



Visual gaze patterns reveal surgeons' ability to identify risk of bile duct injury during laparoscopic cholecystectomy

Journal:	HPB
Manuscript ID	HPB-2020-0584
Article Type:	Original Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	05-Aug-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Sharma, Chetanya; Imperial College London Department of Surgery and Cancer, Singh, Harsimrat ; Imperial College London Department of Surgery and Cancer Orihuela-Espina, Felipe; Instituto Nacional de Astrofísica Óptica y Electrónica Darzi, Ara; Imperial College London Department of Surgery and Cancer Sodergren, Mikael; Imperial College London Department of Surgery and Cancer
Keywords:	Laparoscopic or robotic intervention < Liver, Biliary
Note: The following files were submitted by the author for peer review, but cannot be converted to PDF. You must view these files (e.g. movies) online.	
Video 1.mp4 Video 2.mp4	

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Visual gaze patterns reveal surgeons' ability to identify risk of bile duct injury during laparoscopic cholecystectomy

Running head: Visual gaze patterns in BDI detection

Chetanya Sharma, BA MBBS¹, Harsmirat Singh, PhD¹, Felipe Orihuela-Espina, PhD², Ara Darzi, KBE¹, Mikael H Sodergren, FRCS PhD¹

¹ Department of Surgery and Cancer, Imperial College London, St. Mary's Hospital, London, United Kingdom.

² Instituto Nacional de Astrofísica, Óptica y Electrónica (INAOE), Mexico.

Original article.

Corresponding author:

Dr Mikael Sodergren PhD FRCS
Hepatobiliary and Pancreatic Surgery Unit
Department of Surgery and Cancer
Imperial College London
1st Floor, B Block, Hammersmith Campus
Du Cane Road, White City
W12 0NN UK, London, United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0) 20 3313 2261

Fax: +44 (0) 20 331 3212

E-mail: m.sodergren@imperial.ac.uk

This research was funded by a lectureship grant to Mikael Sodergren from the Academy of Medical Sciences. These data were presented in an oral presentation at the International Hepato-Pancreato Biliary Association World Congress 2018 on the 6th of September 2018.

ABSTRACT

Background: Bile duct injury is a serious surgical complication of laparoscopic cholecystectomy. The aim of this study was to identify using eye tracking technology distinct visual gaze patterns associated with promptly detecting bile duct injury risk during laparoscopic cholecystectomy.

Methods: Twenty-nine participants viewed a laparoscopic cholecystectomy that led to a serious bile duct injury ('BDI video') and an uneventful procedure ('control video') and reported when they perceived an error that could result in bile duct injury. Outcome parameters include fixation sequences on anatomical structures and eye tracking metrics. Surgeons were stratified into two groups based on performance and compared.

Results: The 'early detector' group displayed reduced common bile duct dwell time in the first half of the BDI video, as well as increased cystic duct dwell time and Calot's triangle glances count during Calot's triangle dissection in the control video. Machine learning based classification of fixation sequences demonstrated clear separability between early and late detector groups.

Conclusions: There are discernible differences in gaze patterns associated with early recognition of impending bile duct injury. The results could be transitioned into real time and used as an intraoperative early warning system and in an educational setting to improve surgical safety and performance.

Key words: orientation, laparoscopic cholecystectomy, bile duct injury

INTRODUCTION

1
2
3 Bile duct injuries (BDIs) are the main serious technical complication of laparoscopic
4 cholecystectomy (LC), and persist as a significant challenge in hepatobiliary surgery. BDI can
5
6 lead to serious sequelae such as biliary peritonitis or fistula and bile duct stenosis that can have
7
8 a profoundly negative impact on prognosis and life expectancy,¹ as well as high rates of
9
10 consequent litigation.² The laparoscopic approach is now the gold standard for the procedure
11
12 of cholecystectomy. However, despite the known advantages conferred,³ there may be
13
14 increased risk of iatrogenic bile duct injury as compared with the open approach,⁴ with an
15
16 incidence of 0.3-2.7%.⁵
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 There is a body of research related to methods to decrease the risk of BDI in laparoscopic
25
26 cholecystectomy, including the ‘critical view of safety’ (CVS) first described by Strasberg et al
27
28 in 1995, whereby Calot’s triangle is fully visualised by mobilising the neck of the gallbladder
29
30 from the liver.⁶ Other methods include landmark techniques and specific dissection techniques.⁷
31
32 It has been suggested that up to 97% of intraoperative errors in laparoscopic cholecystectomy
33
34 are as a result of visual perceptual illusion,⁸ rather than lack of technical ability or knowledge
35
36 and that 70 – 80% of BDIs stem from misidentification of biliary anatomy.⁹ Given that as many
37
38 as 90% of injuries are not diagnosed in the intraoperative period, this anatomical disorientation
39
40 poses a major problem.¹⁰ Although this suggests bile duct injuries should certainly be
41
42 considered preventable, one study found that 70% of surgeons regard them as unavoidable.¹¹
43
44
45 Consequently, ongoing research into training and operative methods and tools to minimise
46
47 these hazards would result in valuable reduction in patient morbidity and mortality.
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 The importance of identification of anatomical structures and spatial awareness in preventing
55
56 bile duct injuries makes this area of research well suited to utilising eye-tracking technology.
57
58 Our group have previously used eye-tracking technology to quantify visual attention strategies
59
60

