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Abstract—Objective: The technical skill of surgeons directly impacts patient outcomes. The current state of surgical skills assessment is still performed by subjective observation. Advanced tracking systems enable the development of objective motion-based metrics for skill evaluation, but these metrics are not sufficient to evaluate the performance in complex surgical tasks. Specifically, angular motion is largely overlooked. In this study, we developed metrics for surgical skill evaluation that are based on the orientation of the surgical instruments. Methods: Experienced robotic surgeons and novice users performed teleoperated (using the da Vinci Research Kit) and open needle-driving. Each participant performed 80 trials. We divided each movement into four segments. For each segment, we calculated four metrics: (1) task time and (2) path length—classical measures for surgical skill, (3) normalized angular displacement—accumulated change in instrument orientation normalized by path length, and (4) rate of orientation change—the average rate of the change in instrument orientation. Results: Task time and the rate of orientation change successfully distinguished between experienced surgeons and novice users. Path length and the normalized angular displacement allowed for a good separation only in part of the experiment. Discussion: Our new promising metrics for surgical skill evaluation captured technical aspects that are taught during surgeons’ training. They provide complementing evaluation to those of classical metrics. Significance: Orientation-based metrics add value to skill assessment and may be an adjunct to classic objective metrics providing more granular discrimination of skills.
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I. INTRODUCTION

SUCCESSFUL surgery requires cognitive skill – knowing what to do, and motor skill – knowing how to do it [1]. The technical skill of a surgeon directly impacts patient outcomes [2]. Training programs of junior surgeons are intended to bring learners to a high level of procedural and technical skill. In addition, the lack of standard technical skills metrics has rendered the current state of maintenance of certification for practicing surgeons to be mostly cognitive-based. Evaluating the quality of surgeon’s performance is paramount for both cognitive and motor goals.

Over the last decade, teleoperated robot-assisted minimally-invasive surgery (RMIS) has become popular in a variety of surgical applications. In teleoperated RMIS, the surgeon teleoperates robotic surgical instruments inside the body of the patient [3]. This provides many advantages to the surgeon and the patient [4], [5], but not without disadvantages. For example, the absence of force feedback prevents reliance on the sense of touch [6], and the manipulators present to the surgeon significant dynamics [7]. Therefore, an appropriate training and skill evaluation process is needed for RMIS [8].

State of the art surgical skills assessment is still largely based on direct or video observation by expert surgeons. However, such evaluation is problematic for several reasons. First, experts may not agree with each other, and hence, subjective assessment may differ between different evaluators [9], or may suffer from bias. Second, even if the assessment is structured using checklists (such as Objective Structured Assessment of Technical Skill – OSATS [10], [11]), it is still limited by what the observers are able to see and by their attention. Third, these observations require time and resources. Therefore, it is important to find objective metrics that can describe the surgical performance in many details, without requiring the presence of an expert surgeon. Such criteria can help to identify training deficiencies more accurately, and provide the trainee with near real-time and valuable feedback to optimize their performance [12].

The simplest objective metric is the time that it takes to perform a procedure [13]. However, task time does not provide information about the quality of the action that was performed [14]. For example, a task that was completed with minimal time might have been accomplished with careless and traumatic instrument gestures. With the advancement of technology, tracking systems [15]-[17] and virtual reality trainers [18], [19] enable the collection of motion information and development of new automated metrics for skill evaluation. Examples of such metrics are path length of the instruments, number of movements, the speed of movements,
and the number of errors [20], [21].

The use of surgical robots allows for tracking the movements of the surgeon: position, velocity, angular velocity and more, and use this information to evaluate skill [22]-[25]. It also allows for using advanced classification techniques for skill evaluation [26], [27]. However, such advanced techniques limit the ability to provide the trainee with meaningful feedback. Other recent advances include the use of human motor control grounded metrics [28], [29], and combination of position and force-based metrics [30].

To date, the orientation of surgical instruments has been used to calculate economy of movement parameters for assessing laparoscopic skill [31], [32]. However, there have been no extensive use of orientation-based measures for calculation of other parameters, and evaluation of different skills, such as robotic surgical skill. This is somewhat surprising because rotation of instruments is critical in many tasks. For example, in needle driving, surgeons are taught to rotate the wrist as far back as possible so that the needle addresses the tissue at a right angle and pierces the tissue planes with the least amount of force. Previous studies found that the angular velocity of the hand movements of the experts was significantly larger compared to the novices [22], [33], but this measurement was not linked to a specific task. In sports, measures of rotation were used to assess skill among tennis players [34]. Therefore, it is likely that orientation-based metrics can be used for evaluating surgical skill.

