). It may also be related to the common ED practice of using PVCs to draw blood samples (Fry, 2016; Hawkins et al., 2018), placing PVCs in the cubital fossa or the frequent use of large bore catheters (Bugden et al., 2016; Zarate et al., 2008). A recent audit found that over 25% of PVCs placed in their ED was only used for blood sampling (Fry, 2016). The perceived benefit of this practice is to avoid a possible second needle puncture if the patient should eventually require IV treatment (Fry, 2016). However, our findings of higher infiltration and extravasation associated with ED PVCs, as well as higher rates of haemolysis for blood collected from a PVC compared with venepuncture (Coventry, 2019), highlight a need for ED clinicians to reduce the number of unnecessary placements of PVC, particularly for the purpose of blood sampling.

Catheter dislodgement or accidental removal was identified in this review as a relatively common cause of PVC failure (6.0%). Inadequate securement of the catheter to the skin, which leads to movement of the PVC out of the vein, may explain this type of failure (Marsh, et al., 2015). Poor securement may also be a result of compromised dressings (e.g. lifting off the skin or soiled). A recent global audit of PVCs in 415 hospitals (PVCs = 40,620) found that one fifth of all PVC dressings did not meet the basic requirement of being clean, dry and intact (Alexandrou et al., 2018). This highlights an urgent need for improved dressing and securement products to reduce the incidence of catheter dislodgement. Although RCTs have compared different PVC dressings and/or securements, at this time it remains unclear which

products are best to prevent catheter failure and more high-quality research is needed in this area (Alexandrou et al., 2018; Bausone-Gazda et al., 2010; Chico-Padrón et al., 2011; Marsh, et al., 2018; Marsh, et al., 2015).

Government PVC guidelines from the USA and England currently focus on PVC infection (Loveday et al., 2014; O'Grady et al., 2011) and although a serious complication, PVC-related bloodstream infection has the lowest incidence rate of all vascular access devices (0.1% per PVC, 0.5 per 1,000 PVC days) (Maki et al., 2006). In contrast, our review highlights the extremely common incidence of non-infectious complications with 11% experiencing phlebitis (with or without a phlebitis definition), 13.7% infiltration/extravasation, 8% occlusion, 6.4% pain and 6% of catheters dislodging. We recommend that PVC guidelines need to be updated and extended beyond an infection prevention focus to include strategies to prevent these other complications which constitute a much higher proportion of PVC failure and affect millions of patients each year worldwide. Furthermore, attention to the development of standardized outcome definitions and creating self-monitoring health systems using for example PVC auditing and clinical registries to benchmark PVC outcomes, is a quality and safety challenge that requires inter-disciplinary and inter-departmental efforts.

### 4.1 | Limitations

A limitation of this review was the poor reporting by study authors. Quality and risk of bias for RCTs and cohort studies found that greater than 40% (RCTs) and 11% (cohort studies) of categories scored 'unclear' or 'not reported' as information was not available in the publication. These oversights emphasize the importance of consulting appropriate reporting guidelines such as CONSORT and STROBE Guidelines when developing study protocols.

In addition, for most included studies we were unable to attain the number of catheter-days and this affected our ability to conduct a meta-analysis of incidence rates. The heterogeneity of the study populations may also preclude generalizability to specific patient subgroups. However, results do provide a good reflection of PVC complications at a system level and subgroup analyses explored potential at risk subgroups.

## 5 | CONCLUSION

This extensive review of world-wide data has identified that non-infectious PVC related complications are a substantial global problem. This requires urgent attention and action by clinical leaders and policy makers to improve not only patient, but hospital and health-care delivery outcomes.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We thank all study authors who were able to contribute additional data for the manuscript.

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST

NM's previous employer Griffith University has received on her behalf investigator-initiated research grants and unrestricted educational grants from Becton Dickinson, and Cardinal Health and a consultancy payment provided to Griffith University from Becton Dickinson for clinical feedback related to catheter placement and maintenance (unrelated to the current project).

AJU reports investigator-initiated research grants and speaker fees provided to Griffith University from vascular access product manufacturers (3M Medical, Angiodynamics, Becton Dickinson, Cardinal Health) (unrelated to the current project).

MC reports investigator-initiated research grants and speaker fees provided to Griffith University by vascular access product manufacturers (Baxter, Becton Dickinson, Entrotech Life Sciences), (unrelated to the current project).

CMR's (Griffith University) employer has received, on her behalf investigator-initiated research or educational grants from 3M, Angiodynamics; Becton Dickinson -Bard, Baxter; Cardinal Health, Eloquest Healthcare, Medtronic, Smiths Medical; and consultancy payments for educational lectures/expert advice from 3M, Becton Dickinson -Bard, BBraun, ResQDevices, Smiths Medical (unrelated to the current project).

GM, VC and JW having nothing to declare.

## AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

NM, CMR, JW and MC involved in study conception and protocol design. NM and JW carried out literature search. NM, JW, CMR and AJU involved in data extraction and quality assessment. NM and GM involved in data analysis. NM and GR carried out development of tables and figures. NM carried out first draft and coordinate manuscript preparation and also involved in final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication. All authors involved in data interpretation and critical review of drafts and approval of final manuscript.

## PEER REVIEW

The peer review history for this article is available at <https://publons.com/publon/10.1111/jan.14565>.

