

# AcuNav Reprocessing: An Evaluation of Safety, Clinical Effectiveness and Cost Savings

Rafal Chudzik, Product Development Engineer, Research & Development, Alliance Medical Corporation, Phoenix, Arizona;  
Michael Howell, BSN, RN, Supervisor Cardiac Cath Lab, Paradise Valley Hospital, Paradise Valley, Arizona;  
Atul Mahajan, Manufacturing Engineer, Operations, Alliance Medical Corporation, Phoenix, Arizona

The principle of using ultrasound technology to obtain both morphologic and physiologic information is not new. The concept of using intracardiac phased array ultrasound to view intracardiac space was first introduced in 1990 in which relatively low-frequency transducers (~5.0MHz) were mounted on a modified endoscope, later becoming known as transesophageal probes. However, the technology proved to be mainly useful for “macro” cardiac clinical applications such as valvular stenosis, left ventricular wall motion, etc. The need for a more precise, high frequency solution arose for “micro” cardiac applications. Large transesophageal probes were not designed for, and therefore could not be used or modified to explore smaller intracardiac structures. The need for the development of a smaller, high frequency transducer has been driven by the increase in the number of interventional electrophysiology procedures being performed and the requirement for more complex cardiac assessment.<sup>1</sup>

## Ultrasound – The AcuNav Way

Using state-of-the-art technological advancements in intracardiac ultrasound applications, the AcuNav ultrasound catheter, manufactured by Siemens Medical Solutions (formerly Acuson Corporation of Mountain View, California) is a 10 French (Fr) (3.2 mm) catheter with a 110 cm insertion tube. The distal tip of the device


houses a 64-element vector phased array transducer (5.0-10.0 MHz frequency) to produce two-dimensional grayscale images, full spectral, and color Doppler imaging (pulsed, continuous wave and tissue Doppler). The catheter features dual-plane steering to enable precise catheter orientation and navigation within the chambers of the heart. Four-way steering with 160°

articulation in each direction (left, right, anterior, posterior) provides images at multiple angles. It is capable of producing high-resolution ultrasound images with 12 cm tissue penetration providing far greater anatomic and physiologic detail than what can be obtained with traditional ultrasound imaging methods. Image quality can be further optimized by adjusting the depth, gain and frequency of the signal.<sup>1</sup> The scope of this study is focused on the 10 Fr AcuNav catheter; however, the methods for reprocessing the newly introduced 8 Fr AcuNav catheter are comparable to the methods used for the 10 Fr AcuNav catheter. The quality of data for both catheters is comparable and both catheters are safe for use after reprocessing. The major difference between the two catheters is the 8 Fr catheter has a slightly thinner shaft diameter and longer shaft length. No major technological and functional changes were noted.


## Critical Components and

## Ultrasound Principles

In order to understand how to obtain



**Figure 1. Classical Reprocessing Paradigm.**



**Figure 2. Waveform Voltage Arcing Onset.**

optimal clinical performance from the AcuNav catheter, it is important to first understand basic ultrasound principles and the technology used in the construction of this device. Utilizing a 64-element phased array, the integrity of the AcuNav transducer is the single most critical component when assessing the image quality during an examination. Due to its fragile construction, the transducer is the component that is the most susceptible to malfunction or damage. Therefore, it is critical that functionality testing of the AcuNav catheter includes a thorough evaluation of the trans-

ducer acoustic stack and its performance.<sup>2</sup>

Optimal ultrasound images are created when all the elements along an array are excited simultaneously with short pulses. This creates an acoustic beam with an adequate number of acoustic lines to achieve the required axial and lateral resolution to detect spatial targets within the cardiac space. Electronic delay sequences are added in the signal processing to steer the acoustic beam over more area for sector imaging applications.<sup>2</sup>


As each element is individually excited with a small burst of energy known as a transmit pulse, the created ultrasound wave propagates through the body and is returned back as an echo after striking a target. These echoes are detected by the transducer, converted back into electrical signals and then processed by the ultrasound console creating an image. Since image and Doppler qualities are directly related to the optimal performance of each individual element within the array, it is appropriate to test AcuNav catheters on an element-by-element basis. Understanding and analyzing the performance

characteristics of each element will result in producing the best clinical performance from the AcuNav device.

