

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

What is an invasive procedure? A definition to inform study design, evidence synthesis and research tracking

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-028576.R1
Article Type:	Communication
Date Submitted by the Author:	07-Jan-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Cousins, Sian; University of Bristol, Population Health Sciences Blencowe, Natalie; University of Bristol, Population Health Sciences Blazeby, Jane; University of Bristol, Population Health Sciences
Primary Subject Heading:	Surgery
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health services research
Keywords:	SURGERY, study design, evidence synthesis, research tracking, definitions, invasive procedures

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **What is an invasive procedure? A definition to inform study design, evidence synthesis**
4
5
6 **and research tracking**
7

8
9 Sian Cousins, Research Fellow^{1*},
10

11
12 Natalie S Blencowe, NIHR Clinical Lecturer^{1,2}, Surgery
13

14
15 Jane M Blazeby, Professor of Surgery^{1,2}
16

17
18 ¹Centre for Surgical Research, Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, Canynge
19
20 Hall, Whatley Road, Bristol. BS8 2PS
21

22
23
24 ²Division of Surgery, Head and Neck, University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust,
25
26 Upper Maudlin St, Bristol. BS2 8HW
27

28
29 ***Correspondence to:** Sian Cousins, sian.cousins@bristol.ac.uk
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

Worldwide, there are at least 230 million procedures performed annually and most of us will undergo several invasive procedures during our lifetime. There is therefore a need for high-quality evidence to underpin this clinical area.

Although research involving invasive procedures is challenging, enormous progress is being made in designing and conducting high quality studies in this area. However, this progress is being hampered by the lack of a universal definition of 'invasive procedures'. Currently there is no widely accepted definition of an invasive procedure and the terms 'surgery' and 'interventional procedure' are characterised inconsistently. We propose a definition for invasive procedures which addresses the limitations of those currently available.

Our definition was developed from an analysis of the 3946 papers from the last decade. A preliminary definition was created based on existing definitions and applied to a variety of papers reporting all types of procedures. This definition was continuously updated and subsequently applied iteratively to all articles.

The definition has three key components: i) method of access to the body, ii) instrumentation, and, iii) requirement for operator skill. This definition encapsulates all types of invasive procedure regardless of the method of access to the body (incision, natural orifice or percutaneous access), and is relevant whatever the clinical discipline (e.g. obstetric, cardiac, dental, interventional cardiology or radiology). Crucially, the definition excludes medicinal products, except where their administration occurs within an invasive procedure (and thereby involves operator skill).

1
2
3
4 The application of a universal definition of an invasive procedure would, i) inform the
5
6 selection of relevant methods for study design, ii) streamline evidence synthesis, and iii)
7
8 improve research tracking, helping to identify evidence gaps and direct research funds.
9

10 11 **Introduction**

12
13
14 Invasive procedures, including surgery, are fundamental to healthcare. Worldwide, there
15
16 are at least 230 million procedures performed annually and numbers are likely to increase
17
18 due to the widening application of minimally invasive and image guided techniques.¹
19
20
21 Despite the volume of invasive procedures undertaken, the number and quality of
22
23 randomised controlled trials (RCTs) in this area has historically been poor. Papers examining
24
25 the quality of surgical RCTs have repeatedly demonstrated limitations in study design and
26
27 conduct, such as issues with recruitment, quality assurance of interventions, and the
28
29 blinding of trial personnel.²⁻⁴ In the absence of evidence from well designed and conducted
30
31 RCTs, clinical practice has been largely driven by personal preference, experience and
32
33 anecdote. This results in variations and inequalities between surgeons, centres and regions
34
35 with respect to the indications for, and types of, invasive procedures performed.⁵⁻⁷
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 **Cultivating research in invasive procedures**

43
44
45 In the UK, the situation has begun to improve. The number of funded RCTs in surgery is
46
47 increasing, which has been facilitated by methodological advances and a marked shift in
48
49 research culture. The Royal College of Surgeons of England has invested in surgical trials
50
51 centres,⁸ networks of research-active surgeons have been established,⁹ and the quality of
52
53 surgical RCTs has improved.^{10, 11} These activities have resulted in approximately 50 new
54
55 surgical RCTs in the last five years and over 150 new chief and principal investigators. As a
56
57 result, the number of patients entering surgical RCTs has doubled.¹² Although these
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 improvements have largely centred around surgery, the underlying principles are common
5
6 to invasive procedures undertaken in other clinical disciplines such as cardiology,
7
8 gastroenterology and radiology. To maximise the opportunities afforded by these initiatives,
9
10 it is now necessary to understand exactly what is meant by an invasive procedure, by
11
12 developing a transparent and practical definition.
13
14

