Robotic systems in spine surgery

Latest PubMed Articles

- Photocatalytic microrobots for treating bacterial infections deep within sinuses
- Robot-assisted versus navigated spinal fusion surgery: a comparative multicenter study on transpedicular screw placement accuracy and patient outcomes
- Visuohaptic Feedback in Robotic-Assisted Spine Surgery for Pedicle Screw Placement
- Performance and usability of an intraoperative registration paste frame for a spine surgical navigation system
- Lumbar spinal stenosis: current concept of management
- 3D-printed guide template for cervical stabilization surgery: A case report
- SurgPointTransformer: transformer-based vertebra shape completion using RGB-D imaging
- A robotic-assisted Pancoast tumour resection

Robotic systems in spine surgery have emerged as powerful tools that enhance the surgeon's capabilities, improve safety, and support minimally invasive approaches.

🤖 Main Robotic Systems Currently in Use

MazorX and Mazor X Stealth Edition (Medtronic)

Based on preoperative planning and intraoperative guidance.

Often used for pedicle screw placement.

Integrated with Medtronic's navigation platform.

ExcelsiusGPS (Globus Medical)

Combines navigation and robotics in a single platform.

Allows for real-time visualization of instrumentation.

ROSA Spine (Zimmer Biomet)

Used for minimally invasive screw placement.

Includes a planning module and intraoperative adaptation.

Cirq (Brainlab)

Robotic arm integrated with Brainlab navigation.

Less autonomous, more like a robotic guide.

TianJi Robot (Tinavi Medical)

Developed in China and approved for clinical use in Asia and Europe.

Used in complex spine and pelvic procedures.

⚙ Key Features & Advantages Preoperative Planning: Simulates and optimizes screw trajectories.

Precision: Sub-millimeter accuracy, particularly for pedicle screws.

Reduced Radiation: Less reliance on intraoperative fluoroscopy.

Minimally Invasive Access: Smaller incisions, less muscle dissection.

Shorter Hospital Stays: Faster recovery and mobilization.

Consistency: Particularly useful for less experienced surgeons.

 Limitations and Challenges Cost: High acquisition and maintenance costs.

Learning Curve: Requires specialized training and adaptation of workflow.

Setup Time: Can increase total operative time initially.

Limited Autonomy: Most systems are robotic-assisted, not fully autonomous.

Integration Issues: Compatibility with hospital IT systems and imaging modalities.

 Evidence and Outcomes Accuracy: Multiple studies show improved screw placement accuracy (up to 98–99%).

Complication Rates: Tend to be lower in robotic-assisted procedures.

Surgical Time: May be longer at first, but improves with experience.

Patient Satisfaction: Generally high due to lower postoperative pain and faster recovery.

 Future Directions AI Integration: To improve planning, prediction of outcomes, and error prevention.

Haptic Feedback: Robotic systems with tactile sensation for the surgeon.

Augmented Reality: For enhanced intraoperative visualization.

Remote Surgery: Telerobotic capabilities under investigation.

Expanded Indications: Use in tumor resections, deformity corrections, and spinal cord stimulation.

Narrative Reviews

A narrative review explores the state of robotic systems in spine surgery, focusing on the feasibility of full automation. The authors assess existing technologies like Cirq®, Mazor X™, and ExcelsiusGPS™, specifically focusing on trajectory-guidance mechanisms and tracking systems [1)]. Their central research question examines both the current capabilities and limitations of robotics in the surgical field and the technological leaps required for progressing toward automation.

Critical Analysis:

The review is structured around a comprehensive examination of available robotic tools, offering a well-balanced discussion of both their promises and shortcomings. It highlights a crucial distinction: while robotic assistance is advancing, autonomy remains elusive. The discussion of tracking technologies is especially valuable, comparing traditional optical tracking to emerging encoder-based systems, the latter showing enhanced reliability and accuracy.

However, as a narrative review, the methodology lacks systematic rigor. Selection criteria for the included literature are not explicitly defined, limiting reproducibility and potentially introducing bias. In contrast, a systematic review might have offered more transparency and breadth in data selection and interpretation.

The review convincingly argues that despite progress, full robotic automation faces significant hurdles. The authors correctly identify that human decision-making is not easily replicable in the surgical context, particularly in the face of anatomical variability and intraoperative complexity.

Strengths:

Clear synthesis of technical challenges in robotic spine surgery.

Forward-looking perspective on encoder-based systems.

Realistic assessment of the limits of current technologies.

Limitations:

Narrative format limits methodological rigor.

Lack of quantitative comparison or meta-analytical components.

Underrepresentation of ethical and medico-legal implications of automation.

Conclusion: This article provides an insightful update on the status and direction of robotic innovation in spine surgery. While it underscores the unrealized goal of full automation, it offers a hopeful trajectory of increasing robot-surgeon collaboration. The piece is a useful resource for understanding where the field stands and what technological and philosophical obstacles must be overcome.

For further exploration, visit the related pages: robotic_spine_surgery | automation_in_medicine | surgical_navigation_systems

---

 Conclusion Robotic systems in spine surgery are reshaping the operative landscape. While they do not replace the surgeon’s expertise, they significantly augment accuracy, reproducibility, and outcomes—especially in complex or minimally invasive procedures. Future innovations promise even deeper integration with AI, imaging, and augmented environments.

[1]
Samprón N, Lafuente J, Presa-Alonso J, Ivanov M, Hartl R, Ringel F. Advancing spine surgery: Evaluating the potential for full robotic automation. Brain Spine. 2025 Mar 17;5:104232. doi: 10.1016/j.bas.2025.104232. PMID: 40191588; PMCID: PMC11968298.