## ORCID

Nicole Marsh  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5779-1304>

Marie Cooke  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9928-4685>

## REFERENCES

- Abbas, S. Z., de Vries, T. K., Shaw, S., & Abbas, S. Q. (2007). Use and complications of peripheral vascular catheters: A prospective study. *British Journal of Nursing*, *16*, 648–652. <https://doi.org/10.12968/bjon.2007.16.11.23675>
- Abolfotouh, M. A., Salam, M., Bani-Mustafa, A., White, D., & Balkhy, H. H. (2014). Prospective study of incidence and predictors of peripheral intravenous catheter-induced complications. *Therapeutics and Clinical Risk Management*, *10*, 993–1001. <https://doi.org/10.2147/TCRM.S74685>
- Adhikari, S., Blaivas, M., Morrison, D., & Lander, L. (2010). Comparison of infection rates among ultrasound-guided versus traditionally placed peripheral intravenous lines. *Journal of Ultrasound in Medicine*, *29*, 741–747. [org/10.7863/jum.2010.29.5.741](https://doi.org/10.7863/jum.2010.29.5.741)
- Alexandrou, E., Ray-Barruel, G., Carr, P. J., Frost, S. A., Inwood, S., Higgins, N., & Rickard, C. M. (2018). Use of short peripheral intravenous catheters: Characteristics, management and outcomes worldwide. *Journal of Hospital Medicine*, *13*, 0.12788/jhm.3039
- Anderson, N. R. (2016). Influencing patient satisfaction scores: Prospective one-arm study of a novel intravenous catheter system with retractable coiled-tip guidewire compared with published literature for conventional peripheral intravenous catheters. *Journal of Infusion Nursing*, *39*, 201–209. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NAN.000000000000173>
- Ascoli, G., Deguzman, P., & Rowlands, A. (2012). Peripheral intravenous catheter complication rates between those indwelling > 96 hours to those indwelling 72–96 hours: A retrospective correlational study. *International Journal of Nursing*, *1*, 7–12.
- Atay, S., Şen, S., & Cukurlu, D. (2018). Phlebitis-related peripheral venous catheterization and the associated risk factors. *Nigerian Journal of Clinical Practice*, *21*, 827–831. [https://doi.org/10.4103/njcp.njcp\\_337\\_17](https://doi.org/10.4103/njcp.njcp_337_17)
- Aulagnier, J., Hoc, C., Mathieu, E., Dreyfus, J., Fischler, M., & Guen, M. (2014). Efficacy of AccuVein to facilitate peripheral intravenous placement in adults presenting to an emergency department: A randomized clinical trial. *Academic Emergency Medicine*, *21*, 858–863. <https://doi.org/10.1111/acem.12437>
- Bahl, A., Hang, B., Brackney, A., Joseph, S., Karabon, P., Mohammad, A., ... Shotkin, P. (2019). Standard long IV catheters versus extended dwell catheters: A randomized comparison of ultrasound-guided catheter survival. *The American journal of emergency medicine*, *37*(4), 715–721.
- Barker, P., Anderson, A., & MacFie, J. (2004). Randomised clinical trial of elective re-siting of intravenous cannulae. *Annals of the Royal College of Surgeons of England*, *86*, 281–283. <https://doi.org/10.1308/147870804317>
- Bausone-Gazda, D., Lefaiver, C. A., & Walters, S. (2010). A randomized controlled trial to compare the complications of 2 peripheral intravenous catheter-stabilization systems. *Journal of Infusion Nursing*, *33*, 371–384. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NAN.0b013e3181f85be2>
- Benaya, A., Schwartz, Y., Kory, R., Yinnon, A. M., & Ben-Chetrit, E. (2015). Relative incidence of phlebitis associated with peripheral intravenous catheters in the lower versus upper extremities. *European Journal of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases*, *913–916*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10096-014-2304-7>
- Benham, J. R., Culp, W. C., Wright, L. B., & McCowan, T. C. (2007). Complication rate of venous access procedures performed by a radiology practitioner assistant compared with interventional radiology physicians and supervised trainees. *Journal of Vascular and Interventional Radiology*, *18*, 1001–1004. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvir.2007.05.014>
- Bertolino, G., Pitassi, A., Tinelli, C., Staniscia, A., Guglielmana, B., Scudeller, L., & Luigi Balduini, C. (2012). Intermittent flushing with heparin versus saline for maintenance of peripheral intravenous catheters in a medical department: A pragmatic cluster-randomized controlled study. *Worldviews on Evidence-Based Nursing*, *9*, 221–226. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6787.2012.00244.x>
- Bolton, D. (2010). Improving peripheral cannulation practice at an NHS Trust. *BJCardN*, *19*, 1346–1350. <https://doi.org/10.12968/bjon.2010.19.21.79998>
- Bonnicci, E. (2012). Safer patient care through better peripheral intravenous catheter management. *Int J Infect Control*, *8*, <https://doi.org/10.3396/ijic.v8i2.017.12>
- Boyce, B. A., & Yee, B. H. (2012). Incidence and severity of phlebitis in patients receiving peripherally infused amiodarone. *Critical Care Nurse*, *32*, 27–34. <https://doi.org/10.4037/ccn2012139>

