Robotics in Healthcare: Surgical Robots and Rehabilitation

Prepared for: R. Rubesh
Date: 21 September 2025

Introduction Robotics is transforming healthcare by enhancing surgical precision, reducing patient trauma, and enabling novel rehabilitation therapies. This report examines two major application areas
— robotic-assisted surgery and robotic rehabilitation — covering technologies, clinical benefits, limitations, recent trends, regulatory status, and future directions. The focus is on evidence-based outcomes and real-world adoption to provide a balanced view for students, clinicians, and technologists.

1. Robotic-Assisted Surgery: technology and clinical impact Robotic-assisted surgery (RAS) refers to procedures in which a surgeon uses a tele-operated or computer-assisted robotic system to manipulate instruments inside a patient. Most systems in use today are master–slave telemanipulators where the surgeon, seated at a console, controls multiple robotic arms offering articulated
instruments and three-dimensional visualization. The da Vinci family (Intuitive Surgical) is the best-known example, used across urology, gynecology, general surgery, and thoracic procedures. New
entrants and national competitors are emerging, broadening choice and driving incremental innovation in ports, optics, and instrumentation [1][2].

Clinical benefits observed across many studies include smaller incisions, reduced intraoperative blood loss, shorter hospital stays, and faster recovery compared with open surgery. For selected procedures, RAS can provide ergonomic advantages for surgeons and improved dexterity in confined anatomical spaces. Systematic reviews and recent literature syntheses indicate consistent improvements
in certain perioperative outcomes, although the magnitude of benefit depends on procedure type and surgeon experience. Cost, longer operating time in early learning phases, and the need for specific
training remain significant barriers [3][4].

2. Levels of autonomy and regulatory status While most clinical systems remain surgeon-controlled, research advances are progressively adding automation for specific subtasks — for example, suturing
assistance, camera control, and preoperative plan execution. Regulatory bodies such as the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) have cleared multiple surgical robots and continue to evaluate devices for different levels of autonomy. Recent systematic work catalogues FDA-cleared systems and highlights that fully autonomous robotic operating systems are not yet standard clinical tools; rather, autonomy today augments but does not replace surgical decision-making [5][6].

3. Cost, access, and health-system considerations Capital cost for a modern surgical robot ranges from several hundred thousand to multiple millions of dollars when factoring platform upgrades, maintenance contracts, and disposable instruments. Cost-effectiveness depends on procedure volume, reimbursement frameworks, and whether robotic approaches reduce downstream costs (shorter stays,
fewer complications). Health systems with concentrated surgical volumes — tertiary centers and specialty hospitals — realize the most immediate value. Policymakers are evaluating centralization vs.
broader distribution; for example, the UK NHS has recently signaled significant expansion plans for robotic surgery to reduce waiting lists, illustrating how policy and capital deployment shape

adoption [7].

4. Robotic Rehabilitation: exoskeletons, gait trainers, and therapy robots Robotics for rehabilitation includes wearable exoskeletons, treadmill-based gait trainers (like the Lokomat), end-effector robots, and socially assistive robots for cognitive and motor therapy. Wearable exoskeletons (e.g., Ekso, ReWalk) help people with spinal cord injury or stroke to stand and walk, enabling task-specific, repetitive training that is difficult to deliver manually. Treadmill-based robotic gait trainers offer body-weight support and programmable gait cycles to assist intensive locomotor training. Systematic reviews report improvements in walking distance, speed, and function in selected patient groups, but evidence quality varies and results are often contingent on patient selection,
training dose, and concurrent therapies [8][9].

5. Evidence and limitations in rehabilitation Recent meta-analyses show that robotic gait training can be as effective as conventional therapy for some outcomes and may provide additive benefit when
combined with traditional physiotherapy. However, several systematic reviews caution that evidence is heterogeneous: many trials are small, protocols vary, and long-term community-level outcomes
(e.g., independent ambulation in daily life) are not consistently demonstrated. Practical limitations include device cost, therapist training requirements, limited portability for home use, and patient eligibility constraints (e.g., weight, residual motor control). Safety considerations — fall prevention, skin integrity under straps, and cardiovascular monitoring during intensive sessions — are essential [9][10].

