

Technical and Functional Validation of a Teleoperated Multirobots Platform for Minimally Invasive Surgery

Alice Leporini¹, Elettra Oleari, Carmela Landolfo, Alberto Sanna, Alessandro Larcher, Giorgio Gandaglia, Nicola Fossati, Fabio Muttin, Umberto Capitanio, Francesco Montorsi, Andrea Salonia, Marco Minelli, *Graduate Student Member, IEEE*, Federica Ferraguti², *Member, IEEE*, Cristian Secchi, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Saverio Farsoni, Alessio Sozzi³, Marcello Bonfé⁴, *Member, IEEE*, Narcis Sayols, Albert Hernansanz, *Member, IEEE*, Alicia Casals, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Sabine Hertle, Fabio Cuzzolin⁵, Andrew Dennison, Andreas Melzer, Gernot Kronreif, Salvatore Siracusano, Fabio Falezza, Francesco Setti⁶, and Riccardo Muradore⁷, *Member, IEEE*

Abstract—Nowadays Robotic assisted Minimally Invasive Surgeries (R-MIS) are the elective procedures for treating highly accurate and scarcely invasive pathologies, thanks to their ability to empower surgeons' dexterity and skills. The research on new Multi-Robots Surgery (MRS) platform is cardinal to the development of a new SARAS surgical robotic platform, which aims at carrying out autonomously the assistants tasks during R-MIS procedures. In this work, we will present the SARAS MRS platform validation protocol, framed in order to assess: (i) its technical performances in purely dexterity exercises, and (ii) its functional performances. The results obtained show a prototype able to put the users in the condition of accomplishing the tasks

requested (both dexterity- and surgical-related), even with reasonably lower performances respect to the industrial standard. The main aspects on which further improvements are needed result to be the stability of the end effectors, the depth perception and the vision systems, to be enriched with dedicated virtual fixtures. The SARAS' aim is to reduce the main surgeon's workload through the automation of assistive tasks which would benefit both surgeons and patients by facilitating the surgery and reducing the operation time.

Index Terms—Validation protocol, tele-operated surgical robotic system, robotic end effector task metrics, functional evaluation, surgical-related tasks.

Manuscript received November 14, 2019; revised April 14, 2020; accepted April 19, 2020. Date of publication April 24, 2020; date of current version May 20, 2020. This article was recommended for publication by Associate Editor G. Dagnino and Editor P. Dario upon evaluation of the reviewers' comments. This work was supported by the European Unions Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme (SARAS Project) under Grant 779813. (Corresponding author: Alice Leporini.)

Alice Leporini, Elettra Oleari, Carmela Landolfo, and Alberto Sanna are with the Department of "eServices 4 Life and Health," IRCCS Ospedale San Raffaele, 20132 Milan, Italy (e-mail: leporini.alice@hsr.it).

Alessandro Larcher, Giorgio Gandaglia, Nicola Fossati, Fabio Muttin, Umberto Capitanio, Francesco Montorsi, and Andrea Salonia are with the Division Experimental Oncology/Unit of Urology, URI-Urological Research Institute, IRCCS Ospedale San Raffaele, 20132 Milan, Italy.

Marco Minelli, Federica Ferraguti, and Cristian Secchi are with the Department of Science and Methods for Engineering, University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, 42122 Reggio Emilia, Italy.

Saverio Farsoni, Alessio Sozzi, and Marcello Bonfé are with the Department of Engineering, University of Ferrara, 44121 Ferrara, Italy.

Narcis Sayols, Albert Hernansanz, and Alicia Casals are with the Department of Automatic Control, Technical University of Catalonia, 08034 Barcelona, Spain.

Sabine Hertle is with Medineering GmbH, 82229 München, Germany. Fabio Cuzzolin is with the Department of Computing and Communication Technologies, Oxford Brookes University, Oxford OX3 0BP, U.K.

Andrew Dennison and Andreas Melzer are with the Institute for Medical Science and Technology, University of Dundee, Dundee DD1 4HN, U.K.

Gernot Kronreif is with the Research Area 1 Department, Austrian Center for Medical Innovation and Technology, 2700 Wiener Neustadt, Austria.

Salvatore Siracusano, Fabio Falezza, Francesco Setti, and Riccardo Muradore are with the Department of Computer Science, University of Verona, 37134 Verona, Italy.