In this study, we focus on needle driving. We chose the needle-driving task to balance between high clinical importance, technical complexity, and minimal necessary procedural knowledge. Needle driving is the building block of surgical suturing that is part of the majority of surgical procedures regardless of specialty field [35]. The needle driving task requires dexterous manipulation of a needle during interaction with a tissue. To successfully complete the task, it is important to orient the needle relative to the driver and the tissue, and rotate it along its arc. Furthermore, needle-driving is a technical maneuver that can be accomplished following simple procedural instruction, and it can be completed without surgical experience.

We analyzed data that were previously collected in a study that compared teleoperated and open unimanual needle-driving movements of experienced robotic surgeons and novices [36]. The task was to use a needle to reach from a marked start to a marked target position, drive a needle via the artificial tissue to another marked target, extract the needle, and reach with its tail to a finish marking (see video). To evaluate the learning process, each participant repeated the movement 80 times. The teleoperated needle-driving was performed using the da Vinci Research Kit (dVRK) [37], which is a custom research version of the da Vinci Surgical System. The open needle-driving was performed with a standard needle-driver that was instrumented with magnetic pose trackers. A kinematic analysis showed that the time to perform the task and the path length of novices are bigger than those of experienced surgeons. Moreover, using the robot reduces the path length but increases the time to perform the task. In addition significant differences were found in learning between novice users and experienced surgeons [36].

In the current paper, we focus on measures of the orientation of the instruments. We present new orientation-based metrics of surgical skill, which enable distinguishing between movements of experienced surgeon and novice users. We hypothesized that segmentation of the needle-driving movement into its stages is necessary to assess surgical skills – each stage has different constraints, and may require the use of different metrics. We also assumed that during the part of the needle insertion when rotation motion is required, orientation-based metrics can successfully separate between different levels of surgical skill. A preliminary version of this study for a subset of metrics and only for teleoperated movements was presented in an extended abstract form at a recent conference [38]. Here we use more metrics (two new orientation-based metrics and two classic metrics) to compare teleoperated and open needle-driving movements of experienced surgeons and novices.

II. METHODS

A. Notations

We use $\mathbf{x}$ as the Cartesian translation vector $(x, y, z)$ position coordinates, $\mathbf{v}$ as the Cartesian velocity vector $(v_x, v_y, v_z)$, $\varphi$ as the opening angle of the needle-driver, and $t$ as the elapsed time since the beginning of the movement. To present orientations, we use $\mathbf{R}$ for the rotation matrix that consists of three unit vectors $(\mathbf{R} = [\hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{z}])$, and $\mathbf{Q}$ for the quaternion that consists of four components $(\mathbf{Q} = [q_0, q_1, q_2, q_3])$. The $^M$ superscript stands for master side, $^P$ for patient side, and $^O$ for open needle-driver. We use $j$ as the index of sampled data points.

B. da Vinci Research Kit Setup

Full details of the experimental setup and procedures are reported in [36], but we summarize here the most important details for the current study. The setup of the dVRK that was used in the experiment is depicted in Fig. 1(a-b). The system consisted of a pair of Master Tool Manipulators (MTMs), a pair of Patient Side Manipulators (PSMs), four manipulator interface boards, a high resolution stereo viewer, and a foot-petal tray. Two large needle-drivers were used as PSM instruments. All parts were fixed on a custom-designed extruded aluminum structure. The electronics and firmware of the interface boards were based on a custom IEEE-1394 FPGA board and quad linear amplifier [37]. The MTM and PSM electronics were all connected via firewire connectors to a single computer with an Intel Core i7 4960X processor. Using a stereo viewer, the participant (surgeon) was watching a 3D view of the task scene. A pair of Flea 3 (Point Grey, Richmond, BC) cameras instrumented with 16 mm f1.8 compact instrumentation lenses (Edmund Optics, Barrington, NJ) were mounted on a custom designed fixture. The position and orientation of the camera were manually adjusted to obtain the best view of the task board.
The control of the system was based on position-exchange with PD controllers. The Cartesian position and the orientation of the MTM and PSM tool tips were calculated from the sampled joint angles via forward kinematics. Velocities were calculated using numerical differentiation and filtering with a second-order Butterworth low-pass filter with a 20 Hz cutoff.

To control the PSM, the position and velocity of the MTM were down-scaled by factor of 3 to mimic the 'fine' movement scaling mode of the clinical da Vinci system:

\[ x^m = 0.33 x^w, \quad v^m = 0.33 v^w. \]

(1)

The orientation was not scaled.

Similarly to the clinical da Vinci, there was no force feedback, and there was a small torque feedback on the orientation degrees of freedom to help users avoid large misalignment in tool orientation between PSM and MTM as a result of joint limits or singular configurations.

C. Experimental Procedures

Sixteen subjects participated in the experiment that was approved by the Stanford University Institutional Review Board, after giving informed consent. The participants included six experienced surgeons (five urologists, \( n_{\text{robotic cases}} > 120 \), and one general surgeon, \( n_{\text{robotic cases}} > 150 \), self-reported), and ten novices (engineering graduate students) without surgical experience. One novice participant had extensive experience with the experimental setup, and hence was removed from the analysis.

