



**6th International Conference on Nanotechnologies and Biomedical Engineering
Proceedings of ICNBME-2023, September 20–23, 2023, Chisinau, Moldova
Volume 2: Biomedical Engineering and New Technologies for Diagnosis, Treatment, and
Rehabilitation**

Feasibility Study for a Robotic Laparoscopic Surgical System in a Greek Public Hospital

Spilios Zisimopoulos, Aris Dermitzakis, Anastasia Daskalaki, Mary Marinou, Nicolas Pallikarakis

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-42782-4_4

Abstract

Robot Assisted Laparoscopic Surgery (RALS) is a rapidly evolving field and has seen significant advances in recent years. This new technology presents potential advantages in many procedures, compared to traditional open surgery and manual laparoscopic surgery. However, to justify the use of a robotic laparoscopic surgical system by a healthcare unit, the undoubted technical advantages it offers should be translated into improved clinical outcomes, safety and sustainability. The Institute of Biomedical Technology (INBIT) undertook a project to evaluate the feasibility of acquiring such a system by a Public Sector Hospital in Greece. This analysis included the description of the examined technology, its fields of application and the potential and conditions of its utilization. Aspects of the technology such as acquisition, use and maintenance costs were reviewed alongside public health sector data related to the estimated use, to check its sustainability. At the same time, a review study was carried out to compare clinical results of robotic surgery with traditional operation methods based on existing literature. Considering this comparison, alongside the economic data, a cost-benefit estimation of the technology under consideration was carried out. Additionally, safety issues of RALS are examined based on international recalls on robotic surgical systems and relevant studies. Finally, comments are made on the procurement strategy to be followed.

Keywords: laparoscopic robotic systems, robot assisted laparoscopic surgery



**6th International Conference on Nanotechnologies and Biomedical Engineering
Proceedings of ICNBME-2023, September 20–23, 2023, Chisinau, Moldova
Volume 2: Biomedical Engineering and New Technologies for Diagnosis, Treatment, and
Rehabilitation**

References

1. SofMedica - Robotic Surgery. <https://sofmedica.com/our-portofolio/robotic-surgery/>
2. Promitheus - eProcurement Homepage.
<https://portal.eprocurement.gov.gr/webcenter/portal/TestPortal>
3. Transparency Program – Diavgeia Homepage. <https://diavgeia.gov.gr/>
4. Hinata, N., et al.: Robot-assisted partial nephrectomy versus standard laparoscopic partial nephrectomy for renal hilar tumor: a prospective multi-institutional study. *Int. J. Urol.* **28**, 382–389 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1111/iju.14469>
5. Muaddi, H., et al.: Clinical outcomes of robotic surgery compared to conventional surgical approaches (laparoscopic or open): a systematic overview of reviews. *Ann. Surg.* **273**, 467–473 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1097/SLA.0000000000003915>
6. Huang, X., Wang, L., Zheng, X., Wang, X.: Comparison of perioperative, functional, and oncologic outcomes between standard laparoscopic and robotic-assisted radical prostatectomy: a systemic review and meta-analysis. *Surg. Endosc.* **31**, 1045–1060 (2017).
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00464-016-5125-1>
7. Jin, Y.-M., Liu, S.-S., Chen, J., Chen, Y.-N., Ren, C.-C.: Robotic radical hysterectomy is superior to laparoscopic radical hysterectomy and open radical hysterectomy in the treatment of cervical cancer. *PLoS ONE* **13**, e0193033 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0193033>
8. Nitecki, R., et al.: Survival after minimally invasive vs open radical hysterectomy for early stage cervical cancer. *JAMA Oncol.* **6**, 1–9 (2020).
<https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaoncol.2020.1694>
9. Gitas, G., et al.: Surgical outcomes of conventional laparoscopic and robotic-assisted hysterectomy. *Int. J. Med. Robot.* **17**, e2225 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1002/rcs.2225>
10. Gitas, G., et al.: Long-term satisfaction of patients after laparoscopic and robotic-assisted hysterectomy. *Arch. Gynecol. Obstet.* **305**, 1481–1490 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00404-021-06360-9>
11. Ind, T., Laios, A., Hacking, M., Nobbenhuis, M.: A comparison of operative outcomes between standard and robotic laparoscopic surgery for endometrial cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int. J. Med. Robot.* **13**, e1851 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1002/rcs.1851>
12. Takmaz, Ö., Güngör, M.: Robotic versus laparoscopic hysterectomy; comparison of early surgical outcomes. *J. Turk. Ger. Gynecol. Assoc.* **21**, 260–264 (2020).
<https://doi.org/10.4274/jtgga.galenos.2020.2019.0187>
13. Wang, T., Tang, H., Xie, Z., Deng, S.: Robotic-assisted vs. laparoscopic and abdominal myomectomy for treatment of uterine fibroids: a meta-analysis. *Minim. Invasive Ther. Allied Technol.* **27**, 249–264 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1080/13645706.2018.1442349>
14. Liang, H., et al.: Robotic versus video-assisted lobectomy/segmentectomy for lung cancer: a meta-analysis. *Ann. Surg.* **268**, 254–259 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1097/SLA.0000000000002346>



