Autonomous tissue retraction with a biomechanically informed logic based framework
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Abstract— Autonomy in parts of robot-assisted surgery is essential to reduce surgeons’ cognitive load and eventually improve the overall surgical outcome. A key requirement to ensure safety in an Autonomous Robotic Surgical System (ARSS) lies in the generation of interpretable plans that rely on expert knowledge. Moreover, the ARSS must be able to reason on the dynamic and unpredictable anatomical environment, and quickly adapt the surgical plan in case of unexpected situations. In this paper, we present the first cognitive modular framework for the autonomous planning and execution of surgical tasks in deformable anatomical environments. Our framework integrates a logic module for task-level interpretable reasoning, a physics-based simulation that complements data from real sensors, and a situation awareness module for context interpretation. The framework performance is evaluated on simulated soft tissue retraction, a common surgical task to remove the tissue hiding a region of interest. Results show that the framework has the adaptability required to successfully accomplish the task, handling dynamic environmental conditions and possible failures, while guaranteeing the computational efficiency required in a real surgical scenario. The framework is made publicly available.

Index Terms— Surgical Task Automation; Logic Programming; Biomechanical simulation;

I. INTRODUCTION

One frontier of research in surgical robotics is the achievement of higher levels of autonomy, which has the potential to improve the quality of an intervention [1]. In particular, level 2 of autonomy as of [1] will introduce the autonomous execution of surgical sub-tasks, limiting human errors and the fatigue of surgeons, who shall monitor the overall execution and focus only on the most critical steps. An Autonomous Robotic Surgical System (ARSS) must guarantee an interpretable behavior, i.e. the cause-effect flow governing each ARSS decision must be straightforward to understand for a monitoring surgeon, for safety and reliability [2]. This requires the cognitive capability to reason on prior expert knowledge about the task and data from sensors, and generate a workflow which is easy to interpret for a human supervisor. Moreover, the surgical scenario is affected by high variability (e.g., patient’s anatomy and tissue properties), which challenges even expert surgeons. Hence, the cognitive ARSS must be able to responsively adapt to the quick changes of the surgical environment and to recover from possible failures.

In this paper, we address the problem of reaching autonomy level 2 [1] in a surgical deformable environment, by proposing a modular framework which integrates interpretable task planning and real-time situation awareness. Interpretability is guaranteed by both encoding prior expert knowledge in logic formalism at task level, and providing semantic interpretation of data from sensors with situation awareness. The proposed framework builds on our previous work [3] for the automation of a standard surgical training task in rigid domain, which provides fast computational performance compatible with the surgical time constraints. In this work, we consider a more realistic and significant surgical use case, consisting in Tissue Retraction (TR) to expose a region of interest (e.g., a tumor or other pathological areas). In order to guarantee safe manipulation of deformable anatomies, our framework integrates a patient-specific biomechanical simulation that follows the real surgical condition throughout task execution. The physics-based model allows to avoid tissue damage by providing an accurate estimate of the applied forces. The capabilities of our cognitive framework are validated on a simulated TR task in deformable environment, executed with the da Vinci Research Kit (dVRK) [4]. The specific contributions of this work are the following:

1) we show that the logic task reasoner generates interpretable plans (see attached video), guaranteeing both the computational efficiency and safety which are essential in surgery;

2) we show that our integrated framework can adapt to the dynamic environmental conditions and re-plan when critical situations occur. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first attempt to failure recovery in a deformable surgical environment;
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3) we show that the integration of a biomechanical simulation allows to deal with specific problems of real surgery, e.g., lack of force feedback and the unknown position of tissue attachments to surrounding anatomical regions;  
4) we publicly share the framework at https://gitlab.com/altairLab/tissue_retraction.git.

The paper is organized as follows: in Section II we review state of the art in automation of TR, and we motivate the use of logic programming; in Section III we describe the TR task and the proposed autonomous framework; Section IV reports the experimental results of this paper; and Section V summarizes the main achievements and possible future research.

