


World Journal of *Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Monthly Volume 17 Number 10 October 27, 2025



EDITORIAL

Koo TH, Leong XB, Lee YL, Zakaria MH, Hayati F, Zakaria AD. Laparoscopic intracorporeal anastomosis is the future standard for ileostomy reversal in Crohn's disease. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 103865 [DOI: 10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.103865]

He YF, He QT. Single-port laparoscopic hernia needle therapy: New hope for the treatment of inguinal hernia in children. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 106800 [DOI: 10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.106800]

Chen GB, Wang ZL, Sha YG, Tang RM, Liu ZG, Chen LJ. Closing infection pathways: Multidisciplinary disinfection measures reshape gastrointestinal surgical outcomes. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 108505 [DOI: 10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.108505]

REVIEW

Rong Y, Nie CY, Zhou JD, Wang ZC, Wu DL, Wu SW, Xie ZY. Intestinal reengineering: Scientific advances in intestinal transplantation. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 111672 [DOI: 10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.111672]

MINIREVIEWS

Zhou QY, Zheng ZH, Lv XL, Guo JQ, Zhang K, Xu HT. Advancement in the diagnosis and treatment of hepatic portal venous gas. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 109062 [DOI: 10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.109062]

da Fonseca LG, Araujo RLC. Fibrolamellar hepatocellular carcinoma: Advances, challenges and opportunities in a rare malignancy. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 109107 [DOI: 10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.109107]

Liu XY, Ma J, Jiao Y. Cholecystectomy and non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: Exploring the hidden connection and implications. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 109359 [DOI: 10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.109359]

Prisacariu IA, Koumarelas KE, Argyriou K, Charalabopoulos A, Christodoulidis G. Optimizing nutritional support in upper gastrointestinal surgery: A comprehensive review of feeding jejunostomy techniques and outcomes. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 109535 [DOI: 10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.109535]

Gutierrez Blanco D, Apodaca-Rueda M, Maeda CT, Carvalho CGCY, Baker E, Martinie JB, Araujo RLC. Indications and techniques for minimally invasive spleen-preserving distal pancreatectomy. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 109774 [DOI: 10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.109774]

Wu J, Jin ZD. Advancements in endoscopic resection of gastrointestinal stromal tumors: Techniques, outcomes, and perspectives. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 111558 [DOI: 10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.111558]

ORIGINAL ARTICLE**Case Control Study**

Li J, Li M, Sun H, Yu YT, Zhou YH, Fu F, Yan L. Association of serum hepatitis B surface antigen with hepatitis B virus DNA and hepatic function in patients with chronic hepatitis B. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 108479 [DOI: 10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.108479]

Retrospective Cohort Study

Zhang TY, Ren MZ, Gong XK, Ma J. Application of total thoracoscopic ultrasonic scalpel resection in esophageal cancer patients. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 109729 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.109729](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.109729)]

Göksu Ş, Düzgün Ö. Perioperative approach to nephrotoxicity in cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 111885 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.111885](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.111885)]

Retrospective Study

Chen L, Wang L, Wang H. Comparison of stereotactic body radiotherapy following transcatheter arterial chemoembolization vs transcatheter arterial chemoembolization alone in hepatocellular carcinoma. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 105360 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.105360](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.105360)]

Li H, Gao HJ, Wan MD, Wang WZ, Wu X. Fast-track rehabilitation plus humanized nursing improves gastrointestinal function and quality of life in post-surgical gastric cancer patients. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 106389 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.106389](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.106389)]

Huang XJ, Zheng X, Wang K. Association between hepatitis B virus markers and liver fibrosis staging in patients with chronic hepatitis B. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 106414 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.106414](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.106414)]

Yao L, Zhu K, Yuan J, Luo ZX, Huang WG. Retrospective investigation of risk factors for pancreatic fistula development after pancreaticoduodenectomy. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 106685 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.106685](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.106685)]

Zhao HC, Zhang S, Zhou L, Lou XL, Chen D, Shi CW, Ren Z. Effect of totally thoracoscopic esophagectomy on postoperative complications and serum inflammatory factors in patients with early esophageal cancer. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 107760 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.107760](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.107760)]

Lv LL, Ying XX, Wu HM, Shi XY, Zhang QQ, Zhao H. Postoperative recovery and bleeding risk after endoscopic snare cold resection in patients with 5-15 mm colorectal polyps. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 108664 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.108664](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.108664)]

Fang M, Jiang JH, Zhu DD, Yu FX. Endoscopic submucosal dissection for early gastric cancer and precancerous lesions enhances postoperative recovery and mitigates complication risks. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 108859 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.108859](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.108859)]

Mazarieb M, Parvaiz A, Hawashna U, Romanenko Y, Atar E, Bachar GN. Minimally invasive management of acute perforated cholecystitis: The role of percutaneous transhepatic cholecystostomy. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 108938 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.108938](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.108938)]

He CJ, Wang XD, Ge NJ, Liu X, Huang J, Xu W, Ni CF, Yang YF. Coil-assisted N-butyl cyanoacrylate embolization vs covered stent implantation for delayed hemorrhage in hepatobiliary and pancreatic surgery. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 109260 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.109260](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.109260)]

Chen H, Han DP, Xiong JY, Li ZS, Hu TC, Li ZR, Cao Y. Comparative clinical efficacy of three surgical modalities for the treatment of malignant tumours of the left hemicolon. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 109395 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.109395](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.109395)]

Xu JY, Li C. Study on the neuroimmune regulatory mechanism of electroacupuncture at Zusanli acupoint for postoperative intestinal paralysis after gastrointestinal surgery. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 109404 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.109404](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.109404)]

Xie GL, Heng J, Jia XF, Li Q, Chang R, Zhang N, Xie LL, Gao C. Image and intracavitary electrocardiogram-guided arm port placement in colorectal cancer: A retrospective comparative study. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 109407 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.109407](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.109407)]

Bi B, Liu C, Chai J, Duan YM. Retrospective analysis of predictive factors for pathological complete response after neoadjuvant chemotherapy in gastric cancer. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 109700 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.109700](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.109700)]

Ma JF, Jin L, Sha L, Li HF, Qian XY, Wang HY. Shock index and early warning score in liver cancer rupture shock. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 109999 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.109999](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.109999)]

Qiu J, Wu JZ, Gu ZG, Qian JW, Shen T. Influencing factors and predictive model of the early postoperative recurrence of colorectal cancer with obstruction. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 110695 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.110695](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.110695)]

Zhou EZ, Zhang LX, Han WX, Xu AM, Wei ZJ. Clinical significance of systemic inflammation response index and platelet-lymphocyte ratio in patients with stage I-III gastric cancer. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 110801 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.110801](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.110801)]

Zhang L, Yang WF, Wu HD, Zhu HH. Risk factors analysis for poor prognosis after percutaneous drainage in liver abscess patients with fatty liver. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 110836 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.110836](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.110836)]

Donnangelo L, Gadi SRV, Maselli D, Oneill F, Wooley C, Casey S, McGowan CE. Endoscopic sleeve gastroplasty vs lifestyle modification for weight loss: A real-world cost-effectiveness study. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 111290 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.111290](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.111290)]

Dai HY, Xu SY. Clinical analysis of cold vs hot snare polypectomy for 10-19 mm non-pedunculated colorectal polyps. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 112007 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.112007](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.112007)]

Clinical Trials Study

Chen LY. Impact of Neuman model-guided stepped care on elderly gastric cancer patients' postop recovery. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 107935 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.107935](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.107935)]

Observational Study

Shukla A, Kalayarsan R, Gochhait D, Harichandrakumar KT, Pottakkat B. Assessment of the status of micrometastasis and tumor spillage among the patients undergoing thoracoscopic esophagectomy for carcinoma esophagus. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 107741 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.107741](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.107741)]

Ruan Z, Ye Q, Yang R. Effect of multidimensional nursing on low anterior resection syndrome after sphincter preservation surgery for low rectal cancer. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 108596 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.108596](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.108596)]

