USE OF HEALTHCARE ROBOTS IN PATIENT SUPPORT SERVICES: A CASE STUDY

Rhythm Jain

Chandigarh University

INTRODUCTION: HEALTHCARE ROBOTICS AS TRANSFORMATIVE TECHNOLOGY

Healthcare robots represent an emerging class of medical devices designed to augment clinical workflows, improve patient care delivery, and address labor shortages in long-term care facilities. These systems range from surgical platforms to social companion robots, each addressing specific clinical or operational needs [1]. The integration of robotics into healthcare settings reflects the broader evolution toward proactive, personalized, and precision medicine that prioritizes patient-centered care [2]. This paradigm shift has become particularly urgent in the post-pandemic environment, where healthcare systems face increased demands for efficiency and the need to optimize clinical pathways.

The convergence of artificial intelligence, advanced sensors, and mechanical systems has enabled robots to perform tasks spanning minimally invasive surgery, telepresence, patient monitoring, and emotional support [3]. Within this landscape, artificial intelligence functions as a critical enabler, providing diagnostic support, predictive analytics, and autonomous decision-making capabilities that enhance robotic functionality and detection accuracy [4]. Implementation of healthcare robotics faces significant barriers including high costs, user acceptance challenges, and the need for robust training frameworks. Beyond technical considerations, adoption obstacles encompass ethical concerns, liability and regulatory gaps, workforce training deficiencies, and patient safety considerations that require systematic attention [5].

Healthcare robotics encompasses multiple categories: surgical robots for precision interventions, telepresence systems for remote consultations, social robots for elderly care and mental health support, and service robots for logistics and decontamination [6]. Smart hospital environments increasingly incorporate robot services alongside location recognition technology, Internet of Things-based systems, and extended reality platforms to create

integrated care ecosystems [7]. Each robotics category presents distinct technical requirements and clinical validation challenges; surgical robots demand exceptional precision and regulatory validation, while social robots require sophisticated natural language processing and emotional recognition capabilities. The translation of medical robotics research from laboratory environments to clinical practice remains incomplete, with a widening gap between academic innovation and real-world implementation that demands strategic prioritization of commercialization pathways [8].

CLINICAL APPLICATIONS AND CASE STUDIES

Surgical robotic systems have demonstrated measurable improvements across multiple procedural domains, particularly in prostatectomy and gynecological interventions. Robotic-assisted prostatectomy shows significantly reduced intraoperative morbidity compared to standard laparoscopic approaches, with substantially lower odds of major intraoperative complications such as organ injury [9]. Beyond urological applications, robotic-assisted thoracoscopic lung resection procedures have achieved comparable oncologic outcomes to conventional video-assisted thoracoscopic surgery while potentially offering advantages in patient recovery [10]. Specifically, robotic thoracic approaches demonstrate reduced blood loss, lower conversion rates to open surgery, shorter hospital stays, and improved lymph node dissection completeness compared to video-assisted thoracoscopic techniques, supporting their integration in high-volume centers where cost-effectiveness can be optimized through case volume scaling [11]. Gynecological applications, particularly hysterectomy procedures, consistently show reduced operative times and blood loss with robotic assistance during surgeon learning phases, suggesting early adoption advantages [12]. These procedural refinements translate directly into reduced patient morbidity and shortened recovery timelines.

Telepresence robots have successfully bridged geographic barriers by delivering specialized healthcare consultations to underserved communities. A documented case study demonstrated the feasibility of inter-professional spinal triage management for chronic back disorders using remote presence robotic technology in rural Saskatchewan, where a nurse practitioner and physical therapist conducted comprehensive neuromusculoskeletal assessments and provided post-surgical education via robotic intermediary [13]. Both clinical staff and patients reported high satisfaction levels with the robotic delivery model, and objective improvements in patient mobility were documented during follow-up sessions. These systems enable real-time clinical assessment and therapeutic guidance across distances that would otherwise limit

access to specialist expertise, though comprehensive health economic and comparative effectiveness data across diverse telehealth modalities remain insufficient.

