

1 **Exploring the impact of an artificial intelligence-based intraoperative image**
2 **navigation system in laparoscopic surgery on clinical outcomes: A protocol for a**
3 **multicenter randomized controlled trial**

4

5 Daichi Kitaguchi^{1,2,3}, Nozomu Fuse⁴, Masashi Wakabayashi⁵, Norihito Kosugi^{1,2}, Yuto
6 Ishikawa^{1,2}, Kazuyuki Hayashi^{1,2}, Hiro Hasegawa^{2,3}, Nobuyoshi Takeshita², Masaaki
7 Ito^{2,3*}

8

9 ¹AI Digital Device Innovation Office, National Cancer Center Hospital East, Chiba, Japan

10 ²Department for the Promotion of Medical Device Innovation, National Cancer Center Hospital
11 East, Chiba, Japan

12 ³Department of Colorectal Surgery, National Cancer Center Hospital East, Chiba, Japan

13 ⁴Clinical Research Support Office, National Cancer Center Hospital East, Chiba, Japan

14 ⁵Biostatistics Division, Center for Research Administration and Support, National Cancer
15 Center Hospital East, Chiba, Japan

16

17 ***Corresponding author:**

18 Masaaki Ito, MD, PhD

19 Department for the Promotion of Medical Device Innovation

20 Department of Colorectal Surgery

21 National Cancer Center Hospital East

22 6-5-1, Kashiwanoha, Kashiwa, Chiba 277-8577, Japan

23 E-mail: maito@east.ncc.go.jp, Tel: +81-4-7133-1111, Fax: +81-4-7130-0199

24

25 **Abstract**

26 **Background:** In the research field of artificial intelligence (AI) in surgery, there are
 27 many open questions that must be clarified. Well-designed randomized controlled trials
 28 (RCTs) are required to explore the positive clinical impacts by comparing the use and
 29 non-use of AI-based intraoperative image navigation. Therefore, herein, we propose the
 30 “ImNavi” trial, a multicenter RCT, to compare the use and non-use of an AI-based
 31 intraoperative image navigation system in laparoscopic surgery.

32 **Methods:** The ImNavi trial is a Japanese multicenter RCT involving 1:1 randomization
 33 between the use and non-use of an AI-based intraoperative image navigation system in
 34 laparoscopic colorectal surgery. The participating institutions will include three
 35 high-volume centers with sufficient laparoscopic colorectal surgery caseloads (>100
 36 cases/year), including one national cancer center and two university hospitals in Japan.
 37 Written informed consent will be obtained from all patients. Patients aged between 18
 38 and 80 years scheduled to undergo laparoscopic left-sided colorectal resection will be
 39 included in the study. The primary outcome is the time required for each target organ,
 40 including the ureter and autonomic nerves, to be recognized by the surgeon after its
 41 initial appearance on the monitor. Secondary outcomes include intraoperative target
 42 organ injuries, intraoperative complications, operation time, blood loss, duration of
 43 postoperative hospital stay, postoperative complications within 30 days, postoperative
 44 male sexual dysfunction 1 month after surgery, surgeon’s confidence in recognizing
 45 each target organ, and the postoperative fatigue of the primary surgeon.

46 **Discussion:** The impact of AI-based surgical applications on clinical outcomes beyond
 47 numerical expression will be explored from a variety of viewpoints while evaluating
 48 quantitative items, including intraoperative complications and operation time, as

secondary endpoints. We expect that the findings of this RCT will contribute to advancing research in the domain of AI in surgery.

Trial registration: The trial was registered at the University Hospital Medical Information Network Center (<https://www.umin.ac.jp/ctr/index-j.html>) on March 28th, 2023 under trial ID: UMIN000050701.

Keywords

Artificial intelligence, computer vision, semantic segmentation, intraoperative image navigation, computer-assisted surgery

Background

Surgical volumes are large and show an increasing trend worldwide [1]; nevertheless, it is estimated that 143 million additional surgical procedures are required annually to save lives and prevent disabilities [2]. Surgery is an essential aspect of healthcare and is associated with increased life expectancy [1]; however, inter-institutional disparities in surgical skill levels remain. The introduction of minimally invasive surgery (MIS), including endoscopic surgical approaches, has made surgery more effective [3]. However, surgery has become more complex, and achieving basic surgical skill levels, which are directly linked to postoperative clinical outcomes, has become more difficult [4, 5]. Improvements in the safety and efficiency of surgery must be a major component in strengthening healthcare systems, and technological innovation may be one of the solutions to achieve this goal.

Computer vision (CV) based on artificial intelligence (AI), particularly deep learning using convolutional neural networks, is a recent technological innovation.

AI-based CV is a field of computer science that enables AI to extract meaningful information from digital images and videos, and to process and make recommendations based on that information [6]. In recent years, AI-based CV has achieved remarkable success in image recognition tasks in the field of medical image diagnosis, such as radiology [7-9], pathology [10, 11], gastroenterology [12], and ophthalmology [13-15]. In the field of surgery, several AI-based CV applications for MIS, specifically semantic segmentation-based intraoperative image navigation, have been developed based on the nature of MIS, which relies heavily on the visual information provided by surgical endoscopes [16-18]. These are expected to reduce intraoperative anatomical cognitive errors. However, the majority of studies in this field are still in the proof-of-concept stage.