15 16 **Why is it important to define invasive procedures?**

17
18
19 A clear definition of invasive procedures has several benefits. It would, i) inform the
20
21 selection of relevant methods for study design, ii) streamline evidence synthesis, and iii)
22
23 improve the accuracy of categorisation and tracking of research activity.
24
25
26

27 28 **i) Designing studies to evaluate invasive procedures**

29
30
31 Evaluation of invasive procedures (or interventions) requires the application of specific
32
33 methods to optimise trial design and conduct. These differ from those required in
34
35 pharmaceutical studies. One of the main differences relates to the fact that invasive
36
37 procedures are complex interventions, defined as those with multiple interacting parts that
38
39 can act independently or interdependently to influence outcomes.¹³ Specific design features
40
41 include the need for iterative development work in early phase studies before undertaking a
42
43 main trial. This may include establishing the parameters of intervention standardization,
44
45 methods for blinding trial personnel and participants, and for assessing adherence to
46
47 treatment protocols. Undertaking later phase studies of invasive procedures also presents
48
49 specific challenges, such as recruitment, and the need to account for operator skill and
50
51 expertise at either the individual and/or centre level. These features are common to studies
52
53 evaluating all types of invasive procedures, regardless of anatomical area or clinical
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 discipline and recognition of this would optimise study design, conduct and associated
4
5 regulations/governance requirements.
6
7

8
9 **ii) Streamlining evidence synthesis**
10

11
12 Developing and applying a common definition for invasive procedures has the potential to
13
14 make systematic literature searching more efficient and sensitive. Currently it is not possible
15
16 to search for studies of invasive procedures without developing extensive key-word lists
17
18 because terms such as 'surgery' and 'invasive procedure' do not consistently identify
19
20 relevant papers. Searches can then be difficult to reproduce because authors define
21
22 'surgery' in different ways using different strategies and MeSH headings.^{4, 16, 17} A common
23
24 definition for invasive procedures linked to a working search strategy and MeSH heading
25
26 would facilitate these reviews by minimising the number of irrelevant papers retrieved and
27
28 reducing the risk of missing relevant papers.
29
30
31
32
33
34

35
36 **iii) Research tracking**
37

38
39 Accurate tracking of research involving invasive procedures is vital for the strategic
40
41 prioritisation of future RCTs. Tracking can help demonstrate output to funding bodies,
42
43 identify evidence gaps, provide funds for under-researched areas, and to reduce research
44
45 waste. A common definition for invasive procedures would provide transparent information
46
47 about research activities and promote the accurate categorisation of studies.
48
49
50

51
52 **Existing definitions**
53

54
55
56 Currently there is no widely accepted definition of an invasive procedure and the terms
57
58 'surgery' and 'interventional procedure' are characterised inconsistently. Some definitions
59
60

1
2
3 include only procedures that physically change the anatomy,² involve making a cut, are
4
5 undertaken in a sterile environment or use anaesthesia.⁴ Each of these has limitations. For
6
7 example, requiring that procedures physically change anatomy will exclude invasive
8
9 diagnostic procedures (e.g. laparoscopy, arthroscopy). Definitions specifying that
10
11 procedures should involve a cut will miss those undertaken via natural orifices (e.g.
12
13 endoscopy) or using percutaneous techniques (e.g. cardiac catheterisation), which are also
14
15 invasive. The need for a sterile environment and/or anaesthetic would also potentially
16
17 exclude these types of procedures from the definition.
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Further definitions of surgery are based on the personnel involved in the study regardless of
25
26 the nature of the intervention, such that any research involving surgeons is labelled
27
28 surgical.¹⁹ This poses problems as studies of pharmaceutical interventions delivered to
29
30 surgical patients will be deemed 'surgical', whereas they clearly require research methods
31
32 and governance appropriate for the evaluation of pharmaceutical interventions rather than
33
34 invasive surgical procedures.
35
36
37
38

