Feasibility of a prototype dual function glucose sensing and insulin delivering

BACKGROUND

cannula





Cheng Yi Yuan, MD¹; Yee Wen Kong, MD¹; David Blessing, BS²; Kelly Connors, CQA²; Robert Janowski, BA, MBA²; Jean Lu, MBBS¹; Emma Netzer, BN¹; Thomas Seidl, PhD²; Huan-Ping Wu, PhD²; David O'Neal, MD¹

¹Diabetes Technology Research Group, The University of Melbourne, Australia ²Pacific Diabetes Technologies, Portland, Oregon Sunni.yuan@unimelb.edu.au

METHODS



%-MARD vs. BG				%-MARD vs. YSI		
ID	Dexcom G6	SynerG™	BG (n)	Dexcom G6	SynerG™	YSI (n)
SV03	7.8	14.4	84	9.7	11.9	45
SV04	6.8	16.3	88	11.4	16.2	45
SV05	26.8	15.5	85	26.7	14.9	46
SV06	8.6	15	90	8.4	11.7	45
SV07	9.1	12.7	88	6.8	12.6	46
SV08	12.2	13	78	12.2	12.3	44
SV09	16.6	11.9	101	17	13.3	45
SV10	7.5	19	102	5	18.6	46
Overall	11.9 *	14.7 *	716	12.2 *	13.9 *	362

Table 1: Individual device MARD compared to BG and YSI as benchmark. *Non-weighted average of individual devices' MARD



Figure 3: Participant SV05 study sensor results during a meal test

- range 70-180mg/dL (TIR) or mean sensor glucose (Table 2).
- These results suggest there was no compromise in insulin delivery or glucose results while using study cannula

p-value 0.401 TIR (%) 57.3±20.7 46.4±25.1 0.440 Dexcom G6 mean sensor 167.4±30.6 185.4±32.4 0.476 glucose (mg/dL)

Table 2: Comparison of TDD, TIR and mean sensor glucose between run-in vs the study cannula. Results expressed in mean± SD or median [IQR]

CONCLUSION

o Initial feasibility data supports successful function of this glucose-sensing and insulin delivering cannula. Algorithm development is underway aimed at improving sensor accuracy.