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/TMRB.2020.2990286

I. INTRODUCTION

THE ADVENT of Minimally Invasive Surgery (MIS), both in its declinations as Laparoscopy- and Robotic-assisted procedures (L-MIS and R-MIS), has revolutionised the treatment of different pathologies, especially in the abdominal area [1]. Since the commercialization of the first tele-operated surgical robot, the da Vinci system (Intuitive Surgical Inc., Sunnyvale, CA) in 1999, and thanks to the ever increasing technological advancements of its successive releases, nowadays R-MIS has established as a gold standard for scarcely invasive surgeries like Radical Prostatectomy [2]. In fact, modern surgical systems offer to surgeons: (i) improved vision, through a three-dimensional visualization that provides depth perception [3], (ii) increased dexterity, thanks to the wrist-like articulations of the instruments mounted on the robotic arms [4], [5], and (iii) a better control of the surgical instruments, with tremor abolition and motion scaling, compared with standard L-MIS [1]. In recent years, researches in surgical robotics produced different prototypes of master-slave surgical robotic platforms for various purposes, like the Micro Hand S, a low-cost and easy-to-use system (Tianjin University, China) for R-MIS abdominal surgery [6] or the M7 robot (Stanford Research Institute, US) for ultra-sound

guided tumor biopsies which master console is mobile [7], the MC²E system, a compact and lightweight robot for endoscopic surgery [8], the Raven system which manipulators are too massive to be easily portable and they are not sterilizable, and the Laprotek system [9], not autoclavable, which was developed to be smaller, less costly than current systems [10], [11]. There are also a few *almost ready* commercial products such as: Senhance Surgical System by TransEnterix,¹ SPORT Surgical System by Titan Medical,² Hugo by Medtronic, Versius Surgical Robotic System by CMR Surgical,³ and the one by Johnson & Johnson. Most of them are in advanced design phase, other are still kept secret, even though at the moment none of them is a real alternative to the da Vinci system. Nevertheless, the SARAS system will be able to work together with all of them since our platform does not need any information besides the video streaming. The SARAS robotic assistant system is smaller, cheaper, and easier to use than the current systems (*i.e.*, da Vinci system) and can be attached to the side of an operating table in the desired position. The manipulators and robotic instruments can be sterilized and cleaned using the same standard procedures used for any other surgical equipment, and no sterile plastic draping is required for the surgical robot system. It is within this context that the present work lays its ground: the EU funded *Smart Autonomous Robotic Assistant Surgeon* project (SARAS, saras-project.eu) aims at developing a new generation of autonomous surgical assistant robots for R-MIS, thus allowing a single surgeon to perform the procedure. To reach this challenging purpose, a preliminary tele-operated version of the future autonomous robotic system has been implemented: the so called *SARAS Multi-Robots Surgery (MRS)* platform [12]. It is conceived as a master-slave robotic system, to be used by an assistant surgeon (who usually operates with standard laparoscopic tools), while s/he is supporting the execution of a R-MIS procedure. In the present contribution we present the validation protocol drawn, and the results obtained, in order to test the performances of the SARAS MRS platform, and to preliminary assess the related suitability in carrying out its intended purpose. Taking into account that, for the operating surgeon, robotic surgery skills are composed by a mixture of human-computer interaction skills (like a good spatial and depth perception in 3D vision with a mediated hand-eye coordination) and the traditional surgical technique [13], [14], complementary aspects have been taken into account while framing the validation protocol. First, in order to evaluate the dexterity-related performances of the SARAS MRS prototype while executing simple manipulation exercises, specific metrics, from the robotic systems motion-data collection, have been considered. These are meant to be compared with those emerging from the execution of the same exercises with a reference commercial robotic platform for surgery (*i.e.*, the da Vinci IS1200 controlled by using the da Vinci Research Kit, dVRK [15]). This part of the protocol is going to be later referred as the *technical validation*. Then, a more qualitative




Fig. 1. Multi-Robots Surgery (MRS) platform architecture.

investigation is carried out, in order to assess if the operator is capable of correctly fulfilling simple surgical-related exercises, which are meant to train motion and cooperation skills preliminary to the real surgical practice. For this reason, this second part is addressed as *functional validation* and it is concluded by the execution of specific steps of a simplified Robotic Assisted Radical Prostatectomy (RARP), by real surgeons tele-operating the da Vinci and SARAS platforms, on synthetic abdominal phantom models [16]. The phantom models have been designed and produced by the Austrian Center for Medical Innovation and Technology (ACMIT)⁴ [12]. The main contributions of this paper are:

- the development of a teleoperated architecture tailored to the assistant surgeon;
- a technical and functional validation of the collected data to safety train the fully autonomous platform that will be developed in a second phase of the EU funded SARAS project.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section II, the Multi-Robots Surgery platform is described; in Section III the validation protocol for the assessment of the MRS platform is presented. Sections IV and V, respectively, detail the results of the technical and functional evaluations and discuss them. Conclusions are drawn in Section VI, together with a discussion on the future perspectives of this study.

