

# Intraluminal pressure in central venous hemodialysis catheters during power injection of contrast media

Nicholas A White, MSc<sup>1,2</sup>

[n.a.white@lumc.nl](mailto:n.a.white@lumc.nl)

Aart J van der Molen, MD<sup>3</sup>

[a.j.van\\_der\\_molen@lumc.nl](mailto:a.j.van_der_molen@lumc.nl)

Ronald W A L Limpens, MSc<sup>4</sup>

[r.w.a.l.limpens@lumc.nl](mailto:r.w.a.l.limpens@lumc.nl)

Jacinta J Maas, MD, PhD<sup>5</sup>

[j.i.maas@lumc.nl](mailto:j.i.maas@lumc.nl)

Koen E A van der Bogt, MD, PhD<sup>6,7</sup>

[vanderbogat@lumc.nl](mailto:vanderbogat@lumc.nl)

Tim Horeman, PhD<sup>1\*</sup>

[t.horeman@tudelft.nl](mailto:t.horeman@tudelft.nl)

Joris I Rotmans, MD, PhD<sup>2\*</sup>

[j.i.rotmans@lumc.nl](mailto:j.i.rotmans@lumc.nl)

\*Both senior author on this work

<sup>1</sup>Department of BioMechanical Engineering, Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands

<sup>2</sup>Department of Internal Medicine, Leiden University Medical Centre, Leiden, The Netherlands

<sup>3</sup>Department of Radiology, Leiden University Medical Centre, Leiden, The Netherlands

<sup>4</sup>Department of Cell and Chemical Biology, Leiden University Medical Center, The Netherlands

<sup>5</sup>Department of Intensive Care, Leiden University Medical Center, The Netherlands

<sup>6</sup>Department of Surgery, Leiden University Medical Center, The Netherlands

<sup>7</sup>University Vascular Centre West, Leiden | The Hague | Delft, The Netherlands

**Short title:** Hemodialysis catheter contrast media injection

**Corresponding Author:** Joris Rotmans

Email: [J.I.Rotmans@lumc.nl](mailto:J.I.Rotmans@lumc.nl)

Leiden University Medical Centre

Department of Internal Medicine

Albinusdreef 2, 2333 ZA, Leiden, The Netherlands

**NOTE:** This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.  
Word count: 5976

## 1 Abstract

### 2 Background

3 Central venous catheters (CVCs) provide direct access to the central circulatory system,  
4 commonly used in hemodialysis and intensive care units for drug administration. Although  
5 uncertified for the procedure, CVCs are sometimes used for power injection of contrast  
6 medium (CM) during CT scans to avoid peripheral intravenous catheter placement. Previous  
7 studies suggest this practice is safe, but incidents have been reported. This study aims to  
8 measure intraluminal pressure during CM injection through CVCs and assess its impact on the  
9 luminal surface to guide responsible clinical use.

### 10 Methods

11 Strain gauges were applied to the exterior walls of four samples from three different types of  
12 unused CVCs. These gauges measured material deformation due to intraluminal pressure  
13 during CM injections at rates of 4.5 mL/s and 8 mL/s, each performed five times. Strain data  
14 were calibrated against known pressures in a static system. The CVCs were then either  
15 pressurized until bursting or subjected to microscopic analysis of their luminal surfaces.

### 16 Results

17 Intraluminal pressures measured (97-545 kPa or 14-79 PSI) were below the burst pressure  
18 (779-1248 Kpa or 113-181 PSI) in all instances. Strain regression analysis shows a statistically  
19 significant ( $p < 0.05$ ) trend over 10 injections in almost all CVCs tested, indicating material  
20 fatigue. Surface microscopy revealed surface micro-cracks from repeated injections,  
21 suggesting material damage.

### 22 Conclusions

23 The intraluminal pressures from power injections of CM are sufficiently low to prevent CVC  
24 bursting. While incidental use for CM injection appears safe, repeated use may cause material  
25 damage

- 26 List of abbreviations
- 27 CM = contrast medium/media
- 28 CVC = central venous catheter

## 29 Introduction

30 Hemodialysis patients frequently utilize a central venous catheter (CVC) as vascular access to  
31 transport blood to and from the dialysis. Similar CVCs may also be used for administration of  
32 drugs to patients in intensive care units. For diagnostic purposes, these patients may need  
33 computed tomography (CT) scan with radiopaque contrast medium (CM). Bolus intravenous  
34 injection of CM using a power (pressure) injector is the preferred method for CM  
35 administration for CT examinations of the neck, chest, and abdomen.<sup>1,2</sup> This is usually  
36 achieved by placing an intravenous needle into a peripheral vein in the forearm. However,  
37 hemodialysis patients often have poor peripheral veins, necessitating preservation for future  
38 arteriovenous access surgery. Despite studies indicating safe pressure levels for CVCs, even  
39 non-hemodialysis CVCs with smaller diameters,<sup>3-9</sup> concerns remain about catheter-related  
40 complications due to high pressures, with several incidents of rupture and dislocation  
41 reported.<sup>10-12</sup>

42 CVCs are regulated under the European Medical Device Regulation in the EU,<sup>13</sup> and similar  
43 bodies elsewhere, like the FDA in the United States.<sup>14</sup> Manufacturers of medical devices only  
44 receive market approval for their products when the relevant requirements for performance  
45 and safety have been met.<sup>13</sup> These requirements relate only to the intended use of the device,  
46 as specified by the manufacturer. Expanding use cases significantly increases the evidence  
47 required for approval, leading manufacturers to limit intended uses due to associated costs.  
48 This restriction is detailed in the device's Instructions for Use, and off-label use shifts liability  
49 from the manufacturer to the healthcare professional.