39 **Proposal for a comprehensive definition of invasive procedures**

40
41
42 We propose a definition for invasive procedures that addresses the limitations of those
43
44 currently available. Our definition was developed from an analysis of the 3946 papers from
45
46 the last decade. Initially, a preliminary definition was created based on existing definitions
47
48 and applied to a variety of papers reporting all types of procedures. The preliminary
49
50 definition was continuously updated and subsequently applied iteratively to all articles. This
51
52 approach allowed us to check that the final definition encapsulated the entire spectrum of
53
54 invasive procedures (Box 1). The definition has three key components: i) method of access
55
56 to the body, ii) instrumentation, and, iii) requirement for operator skill. This definition
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 encapsulates all types of invasive procedure regardless of the method of access to the body
5
6 (incision, natural orifice or percutaneous access) or clinical discipline (e.g. obstetric, cardiac,
7
8 dental, intervention radiology etc). Crucially, the definition excludes medicinal products,
9
10 except where their administration occurs within an invasive procedure (and thereby
11
12 involves operator skill).
13
14

15 16 **Patient perspectives**

17
18
19 Three patients who had previously undergone an invasive procedure provided feedback on
20
21 the proposed definition of 'invasive procedures'.
22
23

24
25 All patients fully endorsed a definition that included procedures where access to the body
26
27 was made via a natural orifice or percutaneous puncture, as well as a cut (such as in a
28
29 traditionally described 'operation'). The patients expressed that their view of invasive
30
31 procedures was not centred on how access to the body was obtained, but rather that "it's
32
33 not about a cut, it's about something entering your body". One patient stated, "surgery is
34
35 not all about cutting... I think that's quite an old-fashioned view. There are more procedures
36
37 around now that may not involve cutting and a definition needs to include those".
38
39

40
41 Furthermore, the purpose of the invasive procedure, whether diagnostic or therapeutic, was
42
43 not expressed as being an important criterion in whether a procedure is defined as invasive,
44
45 and thus has not been included in the proposed definition.
46
47
48
49

50 **Conclusion**

51
52
53 We propose a comprehensive way of defining invasive procedures. Agreeing and applying a
54
55 definition to this fundamental aspect of healthcare is crucial, to optimise study design and
56
57 conduct, facilitate evidence synthesis and improve the tracking of research activity.
58
59
60

Author contributions

All authors are based in the Bristol Centre for Surgical Research, the Surgical Innovation theme of the Bristol Biomedical Research Centre (BRC) and the MRC ConDuCT-II (Collaboration and innovation in Difficult and Complex randomised controlled Trials In Invasive procedures) Hub for Trials Methodology Research. SC is a research fellow and NB and JB are academic surgeons (NIHR clinical lecturer and professor of surgery respectively). JB is an NIHR senior investigator. Repeated challenges in designing and conducting methodological and applied research including recurrent requests from other research groups for advice in this area have led to conceptualisation and writing of this article. SC, NB and JB all contributed to the development of the manuscript and approved its final version. JB is the guarantor.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank Alan Thomas, Azmina Verjee and Elizabeth Locke for their valued input as patient advisers.

Funding

This study was supported by the MRC ConDuCT-II (Collaboration and innovation in Difficult and Complex randomised controlled Trials In Invasive procedures) Hub for Trials Methodology Research and the NIHR Biomedical Research Centre at University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust and the University of Bristol. The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the National Institute for Health Research or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Conflicts of interest

1
2
3
4 The authors declare no conflicts of interest and we have not been paid to write it.
5

