

# 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](mailto: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
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	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<sup>1\*</sup>,

10  
11  
12 Natalie S Blencowe, NIHR Clinical Lecturer<sup>1,2</sup>, Surgery

13  
14  
15 Jane M Blazeby, Professor of Surgery<sup>1,2</sup>  
16

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

23  
24 <sup>2</sup>Division 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](mailto: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.<sup>1</sup>  
19  
20 Despite the volume of invasive procedures undertaken, the number and quality of  
21  
22 randomised controlled trials (RCTs) in this area has historically been poor. Papers examining  
23  
24 the quality of surgical RCTs have repeatedly demonstrated limitations in study design and  
25  
26 conduct, such as issues with recruitment, quality assurance of interventions, and the  
27  
28 blinding of trial personnel.<sup>2-4</sup> In the absence of evidence from well designed and conducted  
29  
30 RCTs, clinical practice has been largely driven by personal preference, experience and  
31  
32 anecdote. This results in variations and inequalities between surgeons, centres and regions  
33  
34 with respect to the indications for, and types of, invasive procedures performed.<sup>5-7</sup>  
35  
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,<sup>8</sup> networks of research-active surgeons have been established,<sup>9</sup> and the quality of  
52  
53 surgical RCTs has improved.<sup>10, 11</sup> 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.<sup>12</sup> Although these  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 improvements have largely centred around surgery, the underlying principles are common  
4  
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  
11 it is now necessary to understand exactly what is meant by an invasive procedure, by  
12  
13  
14 developing a transparent and practical definition.  
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  
22 selection of relevant methods for study design, ii) streamline evidence synthesis, and iii)  
23  
24  
25 improve the accuracy of categorisation and tracking of research activity.  
26

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

28  
29  
30  
31 Evaluation of invasive procedures (or interventions) requires the application of specific  
32  
33  
34 methods to optimise trial design and conduct. These differ from those required in  
35  
36  
37 pharmaceutical studies. One of the main differences relates to the fact that invasive  
38  
39  
40 procedures are complex interventions, defined as those with multiple interacting parts that  
41  
42  
43 can act independently or interdependently to influence outcomes.<sup>13</sup> Specific design features  
44  
45  
46 include the need for iterative development work in early phase studies before undertaking a  
47  
48  
49 main trial. This may include establishing the parameters of intervention standardization,  
50  
51  
52 methods for blinding trial personnel and participants, and for assessing adherence to  
53  
54  
55 treatment protocols. Undertaking later phase studies of invasive procedures also presents  
56  
57  
58 specific challenges, such as recruitment, and the need to account for operator skill and  
59  
60  
61 evaluating all types of invasive procedures, regardless of anatomical area or clinical

1  
2  
3 discipline and recognition of this would optimise study design, conduct and associated  
4  
5  
6 regulations/governance requirements.  
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.<sup>4, 16, 17</sup> 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 **iii) Research tracking**

36  
37  
38 Accurate tracking of research involving invasive procedures is vital for the strategic  
39  
40 prioritisation of future RCTs. Tracking can help demonstrate output to funding bodies,  
41  
42 identify evidence gaps, provide funds for under-researched areas, and to reduce research  
43  
44 waste. A common definition for invasive procedures would provide transparent information  
45  
46 about research activities and promote the accurate categorisation of studies.  
47  
48  
49  
50

51  
52 **Existing definitions**

53  
54  
55 Currently there is no widely accepted definition of an invasive procedure and the terms  
56  
57 'surgery' and 'interventional procedure' are characterised inconsistently. Some definitions  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 include only procedures that physically change the anatomy,<sup>2</sup> involve making a cut, are  
4  
5 undertaken in a sterile environment or use anaesthesia.<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>19</sup> 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 encapsulates all types of invasive procedure regardless of the method of access to the body  
4  
5 (incision, natural orifice or percutaneous access) or clinical discipline (e.g. obstetric, cardiac,  
6  
7 dental, intervention radiology etc). Crucially, the definition excludes medicinal products,  
8  
9 except where their administration occurs within an invasive procedure (and thereby  
10  
11 involves operator skill).  
12  
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](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. RCEENG -  
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  
6 controlled trials with a placebo arm: a systematic review. *BMJ Open* 2016;6(3):e010194.  
7  
8  
9 17. Probst P, Grummich K, Heger P, et al. Blinding in randomized controlled trials in  
10  
11 general and abdominal surgery: protocol for a systematic review and empirical study. *Syst*  
12  
13 *Rev* 2016;5:48.  
14  
15  
16 18. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Interventional procedures  
17  
18 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)  
19  
20 [programmes/nice-guidance/nice-interventional-procedures-guidance](https://www.nice.org.uk/about/what-we-do/our-programmes/nice-guidance/nice-interventional-procedures-guidance)  
21  
22  
23 19. Adie S, Harris IA, Naylor JM, Mittal R. CONSORT compliance in surgical randomized  
24  
25 trials: are we there yet? A systematic review. *Ann Surg* 2013;258(6):872-8.  
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.<sup>20</sup>. 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
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	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<sup>1\*</sup>,

10  
11  
12 Natalie S Blencowe, MRC Clinician Scientist<sup>1,2</sup>, Surgery

13  
14  
15 Jane M Blazeby, Professor of Surgery<sup>1,2</sup>  
16

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

22  
23  
24 <sup>2</sup>Division 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](mailto: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 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.<sup>1</sup>

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.<sup>2-4</sup> 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.<sup>5-7</sup>

### 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 centres<sup>8</sup> and networks of research-active surgeons have been established.<sup>9</sup> 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.<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup> 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  
4 for reviews investigating groups of procedures. For example, a review synthesising evidence  
5  
6 regarding surgical interventions for a particular condition may draw different conclusions  
7  
8 depending on the definition of surgery used. Similar problems are apparent for  
9  
10 methodological reviews investigating surgical procedures as a whole.  
11  
12

13  
14 Another problem is that it is currently not possible to search for studies of invasive  
15  
16 procedures without developing extensive key-word lists, because terms such as 'surgery'  
17  
18 and 'invasive procedure' do not consistently identify relevant papers. Searches can then be  
19  
20 difficult to reproduce because authors define 'surgery' in different ways using different  
21  
22 strategies and MeSH headings.<sup>4 12 13</sup> A common definition for invasive procedures linked to a  
23  
24 working search strategy and MeSH heading would facilitate these reviews by minimising the  
25  
26 number of irrelevant papers retrieved and reducing the risk of missing relevant papers.  
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  
37 prioritisation of future RCTs. Tracking can help demonstrate output to funding bodies,  
38  
39 identify evidence gaps, provide funds for under-researched areas, and to reduce research  
40  
41 waste. A common definition for invasive procedures would provide transparent information  
42  
43 about research activities and promote the accurate categorisation of studies.  
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  
54 'surgery' and 'interventional procedure' are characterised inconsistently. Some definitions  
55  
56 include only procedures that physically change the anatomy,<sup>2</sup> involve making a cut, are  
57  
58 undertaken in a sterile environment, or use anaesthesia.<sup>4</sup> Each of these has limitations. For  
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.<sup>14</sup> 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 Invasive procedures are performed by trained healthcare professionals using  
25  
26 instruments, which include, but are not limited to, endoscopes, catheters, scalpels,  
27  
28 scissors, devices and tubes.  
29  
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.<sup>15</sup>. 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