50 Most standard CVCs are not certified for CM injection<sup>15</sup> which can cause hesitance in  
51 administering CM through these devices. While successful use has been reported  
52 widespread,<sup>15-17</sup> the high viscosity of CM causes an intraluminal pressure that is higher than,  
53 e.g., saline or blood, especially at high flow-rates. Manufacturers can claim that the CVCs are  
54 not rated for this elevated pressure as it may cause damage to the luminal surface of the CVC.  
55 While typical CM flow velocities are around 3-6 mL/s,<sup>18-20</sup> in vitro measurements showed  
56 rupture does not occur even with much higher flows.<sup>5</sup> In clinical use, pressures in the power  
57 injector are limited to maximum of 2000-2250 Kpa (300-325 PSI). Clinical guidelines for CM  
58 injection through CVCs are rare.<sup>21</sup>

59 Although power injectors can usually record the pressure applied to administer CM, it cannot  
60 be claimed that this pressure is constant throughout a dynamic, flowing system. Indeed, there  
61 must be a pressure gradient for fluids to flow from the power injector to the venous  
62 circulation of the patient. The difference in pressure depends on many variables, including  
63 viscosity, flow velocity, friction of the tube surface, and geometry. While this means the pump  
64 pressure overestimates the pressure downstream, (e.g., in a CVC), the non-uniform geometry  
65 of CVCs could cause local increases in pressure and wall stress. It is crucial that pressure is  
66 measured at the correct location to obtain the most accurate data on intraluminal pressure  
67 in CVCs when used for CM injection to properly assess safety.

68 Pressure transducers in a flow circuit interfere with the flow, often requiring a three-way  
69 connection that introduces static fluid dead space. This dead space can impede accurate  
70 pressure measurement due to its lack of direct pressure response to fluid flow and the flow  
71 distortions it introduces. In systems with rapidly changing flow rates, dead space can dampen  
72 fluid oscillations and distort pressure readings, contributing to significant pressure  
73 measurement differences in previous studies (14-483 kPa (2-70 PSI) at 4.5 mL/s with similar  
74 catheters).<sup>3,4,7,9</sup>

75 As a non-invasive method to measure pressure without the intrinsic drawbacks of pressure  
76 transducers, strain gauges may pose a solution. These contain thin pieces of wire that can be  
77 stuck onto a surface that measure deformation, or strain, which can be directly related to  
78 intraluminal pressure. Additionally, strain gauges are typically used to determine material  
79 wear and fatigue over time. As such, they may provide information relating to such effects  
80 occurring in the CVC material with CM injection.

81 The present study aims to equip healthcare professionals with the knowledge required to  
82 make informed decisions regarding the usage of commonly used CVCs for power injection of  
83 CM by presenting a comprehensive study of intraluminal pressure during injection, material  
84 fatigue, bursting pressures, and surface analysis.

## 85 Materials and methods

### 86 Experimental setup

87 The CVCs are tested by repeated injection of CM and recording the response with the strain  
88 gauge. The strain gauges are then calibrated with a pressure transducer in a closed system  
89 with static pressure in which pressure is equal everywhere and in all directions. Calibration is  
90 performed after the CM injection; the pressure necessary to properly calibrate the sensors  
91 must exceed the pressure induced by the CM, and therefore may damage the CVCs and distort  
92 the pressure recordings if performed prior to the power injections. Finally, the CVCs are either  
93 burst or dissected for microscopic surface analysis. The experimental setup is displayed in  
94 Figure 1.

95 The working principle of a strain gauge is shown in Figure 2. Deformation of the material on  
96 to which the gauges are placed results in deformation of the thin wires. This in turn results in  
97 a change in resistance which can be accurately measured. Materials deform predictably when  
98 stress is applied. Intraluminal pressure introduces such stresses in the wall of the CVCs, so  
99 strain gauges may be utilized to measure this deformation. The strain can thus be related to  
100 an intraluminal pressure when calibrated with a pressure transducer in a static closed system.  
101 Additionally, such strain gauges are typically used to determine material wear and fatigue  
102 over time. As such, they may provide information relating to such effects occurring in the CVC  
103 material with CM injection.

104 A GFLAB-3-70 Low Elastic Strain Gauge (Tokyo Measuring Instruments Laboratory Co., Tokyo,  
105 Japan) was placed on the proximal side of the proximal lumen of each CVC and fastened with  
106 cyanoacrylate adhesive. As the geometry of the lumen remains more or less the same  
107 between the inlet and outlet and fluid flows from high to low pressure, pressure should be  
108 highest at this point in the CVC. The strain gauge was placed in a Wheatstone bridge to amplify  
109 the voltage change and correct the signal for effects such as temperature change. The gauges  
110 in the bridge were thus placed on a surplus CVC of the same material. When pressure was  
111 applied to the CVC, the resistance of the strain gauge changed, resulting in a change in voltage  
112 over the bridge. This voltage signal was further amplified by a CPJ Strain Gauge Conditioner  
113 (Scaime, Juvigny, France) and read in LabVIEW through a NI MyDAQ (National Instruments,

114 Austin, TX, USA). Each tested CVC sample was fixated at two points (Figure 1a) to ensure no  
115 deformation of the catheter occurs, other than induced by pressure.

