

1 **Granular analysis reveals smart insufflation to be operationally more efficient and**
2 **financially net positive compared to traditional insufflation for laparoscopic surgery**

3 Aazad Abbas^{1,2}, Imran Saleh³, Graeme Hoyt⁴, Sam Park^{4,5}, Cari Whyne^{2,4,6}, Jay Toor⁴

4 1. Temerty Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto, 1 King's College Circle, Toronto,
5 ON, Canada.

6 2. Orthopaedic Biomechanics Lab, Sunnybrook Research Institute, 2075 Bayview Avenue,
7 Toronto, ON, Canada.

8 3. Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering, University of Toronto, 5 King's
9 College Road, Toronto, ON, M5S 3G8, Canada.

10 4. Division of Orthopaedic Surgery, University of Toronto, 149 College Street Room 508-
11 A, Toronto, ON, Canada.

12 5. University of Toronto Orthopaedics Sports Medicine, Women's College Hospital, 76
13 Grenville St, Toronto, ON, Canada.

14 6. Division of Orthopaedic Surgery, Sunnybrook Health Science Centre, 2075 Bayview
15 Avenue, Toronto, ON, Canada.

16 Corresponding author:

17 Jay Toor, MD, MBA, FRCSC

18 Role: Co-investigator. Ideation. Manuscript preparation.

19 Email: jay.toor@mail.utoronto.ca

20 ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9443-455X>

21 149 College Street Room 508-A, Toronto, ON, M5T 1P5, Canada

22 Phone: 1-416-918-9519

23

24 Co-authors:

25 Aazad Abbas, HBSc, MD

26 Role: Co-investigator. Ideation. Data analysis. Manuscript preparation.

27 Email: aazad.abbas@mail.utoronto.ca

28 ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7414-1701>

29 1 King's College Circle, Toronto, ON, M5S 1A8, Canada

30

31 Imran Saleh, BMATH, MSc.

32 Role: Co-investigator. Ideation. Data analysis. Manuscript preparation.

33 Email: imran.saleh@mail.utoronto.ca

34 ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0172-5391>

35 164 College St, Toronto, ON M5S 3E2, Canada

36

37 Graeme Hoit, MD, PhD (c)

38 Role: Co-investigator. Ideation. Manuscript preparation.

39 Email: graeme.hoit@mail.utoronto.ca

40 ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9443-455X>

41 149 College Street Room 508-A, Toronto, ON, M5T 1P5, Canada

42

43 Sam Park, MD, MASc, FRCSC

44 Role: Co-investigator. Ideation. Manuscript preparation.

45 Email: sam.park@wchospital.ca

46 ORCID:

47 76 Grenville St, Toronto, ON, M5S 1B2, Canada

48

49 Cari Whyne, PhD, FIOR

50 Role: Co-investigator. Ideation. Manuscript preparation.

51 Email: cari.whyne@sunnybrook.ca

52 ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6822-8314>

53 Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre, 2075 Bayview Ave., Room S 620, Toronto, ON, M4N 3M5

54 Phone: 1-416-480-6100, ext. 5056

55

56

57 Jay Toor, MD, MBA, FRCSC

58 Role: Co-investigator. Ideation. Manuscript preparation.

59 Email: jay.toor@mail.utoronto.ca

60 ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9443-455X>

61 149 College Street Room 508-A, Toronto, ON, M5T 1P5, Canada

62

63 **Financial disclosure:**

64 Research funding to conduct this study was provided by a research innovation grant provided by

65 ConMed Corporation (#IRB 22-0113-C). These funds were used for student researcher

66 remuneration, software, and manuscript dissemination. The funders had no role in study design,

67 data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

68

69

70 **Granular analysis reveals smart insufflation to be operationally more efficient and**
71 **financially net positive compared to traditional insufflation for laparoscopic surgery**

72 **Abstract**

73 **Introduction:** Smart insufflation (SI) techniques relying on valve and membrane-free
74 insufflation are increasing in usage. Although considerable literature exists demonstrating the
75 benefits of SI on procedural ease and patient outcomes, there remains a paucity describing the
76 financial impact of these devices. The purpose of this study was to determine the financial and
77 efficiency impact of these devices on the operating room (OR) and inpatient wards of a hospital.

78

79 **Methods:** A discrete event simulation model representing a typical mid-sized North American
80 hospital comparing SI to TI was generated. The National Surgical Quality Improvement
81 (NSQIP) database from 2015 to 2019 was used to populate the model with data supplemented
82 from literature. Outcomes included length of stay (LOS), duration of surgery (DOS), annual
83 procedure volume, profit, return on investment (ROI), and gross profit margin (GPM).

84

85 **Results:** The operational parameters demonstrating favorability of SI to TI were DOS and LOS.
86 DOS savings were 10-32 minutes/case while LOS savings were 0-3 days/case. Implementation
87 of an SI led to an increase in annual throughput of 148 cases (12%). LOS decreased by 189 days
88 (19%). This resulted in an increase in net profit of \$104,675 per annum. The ROI of SI over TI
89 device was >1000%.

90

91 **Conclusion:** Despite the initial financial investment being greater, the implementation of SI
92 offsets these expenses and yields significant financial benefits. Our study demonstrates the

- 93 financial benefits of SI over TI and illustrates how granular operational and financial analysis of
- 94 technologies are essential to aid in sound healthcare procurement decision making.

