REUSE OF SINGLE-USE MEDICAL DEVICES: BRIDGING THE POLICY GAP

A Comprehensive Consensus White Paper on Technical, Ethical, Legal, and Regulatory Pathways for India

Published by: Institute of Medicine and Law (IML)
Context: 10th National Convention on Medicine and Law (NCML 2025)
Date of Formulation: June 2026

Executive Summary

The healthcare delivery system in India operates under a severe dual strain: the absolute mandate to ensure uncompromised patient safety and the socioeconomic necessity to lower the cost of complex, life-saving procedures. This friction is nowhere more visible than in the reuse and reprocessing of Single-Use Devices (SUDs). Marked as "single-use" by manufacturers, a massive percentage of high-cost items—ranging from hemodialyzers to cardiac electrophysiology catheters—are systematically reprocessed and reused across Indian public and private hospitals.

Currently, India faces a critical regulatory vacuum. While the Central Drugs Standard Control Organisation (CDSCO) and the Drugs and Cosmetics Act remain silent or prohibitively ambiguous on reuse, the ground reality reflects an institutional "conspiracy of silence." Hospitals reuse these items out of clinical and economic compulsion to expand patient access, yet they operate in a legal gray zone that exposes medical professionals to severe liabilities under tort, consumer protection, and criminal laws.

This White Paper, conceptualized during the 10th edition of the National Convention on Medicine and Law, synthesizes the insights of distinguished jurists, leading clinicians, patient advocacy groups, industry representatives, and quality assurance experts. It illuminates a structured pathway away from unregulated, hidden practices toward an evidence-based, legally defensible, and clinically safe national policy framework tailored specifically to the harsh realities of the Indian diaspora.

1. Conceptual & Contextual Framework

The National Convention on Medicine and Law (NCML), initiated in 2015 by the Institute of Medicine and Law in collaboration with Dr. Barun Nayak, has served as a pivotal annual multi-stakeholder platform to address critical gaps where healthcare policy fails to keep pace with rapid medical advances. Over the past decade, the NCML has successfully driven impactful legislative and procedural changes, including the formalization of virtual autopsies, the creation of standardized laws for ambulances, the enactment of protection frameworks against violence targeting doctors, and the delinking of brain stem death from organ donation mandates.

The 10th edition addresses the unresolved crisis of SUD reuse. Globally, the pressure to expand medical access, curb healthcare expenditure, and drastically lower the toxic accumulation of medical plastic waste has forced public health systems to re-evaluate manufacturer instructions. In India, where out-of-pocket expenditure remains a dominant hurdle for the masses, the absence of a uniform, centralized standard leaves clinicians caught between the risk of medical negligence litigation and the absolute denial of treatment to impoverished patients. This document seeks to bridge that gap by proposing an equilibrium that respects manufacturer design constraints while prioritizing public interest, transparency, and clinical excellence.

2. Technical & Operational Typologies

A fundamental source of legal and operational confusion within Indian healthcare institutions is the blurred boundary between distinct device lifecycles. To establish an effective regulatory dialogue, policy makers must strictly separate three concepts as defined by convention experts:

Classification	Technical Definition	Regulatory Ownership
Refurbished Equipment	An older, pre-owned medical device that exhibits specific operational defects. The machine is remodeled, repaired, and recalibrated directly within a factory setting, receiving an official certification that its performance matches its original factory specifications.	Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM) / Certified Factory
Remanufactured Device	An extensive overhaul process where a machine or complex device is completely disassembled. Its internal components are heavily replaced or modified, and the unit is re-assembled. It frequently performs at levels equal to or exceeding its original specifications.	Licensed Remanufacturing Entity
Reprocessed SUD	An item originally designated for single-use that undergoes a thoroughly validated sequence of rigorous cleaning, chemical/thermal decontamination, sterilization, and structural/functional testing to ensure it can be safely used again in a clinical procedure.	In-house Hospital CSSD or Licensed Third-Party Reprocessor

3. The Ground Reality: Economic Necessities vs. Safety Mandates

The medical and operational reality across India presents an unavoidable truth: the informal, systemic reuse of single-use devices occurs daily in approximately **40% to 60%** of high-cost specialized procedures. Clinicians and hospital administrators do not engage in this practice by preference, but by socioeconomic compulsion.

