



Reducing Ophthalmic Surgical Waste through Electronic Instructions For Use (eIFU)

Multisociety Position Paper (AAO, ASCRS, ESCRS, EyeSustain)

In 2021, the World Health Organization stated that climate change is the leading threat to global health and will disproportionately harm the poorest and most vulnerable communities.¹ The global healthcare system is a major contributor to waste and accounts for 4.4% of global greenhouse gases.² The National Academy of Medicine recently launched its Action Collaborative on Decarbonizing the U.S. Health Sector to “activate all parts of the health sector for sustainable change” focusing on the healthcare supply chain and infrastructure.³ Ophthalmic procedures represent some of the most common in medicine; almost 30 million cataract surgeries are performed globally each year.^{4 5} Aging populations in most countries will lead to steady increases in ophthalmic procedural volumes over time.^{6 7} This gives ophthalmology a unique opportunity to reduce unnecessary waste and carbon emissions.

Regulatory agencies, such as the European Union (EU) Medical Device Regulation (MDR) and the United States (U.S.) Food and Drug Administration (FDA), require manufacturers to provide detailed instructions for use (IFU) to guide proper and safe use of surgical devices and products. The IFU describe how to use the product, and may include information about applications, component parts, indications and contraindications, precautions, warnings, study results, and adverse events. In ophthalmic surgery, paper IFU accompany most devices and supplies used, such as intraocular lenses (IOLs), IOL insertion cartridges, ophthalmic viscosurgical device (OVD) syringes, dropper bottles of saline, irrigating solution, and phacoemulsification tips and sleeves. Although some IFU may be printed on the package exterior, most are separately supplied as a printed booklet or folded handout within the product package. As an alternative to paper IFU, electronic instructions for use (e-IFU) can be accessed through websites linked through QR codes on the package. Both MDR and FDA regulations permit e-IFU, although for MDR, this is limited to certain products. If a downloadable PDF version were available, surgical facilities could print one copy of each IFU for each product used in the surgery without the waste of including a printed copy with every unit.

EyeSustain, a coalition sponsored by ASCRS, ESCRS, and AAO, collaborated with the Medical Device Manufacturers Association (MDMA) in the U.S. to develop a survey that was emailed to 227 American instrument and supply manufacturers across multiple surgical specialties about e-IFU. Of the 32 responding companies, 95% thought that e-IFU were an acceptable alternative to paper IFU. Most thought that e-IFU would reduce product paperwork (84%) and reduce production costs (80%). However, e-IFU were currently used for all products by only 20%, most products by 10%, many (<50%) products by 25%, a few products by 25%, and no products by 20%. Barriers most frequently cited (in decreasing order

of frequency) were varying and inconsistent IFU requirements between different countries (100%), manufacturer liability (58%), cost to implement (53%), lack of customer demand (32%), lack of company awareness/consideration (32%), and lower company prioritization (21%).

We recommend that surgical manufacturers replace paper IFU with e-IFU whenever possible for ophthalmic surgical products. Given the large volume of ophthalmic surgeries, transitioning from printed to e-IFU will significantly reduce waste while making the same information readily accessible to surgical teams. To understand the potential benefits and disadvantages of e-IFU for virtually all ophthalmic surgical products, it is helpful to consider the example of IOLs.

e-IFU for Intraocular Lenses

Only a few companies have implemented e-IFU for IOLs in the U.S. and EU. The content of each IOL IFU is repeated in multiple languages and includes information on the IOL power calculation (such as the A constant), insertion instructions, warnings/precautions, expected postoperative results, and patient registration information. Because of the extensive information provided in multiple languages, the IFU print size is small, making it more difficult to read than newsprint. Printed paper IFU booklets also contribute to the overall weight and size of the IOL package.

