Central venous Access device SeCurement And Dressing Effectiveness: the CASCADE pilot randomised controlled trial in Adult Intensive Care

Professor Marion L Mitchell, RN, PhD, Centaur Fellow ^{a,b,c}

Associate Professor Amanda J Ullman RN, PhD, Centaur Fellow ^{a, b}

Ms Mari Takashima, RN, BN, Grad Cert Critical Care Nursing, M.Clin. Epi ^{a,b}

Ms Chelsea Davis RN, BN ^c

Mr Gabor Mihala, MEng, GCert (Biostat) ^{a, d, e}

Ms Madeleine Powell RN, BN ^c

Ms Victoria Gibson RN, Grad Cert Paediatric, Child and Youth Health Nursing ^a

Dr Li Zhang, MD, PhD ^a

Ms Michelle Bauer, BBiotech, BASc (Hons), GradCertMgt ^f

Professor E. Geoffrey Playford MBBS ^{a, g}

Professor Claire M Rickard RN, PhD ^{a, b, h}

^a Alliance for Vascular Access Teaching and Research Group (AVATAR), Menzies Health Institute Queensland, Griffith University, Australia

^b School of Nursing and Midwifery, Griffith University, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia

^c Intensive Care Unit, Princess Alexandra Hospital, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia

^d Centre for Applied Health Economics, Menzies Health Institute Queensland, Griffith University, Nathan, Queensland, Australia

^e School of Medicine, Griffith University, Nathan, Queensland, Australia

^f University of Queensland Centre for Clinical Research, Herston, Queensland, Australia

^g Infection Management Services, Princess Alexandra Hospital, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia

^h Visiting scholar, Nursing Professional Development Unit, Princess Alexandra Hospital, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia

Contributions: Dr Mitchell, Dr Ullman and Dr Rickard conceptualised study, designed the data collection instruments, drafted the initial manuscript, and reviewed and revised the final manuscript. Ms Davis and Ms Powell performed the data collection. Ms Takashima drafted the initial manuscript, and reviewed and revised the final manuscript. Mr Mihala carried out the analyses, and reviewed and revised the manuscript. Dr Zhang and Dr Bauer carried out the microbiology analyses and reviewed and revised the manuscript. Dr Geoffrey Playford provided clinical expertise in the design of the data collection instrument, reviewed and revised the final manuscript. All authors approved the final manuscript as submitted and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

Funding: This work was supported by the Intensive Care Foundation, the Princess Alexandra Hospital Foundation, and the Menzies Health Institute Queensland (Griffith University).

Trial registration: ACTRN12615000667516

Protocol: <https://www.anzctr.org.au/Trial/Registration/TrialReview.aspx?id=368765>

Abstract

Introduction: Central venous access devices (CVADs) are a vital medical device for intensive care (ICU) patients, however complications and failure are common, yet potentially prevented through effective dressings and securement.

Objectives/Aims: To test the feasibility of a randomised controlled trial (RCT) comparing standard care with three dressing and securement products, to prevent CVAD failure. Secondary aims included comparing dressing and securement products on CVAD failure, microbial colonisation and intervention costs.

Methods: A single-centre pilot RCT of ICU adult patients requiring CVADs for >24 hours were randomised to: (i) sutures plus chlorhexidine gluconate (CHG) dressing (standard-care); (ii) standard-care plus tissue adhesive (TA); (iii) two sutureless-stabilisation-devices plus CHG dressing (SSD); (iv) sutures, CHG-disc plus integrated-securement-dressing (ISD). Descriptive statistics assessed feasibility. Incidence rates (IR) of CVAD failure compared group differences with Fisher's exact and log-rank tests. Cox regression explored univariable risks for failure. A sub-study examined bacterial colonisation of catheter tips, dressings and skin. Cost estimates of the intervention were compared.

Results: 121 participants were randomised. Study feasibility was established with no withdrawal and moderate staff acceptability, however recruitment was low at 12%. Overall CVAD failure was 14/114 (12%) of CVADs (19 per 1000 catheter-days); highest in the SSD group (IR:27.3 per 1000 catheter-days [95% CI 11.4-65.6]), followed by the standard-care group (IR:22.3 per 1000 catheter-days [95% CI 8.38-59.5]) and TA group (IR:20.6 per 1000 catheter-days [95% CI 6.66-64.0]), and lowest in the ISD group (IR:8.8 per 1000 catheter-days [95% CI 2.19-35.0]). The majority of complications (11/14, 79%) were suspected-CLABSI, of which only one was laboratory confirmed (standard-care group). The cost per patient was lowest in the standard-care group by an average difference of AUD \$14.

Conclusion(s): A large multi-site RCT examining forms of securement and dressing is feasible. ISD is the highest priority to test further as it had the lowest failure rate.

Keywords: Central vascular access device (CVAD), Critical care, Dressing and securement methods, Randomized controlled trial, complications and failures

Word count: 4625 words

Trial registration: ACTRN12615000667516

Protocol: <https://www.anzctr.org.au/Trial/Registration/TrialReview.aspx?id=368765>

Funding: This work was supported by the Intensive Care Foundation, the Princess Alexandra Hospital Foundation, and the Menzies Health Institute Queensland (Griffith University).

Introduction

Central venous access devices (CVADs) are a vital medical device to facilitate the delivery of supportive and interventional medical therapies, including fluid and medication administration, hemodialysis, central venous pressure monitoring and blood sampling in critically ill patients in intensive care units (ICU) (1). Insertion of these devices poses significant procedural risk, and complications are common during current and subsequent CVAD use. A recent meta-analysis examining CVAD failure and complications in adult ICU patients demonstrated 5% (95% CI 3-6%) of CVADs failed before the completion of therapy at a rate of 5.43 (4.43-6.43) per 1000 catheter days (2). Such complications can be mechanical (e.g. blockage, dislodgement, vein thrombosis, CVAD rupture) or infective (e.g. local or bloodstream infections) (2, 3). These complications increase patient suffering, hospitalisation duration, mortality and healthcare costs (1, 4, 5).

Two key factors that can prevent CVAD complications are: (i) securement - that CVADs are adequately secured to the skin to prevent dislodgment, and (ii) dressings - that the insertion site is covered to prevent infection (6). Traditionally, CVADs were secured via sutures, under a simple polyurethane dressing. There is, however, significant evidence of increased bloodstream infections and needle-stick injury risks in RCTs comparing sutures with sutureless securement devices, although use persists due to concerns about equivalent securement efficacy (7, 8). Environmental protection is provided by sterile dressings; however, skin bacteria are the most common source of CVAD infections (5, 8). In the last decade, medication-impregnated dressings have been introduced to prevent such infections with high-quality evidence that chlorhexidine (CHG) impregnated dressings (or discs), reduce the risk of CVAD-related bloodstream infection (CRBSI) compared with non-medicated approaches; RR 0.60, 95% CI 0.39-0.93; $p=0.02$) (9, 10).

Despite the traditional use of sutures to secure CVADs, critically ill patients have multiple risk factors of CVAD dislodgment and rupture, due to multiple, heavy infusion lines (causing drag), and increasingly, light sedation and early mobilisation (11, 12). Vein irritation from poor securement precipitates thrombosis and occlusion, with CVAD-associated thrombosis and occlusion observed in

10% (4-17) and 11% (4-22) of CVADs (2). The scarcity of studies examining CVAD security warrants urgent attention and investigation (10).