95 **1 Introduction**

96 Despite being around for over a century, the use of laparoscopic surgery in modern clinical
97 practice has rapidly increased over the last few decades¹. This is due to the many advances in
98 surgical technology, including live video feedback and abdominal insufflation techniques, as
99 well as reduced postoperative pain, improved cosmetic results and reduced inpatient length of
100 stay¹⁻⁵. Insufflation involves the production of a pneumoperitoneum through the placement of
101 CO₂ gas into the peritoneal cavity, resulting in optimal visualization of the surgical field for
102 surgical manipulation. As such, advances in insufflation technology, in particular “Smart”
103 insufflation techniques, have tremendous potential to impact the field of laparoscopic surgery.
104

105 Traditional insufflation (TI) techniques involve the manual adjustment of the pressure of the
106 pneumoperitoneum during the procedure, while smart insufflation (SI) techniques involve the
107 use of low pressure and valve free access⁶. SI techniques are increasingly being utilized as they
108 provide an immediate response time to even small changes in intra-abdominal pressure⁶⁻¹⁶.
109 These techniques allow for a more stable pneumoperitoneum during situations in which CO₂
110 may escape or be eliminated from the cavity, such as during smoke evacuation or suction.
111

112 Although considerable literature exists to substantiate the benefits of SI regarding surgeon
113 preference, procedural ease and improved patient outcomes, there remains a paucity in the
114 literature on the granular financial impact of these devices^{7, 9, 10, 14-17}. This is an important
115 question to address as these SI devices not only require a larger capital outlay than TI devices,
116 but also increased disposable costs per case. However, they may potentially increase hospital
117 efficiency to offset the initial and additional costs per case, leading to net financial positivity.

118

119 As such, the purpose of this study was to determine the financial and operational efficiency
120 impact of the procurement of a novel SI device on a mid-sized hospital using comprehensive
121 operational and financial modeling. We aimed to determine the financial and operational impact
122 on the operating room (OR), duration of surgery (DOS) and inpatient length of stay (LOS) with
123 respect to common procedures requiring insufflation.

124

125

126 **2 Methods**

127 **2.1 Study Design**

128 This was a retrospective database study utilizing a discrete-event simulation (DES) model
129 representative of daily OR schedule and inpatient ward patient flow for gynecology procedures
130 requiring insufflation at a mid-sized 500-bed academic-affiliated hospital performing
131 approximately 10,000 procedures per year, 2321 number of which are gynecology, 1027 of
132 which can be performed with a SI device. Research ethics approval from Mount Sinai Hospital
133 were obtained before the commencement of this study.

134
135 Two scenarios were tested in the model: 1) using a TI device and 2) using a novel SI device. Ten
136 thousand simulation replications were run and common random numbers were used when
137 comparing scenarios to reduce the variability when comparing the outputs.¹² A comparison was
138 made between the two scenarios across key performance metrics namely duration of surgery,
139 procedures completed per 8 hour window, annual capacity (number of procedures completed and
140 patients managed per year), staffing requirements (with associated labour costs), length of stay,
141 and inpatient versus outpatient ratio.

142
143 These results were then used as the inputs to a discounted cash flow (DCF) model. The DCF
144 model was constructed in Excel using native formulae, with additional model input assumptions
145 based on literature values as well as financial information provided by our accounting
146 department. We assumed a 12-year time horizon based on estimated insufflator as provided by
147 our hospital's accounting department.

148

149 The cash flow in (CF) consisted of increased profit, difference in acquisition costs, and
150 difference in disposable cost per surgery between TI and SI. The model then outputs key
151 financial metrics including net present value (NPV), internal rate of return (IRR), return on
152 investment (ROI), and gross profit margin (GPM).

153

154 **2.2 Data Sources**

155 Our hospital's digital OR information system provided the list of gynecology procedures that
156 could be performed with SI and their relative case-mixes. To allow for generalizable DOS and
157 LOS results, the American College of Surgeons (ACS) National Surgical Quality Improvement
158 (NSQIP) database was used to populate the DOS and LOS for each procedure. The accounting
159 department provided all data regarding labour and capital costs. A literature review was
160 performed to determine the impact of modern insufflators on procedure duration and hospital
161 LOS for each procedure.

162

163 **2.3 Discrete Event Simulation Model Construction**

164 Patient flow through the OR and inpatient ward was first modeled as queueing networks, with
165 ORs, post anesthesia care unit (PACU) beds and inpatient ward beds corresponding to servers,
166 and patients to customers¹⁸. A discrete-event simulation model of the network was then
167 developed in Python (Python Software Foundation, www.python.org) with its inputs using data
168 from the OR workflow. A financial mapping, as described by Toor et al¹⁹, was performed to
169 quantify the output of the models and compare the financial impact of both scenarios (TI vs SI).

170

171 The model rests on two key assumptions. The first is that our hospital's case-mix ratio is
172 representative of similar sized institutions. The second is that inpatient ward time was assumed
173 to be the LOS from the NSQIP database.

174

175 **2.3.1 Model Description**

176 In the case of DOS simulations, scenarios with the TI and SI were identical except that every
177 surgery in the SI is simulated to be a fixed amount of time shorter, representing time savings
178 generated by SI use. Since the exact time saved by SI for the procedures selected is absent from
179 the literature, several scenarios fixing the time saved at different values were tested. Cases were
180 generated based on their probability of occurring at our institute, with DOS sampled with
181 replacement from the NSQIP database. Cases were generated until their total duration exceeded a
182 predetermined amount of time. Doing so allowed for a variable number of cases while
183 minimizing the risk of cases running into overtime at any time step, avoiding the need to account
184 for overtime costs. At our institution, the OR begins to incur overtime costs after 7.5 hours, and
185 the average surgery is approximately 2 hours long, this predetermined amount of time was set to
186 5.5 hours in all scenarios. Each round of a scenario simulation was run for a total of 250-time
187 steps, with each time step corresponding to a day in one OR. A time period of 250 days was
188 assumed as there are 50 working weeks in the year (52 total weeks with 2 weeks of vacation)
189 with 5 working days each week, resulting in 250 days. Since ORs do not share resources in the
190 model, it was sufficient to model the patient flow through a single OR. Ten thousand rounds
191 were simulated per scenario.