6 7 **References**

- 8
9 1. Weiser TG, Regenbogen SE, Thompson KD, et al. An estimation of the global volume
10 of surgery: a modelling strategy based on available data. *Lancet* 2008;372(9633):139-44.
11
12 2. Cook JA. The challenges faced in the design, conduct and analysis of surgical
13 randomised controlled trials. *Trials* 2009;10:9.
14
15 3. Jacquier I, Boutron I, Moher D, Roy C, Ravaud P. The reporting of randomized clinical
16 trials using a surgical intervention is in need of immediate improvement: a systematic
17 review. *Ann Surg* 2006;244(5):677-83.
18
19 4. Blencowe NS, Boddy AP, Harris A, et al. Systematic review of intervention design and
20 delivery in pragmatic and explanatory surgical randomized clinical trials. *Br J Surg*
21 2015;102(9):1037-47.
22
23 5. Goodney PR, Dzebisashvili N, Goodman D, Bronner KK. Variation in the care of
24 surgical conditions. The Dartmouth Institute for Health Policy and Clinical Practice 2014.
25 Available from:
26 http://www.dartmouthatlas.org/downloads/atlasses/Surgical_Atlas_2014.pdf
27
28 6. Dreinhofer KE, Dieppe P, Sturmer T, et al. Indications for total hip replacement:
29 comparison of assessments of orthopaedic surgeons and referring physicians. *Ann Rheum*
30 *Dis* 2006;65(10):1346-50.
31
32 7. Urbach DR, Baxter NN. Reducing variation in surgical care - requires innovative
33 methods for getting evidence into surgical practice. *BMJ* 2005;330(7505):1401-2.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 8. Royal College of Surgeons of England. The Rosetrees and the RCS Surgical Trials
5
6 Initiative: Royal College of Surgeons of England. Available from:
7
8 <https://www.rcseng.ac.uk/standards-and-research/research/surgical-trials-initiative/>
9
- 10
11 9. Nepogodiev D, Chapman SJ, Kolia AG, Fitzgerald JE, Lee M, Blencowe NS. The effect
12
13 of trainee research collaboratives in the UK. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2017;2(4):247-8.
14
- 15
16 10. Blencowe NS, Cook JA, Pinkney T, Rogers C, Reeves BC, Blazeby JM. Delivering
17
18 successful randomized controlled trials in surgery: Methods to optimize collaboration and
19
20 study design. *Clin Trials* 2017;14(2):211-8.
21
- 22
23 11. Ali UA, van der Sluis PC, Issa Y, Abou Habaga I, Gooszen HG, Flum DR, et al. Trends in
24
25 worldwide volume and methodological quality of surgical randomized controlled trials. *Ann*
26
27 *Surg* 2013;258(2):199-207.
28
- 29
30 12. Royal College of Surgeons of England. Surgical research report 2015/16. RCSENG -
31
32 Research. 2015. Available from: [https://www.rcseng.ac.uk/library-and-publications/rcs-](https://www.rcseng.ac.uk/library-and-publications/rcs-publications/docs/surgical-research-report-201516/)
33
34 [publications/docs/surgical-research-report-201516/](https://www.rcseng.ac.uk/library-and-publications/rcs-publications/docs/surgical-research-report-201516/)
35
36
- 37
38 13. Craig P, Dieppe P, Macintyre S, Michie S, Nazareth I, Petticrew M. Developing and
39
40 evaluating complex interventions: the new Medical Research Council guidance. *BMJ*
41
42 2008;337(7676).
43
- 44
45 14. Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency. Is it a clinical trial of a
46
47 medicinal product? 2014 [updated 2018]. Available from:
48
49 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/317952/Algothrim.pdf)
50
51 [data/file/317952/Algothrim.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/317952/Algothrim.pdf)
52
53
- 54
55 15. Heldman A, DiFede D, Fishman JE, et al. Transendocardial mesenchymal stem cells
56
57 and mononuclear bone marrow cells for ischemic cardiomyopathy - The TAC-HFT
58
59 randomized trial. *JAMA* 2014;311(1):62-73.
60

- 1
2
3
4 16. Wartolowska K, Collins GS, Hopewell S, et al. Feasibility of surgical randomised
5 controlled trials with a placebo arm: a systematic review. *BMJ Open* 2016;6(3):e010194.
6
7
8 17. Probst P, Grummich K, Heger P, et al. Blinding in randomized controlled trials in
9 general and abdominal surgery: protocol for a systematic review and empirical study. *Syst*
10
11
12
13 *Rev* 2016;5:48.
14
15 18. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Interventional procedures
16 guidance. 2018. Available from: [https://www.nice.org.uk/about/what-we-do/our-](https://www.nice.org.uk/about/what-we-do/our-programmes/nice-guidance/nice-interventional-procedures-guidance)
17
18 [programmes/nice-guidance/nice-interventional-procedures-guidance](https://www.nice.org.uk/about/what-we-do/our-programmes/nice-guidance/nice-interventional-procedures-guidance)
19
20
21
22
23 19. Adie S, Harris IA, Naylor JM, Mittal R. CONSORT compliance in surgical randomized
24 trials: are we there yet? A systematic review. *Ann Surg* 2013;258(6):872-8.
25
26
27
28 20. Zhu J, Zhou L, XingWu F. Tracking neural stem cells in patients with brain trauma. *N*
29
30 *Engl J Med* 2006;355(22):2376-8.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Box 1. Proposed definition of an invasive procedure

An invasive procedure is one where purposeful/deliberate access to the body is gained via an incision, percutaneous puncture, where instrumentation is used in addition to the puncture needle, or instrumentation via a natural orifice. It begins when entry to the body is gained and ends when the instrument is removed, and/or the skin is closed.