New alternative securement and dressing options are available that may be superior to traditional products in preventing complications, but these require testing for safety, efficacy and cost-effectiveness. For example, sutureless stabilisation devices (SSD) can be used instead of sutures, reducing suture related infections but the impact on other complications is less clear (7). SSDs have large adhesive padded footplates with plastic CVAD-locking clasps which aim to reduce movement, kinking and flow impedance, and are used with polyurethane dressings. Integrated securement dressings (ISD) are 'next generation' polyurethane dressings with a tough fabric adhesive border and integrated catheter stabilisation device around the central polyurethane window, and have been associated with improved dressing performance in small RCTs in other patient/CVAD populations (13-15). Tissue adhesive (TA) is medical grade 'superglue' (cyanoacrylate) used as an alternative to sutures in both internal and external wounds (16). TA also forms an occlusive healing environment and a physical barrier to micro-organisms, with haemostatic properties to reduce ooze and haematomas, and preliminary evidence supports its use in some CVAD types (13-15, 17).

The ideal CVAD securement and dressing should: 1) prevent accidental removal, micro-motion and pistoning; 2) block bacteria entering the wound; 3) have antimicrobial properties; 4) assist with haemostasis; 5) be comfortable for patients; 6) be easy for staff to use; and 7) be cost-effective (11). Although many alternatives to sutures and polyurethane dressings exist, how these meet the above criteria is largely unknown, and high-quality RCTs are necessary to provide estimates of true effectiveness. To date there is lack of high quality evidence on the comparative efficacy of SSD, ISD and TA on CVADs for general ICU participants (10).

Aim

The primary aim was to provide feasibility data for an efficacy RCT comparing standard care to three innovative dressing and securement methods (SSD, ISD and TA) for CVADs in adult ICU patients. The secondary aim was to compare the effect of dressing and securement products on: i)

CVAD failure and complications (infection, occlusion, dislodgement, thrombosis, or breakage); ii) microbial colonisation of catheter tips, skin and dressing; and, iii) healthcare costs.

Methods

Study Design and Setting

This single site, four-armed, parallel group, superiority, pilot RCT had three experimental arms and one control arm. The trial was prospectively registered with the Australian Clinical Trial Registry (ACTRN12615000667516). The study site was a metropolitan, government-run, academic-affiliated, adult hospital in Australia with 640 beds. It has comprehensive critical care services and is an accredited Level 1 Trauma Centre. The 28-bed ICU admits patients from all major specialties including medical, surgical, and spinal injuries, excepting burns and obstetric conditions. The ICU admits approximately 2300 patients per year, with a 1:1 Registered Nurse to patient ratio.

Sample

Inclusion criteria were patients requiring non-tunnelled CVADs (including jugular, femoral and subclavian sites) to be inserted in the ICU, with a predicted dwell-time of >24 hours, and informed consent. Exclusion criteria were peripherally inserted CVADs, dialysis catheters, or pulmonary artery catheters. Patients whose CVAD was to be inserted through diseased, burned, scarred or hirsute skin; were allergic to any study product; or had previous study enrolment during the current admission were also excluded. The target sample size was 120 participants (30 per group), determined by pilot trial sample size recommendations to ensure accuracy of feasibility estimates including effect size (18).

Intervention

Participants were randomised to receive CVAD securement and dressing by:

- A. Standard care: Sutures (Prolene suture [Ethicon Ethilon, Polyamide 6 - REF 1663]) plus CHG dressing (Tegaderm CHG [3M, REF 1658R/1659R]), the site's usual securement and dressing practice;

- B. Standard care plus TA (TA group): (Prolene suture [Ethicon, Ethilon, Polyamide 6 - REF 1663), CHG dressing (Tegaderm CHG [3M REF 1658R/1659R]), plus TA (Histoacryl [BBraun, REF 1050044]);
- C. SSD plus CHG dressing (SSD group): SSD (Statlock stabilization device, CV Plus with Pigtail – REF CV0220)) plus CHG dressing (Tegaderm CHG [3M, REF 1658R/1659R]);
- D. Sutures, CHG disc plus ISD (ISD group): Sutures (Prolene suture [Ethicon, Ethilon, Polyamide 6 - REF 1663), CHG disc (Biopatch [Ethicon; REF 44150]) plus ISD (Sorbaview SHIELD [Centurion Medical Products; REF SV733UDT-6]).

Figure 1: Dressing and securement methods for each study group.

Standard care: Sutures (Prolene suture) plus CHG dressing. Standard care plus TA (TA group): (Prolene suture, CHG dressing plus TA. SSD plus CHG dressing (SSD group): SSD (Statlock stabilization device) plus CHG dressing. Sutures, CHG disc plus ISD (ISD group): Sutures (Prolene suture, CHG disc (Biopatch plus ISD).

Outcome

The primary outcome was the feasibility of an efficacy RCT including: eligibility (percentage of screened patients who were eligible); recruitment (percentage of eligible patients who consented); attrition and retention (percentage of randomised participants lost-to-follow up or who withdrew consent); protocol adherence (percentage of randomised participants who received the allocated intervention), missing data (percentage of missing data for the primary endpoint); intervention acceptability using numeric rating scale (i.e. clinician and participant satisfaction as 10-point scale (0 = completely dissatisfied, 10 = completely satisfied), and ease of study product application using a 10-point scale (0 = very difficult, 10 = very easy), and effect sizes to inform future sample size estimates (19).

The other primary outcome was CVAD failure (a composite measure of any reason for cessation of function before completion of treatment) due to:

- Central line-associated bloodstream infection (CLABSI): a laboratory-confirmed bloodstream infection (LCBSI) that is not secondary to an infection at another body site (CDC National Healthcare Safety Network (NHSN) criteria; excludes Mucosal Barrier Injury LCBSI), with CVAD in place for >2 calendar days when all elements of LCBI were first present together (20). Determined by blinded infectious disease specialist.
- Suspected CLABSI: suspected CVAD-related infection diagnosed by treating clinician that resulted in CVAD removal (2, 21).
- Local infection: purulent phlebitis confirmed with a positive CVAD semi-quantitative tip culture, but with negative or no blood culture (20).
- Dislodgement: partial dislodgement - change in external CVAD length from hub to skin, as measured by marking closest to the hub, or CVAD removal because the tip is no longer in the superior vena cava (diagnosed by x-ray/leakage from the site on injection); complete dislodgement - CVAD body completely leaves the vein. (8)
- Occlusion: partial occlusion: ≥ 1 lumens cannot be flushed and/or aspirated; complete occlusion: all lumens cannot be flushed and/or aspirated. (22)

- Thrombosis: development of thrombosed vessel (partial or complete) at the CVAD site diagnosed on ultrasound as requested by the treating clinician for suspected thrombosis. (23)
- CVAD breakage: visible split in CVAD material diagnosed by leakage or radiographic evidence of extravasation from a portion of the CVAD into surrounding tissue. (24)

Secondary outcomes were CVAD complications during treatment (whether resolvable or causing CVAD removal) including: infection (local and CLABSI), dislodgement (partial, complete), occlusion, thrombosis and breakage.

