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Abstract
Purpose The aim of this work is to determine face validity and construct validity of a new virtual-reality-based simulator for diagnostic and therapeutic knee arthroscopy.

Methods The study tests a novel arthroscopic simulator based on passive haptics. Sixty-eight participants were grouped into novices, intermediates, and experts. All participants completed two exercises. In order to establish face validity, all participants filled out a questionnaire concerning different aspects of simulator realism, training capacity, and different statements using a seven-point Likert scale (range 1–7). Construct validity was tested by comparing various simulator metric values between novices and experts.

Results Face validity could be established: overall realism was rated with a mean value of 5.5 points. Global training capacity scored a mean value of 5.9. Participants considered the simulator as useful for procedural training of diagnostic and therapeutic arthroscopy. In the foreign body removal exercise, experts were overall significantly faster in the whole procedure (6 min 24 s vs. 8 min 24 s, \( p < 0.001 \)), took less time to complete the diagnostic tour (2 min 49 s vs. 3 min 32 s, \( p = 0.027 \)), and had a shorter camera path length (186 vs. 246 cm, \( p = 0.006 \)).

Conclusion The simulator achieved high scores in terms of realism. It was regarded as a useful training tool, which is also capable of differentiating between varying levels of arthroscopic experience. Nevertheless, further improvements of the simulator especially in the field of therapeutic arthroscopy are desirable. In general, the findings support that virtual-reality-based simulation using passive haptics has the potential to complement conventional training of knee arthroscopy skills.

Level of evidence II.
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Introduction

The training of residents is a very important and demanding mission, especially in the surgical disciplines. Virtual-reality-based training systems have been used in the past for this purpose [4, 23]; it has been reported that they have at least equal value compared with direct observation, animal and/or cadaver models, or videotape learning tools [4, 23]. Example systems have been built and used in various medical disciplines, such as visceral surgery, gynaecology, ophthalmology, or urology [1–4, 7, 13–16, 28, 29, 35]; also in the field of orthopaedics, various attempts have been made, but the actual deployment in the clinics is in general still lacking [5, 6, 10, 17–19, 24, 25, 27, 31, 33, 34, 36]. The vast majority of existing systems employs active haptic feedback devices, while simulators relying on passive stimuli are much less prevalent.
Our study focuses on the field of knee arthroscopic surgery. Also in this domain, alternatives are sought to support the acquisition of basic surgical principles outside of the operating room [8, 12].

In current practice, mainly plastic and cadaver models are employed to teach adequate skills. Unfortunately, plastic models offer only reduced realism, while using cadavers implies high maintenance requirements and costs. Virtual-reality-based simulators have been explored for some time now as a possible alternative, also for arthroscopy simulators [11, 20, 32, 34].

The main strengths associated with virtual-reality-based simulators are the availability of objective feedback, ease of integration into a training curriculum, and the 24/7 availability for training without any risks for patients. Drawbacks include the limited realism compared with real surgery and the high initial costs in addition to regular service and support expenses.

The evaluation of a new simulator training tool consists first of establishing face validity. Secondly, construct validity is evaluated [16, 23]. The third step is the evaluation of skill transfer from the simulator to the operating room. This step is usually associated with a large long-term study of considerable effort, that is only tackled after face validity and construct validity have been established [23].

The concept of passive haptic feedback which is also used in the tested simulator has been employed earlier in virtual reality environments [4, 21–23, 30]. It has some advantages compared with active force-feedback, in particular the absence of additional mechanisms and actuators, neither inside the knee nor attached to the instrument replicas. In general, this allows us to move the surgical tools as in reality, since they are not mechanically coupled to a haptic interface.

The purpose of the present study is to assess face validity and construct validity of a virtual reality simulator for diagnostic and therapeutic knee arthroscopy employing passive haptics, which was developed in a collaboration between ETH Zurich (Swiss Federal Institute of Technology) and VirtaMed AG, Switzerland.

The strategy followed in this study is the analysis of simulator metrics of participants with varying experience in arthroscopy, as well as the analysis of standardized questionnaires, which were filled out by the same participants. This design follows the established strategies in the field. The following statements were hypothesized:

1. The participants consider the presented two exercises as a realistic representation of a real knee arthroscopy for different aspects of the simulation.
2. The participants believe that the arthroscopy simulator is a useful tool and would recommend it to orthopaedic residents.
3. The knee arthroscopy simulator can discriminate between experts and novices in various measured metrics for the two exercises.

Materials and methods

The system consists of a plastic knee replica fixed to a stand and a computer including a screen. The knee replica corresponds to a standard box model, comprising rigid plastic models of both the femoral and the tibial bone, and rubber replicas of the anterior and posterior cruciate ligament and of the lateral ligaments. The joint interior is covered with a rubber skin with preset portals. The instrument replicas correspond to standard surgical instruments, which are connected by cables to the simulator. The endoscopic image is virtually generated and can feature a number of anatomies, pathologies, and complications.