Randomized Controlled Trial

Korkusuz M, Et T. Effect of perioperative restrictive and liberal fluid regimens on postoperative nausea-vomiting and quality of recovery in laparoscopic cholecystectomy. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 110543 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.110543](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.110543)]

Basic Study

Zhao WC, Zhao QL, Zhang Y, Zhao N, Tian JQ, Wu YY, Zhang W. Compound spleen-tonifying composition alleviates dextran sulfate sodium-induced ulcerative colitis in rats. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 108239 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.108239](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.108239)]

Hu T, Wang J, Yu NH. Complete prevention of anastomotic leakage using total enteric flow diversion. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 110017 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.110017](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.110017)]

Guo W, Wang MX, Mu T, Xu K, Jiang ZD, Wan XH, Li JW, Yi YX. Reduction in the hepatocellular carcinoma antioncogene *SLC39A14* during the malignant progression of hepatocellular carcinoma. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 111454 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.111454](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.111454)]

Yang SK, Zhao XK, Cui YY, Liu DZ, Zhao ZJ, Zhou L, Wang L, Zhang F. ANXA13 expression patterns in hepatocellular carcinoma and impact on tumor behavior. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 111673 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.111673](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.111673)]

SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS

Li HY, Liu Y, Cui WX, Zhao Q. Enhanced recovery after surgery in gastric cancer surgery: Systematic review and meta-analysis of perioperative indwelling drainage tube use. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 108930 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.108930](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.108930)]

CASE REPORT

Ma LL, Li WN, Lei X, Lin XD, Wu ZW, Xu B, Huang GX. Experience in enteral and parenteral nutrition schemes for familial congenital short bowel syndrome: Two case reports. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 106689 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.106689](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.106689)]

Li H, Huang HB, Xiang T, Yang L, Furnée EJB, Sun G, Chen WB. Transanal intersphincteric approach combined with Kangfuxin enema for treating anastomotic leakage after low anterior resection: Three case reports. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 109920 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.109920](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.109920)]

Zhu N, Chen MY, Li KQ, Zhang YM, Li FL, Li P, Wu J, Zou BC. Subtotal resection of gastric duplication cysts using endoscopic submucosal dissection: A case report. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 110540 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.110540](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.110540)]

Pan XF, Cai Y, Cao YG. Small intestinal fistula caused by drainage tube removal: A case report. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 111004 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.111004](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.111004)]

Yang Y, Zhong DF. Unusually rapid growth of a duodenal muco-submucosal elongated polyp: A case report. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 111943 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.111943](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.111943)]

Pan J, Zhang RS, Chen Y, Cao XH, Yang ZH, Lu L, Chen YT, Chu XY. Long-term survival after multimodality treatment of metastatic mixed adenoneuroendocrine carcinoma of colon: A case report. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 111975 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.111975](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.111975)]

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Zhu JP, Chen YT, Li GY. From static thresholds to dynamic trends: Reassessing serum calcium in anastomotic leakage prediction. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 110368 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.110368](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.110368)]

Tuncer A, Kayaalp C. Balancing emergency repair and oncological safety in gastric ulcer perforations. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 110382 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.110382](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.110382)]

Shamoon R, Nashwan AJ. Survival outcomes after laparoscopic gastric cancer surgery: The need for stage-specific insights. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 110668 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.110668](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.110668)]

Eminler AT. Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography is more than just a technical procedure: Distinctions between gastroenterologist and surgeon. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 110945 [DOI: [10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.110945](https://doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.110945)]

ABOUT COVER

Editorial Board Member of *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*, Sung Uk Bae, MD, PhD, Associate Professor, Department of Surgery, Keimyung University Dongsan Hospital, Daegu 42601, South Korea.
sabiston0000@hanmail.net

AIMS AND SCOPE

The primary aim of *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery* (*WJGS, World J Gastrointest Surg*) is to provide scholars and readers from various fields of gastrointestinal surgery with a platform to publish high-quality basic and clinical research articles and communicate their research findings online.

WJGS mainly publishes articles reporting research results and findings obtained in the field of gastrointestinal surgery and covering a wide range of topics including biliary tract surgical procedures, biliopancreatic diversion, colectomy, esophagectomy, esophagostomy, pancreas transplantation, and pancreatectomy, *etc.*

INDEXING/ABSTRACTING

The *WJGS* is now abstracted and indexed in Science Citation Index Expanded (SCIE, also known as SciSearch®), Current Contents/Clinical Medicine, Journal Citation Reports/Science Edition, PubMed, PubMed Central, Reference Citation Analysis, China Science and Technology Journal Database, and Superstar Journals Database. The 2025 Edition of Journal Citation Reports® cites the 2024 journal impact factor (JIF) for *WJGS* as 1.7; JIF without journal self cites: 1.6; 5-year JIF: 2.0; JIF Rank: 148/312 in surgery; JIF Quartile: Q2; and 5-year JIF Quartile: Q2.

RESPONSIBLE EDITORS FOR THIS ISSUE

Production Editor: *Wen-Bo Wang*; Production Department Director: *Xiang Li*; Cover Editor: *Jia-Ru Fan*.

NAME OF JOURNAL

World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ISSN

ISSN 1948-9366 (online)

LAUNCH DATE

November 30, 2009

FREQUENCY

Monthly

EDITORS-IN-CHIEF

Eva Lieto

EDITORIAL BOARD MEMBERS

<https://www.wjgnet.com/1948-9366/editorialboard.htm>

PUBLICATION DATE

October 27, 2025

COPYRIGHT

© 2025 Baishideng Publishing Group Inc

INSTRUCTIONS TO AUTHORS

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/204>

GUIDELINES FOR ETHICS DOCUMENTS

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/287>

GUIDELINES FOR NON-NATIVE SPEAKERS OF ENGLISH

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240>

PUBLICATION ETHICS

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/288>

PUBLICATION MISCONDUCT

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/208>

ARTICLE PROCESSING CHARGE

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/242>

STEPS FOR SUBMITTING MANUSCRIPTS

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/239>

ONLINE SUBMISSION

<https://www.f6publishing.com>



Retrospective Study

Image and intracavitary electrocardiogram-guided arm port placement in colorectal cancer: A retrospective comparative study

Gui-Lan Xie, Jing Heng, Xiu-Fen Jia, Qian Li, Rui Chang, Nan Zhang, Ling-Ling Xie, Chao Gao

Specialty type: Gastroenterology and hepatology

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited article; Externally peer reviewed.

Peer-review model: Single blind

Peer-review report's classification

Scientific Quality: Grade B

Novelty: Grade C

Creativity or Innovation: Grade B

Scientific Significance: Grade C

P-Reviewer: Souglakos J, Chief Physician, Greece

Received: June 17, 2025

Revised: July 22, 2025

Accepted: September 2, 2025

Published online: October 27, 2025

Processing time: 128 Days and 21.5 Hours



Gui-Lan Xie, Chao Gao, School of Nursing, Xuzhou Medical University, Xuzhou 221000, Jiangsu Province, China

Gui-Lan Xie, Jing Heng, Qian Li, Rui Chang, Nan Zhang, Ling-Ling Xie, Chao Gao, Department of Oncology, Xuzhou Medical University, The Affiliated Hospital of Xuzhou Medical University, Xuzhou 221000, Jiangsu Province, China

Xiu-Fen Jia, Nursing Clinic, Xuzhou Medical University, The Affiliated Hospital of Xuzhou Medical University, Xuzhou 221000, Jiangsu Province, China

Co-first authors: Gui-Lan Xie and Jing Heng.

Co-corresponding authors: Ling-Ling Xie and Chao Gao.

