Sterilization Revolution: Can Autoclaves Reduce Medical Waste in Healthcare?

Rachel Roberts[1], Emma Movahedi[1], Keyan Clapp[2], Allison DeMare[3], Victoria Grieve[2], Kamilia Khatib, Sethmi Madawala[2], Alexia Petoskey[4], Ava Richardson[1], Paige Spitz[2], Selina Tripathy[1], Elizabeth Verhoef[1], Annie Yang[2]

1 Lyman Briggs College, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, United States
2 College of Natural Science, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, United States
3 College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, United States
4 College of Social Science, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, United States

*robe1286@msu.edu, movahed1@msu.edu

Abstract

The expansion of healthcare has led to a sharp increase in medical waste, much of which consists of single-use plastics, disposable equipment, and pharmaceutical byproducts. The reliance on disposable materials, including gloves, syringes, and packaging, poses significant environmental challenges. A large portion of this waste is non-biodegradable, necessitating incineration, which releases harmful chemicals into the environment. Identifying sustainable alternatives to current disposal methods is crucial for reducing the ecological impact of healthcare. This literature review examines the potential role of autoclaves in reducing medical waste and mitigating environmental harm. By systematically analyzing peer-reviewed research from 2010 to 2025, we assess the effectiveness of autoclaving in sterilizing and repurposing medical materials, its feasibility as a large-scale waste management solution, and its environmental impact compared to incineration. Our findings highlight key takeaways regarding the performance of autoclaves, barriers to implementation, and proposed solutions for integrating sustainable waste processing into healthcare systems. Understanding the role of autoclaves in waste reduction can inform policy changes, improve hospital protocols, and support innovations in sustainable medical waste management. This review provides insight into how healthcare institutions can adopt autoclaving as a viable alternative to incineration, ultimately contributing to a more environmentally responsible approach to medical waste disposal.

Literature Review

The demand for personal protective equipment (PPE), including face masks, gloves, gowns, and face shields, surged in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, leading to an unprecedented increase in medical waste. The World Health Organization reported that the accumulation of medical waste during the pandemic increased plastic pollution in the oceans by ten times (Khan et al., 2023). Additionally, hazardous waste generation was estimated at 3.40 kg per infected person per day (Haque et al., 2021), highlighting the immense burden placed on waste management systems. Medical waste includes various disposable tools, such as needles, syringes, and masks, which, while critical in preventing the transmission of infections, contribute significantly to the rising accumulation of waste. This increase has exacerbated an environmental challenge known as PPE pollution, impacting both land and aquatic ecosystems (Haque et al., 2021). Improper disposal of this waste poses significant public health risks, including the spread of infectious or drug-resistant microorganisms, exposure to toxic chemical and pharmaceutical waste, and the release of air pollutants from disposal methods such as incineration (Kheirabadi et al., 2022).

The surge in medical waste has intensified the need for sustainable disposal solutions. One of the most critical yet overlooked aspects of waste management is waste segregation. Studies indicate that the failure to separate biodegradable from non-biodegradable waste

properly complicates recycling and treatment efforts, leading to increased disposal costs and longer processing times (Kokkinos et al., 2024). Poor waste management also results in long-term environmental damage, increasing cleanup costs, and the risk of adverse health outcomes in surrounding communities. The financial burden of medical waste management is significant, with costs associated with onsite waste treatment, shipment fees, labor, fuel, utilities, and vehicle maintenance. Additionally, ineffective waste management can further overwhelm healthcare systems, leading to increased hospitalizations, longer treatment durations, and overall higher healthcare costs that impact entire communities (Chartier et al., 2014).

According to the World Health Organization, the waste management hierarchy prioritizes sustainable waste-handling strategies based on environmental impact, public health protection, financial feasibility, and social acceptability. The hierarchy ranks prevention, reduction, reuse, and recycling as the most desirable strategies, followed by recovery, treatment, and finally, disposal as the least preferred option (Chartier et al., 2014). Despite these recommendations, healthcare waste management continues to face persistent challenges. Current disposal methods include thermal, chemical, radiation, biological, and mechanical treatments, with incineration remaining the most widely used approach. While incineration effectively reduces waste volume, it also generates harmful emissions such as dioxins, furans, and heavy metals, which contribute to air pollution (Kheirabadi et al., 2022). Other methods, such as mechanical shredding and chemical treatments, offer waste volume reduction but fail to fully neutralize pathogens.