II. RELATED WORKS

Recent research has investigated the automation of basic operations in surgery, e.g., suturing [5], needle insertion [6] and dissection [7]. Autonomous TR combining standard motion planning algorithms with features for optimal grasping identification is performed in [8]. In [9], [10], authors have focused on the generation of optimal robotic trajectories and grasping point selection for TR, maximizing target visibility and minimizing tissue damage based on biomechanical simulation. These works assume the execution workflow is predefined, and do not deal with failure recovery and unconventional situations which occur in real (surgical) robotic tasks.

Learning-based methods have recently shown the potential to capture variability in the surgical scenario. In [11], deep reinforcement learning is proposed to learn a policy for robotic TR in a simulated environment. [12] shows that efficient transfer of learned policies from simulation to the real system in uncertain environments can be obtained with the incorporation of few human demonstrations. [13] presents a learning strategy which incorporates human knowledge for the definition of task-specific features. However, learning-based methods fail to generalize to situations not seen at training time and do not guarantee any interpretability [14], which is essential for safety-critical scenarios as surgery.

Interpretability for autonomous robots is guaranteed by logic-based reasoning systems [15]. They encode prior concepts and specifications about a robotic domain in a knowledge base (e.g., an ontology as proposed by [15]), using logic formalism which is easily readable by humans. Planning languages as PDDL then allow to apply logic inference on knowledge [16]. A logic-based task planner does not encode pre-defined workflows (as finite state machines do); instead, it performs human-like logic inference from knowledge and data from sensors, in order to generate an appropriate workflow for the current situation. Hence, the logic-based approach formally guarantees that specifications encoded in prior knowledge (which may be, e.g., safety constraints in surgery) are satisfied during the execution. However, [17] evidences the limits of ontology-based reasoning, which can only represent a static scenario, while real-time knowledge revision for re-planning is computationally inefficient. For this reason, ontologies are mostly used for supervision and assistance in surgery [18], [19]. In this paper, we instead use non-monotonic logic programming [20], which combines knowledge representation and reasoning, and permits online revision of incomplete or dynamic information. Although non-monotonic logic programming has never been applied to surgery, examples in other fields [21], [22] show its feasibility in safety-critical scenarios. In this work, we rely on Answer Set Programming (ASP) [23], a non-monotonic logic paradigm which is more computationally efficient and expressive if compared to its main competitor Prolog [24].

III. METHODS

In this Section, we describe and motivate the choice of the TR task as use case, and describe the proposed framework for ARSS.

A. Tissue retraction task

Tissue retraction (TR) is a common task in surgery. It aims at grasping and lifting an anatomical layer (e.g., adipose tissue) to reveal and make accessible an underlying region of interest (ROI) (e.g., a tumor). We assume that the 3D geometric model of the tissue and the 3D position of the ROI to expose are known from pre-operative data (Fig. 1). The task is executed by the two patient-side manipulators (PSMs) of the dVRK. A challenge of TR is the presence of attachment points (APs) between the tissue and the surrounding anatomy, which are usually only partially known at the beginning of the task. Although the position of APs can be initialized based on statistical information [25], [26], precise knowledge about APs in surgery can only be obtained interacting with the tissue [26], [27]. Discovering and avoiding APs is important in TR to prevent the application of excessive forces on highly constrained areas, thus minimizing the risk of tissue tearing and/or rupture. Safe and efficient TR requires grasping at a point which maximizes the distance from known APs, while minimizing the distance from ROI for faster exposure.

The selected grasping point is considered reachable by one of the PSMs, depending on its position with respect to the tissue $x$–axis of symmetry (hence, distance on $y$–axis is considered, Fig. 1). After grasping, the PSM pulls the tissue up to expose ROI [28]. However, other strategies are needed in case critical conditions rise, e.g., excessive applied force, that can be recognized thanks to the force feedback provided by a biomechanical simulation. The reasoner then generates a safer strategy, e.g. lateral motion to expose the ROI (Fig. 4), or grasp re-planning if an AP is found (Fig. 5).

