



OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY

Alaa El-hussuna,
Aalborg University, Denmark

REVIEWED BY

Asif Mehraj,
Government Medical College (GMC), India
Marco Milone,
Federico II University Hospital, Italy

*CORRESPONDENCE

Marina Yiasemidou
✉ marinayiasemidou@gmail.com;
✉ marina.yiasemidou@york.ac.uk

RECEIVED 24 March 2023

ACCEPTED 04 May 2023

PUBLISHED 23 May 2023

CITATION

Walshaw J, Huo B, McClean A, Gajos S,
Kwan JY, Tomlinson J, Biyani CS, Dimashki S,
Chetter I and Yiasemidou M (2023) Innovation
in gastrointestinal surgery: the evolution of
minimally invasive surgery—a narrative review.
Front. Surg. 10:1193486.
doi: 10.3389/fsurg.2023.1193486

COPYRIGHT

© 2023 Walshaw, Huo, McClean, Gajos, Kwan,
Tomlinson, Biyani, Dimashki, Chetter and
Yiasemidou. This is an open-access article
distributed under the terms of the [Creative
Commons Attribution License \(CC BY\)](#). The use,
distribution or reproduction in other forums is
permitted, provided the original author(s) and
the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the
original publication in this journal is cited, in
accordance with accepted academic practice.
No use, distribution or reproduction is
permitted which does not comply with these
terms.

Innovation in gastrointestinal surgery: the evolution of minimally invasive surgery—a narrative review

Josephine Walshaw¹, Bright Huo², Adam McClean³,
Samantha Gajos⁴, Jing Yi Kwan^{3,5}, James Tomlinson⁶,
Chandra Shekhar Biyani⁵, Safaa Dimashki³, Ian Chetter¹
and Marina Yiasemidou^{7,8*}

¹Academic Vascular Surgical Unit, Hull University Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust, Hull, United Kingdom, ²Faculty of Medicine, Dalhousie University, Halifax, NS, Canada, ³Department of General Surgery, Bradford Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust, Bradford, United Kingdom, ⁴Emergency Medicine Department, York and Scarborough Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, York, United Kingdom, ⁵Department of Vascular Surgery, Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust, Leeds, United Kingdom, ⁶Department of Spinal Surgery, Sheffield Teaching Hospitals, Sheffield, United Kingdom, ⁷NIHR Academic Clinical Lecturer General Surgery, University of Hull, Hull, United Kingdom, ⁸Hull York Medical School, University of York, York, United Kingdom

Background: Minimally invasive (MI) surgery has revolutionised surgery, becoming the standard of care in many countries around the globe. Observed benefits over traditional open surgery include reduced pain, shorter hospital stay, and decreased recovery time. Gastrointestinal surgery in particular was an early adaptor to both laparoscopic and robotic surgery. Within this review, we provide a comprehensive overview of the evolution of minimally invasive gastrointestinal surgery and a critical outlook on the evidence surrounding its effectiveness and safety.

Methods: A literature review was conducted to identify relevant articles for the topic of this review. The literature search was performed using Medical Subject Heading terms on PubMed. The methodology for evidence synthesis was in line with the four steps for narrative reviews outlined in current literature. The key words used were minimally invasive, robotic, laparoscopic colorectal, colon, rectal surgery.

Conclusion: The introduction of minimally surgery has revolutionised patient care. Despite the evidence supporting this technique in gastrointestinal surgery, several controversies remain. Here we discuss some of them; the lack of high level evidence regarding the oncological outcomes of TaTME and lack of supporting evidence for robotic colorectalrectal surgery and upper GI surgery. These controversies open pathways for future research opportunities with RCTs focusing on comparing robotic to laparoscopic with different primary outcomes including ergonomics and surgeon comfort.

KEYWORDS

laparoscopic, robotic, minimally invasive, colorectal (colon) cancer, rectal cancer

Introduction

Minimally invasive (MI) surgery has revolutionised surgery, becoming the standard of care in many countries around the globe. Observed benefits over traditional open surgery include reduced pain, shorter hospital stay, and decreased recovery time (1). Gastrointestinal surgery in particular was an early adaptor to both laparoscopic and robotic surgery (1).

This narrative review was carried out in accordance with the four steps outlined by Demirir et al. (2). Within this review, we provide a comprehensive overview of the evolution of minimally invasive gastrointestinal surgery and a critical outlook on the evidence surrounding its effectiveness and safety.

History of laparoscopic surgery: a brief timeline

One of the earliest documented instances of minimally invasive (MI) surgery was around 460–375BC, where Hippocrates used an apparatus with structural similarities to endoscopes to examine the rectum under direct vision (3). In 936–1013AD a natural light source was incorporated into early endoscopic tools by Albukasim (4). Whilst there were several changes in the years to come, it wasn't until the invention of the light bulb by Edison in 1,880 endoscopic instrumentation changed significantly (5).

George Kelling, a surgeon in Dresden, attempted the very first laparoscopy in 1901. The technique, named Koelioscopie, entailed inserting a cystoscope through a trocar into a dog's abdominal cavity and insufflating oxygen (5). Kelling reporting of 45 laparoscopies (5), generated worldwide interest in laparoscopic techniques, including at the John Hopkins Hospital, where in 1911, Bertram Bernheim introduced laparoscopy to the United States (6).

In 1924, Zollikofer decided to use carbon dioxide (CO₂) instead of atmospheric air for pneumoperitoneum. The rationale was that CO₂ reduced discomfort as it is absorbed more easily by the human body, and is less combustible than air, facilitating the use of heat (7).

The next milestone was in 1929 when German physician Heinz Kalk invented a new lens which allowed him to view internal organs obliquely. Combined with the dual trocar puncture technique he developed, he achieved improved organ visualisation and passage of instruments into the peritoneum. Kalk subsequently published over 21 papers reporting laparoscopic operations on patients (6, 8).

In 1938, Janos Veress invented a needle, to help induce pneumothoraces as a treatment for tuberculosis. This was a spring-loaded, blunt needle bearing a cover which sprung forward to conceal a sharp needle in response to alteration in pressure as it entered the pleural cavity. Today the Veress needle is used to induce pneumoperitoneum in the abdominal cavity (8).