In the research field of AI in surgery, many open questions regarding how AI-based intraoperative image navigation affects surgeon performance exist, including whether it can achieve some improvement in clinical outcomes, and whether it works properly in diverse environments without overfitting. To address these questions, well-designed randomized controlled trials (RCTs) are required to explore the positive clinical impacts of AI-based intraoperative image navigation. Therefore, we propose the “ImNavi” trial, a multicenter RCT, to compare the use and non-use of an AI-based intraoperative image navigation system in laparoscopic surgery.

92

93 **Methods/Design**

94 ***Participants, interventions, and outcomes***

95 ***Trial design***

96 The ImNavi trial is designed as a Japanese multicenter RCT with 1:1 randomization

97 between the use and non-use of an AI-based intraoperative image-navigation system in
98 laparoscopic surgery. The study protocol was prepared according to the reporting
99 guidelines of the Standard Protocol Items: Recommendations for Interventional Trials -
100 Artificial Intelligence extension (SPIRIT-AI) [19]. The SPIRIT-AI checklist is presented
101 in Additional File 1.

102

103 *Study setting and recruitment*

104 This hospital-based study will be conducted in Japan. Eligible candidates will be
105 identified from patients referred to a colorectal surgeon or colorectal cancer
106 multidisciplinary team based on colonoscopy, computed tomography, or magnetic
107 resonance imaging findings, and eligibility will be confirmed after a review of the study
108 criteria. The target surgical procedures in this study are left-sided colorectal resections,
109 including left hemicolectomy, sigmoidectomy, anterior resection, intersphincteric
110 resection, Hartmann's procedure, and abdominoperineal resection. The target organs for
111 semantic segmentation are the ureter and autonomic nerves, including the hypogastric
112 nerves and the aortic plexus. The AI-based intraoperative image navigation system used
113 in this study is based on an existing semantic segmentation algorithm that we developed
114 [20, 21]. The accuracy and performance of both the ureter recognition model
115 (UreterNet) and the autonomic nerve recognition model (NerveNet) have been validated
116 in our previous study [20]. Alienware x15 R2 (Dell Technologies Inc., Round Rock,
117 Texas, U.S.) was used as the computational system in this study.

118

119 *Eligibility criteria*

120 Patients aged between 18 and 80 years scheduled to undergo laparoscopic left-sided

121 colorectal resection and who provided written informed consent will be included in the
122 ImNavi trial. Long-term outcomes will not be included in the endpoints; therefore,
123 patients with any colorectal disease will be eligible. Patients with emergent surgery,
124 expected severe intra-abdominal adhesion, significant anatomical anomaly, and those
125 deemed unsuitable by the doctor in charge will be excluded. The trial flow diagram is
126 illustrated in Figure 1.

127

128 *Interventions*

129 The time required to recognize each target organ, including the ureter and
130 autonomic nerves, after its initial appearance on the monitor will be compared between
131 the surgeons with and without an AI-based intraoperative image navigation system. The
132 initial time of appearance of each target organ will be retrospectively determined by two
133 or more judges observing via video. The system output, semantic segmentation pixels,
134 will be superimposed on a sub-monitor placed adjacent to the main monitor, as
135 illustrated in Figure 2, without influencing the display of the main monitor. The
136 surgeons will decide the time and frequency of viewing the sub-monitor. The primary
137 surgeon will be asked to orally state that they recognize each target organ during surgery.
138 All intraoperative statements made by the primary surgeon will be recorded by a
139 microphone placed near the operating table. The intraoperative audio will be collated
140 with the intraoperative video, and the difference in time points between the initial
141 appearance on the monitor and the primary surgeon's recognition (vocalization) will be
142 calculated for each target organ.

143

144 *Outcomes*

145 The primary outcome is the time required for each target organ, including the ureter
146 and autonomic nerves, to be recognized by the surgeon after its initial appearance on the
147 monitor. Secondary outcomes include intraoperative target organ injuries; intraoperative
148 complications; total operation time; operation time for each surgical step divided by
149 existing definitions [22]; blood loss; duration of postoperative hospital stay;
150 postoperative complications within 30 days; postoperative male sexual dysfunction 1
151 month post-surgery; the surgeon's confidence in recognising each target organ; and
152 postoperative fatigue of the primary surgeon, according to the Piper Fatigue Scale-12
153 (PFS-12) [23]. The severity of all intraoperative and postoperative complications,
154 according to the Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events and the
155 Clavien–Dindo classification, will also be collected as secondary outcomes.