B. The framework

Fig. 2 depicts the main modules of our framework. The framework is initialized with pre-operative information, that define the starting anatomical condition and the position of the target to reach. During task execution, a situation awareness (SA) module receives information from sensors and dynamic feedback from a physics-based simulation of the environment. This information is translated to a semantic
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interpretation (context) of the environment state, and sent to the task reasoner. The task reasoner generates a plan, i.e., a sequence of actions towards the goal of the task. The actions are communicated to a motion control (MC) module, which translates them into motion commands for the robotic arms. The context and the plan can be monitored by an expert human supervisor, to guarantee the reliability of the ARSS.

1) Task reasoner: This module encodes task knowledge in the logic programming formalism of Answer Set Programming (ASP) [29]. An ASP program represents the domain of the task with a description D and a history H. D comprises a signature Σ and axioms. Σ is the alphabet of the task, defining relevant attributes of the domain. Attributes may be statics, i.e., domain attributes whose values do not change over time; fluents, i.e., domain attributes whose values can be changed; and actions. Attributes may be terms; atoms, i.e. predicates of terms (e.g. Atom(T₁, ..., Tₙ) is an atom with terms T₁,...,Tₙ as arguments); and their logical negations. Values of terms are constants (either integers or strings). A term whose value is assigned is ground, and an atom is ground if its terms are ground. Axioms are logical relations between attributes. In this paper, we consider causal rules λ₁ := λ₂₁, ..., λ₂ₙ, defining preconditions λ₁,...,λₙ (body of the rule) for grounding the head λ₃. Following the definition of the task introduced in Sec. III-A, statics are block (from now on B), representing a generic candidate grasping point on the tissue; and arm (from now on A), representing the robotic arm (either psml or psm2). Fluents are relevant environmental conditions for the task. We define them as atoms with the variable t as argument, representing a discrete time step for temporal reasoning. They include reachable(A, B, t) (B reachable by A), in_hand(A, B, t), closed_gripper(A, t) (gripper state), distance(B₁, B₂, X, t) (the distance between B₁-B₂ is X), visible_ROI(t), max_height(A, t) (pulling is no longer possible if excessive force is measured), fixed(B, t) (B is close to APs), at(A, B, t) (location of A on tissue) and above_ROI(B, t) (location of ROI under tissue). All fluents except distance are defined as external atoms, so they can be grounded from the SA module.

Actions for our task are reach(A, B, t), grasp(A, B, t), release(A, t), pull(A, B, t) and move(A, B, t) (for lateral motion). Axioms express logical relations between atoms. For the task of TR, we consider axioms representing causal laws, executability constraints, choice rules and optimization statements. Causal laws define effects of actions on fluents (e.g., A’s gripper is closed after grasping. closed_gripper(A, t) :- grasp(A, B, t)). Executability constraints specify the set of actions and fluents that cannot hold concurrently (e.g., it is not possible to pull up tissue if the force applied to the tissue exceeds safety constraints, :- pull(A, B, t), max_height(A, t)). Choice rules specify the environmental pre-conditions which must be satisfied to execute actions. For our task, at most one single action can be executed at each time step. Then, we define a choice rule gathering pre-conditions for actions as 0 { action(t) : pre-cond(t) } 1, which constrains the cardinality of the set of possible actions returned at each time step between 0 and 1. Optimization statements define preference in the set of possible actions, in particular for optimal grasping as defined in Sec. III-A. For instance, to maximize distance between grasping point and APs, we state #maximize[X : reach(A, B₁, t), distance(B₁, B₂, X, t), fixed(B₂, t)]. We finally define the goal of the TR task as the constraint that the ROI must be eventually visible within a predefined percentage (:- visible_ROI(t)).

Given the ASP program, an ASP solver grounds information from sensors and axioms at each time step, and returns them as H, enhancing interpretability of the behavior of ARSS. For task planning, we select from H only atoms representing actions to command the robot (see attached video).