116 The distal lumen of each CVC was connected to a FlowSens<sup>®</sup> syringeless soft bag CM injector  
117 (Guerbet, Paris, France) with standard consumable tubing and with a PU5405 pressure  
118 transducer (ifm GmbH, Essen, Germany) fastened with a three-way stopcock just proximal to  
119 the CVC connector. The system was flushed with saline and primed so that there was CM  
120 iobitridol 350 mg/ml (Xenetix, Guerbet, Paris, France) in the CVC prior to starting  
121 measurements. The test setup and all fluids used were operated at room temperature as  
122 strain gauges are sensitive to temperature changes. The heating element in the power  
123 injector was switched off. Because viscosity decreases with temperature which increases  
124 necessary pressures, this represents a worst-case scenario in which the fluid is not heated to  
125 body temperature prior to administration. The CM exiting the tip of the CVC was collected in  
126 a vial and reused by feeding it back into the power injector bag.

127 Central venous catheters

128 4 samples each of 3 different types of new, unused CVCs were collected and tested:

- 129 - 13F, 250mm GamCath Dolphin Protect High Flow Double Lumen straight catheter  
130 (Baxter, Deerfield, IL, USA)
- 131 - 13F, 250mm GamCath High Flow Triple Lumen straight catheter (Baxter, Deerfield, IL,  
132 USA)
- 133 - 15.5F, 200mm Jet Medical Short-Term Free Flow pre-curved catheter (Jet Medical SA,  
134 La Chaux-de-Fonds, Switzerland)

135 Flow measurement

136 First, 50 mL of CM was injected into each CVC at 4.5 mL/s over 11 seconds,<sup>22</sup> and both the  
137 pressure transducer and strain gauge values were recorded. Due to the viscoelasticity (i.e.,  
138 non-direct strain response to applying or removing pressure similar to dampening) of the  
139 material, a 5 minute resting time is needed prior to commencing the next measurement. This  
140 process was repeated 5 times. Next, 90 mL was injected at 8 mL/s over 11 seconds,  
141 corresponding to the protocol with the highest flow rate used in our center. The same 5-  
142 minute resting time was applied, for 5 measurements. The maximum pressure in the power  
143 injector was also recorded. For half the samples of each type of CVC, the protocol was

144 reversed to 5 times 8 mL/s injection, and then 5 times 4.5 mL/s injection. Finally, the CVCs  
145 were flushed with saline.

146 Pre-curved CVCs

147 The pre-curved CVC do not have the same “double-D” cross section, but an inner (distal) and  
148 outer (proximal) lumen (Figure 2a). A strain gauge could not be directly applied to the wall of  
149 the distal lumen. The gauges were fixed on the wall of the proximal lumen and measurements  
150 were conducted through this lumen. However, for 3 of the 4 samples, injection with the  
151 power injector was repeated with both lumina and maximum injection pressure was recorded  
152 for both to assess for similarity. The inner lumen in the remaining sample was spared for  
153 microscopic surface analysis.

154 Sensor calibration and data processing

155 After completing the flow measurements, the tip of each catheter was clamped and the  
156 power injector was disconnected. A syringe filled with room temperature water and a screw  
157 feeder was connected to the three-way stopcock to create a closed and static system. The  
158 strain gauge was calibrated by gradually increasing the pressure to ~800 kPa (~120 PSI) over  
159 2 minutes and recording the strain gauge voltage together with the known static pressure.  
160 When 120 PSI was reached, recording was stopped and pressure was released. This process  
161 was repeated 3 times for each catheter. This data was processed in MATLAB (MathWorks,  
162 Natick, Massachusetts), in which the calibration data was zero-shifted, and a 3<sup>rd</sup>-order  
163 polynomial was fitted. The maximum intraluminal pressure of each measurement was  
164 determined by inserting the zero-shifted maximum gauge value into the curve fit of the  
165 respective CVC. Maximum pressures were pooled per injection velocity in each CVC type. To  
166 assess material fatigue (permanent strain) and damage of the CVC material after CM injection,  
167 the resting voltages were recorded of the strain gauge after the 5-minute relaxation period  
168 of each measurement for each individual catheter. Linear regression applied was applied to  
169 these values to assess for a non-zero linear coefficient with 95% confidence.

170 Burst pressure test

171 Three samples each of the 3 different CVC types were connected to a high-pressure manual  
172 bicycle pump with a calibrated Gems 3300 1600 kPa pressure transducer (Gems, Plainville,  
173 CT, USA) fastened through a three-way stopcock just proximal to the CVC connector. The



174 catheter was filled with room temperature water and tip was sealed shut with a medical  
175 clamp. Pressure was manually increased until burst was recorded as a sharp decrease in the  
176 pressure transducer reading and an audible bang.