Invasive procedures are performed by trained healthcare professionals using instruments, which include, but are not limited to, endoscopes, catheters, scalpels, scissors, devices and tubes.

Where invasive procedures also involve the administration of a medicinal product, these could be categorised as being part of an 'invasive procedure' when operator skill is required for its administration within the body, i.e. when an internal action is performed to administer the product or the product is administered to a targeted anatomical area, e.g.²⁰. There are also procedures which involve operator skill to target something inside the body (e.g. electromagnetic radiation in the eye) without an incision, percutaneous puncture, or instrumentation via a natural orifice. These types of procedures do not fall within the definition of an invasive procedure

BMJ Open

What is an invasive procedure? A definition to inform study design, evidence synthesis and research tracking

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-028576.R2
Article Type:	Communication
Date Submitted by the Author:	28-Jun-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Cousins, Sian; University of Bristol, Population Health Sciences Blencowe, Natalie; University of Bristol, Population Health Sciences Blazeby, Jane; University of Bristol, Population Health Sciences
Primary Subject Heading:	Surgery
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health services research
Keywords:	SURGERY, study design, evidence synthesis, research tracking, definitions, invasive procedures

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **What is an invasive procedure? A definition to inform study design, evidence synthesis**
4
5
6 **and research tracking**
7

8
9 Sian Cousins, Research Fellow^{1*},
10

11
12 Natalie S Blencowe, MRC Clinician Scientist^{1,2}, Surgery
13

14
15 Jane M Blazeby, Professor of Surgery^{1,2}
16

17
18 ¹Centre for Surgical Research, Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, Canynge
19
20 Hall, Whatley Road, Bristol. BS8 2PS
21
22

23
24 ²Division of Surgery, Head and Neck, University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust,
25
26 Upper Maudlin St, Bristol. BS2 8HW
27
28

29
30 ***Correspondence to:** Sian Cousins, sian.cousins@bristol.ac.uk
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

Worldwide, there are at least 230 million invasive procedures performed annually and most of us will undergo several in our lifetime. There is therefore a need for high-quality evidence to underpin this clinical area.

Currently, however, there is no widely accepted definition of an invasive procedure and the terms 'surgery' and 'interventional procedure' are characterised inconsistently. We propose a definition for invasive procedures which addresses the limitations of those currently available.

Our definition was developed from an analysis of the 3946 papers from the last decade. A preliminary definition was created based on existing definitions and applied to a variety of papers reporting all types of procedures. This definition was continuously updated and applied iteratively to all articles.

The definition has three key components: i) method of access to the body, ii) instrumentation, and, iii) requirement for operator skill. It therefore encapsulates all types of invasive procedure regardless of the method of access to the body (incision, natural orifice or percutaneous access), and is relevant whatever the clinical discipline (e.g. obstetric, cardiac, dental, interventional cardiology or radiology). Crucially, the definition excludes medicinal products, except where their administration occurs within an invasive procedure (and thereby involves operator skill).

The application of a universal definition of an invasive procedure will i) inform the selection of relevant methods for study design, ii) streamline evidence synthesis, and iii) improve research tracking, helping to identify evidence gaps and direct research funds.

Introduction

Invasive procedures, including surgery, are fundamental to healthcare. Worldwide, there are at least 230 million procedures performed annually and numbers are likely to increase due to the widening application of minimally invasive and image guided techniques.¹ Despite the volume of invasive procedures undertaken, the number and quality of randomised controlled trials (RCTs) in this area has historically been poor. Papers examining the quality of surgical RCTs have repeatedly demonstrated limitations in study design and conduct, such as recruitment, quality assurance of interventions, and the blinding of trial personnel.²⁻⁴ In the absence of evidence from well designed and conducted RCTs, clinical practice has been largely driven by personal preference, experience and anecdote. This results in variations and inequalities between surgeons, centres and regions with respect to the indications for, and types of, invasive procedures performed.⁵⁻⁷