At this point in time, increasing interest in laparoscopy brought about rapid advancements for both equipment and operational technique surgery in the next decades. The invention of the “cold light” illuminator with the use of fibreglass in 1952 by Fourestier, Gladiu and Valmiere, eased concerns as it eliminated the occurrence of intraperitoneal burns caused by previous light sources (9, 10).

By the 1960s, laparoscopic surgery was widely used in gynaecological surgery. Kurt Semm, a German gynaecologist, designed an automated insufflator to closely monitor intra-abdominal pressure, increasing the procedure's safety and disposing of the need for a syringe to establish pneumoperitoneum (11). Semm also introduced thermocoagulation in laparoscopy and

popularised procedures such as laparoscopic omental adhesiolysis, tumour biopsy, uterine perforation repair, endometrial implant coagulation and bowel suturing (6, 8). He was the first surgeon to perform a laparoscopic appendectomy in 1983 (12).

In 1986, technological advances allowed for the projection of video camera images onto video screens (8). A laparoscopic cholecystectomy performed by Phillipe Mouret in 1987 was considered to be the first procedure during which this technology was used (10).

Laparoscopic colorectal surgery

Jacobs et al. (13) performed the first laparoscopic-assisted colectomy in 1991. This was significantly more technically challenging compared to other MI operations performed around the same time period.

MI colorectal surgery was initially reserved for benign disease due to reported high port site seeding (21%) in colorectal cancer resections (14). This concern was later refuted with high-quality studies which demonstrated a rate comparable to open surgery in the area of 0.6–1.1% (15–18). Landmark randomised controlled trials (RCTs) were therefore designed to compare the oncological results of open vs. laparoscopic colorectal surgery (19, 20). In particular, the UK multicentre CLASICC trial (20) demonstrated similar short-term outcomes of 30-day mortality, lymph-node harvest, and oncological clearance as well as a long-term outcome of 10-year recurrence rates when comparing laparoscopic assisted to open groups (21). Further trials and meta-analyses demonstrated similar conclusions (21–27), providing evidence that laparoscopic surgery was feasible and safe.

It is to be noted that transverse colon and rectal cancer cases were excluded from some of these trials (19, 22, 25), which limited the generalisability of the conclusion to these patient groups. The introduction of new surgical techniques such as Total Mesorectal Excision, inspired a number of studies to compare MI and open approaches for these groups (28–30). COLOR II assigned adult patients with cancer up to 15 cm from the anal verge to laparoscopic vs. open surgery and cautiously concluded that laparoscopic in selected patients with rectal cancer performed by skilled surgeons demonstrates similar safety and oncological results to that of open surgery and does provide enhanced recovery (28).

Another landmark trial was the COREAN trial, which focused on mid and low rectal cancers after neoadjuvant chemotherapy (29). It demonstrated similar disease-free survival outcomes, whilst the 10-year follow-up trial confirmed the long-term oncological safety of laparoscopic surgery in this patient population (30).

ALaCaRT (Australasian Laparoscopic Cancer of the Rectum) and ACOSOG Z6051 Randomized Controlled Trial (31, 32), failed to demonstrate non-inferiority of laparoscopic surgery compared to open rectal cancer surgery for completion of resection and disease free survival and recurrence respectively. Although these findings are often misinterpreted in the literature as demonstrating inferiority of laparoscopic surgery, the results

are merely inconclusive (33). Nevertheless, the misinterpretation of the two RCTs did create some concern regarding about the oncological outcome of laparoscopic total mesenteric excision (laTME) (33).

TaTME

Transanal TME was proposed to address concerns raised for laTME (34). This involved dual transabdominal and transanal/bottom-up dissection, with the expectation that it will diminish the technical difficulty of TME in narrow male pelvises, in obese patients (35). Several studies have shown TaTME to be safe (36–43), however authors expressed concern regarding the quality of the evidence this judgement was based upon (44, 45). These concerns escalated to the Norwegian moratorium for the technique in 2020. This was based on the high complication and local recurrence rates reported after a national audit (45). This looked at 157 patients who underwent TaTME; local recurrence rate was 7.6 per cent, eight local recurrences were multifocal or extensive. Eleven of 131 patients with an anastomosis (8.4%) had an anastomotic leak compared with 56 of 1,230 (4.5%) in the Norwegian Gastrointestinal surgery registry (45). These concerns were echoed by ACPGBI in the UK, recommending a “pause for reflection” (46).

Subsequent systematic reviews, although based largely on non-randomised studies, showed similar short (47) and long term oncological, functional outcomes (48–50), quality of life (QoL) (49) and complications (47, 50).

Laparoscopic upper gastrointestinal surgery

Since Mühe performed the first laparoscopic cholecystectomy in 1985 (11), the use of laparoscopic techniques has seen a rapid expansion in upper gastrointestinal (GI) surgery. Cholecystectomy is now one of the most frequently performed laparoscopic procedure worldwide (51). Meta-analyses have demonstrated laparoscopic cholecystectomy to be equivalent to both open (52) and mini-open (52, 53) techniques for operative outcomes, while reducing patients’ post-operative hospital stay and recovery time.

Laparoscopic surgery for upper GI malignancy has been utilised since the early 1990s with ever increasing scope as operative techniques and laparoscopic technology improve (54). Staging laparoscopy has been demonstrated to be an effective tool in aiding treatment and decision making in a wealth of upper GI cancers, while remaining a low-risk operation for the patient (55).

The first laparoscopic gastrectomy for malignancy was reported by Kitano et al. (56) in 1994, using a laparoscopically assisted technique requiring a mini-laparotomy to perform the anastomosis. Advantages proposed for this included reduced post-operative pain, improved nutrition and return to normal intestinal function, and reduced pulmonary complications. While their subsequent RCT did demonstrate successes in blood loss and wound size (57), there was no significant difference in time to

return to oral nutrition or hospital stay. Larger trials have since shown improved post-operative morbidity with laparoscopic assisted surgery while maintaining similar oncological outcomes (58). The largest of these trials, the KLASS-01 (59) demonstrated no significant difference in survival rates between open and laparoscopically treated gastric cancer across 1,416 patients. More recently, total laparoscopic gastrectomy has been shown to be a safe alternative to both laparoscopically assisted and open gastrectomy. The main barrier is operative difficulty in achieving successful reconstruction of the GI tract (60).