177 Microscopic analysis

178 The CVCs that were not burst were dissected. Surface samples from the proximal and distal  
179 ends of the lumina subjected to power injection of CM were collected, sectioned and  
180 prepared for microscopy. Samples were mounted on Scanning Electron Microscopy stubs with  
181 double sides carbon stickers. Samples from the unused, proximal lumina of the same CVCs  
182 were also taken to act as control. Before imaging, all samples were sputter-coated with a layer  
183 of Gold/Palladium Images and were recorded in a GeminiSEM 300 Scanning Electron  
184 Microscope (Zeiss, Oberkochen Germany), operated at 5 kV.

## 185 Results

186 Calibration

187 All CVCs were successfully tested and calibrated. A 3<sup>rd</sup>-order polynomial curve was fitted to  
188 the calibration data of each CVC, and these curves were used to determine the intraluminal  
189 pressure during CM injection. As an example, Figure 3a shows the calibration data, curve fit  
190 and 95% confidence bounds of this fit in of a double lumen CVC tested. The complete set of  
191 calibration figures can be found in Supplemental Figures S1-S3.

192 Power injection of contrast medium

193 Figures 3b-d display the pump pressures, intraluminal strain gauge pressures (determined  
194 with the fitted calibration curves), pressure transducer values at injection velocities 4.5 mL/s  
195 and 8 mL/s, and the lowest recorded burst pressures of the 3 different CVC types.

196 Material fatigue

197 Material fatigue, or permanent strain of the CVC, is assessed for each sample tested. Linear  
198 regression is applied to the strain gauge voltage at rest, which corresponds to the material  
199 strain at rest and fatigue. The linear regression coefficients are non-zero ( $p < 0.05$ ) in every  
200 CVC tested, except CVC sample 2 (double lumen,  $p = 0.53$ ). As an example, Figure 4 displays  
201 the raw strain gauge data of the first CVC measured together with the linear regression  
202 analysis performed on the resting voltages of this CVC. Figure 5 displays the linear regression

203 analysis of CVC sample 2, the only sample in which the linear regression coefficient was not  
204 significantly non-zero. The complete set of linear regression analyses is found in Supplemental  
205 Figures S4-S6.

206 Burst pressure

207 All CVCs failed at one of the locations displayed in Figure 6 during burst pressure  
208 measurement. Burst pressures and the failure location at burst pressure are also recorded in  
209 Table 1.

210 Microscopic surface analysis

211 The microscopic surface analysis of the 3 CVCs examined is depicted in Figure 7. Figures 7a  
212 shows the unused lumen, and Figure 7b the proximal part of the tested lumen of the double  
213 lumen catheter. Magnification has been chosen to best illustrate the differences in the  
214 surface in each CVC. The unused and tested lumen of the triple lumen CVC are shown in  
215 Figures 7c and 7d, respectively. Finally, Figures 7e and 7f display the unused and tested  
216 lumina, respectively, of the pre-curved CVC. With the unused lumina as control, the pictures  
217 of the tested lumina show an increase in size and density of micro-cracks in the double and  
218 triple lumen CVCs. These micro-cracks present themselves as clear black lines in the  
219 microscopy images. However, this contrast is less apparent in the pre-curved CVC.

220 Discussion

221 In this study it was observed that intraluminal pressures during power injection of CM remain  
222 well below burst pressure. By using strain gauges and a pressure transducer in the flow circuit,  
223 the hypothesis could be supported that strain gauges provide a more accurate measurement  
224 of intraluminal pressure. Moreover, the strain gauge measurements suggest material fatigue  
225 and damage can occur to the CVCs with repeated use. Surface analysis of the CVCs was  
226 performed to assess microscopic damage to the material, in which a greater incidence of  
227 micro-cracks was noticed after testing. This data can guide healthcare professionals in  
228 responsible use of CVCs for power injection of CM.

229 The measured pressure data is in line with other experiments in literature in showing that the  
230 intraluminal pressure always remained sufficiently low.<sup>3-8</sup> Bursting pressures are also  
231 comparable.<sup>3,8</sup> The CM injector pressure was higher than the intraluminal pressure, which is

232 necessary to overcome the frictional losses in the tubing and CVCs. A pressure gradient is  
233 required for a fluid to flow. However, the pump pressure also remained below the bursting  
234 pressure in instances with 4.5 mL/s injection, and most instances with 8mL/s. The relatively  
235 large variation in injector pressure, with several outliers may be explained by the pump  
236 exerting an increased pressure on the fluid bag when almost empty, which was a constant  
237 trend. The intraluminal pressures also show a large variation in values. This may for a large  
238 part be explained by the sensitivity of the gauges to environmental factors, measurement  
239 errors and the additional step of calibrating the values with a fitted curve. Regardless, they  
240 always remained below the burst pressure and pump pressure.