1
2
3 associated with successful orientation during laparoscopic cholecystectomy,¹² and have
4 demonstrated that training novices in orientation strategies improves their ability to correctly
5 orient during surgery.¹³ To our knowledge, visual gaze patterns of surgeons in the context of a
6 bile duct injury during laparoscopic cholecystectomy remains unexplored, and yet, its
7 understanding may provide real-time hints of surgical underperformance, all the way from early
8 training to the operating room.
9

10
11
12 The aim of this study was to determine visual gaze patterns for surgeons who can promptly
13 identify an impending bile duct injury. We hypothesize that if surgeon's gaze patterns encode
14 any information about their ability to recognise the mistake leading to a bile duct injury, then
15 gaze patterns between early and late recognizers should be discriminable.
16
17
18

19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 **METHODS**

32 33 34 35 *Subjects*

36
37 The study was approved by the West London National Research Ethics (NRES) committee. All
38 subjects were provided with an information sheet and signed a consent form before participating
39 in the study. A total of 29 surgeons (27 male, 2 female) were recruited to the study. Mean age
40 was 39.3 years (range 31 – 57 years). Subjects had a mean laparoscopic cholecystectomy
41 experience of 215 operations as primary surgeon (range 5 – 1000) and 235 as assistant surgeon
42 (range 40 – 1000).
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 Participants recruited were surgeons working at one of two large London teaching hospitals (St
54 Mary's Hospital, Paddington, and the Royal Free Hospital, Hampstead). Inclusion criteria was
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 simply that surgeons must have performed or assisted at least 5 laparoscopic cholecystectomies.

4
5 No exclusion or elimination criteria were defined.
6
7
8
9

10 *Experimental design*

11
12 During the experiment, subjects were shown 2 recorded videos of laparoscopic
13 cholecystectomies lasting approximately 3 minutes. Subjects were informed of the aim of the
14 experiment to study gaze patterns of surgeons in recognising the risk of bile duct injury, but not
15 explicitly told whether either of the videos featured a bile duct injury. The sequence of viewing
16 the videos was randomised 50:50 between all participants. Video 1 featured a laparoscopic
17 cholecystectomy that ended with a serious bile duct injury (see 'BDI video'). The injury was
18 the classical misidentification of the common bile duct for the cystic duct with complete
19 transection of the common bile duct. The first dissection occurred at 8 seconds, the first obvious
20 error in the dissection that may result in a bile duct injury was at 18 seconds (when the surgeon
21 grasps the bile duct much below the gallbladder) and the transection of the bile duct occurred
22 at 1 minute 57 seconds. Video 2 consisted of a standard laparoscopic cholecystectomy with no
23 injuries (see 'Control video'). The participants were asked to log, by pressing on the keypad,
24 when they first identified any error that if carried forward was likely to result in a bile duct
25 injury, or any error that had already resulted in a bile duct injury. There were no interruptions
26 or feedback given to subjects at any time during or after the experiment.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 The objective was to identify those subjects who were able to recognise an impending bile duct
50 injury in the BDI video early on, and subsequent to grouping into early and late detectors,
51 evaluate the existence of significant and sustained differences in their visual gaze patterns, both
52 in the case of the BDI and control videos.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Eye-tracking

Gaze tracking was performed using an SMI REDn remote eye-tracking system (SensoMotoric Instruments, Berlin, Germany) that was mounted just below the video monitor. This is an infrared video-based binocular eye-tracking system recording the position of gaze in the work plane (screen) at 30 Hz. Images are real-time digitized and processed using 3D eye-model algorithms. Before each recording, subjects viewed multiple moving dots on the screen as a calibration process, allowing, across the screen plane, a gaze position accuracy of 0.4° and spatial resolution of 0.05° . The data were analysed using proprietary software (BeGaze, SMI, Berlin, Germany) and bespoke scripts developed by our group over the years in MATLAB (Mathworks, UK).

Assessment

Multiple areas of interest (AOIs) were selected for each of the two videos, delimiting the various significant organs and structures. The following 13 AOIs were identified: right hand instrument (RHI), liver, gallbladder, common bile duct, cystic duct, cystic artery, hepatic duct, hepatic artery, duodenum, Rouviere's sulcus, Calot's triangle, hepatoduodenal ligament, cystic artery.

