



Society of General Internal Medicine

Choosing Wisely – 5 Things Physicians & Patients Should Question

April, 2016

Original authors (2013): Vineet Chopra, Laurence McMahon, Jr.

Updated by Robert Fogerty, Heather Harrell, Chad Miller, Renee Wilson

Don't place, or leave in place, peripherally inserted central catheters for patient or provider convenience.

Peripherally inserted central catheters (PICCs) are commonly used devices in contemporary medical practice that are associated with costly and potentially lethal healthcare-acquired complications, most commonly central-line associated bloodstream infection and venous thromboembolism. Given the clinical and economic consequences of these complications, placement of PICCs should be limited to acceptable indications (e.g., long-term peripherally compatible infusions, non-peripherally compatible infusions, chemotherapy, palliative care, and frequent blood draws).¹ PICCs should be promptly removed when acceptable indications for their use end.

Summary of Update

We conducted a search of systematic reviews, meta-analyses, and randomized controlled trials of PICCs in non-critically ill, adult inpatients, from 2012 to 2015. After screening 350 citations, we found 14 relevant reviews or studies. On this basis, we reaffirmed the recommendation, added new references, and altered the discussion by adding new information about additional complications, unsuccessful attempts to mitigate complications, and a lack of physician awareness about PICCs.

Discussion

PICCs are non-tunneled, central venous catheters that are inserted in the veins of the upper extremity. Because placement of PICCs in the arm avoids some complications associated with placement of central venous catheters (CVCs) into the veins of the neck and chest, and trained personnel increasingly place PICCs at the bedside, use of PICCs in hospitalized and ambulatory patients has grown across the country.

Although PICCs were originally intended to provide short-term venous access, they frequently remain in place for weeks or months. In this context, an accumulating body of evidence suggests that PICCs are associated with important complications. For instance, PICCs are often implicated in the development of central-line associated bloodstream infections in hospitalized patients,²⁻⁵ and they are associated with an increase in deep vein thrombosis of the upper extremity and pulmonary embolism.⁶⁻¹⁰ These outcomes are not solely related to PICCs themselves; rather, multiple factors interact to increase the risk of complications, including patient characteristics (e.g., history of prior deep vein thrombosis or

neutropenia), device characteristics (e.g., multi-lumen PICCs, or thicker-gauge devices), and provider characteristics (e.g., infusions of vancomycin, or use of anticoagulation).⁵ Recent attempts to mitigate these risk factors did not affect complication rates.¹¹⁻¹⁴ As the use of PICCs frequently involves patients at high-risk of these very complications (e.g., those with cancer and critically-ill populations), a sense of urgency in improving PICC utilization exists.

A growing body of evidence supports the recommendation only to place PICCs in the presence of an acceptable indication and to remove them promptly when no longer indicated.

Several systematic reviews have reported an increased risk of complications among patients who receive PICCs compared to traditional central venous catheters. For instance, in a systematic review and meta-analysis, PICCs were associated with a more than two-fold increase in the risk of venous thromboembolism compared to CVCs.¹⁰ In another systematic review comparing the risk of bloodstream infection with PICCs to CVCs, PICCs were associated with higher rates of bloodstream infections than cuffed and tunneled devices in hospitalized patients.¹⁵ PICCs also have been associated with higher risk of catheter-thrombosis,¹⁶ mechanical complications such as coiling and kinking, and superficial thrombosis relative to central venous catheters.¹⁷ There is also emerging literature about spontaneous late migrations of PICC catheter tips.¹⁸ Further, in patients requiring hemodialysis, a retrospective, case control study showed a strong independent association between prior PICC use and lack of a functioning arterial-venous fistula¹⁹ which may be one factor contributing to lower fistula use in the US and supports the National Kidney Foundation guideline to “avoid PICC placement in the chronic kidney disease population.”²⁰

Evidence suggests widespread variability in current use and appropriateness of PICCs. For instance, a study at a tertiary care academic medical center reported that PICCs were frequently associated with “idle-days” of non-use.²¹ In a statewide survey of 180 hospitalists in Michigan, approximately half of all respondents reported that 10-25% of PICCs placed at their facilities might have been inappropriate or avoidable.²² A recent prospective, multi-center study assessed physician awareness of CVCs where 60% of CVCs were PICCs. Nearly one-third of attending physicians and 16% of residents were unaware their patients had a CVC.²³


Finally, PICC use is growing outside of intensive care units, posing challenges for monitoring central line-associated infections and assembling homogenous care teams.²⁴ PICC use in non-intensive care settings necessitates fundamental changes to existing paradigms of care. Moreover, as patients frequently transition with PICCs to outpatient treatment, fragmentation and non-uniform post-discharge care represent perils to safe PICC use. It is necessary to raise awareness of these issues to help ensure positive outcomes and patient safety. As with other healthcare innovations, the use of PICCs began in a defined population to solve an important clinical problem. Over time, PICC insertion has evolved to span other indications and patient populations. This diffusion has led to recognition that the known advantages associated with PICC use may be offset by risks, costs, and complications in particular instances. Restricting the use of PICCs to specific indications and ensuring timely removal of these devices may help mitigate these risks. Choosing to insert and remove PICCs wisely is thus critical to patient safety and outcomes.