Cultivating research in invasive procedures

In the UK, the situation has begun to improve. The number and quality of funded RCTs in surgery is increasing, which has been facilitated by methodological advances and a marked shift in research culture. The Royal College of Surgeons of England has invested in surgical trials centres⁸ and networks of research-active surgeons have been established.⁹ These activities have resulted in approximately 50 new surgical RCTs in the last five years and over 150 new chief and principal investigators. As a result, the number of patients entering surgical RCTs has doubled.¹⁰ Although these improvements have largely centred around surgery, the underlying principles are common to invasive procedures undertaken in other clinical disciplines such as cardiology, gastroenterology and radiology. To maximise the

opportunities afforded by these initiatives, it is now necessary to understand exactly what is meant by an invasive procedure, by developing a transparent and practical definition.

Why is it important to define invasive procedures?

A clear definition of invasive procedures has several benefits. It would, i) inform the selection of relevant methods for study design, ii) streamline evidence synthesis, and iii) improve the accuracy of categorisation and tracking of research activity.

i) Designing studies to evaluate invasive procedures

Evaluation of invasive procedures requires the application of specific methods to optimise trial design and conduct. These differ from those required in pharmaceutical studies. One main difference is that invasive procedures are complex interventions, with multiple interacting parts that can act independently or interdependently to influence outcomes.¹¹ Specific design features include the need for iterative development work in early phase studies before undertaking a main trial. This may involve establishing the parameters of intervention standardization, methods for blinding trial personnel and participants, and for assessing adherence to treatment protocols. Challenges during later phase studies (i.e RCTs) include recruitment and the need to account for operator skill and expertise at either the individual and/or centre level. These features are common to studies evaluating all types of invasive procedures, regardless of anatomical area or clinical discipline, and recognition of this would optimise study design and conduct, and clarify governance requirements.

ii) Streamlining evidence synthesis

Developing and applying a common definition for invasive procedures has the potential to make systematic literature searching more efficient and sensitive. This is especially relevant

1
2
3 for reviews investigating groups of procedures. For example, a review synthesising evidence
4 regarding surgical interventions for a particular condition may draw different conclusions
5 depending on the definition of surgery used. Similar problems are apparent for
6
7
8
9
10
11 methodological reviews investigating surgical procedures as a whole.
12
13

14 Another problem is that it is currently not possible to search for studies of invasive
15 procedures without developing extensive key-word lists, because terms such as 'surgery'
16 and 'invasive procedure' do not consistently identify relevant papers. Searches can then be
17 difficult to reproduce because authors define 'surgery' in different ways using different
18 strategies and MeSH headings.^{4 12 13} A common definition for invasive procedures linked to a
19 working search strategy and MeSH heading would facilitate these reviews by minimising the
20 number of irrelevant papers retrieved and reducing the risk of missing relevant papers.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 32 iii) **Research tracking** 33

34
35 Accurate tracking of research involving invasive procedures is vital for the strategic
36 prioritisation of future RCTs. Tracking can help demonstrate output to funding bodies,
37 identify evidence gaps, provide funds for under-researched areas, and to reduce research
38 waste. A common definition for invasive procedures would provide transparent information
39 about research activities and promote the accurate categorisation of studies.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Existing definitions** 50

51
52 Currently there is no widely accepted definition of an invasive procedure and the terms
53 'surgery' and 'interventional procedure' are characterised inconsistently. Some definitions
54 include only procedures that physically change the anatomy,² involve making a cut, are
55 undertaken in a sterile environment, or use anaesthesia.⁴ Each of these has limitations. For
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 example, requiring that procedures physically change anatomy will exclude invasive
5
6 diagnostic procedures (e.g. laparoscopy, arthroscopy). Definitions specifying that
7
8 procedures should involve a cut will miss those undertaken via natural orifices (e.g.
9
10 endoscopy) or using percutaneous techniques (e.g. cardiac catheterisation), which are also
11
12 invasive. The need for a sterile environment and/or anaesthetic would also potentially
13
14 exclude these types of procedures from the definition.
15
16

17
18
19 Further definitions of surgery are based on the personnel involved in the study regardless of
20
21 the nature of the intervention, such that any research involving surgeons is labelled
22
23 surgical.¹⁴ This poses problems as studies of pharmaceutical interventions delivered to
24
25 surgical patients will be deemed 'surgical', whereas they actually require research methods
26
27 and governance appropriate for the evaluation of pharmaceutical interventions rather than
28
29 invasive surgical procedures.
30
31
32