Using the BeGaze software, these AOIs were dynamically mapped, enabling the computation of the following eye tracking metrics for each participant: dwell time (sum of fixations and saccades), dwell time %, fixation count, fixation time [ms], fixation time %, average fixation duration [ms] glances count, and revisits. A fixation corresponds to when gaze does not move further than 30 pixels for a minimum of 80 milliseconds. Saccades are defined as the rapid movement between fixation points. In order to normalise the dwell time per AOI, the dwell time was divided by the relative square coverage occupied by that structure within a given time

1
2
3 period (dwell time/AOI coverage). This is frequently used as a surrogate for attention
4
5 allocation.¹²⁻¹⁷
6
7
8
9

10 *Analysis*

11
12 Data were analysed across each quartile of the videos and across each video as a whole. For the
13
14 BDI video, participants were grouped according to how quickly they were able to identify the
15
16 risk of a bile duct injury, defined by when they first pressed on the keypad. Eye tracking metrics
17
18 for both videos were compared across these groups with respect to the different AOIs.
19
20
21
22

23
24 Comparisons between individual nonparametric variables were done using the Mann-Whitney
25
26 *U* test. Correlations of continuous variables were determined by nonparametric linear
27
28 regression. Analyses were performed using statistical software (SPSS v24.0, IBM corporation,
29
30 USA). Differences were considered statistically significant at $P < 0.05$.
31
32
33

34
35 An automated classification of surgeons based on their gaze patterns to identify the risk was
36
37 done using an approach previously employed by our group to profile eye tracking data and
38
39 executed using bespoke analysis software.¹²⁻¹⁷ In particular, subjects' dynamically labelled
40
41 fixation data was processed using a probabilistic hidden Markov model,¹⁷ a model which
42
43 represents an underpinning generative process responsible for a given sequence of observations.
44
45 The model output were descriptors of the exhibited gaze pattern. Statistical differences for
46
47 associated models were computed as surrogate for pairwise difference between AOI-tagged
48
49 fixation sequences using the log probability of a certain sequence being generated by the
50
51 descriptive model of another sequence, permitting behavioural analysis of gaze patterns.
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 **RESULTS**

59
60

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

Figure 1 illustrates the times at which the different participants recognised the risk of bile duct injury as the BDI video was played. The results show a cluster of participants ($n=15$) who detected the risk of BDI within the first 30 seconds of the video, while the remaining participants detected the risk at some time after the half-way point ($n=12$), or not at all ($n=2$). Therefore, we separated the participants into two groups: those who detected the risk of BDI in the first half of the BDI video ('Early Detectors' or Group 'ED'; $n = 15$) and those who detected the risk of BDI in the second half of the BDI video or did not detect the risk at all ('Late Detectors' or Group 'LD'; $n = 14$).

Demographics

There was no significant difference in age (39.00 [IQR 11] vs 37.50 [IQR 6]; $U = 85.5$, $P = 0.400$) or experience in laparoscopic cholecystectomy (150.00 [IQR 249] vs 100.00 [IQR 154]; $U = 97.0$, $P = 0.747$) between Group ED and LD.

Bile duct injury video

In the first half of the BDI video, Group ED had reduced CBD dwell time [ms] ($U = 152.0$, $P = 0.041$), reduced CBD normalised dwell time [ms/% coverage] ($U = 152.0$, $P = 0.041$), reduced CBD dwell time [%] ($U = 152.0$, $P = 0.041$), reduced CBD fixation time [ms] ($U = 152.0$, $P = 0.037$), and reduced CBD fixation time [%] ($U = 153.0$, $P = 0.037$). In the final quarter of the BDI video, Group ED had increased liver glances count ($U = 53.0$, $P = 0.023$) and increased liver revisits ($U = 51.0$, $P = 0.018$). Across the whole BDI video, Group ED had reduced CBD fixation time [ms] ($U = 150.5$, $P = 0.046$) and reduced CBD fixation time % ($U = 150.5$, $P = 0.046$). Table 1 shows the data for these findings, while Table 2 shows the normalised dwell times for each of the AOIs in the first half of the BDI video.

1
2
3
4
5 Group ED had an increased blink count compared with Group LD across the whole BDI video
6 (35 [IQR 22] vs 17 [IQR 19]; $U = 57.5$, $P = 0.037$) and specifically in the second half of the
7
8 BDI video (17 [IQR 14] vs 9 [IQR 10]; $U = 56.5$, $P = 0.033$).
9
10
11
12

13
14 Figures 2B and 2C show heat maps during the dissection of Calot's triangle in the bile duct
15 injury video for Group ED and Group LD respectively. This shows the relative dwell time on
16 different anatomical regions and is a direct visual representation of the discernible differences
17 in gaze patterns between the two groups. Figure 2D shows the similarity-based profiling using
18 hidden Markov models (HMM). Points which are closer in space exhibit similar behaviour, and
19 the results should show two very distinct clusters with clear separability between Group ED and
20 Group LD.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 ***Control video***

34
35 In viewing the video of a normal laparoscopic cholecystectomy, Group ED had, in the third
36 quarter of the video, increased cystic duct dwell time [ms] ($U = 54.0$, $P = 0.026$), increased
37 cystic duct normalised dwell time [ms/% coverage] ($U = 54.0$, $P = 0.026$), increased cystic duct
38 dwell time [%] ($U = 54.0$, $P = 0.026$), increased cystic duct fixation time [ms] ($U = 55.5$, $P =$
39 0.029) and increased cystic duct fixation time [%] ($U = 55.5$, $P = 0.029$). There was also
40 increased Calot's triangle glances count ($U = 51.5$, $P = 0.018$), increased Calot's triangle revisits
41 ($U = 53.5$, $P = 0.023$) and increased Calot's triangle fixation count ($U = 58.5$, $P = 0.041$) in the
42 third quarter. This quarter corresponds to the Calot's triangle dissection, and the data are shown
43 in Table 1. Table 2 shows the normalised dwell times for each of the AOIs in the third quarter
44 of the control video.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57
58 There was no significant difference in blink count or other basic eye tracking parameters
59 between Groups ED and LD while viewing the control video.
60

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

Figures 3B and 3C show heat maps during the dissection of Calot's triangle in the control video for Group ED and Group LD respectively. This is a direct visual representation of the discernible differences in gaze patterns between the two groups. The red areas in the figures correspond with increased average dwell time on these anatomical regions.