Open operative management of oesophageal cancer has been the standard of care worldwide, however is highly invasive with associated morbidity due to the use of a thoraco-abdominal approach (61). The first MI oesophagectomy (MIE) was reported in 1992 by Cuschieri et al. (62) utilising a right thoracoscopic approach. In a 115 patient RCT, Biere et al. (63) demonstrated reduced pulmonary complications, blood loss, and hospital stay in the MI approach group. However, operative time was significantly increased, with 14% of cases requiring conversion to open surgery. The ROMIO (Randomised Oesophagectomy: MI or Open) trial is an ongoing RCT comparing MIE with open oesophagectomy, with 526 participants undergoing analysis for operative outcomes (49). While multiple surgical approaches exist within the MI umbrella, there is no consensus on the optimal approach (64, 65).

Natural orifice transluminal endoscopic surgery and single port laparoscopic surgery

Natural orifice transluminal endoscopic surgery (NOTES) builds on the idea of MI surgery promoting scarless, completely non-invasive procedures that do not require any skin incision. The first appendectomy without an incision of the skin was performed transgastrically by Reddy and Rao in 2004 (66) with the first NOTES cholecystectomy being performed by Marescaux et al. (67) as recently as 2007. Although some isolated human cases of NOTES have been performed, the development of this technique is still in its infancy and has not been accepted as a routine general surgery procedure at present.

A compromise between NOTES and traditional laparoscopic practice is SILS. 1997 saw the first ever single port laparoscopic surgery (SILS) laparoscopic cholecystectomy performed by Navarra et al. (68) in which they inserted 2 trocars into the umbilicus, bridged only by a small strand of fascia which was then divided to aid gallbladder removal. Unlike NOTES, SILS does not accomplish totally non-invasive surgery. SILS does however aim to further minimise invasiveness by making a single abdominal incision to perform an operation via only one access point (69). Research continues into perfecting the technique and establishing it as a new gold standard for various operative procedures.

The reports on colonic surgery NOTES are from experimental settings, clinical studies were not employed due to worrying levels of complications observed in non-clinical projects (70). Conversely, there was a high level of enthusiasm concerning single-port colonic

surgery. However, a number of studies set out to assess the potential impact, showed no significant benefit compared to “traditional” laparoscopic surgery (71–73).

Robotic surgery

Robotic surgery introduced three-dimensional vision output, instrumentation with a significantly higher degree of movement freedom compared to laparoscopic instruments. This came hand-to-hand with increased cost and use of rather sizable pieces of equipment (74, 75).

The Arthrobot was the first robot to assist in surgery in 1983, manipulating the position of the patient’s leg on voice command in arthroscopic surgery (76). Following this, robotic-assisted surgical procedures gradually began to emerge. In 1985 the Programmable Universal Machine for Assembly (PUMA) was used to orient a needle for CT brain tumour biopsies in adults (77) and thalamus astrocytomas in children (63), procedures normally suffering errors from unavoidable hand tremors. Three short years later, the PROBOT was used to perform the first robotic-assisted transurethral prostate resection at Imperial London College (78). The precision of robotic-assisted surgery was later applied in orthopaedic surgery with the ROBODOC which was found to be more effective than human hands to hollow the femur in preparation for total hip arthroplasty, avoiding common complications (79).

The Automated Endoscopic System for Optimal Positioning (AESOP), a voice-activated camera assistant, was introduced in 1994 as the first FDA-approved laparoscopic camera holder. Using the AESOP, the ZEUS surgical system used two additional robotic arms and a control console, allowing the benefit of a more ergonomic position for the surgeon (80). Following this, ZEUS was introduced clinically, with notable success in harvesting left internal mammary arteries for coronary artery bypass grafts (81). In 2001, the Lindberg Operation took place where surgeons Jacques Marescaux and Michel Gagner successfully remotely completed a laparoscopic cholecystectomy between New York City, USA and Strasbourg, France using ZEUS (82). However, delays between the control and operating station are notable reasons as to why telesurgery does not have more widespread success.

The da Vinci Surgical System was launched in 1997 and became the first FDA-approved comprehensive robotic system for laparoscopic surgery in 2000, with widespread applications in a variety of surgical fields. This offered the same degree of freedom as the human arm and slowly moved the surgeon further from the patient (80, 83).

Robotically assisted surgery has found a role in many surgical specialties and has allowed for the possibility of fully automated surgical operations. The Smart Tissue Autonomous Robot (STAR), designed at John Hopkins University, performed the first autonomous intestinal anastomosis in 2022 on porcupines over a one week period (84). The results indicated that the automated system outperformed expert surgeons’ and robot-assisted surgery in terms of both consistency and accuracy, demonstrating the intricacy of robotics and the potential future of robotic surgery.

Robotic colorectal surgery

Robotic colorectal surgery is becoming increasingly more common due to benefits including dexterity and accessibility, particularly in lower rectal cancer. The first robotic colectomy was performed in 2002 (85). By 2004, D’Annibale et al. (86) reported 52 cases including 10 rectal cases, concluding that similar operative and post-operative results were achieved with robotic and laparoscopic techniques.

In 2006 the first 6 cases of robotic TME were documented (72). Rawlings et al. (73) in 2007 reported 17 robotic right hemicolectomies and 13 anterior resections, concluding that robotic surgery is feasible and safe. A similar outcome was reached by Spinoglio et al. (87) in 2008 who compared 50 robotic resections to 161 laparoscopic operations.

