



NEW RESEARCH PROPOSAL
 by IRB - Security Forces Hospital Program in Holy Capital
<http://www.sfhm.med.sa/>

IRB number : 0535-301122

Protocol Title : Cost comparison of single-use versus reusable flexible ureteroscope

Protocol Version : 1.0

Principal Investigator : Suhail Anwarfathi Kalantan

Purpose of the project:

Research project

Type of Project and activities involved:

Retrospective chart review

Is there any possibility that the study may involve any of the following vulnerable groups?

NO

Is the study a single or a multi-center study?

Single center

Has the study been previously reviewed by another ethics committee or IRB?

Yes and approved

- Security Forces Hospital - Makkah Institutional Review Board
- 0528-131122

Is there any co-investigators in this research ?

Yes

Name of co- investigators

Co-Investigators	Title/Position	Affiliation/Department	Study role
Waleed Alhozali	Senior	General Surgery /	Record Review and Data
	Registrar	Urology	Collection
Amr Mohamed Azzam	Registrar	General Surgery /	Record Review and Data
		Urology	Collection
Abdelsalam Ammar Abdallah	Registrar	General Surgery /	Record Review and Data
		Urology	Collection
Ali Hassan Abdelmagied	Registrar	General Surgery /	Protocol Development
		Urology	
Ahmed Issam Abd ElAziz Ali	Consultant	General Surgery /	Protocol Development
		Urology	

Anticipated starting Date :

2016-01-01

Expected duration :

2023-02-28

Total Fund Available (SR) :

0

Introduction and Background :

The flexible ureteroscope is one of the most used instruments in urology. It allows minimally invasive treatment of renal stones [1–3]. The conventional flexible ureteroscope is a reusable instrument which requires certain procedures for disinfection and decontamination to be safely reused. Sterilization procedures take time and include costs for products and materials as well as the cost of personnel [4–6]. With the increased use of fURS, urologists face challenges that can influence their performance. The lack of available fURS is a real problem in certain centers when fURS are being repaired or sterilized [7–10]. Single-use fURS have recently been developed that is acquisition and maintenance costs, breakages, ready availability, and reprocessing between procedures. [11–13]. These devices reproduce the characteristics of conventional reusable ureteroscopes [14–16]. They have been manufactured to overcome the major inconveniences of reusable fURS which require decontamination and sterilization, availability in emergency situations, reduction of efficiency and life span with multiple use and complete sterilization procedures. WiScope® Single-Use Digital Flexible Ureteroscope (OTU Medical Inc.) has recently been introduced with the promise of delivering equivalent clinical performance, but at a reduced cost. To date, the cost issue still remains one of the main barriers in the adoption of these novel technologies.

Research Question :

Cost comparison of single-use versus reusable flexible ureteroscope

Aim and Objective :

Retrospectively evaluate the costs of single-use flexible ureteroscopes and reusable flexible ureteroscope.

Literature Review :

Cost comparison of single-use versus reusable flexible ureteroscope: A systematic review. Eugenio Ventimiglia et al. "In high-volume centers, with proper training for reusable ureteroscopes management, the cost per case of reusable and single-use scopes are overlapping (\$1,212-\$1,743 versus \$1,300-\$3,180 per procedure)" Reusable,Single-Use, or Both: A Cost Efficiency Analysis of Flexible Ureterorenoscopes After 983 Cases. Dries Van Compernolle et al. " using rfURS is more cost-efficient than the constant use of sufURS after 155 to 274 cases "Comparative medico-economic study of reusable vs. single-use flexible ureteroscopes. Khalid Al-Balushi et al. "the single-use fURS was cost-effective compared with the reusable fURS until the 22nd procedure versus the 73rd procedure, respectively. " The Economic Implications of a Reusable Flexible Digital Ureteroscope: A Cost-Benefit Analysis. Christopher J Martin et al " It appears that a disposable ureteroscope may be cost beneficial at centers with a lower case volume per year. However, institutions with a high volume of cases may find reusable ureteroscopes cost beneficial. "

Methodology :

This is a single-center, retrospective study which included all flexible ureteroscopic procedures performed in our department from (Jan / 2016 till present). Flexible ureteroscopies were scheduled and performed by three senior urologists for treatment of renal stones. To evaluate the cost impact of single-use ureteroscopes compared with reusable flexible ureteroscopes, we conducted a retrospective study that evaluated the costs of reusable ureteroscopes including the costs of operation, maintenance and repair. We also evaluated the costs of single-use ureteroscopes. Cost of single use ureteroscopes Single-use fURS are provided in sterile packs which means they do not require decontamination or reconditioning before their utilization. Their only cost is for their purchase. We therefore calculated the total cost of single-use fURS according to the following formula: Total cost (y) = (cost of purchase of each single use fURS + 15 % VAT) × (number of procedures (x)). cost of reusable flexible ureteroscopes In the cost evaluation, we considered the costs of ureteroscope purchase, maintenance, repair and

