ROBOCATH: A PATIENT-MOUNTED PARALLEL ROBOT TO POSITION AND ORIENT SURGICAL CATHETERS
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ABSTRACT

Hosting the cardiac catheters and the necessity for their precise and collision-free navigation in transapical beating-heart interventions require the development of dexterous and reliable robotic platforms. These mechanisms should not only be capable of tracking the desired trajectories with high level of accuracy but also have to have the potential to cope with strict medical constraints such as environment compatibility, patient safety and compactness. In this paper, we propose a robotic platform that takes into account the above mentioned requirements. Benefitting from a state-of-the-art parallel structure, this four degree-of-freedom MRI-compatible patient-mounted and cable-driven manipulator (that we name ROBOCATH) seeks to steer cardiac catheters under beating heart condition, while suitably addressing the deficiencies that currently used manipulators vastly suffer from. In addition to the detailed description of the robot design and its specifications, kinematic model along with some experimental results on the prototype are provided.
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1 Introduction

Since the installation of the first digitally operated and programmable industrial robot in 1961 [1], it took nearly two decades for engineers and scientists to bring robots into the operating rooms [2]. While in mid 80’s and early 90’s, surgical manipulators were simply industrial robots slightly tailored to fit medical requirements, the fast evolution from the first generation of surgical robots to recent mechanisms introduced new manipulators as extremely dexterous and highly customized robotic arms. In the more recent systems, factors such as manipulability, environment compatibility, compactness, light weight, dexterity and versatility are precisely considered. These considerations have resulted in noticeably improved completion of medical interventions using robotic manipulators compared to manual procedures. The mechanism studied in this paper could serve as a platform, in which most of the factors described above are taken into account.

Being coupled with variety of different medical imaging modalities, surgical robotic platforms become even more effective and reliable in operating rooms. Unique modality features such as true 3D imaging, no ionizing radiation, and on-the-fly control of imaging parameters make magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) a competitive option among other modalities [3].
the past two decades, several research groups have made attempts to design and test robotic systems for MRI-guided procedures, focusing on a wide range of anatomic organs such as brain, breast, prostate and heart. The interested reader is referred to [4] and many references therein. One of the latest surgical procedures that has recently attracted the attention of many research groups is the transapical beating-heart intervention. This approach significantly reduces the side effects in cardiopulmonary bypass procedures and results in faster patient recovery [5]. In 2008, development of a robotic system for transapical aortic valve implantation under MRI guidance in beating heart was reported in [6]. Later, the authors integrated their system with a novel pneumatically actuated valve delivery module and evaluated its performance through ex-vivo experiments in [7]. In another study, a cyber physical system aimed for robot assisted MR-guided aortic valve replacement was proposed in [3, 8]. Focusing on beating-heart intracardiac procedures, this study demonstrated the feasibility of using MRI for guiding robotic manipulators in sophisticated heart surgeries.

The objective of the present study is to develop an MRI-compatible robotic platform that can assist with cardiac interventions under beating heart condition. Considering the challenges that similar systems have encountered so far, ROBOCATH is aimed to improve the quality of afore-mentioned robotic procedures. To make the actuation system MRI-compatible, several solutions have been proposed in the literature. Manual actuation [9], use of hydraulic cylinders [10] and utilizing pneumatic systems as the source of actuation [11] are some of the alternatives for magnetic motors for this purpose. Lack of precise navigation, fluid leakage in cylinders and limited stiffness of motors as the consequence of air compressibility are the major drawbacks of implementing these methods respectively [4]. Most of the recent MRI-compatible actuation systems utilize the piezoelectric motors in which motion is produced through the vibration of piezoelectric ceramics. Although these motors are magnet-free, image artifacts are observed due to the high frequency electric currents [12]. To avoid the afore-mentioned drawbacks, in this study, we use the conventional electric motors and place them far from the sensitive areas to make ROBOCATH fully MRI-compatible. In order to transfer the generated torque to the robot’s joints, a cable transmission system is developed. The configuration of the designed system allows for each link to be actuated in both directions only by reversing the rotation in the corresponding motors.

