

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/32964> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation

Author: Peeters, Suzanne Hendrika Philomena

Title: Teaching and quality control in fetoscopic surgery

Issue Date: 2015-05-13

Chapter 8

Operative competence in fetoscopic laser surgery for TTTS: a procedure-specific evaluation

Suzanne HP Peeters

Joost Akkermans

Jacqueline Bustra

Johanna M. Middeldorp

Enrico Lopriore

Roland Devlieger

Liesbeth Lewi

Jan Deprest

Dick Oepkes

In press. Ultrasound Obst Gyn 2015

ABSTRACT

Objective. Fetoscopic laser surgery for twin-twin transfusion syndrome is a procedure for which no objective tools exist to assess technical skills. To ensure that future fetal surgeons reach competence prior to performing the procedure unsupervised, we developed a performance assessment tool. The aim of this study was to validate this assessment tool for reliability and construct validity.

Methods. A procedure-specific evaluation instrument containing all essential steps of the fetoscopic laser procedure was created using Delphi methodology. Eleven experts and 13 novices from three Fetal Medicine centers performed the procedure on the same simulator. Two independent observers assessed each surgery using the instrument (maximum score: 52). Inter-observer reliability was assessed using Spearman correlation. We compared performance of novices and experts to assess construct validity.

Results. Inter-observer reliability was high ($r=0.974$, $p<0.001$). Checklist scores for experts and novices were significantly different: median score for novices was 28/52 (54%) while for experts 42/52 (81%) ($p<0.001$). Procedure time and fetoscopy time were significantly shorter ($p<0.001$) for experts. Residual anastomoses were found in 1/11 (9%) procedures performed by experts and in 9/14 (64%) performed by novices ($p=0.006$). Multivariate analysis showed that the checklist score independently from age and gender predicted competence.

Conclusions. The procedure-specific assessment tool for fetoscopic laser surgery shows a good inter-observer reliability and discriminates experts from novices. This instrument may therefore be a useful tool in the training curriculum for starting fetal surgeons. Further intervention studies with reassessment before and after training may increase the construct validity of the tool.

INTRODUCTION

Fetoscopic laser therapy is the preferred treatment modality for twin-twin transfusion syndrome (TTTS),¹⁻³ but is only offered in a few highly specialized Fetal Medicine centers around the world.⁴ Although fetoscopic laser surgery is a complex procedure that has been in use for more than two decades, standardized surgical training programs for fetoscopic interventions are nonexistent and performance is often authority based, i.e. on personal experience, belief and individual preferences. Also, the learning curve is ill-defined, and varies between 21 to 75 cases (based different survival outcome measures such as minimal double survival rates of 54% or at least one survivor in 70% of cases) to acquire the necessary skills.⁵⁻⁸ Therefore, there is a need for a reliable assessment tool of technical performance. Such a tool would be useful to monitor progress, provide constant feedback along the learning curve, to serve as an instrument for (re-)certification and offer standardized training.

We previously reported on a list of steps judged essential to the laser procedure based on the Delphi methods.⁹ These steps were consensus based by a sample of international experts, making the final tool representative of international, rather than local practice. The aim of this prospective cohort study was to assess reliability and validity of this instrument in the context of simulated operating room performance. We hypothesized that, based on the systematic manner in which this tool was created; we would obtain an acceptable level of inter-observer reliability and that the instrument would discriminate the performance of experts from that of novices.

METHODS

Participants and study design

This study is part of the SILICONE project (**S**imulator for **L**aser therapy and **I**dentification of **C**ritical steps of **O**peration: **N**ew **E**ducation program), conducted to develop a standardized training program for fetoscopic laser surgery for TTTS. In the first part of the project we determined the essential steps of treatment to develop an assessment instrument.⁹ In the current part of the project, this instrument was validated using a silicone simulator involving the complete laser procedure.

This study was conducted in three Fetal Medicine centers: Leiden University Medical Center (the Netherlands), University Hospitals KU Leuven (Belgium) and Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm (Sweden) from September 2014 until December 2014. We recruited

24 volunteers with special interest in fetal therapy to participate in the study. All participants completed a questionnaire to establish baseline demographic characteristics and previous experience in fetoscopic surgery to measure potential confounding factors that affect performance. Participants were stratified into 3 groups with regard to the level of previous experience; expert or novice or intermediate.