156

157 *Participant timelines*

158 Before surgery, written informed consent will be obtained from all patients and
159 their primary surgeons, and patients will be allocated to their respective groups using an
160 electronic data capture (EDC) system. A preoperative report, including patient, disease,
161 and primary surgeon background information, will be provided using case report forms
162 (CRFs). After surgery, an intraoperative report on the primary surgeon's surgical
163 information and postoperative fatigue, according to the PFS-12, will be provided using
164 CRFs and questionnaires, respectively. One month after surgery, the postoperative
165 course and outcome reports, including postoperative complications and date of
166 discharge, will be provided using the CRFs. This study will not regulate modalities or
167 intervals between examinations for each participating institution, or intervene in each
168 institution's routine clinical practice.

169

170 *Sample size*

171 Based on non-published data from previous studies at our institution, the mean time
172 ($\pm$ standard deviation) required by surgeons to recognize each target organ without using
173 the AI-based intraoperative image navigation system after its initial appearance on the
174 monitor is estimated to be 6.0 ($\pm$ 9.0) s. To detect a 2-s decrease with the AI-based
175 system, using a power of 80% and a one-sided significance level of 0.15 in the
176 Wilcoxon rank-sum test, 38 patients in each group (76 patients in total) would be
177 required for this RCT. After accounting for dropouts and ineligibility, an additional 14
178 patients will be included. Thus, the target sample size would be 90 patients.

179

180 *Assignment of interventions*

181 Once eligibility is established, patients will be allocated to either the use or non-use
182 of AI-based intraoperative image navigation groups. Randomization, performed by
183 computers through the Internet (<https://www2.epoc-ncc.net/>), will be adjusted using the
184 minimization method with a random component to balance the groups, participating
185 institution, sex (male versus female), and experience of the primary surgeon (qualified
186 versus unqualified by the Endoscopic Surgical Skill Qualification System of the Japan
187 Society for Endoscopic Surgery) [24]. Patients will be randomized in a 1:1 ratio. Data
188 will be analyzed on an ‘intention-to-treat’ basis when patients are not subjected to a
189 randomized treatment modality.

190

191 *Data collection, management, and analysis*

192 Data collection will be carried out using CRFs and a validated PFS-12

questionnaire. All data will be entered into an EDC system. Regular data quality checks will be performed annually in accordance with the Quality Management Plan. All data will be handled following the Ethical Guidelines for Medical and Biological Research Involving Human Subjects. Data backups will be stored in secure fireproof locations, and test restorations will be performed regularly. After completion of the trial, all essential trial documentation and source documents, including signed informed consent forms and copies of CRFs, will be securely retained for at least 5 years.

200

201 *Statistical analysis*

Baseline numerical data will be described as the mean ($\pm$ standard deviation) or median (range). Baseline categorical data will be presented as percentages. All comparative analyses will be conducted on an ‘intention-to-treat’ basis. In addition to the intention-to-treat analysis, per-protocol and as-treated analyses will be applied as sensitivity analyses. Primary outcomes will be compared using the Wilcoxon’s rank sum test. Secondary outcomes will be compared using the Fisher’s exact test or the Wilcoxon’s rank sum test, as necessary.

209

210 *Monitoring*

Regular data quality checks will be performed yearly, per the Quality Management Plan. Central monitoring will be conducted by the data center based on the CRF data collected via the EDC system. The monitoring staff will prepare a monitoring report after central monitoring and report it to the principal investigator.

215

216 *Ethics and dissemination*

217 The participating institutions will include three high-volume centers with sufficient
218 laparoscopic colorectal surgery caseloads (>100 cases/year), including one national
219 cancer center and two university hospitals in Japan. The protocol for this RCT has been
220 reviewed and approved by the ethics committees of each participating institution, and
221 the trial has been registered at University Hospital Medical Information Network Center
222 (<https://www.umin.ac.jp/ctr/index-j.html>) under the trial ID UMIN000050701. Written
223 informed consent will be obtained from all patients after a thorough oral explanation by
224 the doctor in charge at each center participating in the ImNavi trial. All procedures will
225 be conducted in accordance with the ethical standards of the Declaration of Helsinki.

226

227 **Discussion**

228 Recently, analogous digital solutions have been translated and clinically
229 implemented for diagnostic applications in gastrointestinal endoscopy [25] and
230 radiology [26]. In the field of surgery, several deep learning-based CV solutions have
231 been developed by academic and industry groups, mostly for MIS. Significant work has
232 also been performed on potential use cases [3]; however, no CV tools are widely used
233 for diagnostic or therapeutic applications in surgery. Recently, an intraoperative AI
234 system identifying anatomical landmarks for laparoscopic cholecystectomy has been
235 developed and reported [18]; similarly, in the urological field, an AI alert system that
236 can predict the occurrence of intraoperative bleeding events during robotic surgery has
237 been developed [27]. Although both systems could potentially be used as tools to
238 improve the safety of the intervention, they were only tested in a trial involving 10
239 patients at a single center. Establishing solid evidence through RCTs is essential before
240 AI can be applied in surgery to move beyond the proof-of-concept step to clinical

241 implementation. In addition, a multicenter study design is desirable to eliminate bias
242 due to overfitting and to demonstrate generalization performance. This study is the first
243 multicenter RCT to be designed to explore the clinical significance of AI-based
244 intraoperative image navigation.

