Title: Environmental impact and life cycle financial cost of hybrid (reusable/ single-use) instruments versus single-use equivalents in laparoscopic cholecystectomy

Title	Name	Highest degrees	Affiliation(s)
Miss	Chantelle Rizan*	MRes, MRCS(ENT)	a) Brighton and Sussex University Hospitals NHS Trust Royal Sussex County Hospital, Eastern Road, Brighton, BN2 5BE b) Brighton and Sussex Medical School Falmer, Brighton BN1 9PX
Professor	Mahmood F Bhutta	DPhil, FRCS (ORL-HNS)	a) Brighton and Sussex University Hospitals NHS Trust Royal Sussex County Hospital, Eastern Road, Brighton, BN2 5BE b) Brighton and Sussex Medical School Falmer, Brighton BN1 9PX

*Corresponding author

Email: chantelle.rizan@nhs.net

ABSTRACT:

Background

Hybrid surgical instruments contain both single-use and reusable components, potentially bringing together advantages from both approaches.

Methods

We used Life Cycle Assessment to evaluate environmental impact of hybrid laparoscopic clip appliers, scissors and ports used for a laparoscopic cholecystectomy, comparing these with single-use equivalents. We modelled this using SimaPro to determine 18 midpoint environmental impacts including the carbon footprint, and three aggregated endpoint impacts. We also conducted life cycle cost analysis, taking into account unit cost, decontamination, and disposal costs.

Findings

The environmental impact of using hybrid instruments for a laparoscopic cholecystectomy was lower than single-use equivalents across 17 midpoint environmental impacts, with mean average reductions of 60%, and costing less than half that of single-use equivalents (GBP £131 versus £282). The carbon footprint of using hybrid versions of all three instruments was around one-quarter of single-use equivalents (1,756 g versus 7,194 g CO_2e per operation), and saved an estimated 1.13 e-5 DALYs (disability associated life years, 74% reduction), 2.37 e-8 species.year (loss of local species per year, 76% reduction), and US $ 0.6 in impact on resource depletion (78% reduction). Scenario modelling indicated environmental performance of hybrid instruments was better even given low number of reuses of instruments, decontamination with separate packaging of certain instruments, decontamination using fossil-fuel rich energy sources, or changing carbon intensity of instrument transportation.

Interpretation

Adoption of hybrid laparoscopic instruments could play an important role in meeting carbon reduction targets for surgery, whilst saving money.

Funding

This work was funded by Surgical Innovations Ltd who manufacture hybrid laparoscopic instruments.

INTRODUCTION

The advent of minimally invasive surgery has led to huge advances in abdominal surgery over the last three decades, with advantages over open approaches including faster recovery, shortened hospital stay, and reduced pain and scarring.(1) An estimated 14 million laparoscopic procedures were performed worldwide in 2020, at which point the global laparoscopic devices and accessories market was estimated at US $13.7 billion per annum.(2) The most common laparoscopic procedure performed is cholecystectomy,(3) but others include appendicectomy, colectomy, and bariatric operations, as well as gynaecological and urological procedures.

Anecdotally many surgeons prefer single-use over reusable laparoscopic instruments due to concerns over sterility, or possible failure of reusable instruments (e.g. blunt dissecting scissors or failure of clip appliers).(4) However, the financial cost of single-use laparoscopic instruments is typically higher than reusables,(4) estimated at nineteen times more in laparoscopic cholecystectomy after accounting for costs of decontamination, repair, and replacement.(5) An additional factor in deciding which type of laparoscopic instrument to use should be the environmental impact, which has previously received little attention, but is an urgent agenda because of risks to planetary health. Healthcare is responsible for over 4% of global net greenhouse gas emissions,(6) and in England medical equipment is estimated to account for 10% of this,(7) with consumable items identified as a key carbon hotspot within the operating theatre.(8)

The most common metric for measuring environmental harm is the carbon footprint: an estimate of greenhouse gas emissions associated with a product, process or system, equated and summated as carbon dioxide equivalents (CO_2e). A number of studies document that (almost universally) the carbon footprint of reusable items in the operating theatre is lower than that for single-use equivalents, including for scissors,(9) gowns and drapes,(10) laparotomy pads,(11) sharps containers,(12) and anaesthetic items (anaesthetic drug trays,(13) laryngeal mask airways,(14) and laryngoscope handles and blades.(15)

Hybrid instruments, also referred to as ‘resposable instruments’ or ‘modular systems’, are predominantly reusable, but with some single-use components. For example, in laparoscopy they may include a reusable trocar reusable trocar and port with disposable seal, or a reusable

instrument handle with disposable insert. Such devices likely reduce the environmental impact as well as financial cost of laparoscopic instruments, but this has not previously been evaluated. Here we set out to compare the environmental and financial life-cycle cost of currently available hybrid instruments for laparoscopic cholecystectomy, and compared these to single-use equivalents.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Functional unit

We included in our analysis three types of instrument routinely used in laparoscopic cholecystectomy (Table 1): laparoscopic clip appliers, laparoscopic scissors, and ports (small diameter 5mm ports and large diameter 10-11mm ports). These instruments have both disposable and hybrid versions available on the market. The 'functional unit' (unit of analysis) was defined as the number of these three types of instruments typically required to perform one laparoscopic cholecystectomy; two small diameter ports, two large diameter ports, one laparoscopic scissor and one laparoscopic clip applier.