An expert was defined as a physician who currently practices fetoscopic laser surgery for TTTS and has performed at least 25 fetoscopic laser procedures independently.⁸ Novices included fetal medicine specialists without practical fetal therapy experience OR obstetricians attending a fellowship in perinatology OR senior residents with special interest in perinatology and minimal invasive therapy. All novices were experienced sonographers and had appropriate knowledge of TTTS and its treatment options, but had never performed a fetoscopic laser procedure and had little or no previous experience with other ultrasound-guided invasive procedures (amniocentesis, chorionic villus sampling and/or intrauterine transfusion). Participants with an intermediate level of experience (e.g. performed between 1-25 fetoscopic laser procedures) were excluded.

Assessment

All participants (irrespective of the level of expertise) performed a similar assignment on the simulator. The scenario involved a patient of 17 weeks' gestation with stage 3 TTTS referred for laser therapy. The assignment included the complete fetoscopic laser procedure; starting from the moment the operation room is entered, until the surgery was finished and direct post-operative management was ordered. Three different items were scored: 'time', 'checklist with essential steps of procedure' and 'complete identification of vascular equator'.

All participants were evaluated by 2 independent observers (S.P. and J.A.), using the assessment instrument created by the Delphi consensus.⁹ This list of essential steps was modified into a checklist adjusted to the simulated scenario. A detailed description of the instrument is available in the appendix. Each item was awarded 1 point if it was done properly (range 0-52). Procedure time, defined as 'the moment the surgeon enters the operating room until the moment that direct post-operative management is ordered' and fetoscopy time, defined as 'the moment the fetoscope is introduced for the first time until final removal' were recorded. A map of the placental architecture was used by the assessors to mark the coagulated anastomoses.

Simulated scenario

To explain the task, all participants were shown a standardized multimedia presentation outlining the background and aim of the study, as well as the performance metrics (time, missed essential steps and complete coagulation of the vascular equator). Finally, the context of the scenario (including patient characteristics, findings of diagnostic procedure and pre-surgical management) was presented.

Simulator characteristics

The simulator used for this study has previously been described¹⁰ (Francis LeBouthillier, Surgical touch, Toronto, Canada), but was modified with a highly realistic silicone copy of a 17 week monochorionic twin placenta and twin fetuses (R. Bakker, Manimalworks, Rotterdam, The Netherlands). The silicone topping on the model mimics the abdominal wall. Inside there is a mimic of a uterus, which contains water and the placenta. The individual layers of the abdominal wall, the uterus and placenta have sonographic and compliance properties that mimic the clinical situation. The model allows an operator to practice ultrasound examination of a monochorionic pregnancy, required to select the best site for introduction of the instruments. The model also provides a realistic intrauterine environment, optimal to practice manual dexterity skills and to train navigation along the placental surface. Moreover, the addition of a “stuck” donor twin on the placenta simulates the inability to oversee the complete vascular equator. The addition of a “free-floating” recipient simulates a realistic complex situation of floating fetal extremities and umbilical cord in the recipients’ sac. All necessary instruments (i.e. fetoscope, introduction set, endoscopy tower etc.) were used from the local Fetal Medicine center so that participants perform their tasks in a setting that was identical to what would be their clinical environment. Figure 1 shows a participant performing the procedure on the simulator model.



Figure 1 Participant performing procedure on simulator for fetoscopic laser surgery

Statistical analysis

Demographics, procedure- and fetoscopy time, checklist score and presence of residual anastomoses were compared between experts and novices. Due to the small sample size and non-normality of the data, the Mann Whitney U test was used to test for differences between groups for the continuous variables. To test for differences between groups on non-ordinal categorical outcomes, such as presence or absence of experience, Fisher's exact test was used.

Spearman correlation coefficient was used to measure the inter-observer reliability. A correlation of 0.9 or higher was considered to be indicative of an excellent agreement.

We used a multivariate regression analysis to determine independent predictors for the construct validity of the instrument. Construct validity refers to the degree to which any measurement approach or instrument succeeds in describing or quantifying what it is designed to measure. Moreover, to evaluate the accuracy with which scores on a given instrument can classify groups that are already known to differ on a criterion measure

(i.e. experts and novices). In other words, if experts are the ones with the construct (surgical skills) and the novices are the ones without the construct; construct validity determines whether the instrument identifies the presence or absences of the construct (surgical skills).

