



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Barriers to research in interventional radiology within the UK*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/195184/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Jenkins, P, MacCormick, A, Harborne, K et al. (4 more authors) (2022) Barriers to research in interventional radiology within the UK. *Clinical Radiology*, 77 (12). e821-e825. ISSN 0009-9260

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crad.2022.08.146>

---

© 2022, Elsevier. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

**Reuse**

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) licence. This licence only allows you to download this work and share it with others as long as you credit the authors, but you can't change the article in any way or use it commercially. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



[eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk)  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

## 1 **Introduction**

2 Since its inception in 1964<sup>1</sup>, Interventional Radiology (IR) has pioneered innovative  
3 procedures and techniques which have led to its rapid expansion. IR is now embedded in the  
4 treatment pathways for many conditions such as trauma, vascular disease and oncology  
5 which should only occur in the presence of evidence. Supporting high calibre research is  
6 central to a speciality's survival, especially with more informed patients, increased scrutiny,  
7 tighter financial constraints and competition from other specialties. Developing IR led  
8 research is paramount to shift the perception of IRs as solely proceduralists to being seen as  
9 a complete clinician, taking full responsibility for the patient's diagnostic work-up,  
10 management decisions and follow-up.

11 Despite the introduction of countless novel procedures, the evidence base in IR has not  
12 caught up to traditional surgical specialties, with the absence of high-level evidence to  
13 support some areas of IR practice. Recently, there has been considerable improvement with  
14 landmark studies such as the UK-ROPE<sup>2</sup> and BASIL<sup>3</sup> trials showing the value of IR therapies,  
15 however these have often been led and co-ordinated by other specialties with IRs often not  
16 playing a major role in the research activities. Without evidence, IR therapies will be  
17 challenged and IR will struggle to compete with established treatments, develop services,  
18 obtain research funding and garner support from referring clinicians. As a specialty, IR needs  
19 to develop a greater academic presence to ensure the longevity of the specialty.

20 The number of research active academic interventional radiologists within the UK is unknown  
21 and suspected to be low, with the authors estimating less than 10 University-funded clinical  
22 academics in IR. The recent announcement of the National Institute of Health Research (NIHR)

23 Senior Investigator appointments had no radiologists<sup>4</sup> and out of the 367 listed previous  
24 investigators there were no interventional radiologists (IRs)<sup>5</sup>.

25 A parallel with Emergency Medicine can be drawn, also a relatively young specialty (with their  
26 Royal College only established in 1993)<sup>6</sup>, which has grown at a fast pace with particular focus  
27 on utilising new and innovative technology, however the academic output from emergency  
28 medicine has flourished, with a large network of journals, established academics, ACF's and  
29 trainee-led research networks producing high caliber research<sup>7</sup>. In a similar vein, the relatively  
30 new specialty of vascular surgery also has a strong track record in research, having emerged  
31 from general surgery where there is already an established research culture. In contrast, IR  
32 currently faces more challenges due to a lack of patient ownership, variability of practice, and  
33 at times too much focus on the technical procedure rather than the holistic management for  
34 a patient, which highlights some perceived barriers to the development of academia within  
35 the specialty. Similarly, within clinical radiology as a whole, research is not as ingrained as  
36 other specialties and there remain significant barriers to research<sup>8</sup>. We aim to identify barriers  
37 to being involved in IR research, where different challenges exist, and advocate potential  
38 solutions to advance and support IR academia within the UK

## 39 **Methods**

### 40 *Data Collection*

41 An electronic survey was compiled using Google Forms, approved by the [REDACTED]  
42 and distributed to [REDACTED] Trainee members by email on 15<sup>th</sup> October 2021 and remained open  
43 for 2 months. The questionnaire remained open until after [REDACTED] [REDACTED]  
44 and trainee day on [REDACTED]. This was also shared on  
45 the social media platform [REDACTED] account to

46 access. The target audience for this survey were IRs from all stages of training, including junior  
47 trainees, IR fellows and consultants, however medical students and foundation doctors were  
48 also included. Questions regarding research experience, qualifications, academic publications  
49 and career intent as well as the perceived barriers to being involved in research in IR. The  
50 sample questionnaire is provided in appendix 1. Data was analysed in Microsoft Excel 365.

