

The IDEAL Conference 2018: No innovation without evaluation

GUIDANCE FOR ABSTRACT SUBMISSION

Deadline: Friday 29 June 2018

We welcome two types of abstracts for this conference. These can be related to all types of surgical innovation, including IDEAL primary studies, trials, registries, methodology, regulation and healthcare policy. Hospital audit and quality improvement studies will not be considered.

1: Research abstracts describing surgical innovation (*oral or poster presentation*)

Please submit a structured abstract (250 words maximum) in the format of: Background, Aim, Methods, Results and Conclusion, within one of the following themes:

1.1 *Examples of innovation: pre-clinical and early stage*

Research reporting a) first-in-human use of innovative techniques or devices (IDEAL stage 1), b) early experience during which techniques are rapidly modified (IDEAL stage 2a) and c) involving subsequent widening of experience (IDEAL stage 2b).

1.2 *Examples of innovation: later stage (trials and registries)*

Reports on the formal evaluation of new techniques or devices in an RCT or other comparative trial, or using registry data (IDEAL stage 3-4).

1.3 *Advances in Evaluation of Surgical Innovation: Theory, Methodology and Practical Applications*

Research on the ethics and methodology of the evaluation of surgical innovation generally, and on how methodology can best be used in practice, e.g. to support regulatory, policy and purchasing decisions.

1.3(i) *Research about novel methods for the evaluation of innovation*

Including methods for optimising consent, monitoring innovation and selection and reporting of outcomes.

1.3(ii) *Evaluating Innovation to support regulation and policy*

Reports on work to improve the quality of evidence available for regulatory and/or policy decisions on surgical techniques or devices by integrating appropriate evaluation methods into the evidence gathering process.

1.3(iii) *Ethics of innovation and patient involvement*

Studies of the ethical aspects of surgical research. For example: governance and regulatory approvals, information provision for patients, how patients can contribute to and benefit from participating in research on the development of innovative surgical devices and techniques.

2: Sandpit abstracts describing the beginnings of a proposal for the evaluation of a new/developing innovation using the IDEAL framework

Please submit a structured abstract (100 words maximum) in the format of: (a) rationale for choice of intervention; (b) aim; and (c) expected IDEAL study design.

In this sandpit session we are holding round table discussions. Each round table will consider one selected idea. A facilitator will lead the discussion to shape the idea into a proposal and study. It is intended to be an educational opportunity to enable conference delegates to see IDEAL in action.

NOTES: References to IDEAL Recommendations

- *Hirst A, Philippou Y, Blazeby J, Campbell B, Campbell M, Feinberg J, Rovers M, Blencowe N, Pennell C, Quinn T, Rogers W, Cook J, Koliass AG, Agha R, Dahm P, Sedrakyan A, McCulloch P. No Surgical Innovation Without Evaluation: Evolution and Further Development of the IDEAL Framework and Recommendations. Ann Surg. 2018 Apr 24. doi: 10.1097/SLA.0000000000002794. [Epub ahead of print] PubMed PMID: 29697448.*
- *McCulloch P et al. No surgical innovation without evaluation: the IDEAL recommendations. Lancet. 2009 Sep 26; 374(9695):1105-12. and our Summary Tables available at: <http://www.ideal-collaboration.net/about-ideal/ideal-summary-tables/>*
- *Pennell C et al. Practical Guide to the Idea, Development and Exploration stages of the IDEAL Framework and Recommendations. Br J Surg. 2016 Apr;103(5):607-15. doi: 10.1002/bjs.10115*