VIAMED Sales And Marketing - Any other business

Oxygen sensor review OOM201 & OOM104

Issue ID #81757

Date Created 17/Oct/2016

Issued To: Derek Lamb

Completed Status: Still Outstanding

Notes:

Added by Steve Nixon sent to Derek Lamb

From the statistics it doesn't look as though we have a real problem with our existing R-23V sensor, although we have had a number of sensors returned due to bubbles. This could be caused by sensors being exposed to elevated temperatures, for example in an incubator and this would cause evapouration of the electrolyte.

It has always concerned me why Envitec have had two versions of the Draeger 6850645 and Maxtec have led or followed suit with two sensors. NOTE: Draeger just have one version.

OOM210 (0110023 R-23V) 14-20.7mV, <12s, >500K life NOTE: dual cathode.

OOM104 14-20.0mV, <12s, >500K life NOTE: single cathode.

MAX-11 14-20.0mV, <12s, >500K life NOTE: dual cathode.

MAX-11i (incubators 8000, high temp app) 14-20.0mV, <12s, >500K life NOTE: single cathode.

The question is did the original TAI version and does current Draeger version suffer from problems, and are they evident to customers? If possible we need to obtain new working samples of the Draeger 6850645 sensor.

I will go ahead and create a new sensor based on the OOM104. This will be specifically for use in the I8000 and will offer greater life due to being a single cathode design. Due to the higher output we don't have much scope in using a thicker membrane and also the response time is already relative slow.

Any comments before we go ahead and implement?

I know Envitec/Maxtec seem to have already reached the same conclusion in advance, but this is historic - so perhaps not many people are aware of the reasons behind the design specifications. Therefore please keep technical design rationale `in-house` and confidential.

_____