The relationship between clinical performance and element integrity is dependent on the each element's ability to successfully transmit the ultrasound pulse. Transducer testing is used to determine the number of dead or weak elements, if any, within the array. Dead elements are defined as elements that are not responsive to the transmit pulse and weak elements include those that fall below an acceptance sensitivity threshold. Data has shown that as few as two to four consecutive dead elements can have a drastic negative impact on clinical imaging and Doppler capabilities.<sup>2</sup>

## **AcuNav Reprocessing – An Adapted Science**

Reprocessing AcuNav catheters has been a big success because the foundation for this science has been thoroughly tested and widely used with diagnostic electrophysiology catheters. Figure 1 illustrates the fundamental reprocessing model that has been implemented for AcuNav catheters.



**Figure 3. Example of Capacitance measurements before and after reprocessing (group 1).**

With regard to the cleanliness of the device, cleaning validations have been designed to test devices under extreme worst case conditions for bacterial, chemical and organic cleanliness as outlined in industry-accepted standards and in accordance with Technical Information Report 30 (TIR 30). With electrophysiology catheter reprocessing demonstrating proven clinical safety and effectiveness, it was suitable for the technology to be adapted to the AcuNav ultrasound catheter reprocessing. The AcuNav assembly of components and general construction, such as the handles and shafts, is so similar to EP catheters

that it was appropriate to implement similar cleaning methods for these devices.


Past studies have demonstrated that electrophysiology catheters can sustain repeated uses and resterilizations and still comply with quality control specifications.<sup>13</sup> However, to successfully reprocess catheters it is essential that comprehensive validation protocols and guidelines be implemented into the quality control inspection of finished goods.

When adapting reprocessing steps from the EP catheters to the AcuNav catheter, new technological advancements within interventional cardiac ultrasound also need


to first be understood. Comprehending the logistics and scientific principles of ultrasound energy transfer would prove to be critical in developing successful reprocessing procedures for the AcuNav catheter.

## Methods

This study included two testing groups each consisting of AcuNav ultrasound catheters that were tested as new samples and then retested after being reprocessed two times. Group 1 consisted of nine catheters that were tested as new devices to establish a baseline of comparison for substantial equivalence. Group 2 consisted of a much larger sample size of reprocessed devices. Data collection included subjecting each catheter group to different functional verification tests at various stages during a typical reprocessing sequence, which evaluated all the major potentials for improper device function. Reprocessed AcuNav catheters from group 1 were tested for two fundamental image-specific performance metrics, element sensitivity (volts peak-to-peak) and capacitance (picoFarads) before and after reprocessing. Group 2 testing



**Figure 4. Example of Sensitivity measurements before and after reprocessing (group 1).**



**Figure 5. Overall Capacitance for sample population (group 1).**

included dielectric strength, leakage current, curve articulation and visual inspection under magnification. The devices were split into two groups since testing was completed over a four-month period.

The purpose of this study was to examine the changes in these performance metrics and determine if the devices are suitable for clinical use and substantially equivalent to predicate devices. To gain an

understanding of the performance of reprocessed AcuNav catheters and challenge their durability, samples were subjected to specific functionality tests. The scope of this study was to assess functionality of the devices with the understanding that cleanliness and sterility was proven through comprehensive supplemental validations included with regulatory submissions filed with the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA).

All of the devices included in this study from group 2 have undergone one clinical use and were subjected to two reprocessing cycles at Alliance Medical Corporation (Phoenix, Arizona). Furthermore, new predicate devices were tested to establish a baseline for comparison using a statistical process control (3-sigma distribution). The performance of reprocessed catheters was quantitatively compared to original specifications of new catheters.

