Table S1. Procedural characteristics for femoral, internal jugular, left antecubital and right antecubital venous accesses according to the five operators.

M.V.		Proximal (*n* = 76)		Antecubital (*n* = 196)		
	All (*n* = 272)	Femoral (*n* = 56)	Internal Jugular (*n* = 20)	Left Antecubital (*n* = 108)	Right Antecubital (*n* = 88)	*p*-Value
Radiation dose (cGy/m²)	40 (19–69)	92 (47–195)	118 (27–188)	31 (15–55)	30 (11–57)	<0.001 *
Fluoroscopy time (min)	5 (3–8)	8 (5–12)	6 (2–12)	4 (2–6)	4 (2–8)	<0.001 *
Number of guidewires	0 (0–1)	1 (0–1)	1 (0–1)	0 (0–1)	0 (0–1)	<0.001 *
Use of at least 1 guidewire	127 (46%)	35 (62%)	14 (70%)	53 (49%)	25 (28%)	<0.001 +

L.M.		Proximal (*n* = 71)		Antecubital (*n* = 60)		
	All (*n* = 131)	Femoral (*n* = 62)	Internal Jugular (*n* = 9)	Left Antecubital (*n* = 39)	Right Antecubital (*n* = 21)	*p*-Value
Radiation dose (cGy/m²)	43 (22–89)	60 (22–124)	79 (19–120.5)	31 (22–46)	42 (7.5–64)	<0.001 *
Fluoroscopy time (min)	4 (2–7)	5 (3–8)	6 (2.5–8.5)	3 (2–6)	4 (2.5–7.5)	0.057 *
Number of guidewires	0 (0–1)	0 (0–1)	0 (0–1)	1 (0–1)	0 (0–1)	0.456 §
Use of at least 1 guidewire	62 (47%)	28 (45%)	4 (44%)	20 (51%)	10 (47%)	0.853 +

F.C.		Proximal (*n* = 36)		Antecubital (*n* = 34)		
	All (*n* = 70)	Femoral (*n* = 33)	Internal Jugular (*n* = 3)	Left Antecubital (*n* = 27)	Right Antecubital (*n* = 7)	*p*-Value
Radiation dose (cGy/m²)	32 (16–62)	37 (18.5–58)	243 (187–398)	27 (14.5–61)	16 (9–33.5)	0.042 §
Fluoroscopy time (min)	3 (2–4)	3 (2–6)	4 (3.5–7.5)	2 (2–4)	3 (2–9)	0.137 §
Number of guidewires	1 (0–1)	0 (0–1)	0 (0–1)	1 (0–1)	1 (0–2)	0.066 §
Use of at least 1 guidewire	37 (53%)	15 (45%)	1 (33%)	16 (59%)	5 (83%)	0.751 +

G.T.		Proximal (*n* = 8)		Antecubital (*n* = 14)		
	All (*n* = 22)	Femoral (*n* = 4)	Internal Jugular (*n* = 4)	Left Antecubital (*n* = 7)	Right Antecubital (*n* = 7)	*p*-Value
Radiation dose (cGy/m²)	32 (13–139.5)	97 (22–182.5)	176 (75–241.5)	31 (14–82)	18 (11–35)	0.032 §
Fluoroscopy time (min)	4.5 (2.5–9)	6 (4.5–8)	10 (6–11)	3 (2–5)	3 (2–6)	0.050 §
Number of guidewires	0.5 (0–1)	1 (0.5–1.5)	1 (0.5–1)	0 (0–0)	1 (0–2)	0.098 §
Use of at least 1 guidewire	10 (45%)	4 (100%)	1 (25%)	1 (14%)	4 (56%)	0.762 +

L.B.		Proximal (*n*= 8)		Antecubital (*n* = 12)		
	All (*n* = 20)	Femoral (*n* = 8)	Internal Jugular (*n* = 0)	Left Antecubital (*n* = 9)	Right Antecubital (*n* = 3)	*p*-Value
Radiation dose (cGy/m²)	24 (12–44)	33.5 (15–44)		24 (14–61)	23 (7–56)	0.431 *
Fluoroscopy time (min)	4 (2–6)	3 (2–4.5)		4 (5–2)	6 (4–6)	0.155 *
Number of guidewires	1 (0–1)	1 (0.5–1)		0 (0–1)	0 (0–1)	0.143 §
Use of at least 1 guidewire	10 (47%)	6 (75%)		2 (22%)	1 (33%)	0.808 +

p-Value refers to the comparison between proximal and antecubital accesses. Student's T-test was used in the case of normally distributed variables; Kruskal-Wallis was used for non-normally distributed; Chi-Square test was used for non-continuous variables. * Normally distributed variables (Student's T-test). § Non-normally distributed values (Kruskal-Wallis). + Frequencies compared with Chi-Square test.

Table S2. Baseline and procedural characteristics comparing femoral, internal jugular and antecubital approach.

Baseline Characteristics	All (*n* = 515)	Femoral (*n* = 163)	Internal Jugular (*n* = 36)	Antecubital (*n* = 316)	*p*-Value
Gender (male, %)	161 (31.3%)	51 (31.3%)	19 (52.8%)	95 (30.1%)	0.245 +
Age (years)	54 ± 19	49 ± 22	57 ± 14	57 ± 17	<0.01 *
Weight (kg)	61.8 ± 14.1	59.6 ± 14.5	65.6 ± 14.4	62.6 ± 13.7	0.027 *
Height (cm)	164 ± 9	163 ± 9	164 ± 10	164 ± 9	0.265 *
BMI (kg/m^2)	23.0 ± 4.4	22.4 ± 4.5	24.2 ± 4.5	23.2 ± 4.3	0.060 *
Radiation dose (cGy/m^2)	38 (18–79)	59 (27–126)	112 (31–189)	30 (15–55)	<0.001 §
Fluoroscopy time (min)	4 (2–8)	5 (3–10)	6 (3–11)	3 (2–6)	<0.001 §
Number of guidewires	0 (0–1)	1 (0–1)	1 (0–1)	0 (0–1)	0.033 §
Use of at least 1 guidewire	246 (47.8%)	88 (54.0%)	21 (58.3%)	137 (43.4%)	0.030 +

Data are represented as mean (standard deviation) for normally distributed variables and as median (interquartile ranges) for non-normally distributed variables. * Normally distributed variables compared with ANOVA. § Non-normally distributed values compared with Kruskal-Wallis. + Frequencies compared with Chi-Square test.