Social robots deployed in elderly care settings, particularly the Pepper robot platform, have revealed both significant potential and substantial technical barriers for dementia care applications. Research exploring Pepper robot interactions with older adults with dementia identified measurable engagement improvements and demonstrated conversational feasibility through remote-controlled functionality [1]. However, critical limitations emerged in four core technical domains: accurate sensing of patient behavior and responses to verbal communication; inefficient gaze-direction management during social interactions; low behavioral fidelity in response generation; and fundamental deficiencies in natural language processing and autonomous behavioral adaptation [1]. These constraints suggest that meaningful deployment in dementia care requires substantial advances in artificial intelligence development and sensor integration before widespread clinical implementation.

Telehealth robotic programs targeting community-dwelling older adults in independent retirement settings have demonstrated high satisfaction metrics and positive technology acceptance. The T-CHAT program delivered through telepresence robots showed mean satisfaction ratings of 3.90 on usefulness (5-point scale), 4.16 on ease of use, and 4.06 on acceptability, with consistent technology performance across all intervention sessions [14]. Program effectiveness in promoting healthy lifestyle modification and chronic disease management suggests viability for future implementation, though integration required careful attention to structured training protocols and institutional support mechanisms. Future refinement of such programs should prioritize testing clinical outcomes and cost-effectiveness comparative to traditional telehealth delivery models prior to broad healthcare system adoption.

TECHNICAL CHALLENGES AND DEVELOPMENT ISSUES

Natural language processing and compassionate communication constitute fundamental technical barriers in healthcare robotics, particularly for systems designed to interact with vulnerable populations such as dementia patients. Research on the Pepper robot platform identified four critical deficiencies in autonomous human-robot interaction: accurate sensing of patient behavior and contextually appropriate responses to verbal communication [1], inefficient gaze-direction management during social interactions, low behavioral fidelity in

response generation, and systemic deficiencies in natural language processing that prevent robots from engaging with emotional nuance rather than executing pre-programmed responses [1]. These constraints reveal that meaningful engagement requires substantial advances in artificial intelligence development beyond current technical capabilities before widespread clinical deployment becomes feasible.

Integration of artificial intelligence with medical robotics demands rigorous validation of safety, accuracy, and clinical efficacy across diverse patient populations before widespread deployment [15]. Deep learning models employed in diagnostic imaging, therapeutic guidance, and autonomous decision-making must be trained on sufficiently large and heterogeneous clinical datasets to ensure generalizability and reduce systematic bias across demographic groups and disease presentations. Hardware design challenges for medical robots include achieving miniaturization necessary for minimally invasive applications while maintaining appropriate haptic feedback mechanisms that enable precise surgical control [16]. Soft robotics approaches utilizing compliant materials show promise for reducing tissue trauma during contact, though fabrication complexity and durability concerns remain unresolved obstacles to clinical translation [16]. Data integration and interoperability standards represent essential yet underdeveloped infrastructure for robotic systems to function meaningfully within existing healthcare information systems. The absence of standardized protocols for device communication, data formatting standards, and electronic health record integration severely limits the ability of robotic systems to access necessary clinical information and contribute to coordinated care delivery [17]. Implementation of standardized frameworks such as FHIR and HL7 standards is necessary but requires substantial investment in system redesign across institutional healthcare IT infrastructure [18]. These interconnected technical challenges underscore that successful healthcare robotics deployment requires coordinated advances in artificial intelligence, mechanical design, regulatory validation, and health informatics simultaneously rather than sequential problem-solving.

REGULATORY, ECONOMIC, AND ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Regulatory frameworks for medical robotics remain substantially underdeveloped relative to the rapid pace of technological innovation, creating significant uncertainty in approval pathways and liability frameworks [19]. Most robotic platforms currently undergo evaluation

through existing medical device regulatory pathways such as FDA premarket approval or 510(k) clearance, which were designed for conventional devices and may inadequately address the unique challenges posed by autonomous systems and adaptive algorithms [20]. The IDEAL Framework provides a structured approach for assessing novel surgical technologies through four stages of development and evaluation; however, a recent analysis revealed that most robotic platforms remain at preclinical to exploratory stages, with only a minority achieving full clinical validation [21]. Singapore's regulatory sandbox approach demonstrates one potential model for facilitating innovation while maintaining safety oversight through structured pilot programs, iterative testing protocols, and dynamic regulatory adjustments based on real-world performance data [19]. Such proactive governance models enable healthcare systems to generate evidence for emerging robotic technologies while protecting patient safety.