In a 2013 analysis of carbon emissions from cataract surgery in the NHS, Morris et al found that more than 50% of the carbon emissions arose from medical equipment (32.6%) and pharmaceutical (18%) supply chains.⁸ They also noted that the IOL packaging (plastic and paper) weighed 64 grams and included a 70-page IFU booklet translated into 11 languages. By comparison, the IOL weighed less than 1 gram. A 2023 study of packaging of IOLs commonly used in the U.S. showed a range of package weight from 29 to 79.5 grams (Keyser A. Comparative Analysis of Packaging of Intraocular Lens Commonly Used in the United States, submitted for publication). Eliminating the IFU booklet would net a 60-fold reduction in the paper waste from the IOL packaging. A 2017 analysis performed at the Aravind Eye Care System found that each cataract surgery produced only 250 grams of waste because of the routine reuse of most surgical and pharmaceutical supplies. The IFU and IOL packaging accounted for 25% of this waste.⁹

Assuming that 40 g of the 61 g total weight of an IOL package is from the paper IFU, we estimate that the production and shipping of 30 million IOLs per year produces more than 5 million kgCO₂e (kilograms of carbon dioxide equivalent) per year. Transitioning to e-IFU could reduce greenhouse gases (GHGs) from IOL packaging to less than 2 million (1,736,860 kgCO₂e) for a 67% reduction (Thiel, Cassandra, personal communication). This would save approximately 3,500 metric tons of CO₂ emissions annually, equivalent to the annual GHG emissions from 753 passenger cars or the energy use of 425 U.S. homes. Additionally, a 2023 European study by Stern et al estimated that transitioning from paper to electronic IFU could lead to an 84% reduction in paper and the preservation of over 2000 trees or over 50,000 reams of copier paper each year.¹⁰ Eliminating the excess weight of IOL packaging might also reduce costs for waste treatment and product shipment.

The ramifications of implementing e-IFU for IOLs can also be considered from the standpoint of four different parties and stakeholders. These considerations can be generalized to most surgical products.

1. Surgical Facility Considerations

Reliable internet connectivity is an important consideration for reliance on e-IFU. In most countries, wireless internet or cellular data is widely available and global internet access is rapidly expanding. In the unlikely event that a surgeon urgently needed to refer to the IFU in the operating room, e-IFU would expedite searching for the required information via the “find” option, as opposed to reading the multiple pages and small print of a paper IFU pamphlet. Viewing e-IFU on a computer, tablet, or mobile device would allow the user to enlarge the font and adjust brightness. With a QR code linked to the e-IFU, any mobile device could display the information without the need for a desktop or laptop computer in the OR. As a backup to e-IFU, such as when internet or LTE access is unreliable, facilities should print and file one copy from a downloadable PDF on the company’s website or request a printed copy from the company for each product used in surgery.

2. Surgeon Considerations

Surveys have demonstrated that ophthalmic surgeons overwhelmingly support efforts to decrease cataract surgery’s carbon footprint; one recent survey reported that 93% thought that OR waste is excessive and should be reduced.¹¹ In this 2020 survey of more than 1,000 ophthalmologist respondents, 71% of surgeons thought that single-use item packaging leads to unnecessary waste. Moreover, 76% of surgeons and 72% of nurses strongly agreed with the statement: “Device and supply manufacturers should consider the environment/carbon footprint in their product design.”

For cataract surgery, the IOL model and power are selected preoperatively. Because printed IFU are only accessible after the sterile IOL package is opened, digital IFU would be much easier for surgeons to review preoperatively in the clinic when the IOL model and parameters are selected. From a practical standpoint, surgeons rarely need to reference the IFU, and the fact that a surgeon repetitively uses the same IOL models makes inclusion of paper IFU booklets within every IOL box exceedingly wasteful.

3. Manufacturer Considerations

The global IOL market was valued at almost \$4 billion USD in 2021 with projections for continued growth.¹² More than 10 companies produce the majority of the IOLs for cataract surgery worldwide.

One manufacturer was able to reduce their IOL packing weight by 53% by removing the paper IFU where this was allowed.¹³ Decreasing packaging size and weight should reduce shipping costs, making this an economical as well as an ecological choice. Manufacturers can update e-IFU much faster than paper IFU, and updated e-IFU would immediately become available for units that are already in the manufacturer’s or the surgical facility’s inventory.