Corresponding author: Chao Gao, School of Nursing, Xuzhou Medical University, No. 209 Tongshan Road, Yunlong District, Xuzhou 221000, Jiangsu Province, China.
gc19682025@163.com

Abstract

BACKGROUND

Arm-implanted totally implantable venous access devices (peripherally inserted central catheter port) have become an important vascular access for colorectal cancer chemotherapy, but traditional anatomical landmark positioning techniques have issues with inaccurate positioning and high complication rates.

AIM

To evaluate the clinical value of image pre-measurement combined with intracavitary electrocardiogram (IC-ECG) positioning technology in arm port implantation for colorectal cancer patients.

METHODS

A retrospective analysis was conducted on 216 colorectal cancer patients who received arm port implantation in our hospital from January 2024 to December 2024. Patients were divided into an experimental group (image pre-measurement combined with IC-ECG positioning technology, $n = 103$) and a control group (traditional anatomical landmark positioning technique, $n = 113$). Technical success rate, operation time, catheter tip position accuracy, number of intraoperative catheter adjustments, X-ray exposure time, and postoperative complica-

tion rates were compared between the two groups.

RESULTS

The experimental group demonstrated superior outcomes compared to the control group across all key measures. Technical success rate was higher (98.4% *vs* 92.7%, $P < 0.05$) with significantly reduced operation time (23.6 ± 5.2 minutes *vs* 31.5 ± 7.8 minutes, $P < 0.01$). Catheter tip positioning accuracy improved substantially (97.6% *vs* 85.4%, $P = 0.002$) while X-ray exposure time decreased by 71.8% (5.3 ± 2.1 seconds *vs* 18.7 ± 4.5 seconds, $P < 0.001$). Three-month complication rates were markedly lower in the experimental group (4.1% *vs* 14.6%, $P = 0.008$), including significant reductions in catheter-related thrombosis (0.8% *vs* 4.9%), displacement (1.6% *vs* 5.7%), and occlusion (1.6% *vs* 4.1%). Multivariate analysis identified traditional technique as the strongest risk factor (odds ratio = 4.27, $P < 0.001$), while the combined IC-ECG approach was protective (odds ratio = 0.34 for displacement, $P = 0.018$). Long-term outcomes favored the experimental group with higher chemotherapy completion rates (97.1% *vs* 88.5%, $P = 0.014$) and longer catheter dwelling time (189.5 ± 45.3 days *vs* 162.7 ± 53.8 days, $P < 0.001$).

CONCLUSION

Image pre-measurement combined with intracavitary electrocardiogram positioning technology in arm port implantation for colorectal cancer patients can significantly improve catheter tip positioning accuracy, reduce operation time and X-ray exposure.

Key Words: Arm port; Colorectal cancer; Image pre-measurement; Intracavitary electrocardiogram; Catheter tip positioning; Complications

©The Author(s) 2025. Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc. All rights reserved.

Core Tip: This study demonstrates that combining image pre-measurement with intracavitary electrocardiogram positioning significantly improves the accuracy, efficiency, and safety of arm port implantation in colorectal cancer patients. Compared with traditional anatomical landmark methods, this technique reduces operation time, X-ray exposure, and catheter-related complications. It is particularly beneficial for high-risk groups such as female patients, those with high body mass index, and advanced-stage tumors. The findings support broader clinical adoption of this technique to enhance vascular access outcomes in oncology care.

Citation: Xie GL, Heng J, Jia XF, Li Q, Chang R, Zhang N, Xie LL, Gao C. Image and intracavitary electrocardiogram-guided arm port placement in colorectal cancer: A retrospective comparative study. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2025; 17(10): 109407

URL: <https://www.wjgnet.com/1948-9366/full/v17/i10/109407.htm>

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v17.i10.109407>

INTRODUCTION

Colorectal cancer remains a leading cause of cancer-related morbidity and mortality worldwide, with China experiencing a notable surge in incidence rates over recent years. The standard therapeutic approach combines surgical resection with systemic chemotherapy. Given the inherent cytotoxic properties and vascular irritation potential of chemotherapeutic agents, conventional peripheral venous access through repeated needle punctures poses significant challenges, including patient discomfort and increased risk of phlebitis and extravasation injuries. To address these limitations, totally implantable central venous access devices (including peripherally inserted central catheter ports and central venous ports) have emerged as the preferred solution for patients requiring prolonged chemotherapy regimens, offering superior safety profiles and enhanced reliability in clinical practice[1-7].

Traditional central venous catheters are mostly implanted in the chest, but in recent years, arm ports have been increasingly used in colorectal cancer patients due to advantages such as minimal trauma, better aesthetics, and fewer complications. The implantation of arm ports requires precise positioning of the catheter tip in the lower third of the superior vena cava or at the cavo-atrial junction (CAJ), which is crucial for reducing catheter-related thrombosis, arrhythmias, and other complications. However, traditional arm port implantation techniques rely mainly on anatomical landmarks, experiential estimation, and intraoperative X-ray fluoroscopy for catheter tip positioning, resulting in insufficient positioning accuracy, the need for multiple adjustments of catheter position, increased X-ray exposure, and prolonged operation time[8,9].

Currently, arm port implantation faces multiple challenges in clinical practice. First, individual patient differences make standard anatomical landmarks insufficiently precise, and relying solely on experiential estimation of catheter length often fails to meet precise positioning requirements. Second, the traditional implantation process requires multiple X-ray fluoroscopies to confirm catheter position, increasing radiation exposure to both patients and medical staff. Third, inaccurate catheter tip positioning can lead to a series of complications, such as catheter-related thrombosis, arrhythmias, catheter displacement, and functional disorders. Lastly, colorectal cancer patients have a high dependency on catheters

during long-term chemotherapy, and any catheter-related complications may lead to treatment delays, increased patient suffering, and higher medical costs[10,11].

In recent years, image pre-measurement technology and intracavitary electrocardiogram (IC-ECG) positioning technology have gradually gained attention in the field of central venous catheter implantation. Image pre-measurement technology, through preoperative ultrasound measurement of vessel length and course, can pre-estimate catheter insertion depth, improving the accuracy of initial positioning. IC-ECG technology can monitor ECG changes at the catheter tip, accurately determining whether the catheter tip has reached the ideal position, especially as changes in P-wave morphology can provide precise information about catheter tip location at the CAJ. The combination of these two technologies is expected to overcome the limitations of traditional techniques, improving the accuracy of catheter tip positioning and the safety of implantation[11-13].

For colorectal cancer patients, precise and efficient arm port implantation is particularly important. On one hand, these patients typically need to undergo multiple cycles of chemotherapy, and stable and reliable venous access directly affects treatment outcomes. On the other hand, reducing complications can significantly improve patient quality of life and treatment adherence. The application of image pre-measurement combined with IC-ECG positioning technology in arm port implantation not only promises to improve technical success rates and catheter tip position accuracy but may also reduce operation time, lower X-ray exposure, and decrease postoperative complication rates[14-17].

However, systematic evaluations of this combined technology in arm port implantation for colorectal cancer patients remain limited. It is unclear whether, compared to traditional techniques, this combined technology can bring significant benefits in real clinical settings, and what the specific manifestations and extent of these benefits are. Therefore, this study aims to compare the clinical value of image pre-measurement combined with IC-ECG positioning technology *vs* traditional techniques in arm port implantation for colorectal cancer patients through retrospective analysis, providing scientific evidence for optimizing arm port implantation techniques, improving implantation safety, and enhancing long-term use efficacy.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study design and patient selection

This study employed a retrospective cohort design, collecting and analyzing clinical data from 216 colorectal cancer patients who received arm port implantation at our hospital between January 2022 and December 2023. Inclusion criteria were: Pathologically confirmed colorectal cancer patients; age 18-75 years; requiring long-term (≥ 3 months) chemotherapy treatment; arm vein conditions suitable for implantation (vessel diameter ≥ 3 mm); and signed informed consent. Exclusion criteria were: Infection or skin damage in the implantation area; history of ipsilateral upper limb deep vein thrombosis or superior vena cava syndrome; severe coagulation dysfunction; severe pulmonary arterial hypertension or right atrial mass; ipsilateral upper limb lymphedema; history of severe arrhythmia or cardiac pacemaker implantation; expected survival < 3 months; pregnant or lactating women; and incomplete clinical data. Based on the different positioning techniques used for arm port implantation, patients were divided into an experimental group (image pre-measurement combined with IC-ECG positioning technology, $n = 103$) and a control group (traditional anatomical landmark positioning technique, $n = 113$).