Autoclaving, a steam sterilization method, presents a more environmentally friendly alternative to incineration and other traditional waste disposal practices. This method uses high-pressure steam to sterilize medical waste, effectively eliminating pathogens without releasing toxic emissions. Research has shown that autoclaving can successfully decontaminate medical waste, including high-risk items such as N95 masks, while maintaining their functional integrity. Autoclaving has also been found effective in neutralizing a range of pathogens, including viruses such as polio, hepatitis B, and MRSA (Chartier et al., 2014).

In research laboratories, autoclaves are routinely used to sterilize and allow the reuse of various instruments and materials. This practice reduces waste generation and promotes cost-effectiveness by allowing items such as glassware, metal tools, and certain plastics to be reprocessed. In contrast, healthcare facilities largely depend on single-use disposable medical devices due to infection control protocols that aim to minimize cross-contamination risks. While this ensures patient safety, it also leads to increased waste production. Many disposable medical tools contain intricate designs that are difficult to sterilize effectively, further reinforcing reliance on single-use devices.

Regulatory frameworks play a crucial role in determining sterilization practices and the reuse of medical devices. In research settings, sterilization guidelines are primarily governed by internal protocols aimed at maintaining experimental integrity and safety. However, healthcare facilities are subject to stricter regulations designed to mitigate the risks associated with reprocessing medical devices. In the European Union, the Medical Device Regulation (MDR) (Regulation (EU) 2017/745) requires reprocessed single-use devices to meet the same standards as original devices (Regulation (EU) 2017/745, 2017). Similarly, the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) enforces rigorous standards for reprocessing single-use devices, ensuring that cleaning, sterilization, and functional performance meet safety requirements (FDA, 2006). These strict guidelines prioritize patient safety but also contribute to the growing issue of medical waste accumulation by limiting the ability to reuse sterilized equipment.

As medical waste continues to rise, alternative waste management strategies must be explored to minimize environmental and public health risks. While single-use disposable devices remain a critical component of

infection prevention, autoclaving offers a promising solution for reducing the waste volume while maintaining sterility. By shifting reliance away from incineration and exploring sterilization-based reuse methods where feasible, healthcare facilities can move toward more sustainable waste management practices.

Methods

This study utilizes a literature review approach to examining 23 studies to determine the role of autoclaving in medical waste management and its feasibility as a sustainable alternative to single-use disposables. The review synthesizes data from peer-reviewed sources to analyze medical waste production, autoclave efficiency, regulatory barriers, and the cost-effectiveness of these measures. The literature was categorized into key themes, including single-use waste, autoclave effectiveness in hospital and research settings, and environmental impact.

Academic databases were searched for studies related to nonrenewable medical waste and autoclave usage. Sources were selected based on their relevance to healthcare waste management, autoclave sterilization effectiveness, and sustainability in medical settings. Only peer-reviewed articles published after 2010 were included to ensure the data reflect current practices. The review focuses on identifying how medical supplies are discarded, what makes them non-renewable, and how autoclaves can sterilize and repurpose these materials. Studies were categorized into themes of single-use waste, autoclave efficiency in research and hospital environments, and the environmental impact of these applications.

Data on medical waste volume and autoclave efficiency were gathered from existing case studies, government compliance reports, and waste audit sampling studies. Medical waste volume is typically assessed through weight-based measurements, where facilities sort and weigh medical waste before disposal.

Surveys of medical facilities also provide estimates by evaluating the size of disposal containers used and calculating average daily waste per bed. The effectiveness of autoclaving is monitored through mechanical, chemical, and biological indicators. Biological testing often utilizes spores of *Geobacillus stearothermophilus*, a heat-resistant bacterium, to determine sterilization success. If these spores survive an autoclave cycle, it indicates a failure in sterilization. Studies have used various sterilization indicators, including Class-5 chemical indicators and self-contained biological markers, to assess the effectiveness of autoclave cycles. A nationwide cross-sectional study showed that 71% of autoclave cycles failed sterilization tests when measured by traditional methods, though biological indicators rejected these failure results (Panta, 2019). In an Ohio hospital study, MRSA survival rates were significantly reduced by autoclaving, with sterilization decreasing bacterial recovery by a factor of greater than 1:10,000,000 (Donskey, 2014).

