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Chlorhexidine disinfectant can reduce the risk of central venous catheter infection compared with povidone: a meta-analysis
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Objective: Assess the efficacy of chlorhexidine with povidone solutions as a skin disinfectant for central venous catheter (CVC) care.

Background: Central venous catheters are widely used for critically ill patients. Catheter maintenance can easily lead to a catheter-related bloodstream infection (CRBSI), which is the manifestation of a bloodstream infection (BSI) in a patient who carries a catheter or removes the catheter within 48 hours. There is no clear source of BSIs except for indwelling catheters in the blood vessels, and BSIs significantly increase the morbidity and mortality of patients. We assess the efficacy of chlorhexidine with povidone as a skin disinfectant for CVC care.

Methods: In July 2018, we searched the Cochrane Library, PubMed, EMBASE, Web of Science, OVID, CNKI, SinoMed, WanFangData, CqVip, and DuXiu for publications in English and Chinese. By searching articles published before July 2018, we were able to extract data on study design, participants, antiseptics compared, sample size, and main outcomes. We conducted meta-analyses of the efficacy of chlorhexidine vs povidone solutions as a skin disinfectant for CVC care.

Results: We included 10 randomized controlled trial studies. After conducting subgroup analysis, the results indicated that chlorhexidine was significantly better than povidone in preventing CRBSIs (P = .12; I² = 36%; risk ratio [RR] = 0.49; 95% confidence interval [CI], 0.29-0.85). Compared with povidone, the chlorhexidine catheterization rate of CRBSIs was reduced (P = .16; I² = 32%; RR = 0.54; 95% CI, 0.42-0.69). There was no clear difference in the rates of skin reaction between chlorhexidine and povidone (P = .006; I² = 87%; RR = 1.92; 95% CI, 0.55-6.72). The comparison was underpowered for BSIs without a clear source.

Conclusions: Chlorhexidine solution for CVC care may significantly reduce rates of CRBSIs and catheter colonization compared with povidone solutions. The disinfection effect of chlorhexidine-alcohol is better than that of other solutions. Because the quality of the studies evaluated is relatively low, the true effects may be different, so more evidence is needed.
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INTRODUCTION

Central venous catheters (CVCs) provide secure vascular access for critically and chronically ill patients. They are widely used for intravenous medication administration, fluid replacement, parenteral nutrition, and hemodynamics monitoring. However, catheter maintenance can easily lead to a catheter-related bloodstream infection (CRBSI), which is the manifestation of a bloodstream infection (BSI) in a patient who carries a catheter or removes the catheter within 48 hours. There is no clear source of BSIs except for indwelling catheters in the blood vessels. From January 2007 to December 2012, the International Nosocomial Infection Control Consortium conducted a multicenter, prospective surveillance cohort study of 503 intensive care units (ICUs) in 43 countries and reported a rate for CRBSIs in ICUs of 4.78 cases per 1000 catheter-days. When a patient develops a CRBSI, the infection will significantly increase the morbidity and mortality of the patient, prolong the patient’s hospital stay, and increase the burden of disease; therefore, it is crucial to take positive preventive measures to reduce the incidence of infection.
In order to reduce catheter-related infections, health care staff must be able to choose the best skin disinfectant, during both insertion of the catheter and maintenance, to kill more microorganisms at the catheter insertion point and prevent bacteria from spreading into the body. Many types of disinfectants are currently in use, but, because their application is not strictly regulated, it is difficult to say which disinfectant is better. Some meta-analyses have assessed chlorhexidine vs povidone for CVC care; however, these analyses also evaluated other disinfection methods, as well as CVCs for hemodialysis and plasma exchange and peripherally inserted central catheters. We found no recent comparison of only chlorhexidine and povidone, so we performed a meta-analysis of all available published studies comparing the efficacy of chlorhexidine to povidone as a skin disinfectant for CVC care.

METHODS

Literature search strategy

In July 2018, we searched online using a combination of subject words: central venous catheter, chlorhexidine, chlorhexidine gluconate, iodophor, povidone-iodine, povidone, central line-associated bloodstream infection, catheter-related bloodstream infection (CRBSI), catheter-related infections, central venous catheter-related infections, disinfectant, care, infection. We manually searched the Cochrane Library, PubMed, EMBASE, Web of Science, OVID, CNKI, SinoMed, WanFangData, CqVip, DuXiu for publications in English and Chinese. We searched articles published before July 2018.

