

#### Can Saline replace heparin to prevent occlusion in long term CVCs in children and adolescents?



Natalie Bradford Rachel Edwards Raymond Chan

### Acknowledgments

- Co-authors
  - Rachel Edwards
  - Raymond Chan
- Cochrane Collaboration
- Qld Cancer Council

#### Overview

- How the study came about
- Why this is an important issue
- Undertaking a Cochrane review
- The results
- Where to next?



Images courtesy of jscreationzs at FreeDigitalPhotos.net

## How the study came about

- Experienced nurses in childhood cancer
- Interested in developing nursing research- but where to start?
- Collaboration
- Development of research ideas
- Decision to undertake a Cochrane review



## Choosing the topic and question

- Clinically important
- Potential to improve practice
- Nursing orientated- but relevant to other disciplines
- Needed evidence to exist but

not be overwhelming for first-time 🦯

**Cochrane review** 



#### The research question

What are the clinical effects (benefits and harms) of heparin versus normal saline to prevent occlusion in long-term central venous catheters in infants, children and adolescents?





## Why is this an important issue?

- Worldwide, guideline and clinical practice vary
- Even in our own institution
  - Cancer patients have CVLs & ports heparinised
    Haemophilia patients use saline only
- No clear understanding of which is superior
- Costs and risks of heparin
- Medication errors- heparin one of the most common errors reported

### The evidence

- Adult Cochrane review on same topic (Lopez 2014)
  - No important difference in terms of safety or efficacy
  - Challenge the continued use of heparin
- One study changed practice on the basis of their study in the 1990's- use saline only over age one (Smith 1991)
- Recent systematic review advocated daily heparin as this was practiced amongst facilities surveyed (Conway 2014)

## Undertaking a Cochrane review

- Registering title
- Preparing protocol
- Publishing protocol
- Undertaking review
- Publishing results
- Training and support provided
- Rigorous, lengthy process



Trusted evidence. Informed decisions. Better health.

### The review

Undertaken according to rigorous Cochrane standards,

- Search, data extraction, analysis, write up

- 137 articles potentially relevant
- 3 studies included in final review
  - 245 patients



- 2 studies CVL, 1 study port-a-cath

#### **Outcome Measures**

- Occlusion (inability to infuse)
- CVC associated blood stream infection
- Converted to rate ratios per 1000 catheter days
- Other measures not able to be combined
  - Ability to withdraw blood
  - Catheter duration
  - Use of urokinase



## Quality and bias of studies

- All studies used different protocols- difficult to compare
- Different concentrations of heparin
- Confounding in 2 studies changing not only the solution, but also duration between flushes
- Study quality low to very low with bias in multiple areas

#### Results



Fig. 2. Forest plot comparison: normal saline versus heparin flush, outcome CVC occlusion rate per 1000 catheter days.

Study or Subgroup	log[Rate Ratio]	SE	Normal Saline Total	Heparin Total	Weight	Rate Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI	Rate Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI		
Cesaro 2009	0.9478	0.39	101	102	74.3%	2.58 [1.20, 5.54]			
Goossens 2013	-1.204	1.55	11	17	25.7%	0.30 [0.01, 6.26]			
Total (95% CI)			112	119	100.0%	1.48 [0.24, 9.37]	-		
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect:	= 1.04; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1.8 Z = 0.42 (P = 0.	1, df = 67)	= 1 (P = 0.18); I	2 = 45%			0.002 0.1 Favours normal saling	1 10 Favours he	500 parin

#### Results

- Inconsistent and imprecise
- All studies had risk of bias and problems with internal validity
- Insufficient evidence to determine effects of heparin versus normal saline
- Controversy continues...



### Conclusions

- It remains unclear whether heparin is necessary for CVC maintenance
- Saline is cheaper; heparin is not risk free
- More well-designed studies are required to understand this relatively simple, but clinically important question
- Nurse are ideally placed to undertake this research



#### Summary

Cochrane Library

Trusted evidence. Informed decisions. Better health.

Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews

# Heparin versus 0.9% sodium chloride intermittent flushing for the prevention of occlusion in long term central venous catheters in infants and children

Review

Intervention

#### Natalie K Bradford 🖾, Rachel M Edwards, Raymond J Chan



Review

Heparin versus 0.9% sodium chloride intermittent flushing for the prevention of occlusion in long term central venous catheters in infants and children: A systematic review<sup>\*</sup>



Natalie K. Bradford<sup>a,b,\*</sup>, Rachel M. Edwards<sup>c</sup>, Raymond J. Chan<sup>d,e</sup>

#### Thank you







Australian Government

**Department of Health** 

QUT