

1 **DuckDerm: An Improved Water Infiltration Prevention**  
2 **Product for Long-Term Intravenous Therapy Patients**

3  
4 **Authors:** Dalia Fantini, BSE<sup>1\*</sup>, Abigail Fisk, BSE<sup>1\*</sup>, Andres Leon-Vargas, BSE<sup>1\*</sup>, Emma  
5 Lynch, BSE<sup>1\*</sup>, Christine Scarlett, BSE<sup>1\*</sup>, Devon Stafford, BSE<sup>1\*</sup>, Marcos Zegarra, BSE<sup>1\*</sup>,  
6 Brady John Bielewicz, DNP, CRNP, CNS, CCRN, TCRN<sup>2</sup>

7  
8 **Affiliations:**

9 <sup>1</sup>Department of Bioengineering, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15261

10 <sup>2</sup>School of Nursing, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15261

11 \*all authors contributed equally

12  
13 Corresponding author: Dalia Fantini ([daf121@pitt.edu](mailto:daf121@pitt.edu))

14  
15 **Keywords:** patient care, intravenous (IV) therapy, shower guard

16

17 **Abstract**

18 We propose an alternative to the widely implemented intravenous (IV) shower  
19 guard solution, AnchorDry, which we have coined DuckDerm. The AnchorDry is a rigid  
20 square of plastic with an adhesive border on the outer edge. This design does not  
21 adhere to the arm during the bathing period as it cannot withstand the range of motion  
22 (ROM) patients exert, leaving the Tegaderm and IV site vulnerable to water intrusion.  
23 Significant water intrusion compromises the IV site, leaving it susceptible to infection. By  
24 interviewing seasoned clinicians, nursing faculty, students, and patient care technicians  
25 (PCTs) we ascertained ineffective shower guard fit is an issue rooted in design and  
26 material selections. We have found that nurses and PCTs are often getting creative to  
27 modify or make their own IV shower guards.

28 After several design iterations and consultations with several University of  
29 Pittsburgh nursing faculty, we mass-manufactured our design. The DuckDerm body is  
30 composed of 1 mil polyethylene plastic, which is biocompatible and able to move with  
31 the skin, a hypoallergenic adhesive, and a foam barrier to envelop the Tegaderm. Based  
32 on this initial testing, we formulated our design specifications: (1) maintaining the  
33 patient's ROM, (2) ease of use for both patients and clinicians, and (3) preventing water  
34 infiltration. We provided our manufactured design and interviewed nursing students and  
35 faculty (n=21) to address the following criteria: (1) the DuckDerm must be simple for  
36 clinicians to apply to not take away time from more essential tasks and to encourage  
37 patient self-application; (2) the DuckDerm must retain functionality without providing  
38 discomfort to the patient during use and removal. We also conducted functionality  
39 testing using our manufactured design to address the following criteria on volunteers  
40 (n=11): the DuckDerm must (1) contain all the IV components within the foam barrier,  
41 (2) not place unnecessary pressure on components to dislodge, and (3) fit securely on  
42 the patient's arm. Additionally, the Duckderm must adhere to the skin while subjected to  
43 running water and movement, and the DuckDerm must be able to provide a sufficient  
44 range of motion about the antecubital space to allow for arm movements required while  
45 showering. The Duckderm outperformed the currently utilized solution in both verbal  
46 feedback and assessment by potential users (nurses and PCTs) and in functionality

47 testing; therefore, we propose our novel design as an alternative to the currently  
48 employed AnchorDry.

49

## 50 **Introduction**

### 51 *Surmising the Clinical Need*

52 Approximately 80% of hospitalized patients in the United States require an  
53 intravenous (IV) line to deliver fluid, medicine, or blood [1]. When taking a shower,  
54 patients are required to use a waterproof wrapping (what we call in this work a shower  
55 guard) to secure the line and prevent the infiltration of water and soap to the IV insertion  
56 site. The shower guard does not directly interface with the IV site but functions to  
57 protect the Tegaderm wrapping.

58 Nosocomial infections, also known as healthcare-associated infections (HAIs),  
59 frequently result from the use of intravenous (IV) devices, such as central venous  
60 catheters (CVCs). These infections are primarily caused by microbial colonization of the  
61 catheter's surface or contamination during insertion, leading to bloodstream infections.  
62 Proper aseptic techniques, timely removal of unnecessary catheters, and the use of  
63 antimicrobial-coated devices can reduce infection rates. Nosocomial bloodstream  
64 infections are associated with increased morbidity, mortality, and healthcare costs,  
65 emphasizing the need for stringent infection control measures [2,3]. Nosocomial  
66 infections related to intravenous (IV) devices can be exacerbated by inadequate  
67 protection of the IV site during a patient's hospital stay, particularly during activities such  
68 as showering. Moisture exposure can compromise dressings, creating a pathway for  
69 microbial entry and increasing the risk of bloodstream infections. To mitigate this risk,  
70 protective measures such as waterproof dressings, specifically designed catheter  
71 covers, and proper patient education are critical. Regular inspection of the IV site for  
72 signs of moisture, damage, or infection further enhances safety. Adherence to these  
73 strategies is essential to maintaining the integrity of the IV site and reducing infection  
74 risks [4, 5].