- CLABSI was further categorised as CVAD-related bloodstream infection (laboratory-confirmed with matched organism from blood and catheter tip culture), or not (20).
- All bloodstream infections: positive blood cultures meeting the CDC NHSN criteria for Laboratory Confirmed Bloodstream Infection (LCBSI) (20).
- Primary bloodstream infections: LCBSI (as above) that are not related to an infection at another site (20).
- Securement-dressing failure: clinically indicated securement-dressing replacement less than seven days from application because of loose, missing, bloodstained, diaphoresis or secretion soaked dressings (8).
- CVAD and first securement-dressing dwell time: hours from insertion/application until removal.
- Safety endpoints: skin rash, skin tears, blisters, pruritis, significant haematoma and bruising, local or systemic allergic reaction.
- Cost estimates of time to apply, secure and change dressings and related costs.
- Microbiological laboratory examination of bacterial colonisation of catheter tips, dressing product and skin swabs from under trial dressings.
- We had planned to test tensile strength of removed CVADs, to consider any interaction with TA, but this was not possible within the resources available

Recruitment and randomisation

A Research Nurse (ReN) screened the electronic medical records of all ICU admissions for potential participants daily, obtained written informed consent from participants or their substituted decision maker, and accessed the randomised allocation. Randomisation was conducted via a centralised web-based service (<https://www151.griffith.edu.au/>) using a 1:1:1:1 ratio with randomly varied block sizes of 4 and 8, stratified by site of insertion: jugular or other, which ensured allocation concealment until study entry. CVAD dressings prevented the ability to blind clinicians and patients. Blinded scientists in the hospital and research laboratories performed all cultures, a blinded radiologist defined thrombotic outcomes, and a blinded infectious diseases specialist confirmed all cases of CLABSI.

CVAD procedures

This was a pragmatic RCT to maximise generalisability, therefore, ReNs involvement in CVAD insertion, application of study products or CVAD care was limited. ReNs provided initial education and demonstration of the application of study products and CVAD care for the medical and nursing staff and were available for questions during the study. The inserting clinician (specialist medical consultant, or registrar enrolled in a specialist training program) typically applied the first study product, and ICU nurses undertook subsequent replacements if needed. Study products were in pre-prepared packs and ReNs liaised with the inserting clinicians to ensure familiarity with the study products. CVAD inserters used a large sterile drape and gown and prepared the skin with 2% CHG in 70% isopropyl alcohol. The CVAD inserter selected a site (e.g. jugular, subclavian, and femoral) using ultrasound for insertion and CVAD type (e.g. lumens) based on clinical judgement of participant needs (Arrow g⁺ard Blue PLUSTM Antimicrobial/polyurethane catheter: 20 cm triple and quadruple lumens were routinely used), and then applied the allocated products. The CVAD tip location was confirmed by X-ray for jugular and subclavian insertions. CVAD insertion was conducted as per the Australian and New Zealand Intensive Care Society guidelines (25).

Data collection

The ReNs used REDCap (Research Electronic Data CAPture, Vanderbilt) to collect demographic (age, sex, Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation (APACHE) 2 and 3 scores, weight, length of ICU stay), clinical (diagnosis, comorbidities, skin integrity, skin colour, white blood cells count, existing infection, existing wound/drain/tracheostomy/ stoma, patients level of consciousness, ability to mobilise, and sweatiness), CVAD characteristics (CVAD type, insertion side, subsequent device, inserter, previous experience with product, number of lumens, and multiple insertion attempts), and outcome data. The ReNs asked inserters to rate ease of study product application using a 10-point scale (0 = very difficult, 10 = very easy), and recorded the number of times they had previously used the study product. The ReN checked participants daily during the weekdays to inspect the CVAD and dressing securement products for protocol adherence. Participants were assessed for study outcomes. Product replacements/reinforcements, including tape, and the reasons for these were recorded.

Data were collected at CVAD removal on: the reason for removal including any complications, dwell time and infusates. Final data included microbiological data, ICU length of stay and mortality at 48hrs post CVL removal. Clinical staff ordered blood, CVAD tip, and other cultures if participants were suspected of a CVAD infection (usual practice). Where possible, on the day of removal, the ReN asked the participant about satisfaction with the study products on a 10-point scale (0 = completely dissatisfied, 10 = completely satisfied).

Microbiological method

Microbiological testing was conducted in one laboratory external to the study site. The skin swab, catheter tip, CHG dressing/disc, and SSD swab samples were purposively sampled and aseptically collected at the time of removal and evaluated using next-generation sequencing (MiSeq Illumina) for 16 participants (4 per group). Two centimeters of skin surface area around the insertion site was swabbed using a 'dry swab' moistened with sterile saline water. A twisting back/forth motion 10 times were used to swab the area. Skin swab samples were placed in a glycerol stock. Swabs and collected catheter tips were cultured on blood agar plates and incubated at 37 degrees Celsius for 24

hours, and then bacterial colony counts were conducted. The CHG dressings and disc were aseptically removed from the transport container and placed onto HBA with light pressure for ten seconds. The SSDs were swabbed with 0.9% saline-moistened sterile swabs and streaked across the entire HBA plate. These were re-incubated for 72 hours for slow-growing species. Species identification were determined morphologically, biochemically and genetically through DNA sequencing of representative colonies if necessary. Samples were characterized through identification of microbial species and the colony forming units (CFUs).

Data analysis

Feasibility outcomes were assessed using descriptive statistics. All randomised participants were analysed on an intention-to-treat basis. Baseline group comparisons were described across demographic, clinical, and device characteristics. Incidence rates of CVAD and dressing failure per 1000 device-days or 100 devices were reported to summarise treatment impact, with group differences tested with Fisher's exact and log-rank tests. Kaplan-Meier survival curves were drawn to compare CVAD failure, complication, and first dressing duration over time.

Secondary endpoints were compared between groups using parametric/nonparametric techniques as appropriate. Cox regressions tested the effect of baseline variables (e.g. insertion site, antimicrobial catheters, delirium) on failure. $P < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant. Missing values were not imputed.

Total per-participant and per-group costs were calculated as the cumulative costs of initial product application and any replacements needed. The cost of the initial application included all materials and consumables plus labour cost for a senior registrar doctor (incl. 25% on-cost) using an average time of three insertions measured during the study (convenience sample). The cost of dressing changes included materials and consumables plus labour cost of a registered nurse (incl. 25% on-cost) using an average time of three dressing changes measured during the study (convenience sample). To allow for the different rate of dressing changes during the study between the groups (calculated as the total number of dressing changes divided by the number of participants, per group), the calculated

cost of one dressing change was multiplied with this group-specific ratio. Cost estimates of the intervention product and staffing costs were compared between study groups. There were 12 participants selected ensuring equal distribution across study arms. The procedural time associated with CVAD product application at insertion and dressing changes was collected by the ReN using a stopwatch. Detailed costings of equipment/materials were calculated through a review of current site hospital costings (2018), and staff costings were calculated using current Australian state award wages (26). Costs were reported in Australian Dollars (2018).

For the microbiology testing, microbial species were identified culturally, and the predominant species described for each collection component (catheter tip, swab, CHG dressing, SSD, CHG disk). Microbial load was measured as colony forming units (CFUs) per specimen, categorised in the standard ranges of: 0, 1-14, 15-29, 30-300 and >301 (including Too Numerous To Count: TNTC)(27). Counts below 15 CFUs were considered possible contamination except for counts on catheter tips which were considered colonisation (27).