245 The target CV task of this study is the semantic segmentation of the ureter and
246 autonomic nerves in laparoscopic colorectal surgery. Iatrogenic ureteral injury in
247 colorectal surgery is a rare but potentially devastating complication of colorectal surgery.
248 The incidence is approximately 0.5%–1.5% [28-30]; however, a significant increase has
249 been observed with laparoscopy compared to open colectomies [29, 30] due to the lack
250 of tactile information. In addition, trauma to the aortic plexus may occur during high
251 ligation of the inferior mesenteric artery, and the superior hypogastric nerves may be
252 injured along the sacral promontory or presacral region [31]. Injuries to the sympathetic
253 nerves at this location affect the ability to ejaculate, including retrograde ejaculation,
254 whereas injuries to the parasympathetic nerves result in erectile dysfunction [31]. A
255 previous study reported a decrease in male sexual function following colorectal surgery,
256 with a decrease from 78 to 32% in ejaculatory function, 71 to 24% in erectile function,
257 and 82 to 57% in sexual activity [32]; these dysfunctions are often overlooked but
258 should be strictly avoided.

259 The time required for recognition of each target organ by surgeons after its initial
260 appearance on the monitor was set as the primary endpoint of this study, with the
261 expectation that the AI-based intraoperative image navigation system would contribute
262 to the more rapid recognition of target organs. Intraoperative target organ injury is a
263 more straightforward primary endpoint; however, the number of events was considered
264 too small for analysis. In addition, we believe that more rapid recognition of key

265 anatomical landmarks during surgery can lead to several benefits other than prevention
266 of organ injury, such as identification of the correct dissection plane, and confidence in
267 proceeding with the procedure. The impact of AI-based surgical applications on clinical
268 outcomes beyond numerical expression will be explored from various facets while
269 evaluating quantitative items, including intraoperative complications and operation time,
270 as secondary endpoints. Furthermore, we expect that the findings of this RCT will
271 contribute to advancing research in the domain of AI in surgery.

272 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 273 • The ImNavi trial is a Japanese multicenter RCT with 1:1 randomization between
274 the use and non-use of an artificial intelligence-based intraoperative
275 image-navigation system in laparoscopic surgery.
- 276 • Eligible candidates will be identified from patients referred to a colorectal
277 surgeon or colorectal cancer multidisciplinary team based on colonoscopy,
278 computed tomography, or magnetic resonance imaging findings, and eligibility
279 will be confirmed following a review of the criteria.
- 280 • The primary outcome is the time required for each target organ to be recognized
281 by the surgeon after its initial appearance on the monitor.
- 282 • Secondary outcomes include intraoperative target organ injuries; intraoperative
283 complications; total operation time; operation time for each surgical step divided
284 by existing definitions; blood loss; duration of postoperative hospital stay;
285 postoperative complications within 30 days; postoperative male sexual
286 dysfunction 1 month after surgery; surgeon's confidence in recognition of each
287 target organ; and postoperative fatigue of the primary surgeon, according to the
288 Piper Fatigue Scale-12.

- The severity of all intraoperative and postoperative complications, measured according to Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events and the Clavien–Dindo classification, will also be collected as secondary outcomes.

Trial Status

This trial represents the first version of the study protocol. This trial was registered at the University Hospital Medical Information Network Center (<https://www.umin.ac.jp/ctr/index-j.html>) on March 28th, 2023 (trial ID: UMIN000050701). Recruitment will begin on June 2023 and is scheduled to be completed by December 2024.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- AI:** artificial intelligence
- RCT:** randomized controlled trials
- MIS:** minimally invasive surgery
- CV:** computer vision
- EDC:** electronic data capture
- CRF:** case report forms

DECLARATIONS

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The protocol for this RCT has been reviewed and approved by the ethics committees of each participating institution, and the trial has been registered at the University Hospital Medical Information Network Center (<https://www.umin.ac.jp/ctr/index-j.html>) under the trial ID UMIN000050701. Written informed consent will be obtained from all

313 patients after a thorough oral explanation by the doctor in charge at each center
314 participating in the ImNavi trial. All procedures will be conducted in accordance with
315 the ethical standards of the Declaration of Helsinki.

316 **Consent for publication**

317 Not applicable

318 **Availability of data and materials**

319 Not applicable

320 **Competing interests**

321 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

322 **Funding**

323 This research is supported by the National Cancer Center Japan Research and
324 Development Fund, grant number 2022-A-11.

325 **Authors' contributions**

326 All authors made substantial contributions to the study concept or data analysis and
327 interpretation; drafted the manuscript or revised it critically for important intellectual
328 content; approved the final version of the manuscript to be published; and agreed to be
329 accountable for all aspects of the work.

330 **Acknowledgements**

331 We would like to thank all the members of the Clinical Research Support Office of the
332 National Cancer Center Hospital East for their continuous support during the planning
333 of this study.