Determination of material composition of instruments for analysis

Hybrid instruments were supplied by Surgical Innovations Ltd (Leeds, UK) and Microline Surgical Inc (Beverly, USA). Equivalent single-use instruments were identified from the catalogue of the UK National Health Service (NHS) Supply Chain. We determined raw material composition of each instrument and associated primary packaging using information provided by manufacturers through personal correspondence, or expert knowledge where manufacturers were unable to provide sufficient detail. Weight of component materials was determined using Fisherbrand FPRS4202 Precision balance scales (Fisher Scientific, Loughborough, UK).

Parameters for Life Cycle Assessment

An LCA was modelled using SimaPro v9.10 (PRé Sustainability, Amersfort, Netherlands), and conducted in accordance with ISO 14044 Guidelines.(16) We performed a 'cradle to grave' analysis, including raw material extraction, manufacture, transport, and disposal, plus decontamination for reusable components of hybrid instruments (system boundary outlined in Supplementary Figure 1). Other reusable instruments and consumables used to perform a laparoscopic cholecystectomy were beyond the scope of this analysis.

Material specific global average environmental impact of raw material extraction, production, and transportation to the 'end user' (in this case the manufacturer) of instruments and packaging was determined through matching materials identified with the closest processes within Ecoinvent v3.6, or where unavailable, in Industry data v.2.0 (both databases integrated within SimaPro).

Environmental impact of instrument manufacture was approximated using global average metal working processes for all metal components of instruments, and injection moulding processes for plastic components of instruments (as modelled in Ecoinvent v3.6). The mode and distance of international transportation from site of manufacture to the UK was determined through discussion with instrument suppliers (Supplementary Table 1), and we also assumed 80 km of travel by road using a heavy goods vehicle both within country of origin and in the UK, with the first and last 8 km at either end of this journey by courier.

All reusable components were assumed to be decontaminated and re-used 500 times, in accordance with manufacturer guidance on typical usage, with energy and material inputs for decontamination modelled using our own data presented elsewhere.(17) We assumed reusable components of hybrid instruments were integrated into a general laparoscopic set, as is common practice (Supplementary Table 2a). The typical weight of instruments on a general laparoscopic set was 730 g (data from our local hospital) and the weight of hybrid reusable components was 594g. Thus, hybrid instruments within a set comprise 45% of total weight (594/1324g), and so we also apportioned 45% of environmental harm from decontamination to the reusable components of hybrid instruments. At the end of their life, all items were assumed to be disposed of as clinical waste via high-temperature incineration.

Processes selected from SimaPro databases are detailed in Supplementary Table 3.

Assessment of environmental impact

Following development of the LCA inventory within SimaPro (which identifies flow of energy, materials and water to and from nature resulting from relevant processes), we used the ReCiPe v1.1 Midpoint Hierarchist method (integrated within SimaPro) to characterise such emissions, and to combine these into environmental impacts. This method evaluates eighteen midpoint impact categories (each relating to a single environmental problem): global

warming, stratospheric ozone depletion, ionising radiation, ozone formation (on human health, and terrestrial ecosystems), fine particulate matter formation, terrestrial acidification, eutrophication (freshwater and marine), ecotoxicity (terrestrial, freshwater, and marine), human toxicity (carcinogenic and non-carcinogenic), land use, resource scarcity (mineral and fossil), and water consumption. We performed deeper analysis of global warming impact, and conducted hotspot analysis to determine processes contributing most to carbon footprints. We used the ReCiPe v1.1 Endpoint Hierarchist method to aggregate midpoint impact categories to calculate endpoint factors for damage to human health, the natural environment, and resource scarcity. Finally, we used ReCiPe v1.1 Hierarchist normalisation factors to compare total midpoint and endpoint impacts to the mean average contributions to each of those impacts from a global average person's daily routine activities.(18)

Scenario modelling

To determine sensitivity of results to allocation methods and key assumptions, we modelled four alternative scenarios.

First, we determined the impact of altering the number of uses of instruments, and through this also identified the threshold at which the carbon footprint of reusables became lower than using single-use equivalents.

Laparoscopic clip appliers are not used across all laparoscopic operations performed in a given surgical department (but laparoscopic scissors and ports typically are), and clip appliers are therefore not always integrated into general laparoscopic sets. In our second scenario we modelled decontamination with the clip applier decontaminated separately in a flexible double wrapped polyethylene pouch (Supplementary Table 2b). Here we assumed total weight of items in the laparoscopic general set was 1.1kg, with decontamination of surgical scissors and ports apportioned accordingly (366/1096 g = 33%).

