

# Study Protocol: A Scoping Review on Costing Methodologies in Robotic Ventral Hernia Repair

Kristian Als Nielsen<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Karsten Kaiser<sup>2,3</sup>, Per Helligsø<sup>1</sup>, Michael Festersen Nielsen<sup>1,2,4¶</sup>, Alexandros Valorenzos<sup>1,2¶</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of General Surgery, University Hospital of Southern Denmark, Aabenraa, Denmark  
<sup>2</sup> Institute of regional health research, University of Southern Denmark, Aabenraa, Denmark  
<sup>3</sup> Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics, University Hospital of Southern Denmark, Aabenraa, Denmark  
<sup>4</sup> Department of Clinical Research, University Hospital of Southern Denmark, Aabenraa, Denmark

\* Corresponding author

E.mail: [Kristian.als.nielsen3@rsyd.dk](mailto:Kristian.als.nielsen3@rsyd.dk)

¶ These authors contributed equally to this work

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

## 22 Abstract

23 **Background:** Healthcare expenditure is increasing at a rate that surpasses the growth of the gross  
 24 domestic product in most Western nations, emphasizing the need for precise hospital accounting  
 25 practices. In resource-constrained environments, accurately estimating the costs of hospital  
 26 services, such as robotic ventral hernia repair, is essential for achieving efficiency and  
 27 transparency. Despite the existence of several studies reporting on the cost of robotic ventral  
 28 hernia repair, there is a lack of systematic mapping of current knowledge on the methodological  
 29 designs used in studies reporting on the costs and resource use.

30 **Methods:** This study protocol outlines the methodology for a scoping review aimed at  
 31 systematically mapping the existing literature on costing methodologies in robotic ventral hernia  
 32 repair. The scoping review will follow the framework outlined by Arksey and O'Malley and adhere  
 33 to the PRISMA-ScR guidelines. A systematic search will be conducted in Embase, Medline and  
 34 Cochrane Library. Studies will be included if they involve patients undergoing robotic ventral hernia  
 35 repair and report on cost/costing methodologies. The review will extract data on study  
 36 characteristics, intervention specifics, and detailed costing methodologies. Two independent  
 37 reviewers will conduct the data extraction, with discrepancies resolved through discussion or by a  
 38 third reviewer.

39 **Discussion:** The review will identify significant variations in costing methodologies, including  
 40 differences in perspectives (hospital vs. societal), time horizons, and cost components. It aims to  
 41 highlight gaps and inconsistencies in the current literature, providing a foundation for future  
 42 research to standardize costing methodologies and improve the accuracy of economic evaluations  
 43 in robotic surgery. By systematically mapping the existing literature, this scoping review will provide  
 44 valuable insights into the current state of costing methodologies in robotic ventral hernia repair. It  
 45 will serve as a foundational reference for researchers, policymakers, and healthcare providers,  
 46 offering recommendations to enhance the economic evaluation of robotic surgical technologies.

## Background

Healthcare expenditure is increasing at a rate that surpasses the growth of the gross domestic product in most Western European nations each year(1-3). This trend, coupled with global healthcare reforms, has intensified the dependence on precise hospital accounting practices. In environments with constrained resources, accurately estimating the costs of hospital services is essential for achieving efficiency and transparency. In many high-income countries, hospitals operate under Diagnosis Related Group (DRG)-based prospective payment systems, necessitating the identification and elimination of inefficiencies, particularly in services where production costs exceed pricing(4, 5). Consequently, hospitals require dependable patient-level cost estimates to accurately assess resource utilization. Detailed and pertinent cost information at the patient level is crucial for policymakers, payers, and healthcare providers.

However, accurately calculating costs within the hospital setting is challenging due to factors like case heterogeneity, labor intensity, and the complexity of production processes. Studies indicate significant cost variation for the same service, influenced by provider and patient characteristics, efficiency levels, clinical activities, and, critically, the costing method used(6). Previous systematic reviews comparing the cost-effectiveness of Robotic Minimally Invasive Surgery (RMIS) to other surgical methods have generally found RMIS to be more expensive(7). These conclusions, however, were drawn from limited evidence characterized by diverse study designs, methodologies, and follow-up durations.