334

335

336 **References**

- 337 1. Weiser TG, Haynes AB, Molina G, Lipsitz SR, Esquivel MM, Uribe-Leitz T, et
338 al. Estimate of the global volume of surgery in 2012: an assessment supporting
339 improved health outcomes. *Lancet*. 2015;385 Suppl 2:S11.
- 340 2. Meara JG, Leather AJ, Hagander L, Alkire BC, Alonso N, Ameh EA, et al.
341 Global Surgery 2030: evidence and solutions for achieving health, welfare, and
342 economic development. *Lancet*. 2015;386:569-624.
- 343 3. Mascagni P, Alapatt D, Sestini L, Altieri MS, Madani A, Watanabe Y, et al.
344 Computer vision in surgery: from potential to clinical value. *NPJ Digit Med*.
345 2022;5:163.
- 346 4. Birkmeyer JD, Finks JF, O'Reilly A, Oerline M, Carlin AM, Nunn AR, et al.
347 Surgical skill and complication rates after bariatric surgery. *N Engl J Med*.
348 2013;369:1434-42.
- 349 5. Curtis NJ, Foster JD, Miskovic D, Brown CSB, Hewett PJ, Abbott S, et al.
350 Association of surgical skill assessment with clinical outcomes in cancer surgery.
351 *JAMA Surg*. 2020;155:590-8.
- 352 6. Kitaguchi D, Takeshita N, Hasegawa H, Ito M. Artificial intelligence-based
353 computer vision in surgery: Recent advances and future perspectives. *Ann*
354 *Gastroenterol Surg*. 2022;6:29-36.
- 355 7. McKinney SM, Sieniek M, Godbole V, Godwin J, Antropova N, Ashrafian H, et
356 al. International evaluation of an AI system for breast cancer screening. *Nature*.
357 2020;577:89-94.
- 358 8. Ardila D, Kiraly AP, Bharadwaj S, Choi B, Reicher JJ, Peng L, et al. End-to-end
359 lung cancer screening with three-dimensional deep learning on low-dose chest

- 360 computed tomography. *Nat Med.* 2019;25:954-61.
- 361 9. Huang P, Lin CT, Li Y, Tammemagi MC, Brock MV, Atkar-Khattra S, et al.
362 Prediction of lung cancer risk at follow-up screening with low-dose CT: a
363 training and validation study of a deep learning method. *Lancet Digit Health.*
364 2019;1:e353-62.
- 365 10. Kather JN, Pearson AT, Halama N, Jäger D, Krause J, Loosen SH, et al. Deep
366 learning can predict microsatellite instability directly from histology in
367 gastrointestinal cancer. *Nat Med.* 2019;25:1054-6.
- 368 11. Bera K, Schalper KA, Rimm DL, Velcheti V, Madabhushi A. Artificial
369 intelligence in digital pathology - new tools for diagnosis and precision oncology.
370 *Nat Rev Clin Oncol.* 2019;16:703-15.
- 371 12. Zhou D, Tian F, Tian X, Sun L, Huang X, Zhao F, et al. Diagnostic evaluation of
372 a deep learning model for optical diagnosis of colorectal cancer. *Nat Commun.*
373 2020;11:2961.
- 374 13. Liu H, Li L, Wormstone IM, Qiao C, Zhang C, Liu P, et al. Development and
375 validation of a deep learning system to detect glaucomatous optic neuropathy
376 using fundus photographs. *JAMA Ophthalmol.* 2019;137:1353-60.
- 377 14. Milea D, Najjar RP, Zhubo J, Ting D, Vasseneix C, Xu X, et al. Artificial
378 intelligence to detect papilledema from ocular fundus photographs. *N Engl J*
379 *Med.* 2020;382:1687-95.
- 380 15. Xie Y, Nguyen QD, Hamzah H, Lim G, Bellemo V, Gunasekeran DV, et al.
381 Artificial intelligence for teleophthalmology-based diabetic retinopathy
382 screening in a national programme: an economic analysis modelling study.
383 *Lancet Digit Health.* 2020;2:e240-9.

- 384 16. Madani A, Namazi B, Altieri MS, Hashimoto DA, Rivera AM, Pucher PH, et al.
385 Artificial intelligence for intraoperative guidance: using semantic segmentation
386 to identify surgical anatomy during laparoscopic cholecystectomy. *Ann Surg.*
387 2022;276:363-9.
- 388 17. Mascagni P, Vardazaryan A, Alapatt D, Urade T, Emre T, Fiorillo C, et al.
389 Artificial intelligence for surgical safety: automatic assessment of the critical
390 view of safety in laparoscopic cholecystectomy using deep learning. *Ann Surg.*
391 2022;275:955-61.
- 392 18. Nakanuma H, Endo Y, Fujinaga A, Kawamura M, Kawasaki T, Masuda T, et al.
393 An intraoperative artificial intelligence system identifying anatomical landmarks
394 for laparoscopic cholecystectomy: a prospective clinical feasibility trial
395 (J-SUMMIT-C-01). *Surg Endosc.* 2023;37:1933-42.
- 396 19. Cruz Rivera S, Liu X, Chan AW, Denniston AK, Calvert MJ. Guidelines for
397 clinical trial protocols for interventions involving artificial intelligence: the
398 SPIRIT-AI extension. *Lancet Digit Health.* 2020;2:e549-60.
- 399 20. Kitaguchi D, Harai Y, Kosugi N, Hayashi K, Kojima S, Ishikawa Y, et al.
400 Artificial intelligence for the recognition of key anatomical structures in
401 laparoscopic colorectal surgery. *Br J Surg.* 2023;110:1355-8.
- 402 21. Kojima S, Kitaguchi D, Igaki T, Nakajima K, Ishikawa Y, Harai Y, et al.
403 Deep-learning-based semantic segmentation of autonomic nerves from
404 laparoscopic images of colorectal surgery: an experimental pilot study. *Int J Surg.*
405 2023;109:813-20.
- 406 22. Kitaguchi D, Takeshita N, Matsuzaki H, Oda T, Watanabe M, Mori K, et al.
407 Automated laparoscopic colorectal surgery workflow recognition using artificial

