(2022) 11:137

RESEARCH Open Access



Lower risk of bloodstream infections for peripherally inserted central catheters compared to central venous catheters in critically ill patients

Vassiliki Pitiriga¹, John Bakalis², Kalliopi Theodoridou¹, Petros Kanellopoulos², George Saroglou² and Athanasios Tsakris^{1*}

Abstract

Background: Peripherally inserted central venous catheters (PICCs) serve as an alternative to short-term central venous catheters (CVCs) for providing intravenous access in hospitalized patients. Although a number of studies suggest that PICCs are associated with a lower risk of central line-associated bloodstream infections (CLABSIs) than CVCs, recent data concerning specific patient groups support the contrary. In this regard, we are comparing CVC- and PICC-related CLABSI rates developed in a selected group of critically ill inpatients and evaluating the CLABSI microbiological distribution

Methods: The study was conducted at a tertiary care hospital in Greece between May 2017 and May 2019. We performed a two-year retrospective analysis of the data collected from medical records of consecutive adult patients who underwent PICC or CVC placement.

Results: A total of 1187 CVCs placed for 9774 catheter-days and 639 PICCs placed for 11,110 catheter-days, were reported and analyzed during the study period. Among CVCs, a total of 59 (4.9%) CLABSIs were identified, while among PICCs, 18 (2.8%) cases presented CLABSI (p = 0.029). The CLABSI incidence rate per 1,000 catheter-days was 6.03 for CVC group and 1.62 for PICC group (p < 0.001). The CLABSI rate due to multidrug-resistant organisms (MDROs) among the two groups was 3.17 in CVC group and 0.36 in PICC group (p < 0.001). Within CLABSI-CVC group, the most common microorganism detected was MDR *Acinetobacter baumannii* (27.1%) followed by MDR *Klebsiella pneumoniae* (22%). In CLABSI-PICC group, the predominant microorganism was *Candida* spp. (33.3%) followed by non-MDR gramnegative pathogens (22.2%).

Conclusions: PICC lines were associated with significantly lower CLABSI rates comparing to CVC although they were in place longer than CVC lines. Given their longer time to the development of infection, PICCs may be a safer alternative for prolonged inpatient IV access. The high prevalence of CLABSI-MDROs depicts the local microbial ecology, emphasizing the need of public health awareness.

¹ Department of Microbiology, Medical School, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, 75 Mikras Asias Street, 11527 Athens, Greece Full list of author information is available at the end of the article



^{*}Correspondence: atsakris@med.uoa.gr

Keywords: Catheterization, Central venous catheter, Sepsis, Colonization, Bloodstream infection, Insertion site, Central line-associated bloodstream infection, Peripherally inserted central catheter

Introduction

Central venous catheters (CVCs) are widely used in clinical setting due to their functional role in intravenous therapy, laboratory testing, and hemodynamic monitoring [1]. While they are often placed for saving patients' lives, they are closely associated with considerable morbidity and mortality [2] as well as an increased risk of mechanical complications and infections [3]. Despite the implementation of CVC hygiene bundles, central lineassociated bloodstream infections (CLABSIs) remain an important healthcare-associated complication [4] that can adversely affect patient care and is still strongly related to increased mortality rates [5].

In previous years [6], peripherally inserted central venous catheters (PICCs) were introduced into the treatment of hospitalized patients as a safer alternative to the conventional type of CVCs, particularly for patients to whom long-term venous access is required, and has gained increasing acceptance. Due to the various advantages they exert, at present, PICCs are the most common central venous catheters used in inpatient settings since they have been reported to reduce the incidence of CLABSIs not only in hospitalized patients but also in outpatients receiving intravenous medication at home compared with traditional CVCs [7–12].

However, recent studies [8, 9] indicate that PICC-related CLABSIs rates vary among different patient groups and in some cases they are actually similar or even higher than of CVCs related CLABSIs rates [10]. PICC-related bloodstream infection represents a serious complication that may contribute to increased costs and mortality rates [11]. As the use of PICCs expands to include vulnerable populations, such as critically ill patients, determining the risk of CLABSI posed by PICCs relative to CVCs in this specific group is crucial and needs further attention. In this regard, we conducted the present study in order to compare CVC- and PICC-related CLABSI rates developed in critically ill hospitalized patients. We also aimed to analyse and compare the CLABSI pathogen distribution in each group of events.

