

# Einmalinstrumente für die Steintherapie – Ökonomie versus Ökologie

Walter Ludwig Strohmaier

## Literatur

### References

1. Hesse A, Brändle E, Wilbert D, Köhrmann K-U, Alken P. Study on the prevalence and incidence of urolithiasis in Germany comparing the years 1979 vs. 2000. *European urology* 2003; 44: 709–13.
2. Brikowski TH, Lotan Y, Pearle MS. Climate-related increase in the prevalence of urolithiasis in the United States. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 2008; 105: 9841–9846.
3. Geraghty R, Abourmarzouk O, Rai B, Biyani CS, Rukin NJ, Somani BK. Evidence for Ureterorenoscopy and Laser Fragmentation (URSL) for Large Renal Stones in the Modern Era. *Current urology reports* 2015; 16: 54.
4. Ordon M, Urbach D, Mamdani M, Saskin R, D'A Honey RJ, Pace KT. The surgical management of kidney stone disease: a population based time series analysis. *The Journal of urology* 2014; 192: 1450–56.
5. Bansal H, Swain S, Sharma GK, Mathanya M, Trivedi S, Dwivedi US, et al. Polyscope: a new era in flexible ureterorenoscopy. *Journal of endourology* 2011; 25: 317–21.
6. Dale J, Kaplan AG, Radvak D, Shin R, Ackerman A, Chen T, et al. Evaluation of a Novel Single-Use Flexible Ureteroscope. *Journal of endourology* 2017.
7. Deininger S, Haberstock L, Kruck S, Neumann E, da Costa IA, Todenhöfer T, et al. Single-use versus reusable ureterorenoscopes for retrograde intrarenal surgery (RIRS): systematic comparative analysis of physical and optical properties in three different devices. *World journal of urology* 2018; 36: 2059–2063.
8. Schlager D, Hein S, Obaid MA, Wilhelm K, Miernik A, Schoenthaler M. Performance of Single-Use FlexorVue vs Reusable BoaVision Ureteroscope for Visualization of Calices and Stone Extraction in an Artificial Kidney Model. *Journal of endourology* 2017; 31: 1139–1144.
9. Proietti S, Dragos L, Molina W, Doizi S, Giusti G, Traxer O. Comparison of New Single-Use Digital Flexible Ureteroscope Versus Nondisposable Fiber Optic and Digital Ureteroscope in a Cadaveric Model. *Journal of endourology* 2016; 30: 655–59.
10. Dragos LB, Somani BK, Sener ET, Buttice S, Proietti S, Ploumidis A, et al. Which Flexible Ureteroscopes (Digital vs. Fiber-Optic) Can Easily Reach the Difficult Lower Pole Calices and Have Better End-Tip Deflection: In Vitro Study on K-Box. A PETRA Evaluation. *Journal of endourology* 2017; 31: 630–637.

11. Scotland KB, Chan JYH, Chew BH. Single-Use Flexible Ureteroscopes: How Do They Compare with Reusable Ureteroscopes? *Journal of endourology* 2019; 33: 71–78.
12. Hennessey DB, Fojecki GL, Papa NP, Lawrentschuk N, Bolton D. Single-use disposable digital flexible ureteroscopes: an ex vivo assessment and cost analysis. *BJU international* 2018; 121 Suppl 3: 55–61.
13. Tom WR, Wollin DA, Jiang R, Radvak D, Simmons WN, Preminger GM, et al. Next-Generation Single-Use Ureteroscopes: An In Vitro Comparison. *Journal of endourology* 2017; 31: 1301–1306.
14. Marchini GS, Torricelli FC, Batagello CA, Monga M, Vicentini FC, Danilovic A, et al. A comprehensive literature-based equation to compare cost-effectiveness of a flexible ureteroscopy program with single-use versus reusable devices. *International braz j urol : official journal of the Brazilian Society of Urology* 2019; 45: 658–670.
15. Mager R, Kuroschi M, Höfner T, Frees S, Haferkamp A, Neisius A. Clinical outcomes and costs of reusable and single-use flexible ureterorenoscopes: a prospective cohort study. *Urolithiasis* 2018; 46: 587–593.
16. Qi S, Yang E, Bao J, Yang N, Guo H, Wang G, et al. Single-Use Versus Reusable Digital Flexible Ureteroscopes for the Treatment of Renal Calculi: A Prospective Multicenter Randomized Controlled Trial. *Journal of endourology* 2019.
17. Usawachintachit M, Isaacson DS, Taguchi K, Tzou DT, Hsi RS, Sherer BA, et al. A Prospective Case-Control Study Comparing LithoVue, a Single-Use, Flexible Disposable Ureteroscope, with Flexible, Reusable Fiber-Optic Ureteroscopes. *Journal of endourology* 2017; 31: 468–475.
18. Doizi S, Kamphuis G, Giusti G, Andreassen KH, Knoll T, Osther PJ, et al. First clinical evaluation of a new single-use flexible ureteroscope (LithoVue™): a European prospective multicentric feasibility study. *World journal of urology* 2017; 35: 809–818.
19. Martin CJ, McAdams SB, Abdul-Muhsin H, Lim VM, Nunez-Nateras R, Tyson MD, et al. The Economic Implications of a Reusable Flexible Digital Ureteroscope: A Cost-Benefit Analysis. *The Journal of urology* 2017; 197: 730–735.
20. Al-Balushi K, Martin N, Loubon H, Baboudjian M, Michel F, Sichez P-C, et al. Comparative medico-economic study of reusable vs. single-use flexible ureteroscopes. *International urology and nephrology* 2019; 51: 1735–1741.
21. Tosoian JJ, Ludwig W, Sopko N, Mullins JK, Matlaga BR. The effect of repair costs on the profitability of a ureteroscopy program. *Journal of endourology* 2015; 29: 406–409.
22. Perbet S, Blanquet M, Mourgues C, Delmas J, Bertran S, Longère B, et al. Cost analysis of single-use (Ambu® aScope™) and reusable bronchoscopes in the ICU. *Annals of intensive care* 2017; 7: 3.

23. Davis NF, McGrath S, Quinlan M, Jack G, Lawrentschuk N, Bolton DM. Carbon Footprint in Flexible Ureteroscopy: A Comparative Study on the Environmental Impact of Reusable and Single-Use Ureteroscopes. *Journal of endourology* 2018; 32: 214–217.