

1 **Study Protocol: A Scoping Review on Costing Methodologies in Robotic**
2 **Ventral Hernia Repair**

3

4 Kristian Als Nielsen^{1,2*}, Karsten Kaiser^{2,3}, Per Helligsø¹, Michael Festersen
5 Nielsen^{1,2,4¶}, Alexandros Valorenzos^{1,2¶}

6

7

8 ¹ Department of General Surgery, University Hospital of Southern Denmark, Aabenraa, Denmark

9 ² Institute of regional health research, University of Southern Denmark, Aabenraa, Denmark

10 ³ Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics, University Hospital of Southern Denmark, Aabenraa, Denmark

11 ⁴ Department of Clinical Research, University Hospital of Southern Denmark, Aabenraa, Denmark

12

13 * Corresponding author

14 E.mail: Kristian.als.nielsen3@rsyd.dk

15

16 ¶ These authors contributed equally to this work

17

18

19

20

21

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

22 **Abstract**

23 **Background:** Healthcare expenditure is increasing at a rate that surpasses the growth of the gross
24 domestic product in most Western nations, emphasizing the need for precise hospital accounting
25 practices. In resource-constrained environments, accurately estimating the costs of hospital
26 services, such as robotic ventral hernia repair, is essential for achieving efficiency and
27 transparency. Despite the existence of several studies reporting on the cost of robotic ventral
28 hernia repair, there is a lack of systematic mapping of current knowledge on the methodological
29 designs used in studies reporting on the costs and resource use.

30 **Methods:** This study protocol outlines the methodology for a scoping review aimed at
31 systematically mapping the existing literature on costing methodologies in robotic ventral hernia
32 repair. The scoping review will follow the framework outlined by Arksey and O'Malley and adhere
33 to the PRISMA-ScR guidelines. A systematic search will be conducted in Embase, Medline and
34 Cochrane Library. Studies will be included if they involve patients undergoing robotic ventral hernia
35 repair and report on cost/costing methodologies. The review will extract data on study
36 characteristics, intervention specifics, and detailed costing methodologies. Two independent
37 reviewers will conduct the data extraction, with discrepancies resolved through discussion or by a
38 third reviewer.

39 **Discussion:** The review will identify significant variations in costing methodologies, including
40 differences in perspectives (hospital vs. societal), time horizons, and cost components. It aims to
41 highlight gaps and inconsistencies in the current literature, providing a foundation for future
42 research to standardize costing methodologies and improve the accuracy of economic evaluations
43 in robotic surgery. By systematically mapping the existing literature, this scoping review will provide
44 valuable insights into the current state of costing methodologies in robotic ventral hernia repair. It
45 will serve as a foundational reference for researchers, policymakers, and healthcare providers,
46 offering recommendations to enhance the economic evaluation of robotic surgical technologies.

47 **Background**

48 Healthcare expenditure is increasing at a rate that surpasses the growth of the gross domestic
49 product in most Western European nations each year(1-3).This trend, coupled with global
50 healthcare reforms, has intensified the dependence on precise hospital accounting practices. In
51 environments with constrained resources, accurately estimating the costs of hospital services is
52 essential for achieving efficiency and transparency. In many high-income countries, hospitals
53 operate under Diagnosis Related Group (DRG)-based prospective payment systems, necessitating
54 the identification and elimination of inefficiencies, particularly in services where production costs
55 exceed pricing(4, 5). Consequently, hospitals require dependable patient-level cost estimates to
56 accurately assess resource utilization. Detailed and pertinent cost information at the patient level is
57 crucial for policymakers, payers, and healthcare providers.

