BME iPhone Virtual Reality Model for Microsurgery

BME 200/300

Team Members: Henry Plamondon, Nicholas Jacobson, Mitchell Benyukhis, Haochen Wang, Kenzie Germanson, Cameron Dimino

Advisor: Prof. Walter Block Clients: Dr. Ellen Shaffrey and Dr. Samuel Poore



Overview

- 1. Background
 - a. Microscopes
 - b. Past Designs
- 2. Competing Designs
- 3. Problem Statement
- 4. PDS Summary

- 5. Designs
 - a. Split Lens
 - b. CMBF
 - c. Efficient Algorithm
- 6. Design Matrix
- 7. Future Work
- 8. References

Background - Microscopes

Surgical Microscope

- Very high resolution
- Depth perception
- Expensive
- Uncommon

iPhone

- High resolution
- Minimal depth perception
- Less expensive
- Commonly accessible



Background - Past Designs



Figure 1. Client's Google Cardboard design to increase depth and accessibility. Photo provided by clients.

Google Cardboard

- Accessible
- Streamable
- Depth
- Major delay
- Unadjustable

Previous BME Group

- Program development
- Major delay
- Lacks depth

Presenting: Nicholas Jacobson

Competing Designs (Nicholas)

- Orbeye 4K 3D Orbital Camera System
 - 26x magnification
 - Stereoscopic camera and display
 - Removes the constraints of an optical microscope [1]
- Mitaka MM51
 - Optical Microscope
 - Non-stereoscopic display for viewing subject
 - More restrictive for the surgeon [2]



Figure 2. Orbeye 4K 3D Orbital Camera System



Problem Statement

- Design a cost-effective microsurgical training system that utilizes a smartphone camera and outputs a stereoscopic image.
 - Current imaging technologies are expensive
 - Not readily available for a large amount of trainees
 - Unable to be brought home for practice



PDS Summary

Design Requirements

- Mounted on a adjustable stand
- Light Weight; < 4.5 kg
- Transmit video footage from camera to a stereoscopic display

Performance Requirements

- Creates image with high zoom and resolution to see sutures (0.070 mm in diameter) clearly [3]
- Streaming resolution of at least 10.2 megapixels
- Stream delay of no more than 0.5 seconds

Splitting Lens Design

- Uses a single smartphone
- Two lenses at different positions
- Customized viewing options
 - Polarized
 - VR
 - Monitor
- Eliminate duplicate view (FOV)



Figure 4. The light will reach (3) f being reflected to the smartpho components are no

Figure 4. The light will reach (3) first pair of mirrors then to the second pair (2), and being reflected to the smartphone lens (4). The position and dimensions of the components are not in scale and are subject to change.

Complimentary Multi-Bandpass Filter (CMBF)



Figure 5: (a) A pair of complementary bandpass filters placed at the dual-aperture single objective lens. The scheme describes the two viewpoints made by the complementary bandpass filters. (b) An actual spectral plot of a pair of complementary triple-band bandpass filters purchased commercially off-the-shelf. The bell curves are light bands selected by a tunable filter from a broadband light. Figures adapted from Bae *et al.* [5]

Presenting: Cameron Dimino

Efficient Algorithm



Design Matrix

				Complementary Multi-Bandpass Filter		Efficient Algorithm	
Criteria		Splitting Lens Design		(CMBF)		Design	
	Weight	Raw Score	Score	Raw Score	Score	Raw Score	Score
Effectiveness (Time							
Lag)	25	5/5	25	5/5	25	2/5	10
Quality (Optical							
Quality)	20	3/5	12	4.5/5	18	3/5	12
Ease of Use	20	5/5	20	4/5	16	5/5	20
Cost	15	3/5	9	2/5	6	5/5	15
Safety	10	4/5	8	4/5	8	5/5	10
Ease of Fabrication	5	4/5	4	1/5	1	5/5	5
Durability	5	4/5	4	2/5	2	5/5	5
Total	100	28/35	82	23.5/35	76	30/35	77

Table 1: Design matrix of proposed designs. The criteria assigned with a full score are highlighted in yellow. And the highest total score is highlighted in green.

Future Work

- Depth-Perception
 - Cost Effective
 - Malleable to change
- Small render lag time
- Distance between lenses for binocular vision
- Maintain steadiness
- Determine value of zoom for best resolution and visibility of suture



Figure 7: The baseline required (in a log10 scale) for target depth resolution. The diameter of the suture (minimal detectable size) is marked on the graph. The resulting baseline is 406 mm for the configuration Mathematical model adapted from Seal et al. [6].

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Dr. Walter Block for his assistance advising us this semester in our prototype and guiding us through the design process.

We would also like to thank Dr. John Puccinelli for planning and setting up this class to allow us to work as a BME design team.

And of course, we would like to thank Dr. Ellen Schaffrey, Dr. Samuel Poore, and Dr. Weifeng Zeng for the opportunity to work with them on designing this prototype to help the future of microsurgery trainees!

References

[1]"ORBEYE 4K 3D Digital Video Microscope | Olympus Medical Systems," *www.olympus.co.uk*.

https://www.olympus.co.uk/medical/en/Products-and-solutions/Medical-specialities/Neurosurgery/ORBEYE.html [accessed Oct. 15, 2021].

[2]"Highest Resolution Microsurgery Microscope | MM51," *Mitaka USA*. https://mitakausa.com/mm51/ [accessed Oct. 15, 2021].

[3] D. J. Langer, T. G. White, M. Schulder, J. A. Boockvar, M. Labib, and M. T. Lawton, "Advances in INTRAOPERATIVE Optics: A brief review of Current Exoscope platforms," *Operative Neurosurgery*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 84–93, 2019.

[4] B. M. A. A; "The surgical suture," Aesthetic surgery journal, Apr-2019. [Online]. Available:

https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30869751/. [Accessed: 24-Sep-2021].

[5] S. Y. Bae, R. J. Korniski, H. M. Manohara, A. Ream, and H. K. S. M.D., "New technique of three-dimensional imaging through a 3-mm single lens camera," *Opt. Eng.* vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 1–8, 2012, doi: 10.1117/1.OE.51.2.021106.

[6] J. Seal, D. Bailey, and G. Sen Gupta, "Depth perception with a single camera," 2005.

[7] D. Grady, "Orbeye 3-D system turns surgery into dizzying, immersive experience," The Columbus Dispatch, 12-Jan-2018. [Online]. [Accessed: 15-Oct-2021].