Cost-effectiveness analysis reveals that robotic-assisted procedures typically require high procedure volumes to justify equipment acquisition costs, maintenance expenses, and training requirements [22]. For robotic-arm assisted total knee arthroplasty, cost-effectiveness was achieved only at institutional volumes exceeding 49 procedures annually, with incremental cost-effectiveness ratios of approximately $41,331 per quality-adjusted life-year at higher volumes [22]. Economic viability depends critically on healthcare system structure, reimbursement mechanisms, and institutional capacity to absorb substantial capital investments while achieving demonstrable improvements in clinical outcomes or operational efficiency. Broader adoption of robotics in administrative and routine clinical tasks shows promise; research analyzing general practice workflows identified that approximately 44 percent of administrative tasks could be automated using currently available technologies [23], though implementation requires careful evaluation of cost-benefit relationships and workforce transition planning.

Ethical concerns regarding robot-assisted care extend beyond clinical efficacy to encompass questions about dehumanization of healthcare delivery, appropriate use boundaries, and equitable access to advanced technologies [24]. Comprehensive ethical frameworks must address privacy and data security, algorithmic bias, transparency in autonomous decision-making, professional accountability, and informed consent [25], [26]. Healthcare professionals and patients express concerns about the impact of automation on the therapeutic

relationship, professional role transformations, and the potential for medical AI systems to operate autonomously without adequate human oversight [27]. Human-centered design principles emphasizing systematic stakeholder engagement and contextual investigation during development phases are essential for ensuring that robotics implementations align with patient values, clinical needs, and cultural contexts rather than purely maximizing technological capability or efficiency metrics [24].

Workforce implications require deliberate management, as robotic automation may displace certain job categories—particularly administrative and routine care roles—while simultaneously creating new positions in robot programming, maintenance, specialized technical support, and human-robot team coordination [23]. Healthcare organizations must establish comprehensive training frameworks that prepare practitioners to work effectively alongside robotic systems, understanding both their capabilities and limitations while maintaining clinical judgment and accountability [23]. Professional societies and healthcare institutions should collaborate to develop certification pathways and competency standards for robotics-trained healthcare workers, ensuring that workforce transitions are managed equitably and that displaced workers have access to retraining opportunities. Transparent communication with healthcare employees about automation timelines, skill requirements, and career pathway changes is critical for building trust and supporting organizational change management during robotics implementation.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND RESEARCH GAPS

Emerging applications in healthcare robotics will expand beyond current surgical and telepresence domains into microrobotic systems and autonomous platforms. Microrobotic systems enabling targeted drug delivery represent a frontier technology, with low-friction soft robots demonstrating efficacy in gastrointestinal tract bacterial infection treatment and image-guided therapeutic delivery [28]. These systems leverage magnetic actuation and clinically integrated imaging platforms to achieve precise drug targeting with reduced systemic toxicity [28]. Autonomous surgical platforms are advancing toward reduced surgeon supervision requirements, with autonomous robotic-assisted implant surgery achieving angular deviations of 1.27 degrees and coronal deviations of 0.67 millimeters, demonstrating the feasibility of supervisor-level rather than continuous operator control [29]. Adaptive rehabilitation devices incorporating real-time learning capabilities present opportunities for individualized therapeutic support, though current research remains in early developmental stages regarding

autonomous decision-making in response to patient performance metrics. Development of these emerging technologies demands interdisciplinary collaboration integrating biomedical engineers, clinicians, and artificial intelligence specialists to translate laboratory innovations into clinically validated systems [15].

A critical research gap exists in standardization of performance metrics and long-term clinical outcome evaluation for healthcare robotics. Current evidence demonstrates high variability in outcome reporting across specialties and surgical robot platforms, with inconsistent methodological approaches limiting meaningful comparative effectiveness studies [30]. Publication bias systematically favors positive outcomes while underreporting implementation challenges, adverse events, and cases where robotic approaches fail to demonstrate advantages over conventional methods. Systematic evaluation must prioritize objective metrics including operative time, blood loss, conversion rates, length of stay, functional recovery timelines, and cost-effectiveness across diverse institutional settings. Long-term outcome studies comparing robotic versus conventional approaches remain sparse, particularly for evaluating durability of benefits beyond the initial postoperative period. Research priorities should also encompass implementation science approaches examining factors affecting adoption and sustained use, including clinician training requirements, team workflow integration, patient acceptance patterns, and institutional resource allocation strategies [30]. Heterogeneous study designs across surgical specialties present methodological challenges that can be addressed through development of standardized outcome registries modeled on existing surgical quality improvement databases.