- Brady, T., Bruno, F., Marchionni, C., & Paquet, F. (2016). Prevalence and maintenance practices of peripheral intravenous catheters. *Vascular Access, 10*, 11-19.
- Bridey, C., Thilly, N., Lefevre, T., Maire-Richard, A., Morel, M., Levy, B., & Kimmoun, A. (2018). Ultrasound-guided versus landmark approach for peripheral intravenous access by critical care nurses: A randomised controlled study. *British Medical Journal Open, 8*, e020220. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2017-020220>
- Bugden, S., Shean, K., Scott, M., Mihala, G., Clark, S., Johnstone, C., & Rickard, C. M. (2016). Skin glue reduces the failure rate of emergency department-inserted peripheral intravenous catheters: A randomized controlled trial. *Annals of Emergency Medicine, 68*, 196-201. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annemergmed.2015.11.026>
- Campbell, C., & Bowden, T. (2011). Peripheral vascular access devices: Care and maintenance. *BJCardN, 6*, 132-140. <http://www.bjcardn.org/10.12968/bjca.2011.6.3.132>
- Capdevila, J. A., Guembe, M., Barberan, J., de Alarcon, A., Bouza, E., Farinas, M. C., & Societies, S. (2016). 2016 Expert consensus document on prevention, diagnosis and treatment of short-term peripheral venous catheter-related infections in adult. *Revista Española De Quimioterapia, 29*, 230-238.
- Carr, P. J., Rippey, J. C., Cooke, M. L., Higgins, N. S., Trevenen, M., Foale, A., & Rickard, C. M. (2018). From insertion to removal: A multicenter survival analysis of an admitted cohort with peripheral intravenous catheters inserted in the emergency department. *Infection Control and Hospital Epidemiology, 39*, 1216-1221. <https://doi.org/10.1017/ice.2018.190>
- Catney, M. R., Hillis, S., Wakefield, B., Simpson, L., Domino, L., Keller, S., & Wagner, K. (2001). Relationship between peripheral intravenous catheter dwell time and the development of phlebitis and infiltration. *Journal of Infusion Nursing, 24*, 332-341.
- Chico-Padrón, R., Carrión-García, L., Delle-Vedove-Rosales, L., González-Vargas, C., Marrero-Perera, M., Medina-Chico, S., & Jiménez-Sosa, A. (2011). Comparative safety and costs of transparent versus gauze wound dressings in intravenous catheterization. *Journal of Nursing Care Quality, 26*, 371-376. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NCQ.0b013e318210741b>
- Chiu, P. C., Lee, Y. H., Hsu, H. T., Feng, Y. T., Lu, I. C., Chiu, S. L., & Cheng, K. I. (2015). Establish a perioperative check forum for peripheral intravenous access to prevent the occurrence of phlebitis. *Kaohsiung Journal of Medical Sciences, 31*, 215-221. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.kjms.2015.01.007>
- Chukhraev, A., Grekov, I., & Aivazyan, M. (2000). Local complications of nursing interventions on peripheral veins. *Journal of Infusion Nursing, 23*, 167-169.
- Cicolini, G., Bonghi, A. P., Di Labio, L., & Di Mascio, R. (2009). Position of peripheral venous cannulae and the incidence of thrombophlebitis: An observational study. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 65*, 1268-1273. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2009.04980.x>
- Cicolini, G., Manzoli, L., Simonetti, V., Flacco, M. E., Comparcini, D., Capasso, L., & Eltaji Elfarouki, G. (2014). Phlebitis risk varies by peripheral venous catheter site and increases after 96 hours: A large multi-centre prospective study. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 70*, 2539-2549. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.12403>
- Cooke, M., Ullman, A. J., Ray-Barruel, G., Wallis, M., Corley, A., & Rickard, C. M. (2018). Not "just" an intravenous line: Consumer perspectives on peripheral intravenous cannulation (PIVC). An international cross-sectional survey of 25 countries. *PLoS One, 13*, e0193436. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0193436>
- Coomarasamy, J. D., Wint, N. N., & Saleh, Z. M. (2014). Insertion and management of peripheral intravenous cannula in the adult medical wards of Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia Medical Center: A best practice implementation project. *JBI Database System Rev Implement Rep, 12*, 534-551. <https://doi.org/10.11124/jbisir-2014-1672>
- Cornely, O. A., Bethe, U., Pauls, R., & Waldschmidt, D. (2002). Peripheral teflon catheters: Factors determining incidence of phlebitis and duration of cannulation. *Infection Control and Hospital Epidemiology, 23*, 249-253. <https://doi.org/10.1086/502044>
- Coventry, L. L., Jacob, A., Davies, H., Stoneman, L., Keogh, S., Jacob, E. J. J. O. A. N. (2019). Drawing blood from peripheral intravenous cannula compared with venepuncture: A systematic review and meta-analysis.
- Creamer, E., McCarthy, G., Tighe, I., & Smyth, E. (2002). A survey of nurses' assessment of peripheral intravenous catheters. *British Journal of Nursing, 11*, 999-1006. <https://doi.org/10.12968/bjon.2002.11.15.10538>
- Crowley, M., Brim, C., Proehl, J., Barnason, S., Leviner, S., Lindauer, C., & Papa, A. (2012). Emergency nursing resource: Difficult intravenous access. *Journal of Emergency Nursing, 38*, 335-343. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jen.2012.05.010>
- Curran, E., Coia, J., Gilmour, H., McNamee, S., & Hood, J. (2000). Multi-centre research surveillance project to reduce infections/phlebitis associated with peripheral vascular catheters. *Journal of Hospital Infection, 46*, 194-202. <https://doi.org/10.1053/jhin.2000.0831>
- Danski, M. T. R., Oliveira, G. L. R. D., Johann, D. A., Pedrolo, E., & Vayego, S. A. (2015). Incidence of local complications in peripheral venous catheters and associated risk factors. *Acta Paulista De Enfermagem, 28*, 517-523. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-0194201500087>
- Dargin, J. M., Rebholz, C. M., Lowenstein, R. A., Mitchell, P. M., & Feldman, J. A. (2010). Ultrasonography-guided peripheral intravenous catheter survival in ED patients with difficult access. *American Journal of Emergency Medicine, 28*(1), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajem.2008.09.001>
- Datar, S., Gutierrez, E., Schertz, A., & Vachharajani, V. (2018). Safety of phenylephrine infusion through peripheral intravenous catheter in the neurological intensive care unit. *Journal of Intensive Care Medicine, 33*, 589-592. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0885066617712214>
- Dillon, M. F., Curran, J., Martos, R., Walsh, C., Walsh, J., Al-Azawi, D., & O'Shea, D. (2008). Factors that affect longevity of intravenous cannulas: A prospective study. *Quarterly Journal of Medicine, 101*, 731-735. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qjmed/hcn078>
- do Rego Furtado, L. C. (2011). Maintenance of peripheral venous access and its impact on the development of phlebitis: A survey of 186 catheters in a general surgery department in Portugal. *Journal of Infusion Nursing, 34*, 382-390. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NAN.0b013e318230636b>
- Dougherty, L. (2008a). IV therapy: Recognizing the differences between infiltration and extravasation. *British Journal of Nursing, 17*(896), 898-901. <https://doi.org/10.12968/bjon.2008.17.14.30656>
- Dougherty, L. (2008b). Peripheral cannulation. *Nursing Standard, 22*, 49.
- Dunda, S. E., Demir, E., Mefful, O. J., Grieb, G., Bozkurt, A., & Pallua, N. (2015). Management, clinical outcomes and complications of acute cannula-related peripheral vein phlebitis of the upper extremity: A retrospective study. *Phlebology, 30*, 381-388. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0268355514537254>
- Dychter, S. S., Gold, D. A., Carson, D., & Haller, M. (2012). Intravenous therapy: A review of complications and economic considerations of peripheral access. *Journal of Infusion Nursing, 35*, 84-91. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NAN.0b013e31824237ce>
- Elia, F., Ferrari, G., Molino, P., Converso, M., De Filippi, G., Milan, A., & Apra, F. (2012). Standard-length catheters vs long catheters in ultrasound-guided peripheral vein cannulation. *American Journal of Emergency Medicine, 30*, 712-716. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajem.2011.04.019>
- Enes, S. M., Opitz, S. P., Faro, A. R., & Pedreira Mde, L. (2016). Phlebitis associated with peripheral intravenous catheters in adults admitted to hospital in the Western Brazilian Amazon. *Revista Da Escola De Enfermagem Da USP, 50*, 263-271. <https://doi.org/10.1590/s0080-62342016000200012>