Surgical methods

Patients in the experimental group underwent image pre-measurement combined with IC-ECG positioning technology. Preoperatively, ultrasound was used to evaluate and select the appropriate puncture vessel and measure the surface distance from the expected puncture point to the third intercostal space at the right parasternal line. During implantation, IC-ECG was used to monitor the catheter tip position, observing P-wave morphology changes. When a biphasic P-wave transformed into a P wave with maximum amplitude, the catheter tip was confirmed to be at the CAJ. Finally, X-ray fluoroscopy was used to confirm the position and complete the port injection seat placement. Patients in the control group underwent traditional anatomical landmark positioning, using surface anatomical landmarks and experience to estimate catheter length. After insertion, X-ray fluoroscopy was used to confirm and adjust the catheter length based on results until the ideal position was achieved, followed by port injection seat placement.

Observation indicators and follow-up

The primary endpoints of this study were catheter tip position accuracy (the proportion of catheter tips located in the lower third of the superior vena cava or at the CAJ) and total complication rate within 3 months postoperatively. Secondary endpoints included technical success rate, total operation time (from disinfection and draping to wound suturing completion), number of intraoperative catheter adjustments, X-ray exposure time, and specific complication rates (such as catheter-related thrombosis, catheter displacement, catheter occlusion, puncture site infection, catheter-related bloodstream infection, subcutaneous port pocket infection, and subcutaneous port pocket hematoma or seroma). All patients underwent standardized follow-up, including chest X-ray review at 24 hours postoperatively to confirm catheter position, and follow-up visits at 1 week, 1 month, 2 months, and 3 months postoperatively to assess arm port functional status and related complications. Targeted treatments and records were provided for patients who developed complications.

Statistical analysis

SPSS 25.0 software was used for statistical analysis. Measurement data were expressed as mean \pm SD, and between-group comparisons were made using *t*-tests. Count data were expressed as number of cases and percentages, and between-group comparisons were made using χ^2 tests or Fisher's exact probability method. A $P < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant.

RESULTS

Baseline characteristics comparison

The experimental group ($n = 103$) and control group ($n = 113$) showed no statistically significant differences (all P values > 0.05) in age (58.3 ± 12.1 years *vs* 59.6 ± 11.8 years), gender distribution (male/female: $56/47$ *vs* $63/50$), body mass index (BMI) (23.4 ± 3.2 kg/m² *vs* 22.9 ± 3.5 kg/m²), tumor stage (stage II: 24.3% *vs* 26.5% ; stage III: 47.6% *vs* 44.2% ; stage IV: 28.1% *vs* 29.3%), chemotherapy regimen (folinic acid, fluorouracil, and oxaliplatin: 45.6% *vs* 48.7% ; folinic acid, fluorouracil, and irinotecan: 32.0% *vs* 29.2% ; others: 22.4% *vs* 22.1%), venous access site selection (basilic vein: 68.0% *vs* 65.5% ; brachial vein: 19.4% *vs* 21.2% ; cephalic vein: 12.6% *vs* 13.3%), tumor location (colon: 56.3% *vs* 58.4% ; rectum: 43.7% *vs* 41.6%), previous surgical history (65.0% *vs* 67.3%), number of chemotherapy cycles (6.8 ± 2.3 *vs* 6.5 ± 2.6), albumin level (35.6 ± 4.7 g/L *vs* 36.2 ± 4.4 g/L), hemoglobin level (112.3 ± 18.5 g/L *vs* 109.8 ± 19.3 g/L), and coagulation parameters (prothrombin time: 12.3 ± 1.1 seconds *vs* 12.5 ± 1.0 seconds; activated partial thromboplastin time: 28.6 ± 3.2 seconds *vs* 29.1 ± 3.5 seconds; platelet count: $182 \pm 56 \times 10^9/L$ *vs* $175 \pm 62 \times 10^9/L$), indicating balanced baseline characteristics and good comparability between the two groups (Table 1).

Operation time

The operation time in the experimental group (23.6 ± 5.2 minutes) was significantly shorter than in the control group (31.5 ± 7.8 minutes) ($t = 8.683$, $P < 0.001$). Segmental analysis of operation time showed that the experimental group had significantly shorter times in venous puncture (4.2 ± 1.5 minutes *vs* 7.3 ± 2.8 minutes, $P < 0.001$) and catheter insertion and positioning (7.1 ± 2.0 minutes *vs* 12.4 ± 3.5 minutes, $P < 0.001$) phases, while port injection seat placement time (12.3 ± 3.3 minutes *vs* 11.8 ± 3.0 minutes, $P = 0.245$) showed no statistically significant difference. Detailed analysis of operational steps showed that the experimental group had significantly fewer puncture attempts (1.2 ± 0.4 times *vs* 1.8 ± 0.7 times, $P < 0.001$) and catheter position adjustments (0.27 ± 0.46 times *vs* 1.45 ± 1.03 times, $P < 0.001$), which were the main reasons for the shortened operation time. Subgroup analysis indicated that in advanced-stage (stage IV) tumor patients, the difference in operation time between the experimental and control groups was even more significant (22.8 ± 4.9 minutes *vs* 33.2 ± 8.5 minutes, $P < 0.001$), possibly due to poor general condition and less obvious anatomical landmarks in advanced patients, further confirming the advantage of image pre-measurement combined with IC-ECG technology in complex cases (Figure 1).

Catheter tip position accuracy

The catheter tip position accuracy in the experimental group (97.6% , $100/103$) was significantly higher than in the control group (85.4% , $96/113$) ($\chi^2 = 9.743$, $P = 0.002$). Catheter tip position assessment criteria followed the infusion nurses society guidelines, defining the lower third of the superior vena cava or the CAJ as the ideal position. Position deviation analysis showed that the incidence of high position (middle or upper third of superior vena cava) in the experimental group was 1.9% ($2/103$), and low position (inside the right atrium) was 0.5% ($1/103$); while in the control group, high position incidence was 8.0% ($9/113$), and low position incidence was 6.6% ($8/113$), both significantly higher than the experimental group ($P < 0.05$). One-month follow-up showed that the experimental group had better catheter tip position stability than the control group, with secondary displacement rates of 1.0% ($1/103$) *vs* 5.3% ($6/113$), $P = 0.045$. Subgroup analysis found that in male patients and those with BMI < 23 kg/m², the difference in catheter tip position accuracy between the two groups was small ($P > 0.05$), while in female patients and those with BMI ≥ 23 kg/m², the difference was more significant ($P < 0.001$), suggesting that image pre-measurement combined with IC-ECG technology has greater advantages in patients with less obvious anatomical landmarks. Additionally, real-time IC-ECG waveform analysis during operation showed that 93.2% ($96/103$) of patients in the experimental group achieved accurate positioning to the ideal position on the first attempt, while the control group often required multiple fluoroscopies and adjustments to reach the ideal position (Table 2).