Ethics

Ethical approval was granted from the Hospital and University Human Research and Ethics Committees (HREC/13/QRBW/454, GU Ref No: NRS/10/14/HREC). Informed consent was gained from all study participants (patient or substitute decision-maker), prior to study commencement. All de-identified data were entered via REDCap with password protection. Data will be securely retained for five years.

Results

Participant and catheter characteristics

The baseline characteristics are described in Table 1. There were 31 (26%) participants in the standard care group, 29 (24%) in the TA group, 30 (25%) in the SSD group, and 31 (26%) in the ISD group. A total of 736 catheter-days was studied, with an average of 6.4 days dwell time per device. Participants were high acuity; around 30% had four or more comorbidities, most were unable to

mobilise (64%) at CVL removal, and half were confused, agitated, or drowsy (54%). Most CVADs were inserted in an internal jugular vein (70%) and had quadruple lumens (83%). There were some imbalances (>10%) of baseline variables between groups. Standard care participants were more likely to be male, to have a trauma diagnosis and a quadruple lumen CVAD than other groups. The SSD group had considerably more surgical emergency patients than other groups. ISD group had the greatest incidence of mechanical ventilation (97%). The ISD and SSD groups had more participants with comorbidities than the standard care or TA group. TA and ISD groups had the greatest proportion of junior registrar inserted CVADs. TA participants were least likely to have 'good skin' and most likely to have a medical diagnosis.

Table 1. Participant characteristics by study group at baseline

	<i>n</i>	Standard care	TA	SSD	ISD	Total
Group size ^a	121	31 (26)	29 (24)	30 (25)	31 (26)	121 (100)
Age (years) ^b	115	50.7 (20.3)	53.1 (14.9)	53.4 (18.3)	57.1 (15.3)	53.6 (17.3)
APACHE 2 score ^b	120	20 (7)	22 (8)	20 (7)	19 (6)	20 (7)
APACHE 3 score ^b	120	65 (26)	76 (33)	71 (30)	64 (25)	69 (29)
Length of stay in ICU (days) ^d	120	11 (10)	11 (7)	10 (15)	10 (10)	11 (10)
Weight (kg) ^b (n=84)	115	84 (22)	79 (23)	87 (22)	86 (25)	84 (23)
Males	115	24 (80)	17 (65)	16 (55)	21 (70)	78 (68)
Diagnosis:	115					
- medical: other		4 (13)	10 (38)	9 (31)	9 (30)	32 (28)
- trauma		10 (33)	5 (19)	4 (14)	8 (27)	27 (23)
- medical: sepsis		8 (27)	3 (12)	3 (10)	2 (7)	16 (14)
- medical: respiratory		4 (13)	3 (12)	2 (7)	5 (17)	14 (12)
- surgical emergency		2 (7)	1 (4)	7 (24)	3 (10)	13 (11)
- other		2 (7)	4 (15)	4 (14)	3 (10)	13 (11)
Comorbidities:	115					
- none		8 (27)	7 (27)	6 (21)	5 (17)	26 (23)
- one, two or three		12 (40)	11 (42)	14 (48)	15 (50)	52 (45)
- four or more		10 (33)	8 (31)	9 (31)	10 (33)	37 (32)
Skin integrity:	114					
- good		14 (48)	7 (27)	11 (38)	12 (40)	44 (39)
- fair		11 (38)	15 (58)	10 (34)	13 (43)	49 (43)
- poor		4 (14)	4 (15)	8 (28)	5 (17)	21 (18)
Skin colour:	114					
- pale white		4 (14)	4 (15)	8 (28)	2 (7)	18 (16)
- white		23 (79)	16 (62)	12 (41)	22 (73)	73 (64)
- light brown		2 (7)	3 (12)	2 (7)	2 (7)	9 (8)
- moderate brown		0 (0)	1 (4)	2 (7)	2 (7)	5 (4)
- dark/deeply pigm. brown		0 (0)	2 (8)	5 (17)	2 (7)	9 (8)
Mechanically ventilated		23 (77)	22 (85)	25 (86)	29 (97)	99 (86)
WBC < 1.0×10 ⁹	115	4 (13)	2 (8)	3 (10)	5 (17)	14 (12)
Blood cultures taken <48hrs prior	115	23 (77)	9 (35)	20 (69)	19 (63)	71 (62)
Infection (any)	115	5 (33)	5 (36)	4 (24)	4 (27)	18 (30)
Wound present	115	13 (43)	12 (46)	15 (52)	18 (60)	58 (50)
Drain present	115	7 (23)	5 (19)	4 (14)	10 (33)	26 (23)
Tracheostomy present	115	2 (7)	1 (4)	3 (10)	1 (3)	7 (6)
Stoma present	115	3 (10)	2 (8)	3 (10)	2 (7)	10 (9)
<i>Treatment characteristics at baseline</i>						
CVAD type:	115					
- internal jugular		22 (73)	18 (69)	18 (62)	22 (73)	80 (70)
- femoral		2 (7)	3 (12)	6 (21)	3 (10)	14 (12)
- subclavian		6 (20)	5 (19)	5 (17)	5 (17)	21 (18)
Insertion side: right	115	17 (57)	16 (62)	13 (45)	23 (77)	69 (60)
Inserted by:	114					
- senior registrar		15 (50)	13 (50)	24 (83)	14 (48)	66 (58)
- junior registrar		10 (33)	12 (46)	4 (14)	14 (48)	40 (35)
- other		5 (17)	1 (4)	1 (3)	1 (3)	8 (7)
Number of lumens:	115					
- Triple		3 (10)	3 (12)	5 (17)	7 (23)	18 (16)
- Quad		27 (90)	23 (88)	23 (79)	23 (77)	96 (83)
- Quin		0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (3)	0 (0)	1 (1)
Multiple insertion attempts	112	6 (21)	3 (12)	5 (17)	5 (17)	19 (17)

^a frequencies and row percentages shown; ^b mean (standard deviation) shown; frequencies and column percentages shown, unless otherwise noted; ^c frequencies shown; mod = moderate; pigm = pigmented; dx = dressing; ^d median (inter-quartile range); CVAD = central venous access device; Standard Care group = control with: Prolene suture plus CHG dressing TA: Tissue adhesive; SSD= Sutureless securement device; ISD= integrated securement device.

Feasibility outcomes

Figure 2. CONSORT Flow chart

CHG: chlorhexidine gluconate; Standard Care = control with: Prolene suture plus CHG dressing; TA: Tissue adhesive; SSD= Sutureless securement device; ISD= integrated securement device; CVAD = central venous access device. NB. The detailed description of the protocol deviations are listed in Supplementary Material 1.

The trial recruited from February 2016 until July 2018 during which time 1,141 patients were assessed for eligibility of which 976 (86%) met inclusion criteria. Thirty-three refused participation and 121 ICU participants were recruited (12% of those assessed for eligibility) and randomised (Figure 2); 115 participants received the intervention and included in the analysis (95% of those randomised) with the primary outcome data from 114 participants (99% of those who received the intervention) analysed. Retention was 100% (no attrition/loss to follow-up). Six participants (5%) were excluded after randomisation due to not meeting the inclusion criteria (five did not receive a non-tunnelled CVAD and one had previously participated).