The participants performed teleoperated needle-driving using the dVRK with a large needle-driver (Fig. 1(a-b)), and the open needle-driving using standard surgical needle-driver (Fig. 1(c-d)). In both conditions, the needle was a CT-1 tapered needle without its thread. Each task board consisted of four sets of targets, but only one set of targets was visible during a particular trial. The order of the two sessions was balanced across participants.

In the teleoperated session (Fig. 1(a)), the participant sat in front of the master console of the dVRK. Magnetic pose trackers were attached to the shoulder, elbow and wrist of his right arm, and a magnetic transmitter was placed under the wood armrest. However, in this paper, we did not analyze the movements of the participant’s arm joints that were recorded with the magnetic trackers. Prior to each experiment, the master console ergonomics were adjusted so that the posture of the participant was comfortable. The task board was rigidly mounted on the patient-side table such that its position was fixed relative to the cameras.

In the open session (Fig. 1(c)), to provide similar context to the teleoperated circumstance, the participant also sat in front of the dVRK. A similar task-board was mounted on the armrest of the dVRK. To determine the position and orientation of the surgical needle-driver's tip, magnetic pose trackers were mounted on its shafts using custom-made rigid attachments (Fig. 1(d)). To prevent signal distortion, the tracker was separated from the metal body of the driver by 2 cm.

Each participant watched an introduction video before each session (teleoperated or open). The video was developed with surgical content experts, and contained explanations about bimanual needle handling technique, unimanual needle-driving technique, the needle-driving task, and acceptable correction movements. Each session included 80 trials, after each block (10 trials) a break was offered. After two blocks (20 trials), the suture-pad was readjusted so that a fresh area of the pad and targets were presented to the participant.

Each set of targets on the task board consisted of four marks (Fig. 2(III)): start (s), insertion (i), exit (e), and finish (f). Each trial started with a bimanual adjustment of the needle in the right needle-driver in a configuration that is appropriate for driving the needle via the tissue. This adjustment was performed using the right and left needle-drivers in the teleoperated condition, and the needle-driver and the fingers of the left hand in the open condition. Then, participants placed the tip of the needle at start target (s), and in the teleoperated condition, pressed the left foot-paddle to indicate the beginning of the task sequence. In the open condition, they pressed the left button of a computer mouse that was placed near the left hand of the participant on the armrest instead of the foot paddle.

A single needle-driving trial consisted of four stages (Fig. 2)): (I) transport – reaching with needle head from s to i, (II) insertion – driving the needle through the tissue until its tip exits at e, (III) catching – opening the needle-driver and catching the tip of the needle, and (IV) extraction – pulling the needle and reaching to f with its tail. The trial ended when the tail of the needle was placed at the end target, and left foot-paddle or mouse-button were pressed to indicate trial end.
During the experiment, some of the trials were not performed according to the instructions or not recorded properly and therefore, these trials were removed from the analysis. Among teleoperated sessions, 28 out of the 1200 trials of all the participants were removed, and in the open sessions, 58 trials were removed.

D. Data Acquisition

In the teleoperated session, we analyzed the PSM’s data. The Cartesian position, velocity, orientation and opening angle of the needle-driver were recorded at approximately 2 kHz. In the open session, the position and the orientation of the two magnetic pose trackers were recorded at approximately 120 Hz. The orientations were recorded as rotation matrices.

E. Calculation of metrics

We calculated four metrics: task time, path length, normalized angular displacement, and rate of orientation change. The next three subsections describe the technical steps that we followed to obtain the metrics from the recorded data: preprocessing, segmentation, and calculation of metrics.

1) Preprocessing

In the open condition, we calculated the mapping from the position of the sensors $\mathbf{x}^{O_k}$ and $\mathbf{x}^{O_c}$ to the driver’s endpoint $\mathbf{x}^O$ (Fig. 3(c)) using a calibration dataset. The opening angle of the driver, $\varphi^O_j$, calculated as:

$$\varphi^O_j = \cos^{-1}(\mathbf{\hat{x}}^{O_k}_j \cdot \mathbf{\hat{x}}^{O_c}_j),$$

where $\mathbf{\hat{x}}^{O_k}_j$ and $\mathbf{\hat{x}}^{O_c}_j$ are elements from the rotation matrices which represent the orientations of the right and left magnetic trackers (Fig. 3(c)), and $\cdot$ is the dot product.

We interpolated and downsampled all data to 100 Hz. To preserve the shape of the signals and to prevent overshoots, we interpolated the Cartesian position, velocity, and the opening angle using a piecewise cubic Hermite interpolating polynomial (PCHIP). We filtered the Cartesian position offline at 6 Hz with a 2nd order zero lag low-pass Butterworth filter using the Matlab function filter(). In the open condition, we calculated the Cartesian velocity components $(v_x, v_y, v_z)$ using numerical differentiation of the filtered position.

