Surgomics: personalized prediction of morbidity, mortality and long-term outcome in surgery using machine learning on multimodal data
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Abstract

Background  Personalized medicine requires the integration and analysis of vast amounts of patient data to realize individualized care. With Surgomics, we aim to facilitate personalized therapy recommendations in surgery by integration of intraoperative surgical data and their analysis with machine learning methods to leverage the potential of this data in analogy to Radiomics and Genomics.

Methods  We defined Surgomics as the entirety of surgomic features that are process characteristics of a surgical procedure automatically derived from multimodal intraoperative data to quantify processes in the operating room. In a multidisciplinary team we discussed potential data sources like endoscopic videos, vital sign monitoring, medical devices and instruments and respective surgomic features. Subsequently, an online questionnaire was sent to experts from surgery and (computer) science at multiple centers for rating the features’ clinical relevance and technical feasibility.

Results  In total, 52 surgomic features were identified and assigned to eight feature categories. Based on the expert survey (n = 66 participants) the feature category with the highest clinical relevance as rated by surgeons was “surgical skill and quality of performance” for morbidity and mortality (9.0 ± 1.3 on a numerical rating scale from 1 to 10) as well as for long-term (oncological) outcome (8.2 ± 1.8). The feature category with the highest feasibility to be automatically extracted as...
rated by (computer) scientists was “Instrument” (8.5 ± 1.7). Among the surgomic features ranked as most relevant in their respective category were “intraoperative adverse events”, “action performed with instruments”, “vital sign monitoring”, and “difficulty of surgery”.

**Conclusion** Surgomics is a promising concept for the analysis of intraoperative data. Surgomics may be used together with preoperative features from clinical data and Radiomics to predict postoperative morbidity, mortality and long-term outcome, as well as to provide tailored feedback for surgeons.
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Surgery is an important building block of the treatment for a multitude of diseases, for example in multivessel coronary artery disease [1] or solid cancer [2]. At the same time, surgery is dangerous with postoperative death being the third leading cause of death worldwide [3]. The complexity of surgical treatment results from a multitude of interactions between patients, clinical staff members and medical devices during pre-, intra- and postoperative phases. Optimal surgical results that can theoretically be achieved are not always reached in daily practice. Especially during the postoperative treatment pathway, complications like erosive bleeding from a pancreatic fistula [4] or mediastinitis after an esophageal anastomotic leakage [5] can occur. These complications result in a significant deterioration of the patient’s outcome or even in the death of the patient. Patient-associated factors such as age, sex, body mass index (BMI) or comorbidities such as cardiac disease or diabetes can have a large impact on the postoperative outcome and may therefore be used for outcome prediction [6, 7]. But also surgeon and hospital experience [8], as well as an adequate treatment of major postoperative surgical complications are influencing the mortality rates in different perioperative care systems [9]. With regard to the intraoperative setting, increasing evidence suggests that specific parameters and events are strongly associated with postoperative complications and outcome [10]. For example, intraoperative factors like a staple line bleeding in laparoscopic distal pancreatectomy can be a potential precursor of a later pancreatic fistula, as demonstrated using video review-based analysis [11]. Furthermore, it has been proven that surgical skill and technical performance are strongly associated with postoperative clinical outcome [12–14]. Nevertheless, the predictive accuracy of surgeons for postoperative complications appears limited, e.g. in case of anastomotic leakage in gastrointestinal surgery [15].

In non-surgical areas of multimodal treatment especially for cancer, personalized therapy recommendations along the treatment pathway have already been pursued with the approaches of Genomics, Epigenomics, Transcriptomics, and Microbiomics in (tumor) biology [16],
and with Radiomics in clinical medicine [17]. However, an omics-approach in surgery that uses intraoperative data comprehensively, i.e. combines surgical data specific to the operating room to create a quantitative description of a surgical procedure is not yet established. This deficiency may result from the large scale and velocity of multimodal data in the operating room produced by heterogeneous sources of raw data, or might also be related to the high level of variability of surgical processes [18]. To pave the way for a personalized therapy, which makes use of intraoperative data, relevant surgical process characteristics need to be extracted from data sources like endoscopic videos, intraoperative imaging methods or vital sign monitoring using machine learning (ML) methods [18]. First steps in this endeavor have been made in the preoperative setting using ML to automatically identify high risk surgical patients [19]. Intraoperatively, ML has been widely studied for the recognition of surgical phases [20, 21], for the automatic assessment of the surgeon’s skill level [22], or for predicting postoperative adverse events and distractions [23]. With the OR black box, Jung et al. presented a first comprehensive approach of quantitatively identifying intraoperative events and distractions by collecting intraoperative data [24]. Based on this work, they developed an index to measure the severity of intraoperative events and thus identified patients at high risk of developing postoperative complications [25]. However, their analysis was based on human expert ratings and not on a computer-based approach, thus requiring a huge effort and time limiting its scalability. Up until now ML has not been applied within a comprehensive and concrete approach to use intraoperative surgical data to support surgical decision-making leading to a lack of success stories in the field of surgical data science [26]. We argue that the absence of a useful and classified representation of recorded intraoperative data, which would allow for the analysis of vast amounts of heterogeneous data is one major reason in this regard.

The aim of this article is to approach this shortcoming by defining the concept of Surgomics as a surgical answer to Genomics and Radiomics. After identifying and categorizing intraoperative surgomic features, this article investigates which surgomic features are perceived as clinically most relevant and technically most feasible by surgeons and (computer) scientists with a focus on the example of minimally invasive oncological surgery. In contrast to the general concept of surgical data science, Surgomics will focus on the intraoperative setting to use and integrate the rapidly increasing amounts of intraoperative sensor data. Surgomics may be used together with pre- and postoperative data to improve surgical treatment with surgical data science methods. Furthermore, Surgomics could enable digital surgery applications such as decision support systems, computer-assisted training, and robotics [27].

**Materials and methods**

We started with the idea to systematically explore intraoperative data and use methods of feature extraction from those vast amounts of data similar to Radiomics. In order to elaborate this raw idea we brought together experts from multiple surgical and scientific disciplines and came up with a definition “Surgomics”, i.e. its data sources, methods and applications. Then, we discussed ideas for surgomic features, categorized them, and used what we found to eliminate uncertainties in the definition of Surgomics. Finally, we validated the ideas for features and their relevance in a multicenter expert survey.

**Definition of Surgomics**

We define Surgomics as follows: **Surgomics is the entirety of surgomic features that are process characteristics of a surgical procedure automatically derived from multimodal intraoperative data to quantify processes in the operating room. Surgomics is thus the surgical answer to Genomics and Radiomics and may be used together with preoperative features from clinical data science and Radiomics to predict postoperative morbidity, mortality and long-term outcome as well as to provide tailored feedback for surgeons.**

Based on previous work in surgical data science [18], surgical process models [28], surgical workflow analysis [29], and health information networks [30], we aim to establish Surgomics as a concept to collect, process and structure multimodal data in the intraoperative setting (Fig. 1). To reach this goal, surgical expert knowledge needs to be combined with ML and data science methods to make effective and scalable use of the vast amounts of intraoperative data.

**Categorization of surgomic features**

The aforementioned definition of Surgomics and surgomic features resulted as a first step in development by a multidisciplinary team (n = 19) consisting of experts from the fields of colorectal, pancreatic, upper gastrointestinal, robot-assisted and minimally invasive surgery on one hand, as well as translational surgical oncology, surgical data science, connected medical devices, medical informatics, medical data models, clinical decision support, radiomics, and endoscopic vision on the other hand. In a next step, the multidisciplinary team discussed the variety of data available in the intraoperative setting and their potential relevance for the patient’s short-term surgical outcome (morbidity and mortality), as well as long-term outcome (survival). In the course of the
discussion, examples of surgomic features were collected and categorized. Here, we aimed for a broad spectrum of features using different intraoperative data sources to foster future discussion on new features. Later on, additional information for each feature was added, i.e. unit of measurement, source of raw data, specificity for a certain surgical procedure and literature references if applicable (Table 1).