II. SARAS MULTI-ROBOTS SURGERY PLATFORM

The SARAS Multi-Robots Surgery (MRS) platform is an example of multi-master/multi-slave (MMMS) bilateral teleoperation system, where two users cooperate on a shared environment by means of a telerobotics setup. The overall system architecture is reported in Figure 1. In this scenario the main surgeon controls the da Vinci tools from the da Vinci console, whereas the assistant surgeon teleoperates standard laparoscopic tools mounted on the SARAS robotic arms. Each surgical instrument is inserted into a trocar, that is a medical device made up of an obturator (in metal or plastic), a cannula (basically a hollow tube), and a seal. They serve as portals for the placement of the surgical instruments within the patient's abdomen. The SARAS arms are controlled from a remote station equipped with virtual reality and haptic devices. The

¹<https://transenterix.com/>

²<https://titanmedicalinc.com/technology/>

³<https://cmrsurgical.com/versius/>

⁴<http://www.acmit.at>




Fig. 2. The SARAS Multirobots Surgery platform implementation: master console (left) and robotic arms (right).

assistant surgeon will perform the same actions as in standard robotic surgery, but here by teleoperating the tools instead of moving them manually.⁵

A. Assistant Master Console

The assistant master console (see Fig. 2, left) consists of:

- Two G-Coder Simball (R) joysticks,⁶ used by the assistant surgeon to teleoperate the assistive robotic arms;
- Two 3D Systems Touch (R) haptic devices,⁷ to apply force feedback on the users' hands;
- An Oculus Rift device⁸ used to stream the da Vinci endoscope images with augmented information.

Simball is commonly used to train surgeons on laparoscopic operations, due to its ability to emulate with realism the feeling of a real laparoscopic instrument (in particular the mechanical constraint of the trocars through which the instruments are inserted into the peritoneum of the patient). In our setup we modified the standard configuration of simball devices in order to replicate the same configuration of the robotic arms. The Simball device is bound to the end effector of Touch haptic device, allowing to propagate the force feedback generated by the haptic device to the surgeons' hands. With this configuration the assistant surgeon can feel virtual objects with a true-to-life touch sensation. We use the Oculus Rift device to provide the necessary visual feedback to the assistant surgeon by replicating the same information provided to the main surgeon on the da Vinci console monitors.

B. Robotic Arms

Each SARAS robotic arm (see Fig. 2, right) consists of three different modules:

- 1) one passive *Positioning Arm* with 7 degrees of freedom (DOFs) for rough positioning of the instrument;
- 2) one *Fine Positioning Robot* with 3 actuated DOFs to position the instrument;
- 3) one *SARAS Adapter* with 1 DOF as slot for different surgical tools.

⁵SARAS MRS platform experimental setup at the following link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NMBiRqwLgZE>.

⁶<http://g-coder.com/simball-duo>

⁷<https://www.3dsystems.com/haptics-devices/touch>

⁸<https://www.oculus.com/rift>

The *Positioning Arm* is a passive mechatronic device – *i.e.*, the arm can only be moved manually – for holding and positioning surgical instruments via passive adapters or active robot end effectors. It is fixed to the operating table by an integrated clamp and can be moved and locked in different positions to enable the accessibility of the operating field. The *Fine Positioning Robot* is an active mechatronic device for holding and guiding the instruments during the surgery. It is mounted on the final link of the Positioning Arm and allows for spatially limited but extremely precise movements of the instrument. The motion is guaranteed by two actuated kinematics chains with identical geometry, followed by a linear actuator for the vertical motion. A specific Application Programming Interface (API) of the system allows to fix the remote center of motion along the main axis of the laparoscopic tool where the corresponding trocar is located. The *SARAS Adapter* is an active mechatronic device for holding and guiding the endoscopic instrument. It is attached at the end of the Fine Positioning Robot and is only responsible for the last degrees of freedom of the surgical tool – *i.e.*, opening and closing the tool (scissors, forceps, clip appliers, etc.) and rotating around the main axis of the tool.

The SARAS robotic arms⁹ have been designed and produced by Medineering GmbH,¹⁰ a partner of the SARAS consortium.

C. Bilateral Teleoperation Architecture

Safe and stable interaction between master console and robotic arms is achieved by means of a passivity based two-layer architecture introduced in [17] and applied to surgical robotics in [18]. In particular, the framework is composed of two layers placed in a hierarchical structure. Each layer is designed for a specific purpose: the upper layer to obtain transparency (*i.e.*, the user gets the experience that s/he is directly manipulating the environment), the lower layer to maintain passivity (*i.e.*, the energy which can be extracted from the system is bounded from below by the injected and initial stored energy) and, therefore, guarantee a stable behavior of the teleoperated system. More details about the implementation of

⁹A complete description of the SARAS robotic arms is shown in the deliverable D7.2 of SARAS project (www.saras-project.eu).

¹⁰<http://www.medineering.de>

TABLE I
TECHNICAL AND FUNCTIONAL TASKS' SPECIFICATIONS

Task	SARAS Users	da Vinci® Users	# of reps/user	# of tasks/user
Point to Point	3	1	20	60
Follow a line	3	1	5	15
Goal and Ring	4	0	6	23
Needle grasping	4	0	5	20
Thread cutting	4	0	5	20

the teleoperation architecture in the SARAS platform can be found in [19].