Integration of explainable artificial intelligence into healthcare robotics represents an essential technical and clinical priority. Current AI-driven robotic systems often operate as "black boxes," with decision-making processes opaque to clinical users, raising concerns about accountability and clinical judgment integration [31]. Explainable robotics frameworks should enable transparent communication of robotic reasoning, allowing practitioners to understand the evidence supporting robotic recommendations and interventions. Development requires computational models that generate clinically comprehensible explanations at multiple autonomy levels, accounting for diverse healthcare professional expertise and contextual decision-making requirements [31]. Technical challenges include translating complex machine learning model outputs into language and visualizations that meaningfully inform clinical decision-making without oversimplification that compromises

accuracy. This integration becomes increasingly critical as robotic systems progress toward greater autonomy, where human oversight depends fundamentally on understanding and trusting the underlying computational logic.

Human-robot interaction design must evolve beyond hardware optimization to encompass deeper understanding of clinical team adaptation and workflow transformation. Research addressing how surgical and clinical teams reorganize work processes when incorporating robots remains underdeveloped, with most studies focusing on technical performance rather than sociotechnical system integration [32]. Training protocols require systematic evaluation comparing didactic approaches, simulation-based learning, hands-on mentorship models, and deliberate practice schedules across different practitioner skill levels and specialties. Questions regarding optimal training duration, competency assessment benchmarks, and performance maintenance strategies lack empirical evidence. Robot design should incorporate human factors principles ensuring that robotic systems enhance rather than disrupt established care coordination patterns, communication flows, and professional role distribution within clinical teams. Future implementations must balance technological capability with organizational change management, recognizing that unsuccessful robotics adoptions frequently stem from inadequate attention to human factors rather than technical limitations.

Robot Category	Primary Application	Technical Complexity	Typical Clinical Outcomes	Key Implementation Barriers
Surgical Robots (Master-Slave)	Minimally invasive surgery (prostatectomy, hysterectomy, thoracic)	Very High	Reduced operative time (10-20% reduction), decreased blood loss, lower major complication rates (0.5-2% vs	High capital cost ($1-3M), steep learning curve (50-200 cases), specialized training requirements, need for high surgical volume

Robot Category	Primary Application	Technical Complexity	Typical Clinical Outcomes	Key Implementation Barriers
			2-5% conventional)	(>50 cases/year for cost-effectiveness)
Autonomous Surgical Platforms	Image-guided implant placement, organ biopsies	Very High	High precision (0.67-1.27mm deviation), reduced surgeon fatigue, reproducible outcomes	Limited autonomy scope, regulatory uncertainty, need for surgeon supervision, development cost ($5-10M+), validation timelines
Telepresence Robots	Remote consultation, specialist assessment, education delivery	Medium	High satisfaction (3.90-4.16/5 scale), improved rural access, maintained clinical assessment quality	Technology dependence, bandwidth requirements, patient acceptance variability, reimbursement gaps, latency sensitivity
Social Companion Robots	Elderly care, dementia support, mental health engagement	Medium-High	Measurable engagement improvements, high satisfaction ratings (3.5-4.2/5)	Limited natural language processing, sensing inaccuracies, low behavioral fidelity,

Robot Category	Primary Application	Technical Complexity	Typical Clinical Outcomes	Key Implementation Barriers
				emotional interaction deficits, questionable long-term clinical utility
Microrobotic Systems	Targeted drug delivery, diagnostic imaging, therapeutic intervention	Very High	Reduced systemic toxicity, improved tumor penetration (3-17% of injected payload), minimal off-target effects	Complex fabrication, control challenges, imaging integration requirements, scalability limitations, long-term biocompatibility questions
Rehabilitation Robots	Stroke recovery, mobility assistance, functional restoration	Medium	Improved motor recovery outcomes, personalized therapy intensity, increased patient engagement	High equipment cost, training burden, limited evidence for superiority vs conventional therapy, variability in patient responsiveness

