

Robot-Assisted Surgery: Patient Safety and Liability Risks

Laura M. Cascella, MA, CPHRM

PEACE OF MIND	EXPERTISE	СНОІСЕ	THE MEDPRO GROUP DIFFERENCE
---------------	-----------	--------	-----------------------------

Since its inception, robot-assisted surgery (RAS) has been lauded as a symbol of medical progress and a revolutionary advancement in surgical treatment. Now, more than 20 years after the first robotic surgical system was approved for laparoscopic procedures in the United States, surgeons have used RAS for millions of procedures, and the number continues to grow.²

Healthcare organizations of all sizes have invested in robotic surgical technology, and the number and types of procedures done using robots have expanded over the years, reaching various specialties such as general surgery, urology, gynecology, cardiology, otolaryngology, orthopedics, and even dentistry.

For many healthcare organizations, the incentive to invest in robotic surgical systems is significant. Robots have been marketed as a way to increase revenue, capture market share, and recruit sought-after surgeons. Additionally, direct-to-consumer marketing of RAS has resulted in increasing pressure for hospitals to offer the technology as a means to satiate patient demand, boost satisfaction, and eclipse competitors.³

Robot-Assisted Surgery and Malpractice

As the number of robotic procedures has grown, so too has the number of malpractice cases involving RAS. A 2023 analysis in the *Journal of Robotic Surgery* notes that malpractice claims involving RAS have increased more than 250 percent in the past 7 years compared to the 7 years prior.¹

Reports of adverse events linked to RAS have resulted in law firms seeking to represent clients who have suffered complications or poor outcomes following robotic surgery. Lawsuits have been brought against device manufacturers, healthcare providers, and healthcare facilities — some of which have resulted in substantial settlements. However, despite RAS's impressive ascent and proven and purported benefits — such as greater precision and visualization, smaller scars, faster recovery, lower infection rates, and less pain — many questions have arisen about patient safety, long-term outcomes, research quality, associated costs, and the appropriate use of this technology. These concerns highlight the need for healthcare organizations and surgeons using RAS to evaluate risks and take necessary precautions to maximize patient safety and minimize liability exposure.

Evaluating Robot-Assisted Surgery From a Risk Management and Patient Safety Perspective

As the market for robotic surgical systems continues to expand and patient demand for less invasive treatment options persists, healthcare organizations will continue to invest in the technology. Further, because these systems carry a hefty price tag, organizations will want to see a return on their investments, which may result in increased pressure on surgeons to use the robots.⁴

RAS potentially offers benefits for both patients and surgeons; however, like any medical technology, it also presents challenges. Examples of these challenges include ensuring appropriate training and credentialing, overcoming learning curves to attain proficiency, determining patient selection criteria, and conducting appropriate informed consent for patients having robotic procedures.

Training and Credentialing

Since the time RAS was initially approved until present day, appropriate training has been a top risk concern. Even though more than two decades have passed, a standardized training curriculum and unified credentialing standards for RAS remain elusive.⁵ As a result, each

"Even though more than two decades have passed, a standardized training curriculum and unified credentialing standards for RAS remain elusive."

healthcare organization that offers, or plans to offer, RAS is "responsible to develop and implement training and credentialing processes that are medically sound, that promote patient safety, and that protect the organization from undue risk."⁶

Robot-Assisted Surgery: Patient Safety and Liability Risks

Although product training and technical training often are offered through device manufacturers, this training alone may not sufficiently prepare surgeons to perform surgery using complex robotic systems.⁷ Thus, healthcare organizations must define rigorous and specific standards for clinical training, proctoring and oversight, competency, and credentialing to ensure that the entire surgical team is prepared to undertake RAS.

A foundational consensus group statement from the Society of American Gastrointestinal and Endoscopic Surgeons (SAGES) and the Minimally Invasive Robotics Association (MIRA) recommends a twofold training approach that involves acquiring technical knowledge and capability with complex robotic systems and developing skills for using these systems for specific procedures.⁸ The SAGES-MIRA statement notes that surgeons must:

- Have a thorough knowledge base and practical experience
- Understand standard operating procedures and emergency protocols
- Be able to anticipate risks and develop appropriate responses

For example, surgeons must be prepared to convert to traditional laparoscopy or an open procedure in the event of technical problems or certain clinical complications.⁹ For doctors whose primary surgical experience is using a robotic surgical system, conversion to open surgery might be problematic. In these cases, another surgeon who is experienced with open surgery should be available to assist if necessary. Surgical teams also must be aware of the risks that can occur as a result of conversion — such as issues related to patient positioning and prolonged use of anesthesia — and have plans in place to manage those risks.¹⁰