III. VALIDATION PROTOCOL

SARAS MRS is a prototype tele-operated platform meant to be able to cooperate with another external robotic system during R-MIS. Therefore, the validation, and corresponding evaluation, of its performances embraces different aspects: (i) its capability to reproduce the intended movements of the operator, (ii) its ability to perform single and cooperative surgical-related tasks, and (iii) its effectiveness in performing the needed passages during a simulated surgical procedure. On this basis, the validation of the SARAS MRS platform was conceived as twofold: on one side, it has been tested on specific *technical performance parameters* to be compared with the same ones derived through a commercial robotic surgical system; on the other hand, a *functional validation* was carried out in order to evaluate its performances in actions, and tasks, connected to the surgical practice. The corresponding protocols are detailed in the next paragraphs.

A. Technical Validation

This first part of the validation protocol focused on a *quantitative evaluation* of specific *technical parameters*, collected during the execution of simple dexterity tasks. The aim is to derive an assessment of the SARAS MRS performances in comparison to our reference gold standard robotic platform, *i.e.*, the da Vinci IS1200 system. The validation tests sessions were held at the ALTAIR Robotics Lab premises (Verona, Italy), where both the robotic systems are available. Four subjects took part to the tests, IT PhD students from the ALTAIR lab: three teleoperating SARAS and one the da Vinci.

Each subject performed two dexterity exercises: namely, the *Point-to-Point* task and the *Follow-a-line* one. Before starting the test session, the subjects had the chance to get acquainted with the system having at disposal 15 minutes, in which freely trying to reproduce the tasks. In the *Point-to-Point* one, the users were asked to move the end effector mounted on the right SARAS arm (a scissor) between two fixed points, called start and target. In the *Follow-a-line* task, the users were requested to follow a semi-circular trajectory with the right SARAS end effector (see Fig. 3). The same tasks were also repeated with the da Vinci system. Table I summarizes the tests' specifications. All objective performance metrics were based on kinematic measurements of the instrument tips.




Fig. 3. Technical Validation: Point to Point tasks (*left*) and Follow a line task (*right*).

Kinematics of the da Vinci tools were collected using the dVRK interface at 75 Hz (determined by API). Kinematics of SARAS arms were collected by means of internal APIs directly embedded in the SARAS MRS platform software. In both cases data are recorded using Robot Operating System (ROS) for communication between different machines and stored in a rosbag. All these data are provided w.r.t. a common reference frame which is rigidly connected with the target points for all the experiments. Post processing of data was performed in MATLAB (version R2018b; Mathworks, Inc., Natick, MA, USA). Variables of interest streamed from the API were position (x , y , and z location) of the instrument tips.

According to [5], [14], the following tasks' parameters have been taken into account for the SARAS performance assessment:

- *Displacement time [s] (DT)*: is the average time to perform a complete task;
- *Trajectory length [cm] (TL)*: is the length of the instrument's pathway between the starting position and the target/ending position:

$$TL = \int_{t_{\text{start}}}^{t_{\text{target}}} \sqrt{\left(\frac{dx}{dt}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{dy}{dt}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{dz}{dt}\right)^2} dt \quad (1)$$

where x , y , z are the 3D displacement of x , y and z axes of the SARAS right end-effector;

- *Movement speed [cm/s] (MS)*: is the average velocity of movements of the SARAS right robotic end effector during the task;
- *Trajectory redundancy [%] (TR)*: is the ratio of the actual distance to the linear distance. L_1 is the distance covered by the end effector and L_2 represents the linear distance




Fig. 4. Exemplification of the Trajectory Redundancy.

between the starting position and the target position [14]:

$$TR = \frac{L_1}{L_2} \quad (2)$$

(see Figure 4);

- *Maximum deviation [cm]*: is an indicator of the precision with which the end effector follows the expected trajectory. It is evaluated as the mean of the maximum deviations between the real and expected trajectories;
- *Precision in completing the task [cm]*: is an indicator of the precision with which the end effector reaches the start and target points. It is evaluated as the mean of the maximum deviations between the real and expected coordinates of the two points.

B. Functional Validation

The second part of the validation protocol aimed at evaluating the effectiveness of the SARAS MRS platform in executing surgical-related tasks, on two different levels: the first one is *Quantitative Functional validation*, that is the ability to accomplish cooperative exercises (*i.e.*, between one arm of SARAS and one of the da Vinci), which are preparatory to the surgical practice. The exercises to be evaluated are inspired by the tasks normally used during training curricula for surgeons to acquire specific skills for L-MIS or R-MIS [20], [21], [22]. The second one is *Qualitative Functional validation*, the effectiveness in allowing the execution of a simulated surgical procedure. The RARP procedure has been specifically modeled [16] and simplified [12] in order to cover the key passages of the surgical practice and demonstrate the feasibility of the cooperation between the two robotic platforms. This last piece of validation is going to be referred as *Qualitative Functional validation*, as it aims at evaluating SARAS performances in a qualitative way, relying on the feedback from expert surgeons who have experienced it on the following topics: (i) the perceived satisfaction in tele-operating SARAS, and (ii) the coordination and cooperation between the surgeons using the two robotic platforms.