To compare medical and research lab practices, the study examined how laboratories safely reuse tools following sterilization and what changes hospitals would need to implement to adopt similar processes. Laboratories rely on sterile packaging procedures, contamination monitoring, and strict regulatory standards to ensure safe reuse of these materials. Tools are stored in sterile cabinets, labeled with expiration dates, and subjected to frequent sterility testing. Research laboratories prioritize reusable glassware and metal tools, whereas hospitals predominantly use disposable medical equipment due to stringent infection control protocols. Regulatory agencies, including the CDC, FDA, WHO, and OSHA, enforce strict sterilization standards in hospitals, which limit the reuse of sterilized tools. By increasing the use of reusable equipment and implementing training programs similar to those used in research settings, hospitals can reduce medical waste while maintaining safety.

Autoclaving was compared to single-use sterile packaging in terms of sterilization effectiveness and feasibility. Autoclaves utilize steam, pressure, temperature, and time to eliminate microorganisms from reusable medical instruments. While effective for materials that can withstand high temperatures,

autoclaving is unsuitable for heat-sensitive plastics, which may degrade under high temperatures and pressure. In contrast, single-use plastics ensure immediate sterility but contribute significantly to medical waste due to their non-biodegradable nature. While disposable medical tools, such as syringes, IV bags, and surgical gloves, remain essential for infection control, incorporating sustainable alternatives and expanding autoclave use could help mitigate environmental impact.

A financial analysis was conducted to compare the cost of autoclaving versus single-use disposable medical tools. Autoclave machines require an initial investment ranging from $10,000 to $50,000, depending on size and application. In hospital settings, the cost per autoclave cycle varies based on electricity use, water consumption, and maintenance, with an estimated cycle cost ranging from $2 to $5. The sterilization of a surgical instrument set costs approximately $6.23 per unit, while minor procedure sets cost around $1.35 per unit. In contrast, single-use disposables have lower upfront costs but result in recurring expenses for procurement and disposal. Practice Greenhealth (2010) found that hospitals using single-use disposables spent 30% more on waste management. Additionally, transitioning to reusable systems has been shown to reduce medical waste by up to 50%, as reported by Healthcare Without Harm in 2021. Financial incentives for autoclaves include long-term savings from reduced waste disposal costs and the prevention of supply shortages. However, barriers to implementation include the high initial costs of autoclave systems and the need for ongoing maintenance.

Practice Greenhealth's study also examined ethical and practical considerations regarding the reuse of sterilized medical equipment (2010). Concerns about patient safety, potential contamination risks, and regulatory compliance remain key barriers to wider autoclave implementation. Ethical dilemmas arise in balancing infection control with environmental sustainability, as hospitals prioritize patient safety over waste reduction. Regulations require that reprocessed single-use devices meet the same standards as newly manufactured ones, ensuring they do not compromise patient care. While the adoption of autoclaving could help address medical waste concerns, further research is needed to assess long-term outcomes, financial feasibility, and policy changes required for broader hospital implementation.

Findings and Discussion

The expansion of healthcare has led to a dramatic increase in medical waste, much of which consists of single-use plastics, disposable equipment, and pharmaceutical byproducts. This reliance on disposables such as gloves, syringes, and packaging poses significant environmental challenges, as a large portion of this waste is non-biodegradable and requires incineration, releasing harmful chemicals into the environment. The literature consistently highlights the severe consequences of single-use medical waste, with North and Halden (2013) emphasizing the persistence of plastic waste in ecosystems, its toxic chemical leaching, and the long-term public health risks associated with it. The COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated this issue, with PPE waste increasing ocean plastic pollution tenfold (Khan et al., 2023), while Haque et al. (2021) estimated hazardous waste generation at 3.40 kg per infected person per day, placing immense strain on waste management systems.

Autoclaving presents a promising alternative to incineration and other traditional disposal methods. Studies demonstrate its high efficacy in pathogen elimination, with Donskey (2014) reporting a >99.9999% reduction in MRSA and research confirming successful reprocessing of the N95 mask. However, challenges remain, as Panta's (2019) study found that 71% of autoclave cycles failed sterilization tests when measured by traditional methods, though biological indicators later refuted these results. This discrepancy underscores the need for standardized testing protocols. Additionally, while autoclaving works well for heat-resistant materials like glass and metal, many single-use plastics degrade under high

temperatures, limiting their universal applicability.

