

UV Germicidal Enclosure

ECRI Evaluation Summary

The ECRI Institute serves over 5,000 healthcare organizations worldwide, including hospitals, health systems, public and private payers, U.S. federal and state government agencies, ministries of health, voluntary sector organizations, associations, and accrediting agencies. With these groups, ECRI Institute shares its experience in patient safety improvement, comparative effectiveness, quality management, evidence-based practice, healthcare processes, devices, procedures, and drug technology.

ECRI Institute has nearly 450 full-time employees whose interdisciplinary backgrounds include medicine, nursing, epidemiology, biomedical science, research methodology, social science, clinical engineering, physics, health law, healthcare management, patient safety and risk management, information technology, medical informatics, clinical writing and editing, and many other areas.

ECRI Institute employs strict rules to prevent conflict of interest, by not accepting gifts, grants, or contracts from the medical device or pharmaceutical industries.

ECRI Institute has been undertaking brand and model comparative evaluations of medical devices since 1971. Since its designation as an Evidence-based Practice Center with the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality in 1997, it has undertaken systematic reviews of clinical procedures using meta-analysis for the Medicare program, other federal and state agencies, and clinical specialty organizations.

Most every hospital has a membership to the ECRI Institute and can view the comparative results of various medical devices and equipment. Below is a summary of the comparison completed by the ECRI Institute for UV Germicidal Enclosures. This summary compares AUVS UV Box

ECRI Germicidal Enclosure Summary

Model	Rating	Performance	Safety	Workflow	Maintenance	Cost of Ownership
AUVS KR615	3 Star	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good
ClorDis Flashbox Mini UV	1 Star	Good	Poor	Good	Good	Good
Limestone Labs Cleanslate	3 Star	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good
Readydock Duo	2 Star	Good	Good	Poor	Poor	Good
Readydock RD5	2 Star	Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Good

AUVS Summary

Performance:

- ECRI only tested to 3 log reduction for C-Diff spores, achieved in pre-set cycle setting. The AUVS UV Box tested for a 4.5 log reduction of C.Diff Spores in by a FDA independent lab.
- Interior 3.5" high x 8" deep x 15.5" wide
- Can accommodate:
 - One tablet 6.6" x 9.4"
 - 5 Spectralink phones model 7772 2" x 5.5"
 - 10 Pagers, 2.8" x 1.9"
 - 4 Apple 6 and 6S
- Safety, good, light turns off when door opened before complete cycle, can't operate with burned out bulb.
- Workflow, good, short cycle, cord pass through, accommodate many hand held devices.
- Maintenance, bulb life long, moderately difficult to clean, easy to switch out bulbs and quartz rods with new access panel (not evaluated by ECRI)
- Cost of ownership, (based on \$2500 acquisition price) over 3 years \$2700

AUVS Advantages over Competitive Models

Flashbox

- Primary disinfection only phones and tablets.
- Not tested to IEC 60601-1-2 for electrical safety
- Could operate with a burned out bulb
- Bulb replacement done at factory or 90-minute replacement in house.
- Safety, measured irradiance far exceeds OSHA with door open. (Note operates with door open)

Cleanslate

- Primary disinfection only phones and tablets.
- Smaller disinfection chamber than AUVS at 2" high x 10" deep x 8" wide.
- Estimated cost of 3-year ownership \$8600, 3 times more than AUVS.

Readydock Duo

- 75 second cycle, (20 seconds longer than AUVS)
- Primary disinfection only phones and tablets
- Smaller each disinfection chamber 2.5" high x 10" deep x 8" wide (but note there are two chambers).
- Estimated 3 year cost \$6000, over 2 times more than AUVS.

Readydock RD5 Countertop UV

- Power failure can't remove devices.
- Difficult to use.
- 3-year cost of ownership \$4500, almost twice the AUVS cost.