Materials and methods

We performed a retrospective analysis of data collected from the medical records of consecutive adult hospitalized patients who underwent PICC and CVC placement at the Metropolitan Hospital, Piraeus, Greece, between May 2017 and May 2019. Metropolitan Hospital is a large tertiary-care hospital that includes several surgical, oncological and internal medicine units as well as a general intensive care unit (ICU). The observational study was approved by the institutional review board.

Data collection

After insertion, catheters were checked using a checkbox form containing the patient's diagnosis, operator's name, site chosen, date placed and removed, date of intensive care units (ICU) discharge or death, mechanical ventilation, arterial catheters, parenteral nutrition, and daily clinical assessment (e.g., discharge, erythema, and tenderness) of possible catheter infection. The operator inserting the catheter entered the initial data; nurse personnel entered data the following days while the infection control nurse monitored data collection 3-4 times per week. Data was retrospectively collected from two different data sources: (1) medical database (for demographic and clinical data related to the patient's admission and clinical course) and (2) Clinical Laboratory and hospital infection control team database (for blood culture and antibiotic susceptibility results).

CVC and PICC insertion protocol

In our hospital triple lumen, non-antibiotic impregnated catheters (Arrow model, total provided by Arrow®/Teleflex®, Wayne, USA) are mainly used. Double lumen catheters (Arrow®/Teleflex®, Wayne, USA), are also used but in a lower percentage, particularly in patients that do not require complex therapeutic interventions. The choice of the site of insertion was left to the discretion of the physician caring for the patient. Maximal sterile barrier precautions (large sterile drape; surgical hand antisepsis; and mask, cap, sterile gloves, and gown) were used at catheter insertion according to CDC recommendations.

Catheter care protocol

Standardized CVC/PICC care practices were implemented by a highly proficient nursing staff. Every couple of days or earlier if clinically required, the nursing staff changed the dressing, cleaned the skin site and the catheter hub with iodine solution, and changed the intravenous accessory tubing. Catheters were removed when (a) there was evidence or suspicion of infection, (b) when the catheter was no longer required.

Culture techniques

All catheters were examined for the presence of pathogens either as a routine after removal or after suspicion

of infection. After disinfecting skin around the catheter entry site, the proximal 4–5 cm part of the tip was cut off using sterile scissors. The specimen was placed in a sterile container and transported to the department of microbiology within 15 min at room temperature. The intradermal and intravascular portion of the catheter was analyzed by the semiquantitative culture technique described by Maki et al. [12]. According to Maki's technique, catheter-tip culture is considered positive in the presence of ≥ 5 colony-forming units (CFU) growth of any organism.

Blood cultures were incubated in Becton Dickinson Bactec (BD Bio-sciences, USA) in aerobic and anaerobic broth media. Identification of isolates and antimicrobial resistance patterns were determined by the VITEK®2Automated Compact System (BioMérieux Co., France). E-test (BioMérieux Co., France) was performed as an additional test, in order to confirm the resistance phenotypes reported by the VITEK System, according to the standard laboratory procedures.

Definitions

CVC was defined as any central venous access device inserted into the internal jugular, subclavian, or femoral vein that terminated in the inferior vena cava or right atrium.

PICCs were defined as catheters inserted in the basilic, cephalic, or brachial veins of the upper extremities with tips that terminated in the superior vena cava or right atrium.

Catheter infection definition were based on the Centers for Disease Control bloodstream infection guidelines and the semi-quantitative culture technique by Maki et al.

Catheter associated BSI (CLABSI) was defined as a laboratory confirmed BSI (a positive blood culture with no other apparent source of infection) occurring in the presence of a CVC/PICC or within 48 h of catheter removal.

Catheter-days was defined as the number of CVCs/PICCs presents among all units' patients at 08:00 h each morning.