A systematic review in 2014 assessed robotic surgery for rectal cancer (88). According to this report, robotic surgery demonstrated prolonged operative time compared to laparoscopic surgery and no difference in blood loss and oncological effect (positive circumferential margins and number of retrieved lymph nodes). Conversion rates to open surgery were found to be smaller for robotic surgery. Additionally, the substantially higher cost of robotic surgery and the lack of evidence regarding long-term oncological and functional outcomes were highlighted. A second systematic review by Milone et al. showed the robotic approach to be better in achieving a complete TME. However, no randomised controlled trials were included in their analysis (89).

The multicentre ROLARR trial (90) randomised 471 patients with rectal adenocarcinoma to robotic-assisted and conventional laparoscopic surgery. The primary outcome was conversion to open laparotomy and robotic-assisted laparoscopic surgery was found to not significantly reduce the risk of that. There was no significant difference in intraoperative or postoperative complications, 30-day mortality, or circumferential margin positivity.

Robotic upper gastrointestinal surgery

Robotic-assisted upper GI surgery is a rapidly advancing field, due to benefits including providing a high degree of instrument freedom and stabilising the surgeon’s tremor. However the current evidence base does not yet fully support its widespread use or justify the associated expense (91).

In 1997, the first robotic cholecystectomy (RC) was performed, marking the first use of the da Vinci Surgical System (83, 92). The current standard of care for the removal of the gallbladder is laparoscopic cholecystectomy (93). A recent systematic review has shown low rates of complications and comparable post-operative outcomes for RC vs. laparoscopic in the elective setting (94). However more studies are needed to assess more complex gallbladder disease outcomes. Several studies have also demonstrated that RC is effective and safe for general surgeons as a tool for robotic surgery training (92, 95).

Robotic-assisted MI oesophagectomy (RAMIE) was introduced in 2003 as a safe and viable option for oesophagectomy. The ROBOT

RCT (96) showed that RAMIE yielded comparable oncologic outcomes to open oesophagectomy, with superior rates of surgically related postoperative complications, lower median blood loss, improved functional recovery at postoperative day 14, and better quality of life at discharge and at 6 weeks post-discharge. Long-term survival analysis showed that overall and disease-free survival was comparable, supporting the use of robotic surgery in oesophageal cancer (97). Additionally, Yang et al. (98) showed that RAMIE yielded shorter operation time with improved lymph node dissection compared to MIE, with no difference in complications including vocal cord paralysis, anastomotic leak, pulmonary complications, blood loss, and conversion rate. Long-term survival data from this trial is currently awaited. Further, a systematic review supports the use of RAMIE showing comparable mortality and reduced morbidity rates, however, operative time was found to be longer in patients receiving RAMIE compared to MIE (99).

Conclusion

The introduction of minimally invasive surgery has revolutionised patient care. Despite the evidence supporting this technique in gastrointestinal surgery, several controversies remain. Here we discuss some of them; the lack of high level evidence regarding the oncological outcomes of TaTME and lack of supporting evidence for robotic colorectal surgery and upper GI surgery. These controversies open pathways for future research opportunities with RCTs focusing on comparing robotic to laparoscopic with different primary outcomes including ergonomics and surgeon comfort.

References

- Jayne DG, Guillou PJ, Thorpe H, Quirke P, Copeland J, Smith AM, et al. Randomized trial of laparoscopic-assisted resection of colorectal carcinoma: 3-year results of the UK MRC CLASICC trial group. *J Clin Oncol.* (2007) 25(21):3061–8. doi: 10.1200/JCO.2006.09.7758
- Demiris G, Oliver DP, Washington KT. *Defining and analyzing the problem.* Amsterdam: Academic Press (2019).
- RDe. *Minimal access medicine and surgery.* Oxford: Radcliffe Medical Press (1993).
- CT F. *Minimal access medicine and surgery.* St. Louis: Mosby (1995).
- Lau WY, Leow CK, Li AK. History of endoscopic and laparoscopic surgery. *World J Surg.* (1997) 21(4):444–53. doi: 10.1007/PL00012268
- Mishra RK. *Laparoscopy hospital—history of minimal access surgery.* Delhi: World Laparoscopy Hospital (2022). Available at: https://www.laparoscopyhospital.com/history_of_laparoscopy.htm
- Gomella LG, K M, Wingfield HN (eds). *Laparoscopic urologic surgery.* In: Raven, editors. New York: Raven press (1994) pp 267–73.
- Gaskin TA, Isobe JH, Mathews JL, Winchester SB, Smith RJ. Laparoscopy and the general surgeon. *Surg Clin North Am.* (1991) 71(5):1085–97. doi: 10.1016/S0039-6109(16)45536-2
- Spaner SJ, Warnock GL. A brief history of endoscopy, laparoscopy, and laparoscopic surgery. *J Laparoendosc Adv Surg Tech A.* (1997) 7(6):369–73. doi: 10.1089/lap.1997.7.369
- Perissat J. Laparoscopic surgery: a pioneer's Point of view. *World J Surg.* (1999) 23(8):863–8. doi: 10.1007/s002689900590
- Litynski GS. Kurt Semm and the fight against skepticism: endoscopic hemostasis, laparoscopic appendectomy, and Semm's impact on the "laparoscopic revolution". *JSLs.* (1998) 2(3):309–13. PMID: 9876762; PMCID: PMC3015306. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/9876740/>
- Klaiber C, Metzger A, Petelin JB. *Manual of laparoscopic surgery.* In: Pub HH, Seattle: Hogrefe & Huber (1993).
- Jacobs M, Verdeja JC, Goldstein HS. Minimally invasive colon resection (laparoscopic colectomy). *Surg Laparosc Endosc.* (1991) 1(3):144–50. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/1688289/>
- Berends FJ, Kazemier G, Bonjer HJ, Lange JF. Subcutaneous metastases after laparoscopic colectomy. *Lancet.* (1994) 344(8914):58. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(94)91079-0
- Reilly WT NH, Schroeder G, Wieand HS, Bolton J, O'Connell MJ. Wound recurrence following conventional treatment of colorectal cancer. A rare but perhaps underestimated problem. *Dis Colon Rectum.* (1996) 26:200–7. doi: 10.1007/BF02068076
- Hughes ES, McDermott FT, Polglase AL, Johnson WR. Tumor recurrence in the abdominal wall scar tissue after large-bowel cancer surgery. *Dis Colon Rectum.* (1983) 26(9):571–2. doi: 10.1007/BF02552962
- Fleshman JW, Nelson H, Peters WR, Kim HC, Larach S, Boorse RR, et al. Early results of laparoscopic surgery for colorectal cancer. Retrospective analysis of 372 patients treated by clinical outcomes of surgical therapy (COST) study group. *Dis Colon Rectum.* (1996) 39(10 Suppl):S53–8. doi: 10.1007/BF02053806
- Allardyce RA. Is the port site really at risk? Biology, mechanisms and prevention: a critical view. *Aust N Z J Surg.* (1999) 69(7):479–85. doi: 10.1046/j.1440-1622.1999.01606.x
- Veldkamp R, Kuhry E, Hop WC, Jeekel J, Kazemier G, Bonjer HJ, et al. Laparoscopic surgery versus open surgery for colon cancer: short-term outcomes of a randomised trial. *Lancet Oncol.* (2005) 6(7):477–84. doi: 10.1016/S1470-2045(05)70221-7
- Guillou PJ, Quirke P, Thorpe H, Walker J, Jayne DG, Smith AM, et al. Short-term endpoints of conventional versus laparoscopic-assisted surgery in patients with colorectal cancer (MRC CLASICC trial): multicentre, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet.* (2005) 365(9472):1718–26. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(05)66545-2
- Arulampalam TH, Austin RC, Motson RW. MRC CLASICC trial. *Lancet.* (2005) 366(9487):712; author reply 3–4. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(05)67168-1

