Take control of safety

BD® Insyte Autoguard™ Shielded IV Catheter

BD

A spotlight on clinician safety

Even the most routine peripheral IV catheter (PIVC) placements present a point of risk for clinicians.

- Studies indicate about 80% of healthcare workers have been affected by needlestick injuries (NSIs).[2]
- Clinicians can develop psychiatric illnesses similar to PTSD following a needlestick injury.[3]
- 19% of adult IV catheter insertions can require 2 or more attempts.[4]
- On average, pediatric IV catheter insertions can require 2.1 attempts.[5]

Safety PIVCs should also support ease of handling and placement.

In a 2007 study, the overall cost to manage reported exposure to bloodborne pathogens was up to

$4,838 per incident.[6-7]

IV catheter placement is the most common invasive hospital procedure worldwide. Globally, more than a billion peripheral IV catheters are placed every year.[1]

Simple to place
Safe to handle

The push-button needle shielding technology featured in the Insyte Autoguard™ Shielded IV Catheter has been designed to help reduce NSIs.[8]



1

Control with the push of a button
Push-button needle shielding technology may help provide protection against NSIs, confirmed with the push of a button.

2

Control first-attempt insertion success
In a clinical study, BD® Instaflash™ Needle Technology increased first-attempt insertion success compared to a traditional non-notched needle.[*,9-10]

3

Control complications
BD® Vialon™ Catheter Material softens, enabling longer dwell time and reducing the chance of phlebitis.[†,11-13]

4

Control needle safety
A fully-encapsulated needle enables safe handling of a withdrawn needle.

*Compared to a non-notched needle; featured on 20–24 gauges
†Compared to an FEP catheter

Take control when it counts

With the push of a button, clinicians can take action to help protect themselves against NSIs. And choosing Insyte Autoguard™ Shielded IV Catheter with Instaflash™ Needle Technology, incorporates a notched needle, which clinically demonstrated improved first-attempt insertion success, reducing painful hit-and-miss insertions.*,9-10

Vascular Access Management

BD Vascular Access Management is an integrated approach that partners with healthcare facilities to identify and address gaps in the vascular access process and is designed to help reduce the risk of vascular access-related complications, improve clinical and economic outcomes and increase patient satisfaction.14-17



*Compared to a non-notched needle; featured on 20–24 gauges

Take control of safety with Insyte Autoguard™ Shielded IV Catheter

a safety PIVC designed to give clinicians control of safety activation with the push of a button



References

1 Alexandrou E, Ray-Barruel G, Carr PJ, et al. International prevalence of the use of peripheral intravenous catheters. *J Hosp Med.* 2015;10(8):530-533.

2 Elseviers MM, Arias-Guillen M, Gorke A, Arens H-J. Sharps injuries amongst healthcare workers: review of incidence, transmissions and costs. 2014;40(3);150-156.

3 Green & Griffiths. 2013. Psychiatric consequences of needlestick injury. *Occupational Medicine.* 63:183–188.

4 van Loon FHJ, van Hooff LWE, de Boer HD, et al. The modified A-DIVA scale as a predictive tool for prospective identification of adult patients at risk of a difficult intravenous access: a multicenter validation study. *J. Clin. Med.* 2019;8(144). doi:10.3390/jcm8020144.

5 Goff DA, Larsen P, Brinkley J, et al. Resource utilization and cost of inserting peripheral intravenous catheters in hospitalized children. *H Peds.* 2013;3:185. doi:10.1542/hpeds.2012-0089.

6 O'Malley EM, ScoV RD 2nd, Gayle J, et al. Costs of management of occupational exposures to blood and body fluids. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol.* 2007;28(7):774-782.

7 Wang D, Ye Y, Zheng Q. Cost of blood and body fluid occupational exposure management in Beijing, China. *International Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health.* 2020;17(12):4192. doi:10.3390/ijerph17124192.

8 Tosini W, Ciotti C, Goyer F, et al. Needlestick injury rates according to different types of safety-engineered devices: results of a French multicenter study. *Infection Control and Hospital Epidemiology.* 2010;31(4):402-407.

9 van Loon FHJ, Timmerman R, den Brok GPH, Korsten EHM, Dierick-van Daele ATM, Bouwman ARA. The impact of a notched peripheral intravenous catheter on the first attempt success rate in hospitalized adults: block-randomized trial. *JVA.* DOI:10.1177/1129729821990217.

10 Seetharam AM, Raju U, Suresh K. A randomized controlled study to compare first stick success with Instaflash technology: The FIRSST study. *JVA.* 2022 DOI:10.1177/11297298221080369.

11 Maki DG, Ringer M. Risk factors for infusion-related phlebitis with small peripheral venous catheters. *Annals of Internal Medicine.* 1991;114:845- 854.

12 Kus B, Buyukyilmaz F. Effectiveness of Vialon biomaterial versus Teflon catheters for peripheral intravenous placement: A randomized clinical trial. *Jpn J Nurs Sci.* 2020;e12328. https://doi.org/10.1111/jjns.12328.

13 Gaukroger PB, Roberts JG, Manners TA. Infusion thrombophlebitis: a prospective comparison of 645 Vialon and Teflon cannulae in anaesthetic and postoperative use. *Anaesthesia and Intensive Care.* 1988;16:265-271.

14 Helm RE, Klausner JD, Klemperer JD, Flint LM, Huang E. Accepted but unacceptable: peripheral IV catheter failure. *JIN.* 2015;38(3):189-203.

15 Morrell E. Reducing risks and improving vascular access outcomes. *JIN.* 2020;43(4):222-228.

16 Platt V, Osenkarski S. Improving vascular access outcomes and enhancing practice. *JIN.* 2018;41(6):375-382.

17 Chapman A. An ode to efficiency. *Reuters Events.* 2024.

BD Medical

Sandy, UT 84070, U.S.

BD.com

BD, the BD Logo, Instaflash, Insyte Autoguard and Vialon are trademarks of Becton, Dickinson and Company or its affiliates.
© 2025 BD. All rights reserved. BD-45359 (02/25)