

The Cost-Effectiveness of Glove Reprocessing

Ali Kagan Coskun¹ · Ali Harlak¹

Received: 10 June 2015 / Accepted: 22 June 2015 / Published online: 30 June 2015
© Association of Surgeons of India 2015

We have read, with interest, the original article entitled “Gloves Reprocessing: Does It Really Save Money?” by Arora et al. [1] in the *Indian Journal of Surgery*. The authors presented the advantage of using disposable gloves in terms of cost-effectiveness. When we read the article, we have wondered about a few conditions. We feel that clarification regarding the following details would be beneficial.

According to Health Protection Scotland, sterile gloves should be worn for surgical procedures, for invasive procedures, as part of aseptic technique, for the insertion of invasive devices, and for the immediate management of acute wounds, e.g., suturing. And non-sterile gloves should be worn for non-sterile procedures and chronic wound care [2]. If the authors made a classification due to above information, would there be any difference? Another question related to the users of the both gloves. Were there any difference for tactile sensation and dexterity?

We have also wondered about the infection rate of the non-sterile gloves for the transmitted diseases and sterilization unit’s staff costs at the same time period with the study. If there was, the increase for the cost of medical bill in the patient population would be interesting to the readers.

Conflicts of interest The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

References

1. Arora P, Kumari S, Sodhi J, Talati S, Gupta AK (2015) Gloves reprocessing: does it really save money? *Indian J Surg*. doi:10.1007/s12262-015-1279-7
2. Infection control team (2014) SICP literature review: PPE (Gloves): Health Protection Scotland ;version 2.0

✉ Ali Kagan Coskun
kagancoskun@gmail.com

¹ Department of Surgery, Gulhane School of Medicine, Tevfik Saglam St Etlik, Ankara, Turkey