

Quality measurement in vascular access: delphi study



Valdelvira-Gimeno B, Casanova-Vivas S, Solaz-Martínez V, López-Guardiola P, Gil-Carbonell MJ, Jimenez-Pérez A, Paniagua-Moliner A, S Gomis-Baldoví

Background and objective

Over time, healthcare materials, care techniques, and maintenance of vascular access devices (VADs) have undergone variations and changes related to the introduction of new materials (Pittiruti 2021) in hospitals as well as scientific advances (Pinelli F. 2023). Indicators to measure compliance with these practices must be continuously reviewed. The objective of this study was to update the INCATIV questionnaire and its indicators (Casanova et al, 2021) by incorporating available scientific evidence and current materials in the market.

Results

The response rate was 90% in the first round and 100% in the second and third rounds after an email reminder. In the first round, regarding the pertinence and relevance of the proposed items, there was consensus in 90.90%. In the second round, the consensus was 100% on 7 items regarding the priority in importance. The item considered less important obtained a 78% consensus. In addition, the experts suggested two additional indicators. The third round confirmed 8 items that will compose the new indicator according the study criteria.

Conclusions

The results of this panel of experts will be used to validate a measurement instrument in a next phase of research to obtain good indicators to help achieve excellence in care for our patients' vascular access.

Methods



Qualitative study



The INCATIV questionnaire was reviewed, and 8 indicators relevant to the care and maintenance of VADs, collectible through direct observation of the patient's AV, were selected.



Between April and September 2023, a national panel of experts determined the relevance, feasibility, and suitability of these indicators.



Three rounds were conducted using the RedCap platform. Consensus was predefined with at least 75% agreement at the highest level on a 5-point Likert scale.



In final round, an email was sent with feedback that included the results of each item (median), indicating whether they met the consensus criteria. Additionally, Round 3 consisted of a single question aimed at assessing satisfaction with the process



72,7% 27,28%
Expert panel