Third, we modelled the impact of switching the electricity source for decontamination to that typical of Australia, a country using a lower proportion of renewable energy.

Finally we modelled impact of changing overseas transport of single-use instruments to shipping by sea, with distances determined using the online Pier2Pier tool (19) and alternative road distances using Google maps(20) (Supplementary Table 1).

Consequentialist approach to LCA

Our baseline analysis uses standard practice of an attributional approach to LCA,(21) where products are allocated a proportion of the total lifecycle material and energies required for processes shared with other products. We performed alternative analysis of our base scenario using the consequential approach to LCA, which examines consequences of a change.(21) Specifically, when switching from single-use to hybrid laparoscopic instruments, hybrid components are integrated into surgical sets already destined for decontamination, meaning under the consequentialist model there is no additional impact from decontamination.

Assessment of life cycle financial cost

The cost of instruments reported in the NHS Supply Chain database(22) was equated to cost of manufacture and distribution. Disposal at the end of instrument life was costed at £617.22 per tonne, based on the price of clinical waste incineration reported by the NHS Digital Estates Returns Information Collection dataset.(23) Cost of decontaminating reusable components of hybrid instruments was based on the charge made by our hospital sterilisation services per instrument set, apportioned according to the weight of hybrid reusable components (here 45%).

Role of the funding source

This work was funded by Surgical Innovations Ltd who manufacture hybrid laparoscopic instruments, but the company played no part in scientific conduct, analysis, or writing of this manuscript.

RESULTS

Environmental life cycle analysis

Table 1 details material composition and life-span assumptions used for the laparoscopic instruments. The carbon footprint per operation of a laparoscopic hybrid instrument compared to its single-use equivalent was 17% for a clip applier (445 g versus 2,559 g CO_2e); 33% for scissors (378 g versus 1,139 g CO_2e); and 27% for four ports (933 g CO_2e versus 3,495 g CO_2e/ operation) (Figure 1). When combined, the carbon footprint of using hybrid versions of all three instrument types for an operation was 24% of that for single-use equivalents (1,756 g CO_2e versus 7,194 g CO_2e), saving a total of 5.4 kg CO_2e. This equates to the normal activities of a global average person over 6 hours (normalised results).

Hotspot analysis indicated that the majority of the carbon footprint of hybrid instruments was due to the single-use components (mean 62%, range 43% - 79%), followed by decontamination of reusable components (mean: 37%, range 21-56%) (Supplementary Table 4). For single-use instruments, raw material extraction and manufacture (including transportation between these two processes) was a major contributor (mean 57%, range 52% -61%), followed by onward transportation (mean 29%, range 24%-36%), and waste (mean 14%, range 12% -16%). Supplementary figures 2-7 provide network diagrams visualising the process drivers of global warming impacts for each product.

The environmental impact of using a combination of hybrid laparoscopic clip appliers, scissors, and ports for an operation was lower than using single-use equivalents across all 18 midpoint environmental impacts except for marine eutrophication (Supplementary Figure 8), with mean average reductions in environmental impact of 60% (range -32% to 84%). Disaggregated data for each instrument showed midpoint environmental impact categories to be lower for hybrid products, with a small number of exceptions (Table 2). Contribution analysis (Supplementary Figures 9 and 10) indicated that the 3% higher freshwater ecotoxicity and 7% higher marine ecotoxicity impacts for hybrid compared to single-use laparoscopic scissors were principally due to aluminium within the single-use component of the hybrid scissors (38% for freshwater ecotoxicity, and 37% for marine ecotoxicity), and due to copper assumed to be used within the metal working process (contributing 50% to both categories). Higher marine eutrophication impacts for the hybrid laparoscopic clip applier (38% higher) and ports (76% higher) were largely attributable (89% and 85% respectively) to the handling of wastewater from decontamination (Supplementary Figure 11 and 12). The ionising radiation impact of hybrid laparoscopic scissors and ports (Supplementary Figure 13 and 14) was higher than single-use equivalents (14% and 32% respectively) due to the electricity used in the decontamination process (accounting for 55% and 78% of the impact respectively).

For endpoint categories, using a combination of hybrid laparoscopic clip appliers, scissors, and ports for a single laparoscopic cholecystectomy saved an estimated 1.13 e-5 DALYs (disability associated life years), 2.37 e-8 species.year (loss of local species per year), and US $ 0.6 impact on resource depletion, representing reductions of 74%, 76% and 78% respectively compared to single-use equivalents (Figure 2, Supplementary Table 5).

Scenario modelling

For all hybrid instruments, carbon footprint was lower than single-use equivalents when the reusable component was used more than twice. Impact on carbon plateaued at around 10 uses of reusable components, with little additional gain (<1%) after using laparoscopic scissors 60 times, ports 70 times, and clip appliers 100 times (Figure 3).