241 The intraluminal pressures in the different types of CVCs show some discrepancy. Although  
242 pump pressures were quite similar throughout the measurements, the lumina of the types of  
243 catheters have dissimilar cross-sections. Due to the shape and larger diameter of the pre-  
244 curved CVCs, the tested lumen in this CVC type has the greatest cross-sectional area, which  
245 in the measurements corresponds to the lowest intraluminal pressures. Contrarily, the  
246 highest intraluminal pressures were found in the triple lumen CVCs, which have the smallest  
247 cross-sectional area as a result of the extra lumen. Despite the geometrical differences  
248 between the lumina of the pre-curved CVCs, the pump pressures were similar through both  
249 when injecting at the same velocity. This suggests intraluminal pressures are also similar  
250 through each lumen.

251 Although the CM injector exerted a significantly greater pressure for an 8 mL/s injection  
252 compared to 4.5 mL/s, the intraluminal pressures in the strain gauges appear very similar. An  
253 explanation could lie in the frictional losses of the fluid flowing through a substantial length  
254 of tubing before entering the CVC. Frictional losses are greater with a higher velocity, and due  
255 to the small diameter of the tubing and high viscosity of the CM, it can be expected that the  
256 losses contribute considerably to pressure losses. Additionally, the three-way stopcock  
257 present in the flow circuit may have introduced more turbulence in the flow which could have  
258 resulted in a slight drop in pressure and affected the measurements downstream.

259 The laws of fluid mechanics state that the pressure transducer should measure a greater  
260 pressure than the strain gauges, as it is placed further upstream. Therefore, it is an interesting  
261 finding that the pressure measured by the pressure transducer during the injections is  
262 noticeably lower than the intraluminal pressure as measured by the strain gauges. An

263 explanation may lie in geometrical conditions. Pressure transducers placed into a flow circuit  
264 inevitably interfere with the flow itself, as most often, a three-way connection is placed to  
265 connect the transducer that introduces dead space in which fluid is static. These stagnant  
266 zones act as reservoirs of pressure, exerting localized effects that can distort the overall  
267 pressure profile in such locations. Turbulent eddies may form in regions of abrupt flow  
268 constriction or expansion, causing fluctuations in pressure and velocity. In systems with  
269 rapidly changing flow rates, the presence of dead space can thus impede the propagation of  
270 pressure waves and dampen fluid oscillations, leading to distorted pressure transducer  
271 readings.<sup>23</sup> This dead space will thus not always show a direct pressure response to fluidic  
272 flow, which impedes accuracy of the measurement. These phenomena may contribute to the  
273 rather large differences in measured pressures throughout previous in vitro studies (2-70 PSI  
274 at 4.5 mL/s velocities with similar catheters).<sup>3,4,7,9</sup> As the strain gauges do not interfere with  
275 the flow and they measure pressure directly at the location of interest, the pressures they  
276 measured are more likely to be valid.

277 Repetitive CM injections revealed a gradual increase in strain throughout the measurements.  
278 The fatigue analysis of the strain values implies that material damage accumulates  
279 throughout the repeated measurements. Consistency in peak amplitudes suggests that the  
280 adhesive interface between the strain gauge and CVC remained intact. In all CVCs, except one,  
281 this coefficient is statistically significant. In CVC sample 2 the non-significant coefficient  
282 appears to result from the last 2 measurements having a far higher resting voltage. This likely  
283 occurred through accidental interference with the CVC during testing. Moving the CVC can  
284 result in small changes in deformation which are also registered due to the high sensitivity of  
285 strain gauges.

286 The fatigue measured in the CVCs over the power injections recorded by the strain gauges is  
287 further supported by the microscopic surface analysis. The microscopy shows an increase in  
288 size and density of micro-cracks between the unused and tested luminal surfaces in the  
289 double and triple lumen CVCs. These cracks seem to propagate along what appear to be small  
290 pores in the material. Propagation is likely induced by the pressure of the CM injection.  
291 Electron microscopy in literature of similar dialysis CVCs exposed to normal use and explanted  
292 from patients do not show such clear micro-cracks.<sup>24,25</sup> This upholds the notion that the high  
293 pressure and viscosity of the CM can cause permanent damage to the CVC surfaces. In the

294 pre-curved CVCs, no such phenomenon is clearly visible. This could be due to the intraluminal  
295 pressures in the pre-curved CVCs being lower, but the material itself also appears smoother.

296 As the CVC material appears to stretch after CM injection, permanent stretching and offset  
297 may have occurred prior to calibration. The validity of calibration data can thus be questioned.  
298 Although most regression coefficients are significantly non-zero, the actual changes in resting  
299 voltage are relatively small compared to the height of the voltage peaks. Moreover, the  
300 heights of the voltage peaks (maximum value minus resting voltage) remain fairly constant  
301 throughout the 5 measurements at the different injection velocities in all CVCs. The effects  
302 on the determined intraluminal pressure values are therefore expected to be limited.