2) Situation awareness: The SA module continuously monitors the state of the robot and the environment, to provide high-level interpretation of the environmental context and guarantee safe execution (avoiding tissue damage). The functions of the SA module are described in Alg. [1] The SA module receives the state of the robot S_R, i.e. the 3D position of PSMs p₁₂ and joint angles of grippers j₁₂, from robot kinematics; and the state of the environment S_E, including the point cloud of tissue points P₁ and known APs P₁ ⊆ P₁ from sensors; the set Σ of mechanical forces at each tissue point from the biomechanical simulation; and the position of the ROI ROI. All the quantities in S_R and S_E are referred to the same kinematic frame (Fig. [1]). External fluents for task reasoning are computed by the function compute_fluents as described by Alg. [2] (time t is omitted because it is assigned at ASP level). Specifically, Lines 7-8 compute ROI visibility. To this purpose, at the beginning of the task (Line 3 in Alg. [1]) we compute P_close as the set of tissue points close to the ROI within a fixed threshold (10 mm in this work). The ROI is assumed to be visible when a pre-defined percentage (above a threshold δ) of P_close becomes far enough from
the ROI itself (e.g., more than 10 mm in this work), thus indicating that the tissue has been displaced such that the ROI is accessible. When an action has to be executed, function compute_target computes the motion target \( g \) for it. The target is needed only for actions reach(A, B, t) (the position of grasping point B, see Fig. 1) and move(A, B, t) \(((x_B, y_B, z_i))\). During the execution of pull(A, B, t) action, the function check_failure verifies that max\(\Sigma \) < \( \epsilon \), where \( \epsilon \) is a threshold depending on the tissue mechanical properties. Otherwise, failure is notified to the MC module to interrupt the execution, and the task reasoner re-plans (with grounding of max\(\text{height}(A, t)\)).

3) Motion control: The MC module receives the current action in the plan from the task reasoner. For each action, it selects the appropriate motion primitive from a pre-defined set, as in [3]. For actions reach(A, B, t) and move(A, B, t), it also receives the goal position from the SA module. Otherwise, the target is \((x_i, y_i, z_i+h)\) for pull(A, B, t), i.e. the tissue is pulled up to a pre-defined height \((h = 50 \text{ mm in our task})\). Grasping and releasing of the gripper are direct joint closing and opening commands, respectively. In this work, economy of motion is maximized by considering only linear trajectories, keeping a fixed orientation at the end-effector.

4) Simulated environment: A physics-based model of the anatomical environment is created starting from patient-specific geometry and mechanical properties extracted from pre-operative data. At each time instant, the simulation updates the tissue state based on the current robot configuration received from the MC module. To obtain a physically accurate result, we model the deformable behavior of anatomical tissues exploiting continuum mechanics laws, solved with the finite element (FE) method [30]. The choice of a physics-based method allows to continuously extract real tool-tissue interaction forces, a crucial quantity to monitor and avoid unnecessary tissue damage. In the considered simulation environment, grasping is implemented by constraining the tissue points closest to the simulated PSM (distance below a small threshold, 5 mm in our task) to follow PSM motion, similarly to [9], [11]. Grasping is activated or released based on commands received from the MC module. Current implementation does not consider the possibility of slippage or breaking contacts between the tool and the tissue, that might happen during real retraction.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

For the experimental evaluation of the framework, we use the dVRK to control the surgical robot and receive kinematic information. The task reasoning module is implemented using the state-of-the-art ASP solver Clingo [31]. We assess performance of the presented framework on TR of a rectangular soft tissue sample of dimension 100 \( \times \) 120 \( \times \) 5 mm, in a simulated environment. Hence, in this evaluation, all the information about the state of the environment \( S_E \) (including the point cloud of tissue points \( P_i \)) are provided to the SA module by the simulation itself (Fig. 2). The tissue is modelled as a St Venant-Kirchoff material with Young’s modulus 3 kPa and Poisson ratio 0.45, a common modelling choice for adipose tissues [27], [32], which are often responsible of hiding structures of interest during real surgery [28]. APs are defined as random tissue patches, following the strategy
proposed in [27]. In this evaluation, we consider a finite set of candidate grasping points, uniformly spaced on an $N \times N$ grid, centered on the tissue of interest (Fig. 1). In all tests, we set the threshold for visibility $\delta = 70\%$ in Alg. 2. Tests are run on a PC with 2.6 GHz Intel Core i7 processor and 16 GB RAM.