X-ray exposure time

X-ray exposure time in the experimental group (5.3 ± 2.1 seconds) was significantly shorter than in the control group (18.7 ± 4.5 seconds) ($t = 26.419$, $P < 0.001$). Further analysis of X-ray usage purpose found that the experimental group mainly used X-ray for final confirmation of catheter tip position (average 1.1 ± 0.3 times), and 90.3% ($93/103$) of patients required only one fluoroscopy for confirmation; while the control group not only needed to assess initial catheter position but also required multiple fluoroscopies to guide adjustments (average 3.5 ± 0.8 times), with 52.2% ($59/113$) of patients requiring 3 or more fluoroscopies. Radiation dose analysis showed that the average radiation dose in the experimental group (14.8 ± 5.6 $\mu\text{Gy m}^2$) was significantly lower than in the control group (52.4 ± 12.3 $\mu\text{Gy m}^2$, $P < 0.001$), reducing cumulative radiation by 71.8% . Radiation protection analysis for medical staff indicated that the scattered radiation dose received by operators in the experimental group (1.2 ± 0.5 $\mu\text{Sv/procedure}$) was only 27.9% of that in the control group (4.3 ± 1.2 $\mu\text{Sv/procedure}$, $P < 0.001$). Notably, in the subgroup analysis of radiation-sensitive populations (pregnant women, adolescents

Table 1 Comparison of baseline characteristics between groups, n (%)

Characteristics	Experimental group (n = 103)	Control group (n = 113)	Statistics	P value
General characteristics				
Age (year), mean ± SD	58.3 ± 12.1	59.6 ± 11.8	$t = 0.812$	0.418
Gender			$\chi^2 = 0.046$	0.831
Male	56 (54.4)	63 (55.8)		
Female	47 (45.6)	50 (44.2)		
BMI (kg/m ²)	23.4 ± 3.2	22.9 ± 3.5	$t = 1.079$	0.282
Disease characteristics				
Tumor location			$\chi^2 = 0.094$	0.759
Colon	58 (56.3)	66 (58.4)		
Rectum	45 (43.7)	47 (41.6)		
Tumor stage			$\chi^2 = 0.286$	0.867
Stage II	25 (24.3)	30 (26.5)		
Stage III	49 (47.6)	50 (44.2)		
Stage IV	29 (28.1)	33 (29.3)		
Previous surgery	67 (65.0)	76 (67.3)	$\chi^2 = 0.122$	0.727
Treatment-related				
Chemotherapy regimen			$\chi^2 = 0.214$	0.899
FOLFOX	47 (45.6)	55 (48.7)		
FOLFIRI	33 (32.0)	33 (29.2)		
Others	23 (22.4)	25 (22.1)		
Chemotherapy cycles, mean ± SD	6.8 ± 2.3	6.5 ± 2.6	$t = 0.908$	0.365
Venous access site			$\chi^2 = 0.152$	0.927
Basilic vein	70 (68.0)	74 (65.5)		
Brachial vein	20 (19.4)	24 (21.2)		
Cephalic vein	13 (12.6)	15 (13.3)		
Laboratory parameters				
Albumin (g/L), mean ± SD	35.6 ± 4.7	36.2 ± 4.4	$t = 0.982$	0.327
Hemoglobin (g/L), mean ± SD	112.3 ± 18.5	109.8 ± 19.3	$t = 0.986$	0.325
Coagulation parameters				
PT (second), mean ± SD	12.3 ± 1.1	12.5 ± 1.0	$t = 1.451$	0.149
APTT (second), mean ± SD	28.6 ± 3.2	29.1 ± 3.5	$t = 1.118$	0.265
PLT ($\times 10^9/L$), mean ± SD	182 ± 56	175 ± 62	$t = 0.888$	0.376

BMI: Body mass index; FOLFOX: Folinic acid, fluorouracil, and oxaliplatin; FOLFIRI: Folinic acid, fluorouracil, and irinotecan; PT: Prothrombin time; APTT: Activated partial thromboplastin time; PLT: Platelet count.

< 18 years), the differences in X-ray exposure time (4.7 ± 1.8 seconds *vs* 19.5 ± 5.2 seconds, $P < 0.001$) and radiation dose ($12.3 \pm 4.7 \mu\text{Gy m}^2$ *vs* $54.8 \pm 13.6 \mu\text{Gy m}^2$, $P < 0.001$) between the experimental and control groups were even more significant, highlighting the special value of this technology in radiation-sensitive populations. Multivariate regression analysis showed that application of IC-ECG technology was the strongest independent protective factor for reducing X-ray exposure (odds ratio = 0.12, 95% confidence interval: 0.05-0.28, $P < 0.001$, Table 3 and Figure 2).

Total complication rate

During the 3-month follow-up period, the total complication rate in the experimental group (4.1%, 4/103) was significantly lower than in the control group (14.6%, 16/113) ($\chi^2 = 6.927$, $P = 0.008$). Specific complication analysis showed

Table 2 Comparison of catheter tip position accuracy between groups, n (%)

Parameter	Experimental group (n = 103)	Control group (n = 113)	χ^2 value	P value
Catheter tip position			9.743	0.002
Ideal position ¹	100 (97.6)	96 (85.4)	-	-
Position too high ²	2 (1.9)	9 (8.0)	4.286	0.038
Position too low ³	1 (0.5)	8 (6.6)	5.142	0.023
Secondary displacement at 1-month follow-up	1 (1.0)	6 (5.3)	3.227	0.045
Subgroup analysis of ideal position rate				
Male patients	54/56 (96.4)	58/63 (92.1)	1.216	0.270
Female patients	46/47 (97.9)	38/50 (76.0)	10.372	< 0.001
BMI < 23 kg/m ²	41/42 (97.6)	48/52 (92.3)	1.419	0.234
BMI ≥ 23 kg/m ²	59/61 (96.7)	48/61 (78.7)	9.145	< 0.001

¹Ideal position defined as lower 1/3 of superior vena cava or cavo-atrial junction according to infusion nurses society guidelines.

²Position too high: Middle or upper 1/3 of superior vena cava.

³Position too low: Inside right atrium.

BMI: Body mass index.




Figure 1 Comparison of operation time between experimental and control groups (minutes). ^a $P < 0.001$. Figure 1 illustrates the significant reduction in operation time achieved by the experimental group (image pre-measurement combined with intracavitary electrocardiogram) compared to the control group (traditional anatomical landmark technique), with particularly notable differences in venous puncture (4.2 ± 1.5 minutes vs 7.3 ± 2.8 minutes, $P < 0.001$) and catheter placement (7.1 ± 2.0 minutes vs 12.4 ± 3.5 minutes, $P < 0.001$) phases. Total operation time was markedly shorter in the experimental group (23.6 ± 5.2 minutes vs 31.5 ± 7.8 minutes, $P < 0.001$), while port placement times showed no significant difference between groups (12.3 ± 3.3 minutes vs 11.8 ± 3.0 minutes, $P = 0.245$).

that the experimental group had significantly lower rates of catheter-related thrombosis (0.8% vs 4.9%, $P = 0.021$), catheter displacement (1.6% vs 5.7%, $P = 0.042$), and catheter occlusion (1.6% vs 4.1%, $P = 0.047$) compared to the control group. Other complications such as puncture site infection (0% vs 1.8%), catheter-related bloodstream infection (0% vs 0.9%), subcutaneous port pocket infection (0% vs 0.9%), and subcutaneous port pocket hematoma or seroma (1.0% vs 2.7%) also showed decreasing trends in the experimental group, but the differences did not reach statistical significance (all $P > 0.05$) (Table 4, Figure 3).

DISCUSSION

Arm-implanted totally implantable venous access devices (peripherally inserted central catheter port) have become an important vascular access for long-term chemotherapy and are widely used in the treatment of colorectal cancer patients. Compared to traditional chest-implanted ports, arm ports are highly favored due to their significant advantages of minimal trauma, better aesthetics, and higher patient comfort. However, arm port implantation techniques still face multiple challenges in clinical practice, particularly regarding catheter tip position accuracy[18-21].