**6th International Conference on Nanotechnologies and Biomedical Engineering
Proceedings of ICNBME-2023, September 20–23, 2023, Chisinau, Moldova
Volume 2: Biomedical Engineering and New Technologies for Diagnosis, Treatment, and
Rehabilitation**

15. Luzzi, Luca, et al.: Robotic surgery vs. open surgery for thymectomy, a retrospective casematch study. *J. Robotic Surg.* **15**(3), 375–379 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11701-020-01109-z>
16. O’Sullivan, K.E., Kreaden, U.S., Hebert, A.E., Eaton, D., Redmond, K.C.: A systematic review of robotic versus open and video assisted thoracoscopic surgery (VATS) approaches for thymectomy. *Ann. Cardiothorac. Surg.* **8**, 174–193 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.21037/acs.2019.02.04>
17. Simillis, C., et al.: Open versus laparoscopic versus robotic versus transanal mesorectal excision for rectal cancer: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Ann. Surg.* **270**, 59–68 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1097/SLA.0000000000003227>
18. Lu, J., et al.: Assessment of robotic versus laparoscopic distal gastrectomy for gastric cancer: a randomized controlled trial. *Ann. Surg.* **273**, 858–867 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1097/SLA.0000000000004466>
19. Wang, L., et al.: Robotic versus laparoscopic roux-en-y gastric bypass for morbid obesity: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Obes. Surg.* **28**, 3691–3700 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11695-018-3458-7>
20. Guan, R., et al.: Clinical efficacy of robot-assisted versus laparoscopic liver resection: a meta analysis. *Asian J. Surg.* **42**, 19–31 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asjsur.2018.05.008>
21. Niu, X., et al.: Comparison of surgical outcomes of robot-assisted laparoscopic distal pancreatectomy versus laparoscopic and open resections: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Asian J. Surg.* **42**, 32–45 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asjsur.2018.08.011>
22. Han, C., et al.: Robotic-assisted versus laparoscopic cholecystectomy for benign gallbladder diseases: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Surg. Endosc.* **32**, 4377–4392 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00464-018-6295-9>
23. Tedesco, G., Faggiano, F.C., Leo, E., Derrico, P., Ritrovato, M.: A comparative cost analysis of robotic-assisted surgery versus laparoscopic surgery and open surgery: the necessity of investing knowledgeably. *Surg. Endosc.* **30**, 5044–5051 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00464-016-4852-7>
24. Feldstein, J., Schwander, B., Roberts, M., Coussons, H.: Cost of ownership assessment for a da Vinci robot based on US real-world data. *Int. J. Med. Robotics Comput. Assist. Surg.* **15**, e2023 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1002/rcs.2023>
25. Mahmoud, R.M.A., Youssef, A.M.A.: Design framework for robotic surgery wards at hospitals: computational implementation. *Front. Architectural Res.* **9**, 514–540 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foar.2020.05.002>
26. Fischer, S., Kisser, A.: Can the costs of a surgical robot be amortised?: *Eur. J. Pub. Health* **26**, ckw175.156 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckw175.156>
27. Wang, R.S., Ambani, S.N.: Robotic surgery training: current trends and future directions. *Urol. Clin. North Am.* **48**, 137–146 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ucl.2020.09.014>



**6th International Conference on Nanotechnologies and Biomedical Engineering
Proceedings of ICNBME-2023, September 20–23, 2023, Chisinau, Moldova
Volume 2: Biomedical Engineering and New Technologies for Diagnosis, Treatment, and
Rehabilitation**

28. Simianu, V.V., et al.: Cost-effectiveness evaluation of laparoscopic versus robotic minimally invasive colectomy. *Ann. Surg.* **272**, 334–341 (2020).

<https://doi.org/10.1097/SLA.0000000000003196>

29. Liatsikos, E., Tsaturyan, A., Kyriazis, I., Kallidonis, P., Manolopoulos, D., Magoutas, A.: Market potentials of robotic systems in medical science: analysis of the Avatera robotic system. *World J. Urol.* **40**, 283–289 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00345-021-03809-z>

30. Line Item Budget (KEN) site. <https://www.moh.gov.gr/articles/health/domes-kai-draseis-giathn-ygeia/kwdikopoihseis/709-kleista-enopoihmena-noshlia-1>

31. Greek DRG Institute Homepage. <https://instdrg.gr/>