75 Current water-resistant shower guards are restrictive (**Fig 1A and B**), limiting  
76 patient mobility, and are typically ill-fitting. In addition, the current solution fails early and  
77 often during the bathing period, requiring clinicians to fashion their own shower guard

78 alternative. After stumbling upon this clear clinical need, we propose our redesigned  
79 shower guard (the DuckDerm, **Fig 2A-C**). This design seeks to prevent water infiltration  
80 and allow for an increased range of motion (ROM), while remaining adhered to the arm  
81 for the duration of the bathing period.

82

## 83 **Results**

### 84 *Final Prototype*

85 We have identified the most prevalent hazards and associated risks for the  
86 shower guard design: 1) water enters the IV insertion site, 2) IV dislodgement, 3) skin  
87 irritation when removing the shower guard, and 4) bacterial contamination of the shower  
88 guard (summarized in **Table S6** and **S7**). The final iteration of the DuckDerm is  
89 showcased in **Fig 2C**.

90 The proposed shower guard device is designed with specific dimensional,  
91 physical, and material specifications to ensure functionality, comfort, and safety. The  
92 straps on the top and bottom measure 16 inches in length and 2 inches in height but  
93 can be trimmed to fit various arm circumferences. The foam component, with a  
94 thickness of 0.5 inches, covers a 6x6 inch square to effectively conceal the IV site,  
95 Tegaderm dressing, and extension tubing. A waterproof adhesive lines the edges of the  
96 guard and foam layer, providing secure attachment, as shown in Figure 1. Dimensional  
97 tolerances are determined by the 0.25-inch width of the marker used to trace the plastic  
98 template, and the product's final mass remains to be determined to ensure it does not  
99 impede patient movement.

100 The general size requirements include a strap height of 2 inches  $\pm$  0.25 inches, a  
101 strap length of 16 inches  $\pm$  0.25 inches, a plastic body height of 7 inches  $\pm$  0.25 inches,  
102 and a plastic body length of 8 inches  $\pm$  0.25 inches. Labels will clearly mark the proximal  
103 and distal ends, alongside numbered peelable adhesive covers indicating the order of  
104 application. A set of written instructions accompanies each unit, providing step-by-step  
105 guidance on proper usage.

106 Designed for single use, the shower guard is disposable and does not require  
107 cleaning after use. Its packaging ensures sterility and protection from contamination  
108 until application. Materials can withstand water temperatures ranging from 36°C to 65°C

109 and humidity levels associated with hot showers. The guard's construction includes  
110 high-tensile-strength polyethylene sheets, skin-safe medical-grade adhesive, and  
111 absorbent foam to prevent water from reaching the IV insertion site. All materials are  
112 hypoallergenic, water-resistant, and cost-effective, making the product accessible for  
113 short-term use in medical settings.

114 Finally, the device must be stored in a clean environment alongside other  
115 disposable medical supplies. It is not intended to interface directly with wounds,  
116 negating the need for sterilization. However, its design allows for contact with alcohol-  
117 based solutions, commonly used for hospital sterilization, ensuring compatibility with  
118 routine medical practices.

119

## 120 *Validation Testing*

### 121 *Shower Guard Assessment*

122 Visualization of the data collected in the shower guard assessment by clinical  
123 users is summarized in **Fig 3A**, and time for application by these users, correlated to  
124 patient care experience (**Fig 3B**). The survey's first question asked whether participants  
125 believed the product would remain securely attached to the antecubital region during  
126 typical showering motions. The average response was 8.14, categorized as passive.  
127 Question 2 assessed whether the foam barrier would protect the IV site from water  
128 intrusion if the surrounding plastic adhesive detached, yielding an average score of 7.82  
129 (passive). Question 3 asked if a primary caretaker (PCT) could easily and quickly apply  
130 the product, scoring 7.86 (passive). Question 4 evaluated the clarity and intuitiveness of  
131 the application instructions, scoring 8.50 (passive). Question 5 asked if the product  
132 appeared more effective than commonly used alternatives, such as AnchorDry, and  
133 received a promoter score of 9.14. Question 6 evaluated the product's comfort during  
134 arm movement, with an average score of 8.45 (passive). Finally, Question 7 assessed  
135 whether the adjustable straps made the product suitable for any patient, scoring 7.82  
136 (passive). Overall, the survey's average score was 8.24 out of 10, which falls within the  
137 passive range but exceeds the acceptance threshold of 65%. Therefore, DuckDerm  
138 successfully passed this evaluation.