operating expenses. Regarding reusable fURS repair, the following factors were taken into account: the duration of non-availability of a ureteroscope for repair (in days) and the costs of repairs (on the invoices supplied by the manufacturer). The costs of protocolled bacteriological examination before reutilization after repair were also included. Operating expenses involved the costs of decontamination, transport, and storage. After each procedure, a ureteroscope undergoes the first treatment in the operating room: wiping, aspiration, and tightness test. The second step in ureteroscope processing (sterilization and repacking) is carried out in the sterilization room, which involves: brush cleaning, rinsing, disinfection, drying, and reconditioning. The third step in reusable fURS processing is transport from the decontamination room to the operating room. The total cost of reusable fURS per procedure was calculated according to the following formula Cost per procedure (y) = (cost of decontamination + repacking + transport per procedure) + (annual cost of repair/number of procedures per year(x)). The overall cost of flexible ureteroscopy activity based on the number of procedures was calculated by the formula: Overall Cost = number of procedure (x) × cost/procedure (y). Patient demographic and clinical data such as age, gender, BMI, stone size, location and laterality were reported. Intraoperative data such as postoperative stenting, laser energy and frequency and complications were collected. Postoperative follow up imaging was reviewed to evaluate for late complication and stone free status.

References :

1. Türk C, Petřík A, Sarica K, Seitz C, Skolarikos A, Straub M et al (2016) EAU guidelines on interventional treatment for urolithiasis. *Eur Urol mArs* 69(3):475–482
2. Rouprêt M, Babjuk M, Compérat E, Zigeuner R, Sylvester RJ, Burger M et al (2018) European Association of Urology Guidelines on Upper Urinary Tract Urothelial Carcinoma: 2017 update. *Eur Urol* 73(1):111–122
3. Seisen T, Peyronnet B, Dominguez-Escrí JL, Bruins HM, Yuan CY, Babjuk M et al (2016) Oncologic outcomes of kidney-sparing surgery versus radical nephroureterectomy for upper tract urothelial carcinoma: a systematic review by the EAU non-muscle invasive bladder cancer guidelines panel. *Eur Urol* 70(6):1052–1068
4. Semins MJ, George S, Allaf ME, Matlaga BR (2009) Ureteroscope cleaning and sterilization by the urology operating room team: the effect on repair costs. *J Endourol* 23(6):903–9055.
5. Ofstead CL, Heymann OL, Quick MR, Johnson EA, Eiland JE, Wetzler HP (2017) The effectiveness of sterilization for flexible ureteroscopes: a real-world study. *Am J Infect Control* 45(8):888–895
6. Sabnis RB, Bhattu A, Vijaykumar M (2014) Sterilization of endoscopic instruments. *Curr Opin Urol* 24(2):195–202
7. Karaolides T, Bach C, Kachrilas S, Goyal A, Masood J, Buchholz N (2013) Improving the durability of digital flexible ureteroscopes. *Urology* 81(4):717–722
8. Carey RI, Gomez CS, Maurici G, Lynne CM, Leveillee RJ, Bird VG (2006) Frequency of ureteroscope damage seen at a tertiary care center. *J Urol* 176(2):607–610 (discussion 610)
9. Carey RI, Martin CJ, Knego JR (2014) Prospective evaluation of refurbished flexible ureteroscope durability seen in a large public tertiary care center with multiple surgeons. *Urology* 84(1):42–45
10. Legemate JD, Kamphuis GM, Freund JE, Baard J, Zanetti SP, Catellani M, et al. Durability of flexible ureteroscopes: a prospective evaluation of longevity, the factors that affect it, and damage mechanisms. *Eur Urol Focus*. 2018
11. Marchini GS, Batagello CA, Monga M, Torricelli FCM, Vicentini FC, Danilovic A et al (2018) In vitro evaluation of single-use digital flexible ureteroscopes: a practical comparison for a patient-centered approach. *J Endourol* 32(3):184–1
12. Emiliani E, Mercadé A, Millan F, Sánchez-Martín F, Konstantinidis CA, Angerri O (2018) First clinical evaluation of the new single-use flexible and semirigid Pusen ureteroscopes. *Cent Eur J Urol*. 71(2):208–213
13. Emiliani E, Traxer O (2017) Single use and disposable flexible ureteroscopes. *Curr Opin Urol* 27(2):176–181
14. Davis NF, Quinlan MR, Browne C, Bhatt NR, Manecksha RP, D'Arcy FT et al (2018) Single-use flexible ureteropyeloscopy: a systematic review. *World J Urol* 36(4):529–536
15. Doizi S, Kamphuis G, Giusti G, Andreassen KH, Knoll T, Osterh P et al (2017) First clinical evaluation of a new single-use flexible ureteroscope (LithoVue™): a European prospective multicentric feasibility study. *World J Urol* 35(5):809–818
16. Usawachintachit M, Isaacson DS, Taguchi K, Tzou DT, Hsi RS, Sherer BA et al (2017) A prospective case-control study comparing LithoVue, a single-use, flexible disposable ureteroscope, with flexible, reusable Fiber-Optic Ureteroscopes. *J Endourol*. 31(5):468–475

Other :

CONSENT FORM

20221130080340.docx (<https://sfhm-irb.online/uploads/20221130080340.docx>)