58

59 However, accurately calculating costs within the hospital setting is challenging due to factors like
60 case heterogeneity, labor intensity, and the complexity of production processes. Studies indicate
61 significant cost variation for the same service, influenced by provider and patient characteristics,
62 efficiency levels, clinical activities, and, critically, the costing method used(6). Previous systematic
63 reviews comparing the cost-effectiveness of Robotic Minimally Invasive Surgery (RMIS) to other
64 surgical methods have generally found RMIS to be more expensive(7). These conclusions,
65 however, were drawn from limited evidence characterized by diverse study designs,
66 methodologies, and follow-up durations.

67

68 Despite the existence of several articles that include an economic evaluation of robotic ventral
69 hernia repair, there is a lack of systematic mapping of current knowledge on the methodological
70 designs used in studies reporting on the costs and resource use of robotic surgery for ventral

71 hernia repair. This scoping review aims to systematically describe the methodological designs
72 employed in studies of resource use and costs related to robotic ventral hernia repair. The primary
73 focus is not on comparing the cost of robotic surgery with other surgical methods, but on evaluating
74 the various methodological choices that could impact the validity of cost analyses.

75

76 Conducting a scoping review of the literature on the costs and costing methodologies of robotic
77 ventral hernia repair can enhance our understanding of the topic, including the different
78 approaches used and the limitations and challenges associated with these methodologies. The
79 objectives of this paper are to provide an overview of the existing literature on the costs of robotic
80 ventral hernia repair, to examine the methodologies employed, to identify gaps in the research, and
81 to offer recommendations for future research in this field.

82

83 **Methods and Design**

84 The scoping review will be conducted following the methodology outlined by Arksey and O'Malley
85 and adhering to the guidelines of the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-
86 Analyses – Scoping Review extension (PRISMA-ScR). The study will be developed in the following
87 five stages:

88

89 ***Stage 1: Identification of the Research Question***

90 This scoping review aims to answer the following questions:

- 91 • What is known from the existing literature about the cost of ventral hernia repair using a
92 robotic platform?

- 93
- What are the methodological designs employed in studies reporting resource use and
- 94 costs related to robotic ventral hernia repair, and how do these methodological choices
- 95 impact the validity of cost analyses?

96

97 **Stage 2: Identification of Relevant Literature**

98 A systematic search will be conducted in cooperation with a medical librarian from our institution

99 using the following databases:

100 - Embase

101 - Medline

102 - Cochrane Library

103 - Scopus for citation tracking

104 An example of the search strategy for Embase (Ovid) is presented in Table 1. The search strategy

105 will be translated for Medline and Cochrane Library.

106

107 *Table 1. Embase (Ovid) search strategy*

Ventral hernia block	1	abdominal wall hernia/
	2	umbilical hernia/
	3	incisional hernia/
	4	herni*.ti,ab,kf.
RMIS block	5	robot/
	6	robot*.ti,ab,kf.
	7	robotics/
	8	robot assisted surgery/

	9	computer assisted surgery/
Costing block	10	"cost"/
	11	cost*.ti,ab,kf.
	12	economics/
	13	economics*.ti,ab,kf.
	14	financial.ti,ab,kf.
	15	pric*.ti,ab,kf.
Combination	16	1 or 2 or 3 or 4
	17	5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9
	18	10 or 11 or 12 or 13 or 14 or 15
	19	16 and 17 and 18

108

109

110 **Stage 3: Study Selection**

111 Inclusion and exclusion criteria in accordance with the PCC principle are outlined below. Only
 112 peer-reviewed original research concerning costs in robotic ventral hernia repair will be included.
 113 Only English-language articles will be included. All results will be imported into Covidence for
 114 screening. All duplicates will be removed. Two reviewers will screen titles and abstracts using the
 115 inclusion and exclusion criteria outlined below. The same two reviewers will examine the remaining
 116 articles and select studies according to the inclusion criteria. Disagreements will be resolved
 117 through discussion and overseen by a third-party investigator. A PRISMA flowchart will be
 118 presented to summarize the search, screening, exclusion, and inclusion process for the study
 119 selection of relevant studies.

120

121 *Inclusion Criteria*

122 Population:

- 123 • Studies involving patients undergoing robotic ventral hernia repair.

