

Funding: HJM was supported by an Imperial College Wellcome Trust clinical fellowship, and CJP was supported by a Wates Foundation fellowship.

Competing interests: All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at www.icmje.org/doi_disclosure.pdf and declare: no support from any organisation for the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years; no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

Ethical approval: Not required.

Data sharing: No additional data available.

Transparency: The lead authors (the manuscript's guarantors) affirm that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned have been explained.

This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 3.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt and build upon this work, for commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited. See: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>.

- Steiner CA, Bass EB, Talamini MA, Pitt HA, Steinberg EP. Surgical rates and operative mortality for open and laparoscopic cholecystectomy in Maryland. *N Engl J Med* 1994;330:403-8. doi:10.1056/NEJM199402103300607.
- Barkun JS, Aronson JK, Feldman LS, et al. Balliol Collaboration. Evaluation and stages of surgical innovations. *Lancet* 2009;374:1089-96. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(09)61083-7.
- Drolet BC, Lorenzi NM. Translational research: understanding the continuum from bench to bedside. *Transl Res* 2011;157:1-5. doi:10.1016/j.trsl.2010.10.002.
- Thompson M, Heneghan C, Billingsley M, Cohen D. Medical device recalls and transparency in the UK. *BMJ* 2011;342:d2973. doi:10.1136/bmj.d2973.
- Zuckerman D, Brown P, Das A. Lack of publicly available scientific evidence on the safety and effectiveness of implanted medical devices. *JAMA Intern Med* 2014;174:1781-7. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2014.4193.
- Zuckerman DM, Brown P, Nissen SE. Medical device recalls and the FDA approval process. *Arch Intern Med* 2011;171:1006-11. doi:10.1001/archinternmed.2011.30.
- Contopoulos-Ioannidis DG, Alexiou GA, Gouvas TC, Ioannidis JP. Medicine. Life cycle of translational research for medical interventions. *Science* 2008;321:1298-9. doi:10.1126/science.1160622.
- Contopoulos-Ioannidis DG, Ntzani E, Ioannidis JP. Translation of highly promising basic science research into clinical applications. *Am J Med* 2003;114:477-84. doi:10.1016/S0002-9343(03)00013-5.
- Marcus HJ, Payne CJ, Hughes-Hallett A, et al. Making the leap: The translation of innovative surgical devices from the laboratory to the operating room. *Ann Surg* 2015. doi:10.1097/SLA.0000000000001532.
- Paul S, McCulloch P, Sedrakyan A. Robotic surgery: revisiting "no innovation without evaluation". *BMJ* 2013;346:f1573.
- Wilmshurst P. The regulation of medical devices. *BMJ* 2011;342:d2822. doi:10.1136/bmj.d2822.
- Nieuwenhuijse MJ, Nelissen RG, Schoones JW, Sedrakyan A. Appraisal of evidence base for introduction of new implants in hip and knee replacement: a systematic review of five widely used device technologies. *BMJ* 2014;349:g5133. doi:10.1136/bmj.g5133.
- Kesselheim AS, Rajan PV. Regulating incremental innovation in medical devices. *BMJ* 2014;349:g5303. doi:10.1136/bmj.g5303.
- Cook JA, McCulloch P, Blazeby JM, et al. IDEAL framework for surgical innovation 3: randomised controlled trials in the assessment stage and evaluations in the long term study stage. *BMJ* 2013;346:f2820.
- Ergina PL, Barkun JS, McCulloch P, et al. IDEAL framework for surgical innovation 2: observational studies in the exploration and assessment stages. *BMJ* 2013;346:f3011.
- McCulloch P, Cook JA, Altman DG, et al. IDEAL framework for surgical innovation 1: the idea and development stages. *BMJ* 2013;346:f3012.
- McCulloch P, Altman DG, Campbell WB, et al. Balliol Collaboration. No surgical innovation without evaluation: the IDEAL recommendations. *Lancet* 2009;374:1105-12. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(09)61116-8.
- Ergina PL, Cook JA, Blazeby JM, et al. Balliol Collaboration. Challenges in evaluating surgical innovation. *Lancet* 2009;374:1097-104. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(09)61086-2.
- Normand SLT, Hatfield L, Drozda J, et al. In: Res C, ed. Postmarket surveillance for medical devices: America's new strategy. *BMJ* 2012;345.
- McMurry-Heath M, Hamburg MA. Creating a space for innovative device development. *Sci Transl Med* 2012;4:163fs43. doi:10.1126/scitranslmed.3005269.
- Chang L, Dhruva SS, Chu J, Bero LA, Redberg RF. Selective reporting in trials of high risk cardiovascular devices: cross sectional comparison between premarket approval summaries and published reports. *BMJ* 2015;350:h2613. doi:10.1136/bmj.h2613.
- Rathi VK, Krumholz HM, Masoudi FA, Ross JS. Characteristics of clinical studies conducted over the total product life cycle of high-risk therapeutic medical devices receiving FDA premarket approval in 2010 and 2011. *JAMA* 2015;314:604-12. doi:10.1001/jama.2015.8761.

© BMJ Publishing Group Ltd 2016

Web appendix: supplementary information