## 51 **Results**

52 A total of 106 responses were received from the invited participants. The greatest proportion  
53 of responses were from junior radiology trainees (42.5%) and senior radiology trainees  
54 (25.5%). This was closely followed by consultants (18.9%), foundation trainees (7.5%) and  
55 medical students (5.7%).

56 83% of respondents (88/106) had not undertaken any postgraduate research qualifications  
57 and of the 18 who had, only 5 had undertaken a PhD and 2 an MD, with the remainder  
58 undertaking a Masters in research. 56.4% (44/78) of respondents stated that they would be  
59 interested in undertaking clinical research training leading to a PhD or MD.

60

61 The majority of respondents had led a retrospective audit (89.6% (95/106), with 57.5%  
62 (61/106) having led a retrospective research project. Only 22.6% (24/106) of respondents  
63 stated they had led a prospective research project. 73.6% (78/106) of respondents had been  
64 a named author on a paper in a peer reviewed journal. Of the 77 who responded to the follow  
65 up question, the majority (57.1%) had published within radiology specific journals with only  
66 24 (31.2%) publishing within an IR specific journal. Over half (50.6%) of respondents (50.6%)  
67 had published within a surgical journal. Table 1 provides an overview of the type of journals  
68 published within.

69

70 Respondents were asked how confident they would be in leading a research project from the  
71 start, with 0 representing 'not confident at all' and 5 representing 'very confident'. The  
72 median response was a 2, indicating an overall lack of confidence. Similarly, respondents felt  
73 unconfident to progress a research project within their local department (median score 2).  
74 Despite this 81.1% planned on being involved in research within their future career. The main  
75 barriers to research identified are listed within Table 2 with lack of time, lack of senior  
76 supervision and lack of research experience being given as the top three items. The main  
77 reasons for wanting to be involved in research were 'in search of new knowledge', 'personal  
78 development' and 'moving the specialty forward'. These are highlighted within Table 3.

79

## 80 **Discussion**

81 The results of this study highlight significant interest in research amongst radiology trainees  
82 and consultants, however, numerous barriers which hinder research activity and output in IR  
83 should be addressed.

84 Firstly there was a paucity of respondents who had undertaken a postgraduate qualification  
85 in research. Although this is not a requirement to be involved in research, the skills and  
86 experience that can be gained through the completion of a Masters in Research or an MD/PhD  
87 can be of paramount importance to ensure high quality research is undertaken, establish a  
88 robust research infrastructure and develop an academic culture. These skills may include  
89 critical appraisal, academic writing, statistical analysis and understanding of clinical trial  
90 design. Unsurprisingly, there was a general lack of confidence from respondents in their  
91 ability to lead a research project from the start given the lack of formal research training.

92 More should be done to encourage IR trainees to undertake research degrees by addressing  
93 funding and accessibility issues. Greater focus should also be placed towards conducting  
94 meaningful research studies instead of less impactful audits amongst the trainees which are  
95 sometimes done as a tick box exercise.

96 The overwhelming response from trainees is that there is enthusiasm towards research which  
97 is not matched by designated research orientated pathways nor a standard requirement for  
98 a consultant job. These factors lead to a lack fo academic IRs in the UK, both at trainee and  
99 consultant level. The majority of Academics are in a honorary position which does not provide  
100 designated time for research, nor require PHD candidate supervision, where much research  
101 is created. Designated chairs are required to be created to promote the research through  
102 PhD / MD supervision and expand the next generation of IR research.