A two-sided p-value <0.05 was considered to indicate statistical significance. Statistical analyses were performed with IBM. SPSS version 21.0 (IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 21.0 Armonk, New York: IBM Corp.) Since no patients were involved, no formal ethical approval and written informed consent was needed for this study.

RESULTS

In this study, 24 fetoscopic simulated laser surgeries were analyzed. They were performed by 11 (46%) experts and 13 (54%) novices. Eleven participants were male, 13 were female. Although 4/13 (31%) of the novices in the study had previous limited experience with invasive obstetric procedures (e.g. amniocentesis, chorionic villus sampling, intrauterine transfusion etc.) none had previously performed the fetoscopic laser procedure for TTTS. In the group of experts, 5/11 (45%) had performed >100 procedures with a median of 10 procedures (range 8-20) annually. The demographics of the participants are shown in table 1.

Overall median procedure time was 40 minutes (range: 26-50 minutes). Experts were able to complete the procedure in 32 minutes, versus 43 minutes ($p=0.003$) by novices. Fetoscopy time was also significantly different between the groups. Median fetoscopy time for all participants was 17 minutes, (range: 10-27 minutes): 11 minutes for experts versus 20 minutes for novices ($p<0.001$). Residual anastomoses were found in 10/25 (40%) procedures, 1/11 (9%) performed by experts and in 9/14 (64%) performed by novices ($p=0.005$).


Demographics	Expert n/N (%)	Novices n/N (%)	p value
Gender			
Male	8/11 (73)	3/13 (23)	0.015
Female	3/11 (27)	10/13 (77)	
Age			
(median in years, range)	52 (35-59)	32 (28-42)	<0.001
Experience with invasive obstetric procedures			
Has experience with invasive obst. procedures	11/11 (100)	4/13 (31)	0.001
<i>years (median, range)</i>	15 (7-23)	3 (1-8)	0.003
Type of invasive obstetric procedures			
<i>Amniocentesis</i>	11/11 (100)	3/13 (23)	
<i>Chorionic villus sampling</i>	11/11 (100)	3/13 (23)	
<i>Intrauterine transfusion</i>	8/11 (73)	1/13 (8)	
<i>Fetal shunt placement</i>	8/11 (73)	0	
<i>Bipolar cord occlusion</i>	11/11 (100)	0	
<i>Open fetal surgery</i>	4/11 (36)	0	
<i>Other</i>	4/11 (36)	0	
No. of FLS attended (incl. assisting or watching procedure)			
None	0	2/13 (15)	0.001
< 10 procedures	0	7/13 (54)	
10-25 procedures	0	0	
25-50 procedures	1/11 (9)	2/13 (15)	
50-100 procedures	1/11 (9)	0	
>100 procedures	9/11 (82)	2/13 (15)	
Experience with simulator training			
Never	2/11 (18)	1/13 (8)	0.447
A few times	4/11 (36)	8/13 (62)	
Regularly	5/11 (46)	4/13 (30)	

Table 1 Demographics of study participants

Reliability

The overall inter-observer reliability of the two raters' total scores (J.A. and S.P.) for the fetoscopic laser procedure was excellent (r_s : 0.974 ($p<0.001$)) (Figure 2).

Agreement was less but still strong in the domains concerning 'direct post-operative management' (r_s : 0.722; $p<0.001$) and 'assessment during procedure' (r_s : 0.789; $p<0.001$) as displayed in table 2. The inter-observer variability did not significantly change over time (data not shown).



Domain	No. of steps	R_s	p value
A Preparation in operating room	7	0.956	<0.001
B Ultrasound examination (together with sonographer)	7	0.862	<0.001
C Pre-operative preparations	7	0.943	<0.001
D Positioning and connection of instruments (pre-insertion)	6	0.977	<0.001
E Insertion	5	0.947	<0.001
F Orientation	8	0.857	<0.001
G Laser coagulation	4	0.862	<0.001
H Assessment during procedure	3	0.789	<0.001
I Amniodrainage	2	1.000	<0.001
J Closure	1	0.845	<0.001
K Direct post-operative management	2	0.722	<0.001
Overall	52	0.974	<0.001


Table 2 Inter-observer reliability by domain

R_s : Spearman correlation coefficient

Construct validity

Rater 1’s median score for novices on the assessment tool was 29/52 (56%) (range: 20-43), compared to an median expert score of 47/52 (90%) (range: 44-50) ($p<0.001$). Rater 2’s median novice score similarly demonstrated statistically significant differences between novice and expert performance [30/52 (58%) (range: 19-45) versus 48/52 (92%) (range: 43-52)] ($p<0.001$).