Another consensus group brought together numerous multidisciplinary subject matter experts to determine the critical skills and tasks that a comprehensive basic curriculum for RAS should include.¹¹ The group ultimately developed Fundamentals of Robotic Surgery (FRS), a "multi-specialty, proficiency-based curriculum of basic technical skills to train and assess surgeons to safely and efficiently perform robotic-assisted surgery."¹² However, the American Board of Surgery notes that FRS — unlike Fundamentals of Endoscopic Surgery and Fundamentals of Laparoscopic Surgery — is not a requirement for completion of a general surgery residency.¹³

Some experts recommend that organizations set up robotic steering committees or robotic credentialing committees that include surgeons and other stakeholders to help determine

Robot-Assisted Surgery: Patient Safety and Liability Risks

appropriate training and credentialing standards.¹⁴ Additionally, guidance from professional associations and information from robotic surgery research studies and literature can help healthcare organizations establish appropriate training and credentialing criteria. Several research studies and systematic reviews on robotic surgery call for training that (a) is based on competency rather than time or quantity, (b) uses graduated learning objectives with assessment at each level, (c) involves simulation/virtual training, and (d) sets minimum criteria for demonstrating competency.¹⁵

Various professional associations have published recommendations for RAS training, curriculum development, and credentialing/privileging standards, which healthcare organizations can use to guide development of RAS-related policies, procedures, and standards. Examples include the American Urological Association, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the American Association of Gynecologic Laparoscopists, the Society of Laparoendoscopic Surgeons, the Society of Thoracic Surgeons, and more.

In addition to comprehensive RAS training for surgeons, healthcare organizations should support interdisciplinary training for other members of the surgical team, such as anesthesiologists, assisting surgeons, and nurses. RAS creates unique situations and challenges in the operating room, and "Interdisciplinary training has the potential to help

"In addition to comprehensive training for surgeons, healthcare organizations should support interdisciplinary training for other members of the surgical team . . ."

team members practice their individual roles while the team reviews its functioning as a collective unit."¹⁶

The lessons learned from various types of training, including coursework, workshops, simulation drills, and proctored surgeries, can provide the basis for a strong training and credentialing program as well as the development of RAS best practices and protocols.

Learning Curve and Proficiency

Along with training considerations, surgeons should be aware of the learning curve associated with using robotic surgical systems. In addition to developing and refining surgical skills, proficiency with these complex systems is necessary to ensure safety during procedures. Surgeons must master use of the platform's functions, such as camera controls, foot pedals,

robotic arm movements, and instrument operations. "Utilizing robots necessitates additional knowledge of the working of the robot and its method of use, apart from the surgical and anatomical knowledge of the procedure planned."¹⁷

Unfortunately, attaining proficiency with a robotic surgical system is not a one-size-fits-all formula. The number of procedures required to demonstrate competency varies based on the type of procedure, and no firm standards have been set. Estimates suggest anywhere from 50–200 procedures are necessary to attain proficiency.¹⁸

Beyond quantity of procedures, various other factors also contribute to proficiency, such as basic skill, experience and comfort level with technology, familiarity with the procedures being performed, frequency of cases, and type of training.

Just as with other surgical techniques, robotic surgery skills are honed over time. For less experienced surgeons, procedures might take longer, associated costs might be higher, and the risk of complications might be greater.¹⁹ A study assessing the effect of the learning curve on robotic-assisted radical prostatectomies showed that key measurements — such as conversion rates, surgery time, hospital

Case Example

Lack of defined training standards and limited awareness of the learning curve for RAS have played a role in malpractice lawsuits. In one case, a surgeon performed an unsupervised prostate surgery on a patient after completing only two previous supervised robotic prostate surgeries. The surgery took more than 13 hours and resulted in multiple injuries, severe blood loss, and the need to convert to open surgery during the process. The complications from the surgery were alleged to have contributed to the patient's death several years later.

stays, and complication rates — improved within surgeons' initial 100 cases, as well as beyond 100 cases.²⁰

Establishing proctoring and mentoring opportunities as part of credentialing guidelines can help contribute to patient safety initiatives and address risks related to RAS learning curves and competency challenges. Additionally, organizational policies should establish criteria for maintaining proficiency over time, such as performance monitoring, continuing education, training, and recredentialing.