One of the most interesting and yet challenging issues that is frequently encountered in free beating heart interventions is the chest motion due to the breathing. Obviously, in cases where the robot is mounted on the patient couch or the scanner structure, this relative motion has to be canceled out using the control algorithm. An alternative is to develop a platform that can passively compensate for it. The concept of developing patient-mounted robots has been examined before in [13]. In a recent study, five examples of body-supported surgical robots were surveyed [14]. These robots were employed for surgical procedures such as hip and knee replacement, spinal needle insertion, ultrasound exams and endoscope manipulation. Another case which is close to our application is a patient-mounted robotic platform for CT-guided procedures, in which the designed 5-DOF parallel structure is claimed to be capable of meeting the requirements of most interventional radiology procedures [15]. To the best of our knowledge, no patient-mounted robotic platform for MRI-guided interventions has been introduced so far. Mounting the platform on the patient not only helps the system cope with relative chest motion with respect to the fixed frames but also enables us to achieve extreme compactness in our design. This compactness later results in improved accuracy and the safety, as well as the reduced cost. As a summary, we list in Table 1 the specifications that should be taken into account in the design of ROBOCATH along with the methods that we offer to meet these requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Solution method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>Parallel architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRI-compatibility</td>
<td>Cable-driven actuation system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion compensation</td>
<td>Patient-mounted platform</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this paper, we first describe the design and manufacturing process, as well as the benefits that the developed system offers compared to the existing surgical robotic platforms. Integration of the designed parallel robot with additional platform components including imaging and controls (using dSPACE) will be further described. Finally, an experimental test bed is employed to show some of the preliminary results achieved on the prototyped system as proof-of-concept for the proposed ROBOCATH system.

2 Design of the Mechanism

ROBOCATH is aimed to handle in-plane positioning and orientation of the catheter’s tip. This particular mission necessitates the development of a 5-DOF manipulator; however, since the end effector is axi-symmetric, one degree of freedom could be omitted leading to a 4-DOF configuration. Table 2 lists the specifications for the kinematic requirements of the catheter. These specifications are dictated mainly by the intracardiac interventions.

In this paper, a highly customized parallel structure is proposed for the design of ROBOCATH. The proposed design is inspired by some earlier works such as the mechanisms introduced in [16, 17]. In addition to the advantages that conventional parallel robots offer, our novel design helps to further customize the platform to perfectly match the kinematic requirements mentioned earlier. Figure 1 illustrates the kinematics of the designed
robot. In order to ensure the proper operation of the system, a combination of 9 prismatic and revolute degrees of freedom in the mechanism are defined. The degrees of freedom that are closer to the base are driven by the actuators (DOFs 1-4), while rest are actuated passively (DOFs 5-9). This arrangement facilitates the remote actuation of the manipulator. Finally, the Roman numbers represent the provided degrees of freedom for the catheter.

### Table 2. Catheter’s kinematic requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of freedom</th>
<th>Motion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal motion</td>
<td>±5cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transversal motion</td>
<td>±5cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagittal plane angle</td>
<td>25°-35°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontal plane angle</td>
<td>±15°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To derive the equations corresponding to the forward kinematics of the mechanism, four different frames depicted in Figure 3 are defined as: (1) base frame \( \{B\} \), which is fixed in the universal coordinate system and its Z-axis is in vertical direction, (2) lower frame \( \{L\} \), which is attached to the center point of the lower cylinder with its Z-axis being along the vertical direction and the X-axis coinciding with the lower level linear direction, (3) upper frame \( \{U\} \), which is the same as the lower frame except that it is placed at the center point of upper cylinder with its X-axis being along the upper sliding bar’s center line and finally (4) end effector base \( \{E\} \), which is attached to the catheter’s center of mass with its Z-axis being along the catheter long axis. For each coordinate system, e.g. \( \{B\} \), we call the unit vectors indicating principle directions as \( \hat{X}_B, \hat{Y}_B \) and \( \hat{Z}_B \). In addition to the afore-mentioned frames, there are two other frames \( \{UE\} \) and

3 Kinematics of the Designed Platform

In this section, we derive the forward and inverse kinematics corresponding to the proposed design of the mechanism described in the previous section.

