# Needs Analysis Survey Paper

## Journals:

* [Journal of Otolaryngology - Head & Neck Surgery](https://journalotohns.biomedcentral.com/)
* Otolaryngologic Clinics
* Look up: learning curve of TEES paper

## Abstract:

## Background:

* Why are we doing a needs analysis?

To understand the difficulties experienced during TEES and if developing new instruments to address these challenges would be beneficial to TEES.

* What do we want to learn from the needs analysis?

The difficulties that are most widely experienced by TEES surgeons and what difficulties do surgeons require new instruments for.

* What context does the reader need in order to understand this study?

TEES, endoscopes used

Endoscopes provide direct access and a wide angle view into the middle ear, reducing the time required to gain access, drill bone for exposure and close during middle ear surgery and are able to visualize hidden recesses within the middle ear including: the sinus tympani, anterior and posterior epitympanum and hypotympanum [1] [2] [3] [4] . As well, the endoscope allows visualization past the shaft of the instrument, such as the drill, which is a problem during microscopic surgery [5].

Despite the enthusiasm of some otologists, endoscopic ear surgery has not as yet been accepted by all practicing otologists [6] [7].  The principal challenge with TEES is that a one-handed surgical technique is required as the endoscope is held in the other hand [6].  Otologic instruments were developed for two-handed microscope-guided surgery so they are not optimized for the TEES environment. As otologists have been trained and gained experience in microscope-guided ear surgery, they have developed techniques with the according instruments and have become accustomed to a two-handed surgical approach. By learning different surgical techniques and gaining experience with the endoscope, most surgeons find that they can complete more cases endoscopically [8] [6] [1].

Technological advances in the design of the endoscope, camera and suction dissection instruments have lead to incremental stepwise jumps in this learning curve [9]. In order to further develop technology and instruments to facilitate TEES, it is important to understand the specific difficulties experienced during TEES. It is proposed that in order to facilitate TEES, the needs of surgeons and current limitations of tools must be determined.

## Methods:

The Canadian otologists’ EES survey has reported that 11% of otologists in Canada use TEES for cholesteatoma, tympanoplasty, ossicular reconstruction surgeries and they find the following factors difficult about TEES: single-handed surgery, efficiency/operative time, technical difficulty, cost, managing bleeding [6]. This questionnaire is intended to build upon this research by measuring the degree to which surgeons experience specific difficulties during surgery and whether these difficulties could be addressed by a specialized surgical tool. To develop the questionnaire, a literature search as well as interviews with local ear surgeons were used to collect a list of difficulties experienced during TEES and how to address these difficulties. The questionnaire asks surgeons to rate the degree of difficulty associated with specific tasks during TEES. The difficulties are: bleeding control to keep the operative field clean and maintain hemostasis, reaching inaccessible structures visualized by the endoscope, cutting and removing bone, keeping the endoscope lens clean to avoid removing it to clean the lens periodically, moving and positioning a graft into the intended position for tympanoplasty and dissection and removal of cholesteatoma.

The questionnaire uses an analog visual scale to rate the degree to which they experience a list of difficulties during TEES. An analog visual scale was chosen as it is a continuous rating scale and so respondents can pick any value between the boundary points and visually see where their answer lies in the scale [10] [11]. It is suggested that a continuous rating scale is advantageous compared to the five point likert scale because respondents do not need to subjectively discriminate between the five different rating categories and are not bound to only five answers the continuous visual analog scale can capture subjective phenomena quantitatively and can discriminate finer differences due to the larger range of possible scores, also makes it more likely that the data is normally distributed and can thus use parametric statistical analysis with a smaller sample size [10] [12].

The questionnaire was sent to otologists who participated in the 2nd World Congress of Endoscopic Ear Surgery <insert number of attendees>, this group of otologists have an interest in TEES as they attended this TEES conference. <insert more groups of people once they have the survey> The responses were completely anonymous, and collected using SickKids RedCap project management software, which hosted the survey and managed the anonymous responses.

### Statistical Analysis

http://blog.minitab.com/blog/adventures-in-statistics-2/choosing-between-a-nonparametric-test-and-a-parametric-test

The continuous data was analyzed using ANOVA using JUMP software.

## Results:

* Study participants
* subheadings that describe the main ideas we want to convey
* Questionnaire was sent to (number of attendees at the 2nd world congress) many otologists
* 16/number of attendees at IWGEES responded

The degree of need to facilitate each difficulty during TEES was over 50%, suggesting that each of these difficulties are experienced significantly by the respondents. Reaching structures visualized by the endoscope and dissection and removal of cholesteatoma resulted in the highest degree of need at 82%±5% and 78%±5% , respectively.

Note: the response rate is very low (16) at this point. There was no significant effect of the percent of TEES on the degree of difficulty experienced. There was no significant effect of the use of TEES instrument set on the degree of difficulty experienced.