The orientations were recorded as rotation matrices. Rotation matrices are orthogonal by definition, but because of the quantization, the sampled matrices were not orthogonal. Therefore, we used singular value decomposition (SVD) to find the nearest orthogonal matrix for each sampling point. Then, we converted the matrices to quaternions using Matlab dcm2quat() function, and interpolated them using spherical linear interpolation (Slerp) [39]. Quaternions which represent orientation are unit quaternions (i.e. normalized quaternions), but due to numerical errors in the calculations (such as rounding errors), the quaternions were not normal. Therefore, we normalized the quaternions after each calculation.

2) Segmentation

We segmented the needle-driving movement into four stages (transport, insertion, catching, and extraction). The third and the last segments are highly affected by whether the participants followed the instructions about corrections, and had substantial strategic variability, so in this paper, we focus on the relatively consistent across participants and trials first and second segments. The segmentation was performed using the position, speed (||v||, where || || is the 2-norm), time, and opening angle of the needle driver ($\varphi$).

Because the data in the teleoperated and open conditions were collected using different sensors, and the needle-driving was characterized by different trajectories, we used two different algorithms for data segmentation. We are aware that the different sensors and segmentation algorithms may introduce significant differences between the conditions, and therefore in our statistical analysis, we never directly compare teleoperated and open conditions, nor do we make any conclusions about their relative differences. Instead, we focus on the differences between experienced surgeons and novice participants and their learning curves.

In the teleoperated session (Fig. 4(a,c)), in the end of the transport (segment I), the participants slowed down. In addition, the approximate position of the insertion target was defined by the task, and therefore, we constrained the position of the end of this segment. The index $j^I_1$, which represents the end of segment I in the teleoperated condition, was defined as the first of the local minima of $||v||$ which is below the 25th percentile of $||v||$ (marked $j_{\text{show}}$), and satisfies $x^P < -135$ mm (marked $j_{\text{left}}$) and $t > 0.5$ s. The end of segment II, $j^I_2$, was defined as the first time that the gripper was opened ($\varphi^O > 0$).

In the open session (Fig. 4(b,d)), prior to the segmentation, we filtered the speed, $||v||$, the opening angle, $\varphi^O$, and the...
lateral component of the velocity vector, \( v_x^O \), using a 2nd order zero lag low-pass Butterworth filter. We used cutoff at 4 Hz for the speed, 8 Hz for the opening angle, and 3 Hz for \( v_x^O \). These cutoff frequencies were used only in the segmentation, and not in the subsequent analysis.

Segment I is a transport of the needle, and had characteristic bell-shaped velocity trajectory of a reaching movement [40], as depicted clearly in the trajectory of \( |v_x^O| \) in Fig. 4(d). Therefore the end of this segment was identified as the first local minimum of \( |v_x^O| \) which is smaller than a threshold of 20 mm/s and occurred after the peak of the bell-shaped trajectory (marked \( j_{\text{min}} \)). The peak was identified as the first local maximum of \( |v_x^O| \) which is higher than a threshold of 20 mm/s (marked \( j_{\text{peak}} \)).

In the end of segment II, the participant opened the needle-driver. Each participant used a different opening angle, and in some cases, atypical motion resulted from the unlocking of the needle-driver. Therefore, in the open condition, unlike in the teleoperated, we could not use a threshold on the opening angle, \( \phi^O \). When the user opens the driver, there is a local maximum in the opening rate, \( \Delta \phi^O \). In addition, at the end of segment II the participants slowed down, and at the beginning of segment III they increased their speed. As a result, at the end of segment II there is a local minimum in the speed, \( |v^O| \).

Thus, the end of segment II, \( j_{2}^O \), was determined as follows:

\[ j_{\text{max}} \] is the index of the first local maximum of \( \Delta \phi^O \) which is above 80% of the maximal \( \Delta \phi^O \). \( j_{2}^O \) is the index of the last local minimum of the velocity magnitude \( |v^O| \), which is located before \( j_{\text{max}} \).

We examined the segmentation algorithm by manual inspection of the results. In cases where the algorithm failed to segment the movement, we corrected the segmentation manually. In the teleoperated condition, 7 trials were segmented manually. In the open condition, 127 trials were segmented manually, including all the trials of one of the participants.

3) Metrics

For each trial and each segment, we calculated four metrics:

1. **task time** – the time elapsed between the beginning and the end of the movement;
2. **path length** – the distance travelled by the instrument, which is a classical measure for surgical skill;
3. **normalized angular displacement** – the accumulated change in instrument orientation normalized by path length; and
4. **rate of orientation change** – the average rate of the

![Fig. 4. Segmentation. (a)-(b) Example of segmentations of teleoperated (a) and open (b) needle-driving. The numbers and the different colors indicate the segments of the movement. (c)-(d) The signals and points that were used for the segmentation of the teleoperated (c) and open (d) needle-driving.](image-url)
change in instrument orientation.