- Erdogan, B. C., & Denat, Y. (2016). The development of phlebitis and infiltration in patients with peripheral intravenous catheters in the neurosurgery clinic and affecting factors. *International Journal of Caring Sciences*, 9, 619–629.
- Fakih, M. G., Jones, K., Rey, J. E., Berriel-Cass, D., Kalinicheva, T., Szpunar, S., & Saravolatz, L. D. (2012). Sustained improvements in peripheral venous catheter care in non-intensive care units: A quasi-experimental controlled study of education and feedback. *Infection Control and Hospital Epidemiology*, 33, 449–455. <https://doi.org/10.1086/665322>
- Fields, J. M., Dean, A. J., Todman, R. W., Au, A. K., Anderson, K. L., Ku, B. S., ... Panebianco, N. L. (2012). The effect of vessel depth, diameter and location on ultrasound-guided peripheral intravenous catheter longevity. *American Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 30, 1134–1140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajem.2011.07.027>
- Forni, C., D'Alessandro, F., Gambino, O., Amodeo, A., Pignotti, E., Zanotti, E., & Loro, L. (2012). Effectiveness of the transparent sterile dressing vs standard to fix the peripheral venous catheter (PVC) on the incidence of phlebitis. A randomized controlled trial. *Assistenza Infermieristica E Ricerca*, 31, 63–69. <https://doi.org/10.1702/1131.12467>
- Fry, M., Romero, B., & Berry, A. (2016). Utility of peripheral intravenous cannulae inserted in one tertiary referral emergency department: A medical record audit. *AENJ*, 19, 20–25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aenj.2015.10.003>
- Fujita, T., & Namiki, N. (2008). Replacement of peripheral intravenous catheters. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 17, 2509–2510. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2702.2008.02358.x>
- Fujita, T., Namiki, T., Suzuki, T., & Yamamoto, E. (2006). Normal saline flushing for maintenance of peripheral intravenous sites. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 15, 103–104. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2702.2005.01238.x>
- Gallant, P., & Schultz, A. A. (2006). Evaluation of a visual infusion phlebitis scale for determining appropriate discontinuation of peripheral intravenous catheters. *Journal of Infusion Nursing*, 29, 338–345. 00129804-200611000-00004
- Goransson, K. E., & Johansson, E. (2012). Prehospital peripheral venous catheters: A prospective study of patient complications. *Journal of Vascular Access*, 13, 16–21. <https://doi.org/10.5301/jva.2011.8418>
- Gregg, S. C., Murthi, S. B., Sisley, A. C., Stein, D. M., & Scalea, T. M. (2010). Ultrasound-guided peripheral intravenous access in the intensive care unit. *Journal of Critical Care*, 25, 514–519. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jccr.2009.09.003>
- Grune, F., Schrappe, M., Basten, J., Wenchel, H. M., Tual, E., & Stutzer, H. (2004). Phlebitis rate and time kinetics of short peripheral intravenous catheters. *Infection*, 32, 30–32. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s1501-0-004-1037-4>
- Günther, S. C., Schwebel, C., Hamidfar-Roy, R., Bonadona, A., Lugosi, M., Ara-Somohano, C., & Timsit, J. F. (2016). Complications of intravascular catheters in ICU: Definitions, incidence and severity. A randomized controlled trial comparing usual transparent dressings versus new-generation dressings (the ADVANCED study). *Intensive Care Medicine*, 42, 1753–1765. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-016-4582-2>
- Gupta, A., Mehta, Y., Juneja, R., & Trehan, N. (2007). The effect of cannula material on the incidence of peripheral venous thrombophlebitis. *Anaesthesia*, 62, 1139–1142. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2044.2007.05180.x>
- Haddad, F., Waked, C., & Zein, E. (2006). Peripheral venous catheter-related inflammation. A randomized prospective trial. *Journal medical libanais. The Lebanese Medical Journal*, 54, 139–145.
- Harris, R., Bradburn, M., Deeks, J., Harbord, R., Altman, D., & Sterne, J. (2008). Meta-an: Fixed-and random-effects meta-analysis. *Stata Journal*, 8, 3.
- Hasselberg, D., Ivarsson, B., Andersson, R., & Tingstedt, B. (2010). The handling of peripheral venous catheters—from non-compliance to evidence-based needs. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 19, 3358–3363. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2702.2010.03410.x>
- Hawes, M. L. (2007). A proactive approach to combating venous depletion in the hospital setting. *Journal of Infusion Nursing*, 30, 33–44. 00129804-200701000-00006
- Hawkins, T., Greenslade, J. H., Suna, J., Williams, J., Rickard, C. M., Jensen, M., & Egerton-Warburton, D. (2018). Peripheral intravenous cannula insertion and use in the emergency department: An intervention study. *Academic Emergency Medicine*, 25, 26–32. <https://doi.org/10.1111/acem.13335>
- Helm, R. E., Klausner, J. D., Klemperer, J. D., Flint, L. M., & Huang, E. (2015). Accepted but unacceptable: Peripheral IV catheter failure. *Journal of Infusion Nursing*, 38, 189–203. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NAN.0000000000000100>
- Higgins, J. P. T. (2011). Green S. Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions version 5.1. O. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 5.
- Higginson, R., & Parry, A. (2011). Phlebitis: Treatment, care and prevention. *Nursing times*, 107, 18–21.
- Hirschmann, H., Fux, L., Podusel, J., Schindler, K., Kundi, M., Rotter, M., & Wewalka, G. (2001). The influence of hand hygiene prior to insertion of peripheral venous catheters on the frequency of complications. *Journal of Hospital Infection*, 49, 199–203. <https://doi.org/10.1053/jhin.2001.1077>
- Holder, M. R., Stutzman, S. E., & Olson, D. M. (2017). Impact of ultrasound on short peripheral intravenous catheter placement on vein thrombosis risk. *Journal of Infusion Nursing*, 40, 176–182. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NAN.0000000000000214>
- Infusion Nurses Society (2016). Infusion therapy standard of practice. *Journal of Infusion Nursing*, 39(1S), 1–160.
- Jackson, A. (2012). Retrospective comparative audit of two peripheral IV securement dressings. *British Journal of Nursing*, 516–20. <https://doi.org/10.12968/bjon.2012.21.Sup1.S10>
- Johansson, M. E., Pilhammar, E., Khalaf, A., & Willman, A. (2008). Registered nurses' adherence to clinical guidelines regarding peripheral venous catheters: A structured observational study. *Worldviews on Evidence-Based Nursing*, 5, 148–159. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6787.2008.00105.x>
- Kagel, E. M., & Rayan, G. M. (2004). Intravenous catheter complication in the hand and forearm. *Journal of Trauma*, 56, 123–127. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.TA.0000058126.72962.74>
- Karadağ, A., & Görgülü, S. (2000). Effect of two different short peripheral catheter materials on phlebitis development. *Journal of Intravenous Nursing*, 23, 158–166.
- Karadeniz, G., Kutlu, N., Tatlisumak, E., & Ozbakkaloglu, B. (2003). Nurses' knowledge regarding patients with intravenous catheters and phlebitis interventions. *Journal of Vascular Nursing*, 21, 44–47. S1062030303000347
- Kaur, P., Thakur, R., Kaur, S., & Bhalla, A. (2011). Assessment of risk factors of phlebitis amongst intravenous cannulated patients. *Nursing and Midwifery Research*, 7.
- Keogh, S., Flynn, J., Marsh, N., Mihala, G., Davies, K., & Rickard, C. (2016). Varied flushing frequency and volume to prevent peripheral intravenous catheter failure: A pilot, factorial randomised controlled trial in adult medical-surgical hospital patients. *Trials*, 17, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13063-016-1470-6>
- Lanbeck, P., Odenholt, I., & Paulsen, O. (2002). Antibiotics differ in their tendency to cause infusion phlebitis: A prospective observational study. *Scandinavian Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 34, 512–519. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00365540110080908>
- Lanbeck, P., Odenholt, I., & Paulsen, O. (2003). Dicloxacillin: A higher risk than cloxacillin for infusion phlebitis. *Scandinavian Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 35, 397–400.

