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Abstract:

BACKGROUND: Our aim was to compare the applications of totally implanted vascular access devices (TIVAD) and peripherally inserted central catheter (PICC) in breast cancer patients.

METHODS: We analyzed 4080 cases of TIVAD and 1433 cases of PICC at the Breast Center of the Fourth Hospital of Hebei Medical University. The success rate, operation time, and procedures of catheterization, as well as the catheterization-related complications, catheter indwelling-related complications, and the utilization conditions were compared between these two methods.

RESULTS: Our results showed that the success rate of catheterization was relatively higher in PICC group (99.5%) than the TIVAD group (99.0%)(χ² = 3.521, P = 0.038), and the operation time and the rate of catheterization-related complications were lower in PICC (18.65 ± 4.7603 min, 0.91%) compared to TIVAD (29.55 ± 4.0843 min, 1.59%)(t = 38.000, P < 0.01, χ² = 3.578, P = 0.035). However, the rate of catheter indwelling-related complications was lower in TIVAD group (2.47%) than the PICC group (3.62%)(χ² = 5.227, P = 0.016), and the catheter care was also better in TIVAD. CONCLUSIONS: Based on these analyses, we recommended TIVAD for the patients who need long-term and high-dose chemotherapy and
PICC for the patients who need short chemotherapy cycle and live close to the hospital.
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