1) *Quantitative Functional Validation*: as for the Technical Validation, these functional tests were held at the ALTAIR lab in Verona, with four operators of the SARAS MRS platform. The experimental procedure was also similar: after a familiarization period, the subjects performed the *Goal and Ring* task, the *Needle Grasping* task and the *Thread Cutting* task (see Figure 5). The first consists in passing a colored ring from the right da Vinci arm to the left SARAS one, and placing it




Fig. 5. Quantitative Functional Validation: Goal and Ring (*top left*) task, Needle Grasping (*top right*) task and Thread Cutting task.

in a square of the corresponding color. The second asks for grasping a surgical needle, maintained in position by the right da Vinci arm, with a grasper held by the left SARAS arm. The third requires to cut a surgical thread, maintained in position by the left and right da Vinci arms, with a scissor held by the right SARAS arm. For the tests' specifications, please look at Table I.

The following evaluation parameters have been taken into account:

- *Overall task's Success Rate [%] (OSR)*: is the number of times in which the final goal of the task is achieved. In our cases: the coloured ring is put in the corresponding box, the thread is cut and the needle is grasped;
- *sub-task's Success Rate [%] (sSR)*: represents the success rate in performing the collaborative sub-tasks preceding the final goal actuation. In our cases: the passage of the ring between the two robotic arms in the Goal and Ring task, the positioning of the grasper near to the needle and the positioning of the scissor near to the thread in the Needle Grasping and Thread Cutting tasks respectively.

2) *Qualitative Functional Validation*: at the ALTAIR premises, on the basis of [23], four urological surgeons, two of them experienced and the other two no-experienced in R-MIS, (capable to perform both the first surgeons and assistants tasks) have been involved in the evaluation. A brief pre-test questionnaire has been sketched in order to characterize the participating sample. To familiarize with the SARAS teleoperation system, all the surgeons had the possibility to use SARAS up to 30 minutes and performing simple exercises, *e.g.*, the Goal and Ring one. Then, with the surgeons alternating in the roles of the first operator and the assistant, four key steps of RARP simplified procedure (see [12, Table 1]) have been reproduced, putting particular attention to the execution of the corresponding assistant's surgical actions: *i.e.*, traction and holding of the bladder, grasping of the catheter, needle holding and thread cutting (see Figure 6). At the end of this conclusive part of the protocol, each surgeon completed several questionnaires¹¹ specifically developed for this validation:

¹¹All the questionnaires are available at the following link: <https://saras-project.eu/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Functional-Validation-Questionnaires.pdf>.

TABLE II
RESULTS OF THE TECHNICAL VALIDATION—*Point-to-Point*: MEANS AND (STANDARD DEVIATIONS)

Task Metrics	da Vinci® User	SARAS User1	SARAS User2	SARAS User3	SARAS Mean
Displacement time [s]	3.05 (.91)	6.57 (2.35)	7.33 (2.32)	5.62 (1.65)	6.51 (2.23)
Trajectory length [cm]	10.94 (.57)	16.04 (3.55)	18.51 (3.41)	16.02 (3.37)	16.86 (3.62)
Movement speed [cm/s]	3.85 (.94)	2.60 (.48)	2.61 (.58)	2.93 (.47)	2.71 (.53)
Trajectory redundancy [%]	109.4 (5.72)	161.53 (36.60)	185.14 (34.08)	160.23 (33.67)	168.96 (36.47)
Max Deviation [cm]	0.5 (.15)	2.38 (.76)	2.65 (1.01)	2.58 (.84)	2.54 (.88)
Precision [cm]	0.21 (.12)	0.44 (.25)	0.55 (.38)	0.52 (.40)	0.50 (.35)

TABLE III
RESULTS OF THE TECHNICAL VALIDATION—*Follow-a-Line*: MEANS AND (STANDARD DEVIATIONS)

Task Metrics	da Vinci® User	SARAS User1	SARAS User2	SARAS User3	SARAS Mean
Displacement time [s]	9.64 (2.86)	16.16 (2.18)	15.29 (3.47)	17.63 (3.41)	16.36 (3.16)
Trajectory length [cm]	26.32 (.39)	43.86 (7.49)	45.53 (7.26)	39.31 (4.92)	42.90 (7.03)
Movement speed [cm/s]	2.85 (.83)	2.73 (.41)	3.03 (.43)	2.08 (.37)	2.62 (.56)
Trajectory redundancy [%]	102.40 (1.53)	170.59 (29.14)	177.12 (28.25)	152.92 (19.13)	166.88 (27.34)
Max Deviation [cm]	1.84 (.16)	3.10 (.70)	3.88 (1.18)	3.58 (.98)	3.52 (1.00)

TABLE IV
RESULTS OF QUANTITATIVE FUNCTIONAL VALIDATION—MEANS AND (STANDARD DEVIATIONS)

Task	User1		User2		User3		User4		Users Mean	
	OSR [%]	sSR [%]	OSR [%]	sSR [%]	OSR [%]	sSR [%]	OSR [%]	sSR [%]	OSR [%]	sSR [%]
Goal and Ring	100	67 (36.51)	100	81 (30.58)	67	83 (40.82)	100	67 (31.18)	92 (16.67)	74 (8.89)
Needle Grasping	100	75 (35.36)	100	62 (36.13)	100	29 (13.31)	100	90 (22.36)	100	64 (26.00)
Thread Cutting	100	90 (22.36)	100	80 (27.39)	100	90 (22.36)	100	90 (22.36)	100	88 (5.00)




Fig. 6. Qualitative Functional Validation of four key surgical action of the assistant: traction of the bladder (*top left*), grasping of the catheter (*top right*), needle holding (*bottom left*) and thread cutting (*bottom right*).

(i) the Qualitative Assessment Questionnaire (QAQ), (ii) the Usability Survey (US) and (iii) the Communication and Coordination Questionnaire (CCQ). Surgeons' answers to the

Qualitative Assessment and Usability questionnaires were rated on a 5-point likert scale, both numerical (1-5, with 5 as maximum score) and alphabetic (A-E, with E as maximum agreement).

IV. RESULTS

A. Technical Validation

Table II and III provide the overview of the technical performances of the two robotic platforms during the simple dexterity exercises. For every parameter the means and standard deviations per user are reported, as well as the overall mean performance of the SARAS users' group. Please note that for the *Follow-a-line* task the Precision is not reported as, in this case, it corresponds to the Maximum deviation.

B. Functional Validation

1) *Quantitative Functional Validation*: Table IV presents a summary view of the results obtained for this part of the validation. For each tasks, the mean performances per SARAS user and the corresponding overall mean on the experimental group are reported.

TABLE V
QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE (QAQ) RESULTS

Code	Q1. Instruments Handling	Q2. Spatial awareness	Q3. Time and Motion	Q4. Depth Perception	Q5. Bimanual dexterity	Q6. Efficiency	Q7. Sensitivity	Q8. Moves Accuracy	Q9. Placement Accuracy	Q10. Speed
SURG01	4	4	4	2	3	3	2	4	4	3
SURG02	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	2
SURG03	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	3
SURG04	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	3	3	3
Mean (dev.st)	3.8 (.50)	3.5 (.58)	3.3 (.96)	2.8 (.50)	3.3 (.50)	3.5 (.58)	3 (.82)	3 (.82)	3.3 (.50)	2.8 (.50)

TABLE VI
USABILITY SURVEY (US) RESULTS

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14
SURG01	4	3	4	3	4	2	2	2	3	3	2	4	3	4
SURG02	4	3	3	4	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3
SURG03	4	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3
SURG04	4	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	4
Mean (dev.st)	4	3	3.3 (.50)	3.5 (.58)	3.3 (.50)	3.3 (.96)	2.5 (.58)	2.8 (.50)	2.8 (.50)	3.3 (.50)	2.8 (.50)	3.3 (.96)	2.8 (.50)	3.5 (.58)

TABLE VII
COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION QUESTIONNAIRE (CCQ) RESULTS—1 TO 5 LIKERT SCALE, WITH 5 MAXIMUM SCORE

Topics	SURG01		SURG02		SURG03		SURG04	
	Main	Ass	Main	Ass	Main	Ass	Main	Ass
Communication skills	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4
I was able to communicate effectively	3	4	4	4	3	3	4	4
I felt the first/assistant surgeon able to understand my questions and comments	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4
I felt comfortable in communicating with the assistant/first surgeon from my telesurgery location	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4
I was able to clearly hear remote clinical communications	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4

2) *Qualitative Functional Validation*: On the basis of the pre-test questionnaire, we can say that the four surgeons had the same level of expertise for L-MIS as main surgeon (in the 1-50 range of L-MIS surgeries), but SURG03 was more experienced in L-MIS as assistant (in the 50-100 range). SURG02 and SURG04 had the same level of expertise for R-MIS as main surgeon and assistant (in the 1-50 range), while SURG01 and SURG03 were more experienced in R-MIS for both surgical roles (in the 50-100 range). Tables V and VI report the results of these investigations; regarding the usability the evaluation has been re-scaled on a numerical likert scale (*i.e.*, A=1, B=2, etc.). Concluding, the coordination and communication evaluations are summarised in Table VII.

V. DISCUSSIONS OF THE RESULTS

A. Technical Validation

Considering the overview of the tasks' metrics of the two robotic platforms, reported in Table II and III, we can generally assess that SARAS is less performing than the da Vinci standard (as expected, being a prototype). More precisely, the

SARAS MRS platform takes longer to complete the tasks (*i.e.*, the mean SARAS DTs are approximately doubled respect to the da Vinci ones), describing a more articulated and therefore longer (SARAS TRs and TLs are one and a half, or twice, times the da Vinci ones) trajectory, but remaining proportionally faster than the da Vinci platform (see Figure 7). These factors translate into a less precision in the execution of the task (please see the corresponding values of Maximum deviation and Precision for the two tasks). The oscillatory behaviour and the lower precision could be a software random delay due to the interconnection of the ROS middleware with the robot controllers API and a slightly misalignment between the frame of the SARAS haptic devices and the slave arms.

B. Functional Validation

1) *Quantitative Functional Validation*: With reference to Table IV, in general we observe that the OSR is fully achieved, for each tasks' repetition by all the users, with exception of User3. Therefore, the SARAS MRS platform seems suitable to reproduce surgical-training-inspired exercises with a good




Fig. 7. Example of movement trajectories for Point to Point task (*top*) and Follow a line task (*bottom*) with da Vinci right arm (*left*) and SARAS right arm (*right*) for a one user.

confidence. Different is the case of the sub-tasks' success rate (sSR), which rate lower scores, *i.e.*, in a range varying between roughly 60% and 90%, with a higher variability within subjects (see Table IV). On this point, it is worth noting that the sub-tasks considered have a higher degree of difficulty respect to the overall goal of the exercise. In fact, they imply a tight coordination between the arms of the two robotic platforms. Being the SARAS MRS platform a prototype, certainly influences the collaboration between the two end effectors. In particular, the stability of the instrument (tremor) and a difficult depth perception have been reported by the users as the main challenges in the execution of the sub-tasks.

2) *Qualitative Functional Validation*: As it could be noted from Tables V and VI, the overall quality of the experience in tele-operating SARAS is quite positive (*i.e.*, rated with a 3-upward scoring) for all the surgeons. However, from the QAQ and Usability questionnaires, it emerges that the major difficulty faced by all the users is related to the depth perception of the working space (QAQ-Q4 and US-Q7). This could be caused by the currently lack of virtual fixtures in the SARAS system, *i.e.*, the overlay of virtual sensory information on the visualised work-space, in order to increase the perception, and therefore the performance, during a tele-manipulation task. Furthermore, the Oculus Rift is not comfortable at a first use and the images don't change if the operator moves his/her

neck, this makes the user a bit uncomfortable and dizzy. The misleading depth perception is reflected into other low-scores feed backs from the surgeons, closely related to it, which however are centered around different aspects. SURG01, one of the most experienced in R-MIS, asks for improvements in the visual equipment, due to the absence of a guidance support (*e.g.*, additional information overlay); while SURG02 reports a low performance in the movements economy and accuracy.

VI. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

In this paper we present the validation protocol framed for the evaluation of a new master-slave robotic system, the SARAS MRS platform. It is intended to be operated by the assistant surgeon during R-MIS and, therefore, to cooperate with a commercial da Vinci surgical system. The validation has been carried out in order to assess the SARAS performances from both a technical- and a surgical-related perspective. In the former case, it was evaluated in its motion-related parameters (*e.g.*, trajectory length, motion speed, etc.) while executing simple dexterity tasks. In the latter, it was analysed in its capability to fulfill surgical training-inspired tasks and while simulating some critical passages of an elective R-MIS procedure on synthetic human abdomen phantom models: a simplified RARP. The results obtained describe a prototype with reasonably lower performances than the reference da Vinci IS1200 standard, where the most important aspects to be improved are: the stability of movements of the end effectors and the depth perception. In addition, it is interesting to note that the urologic surgeons, who took part to the protocol, suggested an improvement of the visual equipment, to be possibly enriched with specific virtual fixture to gain a more effective response of the system status. The research on this new MRS platform, although with performances that are not comparable to the current surgical standard, is cardinal and preliminary to the development of a new SARAS surgical robotic platform, which aims at carrying out autonomously the assistants tasks during both L-MIS and R-MIS procedures. To this purpose, a new ground-breaking Artificial Intelligence (AI) module will be implemented and fed by both an *a priori medical knowledge* (as described in [16]) and a *real intra-operative* one, consisting in procedural data gathered through multiple simulated surgeries with the SARAS MRS platform.

REFERENCES

- [1] T. N. Judkins, D. Oleynikov, and N. Stergiou, "Objective evaluation of expert and novice performance during robotic surgical training tasks," *Surg. Endoscopy*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 590–597, 2008.
- [2] *Robotic Surgery Statistics Show Movement Towards More Minimally Invasive Procedures*, iDataRes., Burnaby, BC, Canada, Accessed: Aug. 8, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://idataresearch.com>
- [3] A. D'Annibale *et al.*, "The da Vinci robot in right adrenalectomy: Considerations on technique," *Surg. Laparoscopy Endoscopy Percutaneous Tech.*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 38–41, 2004.
- [4] Y. Munz *et al.*, "The benefits of stereoscopic vision in robotic-assisted performance on bench models," *Surg. Endoscopy Interv. Tech.*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 611–616, 2004.
- [5] I. Nisky, A. M. Okamura, and M. H. Hsieh, "Effects of robotic manipulators on movements of novices and surgeons," *Surg. Endoscopy*, vol. 28, no. 7, pp. 2145–2158, 2014.

- [6] B. Yi *et al.*, “Domestically produced Chinese minimally invasive surgical robot system ‘micro hand s’ is applied to clinical surgery preliminarily in China,” *Surg. Endoscopy*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 487–493, 2017.
- [7] C. R. Doarn, M. Anvari, T. Low, and T. J. Broderick, “Evaluation of teleoperated surgical robots in an enclosed undersea environment,” *Telem. e-Health*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 325–335, 2009.
- [8] N. Zemiti, G. Model, T. Ortmaier, and N. Bonnet., “Mechatronic design of a new robot for force control in minimally invasive surgery,” *IEEE/ASME Trans. Mechatronics*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 143–153, Apr. 2007.
- [9] R. J. Franzino, “The Laprotek surgical system and the next generation of robotics,” *Surg. Clinics North America*, vol. 83, no. 6, pp. 1317–1320, 2003.
- [10] P. Berkelman and J. Ma, “A compact modular Teleoperated robotic system for Laparoscopic surgery,” *Int. J. Robot. Res.*, vol. 28, no. 9, pp. 1198–1215, 2009.
- [11] M. J. Lum *et al.*, “Multidisciplinary approach for developing a new minimally invasive surgical robotic system,” in *Proc. IEEE-RAS/EMBS Int. Conf. Biomed. Robot. Biomechatronics*, Pisa, Italy, 2006, pp. 841–846.
- [12] F. Setti *et al.*, “A multirobots Teleoperated platform for artificial intelligence training data collection in minimally invasive surgery,” in *Proc. Int. Symp. Med. Robot. (ISMR)*, 2019, pp. 1–7.
- [13] R. Kumar *et al.*, “Assessing system operation skills in robotic surgery trainees,” *Int. J. Med. Robot.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 118–124, 2012.
- [14] K. Liang, Y. Xing, J. Li, S. Wang, A. Li, and J. Li, “Motion control skill assessment based on kinematic analysis of robotic end-effector movements,” *Int. J. Med. Robot. Comput. Assist. Surg.*, vol. 14, no. 1, 2017, Art. no. e1845.
- [15] P. Kazanzides, Z. Chen, A. Deguet, G. S. Fischer, R. H. Taylor, and S. P. DiMaio, “An open-source research kit for the da vinci[®] surgical system,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Robot. Autom. (ICRA)*, 2014, pp. 6434–6439.
- [16] E. Oleari *et al.*, “Enhancing surgical process modeling for artificial intelligence development in robotics: The SARAS case study for minimally invasive procedures,” in *Proc. 13th Int. Symp. Med. Inf. Commun. Technol. (ISMICT)*, 2019, pp. 1–6.
- [17] M. Franken, S. Stramigioli, S. Misra, C. Secchi, and A. Macchelli, “Bilateral telemanipulation with time delays: A two-layer approach combining passivity and transparency,” *IEEE Trans. Robot.*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 741–756, Aug. 2011.
- [18] F. Ferraguti *et al.*, “An energy tank-based interactive control architecture for autonomous and teleoperated robotic surgery,” *IEEE Trans. Robot.*, vol. 31, no. 5, pp. 1073–1088, Oct. 2015.
- [19] M. Minelli, F. Ferraguti, N. Piccinelli, R. Muradore, and C. Secchi, “An energy-shared two-layer approach for multi-master-multi-slave bilateral teleoperation systems,” in *Proc. Int. Conf. Robot. Autom. (ICRA)*, 2019, pp. 423–429.
- [20] V. Palter, “Comprehensive training curricula for minimally invasive surgery,” *J. Grad. Med. Educ.*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 293–298, 2011.
- [21] A. N. Sridhar, T. P. Briggs, J. D. Kelly, and S. Nathan, “Training in robotic surgery-an overview,” *Current Urol. Rep.*, vol. 18, no. 8, p. 58, 2011.
- [22] M. Kim *et al.*, “A development of assistant surgical robot system based on surgical-operation-by-wire and hands-on-throttle-and-stick,” *Biomed. Eng. Online*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1–19, 2016.
- [23] A. Q. Ereso, P. Garcia, E. Tseng, M. M. Dua, G. P. Victorino, and L. T. S. Guy, “Usability of robotic platforms for remote surgical teleproctoring,” *Telem. e-Health*, vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 445–453, 2009.