103 The lack of availability of academic supervision by senior interventional radiologists is  
104 concerning. Trainees who wish to undertake higher degrees in research should consider  
105 approaching allied medical specialties such as Oncology, Surgery, Cardiology and Emergency  
106 Medicine to support their academic development within IR. Imaging based research  
107 opportunities are growing with the advent of artificial intelligence, big data and predictive  
108 imaging biomarkers. It is important that trainees are supported by both radiologists and other  
109 specialties to undertake these projects which will also help promote cross-specialty  
110 research.<sup>9-11</sup>

111 The required research support from outside of IR is reflected in the types of journals that the  
112 respondents are publishing within with the most common journal to publish in being  
113 radiological themed. However a large proportion of papers have also been published in  
114 surgical journals, in contrast to the smaller number published within IR specific journals. This

115 may be due to the wider availability and range of higher impact surgical journals in which to  
116 publish. Currently, no UK based IR-specific journal is available, and developing one would  
117 potentially increase the accessibility of publishing and communicating scientific findings for  
118 the UK IR community.

119 In addition to support and experience, time was identified as a key barrier. One radiology-  
120 specific reason for this is the radiology fellowship examination structure, notorious in their  
121 difficulty, frequency and how early on in training they must be taken, leaving minimal time  
122 for research<sup>12</sup>. Following exam completion, there is a relatively short period of time to upskill  
123 clinically in IR whilst retaining diagnostic skills before applying for consultant posts. The Royal  
124 College of Radiologists (RCR) has commenced a new direct entry route into IR for prospective  
125 radiology applicants, a step towards IR becoming a separate specialty as seen in the USA<sup>4</sup>.  
126 This may help to recruit interested candidates who had previously considered surgical  
127 specialties and with the early IR exposure, they may be more engaged with IR research earlier  
128 in their training. The 2021 RCR IR curriculum also reiterates the need for all to have research  
129 experience as a pre-requisite for completion of training which hopefully renews the focus on  
130 academia within IR training and translates to subsequent increased academic productivity  
131 within the UK IR community.

132 Senior trainees and consultants highlighted lack of time as a key barrier to conducting  
133 research, partly due to a heavy workload from understaffed rotas. Currently there are also no  
134 dedicated IR Academic Clinical Fellows (ACF's) to give trainees dedicated time to conduct  
135 research, and those who do choose to undertake higher research training will likely undertake  
136 projects with limited IR applicability and are supervised by diagnostic radiologists or clinicians  
137 from other clinical specialties. Addressing the IR consultant workforce shortage through

138 increasing training numbers will also free up more time for research. In addition, developing  
139 a shift in culture to prioritising research that supports holistic patient care rather than  
140 focusing too much on the technical procedural part will also be beneficial. Funding for  
141 protected research posts and research programmed activities should be encouraged by  
142 employers, improving the attractiveness of the specialty. In the longer term, the aim would  
143 be to develop dedicated tenured university posts for IRs who would be able to mentor and  
144 support future academic trainees. The value of additional support from research nurses and  
145 clinical trials units cannot be emphasised enough, but both ultimately come with financial  
146 cost, however early engagement with such services will improve the quality of IR research.

147 The newly formed UK National Interventional Radiology Trainee Research (UNITE)  
148 collaborative,<sup>13</sup> an IR trainee led research network, provides another platform for multi-  
149 centre IR projects which can stimulate early academic interest. Similarly, increasing  
150 awareness of NIHR research pathways, even for established consultants, will help IRs identify  
151 tailored options for them to be more involved with research. Calls for funding towards IR from  
152 the NIHR, RCR and other research societies would be welcomed, specifically targeted towards  
153 increasing the availability of supervision and support for trainees interested in research. The  
154 development of the NIHR principal investigator (PI) program, which provides early career  
155 researchers with on the job academic training opportunities by working closely with a local PI  
156 on a research study, is another way for IRs to obtain practical experience and mentorship<sup>14</sup>.