192

193 Similarly, the scenarios generated for inpatient days were also similar to each other, except that
194 positive length of stays were decreased by a day in the scenario in which the SI was used. The
195 types of surgeries and number of cases generated at each time step of the simulation were
196 identical to as aforementioned. The time savings were incorporated into the generation of
197 surgeries' durations in the scenarios in which SI insufflators saved a positive amount of time in
198 each surgery.

199

200 **2.4 Discounted Cash Flow (DCF) Model Assumptions**

201 The accounting department at our institution provided all financial inputs for the model. Cash
202 outflows included an annual maintenance cost of \$10,000 for TI and \$15,000 for SI beginning
203 year 1, disposable incremental costs of \$75 for TI and \$250 for SI, and an acquisition cost of
204 \$12,000 for TI and \$22,000 for SI machines. Cost of capital used was healthcare industry
205 standard 4.59%,¹⁴ with a time horizon of 12 years and a profit per case range of \$500 to \$1000. A
206 base DCF model was constructed on the assumption of the midpoint of the range of the DOS and
207 total hospital LOS savings per procedure, with a medium profit per case of \$750. Sensitivity
208 analysis was conducted by varying the DOS and LOS savings from 0 until the maximum
209 reduction found in the literature, while varying the profit per case from \$500 to \$1000, to
210 determine the difference in profit between the two scenarios. For each day reduction in total LOS
211 produced by SI, it was assumed a similar laparoscopic procedure using TI was done.

212

213 **2.5 Subgroup Analysis**

214 Since the SI devices are specifically designed for complex procedures (e.g., hysterectomies),
215 subgroup analysis was done with the above methods comparing all procedures with only

- 216 complex gynecological procedures. These procedures were defined to be laparoscopic
- 217 oophorectomy and total hysterectomies with and without salpingo-oophorectomy.

218 **3 Results**

219 Based on the literature review, the average time savings of smart insufflation was between 0- and
220 25-minutes surgical duration and between 0.5 and 2.5 days for inpatient length of stay reduction
221 ^{3, 9, 11-14, 20-23}. As such, duration of surgery reduction in the model ranged from 0 to 30 minutes and
222 length of stay reduction from 0 to 3 days^{3, 9, 11-14, 20-23}. Since the literature did not contain studies
223 analyzing the time savings for gynecological procedures, we assumed the time savings would be
224 similar for the currently available studies. The procedures included diagnostic laparoscopies,
225 laparoscopic oophorectomy, laparoscopic resection of endometriosis, total laparoscopic
226 hysterectomy with salpingo-oophorectomy and total laparoscopic hysterectomy without
227 salpingo-oophorectomy. See Table 1 for relative institutional case mix, NSQIP DOS and LOS
228 for included procedures.

229 Table 1. Case mix, NSQIP DOS, NSQIP LOS and CPT codes for the procedures used.

Procedure name	Case Mix (%) *	Mean DOS (SD)†	Mean LOS (SD)†	CPT Codes
Diagnostic Laparoscopy	7.3	66.9 (42.4)	4.9 (7.1)	49320, 49321
Laparoscopic Oophorectomy	26.1	80.3 (51.6)	2,0 (4.3)	58661
Laparoscopic resection of endometriosis	14.3	89.4 (65.8)	1.7 (2.7)	58662
Total laparoscopic hysterectomy with salpingo-oophorectomy	33.1	126.8 (57.8)	1.2 (1.9)	58571, 58573
Total laparoscopic hysterectomy without salpingo-oophorectomy	19.1	132.4 (61.7)	1.4 (2.2)	58570, 58572

230 *From our institutional dataset.

231 †From the NSQIP dataset.

232 DOS: duration of surgery, LOS: length of stay, NSQIP: National Surgical Quality Improvement Program, SD: standard deviation.

233 **3.1 Scenario Comparison: TI vs SI**

234 See Tables 2 and 3 for further details comparing the number of patients and throughput for all
235 procedures and complex procedures. In terms of the number of procedures completed per year,
236 the TI resulted in a total of 946 surgeries over a 250 day time frame. When varying the DOS time
237 savings from 5 to 30 minutes when using the SI, the number of procedures completed per year
238 ranged from 988 to 1292. This resulted in an increase in throughput ranging from 42 to 346
239 patients, a 4.4% to 36.6% increase in throughput. Similarly for complex procedures, 893
240 surgeries were done over 250 days, with SI increasing this to 931 to 1190 surgeries. Throughput
241 increased from 38 to 297 patients, a 4.3% to 33.3% increase.

242 Table 2. Outputs of discrete event simulation (DES) models regarding number of procedures completed and total number of length of
 243 stay in terms of days per year for all procedures.

Outcome Measure	TI	SI (5 min)	SI (10 min)	SI (15 min)	SI (20 min)	SI (25 min)	SI (30 min)
Number of Procedures Completed Per Year*	946	988	1036	1089	1149	1215	1292
Total number of inpatient days per annum for 1 day reduction per patient†	957	598	627	658	695	738	782
Total number of inpatient days per annum for 2 day reduction per patient†	957	426	447	469	495	524	559
Total number of inpatient days per annum for 3 day reduction per patient†	957	343	359	378	397	421	447

244 *At 250 days.

245 †At 7.5 hours for every 250 days.

246 TI: traditional insufflation, SI: smart insufflation.

247

248 Table 3. Outputs of discrete event simulation (DES) models regarding number of procedures completed and total number of length of
 249 stay in terms of days per year only for complex procedures (laparoscopic oophorectomy, total laparoscopic hysterectomy with and
 250 without endometriosis).

Outcome Measure	TI	SI (5 min)	SI (10 min)	SI (15 min)	SI (20 min)	SI (25 min)	SI (30 min)
Number of Procedures Completed Per Year*	893	931	971	1018	1069	1125	1190
Total number of inpatient days per annum for 1 day reduction per patient†	648	325	338	354	374	394	417
Total number of inpatient days per annum for 2 day reduction per patient†	648	195	204	213	224	237	250
Total number of inpatient days per annum for 3 day reduction per patient†	648	143	149	156	164	173	183

251 *At 250 days.