Multidrug-resistant organisms (MDROs) were defined as species of microorganisms that exhibit antimicrobial resistance to at least one antimicrobial drug in three or more antimicrobial categories. This definition concerns both gram-positive and gram-negative bacteria [13].

Statistical analysis

Descriptive analysis to characterize patients' population were reported as count (percent) or mean value (\pm standard deviation) for qualitative and quantitative variables, respectively, and were compared between the two groups using Chi-square test or Student's t test, as appropriate. A two-sided P value of \leq 0.05 was considered as statistically significant.

Results

A total of 1187 CVCs for 9774 catheter-days and 639 PICCs for 11,110 catheter-days were placed and analyzed during the two-year study period. Among CVCs, a total of 59 (4.9%) CLABSI cases with clinical symptoms were identified. Among PICCs, 18 (2.8%) cases presented CLABSI during our survey. Patients' demographic characteristics and hospitalization data that was considered as baseline indicators of illness severity are presented in Table 1. No statistically significant differences were observed among the two groups. The majority of the study population was catheterized with three-lumen catheters. Two-lumen catheters were placed in only 2 cases (2.5%). Patients who were discharged with PICCs and CVCs and patients with catheters urgently placed

Table 1 Demographical characteristics and indicators of illness severity among CVC/PICC groups

Characteristics	CVC-patients (n = 59)	PICC-patients (n = 18)	
	N (%)	N (%)	
Age, mean \pm SD (years)	55.08 ± 19.8	60.24 ± 17.5	
Gender (M/F)	41/18	13/6	
Obesity	19 (32.2)	9 (50)	
Indicators of illness severity			
ICU admission	32 (54.2)	9 (50)	
Total parenteral nutrition	38 (63.8)	9 (50)	
APACHE II at inclusion, (mean \pm SD)	12.8 ± 8.2	10.2 ± 6.5	
Length of hospital stay before IV catheter, (mean \pm SD)	57.7 ± 35.8	41.6 ± 19.5	
Duration of catheter use, (mean \pm SD)	16.19 ± 10.1	28.4 ± 12.5	
In-hospital mortality	19 (32.2)	6 (33.3)	

IV, Intravenous; SD, standard deviation; M/F, male/female

were not excluded from the study. The proportion of these incidences were relatively low, of approximately 5% and 1%, respectively.

The mean duration of CVCs placement was 16.2 ± 10.1 days (Range: 2-56 days), while the mean duration of PICCs placement was 28.4 ± 12.5 days (Range: 2-93 days). The CLABSI incidence rate per 1000 catheter-days was 6.03 for CVC group and 1.62 for PICC group (t-test, p < 0.001). The median time to development of infection was 23 days in the patients with a PICC and 13 days in patients with CVC (t-test, p = 0.03).

The CLABSI rate due to multidrug-resistant organisms (MDROs) among the two groups was 3.17 in CVC group and 0.36 in PICC group (t-test, p<0.001) (Table 2). The distribution of pathogens in CLABSI-CVC and CLABSI-PICC groups are presented in Table 3. Within CLABSI CVC group, the most common microorganism isolated was MDR *Acinetobacter baumannii* (27.1%) followed by MDR *Klebsiella pneumoniae* (22%). In CLABSI-PICC group, the predominant microorganism isolated was

Table 2 CLABSI and CLABSI-MDROs incidence rate among CVC/PICC groups

	PICCs	CVCs	<i>P</i> -value
No of catheters	639	1187	
Total catheter-days	11,110	9774	
No of CLABSI	18	59	$X^2 = 4.74 P = 0.029$
CLABSI incidence rate (per 1000 cath-days)	1.62	6.03	<i>T</i> -test, <i>p</i> < 0.001
No of CLABSI-MDRO	4	31	$X^2 = 8.7 P = 0.003$
CLABSI-MDRO incidence rate (per 1000 cath-days)	0.36	3.17	<i>T</i> -test, <i>p</i> < 0.001

Candida spp. (33.3%) followed by non-MDR gram-negative pathogens (22.2%).

Discussion

Since central lines are increasingly prevalent in critically-ill patients, it is important to take into serious consideration that CLABSI is a leading cause of preventable healthcare-associated infections leading to longer hospital stays, higher hospital costs, and significant mortality [14].