- 408 intelligence: Experimental research. *Int J Surg*. 2020;79:88-94.
- 409 23. Reeve BB, Stover AM, Alfano CM, Smith AW, Ballard-Barbash R, Bernstein L,
410 et al. The Piper Fatigue Scale-12 (PFS-12): psychometric findings and item
411 reduction in a cohort of breast cancer survivors. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*.
412 2012;136:9-20.
- 413 24. Mori T, Kimura T, Kitajima M. Skill accreditation system for laparoscopic
414 gastroenterologic surgeons in Japan. *Minim Invasive Ther Allied Technol*.
415 2010;19:18-23.
- 416 25. Hassan C, Spadaccini M, Iannone A, Maselli R, Jovani M, Chandrasekar VT, et
417 al. Performance of artificial intelligence in colonoscopy for adenoma and polyp
418 detection: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Gastrointest Endosc*.
419 2021;93:77-85.e6.
- 420 26. van Leeuwen KG, Schalekamp S, Rutten MJCM, van Ginneken B, de Rooij M.
421 Artificial intelligence in radiology: 100 commercially available products and
422 their scientific evidence. *Eur Radiol*. 2021;31:3797-804.
- 423 27. Checcucci E, De Cillis S, Amparore D, Gabriele V, Piramide F, Piana A, et al.
424 Artificial Intelligence alert systems during robotic surgery: a new potential tool
425 to improve the safety of the intervention. *Urol Vid J*. 2023;18:100221.
- 426 28. Halabi WJ, Jafari MD, Nguyen VQ, Carmichael JC, Mills S, Pigazzi A, et al.
427 Ureteral injuries in colorectal surgery: an analysis of trends, outcomes, and risk
428 factors over a 10-year period in the United States. *Dis Colon Rectum*.
429 2014;57:179-86.
- 430 29. Palaniappa NC, Telem DA, Ranasinghe NE, Divino CM. Incidence of iatrogenic
431 ureteral injury after laparoscopic colectomy. *Arch Surg*. 2012;147:267-71.

- 432 30. Marcelissen TA, Den Hollander PP, Tuytten TR, Sosef MN. Incidence of
433 iatrogenic ureteral injury during open and laparoscopic colorectal surgery: A
434 single center experience and review of the literature. Surg Laparosc Endosc
435 Percutan Tech. 2016;26:513-5.
- 436 31. Giglia MD, Stein SL. Overlooked long-term complications of colorectal surgery.
437 Clin Colon Rectal Surg. 2019;32:204-11.
- 438 32. Adam JP, Denost Q, Capdepon M, et al. Prospective and longitudinal study of
439 urogenital dysfunction after proctectomy for rectal cancer. Dis Colon Rectum.
440 2016;59:822-30.

441

442 **Figure legends**

443 **Figure 1:** Trial flow diagram

444 **Figure 2:** Example of the monitor layout in an operation room

445 The system output (semantic segmentation pixels) is superimposed on a sub-monitor
446 placed adjacent to the main monitor, and does not affect the main monitor.

447

448 **Additional files**

449 **Additional file 1:** Ethical approval document (English translation version)

450 **Additional file 2:** Copy of the original funding documentation (English translation
451 version)

452 **Additional file 3:** A completed SPIRIT checklist

453 **Additional file 4:** A SPIRIT figure

SPIRIT-AI Checklist: Recommended items to address in a protocol and related documents for clinical trials evaluating AI interventions

Section		SPIRIT 2013 Item ^a	SPIRIT-AI Item	Addressed on Page No ^b
Administrative Information				
Title	1	Descriptive title identifying the study design, population, interventions, and, if applicable, trial acronym	SPIRIT-AI 1(i) Elaboration	Indicate that the intervention involves artificial intelligence / machine learning and specify the type of model. 1
			SPIRIT-AI 1(ii) Elaboration	Specify the intended use of the AI intervention. 1
Trial registration	2a	Trial identifier and registry name. If not yet registered, name of intended registry		4
	2b	All items from the World Health Organization Trial Registration Data Set		4
Protocol version	3	Date and version identifier		N/A
Funding	4	Sources and types of financial, material, and other support		17
Roles and responsibilities	5a	Names, affiliations, and roles of protocol contributors		1
	5b	Name and contact information for the trial sponsor		1-2
	5c	Role of study sponsor and funders, if any, in study design; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of data; writing of the report; and the decision to submit the report for publication, including whether they will have ultimate authority over any of these activities		17
	5d	Composition, roles, and responsibilities of the coordinating centre, steering committee, endpoint adjudication committee, data management team, and other individuals or groups overseeing the trial, if applicable (see Item 21a for data monitoring committee)		17
Introduction				