Selection criteria

The types of studies we included were randomized controlled trials (RCTs) in which any type of chlorhexidine solution was compared to a povidone solution for CVC care. Locations of the central venous catheters included subclavian, internal jugular, and femoral venous sites. Also, each study had to report the incidence of CRBSIs or catheter colonization, skin reactions, or BSIs without a clear source. The diagnosis of each observation was based on international diagnostic criteria. The following studies were excluded: (1) pediatric studies, (2) duplicate studies, (3) studies with incomplete data, (4) low-quality studies, and (5) studies involving CVCs for hemodialysis and plasma exchange.

Data extraction and quality assessment

Two authors independently extracted data on study design, participants, antiseptics compared, sample size, and main outcome. Two authors also independently evaluated the quality of each article.
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by using the Cochrane risk-of-bias tool. If there was a disagreement, they would consult a third person. The quality of each article was rated as good if all biases were low. The quality was rated as low if all biases were high and medium if some biases are high.

**Data analysis**

We used the Cochrane RevMan 5.2 software to analyze the data by calculating risk ratios (RRs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs). The

---

**Table 1**

Characteristics of studies comparing chlorhexidine solutions with povidone solutions for central venous catheters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Type of population (sample size)</th>
<th>Antiseptics compared</th>
<th>Outcomes, n/n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yasuda et al9</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Adult patients from ICUs (n = 997)</td>
<td>I: (1) 0.5% chlorhexidine-aqueous; (2) 1% chlorhexidine-aqueous</td>
<td>Catheter colonization I: (1) 5/329; (2) 6/339 C: 13/329 CRBSI I: 6/1181 C: 39/1168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimoz et al10</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Adult patients from ICUs (n = 2349)</td>
<td>I: 2% chlorhexidine-alcohol; C: 10% povidone iodine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamamoto et al11</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Adult patients from hematology departments (n = 107)</td>
<td>I: 1% chlorhexidine-alcohol; C: 10% povidone iodine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vallés et al12</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Adult patients from ICUs (n = 631)</td>
<td>I: (1) 0.5% chlorhexidine-alcohol; (2) 2% chlorhexidine-aqueous</td>
<td>Catheter colonization I: (1) 9/226; (2) 9/211 C: 9/194 CRBSI I: 34/226; (2) 38/211 C: 48/194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimoz et al13</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Adult patients from ICUs (n = 481)</td>
<td>I: 0.25% chlorhexidine, 0.025% benzalkonium chloride, and 4% benzylic alcohol C: 5% povidone-iodine in 70% ethanol</td>
<td>CRBSI I: 4/242 C: 10/239 Catheter colonization I: 28/242 C: 35/239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humar et al14</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Adult patients from ICUs (n = 242)</td>
<td>I: 0.5% chlorhexidine-aqueous; C: 10% povidone iodine</td>
<td>CRBSI I: 4/125 C: 4/117 Catheter colonization I: 34/125 C: 40/117 Bloodstream infections without a clear source I: 22/125 C: 13/117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimoz et al15</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Adult patients from ICUs (n = 315)</td>
<td>I: 0.25% chlorhexidine, 0.025% benzalkonium chloride, and 4% benzylic alcohol C: 5% povidone-iodine in 70% ethanol</td>
<td>CRBSI I: 3/170 C: 3/145 Catheter colonization I: 12/170 C: 24/145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meffre et al16</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Adult patients from any unit in the hospital (n = 1117)</td>
<td>I: 0.5% chlorhexidine in alcohol C: 10% povidone iodine</td>
<td>CRBSI I: 3/568 C: 3/549 Catheter colonization I: 9/568 C: 22/549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheehan et al17</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Adult patients from ICUs (n = 346)</td>
<td>I: 2% chlorhexidine-aqueous; C: 10% povidone iodine</td>
<td>CRBSI I: 1/169 C: 1/177 Catheter colonization I: 3/169 C: 14/177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maki et al18</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Adult patients from ICUs (n = 441)</td>
<td>I: 2% chlorhexidine-aqueous; C: 10% povidone iodine</td>
<td>CRBSI I: 1/214 C: 6/227 Catheter colonization I: 5/214 C: 6/227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C, control; CRBSI, catheter-related bloodstream infection; I, intervention; RCT, randomized controlled trial; ICUs, intensive care units.
heterogeneity of the study was evaluated by $\chi^2$ and $I^2$ tests. If the study had statistical heterogeneity ($I^2 \geq 50\%; P \leq .10$), we used a random-effects model. In contrast, if $I^2 < 50\%$ and $P > .10$, then a fixed-effects model was used. Because of differences in the disinfectant ingredients, we conducted some subgroup analyses. We also conducted sensitivity analyses for some comparisons.