Our findings support that PICC utilization carries less risk for the development of CLABSIs than CVCs since PICC-CLABSI rates were considerably lower compared to CVC-CLABSIs among the study group. Furthermore, in patients with PICC-CLABSIs, the mean time to infection was 12 days longer than the one of patients with CVC-CLABSIs, suggesting the use of PICCs as an attractive alternative to CVC lines, especially in the group of critically-ill patients or those requiring prolonged inpatient IV access.

There have been several reports regarding comparison of the rate of CLABSI associated with PICCs and CVCs in hospitalized patients in different medical care units, however their outcomes are widely conflicting. Furthermore, limited data exist on the CLABSI risk comparison between PICCs and CVCs events in critically-ill patients combined with the pathogen epidemiology of each category. This low CLABSI rate associated with PICCs is in line with the prevailing opinion [15, 16] that supports the extent use of PICCs in daily practice due to their less invasive insertion technique, the low rate of mechanical complications, and their safety due to the lower infectious rates and the easy removal techniques.

 Table 3
 Pathogen distribution among CVC/PICC groups

Pathogens	CVC-CLABSIs (n = 59)	PICC-CLABSIs (n = 18) N (% of total isolates)	
	N (% of total isolates)		
Gram-negative bacteria			
MDR K. pneumoniae	13 (22)	2 (11.1)	
MDR A. baumannii	16 (27.1)	1 (5.6)	
MDR P. aeruginosa	2 (3.4)	1 (5.6)	
Non-MDR <i>P. mirabilis</i>	1 (1.7)	-	
Non-MDR <i>P. aeruginosa</i>	1 (1.7)	-	
Gram-positive bacteria			
Coagulase-negative staphylococci	9 (15.3)	3 (16.6)	
Methicillin-resistant S. aureus	3 (5.0)	_	
Enterococcus spp.	2 (3.4)	1 (5.6)	
Yeasts			
Candida spp.	6 (10.2)	6 (33.3)	
Other bacterial pathogens	6 (10.2)	4 (22.2)	

With respect to infections, PICCs have been acknowledged to be safer than other central lines by many authors, possibly due to minor microbial density and lower temperature of the PICC placement site compared to those of other central venous catheters which include neck and groin [17].

In our study, Acinetobacter spp., K. pneumoniae, coagulase-negative staphylococci and Candida albicans were the most common microorganisms isolated from CVCs. Based on the international reports on CLABSI pathogen epidemiology available from numerous studies, causative microorganisms typically originate from the normal resident flora of the skin present at the insertion site, which are mostly consisting by gram-positives such as coagulase-negative staphylococci, and Corynebacterium spp [18-20]. However, previous studies report a change in CLABSI pathogen profile, with Gram-negatives either predominating in the panel of isolated organisms or displaying increasing trends [21-23]. This change in the types of pathogens could be attributed to the broad implementation of infection control programs targeting Gram-positive organisms [24]. In our study the epidemiology profile of CVC-CLABSI pathogens reflects the Greek ICU pathogen profile depicted by previous reports, where MDR A. baumannii is frequently isolated [25]. This emergence of MDROs has created a great concern on medical settings in Greek hospitals, especially for ICU patients [26]. Based on the annual data of antimicrobial resistance rates reported by our hospital's clinical laboratory, the rate of the three most commonly isolated MDR Gram-negatives (A. baumannii, K. pneumoniae, P. aeruginosa) recovered from hospitalized patients was > 20% during the study period, mainly originated from ICU patients. Moreover, given the fact that most CVC-CLABSI patients in our study population had a prolonged stay in ICU and had been exposed to many different classes of antibiotics, it is not surprising that MDR Gram-negatives caused the majority of CLABSIs in our setting.