303 These data suggest that intraluminal pressure values during CM injection are sufficiently low  
304 as to not cause rupture of the CVCs included in our study. Failure of the CVCs at bursting  
305 pressure always occurred at the inlet, which in clinical use will remain outside the body.  
306 However, the stretching of the material and increase in micro-crack size and density  
307 suggested damage accumulates with repeated CM injection. The micro-cracks may increase  
308 risks of thrombus formation in the CVC but remains to be studied. With the velocities tested,  
309 incidental use likely carries little risk, especially with relatively new CVCs that have not yet  
310 been frequently subjected to intraluminal pressure. However, these medical devices remain  
311 uncertified for this use case. Therefore, caution must be taken and caretakers must  
312 understand that liability is shifted away from the manufacturer when using such CVCs for CM  
313 injection. Clinical use of CVCs for this purpose has previously been shown to be safe and  
314 effective, provided adequate protocols are in place.<sup>16</sup> For example, a sufficiently safe  
315 maximum pressure should be placed on the injector. If a blockage would be present in the  
316 CVC preventing flow, the injector pressure would equate to the intraluminal pressure in the  
317 CVC, which could cause damage or even rupture.

318 This study has several limitations. Firstly, intraluminal pressures were measured in an in vitro  
319 setup, in which conditions present in the human body are not fully simulated. The CVCs were  
320 not maintained at body temperature. Testing at body temperature could have increased  
321 flexibility of the material to some extent. Contrarily, fibrous tissue tends to form on the  
322 exterior of the catheters when placed in the body, which can increase rigidity and therefore  
323 intraluminal pressure. Venous pressure at the tip was not present, which may have increased  
324 intraluminal pressure. However, venous pressure is typically far lower than the pressures

325 measured in the system. Moreover, intraluminal pressure is only measured at one location in  
326 the catheters. Although pressure close to the inlet is expected to be highest, it does not fully  
327 examine the pressure and stress profile throughout the entire CVC and therefore does not  
328 consider any stress or pressure concentrations that could occur. Additionally, the CM was at  
329 a lower temperature than typically used when injecting into the body. The viscosity will  
330 therefore have been higher, and the resulting pressures likely overestimated. Any changes in  
331 fluid composition due to evaporation during reuse of the fluid are not considered. Moreover,  
332 the fatigue analysis suggests that stretching of and damage to the material occurs after  
333 repeated use. However, it is not known how the material fatigue relates to the strength of  
334 the material, and to which extent safe use may be maintained. This should receive attention  
335 in future studies. Finally, the CVCs are not subjected to normal clinical handling. Human  
336 factors like bending, pushing and pulling during placement may have a significant effect on  
337 the material integrity.

## 338 Conclusion

339 This study aimed equip healthcare professionals with the knowledge for responsible  
340 administration of CM injection for angiography through CVCs. Healthcare professionals must  
341 understand that liability shifts away from the manufacturer if such a device is not certified for  
342 this use case. Strain gauges allowed intraluminal pressure measurements at the location of  
343 interest as well as an estimation of stretch that the intraluminal pressure induces.  
344 Intraluminal pressures during CM injection remained below bursting pressure in all instances,  
345 but permanent stretch of the material was recorded. Microscopic surface analysis revealed  
346 an increase in micro-crack size and density in the material after repeated use with high  
347 intraluminal pressures. These findings suggest that incidental use of CVCs for CM injection  
348 does not directly cause issues, but damage may accumulate if CM injections are done  
349 repetitively. Caution must therefore always be taken, especially after repeated use.

## 350 Acknowledgments

351 The authors would like to express their gratitude to J. Brenkman of the TU Delft for assisting  
352 in the assembly of the strain gauge test setup. They also thank R.I. de Koning of the LUMC for  
353 his help with the electron microscopy.

354 Sources of Funding

355 This research received financial support from the departments of Internal Medicine,  
356 Radiology, Intensive Care and Cell and Chemical Biology of the Leiden University Medical  
357 Center, the department of BioMechanical Engineering of Delft University of Technology, and  
358 the Delft Health Initiative.

359 Disclosures

360 None

361 Supplemental Materials

362 Figures S1-S6

363 References

- 364 1. Contrast Media Safety Committee. ESUR Guidelines on Contrast Agents v10.0 [Internet].  
365 European Society of Urogenital Radiology. 2018. 0–45 p. Available from:  
366 [http://www.esur.org/fileadmin/content/2019/ESUR\\_Guidelines\\_10.0\\_Final\\_Version.pdf](http://www.esur.org/fileadmin/content/2019/ESUR_Guidelines_10.0_Final_Version.pdf)
- 367 2. Davenport, Matthew S.Daniella AJC e. al. ACR Manual On Contrast Media 2020 ACR  
368 Committee on Drugs and Contrast Media. Stanford Protocol. 2023. 131 p.
- 369 3. Beckingham T, Roberts A, St. John A, O’Callaghan G. Bursting pressure of triple-lumen central  
370 venous catheters under static and dynamic loads. J Vasc Access [Internet]. 2017;18(5):430–5.  
371 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.5301/jva.5000776>
- 372 4. Macha DB, Nelson RC, Howle LE, Hollingsworth JW, Schindera ST. Central venous catheter  
373 integrity during mechanical power injection of iodinated contrast medium. Radiology.  
374 2009;253(3):870–8.
- 375 5. Zamos DT, Emch TM, Patton HA, D’Amico FJ, Bansal SK. Injection Rate Threshold of Triple-  
376 Lumen Central Venous Catheters: An In Vitro Study. Acad Radiol. 2007;14(5):574–8.
- 377 6. Herts R, Cohen MAH, Zepp C, Einstein M. Power Injection of Intravenous Contrast Material  
378 through Central Venous Catheters for CT: In Vitro Evaluation. Radiology. 1996;200(3):731–5.
- 379 7. Hollander S, Mojibian H, Emery M, Tal MG. Power injection of iodinated intravenous contrast  
380 material through acute and chronic hemodialysis catheters. J Vasc Access. 2013;13(1):61–4.
- 381 8. Smirk C, Soosay Raj T, Smith AL, Morris S. Neonatal percutaneous central venous lines: fit to  
382 burst. Arch Dis Child - Fetal Neonatal Ed. 2009 Jul 1;94(4):F298–300.
- 383 9. Schwartz FR, Lewis DS, King AE, Murphy FG, Howle LE, Kim CY, et al. Hemodialysis catheter  
384 integrity during mechanical power injection of iodinated contrast medium for computed  
385 tomography angiography. Abdom Radiol. 2021 Jun 1;46(6):2961–7.
- 386 10. Coyle D, Bloomgarden D, Beres R, Patel S, Sane S, Hurst E. Power Injection of Contrast Media  
387 via Peripherally Inserted Central Catheters for CT. J Vasc Interv Radiol. 2004 Aug 1;15(8):809–