A. Cardiology and Emergency Medicine

In high-volume interventions such as Percutaneous Transluminal Coronary Angioplasty (PTCA), imported devices like cardiac catheters, guide wires, electrophysiology catheters, and endoscopic clips are extraordinarily expensive. A new imported cardiac catheter typically retails between **₹1,80,000 and ₹3,50,000**. Following safe, institutional reprocessing protocols, the functional cost of that exact device plummets to a bracket of **₹40,000 to ₹80,000**. For nearly 80% of the patient demographic in India, forcing the use of a brand-new device is functionally equivalent to completely denying the procedure, directly impacting patient survival.

B. Nephrology and Renal Care

The field of nephrology stands as an exceptional model where reuse has achieved open clinical legitimacy. High-flux dialyzers and antibody absorption filters used during kidney transplants cost thousands to lakhs of rupees. Because renal failure requires continuous, multi-weekly hemodialysis, purchasing a new dializer for every single session is economically impossible for the average citizen.

Recognizing this, the Government of India has implicitly accepted the safety and efficacy of reuse. In public-private partnership (PPP) hemodialysis tenders floated by various state health missions, the government routinely embeds specific clauses detailing the mandatory minimum number of times a single dializer filter must be reprocessed and reused to control state expenditures. Extensive domestic and international peer-reviewed publications have robustly verified that when proper validation steps are executed, dializer reuse maintains absolute therapeutic efficacy with zero escalation in patient risk profiles.

Case Study: The Aravind Eye Care System Model

The Aravind Eye Care System provides compelling, peer-reviewed empirical proof that structured, high-volume reuse of single-use devices can match or exceed Western safety benchmarks while dramatically reducing costs and environmental degradation.

- **Surgical Volumes:** Operating a massive network of 69 hospitals, Aravind handles over 6.1 million outpatient visits and performs 734,000 ophthalmic procedures annually, including 450,000 cataract surgeries. Half of these are given entirely free or heavily subsidized.
- **The Core Protocol:** Aravind utilizes a system of short-cycle steam sterilization alongside the continuous, validated reuse of single-use surgical gloves, solutions, phacoemulsification tubings, and cassettes.
- **Safety & Infection Control Outcomes:** In a landmark study analyzing 1 million consecutive surgeries where single-use phaco cassettes were reprocessed and used for up to 10 cases, the post-operative endophthalmitis rate was sustained at a spectacular **less than 1 per 10,000 surgeries (<0.01%)**. This infection rate is drastically superior to published data from the United States and the United Kingdom, where single-use-only mandates are strictly legally enforced.
- **Environmental Sustainability:** An environmental audit conducted by a Fulbright scholar revealed that while a standard cataract surgery in the US generates between 2.5 to 5.0 kilograms of solid hazardous waste, the Aravind model generates a mere **40 grams of hazardous waste**—a 20-fold reduction in carbon footprint.

4. Multilateral Stakeholder Analysis

The debate surrounding the formalization of an SUD reprocessing framework features highly polarized arguments from five core stakeholder domains:

A. The Clinical Perspective

Led by bodies like the Consortium of Accredited Healthcare Organizations (CAHO), senior clinicians maintain that if technology can prove a reprocessed device is functionally identical and microbiologically sterile, reuse is an ethical victory for patient access. The primary anxieties for doctors are twofold: how to safely bypass the arbitrary "single-use" directive stamped on packaging by international manufacturers, and how to protect themselves from legal liability if an inherent material defect causes a device to fail during its second or third use.

B. The Medical Technology Industry Perspective

Represented by global industry bodies like the Medical Technology Association of India (MTaI) and domestic groups like the Association of Indian Medical Device Industry (AiMeD), manufacturers argue that the "single-use" label is a scientific classification, not a commercial trick. Many advanced devices are

engineered with ultra-fine microlumens, delicate hydrophilic or drug-eluting coatings, and epoxy-bonded joints that structurally degrade when subjected to repeated autoclaving heat or aggressive chemical disinfectants.

Industry experts highlight the severe risk of cross-contamination from highly resilient pathogens (such as prions) and residual chemical toxicity from cleaning agents. Furthermore, they note a critical break in the engineering accountability chain: if a hospital processes a device 18 times and it mechanically fractures inside a patient during the 18th procedure, the manufacturer is routinely blamed for a device malfunction, despite the device being operated far outside its validated engineering limits.