Background and rationale	6a	Description of research question and justification for undertaking the trial, including summary of relevant studies (published and unpublished) examining benefits and harms for each intervention	SPIRIT-AI 6a (i) Extension	Explain the intended use of the AI intervention in the context of the clinical pathway, including its purpose and its intended users (e.g. healthcare professionals, patients, public).	6-7
			SPIRIT-AI 6a (ii) Extension	Describe any pre-existing evidence for the AI intervention.	6-7
	6b	Explanation for choice of comparators			6-7
Objectives	7	Specific objectives or hypotheses			7
Trial design	8	Description of trial design including type of trial (eg, parallel group, crossover, factorial, single group), allocation ratio, and framework (eg, superiority, equivalence, noninferiority, exploratory)			7-8
Methods: Participants, Interventions and Outcomes					
Study setting	9	Description of study settings (eg, community clinic, academic hospital) and list of countries where data will be collected. Reference to where list of study sites can be obtained	SPIRIT-AI 9 Extension	Describe the onsite and offsite requirements needed to integrate the AI intervention into the trial setting.	8
Eligibility criteria	10	Inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants. If applicable, eligibility criteria for study centres and individuals who will perform the interventions (eg, surgeons, psychotherapists)	SPIRIT-AI 10 (i) Elaboration	State the inclusion and exclusion criteria at the level of participants.	9
			SPIRIT-AI 10 (ii) Extension	State the inclusion and exclusion criteria at the level of the input data.	9
Interventions	11a	Interventions for each group with sufficient detail to allow replication, including how and when they will be administered	SPIRIT-AI 11a (i) Extension	State which version of the AI algorithm will be used.	9-10
			SPIRIT-AI 11a (ii) Extension	Specify the procedure for acquiring and selecting the input data for the AI intervention.	9-10
			SPIRIT-AI 11a (iii) Extension	Specify the procedure for assessing and handling poor quality or unavailable input data.	9-10
			SPIRIT-AI 11a	Specify whether there is human-AI interaction in the	9-10

			(iv) Extension	handling of the input data, and what level of expertise is required for users.	9-10
			SPIRIT-AI 11a (v) Extension	Specify the output of the AI intervention.	
			SPIRIT-AI 11a (vi) Extension	Explain the procedure for how the AI intervention's output will contribute to decision-making or other elements of clinical practice.	9-10
	11b	Criteria for discontinuing or modifying allocated interventions for a given trial participant (eg, drug dose change in response to harms, participant request, or improving/worsening disease)			9-10
	11c	Strategies to improve adherence to intervention protocols, and any procedures for monitoring adherence (eg, drug tablet return, laboratory tests)			9-10
	11d	Relevant concomitant care and interventions that are permitted or prohibited during the trial			9-10
	12	Primary, secondary, and other outcomes, including the specific measurement variable (eg, systolic blood pressure), analysis metric (eg, change from baseline, final value, time to event), method of aggregation (eg, median, proportion), and time point for each outcome. Explanation of the clinical relevance of chosen efficacy and harm outcomes is strongly recommended			10
Participant timeline	13	Time schedule of enrolment, interventions (including any run-ins and washouts), assessments, and visits for participants. A schematic diagram is highly recommended (see Figure)			10-11
Sample size	14	Estimated number of participants needed to achieve study objectives and how it was determined, including clinical and statistical assumptions			11-12

		supporting any sample size calculations			
Recruitment	15	Strategies for achieving adequate participant enrolment to reach target sample size			8
Methods: Assignment of Interventions (For Controlled Trials)					
Sequence generation	16A	Method of generating the allocation sequence (eg, computer-generated random numbers), and list of any factors for stratification. To reduce predictability of a random sequence, details of any planned restriction (eg, blocking) should be provided in a separate document that is unavailable to those who enrol participants or assign interventions			12
Allocation concealment mechanism	16b	Mechanism of implementing the allocation sequence (eg, central telephone; sequentially numbered, opaque, sealed envelopes), describing any steps to conceal the sequence until interventions are assigned			12
Implementation	16c	Who will generate the allocation sequence, who will enrol participants, and who will assign participants to interventions			12
Blinding (masking)	17a	Who will be blinded after assignment to interventions (eg, trial participants, care providers, outcome assessors, data analysts), and how			12
	17b	If blinded, circumstances under which unblinding is permissible, and procedure for revealing a participant's allocated intervention during the trial			12
Methods: Data Collection, Management, And Analysis					
Data collection methods	18a	Plans for assessment and collection of outcome, baseline, and other trial data, including any related processes to promote data quality (eg, duplicate measurements, training of assessors) and a description of study instruments (eg, questionnaires, laboratory tests) along with their reliability and validity, if known. Reference to where data collection forms			12-13

