Dialyzer reuse: is it safe and worth it?
Reutilização do dialisador: é seguro e vale a pena?

Dialyzer reuse, the practice of using the same dialyzer for multiple hemodialysis treatments, has been in place since 1960s. While there has been a steady decline of dialyzer reuse in the United States and Europe since late 1990s, it continues to be mainstream across most of the developing world.

Dialyzer reuse involves a complicated multistep process that includes rinsing, cleaning, performance testing, and disinfection of dialyzers prior to reuse. The process requires the use of cleaning and germicidal agents that are potentially toxic, and accidental contact with these agents may expose both patients and dialysis staff to health hazards.

There are also reports of Gram-negative bacteremia outbreaks from the breakdown in infection-control systems, and even a low-level exposure to toxins and microbiological contamination may contribute to chronic inflammation. Despite these potential risks, there are no randomized-controlled trials comparing single-use and reuse practices, and the evidence from observational studies are inconsistent. There is also a concern for conflicts of interest as studies sponsored by disinfectant manufacturers tend to show single-use and reuse practices having similar health outcomes while those sponsored by dialyzer manufacturers are more prone to show reduced risk with single-use.

Notwithstanding the available evidence, given the 50 years of clinical experience with dialyzer reuse, there is a general agreement that the reuse process is likely safe when there is a strict adherence to the standards set by the Association for the Advancement of Medical Instrumentation (AAMI).

Traditionally, dialyzer reuse was employed to improve dialyzer membrane biocompatibility, particularly of cellulose membranes, and lower the risk of first-use syndromes observed in ethylene oxide-sterilized dialyzers. These advantages of reuse are now moot due to the widespread availability of biocompatible dialyzer membranes and favorable sterilization techniques.

Economic considerations, on the other hand, continue to make dialyzer reuse appealing for many dialysis service providers. Economic considerations, however, are not uniform around the world or, in many places, even within the same country. There is an argument that the cost-benefit with reuse may be negligible in areas of the world where the costs related to reuse-related personnel and safe storage space are high. The relative cost savings, however, is expected to be higher in areas where the personnel and space costs are low. Even a marginal cost-saving would be important in financially strained health systems, or in instances when patients share the cost of their dialysis care.

In this backdrop, Dr. Ribeiro and colleagues report the findings of their small cross-over study examining the differences in clinical and microbiological parameters with single-use and reuse practices. Ten patients were selected to undergo one hemodialysis treatment using the single-use practice and twelve hemodialysis treatments using the
Dialyzer reuse: is it safe and worth it?

In conclusion, the study by Dr. Ribeiro and colleagues reinforces the notion that the dialyzer reuse practice is likely safe when performed according to the standards set by the AAMI. The medical reasoning for dialyzer reuse, however, is obsolete in the current era of biocompatible dialyzers, and the potential for cost-saving is the only rationale for its continued practice. It is now imperative to conduct a systematic cost-benefit analysis of reuse practices in developing countries where any cost-saving can have an important impact in the availability of hemodialysis treatments.
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