- Larsen, E., Keogh, S., Marsh, N., & Rickard, C. (2017). Experience of peripheral IV insertion in hospital: A qualitative study. *British Journal of Nursing*, 26, S18–25.
- Lee, W., Chen, H., Tsai, T., Lai, I., Chang, W., Huang, C., & Fang, C. (2009). Risk factors for peripheral intravenous catheter infection in hospitalized patients: A prospective study of 3165 patients. *American Journal of Infection Control*, 37, 683–686. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2009.02.009>
- López, J., Arribi Vilela, A., Fernández del Palacio, E., Olivares Corra, I. J., Benedicto Martí, C., & Herrera Portal, P. (2014). Indwell times, complications and costs of open vs closed safety peripheral intravenous catheters: A randomized study. *Journal of Hospital Infection*, 86, 117–126. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2013.10.008>
- Loveday, H. P., Wilson, J. A., Pratt, R. J., Golsorkhi, M., Tingle, A., Bak, A., & Health, U. K. D. O. (2014). epic3: National evidence-based guidelines for preventing healthcare-associated infections in NHS hospitals in England. *Journal of Hospital Infection*, 86(Suppl 1), S1–70. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0195-6701\(13\)60012-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0195-6701(13)60012-2)
- Macklin, D. (2003). Phlebitis: A painful complication of peripheral IV catheterization that may be prevented. *The American Journal of Nursing*, 103, 55–60.
- Mahmoud, A. A., El-Shafei, H. I., Yassin, H. M., Elramely, M. A., Abdelhaq, M. M., El Kady, H. W., & Awada, W. N. F. (2017). Comparison between retrograde and antegrade peripheral venous cannulation in intensive care unit patients: Assessment of thrombus formation. *Anesthesia and Analgesia*, 124, 1839–1845. <https://doi.org/10.1213/ANE.0000000000001703>
- Maki, D. G., Kluger, D. M., & Crnich, C. J. (2006). The risk of bloodstream infection in adults with different intravascular devices: A systematic review of 200 published prospective studies. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*, 81, 1159–1171. <https://doi.org/10.4065/81.9.1159>
- Malach, T., Jerassy, Z., Rudensky, B., Schlesinger, Y., Broide, E., Olsha, O., & Raveh, D. (2006). Prospective surveillance of phlebitis associated with peripheral intravenous catheters. *American Journal of Infection Control*, 34, 308–312. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2005.10.002>
- Maly, C., Fan, K. L., Rogers, G. F., Mitchell, B., Amling, J., Johnson, K., & Open, R. S. G. (2018). A Primer on the Acute Management of Intravenous Extravasation Injuries for the Plastic Surgeon. *Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open*, 6.
- Marsh, N., Larsen, E., Genzel, J., Mihala, G., Ullman, A. J., Kleidon, T., & Rickard, C. M. (2018). A novel integrated dressing to secure peripheral intravenous catheters in an adult acute hospital: A pilot randomised controlled trial. *Trials*, 19, 596.
- Marsh, N., Webster, J., Flynn, J., Mihala, G., Hewer, B., Fraser, J., & Rickard, C. M. (2015). Securement methods for peripheral venous catheters to prevent failure: A randomised controlled pilot trial. *Journal of Vascular Access*, 16, 237–244. <https://doi.org/10.5301/jva.5000348>
- Marsh, N., Webster, J., Larsen, E., Genzel, J., Cooke, M., Mihala, G., & Rickard, C. M. (2018). Expert versus generalist inserters for peripheral intravenous catheter insertion: A pilot randomised controlled trial. *Trials*, 19, 564.
- Marsh, N., Webster, J., Larson, E., Cooke, M., Mihala, G., & Rickard, C. (2018). Observational Study of Peripheral Intravenous Catheter Outcomes in Adult Hospitalized Patients: A Multivariable Analysis of Peripheral Intravenous Catheter Failure. *Journal of Hospital Medicine*, E1–E7. <https://doi.org/10.12788/jhm.2867>
- Marsh, N., Webster, J., Mihala, G., & Rickard, C. M. (2015). Devices and dressings to secure peripheral venous catheters to prevent complications. *The Cochrane Library*, <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD011070.pub2>
- Martínez, J., Piazuelo, M., Almela, M., Blecua, P., Gallardo, R., Rodríguez, S., & Trilla, A. (2009). Evaluation of add-on devices for the prevention of phlebitis and other complications associated with the use of peripheral catheters in hospitalised adults: A randomised controlled study. *Journal of Hospital Infection*, 73, 135–142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2009.06.031>
- McCallum, L., & Higgins, D. (2012). Care of peripheral venous cannula sites. *Nursing times*, 108(12), 14–15.
- McNeill, E. E., Hines, N. L., & Phariss, R. (2009). A clinical trial of a new all in one peripheral short catheter. *JAVA*, 14, [org/10.2309/java.14-1-8](https://doi.org/10.2309/java.14-1-8)
- Mee-Marquet, N., Amirault, P., Besnard, P., Bloc, D., Branger, B., Boucher, M., & Voyer, I. (2007). Efficacy and safety of a two-step method of skin preparation for peripheral intravenous catheter insertion: A prospective multi-centre randomised trial. *BMC Anesthesiology*, 7, 1. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2253-7-1>
- Meng, L., Nguyen, C. M., Patel, S., Mlynash, M., & Caulfield, A. F. (2018). Association between continuous peripheral iv infusion of 3% sodium chloride injection and phlebitis in adults. *The Bulletin of the American Society of Hospital Pharmacists*, 75, 284–291. <https://doi.org/10.2146/ajhp161028>
- Mermel, L. A. (2017). Short-term peripheral venous catheter-related bloodstream infections: A systematic review. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, 65, 1757–1762. [org/10.1093/cid/cix562](https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/cix562)
- Mestre, G., Berbel, C., Tortajada, P., Alarcia, M., Coca, R., Fernandez, M., & Martinez, J. (2013). Successful multifaceted intervention aimed to reduce short peripheral venous catheter-related adverse events: A quasiexperimental cohort study. *American Journal of Infection Control*, 41, 520–526. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2012.07.014>
- Mestre Roca, G., Berbel Bertolo, C., Tortajada Lopez, P., Gallemi Samaranch, G., Aguilar Ramirez, M. C., Cayla Buqueras, J., & Martinez, J. A. (2012). Assessing the influence of risk factors on rates and dynamics of peripheral vein phlebitis: An observational cohort study. *Medicina Clínica*, 139, 185–191. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.medcli.2011.12.021>
- Miliani, K., Taravella, R., Thillard, D., Chauvin, V., Martin, E., Edouard, S., & Astagneau, P. (2017). Peripheral venous catheter-related adverse events: Evaluation from a multicentre epidemiological study in France (the CATHEVAL project). *PLoS One*, 12, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0168637>
- Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D. G., & Group, P. (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. *PLoS Medicine*, 6, e1000097. [org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097)
- Murayama, R., Uchida, M., Oe, M., Takahashi, T., Oya, M., Komiyama, C., & Sanada, H. (2017). Removal of peripheral intravenous catheters due to catheter failures among adult patients. *Journal of Infusion Nursing*, 40, 224–231. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NAN.0000000000000168>
- Myrianthefs, P., Karatzas, S., & Baltopoulos, G. (2005). Complications, thrombophlebitis rates and intravenous catheter replacement strategies. *Infection*, 33, 96–97. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s1501-0-005-4044-1>
- Nassaji-Zavareh, M., & Ghorbani, R. (2007). Peripheral intravenous catheter-related phlebitis and related risk factors. *Singapore Medical Journal*, 48, 733–736.
- Niesen, K., Harris, D., Parkin, L., & Henn, L. (2003). The effects of heparin versus normal saline for maintenance of peripheral intravenous locks in pregnant women. *Journal of Obstetric, Gynecologic, & Neonatal Nursing*, 32(4), 503–508.
- Nishanth, S., Sivaram, G., Kalayarasan, R., Kate, V., & Ananthkrishnan, N. (2009). Does elective re-siting of intravenous cannulae decrease peripheral thrombophlebitis? A randomized controlled study. *National Medical Journal of India*, 22, 60–62.
- Norton, L., Ottoboni, L. K., Varady, A., Yang-Lu, C.-Y., Becker, N., Cotter, T., & Matsuda, K. (2013). Phlebitis in amiodarone administration: Incidence, contributing factors and clinical implications. *American Journal of Critical Care*, 22, 498–505. <https://doi.org/10.4037/ajcc2013460>