C. Patient Advocacy & Trust Perspective

Core committees representing Patients for Patient Safety initiatives emphasize that patients do not fundamentally fear the concept of reprocessed devices; what they fear is **hidden reuse and predatory billing**. An acute ethical crisis occurs when a hospital utilizes a reprocessed catheter costing a fraction of its retail price, but bills the patient or the insurance company for the cost of a brand-new, premium device. Transparency, mandatory open disclosure, and a strict separation of pricing metrics are non-negotiable prerequisites to maintaining public trust.

D. Quality Assurance and Accreditation Bodies

Former and current representatives from the National Accreditation Board for Laboratories (NABL) and the National Accreditation Board for Hospitals (NABH) highlight severe gaps in technical training at the grassroots level. Audits reveal that many central sterile supply department (CSSD) technicians lack clear, standardized training—such as prematurely turning off autoclaves at 114°C instead of waiting for the scientifically required 121°C necessary to eliminate highly resistant spores. While NABH standards require hospitals to document an internal reuse policy, the current lack of a centralized national guideline forces hospitals to draft protocols completely at their own discretion, leading to dangerous variances in quality.

5. Comparative Global Regulatory Landscape

To formulate an India-specific policy, the regulator must closely examine the divergent legal pathways carved out by international jurisdictions:

Jurisdiction	Regulatory & Legal Framework	Impact & Precedent
United States (US FDA)	Fully permits and regulates reuse. Hospitals and specialized third-party reprocessors are legally treated as "manufacturers." They must submit intensive pre-market notifications (510k), validate data on maximum safe reuse cycles, and track every device via Unique Device Identification (UDI) codes. Devices are stratified into Class I, II, and III based on risk criticality.	Highly successful ecosystem; drove down the purchase price of new devices by 15-30% due to stiff market competition from reprocessed units.
United Kingdom (MHRA)	Does not explicitly ban reuse but issues severe legal disincentives. The MHRA mandates that any institution that reststerilizes and reuses an SUD against manufacturer instructions shifts 100% of product liability onto itself, assuming the identical legal obligations of the original OEM.	Forces extreme institutional caution; shifts the entire burden of litigation to the hospital's legal and financial reserves.
Germany	Maintains a highly pragmatic, uniform approach. The regulatory framework does not distinguish between whether a device is labeled as reusable or single-use by the manufacturer. Instead, it enforces identical, rigorous validation and decontamination rules across both classes.	Removes commercial labels and anchors policy entirely onto localized, objective scientific testing standards.
France & China	Historically issued absolute, explicit statutory bans on the reuse of any medical device marked for single-use, backed by apex constitutional court rulings.	France has recently launched a highly controlled, 2-year data-driven national pilot project to evaluate shifting from a total ban to a regulated pathway.
India	Total legislative silence. The Drug and Cosmetics Act contains no provision acknowledging or defining the parameters of SUD reprocessing. Individual hospitals operate entirely on localized, unvalidated internal discretion.	Creates a pervasive "gray market," leaving clinicians exposed to massive litigation while ignoring widespread informal reuse.

6. Legal Vulnerabilities & The Consent Dilemma

In the eyes of the Supreme Court of India and the broader legal fraternity, the current framework leaves healthcare providers heavily exposed. From a strict tort and consumer law perspective, if a hospital reuses an item explicitly marked as single-use without specific regulatory protection, and a patient suffers an adverse event, proving a deviation from the standard of care is straightforward for a claimant.

Legal scholars point out that the absence of statutory law does not absolute clinicians; rather, it places the entire burden of proof on their shoulders. When disputes reach the courts, judges rely heavily on judicial precedents regarding informed consent, most notably the landmark judgment in **Samira Kohli v. Dr. Prabha Manchanda (2008)**. The Supreme Court established that consent must be specific, intelligent, and real. In public and government hospital settings, where patients wait in grueling lines for months to access an operating theater, the legal fraternity questions whether a patient can truly give "free and uncoerced" consent for a reprocessed device when the alternative is a total denial of care.