124 Concept:

- 125 • Studies that report on cost and/or costing methodologies.

126 Context:

- 127 • Studies conducted in hospitals or healthcare institutions where robotic ventral hernia repair
128 is performed.
- 129 • Original research of all types, including randomized controlled trials, prospective and
130 retrospective cohort studies, case-control studies, reviews, and economic evaluations.
- 131 • Studies published in any country and in English.

132

133 *Exclusion Criteria*

134 Population:

- 135 • Studies not specifically addressing patients undergoing robotic ventral hernia repair.

136 Concept:

- 137 • Studies that do not report details on costs and/or costing methodologies.

138 Context:

- 139 • Non-English literature
- 140 • Grey literature

141

142 **Stage 4: Charting the Data**

143 For this scoping review, a standardized data extraction form will be used to collect relevant details
144 from each included study. This form will capture essential elements such as study characteristics
145 (e.g., author, year, country, study design, and type of economic evaluation), intervention specifics
146 (e.g., type of robotic ventral hernia repair and comparator techniques), and methodological aspects
147 related to costing (e.g., perspective, time horizon, cost components, and calculation methods).

148

149 *Specific Aspects to be Captured:*

150 1. Type of Economic Evaluation:

151 - Cost minimization analysis

152 - Cost-benefit framework

153 - Activity-based costing

154 - Cost studies

155

156 2. Costing Methodologies:

157 - Microcosting

158 - Gross costing

159 - Hospital charges

160

161 3. Specific Costs of Relevance:

162 - Purchasing Cost of the Robot:

163 - Depreciation accounted for

164 - Number of years the robot is expected to operate

165 - Number of procedures per year the robot is used for

166 - Maintenance of the Robot:

167 - Service agreement costs

168 - Preoperative Preparation of the Patients

169 - Staff Salary:

170 - Specific staff members (e.g., surgeons, ER nurses, anesthesiologists)

171 - Surgical Equipment

172 - Operating Room Costs:

173 - Sterilization of equipment

174 - Cleaning costs

175 - Drug Costs:

176 - Anesthesia

177 - Pain medications

178 - IV infusions

179 - Antibiotics

- 180 - Hospital Room Costs:
 - 181 - Level of detail (e.g., food for patients, cleaning, clothing)
 - 182 - Accounting for length of hospital stay
- 183 - Post-Discharge Costs:
 - 184 - Readmission costs
 - 185 - Reoperation costs
 - 186 - Use of equipment (e.g., splints)
 - 187 - Pain medications
 - 188 - Outpatient control costs
- 189
- 190 4. Adjustments:
 - 191 - Whether the study accounts for the learning curve of using the robotic system
 - 192 - Whether the study accounts for the operation time
- 193
- 194 5. Perspective of Costing:
 - 195 - Hospital perspective
 - 196 - Societal perspective
- 197

198 Additionally, any reported challenges and limitations in the costing methodologies will be
199 documented. The data charting process will be conducted by two independent reviewers, blinded
200 to each other to ensure accuracy and comprehensiveness. Discrepancies will be resolved through
201 discussion or by consulting a third reviewer.

202

203 This detailed approach to data charting will enable a thorough and nuanced understanding of the
204 costing methodologies used in studies of robotic ventral hernia repair, and will help to identify gaps
205 and inconsistencies in the literature.

206

207 ***Stage 5: Collating, Summarizing, and Reporting of Results***

208 The collected data will be systematically collated, summarized, and reported to provide a
209 comprehensive overview of the findings. This process involves organizing the extracted data into
210 meaningful categories that align with the research questions and objectives. Quantitative data will
211 be presented in tabular and graphical formats to illustrate trends, frequencies, and distributions of
212 costing methodologies used in robotic ventral hernia repair studies. This stage will also involve
213 identifying patterns, inconsistencies, and gaps in the literature. The final report will present a
214 detailed summary of the reviewed studies, highlighting key findings, methodological variations, and
215 areas requiring further research. The results will be discussed in the context of existing knowledge,
216 and recommendations will be made for future studies to enhance the understanding and accuracy
217 of costing methodologies in robotic ventral hernia repair.