3.1 Forward kinematics

To derive the equations corresponding to the forward kinematics of the mechanism, four different frames depicted in Figure 3 are defined as: (1) base frame \( \{B\} \), which is fixed in the universal coordinate system and its Z-axis is in vertical direction, (2) lower frame \( \{L\} \), which is attached to the center point of the lower cylinder with its Z-axis being along the vertical direction and the X-axis coinciding with the lower level linear direction, (3) upper frame \( \{U\} \), which is the same as the lower frame except that it is placed at the center point of upper cylinder with its X-axis being along the upper sliding bar’s center line and finally (4) end effector base \( \{E\} \), which is attached to the catheter’s center of mass with its Z-axis being along the catheter long axis. For each coordinate system, e.g. \( \{B\} \), we call the unit vectors indicating principle directions as \( \hat{X}_B, \hat{Y}_B \) and \( \hat{Z}_B \). In addition to the afore-mentioned frames, there are two other frames \( \{UE\} \) and
Figure 3. The coordinate system used in deriving the forward kinematics

\{LE\} that have the same orientation as \{U\} and \{L\} do but are attached to the universal joint’s center points in upper and lower levels, respectively. \(B_P_u\) and \(B_P_l\) are two vectors described in frame \{B\} that point to the location of catheter holders in upper and lower levels. \(U_P_u\) and \(U_P_l\) are the same vectors described in frames \{U\} and \{L\}, respectively. \(B_{EORG}\) is a vector that points to the catheter’s center of gravity in the base frame. By manipulating these vectors and taking advantage of the relationship between them, the forward kinematics of the system can be obtained as follows

\[
B_{P_u} = B_E R_B U_{P_u} + B_{EORG}, \tag{1}
\]

where \(B_E R_B\) is a mapping that represents the rotation of \{U\} relative to \{B\} and \(B_{EORG}\) is a vector that represents the origin of \{E\} relative to \{B\}. Through several steps of mathematical manipulations, we have

\[
B_{P_u} = \begin{bmatrix}
p\cos \theta_u \\
p\sin \theta_u \\
\|B_{EORG}\|
\end{bmatrix}, \tag{2}
\]

where \(||.||\) indicates the length of a vector, \(\theta_u\) represents the rotation of upper cylinder about vertical axis and \(p\) is the distance between holder and upper cylinder’s center point where \{U\} is attached. These joint parameters will be actively controlled at the time of manipulating the catheter. An alternative way to locate the upper tool holder is through the end-effector frame \(\{E\}\) using

\[
B_{P_u} = B_E R_E^R B_P_u + B_{EORG}, \tag{3}
\]

where \(B_E R_E^R\) represents the orientation of the catheter, \(B_P_u\) is the upper holder position vector in \{E\} and \(B_{EORG}\) is a vector that describes the origin of frame \{E\} relative to \{B\}. Likewise, the simplified version of this equation is

\[
B_{P_u} = B_E l B Z_E + \begin{bmatrix}
q \cos \theta_l \\
q \sin \theta_l \\
\|B_{EORG}\|
\end{bmatrix}, \tag{4}
\]

where \(\theta_l\) and \(q\) play the same role \(\theta_u\) and \(p\) did in (2) except that they are related to lower level of the platform. In addition, in (4), \(l\) is the length of the catheter between lower and upper holders that may change with time. From (2) and (4), we have

\[
B_E l B Z_E = \begin{bmatrix}
p \cos \theta_u - q \cos \theta_l \\
p \sin \theta_u - q \sin \theta_l \\
h
\end{bmatrix}, \tag{5}
\]

where \(h = \|B_{EORG}\| - \|B_{LORG}\|\) is the vertical distance between upper and lower cylinders. Since any 3×3 rotation matrix can be described by only three parameters, (5) contains four unknowns including \(B_E R_E^R\) and \(l\). Since the catheter does not rotate about its long axis, it only has two rotational degrees of freedom. By choosing a proper representation of its orientation, the number of unknowns in (5) can be reduced to three and hence the forward kinematic problem becomes solvable. The X-Y-Z Euler angles representation is used for this purpose [18]. Based on this representation, the final orientation of the catheter is

\[
R_{XYZ}(\alpha, \beta, 0) = \begin{bmatrix}
c\beta & 0 & s\beta \\
-s\alpha s\beta & c\alpha & c\alpha s\beta \\
c\alpha s\beta & -c\alpha & c\alpha s\beta
\end{bmatrix}, \tag{6}
\]