### 139 *Ease of Use Testing*

140 Ease of use rating, experience, and application time were recorded (experimental  
141 set-up is highlighted in **Fig 4A**), with the distribution of those ratings displayed in **Fig 4B**  
142 and **4C**. We found that well over 75% of participants found the product to be satisfactory  
143 or higher in each ease-of-use category. 65% of participants found the shower-guard  
144 satisfactory in the category of intuitive application, size accommodation, and adhesive  
145 application. Those same categories received exceptional ratings in 35%, 35%, and 30%  
146 of responses respectively. Time for application had 55% of participants rate it  
147 satisfactory and 35% exceptional ratings. This gave a combined response of  
148 satisfactory or greater of 100%, 90%, 100%, and 95% in intuitive application, time for  
149 application, size accommodation, and adhesive application respectively. The average of  
150 the satisfaction score is shown in figure 2. We wanted to check the time for application  
151 relative to clinical experience for potential trends and found that time for applications  
152 decreases with years of experience after a one-year minimum experience (Figure 3).

153

#### 154 *Verification Testing*

#### 155 *Comfortability Testing*

156 The comfort and pain ratings are summarized in Figure 5A, revealing generally  
157 low scores: average comfort during wear was 1.73, average pain during wear was 1.00,  
158 and average pain during removal was 2.73. These results indicate that participants  
159 found the product comfortable to wear, with minimal pain reported during wear or  
160 removal. All scores were below the failing threshold, confirming the product passed the  
161 comfort assessment. Wear duration did not significantly affect comfort or pain scores  
162 (Figures 5B and 5C), as participants who wore the product for extended periods  
163 reported similar levels of comfort and pain as those who wore it for shorter durations.  
164 While bicep circumference showed no significant correlation with comfort scores (Figure  
165 5E), forearm circumference was slightly negatively correlated with comfort scores ( $r = -$   
166  $0.623$ ,  $p = 0.041$ ; Figure 5D). This suggests that participants with smaller forearm  
167 circumferences found the product less comfortable compared to those with larger  
168 forearms.

#### 169 *Range of Motion Testing*

170 The DuckDerm must be able to provide a sufficient range of motion about the  
171 antecubital space to allow for arm movements required while showering. We assessed  
172 elbow flexion, extension, and rotation about the elbow as well as pronation and  
173 supination of the wrist to simulate movements performed during a shower. Each motion  
174 was assigned a score of 0, 1, or 2, correlating to complete fail, minor fail or pass,  
175 respectively. A score greater than or equal to 11 out of 20 possible points was  
176 considered an overall pass whereas anything below that was considered a fail. Out of  
177 the eleven participants tested, ten of them received an overall passing score (**Table 1**).  
178 The average score for all the participants was 18.5, indicating the DuckDerm did not  
179 inhibit or limit participant mobility by our predetermined threshold score of 15.

#### 180 *Shower Simulation*

181 The DuckDerm must adhere to the skin while subjected to running water and  
182 movement (**Fig 6A** and **Fig 6B**). This test examines the functionality of the shower  
183 guard over an allotted 5 minutes while the participant performs flexion/extension,  
184 pronation/supination, and rotation. This test primarily determines the efficacy of the  
185 primary and secondary barriers implemented in the design, the adhesive, and the foam,  
186 respectively. Each participant placed their arms directly into the stream of water while  
187 performing the aforementioned movements. Water indicator tape lined the IV and  
188 extension tubing along the antecubital space. Upon contact with water, the tape would  
189 turn a bright red color. Activation of the water contact tape would result in a "fail", with  
190 the time of failure recorded. Of the 8 participants who have undergone this testing, 4  
191 received a passing score (**Fig 6C**). Of the 4 participants who received a "fail" on this  
192 test, the average time of failure is 125.75 seconds (or 2 minutes and 5.75 seconds).  
193 Minimal correlation has been detected between bicep circumference (**Fig 6D**) or  
194 forearm circumference (**Fig 6E**) in regard to DuckDerm adherence.

195

#### 196 **Discussion**

197 The development of DuckDerm began by gathering valuable insights from  
198 relevant stakeholders, including healthcare providers and patients, who were  
199 interviewed about their experiences with existing waterproof IV shower guards like the  
200 Shower Shield and AnchorDry. These products highlighted key challenges that needed

201 addressing, such as ensuring the guard stayed securely adhered to the arm during  
202 movement, preventing water exposure to the IV site, ease of application by caretakers,  
203 and comfort for extended wear during a shower. The ethnographic data collected  
204 formed the basis for identifying critical requirements for DuckDerm.

