#1 Selling pen needles just got even better.[1,2*]

Patient-preferred BD Nano™ 2nd Gen Pen Needles[2*]

4 mm x 32G
BD Nano™ 2nd Gen Pen Needles
NDC/HRI #: **08290-3205-50**

Patented features include:[2,3]

Wider outer cover
easier to attach to pen device

Larger, green, inner needle shield
easier to grip and remove before an injection

Contoured needle base
provides greater comfort and compensates for injection force variability, supporting more reliable subcutaneous injections

Existing proven benefits of BD Ultra-Fine™ PentaPoint™ Comfort and EasyFlow™ Technology[4,5]

✓ **BD Nano™ 2nd Gen Pen Needles** NDC/HRI #: 08290-3205-50
will replace BD Nano™ Ultra-Fine™ Pen Needles NDC/HRI #: 08290-3201-22

The unique features of BD Nano™ 2nd Gen 4mm Pen Needles offer a number of potential benefits, including:

- Reduction in injection pain[6†]
- Less force required to deliver the full dose[4‡]
- Greater confidence that the full dose has been delivered compared to other pen needles studied[4§‖]

Compatible with widely used pen injection devices[7]
Covered by most health plans across Commercial, Medicaid, and Medicare Part D¶

Available through your preferred wholesaler today!

embecta, formerly part of BD

embecta™

Did you know?

Patients with diabetes on insulin who received **structured injection technique training experienced a 1% reduction in A1c at 6 months.**[8#]

A few steps to deliver structured injection technique training include:[9]

- Use a new needle with every injection
- Rotate injection sites and inject within sites at least one finger width apart
- Shift to shorter needle lengths (e.g., 4mm pen needles and 6mm needle insulin syringes)

Nearly 50% of patients reuse their needles[10**]

Reusing the same needle has been associated with injection pain and increased risk of developing lipohypertrophy (lumps and bumps under the skin) at injection sites[11]

Remember to ask patients if they need a refill of needles when refilling a prescription for insulin.

*226 patients with diabetes on insulin treatment were studied with a 150 mm visual analog scale (mean scores of >0 mm; clinically significant difference of ≥5 mm). BD Nano™ 2nd Gen demonstrated superiority vs. BD Nano™ for overall preference.†Single-blind, randomized, control trial of 209 patients with diabetes where each completed 6 pairs of abdominal injections of 0.3 mL sterile saline in random order and utilized a 150mm visual analog scale (mean scores of >0mm; clinically significant difference of ≥5mm). BD Nano™ 2nd Gen 32Gx4mm demonstrated superiority vs each comparator group for less injection pain. [(P <0.01) (Artsana 33Gx4mm mean +17.4 mm, 95% CI, +11.3 to +23.5mm); (Artsana 34Gx3.5mm mean +17.6mm, 95% CI, +11.4 to +23.7mm); (Comfort EZ 33Gx4mm mean +9.1mm, 95% CI, +3.1 to +15.3mm); (Terumo 34Gx4mm mean +7.3mm, 95% CI, +2.2 to +12.4mm)]. ‡Single-blind, randomized, control trial of 209 patients with diabetes where each completed 6 pairs of abdominal injections of 0.3 mL sterile saline in random order and utilized a Likert Scale where ratings range from -2 to 2; positive scores reflect less thumb force for BD Nano and negative scores reflect less thumb force for the comparator pen needle. Scores of 0 indicate no difference. BD Nano™ 2nd Gen 32Gx4mm contoured hub 5-bevel extra thin wall demonstrated superiority vs each comparator group for less injection force. [(P <0.01) (Artsana 33Gx4mm mean +0.80, 95% CI, +0.62 to +0.98); (Artsana 34Gx3.5mm mean +0.98, 95% CI, +0.80 to +1.16); (Comfort EZ 33Gx4mm mean +0.31, 95% CI, +0.13 to +0.49); (Terumo 34Gx4mm mean +0.21, 95% CI, +0.07 to +0.35)]. §198 patients with diabetes were included in this prospective, multicenter, randomized, open-label, 2-period, crossover study to evaluate differences in confidence that the full dose of insulin was delivered between the participants' usual pen needle (PN) and the corresponding extra-thin wall (XTW) PN. Confidence in delivering the full dose of insulin was assessed with the use of a visual analog scale (VAS). Confidence results would be considered statistically significant if the 95% CI for the mean VAS score was either positive (XTW preferred) or negative (current PN preferred). XTW PNs had statistically significantly increased confidence that the full dose was delivered by 24.4mm ([95% CI, 19.7-29.1] [P<0.001]). ‖Single-blind, randomized, control trial of 154 patients with diabetes where each completed 6 pairs of abdominal injections of 0.3 mL sterile saline. Leakage was measured with a calibrated analytical scale. The occurrence of leakage from the needle tip and the injection site (measurements combined) was defined as wet weight equivalent to ≥5% of the injection volume, [equivalent to ≥0.015 g (0.015 mL)]. Leakage frequency for BD Nano™ 2nd Gen 32Gx4mm contoured hub 5-bevel extra thin wall was 0.4% vs 3-bevel posted hub (Artsana 33Gx4mm, 6.2%; P<0.001); (Artsana 34Gx3.5mm, 18.8%; P =0.026); (No significant difference vs Comfort EZ 33Gx4mm). ¶Fingertip Formulary, as of 1/27/2022. #6-month study duration, n=116; baseline HbA1c 8.7% 1.4 %. **13,289 patients with diabetes who inject insulin participated in an ITQ survey. 38.8% of the 2,711 patients using insulin syringes reported needle reuse. 55.8% of the 11,961 patients using pen needles reported needle reuse.