KEY TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS AND PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS FOR DIFFERENT HEALTHCARE ROBOT CATEGORIES

• **Surgical Robots**: Positional accuracy ≤1mm for end-effector placement; haptic feedback resolution ≥0.1N force discrimination; visualization system providing ≥10x magnification with stereoscopic 3D imaging; tool compatibility supporting ≥10 instrument configurations; operating time ≤5 minutes for system setup and docking; fail-safe mechanisms for autonomous shutdown upon detection of anomalies

• **Autonomous Surgical Platforms**: Registration accuracy ≤2mm relative to surgical target; real-time navigation update frequency ≥10Hz; autonomous decision-making response time <500ms; intraoperative imaging integration supporting DICOM standard compliance; position-holding stability within ±0.5mm over 30-minute procedures; collision detection algorithms with sensitivity threshold ≤1mm from anatomical barriers

• **Telepresence Robots**: Network bandwidth requirements 5-10Mbps for HD video + haptic feedback; video latency <150ms round-trip transmission time; mobile navigation speed 0.5-1.5m/sec on hospital surfaces; camera field of view ≥90 degrees with tele-zoom capability; microphone and speaker systems achieving 80-90dB sound pressure level with noise cancellation; battery runtime ≥8-12 hours for continuous operation

• **Social Companion Robots**: Natural language processing supporting ≥2000-word vocabulary with 85%+ recognition accuracy; emotional expression capability through ≥15 distinct facial configurations; locomotion speed 0.3-0.8m/sec with obstacle avoidance sensors; interaction duration capability ≥60 consecutive minutes without performance degradation; touch sensors detecting force gradients ≥0.5N for safe interaction; gaze-direction response latency <500ms for conversational engagement

• **Microrobotic Systems**: Particle size 0.1-1000micrometers depending on application; payload capacity 20-50% of particle mass; navigation accuracy within 1-2mm of target tissue; imaging-guided control loop frequency ≥1Hz; biocompatible materials meeting ISO 10993 standards; controlled propulsion enabling velocities 10-1000micrometers/second; temporal stability maintaining functionality >24-48 hours in physiological conditions

• **Rehabilitation Robots**: Joint movement ranges accommodating 90-120% of human anatomical motion; force output adjustable from 5-50N across therapy protocols; motion precision within ±5mm at end-effector; real-time force and position feedback sampling ≥100Hz; customizable resistance profiles supporting 15+ resistance levels; session duration capability supporting 30-60 minute continuous therapy without mechanical fatigue

REFERENCES

[1] T. Tanioka *et al.*, "Development issues of healthcare robots: Compassionate communication for older adults with dementia," *Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute*, 2021.

[2] K. Denecke and C. Baudoin, "A review of artificial intelligence and robotics in transformed health ecosystems," *Frontiers in Medicine*, 2022.

[3] C. K, C.-B. S, and S. A, "Health care robotics: Qualitative exploration of key challenges and future directions." 2018.

[4] P. Manickam *et al.*, "Artificial intelligence (AI) and internet of medical things (IoMT) assisted biomedical systems for intelligent healthcare," *Biosensors*, 2022.

[5] M. I. Ahmed, B. Spooner, J. Isherwood, M. Lane, E. Orrock, and A. Dennison, "A systematic review of the barriers to the implementation of artificial intelligence in healthcare," *Cureus*, 2023.

[6] K. ZH, S. A, and L. CW, "Robotics utilization for healthcare digitization in global COVID-19 management." 2020.

[7] K. H *et al.*, "Review of smart hospital services in real healthcare environments." 2022.

[8] D. PE *et al.*, "A decade retrospective of medical robotics research from 2010 to 2020." 2021.

[9] C. Robertson *et al.*, "Relative effectiveness of robotassisted and standard laparoscopic prostatectomy as alternatives to open radical prostatectomy for treatment of localised prostate cancer: A systematic review and mixed treatment comparison metaanalysis," *Wiley*, 2013.