205 To meet these needs, we engaged with plastics and adhesive manufacturers,  
206 along with professionals in relevant fields, to determine the material requirements for  
207 the product. Our final design incorporated 1 mil polyethylene plastic for the body of the  
208 DuckDerm. This material is biocompatible and flexible, allowing it to move with the skin,  
209 reducing discomfort during use. We also chose a hypoallergenic adhesive to ensure  
210 that the product adhered securely to the skin without causing irritation. Low-resolution  
211 iterative prototypes were created to test different geometries, ensuring the design  
212 functioned effectively before advancing to formal testing.

213 The validation and verification testing of DuckDerm, as outlined below,  
214 demonstrated that the product met its design requirements. These testing phases  
215 supported our choice of materials and design features, confirming the potential of  
216 DuckDerm to address the significant gap in the market for a reliable, comfortable, and  
217 effective IV shower guard. Given that approximately 80% of hospitalized patients  
218 require an IV line at some point [1], DuckDerm could provide a much-needed solution to  
219 enhance patient care, prevent complications, and improve the overall patient experience  
220 during hospitalization. This thorough, stakeholder-driven approach has resulted in a  
221 product that not only solves practical issues but also ensures comfort and security for  
222 the patient, representing a promising innovation in patient care.

223

## 224 **Methods**

### 225 *Initial Prototyping*

226 In the first revision prototype (**Fig S1 A**) our group produced, we were eager to  
227 implement a crisscrossing arm band component to ensure proper fit to the IV site. The  
228 material utilized in this iteration was 6 mil polyethylene (PE) plastic, velcro, and gauze  
229 attached to the PE by glue as the absorptive element. The velcro was used for  
230 prototype handling and ease of use testing. We had determined the plastic thickness  
231 used in this design was far too thick, constricting the patient's range of motion and was



232 uncomfortable during use. A critique from our project mentor was the ease of use of the  
233 shower guard. With the long straps, it would be difficult for the clinician to put on the  
234 shower guard, let alone for the patient to do it independently. Additionally, the gauze  
235 was found to be far too small to envelop the Tegaderm and prevent water infiltration.

236 In the second revision (**Fig S1 B**), we acquired a more suitable plastic for our  
237 prototype, shifting to 1 mil polyethylene. We found that while this plastic was more  
238 difficult to work with when placed on a mannequin or one of our arms, the plastic film  
239 was better able to flex with movement. Another notable revision was the shortening of  
240 the plastic straps to cut down on plastic usage for usability and sustainability purposes.  
241 A double-sided adhesive was also implemented to determine the ease of application.  
242 The gauze as the absorptive component was kept from the previous revision; however,  
243 we were initiating contact with materials experts and companies to find medical-grade  
244 materials to incorporate into the final design.

245 For the third revision (**Fig S1 C**), we sought to increase the surface area of the  
246 adhesive placement following a conversation with our project mentor. Additionally, we  
247 transitioned from the gauze present in the first two iterations following a series of killer  
248 testing experiments to determine the water-absorbing capacity of the Ca-alginate gauze  
249 versus wound care foam. The wound care foam significantly outperformed the gauze,  
250 and we pivoted to implement foam in our design. Additionally, we opted to place a  
251 double-sided adhesive film onto the foam itself to provide an additional water barrier.

252

### 253 *DuckDerm Manufacturing*

254 Laser-cut templates were developed for the DuckDerm in accordance with final  
255 design specifications to enable mass production for validation and verification testing.  
256 These templates ensured precise cutting of the medical-grade foam and plastic film.  
257 The adhesives utilized included Waterproof Transparent Film Roll (Housables), 3M  
258 Super 77 spray adhesive, and Vapon double-sided tape. The final mass-manufactured  
259 design incorporated medical-grade foam (MedPride Foam Dressing) and a 1-mil  
260 medical-grade polyethylene film.

261

### 262 *Validation Testing*

263 Once our protocols were vetted and approved by the University of Pittsburgh internal  
264 review board, we were able to recruit a total of 22 participants, all of whom are either  
265 current or student nurses, patient care technicians, and University of Pittsburgh nursing  
266 faculty members to participate in our validation studies.

### 267 *Shower Guard Assessment*

268 Participants begin by reading over the provided application instructions (refer to  
269 **(Fig S2)** for the product, and then are asked to apply the product to a mannequin arm  
270 with an IV site simulated in the antecubital region. After the subject has applied the  
271 shower guard, they are asked for their feedback on the product. The participant is then  
272 asked about the ease of use, design, comfort, effectiveness, and sizing of the product.  
273 Seven questions are asked on a scale from zero to ten, zero being strongly disagree  
274 with the statement, and ten being strongly agreeing with the statement. Seven  
275 statements were posed of the subject in the survey for this study and are as follows:

- 276 1. This product will remain adhered to the antecubital region through the typical  
277 range of motion seen while showering.
- 278 2. A primary caretaker will be able to easily and quickly apply this product.
- 279 3. The foam barrier will protect the IV site from water intrusion if the surrounding  
280 plastic adhesive detach from the arm.
- 281 4. The instructions to apply the product are clear and intuitive.
- 282 5. The product appears comfortable for the patient to wear and move their arm in.
- 283 6. The adjustable length of the straps will allow this product to fit on any patient.
- 284 7. This product appears more effective than the current product used (AnchorDry).