Additional supplementary tests such as mechanical, electrical and acoustic output were conducted, but are not included in the scope of this study. Data from those studies demonstrated substantial



**Table 1.**  
**Analysis of changes after Reprocessing, compared to intrinsic element variability (capacitance)**

<u>Capacitance</u>		
New	Reprocessed	Change
4.9%	6.0%	-1.1%

**Table 2.**  
**Analysis of changes after Reprocessing, compared to intrinsic element variability (sensitivity)**

<u>Sensitivity</u>		
New	Reprocessed	Change
19.6%	18.4%	-2.2%

Catheter tip deflections were measured against an established baseline for comparison specification derived from predicate device testing. Each tip was placed on a calibrated template that assessed the curve diameter and angle for each direction (anterior, posterior, left, right) at maximum articulation. Testing each tip in every direction ensures that the catheter will accurately and smoothly maneuver within the vascular system.

standard UL 2601-1 Medical Electrical Equipment, Part 1: General Requirements for Safety.<sup>7</sup> All tested catheters were found to be within the specification set by the industry-acceptable standard.

### Leakage Current

Quantifying the amount of leakage current associated with device use is another critical parameter that should be evaluated when reprocessing AcuNav catheters. Typically, leakage current flows from the catheter through the ground path and back to the earth ground through the ground terminal on the console power cable. However, if malfunctioning, an electrical potential can build up, and if a user is exposed to this potential, the individual

tance criteria is also required. Furthermore, leakage current is measured to ensure that direct contact with a medical device does not result in electrical shock.<sup>3</sup> Leakage current measurements were performed in accordance to the industry-accepted standard IEC 60601-1 Medical Electrical Equipment – Part 1: General Requirements for Safety and Essential Performance.<sup>6</sup> All tested catheters were found to be within the specification set by the industry-acceptable standard.

### Curve Articulation Assessment

Due to the precision required to navigate within the heart chambers, the curve angles and diameters were evaluated for each reprocessed AcuNav catheter.

### Visual Inspection

Lastly, as an extra quality step, each catheter was visually inspected under 10x magnification for surface defects and cleanliness. Devices are meticulously evaluated and each component undergoes a separate inspection before the device is packaged and sterilized. A subassembly inspection for the AcuNav catheters is an appropriate approach since it ensures that contaminants are not

**Table 3.**  
**Group 2 data analysis summary**

	<b>New</b>			<b>Reprocessed</b>		
	<b>Hipot Current (mA)</b>	<b>Leakage Current (µA)</b>	<b>Articulation</b>	<b>Hipot Current (mA)</b>	<b>Leakage Current (µA)</b>	<b>Articulation</b>
<b>Mean</b>	0.44579	9.9583	Pass	0.45368	9.3468	Pass
<b>Std</b>	0.01742	0.1273	Pass	0.01674	0.2486	Pass
<b>Range</b>	0.42 - 0.47	9.71 - 10.11	Pass	0.42 - 0.46	8.87 - 9.69	Pass
<b>% Error</b>	N/A	N/A	Pass	1.76%	6.14%	Pass
<b>95% CI</b>	(0.4373, 0.4541)	(9.8774, 10.0392)	Pass	(0.4456, 0.4617)	(9.2212, 9.4641)	Pass

**Table 4.**  
**Element-by-Element sensitivity data summary**

	<b>New</b>	<b>Reprocessed</b>
<b>N</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>576</b>
<b>(Mean (Vpp))</b>	<b>0.54061</b>	<b>0.55758</b>
<b>Difference (mean)</b>		<b>0.01697</b>
<b>Std.</b>	<b>0.0786</b>	<b>0.12723</b>
<b>Difference (Std.)</b>		<b>0.04863</b>
<b>95% CI (mean)</b>	<b>(0.48011, 0.60101)</b>	<b>(0.54717, 0.56800)</b>
<b>Difference (95% CI)</b>		<b>(0.06706, 0.03301)</b>
<b>P-Value</b>	<b>&lt;0.01</b>	<b>&lt;0.03</b>
<b>TrMean</b>	<b>0.5406</b>	<b>0.55809</b>
<b>Q1</b>	<b>0.4665</b>	<b>0.476</b>
<b>Q3</b>	<b>0.6105</b>	<b>0.6400</b>

coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) also indicates a good model fit between the empirical data for pre and post reprocessing. The most reliable  $R^2$  value that indicates how closely the estimate values for the trendline correspond to the actual data is at or near 1.