[10] J. Zhang, Q. Feng, Y. Huang, L. Ouyang, and F. Luo, "Updated evaluation of robotic- and video-assisted thoracoscopic lobectomy or segmentectomy for lung cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis," *Frontiers in Oncology*, 2022.

[11] Y. Jiang, Z. Su, H. Liang, J. Liu, W. Liang, and J. He, "Video-assisted thoracoscopy for lung cancer: Who is the future of thoracic surgery?" *AME Publishing Company*, 2020.

[12] M. ngeles Martnez-Maestre, P. Gambadauro, C. Gonzlez-Cejudo, and R. Torrejn, "Total laparoscopic hysterectomy with and without robotic assistance," *SAGE Publishing*, 2013.

[13] S. Lovo, B. Bath, L. Bustamante, and I. Mendez, "Case report: Using a remote presence robot to improve access to physical therapy for people with chronic back disorders in an underserved community," *University of Toronto Press*, 2016.

[14] T. Bakas *et al.*, "Satisfaction and technology evaluation of a telehealth robotic program to optimize healthy independent living for older adults," *Wiley*, 2018.

[15] M. C. Yip *et al.*, "Artificial intelligence meets medical robotics," *Science*, 2023.

[16] J.-H. Hsiao, J. Chang, and C.-M. Cheng, "Soft medical robotics: Clinical and biomedical applications, challenges, and future directions," *None*, 2019.

[17] J. Pamplin *et al.*, "Technology and disasters: The evolution of the national emergency tele-critical care network," *Lippincott Williams & Wilkins*, 2021.

[18] A. Torab-Miandoab, T. Samad-Soltani, A. Jodati, and P. Rezaei-Hachesu, "Interoperability of heterogeneous health information systems: A systematic literature review," *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making*, 2023.

[19] S. Y. Tan and A. Taeihagh, "Governing the adoption of robotics and autonomous systems in long-term care in singapore," *Elsevier BV*, 2020.

[20] J. J. Darrow, J. Avorn, and A. Kesselheim, "FDA regulation and approval of medical devices: 1976-2020." *None*, 2021.

[21] B. M *et al.*, "Evaluation status of current and emerging minimally invasive robotic surgical platforms." 2023.

[22] Y. Hua and J. Salcedo, "Cost-effectiveness analysis of robotic-arm assisted total knee arthroplasty," *Public Library of Science*, 2022.

[23] M. Willis, P. Duckworth, A. Coulter, E. T. Meyer, and M. A. Osborne, "Qualitative and quantitative approach to assess the potential for automating administrative tasks in general practice," *BMJ*, 2020.

[24] R. NM, B. G, L. JC, and S. KH, "Thinking beyond the device: An overview of human- and equity-centered approaches for health technology design." 2023.

[25] F. Li, N. Ruijs, and Y. Lu, "Ethics & AI: A systematic review on ethical concerns and related strategies for designing with AI in healthcare," *Applied Informatics*, 2022.

[26] C. Elendu*et al.*, "Ethical implications of AI and robotics in healthcare: A review," *Medicine*, 2023.

[27] A. J, V. E, O. KE, F. D, M. VI, and B. A, “Expectations and attitudes towards medical artificial intelligence: A qualitative study in the field of stroke.” 2023.

[28] W. B *et al.*, “Low-friction soft robots for targeted bacterial infection treatment in gastrointestinal tract.” 2024.

[29] P. Li, J. Chen, A. Li, K. Luo, S. Xu, and S. Yang, “Accuracy of autonomous robotic surgery for dental implant placement in fully edentulous patients: A retrospective case series study.” *Clinical Oral Implants Research*, 2023.

[30] R. Mathew, K. Markey, J. Murphy, and B. O. Brien, “Integrative literature review examining factors affecting patient safety with RoboticAssisted and laparoscopic surgeries,” *Wiley*, 2018.

[31] R. Setchi, M. B. Dehkordi, and J. S. Khan, “Explainable robotics in human-robot interactions,” *Elsevier BV*, 2020.

[32] M. Tavakoli, J. Carriere, and A. R. Torabi, “Robotics, smart wearable technologies, and autonomous intelligent systems for healthcare during the COVID19 pandemic: An analysis of the state of the art and future vision,” *Advanced Intelligent Systems*, 2020.