RESULTS

Study selection and characteristics

We first retrieved 2085 articles from various databases. Excluding duplicate articles reduced that number to 1548 articles, and, after screening based on inclusion and exclusion criteria, we finally narrowed our focus to 10 RCT articles (Fig 1).9-18 Table 1 shows the characteristics of the included studies; the 10 trials involved a total of 7026 catheters.

Assessment of risk of bias in included studies

In general, there was wide variation in the risk of bias for the included studies. With the exception of the 2015 study by Mimoz et al,18 the studies were assessed to be at high risk for performance bias. Only the 1991 study by Maki et al18 had a high risk of bias in random sequence generation; the others were judged to be at low risk. The risks of bias for the studies are shown in Figure 2.

Outcomes

First, we comprehensively analyzed the effects of chlorhexidine and povidone solutions in CVCs. Second, we divided the included studies into 3 subgroups for comparison according to the composition of the disinfectant: (1) chlorhexidine in aqueous solution vs povidone in aqueous solution; (2) chlorhexidine in alcohol solution vs povidone in aqueous solution; and (3) chlorhexidine in alcohol solution vs povidone in alcohol solution. We performed a subgroup analysis of each observation (CRBSI, catheter colonization, skin reaction, and BSIs without a clear source).

Catheter-related bloodstream infections

We conducted a comprehensive analysis of 9 articles that involved 6029 catheters. Before subgroup analysis, the analysis showed no clear difference in the rates of CRBSI ($P = .08; I^2 = 43\%; RR = 0.47; 95\% CI, 0.26-0.85$). When we conducted some subgroup analyses according to the various disinfectant ingredients, the results indicated that chlorhexidine was significantly better than povidone ($P = .12; I^2 = 36\%; RR = 0.49; 95\% CI, 0.29-0.85$) (Fig 3). There were no significant differences in the comparisons of chlorhexidine in aqueous solution vs povidone in aqueous solution (RR = 0.64; 95\% CI, 0.26-1.58) or chlorhexidine in alcohol solution vs povidone in aqueous solution (RR = 0.74; 95\% CI, 0.39-1.39). However, the risk for CRBSIs was significantly lower for chlorhexidine-alcohol than povidone-alcohol (RR = 0.23; 95\% CI, 0.09-0.57). We analyzed the published bias according to the funnel plot and found that the bias had a greater impact (Fig 4).

Catheter colonization

We conducted a comprehensive analysis of 8 articles involving 4352 catheters. Chlorhexidine showed a significant advantage for reducing catheter colonization compared to povidone ($P = .22; I^2 = 25\%; RR = 0.54; 95\% CI, 0.45-0.65$). The heterogeneity of the research was acceptable. After conducting subgroup analysis, we found that chlorhexidine performed significantly better than povidone ($P = .16; I^2 = 32\%; RR = 0.54; 95\% CI, 0.42-0.69$) (Fig 5). Analyses of subgroups showed that any solution of chlorhexidine was associated with a lower rate of catheter colonization than any solution of povidone: (1) chlorhexidine in aqueous solution vs povidone in aqueous solution ($RR = 0.42; 95\% CI, 0.23-0.76$); (2) chlorhexidine in alcohol solution vs povidone in aqueous solution ($RR = 0.60; 95\% CI, 0.44-0.83$); or (3) chlorhexidine in alcohol solution vs povidone in alcohol solution ($RR = 0.52; 95\% CI, 0.34-0.80$). The results of the subgroup analysis indicated a reduction in the rate of catheter colonization in chlorhexidine compared with povidone. We analyzed the published bias based on the funnel plot and found that the bias had a greater impact (Fig 6).