285 These questions were all ranked on a scale from 0 (strongly disagree) to 10 (strongly  
286 agree). A net promoter score was given, with a score from 0 to 6 as a detractor, 7 and 8  
287 being passive, and 9 and 10 being a promoter. Twenty-two responses were collected  
288 when this test was administered.

### 289 *Ease of Use Assessment*

290 To obtain feedback from PCTs and nurses on the ease of use of the shower  
291 guard, we provided subjects with the novel shower guard and a mannequin arm with  
292 artificial skin for use in clinical simulations. We also provided two versions of application  
293 instructions that would be included in a market-distributed version of the shower guard.

294 Participants had an opportunity to review the instruction sheet they felt was most  
295 intuitive to use.

296         Once satisfied with reviewing the instructions, participants were timed as they  
297 began applying the shower-guard on the mannequin arm with no feedback from the  
298 research team. The no-feedback policy was used to properly gauge the intuitiveness of  
299 the application in a market-setting, where the development team would be unable to  
300 provide feedback. Upon completion of the application, the time of application was  
301 recorded. We then asked for feedback from the participants on the relative ease of use  
302 of the product in comparison to existing shower-guard solutions. We asked participants  
303 to rate the ease of use in terms of intuitive application, time for application, and sizing  
304 accommodations. Intuitive application refers to the ability to apply the shower-guard with  
305 minimal or no feedback in a manner that the individual applying it is confident and  
306 satisfied with the final application. Time for application refers to their satisfaction with the  
307 time taken to apply, it is not too long and becomes cumbersome in a clinical setting.  
308 Size accommodation refers to the ability to apply the shower guard, with or without rapid  
309 modifications (trimming of arm bands), on varying arm sizes. Adhesive application refers  
310 to the ease of working with the adhesive used on the shower-guard, usually referring to  
311 ability to ensure the adhesive attaches to desired locations with minimal effort and  
312 preventing unwanted self-adhesion. These were all rated on a scale of 1 to 3, with 1  
313 being unsatisfactory, 2 satisfactory, and 3 extremely satisfactory. Experience of  
314 participants in nursing or PCT was also recorded.

315

### 316 *Verification Testing*

317         Once our protocols were vetted and approved by the University of Pittsburgh  
318 internal review board, we were able to recruit participants from the ages of 20 to 29 with  
319 4 males and 7 females (n=11 participants) to participate in our verification studies.

### 320 *Comfortability*

321         Comfortability was assessed at the end of human testing sessions following  
322 successful application of the DuckDerm (**Table S1**). Time of wear was taken as soon as  
323 the product has been removed. The participant was then be asked if the product was  
324 comfortable to wear. Verbal feedback was recorded. The participant was then asked to

325 score their comfort during wear using the provided ranking scale. A lower score  
326 correlates with the product being more comfortable. The participant was then asked if  
327 the product caused them any pain during wear. Verbal feedback was recorded. Using  
328 the provided ranking scale, the participant can be asked to provide a score for their pain  
329 during wear. A lower score correlates with less pain. Finally, the participant was then be  
330 asked if the product caused them any pain during removal. Verbal feedback was  
331 recorded. Using the provided ranking scale, the participant was then asked to provide a  
332 score for their pain during removal. A lower score correlates with less pain.

### 333 *Range of Motion Testing*

334 Prior to beginning the test, anthropometric measurements were taken for each  
335 subject, specifically biceps and forearm circumference. The DuckDerm was placed on  
336 the test subject's antecubital space, according to the supplied directions (**Fig S2**), over  
337 the IV simulation materials. The subject was then asked to stand in anatomical position  
338 to begin the first set of range of motion exercises, starting with 3 to 4 rounds of flexion  
339 and extension at the elbow. The subject then adjusted their body so that their arms were  
340 straight out in front of them creating a 90° angle with the front of the trunk of the body  
341 while the arms remain perpendicular to the chest. From this position, the subject was  
342 asked to perform 3 to 4 sets of pronation and supination about the wrist followed by 3 to  
343 4 sets of flexion and extension about the elbow. From this same position with the arm  
344 flexed at the elbow, they rotated their forearm about the elbow 3 to 4 times. The subject  
345 then transitioned to the final body position which was a T-pose, where the extended  
346 arms created a 90° angle with the side of the trunk of their body. They again performed  
347 3 to 4 sets of flexion and extension about the elbow moving their arm towards the head,  
348 followed by another 3 to 4 rotations about the elbow to simulate scrubbing their scalp in  
349 the shower. After each of these movements, the DuckDerm was analyzed to assess  
350 whether there was any peeling of the main plastic body from the subject's arm. A score  
351 was assigned to the subject for each of the movements depending on the amount of  
352 peeling or movement inhibition that occurred.

