

**A systematic review of patients' perspectives on the subcutaneous route of medication administration**

Ridyard, Colin; Dawoud, D.M.; Tuersley, L.V.; Hughes, D.

Patient: Patient–Centered Outcomes Research

DOI:

[10.1007/s40271-015-0160-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40271-015-0160-x)

Published: 01/08/2016

Peer reviewed version

[Cyswllt i'r cyhoeddiad / Link to publication](#)*Dyfyniad o'r fersiwn a gyhoeddwyd / Citation for published version (APA):*

Ridyard, C., Dawoud, D. M., Tuersley, L. V., & Hughes, D. (2016). A systematic review of patients' perspectives on the subcutaneous route of medication administration. *Patient: Patient–Centered Outcomes Research*, 9(4), 281-292. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40271-015-0160-x>

Hawliau Cyffredinol / General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

The final publication is available at Springer via <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40271-015-0160-x>

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1 **Title:** A systematic review of patients' perspectives on the subcutaneous route of medication
2 administration.

3

4 **Authors:** Colin H Ridyard¹ PhD, Dalia M M Dawoud² PhD, Lorna V Tuersley¹ PhD
5 MRPharmS and Dyfrig A Hughes¹ PhD, MRPharmS

6

7 ¹ Centre for Health Economics and Medicines Evaluation, Bangor University

8 ² Clinical Pharmacy Department, Faculty of Pharmacy, Cairo University

9

10 **Corresponding Author:** Professor Dyfrig A. Hughes, Centre for Health Economics and
11 Medicines Evaluation, Bangor University, Ardudwy, Normal Site, Holyhead Road, Bangor
12 LL57 2PZ, UK

13

14 Tel: +44 (0)1248 382950

15 E-mail: d.a.hughes@bangor.ac.uk

16

17 **Keywords:** Subcutaneous drug administration, administration, subcutaneous injections,
18 injection devices, systematic review, patient preference, patient satisfaction

19

20 **Running Head:** Review of patient perspectives on subcutaneous medications

21

22 **Acknowledgements:** This research is supported the MRC North West Hub in Trial
23 Methodological Research: G0800792

24

25 **Conflict of Interest:** CR, DD, LT, DH declare no conflict of interest. All authors have
26 completed the Unified Competing Interest form at www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf
27 (available on request from the corresponding author) and declare: no support from any

28 organisation for the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that
29 might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous 3 years; no other relationships
30 or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

31

32 **Contributions:** CHR and DAH contributed substantially to the conception and design of the
33 work. All authors made contributions to the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data.
34 CHR and LT drafted and DAH redrafted the paper; all authors revised it critically for
35 important intellectual content, and gave their final approval of the version to be published. All
36 authors agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related
37 to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and
38 resolved.

39

40

41 **Key points for decision makers**

- 42 • Subcutaneous drug administration is used increasingly in place of intravenous drug
43 delivery and is an alternative to oral dosing for some treatments
- 44 • Studies of patients' perspectives typically assess ease of use, patient satisfaction and
45 fear of adverse reactions relating to treatment administration
- 46 • Among the studies assessed, oral, subcutaneous infusion, intramuscular injection, and
47 needle-free injection devices were not favoured over subcutaneous injections

48

49

50 **Abstract**

51

52 **Background:** Subcutaneous injections allow for self-administration, but consideration of
53 patients' perspectives on treatment choice is important to ensure adherence. Previous
54 systematic reviews have been limited in their scope for assessing preferences in relation to
55 other routes of administration

56

57 **Aim:** To examine patients' perspectives on subcutaneously administered, self-injectable
58 medications when compared with other routes or methods of administration for the same
59 medicines.

60

61 **Methods:** Nine electronic databases were searched for publications since 2000 using terms
62 pertaining to methods of administration, choice behaviour and adverse effects. Eligibility for
63 inclusion was determined through reference to specific criteria by two independent
64 reviewers. Results were described narratively.

65

66 **Results:** Of the 1,726 papers screened, 85 met the inclusion criteria. Studies were focused
67 mainly on methods of insulin administration for diabetes but also included treatments for
68 paediatric growth disorders, multiple sclerosis, HIV and migraine. Pen devices and
69 autoinjectors were favoured over administration with needle and syringe; particularly with
70 respect to ergonomics, convenience and portability. Inhalation appeared to be more
71 acceptable than subcutaneous injection (in the case of insulin), but it is less certain how
72 subcutaneous infusion, intramuscular injection, and needle-free injection devices compare
73 with subcutaneous injections in terms of patient preference.

74

75 **Conclusions:** The review identified a number of studies showing the importance of the
76 methods and routes of drug delivery on patient choice. However, studies were prone to bias

77 and further robust evidence, based on methodologically sound approaches, is required to
78 demonstrate how patient choice might translate to improved adherence.

79 **Introduction**

80

81 Patients' attitudes towards their medicines are influenced by many factors, including their
82 perceived (or real) benefits and harms, previous experience of use, perceptions of their
83 illness, satisfaction with treatment and personal preferences [1]. Thus achieving optimal
84 treatment outcomes requires that the right patients get the right choice of medicine at the
85 right time [2]. This notion of "medicines optimisation" also encompasses encouraging
86 patients to take their medicines correctly, avoid taking unnecessary medicines, reduce
87 wastage of medicines, and improve medicines safety [2,3]. For some medicines, offering
88 patients different methods or routes of drug administration may help achieve a patient-
89 centred approach to care thereby improving medication adherence, especially in the context
90 of parenteral administration [4-6].

91

92 While oral dosing is the posology of choice for chronic disease management, this may not be
93 possible for some medicines (e.g. because of low bioavailability) or desirable for others (e.g.
94 because of poor targeting of the site of action). The subcutaneous (SC) route of
95 administration is being used increasingly, particularly as alternative formulations of biologics
96 are developed for conditions such as cancers and inflammatory diseases [7]. Treatments
97 including trastuzumab and rituximab –previously only available for intravenous
98 administration– are now licensed for SC use. Compared with other routes of parenteral
99 administration, subcutaneously-injectable formulations may offer advantages in terms of
100 convenience, ease of use and the possibility of self-administration, which can also save
101 health professionals' time and, thus, reduce costs. However, barriers to the use of SC
102 injections, such as anxiety [8] and adverse, injection-site reactions [9] may have a negative
103 impact on adherence and the benefits of such treatments.

104

105 There also exists several methods of SC administration, and patients' satisfaction with, or
106 preferences towards delivery devices are likely to differ. In the case of insulin, for instance,
107 patients consider pen devices to be a more acceptable method of administration than
108 conventional vial and syringe or pre-filled syringes [10]. These offer improved portability,
109 convenience and ease of use and reduced injection-site pain leading to better patient
110 satisfaction. Compared to vials and syringes, use of insulin pen devices may consequently
111 improve adherence and reduce healthcare resource use and associated costs [11].