Finally, the series of equations to describe the forward kinematics can be expressed as follows

\[
l \sin \beta = p \cos \theta_u - q \cos \theta_l \tag{7a}
\]

\[
l \sin \alpha \cos \beta = q \sin \theta_l - p \sin \theta_u \tag{7b}
\]

\[
l \cos \alpha \cos \beta = h. \tag{7c}
\]
Solving the above equations provides the orientation parameters based on the known input distances and angles as

$$\begin{align}
\alpha &= \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{q\sin\theta_t - p\sin\theta_u}{h}\right) \quad (8a) \\
\beta &= \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{p\cot\theta_u - q\cos\theta_t}{\sqrt{h^2 + (q\sin\theta_t - p\sin\theta_u)^2}}\right) \quad (8b)
\end{align}$$

In order to validate the results, a numerical model is developed in MATLAB by keeping $q$ and $\theta_t$ to be zero while $p$ was arbitrarily chosen to be a constant number (here 2 cm). Now by increasing $\theta_u$, a full circle is swept by the tip of the catheter as expected. Figure 4 shows the position of the catheter under afore-described conditions.

Once the position of the center of mass in catheter is specified, the vectors $\hat{B} LE$ and $\hat{B} Bi$ can be expressed as a combination of $\hat{B} X$, $\hat{B} Y$, and $\hat{B} Z$.

$$\hat{B} T_{E\text{org}} = \begin{bmatrix}
q\cos\theta_t - l'\sin\beta \\
q\sin\theta_t + l'\sin\alpha\cos\beta \\
\sqrt{\|B T_{E\text{org}}\|^2 - \cos\alpha\cos\beta}
\end{bmatrix},$$

and linear velocity and acceleration can be simply achieved by differentiating the above equation with respect to time. Consequently, angular acceleration can be obtained by differentiating $\dot{\omega}$ with respect to time.

3.2 Inverse kinematics

The primary objective in obtaining the inverse kinematics of any robotic platform is to connect the task space with the joint space. This enables the controller to position and orient the end effector by adjusting the joint parameters. As stated earlier, the general mission of the ROBOCATH is to drive the surgical tool to reach any arbitrary point inside the heart. However, for the particular case of aortic valve replacement operation using a transapical approach, catheter should be steered such that it could eventually reach aortic annulus. Based on the approach described in [3] and depicted in Figure 5, if the catheter passes through the apex and the steering point, it needs to be bent to access the aorta. The bending part is handled by another mechanism whose description and functionality is not within the scope of this paper.

$$\begin{align}
\dot{Z}_E &= \frac{\hat{B} P_a - \hat{B} P_s}{\|\hat{B} P_a - \hat{B} P_s\|} \quad (10a) \\
\dot{Y}_E &= \frac{\hat{X}_B \times \dot{Z}_E}{\|\hat{X}_B \times \dot{Z}_E\|} \quad (10b) \\
\dot{X}_E &= \hat{Y}_E \times \dot{Z}_E. \quad (10c)
\end{align}$$

It is worth mentioning that since the rotation matrix deduced from above unit vectors is to be compared with the Euler angle based rotation matrix obtained earlier, $\dot{Y}_E$ is intentionally placed in the $YZ$ plane in the base frame. The rotation matrix is obtained...
Based on this description, Euler parameters $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are

\[
\alpha = \arctan2 \left( B^E_R(3, 2), B^E_R(2, 2) \right) \quad \text{(12a)}
\]

\[
\beta = \arctan2 \left( B^E_R(1, 3), B^E_R(1, 1) \right) \quad \text{(12b)}
\]

