

## Title

**The environmental impact of different gynecological treatment options: patients with heavy menstrual blood loss (HMB)**

## Problem statement

In healthcare, patients are involved in the decision-making process of their treatment. If multiple treatment options are available, doctors discuss certain characteristics, like e.g., benefits or complication rates with the patient. Based on these characteristics and in consultation with the doctor, patients can finalize their decision. We would like to know if environmental sustainability can play a role in the patients' treatment choice. For this reason, we would like to determine the environmental impact of the different treatment options for gynecological patients with heavy menstrual blood loss (HMB). This medical condition can be treated with a variety of treatment options, which makes it a suitable case study. The options include: contraception, intra-uterine device (IUD), endometrial ablation and hysterectomy.

The ultimate goal of this research is to compare the environmental impact *between* the different treatment options. In addition, we aim to identify the environmental hotspots *within* the different treatment options, in order to detect possible methods to reduce the environmental impact.

## Research question(s)

- What is the patient journey considering the different treatment options (contraception, IUD, endometrial ablation, hysterectomy)?
- What are the environmental impacts of the different treatment options for patients with HMB (contraception, IUD, endometrial ablation, hysterectomy)?
- What are the environmental hotspots within the different treatment options? How can these be reduced?

## Expected type of work

The possible work includes performing life cycle assessments, material flow analyses and mapping the patient journey for HMB.

## References

- Thiel C.L., Eckelman M., Guido R., Huddleston M., Landis A.E., Sherman J., Shrake S.O., Woods N.C., Bilec M.M. Environmental impacts of surgical procedures: life cycle assessment of hysterectomy in the United States. *Environ Sci Technol.* 2015 Feb 3;49(3):1779-86.
- Thiel C.L., Woods N.C., Bilec M.M. Strategies to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Laparoscopic Surgery. *Am J Public Health.* 2018 Apr;108(S2):S158-S164.
- Ibbotson, S., Dettmer, T., Kara, S. et al. Eco-efficiency of disposable and reusable surgical instruments—a scissors case. *Int J Life Cycle Assess* 18, 1137–1148 (2013).
- Donahue L.M., Hilton S., Bell S.G., Williams B.C., Keoleian G.A. A comparative carbon footprint analysis of disposable and reusable vaginal specula. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 2020 Aug;223(2):225.e1-225.e7.

## Commissioner details

Organization / Department: LUMC, Gynaecology/Obstetrics

Name: Kim van Nieuwenhuizen, Anne van der Eijk, Frank Willem Jansen

Email: k.e.van\_nieuwenhuizen@lumc.nl, a.c.van\_der\_eijk@lumc.nl, f.w.jansen@lumc.nl