- Nyaga, V. N., Arbyn, M., & Aerts, M. (2014). Metaprop: A Stata command to perform meta-analysis of binomial data. *Arch Public Health*, *72*, 39. <https://doi.org/10.1186/2049-3258-72-39>
- O'Grady, N. P., Alexander, M., Burns, L. A., Dellinger, E. P., Garland, J., Heard, S. O., & Saint, S. (2011). Guidelines for the prevention of intravascular catheter-related infections. *American Journal of Infection Control*, *39*(4 Suppl 1), S1–S4. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2011.01.003>
- Ortiz, D., Jahangir, A., Singh, M., Allaqaband, S., Bajwa, T. K., & Mewissen, M. W. (2014). Access site complications after peripheral vascular interventions: Incidence, predictors and outcomes. *Circulation: Cardiovascular Interventions*, *7*, 821–828. <https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCINTERVENTIONS.114.001306>
- Oto, J., Imanaka, H., Konno, M., Nakataki, E., & Nishimura, M. (2011). A prospective clinical trial on prevention of catheter contamination using the hub protection cap for needleless injection device. *American Journal of Infection Control*, *39*, 309–313. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2010.06.016>
- Palefski, S. S., & Stoddard, G. J. (2001). The infusion nurse and patient complication rates of peripheral-short catheters: A prospective evaluation. *Journal of Intravenous Nursing*, *24*, 113–123.
- Palese, A., Ambrosi, E., Fabris, F., Guarnier, A., Barelli, P., Zambiasi, P., & Saiani, L. (2016). Nursing care as a predictor of phlebitis related to insertion of a peripheral venous cannula in emergency departments: Findings from a prospective study. *Journal of Hospital Infection*, *92*, 280–286. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2015.10.021>
- Panadero, A., Iohom, G., Taj, J., Mackay, N., & Shorten, G. (2002). A dedicated intravenous cannula for postoperative use effect on incidence and severity of phlebitis. *Anaesthesia*, *57*, 921–925. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2044.2002.02786.x>
- Pandurangadu, A. V., Tucker, J., Brackney, A. R., & Bahl, A. (2018). Ultrasound-guided intravenous catheter survival impacted by amount of catheter residing in the vein. *Emergency Medicine Journal*, *35*, 550–555. <https://doi.org/10.1136/emermed-2017-206803>
- Pasalioğlu, K. B., & Kaya, H. (2014). Catheter indwell time and phlebitis development during peripheral intravenous catheter administration. *Peking Journal of Medicinal Science*, *30*, 725. <https://doi.org/10.12669/pjms.304.5067>
- Periard, D., Monney, P., Waeber, G., Zurkinden, C., Mazzolai, L., Hayoz, D., & Denys, A. (2008). Randomized controlled trial of peripherally inserted central catheters vs. peripheral catheters for middle duration in-hospital intravenous therapy. *Journal of Thrombosis and Haemostasis*, *6*, 1281–1288. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1538-7836.2008.03053.x>
- Powell, J., Tarnow, K. G., & Perucca, R. (2008). The Relationship Between Peripheral Intravenous Catheter Indwell Time and the Incidence of Phlebitis. *Journal of Infusion Nursing*, *31*, 39–45. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.NAN.0000308544.67744.50>
- Prunet, B., Meaudre, E., Montcriol, A., Asencio, Y., Bordes, J., Lacroix, G., & Kaiser, E. (2008). A prospective randomized trial of two safety peripheral intravenous catheters. *Anesthesia and Analgesia*, *107*, 155–158. <https://doi.org/10.1213/ane.0b013e318174df5f>
- Ray-Barruel, G., Polit, D. F., Murfield, J. E., & Rickard, C. M. (2014). Infusion phlebitis assessment measures: A systematic review. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*, *20*, 191–202. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jep.12107>
- Renard, E., Guerci, B., Leguerrier, A., & Boizel, R. (2010). Lower rate of initial failures and reduced occurrence of adverse events with a new catheter model for continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion: Prospective, two-period, observational, multicenter study. *Diabetes Technology & Therapeutics*, *12*, 769–773. <https://doi.org/10.1089/dia.2010.0073>
- Rickard, C., Marsh, N., Webster, J., Runnegar, N., Larsen, E., McGrail, M., & Choudhury, M. (2018). Dressings and securements for the prevention of peripheral intravenous catheter failure in adults (SAVE): A pragmatic, randomised controlled, superiority trial. *The Lancet*, *392*, 419–430. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(18\)31380-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31380-1)
- Rickard, C., McCann, D., Munnings, J., & McGrail, M. (2010). Routine resite of peripheral intravenous devices every 3 days did not reduce complications compared with clinically indicated resite: A randomised controlled trial. *BMC Medicine*, *8*, 53. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1741-7015-8-53>
- Rickard, C., & Ray-Barruel, G. (2017). Peripheral intravenous catheter assessment: Beyond phlebitis. *Lancet Haematol*, *4*, e402–e403. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-3026\(17\)30145-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-3026(17)30145-X)
- Rickard, C., Webster, J., Wallis, M., Marsh, N., McGrail, M., French, V., & Whitby, M. (2012). Routine versus clinically indicated replacement of peripheral intravenous catheters: A randomised controlled equivalence trial. *Lancet*, *380*, 1066–1074. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(12\)61082-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61082-4)
- Rojas-Sánchez, L. Z., Parra, D. I., & Camargo-Figuera, F. A. (2015). Incidence and factors associated with the development of phlebitis: Results of a pilot cohort study/Incidencia y factores asociados al desarrollo de flebitis: Resultados del estudio piloto de una cohorte/Incidência e fatores associados com o desenvolvimento de flebite: Resultados do estudo piloto de uma coorte. *Revista De Enfermagem Referência*, *4*, 61. <https://doi.org/10.12707/RII13141>
- Ronen, O., Shlomo, F., Ben-Adiva, G., Edri, Z., & Shema-Didi, L. (2017). A prospective clinical trial to assess peripheral venous catheter-related phlebitis using needleless connectors in a surgery department. *American Journal of Infection Control*, *45*, 1139–1142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2017.05.001>
- Roszell, S., & Jones, C. (2010). Intravenous administration issues: A comparison of intravenous insertions and complications in vancomycin versus other antibiotics. *Journal of Infusion Nursing*, *33*, 112–118. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NAN.0b013e3181cfcee4>
- Royer, T. F. (2003). Improving short peripheral IV outcomes: A clinical trial of two securment methods. *JAVA*, *8*, 45–49. <https://doi.org/10.2309/155288503774651805>
- Sabir, A., Szalas, J., Holmes, K. S., Labib, L., & Mussivand, T. (2012). Failed attempts and improvement strategies in peripheral intravenous catheterization. *Bio-Medical Materials and Engineering*, *23*, 93–108. <https://doi.org/10.3233/BME-120735>
- Saini, R., Agnihotri, M., Gupta, A., & Walia, I. (2011). Epidemiology of infiltration and phlebitis. *Nursing and Midwifery Research Journal [online]*, *7*.
- Salgueiro-Oliveira, A., Veiga, P., & Parreira, P. (2012). Incidence of phlebitis in patients with peripheral intravenous catheters: The influence of some risk factors. *Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *30*, 32.
- Salles, F. T., Santos, V. L. C., Secoli, S. R., Aron, S., Del Debbio, C. B., Baptista, C. C., & Rogenski, N. M. B. (2007). A comparison and cost-effectiveness analysis of peripheral catheter dressings. *Ostomy Wound Management*, *53*, 26–33.
- Sarafzadeh, F., Sepehri, G., & Yazdizadeh, M. (2012). Evaluation of the severity of peripheral intravenous catheter related phlebitis during one year period in an Iranian educational hospital, Kerman, Iran. *Annals Biology Research*, *3*, 4741–4746.
- Schears, G. J. (2006). Summary of product trials for 10,164 patients: Comparing an intravenous stabilizing device to tape. *Journal of Infusion Nursing*, *29*, 225–231.
- Sebbane, M., Claret, P.-G., Lefebvre, S., Mercier, G., Rubenovitch, J., Jreige, R., & de La Coussaye, J.-E. (2013). Predicting peripheral venous access difficulty in the emergency department using body mass index and a clinical evaluation of venous accessibility. *Journal of Emergency Medicine*, *44*, 299–305. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jemermed.2012.07.051>
- Singh, R., Bhandary, S., & Pun, K. D. (2008). Peripheral intravenous catheter related phlebitis and its contributing factors among adult population at KU Teaching Hospital. *KUMJ*, *6*, 443–447.