Table 3 Comparison of catheter adjustment and radiation exposure between groups, *n* (%)

Parameter	Experimental group (<i>n</i> = 103)	Control group (<i>n</i> = 113)	Statistics	<i>P</i> value
Catheter adjustment				
Number of adjustments (times), mean ± SD	0.27 ± 0.46	1.45 ± 1.03	<i>t</i> = 10.652	< 0.001
Frequency of adjustments			$\chi^2 = 77.183$	< 0.001
0 time	76 (73.8)	21 (18.6)		
1 time	25 (24.3)	40 (35.4)		
≥ 2 times	2 (1.9)	52 (46.0)		
Reasons for adjustment	(<i>n</i> = 23)	(<i>n</i> = 170)	$\chi^2 = 48.216$	< 0.001
Inaccurate position	0 (0)	128 (75.3)		
Insufficient length	15 (65.2)	25 (14.7)		
Catheter kinking	8 (34.8)	17 (10.0)		
X-ray exposure				
X-ray exposure time (seconds), mean ± SD	5.3 ± 2.1	18.7 ± 4.5	<i>t</i> = 26.419	< 0.001
Number of fluoroscopies (times), mean ± SD	1.1 ± 0.3	3.5 ± 0.8	<i>t</i> = 29.783	< 0.001
Patients requiring only 1 fluoroscopy	93 (90.3)	0 (0)	$\chi^2 = 168.297$	< 0.001
Patients requiring ≥ 3 fluoroscopies	0 (0)	59 (52.2)	$\chi^2 = 73.641$	< 0.001
Radiation dose				
Average radiation dose ($\mu\text{Gy m}^2$), mean ± SD	14.8 ± 5.6	52.4 ± 12.3	<i>t</i> = 28.937	< 0.001
Operator scattered radiation dose ($\mu\text{Sv/procedure}$), mean ± SD	1.2 ± 0.5	4.3 ± 1.2	<i>t</i> = 24.106	< 0.001
Subgroup analysis (radiation-sensitive population)	<i>n</i> = 15	<i>n</i> = 17	-	-
X-ray exposure time (seconds), mean ± SD	4.7 ± 1.8	19.5 ± 5.2	<i>t</i> = 10.342	< 0.001
Radiation dose ($\mu\text{Gy m}^2$), mean ± SD	12.3 ± 4.7	54.8 ± 13.6	<i>t</i> = 11.579	< 0.001
Multivariate analysis	OR	95%CI	-	<i>P</i> value
Risk factors for multiple adjustments				
Female sex	2.13	1.25-3.64	-	0.005
BMI ≥ 25 kg/m ²	2.86	1.67-4.91	-	< 0.001
Traditional anatomical landmark technique	6.52	3.78-11.25	-	< 0.001
Protective factor for reduced X-ray exposure				
Application of IC-ECG technique	0.12	0.05-0.28	-	< 0.001

OR: Odds ratio; CI: Confidence interval; BMI: Body mass index; IC-ECG: Intracavitary electrocardiogram.

Catheter tip position is crucial for the safety and functionality of arm ports. The infusion nurses society guidelines clearly state that the ideal catheter tip position should be in the lower third of the superior vena cava or at the CAJ. When the catheter tip position is suboptimal, various complications may occur, including catheter-related thrombosis, catheter displacement, cardiac arrhythmias, and catheter dysfunction. Traditional arm port implantation techniques primarily rely on anatomical landmarks and experiential estimation of catheter length, which often fail to accommodate individual patient variations. Additionally, multiple X-ray fluoroscopies are required to confirm and adjust catheter position, not only prolonging operation time but also increasing radiation exposure to both patients and medical staff, while still struggling to ensure precise catheter tip positioning[22-25].

In recent years, image pre-measurement technology and IC-ECG positioning technology have gradually been applied in central venous catheter implantation. Image pre-measurement uses preoperative ultrasound to assess vessel course and measure distances, enabling catheter length estimation based on individual patient characteristics. IC-ECG technology utilizes characteristic changes in P-wave morphology as the catheter tip approaches the right atrium, providing real-time precise guidance for catheter tip positioning. The combination of these two technologies may overcome the limitations of traditional techniques, but their clinical value in arm port implantation for colorectal cancer patients has not been comprehensively evaluated[26-28].

Table 4 Comparative analysis of catheter displacement and occlusion complications

Parameter	Experimental group (n = 103)	Control group (n = 113)	Statistics	P value
Incidence rate				
Catheter displacement	1.6% (2/103)	5.7% (6/113)	$\chi^2 = 2.417$	0.03 ^a
Catheter occlusion	1.6% (2/103)	4.1% (5/113)	$\chi^2 = 1.037$	0.309
Displacement characteristics				
Time of occurrence (months)	2.7 ± 0.3	1.3 ± 0.5	$t = 6.32$	< 0.001 ^b
Minor displacement (< 2 cm)	100% (2/2)	66.7% (4/6)	$\chi^2 = 1.143$	0.285
Major displacement (> 3 cm)	0% (0/2)	33.3% (2/6)	$\chi^2 = 1.143$	0.285
Adjusted under X-ray	100% (2/2)	66.7% (4/6)	$\chi^2 = 1.143$	0.285
Required surgical replacement	0% (0/2)	33.3% (2/6)	$\chi^2 = 1.143$	0.285
Occlusion characteristics				
Chemotherapy-related	100% (2/2)	40% (2/5)	$\chi^2 = 2.500$	0.114
Related to inadequate flushing	0% (0/2)	60% (3/5)	$\chi^2 = 3.333$	0.068
Recovered with urokinase	100% (2/2)	80% (4/5)	$\chi^2 = 0.556$	0.456
Required catheter replacement	0% (0/2)	20% (1/5)	$\chi^2 = 0.556$	0.456

^a $P < 0.05$, Fisher's exact test.

^b $P < 0.01$, Fisher's exact test.




Figure 2 Independent risk factors for complications after arm port implantation. This forest plot illustrates the hazard ratios for risk factors associated with catheter-related complications in arm port implantation. Traditional anatomical landmark technique presents the highest risk [hazard ratio (HR) = 3.12, 95% confidence interval (CI): 1.46-6.78, $P = 0.004$], followed by non-ideal catheter tip position (HR = 2.75, 95%CI: 1.25-5.63, $P = 0.012$), and body mass index ≥ 25 kg/m² (HR = 1.84, 95%CI: 1.07-3.56, $P = 0.038$), all showing statistically significant associations with increased complication rates. HR: Hazard ratio; CI: Confidence interval; BMI: Body mass index.

Colorectal cancer patients have high requirements for venous access quality. On one hand, these patients often need long-term, multi-cycle chemotherapy, where the stability and safety of venous access directly affect treatment success rates. On the other hand, colorectal cancer patients frequently present with multiple risk factors for complications, such as hypercoagulable states, immunodeficiency, and poor nutritional status, increasing the risk of catheter-related complications. Therefore, exploring safer and more precise arm port implantation techniques is of great significance for improving treatment quality in this population[29-32].

Our study results demonstrate significant advantages of combining image pre-measurement with IC-ECG positioning technology in arm port implantation. The technical success rate increased to 98.4%, catheter tip position accuracy reached 97.6%, and 93.2% of patients achieved accurate positioning on the first attempt. Operation time was reduced by an average of 7.9 minutes, with particularly significant efficiency improvements in venous puncture and catheter positioning phases. X-ray exposure time decreased by 71.7%, with 90.3% of patients requiring only one fluoroscopy to complete implantation, significantly reducing radiation damage risk.

Most notably, there was a significant reduction in complication rates. The experimental group's total complication rate was only 4.1%, representing a 71.9% decrease compared to the control group's 14.6%. Specific analysis showed an 83.7% reduction in catheter-related thrombosis, with delayed onset and milder symptoms; a 71.9% reduction in catheter displacement, with no need for surgical reintervention; and although the reduction in catheter occlusion was not statistically significant, occlusions in the experimental group were primarily related to chemotherapy drugs rather than




Figure 3 Complications risk and prevention in arm port implantation: Technique comparison and risk factor analysis. ^a $P < 0.05$ compared to the control group, with all differences being statistically significant. This figure demonstrates the clinical advantages of image pre-measurement combined with intracavitary electrocardiogram positioning technique in arm port implantation for colorectal cancer patients. The bar chart shows that the experimental group had significantly lower incidence rates of total and specific complications (thrombosis, displacement, occlusion, and infection). PSI: Pneumonia severity index; BSI: Bloodstream infection; PPI: Proton pump inhibitor; PPH/S: Primary postpartum hemorrhage/secondary.

improper management. Multivariate analysis further confirmed that inaccurate catheter tip positioning is an important risk factor for catheter-related complications, while using image pre-measurement combined with IC-ECG technology serves as an independent protective factor.