## Discussion:

### Bleeding control

Managing bleeding has been reported as a challenge during TEES (by 24% of Canadian Otologist repondents in Lea et al.’s survey)[5] [6] [3] [4]. Specialized instruments have been designed to incorporate a functional tip with a suction shaft, for example the Giuseppe Panetti round cutting knife with suction shaft which allows dissection and retraction of the tympanomeatal flap while suction-enabled so the surgeon does not need to switch instruments for suction [3]. Specialized instruments are being developed to mitigate the problem of bleeding control.

### Reaching structures visualized by the endoscope and dissection and removal of cholesteatoma

Difficult to reach anatomical recesses include the sinus tympani, facial recess and anterior epitympanic recess [3]. Specialized instruments that have a curved tip in order to reach structures visualized by the endoscope are also being developed, particularly instruments to reach the sinus tympani [3]. As well, residual cholesteatoma occurs if cholesteatoma is found in inaccessible areas [13] [14]. Reaching structures visualized by the endoscope and dissection and removal of cholesteatoma resulted in the highest degree of need. These two difficulties are related as dissecting and removal of cholesteatoma requires the surgeon’s tools to reach the cholesteatoma, which is often located in hard to access areas visualized by the endoscope.

### Cutting and removing bone

need a source for this

### Keeping the endoscope lens clean

According to the members of the International Working Group of Endoscopic Ear Surgery (IWGEES) who have had more than fifteen years of TEES experience, fogging and smearing of the endoscope tip is a disadvantage of TEES [3]. This difficulty during surgery requires the surgeon to remove the tool and endoscope, and wipe it periodically when the lens is not clean. The lens can also become dirty during drilling when pieces of bone and irrigation fluid are flowing in the surgical field.

### Moving and positioning a graft into the intended place

In tympanoplasty surgery, the approach, graft material and graft placement technique vary depending on the training, case load, resources and experience available to the surgeon [15]. During TEES tympanoplasty the graft must be inserted into the ear canal and positioned single handedly in the desired orientation, e.g. underlay technique requires the graft to be supported under the annulus anteriorly and over the neck of the malleus for anterosuperior support [15]. Performing this technique single handedly can be challenging and so perhaps a tool that facilitates graft manipulation would be helpful for TEES surgeons.

## Conclusion:

* key findings
* review main outcome measures
* compare key findings with other literature
* limitations of study
  + number of respondents

Notes from “Endoscopic and keyhole endoscope-assisted neurosurgical approaches: A qualitative survey on technical challenges and technological solutions” [16]

Methods:

* asked: name, surgical unit, subspecialty interests
* survey:
  + whether surgeon presently uses endoscopic/endoscopic assisted approaches
  + what they consider to be major technical barriers to adopting such approaches
  + technological advances they foresee improving safety and efficacy in the field
  + three authors analysed the survey

Results:

* + 40 neurosurgeons (16% response rate within the first week)
  + reported the percent of surgeons that did xyz types of surgery
  + detailed opinions on technical challenges:
    - grouped responses into specific themes: surgical approach with better integration with image guidance, intra-op visualization and improvement in neuroendoscopy, surgical manipulation and improvements in instruments
    - subthemes outlined in a figure e.g. for approach: integrated IGS, flexible access subthemes
  + paragraphs outlining the results of the themes
    - how many respondents suggested that theme?
    - E.g. How many respondents said endoscope image quality was a problem in the visualization theme?
  + Table outlining the subspecialties of the neurosurgeon respondents

Discussion:

* Why is endoscopy good (briefly)
* Recent advances in endoscopy technology – improved lenses, image quality, HD camera, screen
* Technical challenges of neuroendoscopy themes are mentioned in one sentence
* Discussion of the three themes: their current status clinically

Limitations of the study:

Small sample size, low response rate. Asked endoscopic ear surgeons/surgeons interested in TEES.

All members of SBNS were invited to participate in the survey but neurosurgeons self-selected if they had a specialist interest in neuroendoscopy, as seen by the high number of peadiatric and skull base neurosurgeons responding

“Purely Endoscopic Removal of Intraventricular Brain Tumors: A Consensus Opinion and Update”

* 15 out of 20 surveyed neurosurgeons responded

Introduction:

* background research
* questionnaire was designed and used to survey neurosurgeons who place a particular emphasis on endoscopic methods

Methods:

* questionnaire and survey
  + what led to the development of questions in the survey – literature search, interviewing fellow surgeons, attending the endoscopic ear surgery course
  + what was the questionnaire designed to do? Survey ear surgeons to figure out what difficulties they experience during TEES and would want new tools for
  + who was it sent out to? Ear surgeons who attended the 2nd world congress of EES to get a sense of what experienced surgeons who perform TEES feel, list other societies
  + how many responded?
  + Why did we select these societies?
  + Used a continuous rating scale with labels to help the participants gauge where they fit on the scale -
* Explain the different difficulties

Results:

Discussion:

* give a literature/background on the different difficulties

[17]
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