INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL of SPINE SURGERY

Can Robotic Spine Surgery Become the Standard of Care?

Alexander M. Satin, Stanley Kisinde and Isador H. Lieberman

Int J Spine Surg 2022, 16 (S2) S44-S49
doi: https://doi.org/10.14444/8276
https://www.ijssurgery.com/content/16/S2/S44

This information is current as of October 11, 2024.

Email Alerts Receive free email-alerts when new articles cite this article. Sign up at: http://ijssurgery.com/alerts

The International Journal of Spine Surgery
2397 Waterbury Circle, Suite 1,
Aurora, IL 60504, Phone: +1-630-375-1432
© 2022 ISASS. All Rights Reserved.
Downloaded from https://www.ijssurgery.com/ by guest on October 11, 2024

International Journal of Spine Surgery, Vol. 16, No. S2, 2022, pp. S44–S49
https://doi.org/10.14444/8276
© International Society for the Advancement of Spine Surgery

Can Robotic Spine Surgery Become the Standard of Care?

ALEXANDER M. SATIN, MD[1]; STANLEY KISINDE, MBChB, MMed[1]; AND ISADOR H. LIEBERMAN, MD, MBA, FRCSC[1]

[1]*Texas Back Institute, Plano, Texas, USA*

ABSTRACT

Concerns regarding traditional techniques led to the development of robotic systems to facilitate the safe and accurate placement of pedicle screws. The Mazor Spine Assist was the first robotic spine surgery (RSS) platform to receive US Food and Drug Administration approval in 2004. Since then, there has been a steady increase in the application of RSS with several additional iterations of the Mazor platform and other competing systems receiving approval. As the indications, potential benefits, and utilization of RSS continue to expand, the question naturally arises as to whether RSS will eventually become the standard of care for spine surgery. In this article, we review the available evidence and experience with RSS and discuss the potential for RSS to become the medical standard of care.

New Technology

Keywords: robotic spine surgery, standard of care, minimally invasive spine surgery

INTRODUCTION

In 2004, the Mazor Spine Assist (Medtronic, Minneapolis, MN) became the first robotic spine surgery (RSS) platform to receive Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approval.[1–3] Since that time, there has been a steady increase in the application of RSS with several additional iterations of the Mazor platform and other competing systems receiving FDA approval. Presently, there are 3 RSS systems available in the United States that have received FDA approval. The Mazor X Stealth Edition gained approval in 2018 and incorporates real-time intraoperative navigation and represents the fourth generation of the Mazor RSS platform. The other available systems are the ExcelsiusGPS (Globus Medical, Audubon, PA) and ROSA (Zimmer Biomet, Warsaw, IN). The ExcelsiusGPS gained FDA approval in 2017 and has real-time intraoperative navigation capabilities.[1] While these systems have different features, they are all based on a shared control model—whereby surgeon and robot concurrently control motions, and the surgeon performs the pedicle drilling and screw placement.[4–6]

Pedicle screws allow for rigid 3-column spinal fixation. The accurate placement of pedicle screws is a critical component of instrumented spinal fusion surgeries. Malpositioned pedicle screws can cause catastrophic damage to adjacent neurologic and vascular structures. Furthermore, inaccurate placement can compromise the mechanical stability of a hardware construct. Freehand placement relies solely on described anatomic landmarks and level-specific average medial-lateral trajectories for accurate pedicle screw placement. The subsequent introduction of computer-assisted navigation led to improvements in precision and safety over freehand placement,[7–10] but they are not without patient safety concerns and include increased radiation exposure to the patient and staff.[1] Additionally, both techniques are subject to surgeon fatigue and diminished precision.[11] Concerns with the aforementioned techniques led to the development of robotic systems to facilitate the safe and accurate placement of pedicle screws.

As the indications, potential benefits, and utilization[12] of RSS continue to expand, the question naturally arises as to whether RSS will eventually become the standard of care (SOC) for spine surgery.

