# PIV failure – how effective is your clinical practice?

BY NICOLE MARSH RN, BN, MADVPRAC, KAYE ROLLS RN ACC BAPPSC (SYDNEY) DN

THE NURSING AND MIDWIFERY RESEARCH CENTRE, ROYAL BRISBANE AND WOMEN'S HOSPITAL; SCHOOL OF NURSING AND MIDWIFERY, GRIFFITH UNIVERSITY; THE ALLIANCE FOR VASCULAR ACCESS TEACHING AND RESEARCH GROUP, MENZIES HEALTH INSTITUTE; SYDNEY NURSING SCHOOL, UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY.

Based on an observational study of peripheral intravenous catheter outcomes in adult hospitalised patients – a multivariable analysis of peripheral intravenous catheter failure, Journal of Hospital Medicine (published online October 2017).

Marsh, N., Webster, J., Larsen, E., Cooke, M., Mihala, G. & Rickard C.M.

Nurses can expect to care for patients with a peripheral intravenous catheter (PIV) on a daily basis.

Of significant concern however is that up to 69% of PIV may fail before therapy is complete, exposing patients to unacceptable risks.

To improve patient outcomes there is a need to identify patient, and insertion and maintenance factors that can be improved.

A prospective cohort study (including patients aged over 18 years in medical surgical wards) was undertaken in a large tertiary hospital in Queensland Australia between October 2014 and December 2015.

One thousand patients with 1578 PIVs were recruited with 32% (512) of catheters failing (any cause), (136 per 1000 catheter days; 95% CI 125 to 148); including phlebitis 17% (267), occlusion/infiltration 14% (228), and dislodgement 10% (154).

Insertion practices or factors associated failure included:

 Bruising at the insertion site doubled the risk of phlebitis (HR 2.16, 95% CI1.26-3.71)

- PIV insertion in the pre-hospital setting almost doubled the risk of dislodgement (HR 1.78, 95% CI 1.03-3.06)
- A size 22 gauge catheter increased the risk of occlusion /infiltration by 1.5 (HR 1.43, 95% CI 1.02-2.003), and
- When the PIV was inserted in the patient's dominant side the risk of phlebitis increased 1.5 times (HR 1.39, 95% CI 1.09-1.77).

By contrast the use of secondary securement improved the life of a PIV by halving the risk for all types of failure including:

- Use of non-sterile tape in addition to the primary PIV dressing [Occlusion/ infiltration (HR 0.46, 95% CI 0.33-0.63); phlebitis, (HR 0.63, 95% CI 0.48-0.82); dislodgment (HR 0.44, 95% CI 0.31-0.63)]
- An elasticised tubular bandage (occlusion/infiltration HR 0.49, 95% CI0.35-0.70), and
- Any form of additional securement [occlusion/infiltration (HR 0.35, 95% CI 0.26-0.47; phlebitis (HR 0.53, 95% CI 0.39-0.70); dislodgment (HR 0.32, 95% CI 0.22-0.46).

Two practices increased the risk of PIV failure:

- Intravenous flucloxacillin doubled the risk of both occlusion/infiltration (HR 1.98, 95% CI 1.19-3.310) and phlebitis (HR 2.01, 95% CI 1.26-3.21)
- Frequent PIV access also increased the risk of failure including occlusion /infiltration (HR 1.12, 95% CI 1.04-1.21), phlebitis. (HR 1.14, 95% CI 1.08-1.21) and dislodgment (HR 1.14, 95% CI 1.08-1.21).

## Lessons for practice

 To minimise bruising, prior to insertion of a PIV clinicians should evaluate how difficult the procedure may be, and seek assistance or escalate to a more experienced PIV inserter.



- Clinicians must ensure that the PIV is well-secured and protected by correct application of sterile dressing and consider the use of secondary securement.
- To reduce the risk of occlusion/ infiltration and phlebitis related to IV flucloxacillin, clinicians should adhere to correct administration regimes.

# •<u>Ö</u>-

# **REFLECTIVE QUESTIONS**

- After reading this article, do you feel there are areas for improvement in your clinical area in relation to PIV insertion and maintenance?
- 2. How do you dress and secure PIVs in your clinical practice? Do you think it is adequate?

Don't forget to make note of your reflections for your record of CPD.

### References

Bausone-Gazda, D., C.A. Lefaiver, and S.A. Walters,. Journal of Infusion Nursing, 2010. 33(6): p. 371-84.

Rickard, C.M., et al.,. Lancet, 2012. 380(9847): p. 1066-74.

Webster, J., et al., British Medical Journal, 2008. 337: p. a339.