		can be found, if not in the protocol			
	18b	Plans to promote participant retention and complete follow-up, including list of any outcome data to be collected for participants who discontinue or deviate from intervention protocols			12-13
Data management	19	Plans for data entry, coding, security, and storage, including any related processes to promote data quality (eg, double data entry; range checks for data values). Reference to where details of data management procedures can be found, if not in the protocol			12-13
	20a	Statistical methods for analysing primary and secondary outcomes. Reference to where other details of the statistical analysis plan can be found, if not in the protocol			13
Statistical methods	20b	Methods for any additional analyses (eg, subgroup and adjusted analyses)			13
	20c	Definition of analysis population relating to protocol non-adherence (eg, as randomised analysis), and any statistical methods to handle missing data (eg, multiple imputation)			13
Methods: Monitoring					
Data monitoring	21a	Composition of data monitoring committee (DMC); summary of its role and reporting structure; statement of whether it is independent from the sponsor and competing interests; and reference to where further details about its charter can be found, if not in the protocol. Alternatively, an explanation of why a DMC is not needed			13-14
	21b	Description of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines, including who will have access to these interim results and make the final decision			13-14

		to terminate the trial			
Harms	22	Plans for collecting, assessing, reporting, and managing solicited and spontaneously reported adverse events and other unintended effects of trial interventions or trial conduct	SPIRIT-AI Extension	22	Specify any plans to identify and analyse performance errors. If there are no plans for this, explain why not.
Auditing	23	Frequency and procedures for auditing trial conduct, if any, and whether the process will be independent from investigators and the sponsor			
Ethics and Dissemination					
Research ethics approval	24	Plans for seeking research ethics committee/institutional review board (REC/IRB) approval			
Protocol amendments	25	Plans for communicating important protocol modifications (eg, changes to eligibility criteria, outcomes, analyses) to relevant parties (eg, investigators, REC/IRBs, trial participants, trial registries, journals, regulators)			
Consent or ascent	26a	Who will obtain informed consent or assent from potential trial participants or authorised surrogates, and how (see Item 32)			
	26b	Additional consent provisions for collection and use of participant data and biological specimens in ancillary studies, if applicable			
Confidentiality	27	How personal information about potential and enrolled participants will be collected, shared, and maintained in order to protect confidentiality before, during, and after the trial			
Declaration of interests	28	Financial and other competing interests for principal investigators for the overall trial and each study site			
Access to data	29	Statement of who will have access to the final trial dataset, and disclosure of contractual agreements that limit such access for investigators	SPIRIT-AI Extension	29	State whether and how the AI intervention and/or its code can be accessed, including any restrictions to access or re-use.
Ancillary and	30	Provisions, if any, for ancillary and post-trial care, and for compensation			

post-trial care		to those who suffer harm from trial participation			
Dissemination policy	31a	Plans for investigators and sponsor to communicate trial results to participants, healthcare professionals, the public, and other relevant groups (eg, via publication, reporting in results databases, or other data sharing arrangements), including any publication restrictions			14-15
	31b	Authorship eligibility guidelines and any intended use of professional writers			14-15
	31c	Plans, if any, for granting public access to the full protocol, participant-level dataset, and statistical code			14-15
Appendices					
Informed consent materials	32	Model consent form and other related documentation given to participants and authorised surrogates			N/A
Biological specimens	33	Plans for collection, laboratory evaluation, and storage of biological specimens for genetic or molecular analysis in the current trial and for future use in ancillary studies, if applicable			N/A

^a It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the SPIRIT 2013 Explanation & Elaboration for important clarification on the items.

^b Indicates page numbers to be completed by authors during protocol development

SPIRIT figure: The schedule of enrolment, interventions, and assessments.

TIMEPOINT	STUDY PERIOD				
	Enrolment	Allocation	Post-allocation		Close-out
	$-t_1$	0	OP*	Post-OP	POM1**
ENROLMENT:					
Eligibility screen	X				
Informed consent	X				
Allocation		X			
INTERVENTIONS:					
<i>Without AI navigation</i>			X		
<i>With AI navigation</i>			X		
ASSESSMENTS:					
<i>Baseline variables</i>	X	X			
<i>Postoperative variables</i>				X	X
<i>Follow-up variables</i>					X

*OP: date of operation

**POM1: postoperative month 1

Enrollment

Eligibility

- Laparoscopic left-sided colorectal resection
- 18 – 80 years old
- Written informed consent

Exclusion

- Emergent surgery
- Expected intra-abdominal severe adhesion
- Significant anatomical abnormality
- Cases deemed unsuitable by the doctor in charge

Randomization (1:1)

Allocation adjustment factors

- Institution
- Sex (M vs F)
- Experience of the primary surgeon
(Qualified vs Unqualified surgeon)

Without AI navigation

With AI navigation

