Design Inputs for: Device for the Controlled Reduction of Pediatric Intussusception

| | | | | nctional formance | nstraint ysician | tient solital | spital | | ed | Ĕ | st alysis | monstration | bection |
|----------|-------------------------|--|---|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|----------------|--|--------|--|--------------|-------------|---|
| C | ategory | Parameter Product Re | Comment | Pel | 8 8 2 | | 2 t M | letric E | 5 2 | ⁸ Reference | Method of \ | erification | 2 Verification Description |
| A1 | | pressure generation range | how much pressure do we need to generate in system | | | User | [2 | 20 mmHg, >=240 mmHg) | Nating | standard procedure used today goes to 120mmHg, this is double; (Shiels, 1993) | Wiethod of V | ernication | hook system up to gauge pressure indicator and read max pressure capable of being generated |
| A2 | Pressure Regulation | pressure delivery error | how much fluctuation? | | | | es | stimate: +/- 10 mmHg | | interviews suggest that fluctuations are large (as high as 100 mmHg). We hypothesize that smaller fluctuations will lead to better outcomes. This will require post prototype construction testing | | | hook system up to gauge pressure indicator and read error at various pressure settings |
| A3 | | pressure cut-off | what causes perforation? mechanical blowout valve; this is the worst case scenario; there should be 2 pressure safety systems in place before this safety feature will be reached | | | | es | stimate: 500 mmHg | | this will be a mechanical pressure blow out, which should only ever kick in if there is a failure mode. Shiels 1993 suggests that pressure should be <270 mmHg, so we increase the value for system failure | | | intentionally over-pressure system. Insure that system dumps pressure |
| B1 | | pressure retention in intestine | must be capable of holding/sealing against a pressure in intestine such that our flow rate can maintain pressure | | | | sh | nould seal to 140 mmHg | | standard procedure used today goes to 120mmHg, this adds a slight safety factor for spikes due to coughing, etc Some leakage above that pressure is acceptable; (Shiels, 1995), (Shiels, 1993), (Kaiser, 2007) | | | ensure that pressure is held in test bed intestine (ASTM D1456 - rubber elongation) |
| B2 | | enema tip size | must be insertable into rectum of child, should come in multiple sizes to satisfy patient diversity | | | | at | t minimum 24 French and 40 French sizes | | tips which satisfy B2 and B3 for the full range of infant anus sizes from 0-2 years old; prior art offers 24 and 40 French sizes (Grattan-Smith. 2015: Shiels. 1991) | | | ensure that tip can be inserted into test bed rectum and conforms to expected dimension |
| в3 | Rectal Device Interface | enema tip/catheter slip-out pressure | how much pressure can be applied prior to tip/catheter slip out | | | | 50 | 00 mmHg | | standard 140 mmHg + significant safety factor for tugging on line, child movement, Valsalva maneuver, etc will require additional testing post prototype fabrication to determine exact value necessary (Shiels, 1995; Shiels, 1991; Mahaffey, 2015) | | | pressurize test bed rectum and ensure that tip stays inserted without user intervention |
| В4 | | enema tip insertion length | must be capable of being inserted at least 3 inches | | | | >3 | 3 inches | | current insertion length is generally 3 inches or less (Grattan-Smith, 2015; Mahaffey, 2015) | | | measure insertable length |
| C1 | | storage and portability | must be capable of being stored and easily moved | | | | we | reight is comfortable for transport by nurses (<10lbs); size no more than prior art case (11inx9inx4in) | | must be easy to use and fit in the same space as prior art. Interview with Grattan-Smith and visit to hospital allowed physical contact with Shiels device case (Grattan-Smith, 2015; Shiels, 1995) | | | will ensure size and weight are no larger than prior art case; will survey nurses for comfort level moving device |
| C2 | Physical Embodiment | compatiblity with non-specified tips | connectors out of pressure control system should be industry standard | | | | lu | er lock compatible | | ISO 594 (luer-lock) | | | inspection to ISO specifications |
| СЗ | | visual intimidation | should minimize fear and intimidation | | | | by be | y survey would person (patient parent, physician, nurse) e less comfortable than with the predicate device | | (Grattan-Smith, 2015; Mahaffey, 2015) | | | survey |
| E1 | Environmental | environmental impact | should minimize impact on the environment | | | | co N | onform to ISO 14040 and ISO 14044 (Envirenmental Managment / Lifecycle analysis) | | ISO 14040 and ISO 14044 (Envirenmental Managment / Lifecycle analysis) | | | process and design review |
| F1 | Starility | aseptic catheter/enema tip and tube | enema tip and tube should be clean | | | | co pr | onform to ISO 13408 (asptic processing of healthcare roducts) | | ISO 13408 (asptic processing of healthcare products) | | | bioburden, visual inspection |