33 34 **Proposal for a comprehensive definition of invasive procedures**

35
36
37 We propose a definition for invasive procedures that addresses the limitations of those
38
39 currently available. Our definition was developed from an analysis of the 3946 papers from
40
41 the last decade. Initially, a preliminary definition was created based on existing definitions
42
43 and applied to a variety of papers reporting all types of procedures. The preliminary
44
45 definition was continuously updated and applied iteratively to all articles, thereby verifying
46
47 that the final definition could be applied to the entire spectrum of invasive procedures (Box
48
49 1). The definition has three key components: i) method of access to the body, ii)
50
51 instrumentation, and, iii) requirement for operator skill. This definition encapsulates all
52
53 types of invasive procedure regardless of the method of access to the body (incision, natural
54
55 orifice or percutaneous access) or clinical discipline (e.g. obstetric, cardiac, dental,
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 intervention radiology etc). Crucially, the definition excludes medicinal products, except
4
5 where their administration occurs within an invasive procedure (and thereby involves
6
7 operator skill).
8
9

10 11 **Box 1. Proposed definition of an invasive procedure**

12
13
14
15 An invasive procedure is one where purposeful/deliberate access to the body is gained
16
17 via an incision, percutaneous puncture, where instrumentation is used in addition to the
18
19 puncture needle, or instrumentation via a natural orifice. It begins when entry to the
20
21 body is gained and ends when the instrument is removed, and/or the skin is closed.

22
23
24
25 Invasive procedures are performed by trained healthcare professionals using
26
27 instruments, which include, but are not limited to, endoscopes, catheters, scalpels,
28
29 scissors, devices and tubes.
30
31

32
33 Where invasive procedures also involve the administration of a medicinal product, these
34
35 could be categorised as being part of an 'invasive procedure' when operator skill is
36
37 required for its administration within the body, i.e. when an internal action is performed
38
39 to administer the product or the product is administered to a targeted anatomical area,
40
41 e.g.¹⁵. There are also procedures which involve operator skill to target something inside
42
43 the body (e.g. electromagnetic radiation in the eye) without an incision, percutaneous
44
45 puncture, or instrumentation via a natural orifice. These types of procedures do not fall
46
47 within the definition of an invasive procedure
48
49
50
51

52 53 **Patient perspectives**

54
55
56
57 Three patients who had previously undergone an invasive procedure provided feedback on
58
59 the proposed definition of 'invasive procedures'. The patients expressed that their view of
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

invasive procedures was not centred on how access to the body was obtained, but rather that “it’s not about a cut, it’s about something entering your body”. One patient stated, “surgery is not all about cutting... I think that’s quite an old-fashioned view. There are more procedures around now that may not involve cutting and a definition needs to include those”. Furthermore, the purpose of the invasive procedure, whether diagnostic or therapeutic, was not expressed as being an important criterion in whether a procedure is defined as invasive, and thus has not been included in the proposed definition.

Conclusion

We propose a comprehensive way of defining invasive procedures. Agreeing and applying a definition to this fundamental aspect of healthcare is crucial, to optimise study design and conduct, facilitate evidence synthesis and improve the tracking of research activity.

Author contributions

All authors are based in the Bristol Centre for Surgical Research, the Surgical Innovation theme of the Bristol Biomedical Research Centre (BRC) and the MRC ConDuCT-II (Collaboration and innovation in Difficult and Complex randomised controlled Trials In Invasive procedures) Hub for Trials Methodology Research. SC is a research fellow and NB and JB are academic surgeons (MRC Clinician Scientist and professor of surgery respectively). JB is an NIHR senior investigator. Repeated challenges in designing and conducting methodological and applied research including recurrent requests from other research groups for advice in this area have led to conceptualisation and writing of this article. SC, NB and JB all contributed to the development of the manuscript and approved its final version. JB is the guarantor.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank Alan Thomas, Azmina Verjee and Elizabeth Locke for their valued input as patient advisers.

Funding

This study was supported by the MRC ConDuCT-II (Collaboration and innovation in Difficult and Complex randomised controlled Trials In Invasive procedures) Hub for Trials Methodology Research and the NIHR Biomedical Research Centre at University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust and the University of Bristol. The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the National Institute for Health Research or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest and we have not been paid to write it.