When packaged and decontaminated separately, the carbon footprint of the hybrid laparoscopic clip applier increased 3.7 fold to 1,650 g CO_2e per use (Supplementary Table 6). There were small accompanying increases for laparoscopic scissors (to 394 g CO_2e per use, 4% increase) and ports (999 g CO_2e per use, 7% increase), due to a greater proportional weight in the instrument set. Nevertheless, in this alternative model the carbon footprint of all hybrid instruments remained lower than single-use equivalents (36% less for laparoscopic clip appliers, 65% less for laparoscopic scissors, and 71% less for ports).

The carbon footprint of the decontamination process itself was 54% higher when Australian electricity was modelled, which increased carbon footprint of the hybrid instruments by 11% - 30% (Supplementary Table 7), but this was still 63%- 77% lower than single-use equivalents.

Shipping in place of air freight for international transport of single-use instruments reduced carbon footprint by 22% - 33% relative to the baseline single-use items (Supplementary Table 8), but the hybrid baseline instruments remained lower than the shipped single-use equivalents; by 74% for the clip applier, 55% for the scissors, and 65% for the ports.

Consequentialist approach to LCA

Under the consequential approach to LCA, carbon footprint of a hybrid laparoscopic clip applier was 198 g CO_2e (7% of single-use equivalent of 2,559 g CO_2e), for scissors this was 299 g CO_2e (26% of single-use equivalent of 1,139 g CO_2e), and for four hybrid ports was 614 g CO_2e (18% of single-use equivalent of 3,495 g CO_2e). When combined, under the consequentialist approach the carbon footprint of using hybrid versions of all three instruments types for an operation was 15% of that for single use equivalents (1,110 g versus 7,194 g CO_2e), saving a total of 6,083 g CO_2e.

Life cycle financial cost

Per operation, the cost of hybrid compared to single-use instruments (table 3) was 33% for a clip applier (GBP £ 52 versus £ 156), 83% for scissors (GBP £ 20 versus £ 24), and 58% for ports (GBP £ 59 versus £ 102). Most of these costs (≥87% contribution in all cases) were from single-use items or components, with smaller contributions from decontamination (≤10%), reusable components (≤ 4%), or waste (≤ 0.2%). For a single laparoscopic cholecystectomy, cost of using a combination of hybrid laparoscopic clip appliers, scissors and ports was 47% of that of single-use equivalents (GBP £ 131 versus £ 282).

DISCUSSION

The NHS has recently set the ambitious aim to become the world's first 'net zero' carbon national health service.(7) Reducing the number of single-use items to deliver surgical care, and opting for low carbon alternatives within the operating theatre will be important in meeting that ambition.

Here we found that the carbon footprint of using hybrid scissors, ports and clip appliers was 76% lower than using single-use equivalents, saving 5.4 kg CO_2e per operation (equal to driving 16 miles in an average petrol car). There are almost 73,000 laparoscopic cholecystectomy operations performed each year in England,(24) and if the three hybrid instruments analysed were used across all of these operations in place of single-use equivalents, this would save 396 tonnes CO_2e, equivalent to 50 years of daily activities of a global average person (normalised results), or driving 1.2 million miles in an average petrol car.(25) Additional annual environmental benefits would be an estimated 0.82 DALYs (equating to 296 disability adjusted life days), 0.0017 species.year, and US $ 43,188 due to resource depletion. Under a consequentialist analysis, these values would be even higher. The direct financial costs across the lifespan of the hybrid instruments were less than half those of single-use items, and would save over £11 million per year if adopted for all laparoscopic cholecystectomies in England.

Use of plastics within healthcare is also gaining increasing attention,(26) and in separate analyses (data not shown) we found that when using hybrid laparoscopic clip appliers, scissors, and ports for a laparoscopic cholecystectomy, the total plastic was 15% that of using single-use equivalents, and generated around 15% of the waste. If translated across all

laparoscopic cholecystectomies in England this would save an estimated production and disposal of 30 tonnes of plastic per year.

The carbon footprint of a laparoscopic cholecystectomy has not previously been estimated, but the carbon footprint of the CO_2 gas used for abdominal insufflation in laparoscopic or other procedures has been estimated at 141 kg CO_2e per operation,(27) and the carbon footprint of a laparoscopic endometrial staging procedure at 29.2 kg CO_2e,(28) and a laparoscopic hysterectomy at 562 kg CO_2e.(29) The wide variation in these figures is likely due to differences in study boundaries and assumptions, but nevertheless indicate that switching to hybrid laparoscopic instruments in place of single-use equivalents could significantly impact the overall carbon footprint of a laparoscopic procedure.

The principle of using hybrid in preference to single-use instruments is likely generalisable to other hybrid laparoscopic instruments and other laparoscopic procedures. We are aware of hybrid laparoscopic articulating dissectors, retractor rings, electrocautery probes, and a variety of forceps on the market, and further research and innovation may expand this repertoire to enable further replacement of single-use equivalents. However, we also recognise that entirely re-useable instruments will (and should) always remain preferable to hybrid equivalents.