112

113 Whilst differences in the pharmacokinetics and efficacy of competing methods and routes of
114 drug administration are well documented, less is known of patients' perspectives. Relevant
115 research methods include the use of self-reported outcomes, such as from rating and
116 ranking scales, willingness-to-pay studies, discrete choice experiments, conjoint analyses
117 and best-worst scaling exercise.

118

119 This review aims to examine patients' perspectives on subcutaneously administered, self-
120 injectable medications. It focuses on study methodologies and on examining how patients'
121 choices compare for different devices and routes of administration.

122

123 **Methods**

124

125 The systematic review protocol was registered with the All Wales Systematic Reviews
126 Register [12,13], conducted according to the methods of the Centre for Reviews and
127 Dissemination [14] and reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic
128 Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement [15].

129 *Sources searched:* The following databases were searched during July 2013, using a
130 combination of MeSH and free text searches: Embase (Ovid), CINAHL (EBSCO Host),
131 Pubmed, Cochrane (including the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews), TOXLINE
132 (ProQuest), PsycARTICLES (ProQuest), PsycINFO (ProQuest), Health & Safety Science
133 Abstracts (ProQuest), Physical Education Index (ProQuest).

134 *Search terms:* Free-text or MeSH heading terms pertaining to (i) the route of administration
135 were combined using the Boolean operator AND with terms relevant for (ii) identifying choice
136 behaviour and methods of elicitation, and (iii) (perceived) adverse injection-site reactions or
137 process utility:

138 (i) subcutaneous drug administration OR subcutaneous injections OR subcutaneous
139 injection OR subcutaneous drug administration OR injection devices OR self injection

140 (ii) Prefer* OR "trade-off" OR "patient participation" OR "patient satisfaction" OR "decision
141 making" OR elicit* OR assess* OR "choice behaviour" OR "choice behavior" OR (Conjoint
142 OR choice* AND (analys* OR experiment* OR elicit* OR assess* OR measurement)

143 (iii) injection site pain OR injection pain OR adverse drug reaction OR injection site reaction
144 OR cutaneous reaction OR "process utility" OR (("treatment related attributes" OR "drug
145 administration" OR "dose frequency") AND (utilities OR "utility measurement"))

146 *Inclusion criteria:* Studies were included if they reported on a comparison(s) of administration
147 of a medicinal product via SC with a different route of administration, or using a different SC

148 device, including hypothetical scenarios; in patients currently or likely to become responsible
149 for self-administration of SC medication; and which measured patients' perspectives towards
150 to the health technology, adverse effects attributable to the method / route of administration
151 such as pain or injection site reactions, or satisfaction.

152 *Exclusion criteria:* Studies were excluded if they: were published prior to 2000; written in a
153 language other than English; were reviews, case studies, decision models, news,
154 correspondence, commentaries; were published as conference abstracts or posters or in
155 books, trade journals; were animal, mechanistic or pharmacokinetic studies; assessed
156 vaccines, anaesthesia or palliative care; or considered injection drug users or non-
157 ambulatory patients.

158 *Review methods:* Titles and abstracts were read and eligibility assessment was performed
159 independently by two reviewers. The full manuscripts of potentially eligible studies were
160 retrieved and assessed by both reviewers against the inclusion and exclusion criteria.
161 Disagreements in the application of inclusion or exclusion criteria were resolved by
162 consensus and/or consultation with two other reviewers.

163 *Outcome measures:* A wide range of outcomes was considered, to reflect the various
164 dimensions that influence patient choice:
165 (i) Health technology-related outcomes (including ease of use, portability and convenience);
166 (ii) Behavioural outcomes (including perceived benefits, perceived barriers, satisfaction and
167 fear/discomfort of needles);
168 (iii) Adverse reactions (including fear of pain and injection site reactions)

169

170 *Data extraction:* Data were extracted on: (1) description of study; (2) characteristics of the
171 population and intervention; (3) types of outcome measures; (4) any measured revealed
172 preferences (adherence); (5) comparators; (6) study type; (7) results and (8) characteristics
173 of study sponsors and links to authors.

174 *Data analysis:* Results were primarily presented narratively [14] with strength of patients'
175 choices assessed from the statistical significance reported or inferred from individual studies.
176 The potential to perform a quantitative (meta)-analysis was specified *a priori*, conditional on
177 a rigorous assessment of clinical, methodological and statistical heterogeneity between
178 studies. We were cognisant of the dangers of synthesising results from diverse studies as
179 this could lead to biased assessments and give rise to misleading results. We therefore
180 limited any quantitative analysis of the data to studies that: (i) compared a common drug, (ii)
181 made the same comparison among 2 (or more) devices /routes of administration (we
182 excluded studies in which comparators were not described in full), (iii) reported a common
183 outcome, and (iv) used a common method of assessing outcomes (methods that were not
184 validated or not reported were excluded). Meta-analyses of eligible studies were performed
185 in RevMan version 5 (Cochrane Collaboration) using random effects modelling to assess the
186 pooled mean difference (for continuous variables) or odds ratio (for dichotomous variables).

187

188 **Results**

189

190 *Number of studies:* A total of 2,337 articles relating to patient preferences for SC
191 medications were identified. Following de-duplication and screening, 85 were judged
192 suitable for inclusion. The PRISMA flow diagram of the search and screening process is
193 presented in Figure 1. A summary of the main characteristics of each paper is presented in
194 Supplementary Online Appendix 1.

195

196 *Study populations:* Sample sizes ranged from 19 to 6,528 people. The majority involved
197 administration of insulin for the management of diabetes (n=51 studies), followed by growth
198 hormone deficiency (n=10), migraine (n=5) and multiple sclerosis (n=4). Other areas
199 included HIV, infertility, contraception, chronic kidney disease, and rheumatoid arthritis. The
200 age range of patients from whom views were obtained directly was 3.5 to 95 years.

201

202 *Study characteristics:* The studies described 102 separate comparisons (Figure 2), with the
203 majority considering alternative means of SC administration (Table 1). No details on the type
204 of SC device were given for 16 comparisons, and there was incomplete information on how
205 multiple daily injections (MDI) were achieved in a further 16 comparisons involving insulin.

206

207 A variety of study designs were described. Forty-three were randomised studies, 29 were
208 cross-over trials and 18 were parallel arm studies. The duration of clinical studies ranged
209 from 1 week to 2 years. The majority used generic or disease-specific questionnaires; 16
210 used open-ended questioning or semi-structured interviews. Nine studies used Likert scales,
211 and 12 studies used other rating scales, including a visual analogue scale. Five studies
212 sought to elicit stated preferences for routes of administration using choice-based methods
213 including discrete choice experiment (DCE), adaptive conjoint analysis (ACA) and time
214 trade-off (TTO) analysis. Some studies used simulated injections to obtain information on
215 ease of administration. Table 2 summarises the methods used to elicit preference.

