

2. Bennett DS, Walsh KA, Gould H. Foodborne disease outbreaks caused by *Bacillus cereus*, *Clostridium perfringens*, and *Staphylococcus aureus*—United States, 1998–2008. *Clinical Infect Dis* 2013;57:425.
3. Watkins RR. Gastrointestinal infections in the setting of natural disasters. *Curr Infect Dis Rep* 2012;14:47–52.
4. Yee EL, Palacio H, Atmar RL, *et al.* Widespread outbreak of norovirus gastroenteritis among evacuees of Hurricane Katrina residing in a large “megashelter” in Houston, Texas: lessons learned for prevention. *Clin Infect Dis* 2007;44:1032–1039.
5. Kadariya J, Smith TC, Thapaliya D. *Staphylococcus aureus* and staphylococcal food-borne disease: an ongoing challenge in public health. *BioMed Res Int* 2014;article ID 827965:1–9.
6. Pillsbury A, Chiew M, Bates J, Sheppard V. An outbreak of staphylococcal food poisoning in a commercially catered buffet. *Commun Dis Intel Q Rep* 2013;37:E144–E148.
7. Hennekinne JA, De Buyser M-L, Dragacci S. *Staphylococcus aureus* and its food poisoning toxins: characterization and outbreak investigation. *FEMS Microbiol Rev* 2012;36:815–836.
8. Ercoli L, Gallina S, Nia Y, *et al.* Investigation of a staphylococcal food poisoning outbreak from a chantilly cream dessert, in Umbria (Italy). *Foodborne Path Dis* 2017;14:407–413.
9. Elward A, Grim A, Schroeder P, *et al.* Outbreak of *Salmonella javiana* infection at a children’s hospital. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2006;27:586–592.
10. Bloom MS, Palumbo J, Saiyed N, Lauper U, Lin S. Food and waterborne disease in the greater New York City area following Hurricane Sandy in 2012. *Disaster Med Public Health Prepare* 2016;10:503–511.

## Laterality of a short-term peripheral intravenous catheter does not affect complications or patient satisfaction: a subanalysis of the One Million Global Peripheral Intravenous Catheter Study

Rami Sommerstein MD, Lisa Kottanattu MD and Jonas Marschall MD, MSc

Department of Infectious Diseases, Bern University Hospital, Bern, Switzerland

*To the Editor*—The One Million Global Peripheral Intravenous Catheter Study (OMG PIVC) was the largest prevalence study to date on the use and management of short-term peripheral intravenous catheters (PIVC) in adult and pediatric inpatients from 49 countries.<sup>1</sup> The authors found that many PIVCs were placed in areas of flexion, were symptomatic or idle, had suboptimal dressings, or lacked adequate documentation, which suggested an inconsistency between recommendations in PIVC management and current practice.<sup>1</sup>

Although few data are available on the effect of laterality on (peripherally inserted) central venous catheters,<sup>2–4</sup> information is completely lacking for PIVCs. Thus, we supplemented the data from the 302 PIVCs our center contributed to the OMG PIVC study with additional variables on PIVC laterality and patient handedness. All other variables were collected as described in detail in the OMG PIVC study.<sup>1</sup>

Our aim was to correlate the laterality of PIVCs placed in the upper extremity with the outcome rates of complications and patient satisfaction. We included 291 of 302 PIVCs (96.4%) that were inserted at the upper extremity and where information on laterality was available. Characteristics such as handedness, bed days at the time of data collection (April 15, 2015) and PIVC insertion position at the upper extremity (wrist and/or hand versus forearm and/or elbow) did not differ significantly depending on the laterality of the PIVC (Table 1). Also, PIVC outcomes and patient satisfaction did not depend on PIVC laterality (Table 1). Based on this, we conclude that laterality

should not influence the decision regarding where to insert a PIVC at the upper extremity.