Difficulties in recruitment included that CVADs were frequently inserted outside office hours preventing study inclusion; emergent CVAD insertion precluding prior consent, and failure to capture due to the ReN not being contacted before CVAD insertion. There were three participants (3%) with protocol deviations in the standard care group, three participants in the TA group, five participants in the SSD group, and three ISD participants in 912 study days (2% of study days). Please see the details of protocol deviations in the Supplementary Material 1 table.

Overall, acceptability of the interventions was similar across study groups (Table 2). The previous experience of doctors with the intervention products were highest in the standard care group (27; 96%) followed by SSD group (19; 83%), TA group (6; 25%), and ISD group (4; 14%). The ISD group had the lowest (worst) scores in the 'ease of dressing applications', 'participant satisfaction' and 'nurse confidence' categories, and the standard care group had the highest (best) scores for 'participant satisfaction', 'nurse satisfaction', and nurse confidence'. The TA group had the lowest nurse satisfaction with dressing removal scores.

CVAD failure and complications

The overall incidence rate of catheter failure was 14/114 (12%) of CVADs [19.0 (11.3-32.1) per 1000 catheter-days]. The incidence was highest in SSD group at 27.3 (11.4-65.6) per 1000 catheter-days, and lowest in the ISD group with 8.76 (2.19-35.0) (Table 2). These rates were not statistically different between any experimental group and the control group on log-rank testing

($p=0.26-0.92$), or on the Kaplan-Meier curves (Supplementary Material 2). The majority of failures (11/14; 61%) were suspected CLABSI, but only one of these was laboratory-confirmed CLABSI. Skin reactions not statistically significant between groups, although the SSD group had the most reactions (two skin rashes, one skin tear, one bruising, one pruritis, and one local allergic reaction) followed by the ISD group (two skin rashes, one pruritis, and one local allergic reactions). There was one skin tear in the Standard Care group, and two skin rashes in the TA group. On univariable regression, the Hazard Ratio (HR) of CVAD failure was 0.89 (0.20-3.99) for the TA group, 1.23 (0.33-4.59) for SSD, and 0.35 (0.06-1.91) for ISD, with a darker skin colour the only variable significantly associated with failure (HR 1.52 (1.03-2.22) (Supplementary Material 3).

Table 2. CVAD failure and complications

	N	Standard care	TA	SSD	ISD	P-values
CVAD failure (%)	114	4 (13)	3 (12)	5 (18)	2 (7)	0.641 ^b
Dwell time ^c (days)	115	6.0 (2.2)	5.6 (3.4)	6.3 (4.3)	7.6 (3.7)	
Device-days	115	179	145	183	228	
Incidence Rate (95% CI) ^d		22.3 (8.38-59.5)	20.6 (6.66-64.0)	27.3 (11.4-65.6)	8.8 (2.19-35.0)	
Incidence Rate Ratio (95% CI) ^d		ref.	0.92 (0.14-5.47)	1.22 (0.26-6.17)	0.39 (0.04-2.74)	
p-value of log-rank test		ref.	0.924	0.866	0.255	0.460
Primary Outcome:						
Reasons of CVAD failure:^e	18					
- suspected CLABSI		3	1	5	2	
- partial occlusion		1	1	0	0	
- dislodgement		0	1	0	0	
- thrombosis		0	1	0	0	
- local skin breakdown		0	0	0	0	
- other*		1	0	1	0	
Laboratory-confirmed CLABSI		1	0	0	0	
Secondary outcomes:						
Skin reactions at removal:^e	114					
- rash		0	1	2	0	
- residue		0	1	0	0	
- pruritis		0	0	1	0	
Dressing/securement failure ^f	111	13 (43)	10 (42)	11 (41)	17 (57)	
Complications during treatment:						
CVAD complications						
- Local infection (incl. suspected)	114	0	0	0	0	
- CLABSI (incl. suspected)	115	5	1	6	2	
- Dislodgment (incl. partial)	114	0	1	0	0	
- Occlusion (incl. partial)	115	2	1	0	2	
- Thrombosis	115	0	1	0	0	
- Breakage	114	0	0	0	0	
Serious adverse events:	115					
- Death		3	7	4	1	
- Positive blood culture		1	0	0	0	
- Other*		1	0	1	0	
Feasibility: comparison of acceptance of dressing interventions by clinicians						
Ease of dressing application (0-10) ^{g,h}	115	7.1 (3.6)	6.5 (3.7)	7.8 (2.3)	6.0 (4.0)	
Participant satisfaction with product (0-10) ^{g,i}	115	10.0 (0.0)	10.0 (0.0)	10.0 (6.0)	5.0 (4.0)	
Nurse satisfaction with removal (0-10) ^{g,j}	115	9.0 (2.0)	6.5 (4.0)	7.0 (4.0)	9.0 (7.0)	
Nurse confidence in product (0-10) ^{g,i}	115	8.0 (4.0)	5.0 (2.0)	7.5 (4.0)	4.5 (3.5)	

frequencies and column percentages shown, unless otherwise noted; ^a frequencies and row percentages shown; ^b Fisher's exact test; ^c mean (standard deviation) shown; ^d per 1000 device-days; ^e May have one or more outcomes per catheter ^f defined as replacement before seven days for loose, soiled or missing dressings; ^g median (interquartile) shown; ^h 0=worst 10=best; ⁱ 0=worst 10=best; ^j 0=very difficult, 10=very easy; ; Standard Care = control with: Prolene suture plus CHG dressing; TA: Tissue adhesive; SSD= Sutureless securement device; ISD= integrated securement device; CVAD = central venous access device; BSI = bloodstream infection; CLABSI – CVAD-associated BSI; CI = confidence interval; *Other complications at removal included: allergic reaction to chlorhexidine in SSD group; suspected air embolus on removal of CVL in standard care group.

Microbiology

The dwell time of the catheters sampled for microbiology testing ranged from six to 18 days with those specimens colonized >301 CFU having a dwell time between six and eight-days (Supplementary Material 4). Microbiological analysis indicated that one of 16 (6%) catheter tips from the TA group was colonized (CFUs >15).

For CVAD site swabs, there were three (30%) samples colonised with >15 CFUs. Two samples with 15-29 CFUs and one sample >300 CFUs. Sixty percent of the 10 CHG dressing samples were colonised, with bacteria isolated on all samples in SSD group (3/3). Twenty-five percent (1/4) of the CHG disc (ISD group) were colonised with >15 CFUs. No Sorbaview dressings (ISD group) were tested for microbiology analysis as the CHG component was the consistent part tested between all four study arms. One (25%) Statlock sample (SSD group) had 30-300 CFUs. Overall, microbial colonisation of the products was evident across study arms.

Cost estimate

The cost estimate per patient of standard care was lowest (A\$70) followed by the SSD group (A\$81), the ISD group (A\$90), and TA group (A\$95) (Table 3). On average, the TA group required the most time on initial application (9.1 minutes), and the SSD group required the most time on dressing changes (16.3 minutes). The ISD group had the highest number of changes per participant (1.53) followed by the standard care group (1.27).