As with all LCAs, our analysis is limited by assumptions, the system boundary (products and processes included), parameter uncertainty (potential inaccuracy in the primary activity data, and emission factors embedded within SimaPro), and model uncertainty (limitation of the extent to which our model reflects reality). Nevertheless, our scenario modelling found hybrid laparoscopic instruments remained preferable to single-use equivalents even if there was infrequent reuse of hybrid instruments, if hybrid clip appliers were packaged and decontaminated separately to the main instrument set, if using a fossil-fuel rich source for decontamination, or if switching international transport of single-use equipment to shipping in preference to air-freight. Nevertheless, to maximise environmental benefits of hybrid instruments they should be used for their full lifespan, decontaminated within main instrument sets where possible, and manufactured, transported, and decontaminated using low carbon intensity methods.

Conclusion

The carbon footprint of using hybrid instruments for laparoscopic cholecystectomy is around a quarter of that for single-use equivalents, and the financial cost around half. Given the global scale of laparoscopic surgery, adoption of hybrid instruments could play an important role in meeting carbon reduction targets in healthcare, and saving money.

Acknowledgements:

We thank Surgical Innovations Ltd who provided data on the hybrid instruments, and some data on single-use equivalents. We also thank other industry partners who provided data, but wish to remain anonymous.

Declaration of interests:

This work was funded by Surgical Innovations Ltd who manufacture hybrid laparoscopic instruments. However, the company played no part in scientific conduct, analysis, or writing of this manuscript.

Funding:

This work was funded by Surgical Innovations Ltd who manufacture hybrid laparoscopic instruments. However, the company played no part in scientific conduct, analysis, or writing of this manuscript.

References

1. Agha R, Muir G (2003) Does laparoscopic surgery spell the end of the open surgeon? J R Soc Med 96(11):544-6.
2. iData Research (2020) Laparoscopic Devices Market Analysis, Size, Trends. Available at: https://idataresearch.com/product/laparoscopic-devices-market/. Accessed 27 Jan 2021.
3. Comitalo JB (2012) Laparoscopic cholecystectomy and newer techniques of gallbladder removal. JSLS 16(3):406-12.
4. Siu J, Hill AG, MacCormick AD (2017) Systematic review of reusable versus disposable laparoscopic instruments: costs and safety. ANZ J Surg 87(1-2):28-33.
5. Adler S, Scherrer M, Rückauer KD, Daschner FD (2005) Comparison of economic and environmental impacts between disposable and reusable instruments used for laparoscopic cholecystectomy. Surg Endosc 19(2):268-72.
6. Health Care without Harm (2019) Health care's climate footprint, Climate-smart health care series green paper number one. Available at: https://noharm-uscanada.org/content/global/health-care-climate-footprint-report. Accessed 27 Jan 2021.
7. NHS England and NHS Improvement (2020) Delivering a 'Net Zero' National Health Service. Available at: https://www.england.nhs.uk/greenernhs/wp-content/uploads/sites/51/2020/10/delivering-a-net-zero-national-health-service.pdf. Accessed 27 Jan 2020.
8. Rizan C, Steinbach I, Nicholson R, Lillywhite R, Reed M, Bhutta MF (2020) The carbon footprint of operating theatres: a systematic review. Annals of Surgery 272(6):986-95.
9. Ibbotson S, Dettmer T, Kara S, Herrmann C (2013). Eco-efficiency of disposable and reusable surgical instruments- a scissors case. The International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment 18:1137-48.
10. Overcash M (2012). A comparison of reusable and disposable perioperative textiles: sustainability state-of-the-art. Anesth Analg 114(5):1055-66.
11. Kummerer K, Dettenkofer M, Scherrer M (1996) Comparison of reusable and disposable laparotomy pads. The International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment 1(2):67-73.
12. McPherson B, Sharip M, Grimmond T (2019) The impact on life cycle carbon footprint of converting from disposable to reusable sharps containers in a large US hospital geographically distant from manufacturing and processing facilities. PeerJ 7:e6204.
13. McGain F, McAlister S, McGavin A, Story D (2010) The financial and environmental costs of reusable and single-use plastic anaesthetic drug trays. Anaesth Intensive Care 38(3):538-44.
14. Eckelman M, Mosher M, Gonzalez A, Sherman J (2012) Comparative life cycle assessment of disposable and reusable laryngeal mask airways. Anesth Analg 114(5):1067-72.
15. Sherman JD, Raibley LA, Eckelman MJ (2018) Life Cycle Assessment and Costing Methods for Device Procurement: Comparing Reusable and Single-Use Disposable Laryngoscopes. Anesth Analg 127(2):434-43.
16. International Organization for Standardazation (2016). ISO 14044: 2006 Environmental management- Life cycle assessment- Requirements and guidelines. Available at: https://www.iso.org/standard/38498.html. Accessed 27 Jan 2021.
17. Rizan C, Bhutta M, Reed M, Lillywhite R (2020). The carbon footprint of processing reusable surgical instruments. Life Cycle Innovation Conference; Berlin, Germany. Available at: https://fslci.org/groups/lcic-2020/forum/topic/discussion-session-13-sustainable-pathways-for-decarbonization/. Accessed 27 Jan 2021.

