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Objectives

- Historical perspective on medical device reprocessing
- Review of regulations and guidance from FDA
- Provide perspectives as they relate to the medical waste disposal industry
The Amphitheatre served as the operating room from 1804 through 1868.
http://www.uphs.upenn.edu/paharc/tour/tour5.html
Fig. 13-10. The delivery room. Nurse is preparing instrument table.
17th-century surgical instrument called the *Elevatorium biploidium*.

The instrument was used to raise an indented portion of the skull, as from the wound produced by the low-velocity guns of the day.
SUDs - Single Use Devices
• Background and history

The practice of reprocessing single-use devices (SUDs) for reuse began in hospitals in the late 1970's. Approval of the practice of reusing hemodialyzers in the early 1980s by the US Public Health Service led the way for current activity.
An FDA survey of hospitals conducted in February 2002, found that 24 percent of hospitals were using at least one type of reprocessed SUD and the majority of them used "third parties" to reprocess their SUDs. The most commonly reprocessed SUDs and percent of hospitals reprocessing these devices in 2002 were:

- Sequential compression device (SCD) sleeves (15.8 percent of hospitals)
- Drill bits, saws, blades, or burrs (7.3 percent)
- Biopsy forceps, snares (6.2 percent)
- Endoscopic/laparoscopic scissors, graspers, dissectors, or clamps (6.1 percent)
- Electrophysiology (EP) diagnostic catheters (3.9 percent)
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REPROCESSED SINGLE-USE MEDICAL DEVICES

FDA Oversight Has Increased, and Available Information Does Not Indicate That Use Presents an Elevated Health Risk
Regulation of Reuse of Sharps Containers

Office of Compliance
General Hospital Devices Branch
FDA

Slides courtesy of US FDA – Ms. Diane Goldsberry
The Food and Drug Administration (FDA)

Is a regulatory agency responsible for the protection of public health
FDA Authorities

- Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FD&C Act) & (Implementing Regulations)
  - Inspection Authority

- Section 704 of the FD&C Act
FDA Authorities

- Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FD&C Act) & (Implementing Regulations)
  - Title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (21 CFR)
    - Part 820 (Quality Systems Regulations)
    - Part 803 (Medical Device Reporting)
    - Part 801 (Labeling)
    - Part 807 & 814 (Premarket Requirements)
    - Part 803 (Medical Device Reporting)
Center for Devices and Radiological Health

Responsible for regulating:

Devices, as defined in §201(h) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act
Mammography Quality
All Radiological products that emit radiation
Medical Devices

Are classified into 1 of 3 Classes based upon level of regulation necessary to protect the public.

• Class I - General Controls (GC), 510(k)*
• Class II - Special Controls + GC, 510(k)
• Class III – Premarket Approval

*510(k) is a premarket notification clearance procedure, not an approval
Office of Compliance

- Office of Compliance is responsible for:
  
  Regulatory operations

- Establishment Registration
- Device listing
- Import sampling and testing
- Automatic Detention
- Coordination with personnel from district office
- Health Hazard evaluation and recalls
Office of Device Evaluation

- Premarket Notification [510(k)] review and clearance
- Premarket Approval
- Coordinates with Office of Compliance
Office of Surveillance and Biometrics

Responsible for:

• Medical Device Reporting - (301) 594-3060
• Medwatch
Office of Health and Industry Programs

• Division of Small Manufacturers Assistance
  (301)443-6597
• Human Factors
Office of Science and Technology

- Scientific testing/support
- Sample Analysis

Winchester Engineering and Analytical

- Sample Analysis
Now, let’s examine CDRH’s Concerns

Overall - Safety & Effectiveness

• Human Factors
• Labeling
• Quality upon delivery
Interaction with Industry

• Plant Inspections

  Compliance with Quality System Regulations
domestic and foreign

• Educational efforts

  ✓ presentations at industry conferences
  ✓ publications and guidance documents
  ✓ satellite broadcasts
  ✓ video programs
Let’s Talk About Sharps Containers and Reuse
Why Deal with this Issue?

- Same regulatory controls needed as new devices
  Reprocessing IS manufacturing
- Public concern
- Protection of Public Health
Sharps Container Inspection Data

Many reprocessors are unaware that sharps containers are classified as medical devices.
FDA’s Findings from Inspection:

- Reprocessors lacked:
  - Written cleaning procedures
  - Validation of cleaning procedures
  - Training program
  - Specifications for cleaning and decontaminating parameters
  - Labeling on containers
### Schedule of Premarket Submissions by Risk for Reuse Devices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device Class</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>February, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Class II</em></td>
<td>August, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>February, 2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sharps Containers are Class II devices*
The Regulated Industry Needs to Comply with the Following

• Premarket submissions

• Establishment registration and device listing

• Conform to labeling requirements

• Comply with quality systems regulations
Definition of “Clean”

• FDA does not have a definition for “clean” devices

• Some states have definitions

• OSHA defines “cleaning” and decontamination
Cleaning and Decontamination

- What is the process for decontamination and cleaning?
- Coordinate with hospitals and other medical facilities to assure appropriate criteria are established and expectations met.
Who Will Conduct Inspections?