Table 3: Cost estimate of dressing interventions per patient

	Standard Care (n=3)	Study group		
		TA (n=3)	SSD (n=3)	ISD (n=3)
Initial application				
- materials and consumables	\$ 39.18	\$ 50.98	\$ 40.20	\$ 43.18
- per minute labour rate ^a	\$ 1.25	\$ 1.25	\$ 1.25	\$ 1.25
- insertion time (minutes) average	5.8	9.1	6.7	6.9
- total per patient	\$ 46.43	\$ 62.31	\$ 48.60	\$ 51.76
Dressing changes during trial				
- Average number of changes per patient ^c	1.27	1.00	1.00	1.53
- materials and consumables	\$ 12.92	\$ 24.88	\$ 19.87	\$ 16.92
- per minute labour rate ^b	\$ 0.79	\$ 0.79	\$ 0.79	\$ 0.79
- change time (minutes) average	7.6	10.2	16.3	10.5
- total per patient	\$ 23.99	\$ 32.95	\$ 32.78	\$ 38.69
Grand total	\$70.00	\$95.00	\$81.00	\$90.00

^a Senior Registrar – average hourly rate \$60/hr; ^b Registered nurse = average hourly rate \$38/hour; ^c derived from number of changes divided by study sample size. Standard Care = control with Prolene suture plus CHG dressing; TA= Tissue adhesive; SSD= Sutureless securement device; ISD= integrated securement device.

Discussion

This is the first pilot RCT examining the feasibility and effectiveness of usual CVAD securement and dressing, in comparison to three innovative methods in general ICU adult patients, and the first in any setting to compare the effectiveness of CHG dressing versus CHG disc with an ISD dressing. Feasibility outcomes were positive overall, with excellent retention, attrition, protocol adherence and staff acceptability. Of all randomised patients, only one patient had some missing outcome data not included in the final analysis. Recruitment was challenging within the current protocol (i.e. CVAD insertion in ICU, ReN availability), with 122 participants recruited over 29 months. It is predicted that these challenges would be improved within a future efficacy trial, by including multiple sites, with increased research staffing availability and recruitment of CVADs inserted perioperatively, thereby increasing recruitment rates. Additionally, deferred or waived consent as used in other ICU trials could increase the recruitment rates (28). Protocol adherence could be enhanced with closer supervision by research team members and project champions. A future two-group superiority RCT would need at least 389 participants per group to test a hypothesis of 13% [Standard Care] versus 7 % [ISD] CVAD failure with alpha of 0.8.

Although the ISD group had the lowest incidence rate of catheter failure, in comparison to previous trials, ISD also had the lowest scores in the 'ease of dressing applications', 'participant satisfaction' and 'nurse confidence' categories (13-15). Clinicians who applied the study products were least familiar with two components of this treatment arm and given the slow recruitment had little chance to become familiar with it, both of which may have contributed to these lower scores. There was some negative feedback about this group since clinicians were unable to visualise the CVAD insertion site with the CHG disc in situ. Also, if the dressing required replacement, some nurses reported difficulty changing the dressing due to the CHG disc adhering to the ISD dressing and surrounding the CVAD. A future trial requires additional training and exposure to dressing techniques for clinicians to increase acceptability.

The overall incidence of CVAD failure was 12% (14/114); with most cases (11/14; 79%) due to suspected CLABSI. Although these rates are higher than previously reported, they should not be

compared with current literature as evidence as this is a pilot study. Similarly the trial sample size does not allow statistical testing of hypotheses, CVAD failure was highest in the SSD group and lowest in the ISD group, suggesting that ISD followed by TA and then SSD would be the priorities for testing in future trials. Removal due to suspected infection was more common than reported in a meta-analysis of CVAD outcomes in similar populations [4% (3-6)] (2), is consistent with a recent observational study and a systematic review, and warrants further investigation since many lines may be unnecessarily removed (2, 21). In this study only one of the suspected CLABSI was in fact confirmed, thus giving support to consideration of a 'watch and monitor' strategy in the effort to reduce unwarranted CVAD removal with the potential need for insertion of a new device. Previous studies (29-31) investigated the effects of immediate, deferred, or no removal of CVADs suspected of infection and found no difference in morbidity or mortality between groups (antibiotic treatment and frequent monitoring were used).

There were few non-infectious complications (two partial occlusions, one dislodgement, and one thrombosis) which due to the pilot design cannot be tested for differences between groups. Only one dislodgment occurred, demonstrating the effectiveness of securement with both sutures and SSD methods which appeared equally effective in this trial. A similar trial by Rickard et al. demonstrated substantially fewer dislodgements when sutures were added to TA plus a simple polyurethane dressing (11).

The SSD group and ISD group had the most CVAD-associated skin impairment, most likely due to strong adhesives used in these products (32, 33). Application of skin barrier solutions were not routine practice at this site, but such products are strongly recommended prior to dressing application in the Infusion Therapy Standards of Practice as they have demonstrated ability to prevent erythema and skin stripping following adhesive removal (32, 34, 35).

The microbiology analyses showed significant colonisation in some patients under the CHG dressing as well as the CHG disc. This is concerning as the CHG products are designed to suppress the growth of such colonisation. The presence of CHG resistant bacteria was also shown in a previous microbiology study where CHG resistant genes were highly prevalent on hospital patients' skin (36).

Bacterial growth was predominantly with common skin bacteria although there was one *Staphylococcus aureus* positive specimen in the ISD group.

Standard care was the cheapest intervention studied. We focussed on a cost estimate and did not account for the cost of complications which was beyond the scope of this study. With this costing and until further evidence from future RCTs, the standard care approach is the most cost-effective.

Although the study provided valuable information, there are several limitations. The study was carried out at a single facility, limiting generalisability to other populations and clinical settings. As a pilot study, despite randomisation there were some imbalanced risk factors between groups, and the sample size was inadequate to test statistical hypotheses. Participants, clinicians and research staff were not blinded to the study interventions; however, it is unlikely that this influenced the study outcomes. Importantly, the statistician, infectious disease physician and radiologists were blinded to intervention, improving study validity. Despite these limitations, this study demonstrated the safety and feasibility of all study interventions and processes.

Conclusions

The overall catheter failure rate continues to be of concern from both a patient impact and institutional expense perspective, and new trials are urgently needed. A large multi-site RCT examining the four forms of securement and dressings is feasible. Investigation of ISD would be the highest priority to test further as it had the lowest failure rate of the four arms.