The small standard error of the mean for the testing concludes that little variation exists and would hold true if repeated samples were tested from the same population.

A small mean error results in confidence in the performance measurements and their relationships between predicate devices and reprocessed devices. The sensitivity for each individual element of the same probe can be seen in Figure 4. Due to slight alignment inconsistencies during testing, a root mean square (RMS) analysis was performed to accurately summarize the overall sensitivity error for the transducer.<sup>5</sup>

The aggregate capacitance and sensitivity values were analyzed and the results are shown in Tables 1 and 2, which compare the observed average change with the variability of the measurements both before and after reprocessing. The results indicate that the changes in capacitance and

present at interfacing or mating sections.

### Statistical Analyses

All continuous variables are reported as mean,  $\pm$  Standard Deviation, range, error and 95% confidence interval with  $\sigma = 0.05$ . Nominal variables were compared by a sample t-test, and categorical variables were summarized as percentages. Results with a  $p < 0.05$  were considered statistically significant.

### Discussion of Results

The FirstCall system provides a capacitance measurement of every element, along with a pulse-echo response against a known target. The system can also detect the failure of any element due to the number of root causes, such as broken electrical connection within the wires, lens

delamination, or debonding with array layers, etc. In this way, it is a more sensitive measurement than total acoustic power. For instance, if two of the 64 elements in the AcuNav transducer array were to fail and be completely dead, the impact on the total power would only be 2/64 or 3.1%, which is below the expected measurement repeatability for total power when measured on small devices of this type. Therefore, this demonstrates that using the FirstCall system for function testing is intrinsically a more accurate test of device integrity than an acoustic output measurement.<sup>5</sup>

As shown in Figures 3 and 4, the typical relationship between the individual transducer (probe) element capacitance and sensitivity measured before and after the two reprocessing cycles demonstrates a minimal standard deviation. In addition, the

**Table 5.  
Estimated Cost Savings**

Manufacturer	Model Number	French Size	Quantity	Estimated Acquisition	Estimated Savings with Reprocessing	Estimated Waste Reduction (lbs.)
Siemens	08255790	10F	125	\$3,000.00	\$218,750.00	162
Siemens	08267996	8F	50	\$3,000.00	\$87,500.00	65
<b>Total</b>				<b>\$306,250.00</b>	<b>\$218,750.00</b>	<b>277 lbs</b>

is acceptable as indicated by the correlation distribution bars and the linear data cluster.

sensitivity due to reprocessing are less than the intrinsic element-to-element variability of the AcuNav probes themselves, demonstrating negligible performance degradation and acceptable clinical effectiveness.

These results indicate that there is little or no change in the measured FirstCall parameters due to the reprocessing methods used at Alliance Medical Corporation. Furthermore, because the FirstCall system provides data on an individual element basis, it is a much more sensitive measurement approach for any changes in performance of the acoustic stack than, for example, total acoustic power that was evaluated in preceding studies.<sup>9</sup>

Figure 5 represents a collective capacitance analysis for the entire sample population of AcuNav catheters after two reprocessing cycles. Data shows a strong correlation between before and after reprocessing a device with minimal variability. The one device outlier in the group represents a

failure noted on a brand new catheter, and is not statistically significant in this study.

The results from the devices in group 2 are listed in Table 3. These results are representative of AcuNav catheters tested for hipot, leakage current and steerability. The percent error calculations represent the error from a reprocessed catheter, compared to a new catheter.

Finally, the sensitivity data outlined in Table 4 and Figure 6 include recordings for each individual element. Since each element plays a vital role in optimal image quality, it was appropriate to show data and how it varies independently.