Regarding the categorization of the surgomic features, the multidisciplinary team agreed on the following eight feature categories (Fig. 2):

1. Surgical field
   The surgical field category contains surgomic features which can be derived from the surgical video (for example in laparoscopy or thoracoscopy) and directly apply to the surgical procedure, for example the level of blood and smoke in the surgical field or imaging methods like the accumulation of indocyanine green (ICG) as a measure for the perfusion in an anastomosis.

2. Instrument
   The instrument category comprises features related to surgical instruments, e.g. the instrument location in the surgical video, the action performed with an instrument or medical device, device settings such as voltage in electrosurgery, or vacuum and pressure settings for suction and irrigation. The source of raw data can be the (endoscopic) video, but data can also be derived directly from the medical device sensor connected to an instrument.

3. Temporal course of procedure
   The category relating to the temporal course of procedure contains characteristics, which describe the surgery with respect to its workflow, e.g. the duration and order of performed surgical steps.

4. Patient
   The patient category represents patient-specific characteristics such as the visual texture of lung or liver derived from surgical video, or the pancreatic duct diameter. These features are derived directly from the patient and may also be available preoperatively, e.g. from computed tomography.

5. Anesthesiological data
   Examples for features in the anesthesiological data category are data of the blood gas analysis or the vital sign monitoring. The features can be derived from the (electronic or digitized) anesthesia protocol or from anesthesiological devices.

6. Surgical skill and quality of performance
   The category referring to the surgical skill and quality of performance contains features, which are specific to each surgeon. For instance, surgical skill can be objectified with the GOALS score [31] including features such as bimanual dexterity or tissue handling. Other features occurring in the course of surgery, directly depending on the operating surgeon, are the quality of a suture or the extent of dissection of lymphatic tissue in oncological surgery [32].

7. Surgical team
   These features depend on the constellation and interaction of the surgical team like the position of the different team members around the patient or the quality of team communication. Additionally, characteristics, which are individual for each team member, like their experience in the respective surgical procedure or their
| No | Feature                          | Description and use case                                                                 | Feature category        | Source of raw data                  | Procedure specific? | Relevant reference |
|----|---------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| 1  | Bloodiness                      | How bloody is the surgical field based on a predefined scale, e.g., five options, one of them “small amount of blood”. Based on this feature, other information like the number of bleedings requiring hemostasis can be calculated | Surgical field          | Video                               | No                  | [36]               |
| 2  | Smokiness                       | How smoky is the surgical field based on a predefined scale, e.g., four options one of them “no visibility due to the amount of smoke” | Surgical field          | Video                               | No                  | [37]               |
| 3  | Presence of anatomic structure  | E.g., is the gastric tube or the azygos vein visible in the video?                      | Surgical field          | Video                               | No                  | [38]               |
| 4  | Location of anatomic structure  | Where is an anatomic structure like the gastric tube located? What is the 3D position of the anatomic structure? | Surgical field          | Video                               | No                  | [39]               |
| 5  | Action performed with anatomic structure | Which action is performed with the anatomic structure and how often or for how long has the action occurred? E.g., the gallbladder has been grasped ten times | Surgical field          | Video                               | No                  | [40, 41]           |
| 6  | Colors of anatomic structures   | E.g., does the color of the gastric tube look pale or vital?                           | Surgical field          | Video                               | No                  |                    |
| 7  | Indocyanine green accumulation curve of perfusion in anatomic structures | How well is the esophagastrotomy perfused based on the ICG-accumulation? | Surgical field          | Video                               | Yes                 | [42]               |
| 8  | Hyperspectral imaging of anatomic structures | How well is the perfusion of an organ as measured by hyperspectral imaging? | Surgical field          | Hyperspectral imaging device        | Yes                 | [43]               |
| 9  | Intraoperative adverse events   | Which intraoperative adverse events like a major vessel injury or a re-do anastomosis do occur during the procedure? | Surgical field          | Video, anesthesia protocol, surgery report | No                  | [23, 25, 44]       |
| 10 | Presence of instrument          | E.g., is the suction, clip-applier or vessel sealer visible in the video?              | Instrument              | Video                               | No                  | [46]               |
| 11 | Location of instrument          | Where is an instrument like the grasper located? What is the 3D position of the instrument? | Instrument              | Video, robot                        | No                  | [22]               |
| No | Feature                                      | Description and use case                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Feature category | Source of raw data           | Procedure specific? | Relevant reference |
|----|---------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| 12 | Action performed with instrument            | Which action is performed with the instrument? How often or for how long has the action occurred? E.g., the vessel sealer is used for 30 min                                                                                                                                                                                                             | Instrument       | Video                       | No                  | [41, 47]           |
| 13 | Instrument usage                            | Which pattern does the instrument usage show? E.g., for how long and in which sequence has the instrument been used? How many tool changes occur or in which combination with other instruments is the tool used?                                                                                                                                             | Instrument       | Video, device data          | No                  | [48]               |
| 14 | Instrument open/closed                      | Is the instrument, e.g., the scissors, open or closed?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Instrument       | Video, robot                | No                  |                    |
| 15 | Number of camera cleanings                  | How often has the camera been cleaned during the surgery?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Instrument       | Video                       | No                  |                    |
| 16 | Instrument pressure or flow                 | How strong is e.g., the insufflator flow over time?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | Instrument       | Device data                 | No                  | [49]               |
| 17 | Duration of surgery                         | How long does the surgery take? How long do the different surgical phases and steps, e.g. the gastric tube construction take?                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Temporal course of procedure | Video                       | No                  | [50]               |
| 18 | Order of performed phases/steps             | In which order are the surgical phases or steps performed? Are there deviations from the normal order?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Temporal course of procedure | Video                       | No                  | [20, 50]           |
| 19 | Duration of inside/outside sequences        | When is the camera outside of the patient’s body? How long do these outside sequences take?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | Temporal course of procedure | Video                       | No                  |                    |
| 20 | Texture of lungs                            | How does the texture of the lung appear, e.g., what is the smoker status of the patient?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Patient           | Video                       | No                  | [51]               |
| 21 | Texture of liver                            | E.g., does the patient’s liver show cirrhosis or metastases? How does the liver texture appear e.g., after a chemotherapy?                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | Patient           | Video                       | No                  | [52]               |
| 22 | Texture of pancreatic gland                 | How does the texture of the pancreatic gland appear, e.g. are there signs of atrophy or chronic inflammation?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Patient           | Video                       | No                  | [53, 54]           |
| No | Feature                     | Description and use case                                                                 | Feature category                     | Source of raw data       | Procedure specific? | Relevant reference |
|----|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 23 | Frozen section result       | Is the frozen section result tumor free or are still malignant cells present?             | Patient                            | Pathology protocol       | Yes                  | [55]                |
| 24 | Gastric tube diameter       | How wide is the diameter of the gastric tube estimated intraoperatively during an esophagectomy? | Patient                            | Video                    | Yes                  |                     |
| 25 | Pancreatic duct diameter    | How wide is the diameter of the pancreatic duct estimated intraoperatively?              | Patient                            | Video                    | Yes                  | [54]                |
| 26 | Volume of remnant gland     | How large is the volume of the pancreatic gland at the end of a pancreatic surgery?     | Patient                            | Video                    | Yes                  |                     |
| 27 | Drug administration         | Which medication is administered to the patient during surgery?                          | Anesthesiological data              | Anesthesia protocol      | No                   |                     |
| 28 | Blood gas analysis          | Does the patient e.g. develop a metabolic acidosis during surgery?                      | Anesthesiological data              | Anesthesia protocol      | No                   |                     |
| 29 | Vital sign monitoring data  | How are the vital signs of the patient during the surgery, e.g. the arterial blood pressure curve? | Anesthesiological data              | Anesthesia protocol, device | No                  | [56]                |
| 30 | Difficulty of surgery       | How difficult is the surgery compared to other surgeries of the same type, e.g., are there aberrant vessels present or are there a lot of abdominal adhesions? | Surgical skill and quality of performance | Video, sound recording, ... | No                  | [57]                |
| 31 | Depth perception            | How well does the surgeon operate with the laparoscopic or robotic optical system, e.g. are there frequent overshootings of the instruments? | Surgical skill and quality of performance | Video                   | No                   | GOALS-Score [31]    |
| 32 | Bimanual dexterity          | How well does the surgeon use both hands, e.g., does he or she frequently ignore the nondominant hand? | Surgical skill and quality of performance | Video                   | No                   | GOALS-Score [31]    |
| 33 | Efficiency                  | How fluent is the surgeon in his or her actions, e.g. does the surgeon often switch from one area of dissection to another? | Surgical skill and quality of performance | Video                   | No                   | GOALS-Score [12, 31] |
| No | Feature                        | Description and use case                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Feature category                          | Source of raw data          | Procedure specific? | Relevant reference         |
|----|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| 34 | Tissue handling               | Does the surgeon handle tissue gently and is the use of laparoscopic or robotic instruments appropriate, e.g., does he or she adapt to the loss of tactile feedback?                                                    | Surgical skill and quality of performance | Video                        | No                   | GOALS-Score [12, 22, 31] |
| 35 | Autonomy                      | How much guidance of a more experienced surgeon does the operating surgeon need, e.g., does the more experienced surgeon needs to take over the operation?                                                                   | Surgical skill and quality of performance | Video, sound recording       | No                   | GOALS-Score [31]         |
| 36 | Tissue exposure               | How well is the tissue exposed for the performed surgical action, e.g., the critical view of safety in cholecystectomy?                                                                                                 | Surgical skill and quality of performance | Video                        | No                   | [12]                     |
| 37 | Suture quality of anastomosis | E.g., is the approximation of the sutures appropriate?                                                                                                                                                                   | Surgical skill and quality of performance | Video                        | Yes                  | [32]                     |
| 38 | Extent of dissection/resection| How well have anatomic structures like the aorta been dissected? How large is the extent of removed lymphatic tissue?                                                                                                     | Surgical skill and quality of performance | Video                        | No                   | [32]                     |
| 39 | Tension of anastomosis        | Is there tension at an anastomosis, e.g., an esophagogastrostomy, visible?                                                                                                                                             | Surgical skill and quality of performance | Device                       | Yes                  | [32]                     |
| 40 | Force of stomach pull-up      | E.g., was excessive force used during the stomach-pull up in an esophagectomy?                                                                                                                                       | Surgical skill and quality of performance | Device                       | Yes                  |                          |
| 41 | Number of team members        | How many people are in the operating room and who are part of the surgical team? How does the number of team members change over time? Are more people present during specific surgical steps than during others? | Surgical team                           | OR camera                     | No                   | [24]                     |
| 42 | Position of team members      | Where are the different surgical team members located in the operating room? How does the constellation change during surgery?                                                                                      | Surgical team                           | OR camera                     | No                   | [58]                     |
| No | Feature | Description and use case                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Feature category | Source of raw data          | Procedure specific? | Relevant reference |
|----|---------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 43 | Quality of team communication | How do different surgical team members interact and communicate with each other, e.g., are there often misunderstandings or in which moments do distractions occur? | Surgical team     | Sound recording              | No                  | [24]                |
| 44 | Fastness of decision-making | If an intraoperative adverse event occurs, how and how fast does the surgical team make a decision? | Surgical team     | Sound recording              | No                  | [59]                |
| 45 | Surgeries performed as a team | How many surgeries has the surgical team performed in this constellation? | Surgical team     | Past OR schedules            | No                  |                     |
| 46 | Familiar surgeries performed / Experience with surgery | How many robotic or laparoscopic surgeries has a surgical team member already performed? What is the overall experience of the team member with robotic or laparoscopic surgery? How many surgeries of exactly the present surgery, e.g., robot-assisted esophagectomies has a surgical team member already performed? | Surgical team     | Past OR schedules            | No                  | [60]                |
| 47 | Stress level | How high is the stress level of the surgical team members? This could be measured by the cortisol level | Surgical team     | Blood sample                 | No                  |                     |
| 48 | Heart rate | How high is the heart rate of the surgical team members? | Surgical team     | Device                       | No                  |                     |
| 49 | Voice frequency | How high is the voice frequency of the surgical team members? | Surgical team     | Device                       | No                  | [59]                |
| 50 | Emotional atmosphere in OR | How is the emotional atmosphere in the operating room? E.g., could the atmosphere be tense after an adverse event occurred connected with more noises and a rather harsh language | Environment       | Sound recording              | No                  | [24]                |
| 51 | Temperature in OR | How high is the temperature in the operating room? | Environment       | Device                       | No                  |                     |
current stress level as measured by cortisol level or heart rate, are included in this category. Furthermore, team aspects such as the number of procedures that two or more members of the surgical and/or anaesthesiological team have performed together prior to the operation, can be considered within this category. However, data sources to collect intraoperative information on the team like a microphone or a room camera in the OR have to be used with caution considering data privacy concerns.