Author contributions

Writing—original draft: JW, BH, AM, SG, JK, and MY. Writing—reviewing and editing: JW, CB, JT, IC, SD, and MY. All authors contributed to the article and approved the submitted version.

Acknowledgments

MY is an NIHR Academic Clinical Lecturer and JK is an NIHR Academic Clinical Fellow.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

22. Clinical Outcomes of Surgical Therapy Study G. A comparison of laparoscopically assisted and open colectomy for colon cancer. *N Engl J Med.* (2004) 350(20):2050–9. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa032651
23. Weeks JC, Nelson H, Gelber S, Sargent D, Schroeder G. Clinical outcomes of surgical therapy study G. Short-term quality-of-life outcomes following laparoscopic-assisted colectomy vs open colectomy for colon cancer: a randomized trial. *JAMA.* (2002) 287(3):321–8. doi: 10.1001/jama.287.3.321
24. Leung KL, Kwok SP, Lam SC, Lee JF, Yiu RY, Ng SS, et al. Laparoscopic resection of rectosigmoid carcinoma: prospective randomised trial. *Lancet.* (2004) 363(9416):1187–92. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(04)15947-3
25. Lacy AM, Garcia-Valdecasas JC, Delgado S, Castells A, Taura P, Pique JM, et al. Laparoscopy-assisted colectomy versus open colectomy for treatment of non-metastatic colon cancer: a randomised trial. *Lancet.* (2002) 359(9325):2224–9. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(02)09290-5
26. Bonjer HJ, Hop WC, Nelson H, Sargent DJ, Lacy AM, Castells A, et al. Laparoscopically assisted vs open colectomy for colon cancer: a meta-analysis. *Arch Surg.* (2007) 142(3):298–303. doi: 10.1001/archsurg.142.3.298
27. Jackson TD, Kaplan GG, Arena G, Page JH, Rogers SO Jr. Laparoscopic versus open resection for colorectal cancer: a metaanalysis of oncologic outcomes. *J Am Coll Surg.* (2007) 204(3):439–46. doi: 10.1016/j.jamcollsurg.2006.12.008
28. van der Pas MH, Haglind E, Cuesta MA, Furst A, Lacy AM, Hop WC, et al. Laparoscopic versus open surgery for rectal cancer (COLOR II): short-term outcomes of a randomised, phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncol.* (2013) 14(3):210–8. doi: 10.1016/S1470-2045(13)70016-0
29. Jeong SY, Park JW, Nam BH, Kim S, Kang SB, Lim SB, et al. Open versus laparoscopic surgery for mid-rectal or low-rectal cancer after neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy (COREAN trial): survival outcomes of an open-label, non-inferiority, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Oncol.* (2014) 15(7):767–74. doi: 10.1016/S1470-2045(14)70205-0
30. Park JW, Kang SB, Hao J, Lim SB, Choi HS, Kim DW, et al. Open versus laparoscopic surgery for mid or low rectal cancer after neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy (COREAN trial): 10-year follow-up of an open-label, non-inferiority, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol.* (2021) 6(7):569–77. doi: 10.1016/S2468-1253(21)00094-7
31. Stevenson AR, Solomon MJ, Lumley JW, Hewett P, Clouston AD, Gebiski VJ, et al. Effect of laparoscopic-assisted resection vs open resection on pathological outcomes in rectal cancer: the ALaCaRT randomized clinical trial. *JAMA.* (2015) 314(13):1356–63. doi: 10.1001/jama.2015.12009
32. Fleshman J, Branda M, Sargent DJ, Boller AM, George V, Abbas M, et al. Effect of laparoscopic-assisted resection vs open resection of stage II or III rectal cancer on pathologic outcomes: the ACOSOG Z6051 randomized clinical trial. *JAMA.* (2015) 314(13):1346–55. doi: 10.1001/jama.2015.10529
33. Acuna SA, Dossa F, Baxter NN. Frequency of misinterpretation of inconclusive noninferiority trials: the case of the laparoscopic vs open resection for rectal cancer trials. *JAMA Surg.* (2019) 154(1):90–2. doi: 10.1001/jamasurg.2018.3222
34. Sylla P, Rattner DW, Delgado S, Lacy AM. NOTES Transanal rectal cancer resection using transanal endoscopic microsurgery and laparoscopic assistance. *Surg Endosc.* (2010) 24(5):1205–10. doi: 10.1007/s00464-010-0965-6
35. Targarona EM, Balague C, Pernas JC, Martinez C, Berindoague R, Gich I, et al. Can we predict immediate outcome after laparoscopic rectal surgery? Multivariate analysis of clinical, anatomic, and pathologic features after 3-dimensional reconstruction of the pelvic anatomy. *Ann Surg.* (2008) 247(4):642–9. doi: 10.1097/SLA.0b013e3181612c6a
36. Atallah S. Transanal total mesorectal excision: full steam ahead. *Tech Coloproctol.* (2015) 19(2):57–61. doi: 10.1007/s10151-014-1254-5
37. Koedam TWA, Veltcamp Helbach M, van de Ven PM, Kruij PM, van Heek NT, Bonjer HJ, et al. Transanal total mesorectal excision for rectal cancer: evaluation of the learning curve. *Tech Coloproctol.* (2018) 22(4):279–87. doi: 10.1007/s10151-018-1771-8
38. Lacy AM, Tasende MM, Delgado S, Fernandez-Havia M, Jimenez M, De Lacy B, et al. Transanal total mesorectal excision for rectal cancer: outcomes after 140 patients. *J Am Coll Surg.* (2015) 221(2):415–23. doi: 10.1016/j.jamcollsurg.2015.03.046
39. Lee L, de Lacy B, Gomez Ruiz M, Liberman AS, Albert MR, Monson JRT, et al. A multicenter matched comparison of transanal and robotic total mesorectal excision for mid and low-rectal adenocarcinoma. *Ann Surg.* (2019) 270(6):1110–6. doi: 10.1097/SLA.00000000000002862
40. Penna M, Hompes R, Arnold S, Wynn G, Austin R, Warusavitarne J, et al. Transanal total mesorectal excision: international registry results of the first 720 cases. *Ann Surg.* (2017) 266(1):111–7. doi: 10.1097/SLA.0000000000001948
41. Rubinkiewicz M, Nowakowski M, Wierdak M, Mizera M, Dembinski M, Pisarska M, et al. Transanal total mesorectal excision for low rectal cancer: a case-matched study comparing TaTME versus standard laparoscopic TME. *Cancer Manag Res.* (2018) 10:5239–45. doi: 10.2147/CMAR.S181214