**Acknowledgments.** We acknowledge the One Million Global Peripheral Intravenous Catheter (OMG PIVC) study team for the original concept and study design (Evan Alexandrou, Gillian Ray-Barruel, Niall Higgins, Steven Frost, Peter Carr, Sheila Inwood, Frances Lin, Leonard Mermel and Claire Rickard). Also, we thank the infection prevention team at Bern University Hospital for data collection.

**Financial support.** No financial support was provided relevant to this article.

**Conflicts of interest.** All authors report no conflicts of interest relevant to this article.

### References

1. Alexandrou E, Ray-Barruel G, Carr PJ, Frost SA, *et al.* Use of short peripheral intravenous catheters: characteristics, management, and outcomes worldwide. *J Hosp Med* 2018. doi: 10.12788/jhm.3039.
2. Engstrom BI, Horvath JJ, Stewart JK, *et al.* Tunneled internal jugular hemodialysis catheters: impact of laterality and tip position on catheter dysfunction and infection rates. *J Vasc Interv Radiol* 2013;24:1295–1302.
3. Sperry BW, Roskos M, Oskoui R. The effect of laterality on venous thromboembolism formation after peripherally inserted central catheter placement. *J Vasc Access* 2012;13:91–95.
4. Paquet F, Boucher LM, Valenti D, Lindsay R. Impact of arm selection on the incidence of PICC complications: results of a randomized controlled trial. *J Vasc Access* 2017;18:408–414.

**Author for correspondence:** Rami Sommerstein, Infectious Diseases/Hospital Epidemiology, Freiburgstrasse, 3010 Bern, Bern University Hospital, Switzerland. E-mail: rami.sommerstein@insel.ch

**Cite this article:** Sommerstein R, *et al.* (2019). Laterality of a short-term peripheral intravenous catheter does not affect complications or patient satisfaction: a subanalysis of the One Million Global Peripheral Intravenous Catheter Study. *Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology* 2019, 40, 117–118. doi: 10.1017/ice.2018.291

**Table 1.** Characteristics and Outcomes of Peripheral Intravenous Catheters Correlated With Laterality

Variable	Right Upper Extremity, No. (%)	Left Upper Extremity, No. (%)	<i>P</i> Value <sup>a</sup>
Total	153	138	
<b>Baseline characteristics</b>			
Bed days on study day, median (IQR)	2 (1–3)	2 (1–3)	.26
<b>Handedness</b>			
			.23
Right	141 (92.2)	120 (87.0)	
Left	7 (4.6)	8 (5.8)	
Ambidexter	2 (1.3)	1 (0.7)	
NA	3 (2.0)	9 (6.5)	
Position, forearm or elbow	83 (54.2)	68 (49.3)	.47
<b>PIVC assessment outcomes</b>			
Pain/tenderness on palpation	10 (6.5)	5 (3.6)	.39
Redness > 1 cm from insertion site	1 (0.7)	1 (0.7)	1
Swelling > 1 cm from insertion site	3 (2.0)	2 (1.4)	1
Purulence	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	NA
Itching/rash under dressing	0 (0.0)	1 (0.7)	.96
Blistering/skin tears under dressing	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	NA
Bruising/dried blood around PIVC	7 (4.6)	6 (4.3)	1
Palpable hard vein cord beyond tip	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	NA
Streak/red line along vein	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	NA
Induration/hardness of tissue > 1 cm	0 (0.0)	1 (0.7)	.9
Leaking PIVC	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	NA
Extravasation/Infiltration	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	NA
Blood in line	6 (10.5)	12 (8.7)	.7
Dislodgement of PIVC	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	NA
<b>Any noticeable outcome</b>	31 (20.3)	24 (17.4)	.64
<b>Patient satisfaction (self-assessment)</b>			
Experience with PIVC, median (IQR) <sup>b</sup>	9 (7–10)	9 (8–10)	.54

Note. NA, not available; PIVC, peripherally inserted venous catheter.

<sup>b</sup>Likert scale response: 0 = worst possible; 10 = best possible.

<sup>a</sup>Determined using the  $\chi^2$  and Mann-Whitney U tests, as appropriate.