TABLE A-13

Case study: Sedasys

(Innovation failure summary)

Variable	Description
Innovation	Machine that administers propofol anesthetic to patients undergoing certain procedures under the supervision of a nurse, negating the need for more highly paid anesthesiologists, launched 13 October 2014
Radical or incremental	Radical
Category	Product
Sector	Medical technology
Failure timing	Launch stage, failure in March 2016
Failure root cause	No market demand • Opposition from the American Society of Anesthesiologists claiming a machine would not be capable of exercising the same level of care and diligence as a trained professional; limiting it to too few routine procedures (e.g., colonoscopies, endoscopies) • As a safety measure added to gain approval by regulators, the machine could only decrease the level of anesthetic—increases in dosage required intervention of a clinician—further limiting the machine's operability
Failure root cause timing	Product development
Outcomes	• As a result of the limitations of the machines, it was not financially beneficial to most hospitals • The machine did not sell well, with only a handful of hospitals in the United States purchasing the equipment • Johnson & Johnson stopped selling the product
Business insight into the innovation process	• Products that require formal or informal approval from expert groups or regulators should not be developed absent their input or support
Pivot	na
Pivot enabler	na

na = not applicable.

Source(s):
National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics and SRI International, special research (2020) of 2010–20 open-access articles, including *MIT Technology Review*, *New York Times*, *Fast Company*, U.S. General Accountability Office, and *Defense News*.