# SAFETY ENGINEERED DEVICES IN THE HOSPITAL SETTING: THE ITALIAN MARKET

### S.E. Campbell Davies<sup>1</sup>, C. Inserra<sup>2</sup>, A. Mazzucchelli<sup>1,3</sup>, S. Dellepiane<sup>2,3</sup>, R. Lombardo<sup>3</sup> <sup>1</sup> A. O. Fatebenefratelli e Oftalmico, Servizio Di Farmacia, Milan, Italy <sup>2</sup> Centro Cardiologico Monzino IRCCS, Servizio Di Farmacia, Milan, Italy

<sup>3</sup> SIFO Lombardy, Medical Device Group, Milan, Italy

OHP-012

# Background

As needles constitute a risk for healthcare workers, many safety engineered devices (SEDs) have been marketed in Italy over the past few years. However, marketing rules do not clearly state safety mechanism standards and there are no evidence based data demonstrating effectiveness between different protective mechanisms. Therefore, selection of SEDs for hospital introduction can be challenging for the pharmacist.



## Results

134 SEDs were divided according to medical procedure and different types of safety activation mechanisms: active, including toppling shield (TS), sliding protection (SP) or by button pushing (BP), and passive (P). For venous blood sampling, 17 butterfly needles were divided into 3 different safety activation mechanisms: TS (1 SED), SP (11 SEDs) and BP (5 SEDs); 6 syringes with needles: SP (3 SEDs) and BP (3 SEDs); and 7 hypodermic needles: TS (6 SEDs) and SP (1 SED). Arterial blood sampling (5 devices): TS (3 SEDs), SP (1 SED) and recapping mechanism (1 SED). Capillary blood sampling (12 lancets): P (12 SEDs). For administration, 18 butterfly needles: TS (1 SED), SP (12 SEDs) and BP (5 SEDs); 10 syringes with needles: SP (6 SEDs) and BP (4 SEDs); 7 hypodermic needles: TS (6 SEDs) and SP (1 SED); and 4 pen needles: P (4 SEDs). Vascular catheterisation (26 devices): SP (1 SED), BP (1 SED) and P (24 SEDs). Central catheterisation (10 Huber needles): SP activated with either one (3 SEDs) or two hands (7 SEDs). Others included 6 single use scalpels (6 SP) and 6 fistula needles (2 SP and 4 BP). Overall, passive mechanisms represented 31% of devices. The mechanism was not always clear (5% erroneously reported).

ACTIVE PASSIVE infunfunfunfun Sliding protection Toppling shield Button pushing (BP) Passive (P) Figure 2. Different types of safety activation mechanisms

Venous blood sampling Butterfly needles тs 1 1 Administration Butterfly needles тs 1 SP 11 SP 12 ĸ K. BP 5 BP č. 5 <u>íe</u> 3 тs SP 6 Syringes with Syringes with X eedles BP Š. 4 ΒP š. 3 0 Hypodermic 6 ΤS 1 Hypodermic тs 6 eedles eedles SP 1 1 1 3 Arterial blood sampling EGA syringes TS Pen needles Ρ **S** SP 🏂 Vascular 1 1 SP Ł catheterisation Recapping 1 BP 1 des 1 Capillary blood sampling Lancets Ρ 12 24 Activation Central catheterisation Huber Others Single use scalpels SP 6 with 1 needles Fistula needles SP Ł 2 hand BP še. 4 Activation with 2

Table 1. SEDs divided according to medical procedure and different types of safety activation mechanisms

hands

#### Conclusion

As many critical points were identified in the evaluation of SEDs, which could mislead the pharmacist in the choice of the device, a database has been built as a clear instrument to easily access all SED information.

**Contact information** Sophia Elizabeth Campbell Davies secampbelldavies@gmail.com





Figure 3. Examples of safety engineered devices



Figure 4. Percentage of active and passive safety activation mechanisms



Figure 5. Percentage of erroneously reported safety activation mechanisms by manufacturers