In contrast, the pathogen distribution in PICC CLABSIs exhibited a different bacterial profile, with *Candida* spp. being the predominant isolated microorganism. This is reasonable since the duration of catheter utilization before the development of infection was significantly longer in patients with PICCs compared with those with CVCs. Indeed, among many risk factors, prolonged use of catheters placement consists an independent risk factor for the development of invasive candidemia in hospitalized patients [27, 28]. Our findings are in agreement to other studies [29] supporting that the presence of a peripherally inserted central catheter significantly correlates with candidemia. *Candida* species have been reported as the fourth

most common causes of bloodstream infections (BSIs) among immunocompromised inpatients worldwide in the last two decades [30, 31].

This study has potential limitations, since the development of CLABSI in patients with PICCs vs CVCs is known to be influenced by a combination of different factors of both patients and devices' characteristics. Therefore, the present retrospective analysis could be subject to considerable biases and confounding, mainly regarding the severity of illness and the different duration of catheterization between the two study-populations. Thus, it would be important to examine the characteristics of the whole population that was catheterized with PICCs and CVCs during that period, in order to better understand the difference in patient risk between the two groups. Unfortunately, we have had limited access to data of the entire population. Based on available data from almost 30% of the whole catheterized population (347 patients with CVCs and 175 with PICCs), no significant differences in APACHE score and length of hospital stay before catheterization were determined. This was considered reasonable since PICCs and CVCs are applied to the same patient population in our hospital, that include severe cases after surgical operation, septic and multi-trauma patients. Moreover, considering the demographical characteristics of both groups that developed CLABSIs, no significant differences in underlying diseases or medical history were observed. In addition, the APACHE score, which is considered as the most straightforward single variables to estimate severity of illness, was similar between the above two groups (Table 1). Regarding the different time duration of catheterization for PICCs and CVCs, our previous study have shown that longer duration of catheterization is linked with greater rates of CLABSIs [32]. In the current study, though time duration of PICCs' catheterization was considerably longer than of CVCs, the rates of PICCs CLABSIs were significantly lower than those of CVCs.

Conclusions

The findings of the present study support the beneficial use of PICC lines compared to CVCs in critically ill patients, in terms of CLABSI rates, despite the longer indwelling time of PICCs. Moreover, a substantial swift in the epidemiological profile of CLABSIs pathogens towards a high proportion of Gram-negative pathogens and specifically MDROs was noted in CVC-CLABSIs.

Abbreviations

CLABSI: Central-line associated bloodstream infection; CVC: Central venous catheter; ICU: Intensive care unit; MDRO: Multidrug-resistant organism; PICC: Peripherally inserted central venous catheter.

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge the contribution of the hospital healthcare workers who participated in this study. We would also like to acknowledge the contribution of Mr. Pavlos Mariatos, Director of Quality Management Department in data recording and analysis.

Author contributions

VP, PK, GS, AT designed and set up methodology, VP, JB, KT, PK performed the study, VP, KT, PK, GS, AT analyzed the data, all authors contributed to read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding

No specific funding was received for this study.

Availability of data and materials

All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this published article.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

This study has been approved by the ethical committee of Metropolitan Hospital review board.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interest.

Author details

¹Department of Microbiology, Medical School, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, 75 Mikras Asias Street, 11527 Athens, Greece. ²Department of Internal Medicine, Metropolitan Hospital, 9 Ethnarchou Makariou Street, 18547 Athens, Greece.

Received: 3 May 2022 Accepted: 1 November 2022 Published online: 09 November 2022