References

1. Chopra V, Flanders S, Saint S, et al. The Michigan appropriateness guide for intravenous catheters (MAGIC): results from a multispecialty panel using the RAND/UCLA appropriateness method. *Ann Intern Med.* 2015; 163: S1-S39.
2. Ajenjo MC, Morley JC, Russo AJ, et al. Peripherally inserted central venous catheter-associated bloodstream infections in hospitalized adult patients. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol.* 2011; 32(2):125-130.
3. Chopra V, Anand S, Krein SL, Chenoweth C, Saint S. Bloodstream infection, venous thrombosis, and peripherally inserted central catheters: reappraising the evidence. *Am J Med.* 2012; 125(8):733-741.
4. Pongruangporn M, Ajenjo MC, Russo AJ, et al. Patient-and device-specific risk factors for peripherally inserted central venous catheter-related bloodstream infections. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol.* 2013; 34(2):184-189.
5. Chopra V, O'Horo JC, Rogers MA, et al. 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 Hosp Epidemiol.* 2013; 34 (9): 908-918.
6. Aw A, Carrier M, Kocerginski J, McDiarmid S, Tay J. Incidence and predictive factors of symptomatic thrombosis related to peripherally inserted central catheters in chemotherapy patients. *Thrombosis Research.* 2012; 130(3):323-326.
7. Evans RS, Sharp JH, Linford LH, et al. Risk of symptomatic DVT associated with peripherally inserted central catheters. *Chest.* 2010; 138(4):803-810.
8. Leung A, Heal C, Perera M, Pretorius C. A systemic review of patient-related risk factors for catheter-related thrombosis. *J Thromb Thrombolysis.* 2015; 40 (3): 363-373.
9. Fallouh N, McGuirk HM, Flanders S, Chopra V. Peripherally inserted central catheter-associated deep venous thrombosis: A narrative review. *Am J Med.* 2015; 128 (7): 722-738.10.
- 10.. Chopra V, Anand S, Hickner A, et al. The risk of venous thromboembolism associated with peripherally inserted central catheters: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet.* 2013; 382: 311-325.
11. Alport B, Burbridge B, Lim H. Bard PowerPICC Solo2 vs Cook Turbo-Ject: A tale of two PICCs. *Can Assoc Radiol J.* 2012; 63(4): 323-328.
12. Miyagaki H, Nakajima K, Hara J, et. al. Performance comparison of peripherally inserted central venous catheters in gastrointestinal surgery: A randomized controlled trial. *Clin Nutr.* 2012; 31: 48-52.
13. Mitchell MD, Agarwal R, Hecht THE, Umscheid CA. Nonpharmacologic interventions for prevention of catheter-related thrombosis: A systematic review. *J Crit Care.* 2013; 28: 316.e9-316.e16.
14. Lyons MG, Phalen AG. A randomized controlled comparison of flushing protocols in home care patients with peripherally inserted central catheters. *J Infus Nurs.* 2014; 37 (4): 270-281.
15. Safdar N, Maki DG. Risk of catheter-related bloodstream infection with peripherally inserted central venous catheters used in hospitalized patients. *Chest.* 2005;128(2):489-495.
16. Saber W, Moua T, Williams EC, et al. Risk factors for catheter-related thrombosis (CRT) in cancer patients: a patient-level data (IPD) meta-analysis of clinical trials and prospective studies. *J Thromb Haemost.* 2011;9(2):312-319.

17. Pikwer A, Akeson J, Lindgren S. Complications associated with peripheral or central routes for central venous cannulation. *Anaesthesia*. 2012;67(1):65-71.
18. Beccaria P, Silvetti S, Mucci M, et.al. Contributing factors for a late spontaneous peripherally inserted central catheter migration: A case report and review of literature. *J Vasc Access*. 2015; 16(3):178-182.
19. El Ters MJ, Schears GJ, Taler SJ, et.al. Association between prior peripherally inserted central catheters and lack of functioning arteriovenous fistulas: A case-control study in hemodialysis patients. *Am J Kidney Dis*. 2012; 60 (4): 601-608.
20. Vascular Access 2006 Work Group. Clinical practice guidelines for vascular access. *Am J Kidney Dis*. 2006; 48: S176-247.
21. Tejedor SC, Tong D, Stein J, et al. Temporary central venous catheter utilization patterns in a large tertiary care center: Tracking the "Idle central venous catheter". *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2012;33(1):50-57.
22. Chopra V, Kuhn LK, Coffey C, et al. Hospitalist experiences, practice, opinions and knowledge regarding peripherally inserted central catheters: a Michigan survey. *J Hosp Med*. 2013; 8(11): 635-638.
23. Chopra V, Govindan S, Kuhn L, et. al. Do clinicians know which of their patients have central venous catheters? *Ann Intern Med*. 2014; 161: 562-567.
24. Son CH, Daniels TL, Eagan JA, et al. Central line-associated bloodstream infection surveillance outside the intensive care unit: a multicenter survey. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2012; 33(9):869-874.

Figure 1
Results for Choosing Wisely search update



* Sum of excluded abstracts exceeds 325 because reviewers were not required to agree on reasons for exclusion

† Sum of excluded articles exceeds 11 because reviewers were not required to agree on reasons for exclusion