By knowing the distal position of the end effector, as well as the parameters $\alpha$ and $\beta$, (7a)-(7c) can be solved to obtain joint parameters $\theta_i$, $\theta_a$, $p$, and $q$ as follows

\[
q = \left| B^P_a \cdot \frac{B^P_a \cdot B^Z_B}{Z_E \cdot Z_B} \right| \quad \text{(13a)}
\]

\[
\theta_i = \arccos \left( \frac{B^P_a \cdot B^Z_B}{Z_E \cdot Z_B} \cdot \frac{B^P_a \cdot B^Z_B}{Z_E \cdot Z_B} \right) \quad \text{(13b)}
\]

\[
\theta_a = \arctan \left( \frac{q \sin \theta_i - h \tan \alpha}{h \tan \beta + q \cos \theta_i} \right) \quad \text{(13c)}
\]

\[
p = \frac{q \sin \theta_i - h \tan \alpha}{\sin \theta_a} \quad \text{(13d)}
\]

It should be noted that there are some singularity issues in solving the inverse kinematic of the robot such as when the catheter passes through origin of lower and upper frames; however, such issues are numerically treatable. In addition, the general issue of having more than one solution to the inverse problem can be addressed by restricting the end effector to pass through two set points rather than one.

### 4 Driving and Control of ROBOCATH Prototype

The prototyped model of ROBOCATH shown in Figure 6 weighs less than 300 g that makes it appropriate to serve as a patient-mounted platform. This version of the robot is fully made of Acrylonitrile Butadiene Styrene (ABS plastic) and manufactured through rapid prototyping with the exception of the guide bars that have a significant impact on robot performance and are chosen from a special type of polyamides known as Torlon. This self-lubricating plastic shows reasonably high stiffness and tensile strength and hence is suitable for our application. Geometric parameters of the model are provided in Table 3.