42. Milone M, Adamina M, Arezzo A, Bejinariu N, Boni L, Bouvy N, et al. UEG And EAES rapid guideline: systematic review, meta-analysis, GRADE assessment and evidence-informed European recommendations on TaTME for rectal cancer. *Surg Endosc.* (2022) 36(4):2221–32. doi: 10.1007/s00464-022-09090-4
43. Vignali A, Elmore U, Milone M, Rosati R. Transanal total mesorectal excision (TaTME): current status and future perspectives. *Updates Surg.* (2019) 71(1):29–37. doi: 10.1007/s13304-019-00630-7
44. Patel SV ZL, Elsolh B, Yu D, Chadi SA. Spin in articles about minimally invasive transanal total mesorectal excision: an assessment of the current literature. *Colorectal Dis.* (2019) 21:8–14. doi: 10.1111/codi.14451
45. Wasmuth HH, Faerden AE, Myklebust TA, Pfeffer F, Norderval S, Riis R, et al. Transanal total mesorectal excision for rectal cancer has been suspended in Norway. *Br J Surg.* (2020) 107:121–30. doi: 10.1002/bjs.11459
46. Fearnhead NS, Acheson AG, Brown SR, Hancock L, Harikrishnan A, Kelly SB, et al. The ACPGBI recommends pause for re-ecction on transanal total mesorectal excision. *Colorectal Dis.* (2022) 7:745–8. doi: 10.1111/codi.15143
47. Ziati J, Souadka A, Benkabbou A, Boutayeb S, Ahmadi B, Amrani L, et al. Transanal total mesorectal excision for patients with rectal cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Gulf J Oncolog.* (2021) 1(35):66–76. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33716215/
48. Alimova I CS, Nagudov M, Rybakov E. Comparison of oncological and functional outcomes and quality of life after transanal or laparoscopic total mesorectal excision for rectal cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Tech Coloproctol.* (2021) 25:901–3. doi: 10.1007/s10151-021-02420-z
49. Choy KT YT, Prabhakaran S, Heriot A, Kong JC, Warriar SK. Comparing functional outcomes between transanal total mesorectal excision (TaTME) and laparoscopic total mesorectal excision (LaTME) for rectal cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Colorectal Dis.* (2021) 36:1163–74. doi: 10.1007/s00384-021-03849-2
50. Bianco S L, Lanzafame K, Piazza CD, Piazza VG, Provenzano D, Piazza D. Total mesorectal excision laparoscopic versus transanal approach for rectal cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Med Surg.* (2022) 74:103260. doi: 10.1016/j.amsu.2022.103260
51. Lee WJ, Chan CP, Wang BY. Recent advances in laparoscopic surgery. *Asian J Endosc Surg.* (2013) 6(1):1–8. doi: 10.1111/ases.12001
52. Keus F, de Jong JA, Gooszen HG, van Laarhoven CJ. Laparoscopic versus small-incision cholecystectomy for patients with symptomatic cholecystolithiasis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* (2006) 2006(4):CD006229. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD006229
53. Purkayastha S, Tilney HS, Georgiou P, Athanasiou T, Tekkis PP, Darzi AW. Laparoscopic cholecystectomy versus mini-laparotomy cholecystectomy: a meta-analysis of randomised control trials. *Surg Endosc.* (2007) 21(8):1294–300. doi: 10.1007/s00464-007-9210-3
54. Kuper MA, Eisner F, Konigsrainer A, Glatzle J. Laparoscopic surgery for benign and malign diseases of the digestive system: indications, limitations, and evidence. *World J Gastroenterol.* (2014) 20(17):4883–91. doi: 10.3748/wjg.v20.i17.4883
55. Chang L, Stefanidis D, Richardson WS, Earle DB, Fanelli RD. The role of staging laparoscopy for intraabdominal cancers: an evidence-based review. *Surg Endosc.* (2009) 23(2):231–41. doi: 10.1007/s00464-008-0099-2
56. Kitano S, Iso Y, Moriyama M, Sugimachi K. Laparoscopy-assisted billroth I gastrectomy. *Surg Laparosc Endosc.* (1994) 4(2):146–8. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/8180768/
57. Kitano S, Shiraishi N, Fujii K, Yasuda K, Inomata M, Adachi Y. A randomized controlled trial comparing open vs laparoscopy-assisted distal gastrectomy for the treatment of early gastric cancer: an interim report. *Surgery.* (2002) 131(1 Suppl): S306–11. doi: 10.1067/msy.2002.120115
58. Zeng YK, Yang ZL, Peng JS, Lin HS, Cai L. Laparoscopy-assisted versus open distal gastrectomy for early gastric cancer: evidence from randomized and nonrandomized clinical trials. *Ann Surg.* (2012) 256(1):39–52. doi: 10.1097/SLA.0b013e3182583e2e
59. Kim HH, Han SU, Kim MC, Kim W, Lee HJ, Ryu SW, et al. Effect of laparoscopic distal gastrectomy vs open distal gastrectomy on long-term survival among patients with stage I gastric cancer: the KLAS-01 randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Oncol.* (2019) 5(4):506–13. doi: 10.1001/jamaoncol.2018.6727
60. Chen K, Pan Y, Cai JQ, Xu XW, Wu D, Mou YP. Totally laparoscopic gastrectomy for gastric cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis of outcomes compared with open surgery. *World J Gastroenterol.* (2014) 20(42):15867–78. doi: 10.3748/wjg.v20.i42.15867
61. Morita M, Nakanoko T, Fujinaka Y, Kubo N, Yamashita N, Yoshinaga K, et al. In-hospital mortality after a surgical resection for esophageal cancer: analyses of the associated factors and historical changes. *Ann Surg Oncol.* (2011) 18(6):1757–65. doi: 10.1245/s10434-010-1502-5
62. Cuschieri A SS, Banting S. Endoscopic oesophagectomy through a right thoracoscopic approach. *J R Coll Surg Edinb.* (1992) 37:7–11. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/1573620/
63. Biere SS, van Berge Henegouwen MI, Maas KW, Bonavina L, Rosman C, Garcia JR, et al. Minimally invasive versus open oesophagectomy for patients with oesophageal cancer: a multicentre, open-label, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet.* (2012) 379:1887–92. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60516-9
64. Lagergren J, Smyth E, Cunningham D, Lagergren P. Oesophageal cancer. *Lancet.* (2017) 390(10110):2383–96. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(17)31462-9