Patient Selection Criteria

A driving factor in the growth of robotic surgery over the past two decades is patient demand.²¹ However, some patients who are eager for this technology might not be ideal candidates due to comorbidities or other factors. For example, in the prostate surgery case mentioned previously, the patient was obese, diabetic, and had a history of heart surgery. These health conditions, combined with the surgeon's limited RAS experience, should have raised red flags about whether the patient was an appropriate candidate for RAS.²²

To counter patient pressure, a crucial strategy for managing risk is careful consideration of patient selection criteria. In a small sample survey of surgeons who had experience with RAS, all participants felt that appropriate selection criteria played a pivotal role in successful patient outcomes.

"To counter patient pressure, a crucial strategy for managing risk is careful consideration of patient selection criteria."

Although they noted that criteria may vary across specialties, standards were primarily based on maintaining patient safety.²³

A robotic surgery advisory issued a number of years ago from the Massachusetts Board of Registration in Medicine emphasized the importance of establishing patient selection criteria, noting that "Careful preoperative assessment of patient risk is critical for preventing perioperative complications. Both the patient's comorbidities and the complexity of the robotic surgical case are important risk factors that should be considered."²⁴

In addition to patient-specific factors, surgeons also should consider evidence related to effectiveness and clinical benefit for various types of procedures. For example, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration issued a notice in 2019 cautioning that the safety and effectiveness of using RAS to perform mastectomies and other cancer-related treatments have not been established.²⁵

By developing greater awareness of potential risk factors and contraindications for RAS, healthcare organizations and surgeons can create and implement patient selection guidelines and assessment protocols as well as reinforce or improve quality measures. Additionally, documenting the assessment of patient risks in accordance with established selection criteria supports the clinical decision-making process. Beyond establishing patient selection criteria, managing patients' expectations related to RAS is crucial. This may prove challenging for surgeons because the technology is complex, and direct claims about benefits and safety can be difficult to make.

Compounding this challenge are direct-toconsumer marketing and advertising campaigns that might overestimate benefits, overpromise results, and/or fail to define specific risks, leading to inflated patient perceptions.²⁶

A careful review of advertising and marketing efforts promoting RAS might help healthcare organizations and medical staff pinpoint potentially misleading statements and identify opportunities to clarify benefits and risks. Ultimately, these strategies might assist patients in making more educated decisions about their care and decrease liability exposure for healthcare organizations.²⁷

Case Example

Failure to accurately portray benefits and risks of treatment may result in suboptimal outcomes and patients feeling misled, which could potentially lead to a malpractice claim.

For example, in a gynecology case, a doctor proposed a robot-assisted hysterectomy as an alternative treatment option for a woman who knew little about the procedure. The patient agreed to the surgery based on the doctor's recommendation and online videos that extoled the precision of surgical robots.

Unfortunately, during the course of the procedure, the surgeon punctured the patient's bowel. The costly injury required nine operations to fix, and the patient was hospitalized multiple times. The patient later stated that she felt deceived by the optimistic marketing of the robot from her doctor and the manufacturer.

Informed Consent

Concerns about patient expectations and misleading marketing and advertising not only point to the need for accurate and objective verbal and written information, but they also highlight the essential role of informed consent for robotic procedures. A study of medical malpractice in RAS found that informed consent issues were cited in more than 30 percent of cases.²⁸

Just like with any type of surgery, informed consent for RAS should involve a process in which the treating surgeon educates the patient about the procedure. The informed consent process should include disclosure of standard consent information, such as an explanation of the procedure, the healthcare providers who will be involved in the procedure, potential risks and benefits, alternative options, etc. The process also should include disclosure of information specific to RAS. For example, the surgeon should educate the patient about:

- The specific procedure and how it is performed
- The steps in the surgery that will involve the robot
- The potential risks of robotic surgery in relation to equipment failures and malfunctions, such as:
 - System errors
 - Video imaging problems
 - Broken components
 - Electrical arcing, sparking, and charring
 - Unintended instrument movements²⁹
- The potential risks of robotic surgery in relation to the patient's specific condition and comorbidities
- The surgeon's past experience with RAS in general and with the recommended robotic procedure specifically
- Alternative options or techniques for treatment and any information about how those techniques compare to RAS
- What will happen in the event of an emergency or complication (e.g., the surgeon will switch to open surgery or traditional laparoscopy) as well as any related risks

Taking the time to provide patients with these details and answer any questions can help ensure that they have the appropriate information to make critical decisions about their treatment. Following the informed consent process, surgeons should document these discussions in patients' health records and include copies of any related consent forms.

In Summary

Over the past two decades, RAS has continued to gain momentum and establish a foothold in modern surgery. Many factors have contributed to the rise of this technology, including the pursuit of new minimally invasive treatment options, strategic healthcare decisions, savvy marketing, and patient demand.