8. Environment

Features regarding the environmental setting of the OR containing metadata of the surgery are summarized in this category. Examples are the emotional atmosphere, the noises, or the temperature in the operating room. Again, a microphone or a room camera could be used for data acquisition.

**Multicenter expert survey**

In the next step a questionnaire presenting all surgomic feature categories and their respective features was developed to validate and rate them. The questionnaire was implemented and analyzed with the online tool LimeSurvey (LimeSurvey GmbH, Hamburg, Germany) hosted by Heidelberg University (Heidelberg, Germany). We sent out the questionnaire to the departments of general and visceral surgery at three German university hospitals, six German research groups from computer science, the section for computer and telematic assisted surgery of the German Society of Surgery (DGCH), and participants of the endovis-challenges HeiChole 2019 and HeiSurf 2021 (https://endovis.challenge.org/).

The opening page of the questionnaire explained the concept of Surgomics and mentioned the different partners involved in the project.

The participants were then asked for their gender, professional background (general or visceral surgeon, other surgical specialty, computer scientist, scientist from other discipline, other) and years of professional work experience since graduation (for surgeons since beginning of residency).

In the next step the participants were asked to rate the eight feature categories on a numeric rating scale from 1 to 10 (1 = not relevant/feasible; 10 = extremely relevant/feasible) regarding their:

1. Clinical relevance for morbidity ("patient suffers postoperative complications") and mortality ("patient dies within 90 days after surgery")
2. Clinical relevance for the long-term oncological outcome ("survival, e.g. postoperative survival 10 years after surgery")
(3) Technical feasibility of automatic recognition with machine learning ("Artificial Intelligence").

Each feature category was displayed with at least one example. If the participant needed more information about a category, there was the option to hover over the category and get a more detailed description displayed.

Finally, participants were asked to rank the 52 available surgomic features within their respective category (Table 1) via drag and drop regarding their overall priority. Again, if the participant needed more information about a specific surgomic feature, there was the option to hover over the feature and display a more detailed description. Additionally, participants were invited to add missing surgomic features in a free text field.

Statistical analysis

The results of the survey were analyzed using descriptive statistics with Python 3.10 using pandas 1.4, scipy 1.8 and seaborn 0.11, (Python Software Foundation [33]). For the surgomic feature categories mean and standard deviation were calculated for clinical relevance and technical feasibility. For the priority ranking of the surgomic features in each category mean ± standard deviation of the rank were calculated. Results were calculated separately for surgeons and (computer) scientists. A test for normal distribution was performed with the Shapiro–Wilk-test [34] and results were compared with Welch’s unequal variances t test [35].

Results

Overall, 52 intraoperative surgomic features have been identified in the multidisciplinary panel discussion. Table 1 gives an overview of the surgomic features and their properties. Most features were assigned to the “surgical skill and quality of performance” category (n = 11). The categories “temporal course of procedure”, “anesthesiological data” and “environment” had the least features (n = 3 each). The categories “surgical field” and the “surgical team” (n = 9 each) as well as “instrument” and “patient” (n = 7 each) had intermediate numbers of features. Overall, n = 9 (17%) features were procedure specific, meaning that they cannot be derived and analyzed in every surgery like the ICG-accumulation curve of an anastomosis.

The anonymous expert survey was then conducted with n = 66 participants from multiple centers. This included 34 surgeons, all working in general or visceral surgery, 8 (24%) were female and 26 (76%) were male. They had been working in their professional field since the beginning of residency for a mean of 11.9 ± 7.0 years. Furthermore, 28 scientists participated, 23 of them computer scientists (82%), 7 (25%) of them were female and 21 (75%) male. They had been working as scientists since graduation for a mean of 7.6 ± 7.8 years. Participants with “other” professional backgrounds were excluded from analysis (n = 4).