DEFINING SOC

While the term SOC is often referenced and discussed, it is not a concept taught in medical education or defined in routine clinical practice. Rather, it is primarily a legal concept used by attorneys in cases of medical negligence. Others believe that SOC cannot be universally defined and should be interpreted in both legal and clinical contexts.[13] While evidence and data play a role, the concept of medical SOC is more abstract.

Downloaded from https://www.ijssurgery.com/ by guest on October 11, 2024

Legal SOC is typically defined as the level and type of care that a reasonably competent and skilled health care professional, with a similar background and in the same medical community, would have provided under the circumstances that led to the alleged breach of care. The legal community has established 4 pillars in their effort to define the SOC—knowledge, skill, diligence, and care. These 4 pillars today act as the foundation for determining liability in most instructions to the jury when deliberating medical malpractice cases. Regardless of how SOC is defined, it is subject to change over time as a given specialty evolves and improves.[14] To that end, the SOC is in a constant state of flux and evolution. However, as pointed out by Greenberg,[15] simply recognizing that medical practice changes over time does not provide insight on to how those changes occur. Rather than being a seamless transition, the introduction and subsequent adoption of new technology occur by "fits and starts" and at first represent a departure from what most physicians are doing.

When defining medical SOC for disc replacement, Gornet et al considered both evidence and experience.[13] In doing so, they acknowledged that when evaluating the best treatment in individual situations, one must also consider surgeon comfort and experience rather than simply the one that has the best data. There is no standard definition of medical SOC, but the idea that evidence and experience define medical SOC will serve as a guide for our discussion of RSS.

EVIDENCE

Screw Accuracy

Numerous studies, including randomized controlled trials (RCTs), have been conducted to assess the accuracy of pedicle screws placed using RSS systems. Mazor robotics pioneered RSS and, as a result, their systems have been the most extensively studied to date.[5,16–28] Cadaveric studies have confirmed accuracy of the Mazor system within 1 mm of preoperative templates.[29,30] A retrospective case series published by Hu et al reported 98.9% accuracy of 960 screws placed in 95 patients.[31]

In 2012, Ringel et al published the first RCT comparing pedicle screws placed via the Mazor Spine Assist, the first iteration of the Mazor platform, with freehand technique.[32] In total, 298 pedicle screws were placed in 60 patients. Surprisingly, a lower percentage of the robotic-placed screws were deemed acceptable (Gertzbein-Robbins score grade A or B) than the freehand group; 85% vs 93%. Lateral pedicle breaches were attributed to insufficient fixation of the robot to the patient, leading to deviation of the implantation cannula at the entry point. Subsequent models of the Mazor robot (Renaissance, Mazor X, and Mazor X Stealth Edition) have greatly enhanced fixation mechanisms. To date, this remains the only study that has demonstrated inferiority of robotic assistance.[16]

In a 2016 RCT comparing screw accuracy of the Mazor Renaissance robot with freehand technique, Kim et al found no differences in screw accuracy using the Gertzbein-Robbins classification.[20] However, there was a significant reduction in proximal facet violation with robotic assistance. A subsequent RCT completed by Hyun et al also evaluated the accuracy of screws placed by the Mazor Renaissance model and compared them with fluoroscopically placed pedicle screws.[33] In total, 270 pedicle screws were placed in 60 patients. Screws placed with the robot were more accurate (100% vs 98.6%) and reduced the number of proximal facet violations.[19]

Additional RCTs and meta-analyses have found comparable or improved placement of pedicle screws using the Mazor robotic system when compared with more traditional techniques.[20,34–37]

To date, there are no prospective RCTs evaluating the ExcelsiusGPS, but lower-level studies have shown high accuracy and safety profile similar to the Mazor platform.[38–46] Additional non-RCTs have demonstrated increased pedicle screw accuracy with different robotic assistance systems compared with traditional techniques.[19,47]

Radiation Exposure

While preoperative and/or intraoperative computed tomography is utilized, a theorized benefit of RSS is the reduction or elimination of radiation exposure to the surgeon and operating room staff. Numerous studies have evaluated radiation exposure during RSS with varying results based on robotic platform, surgeon experience, and technique.[1,2] Fan et al reported a 50% reduction in average fluoroscopy time for screw placement with robotic assistance compared with freehand technique.[48] When combining the results of 2 RCTs, Gao et al found that robotic assistance significantly reduced intraoperative radiation time and dosage.[35]