157 Additional funding avenues should be promoted amongst the IR community including  
158 research bursaries aimed at pump priming<sup>15</sup> and small research grants to enable clinicians to  
159 gain experience in grant application and help develop initial ideas that may lead to larger scale  
160 externally funded studies. One research approach is using available registry data, such as the

161 National Vascular Registry (NVR) or other societal or industry led registries which may foster  
162 further collaboration which brings additional funding from the relevant device or  
163 pharmaceutical company.

164 This survey demonstrates that although there are still significant barriers to IR research in the  
165 UK, tremendous enthusiasm does exist. Respondents highlighted the interest in moving the  
166 specialty forward, development of new knowledge and personal development. Over half of  
167 respondents stated they would like to undertake an MD or PhD and 81% planned on being  
168 involved in research during their career. Whilst this is only aspirational, this does highlight the  
169 interest for research which we hope will continue to drive IR towards an evidence-based  
170 specialty if supported well.

171 The main limitation of this study is that it only represents a snapshot of UK IR's and trainees.  
172 The questionnaire was intended for trainees with a desire to undertake IR training, not only  
173 those in a formal IR training post, therefore due to the subjectivity the respondents may have  
174 self-identified, particularly without IR dedicated ST1 trainees, it was difficult to define a junior  
175 IR trainee. In addition, this is a self-selecting group, who are likely to respond to a  
176 questionnaire about research if they are interested in research. This does, however,

177 demonstrate a strong interest in research within this community and highlights the barriers  
178 that are perceived by even the most enthusiastic of researchers which need to be addressed.

Suggested actions

1. The development of a specific UK IR journal
2. NIHR IR specific funding calls and further development of the NIHR PI scheme towards IR
3. Increasing awareness of the [REDACTED]
4. The development of trainee research networks within IR – Such as UNITE
5. The recent development of an IR research fellow to enable registry data to be analysed
6. RCR to highlight radiology research opportunities e.g. 1 year research fellowships, dedicated IR research grants and PhD funding
7. RCR to encourage more trainees to be involved with research during training e.g. through new curriculum
8. **Push towards creation of IR dedicated tenured university posts**

179

180

181 **Conclusion**

182 An urgent need to support the development of research within interventional radiology is  
183 called for. The enthusiasm by trainees (in particular) to be involved in research and undertake  
184 additional research training is encouraging, however, this needs to be matched by support  
185 from trusts, societies and the Royal College. IR's may need to consider looking towards allied  
186 specialties for support and collaboration in developing a research portfolio.

187

188

189 **References**

- 190 1. Dotter, C. Judkins M. Transluminal Treatment of Arteriosclerotic Obstruction  
191 Description of a New Technic and a Preliminary Report of Its Application. *Circulation*. 1964  
192 30:654–670.
- 193 2. Ray AF, Powell J, Speakman MJ, et al. Efficacy and safety of prostate artery  
194 embolization for benign prostatic hyperplasia: an observational study and propensity-  
195 matched comparison with transurethral resection of the prostate (the UK-ROPE study). *BJU*  
196 *Int*. 2018 Aug;122(2):270-282.
- 197 3. Bradbury AW, Adam DJ, Bell J. Bypass versus Angioplasty in Severe Ischaemia of the  
198 Leg (BASIL) trial: An intention-to-treat analysis of amputation-free and overall survival in  
199 patients randomized to a bypass surgery-first or a balloon angioplasty-first revascularization  
200 strategy. *J Vasc Surg*. 2010 May;51(5 Suppl):5S-17S.
- 201 4. National Institute for Health Research. NIHR Senior Investigators 2021. 2021  
202 Available at <https://www.nihr.ac.uk/documents/nihr-senior-investigators-2021/26864>  
203 accessed 21/3/22
- 204 5. National Institute for Health Research. Senior investigator Directory 2022. Available  
205 at <https://si.gmg-is.co.uk/home>. Accessed 21/3/22
- 206 6. Williams DJ. Brief history of the specialty of emergency medicine *Emergency*  
207 *Medicine Journal* 2018;35:139-141.