### 353 *Shower Simulation*

354 Moisture indicator tapes were placed surrounding the IV components, with the  
355 DuckDerm enveloping both the Tegaderm and indicator tapes. With these in place, the

356 subject was instructed to place their arm in the shower under running water. While the  
357 participant had their arm under a stream of water, the facilitator of the test instructed the  
358 subject to perform a set of arm movements. For each movement instructed by the  
359 facilitator, the subject performed that movement for 30 seconds. The facilitator recorded  
360 any relevant notes or feedback about the device.

361

### 362 **Ethics Declaration**

363 We ascertain that all interviews, validation testing, and verification testing were done in  
364 collaboration with and approved by the University of Pittsburgh Internal Review Board  
365 (IRB) and have acquired exempt status by the IRB. All data has been deidentified and  
366 cannot be linked to individual participants.

367

### 368 **Funding**

369 The authors would like to thank the University of Pittsburgh's Bioengineering  
370 Department for funding, facilities, and assistance in the completion of this medical  
371 product design project.

372

### 373 **Acknowledgements**


374 The authors would like to thank Dr. Mark Gartner, our Bioengineering faculty advisor, for  
375 his advice and guidance during the design and validation and verification testing  
376 process.

377

378


379 **References**

- 380 [1] Infusion Nurses Society. (2023). Complications of Peripheral Venous Access  
381 Devices: Prevention, Detection, and Recovery Strategies. *Critical Care Nurse*.  
382 Retrieved from <https://aacnjournals.org>
- 383 [2] Mermel LA. Short-term Peripheral Venous Catheter-Related Bloodstream Infections:  
384 A Systematic Review. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2017 Oct 30;65(10):1757-1762. doi:  
385 10.1093/cid/cix562. PMID: 29020252.
- 386 [3] Magill, S. S., O’Leary, E., Janelle, S. J., et al. (2018). Changes in Prevalence of  
387 Health Care-Associated Infections in U.S. Hospitals. *New England Journal of Medicine*,  
388 379(18), 1732–1744. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1801550>.
- 389 [4] Dougherty, L., & Lister, S. (2021). *The Royal Marsden Manual of Clinical Nursing*  
390 *Procedures* (10th ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
- 391 [5] Infusion Nurses Society. (2022). *Infusion Therapy Standards of Practice*. *Journal of*  
392 *Infusion Nursing*, 45(1S), S1–S224.
- 393



394  
395  
396  
397  
398


**Figure 1.** (A) Image shows the currently implemented clinical solution (AnchorDry) overtop the mock intravenous site, complete with a Tegaderm; (B) Image shows an IV access kit, complete with an IV catheter, TegaDerm dressing, an IV extension set, alcohol and gauze prep pads, and Transpore tape.



399  
400  
401  
402  
403


**Figure 2.** A SolidWorks (A, B) and physical representation (C) of the most updated revision following design changes based on qualification testing.





404  
405 **Figure 3.** (A) Graphical representation of responses on a scale of 0 to 10, outlining  
406 users responses for intuitive application, time for application, size accommodation, and  
407 adhesive application; (B) Plot outlining application time for the DuckDerm versus  
408 duration of clinical experience.

409  
410  
411




412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418

**Figure 4.** (A) Test set-up, including a facilitator, note taker, participant, instructions sheet, mannequin arm with simulated IV, and shower guard prototype; (B) Average percent of responses to all questions given in the promotor, passive, and detractor categories; (C) Graphical representation of the average scores on questions posed to potential clinical users.

419

**A**

Comfortability Score: Human Testing			
	Comfort (During Wear)	Pain (During Wear)	Pain (During Removal)
Average Score	1.73	1.00	2.73
Standard Deviation	0.90	1.00	1.40
Max Score	3.00	3.00	4.00
Min Score	0.00	0.00	0.00




420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425

**Figure 5.** Overall comfortability scoring (A), comfort and pain scores correlated to time (B, C), and comfortability scoring correlated to forearm circumference and bicep circumference (E).

