NanoBone Cost Effectiveness Monograph

Cost Efficacy of NanoBone in Bone Grafting

The use of bone grafts and substitutes reduces the need to harvest autograft bones from patients, which in turn decreases postoperative pain and healing time.

Increased use of bone graft substitutes facilitates minimally invasive surgeries (MIS) and short surgical procedures, which benefit the patient as well as hospitals.

Originally, these procedures were used in spinal fusion and deformity treatment. However, the adoption of these procedures has increased for various orthopaedic surgical applications, including extremity reconstruction and treatment of fractures.

Of all marketed bone graft substitutes, NanoBone is the most cost-effective option available.

- Harvesting bone graft from the iliac crest is time consuming, requires additional surgery, and can cause long-lasting postoperative pain and other complications.
- On average, NanoBone is half the cost of BMP with comparable results. BMP is an expensive
 option to facilitate orthopaedic surgeries, with a significant risk of unexpected results and
 complications.
- NanoBone is less expensive than stem cell products, with better clinical results. Stem cell
 products have been used for nearly 15 years with little published clinical evidence of good
 clinical outcomes. After numerous industry-sponsored studies, quality clinical outcomes from
 stem cells use remain elusive.
- NanoBone is a better value than other synthetic bone graft products. NanoBone is FDAcleared as a stand-alone bone graft substitute. Clinical use of NanoBone has demonstrated that NanoBone works as well as autograft, with no additional products required.

The development and use of bone grafts materials with bioidentical properties, such as NanoBone, has occurred in parallel with the increase in prevalence of bone and joint disorders. There is a significant increase in the number of patients suffering from rheumatoid arthritis, osteoarthritis, and other joint disorders, which has driven surgical procedure volumes. This, in turn, reinforces the need for NanoBone as a cost- and clinically-effective bone graft substitute.