Clinical relevance for morbidity and mortality as rated by surgeons was highest for the feature category “surgical skill and quality of performance” (9.0 ± 1.3) with an average rating of 6.8 ± 1.1 over all categories and also for long-term outcome (8.2 ± 1.8) with an average rating of 5.8 ± 1.2 over all categories. Technical feasibility of automatic recognition with ML as rated by scientists was highest for the “Instrument” category (8.5 ± 1.7) with an average feasibility rating over all categories of 6.8 ± 1.3. Figure 3 gives an overview of the ratings for all categories.

Surgeons and scientists gave the highest ranking of overall relevance within their respective category to the same surgomic features “intraoperative adverse events” (surgical field category), “action performed with instrument” (instrument category), “vital sign monitoring data” (anesthesiological category), “difficulty of surgery” (surgical skill category), “familiar surgeries performed / experience with surgery” (surgical team category), and “emotional atmosphere in OR”
Table 2 gives an overview of the ranking for all surgomic features. In the free text answers for new surgomic features a total of \( n = 34 \) new features were mentioned. Most ideas for new features were given in the “anesthesiological data” category and the “surgical field” category. Here, eight new feature ideas were added each, e.g. “degree of relaxation/depth of narcosis” and “anastomosis technique (in general which techniques were used)”, respectively. In the “anesthesiological data” category “ventilation parameters” were mentioned by \( n = 3 \) participants. The “instrument” category followed with five new feature ideas, e.g. “movement of instrument (trajectory)” \( (n = 2 \) participants). In this category one participant also suggested an intraoperative assistance based on the surgomic features, i.e. the “visual highlight of potentially dangerous instruments when inserted”. In category “temporal course of procedure” \( n = 6 \) participants suggested the duration of certain phases as a new feature, which was originally listed by us as part of the feature “duration of surgery”, but should be a separate feature. The full list of the free text answers for new surgomic feature ideas can be found in supplement 1.

**Discussion**

**Conceptualizing Surgomics**

With Surgomics we coined a neologism to comprehensively describe a surgical procedure based on automatic analysis of intraoperative data. This is in analogy to Radiomics, where the mere idea that “images are more than pictures, they are data” is far from new [61]. The specific challenge of surgical data is taking temporal data and the whole surgical team into account. Here, the representation of temporal data is far from trivial and actually an open research question. Data has been systematically collected in the operating room to improve patient care [24], ML has been used for surgical skill assessment [62]. However, with Surgomics our aim is to go beyond assessment of an individual surgeon’s skill. The aim is to approach the massive amount of data that is generated daily in the operating rooms with a holistic perspective on all possible sources of data and provide a conceptual framework for future developments of automatic analysis of this data keeping the improvement of surgical patient care in focus. Thereby, Surgomics can also add a fine granular, objective analysis to previous approaches that proved the importance of intraoperative adverse event classification [44, 45].

Fig. 3  Rating of surgomic feature categories. Ratings are displayed in each subplot per feature category for clinical relevance regarding morbidity and mortality, clinical relevance regarding long-term (oncological) outcome and technical feasibility. Colors depict ratings of surgeons and scientists, respectively. The only significant difference between surgeons and scientists was in the category “surgical skill and quality of performance” regarding the relevance for morbidity and mortality \( (p = 0.002) \).
**Table 2** Overall priority of surgomic features

| Category                        | Surgical field     | Instrument                      | Temporal course of procedure                          | Patient                  |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1st Intraoperative adverse events (2.4 ± 2.0) | Intraoperative adverse events (3.5 ± 2.7) | Action performed with instrument (1.8 ± 0.9) | Duration of surgery (1.5 ± 0.6) | Texture of liver (3.2 ± 1.8) |
| 2nd Bloodiness (3.6 ± 2.3)      | Presence of anatomic structure (3.6 ± 2.5) | Instrument usage (3.5 ± 1.4) | Order of performed phases/steps (1.6 ± 0.7) | Frozen section result (2.9 ± 1.9) |
| 3rd Action performed with anatomic structure (3.8 ± 1.9) | Action performed with anatomic structure (3.8 ± 1.9) | Location of instrument (3.7 ± 1.7) | Duration of inside/outside sequences (2.8 ± 0.5) | Texture of pancreatic gland (3.3 ± 1.5) |
| 4th Presence of anatomic structure (5.2 ± 2.7) | Location of anatomic structure (4.0 ± 2.5) | Presence of instrument (3.7 ± 2.3) | Duration of inside/outside sequences (2.6 ± 0.6) | Texture of lung (3.4 ± 2.3) |
| 5th Location of anatomic structure (5.6 ± 2.4) | Bloodiness (4.2 ± 1.9) | Instrument pressure or flow (4.4 ± 2.1) | Duration of inside/outside sequences (2.6 ± 0.6) | Texture of pancreatic gland (3.1 ± 1.6) |
| 6th Hyperspectral imaging of anatomic structures (5.8 ± 2.3) | Colors of anatomic structures (6.0 ± 2.1) | Instrument open/closed (5.3 ± 1.3) | Duration of inside/outside sequences (2.6 ± 0.6) | |
| 7th Indocyanine green accumulation curve of perfusion in anatomic structures (5.9 ± 2.4) | Hyperspectral imaging of anatomic structures (6.4 ± 2.3) | Number of camera cleanings (5.6 ± 1.2) | Duration of inside/outside sequences (2.6 ± 0.6) | |
| 8th Smokiness (6.3 ± 2.2)      | Indocyanine green accumulation curve of perfusion in anatomic structures (6.5 ± 1.9) | n/a | Duration of inside/outside sequences (2.6 ± 0.6) | |
| 9th Colors of anatomic structures (6.5 ± 2.0) | Smokiness (7.0 ± 2.0) | n/a | Duration of inside/outside sequences (2.6 ± 0.6) | |
| 10th | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 11th | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
Table 2 (continued)