218

219 **Discussion**

220 This scoping review aims to systematically map the existing literature on costs and costing
221 methodologies in robotic ventral hernia repair. By including a wide range of studies, we intend to
222 provide a comprehensive overview of the costs associated with the robotic platform in ventral
223 hernia repair, how these costs are calculated, the methodological choices made, and the
224 challenges encountered in this field. The review will highlight significant variations in costing
225 methodologies, including differences in perspectives, time horizons, and cost components included
226 in the analyses. Such variations can profoundly impact the reported cost-effectiveness of robotic
227 surgery, potentially leading to inconsistent conclusions and impeding informed decision-making.

228

229 One of the anticipated findings is the lack of standardization in costing methodologies. The review
230 is likely to reveal that many studies do not adhere to best practices in economic evaluations, such
231 as including comprehensive cost components like the purchase and maintenance of robotic
232 systems or adequately accounting for indirect costs. These gaps can undermine the validity and
233 comparability of cost analyses, suggesting a need for more rigorous methodological standards.

234

235 Additionally, this review will identify key areas for future research, such as the need for longitudinal
236 studies to capture long-term costs and benefits, and the importance of incorporating broader
237 economic perspectives. By synthesizing the existing evidence, this review will provide valuable
238 insights that can guide future research efforts and improve the transparency and reliability of
239 costing studies in robotic ventral hernia repair.

240

241 Overall, this scoping review will serve as a foundational reference for researchers, policymakers,
242 and healthcare providers, highlighting current knowledge, identifying gaps, and suggesting
243 directions for future research to enhance the economic evaluation of robotic surgical technologies.

244

245 **Acknowledgements**

246 We would like to express our sincere gratitude to Caroline Moos, Medical Librarian at the
247 Department of Medical Research, University of Southern Denmark, for her invaluable guidance
248 regarding systematic search strategies and methodology. Her expertise and support were
249 instrumental in the development of this study protocol.

250

251 **References**

- 252 1. Busse R. Expenditure on health care in the EU: making projections for the future
253 based on the past. *The European Journal of Health Economics (HEPAC)*. 2001;2(4):158-61.
- 254 2. Hagist C, Kotlikoff L. Who's Going Broke? Comparing Growth in Healthcare Costs in
255 Ten OECD Countries. National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc; 2005.
- 256 3. Jakovljevic M, Fernandes PO, Teixeira JP, Rancic N, Timofeyev Y, Reshetnikov V.
257 Underlying Differences in Health Spending Within the World Health Organisation Europe Region-
258 Comparing EU15, EU Post-2004, CIS, EU Candidate, and CARINFONET Countries. *Int J Environ
259 Res Public Health*. 2019;16(17).
- 260 4. Scheller-Kreinsen D, Quentin W, Busse R. DRG-based hospital payment systems
261 and technological innovation in 12 European countries. *Value Health*. 2011;14(8):1166-72.
- 262 5. Mihailovic N, Kocic S, Jakovljevic M. Review of Diagnosis-Related Group-Based
263 Financing of Hospital Care. *Health Serv Res Manag Epidemiol*. 2016;3:2333392816647892.
- 264 6. Gani F, Hundt J, Daniel M, Efron JE, Makary MA, Pawlik TM. Variations in hospitals
265 costs for surgical procedures: inefficient care or sick patients? *Am J Surg*. 2017;213(1):1-9.

266 7. Korsholm M, Sørensen J, Mogensen O, Wu C, Karlsen K, Jensen PT. A systematic
267 review about costing methodology in robotic surgery: evidence for low quality in most of the
268 studies. Health Econ Rev. 2018;8(1):21.

269