



## Correspondence

**Author's reply: "Time is over: step back to reusable and step forward to recyclable!"**



Dear Editor,

We would like to thank the Editors of DLD for the opportunity to reply to the comments of Schepis et al. on our recent paper on issues related to sustainability in gastroenterology and digestive endoscopy from the Italian Association of Hospital Gastroenterologists and Digestive Endoscopists (AIGO) [1]. The commentary is of extreme interest, and provides insight into how endoscopic ultrasound (EUS) and retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) may contribute to the environmental impact of digestive endoscopy [2].

In a previous study, Namburkar et al. estimated the carbon footprint of digestive endoscopy, including biliary endoscopies (ERCP and EUS), in their analysis [3]. However, their study focused only on the disposable waste produced and did not differentiate the environmental contributions of the single and specific endoscopic procedures. Unfortunately, we still face a knowledge gap that hampers our ability to accurately calculate the environmental impact of a single specific endoscopic procedure. In fact, the industry does not currently provide the exact material composition of endoscopes and devices, nor does it provide the carbon footprint of the production phase, which can allow to calculate the life cycle assessment of endoscopes and accessories. Despite these limitations, we could reasonably infer that EUS and ERCP, since they are frequently operative, have a higher carbon footprint compared to esophagogastroduodenoscopy (EGD) and colonoscopy (CLS). Despite not being supported by solid evidence of their benefit for patients, the recent widespread use of single-use scopes and devices contributes heavily to increasing the environmental impact of endoscopy, and particularly of EUS and ERCP, especially in light of the current supply chain crisis [3,4]. The latest position statement by the European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) on sustainability advised against the routine use of disposable endoscopes and underscored the need to reconsider and reduce the impact of disposable devices in endoscopy [5].

According to the data from Schepis et al. the waste mass generated during EUS is almost double compared to CLS and EGD, and ERCP generates approximately five times as much waste as colonoscopy. Future studies, hopefully emerging through the proactive collaboration of clinicians, industry and institutions, are

needed to confirm these data and clarify the exact carbon footprint of each specific endoscopic procedure. Meanwhile, a rational application of guidelines on quality, appropriateness and sustainability is essential to improve the environmental impact of endoscopy, especially EUS and ERCP, without altering the quality of patient care, therefore guiding digestive endoscopy toward a more sustainable future.

### Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest related to the present paper.

### References

- Bortoluzzi F, Sorge A, Vassallo R, et al. Sustainability in gastroenterology and digestive endoscopy: position paper from the Italian association of hospital gastroenterologists and digestive endoscopists (AIGO). *Dig Liver Dis* 2022;54:1623–9.
- Schepis T, Boškoski I, Tringali A, Perri V, Costamagna G, Spada C. Time is over: step back to reusable and step forward to recyclable!. *Dig Liver Dis* 2023;55:1150–1.
- Namburkar S, von Renteln D, Damianos J, et al. Estimating the environmental impact of disposable endoscopic equipment and endoscopes. *Gut* 2022;71:1326–31.
- Sorge A, Tontini GE, Scaramella L, et al. Could war and the supply chain crisis affect the sustainability of gastrointestinal endoscopy and single-use endoscopes? *Gut* 2023;72:407–8.
- Rodríguez de SE, Dinis-Ribeiro M, Pohl H, et al. Reducing the environmental footprint of gastrointestinal endoscopy: European society of gastrointestinal endoscopy (ESGE) and European society of gastroenterology and endoscopy nurses and associates (ESGENA) position statement. *Endoscopy* 2022;54:797–826.

Andrea Sorge\*

Gastroenterology and Endoscopy Unit, Fondazione IRCCS Ca' Granda

Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico, Milan, Italy

Department of Pathophysiology and Transplantation, University of

Milan, Milan, Italy

Luca Elli

Gastroenterology and Endoscopy Unit, Fondazione IRCCS Ca' Granda

Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico, Milan, Italy

\*Corresponding author at: Gastroenterology and Endoscopy Unit, Fondazione IRCCS Ca' Granda Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico, Milan, Italy.

E-mail address: [andreasorge6@gmail.com](mailto:andreasorge6@gmail.com) (A. Sorge)

DOIs of original articles: [10.1016/j.dld.2023.04.024](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dld.2023.04.024), [10.1016/j.dld.2022.08.018](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dld.2022.08.018)

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dld.2023.05.020>

1590-8658/© 2023 Editrice Gastroenterologica Italiana S.r.l. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.