The danger of regulatory silence is further underscored by extreme corporate malpractices, such as the widely publicized Khyati Hospital fraud in Ahmedabad. In that instance, institutions weaponized a total lack of transparency to perform unnecessary procedures and exploit government schemes like the Ayushman Bharat (PM-JAY) initiative, leading to massive public outcry and criminal prosecutions. Unregulated reuse creates an environment where financial greed can easily masquerade as cost-effective healthcare. Transparency is the only mechanism capable of keeping this systemic vulnerability in check.

7. Proposed National Policy Roadmap: Core Pillars

To transition India away from a hazardous "conspiracy of silence" toward an internationally respected, transparent medical infrastructure, the Convention proposes a phased, tightly regulated, and India-specific National Policy framework anchored on five core pillars:

Pillar 1: Multidisciplinary Device Categorization ("The Green List")

The central government must urgently establish a permanent, independent regulatory board under the CDSCO, comprising senior clinicians, biomedical engineers, advanced microbiologists, quality auditors, and patient representatives. This board must explicitly move away from blind reliance on manufacturer labels. It must scientifically evaluate every device type to publish a national **"Green List"** of single-use devices that are structurally, chemically, and thermally capable of undergoing reprocessing, alongside a binding cap on the maximum number of safe reuse cycles. Critical, high-risk items (Class III/critical implants) must face an absolute, non-negotiable ban on reuse.

Pillar 2: Formal Licensing of Reprocessing Entities

Reprocessing can no longer remain an unmonitored, back-room hospital activity. India must adopt the US framework: any entity engaged in reprocessing—whether an advanced centralized hospital CSSD or a specialized third-party commercial vendor—must obtain a formal manufacturing-level license from the CDSCO. This license must mandate real-time functional testing, material stress validation, and complete alignment with strict international decontamination protocols.

Pillar 3: UDI Integration and Mandatory Adverse Event Reporting

Every single device cleared for the national Green List must be laser-etched with a serialized **Unique Device Identification (UDI)** barcode. This barcode must track the device's entire lifecycle: the exact date of its original use, the specific technician who executed each reprocessing cycle, the validation data of

sterilization, and the identity of every patient exposed to that specific unit. Concurrently, reporting to the Materiovigilance Programme of India (MVPI) under the Indian Pharmacopoeia Commission must transition from a voluntary system to a strict, legally binding mandate for all accredited healthcare institutions, with severe penalties for non-disclosure.

Pillar 4: Dual-Tiered Pricing Transparency and Financial Equity

To eradicate the unethical practice of billing premium rates for reprocessed items, the national healthcare framework must enforce a mandatory two-tiered pricing structure. Hospitals must maintain entirely separate billing codes and distinct lines on financial invoices for "Brand New OEM Devices" versus "Validated Reprocessed Green-List Devices." The massive cost savings generated by reprocessing must, by law, be passed directly to the ultimate payer—the patient or the public/private insurer—thereby completely eliminating the commercial incentive for covert reuse.

Pillar 5: Standardized Informed Consent Pathways

Informed consent must be radically standardized. Every hospital utilizing a Green-List device must execute a dedicated, standalone disclosure form available in all local languages. This form must clearly state that a validated, certified reprocessed device is being proposed, detail the exact scientific safety data backing the device, clearly outline the cost differential, and explicitly preserve the patient's absolute right to refuse and demand a brand-new device if they choose to bear the economic difference.

8. Conclusion & Call to Action

The practice of reusing single-use medical devices in India is an open reality, driven by the structural economics of our healthcare ecosystem. Continuing to maintain total regulatory silence does not protect patient lives; it merely abdicates state responsibility, drives safe practices underground, and leaves ethical medical practitioners exposed to severe legal vulnerabilities.

The path forward requires courageous, collaborative, and immediate policy intervention. By institutionalizing the core pillars outlined in this White Paper—anchored on rigorous scientific validation, mandatory UDI traceability, uncompromising quality audits, and absolute financial transparency—India can build a regulatory model that safely balances affordability with patient safety. This framework will protect medical professionals, preserve public trust, and serve as an exemplary model for the entire developing world.

Justice Ravi R. Tripathi (Retd.)
Chairperson, National Convention on Medicine and Law
Former Judge, Gujarat High Court

Dr. Barun Nayak
Convenor, National Convention on Medicine and Law
Institute of Medicine and Law