The financial and operational trade-offs between single-use and reusable systems are significant. Autoclaves require substantial upfront investments ($10,000–$50,000) and ongoing costs ($2–$5 per cycle), yet long-term savings are evident. McGain and Story's (2022) systematic review found that hospitals using reusable devices spent 30% less on waste management than those reliant on disposables. Conversely, single-use systems incur recurring procurement and disposal fees, with supply chain disruptions such as those seen during the pandemic further driving up costs (Innovative Health, 2022). The Johns Hopkins study (2023) reinforced that multi-use systems are economically superior when sterilization protocols are rigorously followed. However, initial resistance from healthcare providers, driven by infection control concerns, remains a barrier.

Regulatory and ethical considerations further complicate the adoption of autoclaving. Strict guidelines, such as the FDA's reprocessing standards and the EU's Medical Device Regulation (MDR), require reprocessed devices to meet the same safety benchmarks as new ones, limiting their reuse (BSI, 2024). Surveys indicate clinician hesitancy due to perceived contamination risks (De Angelis et al., 2022), despite evidence that proper autoclaving effectively mitigates these concerns (Thiel et al., 2015). The HHS has called for policy reforms to incentivize reprocessing, noting its potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (Innovative Health, 2022). Meanwhile, the WHO's waste hierarchy prioritizes prevention, reuse, and recycling over disposal (Chartier et al., 2014), yet incineration remains the default in many regions due to convenience and regulatory inertia.

Case studies highlight the potential for integrated solutions. Rizan et al. (2022) found that combining autoclaving with improved waste segregation could reduce healthcare carbon footprints by 30–50%. Similarly, Healthcare Without Harm (2021) reported that transitioning to reusable systems in certain departments cut medical waste volumes by half. However, achieving widespread adoption requires addressing material limitations (e.g., developing heat-stable plastics), standardizing sterilization validation, and providing training on waste segregation and autoclave best practices.

Autoclaving offers a scalable, environmentally friendly alternative to incineration, but its full potential remains untapped due to regulatory, financial, and material barriers. A hybrid approach combining reusable systems for heat-tolerant items with sustainably designed disposables, where necessary, could balance infection control with ecological responsibility. Future research should explore innovations in autoclave-compatible materials, policy incentives for reprocessing, and hospital pilot programs to demonstrate feasibility. By addressing these challenges, healthcare systems can reduce their environmental footprint while maintaining patient safety.

Conclusion

The exponential growth of medical waste, driven by the healthcare sector's reliance on single-use plastics and disposable equipment, has reached a critical juncture demanding sustainable intervention. The findings of this review underscore the urgent need to transition from traditional, high-impact waste disposal methods, such as incineration, toward more sustainable alternatives like autoclaving. While incineration effectively reduces waste volume, its environmental and public health consequences, including the release of toxic emissions like dioxins and heavy metals, make it an unsustainable long-term solution. Autoclaving, by contrast, offers a promising pathway to mitigate these harms by sterilizing medical waste without generating hazardous byproducts, thereby aligning with global efforts to reduce healthcare's carbon footprint.

The environmental benefits of autoclaving are well-documented. Studies confirm its efficacy in neutralizing pathogens, including highly resistant bacteria and viruses, while preserving the structural integrity of reusable medical equipment. However, its implementation is not without challenges. Material

limitations, particularly the incompatibility of many single-use plastics with high-temperature sterilization, pose a significant barrier. Additionally, inconsistent sterilization validation methods, as highlighted by Panta (2019), reveal the need for standardized protocols to ensure reliability across healthcare settings. Despite these hurdles, autoclaving has proven successful in research laboratories, where reusable glassware and metal instruments are routinely sterilized, reducing waste generation by up to 50% (Rizan et al., 2022). Scaling this model to hospital settings requires addressing both technical and cultural obstacles, including clinician apprehensions about contamination risks and the stringent regulatory frameworks governing medical device reprocessing.