Figure 3D shows the similarity-based profiling using hidden Markov models (HMM). Similar to the BDI video plot, this shows two very distinct clusters with clear separability between Group ED and Group LD.

DISCUSSION

This study presents the first evaluation of surgeon gaze behaviour in the context of bile duct injury, comparing surgeons based on their ability to detect the risk of bile duct injury. Much of the published work on bile duct injuries in laparoscopic cholecystectomy emphasises the importance of clear identification of biliary anatomy before dividing any structure. However, a surgeon should not divide a structure without identifying it, and likewise would not divide the bile duct if they knew it was the common duct.¹⁸ Thus, a critical contributory factor in being mistakenly persuaded that the structure being transected is the correct one is the underestimation of risk, which is why we used the endpoint of time taken to detect the risk of bile duct injury to divide our subjects into two groups. Our results here have shown that there are discernible visual gaze patterns that are associated with the early detection of the risk of bile duct injury.

1
2
3 When examining AOI metrics in the BDI video, Group ED had increased dwell time on the
4 right hand instrument during the first quarter of the video. This may be due to focussed attention
5 at the site of dissection during the initial stages of the operation. Group ED also displayed
6 reduced fixation times and dwell times on the common bile duct, particularly in the first half of
7 the BDI video. This may suggest visual attention was distributed more to surrounding
8 anatomical landmarks rather than the common bile duct in those able to successfully identify
9 the risk of BDI. In the final quarter of the BDI video, Group ED also displayed increased liver
10 glances and revisits compared with Group LD, which may reflect an attempt to re-establish
11 what was perceived as a possible loss of orientation in the video from this group of participants,
12 who were better aware of the incorrect surgical approach.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 When examining AOI metrics in the control video, in the third quarter Group ED had increased
29 fixation times and dwell times on the cystic duct. In addition, there were increased glances,
30 revisits and fixation count on Calot's triangle. Importantly, this third quarter of the video
31 contains the beginning and completion of the dissection of the two windows of Calot's triangle.
32 Identification of Calot's triangle is the key component in obtaining the Critical View of Safety
33 (CVS). This strongly suggests that increased attention during this imperative stage of
34 laparoscopic cholecystectomy is conducive to better risk identification. Crucially, these results
35 demonstrate that the two groups of participants are consistently different in their approach even
36 when viewing a normal laparoscopic cholecystectomy, suggesting there are key differences in
37 orientation strategies that account for the differences in injury risk assessment.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 By using hidden Markov modelling for analysis of these data, we were able to represent visual
55 behaviour patterns as captured by a fixation sequence as a point in a plane or 2D plot. We
56 demonstrated clear separability of participants grouped according to how quickly they were
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 able to detect the risk of bile duct injury. Significantly, the separability of these two groups
4 using Markovian modelling was consistent while viewing a normal laparoscopic
5 cholecystectomy video, adding further weight to the notion that surgeons have innate patterns
6 of gaze behaviour which directly contribute to how likely they are to detect the risk of a bile
7 duct injury.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 Interestingly, blink count was also found to be greater in Group ED across the whole of the BDI
18 video, and specifically in the second half. Blink count is known to be linked to cognitive
19 flexibility,¹⁹ which may suggest surgeons able to detect the risk of BDI early were more able
20 to foresee the inevitable outcome from the initial approach. The blink count was not
21 significantly different in the control video, which may be explained by the lower cognitive
22 demand required to follow the orientation and steps of this procedure compared with the BDI
23 video.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 We found no significant difference in age or experience (measured by the number of
36 laparoscopic cholecystectomies performed as the primary surgeon) between the two groups.
37 This is consistent with research that shows bile duct injuries cannot simply be explained as a
38 'learning curve' problem, occurring with similar frequency regardless of a surgeon's seniority
39 or experience.^{20,21} This implies that there are more complex underlying factors involved in
40 avoiding, and presumably by extension, recognising the risk of, a bile duct injury. A preceding
41 study by our group has suggested that surgeons reach a plateau in their orientational skills, in
42 keeping with an innate ability during training.¹² The results of this study are in keeping with
43 this paradigm and suggest that eye tracking technology could play a greater role in both the
44 training of surgeons and in intraoperative monitoring to ensure a safe surgical approach. For
45 example, if a surgeon's gaze patterns during the crucial steps of the procedure, such as
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 dissecting the windows of Calot's triangle, correlate with that of unsafe surgical technique, the
4
5 surgeon could be alerted and encouraged to adopt a different approach or seek senior help. Eye
6
7 tracking technology has already been used to identify distinct visual attention strategies by
8
9 surgeons during a normal laparoscopic cholecystectomy that are associated with successful
10
11 orientation.¹²
12
13
14
15
16