| Category | Anesthesiological data | Surgical skill and quality of performance | Surgical team | Environment |
|----------|------------------------|-------------------------------------------|---------------|-------------|
|          |                        |                                           |               |             |
|          |                        | Vital sign monitoring data (1.1 ± 0.3)    |                |             |
| Ranking  | Surg                   | Sci                                       | Surg          | Sci         |
| 1st      | Vital sign monitoring  | Vital sign monitoring data (1.3 ± 0.6)    | Difficulty of surgery (3.3 ± 3.1) | Difficulty of surgery (3.5 ± 3.1) | Familiar surgeries performed / Experience with surgery (2.3 ± 2.0) | Familiar surgeries performed / Experience with surgery (2.7 ± 2.0) | Emotional atmosphere in OR (1.6 ± 0.8) | Emotional atmosphere in OR (1.8 ± 0.8) |
| 2nd      | Blood gas analysis     | Blood gas analysis (2.2 ± 0.6)            | Suture quality of anastomosis (4.6 ± 3.0) | Tissue handling (4.5 ± 2.2) | Quality of team communication (3.3 ± 1.9) | Quality of team communication (3.1 ± 2.2) | Noises in the OR (1.8 ± 0.7) | Noises in the OR (1.8 ± 0.7) |
| 3rd      | Drug administration    | Drug administration (2.7 ± 0.5)           | Tissue handling (5.4 ± 2.9) | Suture quality of anastomosis (4.6 ± 2.4) | Surgeries performed as a team (3.5 ± 2.4) | Stress level (4.4 ± 1.9) | Fastness of decision-making (4.5 ± 2.1) |
|          |                        |                                           | Framiliar surgeries performed as a team (3.8 ± 2.1) |          |              |              |              |
| 4th      | n/a                    | n/a                                       | Tension of anastomosis (5.5 ± 2.9) | Efficiency (5.6 ± 2.7) | Noises in the OR (1.8 ± 0.7) | Noises in the OR (1.8 ± 0.7) |              |
| 5th      | n/a                    | n/a                                       | Efficiency (6.2 ± 3.4) | Tissue exposure (5.6 ± 2.9) | Tissue exposure (5.6 ± 2.9) | Tissue exposure (5.6 ± 2.9) | Tissue exposure (5.6 ± 2.9) | Tissue exposure (5.6 ± 2.9) |
| 6th      | n/a                    | n/a                                       | Extend of dissection/ resection (6.4 ± 2.8) | Extend of dissection/ resection (6.4 ± 2.8) | Number of team members (6.3 ± 2.4) | Number of team members (6.3 ± 2.4) | Number of team members (6.3 ± 2.4) | Number of team members (6.3 ± 2.4) |
| 7th      | n/a                    | n/a                                       | Tissue exposure (6.5 ± 2.7) | Tissue exposure (6.5 ± 2.7) | Heart rate (6.5 ± 2.0) | Heart rate (6.5 ± 2.0) | Heart rate (6.5 ± 2.0) | Heart rate (6.5 ± 2.0) |
| 8th      | n/a                    | n/a                                       | Tissue exposure (6.5 ± 2.7) | Tissue exposure (6.5 ± 2.7) | Tissue exposure (6.5 ± 2.7) | Tissue exposure (6.5 ± 2.7) | Tissue exposure (6.5 ± 2.7) | Tissue exposure (6.5 ± 2.7) |
| 9th      | n/a                    | n/a                                       | Tissue exposure (6.5 ± 2.7) | Tissue exposure (6.5 ± 2.7) | Tissue exposure (6.5 ± 2.7) | Tissue exposure (6.5 ± 2.7) | Tissue exposure (6.5 ± 2.7) | Tissue exposure (6.5 ± 2.7) |
| 10th     | n/a                    | n/a                                       | Tissue exposure (6.5 ± 2.7) | Tissue exposure (6.5 ± 2.7) | Tissue exposure (6.5 ± 2.7) | Tissue exposure (6.5 ± 2.7) | Tissue exposure (6.5 ± 2.7) | Tissue exposure (6.5 ± 2.7) |
| 11th     | n/a                    | n/a                                       | Tissue exposure (6.5 ± 2.7) | Tissue exposure (6.5 ± 2.7) | Tissue exposure (6.5 ± 2.7) | Tissue exposure (6.5 ± 2.7) | Tissue exposure (6.5 ± 2.7) | Tissue exposure (6.5 ± 2.7) |

Features are sorted per category as ranked by surgeons (Surg) and scientists (Sci)
We thus gathered a group of 19 specialists from both surgery and (computer) science to flesh out the concept of Surgomics. As a result we came up with a first collection of 52 surgomic features that may serve as surrogate parameters for the quality of patient care and defined eight categories to group them (Table 1).

When validating this conception with a broader audience of surgeons and (computer) scientists we found the rating of relevance for morbidity and mortality for the category “surgical skill and quality of performance” as the only one with a significant difference between surgeons and scientists (p = 0.002). In contrast to surgeons, scientists rated the category “anesthesiological data” as most relevant for morbidity and mortality and not “surgical skill and quality of performance”. We assume this surprising agreement to result from a selection bias, because the participating (computer) scientists are members of surgical-technical societies and/or have a long track record of scientific work in computer-assisted surgery. This highlights that a close scientific exchange between clinicians and computer scientists is beneficial or even mandatory to ensure optimal planning of the next steps to differentiate and develop individual surgomic features.

Surgeons rated the category “surgical skill and quality of performance” highest in relevance for morbidity and mortality as well as for long-term (oncological) outcome. The feasibility of this category, however, was rated penultimate by scientists. Interestingly, the surgomic feature rated with highest overall priority in this category was “difficulty of surgery” far beyond sub-dimensions of the established GOALS-score such as “tissue handling”, “tissue exposure” and “efficiency”.

A better relation between clinical relevance and technical feasibility was found for “anesthesiological data” with high ratings for morbidity and mortality, but not for long-term (oncological) outcome. At the same time this category had the second highest rating for feasibility, rendering it a good candidate for further investigation. When rating the features surgeons and scientists agreed on “vital sign monitoring” having the highest relevance. It would be interesting to investigate which parameter(s), such as heart rate, arterial blood pressure, central venous pressure or ventilation parameters are of highest relevance.

Another promising category is “patient” with the second highest rating in long-term (oncological) outcome and third in morbidity and mortality. Whereas the technical feasibility was rated lower, surgomic features that could be easily obtained with computer vision from laparoscopic video such as “texture of liver”, “texture of lungs” and “texture of pancreatic gland” had high relevance ratings.

Other feature categories that have been of high interest in the scientific literature on computer vision for laparoscopic surgery, namely “surgical field”, “instrument” and “temporal course of procedure” received only medium ratings for clinical relevance, but comparatively high technical feasibility. Because of that high technical feasibility these categories should also be a matter of future investigations, in order to create a success story of the Surgomics concept that would boost motivation to tackle more challenging features for example from the category of “surgical skill and quality of performance”. Good feature candidates would be the highly rated “intraoperative adverse events”, “bloodiness”, “action performed with anatomic structure”, “action performed with instrument”, and “instrument usage”.

The category “environment” was neither rated high in clinical relevance nor in technical feasibility and will thus have a low priority for future investigations.

Although many surgomic features have been identified and described, our list is far from complete. The free text questions for more surgomic feature ideas already revealed 34 new features. Furthermore, a relevant proportion of our 52 surgomic features is to be extracted from surgical video in minimally invasive surgery. More surgomic features from various sources of raw data will be identified in surgical and scientific discussions as well as during the development process of other features. Either way, the suitability of every surgomic feature for a certain application has to be validated thoroughly before introduction into clinical practice.

A limitation of our study is that in our group only general and visceral surgeons participated, potentially missing features that would be important for other specialties such as cardiac or thoracic surgery. Also, other parts of the OR team such as anesthesiologists and scrub nurses have not been involved in our study, but probably will come up with other surgomic features in future discussions.

Furthermore, some definitions of features and their categories can be hard to distinguish. The instrument category could be perceived as part of the surgical field category, but we chose to define a different category to distinguish what happens in the surgical field and which instruments perform these activities integrating data that is not derived from the video, but from connected medical devices (e.g. electrocautery). Other surgomic features like the “emotional atmosphere in the OR”, which was assigned to the “environment” category, could as well be assigned to the “surgical team” category.

**Pre-, intra- and postoperative use**

Based on the idea of using intraoperative data for improvement of patient care, numerous potential applications for Surgomics along the whole treatment path arise. Preoperative information about the patient (comorbidities, previous surgeries) as well as their disease (tumor stage, lymph node involvement) is routinely collected. It is obvious that this information will influence the intraoperative course. For example, previous surgeries may result in more or less
severe abdominal adhesions and some surgical centers may limit minimally invasive oncologic surgery to T2/T3 cancers. Antithrombotic medication may turn a straightforward procedure into a more demanding one. Whereas established metrics such as overall procedure time or intraoperative blood loss can hint towards those correlations, surgomic features such as bloodiness or length of certain key steps of a procedure can give deeper insights into correlations or even causality.

Intraoperatively, assistance-systems based on Surgomics may support learning surgeons with real time analysis and a recommendation of what other surgeons would do in the same situation. Furthermore, Surgomics may help with intraoperative decision-making for individual patients by correlating quantitative measurements such as gastric tube width or indocyanine green (ICG) perfusion quantification with other procedure or postoperative outcome parameters.

Postoperatively, the aim of Surgomics is to predict life-threatening complications. Even if the blood loss as estimated by the anesthesiologist is low, the “bloodiness” of an operation may be high in a specific part of the procedure leading to postoperative hematoma and infection. Even if the subjective impression of ICG perfusion of an anastomosis seems good, the accumulation of the perfusion in combination with an ruptured suture may result in anastomotic insufficiency. By applying the concept of Surgomics, clinical researchers may find correlations that can be used to develop clinical decision support systems based on those surgomic features. Here, the aim would be to predict complications of the individual patient before they become clinically apparent and to warn surgeons accordingly [56] to reduce the rate of “failure to rescue” [63].