Perhaps the greatest potential for reducing radiation exposure is in minimally invasive spine surgery, specifically percutaneous pedicle screw placement. Open procedures require exposure of the relevant anatomy for proper placement of pedicle screws and are associated with increased estimated blood loss, more postoperative

Downloaded from https://www.ijssurgery.com/ by guest on October 11, 2024

pain, and greater length of stay.[49–51] Conversely, minimally invasive percutaneous pedicle screws are placed via small, muscle-sparing paramedian incisions. However, traditional percutaneous techniques require frequent biplanar fluoroscopy for safe screw placement. Robotic assistance can provide similar minimally invasive benefits while significantly reducing radiation exposure. To that end, in a cadaveric study comparing the ExcelsiusGPS to conventional minimally invasive techniques, Vaccaro et al demonstrated improved pedicle screw accuracy and reduced surgical time while eliminating radiation exposure to the surgeon and operating room staff with robotic assistance.[52] In an RCT evaluating percutaneous pedicle screw placement, Hyun et al found that RSS significantly reduced per-screw radiation exposure to the surgeon compared with a fluoroscopy-guided open approach.[33]

Cost

High initial acquisition cost (>$1 million) and expensive annual service contracts ($100,000) remain key barriers to widespread adoption of RSS.[5,16] Concern regarding these costs is amplified by a lack of long-term cost-effectiveness data. However, several factors related to RSS, such as reduced operative time,[52] reduced blood loss,[48] less revision surgeries,[19,53] fewer postoperative infections,[19] and shorter length of stay[20,33,48] may ultimately offset these costs and indirectly produce long-term financial savings.

To that end, Menger and colleagues[54] retrospectively reviewed 557 patients and evaluated the financial impact of minimally invasive spine surgery made possible by RSS. Their analysis found RSS to be cost-effective through reduced length of stay, fewer revision surgeries, lower infection rates, and shorter operative time.

Additional high-level studies are needed to better understand the financial implications of RSS and to set benchmarks for cost savings such as number of cases needed to recuperate initial cost.

EXPERIENCE

The current state of RSS and surgeon experience can be analyzed from multiple perspectives. First, one must consider, as with any new technology, the associated learning curve and how it impacts clinical practice. It is certainly understandable that established, efficient, high-volume surgeons would be hesitant to introduce robotics into their practice. Initial accounts analyzing the learning curve associated with RSS efficiency,[55] successful screw placement,[31] and screw accuracy[56] seemed to reinforce this belief. However, a more recent account of user experience with a modern robotic platform (Mazor X) demonstrated minimal learning curve with high reliability and accuracy.[57] As the performance and user experience of newer robotic platforms improve, the learning curve and the associated resistance to adoption will continue to decrease.

Despite the evidence supporting RSS and increased use, a major question remains regarding the adoption of RSS: Will there ever be a procedure or technique that is solely done through RSS? Surely, if this was the case, one could consider RSS the SOC. While this is not currently the case, examples outside of spine surgery can provide insight into the factors associated with this potential transition.

The da Vinci surgical system (Intuitive Surgical, Sunnyvale, CA) is a telerobotic platform that gained FDA approval in 2000. Since then, it has become increasingly popular in general surgery, gynecology, and urology.[58] For example, in 2003, less than 1% of surgeons in the United States performed robotic-assisted radical prostatectomies (RARP). By 2014, RARP accounted for 90% of radical prostatectomies performed in the United States. While less invasive than traditional techniques, some have criticized the platform's high cost with similar long-term outcomes.[59] However, RARP is less invasive (reduced blood loss, less pain, and shorter recovery) than traditional techniques and has distinct advantages for the surgeon. Use of the platform increases visualization and allows the surgeon to sit for the 2- to 4-hour procedure. While the surgeon does not currently sit during RSS, some authors have pointed to the obvious ergonomic advantages of RSS over traditional techniques.[11] Given the aforementioned advantages (evidence) and widespread utilization (experience), RARP would be considered the SOC as defined by Gornet and colleagues.