The task time was calculated as:

\[ TT = t_{i+1} - t_i, \]

(3)

where \( t_i \) is the time elapsed between the beginning of the movement and the beginning of the \( i \text{th} \) segment.

To calculate the other metrics, we found the distance, \( \Delta d_{j,j+1} \), and the rotation, \( \Delta Q_{j,j+1} \), between pairs of consecutive sampled frames that were attached to the tip of the instrument (Fig. 5). The distance was calculated as (Fig. 5(a)):

\[ \Delta d_{j,j+1} = \| \{ \Delta x_j, \Delta y_j, \Delta z_j \} \|, \]

(4)

where \( \Delta x, \Delta y, \Delta z \) are the differences of \( x, y, z \) positions, respectively. Using the distance, we calculated the path length:

\[ P = \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \Delta d_{j,j+1}, \]

(5)

where \( N \) is the number of samples in the segment.

For the orientation-based metrics, we first calculated the rotation:

\[ \Delta Q_{j,j+1} = Q_{j+1} Q_j^{-1}, \]

(6)

where \( Q_j \) and \( Q_{j+1} \) are unit quaternions represent the orientation of the frames. \( \Delta Q_{j,j+1} \) is a unit quaternion and thus can be referred to as rotation around the axis \( \mathbf{k} = [k_x, k_y, k_z] \) by \( \Delta \theta_{j,j+1} \) (Fig. 5(b)):

\[ \Delta Q_{j,j+1} = [q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4] = \left[ \cos \left( \frac{\Delta \theta_{j,j+1}}{2} \right), k \sin \left( \frac{\Delta \theta_{j,j+1}}{2} \right) \right] \]

(7)

We calculate the angle \( \Delta \theta_{j,j+1} \) (Fig. 5(b)), which represents the orientation change between pairs of consecutive sampled frames:

\[ \Delta \theta_{j,j+1} = 2 \cos^{-1}(q_1), \]

(8)

where \( q_1 \) is the first component of the quaternion \( \Delta Q_{j,j+1} \).

For each participant and segment, outlier angle values were defined as angle values that were 35 times larger than the average of the angles across all the trials of that participant and segment. The entire segment that included an outlier angle was removed from the analysis. In the teleoperated condition, this outlier removal procedure resulted in the removal of 6 segments, and in the open condition, none of the segments were removed.

The normalized angular displacement, was defined as:

\[ A = \left( \frac{1}{P} \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} | \Delta \theta_{j,j+1} | \right). \]

(9)

This metric quantifies the overall change in orientation during the movement – the angular path. To mitigate the accumulation of large angular path during long paths, we normalized the total angular displacement by the path length.

In the open needle-driving, we measured two orientations – one for each magnetic tracker. Because the trackers were rigidly attached to the driver, we assumed that as long as the needle driver is closed around the needle, the change in the orientation between subsequent samples should be equal for both of the trackers. However, some participants held the driver so that one of their fingers touched one of the trackers. This contact disturbance caused movements of the tracker, and therefore, unintentional changes in the orientation that inflated the angular displacement metric. Therefore, we calculated the angular displacement for the two trackers, and used the smaller angular displacement in further calculations.

The rate of orientation change was defined as:

\[ C = \left( 1/(N-1) \right) \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} (\Delta \theta_{j,j+1} / \Delta t_{j,j+1}), \]

(10)

where \( \Delta t_{j,j+1} \) is the time difference between the subsequent samples, i.e. the sampling interval. This metric quantifies the rate of the change of the instrument orientation during the movement. In the open condition, we calculated the \( \Delta \theta_{j,j+1} \) from the same tracker that was used for the calculation of the normalized angular displacement (without the finger contact disturbance).

F. Statistical analysis

For each trial, we calculated the four metrics for the first and second segments (I-transport and II-insertion). Before the statistical analysis, we used the Lilliefors test to identify metrics that were not normally distributed. We log-transformed the path length and the rate of orientation change to correct their non-normal distribution. For each metric, each condition (teleoperated and open), and each segment (I-transport and II-insertion), we calculated the averages of the first and last 10 trials of each participant, and built a 2-way mixed model ANOVA. The fixed effect independent variables were: trial (early/late, within subject), experience (experienced surgeon/novice, between subject), and their interaction. We used the Bonferroni correction for post-hoc comparisons. Statistical significance was determined at the 0.05 threshold.