Financial considerations further complicate the adoption of autoclaving. While the initial investment in autoclave equipment and maintenance is substantial, long-term cost analyses reveal that reusable systems are economically advantageous. Hospitals that have transitioned to reprocessing medical devices report significant savings in waste management expenses, with some studies indicating a 30% reduction in costs compared to single-use systems. Moreover, the hidden expenses of incineration, such as environmental cleanup, public health impacts, and carbon emissions, are rarely accounted for in traditional cost assessments. A full lifecycle analysis, incorporating both economic and ecological factors, would strengthen the case for autoclaving as a cost-effective and sustainable solution.

Regulatory and ethical dilemmas also play a pivotal role in shaping medical waste management practices. Current policies, such as the FDA's stringent reprocessing standards and the EU's Medical Device Regulation, prioritize patient safety but inadvertently perpetuate reliance on single-use plastics. While these regulations are essential for preventing infections, they must evolve to accommodate advancements in sterilization technology and materials science. Ethical tensions between immediate patient safety and long-term environmental responsibility further complicate the decision-making process. However, emerging evidence suggests that these priorities are not mutually exclusive; properly sterilized reusable devices can meet safety standards while drastically reducing waste. Policymakers must therefore explore regulatory reforms that incentivize sustainable practices, such as tax breaks for hospitals that adopt autoclaving or grants for research into heat-resistant medical-grade plastics.

The COVID-19 pandemic served as a stark reminder of the vulnerabilities in global medical supply chains and the environmental toll of disposable PPE. The surge in plastic waste during this crisis underscored the urgent need for resilient, sustainable alternatives. Moving forward, healthcare systems must adopt a circular economy approach, where waste minimization, reuse, and recycling are prioritized over disposal. This shift will require collaboration across multiple stakeholders, including manufacturers, healthcare providers, regulators, and environmental scientists, to redesign medical products for durability, sterilizability, and end-of-life recyclability. Pilot programs in hospitals, particularly in surgical and diagnostic departments where waste generation is highest, could demonstrate the feasibility of large-scale autoclave integration. Education and training will also be critical in driving this transition. Healthcare workers must be equipped with the knowledge to segregate waste effectively, operate autoclaves safely, and advocate for sustainable practices within their institutions. Public awareness campaigns can further amplify the message, encouraging patients and communities to support eco-friendly healthcare policies.

In summary, autoclaving represents a viable and necessary step toward reducing the environmental impact of medical waste. While challenges remain, including material limitations, regulatory barriers, and upfront costs, the potential benefits for both public health and the planet are too significant to ignore. A hybrid model, combining autoclaving for heat-resistant items with innovative biodegradable alternatives for single-use applications, offers a balanced path forward.

By embracing this approach, the healthcare sector can fulfill its dual mandate: safeguarding patient well-being while protecting the environment for future generations. The time for action is now; sustainability must become an integral pillar of modern medical practice. The time for action is now; sustainability must become an integral pillar of modern medical practice.

Final Recommendations

1. Policy Reform: Governments should revise medical device regulations to facilitate safe reprocessing while maintaining high safety standards.
2. Investment in R&D: Funding should be directed toward developing autoclave-compatible materials and improving sterilization validation methods.
3. Hospital Pilot Programs: Large-scale trials of autoclave-based waste systems should be implemented to assess real-world feasibility.
4. Financial Incentives: Tax credits or subsidies could encourage hospitals to transition from single-use to reusable systems.
5. Training Initiatives: Healthcare staff should receive education on waste segregation, autoclave operation, and sustainable practices.
6. Public Awareness: Campaigns should highlight the environmental impact of medical waste and advocate for patient support of green healthcare initiatives.

By addressing these areas, the healthcare industry can lead the way in sustainable waste management, setting a precedent for other sectors to follow. The stakes are high, but the opportunity to create a healthier, more sustainable future is within reach.

References

1. British Standards Institution. (2024). Creating a circular eco-system for medical devices: Single-use vs reusable. *BSI Compliance Navigator*. https://compliancenavigator.bsigroup.com/en/medicaldeviceblog/creating-a-circular-eco-system-for-medical-devices-eco-design2/

2. Chartier, Y., Emmanuel, J., Pieper, U., Prüss, A., Rushbrook, P., Stringer, R., Townend, W., Wilburn, S., and Zghondi, R. (2014). *Safe management of wastes from health-care activities* (2nd ed.). World Health Organization. https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/85349/9789241548564_eng.pdf

3. De Angelis, G., et al. (2022). Healthcare workers' knowledge, attitudes, and practices towards medical waste management: A cross-sectional study in Italy. *BMC Health Services Research* 22(1), 1–12.