18. Sleeswijk AW, van Oers LF, Guinée JB, Struijs J, Huijbregts MA. Normalisation in product life cycle assessment: an LCA of the global and European economic systems in the year 2000. Sci Total Environ. 2008;390(1):227-40.
19. Pier2Pier. Pier2Pier. 2021. http://www.pier2pier.com/Co2/ (accessed Mar 5 2021).
20. Google. Google Maps. 2021. https://www.google.com/maps (assessed Mar 5 2021).
21. Institute of World Resources, 2011 Greenhouse gas protocol, product life cycle accounting and reporting standard. https://www.wri.org/publication/greenhouse-gas-protocol-product-life-cycle-accounting-and-reporting-standard. 2011. (accessed 27 Dec 2019).
22. NHS Supply Chain (2017) NHSSC Minimally Invasive FAG16308-01.02.17-31.01.21. [Database]. Accessed 27 Jan 2021.
23. NHS Digital (2020) Estates Return Information Collection (ERIC) for 2019/20. Available at: https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/estates-returns-information-collection/england-2019-20. Accessed 27 Jan 2021.
24. NHS Digital (2020) Hospital Admitted Patient Care Activity, 2019-20. Available at: https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/hospital-admitted-patient-care-activity/2019-20. Accessed 27 Jan 2021.
25. Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (2020) Greenhouse gas reporting: conversion factors 2020. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/greenhouse-gas-reporting-conversion-factors-2020. Accessed 27 Jan 2021.
26. Rizan C, Mortimer F, Stancliffe R, Bhutta MF (2020) Plastics in healthcare: time for a re-evaluation. J R Soc Med 113(2):49-53.
27. Power NE, Silberstein JL, Ghoneim TP, Guillonneau B, Touijer KA (2012) Environmental impact of minimally invasive surgery in the United States: an estimate of the carbon dioxide footprint. J Endourol 26(12):1639-44.
28. Woods DL, McAndrew T, Nevadunsky N, Hou JY, Goldberg G, Yi-Shin Kuo D, et al (2015) Carbon footprint of robotically-assisted laparoscopy, laparoscopy and laparotomy: a comparison. Int J Med Robot 11(4):406-12.
29. Thiel CL, Woods NC, Bilec MM (2018) Strategies to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Laparoscopic Surgery. Am J Public Health 108(S2):S158-S64.

Table 1:
Title: Material composition of laparoscopic clip applier, scissors, and ports.
Legend: No.= number of uses (number of uses same for product and packaging), HDPE= high density polyethylene, LDPE= low density polyethylene; PEEK= polyether ether ketone, PET= Polyethylene terephthalate, PPS (polyphenylene sulphide), PVC= polyvinylchloride, *= not disclosed at request of manufacturers supplying information on material composition

Product	**Sub-component**	**Supplier (model)**	**No. products required per laparoscopic cholecystectomy**	**Product**		**Packaging**	
				Material	**Weight (g)**	**Material**	**Weight (g)**
Hybrid clip applier	Reusable clip applier	Microline Surgical (1002 Reusable multi-fire clip applier 10mm)	1	Stainless steel PEEK Liquid crystal polymer	146.71 71.2 9.7	Cardboard (corrugated) Polyurethane foam Paper	163.49 62.7 39.43
	Single-use clip cartridge	Microline Surgical (1122 Disp. 10clips M/L Titanium K2 cartridge)	1	Stainless steel Polycarbonate Titanium	13.8 0.4 0.08	HDPE Paper LDPE	4.6 1.1 0.34
Single-use Clip applier	Single-use clip applier and cartridge	Not disclosed*	1	Stainless steel Polypropylene Polycarbonate PVC Nylon Titanium	64.13 24.91 19.83 6.71 0.40 0.08	Cardboard (boxboard) PET Paper HDPE	135.70 97.18 42.94 9.39
Hybrid laparoscopic scissor	Reusable handle	Surgical Innovations (101-43000 Logic™ Vertical Handle without ratchet)	1	PPS Stainless steel Copper Zinc Nickel	51.9 19.97 0.3 0.3 0.3	Paper Cardboard (boxboard)	22.30 49.97
	Single-use scissor shaft with blades	Surgical Innovations (120-7000 LogiCut™ Metzenbaum Scissors disp.)	1	Stainless steel Aluminium PPS Silicone	14.84 8.7 0.8 0.8	HDPE	8.42
Single-use laparoscopic	Single-use laparoscopic	Not disclosed*	1	Stainless steel Polycarbonate	27.23 26.68	Nylon HDPE	14.01 14.01