252 †At 7.5 hours for every 250 days.

253 TI: traditional insufflation, SI: smart insufflation.

254

255 In terms of total number of days in the inpatient ward, the TI resulted in a total in patient LOS of
256 957 days. When varying the DOS time savings from 5 to 30 minutes when using the SI and
257 assuming a 1 day LOS reduction for each patient when using an SI, the total number of inpatient
258 LOS days ranged from 598 to 782 days, a reduction ranging from 175 to 359 days. Accordingly,
259 the reduction in total inpatient length of stay ranged from 18.3% to 37.5%. Similarly, when
260 assuming a 2 day LOS reduction for each patient when using an SI, the total number of inpatient
261 LOS days ranged from 426 to 559, a reduction ranging from 398 to 531 days. Accordingly, the
262 reduction in total inpatient length of stay ranged from 41.6% to 55.5%. Similarly, when
263 assuming a 3 day LOS reduction for each patient when using an SI, the total number of inpatient
264 LOS days ranged from 343 to 447, a reduction ranging from 510 to 614 days. Accordingly, the
265 reduction in total inpatient length of stay ranged from 46.7% to 65.2%.

266

267 Similar results were noted for complex procedures, TI having 648 days on inpatient ward. The 1
268 day LOS reduction provided a decrease in inpatient days from 325 to 417 (231 and 323 days
269 less), resulting in 35.6% to 49.5% reduction in total inpatient days. For a 2 day LOS reduction,
270 total inpatient LOS ranged from 195 to 250 (398 to 453 days less), a 30.0% to 69.9% reduction.
271 Again for 3 day LOS reduction, total inpatient LOS ranged from 143 to 183 (465 to 505 days
272 less), a 71.8% to 77.9% reduction.

273

274 As expected, the total number of inpatient LOS increases when more time is saved for SI
275 compared to TI; more procedures are performed, resulting in a larger throughput of patients in
276 the system for all procedures in general and complex procedures only (Tables 2-3 and Figure 1).

277 3.2 Financial Analyses

278 Including all procedures, for the base DCF model, the profit from the TI was \$638,550 and the
279 profit from the SI was \$746,325. Similarly, the GPM for the TI was 90.0% while the GPM for
280 the SI was 71.7%. Regarding the difference between the two scenarios, the profit was \$107,775,
281 the NPV was \$897,355.75, IRR was 294%, and the ROI was 1117%. For only the complex
282 procedures, the profit for TI and SI was \$602,775 and \$707,450, respectively. GPM was similar
283 at 90.0% for TI and 71.9% for SI. The profit difference was \$104,675, NPV was \$869,233.12,
284 IRR was 285%, and ROI was 1081%.

285
286 Sensitivity table analysis of the profit difference between the TI and SI by varying the duration
287 of surgery time savings (0 to 30 minutes), profit per case (\$500-\$1000) and length of stay
288 savings (0 to 3 days) is shown in Figure 2 for all procedures and Figure 3 for complex
289 procedures. For all procedures, length of stay savings of 0 days produced a positive profit
290 difference only when the profit per case was above \$900 for 25 minutes of DOS savings and
291 above \$750 for 30 minutes of DOS savings. For complex procedures only, length of stay savings
292 of 0 days produced a positive profit difference only when the profit per case was above \$950 for
293 25 minutes of DOS savings and above \$800 for 30 minutes of DOS savings. For all procedures
294 and length of stay savings of 1 day, as profit per case above and including \$550 and DOS
295 savings above and including 5 minutes resulted in a positive profit difference. For complex
296 procedures and length of stay savings of 1 day, a positive profit difference was noted for profit
297 per case above \$500 for 20 minutes of DOS savings and for \$550 for DOS savings above 5
298 minutes. For all and complex procedures for both length of stay savings above 2 and 3 days, all

299 profit per case ranges (\$500-\$1000) and all DOS time savings resulted in a positive profit
300 difference.

301 4 Discussion

302 Previous work examining the use of smart insufflation devices has focused on the clinical
303 benefits and operational benefits when compared to traditional insufflation approaches^{11-16, 20-23}.
304 However, there exists a gap in the granular financial quantification of the impact of these devices
305 on a hospital level. This study was the first to quantify the financial impact on a hospital of using
306 a smart insufflation (SI) device compared to a traditional insufflation device for gynecological
307 procedures.

308
309 Using the parameters of our model, it was clear that SI increases the number of procedures done
310 per year and decreases the total inpatient LOS at the same time. Of note, the more time saved for
311 each procedure, the higher the throughput of patients per year and the larger the length of stay
312 savings was. However, a key observation is that as the throughput of procedures per year
313 increases, the total inpatient length of stay also increases as more procedures are done per year.
314 This is key for hospitals as the more procedures done per year will result in more inpatient beds
315 required, something they would need to consider from an implementation and operational
316 perspective.

317
318 In terms of financial analysis, the base case clearly showed a larger profit for the SI as compared
319 to the TI. The GPM was lower for SI as opposed to TI (71.7% versus 90.0%), which initially
320 suggests TI to be favourable. This is due to ongoing disposable cost. Despite this, due to
321 significantly increased throughput rate, SI was over one-hundred thousand dollars more
322 profitable per annum. Another factor showing SI as more financially favourable than TI
323 amortized over time was the high and positive NPV, IRR greater than cost of capital, and high

324 ROI. It is important that hospitals consider these key financial metrics from a decision making
325 perspective, especially when deciding to implement the use of a SI device.