The currently utilized driving and control system depicted in Figure 7 consists of a power supply, motor driver boards, data acquisition system, control boards, stepper motors and transmission system. Stepper motors are utilized in this study simply because of their ease of use compared to DC motors. In spite of the fact that the robot requires four motors to be fully actuated, in this study, we use only two motors to make the actuation less complicated. To this end, two DOFs need to be fixed including the robots’ lower level rotational and translational degrees of freedom. The idea of placing the actuators far from the scanner area enables us to employ conventional electric motors to drive the robot. However, this arrangement necessitates the development of a cable transmission configuration that allows one to remotely control the platform. Currently utilized transmission system employs two closed chains of plastic ropes for each level of the platform. In Figure 8, which schematically shows the transmission system for one of the levels, the closed chains numbered 1 and 2 correspond to linear and rotational degrees of freedom. The idea of placing the actuators far from the scanner area enables us to employ conventional electric motors to drive the robot. However, this arrangement necessitates the development of a cable transmission configuration that allows one to remotely control the platform. Currently utilized transmission system employs two closed chains of plastic ropes for each level of the platform. In Figure 8, which schematically shows the transmission system for one of the levels, the closed chains numbered 1 and 2 correspond to linear and rotational degrees of freedom. The idea of placing the actuators far from the scanner area enables us to employ conventional electric motors to drive the robot. However, this arrangement necessitates the development of a cable transmission configuration that allows one to remotely control the platform. Currently utilized transmission system employs two closed chains of plastic ropes for each level of the platform. In Figure 8, which schematically shows the transmission system for one of the levels, the closed chains numbered 1 and 2 correspond to linear and rotational degrees of freedom. The idea of placing the actuators far from the scanner area enables us to employ conventional electric motors to drive the robot. However, this arrangement necessitates the development of a cable transmission configuration that allows one to remotely control the platform. Currently utilized transmission system employs two closed chains of plastic ropes for each level of the platform. In Figure 8, which schematically shows the transmission system for one of the levels, the closed chains numbered 1 and 2 correspond to linear and rotational degrees of freedom. The idea of placing the actuators far from the scanner area enables us to employ conventional electric motors to drive the robot. However, this arrangement necessitates the development of a cable transmission configuration that allows one to remotely control the platform. Currently utilized transmission system employs two closed chains of plastic ropes for each level of the platform. In Figure 8, which schematically shows the transmission system for one of the levels, the closed chains numbered 1 and 2 correspond to linear and rotational degrees of freedom. The idea of placing the actuators far from the scanner area enables us to employ conventional electric motors to drive the robot. However, this arrangement necessitates the development of a cable transmission configuration that allows one to remotely control the platform. Currently utilized transmission system employs two closed chains of plastic ropes for each level of the platform. In Figure 8, which schematically shows the transmission system for one of the levels, the closed chains numbered 1 and 2 correspond to linear and rotational degrees of freedom. The idea of placing the actuators far from the scanner area enables us to employ conventional electric motors to drive the robot. However, this arrangement necessitates the development of a cable transmission configuration that allows one to remotely control the platform. Currently utilized transmission system employs two closed chains of plastic ropes for each level of the platform. In Figure 8, which schematically shows the transmission system for one of the levels, the closed chains numbered 1 and 2 correspond to linear and rotational degrees of freedom. The idea of placing the actuators far from the scanner area enables us to employ conventional electric motors to drive the robot. However, this arrangement necessitates the development of a cable transmission configuration that allows one to remotely control the platform. Currently utilized transmission system employs two closed chains of plastic ropes for each level of the platform. In Figure 8, which schematically shows the transmission system for one of the levels, the closed chains numbered 1 and 2 correspond to linear and rotational degrees of freedom. The idea of placing the actuators far from the scanner area enables us to employ conventional electric motors to drive the robot. However, this arrangement necessitates the development of a cable transmission configuration that allows one to remotely control the platform. Currently utilized transmission system employs two closed chains of plastic ropes for each level of the platform. In Figure 8, which schematically shows the transmission system for one of the levels, the closed chains numbered 1 and 2 correspond to linear and rotational degrees of freedom. The idea of placing the actuators far from the scanner area enables us to employ conventional electric motors to drive the robot. However, this arrangement necessitates the development of a cable transmission configuration that allows one to remotely control the platform. Currently utilized transmission system employs two closed chains of plastic ropes for each level of the platform. In Figure 8, which schematically shows the transmission system for one of the levels, the closed chains numbered 1 and 2 correspond to linear and rotational degrees of freedom. The idea of placing the actuators far from the scanner area enables us to employ conventional electric motors to drive the robot. However, this arrangement necessitates the development of a cable transmission configuration that allows one to remotely control the platform. Currently utilized transmission system employs two closed chains of plastic ropes for each level of the platform. In Figure 8, which schematically shows the transmission system for one of the levels, the closed chains numbered 1 and 2 correspond to linear and rotational degrees of freedom. The idea of placing the actuators far from the scanner area enables us to employ conventional electric motors to drive the robot. However, this arrangement necessitates the development of a cable transmission configuration that allows one to remotely control the platform. Currently utilized transmission system employs two closed chains of plastic ropes for each level of the platform. In Figure 8, which schematically shows the transmission system for one of the levels, the closed chains numbered 1 and 2 correspond to linear and rotational degrees of freedom. The idea of placing the actuators far from the scanner area enables us to employ conventional electric motors to drive the robot. However, this arrangement necessitates the development of a cable transmission configuration that allows one to remotely control the platform. Currently utilized transmission system employs two closed chains of plastic ropes for each level of the platform. In Figure 8, which schematically shows the transmission system for one of the levels, the closed chains numbered 1 and 2 correspond to linear and rotational degrees of freedom. The idea of placing the actuators far from the scanner area enables us to employ conventional electric motors to drive the robot. However, this arrangement necessitates the development of a cable transmission configuration that allows one to remotely control the platform. Currently utilized transmission system employs two closed chains of plastic ropes for each level of the platform. In Figure 8, which schematically shows the transmission system for one of the levels, the closed chains numbered 1 and 2 correspond to linear and rotational degrees of freedom. The idea of placing the actuators far from the scanner area enables us to employ conventional electric motors to drive the robot. However, this arrangement necessitates the development of a cable transmission configuration that allows one to remotely control the platform. Currently utilized transmission system employs two closed chains of plastic ropes for each level of the platform. In Figure 8, which schematically shows the transmission system for one of the levels, the closed chains numbered 1 and 2 correspond to linear and rotational degrees of freedom. The idea of placing the actuators far from the scanner area enables us to employ conventional electric motors to drive the robot. However, this arrangement necessitates the development of a cable transmission configuration that allows one to remotely control the platform. Currently utilized transmission system employs two closed chains of plastic ropes for each level of the platform. In Figure 8, which schematically shows the transmission system for one of the levels, the closed chains numbered 1 and 2 correspond to linear and rotational degrees of freedom. The idea of placing the actuators far from the scanner area enables us to employ conventional electric motors to drive the robot. However, this arrangement necessitates the development of a cable transmission configuration that allows one to remotely control the platform. Currently utilized transmission system employs two closed chains of plastic ropes for each level of the platform. In Figure 8, which schematically shows the transmission system for one of the levels, the closed chains numbered 1 and 2 correspond to linear and rotational degrees of freedom. The idea of placing the actuators far from the scanner area enables us to employ conventional electric motors to drive the robot. However, this arrangement necessitates the development of a cable transmission configuration that allows one to remotely control the platform. Currently utilized transmission system employs two closed chains of plastic ropes for each level of the platform.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Size (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outer diameter of the casing</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner diameter of the rotating ring</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height of the platform</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diameter of the catheter</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
rotational DOFs. Actuation command signals are generated initially in MATLAB and then transmitted to motor drivers through dSPACE acting as our real-time control and data acquisition system. Imaging section of the experimental setup consists of a camera placed above the robot to capture the position of the marker (as shown in Figure 9). Based on the experiment, this marker could be attached either to the distal part of the catheter or to the upper holder. Using MATLAB image processing toolbox, the position of the center point of this marker is tracked. In order to achieve on-the-fly control of the platform, imaging should be executed in real-time. However, in current setup, due to the lack of precision of the used camera, feedback signals are provided by the stepper motors’ built-in encoders. Imaging, on the other hand, is done off-line to capture the motion of the platform. The path lines originated by these images will serve as experimental results in the next section. In the ideal case, we will: (i) use DC motors instead of stepper motors, (ii) actuate all the four available DOFs, and (iii) use the MR image data instead of the encoders’ data.