| F2 | Sterinty | flow back of liquid from patient | no fluid should return from the patient into the device with a pressure gradient up to 500 mmHg | | | | ze pr | ero flow of liquid water from patient into device at A3 ressure (500 mmHg) | | dirty fluid is exiting the child, this must not be passed into the device and onto the next patient (Mahaffey, 2015) | | | will verify by colored water liquid and vapor being pushed through filter mechanism at A3 pressure |
| G1 | | reduction time | should be equivalent or better to current device when used on test bed | | | | tir eq | me to reduction of intussusception on device less than or qual to prior art when compared on our test bed | | device must be better than the prior art; data will be comparative on test bed (Shiels, 1992) | | | have a trained physician perform reduction on test bed using existing device and new device compare time to successful reductions |
| G2 | Performance | subjectively preferred by physicians | by survey of physicians, use is preferred by physicians on test bed | | | | by pr | y survey physicians statistically prefer our device to the rior art when compared on a test bed | | device must be better than the prior art; data will be comparative on test bed (Shiels, 1992) | | | user trial/survey |
| G3 | | subjectively preferred by nurses | by survey of nurses, use is preferred by nurses on test bed | | | | by ar | y survey nurses statistically prefer our device to the prior rt when compared on a test bed | | device must be better than the prior art; data will be comparative on test bed (Shiels, 1992) | | | user trial/survey |
| G4 | | reduction rate | should have a higher rate of successful reduction than prior art | | | | sh | nould have a higher rate of successful reduction than prior | | device must be better than the prior art; data will be comparative on test bed (Shiels, 1992) | | | have a trained physician perform reduction on test bed using existing device and new device compare number |
| H1 | | perforation prevelance | should not lead to increased perforations compared to current device; ideally would notify if a perforation does occur | | | | m co in | anthematically, pressure should be delivered in a more ontrolled fashion; tests on test bed should show no crease in perforations when compared to previous art. | Ī | device must be better than the prior art; data will be comparative on test bed (Shiels, 1992) | | | have a trained physician perform reduction on test bed using existing device and new device compare number of perforations. Guarantee mathematically that the pressure we deliver is in no way more likely cause perforations |
| Н2 | Safety | emergency stop | drops air pressure to zero immediately after activation | | | | co de po | ompliant with ISO 13850 (emergency stops) / will epressurize intestine at system max exit flow rate; kill all ower to system | | ISO 13850 (emergency stops) | | | will measure pressure output from device, time to depressurize, proper electrical state |
| Н3 | | parameter indications | clear indication of set parameters and easy adjustment of said parameters | | | | ea | asy for a new user to understand the set parameters | | ISO 9241 (ergonomics of human-system interaction), ISO 11581 (symbols for computer interfaces) | | | user trials |
| 11 | Poliability/Maintonanco | device health indication | comparative testing using multiple sensors to ensure accurate sensor readouts. Self test solenoids | | | | ab | ble to detect failure of critical components | | the device should minimize the affects of relevant failure modes | | | verify that system has been designed in a way as to minimized affects of relevant failure modes. Test simulated failure modes. |
| 13 | | cleanability | should be sealed against wash-down | | | | m | nust be designed for cleanability | | current ASTM WK31799 (medical device cleanability) is in progress; will have to develop in house method | | | contaminate and mark device surface; wash down device; Does any fluid enter the case? Is there any damage? Is there any remaining marking or bioburden? |
| J1 | Life Span | disposable shelf life | disposable component should be able to last for 10 years | | | | di | isposable component should be able to last for 10 years | | current BARD catheter lifespan | | | accelerated aging |
| J2 | | capital device lifespan | primary device should be able to last for 10 years | | | | pr | rimary device should be able to last for 10 years | | based on Welch Allyn hand aneroid (competitive product) warranty period | | | accelerated aging combined with simulated cycles |
| К1 | Packaging | packaging should not compromise device | it should be easy to open packaging and move straight to use. Should adequately protect device from mechanical and biological attack | | | | co m de | onforms to ISO 11607 (packaging for terminally sterilized edical devices), including adequate protection for the evice; also allows ease of use of packaging | | ISO 11607 (packaging for terminally sterilized medical devices) | | | conformance to standard for protection and user testing for ease of use. |