326

327

328 Sensitivity analysis revealed important considerations. Firstly, it was clear that if the length of
329 stay savings was 0, the SI would need to save at least 25 minutes from the procedure duration for
330 each procedure in order to produce a profit greater than the TI. In addition, the profit per case
331 would need to be at least \$900 for the 25 minute time reduction and \$750 for the 30 minute time
332 reduction. However, as soon as a consistent length of stay reduction of at least 1 day is possible,
333 the SI becomes greatly more profitable to the hospital with even a 5 minute savings in duration
334 of surgery for each procedure (Figure 2). This clearly demonstrates that the SI devices need to
335 provide efficiency in terms of duration of surgery and length of stay in order for them to be
336 financially favourable to a hospital. Secondly, if the total inpatient length of stay savings
337 provided by the use of SI devices are not replaced by similar procedures e.g. in this case the
338 replacement procedures were those that can be done with TI devices, then the financial benefit of
339 implementing an SI device is largely decreased. This is evidenced by the case where length of
340 stay savings is 0, hence limiting the profitability of SI devices (Figure 2). Lastly, it is clear that
341 the majority of the financial benefit of SI comes from the length of stay reductions it provides.
342 The profit difference dramatically increases with each day reduction in length of stay.
343 Institutions should keep this in mind when purchasing SI devices if they would like to reap the
344 financial benefits of these devices.

345

346 This study presents with some limitations. Firstly, the length of stay savings provided by the SI
347 were directly translated into additional procedures at the same profit margin. It may not be
348 practically feasible for a hospital to replace each length of stay savings provided with such a
349 procedure. They may be replaced with more expensive procedures, or not replaced at all, limiting
350 the profitability of our scenario. Secondly, in reality the profit per case assumed in the financial
351 analysis is dependent on each surgical procedure done and is not fixed at a particular value. As
352 such, the real world returns on profit will largely vary according to the procedures done at each
353 institution. However, it is challenging to account for this variability and our sensitivity analysis
354 using a range of profit values is an attempt to account for this variability. Thirdly, the reduction
355 in DOS and LOS provided by SI in the literature included gynecological and non-gynecological
356 procedures, which was extrapolated and applied to the model. This speaks to the limited studies
357 exclusively looking at the benefits of SI on gynecological procedures, something which future
358 studies should expand on. Fourthly, the modeling in this study included simple procedures (e.g.
359 diagnostic laparoscopy) and complex procedures (e.g. total hysterectomies) based on their
360 relative case mixes to accurately represent a hospital's gynecological service. However, SI
361 devices are specifically designed to produce improved DOS and LOS savings compared to TI for
362 complex procedures. As such, the savings demonstrated in this study could be substantially
363 higher should only complex procedures use SI while simple procedures use TI. Lastly, we
364 assumed our hospital's case-mix ratio is largely representative of similar sized institutions. In
365 reality, this is not the case and hospitals range in their relative case-mixes, even on a yearly basis.
366 As such, this may limit the applicability of the exact profit values for each hospital. However, the
367 approach demonstrated in this study may be applied to each institute to granularly quantify the
368 financial effect on their hospital.

369

370 In conclusion, this study has demonstrated through DES operational modeling and DCF financial
371 analysis that a novel smart insufflation device is financially more profitable than a traditional
372 insufflation device on a mid-sized hospital. Classically, incremental costs per procedure have
373 been a deterrent for procurement agents, as SI devices have higher incremental costs than TI
374 devices. However, this study shows that procurement agents should attempt to quantify the entire
375 operational and financial effect that using such devices would have on their hospital using
376 metrics such as profit, NPV, IRR, and ROI. Future work would involve quantifying the real-
377 world savings and financial benefits of implementing SI devices on an institutional level.

378 **5 Figure Legend**

379 Figure 1. The average number of surgeries (blue) and length of stay (LOS) in days (orange)
380 when the smart insufflator (SI) provides time savings ranging from 0 to 30 minutes for all
381 procedures as well as complex procedures. 0 minutes corresponds to the traditional insufflator
382 (TI).

383
384 Figure 2. Sensitivity table for the difference in profit by varying time savings (0 to 30 minutes),
385 profit per case (\$500 to \$1000), and length of stay savings (0 to 3 days) for all procedures.

386
387 Figure 3. Sensitivity table for the difference in profit by varying time savings (0 to 30 minutes),
388 profit per case (\$500 to \$1000), and length of stay savings (0 to 3 days) for complex procedures.

389

390 6 References


- 391 1. Kelley WE. The Evolution of Laparoscopy and the Revolution in Surgery in the Decade of the
392 1990s. *JLS*; 2008. 12(4):351-7.
- 393 2. Perrin M, Fletcher A. Laparoscopic abdominal surgery. *Continuing Education in Anaesthesia*
394 *Critical Care & Pain*; 2004. 4(4):107-10.
- 395 3. Thepsuwan J, Huang K, Wilamarta M, Adlan A, Manvelyan V, Lee C. Principles of safe
396 abdominal entry in laparoscopic gynecologic surgery. *Gynecology and Minimally Invasive*
397 *Therapy*; 2013. 2(4):105-9.
- 398 4. Chapron C, Fauconnier A, Goffinet F, Bréart G, Dubuisson JB. Laparoscopic surgery is not
399 inherently dangerous for patients presenting with benign gynaecologic pathology. Results of a
400 meta-analysis. *Hum Reprod*; 2002. 17(5):1334-42.
- 401 5. Towfigh S, Chen F, Mason R, Katkhouda N, Chan L, Berne T. Laparoscopic appendectomy
402 significantly reduces length of stay for perforated appendicitis. *Surg Endosc*; 2006. 20(3):495-9.
- 403 6. Luketina RR, Knauer M, Köhler G, Koch OO, Strasser K, Egger M, et al. Comparison of a
404 standard CO₂ pressure pneumoperitoneum insufflator versus AirSeal: study protocol of a
405 randomized controlled trial. *Trials*; 2014. 15:239.
- 406 7. Covotta M, Claroni C, Torregiani G, Naccarato A, Tribuzi S, Zinilli A, et al. A Prospective,
407 Randomized, Clinical Trial on the Effects of a Valveless Trocar on Respiratory Mechanics
408 During Robotic Radical Cystectomy: A Pilot Study. *Anesth Analg*; 2017. 124(6):1794-801.

