

Jet Injectors

Jet injection was first proposed for administering insulin over 35 yr ago (1). The stated rationale for the initial devices was to decrease pain of injection compared with needles and syringes (2). There was little further application of jet injection to the treatment of diabetes for over 10 yr, although jet injection developed wide use for mass immunization programs. Recently, the application of jet injection to administering insulin has gained increasing attention. Marketing campaigns by private industry have noticeably increased. The Task Force on Jet Injection of the Youth Council of ADA was formed to review the scientific literature available on jet injectors and, if possible, to recommend guidelines for their use.

The available scientific literature is not sufficient to provide recommendations for the general use of these devices. However, sufficient data are available to support the following specific conclusions.

First, jet injection of insulin appears to offer a mechanically reliable and accurate alternative to syringe injection; however, the comparable precision and accuracy of insulin delivery, reliability, safety, and patient acceptability of all available devices when compared with syringe injection need to be assessed by disinterested investigators and the results published in the medical literature (3). Based on results of testing with one model, jet injection does not appear to be associated with increased risk for infection (4), although again each model needs to be individually evaluated.

Second, insulin absorption and distribution differ when insulin is administered by jet injection from when sy-

ringes are used. Specifically, when insulin is administered by jet injection, it results in a greater decrease in plasma glucose than an equal amount of insulin administered by syringe (5–11). After NPH insulin injection, there appears to be a more rapid rise in free-insulin levels after jet injection (11). Concurrently, the total duration of insulin action appears to be shortened (5,6,11). Whether these changes in insulin absorption and duration of action will meaningfully affect metabolic control in the clinical management of insulin-requiring children and adults remains to be determined. The more rapid onset of insulin action offers theoretical advantages for patients who rely on multiple injections of short-acting insulin but will require a shortening of the interval between injection and eating. Intensified conventional therapy with jet injection (ultralente plus premeal regular insulin) has been shown to result in metabolic control similar to that obtained with continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion. Conversely, the relatively short duration of insulin action makes it reasonable to speculate that jet injection may be less effective for those on a twice-daily insulin regimen. Jet-injected intermediate-acting insulin, NPH or lente, may have insufficient duration of action to last until the next injection. This may be a particular problem in the early morning when the dawn phenomenon normally occurs and more, rather than less, available insulin may be necessary. Studies designed to address these issues are needed.

Third, the possibility was raised that insulin could be denatured as a result of its forceful injection through a tiny port compared to injection through a needle. This could lead to an increased incidence of antibody formation. A prospective, controlled trial of jet injection in newly diagnosed patients needs to address the issue of antibody formation.

The initial expense of purchasing a jet injector needs

Originally approved March 1988. Task Force on Jet Injectors, Council on Youth: Michael P. Golden, MD, Chairperson; Morey Haymond, MD; Deborah A. Hinnen, RN, MSN; Davida F. Kruger, RN, MSN; and O. Peter Schumacher, MD, PhD, Chairman, Council on Youth.

Reprinted from *Diabetes Care* 11:600–601, 1988.

Copyright 1988 by the American Diabetes Association.

to be considered. The cost of this device is partially counteracted by saving the need to purchase disposable syringes. The time needed to recoup the initial expense depends on the purchase price, but currently the time is 2–5 yr. Third-party reimbursement has been variable. In addition, manufacturer-supplied adapters for each insulin bottle must be purchased. Finally, there are no publicly available data to determine the frequency of injector failure or the frequency with which patients discontinue use of jet injectors to return to insulin syringes. All of this information is needed to better estimate true costs.

One potential role for jet injection may be for adults with an extreme fear of injections whose self-care is compromised by an inability to take insulin. Also, once adult patients understand the potential but undefined risks previously discussed, patient preference would be a valid reason for use of jet injection.

Current recommendations for use of jet injection in children should be considered even more tenuous than for adults. Fear of needle injection by children and/or parents should not be treated as an isolated symptom separate from other psychosocial factors related to diabetes management. The neurological risk of hypoglycemia in children should also be carefully considered in view of the potentially more rapid hypoglycemic effect of jet injection.

To summarize, the Task Force on Jet Injectors recommends initiation of prospective, scientifically sound studies to investigate the following issues: 1) the effect of jet injection on metabolic control in various patient populations (e.g., 2 vs. multiple daily injections); 2) the effect of jet injection on metabolic control in insulin regimens differing in frequency of injection and/or insulin type; 3) complications of treatment (e.g., insulin-antibody formation); 4) the frequency and significance of aversion to, or discomfort with, needles; and 5) patient convenience and preference including cost analyses based on complete and independently obtained data.

There are hypothetical risks and benefits attendant to the use of pressure-injection devices. Additional prospective studies will be required before a definitive position on general use can be made.

REFERENCES

1. Perkin GS, Todd GM, Brown TM: Jet injection of insulin in treatment of diabetes mellitus. *Proc Am Diabetes Assoc* 10:184–99, 1950
2. Figge FH, Barnett DJ: Anatomic evaluation of a jet injection instrument designed to minimize pain and inconvenience of parental therapy. *Am Practitioner* 3:197–206, 1947
3. Lindmayer I, Menassa K, Lambert J, Moghrabi A, Legendre L, Legault C, Letendre M, Hallé J-P: Development of new jet injector for insulin therapy. *Diabetes Care* 9: 294–97, 1986
4. Kruger D, Evarts J, Saravolatz L, Whitehouse F: Microbiologic assessment of insulin jet injectors (Abstract). *Diabetes* 35 (Suppl. 1):152A, 1986
5. Worth R, Andersen J, Taylor R, Alberti KGMM: Jet injection of insulin: comparison with conventional injection by syringe and needle. *Br Med J* 281:713–14, 1980
6. Pehling GB, Gerich JE: Comparison of plasma insulin profiles after subcutaneous administration of insulin by jet spray and conventional needle injection in patients with insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus (Abstract). *Mayo Clin Proc* 35 (Suppl. 1):116A, 1984
7. Taylor R, Home PD, Alberti KGMM: Plasma free insulin profiles after administration of insulin by jet and conventional syringe injection. *Diabetes Care* 4:377–79, 1981
8. Perriello G, De Feo P, Ventura MM, De Cosmo S, Lolli C, Pippi R: Jet insulin improves postprandial glycemic control IDDM (Abstract). *Diabetes* 34 (Suppl. 1):116A, 1985
9. Gruneklee D, Meyer M, Ruppert C: Subcutaneous administration of insulin by a variable-dose jet injector (Abstract). *Diabetologia* 15:236A, 1978
10. Hallé JP, Lambert J, Lindmayer I, Menassa K, Coutu F, Moghrabi A, Legendre L, Legault C, Lalumière G: Twice-daily mixed regular and NPH insulin injections with new jet injector versus conventional syringes: pharmacokinetics of insulin absorption. *Diabetes Care* 9:279–82, 1986
11. Malone JL, Lowitt S, Grove NP, Shah SC: Comparison of insulin levels after injection by jet stream and disposable insulin syringe. *Diabetes Care* 9:637–40, 1986
12. Chiasson J-L, Ducros F, Poliquin-Hamet M, Lopez D, Lecavalier L, Hamet P: Continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion (Mill-Hill infuser) versus multiple injections (Medi-Jector) in the treatment of insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus and the effect of metabolic control on microangiopathy. *Diabetes Care* 7:331–37, 1984