| К2 | | labeling should allow intuitive use | easy to read, short instructions for use (IFU) | | | | co pa | onforms to ISO 15223 (symbols for medical device ackaging) standard with clear labeling | | ISO 15223 (symbols for medical device packaging) | | | user trials and spec conformance |
| 11 | Interfacing Devices | electro-magnetic interference (EMI) | conforms to IEC 6060; ensure electro-magnetic interference is at a safe level; does not interfere with fluoroscopy or other relevant devices in the fluoroscopy suite | | | | co de | onforms to IEC 60601 (guide for electronic medical evices) | | IEC 6061 (guide for electronic medical devices) | | | will test per standard |
| L2 | | should interface with standard hospital air source | quick disconnect to interface with 1/4 NPT and barb for tube | | | | m 22 | nust interface with 1/4 NPT and soft tube (barb fitting), ISO 28 (BPT) fitting | | ANSI B1.20.1 (NPT), ISO 228 (BPT), ASME B16 (pipe fittings) | | | test against specifications |
| M1 | | intuitive use | a standard trained radiologist should be able to figure out the interface with no instruction; we will allow a basic IFU on the device | | | | co su in | onforms to standard practices for interface design; by urvey (physicians statistically agreeing on device being utuitive to use) | | ISO 11581 (symbols for computer interfaces); ISO 20282 (ease of operation of everyday devices); ISO 9241 (ergonomics of human-system interaction); IEC 62366:2007 (medical device usability); AAMI- HE75 (human factors for medical devices) | | | user trials/standard verification |
| M2 | | glove compatibility | minimize static touch interfaces, maximize tactile feedback | | | | all | l systems must function fully with gloves | | interviews suggest that all users are fully gloved and that the environment becomes very messy with bowel fluid exiting the patient (Grattan-Smith, 2015; Mahaffey, 2015) | | | intelligent design and user trials |
| МЗ | | status indicator | should have clear status indicator which can be read from at least 6 feet, along with more detailed data up close | | | | in | dicator which can be read from at least 6 feet | | IEC 60601-1-6 (usability of medical electrical equipment); ISO 9241 (ergonomics of human-system interaction) | | | design for easy reading of status, survey users |
| M4 M5 | User Experience | distractions | no alarms; no flashing | | | | nc | o alarms or flashing lights; simple notification of blow off | | IEC 62366:2007 (medical device usability); AAMI-HE75 (human factors for medical devices); Kaye, 2000 (FDA) | | | design per standards |
| | | physical work | currently physicians and nurses are required to exert themselves significantly to perform a successful reduction; this causes fatigue | | | | sh pr | nould reduce physical exertion when compared with the redicate device | | interview with nurse and physician indicated excessive physical exertion (Grattan-Smith, 2015; Mahaffey, 2015) | | | user trials on test bed comparing new and predicate device for fatigue |
| M6 | | tactile feedback | a way for the physician to make real the pressure via feedback and perhaps interact directly | | | | sh (e | nould provide adequate tactile feedback, using ISO 9241 ergonomics of human-system interaction) as guidance | | ISO 9241 (ergonomics of human-system interaction) | | | analysis against standard practices along with user trials |
| М7 | | feedback for end states | the physician should easily know if rupture or reduction has occurred | | | | wi pe | III notify radiologist if an end state (reduction or erforation) has occurred | | (Grattan-Smith, 2015; Mahaffey, 2015) | | | compare ability of device to predict end states to actual presence of end states |
| M8 | | instructions for use (IFU) | easily understood IFU | | | | co | onforms to ISO 37 (IFUs), is easy for new users to use | | ISO 37 (IFUs) | | | compatibility with specifications and user trial |
| N1 | Regulatory | biocompatibility | general medical stuff | | | | en | nsure materials are biocompatible over device lifespan | | ISO 10993 (biological evaluation of medical Devices), USP VI (implantable materials) | | | analysis of known material properties and accelerated aging |
| N3 | | unique device identification (UDI) compliance | plan for upcoming UDI guidance implementation ability to plug in a USB drive and extract a coy file with pressure duration | | | | ev | very device uniquely identified per FDA guidance | | FDA guidance on UDI | | | design in UDI and inspect |
| 01 | Research | data storage capability | date and other relevant data | | | | pr | ressure, duration, date and other relevant data | | IEC 62680 (USB) | | | successfully place patient information less data onto standard USB storage device |