6. Emerging technologies and trends Several trends are accelerating the field. First, miniaturized optics, haptic feedback research, and improved instrument articulation promise to extend robotic benefits to more delicate and complex procedures. Second, AI and computer vision are being integrated for intraoperative decision support: anatomy recognition, margin estimation, and gaze-based
instrument guidance are active research areas. Third, cost pressure and competitive markets have encouraged modular and single-port systems aimed at reducing footprint and capital burden. Fourth,
tele-mentoring and remote proctoring — facilitated by secure networks and improved latency — are expanding the reach of specialist expertise to resource-limited centers. These trajectories suggest that RAS will increasingly become a platform combining surgeon skill and intelligent assistance [11][12].

7. Ethics, training, and workforce implications Robotic systems alter the skillset required of surgeons and therapists. Training curricula must include simulation, proctored cases, and credentialing
processes tied to competency rather than volume alone. Ethical concerns include equitable access (wealthy centers vs. rural hospitals), transparency regarding outcomes, and informed consent where the
benefits compared with conventional approaches remain uncertain. Liability in incidents involving automation or software errors is a developing medico-legal topic that health systems must address through robust governance and post-market surveillance [13][14].

8. Case studies and real-world implementations - Da Vinci systems: Widely used in urology and gynecology with substantial installed bases; iterative device approvals continue to refine usability and
indications [1][6]. - Lokomat and exoskeleton programs: Rehabilitation centers using Lokomat or wearable exoskeletons report structured intensive gait programs yielding measurable short-term improvements; longitudinal community outcomes need more study [8][9].

9. Recommendations for stakeholders For hospitals considering investment: perform a volume-based cost-effectiveness analysis, pilot with a high-volume specialty, and ensure access to surgeon training and maintenance contracts. For clinicians: participate in structured training, report outcomes to registries, and engage in multidisciplinary protocols blending robotics with conventional care. For researchers and industry: prioritize randomized trials with standardized outcome sets, develop lower-cost and portable devices for wider access, and advance explainable AI for intraoperative decision support. For policymakers: design reimbursement pathways that reward value (improved outcomes, reduced complications) and consider regional centers of excellence to maximize utilization and training.

Conclusion Robotics in healthcare — particularly robotic-assisted surgery and robotic rehabilitation — has moved from promising research to established clinical practice in many domains. The technology improves surgical ergonomics and offers new therapeutic modalities for patients with neurological injury, yet challenges remain in cost, evidence heterogeneity, training, and equitable access. Ongoing innovation, combined with rigorous clinical trials and thoughtful deployment strategies, will determine whether robotic systems deliver broad, sustainable improvements in population health.

References [1] Da Vinci Robotic Surgical Systems - Intuitive. [2] Surgical Robots Market Size & Share | Grand View Research. [3] Robot-Assisted Surgery: Current Applications and Future Trends (PMC). [4] Robotic Surgery: A Comprehensive Review of the Literature (PMC). [5] Levels of autonomy in FDA-cleared surgical robots (Nature). [6] Robotic Surgery: Risks vs. Rewards | PSNet (AHRQ).
[7] NHS expansion plans for robotic surgery (news report). [8] Comparison of Efficacy of Lokomat and Wearable Exoskeleton (PMC). [9] Exoskeleton-based exercises for overground gait and balance (PMC). [10] Recent systematic reviews on robotic gait training outcomes (PMC). [11] Advances in haptics and AI integration in surgery (research articles). [12] Emerging modular and single-port systems (industry reports). [13] Ethical and training considerations in robotic surgery (academic literature). [14] Medico-legal implications and workforce studies (health policy sources).