Despite the existence of several articles that include an economic evaluation of robotic ventral hernia repair, there is a lack of systematic mapping of current knowledge on the methodological designs used in studies reporting on the costs and resource use of robotic surgery for ventral

hernia repair. This scoping review aims to systematically describe the methodological designs employed in studies of resource use and costs related to robotic ventral hernia repair. The primary focus is not on comparing the cost of robotic surgery with other surgical methods, but on evaluating the various methodological choices that could impact the validity of cost analyses.

Conducting a scoping review of the literature on the costs and costing methodologies of robotic ventral hernia repair can enhance our understanding of the topic, including the different approaches used and the limitations and challenges associated with these methodologies. The objectives of this paper are to provide an overview of the existing literature on the costs of robotic ventral hernia repair, to examine the methodologies employed, to identify gaps in the research, and to offer recommendations for future research in this field.

## Methods and Design

The scoping review will be conducted following the methodology outlined by Arksey and O'Malley and adhering to the guidelines of the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses – Scoping Review extension (PRISMA-ScR). The study will be developed in the following five stages:

### ***Stage 1: Identification of the Research Question***

This scoping review aims to answer the following questions:

- What is known from the existing literature about the cost of ventral hernia repair using a robotic platform?

- What are the methodological designs employed in studies reporting resource use and costs related to robotic ventral hernia repair, and how do these methodological choices impact the validity of cost analyses?

## **Stage 2: Identification of Relevant Literature**

A systematic search will be conducted in cooperation with a medical librarian from our institution using the following databases:

- Embase

- Medline

- Cochrane Library

- Scopus for citation tracking

An example of the search strategy for Embase (Ovid) is presented in Table 1. The search strategy will be translated for Medline and Cochrane Library.

*Table 1. Embase (Ovid) search strategy*

|                         |   |                         |
|-------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Ventral hernia<br>block | 1 | abdominal wall hernia/  |
|                         | 2 | umbilical hernia/       |
|                         | 3 | incisional hernia/      |
|                         | 4 | herni*.ti,ab,kf.        |
| RMIS block              | 5 | robot/                  |
|                         | 6 | robot*.ti,ab,kf.        |
|                         | 7 | robotics/               |
|                         | 8 | robot assisted surgery/ |

|               |    |                                  |
|---------------|----|----------------------------------|
|               | 9  | computer assisted surgery/       |
| Costing block | 10 | "cost"/                          |
|               | 11 | cost*.ti,ab,kf.                  |
|               | 12 | economics/                       |
|               | 13 | economics*.ti,ab,kf.             |
|               | 14 | financial.ti,ab,kf.              |
|               | 15 | pric*.ti,ab,kf.                  |
| Combination   | 16 | 1 or 2 or 3 or 4                 |
|               | 17 | 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9            |
|               | 18 | 10 or 11 or 12 or 13 or 14 or 15 |
|               | 19 | 16 and 17 and 18                 |

### **Stage 3: Study Selection**

Inclusion and exclusion criteria in accordance with the PCC principle are outlined below. Only peer-reviewed original research concerning costs in robotic ventral hernia repair will be included. Only English-language articles will be included. All results will be imported into Covidence for screening. All duplicates will be removed. Two reviewers will screen titles and abstracts using the inclusion and exclusion criteria outlined below. The same two reviewers will examine the remaining articles and select studies according to the inclusion criteria. Disagreements will be resolved through discussion and overseen by a third-party investigator. A PRISMA flowchart will be presented to summarize the search, screening, exclusion, and inclusion process for the study selection of relevant studies.

121 *Inclusion Criteria*

122 Population:

- 123       • Studies involving patients undergoing robotic ventral hernia repair.