On an individual surgeon level, Surgomics may be used as a foundation for an objective quantitative metric of surgeon performance. By incorporating not only audiovisual data from the OR but other sensors from medical devices, vital sign monitoring, etc. Surgomics is a more comprehensive concept than surgical sabermetrics. Here, Surgomics may be used for regular assessment of surgical residents to objectify their progress and tailor their training accordingly. For experienced surgeons, Surgomics may help to establish data-driven morbidity and mortality analysis and bring up hypotheses for performance improvement by providing deeper insights into correlation of intraoperative activities with postoperative outcomes. Also, in contrast to global scores of overall performance, Surgomics again may help surgeons by breaking down potential reasons for a case being exceptionally difficult by giving insights into factors of patient, surgeon, team, and environment. In this manner, Surgomics can be a methodological approach to use ML for automatic surgical quality assessment, or to better classify and compare procedures in a learning curve.

Furthermore, Surgomics may become a tool to automate the comprehensive description and classification of a surgical procedure, similar to TNM in pathology, going beyond already promising approaches to categorize intraoperative adverse events [44, 45]. Surgomics thus may serve to improve comparability of clinical performance and procedures in surgical trials.

Ethical considerations

When introducing a concept that provides comprehensive insights into the intraoperative course and might even produce objective data of inadequate surgeon performance, difficult ethical questions arise. Here, we are having the same situation as e.g. in aviation with flight recorders (black box) or with CIRS (critical incident reporting systems) in hospitals. If in analogy further approaches regarding the assessment of the surgeon’s skill and the quality of performance are to be made, ethical considerations are extremely important. There is no doubt that performance data needs to be collected objectively [14] with the surgical team members being fully aware of the recording, the further use of the data and the possible consequences of inadequate surgical performance. Moreover, concerns regarding privacy and litigation need to be addressed as investigated in a study on perception of the OR blackbox® [64]. However, nowadays some authors consider a routine video recording of surgeries an ethical duty and a standard of care with potential benefits for e.g. safety, fairness and candor [65]. Already in 2011, the American Board of Medical Specialties (ABMS) defined requirements that a systematic tracking of the surgeon’s performance is necessary [12]. Furthermore, in case there are legal implications, it might even be helpful to have proper documentation of the performed activities to protect surgeons. Apart from the legal aspects, video-based coaching sessions with senior surgeons focusing on the operative technique have already been successfully introduced [66]. Using Surgomics for an automated assessment of surgical skills with anonymous, constructive feedback based on expert knowledge may even be less intimidating than personal feedback from a surgical supervisor a surgeon is dependent on. Nevertheless, we are convinced that objective data of performance can open the room for discussion and improvement. This way, a positive culture regarding mistakes is to be established with surgeons being aware of their own performance level, strengths and room for improvement.

Next steps

The next step to realize the concept of Surgomics would be the automatic recognition of features. Here, our work not only introduces a concept, but provides a conceptual framework for future research that can help to shape the process.
of intraoperative data analysis and provides guidance for surgeons and computer scientists alike. Surgeons with ideas for new surgomic features find the technical feasibility of feature categories rated by (computer) scientists and (computer) scientists that want to apply their technology to surgery find the clinical relevance of surgomic feature categories rated by surgeons. Based on the analysis of our survey with experienced professionals from surgery and (computer) science, surgomic features like “vital sign monitoring” (“anesthesiological data” category) as well as texture of liver, lung, and pancreas (“patient” category) have a suitable combination of expected clinical relevance and technical feasibility. Furthermore, the surgomic features “intraoperative adverse events”, “bloodiness”, “action performed with anatomy” (“surgical field” category), “action performed with instrument”, and “instrument usage” (“instrument” category), should be investigated. Because of their high technical feasibility and the already active scientific community in the field of laparoscopic computer vision, they represent “low hanging fruits” to create success stories for Surgomics.

This success also depends on open source availability of annotated surgical data and ML models. Annotated surgical data can be used in international ML challenges to validate algorithms for automatic extraction of surgomic features from surgical data. The openly available ML models could then be used by surgical researchers at different centers to investigate the use of surgomic features as new parameters in clinical research. This in turn would stimulate discussions within surgical societies to investigate more surgomic features and their application to clinical problems similar to current developments in Radiomics and Genomics for precision medicine.

Conclusion

The aim of Surgomics is to predict a patient’s morbidity, mortality and long-term outcome using ML to derive personalized information from comprehensive intraoperative sensor data and combining it with pre- and postoperative information. With a multidisciplinary group of experts, we defined this concept, and came up with 52 features in eight categories that were rated by experienced professionals from surgery and (computer) science. This is a first step to establish Surgomics as the surgical answer to Radiomics and Genomics for improving surgical patient care.

Supplementary Information  The online version contains supplementary material available at https://doi.org/10.1007/s00464-022-09611-1.

Funding  Open Access funding enabled and organized by Projekt DEAL. This work has been funded by the German Federal Ministry of Health (BMG) within the “Surgomics” project (Grant Number BMG 2520DAT82), by the German Research Foundation DFG within the Cluster of Excellence EXC 2050: “Center for Tactile Internet with Human-in-the-Loop (CeTI)” (Project Number 390696704) and by project funding within the Else Kröner Fresenius Center for Digital Health (EKFZ), Dresden, Germany.

Declarations

Disclosures  A. Stern, H. Alwanni, L. Münndermann, and J. Fallert are employees of KARL STORZ SE & Co. KG. M. Wagner, S. Bodenstedt, F. Fritz-Kebede, M. Dugas, M. Distler, J. Weitz, B. Müller-Stich and S. Speidel are project leaders of the Surgomics-project, funded by the German Federal Ministry of Health (Grant Number 2520DAT82) with medical device manufacturer KARL STORZ SE & Co. KG being a project partner. J. M. Brandenburg, A. Schulze, A. C. Jenke, M. T. J. Daum, F. R. Kolbinger, N. Bhasker, G. Schneider, G. Krause-Jüttler, O. Burgert, D. Wilhelm, F. Nickel, and L. Maier-Hein have no conflicts of interest or financial ties to disclose.

Open Access  This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article’s Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article’s Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article’s Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article’s Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article’s Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

References

1. Head SI, Milojivic M, Daemen I, Abn J-M, Boersma E, Christiansen EH, Domanski MJ, Farkouh ME, Flather M, Fuster V, Hlatky MA, Holm NR, Hueb WA, Kamalesh M, Kim Y-H, Mäkikallio T, Mohr FW, Papageorgiou G, Park S-J, Rodriguez AE, Sabik JF, Stables RH, Stone GW, Serruys PW, Kappetein AP (2018) Mortality after coronary artery bypass grafting versus percutaneous coronary intervention with stenting for coronary artery disease: a pooled analysis of individual patient data. Lancet Lond Engl 391:939–948. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)30423-9

2. Sullivan R, Alatise OI, Anderson BO, Audisio R, Autier P, Aggarwal A, Balch C, Brennan MF, Dare A, D’Cruz A, Eggermont AMM, Fleming K, Gueye SM, Hagner L, Herrera CA, Holmer H, Izbaiwi AM, Jarnheimer A, Ji J, Kingham TP, Liberman J, Leather AJM, Meara JG, Mukhopadhyay S, Murthy SS, Omar S, Parham GP, Pramesh CS, Riviezzo R, Rodin D, Santini L, Shrihavande SV, Shrive M, Thomas R, Tsunoda AT, van de Velde C, Veronesi U, Vijaykumar DK, Watters D, Wang S, Wu Y-L, Zeiton M, Purushotham A (2015) Global cancer surgery: delivering safe, affordable, and timely cancer surgery. Lancet Oncol 16:1193–1224. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(15)00223-5