1. IQVIA XPT Device Retail TRx Data. United States, Nov 2020- Oct 2021. **2.** Whooley S, Briskin T, Gibney MA, et al. Evaluating the User Performance and Experience with a Re-Engineered 4 mm x 32G Pen Needle: A Randomized Trial with Similar Length/Gauge Needles. Diabetes Ther. 2019;10(2):697-712.**3.** Rini CR, Roberts BC, Morel D, Klug R, Selvage B, Pettis RJ. Evaluating the Impact of Human Factors and Pen Needle Design on Insulin Pen Injection. J Diabetes Sci Technol. 2019; doi: 10.1177/1932296819836987. **4.** Aronson R, Gibney M, Oza K, Berube J, Kassler-Taub K, Hirsch L. Insulin pen needles: effects of extra-thin wall needle technology. Clin Ther. 2013;35(7):923-933. **5.** Hirsch L, Gibney M, Berube J, Manocchio J. Impact of a modified needle tip geometry on penetration force as well as acceptability, preference, and perceived pain in subjects with diabetes. J Diabetes Sci Technol. 2012;6(2):328-335. **6.** Gibney M., Fitz-Patrick D., Klonoff D., Whooley S., Lu B., Yue W., Glezer S. User experiences with second-generation 32-gauge × 4 mm vs. thinner comparator pen needles: A Prospective Randomized Trial. Current Medical Research and Opinion, DOI: 0.1080/03007995.2020.1803248, 2020. **7.** BD Compatibility Confirmation for Pen Needles and Pen Injector Manufacturers, Document Number: 149OTH-0004-20, Ver R, Dated 3 February 2021. **8.** Misnikova IV, et al. Diabetes Ther. 2017 Oct 13; 8(6): 1309-1318. **9.** Frid AH, et al. Mayo Clinic Proceed. 2016;91(9):1231–1255. **10.** Frid AH, Hirsch LJ, Menchior AR, Morel DR, Strauss KW. Worldwide Injection Technique Questionnaire Study: Population Parameters and Injection Practices. Mayo Clin Proc. 2016;91(9):1212-1223. doi:10.1016/j.mayocp.2016.06.011. **11.** American Diabetes Association. Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes – 2021. Diabetes Care.2021;44(Suppl 1):S1-S232.

bd.com/pharmacypartner

embecta™