Economic Evidence
Closure Technologies Economic Impact

Boston Scientific
Advancing science for life™

Advanced Endoscopic Techniques

Minimally invasive surgical approaches benefit patients and healthcare systems by **reducing procedural costs** in comparison to conventional surgery.[1]

Endoscopic Closure of Gastrointestinal Defects

The most **common complications** during and after gastrointestinal procedures include:[2]

Bleeding

Perforations

Prophylactic Clip Closure of Defects

Failed Haemostasis

Patients with upper gastrointestinal (UGI) bleeds experienced significantly higher 12-month health-resource utilisation and costs.[3]

Long-term economic burden associated with UGI bleeds[3]

Complications often require **re-intervention**

Mortality is less if re-interventions are avoided.

Several randomised trials have underlined how **prophylactic clip closure of defects** reduces the risk of complications – potentially resulting in cost savings by avoiding re-interventions and re-hospitalisations.[4,5,6]

A **meta-analysis** has demonstrated that prophylactic defect closure reduces the risk of complications.[7]

The **beneficial effect of clip closure** is evident in proximal colon lesions or in patients with a high risk of bleeding.[4,6]

Risk of delayed bleeding[7]

Complications can be **prevented** with **closure technologies**.[4,6,8,9,10,11]

Resolution™ Clip

MANTIS™ Clip

X-Tack™
Endoscopic HeliX Tacking System

OverStitch™
Endoscopic Suturing System

Select the right closure device for each defect considering its:

Location · Size · Shape

MANTIS™ Clip

Anchor, Mobilise and Close Approach.

MANTIS™ has the potential to require **fewer devices** to achieve **large defect closure.**[12]

Reducing closure time can lead to potential **cost savings.**[13]

X-Tack™ Endoscopic HeliX Tacking System

Enables closure of **variously sized and irregularly shaped defects.**

X-Tack™ addresses a significant unmet clinical need.

In a multicentre study, closure could not have been achieved in 24.7% of patients with an alternative device to X-Tack™ due to the defect's location, size, or shape.[14]

X-Tack™ may be used in cases **where other closure devices fail**, highlighting the importance of this new through the scope (TTS) suturing device in the armamentarium of endoscopic tools for defect closure.[15]

Complete defect closure rates were much higher than clips, reaching **99.2%** and **92.1%** for endoscopic mucosal resection (EMR) and endoscopic submucosal dissection (ESD) defects, respectively.[8]

Defect closure rates[8]

This could potentially **reduce the risk of complications** and the associated diagnostic and management costs, thereby **lowering the economic burden.[8]**

100 patients

treated with clips vs X-Tack™

No serious adverse events or procedure-related deaths.[14]

Lowering adverse event management costs

thereby delivering **economic savings.**[16]

34% reduction in **delayed bleeding.**

Potential **economic savings** for healthcare systems.

The **reduction in procedure time** and the **enhanced ease of closure** provided by X-Tack™ could result in potential cost savings.[15]

Most patients achieve complete closure with a **single X-Tack™**, **reducing the number of clips** used regardless of defect size.[14]

1

OverStitch™ Endoscopic Suturing System

OverStitch™ has a **favourable safety profile**, lowering the costs associated with managing complications and **offering potential savings.**[9]

Provides fast resolution of symptoms

allowing patients to potentially be **discharged** on the **same day** of the procedure.[16]

Prospective Multicentre European Registry

OverStitch™ achieved a closure rate of

100%

for mucosal defects.[9]

OverStitch™ can **avoid the need for re-interventions.**

In certain post-surgical gastrointestinal wall defects, OverStitch™ has been shown to **eliminate the need for more complex and costly surgical procedures.**[17]

Comparing the efficacy of two closure methods: clips and endoscopic suturing[18]

In a prospective single centre study the **ease of closure** with both procedures was assessed as **comparable** by the endoscopist.[18]