• FDA for Third-Party Reprocessors
• Possibly JCAHO and some state survey agencies for hospital reprocessors
• FDA will also inspect hospital reprocessors to document possible enforcement actions when necessary
Relationship Between FDA Requirements and State Agencies that Regulate Sharps Containers

FDA has met with the following agencies concerning the public health risk associated with the reuse of Sharps containers:

OSHA
EPA
DOT
Key Elements of Quality System Regulation

What is the scope of FDA’s authority to ensure that containers are cleaned before being reused?
Management Controls (21 CFR 820.20)
Design Controls (21 CFR 820.30)
Corrective and Preventative Actions
(21 CFR 820.100)
Production and Process Controls
(21 CFR 820.70)
Management Controls (21 CFR 820.20)

- Management Reviews
- Quality Policy and Quality Plan
- Quality Audits and Quality System Procedures/Instructions
Design Controls
(21 CFR 820.30)

- Design Plan
- Design Inputs and Outputs
- Design Verification and Validation
- Risk Analysis
- Design Revisions and Design History File
Production and Process Controls

(21 CFR 820.70)

- Verification of Processes
- Specifications
  - The new device must be defined with specifications and tolerances
  - Specifications must be verified
- Device History Records
- Validation as Necessary
- Employee Training
Corrective and Preventative Actions (21 CFR 820.100)

- Evaluations of Existing Problems: Corrective Action
- Identification of Potential Problems: Preventative Actions
- Statistical Methods
- Investigation of Failures
- Implementation and Documentation of Actions
- Effectiveness of Actions
Reusable Sharps Containers

Some of FDA’s Requirements for Reusable Sharps Containers can be found in the Occupational Safety and Health Act, Section 1910.1030 Bloodborne Pathogens
Suggested Simulated-Use Testing for Reusable Sharps Containers

- Specify a reuse test for the containers
- Determine the worst case scenario
- What is the collection Schedule?

For example, assume 1 pick up per week; therefore, decontamination takes place 52 times per year

- Fill container with representative sharps
Suggested Simulated-Use Testing for Reusable Sharps Containers

• Simulate transport of the container (vibration test)

• Process and decontaminate containers according to normal process

• Visually inspect the container and note the presence of scratches, nicks, dents, cracks, discoloration, etc.
World Wide Web/CDRH homepage:

http://www.fda.gov/cdrh/reprocessing/
Studies from the literature

Investigation of Single-Use Versus Reusable Infectious Waste Containers as Potential Source of Microbial Contamination
Neely, et al

American Journal of Infection Control
February 2003 Volume 31 Number 1, p.13-17.
Study assessed the bacterial contamination of single use versus reusable medical waste containers

Findings - Reusable containers had a large concentration of microorganisms as compared to single use/cardboard containers

Authors further go on to conclude the use of the cardboard containers contributed to a reduction in nosocomial infections in patients who are compromised.
• Study limitations

Did not control or look at other cleaning issues or variables e.g. Were other areas sampled for bacterial contamination? Were other infection control practice changes also implemented?

Did not consider or stratify patient severity before or after changes in practices
Bacterial and viral contamination of reusable sharps containers in a community hospital setting

Jack C. Runner, MBA, MT(ASCP), SM(AAM)
Sandusky, Ohio

*American Journal of Infection Control*
October 2007 Volume 35 Number 8, p. 527-530
### Table 2. Bacteria isolated from reprocessed sharps containers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isolate</th>
<th>Number of containers positive for isolate</th>
<th>Percentage of containers positive for isolate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bacillus species</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acinetobacter lwoffi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterobacter agglomerans</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acinetobacter baumannii</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escherichia vulneris</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staphylococcus epidermidis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staphylococcus hominis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Bacterial and viral contamination of reusable sharps containers in a community hospital setting*

Runner, *American Journal of Infection Control* October 2007 Volume 35 Number 8, p. 527-530
### Table 3. Viruses isolated from reprocessed sharps containers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virus</th>
<th>Number of containers positive for virus</th>
<th>Percentage of containers positive for virus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCV</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Bacterial and viral contamination of reusable sharps containers in a community hospital setting*

Runner, *American Journal of Infection Control*  October 2007 Volume 35 Number 8, p. 527-530
• **Study limitations**

• One swab used to samples interior and exterior of container - difficult to differentiate where actual contamination is located (interior or exterior of the container)

• One location

• PCR testing does not differentiate live and dead agents; it merely provides DNA evidence that an agent is present. Consequently, in the case in which viability is important and the ability to grow samples in culture becomes important, the choice of sampling and preservation methods is crucial.
Conclusions

- Standards and guidance exist for the reprocessing of medical devices
- Data is still being collected on the impact of SUDS
- Similar standards and guidance exist for reusable sharps containers
- Limited published data on the efficacy and impact of cleaning that would suggest issues with the existing approach
Thank you!