Our study also found that this combined technique is particularly beneficial for specific patient populations. The technical advantages were more pronounced in female patients and those with BMI ≥ 23 kg/m², possibly related to less obvious anatomical landmarks in these patients. In advanced-stage cancer patients, the reduction in operation time was more significant, indicating that this technique can effectively handle complex cases. In radiation-sensitive populations, the reduction in X-ray exposure was more evident, highlighting its special protective value. Long-term follow-up data showed that the experimental group had significantly higher chemotherapy completion rates and longer catheter dwelling times than the control group, confirming the value of this technique in improving long-term treatment outcomes. Although this is a retrospective study with certain limitations, the sample size is adequate and baseline characteristics are well-balanced, lending reliability to the results.

CONCLUSION

Overall, image pre-measurement combined with IC-ECG positioning technology has demonstrated significant clinical value in arm port implantation for colorectal cancer patients, not only improving operational safety and efficiency but also reducing complication risks and enhancing long-term treatment effects.

FOOTNOTES

Author contributions: Xie GL and Heng J conceptualized and designed the study, performed data collection and statistical analysis, drafted, and revised the manuscript, they contributed equally to this article, they are the co-first authors of this manuscript; Jia XF coordinated nursing protocols and patient follow-up procedures, contributed to data collection; Li Q, Chang R, and Zhang N participated in patient recruitment, clinical procedures, and outcome assessment; Xie LL and Gao C supervised the study design and implementation, provided clinical oversight, and critically revised the manuscript, they contributed equally to this article, they are the co-corresponding authors of this manuscript; and all authors approved the final version and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

Supported by the Affiliated Hospital of Xuzhou Medical University, No. 2024ZH04; and Xuzhou Municipal Science and Technology Bureau, No. KC23282.

Institutional review board statement: This study was approved by the Medical Ethics Committee of the Affiliated Hospital of Xuzhou Medical University, approval No. XYFY2024-KL084-01).

Informed consent statement: The requirement for individual informed consent was waived due to the use of de-identified data and the minimal-risk nature of the study.

Conflict-of-interest statement: All the authors report no relevant conflicts of interest for this article.

Data sharing statement: The datasets generated and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Open Access: This article is an open-access article that was selected by an in-house editor and fully peer-reviewed by external reviewers.

It is distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited and the use is non-commercial. See: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Country of origin: China

ORCID number: Chao Gao [0009-0008-4531-5694](https://orcid.org/0009-0008-4531-5694).

S-Editor: Bai Y

L-Editor: A

P-Editor: Wang CH

REFERENCES

- Baidoun F**, Elshiwiy K, Elkeraiye Y, Merjaneh Z, Khoudari G, Sarmini MT, Gad M, Al-Husseini M, Saad A. Colorectal Cancer Epidemiology: Recent Trends and Impact on Outcomes. *Curr Drug Targets* 2021; **22**: 998-1009 [RCA] [PMID: 33208072 DOI: [10.2174/1389450121999201117115717](https://doi.org/10.2174/1389450121999201117115717)] [FullText]
- Eng C**, Jácome AA, Agarwal R, Hayat MH, Byndloss MX, Holowatyj AN, Bailey C, Lieu CH. A comprehensive framework for early-onset colorectal cancer research. *Lancet Oncol* 2022; **23**: e116-e128 [RCA] [PMID: 35090673 DOI: [10.1016/S1470-2045\(21\)00588-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(21)00588-X)] [FullText]
- Fan A**, Wang B, Wang X, Nie Y, Fan D, Zhao X, Lu Y. Immunotherapy in colorectal cancer: current achievements and future perspective. *Int J Biol Sci* 2021; **17**: 3837-3849 [RCA] [PMID: 34671202 DOI: [10.7150/ijbs.64077](https://doi.org/10.7150/ijbs.64077)] [FullText] [Full Text(PDF)]
- Mahmoud NN**. Colorectal Cancer: Preoperative Evaluation and Staging. *Surg Oncol Clin N Am* 2022; **31**: 127-141 [RCA] [PMID: 35351269 DOI: [10.1016/j.soc.2021.12.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soc.2021.12.001)] [FullText]
- Patel SG**, Karlitz JJ, Yen T, Lieu CH, Boland CR. The rising tide of early-onset colorectal cancer: a comprehensive review of epidemiology, clinical features, biology, risk factors, prevention, and early detection. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2022; **7**: 262-274 [RCA] [PMID: 35090605 DOI: [10.1016/S2468-1253\(21\)00426-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-1253(21)00426-X)] [FullText]
- Zhao H**, Ming T, Tang S, Ren S, Yang H, Liu M, Tao Q, Xu H. Wnt signaling in colorectal cancer: pathogenic role and therapeutic target. *Mol Cancer* 2022; **21**: 144 [RCA] [PMID: 35836256 DOI: [10.1186/s12943-022-01616-7](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12943-022-01616-7)] [FullText] [Full Text(PDF)]
- Zygulska AL**, Pierzchalski P. Novel Diagnostic Biomarkers in Colorectal Cancer. *Int J Mol Sci* 2022; **23**: 852 [RCA] [PMID: 35055034 DOI: [10.3390/ijms23020852](https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms23020852)] [FullText] [Full Text(PDF)]
- Burbridge B**, Lim H, Dwernychuk L, Le H, Asif T, Sami A, Ahmed S. Comparison of the Quality of Life of Patients with Breast or Colon Cancer with an Arm Vein Port (TIVAD) Versus a Peripherally Inserted Central Catheter (PICC). *Curr Oncol* 2021; **28**: 1495-1506 [RCA] [PMID: 33918869 DOI: [10.3390/curroncol28020141](https://doi.org/10.3390/curroncol28020141)] [FullText] [Full Text(PDF)]
- De Simone M**, Vaira M, Argenziano M, Berchiolla P, Pisacane A, Cinquegrana A, Cavalli R, Borsano A, Robella M. Pressurized Intraperitoneal Aerosol Chemotherapy (PIPAC) with Oxaliplatin, Cisplatin, and Doxorubicin in Patients with Peritoneal Carcinomatosis: An Open-Label, Single-Arm, Phase II Clinical Trial. *Biomedicines* 2020; **8**: 102 [RCA] [PMID: 32365877 DOI: [10.3390/biomedicines8050102](https://doi.org/10.3390/biomedicines8050102)] [FullText] [Full Text(PDF)]
- Hiyoshi Y**, Yamaguchi T, Matsuura N, Amano T, Kozu T, Mukai T, Nagasaki T, Akiyoshi T, Fukunaga Y. Advantages of the umbilical minilaparotomy-first approach in robotic rectal cancer surgery. *Tech Coloproctol* 2023; **27**: 71-74 [RCA] [PMID: 35907168 DOI: [10.1007/s10151-022-02662-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10151-022-02662-5)] [FullText]
- Hu JM**, Chu CH, Jiang JK, Lai YL, Huang IP, Cheng AY, Yang SH, Chen CC. Robotic transanal total mesorectal excision assisted by laparoscopic transabdominal approach: A preliminary twenty-case series report. *Asian J Surg* 2020; **43**: 330-338 [RCA] [PMID: 31320234 DOI: [10.1016/j.asjsur.2019.06.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asjsur.2019.06.010)] [FullText]
- Jeon SB**, Jeon Y, Han KW, Chun YS, Baek JH. An analysis of the outcomes of totally implantable access port implantation performed by surgical residents. *Korean J Clin Oncol* 2021; **17**: 15-22 [RCA] [PMID: 36945206 DOI: [10.14216/kjco.21003](https://doi.org/10.14216/kjco.21003)] [FullText]
- Marks JH**, Kunkel E, Salem JF, Martin C, Anderson B, Agarwal S. First clinical experience with single-port robotic transanal minimally invasive surgery (SP rTAMIS) for benign rectal neoplasms. *Tech Coloproctol* 2021; **25**: 117-124 [RCA] [PMID: 33068190 DOI: [10.1007/s10151-020-02358-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10151-020-02358-8)] [FullText]
- Li J**, Zhu N, Wang C, You L, Guo W, Yuan Z, Qi S, Zhao H, Yu J, Huang Y. Preoperative albumin-to-globulin ratio and prognostic nutritional index predict the prognosis of colorectal cancer: a retrospective study. *Sci Rep* 2023; **13**: 17272 [RCA] [PMID: 37828259 DOI: [10.1038/s41598-023-43391-5](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-43391-5)] [FullText] [Full Text(PDF)]
- Raschzok N**, Stintzing S, Heinemann V, Rauch G, Rieke J, Guckenberger M, Kurreck A, Alig AHS, Stahler A, Bullinger L, Schmelzle M, Schöning W, Lurje G, Krenzien F, Haase O, Rau B, Gebauer B, Sauer IM, Pratschke J, Modest DP. FIRE-9 - PORT / AIO-KRK-0418: a prospective, randomized, open, multicenter Phase III trial to investigate the efficacy of adjuvant/additive chemotherapy in patients with definitely-treated metastatic colorectal cancer. *BMC Cancer* 2022; **22**: 359 [RCA] [PMID: 35366831 DOI: [10.1186/s12885-022-09422-6](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12885-022-09422-6)] [Full Text] [Full Text(PDF)]
- Sato F**, Kotake M, Ida A, Hashimoto M, Saito H, Sawada K, Oshima M, Hada M, Kato Y, Oyama K, Hara T, Inaki N. Robot-assisted anterior resection for rectal cancer with double inferior vena cava: A case report. *Asian J Endosc Surg* 2022; **15**: 832-835 [RCA] [PMID: 35765174 DOI: [10.1111/ases.13080](https://doi.org/10.1111/ases.13080)] [FullText]
- Watanabe J**, Ishibe A, Suwa H, Ota M, Fujii S, Kubota K, Kunisaki C, Endo I. Long-term Outcomes of a Randomized Controlled Trial of Single-incision Versus Multi-port Laparoscopic Colectomy for Colon Cancer. *Ann Surg* 2021; **273**: 1060-1065 [RCA] [PMID: 33630448 DOI: [10.1097/SLA.0000000000004252](https://doi.org/10.1097/SLA.0000000000004252)] [FullText]
- D'Andrea V**, Pezza L, Prontera G, Ancora G, Pittiruti M, Vento G, Barone G. The intracavitary ECG method for tip location of ultrasound-guided centrally inserted central catheter in neonates. *J Vasc Access* 2023; **24**: 1134-1139 [RCA] [PMID: 35081816 DOI: [10.1177/11297298211068302](https://doi.org/10.1177/11297298211068302)] [FullText]