65. Omloo JM, Lagarde SM, Hulscher JB, Reitsma JB, Fockens P, van Dekken H, et al. Extended transthoracic resection compared with limited transhiatal resection for adenocarcinoma of the mid/distal esophagus: five-year survival of a randomized clinical trial. *Ann Surg.* (2007) 246(6):992–1000. discussion -1. doi: 10.1097/SLA.0b013e31815c4037
66. Reddy N, Rao P. *Per oral transgastric endoscopic appendectomy in human. Abstract presented at 45th annual conference of the society of gastrointestinal endoscopy of India.* (2004).
67. Marescaux J DB, Perretta S, Wattiez A, Mutter D, Coumaros D. Surgery without scars: report of transluminal cholecystectomy in a human being. *Arch Surg Chic Ill* 1960. (2007) 142:823–6. doi: 10.1001/archsurg.142.9.823
68. Navarra G, Pozza E, Occhionorelli S, Carcoforo P, Donini I. One-wound laparoscopic cholecystectomy. *Br J Surg.* (1997) 84(5):695. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/9171771/>
69. Saidy MN, Tessier M, Tessier D. Single-incision laparoscopic surgery—hype or reality: a historical control study. *Perm J.* (2012) 16(1):47–50. doi: 10.7812/TPP/10-076
70. Kaiser AM. Evolution and future of laparoscopic colorectal surgery. *World J Gastroenterol.* (2014) 20(41):15119–24. doi: 10.3748/wjg.v20.i41.15119
71. Kanakala V, Borowski DW, Agarwal AK, Tabaqchali MA, Garg DK, Gill TS. Comparative study of safety and outcomes of single-port access versus conventional laparoscopic colorectal surgery. *Tech Coloproctol.* (2012) 16(6):423–8. doi: 10.1007/s10151-012-0839-0
72. Fung AK, Aly EH. Systematic review of single-incision laparoscopic colonic surgery. *Br J Surg.* (2012) 99(10):1353–64. doi: 10.1002/bjs.8834
73. Kim SJ, Ryu GO, Choi BJ, Kim JG, Lee KJ, Lee SC, et al. The short-term outcomes of conventional and single-port laparoscopic surgery for colorectal cancer. *Ann Surg.* (2011) 254(6):933–40. doi: 10.1097/SLA.0b013e318237826b
74. Novara G, Ficarra V, D'Elia C, Secco S, Cavalleri S, Artibani W. Prospective evaluation with standardised criteria for postoperative complications after robotic-assisted laparoscopic radical prostatectomy. *Eur Urol.* (2010) 57(3):363–70. doi: 10.1016/j.eururo.2009.11.032
75. Wright JD, Ananth CV, Lewin SN, Burke WM, Lu YS, Neugut AI, et al. Robotically assisted vs laparoscopic hysterectomy among women with benign gynecologic disease. *JAMA.* (2013) 309(7):689–98. doi: 10.1001/jama.2013.186
76. Mohammad S. Robotic surgery. *J Oral Biol Craniofac Res.* (2013) 3(1):2. doi: 10.1016/j.jobcr.2013.03.002
77. Kwok YS, Hou J, Jonckheere EA, Hayati S. A robot with improved absolute positioning accuracy for CT guided stereotactic brain surgery. *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng.* (1988) 35(2):153–60. doi: 10.1109/10.1354
78. Drake JM, Joy M, Goldenberg A, Kreindler D. Computer- and robot-assisted resection of thalamic astrocytomas in children. *Neurosurgery.* (1991) 29(1):27–33. doi: 10.1227/00006123-199107000-00005
79. Sugano N. Computer-assisted orthopaedic surgery and robotic surgery in total hip arthroplasty. *Clin Orthop Surg.* (2013) 5(1):1–9. doi: 10.4055/cios.2013.5.1.1
80. Pugin F, Bucher P, Morel P. History of robotic surgery: from AESOP(R) and ZEUS(R) to da vinci(R). *J Visc Surg.* (2011) 148(5 Suppl):e3–8. doi: 10.1016/j.jvisurg.2011.04.007
81. Reichenspurner H, Damiano RJ, Mack M, Boehm DH, Gulbins H, Detter C, et al. Use of the voice-controlled and computer-assisted surgical system ZEUS for endoscopic coronary artery bypass grafting. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* (1999) 118(1):11–6. doi: 10.1016/S0022-5223(99)70134-0
82. Bernard AC, Rabadan C, Simon MA. L'Opération lindbergh. *Ann Télécommunications.* (2003) 58:698–718. doi: 10.1007/BF03001526
83. Himpens J, Leman G, Cadiere GB. Telesurgical laparoscopic cholecystectomy. *Surg Endosc.* (1998) 12(8):1091. doi: 10.1007/s004649900788
84. Saeidi H, Opfermann JD, Kam M, Wei S, Leonard S, Hsieh MH, et al. Autonomous robotic laparoscopic surgery for intestinal anastomosis. *Sci Robot.* (2022) 7(62):eabj2908. doi: 10.1126/scirobotics.abj2908