216

217 The majority of studies stated links with one or more organisations likely to have commercial
218 interest in the outcomes. The level of involvement ranged from provision of specific costs
219 such as translation or equipment, to direct study funding and/or authorship, receipt of grants
220 or being an advisory board member.

221

222 *Main study findings:* Results from four studies comparing SC administration with
223 intramuscular (IM) injection [16-19] were mixed. While one observational study of interferon-
224 beta-1a in patients with multiple sclerosis found a significant difference in patients' desire to
225 change or discontinue treatment adherence at 1-year in favour of IM with the number of
226 injection site reactions reported as an important factor [16], another suggested a preference
227 towards SC administration [17]. The findings of two studies of the contraceptive

228 medroxyprogesterone acetate were similarly inconclusive, with one indicating a tendency
229 towards higher satisfaction with SC [18], and the other showing no statistically significant
230 difference in reported measures of satisfaction [19].

231

232 Inhaled insulin was preferred to SC insulin in all included studies [20-26]. However all
233 studies reported ties with the manufacturers of inhaled insulin technologies. The possibility of
234 publication bias could not be rejected.

235

236 Comparisons of SC injection with oral administration did not reveal any statistically
237 significant differences in preference. In two surveys presenting hypothetical scenarios to
238 patients with migraine, there was a tendency for the oral route being preferred, [31] and for
239 formulation type to be more important than speed of onset [27]. However two clinical
240 comparisons of sumatriptan suggested the opposite, with SC formulation tending to be
241 preferred [28,29]. A DCE among patients with osteoporosis indicated that patients would be
242 willing to pay €142 a month for a daily SC injection rather than a daily or weekly tablet [30].

243

244 Four of the comparisons of oral and SC formulations in migraine also considered nasal
245 administration but none demonstrated any statistically significant difference in preference
246 [27-29,31].

247

248 Two studies compared SC with transdermal administration [31,32]. In a crossover study of
249 insulin delivery, significantly more patients with type 1 or 2 diabetes stated that they would
250 switch to a patch treatment, if available [32].

251

252 Among studies comparing needle-free injector devices (NFID) with SC injections, four
253 compared enfuvirtide delivered via NFID and needle and syringe in patients with HIV. All
254 found significant differences in favour of NFID in terms of patient-rated ease of use [33],

255 preference [35], or a desire to continue with the NFID at the end of the study [34, 36].

256 However, there was no significant difference in patient satisfaction among women self-

257 administering gonadotropin for infertility treatment [37], or in three studies of children

258 receiving growth hormone therapy [38-40].

259

260 Nine comparisons of autoinjector devices with vial and syringe and/or pre-filled syringes

261 (PFS) or other auto-injectors were identified. An adaptive conjoint analysis of users of growth

262 hormone therapy revealed autoinjection to generate higher utility [38]. Autoinjectors for

263 adalimumab were preferred to PFS and associated with less injection site pain in patients

264 with rheumatoid arthritis [41,42]. Autoinjectors were similarly preferred for darbopoetin in

265 chronic kidney disease [43] and for sumatriptan in migraine [48]. While one study of

266 autoinjector devices for growth hormone found a preference among both patients and

267 parents [45], another found less favourable scores compared with pen devices, largely due

268 to the requirement for reconstitution [44]. Studies of interferon beta 1a autoinjectors in

269 multiple sclerosis yielded varying results. One found no significant changes from baseline in

270 a disease-specific treatment concern questionnaire [46] while another suggested a

271 preference for autoinjectors [47].

272

273 Of 12 papers comparing insulin via SC catheter (mainly continuous SC infusion) with

274 multiple daily injections (MDI) [49-60], 9 found significant differences in favour of

275 administration by infusion, through a range of largely disease-specific measures [49-54,57-

276 59].

277

278 Eighteen studies compared SC administration using pen devices with syringes, 17 using

279 traditional syringe and vial. These were largely for insulin in diabetes, but also treatments of

280 psoriasis [61], growth hormone deficiency [62], infertility [63,64] and hepatitis C [65]. Pens

281 were significantly preferred in 15 studies, particularly with respect to ease of use,
282 convenience and portability [61-64,66-74,76-78].

283

284 The largest number of comparisons was between different pen devices, including 22 for
285 administration of insulin [74-75,77-96], and 4 for growth hormone [97-100]. However, 13
286 insulin and 3 growth hormone studies used simulated injections and no clinical study of pen
287 devices was longer than 12 weeks. All claimed advantages for the novel device over
288 comparators, with statistically significant differences in 19, but all were authored and/or
289 sponsored by manufacturers.

290

291 Among all the studies examined, only 12 assessed adherence or persistence as a revealed
292 preference [16,19,26,35,36,40-42,62,65,71,73], and most of these relied on patient self-
293 report.

294

295 *Meta analyses:* Four groups of studies were considered eligible for meta-analyses, each of
296 which compared insulin delivered using pen devices versus some alternative method (see
297 Supplementary Online Appendix 2). These were: (i) the assessment of patients' satisfaction
298 compared with continuous SC infusion [51,57], (ii) patient preference for a new pen device
299 versus their existing pen device [80,81,83,92,94], (iii) preference compared with SC needle
300 and syringe [68,71], and (iv) preferences in comparison to any existing method of
301 administration [74,78-79].

302

303 The comparison of pen devices with SC needle and syringe yielded a pooled odds ratio of
304 6.7 (95% confidence interval 4.6, 9.7; heterogeneity $I^2=0\%$) for patients favouring pen
305 devices. However as this represented only 2 of 13 studies making this comparison the
306 potential for selection bias cannot be excluded. All other comparisons were statistically
307 heterogeneous ($I^2 \geq 98\%$) and therefore deemed unreliable.

308

309 **Discussion**

310

311 An understanding of patients' perspectives on the methods and routes of drug delivery is an
312 important consideration for maximising the effectiveness of medicines. Our systematic
313 review identified wide-ranging evidence using a range of methods of assessing patients'
314 stated and actual choice for SC versus alternative routes of drug administration, as well as
315 between different SC injectable devices. The principal findings were: increased satisfaction
316 and preferences with respect to the ergonomics, convenience and portability of insulin pen
317 devices and autoinjectors as compared to needle & syringe, and more satisfaction with
318 inhaled insulin; but no clear favouring of oral, SC infusion, intramuscular injection, and
319 needle-free injection devices when compared with SC injections.

320

321 A significant number of studies meeting our inclusion criteria were of methods of insulin
322 delivery, reflecting developments in pen devices and the (now discontinued) inhaler,
323 Exubera. Satisfaction with, and preference for different insulin devices and routes of
324 administration may relate more to the necessity for a convenient and pain-free method,
325 given the need for punctual and life-long therapy. By contrast, studies in migraine, where the
326 need for medication is intermittent and unpredictable, having available options of routes of
327 administration for use in different circumstances may be more important to patients than any
328 single preferred option. These contrasts suggest that factors important for patient choice of a
329 given route of administration will vary with the clinical situation and context of use.