4. Regulatory Agency Considerations

A major obstacle to e-IFU adoption is that several countries still require a printed IFU (Table 1). Many are low- to middle-income countries, but this list also includes several larger markets as well. For companies that sell IOLs in these global markets, it may be impractical and expensive to have two different packaging lines—one that includes a paper IFU in the package and another that does not. We believe that requiring paper IFU is outdated and environmentally detrimental. There is no evidence that e-IFU pose a danger to patient care. On the contrary, safety information can be updated much faster and more effectively with e-IFU. This is particularly important for IOLs, given the common practice where IOLs are stored under consignment in surgical facilities. Some infrequently used IOL powers may sit on OR shelves for long periods of time, allowing the enclosed paper IFU to become outdated.

In the U.S., the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA) ensures that IFU for devices used in healthcare settings “... may be made available solely by electronic means, provided that the labeling complies with all applicable requirements of law, and that the manufacturer affords such users the opportunity to request the labeling in paper form, and after such request, promptly provides the requested information without additional cost.”¹⁴ In Europe, the MDR provides a set of regulations that all companies in the EU market must abide by for production and distribution of medical devices. Currently, e-IFU for implants such as IOLs are accepted by the MDR across EU member states. However, e-IFU are not accepted by MDR for other products used in cataract surgery, such as instruments and phacoemulsification tubing and machines, because they are not implants or permanently installed systems. MedTech Europe, a trade association for medical technology and devices, published a position paper calling for the use of e-IFU for all medical devices. The association conducted a survey of healthcare professionals, hospital administrators, and pharmacists in multiple languages regarding e-IFU with more than 882 responses from 23 countries. More than 88% of healthcare professionals and more than 90% of hospital pharmacists and administrators stated that they preferred e-IFU due to their easier access and waste reduction. Notably, greater than 99% of respondents had internet access, negating any safety concern about accessing e-IFU.¹⁵ We encourage MDR to resolve this inconsistent logic by permitting e-IFU for all ophthalmic surgical products.

Global regulatory agencies should honor the increasing trend toward environmentally responsible legislation worldwide. An Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) strategy is an environmental policy that requires companies to assume responsibility for their products past the consumer stage. EPR laws and programs have been implemented in Belgium, South Korea, Spain, India, Japan, the Netherlands, the U.K., British Columbia, and several states in the U.S. One such EPR policy increased the recycling rate in Belgium from 10% to 89.8%.¹⁶ Preventing surgical product manufacturers from responsibly reducing unnecessary paper waste and CO₂ emissions by implementing e-IFU is particularly puzzling in this context.

Conclusion

Paper IFU contribute significantly to unnecessary waste and adverse environmental impact from ophthalmic surgery. Compared to an e-IFU, disadvantages of a printed IFU include smaller print, inability to immediately update IFU of IOLs stored in ORs on consignment, and difficulty accessing the information in the clinic when the IOL model and power are selected. Because of the extremely high volume of ophthalmic devices used in procedures such as cataract surgery, implementing e-IFU is a

straightforward way for manufacturers to reduce unnecessary waste and carbon emissions. We recommend that the ophthalmic surgical manufacturing industry move exclusively to e-IFU, initially prioritizing those products routinely used in high volume, such as IOLs, IOL cartridges, and OVD. We request that every global government and regulatory agency facilitate these efforts.

Written by the EyeSustain Task Force on e-IFU: Emily Schehlein, MD, John Hovanesian, MD, Audrey Talley Rostov, MD, Aakriti Garg Shukla, MD, Oliver Findl, MD, David F. Chang, MD