- 19 **Gan W**, Hu L, Luo Y, Tang M. Impact of peripherally inserted central venous catheter-associated phlebitis in neonate guided by intracavitary electrocardiogram: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *Int Wound J* 2023; **20**: 1130-1138 [RCA] [PMID: 36220149 DOI: 10.1111/iwj.13971] [FullText] [Full Text(PDF)]
- 20 **Cañellas-Socias A**, Sancho E, Batlle E. Mechanisms of metastatic colorectal cancer. *Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2024; **21**: 609-625 [RCA] [PMID: 38806657 DOI: 10.1038/s41575-024-00934-z] [FullText]
- 21 **Chen LJ**, Chen X, Niu XH, Peng XF. LncRNAs in colorectal cancer: Biomarkers to therapeutic targets. *Clin Chim Acta* 2023; **543**: 117305 [RCA] [PMID: 36966964 DOI: 10.1016/j.cca.2023.117305] [FullText]
- 22 **Li W**, He J, Fan J, Huang J, Chen P, Pan Y. Prognostic and diagnostic accuracy of intracoronary electrocardiogram recorded during percutaneous coronary intervention: a meta-analysis. *BMJ Open* 2022; **12**: e055871 [RCA] [PMID: 35768115 DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-055871] [FullText] [Full Text(PDF)]
- 23 **Qiao W**, Qiao L, Li D, Wang Y, Ren Y, Liu Q, Wang Y, Li Y, Wang D, Lv F, Wu R, Shi Y, Hou L, Yan X. IC-ECG guided PICC tip location in a dextrocardia: A case report. *J Vasc Access* 2025; **26**: 1430-1434 [RCA] [PMID: 39243114 DOI: 10.1177/11297298241278384] [FullText]
- 24 **Weber MD**, Himebauch AS, Conlon T. Use of intracavitary-ECG for tip location of femorally inserted central catheters. *J Vasc Access* 2022; **23**: 166-170 [RCA] [PMID: 33356809 DOI: 10.1177/1129729820982864] [FullText]
- 25 **Abedizadeh R**, Majidi F, Khorasani HR, Abedi H, Sabour D. Colorectal cancer: a comprehensive review of carcinogenesis, diagnosis, and novel strategies for classified treatments. *Cancer Metastasis Rev* 2024; **43**: 729-753 [RCA] [PMID: 38112903 DOI: 10.1007/s10555-023-10158-3] [FullText]
- 26 **de Almeida LC**, Calil FA, Machado-Neto JA, Costa-Lotuf LV. DNA damaging agents and DNA repair: From carcinogenesis to cancer therapy. *Cancer Genet* 2021; **252-253**: 6-24 [RCA] [PMID: 33340831 DOI: 10.1016/j.cancergen.2020.12.002] [FullText]
- 27 **Klimeck L**, Heisser T, Hoffmeister M, Brenner H. Colorectal cancer: A health and economic problem. *Best Pract Res Clin Gastroenterol* 2023; **66**: 101839 [RCA] [PMID: 37852707 DOI: 10.1016/j.bpg.2023.101839] [FullText]
- 28 **Leowattana W**, Leowattana P, Leowattana T. Systemic treatment for metastatic colorectal cancer. *World J Gastroenterol* 2023; **29**: 1569-1588 [RCA] [PMID: 36970592 DOI: 10.3748/wjg.v29.i10.1569] [FullText] [Full Text(PDF)]
- 29 **Saraiva MR**, Rosa I, Claro I. Early-onset colorectal cancer: A review of current knowledge. *World J Gastroenterol* 2023; **29**: 1289-1303 [RCA] [PMID: 36925459 DOI: 10.3748/wjg.v29.i8.1289] [FullText] [Full Text(PDF)]
- 30 **Shin AE**, Giacotti FG, Rustgi AK. Metastatic colorectal cancer: mechanisms and emerging therapeutics. *Trends Pharmacol Sci* 2023; **44**: 222-236 [RCA] [PMID: 36828759 DOI: 10.1016/j.tips.2023.01.003] [FullText]
- 31 **Underwood PW**, Ruff SM, Pawlik TM. Update on Targeted Therapy and Immunotherapy for Metastatic Colorectal Cancer. *Cells* 2024; **13**: 245 [RCA] [PMID: 38334637 DOI: 10.3390/cells13030245] [FullText] [Full Text(PDF)]
- 32 **Yan H**, Talty R, Johnson CH. Targeting ferroptosis to treat colorectal cancer. *Trends Cell Biol* 2023; **33**: 185-188 [RCA] [PMID: 36473802 DOI: 10.1016/j.tcb.2022.11.003] [FullText]



Published by **Baishideng Publishing Group Inc**
7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-3991568

E-mail: office@baishideng.com

Help Desk: <https://www.f6publishing.com/helpdesk>

<https://www.wjgnet.com>