The overall median checklist scores (combining the scores of the two raters) were 28/52 (54%) 20-44) in novices versus 42/52 (81%) (44-51) in experts ($p<0.001$) and were significantly associated with the presence of residual anastomoses as demonstrated in figure 3 ($p=0.002$). Sensitivity-specificity analysis showed an area under the curve of 0.861. Multivariate analyses showed that age (b_1 : 0.203; $p= 0.351$) and gender (b_1 : 0.088; $p=0.539$) of participants were not significantly associated with checklist scores and level of experience.



DISCUSSION

This study assessed the inter-observer reliability and construct validity of a procedure-specific evaluation tool for fetoscopic laser surgery of TTTS, created using the Delphi methodology.⁹ Our instrument effectively distinguished performance of experts and novices with an acceptable level of inter-observer reliability.

Any discussion of evaluation or assessment must address issues of validity and reliability. The instrument will only be useful to educators or surgeons as a measure of competence when it does measure the construct that it intends to measure (validity) and when the results that are obtained are consistent and therefore meaningful (reliability). Inter-observer reliability refers to a degree to which difference in score on the tool reflects a difference in quality of performance rather than a difference between the raters. A high level of inter-observer reliability allows evaluation of skills by different observers and will be minimally affected by the variability of the rater.¹¹

Till today, trainees in fetal surgery are educated according to the “master–apprentice” principle. Direct observation by experts alone may not be a reliable method of assessment and may lead to recall bias due to the retrospective nature of the evaluation. Use of fixed criteria such as a validated checklist by observing experts can address these concerns.^{12,13} Additionally, task-specific checklists provide trainees with detailed methods on how to perform the procedure and enable formative feedback and deliberate practice. To achieve standardization and wide implementation, an assessment tool must be reflective of practice among many institutions; therefore we included participants from three major Fetal Medicine centers.

Validation of assessment tools for training has been done frequently in other medical areas,¹⁴⁻¹⁷ but never in the field of fetal therapy. Observation of surgical skills without structured criteria has poor reliability and will result in a low level of agreement among the raters.¹⁸ The values for inter-observer reliability in this study indicate that our evaluation tool reaches the cut-off of 0.8 deemed acceptable for assessment.¹¹

The purpose of this study was to validate the evaluation tool for surgeon’s technical performance using a highly realistic simulator. Objective feedback to fetal surgeons on their performance based on highly reliable assessment tools could also be of great value for ongoing assessment and lifelong learning. Developing similar assessment tools for other invasive obstetric procedures will make it possible to teach and evaluate

procedures using disseminated learning materials. Since we want to make the curriculum competency based, it is also important to define expert benchmark levels of proficiency for the final curriculum.

Procedure-specific checklists have been shown to be less reliable and less construct valid than global rating scales¹⁹ However, a global assessment scale can make an instrument indistinctly and have an apparent precision, since items are rated on scales (e.g. 1-10) instead of ‘achieved’ or ‘failed’. For feedback purposes it is sufficient to know at a glance which elements need improvement (instead of adding values to the assessed items).

Procedure time and fetoscopy time were significantly lower in the expert group compared to novices. This may be explained by the often interrupted flow of thoughts when performing a procedure for the first time. Surgical steps need to be carried out consciously for novices, as opposed to automatically for experts, making a procedure-specific tool even more valuable for training purposes and combines efficacy (closing all anastomoses) with safety (avoid complications).

A limitation of this study is that a few items identified through the prior Delphi consensus could not be analyzed during the simulator experiments since they take place in the diagnostic and pre-operative phase of the procedure. These steps include: “diagnostic procedure” (e.g. ultrasound examination at out-patient clinic confirming diagnosis and determine treatment options), “pre-surgical management” (e.g. prescription of procedure related medication etc.) and “follow-up ultrasound examination”. Therefore the construct validity and reliability measurement of this tool does not include these particular steps.