85. Weber PA, Merola S, Wasielewski A, Ballantyne GH. Telerobotic-assisted laparoscopic right and sigmoid colectomies for benign disease. *Dis Colon Rectum.* (2002) 45(12):1689–94; discussion 95–6. doi: 10.1007/s10350-004-7261-2
86. D'Annibale A, Morpurgo E, Fisco V, Trevisan P, Sovernigo G, Orsini C, et al. Robotic and laparoscopic surgery for treatment of colorectal diseases. *Dis Colon Rectum.* (2004) 47(12):2162–8. doi: 10.1007/s10350-004-0711-z
87. Pigazzi A, Ellenhorn JD, Ballantyne GH, Paz IB. Robotic-assisted laparoscopic low anterior resection with total mesorectal excision for rectal cancer. *Surg Endosc.* (2006) 20(10):1521–5. doi: 10.1007/s00464-005-0855-5
88. Araujo SE, Seid VE, Klajner S. Robotic surgery for rectal cancer: current immediate clinical and oncological outcomes. *World J Gastroenterol.* (2014) 20(39):14359–70. doi: 10.3748/wjg.v20.i39.14359
89. Milone M, Manigrasso M, Velotti N, Torino S, Voza A, Sarnelli G, et al. Completeness of total mesorectum excision of laparoscopic versus robotic surgery: a review with a meta-analysis. *Int J Colorectal Dis.* (2019) 34(6):983–91. doi: 10.1007/s00384-019-03307-0
90. Jayne D, Pigazzi A, Marshall H, Croft J, Corrigan N, Copeland J, et al. Effect of robotic-assisted vs conventional laparoscopic surgery on risk of conversion to open laparotomy among patients undergoing resection for rectal cancer: the ROLARR randomized clinical trial. *JAMA.* (2017) 318(16):1569–80. doi: 10.1001/jama.2017.7219
91. Kinross JM MS, Mylonas G, Darzi A. Next-generation robotics in gastrointestinal surgery. *Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol.* (2020) 17:430–40. doi: 10.1038/s41575-020-0290-z
92. Kim VB, Chapman WH, Albrecht RJ, Bailey BM, Young JA, Nifong LW, et al. Early experience with telemanipulative robot-assisted laparoscopic cholecystectomy using da vinci. *Surg Laparosc Endosc Percutan Tech.* (2002) 12(1):33–40. doi: 10.1097/00129689-200202000-00006
93. NICE. Recommendations | Gallstone disease: diagnosis and management | Guidance [Available from: <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg188/chapter/recommendations-diagnosing-gallstone-disease>
94. Shenoy R, Mederos MA, Ye L, Mak SS, Begashaw MM, Booth MS, et al. Intraoperative and postoperative outcomes of robot-assisted cholecystectomy: a systematic review. *Syst Rev.* (2021) 10(1):124. doi: 10.1186/s13643-021-01673-x
95. Chitwood WR J, Nifong LW, Chapman WH, Felger JE, Bailey BM, Ballint T, et al. Robotic surgical training in an academic institution. *Ann Surg.* (2001) 234(4):475–84. discussion 84–6. doi: 10.1097/0000658-200110000-00007
96. van der Sluis PC, van der Horst S, May AM, Schippers C, Brosens LAA, Joore HCA, et al. Robot-assisted minimally invasive thoracoscopic esophagectomy versus open transthoracic esophagectomy for resectable esophageal cancer: a randomized controlled trial. *Ann Surg.* (2019) 269(4):621–30. doi: 10.1097/SLA.0000000000003031
97. de Groot EM, van der Horst S, Kingma BF, Goense L, van der Sluis PC, Ruurda JP, et al. Robot-assisted minimally invasive thoracoscopic esophagectomy versus open esophagectomy: long-term follow-up of a randomized clinical trial. *Dis Esophagus.* (2020) 33(Supplement_2):doaa079. doi: 10.1093/dote/doaa079.
98. Yang Y, Zhang X, Li B, Li Z, Sun Y, Mao T, et al. Robot-assisted esophagectomy (RAE) versus conventional minimally invasive esophagectomy (MIE) for resectable esophageal squamous cell carcinoma: protocol for a multicenter prospective randomized controlled trial (RAMIE trial, robot-assisted minimally invasive esophagectomy). *BMC Cancer.* (2019) 19(1):608. doi: 10.1186/s12885-019-5799-6
99. Angeramo CA, Bras Harriott C, Casas MA, Schlottmann F. Minimally invasive ivor lewis esophagectomy: robot-assisted versus laparoscopic-thoracoscopic technique. Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Surgery.* (2021) 170(6):1692–701. doi: 10.1016/j.surg.2021.07.013