17 Using eye tracking technology to study human attention processes has some inherent
18
19 assumptions. Because attention is composed of higher- and lower-level functions, it is well
20
21 established that humans can voluntarily disassociate attention from their foveal direction of
22
23 gaze.²² Because this experiment involved participants reacting to salient stimuli in a 'bottom-
24
25 up' process, rather than a more task-specified 'top-down' one, it is possible that visual attention
26
27 could deviate from the foveal point of gaze. However, we believe that as this affects all
28
29 participants equally, it does not detract from the findings of this study. Furthermore, capturing
30
31 the live gaze of a surgeon in theatre who inadvertently causes a bile duct injury during
32
33 laparoscopic cholecystectomy would be the only true representation of a 'top-down' process,
34
35 but we are too early in this research line. In the future, surgical simulations could be used to
36
37 analyse gaze patterns of surgeons actually performing 'surgery' that was associated with the
38
39 risk of a bile duct injury, representing a more task-directed experimental set-up.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 We acknowledge certain limitations of our study. We did not perform a sample size
48
49 computation, mainly due to the novelty of this work meaning we lack any previous reliable
50
51 effect size estimation. There is only one video each representing a bile duct injury case and a
52
53 normal case, which may not present adequate variability. The resolution of the BDI video used
54
55 for the experiment was relatively poor compared with the control video, due to the scarce
56
57 availability of such videos. In addition, the scope used in the control video was different, and
58
59
60

1
2
3 the equipment less modern. This could introduce possible bias, as participants may have
4
5 inferred early on that this video was the one more likely to result in a bile duct injury, despite
6
7 the randomised viewing order. An inherent limitation of the study was having to edit out large
8
9 parts of the procedure to fit key steps into a short video. Evaluation of risk is a cumulative
10
11 process, whereas in this experiment participants had to make an assessment in less realistic
12
13 viewing circumstances. This may have proved particularly challenging for less experienced
14
15 surgeons, as the edited videos required the participants to reorient themselves several times.
16
17
18
19
20

21
22 In this study, we have identified quantifiable differences in gaze behaviour between surgeons
23
24 who are able to identify early the risk of impending bile duct injury versus those who are not,
25
26 and have made an effort to explain the underlying causes of such differences. Crucially, these
27
28 differences in gaze patterns of the two groups persist in the procedure in which no injury occurs,
29
30 demonstrating an underlying behavioural divergence. If this analysis can be automated in real
31
32 time it could be used as an intraoperative early warning system. For example, if the gaze
33
34 patterns of a trainee correlate with those associated with an unsafe surgical approach, the
35
36 surgeon could be advised to reconsider the surgical approach or seek clarification from a senior.
37
38 In addition to this, behavioural differences could be used in an educational setting away from
39
40 the operating theatre. ‘Gaze training’ has been shown to improve the efficacy of laparoscopic
41
42 tasks, such as by verbally informing trainees which areas of interest they should focus on,²³ or
43
44 by projecting the supervisor’s point-of-gaze onto a trainee’s screen.²⁴ These strategies could
45
46 complement surgical training in the simulation centre, thus in the future enhancing safety and
47
48 performance in laparoscopic cholecystectomy.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 (I) Conception and design: MS, CS
4
5 (II) Administrative support: CS, MS
6
7 (III) Provision of study materials or patients: MS, AD
8
9 (IV) Collection and assembly of data: CS
10
11 (V) Data analysis and interpretation: CS, MS, HS, FOE
12
13 (VI) Manuscript writing: All authors
14
15 (VII) Final approval of manuscript: All authors
16
17
18
19
20

21 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

22
23 Dr Evangelos Felekouras from the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens for the use
24
25 of his laparoscopic cholecystectomy video. Harsimrat Singh acknowledges support from the
26
27 NIHR Imperial Biomedical Research Centre (BRC).
28
29
30
31

32 **DISCLOSURES**

33
34 Drs Chetanya Sharma, Harsmirat Singh, Felipe Orihuela-Espina, Ara Darzi and Mikael H
35
36 Sodergren have no conflicts of interest or financial ties to disclose. This research was funded
37
38 by a lectureship grant to Mikael Sodergren from the Academy of Medical Sciences. The
39
40 authors are accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the
41
42 accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **REFERENCES**

- 52
53
54
55
56 1. Maddah G, Rajabi Mashhadi MT, Parvizi Mashhadi M, et al. Iatrogenic injuries of the
57
58 extrahepatic biliary system. J Surg Res.2017;213:215-221.
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
2. Alkhaffaf B, Decadt B. 15 years of litigation following laparoscopic cholecystectomy in England. *Ann Surg.* 2010;251(4):682-685.
3. Coccolini F, Catena F, Pisano M, et al. Open versus laparoscopic cholecystectomy in acute cholecystitis. Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Surg.* 2015;18:196-204.
4. Connor S, Garden OJ: Bile duct injury in the era of laparoscopic cholecystectomy. *Br J Surg.* 2006;93:158-168.
5. Ahmad F, Saunders RN, Lloyd GM, et al. An algorithm for management of bile leak following laparoscopic cholecystectomy. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl.* 2007;89:51–56.
6. Strasberg SM, Hertl M, Soper NJ. An analysis of the problem of biliary injury during laparoscopic cholecystectomy. *J Am Coll Surg.* 1995;180:101–125.
7. Connor SJ, Perry W, Nathanson L, et al. Using a standardized method for laparoscopic cholecystectomy to create a concept operation-specific checklist. *HPB (Oxford).* 2014;16(5):422–429.
8. Way LW, Stewart L, Gantert W, et al. Causes and prevention of laparoscopic bile duct injuries: analysis of 252 cases from a human factors and cognitive psychology perspective. *Ann Surg.* 2003;237:460–469.
9. Hugh TB. New strategies to prevent laparoscopic bile duct injury – surgeons can learn from pilots. *Surgery.* 2002;132:826–835.