Test Subject ID	Range of Motion Score	Bicep Circumference (in)	Forearm Circumference (in)	Pass	Fail	General Notes
H01	17	13	10.5	X		Tighter fit at the proximal end. Peeling by the straps.
H02	20	9.75	8	X		Catheter/extension tubing limited flexion/extension. Minor peeling at proximal end.
H03	20	10	6.5	X		Good ROM. No peeling.
H04	20	10.5	8.25	X		Catheter/extension tubing limited flexion/extension.
H05	20	12.25	9.25	X		No peeling. Catheter/extension tubing poked skin.
H06	18	11.75	8.75	X		Tight around the straps. Peeling by proximal/distal edges of straps. Catheter/extension tubing poked skin.
H07	20	10.8	9	X		No limitations in range of motion.
H08	20	11.6	8.5	X		Adhesive pulled on hair, not skin.
H09	10	13	9.5		X	Peeling at proximal and distal ends of the straps.
H10	20	11.5	10.25	X		N/A

H11	18	8.25	7.75	X		Minor limitation on proximal end from bicep.
-----	----	------	------	---	--	--


426 **Table 1.** Range of Motion score for each participant correlated to an overall pass or fail  
427 for the protocol, accompanied by general notes logged by the tester from each  
428 session. Bicep and Forearm circumference were also recorded for each subject.  
429  
430  
431



432  
433 **Figure 6.** (A) Image shows correct product placement of the DuckDerm; (B)  
434 Experimental set-up for the shower simulation testing; (C) A box plot representation of  
435 the human subjects who passed during the entire duration of the protocol (which will be  
436 5 min.) and those subjects who failed and at what point in time they failed; (D) A scatter  
437 plot of the bicep circumference taken from the subjects and their duration of wear, with  
438 the red line being the best fit line of the plot; (E) A scatter plot of the forearm  
439 circumference taken from the subjects and their duration of wear, with the red line being  
440 the best fit line of the plot.

441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446

447 **Supplemental Information**




448 **Figure S1.** Images and sketches above recapitulate the design evolution of our  
449 prototype over the series of three significant revisions (A-C).  
450  
451

Test Subject ID	Secure Fit Around Arm	Contains All Components	No Dislodging of Components	Overall	Notes
H01	✓	✓	✓	✓	Only extension tubing was utilized for this testing, no catheter hub and Tegaderm was too small to fully cover the extension tubing. Adhesive is thin at areas and the adhesive strips were cut for fit
H02	✓	✓	✓	✓	The purple component on the extension loop is up against the plastic. Straps were cut, still overlap around back of arm
H03	✓	✓	✓	✓	Straps were not cut and overlap with the foam barrier section, distal part rolled up slightly and lifts up from the arm
H04	✓	✓	✓	✓	Parts of the IV are pressing against the plastic
H05	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A
H06	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A
H07	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A
H08	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A
H09	✓	✓	✓	✓	Pressure on the IV components which may cause problems with the plastic. Some adhesive seemed to not be fully secure. Could be due to body hair or weak adhesive
H10	✓	✓	✓	✓	Application of top strap covers elbow minimally. Slight adhesive issue at top
H11	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A

452 **Table S1.** Passing (✓) or failing (✗) of test criteria accompanied by general notes  
 453 logged by the tester from each session.  
 454



### DuckDerm Application Directions



#### Placement

1. Have the patient extend their arm as seen in **Figure 1**. Peel the adhesive parts corresponding to the 1 (blue region). Stick shower guard onto the patient so the foam covers the Tegaderm and extension tubing completely and press firmly.
2. Peel the adhesive parts labeled 2 (orange region). Secure the adhesive film onto the sides of the patient's arm by pressing firmly.
3. Wrap the straps around the patient to assess the sizing.
  - a. If necessary, cut parts of the straps (see **Figure 2**) to size so that the plastic wings (section 3) do not interfere with the foam square.
4. Remove the adhesive parts labeled 4 (red region). Secure the adhesive around the patient's arm so that the plastic ends touch. Ensure both straps do **\*not\*** cross over the elbow.



Figure 1



Figure 2

#### Removal

1. Gently peel the proximal adhesive layer off the patient's arm in the same direction of hair growth as to avoid any hair removal.
2. Continue to lift the shower guard off the arm until it is completely removed.
3. Use detachol® or another available adhesive solvent if there is any pain in the removal process.

455  
456  
457  
458

**Figure S2.** Directions for the placement and removal of the DuckDerm complete with a color-coded schematic and photos showing correct placement and an example of customization for patient fit.

459 **Severity Scale:**

Severity	Definition
Major	Resulting in serious injury to the patient and/or impedance to treatment
Moderate	Resulting in injury that will minimally impact patient care if at all
Minor	Resulting in no injury to the patient are considered expected flaws

460

461 **Probability Scale:**

Probability	Definition
High	Hazard will occur more often than not
Medium	Hazard will occur less often than it will
Low	Hazard rarely occurs

462

463 **Risk Classification:**

Risk Level	Definition
Level 1	Unacceptable risk
Level 2	Justifiable risk if limited by materials/cost limitations
Level 3	Acceptable risk if negated by other methods utilized by healthcare workers (within reason)
Level 4	No risk

464

465 **Risk Matrix:**

	Severity			
Probability		Major	Moderate	Minor
High		Level 1	Level 2	Level 2
Medium		Level 2	Level 2	Level 3
Low		Level 3	Level 4	Level 4

466

467

**Tables S2-5:** Tables outlining the severity scale (Table S2), probability scale (Table S3), risk classification (Table S4), and risk matrix (Table S5).