- 388 14.
- 389 11. Donnelly LF, Dickerson J, Racadio JM. Is hand injection of central venous catheters for  
390 contrast-enhanced CT safe in children? *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2007 Dec;189(6):1530–2.
- 391 12. Buijs SB, Barentsz MW, Smits MLJ, Gratama JWC, Spronk PE. Systematic review of the safety  
392 and efficacy of contrast injection via venous catheters for contrast-enhanced computed  
393 tomography. *Eur J Radiol Open*. 2017 Jan 1;4:118–22.
- 394 13. The European Commission. Regulation (EU) 2017/745 of The European Parliament and of the  
395 Council on medical devices. 2017.
- 396 14. Code of Federal Regulations. Title 21 Food and Drugs Chapter I - Food and Drug  
397 Administration Department of Health and Human Services Subchapter H - Medical Devices  
398 Part 801 —Labeling Subpart A—General Labeling Provisions. Vol. 30. 2014.
- 399 15. Plumb AAO, Murphy G. The use of central venous catheters for intravenous contrast injection  
400 for CT examinations. *Br J Radiol*. 2011 Mar 1;84(999):197–203.
- 401 16. Herts BR, O’Malley CM, Wirth SL, Lieber ML, Pohlman B. Power injection of contrast media  
402 using central venous catheters: Feasibility, safety, and efficacy. *Am J Roentgenol*.  
403 2001;176(2):447–53.
- 404 17. Sanelli PC, Deshmukh M, Ougorets I, Caiati R, Heier LA. Safety and feasibility of using a central  
405 venous catheter for rapid contrast injection rates. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* [Internet]. 2004  
406 [cited 2024 May 6];183(6):1829–34. Available from:  
407 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15547237/>
- 408 18. Dodd JD, Kalva S, Pena A, Bamberg F, Shapiro MD, Abbara S, et al. Emergency cardiac CT for  
409 suspected acute coronary syndrome: Qualitative and quantitative assessment of coronary,  
410 pulmonary, and aortic image quality. *Am J Roentgenol*. 2008 Sep 23;191(3):870–7.
- 411 19. Stein PD, Fowler SE, Goodman LR, Gottschalk A, Hales CA, Hull RD, et al. Multidetector  
412 Computed Tomography for Acute Pulmonary Embolism. *N Engl J Med*. 2006;354.
- 413 20. Anderson DR, Kahn SR, Rodger MA, Kovacs MJ, Morris T, Hirsch A, et al. Computed  
414 Tomographic Pulmonary Angiography vs Ventilation-Perfusion Lung Scanning in Patients With  
415 Suspected Pulmonary Embolism: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *JAMA*. 2007 Dec  
416 19;298(23):2743–53.
- 417 21. Radiological Society of the Netherlands. Safe use of contrast media - part 2 [Internet]. 2019  
418 [cited 2024 Jul 22]. Available from: [www.radiologen.nl](http://www.radiologen.nl)
- 419 22. Beckingham T, Roberts A, St. John A, O’Callaghan G. Bursting pressure of triple-lumen central  
420 venous catheters under static and dynamic loads. *J Vasc Access*. 2017;18(5):430–5.




- 421 23. White F, Ng C, Saimek S. Fluid Mechanics (7th ed.). 7th ed. New York City, NY: McGraw-Hill  
422 Education; 2011.
- 423 24. Kanaa M, Wright MJ, Sandoe JAT. Examination of tunnelled haemodialysis catheters using  
424 scanning electron microscopy. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2010;16:780–6.
- 425 25. Lucas TC, Tessarolo F, Veniero P, Caola I, Piccoli F, Haase A, et al. Hemodialysis catheter  
426 thrombi: Visualization and quantification of microstructures and cellular composition. *J Vasc*  
427 *Access [Internet]*. 2013 Sep 4 [cited 2024 Jul 9];14(3):257–63. Available from:  
428 [https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.5301/jva.5000142?url\\_ver=Z39.88-](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.5301/jva.5000142?url_ver=Z39.88-2003&rfr_id=ori%3Arid%3Acrossref.org&rfr_dat=cr_pub++0pubmed)  
429 [2003&rfr\\_id=ori%3Arid%3Acrossref.org&rfr\\_dat=cr\\_pub++0pubmed](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.5301/jva.5000142?url_ver=Z39.88-2003&rfr_id=ori%3Arid%3Acrossref.org&rfr_dat=cr_pub++0pubmed)
- 430
- 431