5 Evaluation of the Design Performance

To evaluate the performance of the developed system, three different sets of experiments are defined and the corresponding results are discussed in this section. The experiments are de-
signed to address some of the important issues such as coupling between degrees of freedom, accuracy and repeatability in tracking set points and reference trajectories.

5.1 Compensation of the DOFs coupling using feedforward controls
Combination of rotational and translational degrees of freedom at each level of the platform enables the robot to position the catheter holders in desired polar coordinates. The undesired coupling of the degrees of freedom should be taken care of to prevent distorted motion of the platform. To properly address DOF coupling issue in this experiment, the platform is commanded to move the catheter such that its upper holder moves on a quarter of a circle’s perimeter positioned at the center of the rotating ring (from point 1 to point 2 in Figure 10). To capture the motion of the holder, the imaging maker is attached to it. Failing to resolve the coupling issue leads to the deviation of the holder from the desired path (dashed line in Figure 10), where it passes through the origin (point c) and stops at the other side of the cylinder plane (point 2’). Adding a feedforward control action compensates for the interference by transmitting proper actuation signals to the stepper motor corresponding to the translational DOF. The perfect arc-shaped motion of the holder after applying this corrective feedforward control (solid line in Figure 10) results in a significant improvement in the navigation of the robot and ensures the effectiveness of the proposed compensation scheme.