scissor	scissor			Silicone Polyester Copper Zinc Nickel	5.53 0.54 0.3 0.3 0.3	Paper Polypropylene	8.28 4.4
Hybrid 5mm port	Reusable 5 mm cannula	Surgical Innovations (YC0509511 YelloPort+PLUS™ 5.5 mm x 95 mm Cannula Threaded +Luer)	2	PEEK Polyoxymethylene PVC Brass Nickel Chromium	10.1 6.4 0.9 0.37 0.37 0.37	Paper HDPE	22 13.6
	Reusable 5 mm trocar	Surgical Innovations (YT0509503 YelloPort+PLUS™ 5.5 mm x 95 mm Pencil Point Trocar)	2	Stainless steel Polyoxymethylene Brass PVC	23.4 10 1.1 0.8	Paper HDPE	22 7.5
	Single-use 5 mm duckbill valve	Surgical Innovations (YA05VSS02 YelloPort+PLUS™ 5 mm Valve S-Use (Tube 2/50 seals))	2	Silicone	1.77	Nylon HDPE Aluminium PET	0.625 0.875 0.25 0.25
Single-use 5 mm port	Single-use 5 mm port (dual pack)	Not disclosed*	1	Polycarbonate Polypropylene Silicone Polyolefin	59.83 7.38 4.36 1.42	Nylon HDPE	5.29 8.54
Hybrid 10 mm port	Reusable 10 mm cannula	Surgical Innovations (EC1010520 YelloPort Elite™ 10 mm x 105 mm Cannulae)	2	PEEK PVC	8.3 2.2	Paper HDPE	22.06 7.5
	Reusable 10 mm trocar	Surgical Innovations (ET1010503 YelloPort Elite™ 10 mm x 105 mm Pencil Point Trocar)	2	Stainless steel Polyoxymethylene PVC	62 17.3 3.2	Paper HDPE	21.7 7.5
	Single-use 5-12 mm	Surgical Innovations (EA512US YelloPort	2	Polycarbonate Silicone	17.9 3.8	Nylon HDPE	0.53 1.29

	universal seal	Elite™ 5-12 mm Universal Seal)		HDPE Polyester	0.7 0.4	Aluminium PET	0.76 0.76
Single-use 11 mm port	Single-use 11 mm port	Not disclosed*	2	Polycarbonate Polypropylene Silicone Stainless steel Polyolefin	58.84 6.29 3.86 1.29 1.6	Nylon HDPE LDPE	5.09 8.29 0.46

Table 2
Title: Environmental impact (midpoint categories) per use of hybrid versus single-use laparoscopic clip applier, scissors, and ports
Legend: Environmental impacts (midpoint categories) measured using life cycle assessment and modelled on one clip applier, one laparoscopic scissor, two 5mm ports, and two 10-11mm ports (one use; number required to perform a single laparoscopic cholecystectomy), comparing hybrid with single-use equivalents. Normalised results= environmental impact relative to the global average person's contribution to the impact category over one year. 1,4-DCB =dichlorobenzene, CFC11= Trichlorofluoromethane, CO_2e= carbon dioxide equivalents, Cu= copper, eq= equivalents, Bq Co-60 eq = becquerel Cobalt-60, m^2a = square meter years, N= nitrogen, NO_x= nitrous oxides, P=phosphate, PM2.5 = particulate matter <2.5 micrometres, SO_2= sulphur dioxide

Impact category	**Unit**	**Laparoscopic clip applier**		**Laparoscopic scissors**		**Ports**		**Total (Normalised results)**	
		Hybrid	**Single-use**	**Hybrid**	**Single-use**	**Hybrid**	**Single-use**	**Hybrid**	**Single-use**
Global warming	g CO_2e	445	2,559	378	1,139	933	3,495	1,756 (2.20e-4)	7,194 (9.01e-4)
Stratospheric ozone depletion	g CFC11 eq	0.0002	0.0008	0.0001	0.0005	0.0004	0.0013	0.0007 (1.16e-5)	0.0026 (4.34e-5)
Ionizing radiation	Bq Co-60 eq	57	80	28	25	79	59	164 (3.42e-4)	164 (3.41e-4)
Ozone formation, Human health	g NO_x eq	0.89	8.12	0.79	3.17	1.42	8.21	3.10 (1.51e-4)	19.51 (9.48e-4)
Fine particulate matter formation	g PM2.5 eq	0.62	4.08	0.78	1.91	0.89	3.53	2.28 (8.93e-5)	9.52 (3.72e-4)
Ozone formation, Terrestrial ecosystems	g NOx eq	0.91	8.27	0.81	3.24	1.46	8.39	3.18 (1.79e-4)	19.90 (1.12e-3)
Terrestrial acidification	g SO_2 eq	1.18	8.53	1.44	4.46	2.08	8.91	4.70 (1.15e-4)	21.90 (5.34e-4)
Freshwater eutrophication	g P eq	0.12	0.62	0.17	0.26	0.17	0.43	0.46 (7.09e-4)	1.31 (2.01e-3)
Marine eutrophication	g N eq	0.09	0.06	0.04	0.05	0.12	0.07	0.24 (5.25e-5)	0.18 (3.97e-5)
Terrestrial ecotoxicity	g 1,4-DCB	3,976	19,767	5,628	8,939	1,171	4,142	10,776 (1.04e-2)	32,849 (3.17e-2)