Closure technologies
provide benefits for both **patients** and **healthcare systems.**

References: 1) Jung C, Maasz S, Tarnstrӧm-Rothmund A, et al. Study of the standard direct costs of various techniques of advanced endoscopy: Comparison with surgical alternatives. Dig Liver Dis. 2018;50:1097-1101 2) Ikenberry SO, Jue TL, Anderson MA, et al. Management of upper GI bleeding. Gastrointest Endosc. 2011;73:1-7 3) Barkun AN, Moore L, Bardou M, et al. Large-scale, pragmatic, cluster randomized trial comparing haemostasis endoscopic devices for non-variceal upper gastrointestinal bleeding (UNIVERSAL trial). BMJ. 2019;364:l295 4) Manta R, Frazzoni M, Conigliaro R, et al. Clip closure Prevents Bleeding After Endoscopic Resection of Large Colonic Polyps in a Randomized Trial. Gastroenterology. 2019;157:1003-1013.e1 5) Kuwai T, Ishii M, Kaizaki R, et al. Effect of prophylactic clip closure after endoscopic submucosal dissection of colorectal tumors: a randomized controlled trial. Endoscopy. 2019;51:1123-1131 6) Ichise Y, Horiuchi A, Nakayama Y, et al. Prophylactic closure reduces the incidence of post-colonoscpolypectomy bleeding: a randomized trial. J Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2010;25:100-104 7) Yang D, Perbtani Y, Wong Kee Song LM, et al. Prophylactic closure of mucosal defects after endoscopic resection reduces adverse events: a meta-analysis. Gastrointest Endosc. 2020;91:1215-1225.e4 8) Ferlitsch M, Hassan C, Bisschops R, et al. Colorectal polyp detection and cold snare polypectomy for small polyps: monocentric, randomised, controlled, non-inferiority trial. Gut. 2017;66:100-107 9) Ryou M, Ngamruengphong S, Sethi A, et al. Endoscopic suturing for closure of large defects after endoscopic resection (with video). Gastrointest Endosc. 2016;84:1028-1033 10) Ryou M, Sethi A, Cohen J, et al. Use of a novel through-the-scope suturing device for closure of mucosal defects after endoscopic resection: a multicenter study (with video). Gastrointest Endosc. 2015;82:1-8 11) Ryou M, Thompson CC. Tissue apposition and retention with a novel endoscopic suturing device (with video). Gastrointest Endosc. 2014;80:1067-1072 12) Boston Scientific Corporation. MANTIS™ Clip Endoscopic Clip System. Instructions for Use. 2020 13) Boston Scientific Corporation. Resolution™ Clip Endoscopic Clip System. Instructions for Use. 2020 14) Boston Scientific Corporation. X-Tack™ Endoscopic HeliX Tacking Device. Instructions for Use. 2020 15) Boston Scientific Corporation. Resolution™ Clip Endoscopic Clip System. Instructions for Use. 2020 16) Boston Scientific Corporation. OverStitch™ Endoscopic Suturing System. Instructions for Use. 2020 17) Ryou M, Ngamruengphong S, Sethi A, et al. Endoscopic suturing for closure of large defects after endoscopic resection (with video). Gastrointest Endosc. 2016;84:1028-1033 18) Ryou M, Sethi A, Cohen J, et al. Use of a novel through-the-scope suturing device for closure of mucosal defects after endoscopic resection: a multicenter study (with video). Gastrointest Endosc. 2015;82:1-8

CAUTION: The law restricts these devices to sale by or on the order of a physician. Indications, contraindications, warnings, and instructions for use can be found in the product labeling supplied with each device or at www.bostonscientific.com. Not all products may be available in all countries. Please contact your Boston Scientific representative for more information.
© 2020 Boston Scientific Corporation or its affiliates. All rights reserved.

352797 X-Tack™ OverStitch™ 003344 Mantis™

Boston Scientific
Advancing science for life™