References

1. Loveday H, Wilson J, Pratt R, Golsorkhi M, Tingle A, Bak A, et al. Epic3: national evidence-based guidelines for preventing healthcare-associated infections in NHS hospitals in England. *J Hosp Infect.* 2014;86:S1-S70.
2. Takashima M, Schults J, Mihala G, Corley A, Ullman A. Complication and Failures of Central Vascular Access Device in Adult Critical Care Settings. *Crit Care Med.* 2018;46(12):1998-2009. doi: 10.1097/ccm.0000000000003370.
3. Ullman AJ, Marsh N, Mihala G, Cooke M, Rickard CM. Complications of Central Venous Access Devices: A Systematic Review. *Pediatrics.* 2015;136(5):e1331-44. doi: 10.1542/peds.2015-1507.
4. Worth LJ, Seymour JF, Slavin MA. Infective and thrombotic complications of central venous catheters in patients with hematological malignancy: prospective evaluation of nontunneled devices. *Support Care Cancer.* 2009;17(7):811-8. doi: 10.1007/s00520-008-0561-7.
5. Mermel, Allon M, Bouza E, Craven DE, Flynn P, O'Grady N, et al. Clinical practice guidelines for the diagnosis and management of intravascular catheter-related infection: 2009 update by the Infectious Diseases Society of America. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2009;49:1-45.
6. Gorski LA. The 2016 Infusion Therapy Standards of Practice. Home healthcare now. 2017;35(1):10-8. doi: 10.1097/nhh.0000000000000481.
7. Yamamoto A, Solomon J, Soulen M, Tang J, Parkinson K, Lin R, et al. Sutureless securement device reduces complications of peripherally inserted central venous catheters. *J Vasc Interv Radiol.* 2002;13(1):77-81.
8. O'Grady NP, Alexander M, Burns LA, Dellinger EP, Garland J, O'Heard S, et al. Guidelines for the prevention of intravascular catheter-related infections. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2011;52(9):e162-93.
9. Velasquez Reyes DC, Bloomer M, Morphet J. Prevention of central venous line associated bloodstream infections in adult intensive care units: A systematic review. *Intensive & critical care nursing.* 2017;43:12-22. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iccn.2017.05.006>.
10. Ullman AJ, Cooke ML, Mitchell M, Lin F, New K, Long DA, et al. Dressing and securement for central venous access devices (CVADs): A Cochrane systematic review. *Int J Nurs Stud.* 2016;59:177-96. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2016.04.003>.
11. Rickard CM, Edwards M, Spooner AJ, Mihala G, Marsh N, Best J, et al. A 4-arm randomized controlled pilot trial of innovative solutions for jugular central venous access device securement in 221 cardiac surgical patients. *J Crit Care.* 2016;36:35-42. doi: 10.1016/j.jcrc.2016.06.006.
12. Hodgson CL, Capell E, Tipping CJ. Early Mobilization of Patients in Intensive Care: Organization, Communication and Safety Factors that Influence Translation into Clinical Practice. *Crit Care.* 2018;22(1):77. doi: 10.1186/s13054-018-1998-9.
13. Chan RJ, Northfield S, Larsen E, Mihala G, Ullman A, Hancock P, et al. Central venous Access device SeCurement And Dressing Effectiveness for peripherally inserted central catheters in adult acute hospital patients (CASCADE): a pilot randomised controlled trial. *Trials.* 2017;18(1):458. doi: 10.1186/s13063-017-2207-x.
14. Kleidon TM, Ullman AJ, Gibson V, Chaseling B, Schoutrop J, Mihala G, et al. A Pilot Randomized Controlled Trial of Novel Dressing and Securement Techniques in 101 Pediatric Patients. *J Vasc Interv Radiol.* 2017;28(11):1548-56.e1. doi: 10.1016/j.jvir.2017.07.012.
15. Ullman AJ, Kleidon T, Gibson V, McBride CA, Mihala G, Cooke M, et al. Innovative dressing and securement of tunneled central venous access devices in pediatrics: a pilot randomized controlled trial. *BMC Cancer.* 2017;17(1):595. doi: 10.1186/s12885-017-3606-9.
16. Simonova G, Rickard CM, Dunster KR, Smyth DJ, McMillan D, Fraser JF. Cyanoacrylate tissue adhesives - effective securement technique for intravascular catheters: in vitro testing of safety and feasibility. *Anaesth Intensive Care.* 2012;40(3):460-6.
17. Wilkinson JN, Sheikh N, Jayamaha J. Tissue adhesive as an alternative to sutures for securing central venous catheters. *Anaesthesia.* 2007;62(9):969-70.
18. Hertzog MA. Considerations in determining sample size for pilot studies. *Research in nursing & health.* 2008;31(2):180-91.. doi: 10.1002/nur.20247.

19. Thabane L, Ma J, Chu R, Cheng J, Ismaila A, Rios LP, et al. A tutorial on pilot studies: The what, why and how. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*. 2010;10(1):1. doi: 10.1186/1471-2288-10-1.
20. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Device Associated Module: CLABSI. Bloodstream Infection Event (Central Line-Associated Bloodstream Infection and Non-central Line Associated Bloodstream Infection) National Healthcare Safety Network; 2018 [cited 2018 03 Oct]. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/nhsn/PDFs/pscManual/4PSC_CLABScurrent.pdf.
21. Takashima M, Gavin, N.C., Northfield, S., Larsen, E., Mihala, G., Corley, A., Zeigenfuss, M., & Rickard, C.M. . Building a Central Vascular Access Device Registry in an adult intensive care: feasibility study *Vascular Access*. 2018;4(1):9-11.
22. Baskin JL, Pui C-H, Reiss U, Wilimas JA, Metzger ML, Ribeiro RC, et al. Management of occlusion and thrombosis associated with long-term indwelling central venous catheters. *Lancet* 2009;374(9684):159-69. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(09)60220-8.
23. Chopra V, Anand S, Hickner A, Buist M, Rogers MA, Saint S, et al. Risk of venous thromboembolism associated with peripherally inserted central catheters: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet*. 2013;382(9889):311-25. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(13)60592-9.
24. Alexandrou E, Spencer TR, Frost SA, Mifflin N, Davidson PM, Hillman KM. Central venous catheter placement by advanced practice nurses demonstrates low procedural complication and infection rates--a report from 13 years of service. *Crit Care Med*. 2014;42(3):536-43. doi: 10.1097/CCM.0b013e3182a667f0.
25. Australian Ne wZiCS. Central Line Insertion and Maintenance Guideline Melbourne: ANZICS Safety and Quality Committee.; 2012 [cited 2019 24th April]. Available from: <https://www.anzics.com.au/>.
26. Queensland Health. Queensland Health wage rates 2017 [cited 2019 24th April]. Available from: https://www.health.qld.gov.au/hrpolicies/wage_rates.
27. Engelkirk PG, Burton GRW, Duben-Engelkirk JL. *Burton's microbiology for the health sciences*. 9th ed. Philadelphia: Wolters Kluwer Health/Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2011.
28. Rickard CM, Marsh NM, Webster J, Gavin NC, McGrail MR, Larsen E, et al. Intravascular device administration sets: replacement after standard versus prolonged use in hospitalised patients—a study protocol for a randomised controlled trial (The RSVP Trial). *BMJ Open*. 2015;5(2):e007257. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-007257.
29. Lorente L, Martin MM, Vidal P, Rebollo S, Ostabal MI, Sole-Violan J. Should central venous catheter be systematically removed in patients with suspected catheter related infection? *Crit Care*. 2014;18(5):564. doi: 10.1186/s13054-014-0564-3. PubMed PMID: 25514404.
30. Rijnders BJ, Peetermans WE, Verwaest C, Wilmer A, Van Wijngaerden E. Watchful waiting versus immediate catheter removal in ICU patients with suspected catheter-related infection: a randomized trial. *Intensive Care Med*. 2004;30(6):1073-80. doi: 10.1007/s00134-004-2212-x.
31. Deliberato RO, Marra AR, Correa TD, Martino MD, Correa L, Dos Santos OF, et al. Catheter related bloodstream infection (CR-BSI) in ICU patients: making the decision to remove or not to remove the central venous catheter. *PloS one*. 2012;7(3):e32687. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0032687.
32. McNichol L, Lund C, Rosen T, Gray M. Medical Adhesives and Patient Safety: State of the ScienceConsensus Statements for the Assessment, Prevention, and Treatment of Adhesive-Related Skin Injuries. *J Wound Ostomy Continence Nurs*. 2013;40(4):365-80. doi: 10.1097/WON.0b013e3182995516.
33. Zhao H, He Y, Huang H, Ling Y, Zhou X, Wei Q, et al. Prevalence of medical adhesive-related skin injury at peripherally inserted central catheter insertion site in oncology patients. *J Vasc Access*. 2018;19(1):23-7. doi: 10.5301/jva.5000805.
34. Thayer D. Skin damage associated with intravenous therapy: common problems and strategies for prevention *J Infus Nurs* 2012;35(6):390-401.
35. Infusion Nurses Society. Infusion therapy standards of practice *J Infus Nurs* 2016;39(1):S1-S159.
36. Choudhury MA, Sidjabat HE, Rathnayake IU, Gavin N, Chan RJ, Marsh N, et al. Culture-independent detection of chlorhexidine resistance genes qacA/B and smr in bacterial DNA recovered from body sites treated with chlorhexidine-containing dressings. *Journal of medical microbiology*. 2017;66(4):447-53. doi: 10.1099/jmm.0.000463.