124 Concept:

- 125       • Studies that report on cost and/or costing methodologies.

126 Context:

- 127       • Studies conducted in hospitals or healthcare institutions where robotic ventral hernia repair  
128       is performed.
- 129       • Original research of all types, including randomized controlled trials, prospective and  
130       retrospective cohort studies, case-control studies, reviews, and economic evaluations.
- 131       • Studies published in any country and in English.

132

133 *Exclusion Criteria*

134 Population:

- 135       • Studies not specifically addressing patients undergoing robotic ventral hernia repair.

136 Concept:

- 137       • Studies that do not report details on costs and/or costing methodologies.

138 Context:

- 139       • Non-English literature
- 140       • Grey literature

141

142 ***Stage 4: Charting the Data***

143 For this scoping review, a standardized data extraction form will be used to collect relevant details  
 144 from each included study. This form will capture essential elements such as study characteristics  
 145 (e.g., author, year, country, study design, and type of economic evaluation), intervention specifics  
 146 (e.g., type of robotic ventral hernia repair and comparator techniques), and methodological aspects  
 147 related to costing (e.g., perspective, time horizon, cost components, and calculation methods).

148

149 *Specific Aspects to be Captured:*

150 1. Type of Economic Evaluation:

- 151 - Cost minimization analysis
- 152 - Cost-benefit framework
- 153 - Activity-based costing
- 154 - Cost studies

155

156 2. Costing Methodologies:

- 157 - Microcosting
- 158 - Gross costing
- 159 - Hospital charges

160

- 161 3. Specific Costs of Relevance:
- 162 - Purchasing Cost of the Robot:
- 163 - Depreciation accounted for
- 164 - Number of years the robot is expected to operate
- 165 - Number of procedures per year the robot is used for
- 166 - Maintenance of the Robot:
- 167 - Service agreement costs
- 168 - Preoperative Preparation of the Patients
- 169 - Staff Salary:
- 170 - Specific staff members (e.g., surgeons, ER nurses, anesthesiologists)
- 171 - Surgical Equipment
- 172 - Operating Room Costs:
- 173 - Sterilization of equipment
- 174 - Cleaning costs
- 175 - Drug Costs:
- 176 - Anesthesia
- 177 - Pain medications
- 178 - IV infusions
- 179 - Antibiotics

- 180       - Hospital Room Costs:
- 181               - Level of detail (e.g., food for patients, cleaning, clothing)
- 182               - Accounting for length of hospital stay
- 183       - Post-Discharge Costs:
- 184               - Readmission costs
- 185               - Reoperation costs
- 186               - Use of equipment (e.g., splints)
- 187               - Pain medications
- 188               - Outpatient control costs
- 189
- 190   4. Adjustments:
- 191       - Whether the study accounts for the learning curve of using the robotic system
- 192       - Whether the study accounts for the operation time
- 193
- 194   5. Perspective of Costing:
- 195       - Hospital perspective
- 196       - Societal perspective
- 197

Additionally, any reported challenges and limitations in the costing methodologies will be documented. The data charting process will be conducted by two independent reviewers, blinded to each other to ensure accuracy and comprehensiveness. Discrepancies will be resolved through discussion or by consulting a third reviewer.

This detailed approach to data charting will enable a thorough and nuanced understanding of the costing methodologies used in studies of robotic ventral hernia repair, and will help to identify gaps and inconsistencies in the literature.

## ***Stage 5: Collating, Summarizing, and Reporting of Results***

The collected data will be systematically collated, summarized, and reported to provide a comprehensive overview of the findings. This process involves organizing the extracted data into meaningful categories that align with the research questions and objectives. Quantitative data will be presented in tabular and graphical formats to illustrate trends, frequencies, and distributions of costing methodologies used in robotic ventral hernia repair studies. This stage will also involve identifying patterns, inconsistencies, and gaps in the literature. The final report will present a detailed summary of the reviewed studies, highlighting key findings, methodological variations, and areas requiring further research. The results will be discussed in the context of existing knowledge, and recommendations will be made for future studies to enhance the understanding and accuracy of costing methodologies in robotic ventral hernia repair.