Although the concept and potential benefits of RAS are exciting, they should not overshadow patient safety and risk concerns. Healthcare organizations, surgeons, and surgical team members that use this technology should be aware of key risk areas related to robotic surgery, such as training and credentialing, proficiency, patient selection, and informed consent. Developing greater awareness of the risks and establishing standards and best practices can help enhance safety initiatives and minimize liability exposure.

Endnotes

¹ De Ravin, E., Sell, E. A., Newman, J. G., & Rajasekaran, K. (2023). Medical malpractice in robotic surgery: A Westlaw database analysis. *Journal of Robotic Surgery, 17*(1), 191–196. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11701-022-01417-6

² McCartney, J. (2023, May 10). Robotic surgery is here to stay — and so are surgeons. *Bulletin of the American College of Surgeons, 108*(5). Retrieved from www.facs.org/for-medical-professionals/news-publications/news-and-articles/bulletin/2023/may-2023-volume-108-issue-5/robotic-surgery-is-here-to-stay-and-so-are-surgeons/

³ Kirkpatrick, T., & LaGrange, C. (2016, February). *Robotic surgery: Risks vs. rewards*. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality Patient Safety Network. Retrieved from https://psnet.ahrq.gov/webmm/case/368/roboticsurgery-risks-vs-rewards; Gross Overtreatment. (n.d.). Is da Vinci robotic surgery a revolution or a rip-off? Retrieved from https://grossovertreatment.com/is-da-vinci-robotic-surgery-a-revolution-or-a-rip-off/; Yoon, T.J., & Kim, T. T. (2023, February 28). *Would you undergo robot-assisted surgery? The role of advertising in high-tech medical procedures*. American Marketing Association. Retrieved from www.ama.org/2023/02/28/are-you-willing-tolet-robots-operate-on-you-the-role-of-advertising-in-high-tech-medical-procedures/

⁴ Rosen, R. D., & Edelman, D. A. (2023). Should organizational investment in robotic surgical technology ever influence surgeons' decisions about surgical approach to patients' surgical care? *AMA Journal of Ethics, 25*(8), E575–582. doi: 10.1001/amajethics.2023.575

⁵ Ridderbusch, K. (2019, December 13). Robotically assisted surgery: 'The Wild West of surgical training.' *U.S. News & World Report.* Retrieved from www.usnews.com/news/healthcare-of-tomorrow/articles/2019-12-13/trainingfor-robotically-assisted-surgery-evolves

⁶ Dubeck, D. (2014, September). Robotic-assisted surgery: Focus on training and credentialing. *Pennsylvania Patient Safety Advisory*, *11*(3), 93–101. Retrieved from http://patientsafety.pa.gov/ADVISORIES/Pages/201409_93.aspx

⁷ Dubeck, Robot-assisted surgery: Focus on training and credentialing; Peters, J. D. (2012, May). Robots holding the scalpel. *Trial, 48*(5), 36-40; ECRI. (2013). Top 10 health technology hazards for 2014: Executive brief. *Health Devices*. Retrieved from www.ecri.org/Resources/Whitepapers_and_reports/2014_Top_10_Hazards_Executive _Brief.pdf

⁸ Society of Gastrointestinal and Endoscopic Surgeons–Minimally Invasive Robotics Association (SAGES-MIRA) Consensus Group. (2007). *A consensus document on robotic surgery.* Retrieved from www.sages.org/publications/guidelines/consensus-document-robotic-surgery/

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Peters, Robots holding the scalpel.

¹¹ Dubeck, Robot-assisted surgery: Focus on training and credentialing.

¹² Institute for Surgical Excellence. (n.d.). Training: Fundamentals of robotic surgery (FRS). Retrieved from www.surgicalexcellence.org/fundamentals-of-robotic-surgery-frs

¹³ Arca, M. J., Adams, R. B., Angelos, P., Fanelli, R. D., Mammen, J. M. V., Nelson, M. T., Neumeister, M. W., . . . Buyske, J. (2021). American Board of Surgery statement on assessment and robotic surgery. *American Journal of Surgery, 221*(2), 424–426. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjsurg.2020.09.039

¹⁴ Rosenthal, T. (2018, October 11). Robotic credentialing and guidelines: Surgeons urged to get seat at table. *General Surgery News.* Retrieved from www.generalsurgerynews.com/In-the-News/Article/10-18/Robotic-Credentialing-and-Guidelines-Surgeons-Urged-to-Get-Seat-at-Table/53006

¹⁵ Liberman, D., Trihn, Q. D., Jeldres, C., Valiquette, L., & Zorn, K. C. (2011). Training and outcome monitoring in robotic urologic surgery. *Nature Reviews Urology*, *9*(1), 17–22; Lee, J. Y., Mucksavage, P., Sundaram, C. P., & McDougall, E. M. (2011, April). Best practices for robotic surgery training and credentialing. *The Journal of Urology*, *185*, 1191–1197; Schreuder, H. W. R., Wolswijk, R., Zweemer, R. P., Schijven, M. P., & Verheijen, R. H. M. (2012). Training and learning robotic surgery, time for a more structured approach: A systematic review. *BJOG*, *119*, 137–149.