III. RESULTS

Fig. 6 depicts examples of a teleoperated and an open trials of two typical participants – an experienced surgeon in the upper panels, and a novice in the lower. Qualitatively, it is evident that the experienced surgeon completed both tasks faster than the novice, and with larger rate of orientation change. It is also evident that the open trials were faster than the teleoperated, but because the recording and analysis of the data differed between the teleoperated and open trials, we do not perform statistical comparisons between them. Hence, we
focus on the differences between the novices and the experienced surgeons within each condition (see Section II.E.2 for details).

Fig. 7-8 depict the metrics in the first two segments (I-transport and II-insertion), for the teleoperated (Fig. 7) and the open (Fig. 8) conditions, as a function of trial number (left panels), and the averages of the first and the last 10 trials (right panels) for each metric. A prominent observation from Fig. 7 and 8 is that most of the noticeable differences between experienced surgeons and novices are in segment II (insertion). This observation is not surprising because the driving of the needle through the tissue (segment II) is the most challenging aspect of our task. Consistently with this observation, the statistical analysis of segment I (transport) shows that for most of the metrics, the differences between experienced surgeons and novices, in both conditions (teleoperated and open) were not statistically significant. The only metric that showed statistically significant differences between experienced surgeons and novices in both conditions was task time (teleoperated: $F_{1,13}=8.942$, $p=0.010$, open: $F_{1,13}=6.206$, $p=0.027$). In addition, the improvement between early and late trials was statistically significant for the task time in both conditions (teleoperated: $F_{1,13}=10.147$, $p=0.007$, open: $F_{1,13}=14.003$, $p=0.002$), and for the rate of orientation change in the open condition ($F_{1,13}=7.891$, $p=0.015$). In the remainder of our paper we focus on segment II (insertion).

Tables I and II summarize the statistical analysis for segment II (insertion). In Table I the results of the 2-way mixed effects ANOVA are presented for the different metrics. Table II summarizes the post-hoc comparisons and the sizes of effects: it depicts the differences in segment II between experienced surgeons and novices, and between the early and late trials, for the different metrics. When the interaction was statistically significant, the differences within the conditions are also shown. In the remainder of the section, we discuss these effects for each metric separately within segment II, and a general discussion will follow in the next section.

**Task time** is a classical metric of surgical skill, and is related to overall procedure completion time. Hence, we expected smaller task times for more experienced surgeons. Indeed, the task time of the experienced surgeons was shorter than of novices, and at the last trials of the experiment, task time was shorter than at the first trials (Fig. 7(a-b), 8(a-b)). This observation is supported by the statistical analysis – for both conditions (teleoperated and open), the effect of expertise and trial was statistically significant. In the open condition, unlike in the teleoperated, the interaction between trial and expertise was statistically significant. The improvement of the novices was greater than of experienced surgeons. Nevertheless, the difference between them remained statistically significant even in the last trials. Eventually, in our task, the trial time metric successfully differentiates between experienced surgeons and novices.

**Path length** is related to the classical economy of motion metrics. Fig. 7(c-d) and 8(c-d) show that in segment II, in both conditions (teleoperated and open), experienced surgeons had a shorter path length than novices, and that there was an improvement between early and late trials. All these effects were statistically significant. In the teleoperated condition, there was a statistically significant interaction between expertise and trial. As can be seen in Fig. 7(d), in the early trials, the paths of experienced surgeons were shorter than of novices. The novices improved more than the experienced surgeons, and as a result, in the late trials, there was no longer a statistically significant difference in path length between experienced surgeons and novices. These results are consistent with our previously reported analysis of the entire task [36]. The fact that there was no difference between experienced surgeons and novice participants after only 80 trials suggests that at least in some tasks, this metric is inadequate for surgical skill assessment.

![Fig. 6. Examples of $\Delta d$ and $\Delta \theta$ in teleoperated and open trials of experienced surgeon and a novice participant. (a) Trial of an experienced surgeon in the teleoperated session. (b) Trial of an experienced surgeon in the open session. (c) Trial of a novice participant in the teleoperated session. (d) Trial of a novice participant in the open session.](image-url)
Normalized angular displacement. Our task requires rotation of the needle along its arc for successful insertion into the tissue. Therefore, we hypothesized that large angular displacement will be correlated to surgical experience. Indeed, Fig. 7(e-f) depict that in the teleoperated condition, experienced surgeons had a larger angular displacement than novices, and this effect was statistically significant. The interaction between expertise and trial was also statistically significant, and the post hoc analysis reveals that in early trials, experienced surgeons were better (larger angular displacement), and that the novices improved and increased their angular displacement, whereas the experienced surgeons did not. Importantly, in the late trials, the difference between the experienced surgeons and novices remained statistically significant, suggesting that in the teleoperated condition, the normalized angular displacement metric may be a good indicator of skill.