## **Discussion**

220 This scoping review aims to systematically map the existing literature on costs and costing  
 221 methodologies in robotic ventral hernia repair. By including a wide range of studies, we intend to  
 222 provide a comprehensive overview of the costs associated with the robotic platform in ventral  
 223 hernia repair, how these costs are calculated, the methodological choices made, and the  
 224 challenges encountered in this field. The review will highlight significant variations in costing  
 225 methodologies, including differences in perspectives, time horizons, and cost components included  
 226 in the analyses. Such variations can profoundly impact the reported cost-effectiveness of robotic  
 227 surgery, potentially leading to inconsistent conclusions and impeding informed decision-making.

228

229 One of the anticipated findings is the lack of standardization in costing methodologies. The review  
 230 is likely to reveal that many studies do not adhere to best practices in economic evaluations, such  
 231 as including comprehensive cost components like the purchase and maintenance of robotic  
 232 systems or adequately accounting for indirect costs. These gaps can undermine the validity and  
 233 comparability of cost analyses, suggesting a need for more rigorous methodological standards.

234

235 Additionally, this review will identify key areas for future research, such as the need for longitudinal  
 236 studies to capture long-term costs and benefits, and the importance of incorporating broader  
 237 economic perspectives. By synthesizing the existing evidence, this review will provide valuable  
 238 insights that can guide future research efforts and improve the transparency and reliability of  
 239 costing studies in robotic ventral hernia repair.

240

241 Overall, this scoping review will serve as a foundational reference for researchers, policymakers,  
 242 and healthcare providers, highlighting current knowledge, identifying gaps, and suggesting  
 243 directions for future research to enhance the economic evaluation of robotic surgical technologies.

244

## 245 **Acknowledgements**

246 We would like to express our sincere gratitude to Caroline Moos, Medical Librarian at the  
247 Department of Medical Research, University of Southern Denmark, for her invaluable guidance  
248 regarding systematic search strategies and methodology. Her expertise and support were  
249 instrumental in the development of this study protocol.

250

## 251 **References**

- 252 1. Busse R. Expenditure on health care in the EU: making projections for the future  
253 based on the past. The European Journal of Health Economics (HEPAC). 2001;2(4):158-61.
- 254 2. Hagist C, Kotlikoff L. Who's Going Broke? Comparing Growth in Healthcare Costs in  
255 Ten OECD Countries. National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc; 2005.
- 256 3. Jakovljevic M, Fernandes PO, Teixeira JP, Rancic N, Timofeyev Y, Reshetnikov V.  
257 Underlying Differences in Health Spending Within the World Health Organisation Europe Region-  
258 Comparing EU15, EU Post-2004, CIS, EU Candidate, and CARINFONET Countries. Int J Environ  
259 Res Public Health. 2019;16(17).
- 260 4. Scheller-Kreinsen D, Quentin W, Busse R. DRG-based hospital payment systems  
261 and technological innovation in 12 European countries. Value Health. 2011;14(8):1166-72.
- 262 5. Mihailovic N, Kocic S, Jakovljevic M. Review of Diagnosis-Related Group-Based  
263 Financing of Hospital Care. Health Serv Res Manag Epidemiol. 2016;3:2333392816647892.
- 264 6. Gani F, Hundt J, Daniel M, Efron JE, Makary MA, Pawlik TM. Variations in hospitals  
265 costs for surgical procedures: inefficient care or sick patients? Am J Surg. 2017;213(1):1-9.

266 7. Korsholm M, Sørensen J, Mogensen O, Wu C, Karlsen K, Jensen PT. A systematic  
267 review about costing methodology in robotic surgery: evidence for low quality in most of the  
268 studies. Health Econ Rev. 2018;8(1):21.

269