
NAVIGATION IN ORTHOPEDIC PRACTICE

Essay

*Submitted for fulfillment of Master Degree in
Orthopedic Surgery*

By

Reda Gomah Mohamed

M.B.B.Ch

Supervised by

Prof. Dr. Ahmed Amin Galal

*Professor of Orthopedic surgery
Faculty of Medicine, Cairo University*

Dr. Mostafa Mahmoud

*Lecturer of Orthopedic surgery
Faculty of Medicine, Cairo University*

Faculty of Medicine

Cairo University

2008

Abstract

Orthopedic surgeons can be proud to lead the way in the development of these tools and the use of these tools to improve their clinical and technical skills for the benefit of patients. The challenge that remains for the clinicians and developers of systems is to understand what these technologies and tools potentially can accomplish and understanding their limitations, and to choose the proper clinical applications which will allow for improved patient outcomes in a cost effective manner. In the near future, these enabling technologies will influence the way surgeons plan, simulate, and execute surgical practice. Currently the only limitation is in the understanding and the imagination of what can be accomplished in the future.

Key words

NAVIGATION IN ORTHOPEDIC PRACTICE

CONTENTS

| | <i>Page</i> |
|----------------------------------------|-------------|
| Introduction..... | 1 |
| Aim of the Work | 4 |
| Navigation in orthopedic practice..... | 5 |
| Summary | 98 |
| Conclusion..... |103 |
| References | 111 |
| | |
| Arabic summary | 120 |
| | |

List of Tables

| Table No. | Title | Page |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1 | Major components and procedures of computer navigation system | 18 |
| 2 | Comparing types of navigation system..... | 19 |

List of Abbreviations

| | |
|---------|--------------------------------------------|
| 2 D | Two Dimensions. |
| 3 D | Three Dimensions. |
| C.T | Computed tomography |
| CAD | Computer assisted design. |
| CAM | Computer assisted Manufacture. |
| CAOS | Computer assisted orthopedic surgery. |
| CATHA | Computer assisted total hip arthroplasty. |
| CATKA | Computer assisted total knee arthroplasty. |
| DRB | Dynamic references base . |
| HTO | High tibial osteotomy . |
| IREDS | Infrared light -emitting diodes. |
| JAT K R | Jigassisted total knee replacement. |
| JBKA | Jig- based knee arthroplasty . |
| LEDs | Light emitting diodes . |
| O.R | Operating Room . |
| OP ALi | Optimizing Alignment. |
| OR I F | Open reduction and internal fixation. |
| ROM | Range of Motion . |
| UKA | Unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. |
| VSS | Virtual surgery system. |

List of Figures

| Figure No. | Title | Page |
|-------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1 | The ROBODOC® surgical assistant..... | 8 |

| | | |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 2 | Intraoperative navigation via C.T cross sections and a 3-dimensional reconstruction..... | 11 |
| 3 | The Stealth Station treon plus platform (Medtronic Navigation, Louisville, CO) | 16 |
| 4 | Components of surgical navigation systems..... | 18 |
| 5 | Surface registration of the knee | 27 |
| 6 | Surface registration of a vertebra before and after the registration process | 28 |
| 7 | Intraoperative tracking of patient anatomy and surgical tools | 30 |
| 8 | Kinematic registration of the hip& knee..... | 36 |
| 9 | Kinematic registration of ankle joint | 37 |
| 10 | Photographs showing the registration process . | 38 |
| 11 | The level of tibial resection is measured from the deepest point | 39 |

List of Figures (Cont...)

| Figure No. | Title | Page |
|---------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 12 | The tibial surface registration to prepare for cuts as it displayed on the screen..... | 39 |
| 13 | Surface registration of the femoral surface as it displayed on the screen..... | 40 |
| 14 | Computer-assisted orientation of the cutting blocks | 42 |
| 15 | Photograph showing reference frames attached to the distal femur and proximal tibia..... | 43 |
| 16 | Serial Photographs showing steps of fluoroscopic preparation and registration for TKR | 47 |
| 17 | The mechanical axis in the sagital plane | 49 |
| 18 | A screen capture during the procedure shows placement of the positioning block | 50 |
| 19 | Position of patient for hip-knee-ankle radiographs | 53 |

List of Figures (Cont...)

| Figure No. | Title | Page |
|---------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 20 | Radiographs showing the determination of the desired level of the joint line which can be referenced to prostheses which are in situ..... | 55 |
| 21 | Photograph showing the checking of the position of the tibial plateau as it is being driven into a composite of morsellised | 56 |
| 22 | Photograph showing the fixation of corticocancellous segments of an allograft femoral head to make up the height of deficient proximal tibia | 57 |
| 23 | The distal femur after it has been grafted and before the application of cement. Allograft morsellised bone is contained | 57 |
| 24 | Measurements of cup alignment | 59 |
| 25 | The illustration shows the pelvic reference plane defined through anterosuperior iliac spines (ASIS) and pubic tubercles with the cup in 45° inclination and 20° anteversion | 62 |

List of Figures *(Cont...)*

| Figure No. | Title | Page |
|------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 26 | The digitized surfaces of the acetabulum | 61 |
| 27 | This software screenshot shows measurement of the postoperative cup position..... | 71 |
| 28 | The photographs show the cup implantation procedure..... | 77 |
| 29 | Positioning of image-guided system for a lumbar pedicle fixation procedure | 82 |
| 30 | Photograph showing the navigation probe and drill guide for spinal surgery | 84 |
| 31 | Intraoperative photograph showing the reference frame attached to spinal anatomy | 85 |
| 32 | The navigational workstation screen | 85 |
| 33 | Registration of 3-dimensional data points intraoperatively digitized with the 3-dimensional model obtained from CT images | 86 |
| 34 | Workstation screen demonstrating navigation for aT-2 pedicle screw..... | 88 |

List of Figures (Cont...)

| Figure No. | Title | Page |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| 35 | Computer display | 89 |
| 36 | The experimental setup, including the drill fitted with a (DRB) | 93 |
| 37 | Graphical user interface for the real-time image interactive guidance of surgical tools for distal locking of the femoral nail..... | 96 |

INTRODUCTION

Advancement in medical technology over the last several decades has occurred at speed manner.

In our specialty of orthopedics, there are numerous examples of rapid improvements in technology that have markedly improved the care of our patients with musculoskeletal disorder. Within the last two decades, computer and computer operated apparatuses have become very important tools to improve medical skills. The incorporation of digital technology into medical devices and procedures has become a subject of high priority in many industrialized countries. Computer assisted orthopedic surgery systems are currently represent new fields in orthopedic surgery and traumatology (*John J. Callaghan ,et al., 2005*).

New technologies in computer assisted surgery (CAS) now allow the production of three-dimensional (3-D) displays of soft tissue representation and super impose these images on the patient's actual position (*Frank L and Lutz N. Peter, 2003*).

With active robotic technology it is furthermore possible to guide instruments to a treatment site and conduct surgical procedures according to a preoperative plan and repeat procedures .two types of CAS systems have been developed to date: passive and active systems. Passive systems generally perform no action and provide the surgeon with additional information prior to and during the surgical

procedure. Passive navigation systems can be subdivided into three general categories, CT- and MRI- based systems, fluoroscopy-based systems that allow real-time imaging during surgery, and non-image-based systems that obtain data from kinematics or anatomical landmarks (*David A Simon and Stbphane LAvalle, 1998*).

For active CAS, robotic technology allows for bones to be machined or drilled during procedures according to the surgeon's specifications therefore, the clinical goals of these computer assisted surgical technologies are as follows:

To develop interactive, patient specific preoperative planners and simulators to optimize the performance of surgery and the subsequent biologic response; and to develop more precise and ultimately less invasive smart tools to assist in the actual measurement and performance of a surgical task (*Picard. F, et al, 2004*).

Computer-integrated surgery systems combining medical imaging, robotic and sensor technology, and advanced computation will have a profound influence on surgical practice in coming decades. By improving the information available to surgical and by enhancing the surgeon's ability to perform delicate and precise surgical tasks in a minimally invasive manner, these systems can both improve patient outcomes and ultimately reduce costs associated with disease(*Jolesz F, 1997*).

AIM OF THE WORK

The aim of this essay is to review the literature about the role of navigation, application, accessibility and achievements in orthopedic practice.

NAVIGATION IN ORTHOPEDIC PRACTICE

Background of NAVIGATION IN ORTHOPEDIC PRACTICE

Throughout history, physicians have tried to improve visibility of the inside of the human body to understand the complexity of normal and diseased body structures. Dissection of the human body began several thousand years ago. The next milestone in improving visibility did not occur until the 19th century, when Roentgen discovered the x-ray and introduced plane radiography (*Frank L and Lutz N Peter, 2003*).

Surgeons in different specialties, especially orthopedics, have succeeded in transferring the powerful images of radiography to operating rooms via X-ray fluoroscopy. The advent of the computer and subsequently computed tomography (CT) in late 20th century opened a new horizon of better accuracy and visibility. Surgeons tried to transfer the operating room to the CT scan suite and vice versa to enable image-guided surgery in real time, but their attempts were not successful. The introduction of position-tracking devices made the application of image-guided surgery possible by linking the different steps of imaging, planning, and surgical implantation, even when performed at different times. (*John J Callaghan et al., 2005*).

Modern computer-assisted technology in the form of robotics and navigation started in the 1980s with several neurosurgical applications. The technology was subsequently transferred from

neurosurgery to orthopedics in the area of spine and then gradually to hip and knee surgery. Practical application of CAS in orthopedics started in the early 1990s when robotic techniques were used for femoral canal preparation in total hip arthroplasty. The technical development gradually moved from active robotics toward passive navigation systems. The earliest navigation systems were image based and used CT scans followed by systems that allowed navigation by intraoperative fluoroscopy or without any previous imaging (image-free) (*Musahl V et al., 2002*).

Definition of computer-assisted surgery (navigation):

It is the application of computer-enabled technology at any stage (*preoperative, intra-operative, and postoperative*) in the surgical management of orthopedic conditions with the use of various systems (*active, semi-active, passive*) performed for several applications (*planning, simulation, guidance, robotic and/or training*) (*Anthony .M .DiGio, 1998*).

Classification and characteristics of computer-assisted orthopedic surgery systems

A simple and clinically based classification system for CAOS was presented by Picard et al. They classified CAOS into 1) *active*, 2) *semi-active*, or 3) *passive systems* and by the imaging requirements, 1) *image-free* and 2) *preoperative* or 3) *intraoperative image-based*, thus creating a 3x3 classification matrix (*Picard F et al., 2004*).

Robotics