References

1. Weiser TG, Regenbogen SE, Thompson KD, et al. An estimation of the global volume of surgery: a modelling strategy based on available data. *Lancet* 2008;372(9633):139-44. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(08)60878-8 [published Online First: 2008/06/28]
2. Cook JA. The challenges faced in the design, conduct and analysis of surgical randomised controlled trials. *Trials* 2009;10:9. doi: 10.1186/1745-6215-10-9 [published Online First: 2009/02/10]
3. Jacquier I, Boutron I, Moher D, et al. The reporting of randomized clinical trials using a surgical intervention is in need of immediate improvement: a systematic review. *Ann*

- 1
2
3
4 *Surg* 2006;244(5):677-83. doi: 10.1097/01.sla.0000242707.44007.80 [published
5
6 Online First: 2006/10/25]
7
- 8
9 4. Blencowe NS, Boddy AP, Harris A, et al. Systematic review of intervention design and
10
11 delivery in pragmatic and explanatory surgical randomized clinical trials. *Br J Surg*
12
13 2015;102(9):1037-47. doi: 10.1002/bjs.9808 [published Online First: 2015/06/05]
14
- 15
16 5. Goodney PR, Dzebisashvili N, Goodman D, et al. Variation in the care of surgical conditions:
17
18 The Dartmouth Institute for Health Policy and Clinical Practice, 2014.
19
- 20
21 6. Dreinhofer KE, Dieppe P, Sturmer T, et al. Indications for total hip replacement:
22
23 comparison of assessments of orthopaedic surgeons and referring physicians. *Ann*
24
25 *Rheum Dis* 2006;65(10):1346-50. doi: 10.1136/ard.2005.047811 [published Online
26
27 First: 2006/01/28]
28
- 29
30 7. Urbach DR, Baxter NN. Reducing variation in surgical care. *BMJ* 2005;330(7505):1401-2.
31
32 doi: 10.1136/bmj.330.7505.1401 [published Online First: 2005/06/18]
33
- 34
35 8. Royal College of Surgeons of England. The Rosetrees and the RCS Surgical Trials Initiative:
36
37 Royal College of Surgeons of England. Available from:
38
39 <https://www.rcseng.ac.uk/standards-and-research/research/surgical-trials-initiative/>
40
41
- 42
43 9. Nepogodiev D, Chapman SJ, Kolia AG, et al. The effect of trainee research collaboratives
44
45 in the UK. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2017;2(4):247-48. doi: 10.1016/S2468-
46
47 1253(17)30033-X [published Online First: 2017/04/14]
48
- 49
50 10. Royal College of Surgeons of England. Surgical research report 2015/16. RCSENG -
51
52 Research. 2015. Available from: [https://www.rcseng.ac.uk/library-and-](https://www.rcseng.ac.uk/library-and-publications/rcs-publications/docs/surgical-research-report-201516/)
53
54 [publications/rcs-publications/docs/surgical-research-report-201516/](https://www.rcseng.ac.uk/library-and-publications/rcs-publications/docs/surgical-research-report-201516/)
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 11. Craig P, Dieppe P, Macintyre S, et al. Developing and evaluating complex interventions:
5
6 the new Medical Research Council guidance. *BMJ* 2008;337:a1655. doi:
7
8 10.1136/bmj.a1655 [published Online First: 2008/10/01]
9
10
11 12. Wartolowska K, Collins GS, Hopewell S, et al. Feasibility of surgical randomised
12
13 controlled trials with a placebo arm: a systematic review. *BMJ Open*
14
15 2016;6(3):e010194. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2015-010194 [published Online First:
16
17 2016/03/24]
18
19
20
21 13. Probst P, Grummich K, Harnoss JC, et al. Placebo-Controlled Trials in Surgery: A
22
23 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2016;95(17):e3516. doi:
24
25 10.1097/MD.00000000000003516 [published Online First: 2016/04/29]
26
27
28 14. Adie S, Harris IA, Naylor JM, et al. CONSORT compliance in surgical randomized trials: are
29
30 we there yet? A systematic review. *Ann Surg* 2013;258(6):872-8. doi:
31
32 10.1097/SLA.0b013e31829664b9 [published Online First: 2013/06/05]
33
34
35 15. Zhu J, Zhou L, XingWu F. Tracking neural stem cells in patients with brain trauma. *N*
36
37 *Engl J Med* 2006;355(22):2376-8.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60