5.2 Reference set point tracking
Within the feedback control law, a threshold level is defined to adjust the accuracy of the system in following the set points. Once the error between the encoder measurements and the reference data exceeds this amount, the actuation signal will be cut off. In the case of utilizing stepper motors, this actuation signal is the pulse frequency that magnetizes the stepper motors’ coils and dictate the angular velocity. In this experiment, a four-node closed contour is defined by its corners’ polar coordinates. Feeding the controller with this data, this test is performed to examine the accuracy of the robot in following such reference inputs. To capture the motion of the end effector, the marker is placed on the distal end of the catheter. While all the set points are reached by the robot as illustrated in Figure 11, the irregular motion of the holder between the set points that does not follow any patterns makes this method less appealing for the trajectory tracking purpose. Another interesting observation is the marker’s profile between upper and lower set points. This is due to discontinuity in rotational degree of freedom that only covers the interval \((0, \pi)\) and prevents the platform to connect upper and lower points with a straight line or an arc. In fact, in order to connect any points in the upper sector of the plane to the lower part, all trajectories have to pass through the center point of the ring. Due to the specific application of the ROBOCATH, in which the catheter is aimed to follow off-center miniature contours, this issue does not affect the performance of the platform.

5.3 Reference trajectory tracking
Continuous trajectory tracking leads to higher computational costs and hence requires more elaborate control efforts compared to the set points tracking. However, the manipulability is significantly extended by this method and the irregular motions of the end effector will no longer appear in the results. To evaluate the accuracy of the platform in following the reference trajectories and also to assess the effectiveness of the implemented control scheme, an arbitrarily chosen zigzag path is considered as the input signal. Utilizing the inverse kinematic model of the platform developed earlier, the controller commands the joint...
such that the desired path is swept by the end effector. Figure 12 shows both the reference path and the platform output, which is the contour that the marker has passed. The maximum error is observed to be less than 1 mm. While this error is partially due to the control deficiencies, as well as the mechanical issues such as backlash, the contribution of other hardware including camera should also be taken into account. In fact, by filtering the perspective effect in the captured images, the obtained results will be significantly improved.

The final experiment introduced in this study is used to examine the repeatability. For this purpose, a circular trajectory in the upper level of the platform is swept by the holder in three consecutive intervals. The captured contours are depicted in Figure 13. The maximum deviation that any of these three paths have produced relative to the others does not exceed 2 mm, while the maximum deviation from the reference input is observed to be 3 mm. This interesting observation, once again, highlights the major contribution of the imaging issue in generating the errors. In addition, the sufficiently close compliance of swept trajectories guarantees the high level of repeatability in the system. The encoder measurements corresponding to this trajectory are shown in Figure 14. While the motor actuating the linear DOF closely follows the reference signal, the other actuator partially fails to track the input, especially around the peak points. This is due to the speed limitations of the stepper motors. We expect that implementing an advanced control method by utilizing DC motors will lead to resolving this problem.

6 Conclusion and Future Work

Beating heart interventions using a transapical approach offer several advantages including less patient’s recovery time compared to the traditional procedures. However, issues such as the moving boundaries of the work space need to be carefully addressed to achieve the desired outcomes. In this paper, we propose the design of a robotic platform that could fit the requirements of such sophisticated and minimally-invasive interventions. Being equipped with MRI as the image modality, ROBOCATH is capable of positioning and orienting the cardiac catheter to avoid any collision between the interventional tool and the internal organs under beating heart condition. Operational needs such as MRI-compatibility, chest’s relative motion compensation, accuracy and compactness are also properly taken care of in design of the platform. Development of the platform’s kinematic model further enables us to ensure that kinematic requirements are met prior to manufacturing the robot. The inverse model is later employed by the controller to allow for reference trajectory tracking. To validate the ROBOCATH design concept and test the prototype model, an experimental setup is developed. Three sets of experiments are designed to evaluate the system performance by implementing a feedback control combined with a corrective feedforward term to compensate for the DOFs coupling issue. These experiments collectively illustrate
the effectiveness of the controller in canceling the coupling, the acceptable accuracy and repeatability of the platform in tracking the reference set points and trajectories.

The authors are currently conducting additional experiments to utilize advanced model-based controls for disturbance attenuation and tracking the reference trajectories generated from the MRI images taken and processed on-the-fly. In addition, to make the mechanism ready to assist with aortic valve replacement procedure, additional degrees of freedom corresponding to the insertion of the catheter and its navigation inside left ventricle are being added to the top of current platform.
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