References

- Parás-Bravo P, Paz-Zulueta M, Sarabia-Lavin R, Jose Amo-Setién F, Herrero-Montes M, Olavarría-Beivíde E, et al. Complications of peripherally inserted central venous catheters: a retrospective cohort study. PLOS ONE. 2016;11(9):e0162479. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0162479.
- Ziegler MJ, Pellegrini DC, Safdar N. Attributable mortality of central line associated bloodstream infection: systematic review and meta-analysis. Infection. 2015;43:29–36.
- O'Grady NP, Alexander M, Dellinger P, Gerberding JL, Heard SO, Maki DG, et al. Guidelines for the prevention of intravascular catheter–related infections. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2002;23:759–69.
- Magill SS, Oleary E, Janelle SJ, Thompson DL, Dumyati G, Nadle J, et al. Emerging infections program hospital prevalence survey team. Changes in prevalence of health care-associated infections in U.S. hospitals. N Engl J Med. 2018;379(18):1732–44. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1801550.
- Stevens V, Geiger K, Concannon C, Nelson RE, Brown J, Dumyati G. Inpatient costs, mortality and 30-day re-admission in patients with central-line-associated bloodstream infections. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2014;20(5):0318–24. https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-0691.12407.
- Hoshal VL. Total intravenous nutrition with peripherally inserted silicone elastomer central venous catheters. Arch Surg. 1975;110(5):644–6. https://doi.org/10.1001/archsurg.1975.01360110190032.
- Gunst M, Matsushima K, Vanek S, Gunst R, Shafi S, Frankel H. Peripherally inserted central catheters may lower the incidence of catheter-related blood stream infections in patients in surgical intensive care units. Surg Infect (Larchmt). 2011;12:279–82.
- 8. Durand GA, Abat C, Cassir N, Jimeno MT, Vidal V, Fenollar F, et al. Peripherally inserted central catheters: a hidden emerging cause of infection

- outbreaks. New Microbes New Infect. 2020;35: 100671. https://doi.org/10. 1016/i.nmni.2020.100671.
- DeVries M, Sleweon T. Bridging the gap: introduction of an antimicrobial peripherally inserted central catheter (PICC) in response to high PICC central line-associated bloodstream infection incidence. Br J Nurs. 2021;30(19):S16–22. https://doi.org/10.12968/bjon.2021.30.19.S16.
- Moran J, Colbert CY, Song J, Mathews J, Arroliga AC, Varghees S, et al. Screening for novel risk factors related to peripherally inserted central catheter-associated complications. J Hosp Med. 2014;9:481–9.
- Chopra V, O'Horo JC, Rogers MA, Maki DG, Safdar N. The risk of bloodstream infection associated with peripherally inserted central catheters compared with central venous catheters in adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2013;34:908–18.
- Maki DG, Weise CE, Sarafin HW. A semiquantitative culture method for identifying intravenous-catheter-related infection. New Engl J Med. 1977:296:1305–9.
- Magiorakos AP, Srinivasan A, Carey RB, Carmeli Y, Falagas ME, Giske CG, et al. Multidrug-resistant, extensively drug-resistant and pandrug-resistant bacteria: an international expert proposal for interim standard definitions for acquired resistance. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2012;18(3):268–81. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-0691.2011.03570.x.
- Zimlichman E, Henderson D, Tamir O, Franz C, Song P, Yamin CK, et al. Health care-associated infections: a meta-analysis of costs and financial impact on the US health care system. JAMA Intern Med. 2013;173:2039–46.
- Santolim TQ, Baptista AM, Giovani AMM, Zumárraga JP, Camargo OP.
 Peripherally inserted central catheters in orthopedic patients: experience from 1023 procedures. Acta Ortop Bras. 2018;26(3):206–10.
- Kim IJ, Shim DJ, Lee JH, Kim ET, Byeon JH, Lee HJ, et al. Impact of subcutaneous tunnels on peripherally inserted catheter placement: a multicenter retrospective study. Eur Radiol. 2019;29(5):2716–23.
- Safdar N, Maki DG. Risk of catheter-related bloodstream infection with peripherally inserted central venous catheters used in hospitalized patients. Chest. 2005;128:489–95.
- Sohail M, Latif Z. Molecular analysis, biofilm formation, and susceptibility
 of methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus strains causing community- and health care-associated infections in central venous catheters.
 Rev Soc Bras Med Trop. 2018;51(5):603–9. https://doi.org/10.1590/
 0037-8682-0373-2017.
- Wright MO, Decker SG, Allen-Bridson K, Hebden JN, Leaptrot D. Healthcare-associated infections studies project: an American journal of infection control and national healthcare safety network data quality collaboration: location mapping. Am J Infect Control. 2018;46(5):577–8.
- Alonso B, Latorre MC, Cruces R, Ampuero D, Haces L, Martín-Rabadán P, et al. Evaluation of the Alfred[™] turbidity monitoring system (Alifax[®]) following sonication in the diagnosis of central venous catheter colonization. Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis. 2019;38(9):1737–42. https://doi.org/ 10.1007/s10096-019-03606-y.
- He Y, Zhao H, Wei Y, Gan X, Ling Y, Ying Y. Retrospective analysis of microbial colonization patterns in central venous catheters, 2013–2017. J Healthc Eng. 2019;2019:8632701. https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/8632701.
- Weiner LM, Webb AK, Limbago B, Dudeck MA, Patel J, Kallen AJ, et al. Antimicrobial-resistant pathogens associated with healthcare-associated infections: Summary of data reported to the National Healthcare Safety Network at the Centers for disease control and prevention, 2011–2014. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2016;37(11):1288–301.
- 23. Lin KY, Cheng A, Chang YC, Hung MC, Wang JT, Sheng WH, et al. Central line-associated bloodstream infections among critically-ill patients in the era of bundle care. J Microbiol Immunol Infect. 2017;50:339–48.
- Rodríguez-Créixems M, Muñoz P, Martín-Rabadán P, Cercenado E, Guembe M, Bouza E. Evolution and aetiological shift of catheter-related bloodstream infection in a whole institution: the microbiology department may act as a watchtower. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2013;19(9):845–51. https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-0691.12050.
- Arvaniti K, Lathyris D, Clouva-Molyvdas P, Haidich AB, Mouloudi E, Synnefaki E, et al. Comparison of Oligon catheters and chlorhexidine-impregnated sponges with standard multilumen central venous catheters for prevention of associated colonization and infections in intensive care unit patients: a multicenter, randomized, controlled study. Crit Care Med. 2012;40(2):420–9.