The comparison in Figure 6 shows the typical relationship between the individual probe element sensitivity measured before and after the two reprocessing cycles. Since the FirstCall system uses a planar reflector, which is at a fixed offset distance from the probe face, slight alignment variations exist. Given this variable, the relationship shown

## Cost Savings and Waste Reduction

The other benefit of reprocessing the AcuNav catheter that compliments the device's safety is the significant potential for cost savings. Third-party medical device reprocessing industry has proven to save money and lessen the wasteful and negative environmental impacts of discarding devices after one use. Medical device reprocessors offer cost savings between 40 and 75%, as compared to the cost of a new device. With a high-end device like the AcuNav catheter, the savings potential results in substantial savings for a hospital with a high procedure count.

Table 5 illustrates savings potential for a facility using 15 devices per month. The data is based on an estimated average reprocessing cost of \$1,250 per AcuNav catheter reprocessed one time. Substantial additional savings opportunities exist as reprocessing cycles increase.

Furthermore, waste is also reduced with reprocessing. Reprocessing results in less waste and trash associated with new device purchases. Lastly, with an average turnaround time of eight days, inventory is quickly restocked and readily available for cases.

## Conclusion

Analytical, graphical and statistical analyses clearly demonstrate that reprocessed AcuNav catheters perform according to the original manufacturers' specifications and are substantially equivalent to predicate devices. Furthermore, reprocessing AcuNav catheters does not result in any clinical performance or safety degradation, demonstrating that reprocessed AcuNav catheters are suitable for clinical use. Data trends in supplementary studies focusing on the frequency

response, bandwidth and center frequency of reprocessed AcuNav probes also demonstrated acceptable results when compared to predicate devices. However, to ensure reprocessing success, due to the complicated nature of intracardiac ultrasound technology, a validated quality control reprocessing program should be in place to ensure clinical safe product release. Lastly, with a proven success in functionality, great cost savings opportunities exist for hospitals that take advantage reprocessing the AcuNav catheter. The significant financial and environmental benefits that are created will result in reduced medical waste in landfills and improved patient care.

## References

1. Hynes BJ, Mart C, Artman S, et al. Role of intracardiac ultrasound in interventional electrophysiology. *Curr Op Cardiol* 2004;19:52–57.
2. Weigang B, Moore W, Gessert J, et al. The

Methods and Effects of Transducer Degradation on Image Quality and the Clinical Efficacy of Diagnostic Sonography. *J Diagn Med Sonography* 2003;19:3–13.

3. Eisner L, Brown MR, Modi D. Leakage Current Standards Simplified. *MD&DI* July 2004.
4. QuadTech. Electrical Safety Testing Reference Guide. 1998.
5. Shafer M. Sonic Tech, Inc. Analysis Report on Alliance Medical Reprocessing of AcuNav Transducers: Analysis of FirstCall™ 2000 repeatability with AcuNav transducers, 2004.
6. IEC 60601-1, “Medical Electrical Equipment — Part 1: General Requirements for Safety and Essential Performance” (Geneva: International Electrotechnical Commission, 1995).
7. UL 2601-1, “Medical Electrical Equipment, Part 1: General Requirements for Safety” (Northbrook, IL: Underwriters Laboratories, 2003).
8. ANSI/AAMI ES1:1993, “Safe Current Limits for Electromedical Apparatus” (Arlington, VA: AAMI, 1993).
9. Report on acoustical measurements conducted for Alliance Medical, Inc., Sonora Medical Systems, Report number 561, pg14.
10. AAMI TIR 30, A compendium of processes, materials, test methods, and acceptance criteria for cleaning reusable devices, 2004.
11. ANSI/AAMI ST35-1991. Good Hospital Practice: Handling and Biological Decontamination of Reusable Medical Devices. ANSI/AAMI.
12. Food and Drug Administration. 1996. Labeling Reusable Medical Devices for Reprocessing in Health Care Facilities: FDA Reviewer Guidance, Office of Device Evaluation.
13. Avital B, Khan M, Krum D, et al. Repeated use of ablation catheters: A prospective study. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1993;22:1367–1372.