432 *Table 1: Testing regime, burst pressure and failure location for each catheter tested. Failure locations are shown in Figure 6.*

Sample no.	CVC type	Testing regime	Burst pressure [kPa] ([PSI])	Failure location
1	Double Lumen	5x4.5mL/s; 5x8mLs	1179 (171)	Inlet tube burst
2	Double Lumen	5x4.5mL/s; 5x8mLs	N/A	N/A
3	Double Lumen	5x8mLs; 5x4.5mL/s	1158 (168)	Inlet tube burst
4	Double Lumen	5x8mLs; 5x4.5mL/s	1110 (161)	Inlet tube burst
5	Triple Lumen	5x4.5mL/s; 5x8mLs	862 (125)	Inlet tube burst
6	Triple Lumen	5x4.5mL/s; 5x8mLs	917 (133)	Inlet tube burst
7	Triple Lumen	5x8mLs; 5x4.5mL/s	N/A	N/A
8	Triple Lumen	5x8mLs; 5x4.5mL/s	800 (116)	Inlet tube burst
9	Pre-Curved	5x4.5mL/s; 5x8mLs	1165 (169)	Connector dislocation
10	Pre-Curved	5x4.5mL/s; 5x8mLs	1248 (181)	Connector dislocation
11	Pre-Curved	5x8mLs; 5x4.5mL/s	1220 (177)	Connector dislocation
12	Pre-Curved	5x8mLs; 5x4.5mL/s	N/A	N/A

433

434



435

436 *Figure 1: The experimental setup for testing the central venous catheters: a) the catheters with strain gauges are clamped*

437 *and connected to a contrast medium injector with a pressure transducer placed at the inlet of the catheter. b) The strain*


438 *gauges are then calibrated through static pressure. The pressure transducer values are stored together with the strain gauge*

439 *voltages. Next the pressure transducer and strain gauge voltages are processed, and a curve fit is generated. Intraluminal*


440 *pressure during injection is determined through this curve fit. c) catheters are finally pressurized until burst; or d) microscopic*

441 *surface analysis is performed on the lumina of 1 sample of each catheter types tested.*

442




444 *Figure 2: Working principle of a strain gauge. The strain gauge is placed on a surface and the resistance  $R$  is continuously*  
445 *measured, of which the value is  $R_0$  at rest with intraluminal pressure  $P_0$ . When the material stretches, e.g. due to a higher*  
446 *intraluminal pressure  $P_1$ , the strain deforms with the material. The resistance of the deformed gauge  $R_1$  will increase due to*  
447 *the increase in length and decrease in cross-sectional diameter of the wire. This can then be measured as a voltage change*  
448 *when amplified in a Wheatstone bridge.*



450

451 *Figure 3: a) The calibration data, fitted 3<sup>rd</sup>-order polynomial and its 95% confidence bounds of catheter sample 1, used to*  
 452 *determine intraluminal pressure with the strain gauge. b-d) Boxplots of the pump pressures, intraluminal strain gauge*  
 453 *pressures and pressure transducer values at injection velocities 4.5 mL/s and 8 mL/s, and the burst pressures of b) the double*  
 454 *lumen catheters; c) the triple lumen catheters; and d) the pre-curved catheters. n=4 applies to (b-d) \*Only 3 samples have*  
 455 *been tested*


456



457

458 *Figure 4: Representative regression plot of catheter 1 showing the trend in resting voltages throughout the measurements.*  
459 *Patterns are similar throughout the tested catheters. a) shows the raw strain gauge data over the 5-minute testing period of*  
460 *measurements 1 through 10 in catheter 1, as indicated by the numbers in the graph; and b) displays the regression analysis*  
461 *of the resting voltages as indicated in a).*


462



463

464 *Figure 5: Fatigue analysis of catheter sample 2. This is the only catheter in which the linear regression coefficient was not*  
465 *statistically significantly non-zero.*

466




467

468 *Figure 6: Failure modes of the central venous catheters at burst pressures: a) failure of the inlet tube resulting in rupture;*


469 *and b) dislocation of the inlet tube connector.*




### Double Lumen Catheter



### Triple Lumen Catheter



### Pre-Curved Catheter



470

471 *Figure 7: Surface analysis through scanning electron microscopy of: a) unused lumen, and b) proximal part of the tested*  
472 *lumen, of the double lumen catheter; c) unused lumen, and d) proximal part of the tested lumen of the triple lumen catheter;*  
473 *e) unused lumen, and f) proximal part of the tested lumen, of the pre-curved catheter. Small white dots and lines visible in all*  
474 *images are identified as pores in the material. The black lines are indicative of micro-cracks. There are notable differences in*  
475 *the luminal surfaces across the various types of catheters. The magnifications used were selected to best illustrate the surface*  
476 *changes in each catheter type before and after exposure to contrast medium injection.*

477