Surgical Skill Level Classification Based on Surgical Tool Movements Using IMU Sensors

Yifeng Zhu¹, Peyman Benharash², Esteban Aguayo², Eunsuk Chong³, Veronica Santos³

³Dept. of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, UCLA

²David Geffen School of Medicine, UCLA

¹Dept. of Control Science and Engineering, Zhejiang University





Background

BIOMECHATRONICS

LAB at UCLA

Objective evaluation of surgical skills is important for training and assessment of the surgical community. Given the limited time and resources for medical education, a reliable system for autonomously evaluating skill level is needed.

Our work aims to:

- Set up a low-cost data collection system
- Autonomously and objectively evaluate surgical skill level



Data from IMU

Quaternion: (q_w, q_x, q_y, q_z)

Experimental Setting

Experimental set-up

• 9 degree-of-freedom inertial measurement unit (IMU sensor: Adafruit BNO055) attached to a needle driver and forceps

Task requirement:

- Suturing
- 10 stitches

Number of trials

Evport	Novice	Tatal

Characterize of experts' and novices' movements

Goal of this study:

Classify surgical skill level into expert and novice



- One IMU on the needle driver - One IMU on the forceps

- We convert quaternions into 3x3 rotation matrices, R
- Linear acceleration: (a_x, a_y, a_z)

Expert	Novice	TOLAT
9	13	22

*Data were collected according to a UCLA IRBapproved protocol.

Methods and Results

Repetitive pattern of needle driver Jerkiness of forceps **Change of Rotation Matrix, Driver** ι and σ of step-wise jerk in x component, Forceps ExpertNovice 1. Calculate change of "distance" between two rotation Jerkiness describes change of linear acceleration matrices^[1]: 1. Normalize time stamps into steps: $d_i = \|\ln(R_i R_0^T)\|, R_0 = I_{3 \times 3}$ $t'_i = \frac{t_i}{total time length}, i = 1, 2 \dots, L$ 2. Normalize sequence $\{d_i\}$ by Normalized time length t **Repetitive Pattern of Driver** $n_i = \frac{-}{\max(\{d_i\}) - \min(\{d_i\})} d_i - 1, i = 1, 2, \dots L$ 2. Calculate step-wise jerk: 3. (Cross Correlation) Obtain the repetitive pattern by $j_{x,i} = \frac{a_{x,t'_{i+1}} - a_{x,t'_i}}{t'_{i+1} - t'_i}, i = 1, 2 \dots, L-1$ ι and σ of step-wise jerk in y component, Forceps $n_i' = \sum n_k \times n_{k-i+i_0}$ Obtain $j_{v,i}$, $j_{z,i}$ in the same way Normalized time length t (with i_0 randomly chosen, $l = \frac{1}{10}L$) Frequency domain of repetitive pattern 3. Calculate mean value μ and standard deviation σ of $\{j_{x,i}\}, \{j_{y,i}\}, \{j_{z,i}\},$ which 4. Frequency analysis of normalized repetitive pattern: is denoted as $\mu_x, \sigma_x, \mu_y, \sigma_y, \mu_z$, and σ_z f = FFT(n') J_1 Choose frequencies f_1 , f_2 corresponding to two largest $p_1^{0.25}$ peaks as features for all data. respectively. Take these six parameters μ and σ of step-wise jerk in z component, Forceps from each data to plot figures on the ExpertNovice

5. Use Support Vector Machine^[2] to classify data based on f_1 and f_2 .





Brown curve: $\{n_k | k = i_0, i_0 + 1 \dots, i_0 + l\}$ Blue and black dashed line boxes: moving the segment selected (brown curve)

Classification based on needle driver SVM Gaussian Kernel Leave-one-out 99.09% cross validation accuracy

Conclusion

We have studied on features of surgical tool movements during suturing. Using only IMU sensors for measuring surgical tool movements, our method shows two meaningful results:

- Good classification accuracy of experts and novices
- Experts show significantly more repetitive pattern in using the needle driver
- Experts show smoother (less jerky) movements in using the forceps.
- Standard deviation is more useful than mean in analyzing jerkiness of forceps' movements

right.

4. Classify data using SVM, and try four choices of features for classification.



Classification based on jerkiness of forceps

Fastures	Leave-one-out	
Features	cross validation accuracy	
$\pmb{\sigma}_{\pmb{\chi}}$, $\pmb{\sigma}_{\pmb{y}}$, $\pmb{\sigma}_{\pmb{z}}$	90.91%	
μ_x , σ_x	77.27%	
μ_y , σ_y	90.91%	
μ_z, σ_z	90.91%	

References

[1]Huynh, Du Q. "Metrics for 3D rotations: Comparison and analysis." *Journal of* Mathematical Imaging and Vision 35.2 (2009): 155-164

[2]Cortes, C., & Vapnik, V. (1995). Support-vector networks. *Machine learning*, 20(3), 273-297.

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Dr. Santos and Dr. Chong for helping me review the mathematical perspective of the analysis, Dr. Benharash and medical student Esteban for giving me some direction of the research and Nathan