Freshwater ecotoxicity	g 1,4-DCB	36	176	97	91	17	39	150 (1.23e-1)	306 (2.5e-1)
Marine ecotoxicity	g 1,4-DCB	47	230	122	118	23	54	192 (1.86e-1)	402 (3.89e-1)
Human carcinogenic toxicity	g 1,4-DCB	45	203	65	91	43	117	153 (5.52e-2)	411 (1.48e-1)
Human non-carcinogenic toxicity	g 1,4-DCB	576	2,871	952	1,386	390	1,013	1,919 (1.29e-2)	5,269 (3.54e-2)
Land use	m^2a crop eq	0.01	0.16	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.04 (8.04e-6)	0.21 (3.37e-5)
Mineral resource scarcity	g Cu eq	9	39	14	19	3	4	26 (2.18e-7)	62 (5.13e-7)
Fossil resource scarcity	g oil eq	137	784	100	315	261	940	498 (5.08e-4)	2,039 (2.08e-3)
Water consumption	m^3	0.0030	0.0146	0.0028	0.0083	0.0081	0.0208	0.0139 (5.22e-5)	0.0437 (1.64e-4)

Table 3
Title: Life cycle costing of hybrid vs single-use laparoscopic clip applier, scissors, and ports
Legend: Cost per laparoscopic cholecystectomy of one clip applier, one laparoscopic scissor, two 5mm ports, and two 10-11mm ports (one use; number required to perform a single laparoscopic cholecystectomy), comparing hybrid with single-use equivalents

Product	**Cost per laparoscopic cholecystectomy (£)**				
	Reusable component	**Single-use component**	**Decontamination**	**Waste**	**Total**
Hybrid laparoscopic clip applier	0.92	46.42	4.39	0.01	51.74
Single-use laparoscopic clip applier	N/A	156.14	N/A	0.25	156.39
Hybrid laparoscopic scissor	0.56	18	1.40	0.02	19.98
Single-use laparoscopic scissor	N/A	24.12	N/A	0.06	24.18
Hybrid ports	2.08	51	5.66	0.04	58.78
Single-use ports	N/A	101.44	N/A	0.16	101.60

Figure 1
Title: Carbon footprint of hybrid vs single-use laparoscopic clip applier, scissors, and ports, and relative contributions of sub-processes

Legend: Modelled on one laparoscopic clip applier, one laparoscopic scissor, two 5mm ports, and two 10-11mm ports (one use; number required to perform a single laparoscopic cholecystectomy), comparing hybrid with single-use equivalents. Percentage figures above bars indicate proportion (%) relative to single-use equivalents. 'Raw material extraction, manufacture' includes global averages for transportation from site of extraction to the manufacturer.

Figure 2
Title: Environmental impact (endpoint categories) of hybrid vs single-use laparoscopic clip applier, scissors, and ports

Legend: Modelled on one laparoscopic clip applier, one laparoscopic scissor, two 5mm ports, and two 10-11mm ports (one use; number required to perform a single laparoscopic cholecystectomy), comparing hybrid with single-use equivalents. Environmental impact compared as proportion (%) of single-use equivalents. Number above bars relate to endpoint category absolute figures for product, measured in disability adjusted life years (DALYs), loss of local species per year (species.year), and extra costs involved for future mineral, and fossil resource extraction (US $).

Figure 3
Title: Impact of number of uses of reusable component of hybrid laparoscopic clip applier, scissors, and ports on carbon footprint

Legend: Modelled on one hybrid laparoscopic clip applier, one hybrid laparoscopic scissor, two 5mm hybrid ports, and two 10-11mm hybrid ports (one use; number required to perform a single laparoscopic cholecystectomy)


4000
3500
3000
2500
2000
1500
1000
500
0
Carbon footprint (g CO_2e)
100%
100%
100%
27%
17%
33%
Hybrid
Single-use
Hybrid
Single-use
Hybrid
Single-use
Clip applier
Laparoscopic scissor
Ports
Raw material extraction, manufacture
Transportation
Waste
Single-use (component)
Raw material extraction, manufacture
Transportation
Decontamination
Waste
Reusable (component)


Value compared to single-use equivalents (%)
100
90
80
70
60
50
40
30
20
10
0
1.1e-6
6.3e-6
1.3e-6
2.9e-6
1.7e-6
6.1e-6
2e-9
1.2e-6
1.8e-9
5.2e-6
3.7e-9
1.4e-8
0.05
0.29
0.03
0.12
0.09
0.34
Human health (DALYs)
Ecosystems (species.yr)
Resources (US $)
Hybrid
Single-use
Hybrid
Single-use
Hybrid
Single-use
Laparoscopic clip applier
Laparoscopic scissor
Ports


4500
4000
3500
3000
2500
2000
1500
1000
500
0
Carbon footprint (g CO_2e) per use
1
10
100
1000
Number of uses
Hybrid laparoscopic clip applier
Hybrid laparoscopic scissors
Hybrid ports