- 409 8. de'Angelis N, Petrucciani N, Giannandrea G, Brunetti F. The protocol of low-impact
410 laparoscopic cholecystectomy: the combination of mini-laparoscopy and low-pressure
411 pneumoperitoneum. *Updates Surg*; 2018. 70(4):553-6.
- 412 9. Ramshaw B, Forman B, Heidel E, Dean J, Gamenthaler A, Fabian M. A Clinical Quality
413 Improvement (CQI) Project to Improve Pain After Laparoscopic Ventral Hernia Repair. *Surg*
414 *Technol Int*; 2016. 29:125-30.
- 415 10. Rückbeil O, Lewin A, Federlein M, Gellert K. The barrier-free trocar technique in three
416 laparoscopic standard procedures. *J Minim Access Surg*; 2012. 8(1):9-12.
- 417 11. Madueke-Laveaux OS, Advincula A, Grimes CL, Walters R, Kim JH, Simpson K, et al.
418 Comparison of Carbon Dioxide Absorption Rates in Gynecologic Laparoscopy with a Valveless
419 versus Standard Insufflation System: Randomized Controlled Trial. *J Minim Invasive Gynecol*;
420 2020. 27(1):225-34.
- 421 12. Rohloff M, Cicic A, Christensen C, Maatman TK, Lindberg J, Maatman TJ. Reduction in
422 postoperative ileus rates utilizing lower pressure pneumoperitoneum in robotic-assisted radical
423 prostatectomy. *J Robot Surg*; 2019. 13(5):671-4.
- 424 13. Shahait M, Cockrell R, Yezdani M, Yu S, Lee A, McWilliams K, et al. Improved Outcomes
425 Utilizing a Valveless-Trocar System during Robot-assisted Radical Prostatectomy (RARP).
426 *JSLS*; 2019. 23(1).

- 427 14. Ferroni MC, Abaza R. Feasibility of robot-assisted prostatectomy performed at ultra-low
428 pneumoperitoneum pressure of 6 mmHg and comparison of clinical outcomes vs standard
429 pressure of 15 mmHg. *BJU Int*; 2019. 124(2):308-13.
- 430 15. Bucur P, Hofmann M, Menhadji A, Abedi G, Okhunov Z, Rinehart J, et al. Comparison of
431 Pneumoperitoneum Stability Between a Valveless Trocar System and Conventional Insufflation:
432 A Prospective Randomized Trial. *Urology*; 2016. 94:274-80.
- 433 16. George AK, Wimhofer R, Viola KV, Pernegger M, Costamoling W, Kavoussi LR, et al.
434 Utilization of a novel valveless trocar system during robotic-assisted laparoscopic prostatectomy.
435 *World J Urol*; 2015. 33(11):1695-9.
- 436 17. Luketina R, Luketina TLH, Antoniou SA, Köhler G, Könneker S, Manzenreiter L, et al.
437 Prospective randomized controlled trial on comparison of standard CO2 pressure
438 pneumoperitoneum insufflator versus AirSeal®. *Surg Endosc*; 2021. 35(7):3670-8.
- 439 18. Richard J. Boucherie, Nico M. Dijk. *Queueing Networks: A Fundamental Approach*. 1st ed.
440 New York, NY: Springer; 2011.
- 441 19. Toor J, Saleh I, Abbas A, Abouali J, Wong P, Chan TCY, et al. An Anesthesia Block Room
442 Is Financially Net Positive for a Hospital Performing Arthroplasty. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg*;
443 2022. 30(15):e1058-65.
- 444 20. Horstmann M, Horton K, Kurz M, Padevit C, John H. Prospective comparison between the
445 AirSeal® System valve-less Trocar and a standard Versaport™ Plus V2 Trocar in robotic-
446 assisted radical prostatectomy. *J Endourol*; 2013. 27(5):579-82.

- 447 21. Annino F, Topazio L, Autieri D, Verdacchi T, De Angelis M, Asimakopoulos AD. Robotic
448 partial nephrectomy performed with Airseal versus a standard CO2 pressure pneumoperitoneum
449 insufflator: a prospective comparative study. *Surg Endosc*; 2017. 31(4):1583-90.
- 450 22. Sroussi J, Elies A, Rigouzzo A, Louvet N, Mezzadri M, Fazel A, et al. Low pressure
451 gynecological laparoscopy (7mmHg) with AirSeal® System versus a standard insufflation
452 (15mmHg): A pilot study in 60 patients. *J Gynecol Obstet Hum Reprod*; 2017. 46(2):155-8.
- 453 23. Feng TS, Heulitt G, Islam A, Porter JR. Comparison of valve-less and standard insufflation
454 on pneumoperitoneum-related complications in robotic partial nephrectomy: a prospective
455 randomized trial. *J Robot Surg*; 2021. 15(3):381-8.