Due to nature of the procedure, we were unable to assess the validity of the instrument in surgery on real patients; therefore the simulator was used. Even though the simulator was regarded highly realistic, clinical features such as ‘tissue reaction after firing the laser’ and ‘complications such as bleeding’ could not be simulated. On the other hand, assessment using a simulator model can also be advantageous, since the lack of standardization in real patients makes consistent assessment of technical skills difficult. Advantages of the simulator model include the fact that tasks can be presented consistently to many trainees, who can operate independently, objective assessment by more than one faculty member is possible and there is no intrusion on operating room time, which has financial and ethical advantages.²⁰

For this study, participants were assessed live in the operating room, therefore observers were able to oversee all steps, in contrast to only fetoscopic view or single camera position. This allowed us to evaluate the complete procedure, including all its facets such

as sterility and handling of the instruments. Unfortunately, this element of our study prevented blinding the raters for the level of experience.

The construct validity of the instrument could be further assessed with a study with a pre- and post-training design. Correlation with a learning curve would further support its validity. Future studies should focus on the development and validation of a training curriculum aimed at improving the operative and technical skills of trainees in fetal therapy. Finally, additional studies should be performed to assess how well instructors can evaluate clinical skills when observing surgeons working with real patients and how to implement this into clinical practice.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank all the participants from the MFM centers who generously shared their time, experience and materials for the purpose of this project.

This research is supported by the Dutch Technology Foundation STW, which is part of the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO), and which is partly funded by the Ministry of Economic Affairs.

REFERENCES

- 1 Senat, M. V. *et al.* Endoscopic laser surgery versus serial amnioreduction for severe twin-to-twin transfusion syndrome. *The New England journal of medicine* 351, 136-144, doi:10.1056/NEJMoa032597 (2004).
- 2 Roby, R., Quarello, E. & Ville, Y. Management of fetofetal transfusion syndrome. *Prenat Diagn* 25, 786-795, (2005).
- 3 Slaghekke, F. *et al.* Fetoscopic laser coagulation of the vascular equator versus selective coagulation for twin-to-twin transfusion syndrome: an open-label randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 383, 2144-2151, (2014).
- 4 Akkermans, J. *et al.* A world-wide survey on laser surgery for twin-twin transfusion syndrome. *Ultrasound in obstetrics & gynecology : the official journal of the International Society of Ultrasound in Obstetrics and Gynecology*, (2014).
- 5 De Lia, J. E., Kuhlmann, R. S. & Lopez, K. P. Treating previable twin-twin transfusion syndrome with fetoscopic laser surgery: outcomes following the learning curve. *J Perinat Med* 27, 61-67 (1999).
- 6 Hecher, K., Diehl, W., Ziklignig, L., Vetter, M. & Hackeloer, B. J. Endoscopic laser coagulation of placental anastomoses in 200 pregnancies with severe mid-trimester twin-to-twin transfusion syndrome. *European journal of obstetrics, gynecology, and reproductive biology* 92, 135-139 (2000).
- 7 Papanna, R., Biau, D. J., Mann, L. K., Johnson, A. & Moise, K. J., Jr. Use of the Learning Curve-Cumulative Summation test for quantitative and individualized assessment of competency of a surgical procedure in obstetrics and gynecology: fetoscopic laser ablation as a model. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 204, 218 e211-219, (2011).
- 8 Peeters, S. H. *et al.* Learning curve for fetoscopic laser surgery using cumulative sum analysis. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand*, (2014).
- 9 Peeters, S. H. *et al.* Identification of essential steps in laser procedure for twin-to-twin transfusion syndrome using the delphi methodology: silicone study. *Ultrasound in obstetrics & gynecology : the official journal of the International Society of Ultrasound in Obstetrics and Gynecology*, (2014).
- 10 Pittini, R. *et al.* Teaching invasive perinatal procedures: assessment of a high fidelity simulator-based curriculum. *Ultrasound in obstetrics & gynecology : the official journal of the International Society of Ultrasound in Obstetrics and Gynecology* 19, 478-483, (2002).
- 11 Gallagher, A. G., Ritter, E. M. & Satava, R. M. Fundamental principles of validation, and reliability: rigorous science for the assessment of surgical education and training. *Surgical endoscopy* 17, 1525-1529, (2003).
- 12 Doyle, J. D., Webber, E. M. & Sidhu, R. S. A universal global rating scale for the evaluation of technical skills in the operating room. *American journal of surgery* 193, 551-555; discussion 555, (2007).
- 13 Hiemstra, E., Kolkman, W., Wolterbeek, R., Trimbos, B. & Jansen, F. W. Value of an objective assessment tool in the operating room. *Canadian journal of surgery. Journal canadien de chirurgie* 54, 116-122, (2011).
- 14 Palter, V. N. & Grantcharov, T. P. A prospective study demonstrating the reliability and validity of two procedure-specific evaluation tools to assess operative competence in laparoscopic colorectal surgery. *Surgical endoscopy* 26, 2489-2503, (2012).
- 15 McEvoy, M. D. *et al.* Validity and reliability assessment of detailed scoring checklists for use during perioperative emergency simulation training. *Simulation in healthcare : journal of the Society for Simulation in Healthcare* 9, 295-303, 2014.
- 16 Alici, F., Buerkle, B. & Tempfer, C. B. Objective Structured Assessment of Technical Skills (OSATS) evaluation of hysteroscopy training: a prospective study. *European journal of obstetrics, gynecology, and reproductive biology* 178, 1-5, (2014).
- 17 Tolsgaard, M. G. *et al.* Sustained effect of simulation-based ultrasound training on clinical performance: A randomized trial. *Ultrasound in obstetrics & gynecology : the official journal of the International Society of Ultrasound in Obstetrics and Gynecology*, (2015).
- 18 Reznick, R. K. Teaching and testing technical skills. *American journal of surgery* 165, 358-361 (1993).
- 19 Beard, J. D., Choksy, S. & Khan, S. Assessment of operative competence during carotid endarterectomy. *The British journal of surgery* 94, 726-730, (2007).
- 20 Goff, B. A., Lentz, G. M., Lee, D., Houmard, B. & Mandel, L. S. Development of an objective structured assessment of technical skills for obstetric and gynecology residents. *Obstet Gynecol* 96, 146-150 (2000).