4. Donskey, C. J., Yowler, M., Falck-Ytter, Y., Kundrapu, S., Salata, R. A., and Rutala, W. A. (2014). A case study of a real-time evaluation of the risk of disease transmission associated with a failure to follow recommended sterilization procedures. *Antimicrobial Resistance and Infection Control* 3(1), 4.

5. Haque, M. S., Uddin, S., Sayem, S. M., and Mohib, K. M. (2021). Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) induced waste scenario: A short overview. *Journal of Environmental Chemical Engineering* 9(1), 104660.

6. Healthcare Without Harm (2021). 2021 Annual Report

7. Innovative Health. (2022, September 28). HHS report to hospitals: Over-reliance on "single-use" medical devices leads to supply chain disruptions, greater emissions; reprocessing among solutions noted to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from health sector. *Business Wire*.

8. Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health. (2023, March 10). Medical industry can reduce its carbon footprint by relying less on single-use supplies. *Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health News*.

9. Khan, M. T., Shah, I. A., Hossain, M. F., Akther, N., Zhou, Y., Khan, M. S., Al-Shaeli, M., Bacha, M. S., & Ihsanullah, I. (2023). Personal protective equipment (PPE) disposal during COVID-19: An emerging source of microplastic and microfiber pollution in the environment. *The Science of the total environment*, 860, 160322.

10. Kheirabadi, G. K., Bagheri, M., and Asgari, G. (2022). Medical waste management during COVID-19 pandemic: A case study. *Waste Management & Research* 40(1), 45–53.

11. Kokkinos, K., Lakioti, E., Moustakas, K., Tsanaktsidis, C., and Karayannis, V. (2024). Sustainable medical waste management using an intuitionistic fuzzy-based decision support system. *Sustainability* 16(1), 298.

12. McGain, F., and Story, D. A. (2022). The impact of switching from single-use to reusable healthcare products: A transparency checklist and systematic review of life-cycle assessments. *Health Services Research* 57(1), 1–10.

13. North, E. J., and Halden, R. U. (2013). Plastics and environmental health: The road ahead. *Reviews on Environmental Health* 28(1), 1–8.

14. Panta, G., Richardson, A. K., Shaw, I. C., and Ko, S. (2019). Effectiveness of autoclaving in sterilizing reusable medical devices in healthcare facilities. *Journal of Hospital Infection* 103(4), 399–404.

15. Practice Greenhealth. (2010). *MetroWest Medical Center, Natick & Framingham, MA: Rigid sterilization containers for surgical instrumentation.* [Case Study].

16. Rizan, C., Bhutta, M. F., Reed, M., and Lillywhite, R. (2022). The carbon footprint of waste streams in a UK hospital. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 365, 132718.

17. Rizan, C., Reed, M., and Bhutta, M. F. (2021). Environmental impact of personal protective equipment distributed for use by health and social care services in England in the first six months of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine* 114(5), 250–263.

18. Thiel, C. L., and Eckelman, M. J. (2021). Environmental impacts of healthcare waste: A global problem. AMA *Journal of Ethics* 23(6), E486–494.

19. Thiel, C. L., Eckelman, M., Guido, R., Huddleston, M., Landis, A. E., Sherman, J., and Shrake, S. O. (2015). Environmental impacts of surgical procedures: Life-cycle assessment of hysterectomy in the United States. *Environmental Science & Technology* 56(2), 1081–1090.

20. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2006). *Reprocessing and reuse of single-use devices: Review priorities.* FDA Guidance Document.

About the Author

Rachel Roberts is a senior at Michigan State University, double-majoring in Biomedical Laboratory Science and Human Biology. She is interested in biomedical, immunology, and clinical research. This project grew from her work as a medical assistant, where she noticed her clinic could reduce costs by autoclaving gauze rather than buying pre-sterilized supplies. With support from her pre-health sorority, she explored whether this practice could be cost-effective and practical. She hopes readers see how evidence-based policy change is essential for making simple, cost-saving solutions more accessible in healthcare.