¹⁶ Clanahan, J. M., & Awad, M. M. (2023). How does robotic-assisted surgery change OR safety culture? *AMA Journal of Ethics, 25*(8), E615–E623. doi: https://doi.org/10.1001/amajethics.2023.615

¹⁷ Pai, S. N., Jeyaraman, M., Jeyaraman, N., Nallakumarasamy, A., & Yadav, S. (2023). In the hands of a robot, from the operating room to the courtroom: The medicolegal considerations of robotic surgery. *Cureus, 15*(8), e43634. doi: https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.43634

¹⁸ Bottura, B., Porto, B., Moretti-Marques, R., Barison, G., Zlotnik, E., Podgaec, S., & Gomes, M. T. V. (2022). Surgeon experience, robotic perioperative outcomes, and complications in gynecology. *Revista da Associacao Medica Brasileira (1992), 68*(11), 1514–1518. Retrieved from www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9720764/

¹⁹ Dubeck, Robot-assisted surgery: Focus on training and credentialing.

²⁰ Davis, J. W., Kreadon, U. S., Gabbert, J., et al. (2014, May). Learning curve assessment of robot-assisted radical prostatectomy compared with open-surgery controls from the premier perspective database. *Journal of Endourology, 28*(5), 560–566.

²¹ Kirkpatrick, et al., *Robotic surgery: Risks vs. rewards.*

²² Ostrum, C. (2013, May 3). Failed robotic surgery focus of Kitsap trial. *The Seattle Times*. Retrieved from www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/failed-robotic-surgery-focus-of-kitsap-trial/

²³ U.S. Food and Drug Administration Medical Product Safety Network. (2013, November). *Small sample survey* — *final report: da Vinci Surgical System.* Retrieved from www.fdanews.com/ext/resources/files/11/11-18-13-surgery.pdf

²⁴ Commonwealth of Massachusetts Board of Registration in Medicine. (2013, March). *Advisory on robot-assisted surgery*. Retrieved from www.mass.gov/doc/march-2013-robot-assisted-surgery-advisory/download

²⁵ U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2019, February 28). *FDA In Brief: FDA cautions patients, providers about using robotically-assisted surgical devices for mastectomy and other cancer-related surgeries.* Retrieved from www.fda.gov/news-events/fda-brief/fda-brief-fda-cautions-patients-providers-about-using-robotically-assisted-surgical-devices

²⁶ Langreth, R. (2013, October 8). Robot surgery damaging patients rises with marketing. *Bloomberg News*. Retrieved from www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-10-08/robot-surgery-damaging-patients-rises-with-marketing.html; Jin, L. X., Ibrahim, A. M., Newman, N. A., Makarov, D. V., Pronovast, P. J., & Makary, M. A. (2011). Robotic surgery claims on United States hospital websites. *Journal for Healthcare Quality*, *33*(6), 48–52.

²⁷ Pai, et al., In the hands of a robot, from the operating room to the courtroom: The medicolegal considerations of robotic surgery.

²⁸ De Ravin, et al., Medical malpractice in robotic surgery: A Westlaw database analysis.

²⁹ Alemzadeh, et al., Adverse events in robotic surgery.

This document does not constitute legal or medical advice and should not be construed as rules or establishing a standard of care. Because the facts applicable to your situation may vary, or the laws applicable in your jurisdiction may differ, please contact your attorney or other professional advisors if you have any questions related to your legal or medical obligations or rights, state or federal laws, contract interpretation, or other legal questions.

MedPro Group is the marketing name used to refer to the insurance operations of The Medical Protective Company, Princeton Insurance Company, PLICO, Inc. and MedPro RRG Risk Retention Group. All insurance products are underwritten and administered by these and other Berkshire Hathaway affiliates, including National Fire & Marine Insurance Company. Product availability is based upon business and/or regulatory approval and may differ among companies.

© 2024 MedPro Group Inc. All rights reserved.