- 1
2
3 10. Abdel Wahab M, el-Ebiedy G, Sultan A, et al. Postcholecystectomy bile duct injuries:
4
5 experience with 49 cases managed by different therapeutic modalities.
6
7
8 Hepatogastroenterology. 1996;43:1141–1147.
9
- 10
11
12 11. Francoeur JR, Wiseman K, Buczkowski AK, et al. Surgeons' anonymous response after
13
14 bile duct injury during cholecystectomy. Am J Surg. 2003;185:468–475.
15
16
- 17
18 12. Sodergren MH, Orihuela-Espina F, Clark J, et al. Evaluation of orientation strategies in
19
20 laparoscopic cholecystectomy. Ann Surg. 2010;252(6):1027-1036.
21
22
- 23
24 13. Sodergren MH, Orihuela-Espina F, Froghi F, et al. Value of orientation training in
25
26 laparoscopic cholecystectomy. Br J Surg. 2011;98:1437-1445
27
28
- 29
30 14. Lami M, Singh H, Dilley JH, et al. Gaze patterns hold key to unlocking successful
31
32 search strategies and increasing polyp detection rate in colonoscopy. Endoscopy.
33
34 2018;50(7):701-707.
35
36
- 37
38 15. Edmondson MJ, Pucher PH, Sriskandarajah K, et al. Looking towards objective quality
39
40 evaluation in colonoscopy: Analysis of visual gaze patterns. J Gastroenterol Hepatol.
41
42 2016;31(3):604-609.
43
44
- 45
46 16. Sodergren MH, Orihuela-Espina F, Mountney P, et al. Orientation strategies in natural
47
48 orifice transluminal endoscopic surgery. Ann Surg. 2011;254(2):257-266.
49
50
- 51
52
53 17. Sodergren MH, Orihuela-Espina F, Clark J, et al. A hidden Markov model-based
54
55 analysis framework using eye-tracking data to characterise re-orientation strategies
56
57 in minimally invasive surgery. Cogn Process. 2010;11(3):275-283.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 18. Dekker SW, Hugh TB. Laparoscopic bile duct injury: understanding the psy- chology
5 and heuristics of the error. ANZ J Surg. 2008;78:1109–1114.
6
7
8
9
10 19. Jongkees BJ, Colzato LS. Spontaneous eye blink rate as predictor of dopamine-related
11 cognitive function—A review. Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews 2016;71:58-82.
12
13
14
15
16
17 20. Windsor JA, Pong J. Laparoscopic biliary injury: more than a learning curve problem.
18 Aust. N. Z. J. Surg. 1998; 68:186–189.
19
20
21
22
23
24 21. Francoeur JR, Wiseman K, Buczkowski AK, et al. Surgeons’ anonymous response after
25 bile duct injury during cholecystectomy. Am. J. Surg. 2003;185:468–475.
26
27
28
29
30
31 22. Posner MI, Snyder CR, Davidson BJ. Attention and the detection of signals. J Exp
32 Psychol. 1980;109:160–174.
33
34
35
36
37
38 23. Vine SJ, Masters RSW, McGrath JS, et al. Cheating experience: guiding novices to
39 adopt the gaze strategies of experts expedites the learning of technical laparoscopic
40 skills. Surgery 2012;152:32–40.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48 24. Chetwood AS, Kwok KW, Sun LW, et al. Collaborative eye tracking: a potential
49 training tool in laparoscopic surgery. Surg Endosc. 2012;26:2003–2009.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

List of supplemental digital content

57
58
59
60 Video 1. “BDI video” - Laparoscopic cholecystectomy showing a bile duct injury (mp4)

Video 2. "Control video" - Laparoscopic cholecystectomy showing a normal procedure (mp4)