3. Nepogodiev D, Martin J, Biccard B, Makupe A, Bhangu A, National Institute for Health Research Global Health Research Unit on Global Surgery (2019) Global burden of postoperative death. Lancet Lond Engl 393:401. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)33139-8
Bilimoria KY, Liu Y, Paruch JL, Zhou L, Kmiecik TE, Ko CY, Wright CD, Kucharczuk JC, O'Brien SM, Grab JD, Allen Fabbi M, Hagens ERC, van Berge Henegouwen MI, Gisbertz SS, Wente MN, Veit JA, Bassi C, Dervenis C, Fingerhut A, Gouma P, Salih S, Sammour T, Wahab HHA, Silva AD, Hayward N, Iyer K, Maddern G, Prevost GA, Settipalli KP, Ye J, Hempenstall P, Lham, Purcell S, Talavera C, Vaska AL, Chaggar G, Chrapko P, Cocco A, Coulter-Nile SMJC, Czertczek G, French J, Gong H, Gosselink M, Jegathees J, Jin I, Kalachov M, Kielhaber K, Lee K, Luong J, Phan S, Pleas H, Veale K, Zeng Z, Au A, DeBiasio A, Deng I, Myooran J, Nair A, Stewart P, Stift A, Unger LW, Wimmer K, Ahmed N, Hasan S, Rahman S, O'Shea M, Padmore G, Peters A, Perduca P, Pulcina G, Tinton N, Buxant F, Dabin E, Garofoalo D, Gossou F, Lawani I, Nganong FHR, Souaibou YI, Bedada AG, Motaleleselelo P, Thelmelong O, Buurke G, Gomes GMA, Barros AV, Batashki I, Damianov N, Stoyanov V, Dardanov D, Maslyankov S, Petkov P, Sokolov M, Todorov G, Zhivkov E, Akisheva A, Moreno MC, Genov G, Ilieva I, Ivanov T, Karamianlive M, Khan A, Mitkov E, Yotsos T, Atanassov B, Belev N, Slavchev M, Nsengiyumva C, Jones E, Stock S, Ekwen G, Kyota S, Brown J, KTM, Samuel LN, Otuencem C, Prosper N, Umenze F, Boutros M, Caminsky N, Dumitra S, Garfinkle R, Morency D, Salama E, Banks A, Ferri L, He H, Katz A, Liberman AS, Metersian S, Pang A, Parvez E, Agarwal A, Dare A, Hamede U, Osman F, Sequeira S, Coburn N, Dare A, Jaffer A, Karanicolas P, Mosseller M, Musselman R, Liu X, Yip CW, Garces-Otero JS, Gurtman C, Sierra S, Valenciah AU, Riveras PAC, Camelo S, Gonzalez A, Gonzalez-Orozco A, Paz MSM, Riverar CJ-P, Gonzalez F, Isaza-Restrepo A, Torres LN-, Madrid NA, Arango MCM, Sierras B, Bake J, Tsandiraki J, Jemendzic D, Kocman B, Shuman O, Canic R, Juricic D, Karakas I, Rupec AK, Pitlovic V, Samardzic J, Kopljar M, Bacic I, Domini E, Karlo R, Miljanic M, Milijanic D, Simic A, Ahmed M, Nasrallah MA, Altaf R, Amiad T, Elownt R, Haidar H, Hassan A, Khalil O, Qasem M, Ramesh R, Sahaya A, Biccard BM, Brocklehurst P, Martin J, McLean KA, Moore R, Pablos JO de, Abbosh A, Gillespie C, Mahmoud A, Mohamed S, Abdulmohsen N, Abdulmohsen M, Dahi A, Gamal N, Gamal M, Hasan A, Hetta H, Mousa N, Omar M, Rabie S, Saad M, Saleh B, Mohamed MS, Shawqi M, Mousa HA, Alnoury M, Elbealaweyy M, Elshafey A, Ahmed MEIEDM, Ghonaim M, Hgag F, Ibrahim M, Morsy M, Loaloa MR, Refaat A, Samir H, Shahien F, Sobhy M, Soroor F, Abdelatif A, Adel M, Affi AA, Affi E, Antaky M, Dawoud A, Zogby NE, El-remaly A, Elfanzaly AA, Gadallah A, Gamal FA, Hashem O, Youssef SM, Attyah AM, Munir M, Shazly O, Taha E, Wilson K, Adel S, Ali A, Eid E, Elhelow E, Elmehdy M, Elshafey B, Zakaria AH el-din, Hossny A, Ibrahim E, M.Yonis A, Metwalli M, Yousry B, Ziad E, Yacoub MA, Abdelhakim A, Abouelsaad N, Alkhitab M, Ashraf A, Ashraf A, Elzab Y, Elfanty M, Elkabir O, Elsayed M, Elshimy A, Elsobky H, Eskander J, Gad A, Hamsho W, Abdelwahed NK, Magdy M, Moharam D, Osama A, Ramadan S, Roum R, Sayed T, Shetha T, Zidan AM, Abbas K, Ali A, Attia M, Balata M, Nakeeb AE, Elewaily MIE, Elfalal A, Elleki H, Elkdaharyy A, Emile S, Ezzat
1. Birkmeyer JD, Finks JF, O’Reilly A, Oerline M, Carlin AM, Nunn
2. Goldenberg MG, Goldenberg L, Grantcharov TP (2017) Surgeon
3. Curtis NJ, Foster JD, Miskovic D, Brown CSB, Hewett PJ, Abbott
4. doi.org/10.1056/NEJMsa1300625
5. https://doi.org/10.1097/SLA.0000000000001906
6. Junger D, Frommer SM, Burgert O (2022) State-of-the-art of
7. Lavanchy JL, Zindel J, Kirtac K, Twick I, Hosgor E, Candinas D,
8. taram G, Turkeri L, Meyyazhgan KR, Patil P, Menon M, Rogers C
9. doi.org/10.1016/j.s41598-021-84295-6
10. Bochnen JD, Mavros MN, Ramly EP, Chang Y, Yeh DD, Lee J,
11. 10.2967/jnumed.118.222893
12. Birkmeyer JD, Finks JF, O’Reilly A, Oerline M, Carlin AM, Nunn
13. https://doi.org/10.1097/SLA.00000000000003897
14. Curtis NJ, Foster JD, Miskovic D, Brown CSB, Hewett PJ, Abbott
15. doi.org/10.1016/j.jamasurg.2020.1004
27. Lam K, Abràmoff MD, Balibrea JM, Bishop SM, Brady RR, Callcut RA, Chand M, Collins JW, Diener MK, Eisenmann M, Fertont K, Neto MG, Hager GD, Hinchliffe RJ, Horgan A, Janpin N, Langerman A, Logisothy K, Mahadik A, Maier-Hein L, Antona EM, Mascagni P, Mathew RK, Müller-Stich BP, Neumuth T, Nickel F, Park A, Pellino G, Rudzicz F, Shah S, Slack M, Smith MJ, Soomro N, Speidel S, Stoyanov D, Tilney HS, Wagner M, Darzi A, Kinross JM, Purkayastha S (2022) A Delphi consensus statement for digital surgery. NJ Digit Med 5:100. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41476-022-00641-6

28. Giaud B, Forestier G, Feldmann C, Ferrigino G, Gonçalves P, Haidegger T, Julliard C, Katit D, Kennngott H, Maier-Hein L, Mázh K, de Momé E, Nagy DÁ, Nakawala H, Neumuth J, Neumuth T, Rojas Balderrama J, Speidel S, Wagner M, Jannin P (2018) Toward a standard ontology of surgical process models. Int J Comput Assist Radiol Surg 13:1397–1408. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11548-018-1824-5

29. Bodenstedt S, Rivoir D, Jenke A, Wagner M, Breuca M, Müller-Stich B, Mees ST, Weitz J, Speidel S (2019) Active learning using deep Bayesian networks for surgical workflow analysis. Int J Comput Assist Radiol Surg 14:1079–1087. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11548-019-01963-9

30. Heinze O, Birkle M, Köster L, Bergh B (2011) Architecture of a consent management suite and integration into IHE-based regional health information networks. BMC Med Inform Decis Mak 11:58. https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6947-11-58

31. Vassiliou MC, Feldman LS, Andrew CG, Bergman S, Leffon-Weiss R, Shapiro SS, Wilk MB (1965) An analysis of variance test for normality (complete samples). Biometrika 52:591–611. https://doi.org/10.1097/SLA.0000000000003850