A. Autonomous tissue retraction

In order to evaluate the capability of the proposed framework to automate TR task handling the different conditions that may occur, we run 100 simulations initialized with different random environmental states (i.e., one possible grasping point every $15 mm$). Success rate of our autonomous framework is assessed by measuring the average visibility percentage as defined in Alg. 1 reached upon task completion.

After the tissue is grasped, we focus on three possible situations, depending solely on the initial state. In the simplest case (Scenario A in Fig. 3), the force applied to the tissue never exceeds the safety threshold $\epsilon$; thus, the tissue is pulled upwards until the ROI is exposed. Instead, in case the force overcomes the safety threshold $\epsilon$, the PSM moves the tissue laterally towards the ROI in order to reveal it (Scenario B in Fig. 4). Without further pulling, the stress on the tissue is reduced (especially at APs). The third possible scenario occurs when the chosen grasping point corresponds to an unknown AP. In this case, the force goes beyond $\epsilon$ immediately after grasping (i.e., when the $z$-position of the PSM is close to the tissue). Then, the task reasoner must re-plan grasping to another point (Scenario C in Fig. 5). The three scenarios are illustrated in the video attachment to this paper, evidencing the interpretability of the plan and the environmental context description. Even though a simplified tissue model is considered for evaluation in this paper, it is worth noticing that our framework can provide a plan for any tissue geometry and state of the environment.

We have found that re-planning (Scenarios B or C) is needed in 27 simulations. The achieved visibility percentage (mean $\pm$ standard deviation) is 96.89% $\pm$ 6.37%, demonstrating that, on average, our autonomous framework is able to expose the region of interest to a high extent, thus successfully accomplishing the task. Results show that re-planning does not affect the final visibility percentage (average visibility is 96.41% when re-planning is needed, comparable to the average over all executions).

One of the contributions of this work lies in the integration of the dynamic feedback from the biomechanical simulation for enhanced situation awareness. Our results demonstrate that the force feedback provided by the simulation is fundamental for safe accomplishment of the task in roughly one third of the cases. In real surgery, where the surgeon has no information about the force applied to the tissues, all these cases represent potentially dangerous situations where minimization of tissue damage is not guaranteed.

In fact, the mechanical stress on the tissue can only be roughly evaluated from visual feedback or based on the surgeon’s expertise. We further verify the importance of force feedback from simulation by running a set of 100 simulations where no force limit is set. In this batch of simulations, the maximum force applied to the tissue is $(1.25 \pm 0.96) N$ (mean $\pm$ standard deviation), i.e. almost 3 times the safety threshold, with a peak of $8.50 N$ (when grasping occurs close to unknown APs). As a consequence, integration of force information from the simulation is crucial for safe task execution.

B. Planning efficiency

An additional requirement of the task reasoning module is responsive reaction to the quickly changing anatomical environment. The computational performance of task reasoner is evaluated as the planning time, defined as the time required by Clingo to compute a plan, given a context interpretation from the SA module. Hence, it does not depend on the rate at which sensor data are received. The planning time includes optimal selection of the grasping point; thus, it may be affected by two main parameters: the number of candidate grasping points and the percentage $f_{\%}$ of APs. In fact, they both influence the size of the search space for possible grasping points. In this evaluation, we consider different resolutions of the grid defining candidate grasping points $N \in \{5, \ldots, 10\}$. For each value of $N$, we run 25 simulation for each value $f_{\%} \in \{10\%, 30\%, 50\%, 70\%\}$. This results in 600 total simulations, each initialized with a different random $p_{ROI}$ and $P_f$ (according to the value of $f_{\%}$).