Table 1: Key eye tracking metrics for bile duct injury and control videos


Time period	Eye tracking metric	Group ED median	Group ED IQR	Group LD	Group LD IQR	U-value	η^2	P-value
First half of BDI video	CBD dwell time [ms]	6632.500	3600.3	9249.300	3924.8	152.0	0.150	0.041
	CBD normalised dwell time [ms/coverage]	112415.254	61022.0339	156767.797	66522.4576	152.0	0.150	0.041
	CBD dwell time %	7.200	3.9	10.050	4.3	152.0	0.150	0.041
	CBD fixation time [ms]	6465.800	3633.5	8899.800	3758.1	153.0	0.156	0.037
	CBD fixation time %	7.000	3.9	9.650	4.1	152.5	0.154	0.037
Final quarter of BDI video	Liver glances count	2.00	2	1.00	2	53.0	0.195	0.023
	Liver revisits	1.00	2	0.00	1	51.0	0.231	0.018
Whole BDI video	CBD fixation time [ms]	7066.000	233.8	9466.350	3583.0	150.5	0.141	0.046
	CBD fixation time %	3.800	1.3	5.150	2.0	150.5	0.141	0.046
Third quarter of control video	Cystic duct dwell time [ms]	15665.300	7999.5	12715.650	8348.7	54.0	0.177	0.026
	Cystic duct normalized dwell time [ms/coverage]	870294.444	444416.667	706425.000	463813.889	54.0	0.177	0.026
	Cystic duct dwell time %	35.900	18.4	29.150	19.2	54.0	0.177	0.026
	Cystic duct fixation time [ms]	15565.200	8166.5	12348.900	8140.4	55.0	0.170	0.029
	Cystic duct fixation time %	35.700	18.7	28.300	18.7	55.0	0.170	0.029
	Calot's triangle glances count	3.00	2	1.50	1	51.5	0.211	0.018
	Calot's triangle revisits	2.00	2	0.50	1	53.5	0.199	0.023
	Calot's triangle fixation count	5.00	4	3.00	3	58.5	0.150	0.041

AOI = Area of interest; Group ED = 'Early Detectors'; Group LD = 'Late Detectors'; IQR = Interquartile range; CBD = common bile duct

Table 2: Normalised dwell times for BDI and control videos


	AOI	Group ED median [ms/coverage]	Group ED IQR [ms/coverage]	Group LD median [ms/coverage]	Group LD IQR [ms/coverage]	U- value	η^2	P- value
First half of bile duct injury video	Right hand instrument	58226.5060	25603.6145	39752.4096	18772.5904	62.0	0.126	0.063
	Hepatic duct	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Gall bladder	13157.8947	29826.3158	21926.3158	38812.5000	114.5	0.006	0.683
	Duodenum	0	0	0	0	112.0	0.012	0.780
	Rouviere's sulcus	0	0	0	0	107.0	0.001	0.949
	Hepatic artery	191408.571	113311.429	149304.286	103325.714	94.0	0.008	0.652
	Common bile duct	112415.254	61022.0339	156767.797	66522.4576	152.0	0.150	0.041
	Calot's triangle	20588.2353	49023.5294	52938.2353	79404.4118	129.5	0.041	0.290
	Hepatoduodenal ligament	261430.806	39968.2464	259850.711	12910.3081	94.0	0.008	0.652
	Liver	11413.8958	3474.93797	10420.8437	8848.13896	99.0	0.002	0.813
Third quarter of the control video	Hepatoduodenal ligament	0	0	0	0	105.0	0.000	1.000
	Rouviere's sulcus	0	0	0	16668.7500	113.5	0.011	0.715
	Right hand instrument	32625.5319	26946.8085	59218.0851	76942.0213	142.5	0.096	0.102
	Cystic artery	899955.556	474033.333	714750.000	674922.222	78.0	0.050	0.252
	Cystic duct	870294.444	444416.667	706425.000	463813.889	54.0	0.177	0.026
	Common bile duct	0	0	0	19050.0000	113.0	0.008	0.747
	Calot's triangle	159077.273	113631.818	99234.0909	162485.227	63.0	0.120	0.070
	Gall bladder	12771.0280	15263.5514	30682.7103	29435.2804	145.0	0.109	0.085
	Duodenum	0	0	0	0	105.0	0.000	1.000
Liver	9722.94618	11707.6487	12039.3768	8096.10482	125.0	0.027	0.400	
<p>'-' indicates AOI did not appear in this time period. '0' indicates no dwell time on the AOI AOI = Area of interest; Group ED = 'Early Detectors'; Group LD = 'Late Detectors'; IQR = Interquartile range</p>								

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




Time at which each participant detected the risk of bile duct injury while watching the bile duct injury video. Each horizontal point represents a participant. The dotted line at 90 seconds represents the separation of the early and late detector groups.

277x57mm (72 x 72 DPI)




A: Median normalized dwell times for different areas of interest in the BDI video, comparing Group ED and Group LD. B & C: heat maps during the dissection of Calot's triangle in the BDI video for Group ED and Group LD respectively (red areas correspond with increased average dwell time). D: Hidden Markov model similarity-based profiling for the BDI video (each numbered point represents a participant, from either Group ED or Group LD as shown by the key).

187x257mm (300 x 300 DPI)



A: Median normalized dwell times for different areas of interest in the control video, comparing Group ED and Group LD. B & C: heat maps during the dissection of Calot's triangle in the control video for Group ED and Group LD respectively (red areas correspond with increased average dwell time). D: Hidden Markov model similarity-based profiling for the control video (each numbered point represents a participant, from either Group ED or Group LD as shown by the key).

187x257mm (300 x 300 DPI)



HPB

Author Statements 2009

This form must be completed by the corresponding author and uploaded to Manuscript Central as a 'Supplementary file for review'. If the contribution was prepared jointly, the corresponding author agrees to inform the co-contributors of the terms of this statement and to obtain their signature to this agreement or their written permission to sign on their behalf. Answer all questions in full - check boxes to affirm, delete statements where appropriate and, if necessary, provide full details. The Editors reserve the right to reject papers that do not conform to the ethical policies of HPB.