330

331 The number of studies comparing SC administration with oral, nasal, transdermal and
332 intramuscular administration were each very small, and covered different therapeutic areas.
333 None of the studies compared SC self-administration with intravenous administration by
334 health care professionals in a clinical setting, which we perceive to be increasing with the

335 introduction of novel biologic therapies. The comparison with clinic-administration by IM
336 injection of medroxyprogesterone acetate as a contraceptive was perhaps the closest
337 situation, but neither study revealed any difference from a patient's perspective [18,19].

338 Whilst our review complied with best methodological practice, the strength of our findings is
339 limited by the weaknesses of the research identified and the variety of approaches
340 employed. The number of studies comparing SC injection with non-SC routes was small for
341 each route and many studies were observational, unmasked, had small sample sizes and
342 short follow-up periods. There was general inadequacy in the descriptions of the
343 technologies being assessed, or of the methods of analysis. Although some studies did not
344 disclose a source of funding, the majority were supported by (or linked to) pharmaceutical
345 companies seeking to differentiate their products from those of competitors. As more
346 biopharmaceutical products are developed, and treatments previously administered
347 intravenously are formulated for SC administration, more patient-centred evaluations are
348 likely to emerge, however this should not be at the expense of methodological rigour.

349 Reviewed studies employed a range of methods, including direct questioning of patients,
350 typically with responses on Likert scales, for their satisfaction with or preference to different
351 treatment options. Such surveys employed a variety of questionnaire designs, only some of
352 which were recognised as validated. The discrete choice experiments or conjoint analyses
353 employed in a small number of studies are a more appropriate choice-based method of
354 preference elicitation grounded in theory [101]. There was considerable heterogeneity
355 among studies, in terms of populations, treatments, methods of drug administration,
356 outcome measure and measurement, to enable unbiased pooled estimates to be determined
357 through meta-analyses in all but one comparison [102]. Combining heterogeneous studies
358 could compromise the systematic and scientifically rigorous representation of empirical
359 evidence that could be more accurately reported in our narrative synthesis [14].

360 Our systematic review has extended previous reviews [10,103], which were restricted to
361 comparisons of pen versus needle and syringe insulin for diabetes. Our findings suggest that
362 differences in patients' perspectives between methods and routes of drug delivery will affect
363 choice of delivery device across a whole spectrum of diseases. But while evidence of patient
364 preference – in addition to all features/attributes of medicines (such as efficacy, safety, route
365 of administration) – may potentially add value to treatments, health technology assessments
366 require evidence on how this improves health outcomes and /or cost-effectiveness to justify
367 any increases in pricing. These were outside the scope of the present review, but even so,
368 very few studies considered patient adherence to treatment that might mediate
369 improvements in health outcomes.

370 The implications of our findings are: firstly, that medicines may be optimised by considering
371 patient choice in the clinical decision to prescribe a particular method or route of
372 administration. Prescribers should be alert to the alternative options for subcutaneously
373 administered medicines, and consider the range of factors that are likely to influence
374 patients' adherence with treatment. Secondly, pharmaceutical companies often cite patient
375 preference as a justification for price premiums. Their value dossiers and health technology
376 assessment reports typically suggest that patients favour some methods or routes of drug
377 administration more than others, and that this can lead to improvement in health outcomes.
378 Our review illustrates that evidence underpinning such claims is weak.

379

380 **Conclusions**

381

382 The review identified a number of studies showing the importance of the methods and routes
383 of drug delivery on patient choice. To improve the evidence base, however, we propose that
384 future studies of patients' perspectives of injectable devices should consider using validated
385 preference measures, combined with a choice-based experiment for stated preference

386 elicitation, and reliable adherence measurement [5] for revealed preferences. Studies need
387 to be unbiased and appropriately powered for demonstrating statistical significance.

388

389

390 **References**

391

392 1. CG76 Medicines adherence: NICE guideline, 28 January 2009, Available from:
393 <http://guidance.nice.org.uk/CG76/NICEGuidance/pdf/English> Accessed 4th August
394 2015.

395 2. NICE Medicines and Prescribing Centre. Medicines Optimisation: The Safe and
396 Effective Use of Medicines to Enable the Best Possible Outcomes. Manchester:
397 National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (UK); 2015.

398 3. Clifford S, Barber N, Elliott R, Hartley E, Horne R. Patient-centred advice is effective in
399 improving adherence to medicines. *Pharm World Sci.* 2006;28(3):165-70.

400 4. Saini SD, Schoenfeld P, Kaulback K, Dubinsky MC. Effect of medication dosing
401 frequency on adherence in chronic diseases. *Am J Manag Care.* 2009;15:e22-33.

402 5. Osterberg L, Blaschke T. Adherence to medication. *N Engl J Med.* 2005;353:487-97.

403 6. Ingersoll KS, Cohen J. The impact of medication regimen factors on adherence to
404 chronic treatment: a review of literature. *J Behav Med.* 2008;31:213-24.

405 7. Hughes M. Prefilled syringes: injecting the end-user's perspective. *Drug Delivery*
406 *Technology.* 2010;10:18-23.

407 8. Turner AP, Williams RM, Sloan AP, Haselkorn JK. Injection anxiety remains a long-
408 term barrier to medication adherence in multiple sclerosis. *Rehabil Psychol.*
409 2009;54:116-21.

410 9. Costello K, Kennedy P, Scanzillo J. Recognizing nonadherence in patients with
411 multiple sclerosis and maintaining treatment adherence in the long term. *Medscape J*
412 *Med.* 2008;10:225.

413 10. Molife C, Lee LJ, Shi L, Sawhney M, Lenox SM. Assessment of patient-reported
414 outcomes of insulin pen devices versus conventional vial and syringe. *Diabetes*
415 *Technol Ther.* 2009;11:529-38.

- 416 11. Asche CV, Shane-McWhorter L, Raparla S. Health economics and compliance of
417 vials/syringes versus pen devices: a review of the evidence. *Diabetes Technol Ther*.
418 2010;12 (suppl 1):S101-8.
- 419 12. All Wales Systematic Reviews Register, Cardiff University Systematic Review Network
420 -SysNet. Available from:
421 [http://www.cardiff.ac.uk/insrv/libraries/sure/sysnet/awsrr/patient_preferences_for](http://www.cardiff.ac.uk/insrv/libraries/sure/sysnet/awsrr/patient_preferences_for_subcutaneous_medications.pdf)
422 [subcutaneous_medications.pdf](http://www.cardiff.ac.uk/insrv/libraries/sure/sysnet/awsrr/patient_preferences_for_subcutaneous_medications.pdf) Accessed 4th August 2015.
- 423 13. Booth A, Clarke M, Ghera D, Moher D, Petticrew M, Stewart L. An international
424 registry of systematic-review protocols. *Lancet*. 2010;377:108-9.
- 425 14. Systematic Reviews: CRD's guidance for undertaking systematic reviews in health
426 care. Published 2009. ISBN: 1900640473. Available from:
427 <http://www.york.ac.uk/inst/crd/SysRev/!SSL!/WebHelp/SysRev3.htm> Accessed 4th
428 August 2015.
- 429 15. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, Mulrow C, Gotzsche P, Ionnadis JPA, Clarke M,
430 Devereaux PJ, Kleijnen J, Moher D. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic
431 reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate healthcare interventions:
432 explanation and elaboration. *BMJ*. 2009;339:b2700.
- 433 16. Beer K, Muller M, Hew-Winzeler AM, Bont A, Maire P, You X, Foulds P, Marlind J,
434 Curtius D. The prevalence of injection-site reactions with disease-modifying therapies
435 and their effect on adherence in patients with multiple sclerosis: an observational
436 study. *BMC Neurol*. 2011;11:144.
- 437 17. Lugeski A, Durastanti V, Gasperini C, Lai M, Pozzilli C, Orefice G, Sotgiu S, Pucci E,
438 Ardito B, Millefiorini E and the CoSa Study Group. Safety and tolerability in relapsing-
439 remitting multiple sclerosis patients treated with high-dose subcutaneous interferon-
440 beta by rebiject autoinjection over a 1-year period: The CoSa study. *Clin*
441 *Neuropharmacol*. 2008;31:167-72.

- 442 18. Lakha F, Henderson C, Glasier A. The acceptability of self-administration of
443 subcutaneous Depo-Provera. *Contraception*. 2005;72:14-8.
- 444 19. Cameron ST, Glasier A, Johnstone A. Pilot study of home self-administration of
445 subcutaneous depo-medroxyprogesterone acetate for contraception. *Contraception*.
446 2012;85:458-64.
- 447 20. Gerber RA, Cappelleri JC, Kourides IA, Gelfand RA. Treatment satisfaction with
448 inhaled insulin in patients with type 1 diabetes: a randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes*
449 *Care*. 2001;24:1556-9.
- 450 21. Cappelleri JC, Cefalu WT, Rosenstock J, Kourides IA, Gerber RA. Treatment
451 satisfaction in type 2 diabetes: a comparison between an inhaled insulin regimen and a
452 subcutaneous insulin regimen. *Clin Ther*. 2002;24:552-64.
- 453 22. Hayes RP, Muchmore D, Schmitke J. Effect of inhaled insulin on patient-reported
454 outcomes and treatment preference in patients with type 1 diabetes. *Curr Med Res*
455 *Opin*. 2007;23:435-42.
- 456 23. Chancellor J, Aballea S, Lawrence A, Sheldon R, Cure S, Plun-Favreau J, Marchant
457 N. Preferences of patients with diabetes mellitus for inhaled versus injectable insulin
458 regimens. *Pharmacoeconomics*. 2008;26:217-34.
- 459 24. Freemantle N, Blonde L, Duhot D, Hompesch M, Eggertsen R, Hobbs FDR, Martinez
460 L, Ross S, Bolinder B, Stridde E. Availability of inhaled insulin promotes greater
461 perceived acceptance of insulin therapy in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes*
462 *Care*. 2005;28:427-8.
- 463 25. Rosenstock J, Cappelleri JC, Bolinder B, Gerber RA. Patient satisfaction and glycemic
464 control after 1 year with inhaled insulin (Exubera) in patients with type 1 or type 2
465 diabetes. *Diabetes Care*. 2004;27:1318-23.
- 466 26. Testa MA, Simonson DC. Satisfaction and quality of life with premeal inhaled versus
467 injected insulin in adolescents and adults with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care*.
468 2007;30:1399-405.

- 469 27. MacGregor EA, Brandes J, Eikermann A, Giammarco R. Impact of migraine on
470 patients and their families: the Migraine And Zolmitriptan Evaluation (MAZE) survey--
471 Phase III. *Curr Med Res Opin.* 2004;20:1143-50.
- 472 28. Weidmann E, Unger J, Blair S, Friesen C, Hart C, Cady R. An open-label study to
473 assess changes in efficacy and satisfaction with migraine care when patients have
474 access to multiple sumatriptan succinate formulations. *Clin Ther.* 2003;25:235-46.
- 475 29. Kaniecki RGR. Mixing sumatriptan: a prospective study of stratified care using multiple
476 formulations. *Headache.* 2001;41:862-6.
- 477 30. Darba J, Restovic G, Kaskens L, Balbona MA, Carbonell A, Cavero P, Jordana M,
478 Prieto C, Molina A, Padro I. Patient preferences for osteoporosis in Spain: a discrete
479 choice experiment. *Osteoporos Int.* 2011;22:1947-54.
- 480 31. MacGregor EA, Brandes J, Eikermann A. Migraine prevalence and treatment patterns:
481 the global Migraine and Zolmitriptan Evaluation survey. *Headache.* 2003;43:19-26.
- 482 32. Bohannon N, Bergenstal R, Cuddihy R, Kruger D, List S, Massaro E, Molitch M,
483 Raskin P, Remtema H, Strowig S, Whitehouse F, Brunelle RL, Dreon D, Tan M.
484 Comparison of a novel insulin bolus-patch with pen/syringe injection to deliver
485 mealtime insulin for efficacy, preference, and quality of life in adults with diabetes: A
486 randomized, crossover, multicenter study. *Diabetes Technol Ther.* 2011;13:1031-7.
- 487 33. Harris M, Joy R, Larsen G, Valyi M, Walker E, Frick LW, Palmatier RM, Wring SA,
488 Montaner JSG. Enfuvirtide plasma levels and injection site reactions using a needle-
489 free gas-powered injection system (Biojector). *AIDS.* 2006;20:719-23.
- 490 34. Boyd MA, Truman M, Hales G, Anderson J, Dwyer DE, Carr A. A randomized study to
491 evaluate injection site reactions using three different enfuvirtide delivery mechanisms
492 (the OPTIONS study). *Antivir Ther.* 2008;13:449-53.
- 493 35. Lalezari JP, Saag M, Walworth C, Larson P. An open-label safety study of enfuvirtide
494 injection with a needle-free injection device or needle/syringe: The Biojector 2000
495 open-label safety study (BOSS). *AIDS Res Hum Retroviruses.* 2008;24:805-13.

- 496 36. Gottlieb M, Thommes JA, WAND Study Team. Short communication safety, tolerability
497 and pharmacokinetics of enfuvirtide administered by a needle-free injection system
498 compared with subcutaneous injection. *Antivir Ther.* 2008;13:723-7.
- 499 37. Solnica A, Oh C, Cho MM, Loughli JS, McCulloh DH, McGovern PG. Patient
500 satisfaction and clinical outcome after injecting gonadotropins with use of a needle-free
501 carbon dioxide injection system for controlled ovarian hyperstimulation for in vitro
502 fertilization. *Fertil Steril.* 2009;92:1369-71.
- 503 38. Ahmed SFS, Smith WAW, Blamires CC. Facilitating and understanding the family's
504 choice of injection device for growth hormone therapy by using conjoint analysis. *Arch*
505 *Dis Child.* 2008;93:110-4.
- 506 39. Dorr HG, Zabransky S, Keller E, Otten BJ, Partsch C-J, Nyman L, Gillespie BK, Lester
507 NR, Wilson AM, Hyren C, van Kuijk MA, Schuld P, Schoenfeld SL. Are needle-free
508 injections a useful alternative for growth hormone therapy in children? Safety and
509 pharmacokinetics of growth hormone delivered by a new needle-free injection device
510 compared to a fine gauge needle. *J Pediatr Endocrinol Metab.* 2003;16:383-92.
- 511 40. Wickramasuriya BPNB, Casey AA, Akhtar SS, Zia R, Ehtisham S, Barrett TG, Shaw
512 NJ, Kirk JMW. Factors determining patient choice of device for GH therapy. *Horm Res.*
513 2006;65:18-22.
- 514 41. Borrs-Blasco J, Gracia-Prez A, Rosique-Robles JD, Castera MD-E, Abad FJ.
515 Acceptability of switching adalimumab from a prefilled syringe to an autoinjection pen.
516 *Expert Opin Biol Ther.* 2010;10:301-7.
- 517 42. Kivitz A, Cohen S, Dowd JE, Edwards JE, Thakker S, Wellborne FR, RRenz CL,
518 Segurado OG. Clinical assessment of pain, tolerability, and preference of an
519 autoinjection pen versus a prefilled syringe for patient self-administration of the fully
520 human, monoclonal antibody adalimumab: the TOUCH trial. *Clin Ther.* 2006;28:1619-
521 29.

- 522 43. Lim WH, Chan D, Boudville N, Pellicano S, Herson H, Moody H, Hutchison B,
523 Snedeker M, Dogra G. Patients' Perceptions of Subcutaneous Delivery of Darbepoetin
524 Alfa by Autoinjector Prefilled Pen Versus Prefilled Syringe: A Randomized, Crossover
525 Study. *Clin Ther.* 2012;34:1948-53.
- 526 44. Pfutzner A, Hartmann K, Winter F, Fuchs GS, Kappelgaard A-M, Rohrer TR.
527 Intuitiveness, ease of use, and preference of a prefilled growth hormone injection pen:
528 a noninterventional, randomized, open-label, crossover, comparative usability study of
529 three delivery devices in growth hormone-treated pediatric patients. *Clin Ther.*
530 2010;32:1918-34.
- 531 45. Stanhope R, Buchanan C, Butler G, Costigan C, Dunger D, Greene S, Hoey H,
532 Hughes I, Kelnar C, Kirk, J, Komulainen J, Lowry M, Warner M. An open-label
533 acceptability study of Norditropin SimpleXx - A new liquid growth hormone formulation.
534 *J Pediatr Endocrinol Metab.* 2001;14:735-40.
- 535 46. Devonshire V, Arbizu T, Borre B, Lang M, Lugaresi A, Singer B, Verdun di Cantogno
536 E, Cornelisse P. Patient-rated suitability of a novel electronic device for self-injection of
537 subcutaneous interferon beta-1a in relapsing multiple sclerosis: An international,
538 single-arm, multicentre, Phase IIIb study. *BMC Neurol.* 2010;10:28.
- 539 47. Wray S, Armstrong R, Herrman C, Calkwook J, Cascione M, Watsky E, Hayward B,
540 Mercer B, Dangond F. Results from the single-use autoinjector for self-administration
541 of subcutaneous interferon beta-1a in patients with relapsing multiple sclerosis
542 (MOSAIC) study. *Expert Opin Drug Deliv.* 2011;8:1543-53.
- 543 48. Landy S, H., Tepper S, J., Wein T, Schweizer E, Ramos E. An Open-Label Trial of a
544 Sumatriptan Auto-Injector for Migraine in Patients Currently Treated With
545 Subcutaneous Sumatriptan An Open-Label Trial of a Sumatriptan Auto-Injector for
546 Migraine in Patients Currently Treated With Subcutaneous Sumatriptan. *Headache.*
547 2013;53:118-25.

- 548 49. Rubin RR, Peyrot M. Health-Related Quality of Life and Treatment Satisfaction in the
549 Sensor-Augmented Pump Therapy for A1C Reduction 3 (STAR 3) Trial. *Diabetes*
550 *Technol Ther.* 2012;14:143-51.
- 551 50. Marmolin ES, Brodsgaard J, Gjessing HJ, Schousboe K, Grodum E, Jorgensen UL,
552 Moller CC, Pedersen J. Better treatment of outpatients with type 1 diabetes after
553 introduction of continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion. *Dan Med J.* 2012;59:A4445.
- 554 51. Skogsberg L, Fors H, Hanas R, Chaplin JE Lindman E, Skogsberg J. Improved
555 treatment satisfaction but no difference in metabolic control when using continuous
556 subcutaneous insulin infusion vs. multiple daily injections in children at onset of type 1
557 diabetes mellitus. *Pediatr Diabetes.* 2008;9:472-9.
- 558 52. Garmo A, Pettersson-Frank B, Ehrenberg A. Treatment effects and satisfaction in
559 diabetic patients changing from multiple daily insulin injections to CSII. *Practical*
560 *Diabetes Int.* 2004;21:7-12.
- 561 53. Nicolucci A, Maione A, Franciosi M, Amoretti R, Busetto E, Capani F, Bruttomesso D,
562 Di Bartolo P, Girelli A, Leonetti F, Morviducci L, Ponzi P, Vitacolonna E. Quality of life
563 and treatment satisfaction in adults with Type 1 diabetes: a comparison between
564 continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion and multiple daily injections. *Diabet Med.*
565 2008;25:213-20.
- 566 54. Hanas R, Adolfsson P, Elfvin-Akesson K, Hammaren L, Ilvered R, Jansson I,
567 Johansson C, Kroon M, Lindgren J, Lindh A, Ludvigsson J, Sigstrom L, Wilk A, Aman
568 J. Indwelling catheters used from the onset of diabetes decrease injection pain and
569 pre-injection anxiety. *J Pediatr.* 2002;140:315-20.
- 570 55. Herman WH, Ilag LL, Johnson SL, Martin CL, Sinding J, Harthi A, Plunkett CD,
571 LaPorte FB, Burke R, Brown MB, Halter JB, Raskin P. A clinical trial of continuous
572 subcutaneous insulin infusion versus multiple daily injections in older adults with type 2
573 diabetes. *Diabetes Care.* 2005;28:1568-73.

- 574 56. Nuboer R, Borsboom GJ, Zoethout JA, Koot HM, Bruining J. Effects of insulin pump
575 vs. injection treatment on quality of life and impact of disease in children with type 1
576 diabetes mellitus in a randomized, prospective comparison. *Pediatr Diabetes*.
577 2008;9:291-6.
- 578 57. Raskin P, Bode BW, Marks JB, Hirsch IB, Weinstein RL, McGill JB, Peterson GE,
579 Mudaliar SR, Reinhardt RR. Continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion and multiple
580 daily injection therapy are equally effective in type 2 diabetes: a randomized, parallel-
581 group, 24-week study. *Diabetes Care*. 2003;26:2598-603.
- 582 58. Scheidegger U, Allemann S, Scheidegger K, Diem P. Continuous subcutaneous
583 insulin infusion therapy: effects on quality of life. *Swiss Med Wkly*. 2007;137:476-82.
- 584 59. Weintrob N, Benzaquen H, Galatzer A, Shalitin S, Lazar L, Fayman G, Lilos P,
585 Dickerman Z, Phillip M. Comparison of continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion and
586 multiple daily injection regimens in children with type 1 diabetes: a randomized open
587 crossover trial. *Pediatrics*. 2003;112:559-64.
- 588 60. Wilson DM, Buckingham BA, Kunselman EL, Sullivan MM, Paguntalan HU, Gitelman
589 SE. A two-center randomized controlled feasibility trial of insulin pump therapy in
590 young children with diabetes. *Diabetes Care*. 2005;28:15-9.
- 591 61. Paul C, Stalder JF, Thaci D, Vincendon P, Brault Y, Kielar D, Tebbs V. Patient
592 satisfaction with injection devices: A randomized controlled study comparing two
593 different etanercept delivery systems in moderate to severe psoriasis. *J Eur Acad*
594 *Dermatology Venereol*. 2012;26:448-55.
- 595 62. Drent ML, Jakobsdottir S, Van Wijk JAE, Oostdijk W, Wit JM. Acceptability of liquid
596 human growth hormone (hGH) [Norditropin SimpleXx] in adults and children with GH
597 deficiency and children with chronic renal disease. *Clin Drug Invest*. 2002;22:633-8.
- 598 63. Bruynesteyn KK, Bonsel GJG, Braat DDMD, Fauser BCJM, Devroey P, van Genugten
599 MLL. Economic evaluation of the administration of follitropin-beta with a pen device.
600 *Reprod Biomed Online*. 2005;11:26-35.

- 601 64. Platteau P, Laurent E, Albano C, Osmanagaolu K, Vernaev V, Tournaye H, Camus
602 M, Van Steirteghem A, Devroey P. An open, randomized single-centre study to
603 compare the efficacy and convenience of follitropin beta administered by a pen device
604 with follitropin alpha administered by a conventional syringe in women undergoing
605 ovarian stimulation for IVF/ICSI. *Hum Reprod.* 2003;18:1200-4.
- 606 65. Cadranel JF, Boujenah JL, Bourliere M, Fontanges T, Pol S, Trepo C, Ouzan.
607 Satisfaction of patients treated for chronic hepatitis C with the peginterferon alfa-2b
608 pen device: the VISA observational study. *Gastroenterol Clin Biol.* 2007;31:180-4.
- 609 66. Pfutzner A, Bailey T, Campos C, Kahn D, Ambers E, Niemeyer M, Guerrero G, Klonoff
610 D, Nayberg I. Accuracy and preference assessment of prefilled insulin pen versus vial
611 and syringe with diabetes patients, caregivers, and healthcare professionals. *Curr Med
612 Res Opin.* 2013;29:475-81.
- 613 67. Bode B, Shelmet J, Gooch B, Hassman DR, Liang J, Smedegaard JK, Skovlund S,
614 Berg B, Lyness W, Schneider SH and InDuo Study Group. Patient perception and use
615 of an insulin injector/glucose monitor combined device. *Diabetes Educ.* 2004;30:301-9.
- 616 68. Korytkowski M, Bell D, Jacobsen C, Suwannasari R. A multicenter, randomized, open-
617 label, comparative, two-period crossover trial of preference, efficacy, and safety
618 profiles of a prefilled, disposable pen and conventional vial/syringe for insulin injection
619 in patients with type 1 or 2 diabetes mellitus. *Clin Ther.* 2003;25:2836-48.
- 620 69. Lee IT, Liu HC, Liao YJ, Lee W-J, Huang C-N, Sheu WHJ-H. Improvement in health-
621 related quality of life, independent of fasting glucose concentration, via insulin pen
622 device in diabetic patients. *J Eval Clin Pract.* 2009;15:699-703.
- 623 70. Shelmet J, Schwartz S, Cappelman J, Peterson G, Skovlund S, Lytzen L, Nicklasson
624 L, Liang J, Lyness W. Preference and resource utilization in elderly patients: InnoLet
625 versus vial/syringe. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract.* 2004;63:27-35.

- 626 71. Stockl K, Ory C, Vanderplas A, Nicklasson L, Lyness W, Cobden D, Change E. An
627 evaluation of patient preference for an alternative insulin delivery system compared to
628 standard vial and syringe. *Curr Med Res Opin.* 2007;23:133-46.
- 629 72. Summers KH, Szeinbach SL, Lenox SM. Preference for insulin delivery systems
630 among current insulin users and nonusers. *Clin Ther.* 2004;26:1498-505.
- 631 73. Wilk T, Mora PF, Chaney S, Shaw K. Use of an insulin pen by homeless patients with
632 diabetes mellitus. *J Am Acad Nurse Pract.* 2002;14:372-9.
- 633 74. Rubin RR, Peyrot M. Quality of life, treatment satisfaction, and treatment preference
634 associated with use of a pen device delivering a premixed 70/30 insulin aspart
635 suspension (aspart protamine suspension/soluble aspart) versus alternative treatment
636 strategies. *Diabetes Care.* 2004;27:2495-7.
- 637 75. Stocks A, Perry S-R, Brydon P. HumaPen Ergo: A new 3.0ml Reusable insulin pen
638 evaluation of patient acceptability. *Clin Drug Invest.* 2001;21:319-24.
- 639 76. Fox C, McKinnon C, Wall A, Lawton SA. Ability to handle, and patient preference for,
640 insulin delivery devices in visually impaired patients with type 2 diabetes. *Pract*
641 *Diabetes Int.* 2002;19:104-7.
- 642 77. Ignaut DA, Schwartz SL, Sarwat S, Murphy HL. Comparative device assessments:
643 Humalog KwikPen compared with vial and syringe and FlexPen. *Diabetes Educ.*
644 2009;35:789-98.
- 645 78. Israel-Bultman H, Hyllested-Winge J, Kolaczynski M, Steindorf J, Garon J. Comparison
646 of preference for NovoPen((R)) 4 with previous insulin pen treatments after 12 weeks
647 in adult patients with type 1 and type 2 diabetes: a multicenter observational study.
648 *Clin Ther.* 2011;33:346-57.
- 649 79. Venekamp WJ, Kerr L, Dowsett SA, Johnson PA, Wimberley D, McKenzie C, Malone
650 J, Milicevic Z. Functionality and acceptability of a new electronic insulin injection pen
651 with a memory feature. *Curr Med Res Opin.* 2006;22:315-25.

- 652 80. Bailey T, Thurman J, Niemeyer M, Schmeisl G. Usability and preference evaluation of
653 a prefilled insulin pen with a novel injection mechanism by people with diabetes and
654 healthcare professionals. *Curr Med Res Opin.* 2011;27:2043-52.
- 655 81. Guo X, Somnavilla B, Vanterpool G, Qvist M, Bethien M, Lilleore SK. Evaluation of a
656 new durable insulin pen with memory function among people with diabetes and
657 healthcare professionals. *Expert Opin Drug Deliv.* 2012;9:355-6.
- 658 82. Hancu N, Czupryniak L, Genestin E, Sourij H. A Pan-European and Canadian
659 prospective survey to evaluate patient satisfaction with the SoloSTAR insulin injection
660 device in type 1 and type 2 diabetes. *J Diabetes Sci Technol.* 2011;5:1224-34.
- 661 83. Nadeau DA, Campos C, Niemeyer M, Bailey T. Healthcare professional and patient
662 assessment of a new prefilled insulin pen versus two widely available prefilled insulin
663 pens for ease of use, teaching and learning. *Curr Med Res Opin.* 2012;28:3-13.
- 664 84. Niskanen L, Jensen LE, Rastam J, Nygaard-Pedersen L, Erichsen K, Vora JP.
665 Randomized, multinational, open-label, 2-period, crossover comparison of biphasic
666 insulin aspart 30 and biphasic insulin lispro 25 and pen devices in adult patients with
667 type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Clin Ther.* 2004;26:531-40.
- 668 85. Reimer T, Hohberg C, Pfutzner A, Jorgensen C, Jensen KH, Pfutzner A. Intuitiveness,
669 instruction time, and patient acceptance of a prefilled insulin delivery device and a
670 reusable insulin delivery device in a randomized, open-label, crossover handling study
671 in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Clin Ther.* 2008;30:2252-62.
- 672 86. Ristic S, Bates PC, Martin JM, Llewelyn JA. Acceptability of a reusable insulin pen,
673 Humapen Ergo, by patients with type 1 and type 2 diabetes. *Curr Med Res Opin.*
674 2002;18:68-71.
- 675 87. Schipper C, Musholt P, Niemeyer M, Loffler A, Forst T, Pfutzner A. Patient device
676 assessment evaluation of two insulin injection devices in a mixed cohort of insulin-
677 treated patients with type 1 or type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Curr Med Res Opin.*
678 2012;28:1297-303.

- 679 88. Asakura T, Seino H, Jensen KH. Patient acceptance and issues of education of two
680 durable insulin pen devices. *Diabetes Technol Ther.* 2008;10:299-304.
- 681 89. Gottesman I, Perron P, Berard L, Stewart J, Basso N, Mettimano K, Elliott T.
682 Evaluation of a new reusable insulin pen (ClikSTAR) in Canadian patients with type 1
683 and type 2 diabetes mellitus receiving insulin glargine. *Diabetes Technol Ther.*
684 2012;14:926-35.
- 685 90. Asakura T, Jensen KH. Comparison of intuitiveness, ease of use, and preference in
686 two insulin pens. *J Diab Sci Technol.* 2009;3:312-9.
- 687 91. Garg S, Bailey T, DeLuzio T, Pollom D. Preference for a new prefilled insulin pen
688 compared with the original pen. *Curr Med Res Opin.* 2011;27:2323-33.
- 689 92. Haak T, Edelman S, Walter C, Lecointre B, Spollett G. Comparison of usability and
690 patient preference for the new disposable insulin device SoloStar versus FlexPen, Lilly
691 disposable pen, and a prototype pen: an open-label study. *Clin Ther.* 2007;29:650-60.
- 692 93. Olsen BS, Lilleore SK, Korsholm CN, Kracht T. Novopen Echo for the delivery of
693 insulin: a comparison of usability, functionality and preference among pediatric
694 subjects, their parents, and health care professionals. *J Diabetes Sci Technol.*
695 2010;4:1468-75.
- 696 94. Oyer D, Narendran P, Qvist M, Niemeyer M, Nadeau DA. Ease of use and preference
697 of a new versus widely available prefilled insulin pen assessed by people with
698 diabetes, physicians and nurses. *Expert Opin Drug Deliv.* 2011;8:1259-69.
- 699 95. Som mavilla BB, Jorgensen CC, Jensen KK. Safety, simplicity and convenience of a
700 modified prefilled insulin pen. *Expert Opin Pharmacother.* 2008;9:2223-32.
- 701 96. Som mavilla B, Pietranera G. A randomized, open-label, comparative crossover
702 handling trial between two durable pens in patients with type 1 or 2 diabetes mellitus.
703 *Journal Diabetes Sci Technol.* 2011;5:1212-21.

- 704 97. Kappelgaard AM, Mikkelsen S, Bagger C, Fuchs GS. Children and adolescent
705 acceptability of a new device system to administer human growth hormone--a pilot
706 study. *J Pediatr Endocrinol Metab.* 2012;25:285-94.
- 707 98. Fuchs GS, Mikkelsen S, Knudsen TK, Kappelgaard A. Ease of use and acceptability of
708 a new pen device for the administration of growth hormone therapy in pediatric
709 patients: an open-label, uncontrolled usability test. *Clin Ther.* 2009;31:2906-14.
- 710 99. Hey-Hadavi J, Pleil A, Deeb LC, Fuqua JS, Silverman LA, Reiner B, Newfield R,
711 Rajicic N, Wajnrajch MP, Cara JF. Ease of use and preference for a new disposable
712 self-injection pen compared with a reusable pen for administering recombinant human
713 growth hormone: A multicenter, 2-Month, single-arm, open-label clinical trial in patient-
714 caregiver dyads. *Clin Ther.* 2010;32:2036-47.
- 715 100. Kappelgaard AM, Mikkelsen S, Knudsen TK, Fuchs GS. Patient preference for a new
716 growth hormone injection device: results of an open-label study in Japanese pediatric
717 patients. *J Pediatr Endocrinol Metab.* 2011;24:489-96.
- 718 101. Ryan M, Gerard K, Amaya-Amya M. Using Discrete Choice Experiments to Value
719 Health and Health Care. *The Economics of Non-Market Goods and Resources,*
720 *Volume 11, Series ed Bateman IJ, Dordrecht: Springer, 2008.*
- 721 102. Sterne JAC, Egger M, Moher D. Chapter 10: Addressing reporting biases. In: Higgins
722 JPT Green S editor(s). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions.*
723 *Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, 2008.*
- 724 103. Anderson BJ, Redondo MJ. What can we learn from patient-reported outcomes of
725 insulin pen devices? *J Diabetes Sci Technol.* 2011;5:1563-71.

726