

Reprocessing Capabilities of Newly Approved Devices for Use in Minimally-Invasive Aesthetic Procedures

Andrew J. Malek, BS¹; Kala T. Pham, BS², Colby J. Hyland, MD³; Justin M. Broyles, MD, MPH³

1. LSU Health Sciences Center, School of Medicine, New Orleans, LA

2. Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, TX

3. Division of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, Department of Surgery, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA

Introduction

- Single-use medical devices are commonly used in aesthetic procedures, contributing to medical waste and the potential for increased costs and environmental impact.
- Reprocessing of medical devices may reduce both cost and environmental impact.
- The landscape of new devices approved for reprocessing in aesthetic surgery is less known.

Objectives

- To comprehensively identify FDA-approved reprocessing capabilities of devices used in minimally-invasive aesthetic procedures and evaluate gaps and recommendations for potential reprocessing innovation.

Methods

- Aesthetic medical devices and their design features were identified using the publicly-available FDA Releasable 510(k) Database from January 2018 - April 2023 using the product codes GEI, GEX, and OLI.
- Only devices that posed a high risk for infection in the FDA's Reprocessing Final Guidance Appendix E were required to provide reprocessing capability information.
- Reprocessing capability was defined as inclusion of approved reprocessing procedures in device summaries.
- Single-use devices were those that included any single-use components and cannot be reprocessed.
- Costs were obtained from medical device company websites.

Table 1. Device Reusability & Cost

Device category	Device #	% reuse-able	% with cost data	Avg. cost: single-use	Avg. cost: reuse-able	Avg cost: overall
<i>High -infection-risk</i>						
Skin tightening	40	2.5%	82.5%	\$34,395	\$35,750	\$34,436
Skin resurfacing	20	5%	70%	\$38,211	\$89,995	\$41,910
Cellulite treatment	11	81.8%	63.6%	\$86,329	-	\$86,329
Full-body systems	6	33.3%	100%	\$48,292	\$20,000	\$38,862
Non-invasive lipo.	5	100%	20%	-	\$15,629	\$15,629
<i>Lasers</i>						
Hair removal	54	16.7%	51.9%	-	\$25,709	\$19,527
Tattoo removal	20	10%	40%	-	-	\$47,989
Skin resurfacing	55	12.7%	54.5%	\$44,000	\$56,283	\$32,394
Vascular lesions	6	16.7%	66.7%	-	-	\$8,775
Vein treatment	2	0%	50%	\$36,829	-	\$36,829
Combo system	83	3.6%	30.1%	\$77,333	\$12,210	\$49,695
UV Therapy	4	25%	25%	-	\$9,850	\$9,850
Accessories	19	0%	36.8%	\$1,454	-	\$2,043
Non-invasive lipo.	9	11.1%	55.6%	-	-	\$16,445

Results

- There were 334 applications for aesthetic devices between 2018-2023, representing 2% (334/16723) of total applications.
- High-risk devices represented 82 (24.6%) applications
- Cellulite treatment (81.8%; 9/11) and non-invasive fat lipolysis devices (100%; 5/5) represented the lowest proportion of single-use devices
- Conversely, 2.5% (1/40) of skin tightening devices, 5% (1/20) of skin resurfacing devices, and 33.3% (2/6) of full body systems had reprocessing capabilities.
- There were 252 (75.4%) laser device submissions.
- None of the laser accessories (0/11) or vein treatment devices (0/2) could be reprocessed.

Conclusion

- Reprocessing capabilities for newly approved high-infection-risk devices in aesthetic surgery is variable.
- New skin resurfacing and tightening devices have the least reprocessing potential,
- Investigation is needed into the cost of purchasing devices with reprocessing potential, coupled with the cost of reprocessing itself, versus the cost of using single-use alternatives.
- Plastic surgeons should consider the reprocessing capabilities of devices used within their practice.
- Device manufacturers should consider ongoing design initiatives to enhance reprocessing capabilities in future device design.