All Procedures



Complex Procedures




Figure 1

		Length of stay savings of 0 days						
Time savings (minutes)		0	5	10	15	20	25	30
Profit per case (\$)	500	-165,550.00	-155,050.00	-143,050.00	-129,800.00	-114,800.00	-98,300.00	-79,050.00
	550	-165,550.00	-152,950.00	-138,550.00	-122,650.00	-104,650.00	-84,850.00	-61,750.00
	600	-165,550.00	-150,850.00	-134,050.00	-115,500.00	-94,500.00	-71,400.00	-44,450.00
	650	-165,550.00	-148,750.00	-129,550.00	-108,350.00	-84,350.00	-57,950.00	-27,150.00
	700	-165,550.00	-146,650.00	-125,050.00	-101,200.00	-74,200.00	-44,500.00	-9,850.00
	750	-165,550.00	-144,550.00	-120,550.00	-94,050.00	-64,050.00	-31,050.00	7,450.00
	800	-165,550.00	-142,450.00	-116,050.00	-86,900.00	-53,900.00	-17,600.00	24,750.00
	850	-165,550.00	-140,350.00	-111,550.00	-79,750.00	-43,750.00	-4,150.00	42,050.00
	900	-165,550.00	-138,250.00	-107,050.00	-72,600.00	-33,600.00	9,300.00	59,350.00
	950	-165,550.00	-136,150.00	-102,550.00	-65,450.00	-23,450.00	22,750.00	76,650.00
1000	-165,550.00	-134,050.00	-98,050.00	-58,300.00	-13,300.00	36,200.00	93,950.00	

		Length of stay savings of 1 day						
Time savings (minutes)		0	5	10	15	20	25	30
Profit per case (\$)	500	-165,550.00	-52,475.00	-2,800.00	52,725.00	53,450.00	55,225.00	54,675.00
	550	-165,550.00	17,575.00	18,200.00	19,375.00	19,800.00	19,175.00	21,375.00
	600	-165,550.00	37,625.00	39,200.00	41,475.00	41,050.00	43,575.00	47,425.00
	650	-165,550.00	57,675.00	60,200.00	63,575.00	66,300.00	67,975.00	73,475.00
	700	-165,550.00	77,725.00	81,200.00	85,675.00	89,550.00	92,375.00	99,525.00
	750	-165,550.00	97,775.00	102,200.00	107,775.00	112,800.00	116,775.00	125,575.00
	800	-165,550.00	117,825.00	123,200.00	129,875.00	136,050.00	141,175.00	151,625.00
	850	-165,550.00	137,875.00	144,200.00	151,975.00	159,300.00	165,575.00	177,675.00
	900	-165,550.00	157,925.00	165,200.00	174,075.00	182,550.00	189,975.00	203,725.00
	950	-165,550.00	177,975.00	186,200.00	196,175.00	205,800.00	214,375.00	229,775.00
1000	-165,550.00	198,025.00	207,200.00	218,275.00	229,050.00	238,775.00	255,825.00	

		Length of stay savings of 2 days						
Time savings (minutes)		0	5	10	15	20	25	30
Profit per case (\$)	500	-165,550.00	70,625.00	73,700.00	77,600.00	81,550.00	85,725.00	89,100.00
	550	-165,550.00	99,275.00	103,700.00	109,150.00	114,800.00	120,825.00	127,300.00
	600	-165,550.00	127,925.00	133,700.00	140,700.00	148,050.00	155,925.00	164,500.00
	650	-165,550.00	156,575.00	163,700.00	172,250.00	181,300.00	191,025.00	201,700.00
	700	-165,550.00	185,225.00	193,700.00	203,800.00	214,550.00	226,125.00	238,900.00
	750	-165,550.00	213,875.00	223,700.00	235,350.00	247,800.00	261,225.00	276,300.00
	800	-165,550.00	242,525.00	253,700.00	266,900.00	281,050.00	296,325.00	313,300.00
	850	-165,550.00	271,175.00	283,700.00	298,450.00	314,300.00	331,425.00	350,500.00
	900	-165,550.00	299,825.00	313,700.00	330,000.00	347,550.00	366,525.00	387,700.00
	950	-165,550.00	328,475.00	343,700.00	361,550.00	380,800.00	401,625.00	424,900.00
1000	-165,550.00	357,125.00	373,700.00	393,100.00	414,050.00	436,725.00	462,100.00	

		Length of stay savings of 3 days						
Time savings (minutes)		0	5	10	15	20	25	30
Profit per case (\$)	500	-165,550.00	105,900.00	111,100.00	116,275.00	123,200.00	129,500.00	137,700.00
	550	-165,550.00	138,700.00	145,500.00	152,375.00	161,350.00	169,750.00	180,500.00
	600	-165,550.00	171,500.00	179,900.00	188,475.00	199,500.00	210,000.00	223,300.00
	650	-165,550.00	204,300.00	214,300.00	224,575.00	237,650.00	250,250.00	266,100.00
	700	-165,550.00	237,100.00	248,700.00	260,675.00	275,800.00	290,500.00	308,900.00
	750	-165,550.00	269,900.00	283,100.00	296,775.00	313,950.00	330,750.00	351,700.00
	800	-165,550.00	302,700.00	317,500.00	332,875.00	352,100.00	371,000.00	394,500.00
	850	-165,550.00	335,500.00	351,900.00	368,975.00	390,250.00	411,250.00	437,300.00
	900	-165,550.00	368,300.00	386,300.00	405,075.00	428,400.00	451,500.00	480,100.00
	950	-165,550.00	401,100.00	420,700.00	441,175.00	466,550.00	491,750.00	522,900.00
1000	-165,550.00	433,900.00	455,100.00	477,275.00	504,700.00	532,000.00	565,700.00	

Figure 2

		Length of stay savings of 0 days						
Time savings (minutes)		0	5	10	15	20	25	30
Profit per case (\$)	500	-156,275.00	-146,775.00	-136,775.00	-125,025.00	-112,275.00	-98,275.00	-82,025.00
	550	-156,275.00	-144,875.00	-132,875.00	-118,775.00	-103,475.00	-86,675.00	-67,175.00
	600	-156,275.00	-142,975.00	-128,975.00	-112,525.00	-94,675.00	-75,075.00	-52,325.00
	650	-156,275.00	-141,075.00	-125,075.00	-106,275.00	-85,875.00	-63,475.00	-37,475.00
	700	-156,275.00	-139,175.00	-121,175.00	-100,025.00	-77,075.00	-51,875.00	-22,625.00
	750	-156,275.00	-137,275.00	-117,275.00	-93,775.00	-68,275.00	-40,275.00	-7,775.00
	800	-156,275.00	-135,375.00	-113,375.00	-87,525.00	-59,475.00	-28,675.00	57,075.00
	850	-156,275.00	-133,475.00	-109,475.00	-81,275.00	-50,675.00	-17,075.00	21,925.00
	900	-156,275.00	-131,575.00	-105,575.00	-75,025.00	-41,875.00	-5,475.00	36,775.00
	950	-156,275.00	-129,675.00	-101,675.00	-68,775.00	-33,075.00	5,125.00	51,625.00
1000	-156,275.00	-127,775.00	-97,775.00	-62,525.00	-24,275.00	17,725.00	66,475.00	