- 208 7. Cottey L, Roberts T, Graham B, et al. Trainee Emergency Research Network (TERN)  
209 and Paediatric Emergency Research in the UK and Ireland (PERUKI), *et al* Need for recovery  
210 amongst emergency physicians in the UK and Ireland: a cross-sectional survey *BMJ*  
211 *Open* 2020;10:e041485.
- 212 8. Chan N, Gangi A, Kamaledeen S, Pantelidou M, Brown P. RADIANT: the Radiology  
213 Academic Network for Trainees Clinical Radiology, Volume 75, Issue 11, 813 - 814
- 214 9. O'Connor, J., Aboagye, E., Adams, J, et al . Imaging biomarker roadmap for cancer  
215 studies. *Nat Rev Clin Oncol* 14, 169–186 (2017).
- 216 10. deSouza, N.M., Achten, E., Alberich-Bayarri, A, et al. Validated imaging biomarkers  
217 as decision-making tools in clinical trials and routine practice: current status and  
218 recommendations from the EIBALL\* subcommittee of the European Society of Radiology  
219 (ESR). *Insights Imaging* 10, 87 (2019).
- 220 11. S Sangha, A Gupta, K Negishi, F Pathan. The reporting of reproducibility of cardiac  
221 imaging biomarkers, *European Heart Journal*, Volume 41, Issue Supplement\_2, November  
222 2020, ehaa946.3549.
- 223 12. RCR, 2021. Clinical radiology exams. available at [https://www.rcr.ac.uk/clinical-](https://www.rcr.ac.uk/clinical-radiology/exams)  
224 [radiology/exams](https://www.rcr.ac.uk/clinical-radiology/exams), accessed 4/1/22
- 225 13. Mandal I, Zhong J, Borchert R, et al. The UNITE Collaborative: Early Experiences of  
226 Introducing Collaborative Trainee Research to Interventional Radiology in the United  
227 Kingdom. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol*. 2021 Oct 19:1–2.

228 14. NIHR. 2021. Associate principle investigator scheme. Available at  
229 [https://www.nihr.ac.uk/health-and-care-professionals/career-development/associate-prin-](https://www.nihr.ac.uk/health-and-care-professionals/career-development/associate-principal-investigator-scheme.htm)  
230 [cipal-investigator-scheme.htm](https://www.nihr.ac.uk/health-and-care-professionals/career-development/associate-principal-investigator-scheme.htm) accessed 4/1/22

231 15. BSIR Education & Research Committee 2021/22. (2022). BSIR bursaries 2022. Availa-  
232 ble at: <https://www.bsir.org/society/bsir-bursaries-2022/#use-of-research-funds>. accessed  
233 4/1/22

234

235

236

237 **Table 1**

238 Respondents were asked what type of journals they had published in  
239

Type of journals published within.	Responses (%)
Radiological themed	44 (57.1%)
Surgical	39 (50.6%)
Interventional radiology	24 (31.2%)
Organ specific	16 (20.8%)
Basic science	11 (14.3%)

240

241

242 **Table 2**

243

244 Respondents were asked what they felt the key barriers were to their engagement within IR  
245 research

	Responses (%)
247 Lack of Time	68 (64.2)
248 Lack of Research Experience	65 (61.3)
249 Lack of Senior Supervision	62 (58.5)
250 Lack of Funding	58 (54.7)
251 Lack of Supporting Administrative Staff	45 (42.5)
252 Unable to Gain Access to Required Data	27 (25.5)
253 Lack of Support from Allied Specialties	23 (21.7)
254 Lack of Personal Interest	17 (16.0)

255

256

257

258 **Table 3**

259

260 Respondents were asked the main factors that made them interested in research

261

	Responses (%)
Search for new knowledge	82 (77.4%)
Sense of personal development	71 (67%)
Move the specialty forwards	70 (66%)
Prestige	21 (19.8%)

262