

SubQ It!®

Evidence Based Justification for Using SubQ It! Bioabsorbable Skin Closure System		
Benefit	Evidence Supporting this Benefit	Value of this Benefit
Uses Proven technique of Set-Back Dermal sutures	Many different techniques of manual subcuticular sutures are documented. SubQ It! uses the “Set-Back Dermal” technique, first published by Kantor in 2011[1]. This technique was evaluated by Wang [2] in a prospective, randomized blinded trial published in Aug 14, 2014 which showed: superior wound eversion better cosmetic outcomes fewer spitting sutures	Improved patient outcomes.
Save time in the operating room	Both Bron [3] and Duteille [4] showed significant savings of time (e.g. 2 minutes for stapler versus 10-14 minutes for manual sutures) on the average when comparing absorbable staples to manual placement of absorbable sutures. SubQ It! is estimated to save one (1) minute per centimeter of incision length (or per incision for MIS procedures) when compared to manual bioabsorbable sutures.	At an average cost of \$62/minute (range: \$22 to \$133/min) [5], for OR time, SubQ It! can save up to \$590 per stapler including the cost of the stapler.
Reduce risk of infection	Fox, et.al [6] reported wound complications including infections at 4.7% for subcuticular absorbable sutures and 11.5% for metal staples (P=0.003). Sharma [7] and Kobayashi [8] found that absorbable staples or absorbable sutures had less incidence of wound infection compared to metal staples and non-absorbable sutures.	Cost to treat Surgical Site Infections (SSI) average \$10,443 per incident [9] (range from \$400 to over \$30,000) [10].
Avoid need and cost to return to remove staples	Metal staples must be removed. This is done by a visiting nurse, or an earlier-than-needed office-visit, or even an extra day in the hospital (particularly common for C-sections[11]). In addition to the costs, patients report anxiety over having metal staples removed. SubQ It! bioabsorbable fasteners provide the benefit of not requiring removal.	Savings of \$16-200, per procedure direct and indirect costs of removing metal staples [12].

SubQ It! ®

Reduce risk of needle-stick	SubQ It! provides the inherent safety of a stapler over manual sutures with no added risk to patient or surgeon.	Sutures account for 19% of the 600,000 to 800,000 needle-stick injuries per year with an estimated cost of \$861 per incident [13].
Unique fastener minimizes tissue trauma, reduces the body's reaction to the suture	Mechanical tension on the wound has been identified as a leading cause of hypertrophic scarring [14]. The barbs of the SubQ It! fastener engage the tissue without a crushing action and are relatively far from the cut edge, where the vascular bed is undisturbed, minimizing the body's reaction to the suture.	At least one case has been reported where a patient with a history of hypertrophic scarring had excellent results when a C-section was closed with SubQ It! [15]

References

- [1] Kantor, Jonathan, "Letters to the Editor", J. American Academy Dermatology, 2010 Feb, pg 352-353,
- [2] Wang AS, Kleinerman, R, Armstrong, AW, Fitzmaurice, S, Pascucci A, Awasthi S, Ratnarathorn M, Sivamani R, King TH, Eisen DB, "Set-back versus buried vertical mattress suturing: Results of a randomized blinded trial", J Am Acad Dermatol, 2015 April, 72(4), 674-680,
- [3] Bron T, Zakine G. "Placement of Absorbable Dermal Staples in Mammoplasty and Abdominoplasty: A 12-Month Prospective Study of 60 Patients", Aesthet Surg J. Apr 2016;36(4);459-68.
- [4] Duteille F, Rouif M, Alfandari B, Andreoletti JB, Sinna R, Laurent B, Perrot P., "Reduction of skin closure time without loss of healing quality: a multicenter prospective study in 100 patients comparing the use of Insoorb absorbable staples with absorbable thread for dermal suture.", Surg Innov. Feb 2013; 20 (1);70-3.
- [5] Macario, Alex, M.D. M.B.A. "What does one minute of operating room time cost?", Journal of Clinical Anesthesia (2010) 22, 233-236.
- [6] Fox NS, Melka S, Miller J, et al. Suture Compared With Staple Closure of Skin Incision for High-Order Cesarean Deliveries. Obstetrics and Gynecology. 2018 Mar;131(3):523-528. doi: 10.1097/AOG.0000000000002484.

SubQ It! ®

[7] Sharma C, Verma A, Soni A, Thusoo M, Mahajan VK, Verma S., “A randomized controlled trial comparing cosmetic outcome after skin closure with 'staples' or 'subcuticular sutures' in emergency cesarean section”, Arch Gynecol Obstet. Oct 2014; 290(4): 655-9.

[8] Kobayashi S, Ito M, Sugito M, Kobayashi A, Nishizawa Y, Saito N. “Association between incisional surgical site infection and the type of skin closure after stoma closure”, Surg Today. Jul 2011; 41(7):941-5.

[9] DJ Anderson, KB Kirkland, KS Kaye, Thacker PA, Kanafani ZA, Auten G, Sexton DJ. “Underresourced Hospital Infection Control and Prevention Programs: Penny Wise, Pound Foolish?”, Infection Control and Hospital Epidemiology. 2007 July. 28;7:767-73.

[10] Urban JA, Cost analysis of surgical site infections, Surg Infect (Larchmt), 2006;7 Suppl 1:S19-22.

[11] Nathan S. Fox, Stephanie Melka, James Miller, Samuel Bender, Michael Silverstein, Daniel H. Saltzman, and Andrei Rebarber, “Suture Compared with Staple Closure of Skin Incision for High-Order Cesarean Deliveries”, Obstetrics & Gynecology Vol. 131, No. 3, March 2018, 523-528 (see Table 2).

[12] “Cost to remove metal staples”, \$16 calculated at 15 minutes at \$50/hour for removal plus cost of metal skin stapler removal kit; \$200 based on cost to patient of office visit: PCP, adult, no complications, Aug 2018, internal report.

[13] Alice Mannocci, Gabriella De Carli, Virginia Di Bari, Rosella Saulle, Brigid Unim, Nicola Nicolotti, Lorenzo Carbonari, Vincenzo Puro, Giuseppe La Torre, “How Much do Needlestick Injuries Cost? A Systematic Review of the Economic Evaluations of Needlestick and Sharps Injuries Among Healthcare Personnel,” Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2016;37:635–646.

[14] Ogawa R, “Keloid and hypertrophic scarring may result from a mechanoreceptor or mechanosensitive nociceptor disorder”, Med Hypotheses, 2008 Oct: 71(4): 493-500. doi 10.1016/j.mehy.2008.05.020. Epub 2008 Jul 9.

[15] Singer, S. “Case Study: Use of SubQ It! in Keloid-sensitive patient”, 2018, on file.