- Moschou A, Ioannou P, Moraitaki E, Stafylaki D, Maraki S, Samonis G, et al. Rectal colonization by drug resistant bacteria in nursing home residents in Crete, Greece. Trop Med Infect Disease. 2021;6(3):123. https://doi.org/ 10.3390/tropicalmed6030123.
- Hu B, Du Z, Kang Y, Zang B, Cui W, Qin B, et al. Catheter-related Candida bloodstream infection in intensive care unit patients: a subgroup analysis of the China-SCAN study. BMC Infect Dis. 2014;14:594. https://doi.org/10. 1186/s12879-014-0594-0.
- 28. Li Y, Du M, Chen L-A, Liu Y, Liang Z. Nosocomial bloodstream infection due to *Candida* spp. in China: species distribution, clinical features, and outcomes. Mycopathologia. 2016;181:485–95. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11046-016-9997-3.
- Tascini C, Sozio E, Tintori G, Ripoli A, Sbrana F, Rosselli Del Turco E, et al. Peripherally inserted central catheter as a predominant risk factor for candidemia in critically ill patients in Internal Medicine wards in Italy. Intensive Care Med. 2015;41:1498–9. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s00134-015-3892-0.
- Chen CY, Sheng WH, Huang SY, Chou WC, Yao M, Tang JL, et al. Clinical characteristics and treatment outcomes of patients with candidaemia due to *Candida parapsilosis* sensu lato species at a medical centre in Taiwan, 2000–12. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2015;70:1531–8. https://doi. org/10.1093/jac/dku540.
- Bassetti M, Merelli M, Ansaldi F, de Florentiis D, Sartor A, Scarparo C, et al. Clinical and therapeutic aspects of candidemia: a five year single centre study. PLOS ONE. 2015;10:e0127534. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal. pone.0127534.
- Pitiriga V, Bakalis J, Kampos E, Kanellopoulos P, Saroglou G, Tsakris A. Duration of central venous catheter placement and central line-associated bloodstream infections after the adoption of prevention bundles: a two-year retrospective study. Antimicrob Resist Infect Control. 2022;11(1):96. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13756-022-01131-w.

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Ready to submit your research? Choose BMC and benefit from:

- fast, convenient online submission
- thorough peer review by experienced researchers in your field
- rapid publication on acceptance
- support for research data, including large and complex data types
- gold Open Access which fosters wider collaboration and increased citations
- maximum visibility for your research: over 100M website views per year

At BMC, research is always in progress.

Learn more biomedcentral.com/submissions