32. Harris A, Butterworth J, Boshier PR, MacKenzie H, Tokunaga M, Heinze O, Giraudet P, Cerezo CR, Xie R, Saeedi F, El Jemil M, Mavroveli S, Ni M, Mikhail S, Yeh C-C, Blencowe A, Murrey L, Zada R, Afshar M, Bissett I, Blanc C, Bissessur A, Bíró Z, Bork P, Arai K, Fujita M, Honda S, Hasegawa M, Hasegawa H, Yamazaki Y, Kanaji S, Matsuda T, Oshikiri T, Nakamura T, Suzuki S, Hiasa Y, Otake Y, Sato Y, Kakeji Y (2020) Automated surgical instrument detection from laparoscopic gastrectomy video images using an open source convolutional neural network platform. J Am Coll Surg 230:725-732.e1. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amcollsurg.2020.01.037

33. Hashimoto DA, Rosman G, Witkowski ER, Navarette-Alba D, De Momi E, Mattos LS, Maier-Hein L (2018) Uncertainty-averse organ classification for surgical data science applications in laparoscopy. IEEE Trans Biomed Eng 65:2649–2659. https://doi.org/10.1109/TBME.2018.2813015

34. Neumuth T, Jannin P, Strauss G, Meixensberger J, Burgort O (2009) Validation of knowledge acquisition for surgical process models. J Am Med Inform Assoc JAMIA 16:72–80. https://doi.org/10.1197/jamia.M2748

35. Welch BL (1938) The significance of the difference between two means when the population variances are unequal. Biometrika 29:350–362. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. media.2018.06.004

36. Dell-Kuster S, Gomes NV, Gavriš L, Aghiamandi S, Aduse-Poku M, Bissessur A, Blanc C, Brandt C, ten Broek RB, Brupphacer HR, Clancy C, Delrio P, Espin J, Galanos-Demiris K, Gecim E, Ghiassi S, Gié O, Goebel B, Hahnloser D, Herbst F, Orestis I, Joller S, Kang S, Martin R, Mayr J, Meier S, Murugesan J, Nally D, Ozcelik M, Pace U, Passeri M, Rabanser S, Ranter B, Rega D, Ridgway PF, Rosman C, Schmid R, Schumacher P, Solis-Pena A, Villarino L, Vrochides D, Engel A, O'Grady G, Loveday B, Steiner LA, Van Goor H, Bucher HC, Claiven P-A, Kirchhoff P, Rosenthal R (2020) Prospective validation of classification of intraoperative adverse events (ClassIntra): international, multicentre cohort study. BMJ m2917. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m2917

37. Moccia S, Wirkert SJ, Kenngott HG, Müller-Stich BP (2021) Heidelberg colorectal data models. J Am Med Inform Assoc JAMIA 16:72–80. https://doi.org/10.1197/jamia.M2748

38. Nwoye CI, Yu T, Gonzalez C, Seeliger B, Mascagni P, Mutter D, Marescaux J, Padov N (2022) Rendezvous: attention mechanisms for the recognition of surgical action triplets in endoscopic videos. Med Image Anal 78:102433. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.media.2022.102433

39. Hamidouk DO, Rosman G, Witkowski ER, Stafford C, Navarette-Welton AJ, Rattner DW, Lillemoe KD, Rus DL, Meireles OR (2019) Computer vision analysis of intraoperative video: automated recognition of operative steps in laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy.
Ann Surg 270:414–421. https://doi.org/10.1097/SLA.000000000003460
51. Yang C-C, Chen C-Y, Kuo Y-T, Ko C-C, Wu W-J, Liang C-H, Huang W-M (2022) Radiomics for the prediction of response to antifibrotic treatment in patients with idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis: a pilot study. Diagn Basel Switz 12:1002. https://doi.org/10.3390/diagnostics12041002
52. Wan S, Wei Y, Zhang X, Yang C, Hu F, Song B (2022) Computed tomography-based texture features for the risk stratification of portal hypertension and prediction of survival in patients with cirrhosis: a preliminary study. Front Med. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmed.2022.863596
53. Schuh F, Fink MA, Feistt M, Eckert C, Dörr-Harim C, Knebel P, Diener MK, Bächler MW, Mihaljevic AL, Probst P (2022) Protocol of a prospective study investigating the association of Pancreatic parenchymal RISk factors with postoperative pancreatic fistula after partial pancreaticoduodenectomy (PARIS trial). BMJ Open 12:e054138. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2021-054138
54. Kolbinger FR, Lambrecht J, Leger S, Ittermann T, Speidel S, Weitz J, Hoffmann R-T, Distler M, Kühn J-P (2022) The image-based pre-operative fistula risk score (preFRS) predicts postoperative pancreatic fistula in patients undergoing pancreatic head resection. Sci Rep 12:4064. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-07970-2
55. Brunner M, Kovacevic J, Krautz C, Merkel S, Hartmann A, Grützmann R, Haller F, Weber GF (2022) Analysis of intraoperative frozen pancreatic resection margin and prediction of postoperative pancreatic fistula risk during pancreaticoduodenectomy. J Am Coll Surg 234:928–937. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamcollsurg.2021.02.018
56. Heller AR, Mees ST, Lauterwald B, Reeps C, Koch T, Weitz J (2020) Detection of deteriorating patients on surgical wards outside the ICU by an Automated MEWS-based early warning system with paging functionality. Ann Surg 271:100–105. https://doi.org/10.1097/SLA.0000000000002830
57. Chang L, Hogle NJ, Moore BB, Graham MJ, Sinanan MN, Bailey R, Fowler DL (2007) Reliable assessment of laparoscopic performance in the operating room using videotape analysis. Surg Innov 14:122–126. https://doi.org/10.1177/1553350607301742
58. Belagiannis V, Wang X, Shirilt HBB, Hashimoto K, Stauder R, Aoki Y, Kranzfelder M, Schneider A, Fua P, Ilie S, Feussner H, Navab N (2016) Parsing human skeletons in an operating room. Mach Vis Appl 27:1035–1046. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00138-016-0792-4
59. Guzmán-García C, Gómez-Tome M, Sánchez-González P, Oropesa I, Gómez EJ (2021) Speech-based surgical phase recognition for non-intrusive surgical skills’ assessment in educational contexts. Sensors. https://doi.org/10.3390/s21041330
60. Chen AB, Liang S, Nguyen JH, Liu Y, Hung AJ (2021) Machine learning analyses of automated performance metrics during granular sub-stitch phases predict surgeon experience. Surgery 169:1245–1249. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.surg.2020.09.020
61. Gillies RJ, Kinahan PE, Hricak H (2016) Radiomics: images are more than pictures, they are data. Radiology 278:563–577. https://doi.org/10.1148/radiol.2015151169
62. Vedula SS, Ishii M, Hager GD (2017) Objective assessment of surgical technical skill and competency in the operating room. Annu Rev Biomed Eng 19:301–325. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-bioeng-071516-044435
63. Suurmeijer JA, Henry AC, Bonsing BA, Bosscha K, van Dam RM, van Eijck CH, Gerhards MF, van der Harst E, de Hingh IH, Intwen MP, Kazemier G, Wilminck JW, Lips DJ, Wit F, de Meijer VE, Molemaa IQ, Patijn GA, van der Schelling GP, Stommel MWJ, Busch OR, Koerkamp BG, van Santvoort HC, Besselink MG, Dutch Pancreatic Cancer Group (2022) Outcome of pancreatic surgery during the first six years of a mandatory audit within the Dutch Pancreatic Cancer Group. Ann Surg. https://doi.org/10.1097/SLA.0000000000005628
64. Gordon L, Reed C, Sorensen JL, Schulthess P, Strandbygaard J, Mcloone M, Grantcharov T, Shore EM (2022) Perceptions of safety culture and recording in the operating room: understanding barriers to video data capture. Surg Endosc 36:3789–3797. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00464-021-08695-5
65. Jesudason E (2022) Surgery should be routinely videoed. J Med Ethics. https://doi.org/10.1136/medethics-2022-108171
66. Hu Y-Y, Peyre SE, Arriaga AF, Osteen RT, Corso KA, Weiser TG, Swanson RS, Ashley SW, Raut CP, Zinner MJ, Gawande AA, Greenberg CC (2012) Postgame analysis: using video-based coaching for continuous professional development. J Am Coll Surg 214:115–124. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamcollsurg.2011.10.009

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.