Surprisingly, in the open condition, the effect of both factors was not statistically significant in segment II (Fig. 8(e-f)). A careful examination of Fig. 6(d) suggests a reason for this absence of difference. The novice participant tried a few times unsuccessfully to rotate the needle through the tissue, and eventually accumulated a large angular displacement that does not necessarily reflect a successful drive of the needle, as evident in the long time and the multiple attempts that it took to complete the drive compared to the experienced surgeon.
We focused the majority of our analysis on the insertion of the needle (segment II) and shows that they use faster orientation changes. Therefore, we hypothesized that higher rate of orientation change will be observed for experienced surgeons. Based on Table I, the rate of orientation change successfully differentiates between experienced surgeons and novices. This suggests that in our task, the rate of orientation change successfully differentiates between experienced surgeons and novices.

IV. DISCUSSION

In this study, we investigated the kinematics of surgical instruments during needle-driving through an artificial tissue. The needle-driving was performed by experienced surgeons and novices in teleoperated and open conditions. We compared the performance of experienced surgeons and novice users using classical metrics of time and path length, and developed new orientation-based metrics for assessing surgical skill. We found that in our task, the classical task time and the rate of orientation change metrics reveal statistically significant differences between experienced surgeons and novices. We suggest that when assessing skill in procedures that require control of orientation, in addition to the existing metrics, it is important to use orientation-based metrics.

A. Task segmentation

Our task was designed to include several clearly defined segments: transport, insertion, catching, and extraction. Each segment has different requirements in terms of task constraints, and may require the use of different metrics to assess surgical skills. For example, it is likely that needle transport does not require prominent orientation change. Therefore, prior to metrics calculation, we used characteristics of the movement to build a segmentation algorithm. Indeed, segmentation was important — for example, the normalized angular displacement was much higher during insertion (segment II) than during transport (segment I), and the rate of orientation change revealed differences between experienced surgeons and novices during insertion but not the transport segment.

In our experiment, the segments were part of the design of the experiment, and therefore, their definition was simple. In most of the clinical procedures, segmentation is also very important [42], and exists both on a macro and micro level. For example in prostatectomy, the procedure can be segmented into discrete steps – mobilization and dropping of the bladder, ligation and division of the dorsal venous complex, bladder neck dissection, seminal vesical dissection, neurovascular bundle dissection, prostate apex dissection and prostate removal, and urethrovesical anastomosis. Each of these steps can be further segmented into sub-movements. For example, the last step — urethrovesical anastomosis — involves the movement gestures and segments detailed within our experiment. To address the segmentation challenge, several prior studies developed algorithms for surgical task segmentation [42]-[45].

We focused the majority of our analysis on the insertion of the needle (segment II) because this was the most challenging aspect of our task, and because most of the differences
between experienced surgeons and novices were observed in that segment. Therefore, the remainder of the discussion focuses on the insertion segment.

B. Metrics

Consistently with previous studies [22], [31], [46]-[50], we found that experienced surgeons completed the task faster than novices. However, the speed-accuracy tradeoff – the inverse relation between the speed of the movement and its accuracy [51], [52] suggests that surgeons can complete the task very fast, but the accuracy of their movements may be low. Therefore, task time must be accompanied by other metrics that measure accuracy [14], [53], [54].

Although path length is a common measure for surgical skill, there is disagreement regarding its effectiveness. Several studies show that path length is a useful metric [31], [47], [55], [56], but other found it to be less adequate [16], [57], [58]. For example, during blunt tissue dissection, it is common for novices to be too ‘timid’ and do inefficient and small instrument sweeps to separate tissue planes, whereas experienced surgeons who understand tissue tolerances better, may make much broader sweeping motions, thus elevating overall path length. Our results show that path length allows for good distinction between experienced surgeons and novices, but at the end of teleoperated sessions, this difference was not statistically significant. This fact may incorrectly suggest that after a short training of 80 trials, engineering students are as skilled as experienced surgeons. Therefore, we believe that at least in needle driving, path length is insufficient for quantifying surgical skill.

To quantify the range of the tool’s orientation change, we proposed a new metric of normalized angular displacement. This metric was successful in the teleoperated condition, and the gap between the groups was maintained in the last trials. However, in the open condition, this metric failed to differentiate between different expertise levels. A possible explanation for the difference in performance of this metric in the two conditions is the absence of haptic feedback in the teleoperated condition. In the open session, participants felt forces that the artificial tissue applied to the needle. Therefore, it is likely that they intuitively corrected the orientation of the tool to enable better insertion. Novices likely used many such (unsuccessful) correction attempts that resulted in a large total angular displacement. On the other hand, the experienced surgeons knew exactly how to rotate their hand as required and needed fewer corrections. Therefore, a movement of an experienced surgeon with fast large accumulated orientation, and a movement of a novice with many corrections may yield the same angular displacement. Our results are in agreement with a pervious study of suturing skill in a virtual reality simulator [59]. They found that during needle insertion, trained subjects had less orientation change than untrained subjects, and suggested that this result may be due to errors in needle grasping and penetration angle that led to many orientation corrections. In contrast, in our teleoperated session, these corrections did not occur even if the insertion was not successful. This difference highlights the importance of developing specific metrics for RMIS, MIS, and open surgery.