Skin reactions

Two studies reported the occurrence of skin reactions. Before subgroup analysis, meta-analyses showed no clear difference in the rates of skin reaction for chlorhexidine compared to povidone ($P = .006; I^2 = 87\%; RR = 1.92; 95\% CI, 0.55-6.72$). The clinical heterogeneity was large. After grouping according to the composition of the disinfectant,
Table 1. Risk ratios of catheter-related bloodstream infections for chlorhexidine vs povidone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Experimental Events</th>
<th>Control Events</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Risk Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Chlorhexidine in aqueous vs povidone in aqueous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Chlorhexidine in alcohol vs povidone in aqueous</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Chlorhexidine in alcohol vs povidone in alcohol</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Forest plot of catheter-related bloodstream infections for chlorhexidine vs povidone. M-H, Mantel-Haenszel; CI, confidence interval.

Figure 4. Funnel plot of catheter-related bloodstream infections for chlorhexidine vs povidone. SE, standard error; RR, risk ratio.
Figure 5. Forest plot of catheter colonization for chlorhexidine vs povidone. M-H, Mantel-Haenszel; CI, confidence interval.

Figure 6. Funnel plot of catheter colonization for chlorhexidine vs povidone. SE, standard error; RR, risk ratio.
the result also showed no clear difference ($P = .02; I^2 = 73\%; RR = 1.54; 95\% CI, 0.76-3.13$) (Fig 7). Analyses according to the 3 subgroups showed no clear differences in the rates of skin reaction for chlorhexidine in aqueous solution vs povidone in aqueous solution ($RR = 1.07; 95\% CI, 0.62-1.87$) or chlorhexidine in alcohol solution vs povidone in aqueous solution ($RR = 1.09; 95\% CI, 0.63-1.88$). Analysis showed that chlorhexidine in alcohol solution was associated with a higher rate of skin reaction than povidone in alcohol ($RR = 3.81; 95\% CI, 1.67-8.73$).

**Bloodstream infections without a clear source**

The single article\(^{14}\) included in our analysis involved 35 catheters. Analyses showed no clear difference in the rates of this outcome between chlorhexidine in aqueous solution and povidone in aqueous solution ($RR = 1.58; 95\% CI, 0.84-3.00$) (Fig 8). Because the sample size of this study was very small, the comparison was underpowered and evidence insufficient.

**Limitations of the review studies**

First, the number of studies included was small, and some studies did not specify the occurrence of outcomes in each site; therefore, we were unable to perform further subgroup analyses of each site. Second, due to insufficient data, we did not conduct further analysis on the concentration of these disinfectants. Third, several studies had an unclear risk of bias due to insufficient allocation information, so there may be some selection bias. Fourth, we included only Chinese and
English articles, so there may be a language bias. More RCT studies are necessary to confirm and update our conclusions.

CONCLUSIONS

This review compared the application of chlorhexidine or povidone in the maintenance of CVCs. In our analyses, we not only comprehensively compared the 2 types of disinfectants but also divided the included studies into 3 subgroups for comparison according to the composition of the disinfectant. In general, the findings of this review are broadly in line with other reviews.19-20 all of which reported that a chlorhexidine solution was better than a povidone solution for CVC care. However, we cannot be certain whether each disinfectant was combined with alcohol or an aqueous solution, the latter of which was found to be better. We need more evidence.

The heterogeneity of the research on CRBSIs was acceptable. There was a significantly lower risk of CRBSIs in chlorhexidine in alcohol solution than for povidone in alcohol solution. Although the relevant articles included only the subgroups of chlorhexidine-alcohol vs povidone-alcohol, the number of catheters included in each group was acceptable. With regard to catheter colonization, chlorhexidine in any solution performed better than povidone in any solution. Chlorhexidine is a potent broad-spectrum germicide that is popular because its antimicrobial activity can persist longer than that of other agents. In recent years, reports on skin reactions caused by chlorhexidine have gradually increased,19,20 all of which reported that a chlorhexidine solution was better than a povidone solution for CVC care. However, we cannot be certain whether each disinfectant was combined with alcohol or an aqueous solution, the latter of which was found to be better. We need more evidence.
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