References

1. (WHO) WHO. Climate change and health. <https://www.who.int/news-room/factsheets/detail/climatechange-and-health>. Published 2021.
2. ARUP and HCWH. *Health Care's Climate Footprint*. 2019. <https://noharm-global.org/documents/healthcare-climate-footprint-report>.
3. Medicine NA of. Action Collaborative on Decarbonizing the U.S. Health Sector. <https://nam.edu/programs/climate-change-and-human-health/action-collaborative-on-decarbonizing-the-u-s-health-sector/>. Published 2021.
4. Rossi T, Romano MR, Iannetta D, et al. Cataract surgery practice patterns worldwide: a survey. *BMJ Open Ophthalmol*. 2021;6(1):e000464. doi:10.1136/bmjophth-2020-000464
5. Chen X, Xu J, Chen X, Yao K. Cataract: Advances in surgery and whether surgery remains the only treatment in future. *Adv Ophthalmol Pract Res*. 2021;1(1):100008. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aopr.2021.100008>
6. Congdon N, Vingerling JR, Klein BEK, et al. Prevalence of cataract and pseudophakia/aphakia among adults in the United States. *Arch Ophthalmol (Chicago, Ill 1960)*. 2004;122(4):487–494.
7. Lee CM, Afshari NA. The global state of cataract blindness. *Curr Opin Ophthalmol*. 2017;28(1):98–103.
8. Morris DS, Wright T, Somner JEA, Connor A. The carbon footprint of cataract surgery. *Eye (Lond)*. 2013;27(4):495–501.
9. Thiel CL, Schehlein E, Ravilla T, et al. Cataract surgery and environmental sustainability: Waste and lifecycle assessment of phacoemulsification at a private healthcare facility. *J Cataract Refract Surg*. 2017;43(11):1391-1398.
10. Stern B, Rampat R, Shahnazaryan D, Gatinel D. Paper Waste from Instructions for Use Brochures in Cataract Surgery Implant Packaging in Europe and the United States. *J Cataract Refract Surg*. Published online September 19, 2023. Accessed December 1, 2023. doi:10.1097/j.jcrs.0000000000001310
11. Chang DF, Thiel CL; Ophthalmic Instrument Cleaning and Sterilization Task Force. Survey of cataract surgeons' and nurses' attitudes toward operating room waste. *J Cataract Refract Surg*. 2020;46(7):933–940.
12. Global News Wire. Global Intraocular Lens Market. <https://www.globenewswire.com/newsrelease/2022/11/23/2561659/0/en/Global-Intraocular-Lens-Market-valued-at-3-9-billion-in-2021-is-set-towitness-a-growth-of-5-6-in-the-next-5-years-but-is-likely-to-be-impacted-by-Recession-in-2022-23.html>.
13. Alcon. *Alcon Corporate Social Responsibility Report*. Geneva, Switzerland; 2023.
14. Congress 107th. *Medical Device User Fee and Modernization Act of 2002 (MDUFMA)*; 2002. <https://www.fda.gov/industry/medical-device-user-fee-amendments-mdufa/medical-device-user-fee-and-modernization-act-2002-mdufma-pl-107-250>.
15. Europe M. *Electronic Instructions for Use for All Professional Use Medical Devices: MedTech Europe Calls for Scope Expansion of EU 2021/2226*. <https://www.medtecheurope.org/resource-library/electronicinstructions-for-use-for-all-professional-use-medical-devices-medtech-europe-calls-for-scope-expansionof-eu-2021-2226-position-paper/>.
16. Partnership TR. *Increasing Recycling Rates with EPR Policy*. <https://recyclingpartnership.org/epreport/>. Published 2023.

Table 1: Current State of e-IFU by Country

(Source: Personal communication with industry representatives)

e-IFU accepted <i>(with restrictions)</i>	e-IFU not accepted	e-IFU acceptance unclear
<p>Angola, Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Aruba, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Cayman Islands, Chile, Columbia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Curacao, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Lichtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Mauritius, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Puerto Rico, Romania, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Korea, Spain, St. Lucia, St. Maarten, St. Vincent and The Grenadines, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tanzania, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turks and Caicos, Uganda, United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe</p>	<p>Afghanistan, Algeria, Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Brunei, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central Africa, Chad, China, Comoros, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kosovo, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Moldova, Montenegro, Morocco, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Qatar, Russia, Serbia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vietnam</p>	<p>Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Burundi, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Georgia, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mongolia, Namibia, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Republic of Macedonia, South Africa, Taiwan, Yemen</p>