Supplementary Material 1: Details of protocol deviations

Interventions:	Period of protocol violation	Non-study intervention
Standard Care group	Day 6/6 dwell days	Simple transparent dressing
	Day 1,3,4,6,7/ 9 dwell days	SSD
	Day 7/8 dwell days	Simple transparent dressing
TA group	Day 7/ 9 dwell days	SSD
	Day 2-3/ 8 dwell days	CHG dressing without TA
	Day 1, 4-5,6 / 7 dwell days	CHG dressing without TA
SSD group	Day 1/ 1 dwell day	Sutures
	Day 2/4 dwell days	Simple transparent dressing
	Day 8/18 dwell days	Simple transparent dressing
	Day 1-2/5 dwell days	CHG and sutures
	Day 1-2,6 /8 dwell days	CHG and sutures
ISD group	Day 10/ 11 dwell days	Bordered polyurethane dressing
	Day 1/7 dwell days	CHG
	Day 7-8/10 dwell days and Day 1,3-4/10 dwell days	CHG and Simple transparent dressing

Standard Care = control with: Prolene suture plus CHG dressing TA: Tissue adhesive; SSD= Sutureless securement device; ISD= integrated securement device

Supplementary Material 2: Figure. Kaplan-Meier curve of intervention groups by device dwell time – removal due to failure

Std Care = control with: Prolene suture plus CHG dressing TA: Tissue adhesive; SSD= Sutureless securement device; ISD= integrated securement device.

Supplementary Material 3: Table. Hazard Ratios of CVAD failure calculated with Cox regression

	Hazard ratio
Study group (ref. Standard Care group):	
- TA	0.89 (0.20-3.99)
- SSD	1.23 (0.33-4.59)
- ISD	0.35 (0.06-1.91)
Age (+1 year)	0.99 (0.96-1.02)
APACHE 2 score (+1 score)	1.05 (0.97-1.12)
APACHE 3 score (+1 score)	1.01 (0.99-1.03)
Female sex	0.40 (0.09-1.78)
Weight (+1 kg)	1.00 (0.97-1.02)
Diagnosis (ref. medical other):	
- trauma	1.00 (0.25-4.00)
- other	1.04 (0.29-3.69)
Infection at enrolment	3.06 (0.85-11.0)
Comorbidities (ref. none):	
- one to three	0.72 (0.23-2.28)
- four or more	0.29 (0.06-1.49)
Skin integrity (ref. good)	
- fair	1.01 (0.31-3.33)
- poor	0.80 (0.16-4.15)
Skin type (one category change to darker)	1.52 (1.03-2.22) *
CVAD type (ref. internal jugular):	
- femoral	0.77 (0.10-6.08)
- subclavian	0.91 (0.25-3.31)
Inserted by junior (ref. senior) registrar	2.95 (0.86-10.1)
Number of lumens (ref. three):	
- four	2.80 (0.36-21.6)
- five	12.3 (0.76-199)
Participant unable to mobilise	1.34 (0.37-4.86)

*Hazard Ratios and 95% CI shown; CI = confidence interval; ref = reference category; * p-value of Wald test < 0.05; Standard Care = control with: Prolene suture plus CHG dressing TA: Tissue adhesive; SSD= Sutureless securement device; ISD= integrated securement device*

1 **Supplementary Material 4: Table. Microbiology result of catheter and dressing samples by intervention arm**

Location	Count Range (CFU)	Counts	Standard Care	TA	SSD	ISD
Mean dwell time (SD)			6.5 (1.29) days	8.5 (1.29) days	9.25 (6.07) days	5.5 (3.1) days
Catheter Tip n=16 specimens	0	15/16	4	3	4	4
	1-14	1 /16	0	1 [Bacillus cereus], (8)	0	0
	15-29	0/16	0	0	0	0
	30-300	0/16	0	0	0	0
Swab CVAD Site n=15 specimens	0	8/15	3	2	1	2
	1-14	4/15	0	2 [Bacillus cereus (8), Staphylococcus epidermidis (10)]	1 [Staphylococcus epidermidis] (7)	1 [Aeromonas] (7)
	15-29	2/15	0	0	1 [Staphylococcus haemolyticus (8)]	1 [Staphylococcus epidermidis] (8)
	30-300	0/15	0	0	0	0
	>301	1/15	1 [Staphylococcus epidermidis] (6)	0	0	0
CHG Dressing n=10 specimens	0	3/10	1	2	0	n/a
	1-14	1/10	1 [Staphylococcus epidermidis & Spp.] (7)	0	0	n/a
	15-29	3/10	1 [Staphylococcus epidermidis] (8)	1 [Staphylococcus haemolyticus] (7)	1 [Staphylococcus epidermidis] (18)	n/a
	30-300	3/10	1 [Staphylococcus haemolyticus] (6)	0	2 [Staphylococcus haemolyticus (8), Staphylococcus aureus (7)]	n/a
CHG Disc n=4 specimens	0	2/4	n/a	n/a	n/a	2
	1-14	1/4	n/a	n/a	n/a	1 [Staphylococcus aureus] (8)
	15-29	0/4	n/a	n/a	n/a	0
	30-300	1/4	n/a	n/a	n/a	1 [Staphylococcus spp.] (7)
SSD n=4 specimens	0	3/4	n/a	n/a	3	n/a
	1-14	0/4	n/a	n/a	0	n/a
	15-29	0/4	n/a	n/a	0	n/a
	30-300	1/4	n/a	n/a	1 [Staphylococcus spp.] (8)	n/a

2 SD= standard deviation; CVAD = central venous access device; CHG = chlorhexidine gluconate-impregnated dressing; NA= not applicable; Standard Care =
3 control with: Prolene suture plus CHG dressing TA: Tissue adhesive; SSD= Sutureless securement device; ISD= integrated securement device; n/a = not
4 applicable; **Dwell time of each specimen is noted in brackets next to the microorganisms.**

5

Accepted version