Manuscript title: Visual gaze patterns reveal surgeons' ability to identify risk of bile duct injury during laparoscopic cholecystectomy

Authors: Chetanya Sharma, Harsmirat Singh, Felipe Orihuela-Espina, Ara Darzi, Mikael H Sodergren

Manuscript submission number:

Funding

1. How was this research and its publication (or this publication if it is not research) funded?

(List all funders giving grant numbers where applicable).

This research was funded by a lectureship grant to Mikael Sodergren from the Academy of Medical Sciences

Role of the sponsor

2. The authors confirm that they had complete access to the study data supporting this publication.



Conflicts of interest

3. Do any of the authors have financial interests in any company or institution that might benefit from this publication?

~~YES~~/NO

(E.g. employment, share ownership, patent rights, consultancy, research funding).

If yes, please give full details:

- Share ownership

- Research funding >£5,000

- Fees for consultancy >£5,000

- Funding to attend/present at conferences >£5,000

- Any income equivalent to >5% of their gross annual income

- Income below the suggested threshold or received at an earlier time that might be considered to the publication should also be declared below:

- 1
2
3
4
5 4. Do any of the authors have any other potential competing interests that readers or editors might **YES/NO**
6 consider relevant to this publication? (*E.g. political or religious affiliations*).
7 If yes, please describe below:
8
9
10
11
12

Authorship and Contributorship

- 13
14
15 5. We declare that all listed authors have made substantial contributions to **all** of the following three parts
16 of the manuscript:

- 17 • research design, or acquisition, analysis or interpretation of data;
- 18 • drafting the paper or revising it critically;
- 19 • approving the submitted version.

20 We also declare that no-one who qualifies for authorship has been excluded from the list of authors.
21
22
23

- 24 6. The Corresponding Author agrees to communicate with all other authors and will obtain their approval for
25 the final version to be published.
26

Role of Authors and Contributors

- 27
28 7. Give a short description of each individual's contribution to the research and its publication
29 (*E.g. designed study, analysed data, drafted paper*).

30 MS and CS designed the paper. MS and AD provided study materials. CS collected and assembled data. CS, MS, HS and FOE analysed and interpreted the data.
31 All authors drafted the paper and approved the final manuscript.
32
33
34
35
36

- 37 8. Was this research or its publication assisted by any non-financial or 'in-kind' contributions? ~~YES/NO~~
38 (*e.g. provision of writing assistance, literature searching, data analysis, administrative support,*
39 *supply of materials*).
40 If yes, give details:
41
42
43
44
45

- 46 9. Written approval has been obtained from all individuals listed in the acknowledgements.
47
48
49

Ownership

- 50
51
52 10. I/we state that the submitted work is my/our own and that copyright has not been breached in seeking its
53 publication.
54

- 55 11. Copies of permission letters for any material reproduced from other, copyrighted publications ~~YES/NO~~ NOT
56 (E.g. tables or figures) have been obtained and sent to the Editorial Office by regular mail. **APPLICABLE**
57
58
59

Originality

12. I/we declare that the submitted work has not previously been published in full and is not currently being considered for publication elsewhere.



13. I/we declare that re-publication of any data (e.g. a secondary analysis or translation) will not constitute redundant publication, will not breach copyright and will reference the original publication. In such cases a copy of the original paper has been sent to the Editorial Office for consideration with the current submission.

~~YES/NO~~ NOT
APPLICABLE

Registration of clinical trials

14. For clinical trials state:

- Trial registration number
- Name of trial register

If none available, please provide an explanation:

Ethical framework

15. This study was approved by the relevant bodies (e.g. institutional review boards, research ethics committees, national authorities).
Please give details below:

~~YES/NO~~

The study was approved by the West London National Research Ethics (NRES) committee.

16. Appropriate consent was obtained from all research participants.
If no, please provide an explanation
(*'Not applicable' is only acceptable for experimental studies*):

~~YES/NO~~ NOT
APPLICABLE

17. Consent for publication has been obtained from living individuals who might be identified from data or images included in this publication (or their families in the case of the deceased).
If no, please provide an explanation.

~~YES/NO~~ NOT
APPLICABLE

This document must be signed by all Authors.

By signing below I certify that the information provided above is correct and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief.

CHETANYA SHARMA	C.Sharma	05/08/2020
.....
Author 1 Print Name	Author 1 Signature	Date

HARSIMRAT SINGH	H. Singh	05/08/2020
.....
Author 2 Print Name	Author 2 Signature	Date

FELIPE ORIHUELA-ESPINA	F. Orihuela-Espina	05/08/2020
.....
Author 3 Print Name	Author 3 Signature	Date

ARA DARZI	A. Darzi	05/08/2020
.....
Author 4 Print Name	Author 4 Signature	Date

MIKAEL SODERGREN	M. Sodergren	05/08/2020
.....
Author 5 Print Name	Author 5 Signature	Date

.....
Author 6 Print Name	Author 6 Signature	Date

Space for additional information, if required: