





Types of Robotics Today

- Industrial
- Materials handling
- Welding
- Inspection
- Manufacturing
- Laboratory applications
- Autonomous vehicles
- Spacecraft systems

















All Truth Passes Through Three Stages

•First, it is ridiculed

- Second, it is violently opposed
- •Third, it is accepted as being self-evident



11

Operating Room and Aviation in the 1920s





Operating Room and Aviation, Modern Day





1st Generation Spine Robot

- 1st robotic spinal system approved by the FDA
- Used in ~ 840 cases in 14 hospitals from 2005-2009
- The system consists of 2 units:
 - 1. A miniature 50 x 80mm, cylindrically shaped robot (250g)
 - Able to move in 6 degrees of freedom
 - 2. Bone mounted robot



15



From: Sukovich et al. Miniature robolic guidance for pedicle screw placement in posterior spinal fusion: early clinical experience with the Spinetaskit. Int J Med Robolics Comput Assist Surg 2006; 2: 114–122

2nd Generation

- 2011
- Uses the same cylindrically shaped robot
- Software upgrades to improve the registration process to minimize time → faster registration
- Improved instruments and workstation





Reduction in Complications and Revisions Robotic Spine Surgery Clinical Value Beyond Instrumentation



19

• Surgical Planning

• Modality Registration

	Author	Year	Study type	Device	# Screws	# Safe Screws	Accuracy Rate
1	Hu	2013	Retrospective	RNS	960	949	98.9%
2	Onen	2014	Prospective	RNS	136	134	98.5%
3	Kim	2015	RCT**	RNS	158	158	100.0%
4	Hyun	2016	RCT**	RNS	130	130	100.0%
5	Fujishiro	2015	Cadaveric study	RNS	216	216	100.0%
6	Кио	2016	Retrospective	RNS	317	313	98.7%
7	Macke	2016	Retrospective	RNS	662	614	92.8%
8	Keric	2017	Retrospective	RNS	1857	1799	96.9%
9	Molliqaj	2017	Retrospective	RNS	439	410	93.4%
.0	Tsai	2017	Retrospective	RNS	662	655	99.0%
1	Minfeng	2016	Retrospective	RNS	83	82	98.8%
2	Hu	2016	Retrospective	RNS	35	35	100.0%
.3	Solomiichuk	2017	Retrospective	RNS	192	162	84.4%
.4	Bederman	2013	Retrospective	RNS	27	27	100.0%
.5	Urakov	2017	Retrospective	RNS	101	89	88.1%
	Renaissance Total				5975	5774	96.6%
1	Van Dijk	2015	Retrospective	SA	487	477	97.9%
2	Devito	2010	Retrospective	SA	646	635	98.3%
3	Schizas	2012	Retrospective	SA	64	61	95.3%
4	Roser	2013	RCT**	SA	72	71	99.0%
5	Ringel	2012	RCT**	SA	146	124	85.0%
6	Schatlo	2014	Retrospective	SA	244	223	91.4%
	SpineAssist Total				1659	1591	95.9%
	Total				7634	7366	96.5%

4th Generation



















The planning software has also been integral to aligning our posterior instrumentation to assist in rod placement for multilevel constructs. Our use of this new technology has been encouraging, with

100% grade 1 accuracy

on the Gertzbein-Robbins scale across our first 90 pedicle screws confirmed on postoperative CT with no complications in any case. In our experience, this robotic technology has the potential to improve patient outcomes and is associated with advanced surgical planning compared with more traditional techniques.



"Average length of stay for our patients was only 1.5 days, with **patients discharged home after surgery in less than half the time** compared to surgery with more traditional techniques"















<section-header><complex-block><complex-block>

35

Future Directions and Research



Accuracy of an Augmented Reality Spine Surgery Guidance System with Stereoscopic Targeting Head Mounted Display Compared to Standard Computer Navigation, Robotic Systems, and Existing AR Systems

Timothy O'Connor, MD¹⁺, Ibrahim Hussain, MD²⁺, Sudesh K Srivastav, PhD³, John Pan, MD⁴, Thomas Voegeli, MD⁵ 1. Marcus Neuroscience Institute, Florida Atlantic University, Baptist Health, Boca Raton, FL; 2. Dept. of Neurosurgery, Weill Cornell-NewYork-Presbyterian Och Spine, New York, NY; 3. Department of Biostatistics and Data Science, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA; 4. Department of Radiology, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA;

Introduction

Augmented Reality (AR) offers the benefit of improved hand-eye coordination by accurately superimposing 3D stereoscopic displays for surgical instruments onto anatomic landmarks.

Objectives

To compare the accuracy of a 4k resolution AR system with novel 3D stereoscopic targeting with existing navigation, robotic and AR systems for implanting thoracic and lumbar pedicle screws.

Methods

120 pedicle screws were implanted using a novel AR system (OnPoint Alm-AR, OnPoint Surgical, Bedford, MA) (thoracic 50, lumbosacral 70; pre-op CT 40, O-arm 80) (Fig. 1).

Heary grading was applied by an independent radiologist assessing the degree of pedicle breaches. 3D measurements of positional error (PE) and angular error (AE) were performed by comparing post-operative CT scans of implanted screws With planned trajectories (Fig. 2). Statistical analyses compared PE and AE for OnPoint AR with the data for other systems using an unequal variance t-test method.









37

Accuracy of an Augmented Reality Spine Surgery Guidance System with Stereoscopic Targeting Head Mounted Display Compared to Standard Computer Navigation, Robotic Systems, and Existing AR Systems Timothy O'Connor, MD1*, Ibrahim Hussain, MD2*, Sudesh K Srivastav, PhD3, John Pan, MD4, Thomas Voegeli, MD5 Marcus Neuroscience Institute, Florida Atlantic University, Baptist Health, Boca Raton, FL; 2. Dept. of Neurosurgery, Weill Cornell-NewYork-Presbyterian Och Spine, New York, NY;
 Bepartment of Biostatistics and Data Science, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA; 4. Department of Radiology, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA;

Results

113 screws placed demonstrated Heary grade 1 accuracy. 6 screws had a larger diameter than the pedicle and were planned with in-out-in technique with Heary grade 2 accuracy. One screw demonstrated a 1mm lateral breach (grade 2) caused by a loose connection to the screwdriver. PE and AE (mean ± 1SD) for OnPoint Alm-AR were the following: for intra-operative spin 1.1mm±0.5mm and $1.3^\circ\pm0.5^\circ;$ for pre-operative CT 1.9mm±1.2mm and 2.2°±1.3° (Figs. 3&4). Percent increment in PE and AE for Medtronic Stealth Station, Brainlab navigation, Stryker nav3i, Medtronic Mazor X robot, Globus Excelsius robot, Augmedics Xvision, and Novarad VisAR compared to OnPoint AR ranged between 40-80% (Fig. 5), with differences being highly significant for all comparisons (Fig. 5).

Conclusions

PE and AE for placing pedicle screws are statistically significantly smaller for the novel Alm-AR system compared to existing navigation, robotic, and AR systems. A positional error of 1.1mm and angular error of 1.3° makes this technology particularly suited for small pedicles, challenging anatomy and MIS techniques





stration of pre-opera ve CT (red). B. Com















References	 O'Connor, T., et al. (2021). Stealth Technology: A Technical Note. World Neurosurgery, 145(1), 1-1. Retrieved from https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/\$1878875020322026 O'Connor, T., et al. (2023). Accuracy of an Augmented Reality Spine Guidance System with Stereoscopic Targeting Head Mounted Display Compared to Standard Computer Navigation, Robotic Systems, and Existing AR Systems. Oral Presentation presented at the Congress of Neurological Surgeons, Washington DC.
	 O'Connor, T., et al. (2023). Augmented Reality Guidance System for Spine Surgery: Comparison of Screw Placement Accuracy using Preoperative CT vs Intraoperative 3D Spin. Poster Presentation presented at the Congress of Neurological Surgeons, Washington DC.
	43 📓