The second column of Table 4 reports the time required by the task reasoner to generate the initial plan, assuming that the location of APs is known. This assumption is made only to identify a possible dependence of the planning time on the amount of attached areas. Obtained results show that the most influencing parameter is $N$, while $f_{\%}$ does not significantly affect the average planning time. The task reasoner is able to compute the optimal grasping point and a plan within 1.5s when using a $7 \times 7$ grid discretization for grasping point definition, demonstrating high efficiency. Given the realistic size of the tissue chosen for our simulation [28], this means that logic constraints can fairly approximate safe grasping far from known APs and fast ROI exposure (see Section III-A). Although here we do not intend to provide a strategy for optimal grasping point selection, obtained results suggest that the proposed approach can be used in combination with state-of-the-art grasping point selection algorithms, to significantly improve their performance through search space shrinkage and provide safety guarantees even in real surgery [10].

The computational capabilities of our cognitive system are also validated in terms of re-planning time (Scenarios B-C). We run 100 simulations for each value of $N$, setting constant $f_{\%} = 50\%$ (since $f_{\%}$ has shown not to influence the planning time). For Scenario B, we assume known APs, thus excluding situations when re-planning is triggered by grasping unknown APs. Instead, re-planning times relative
TABLE I: Planning time and re-planning times in Scenarios B and C (average ± standard deviation), with different tissue grid size $N$ and percentage of APs $f_\%$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Planning time [s]</th>
<th>Re-planning time B [s]</th>
<th>Re-planning time C [s]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$f_% = 10%$</td>
<td>$f_% = 30%$</td>
<td>$f_% = 50%$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.25 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.24 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.23 ± 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.68 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.65 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.64 ± 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.30 ± 0.02</td>
<td>1.48 ± 0.03</td>
<td>1.41 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.06 ± 0.04</td>
<td>2.97 ± 0.06</td>
<td>2.90 ± 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.88 ± 0.08</td>
<td>5.70 ± 0.15</td>
<td>5.51 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.75 ± 0.20</td>
<td>10.21 ± 0.28</td>
<td>9.92 ± 0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To Scenario C are computed by running the same 100 simulations, but considering unknown APs at the beginning of the task. Results are reported in the last two columns of Table I. The average re-planning time for Scenario B is approximately half of the planning time obtained at the same value of $N$. This happens because the system does not need to re-plan for optimal grasping, hence a significant part of the ASP computational effort is removed. On the contrary, in Scenario C the system requires more time to re-plan because tissue releasing and new grasp planning are required. Overall, the re-planning time is below 2 s for a $7 \times 7$ grasping points discretization, which guarantees highly efficient adaptation to the quickly changing anatomical environment, introducing only a minor delay which is compatible with intra-operative times.

V. CONCLUSIONS

This work presents a cognitive framework for autonomous surgical task execution in a deformable anatomical environment, supporting real-time planning and failure recovery. Our preliminary results on a simulated tissue retraction task demonstrate that the framework has the required features to handle a real surgical scenario. Logic-based task reasoning and real-time situation awareness guarantee interpretability of the workflow of execution (environmental context interpretation and consequent plan generation), which is necessary for monitoring and to guarantee the reliability and safety of the ARSS. Logics can provide safety guarantees and reduce the computational burden of standard state-of-the-art algorithms for grasping selection. A biomechanical simulation provides feedback on the forces applied on the tissue, guaranteeing safe manipulation even when unknown attachment points are grasped, as in real surgery. Future works will focus on the validation on a real scenario, where the role of the SA module and the simulation will be fundamental to close the control loop and ensure safe execution. Furthermore, we plan to exploit the output from the SA module to continuously update the simulated environment and compensate for possible modelling uncertainties [27], [33]. Extension to more complex surgical tasks would also require the integration with more sophisticated motion planning strategies [3].
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