Additional insight into the adoption of new orthopedic technology and techniques can be gained by examining the transition from open to arthroscopic shoulder surgery at the end of the 20th century and beginning of the 21st century. In a 2003 American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons Instructional Course Lecture, Yamaguchi and colleagues[60] discuss the growing enthusiasm for complete arthroscopic rotator cuff repair, which was first introduced in 1980. As surgeons became more comfortable with arthroscopic shoulder surgery, both the use and acceptable indications increased. While outcomes were similar to older techniques, the arthroscopic technique was associated with less morbidity, less pain, and

Downloaded from https://www.ijssurgery.com/ by guest on October 11, 2024

quicker recovery. Regardless, the authors encouraged surgeons to not compromise basic surgical principles and to employ the technique that is most reproducible in their hands.

These concepts can be applied to new technology in any surgical field. With a proper transition strategy, surgeons can gradually and safely become more skilled and comfortable utilizing new surgical techniques. As the benefits of new technology become more apparent, more surgeons transition to new technology, and trainees pursue programs to gain early exposure and specialized training. In some instances, such as arthroscopic rotator cuff repair, the new and technically challenging procedure becomes the clinical SOC.

When discussing experience in this context, we would be remiss to not discuss the potential negative unintended consequences of widespread RSS adoption. The large capital costs associated with RSS have the potential to increase inequality gaps between hospitals and even countries. There are also concerns regarding surgeon training and experience. Currently, all surgeons have at least some proficiency with freehand pedicle screw techniques. While the available robotic systems are highly accurate and safe, the surgeon still must know the general landmarks and trajectories for screw placement. What will happen if the robot malfunctions or fails midcase and the surgeon only knows how to perform RSS? Will the surgeon fail to see the seemingly obvious screw trajectory or be unable to continue the case without the robot? Perhaps, even as RSS becomes more popular, freehand techniques should remain part of surgical training to avoid these exact scenarios. However, what proportion of today's graduating orthopedic residents are familiar with an open rotator cuff repair or knee meniscectomy?

CONCLUSIONS

While a universally accepted definition of clinical SOC does not exist, prior authors have utilized both experience and evidence to define clinical SOC in spine surgery. Despite growing support regarding the benefits of RSS over traditional techniques (evidence), more time is needed to see if there is widespread adoption (experience) of RSS. Nevertheless, the potential for greater adoption of RSS certainly exists. As such, we believe that RSS will eventually become the clinical SOC for spine surgery. Barriers to adoption include high capital costs, the perceived learning curve, and competition from emerging technologies such as augmented reality. Examples from outside of spine surgery can provide insight into the modern adoption of new technology that was fraught with similar concerns yet managed to become the SOC in their respective fields—RARP and arthroscopic shoulder surgery. Additional untapped potential for RSS lies in minimally invasive spine surgery. Perhaps endoscopic spine surgery, a rapidly advancing field within minimally invasive spine surgery, will one day be incorporated into a robotic platform. Further advances and the incorporation of navigation will facilitate minimally invasive decompressions, tumor resections, facet decortication, and interbody placement using robotic assistance.[61] This will allow RSS to be more comprehensive and further reduce perioperative morbidity, length of stay, and, ultimately, costs associated with spine surgery.

REFERENCES

1. Joseph JR, Smith BW, Liu X, Park P. Current applications of robotics in spine surgery: a systematic review of the literature. *Neurosurg Focus*. 2017;42(5):E2. doi:10.3171/2017.2.FOCUS16544
2. Ghasem A, Sharma A, Greif DN, Alam M, Maaieh MA. The arrival of robotics in spine surgery: a review of the literature. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2018;43(23):1670–1677. doi:10.1097/BRS.0000000000002695
3. Khan A, Meyers JE, Siasios I, Pollina J. Next-generation robotic spine surgery: first report on feasibility, safety, and learning curve. *Oper Neurosurg (Hagerstown)*. 2019;17(1):61–69. doi:10.1093/ons/opy280
4. Taylor RH, Menciassi A, Fichtinger G, Fiorini P, Dario P. Medical robotics and computer-integrated surgery. *Springer Handbook of Robotics*. 2016:1657–1684.
5. Vo CD, Jiang B, Azad TD, Crawford NR, Bydon A, Theodore N. Robotic spine surgery: current state in minimally invasive surgery. *Global Spine J*. 2020;10(2 Suppl):34S-40S. doi:10.1177/2192568219878131
6. Fiani B, Quadri SA, Farooqui M, et al. Impact of robot-assisted spine surgery on health care quality and neurosurgical economics: a systemic review. *Neurosurg Rev*. 2020;43(1):17–25. doi:10.1007/s10143-018-0971-z
7. Overley SC, Cho SK, Mehta AI, Arnold PM. Navigation and robotics in spinal surgery: where are we now? *Neurosurgery*. 2017;80(3S):S86–S99. doi:10.1093/neuros/nyw077
8. Marcus HJ, Cundy TP, Nandi D, Yang G-Z, Darzi A. Robot-assisted and fluoroscopy-guided pedicle screw placement: a systematic review. *Eur Spine J*. 2014;23(2):291–297. doi:10.1007/s00586-013-2879-1
9. Verma R, Krishan S, Haendlmayer K, Mohsen A. Functional outcome of computer-assisted spinal pedicle screw placement: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 23 studies including 5,992 pedicle screws. *Eur Spine J*. 2010;19(3):370–375. doi:10.1007/s00586-009-1258-4
10. Shin BJ, James AR, Njoku IU, Härtl R. Pedicle screw navigation: a systematic review and meta-analysis of perforation risk for computer-navigated versus freehand insertion. *J Neurosurg Spine*. 2012;17(2):113–122. doi:10.3171/2012.5.SPINE11399
11. Rasouli JJ, Shao J, Neifert S, et al. Artificial intelligence and robotics in spine surgery. *Global Spine J*. 2021;11(4):556–564. doi:10.1177/2192568220915718

Downloaded from https://www.ijssurgery.com/ by guest on October 11, 2024

12. Spine Surgery Robots Market. *Transparency Market Research*. 2018. https://www.transparencymarketresearch.com/spine-surgery-robots-market.html. Accessed March 20, 2021.

13. Gornet M, Buttermann G, Guyer R, Yue J, Ferko N, Hollmann S. Defining the ideal lumbar total disc replacement patient and standard of care. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2017;42 Suppl 24:S103–S107. doi:10.1097/BRS.0000000000002453

14. Dormans JP. Establishing a standard of care for neuromonitoring during spinal deformity surgery. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2010;35(25):2180–2185. doi:10.1097/BRS.0b013e3181eba84f

15. Greenberg MD. Medical malpractice and new devices: defining an elusive standard of care. *Health Matrix Clevel*. 2009;19(2):423):423–445:.

16. Ahern DP, Gibbons D, Schroeder GD, Vaccaro AR, Butler JS. Image-guidance, robotics, and the future of spine surgery. *Clin Spine Surg*. 2020;33(5):179–184. doi:10.1097/BSD.0000000000000809

17. Tian W, Han X, Liu B, et al. A robot-assisted surgical system using a force-image control method for pedicle screw insertion. *PLoS One*. 2014;9(1):e86346. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0086346

18. Bederman SS, Hahn P, Colin V, Kiester PD, Bhatia NN. Robotic guidance for S2-alar-iliac screws in spinal deformity correction. *Clin Spine Surg*. 2017;30(1):E49–E53. doi:10.1097/BSD.0b013e3182a3572b

19. Kantelhardt SR, Martinez R, Baerwinkel S, Burger R, Giese A, Rohde V. Perioperative course and accuracy of screw positioning in conventional, open robotic-guided and percutaneous robotic-guided, pedicle screw placement. *Eur Spine J*. 2011;20(6):860–868. doi:10.1007/s00586-011-1729-2

20. Kim HJ, Jung WI, Chang BS, Lee CK, Kang KT, Yeom JS. A prospective, randomized, controlled trial of robot-assisted vs freehand pedicle screw fixation in spine surgery. *Int J Med Robot*. 2017;13(3). doi:10.1002/rcs.1779

21. Kuo K-L, Su Y-F, Wu C-H, et al. Assessing the intraoperative accuracy of pedicle screw placement by using a bone-mounted miniature robot system through secondary registration. *PLoS One*. 2016;11(4):e0153235. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0153235

22. Macke JJ, Woo R, Varich L. Accuracy of robot-assisted pedicle screw placement for adolescent idiopathic scoliosis in the pediatric population. *J Robot Surg*. 2016;10(2):145–150. doi:10.1007/s11701-016-0587-7

23. Pechlivanis I, Kiriyanthan G, Engelhardt M, et al. Percutaneous placement of pedicle screws in the lumbar spine using a bone mounted miniature robotic system: first experiences and accuracy of screw placement. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2009;34(4):392–398. doi:10.1097/BRS.0b013e318191ed32

24. Schizas C, Thein E, Kwiatkowski B, Kulik G. Pedicle screw insertion: robotic assistance versus conventional C-arm fluoroscopy. *Acta Orthop Belg*. 2012;78(2):240–245.

25. Sensakovic WF, O'Dell MC, Agha A, Woo R, Varich L. CT radiation dose reduction in robot-assisted pediatric spinal surgery. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2017;42(7):E417–E424. doi:10.1097/BRS.0000000000001846

26. Tsai T-H, Wu D-S, Su Y-F, Wu C-H, Lin C-L. A retrospective study to validate an intraoperative robotic classification system for assessing the accuracy of kirschner wire (K-wire) placements with postoperative computed tomography classification system for assessing the accuracy of pedicle screw placements. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2016;95(38):e4834. doi:10.1097/MD.0000000000004834

27. van Dijk JD, van den Ende RPJ, Stramigioli S, Köchling M, Höss N. Clinical pedicle screw accuracy and deviation from planning in robot-guided spine surgery: robot-guided pedicle screw accuracy. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2015;40(17):E986-91. doi:10.1097/BRS.0000000000000960

28. Molliqaj G, Schatlo B, Alaid A, et al. Accuracy of robot-guided versus freehand fluoroscopy-assisted pedicle screw insertion in thoracolumbar spinal surgery. *Neurosurg Focus*. 2017;42(5):E14. doi:10.3171/2017.3.FOCUS179

29. Lieberman IH, Togawa D, Kayanja MM, et al. Bone-mounted miniature robotic guidance for pedicle screw and translaminar facet screw placement: part I--technical development and a test case result. *Neurosurgery*. 2006;59(3):641–650. doi:10.1227/01.NEU.0000229055.00829.5B

30. Togawa D, Kayanja MM, Reinhardt MK, et al. Bone-mounted miniature robotic guidance for pedicle screw and translaminar facet screw placement: part 2--evaluation of system accuracy. *Neurosurgery*. 2007;60(2 Suppl 1):S129-39. doi:10.1227/01.NEU.0000249257.16912.AA

31. Hu X, Ohnmeiss DD, Lieberman IH. Robotic-assisted pedicle screw placement: lessons learned from the first 102 patients. *Eur Spine J*. 2013;22(3):661–666. doi:10.1007/s00586-012-2499-1

32. Ringel F, Stüer C, Reinke A, et al. Accuracy of robot-assisted placement of lumbar and sacral pedicle screws: a prospective randomized comparison to conventional freehand screw implantation. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2012;37(8):E496-501. doi:10.1097/BRS.0b013e31824b7767

33. Hyun S-J, Kim K-J, Jahng T-A, Kim H-J. Minimally invasive robotic versus open fluoroscopic-guided spinal instrumented fusions: a randomized controlled trial. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2017;42(6):353–358. doi:10.1097/BRS.0000000000001778

34. Park S-M, Kim H-J, Lee SY, Chang B-S, Lee C-K, Yeom JS. Radiographic and clinical outcomes of robot-assisted posterior pedicle screw fixation: two-year results from a randomized controlled trial. *Yonsei Med J*. 2018;59(3):438–444. doi:10.3349/ymj.2018.59.3.438

35. Gao S, Lv Z, Fang H. Robot-assisted and conventional freehand pedicle screw placement: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Eur Spine J*. 2018;27(4):921–930. doi:10.1007/s00586-017-5333-y

36. Roser F, Tatagiba M, Maier G. Spinal robotics: current applications and future perspectives. *Neurosurgery*. 2013;72 Suppl 1(suppl_1):12–18. doi:10.1227/NEU.0b013e318270d02c

37. Fan Y, Du JP, Liu JJ, et al. Accuracy of pedicle screw placement comparing robot-assisted technology and the free-hand with fluoroscopy-guided method in spine surgery: an updated meta-analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2018;97(22):e10970):22:. doi:10.1097/MD.0000000000010970

38. Ahmed AK, Zygourakis CC, Kalb S, et al. First spine surgery utilizing real-time image-guided robotic assistance. *Comput Assist Surg (Abingdon)*. 2019;24(1):13–17. doi:10.1080/24699322.2018.1542029

39. Jiang B, Karim Ahmed A, Zygourakis CC, et al. Pedicle screw accuracy assessment in ExcelsiusGPS® robotic spine surgery: evaluation of deviation from pre-planned trajectory. *Chin Neurosurg J*. 2018;4(1):23. doi:10.1186/s41016-018-0131-x

40. Godzik J, Walker CT, Theodore N, Uribe JS, Chang SW, Snyder LA. Minimally invasive transforaminal interbody fusion with robotically assisted bilateral pedicle screw fixation:

Downloaded from https://www.ijssurgery.com/ by guest on October 11, 2024

2-dimensional operative video. *Oper Neurosurg (Hagerstown)*. 2019;16(3):E86–E87. doi:10.1093/ons/opy288

41. Walker CT, Godzik J, Xu DS, Theodore N, Uribe JS, Chang SW. Minimally invasive single-position lateral interbody fusion with robotic bilateral percutaneous pedicle screw fixation: 2-dimensional operative video. *Oper Neurosurg (Hagerstown)*. 2019;16(4):E121. doi:10.1093/ons/opy240

42. Zygourakis CC, Ahmed AK, Kalb S, et al. Technique: open lumbar decompression and fusion with the excelsius GPS robot. *Neurosurg Focus*. 2018;45(VideoSuppl1):2018.7.FocusVid.18123. doi:10.3171/2018.7.FocusVid.18123

43. Elswick CM, Strong MJ, Joseph JR, Saadeh Y, Oppenlander M, Park P. Robotic-assisted spinal surgery: current generation instrumentation and new applications. *Neurosurg Clin N Am*. 2020;31(1):103–110. doi:10.1016/j.nec.2019.08.012

44. Huntsman KT, Ahrendtsen LA, Riggleman JR, Ledonio CG. Robotic-assisted navigated minimally invasive pedicle screw placement in the first 100 cases at a single institution. *J Robot Surg*. 2020;14(1):199–203. doi:10.1007/s11701-019-00959-6

45. Vardiman AB, Wallace DJ, Crawford NR, Riggleman JR, Ahrendtsen LA, Ledonio CG. Pedicle screw accuracy in clinical utilization of minimally invasive navigated robot-assisted spine surgery. *J Robot Surg*. 2020;14(3):409–413. doi:10.1007/s11701-019-00994-3

46. Benech CA, Perez R, Benech F, Greeley SL, Crawford N, Ledonio C. Navigated robotic assistance results in improved screw accuracy and positive clinical outcomes: an evaluation of the first 54 cases. *J Robot Surg*. 2020;14(3):431–437. doi:10.1007/s11701-019-01007-z

47. Lonjon N, Chan-Seng E, Costalat V, Bonnafoux B, Vassal M, Boetto J. Robot-assisted spine surgery: feasibility study through a prospective case-matched analysis. *Eur Spine J*. 2016;25(3):947–955. doi:10.1007/s00586-015-3758-8

48. Fan Y, Du J, Zhang J, et al. Comparison of accuracy of pedicle screw insertion among 4 guided technologies in spine surgery. *Med Sci Monit*. 2017;23:5960–5968. doi:10.12659/msm.905713

49. Foley KT, Holly LT, Schwender JD. Minimally invasive lumbar fusion. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2003;28(15 Suppl):S26-35. doi:10.1097/01.BRS.0000076895.52418.5E

50. Ntoukas V, Müller A. Minimally invasive approach versus traditional open approach for one level posterior lumbar interbody fusion. *Minim Invasive Neurosurg*. 2010;53(1):21–24. doi:10.1055/s-0030-1247560

51. Park Y, Ha JW. Comparison of one-level posterior lumbar interbody fusion performed with a minimally invasive approach or a traditional open approach. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2007;32(5):537–543. doi:10.1097/01.brs.0000256473.49791.f4

52. Vaccaro AR, Hussain M, Harris J, et al. In vitro analysis of accuracy, dosage and surgical time required for pedicle screw placement using conventional percutaneous screw and robotic-assisted screw techniques. *Spine J*. 2017;17(10):S261. doi:10.1016/j.spinee.2017.08.191

53. Schröder ML, Staartjes VE. Revisions for screw malposition and clinical outcomes after robot-guided lumbar fusion for spondylolisthesis. *Neurosurg Focus*. 2017;42(5):E12. doi:10.3171/2017.3.FOCUS16534

54. Menger RP, Savardekar AR, Farokhi F, Sin A. A cost-effectiveness analysis of the integration of robotic spine technology in spine surgery. *Neurospine*. 2018;15(3):216–224. doi:10.14245/ns.1836082.041

55. Urakov TM, Chang K-K, Burks SS, Wang MY. Initial academic experience and learning curve with robotic spine instrumentation. *Neurosurg Focus*. 2017;42(5):E4. doi:10.3171/2017.2.FOCUS175

56. Schatlo B, Martinez R, Alaid A, et al. Unskilled unawareness and the learning curve in robotic spine surgery. *Acta Neurochir (Wien)*. 2015;157(10):1819–1823. doi:10.1007/s00701-015-2535-0

57. Khan A, Meyers JE, Siasios I, Pollina J. Next-generation robotic spine surgery: first report on feasibility, safety, and learning curve. *Oper Neurosurg (Hagerstown)*. 2019;17(1):61–69. doi:10.1093/ons/opy280

58. Sheetz KH, Claflin J, Dimick JB. Trends in the adoption of robotic surgery for common surgical procedures. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(1):e1918911. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.18911

59. Crew B. A closer look at a revered robot. *Nature*. 2020;580(7804):S5–S7. doi:10.1038/d41586-020-01037-w

60. Yamaguchi K, Levine WN, Marra G, Galatz LM, Klepps S, Flatow E. Transitioning to arthroscopic rotator cuff repair. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2003;85(1):144–155. doi:10.2106/00004623-200301000-00022

61. Staub BN, Sadrameli SS. The use of robotics in minimally invasive spine surgery. *J Spine Surg*. 2019;5(Suppl 1):S31–S40. doi:10.21037/jss.2019.04.16

Funding: The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Conflicts and Disclosures: Alexander M. Satin reports consulting for DeGen Medical, Inc., and serving on the Scientific Advisory Board for Agada Medical Ltd. Isador H. Lieberman reports consulting for Medtronic, Misonix, and Safe Orthopaedics; royalties from Globus Medical; and serving on the Scientific Advisory Board for SI-BONE. Stanley Kisinde reports no disclosures.

Corresponding Author: Isador H. Lieberman, Scoliosis and Spine Tumor Center, 6020 W Parker Rd, 200, Plano, TX 75093, USA; ilieberman@texasback.com

Published 09 May 2022

This manuscript is generously published free of charge by ISASS, the International Society for the Advancement of Spine Surgery. Copyright © 2022 ISASS. To see more or order reprints or permissions, see http://ijssurgery.com.

Downloaded from https://www.ijssurgery.com/ by guest on October 11, 2024