		Length of stay savings of 1 day						
Time savings (minutes)		0	5	10	15	20	25	30
Profit per case (\$)	500	-156,275.00	\$9,500.00	\$5,025.00	\$75.00	\$4,175.00	\$9,675.00	\$16,150.00
	550	-156,275.00	\$8,550.00	\$14,375.00	\$20,875.00	\$26,675.00	\$33,975.00	\$42,550.00
	600	-156,275.00	\$26,600.00	\$33,775.00	\$41,825.00	\$49,175.00	\$58,275.00	\$68,950.00
	650	-156,275.00	\$44,650.00	\$53,175.00	\$62,775.00	\$71,675.00	\$82,575.00	\$95,350.00
	700	-156,275.00	\$62,700.00	\$72,575.00	\$83,725.00	\$94,175.00	\$106,875.00	\$121,750.00
	750	-156,275.00	\$80,750.00	\$91,975.00	\$104,675.00	\$116,675.00	\$131,175.00	\$148,150.00
	800	-156,275.00	\$98,800.00	\$111,375.00	\$125,625.00	\$139,175.00	\$155,475.00	\$174,550.00
	850	-156,275.00	\$116,850.00	\$130,775.00	\$146,575.00	\$161,675.00	\$179,775.00	\$200,950.00
	900	-156,275.00	\$134,900.00	\$150,175.00	\$167,525.00	\$184,175.00	\$204,075.00	\$227,350.00
	950	-156,275.00	\$152,950.00	\$169,575.00	\$188,475.00	\$206,675.00	\$228,375.00	\$253,750.00
1000	-156,275.00	\$171,000.00	\$188,975.00	\$209,425.00	\$229,175.00	\$252,675.00	\$280,150.00	

		Length of stay savings of 2 days						
Time savings (minutes)		0	5	10	15	20	25	30
Profit per case (\$)	500	-156,275.00	\$45,750.00	\$51,925.00	\$59,850.00	\$67,925.00	\$76,400.00	\$87,125.00
	550	-156,275.00	\$70,300.00	\$78,025.00	\$87,850.00	\$97,925.00	\$108,550.00	\$121,875.00
	600	-156,275.00	\$94,850.00	\$104,125.00	\$115,850.00	\$127,925.00	\$140,700.00	\$156,625.00
	650	-156,275.00	\$119,400.00	\$130,225.00	\$143,850.00	\$157,925.00	\$172,850.00	\$191,375.00
	700	-156,275.00	\$143,950.00	\$156,325.00	\$171,850.00	\$187,925.00	\$205,000.00	\$226,125.00
	750	-156,275.00	\$168,500.00	\$182,425.00	\$199,850.00	\$217,925.00	\$237,150.00	\$260,875.00
	800	-156,275.00	\$193,050.00	\$208,525.00	\$227,850.00	\$247,925.00	\$269,300.00	\$295,625.00
	850	-156,275.00	\$217,600.00	\$234,625.00	\$255,850.00	\$277,925.00	\$301,450.00	\$330,375.00
	900	-156,275.00	\$242,150.00	\$260,725.00	\$283,850.00	\$307,925.00	\$333,600.00	\$365,125.00
	950	-156,275.00	\$266,700.00	\$286,825.00	\$311,850.00	\$337,925.00	\$365,750.00	\$399,875.00
1000	-156,275.00	\$291,250.00	\$312,925.00	\$339,850.00	\$367,925.00	\$397,900.00	\$434,625.00	

		Length of stay savings of 3 days						
Time savings (minutes)		0	5	10	15	20	25	30
Profit per case (\$)	500	-156,275.00	\$67,850.00	\$75,300.00	\$84,075.00	\$93,425.00	\$103,600.00	\$115,600.00
	550	-156,275.00	\$95,000.00	\$104,150.00	\$114,925.00	\$126,425.00	\$138,950.00	\$153,700.00
	600	-156,275.00	\$122,150.00	\$133,000.00	\$145,775.00	\$159,425.00	\$174,300.00	\$191,800.00
	650	-156,275.00	\$149,300.00	\$161,850.00	\$176,625.00	\$192,425.00	\$209,650.00	\$229,900.00
	700	-156,275.00	\$176,450.00	\$190,700.00	\$207,475.00	\$225,425.00	\$245,000.00	\$268,000.00
	750	-156,275.00	\$203,600.00	\$219,550.00	\$238,325.00	\$258,425.00	\$280,350.00	\$306,100.00
	800	-156,275.00	\$230,750.00	\$248,400.00	\$269,175.00	\$291,425.00	\$315,700.00	\$344,200.00
	850	-156,275.00	\$257,900.00	\$277,250.00	\$300,025.00	\$324,425.00	\$351,050.00	\$382,300.00
	900	-156,275.00	\$285,050.00	\$306,100.00	\$330,875.00	\$357,425.00	\$386,400.00	\$420,400.00
	950	-156,275.00	\$312,200.00	\$334,950.00	\$361,725.00	\$390,425.00	\$421,750.00	\$458,500.00
1000	-156,275.00	\$339,350.00	\$363,800.00	\$392,575.00	\$423,425.00	\$457,100.00	\$496,600.00	

Figure 3