APPENDIX

No.	Domain and substeps	Score
A	Preparation in operating room	7
1	Ultrasound correct settings	
2	Endoscopy tower settings	
3	Positioning of screens	
4	Adjusting lights	
5	Correct laser modus	
6	Correct power settings	
7	Positioning of patient	
B	Ultrasound examination (together with sonographer)	7
8	Identification of donor	
9	Identification of recipient	
10	Identification localization placenta	
11	Identification cord insertions	
12	Assess deepest pockets	
13	Determine expected position equator	
14	Determine insertion site fetoscope	
C	Pre-operative preparations	7
15	Surgical briefing (time out) about (complete) procedure to fetal therapy team	
16	Aseptic procedure for surgeon, scrub nurse and sonographer	
17	Mention maternal condition	
18	All instrumentation remains sterile	
19	All is sufficiently covered	
20	Pre-insertion connection scope - shaft	
21	Pre-insertion connection light cable	
D	Positioning and connection of instruments (pre-insertion)	6
22	Choose fetoscope	
23	Fetoscope: orientation	
24	Fetoscope: focus	
25	Fetoscope: white balance	
26	Connection of laser fiber	
27	Correct loading of laser fiber in fetoscope	
E	Insertion	5
28	Preparation of introduction method	
29	Performance of all manipulations under ultrasound visualization	
30	Correct administration of local anesthetic	
31	Make adequate-size skin incision with surgical knife	
32	Awareness of location of maternal uterine vessels and intestines, and placental edge during insertion	
F	Orientation	8
33	Assess visibility (optional: score visibility)	
34	Determine need for amniotic exchange	
35	Fetoscopic view of placenta	
36	Fetoscopic view of donor	
37	Fetoscopic view of cord insertion recipient	

38	Identification of placental edges	
39	Difference between artery and vene	
40	Find (part of) vascular equator	
G	Laser coagulation	4
41	Coagulation of all vascular anastomoses that cross the vascular equator	
42	Laser fiber correct position in fetoscope	
43	Laser fiber correct distance from vessel during coagulation	
44	Prevent the unnecessary sacrifice of placental tissue	
H	Assessment during procedure	3
45	Prevent unnecessary delay during procedure	
46	Check for complications(e.g. bleeding, rupture intertwin membranes)	
47	Identify and record number and type of anastomoses coagulated	
I	Amniodrainage	2
48	Controlled drainage of polyhydramnios	
49	Assess adequate drainage (ultrasound guided) until pre-defined level	
J	Closure	1
50	Closing skin incision (suture or suture free adhesive product)	
K	Direct post-operative management	2
51	Inform patient, partner/family and referring specialist	
52	Instructions for monitoring of maternal and fetal condition	

Appendix 1 Evaluation instrument