The last metric, rate of orientation change, allowed for a good distinction between novices and experienced surgeons. We also found that in the last trials, the participant changed the tool’s orientation faster than at the first trials. These results demonstrate that the rate of the change of the tool’s orientation is important for the success of needle driving.

We suggest that for each surgical task it is important to choose the relevant metrics. The new orientation-based metrics may help get more accurate estimation of technical skill in tasks that involve control of orientation, such as suturing. Each individual metric has its strengths and its limitations. The rate of orientation change discriminated between experienced surgeons and novices for both conditions whereas the normalized angular displacement only managed to separate the groups in the teleoperated condition. However, this fact does not necessarily mean that the rate of orientation rate is better, because each of these two new metrics refer to a different aspect of angular motion. Moreover, it appears necessary to combine more than one metric. Composite scoring is standard in the OSATS rubric because, historically, individual performance domains approached statistical significance and independent variables, but a combination of variables provided stronger signal [10]. In a task of needle insertion, if only orientation-based metrics are used, it is possible to ‘game’ the task by significantly and quickly rotating the tool before starting the insertion and getting a better score. Therefore, in developing training curricula it is important to combine many metrics for skill assessment.

C. Future work

For the orientation-based metrics, there was great variability within the experienced surgeons group (Fig. 7(e,g) and Fig. 8(e,g)). This may be a result of different strategies, or different skill levels within the group. A composite of these metrics may provide more granular discrimination among surgeons – not just novices and experienced surgeons – but novice to intermediate and intermediate to expert and all levels between. Future studies with additional participants from different expertise groups such as medical students, residents, fellows, and experienced surgeon with larger variety of case experience are needed to explore such composite metrics. In addition, it may be interesting to investigate experienced surgeons from different specialties. Additionally, correlating these metrics with known OSATS scoring for a given performance, may add validation to these novel performance metrics.

In this study, we did not compare between teleoperated and open needle driving due to experimental design limitation. Nevertheless, a qualitative examination of the results suggests that they are different. The teleoperated needle driving was performed without haptic (force) feedback. The absence of haptic feedback likely affected the performance of the participants and the metrics that we examined. There is no consensus regarding the benefit of haptic feedback in RMIS [6], [60], [61]. In future studies in a virtual reality environment or in force-reflecting teleoperation RMIS, it will be possible to
use our new orientation-based metrics to investigate the effect of force feedback on needle driving. In addition, the dynamics of the master manipulator may also affect the performance and the learning process of surgeons [7]. A similar experiment in which the data will be recorded in the same way in the teleoperated and open conditions can help to reveal whether the differences stem from the manipulator dynamics and control. It is also worth considering that over time, surgery will be performed more with some form of teleoperated and cockpit information delivery interface such that exhaustive investigation into open tool performance feedback may have less importance. For the time being, however, open surgery comprises the majority of surgeries performed worldwide.

D. Implications to human motor control

The insertion of the needle involves a complicated motion that requires control of the orientation of the tool and the needle. In human motor control, point-to-point and planar drawing movements are well studied, and many models were proposed to explain how we control these movements. Such models include the minimum-jerk [40], minimum torque-change [62], and minimum acceleration with constraints [63] for reach movements, and the two-third power law [64] for drawing. Three-dimensional movements were also studied [65], [66], but to a much lesser extent, and the control of orientation [67] is almost never explored.

In addition, our task involves insertion of a curved needle into an artificial tissue. Interaction with elastic objects is often studied in one-dimensional movements [68], [69], and needle insertion into soft tissue was also previously studied [70], but using highly simplified model of tissue in a constrained task. However, models of movement and orientation coordination in three dimensional movement while manipulating complex end-effectors (such as our needle) are yet to be developed. Our new orientation-based metrics may help in understanding how surgeons control the orientation of their hands and instruments. Therefore, with future work, our study can advance the understanding of movement coordination in realistic scenarios.

V. CONCLUSIONS

We present novel metrics for surgical skill evaluation – normalized angular displacement and rate of orientation change. These metrics capture technical aspects of rotation of hands and instruments that are taught during the training of surgeons. We demonstrated that the rate of orientation change correlates with experience in both teleoperated and open environments, and that the normalized angular displacement enabled good distinction between experts and novices in the teleoperated condition. The new orientation-based metrics may add value to skill assessment when combined with established metrics. Future studies are needed to test these metrics on a larger cohort of surgeons and to translate these novel metrics into meaningful training feedback to facilitate more efficient training. Characterizing the movements of the surgeons may help improve the evaluation and the acquisition of motor skills that are critical to surgery, and may also provide new insight into how to improve the control of surgical robots, and the training of new surgeons.
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