- Smith, B. (2006). Peripheral intravenous catheter dwell times: A comparison of 3 securement methods for implementation of a 96-hour scheduled change protocol. *Journal of Infusion Nursing*, 29, 14–17. [00129804-200601000-00004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2002.1101)
- Stroup, D. F., Berlin, J. A., Morton, S. C., Olkin, I., Williamson, G. D., Rennie, D., & Thacker, S. B. (2000). Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology: A proposal for reporting. Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) group. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 283, 2008–2012. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.283.15.2008>
- Takahashi, T., Murayama, R., Oe, M., Nakagami, G., Tanabe, H., Yabunaka, K., & Sanada, H. (2017). Is thrombus with subcutaneous edema detected by ultrasonography related to short peripheral catheter failure? A prospective observational study. *Journal of Infusion Nursing*, 40, 313–322. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NAN.0000000000000216>
- Tan, P. C., Mackeen, A., Khong, S., Omar, S., & Noor Azmi, M. (2016). Peripheral Intravenous catheterisation in obstetric patients in the hand or forearm vein: A randomised trial. *Scientific Reports*, 6, 23223. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep23223>
- Tan, Y., Tai, W., Sim, C., & Ng, H. (2017). Optimising peripheral venous catheter usage in the general inpatient ward: A prospective observational study. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 26, 133–139. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.13451>
- Tanabe, H., Murayama, R., Yabunaka, K., Oe, M., Takahashi, T., Komiyama, C., & Sanada, H. (2016). Low-angled peripheral intravenous catheter tip placement decreases phlebitis. *Journal of Vascular Access*, 17, 542–547. <https://doi.org/10.5301/jva.5000601>
- Taylor, F. (2003). A study of the rates of infection and phlebitis associated with peripheral intravenous therapy at the Royal Hobart Hospital. *Australian Infection Control*, 8, 57–64. [org/10.1017/HI03057](https://doi.org/10.1017/HI03057)
- Thamby, S. (2007). A prospective survey and analysis of nosocomial infections in a tertiary care teaching hospital in South India. *International Journal of Pharmaceutical Science Research*, 5, 231–236.
- United Nations. (2016). World Economic Situation and Prospects.
- Urbanetto, J. D. S., Muniz, F. D. O. M., Silva, R. M. D., Freitas, A. P. C. D., Oliveira, A. P. R. D., & Santos, J. D. C. R. D. (2017). Incidence of phlebitis and post-infusion phlebitis in hospitalised adults. *Revista Gaúcha De Enfermagem*, 38(2), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1983-1447.2017.02.58793>
- Urbanetto, J. D. S., Peixoto, C. G., & May, T. A. (2016). Incidence of phlebitis associated with the use of peripheral IV catheter and following catheter removal. *Revista Latino-Americana De Enfermagem*, 24, <https://doi.org/10.1590/1518-8345.0604.2746>
- Uslusoy, E., & Mete, S. (2008). Predisposing factors to phlebitis in patients with peripheral intravenous catheters: A descriptive study. *Journal of the American Academy of Nurse Practitioners*, 20, 172–180. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-7599.2008.00305.x>
- Van Donk, P., Rickard, C., McGrail, M., & Doolan, G. (2009). Routine replacement versus clinical monitoring of peripheral intravenous catheters in a regional hospital in the home program: A randomized controlled trial. *Infection Control and Hospital Epidemiology*, 30, 915–917. <https://doi.org/10.1086/599776>
- Vandenbos, F., Basar, A., Tempesta, S., Fournier, J. P., Bertrand, F., Vanesland, L., & Roger, P. M. (2003). Relevance and complications of intravenous infusion at the emergency unit at Nice University Hospital. *Journal of Infection*, 46, 173–176. <https://doi.org/10.1053/jinf.2002.1101>
- Vandenbroucke, J. P., Von Elm, E., Altman, D. G., Gøtzsche, P. C., Mulrow, C. D., Pocock, S. J., ... Egger, M., (2014). Strengthening the reporting of observational studies in epidemiology (STROBE): Explanation and elaboration. *International Journal of Surgery (London, England)*, 12, 1500–1524. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsu.2014.07.014>
- Von Elm, E., Altman, D. G., Egger, M., Pocock, S. J., Gøtzsche, P. C., & Vandenbroucke, J. P. (2014). The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: Guidelines for reporting observational studies. *International Journal of Surgery (London, England)*, 12, 1495–1499. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsu.2014.07.013>
- Wang, R., Luo, O., He, L., Li, J. X., & Zhang, M. G. (2012). Preservative-free 0.9% sodium chloride for flushing and locking peripheral intravenous access device: A prospective controlled trial. *Journal of Evidence-Based Medicine*, 5, 205–208. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jebm.12004>
- Wang, R., Zhang, M., Luo, O., He, L., Li, J., Tang, Y., & Kantarcıken, B. (2015). Heparin saline versus normal saline for flushing and locking peripheral venous catheters in decompensated liver cirrhosis patients: A randomized controlled trial. *Medicine (United States)*, 94, <https://doi.org/10.1097/MD.0000000000001292>
- Webster, J., Clarke, S., Paterson, D., Hutton, A., Van Dyk, S., Gale, C., & Hopkins, T. (2008). Routine care of peripheral intravenous catheters versus clinically indicated replacement: Randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*, 337, 157–160. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.a339>
- Webster, J., Lloyd, S., Hopkins, T., Osborne, S., & Yaxley, M. (2007). Developing a research base for intravenous peripheral cannula re-sites (DRIP trial). A randomised controlled trial of hospital in-patients. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 44, 664–671. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2006.02.003>
- White, S. A. (2001). Peripheral intravenous therapy-related phlebitis rates in an adult population. *Journal of Intravenous Nursing*, 24, 19–24.
- Xu, L., Hu, Y., Huang, X., Fu, J., & Zhang, J. (2017). Heparinized saline versus normal saline for maintaining peripheral venous catheter patency in China: An open-label, randomized controlled study. *Journal of International Medical Research*, 45, 471–480. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0300060516685203>
- Yılmaz, G., Koksal, I., Aydin, K., Caylan, R., Sucu, N., & Aksoy, N. (2007). Risk factors of catheter-related bloodstream infections in parenteral nutrition catheterization. *JPEN. Journal of Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition*, 31, 284–287. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0148607107031004284>
- Zarate, L., Mandelco, B., Wilshaw, R., & Ravert, P. (2008). Peripheral intravenous catheters started in prehospital and emergency department settings. *Journal of Trauma Nursing*, 15, 47–52. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.JTN.0000327326.83276.ce>
- Zhu, A., Wang, T., & Wen, S. (2016). Peripheral intravenous catheters in situ for more than 96 h in adults: What factors affect removal? *International Journal of Nursing Practice*, 22, 529–537. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijn.12492>
- Zingg, W., & Pittet, D. (2009). Peripheral venous catheters: An under-evaluated problem. *International Journal of Antimicrobial Agents*, 34(Suppl 4), S38–42. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0924-8579\(09\)70565-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0924-8579(09)70565-5)

## SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information may be found online in the Supporting Information section.

**How to cite this article:** Marsh N, Webster J, Ullman AJ, et al. Peripheral intravenous catheter non-infectious complications in adults: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Adv Nurs* 2020;76:3346–3362. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.14565>

The *Journal of Advanced Nursing (JAN)* is an international, peer-reviewed, scientific journal. *JAN* contributes to the advancement of evidence-based nursing, midwifery and health care by disseminating high quality research and scholarship of contemporary relevance and with potential to advance knowledge for practice, education, management or policy. *JAN* publishes research reviews, original research reports and methodological and theoretical papers.

For further information, please visit *JAN* on the Wiley Online Library website: [www.wileyonlinelibrary.com/journal/jan](http://www.wileyonlinelibrary.com/journal/jan)

**Reasons to publish your work in *JAN*:**

- **High-impact forum:** the world's most cited nursing journal, with an Impact Factor of 1.998 – ranked 12/114 in the 2016 ISI Journal Citation Reports © (Nursing (Social Science)).
- **Most read nursing journal in the world:** over 3 million articles downloaded online per year and accessible in over 10,000 libraries worldwide (including over 3,500 in developing countries with free or low cost access).
- **Fast and easy online submission:** online submission at <http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/jan>.
- **Positive publishing experience:** rapid double-blind peer review with constructive feedback.
- **Rapid online publication in five weeks:** average time from final manuscript arriving in production to online publication.
- **Online Open:** the option to pay to make your article freely and openly accessible to non-subscribers upon publication on Wiley Online Library, as well as the option to deposit the article in your own or your funding agency's preferred archive (e.g. PubMed).