468 **FMEA Table:**

Component or subassembly	Failure Mode	Effect on system	Possible Hazards	Risk Classification	User Detection Means	Applicable Control(s)
Polyethylene (PE) plastic	Plastic tears or peels off the skin during the shower	Infiltration of water to the IV site	Contamination of the IV site, resulting in the need to replace tegaderm, IV, or both	Level 2	User will be able to visually detect failure	Ensure plastic film component is fitted to the user properly with proper geometry to enable mobility to prevent tearing and peeling of plastic
Dynarex Curafoam Dressing	Foam falls off of the plastic it was adhered to; Unable to absorb further amounts of water	Infiltration of water to the IV site	IV site is more vulnerable to water infiltration	Level 2	User will be able to visually detect failure	Ensure proper adhesion of the absorptive component to the plastic film; Application of adhesive prior to the foam to ensure copious amounts of water are not absorbed

Waterproof Bandage Adhesive	Adhesive performs poorly in contact with water and lifts, exposing tegaderm to water; Adhesive irritates the skin	Compromising IV site by water infiltration; Skin redness/irritation at places of contact	IV site is more vulnerable to water infiltration as adhesive fails to provide a water-tight barrier; Soreness or irritated areas of the skin causing pain or discomfort for the patient	Level 1	User will be able to visually detect failure	Careful choice of adhesive to allow for mobility without peeling as well as biocompatibility to mitigate chances of skin irritation
Spray Adhesive (used in the assembly of the prototype adhering the Polyethylene Sheet to the Waterproof Bandage)	Fails under to adhere the Polyethylene Sheet to the Waterproof Bandage the higher temperature of the water	Failure of the adhesive compromises the structural integrity and function of the shower guard	Contamination of the IV site, resulting in the need to replace Tegaderm, IV, or both	Level 2	User will be able to visually detect failure	Careful choice of adhesive to allow for mobility without peeling; Strict quality control measures

469 **Table S6.** Table outlines potential hazards for each component involved in the  
 470 construction of the DuckDerm. Tables S2-5 provide backing for the risk classification for  
 471 each design failure mode that has been identified.  
 472

Risk	Design-Based Risk Control	Residual Risks
Water Intrusion	Choosing an appropriate waterproof bandage adhesive that will hold together the polyethylene plastic, foam padding, and the skin the product is applied to.	There is a reduced chance that water will infiltrate the IV site through failed adhesive.
	Choosing a polyethylene plastic sheet with appropriate strength and flexibility to prevent tearing during use.	There is a reduced chance that water will infiltrate the IV site through tearing of the plastic.
	Specifying design geometry to handle a wide range of motion, preventing tearing. This includes both the gap at the elbow for better range of motion without tearing as well as ensuring adhesive attaches the straps of the product to itself, creating a better seal.	There is a reduced chance that water will infiltrate the IV site through tearing of the plastic.
	Choosing MedPride Foam Dressing material that can absorb large amounts of water.	There is a reduced chance that water will infiltrate the IV site through as there is a second barrier behind the adhesive to stop water from penetrating
Bacterial Contamination	Sterile packaging to prevent contamination before use.	Reduced risk of bacterial contamination prior to use.
	Product is designed to be single-use and disposable to prevent buildup of contaminants between uses.	Product will not accumulate bacteria over time with each additional use.
Skin Irritation	Inclusion of directions/suggestions for the removal of the device.	If the user follows the directions, it will instruct them to remove with the direction of hair growth as to not irritate the skin.

	Inclusion of directions and/or warnings for the proper application and use of the device so that it is applied correctly with the appropriate tightness.	User will be less likely to apply on incorrectly.
Dislodging of IV	Square of MedPride Foam padding placed around IV insertion site serves as stabilization for the dressing to dissuade dislodging due to excessive movement.	Patient will be less likely to disturb the inserted IV as it has a wall of protection around it
	Inclusion of directions and/or warnings for the proper application and use of the device so that it is applied correctly with the appropriate tightness.	User will be less likely to apply on incorrectly.

474 **Table S7.** Table outlines device specifications correlating to the qualitative user needs  
475 identified during ethnographic data collection. Functional, performance, and material  
476 requirements as well as use environment, are identified using the insights developed  
477 from the risk analyses. Key risks have been identified; design-based risk controls have  
478 been proposed along with residual risks introduced by the aforementioned design  
479 changes.