Participants

Participants (N = 68) of an international arthroscopy course held in and from our clinic were grouped into novices (N = 33, <20 knee arthroscopies (KA) performed), intermediates (N = 19, 21–99 KA), and experts (N = 16, >100 KA). Note that a minimum of 100 arthroscopies is requested to complete the specialization in orthopaedic surgery according to the logbook of the national medical board in our country. Therefore, participants having performed more than 100 interventions were defined as “experts”.

Protocol

The informed consent form was signed by all participants. Subjects were informed that data were acquired for the general goal of a validation study. The exact computer-based metrics were not explained. Participants underwent a standardized introduction to the simulator including a video explaining the exercises in detail, followed by 1 min of hands-on time to get familiar with the system. The participants then removed the endoscopic camera and all other tools from the knee.

The first exercise began when the knee was entered again with the camera, at which stage an internal timer started. The first task comprised first a complete diagnostic knee arthroscopy including the visualization of suprapatellar pouch, patella, trochlea, lateral compartment with entire meniscus and popliteus tendon, the medial compartment with entire meniscus, and the central pillar with posterior and anterior cruciate ligament. After the participants claimed to have completed the diagnostic knee
arthroscopy, the removal of five foreign bodies using a grasper was performed. In our study, we discriminated between a diagnostic and a therapeutic procedure time. The former was counted from the point when the knee was entered with the camera until the grasper was inserted via the medial portal. The latter was taken from entering the grasper until either all foreign bodies were removed or a total time of 600 s was exceeded. The order of removal of the foreign bodies was up to the participants. The objects were located in the suprapatellar pouch, in the medial compartment near the anterior meniscal horn and at the root of the posterior horn, in the lateral compartment close to the pars intermedia, and in the posterior horn of the lateral meniscus. The location of the stars was not known to the participants beforehand.

The second exercise consisted of the resection of a radial lateral tear of the meniscus in the pars intermedia using a punch and/or shaver. The desired optimal resection area was displayed coloured in the simulation. The goal was to achieve a perfect partial resection cutting out the whole coloured part. The exercise was completed either when a participant was satisfied with the performed resection or after a maximum time of 360 s. Time was taken again from the moment a participant entered the knee with the camera. In the introduction video, the location of the lesion in the pars intermedia was already stated. Participants were informed that the goal was to resect the coloured part. Whether they wanted to enter the knee through the lateral or the medial portal was up to them. The covered distances of the camera and the tools were accumulated as long as the respective instrument was inside the knee.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire inquired about gender, dexterity, experience in the orthopaedic field, and prior exposure to surgical simulators in general. The latter question mainly related to previously attended skills training courses or other educational programmes regarding surgery. Further, the questionnaire asked for the assessment of the simulator regarding realism, training capability, and statements on the system. For this, the widely used Likert scale is employed. Usually, five-, seven-, or ten-point scales are used. Our questionnaire followed a seven-point Likert scale to evaluate the realism and training capacity. The questionnaire included fourteen questions to assess the realism of the simulation: from “1—absolutely not realistic” to “7—absolutely realistic”. Seven further questions concerned the usefulness of the simulation with regard to training, also rated on a seven-point Likert scale, ranging from “1—fully disagree” to “7—fully agree”. Finally, participants answered eight verbal agree–disagree statements concerning training with the simulator.

Face validity

Face validity was assessed using the questionnaires after the participants had finished the two exercises, following established procedures in former validation studies in endoscopic surgery [1–5, 7, 9, 13–16, 27–29, 35]. A point of discussion is the threshold when face validity is demonstrated. Following similar work in surgical training simulators, we considered a rating for realism and training capacity of 5 out of 7 (71 %) as acceptable. This is for instance in line with [34] where a score of seven on a 10-point rating scale (70 %) is considered sufficient.

Construct validity

Prior to studying construct validity, a power calculation for the null hypothesis (“performance of experts is equal to that of novices”) with an acceptable significance (type 1 error, α = 0.05) and acceptable type 2 error (β = 0.20, power = 0.8) was performed. For the power calculation, we used data for intervention time from a previous simulator pilot study (operation time 300 s, standard deviation 105 s). We considered a 20 % reduction in intervention time as a relevant difference. This resulted in a minimum number of 12 subjects in each group, which is in line with previously reported validation studies using similar set-ups [5, 6, 10, 17–19, 24–27, 31, 33, 34, 36]. Sixteen experts, 19 intermediates, and 33 novices were finally recruited at the training course.

IRB approval

All participants gave written informed consent that their blinded information could be used for research. Formal exemption of the institutional review board had been obtained.

Statistical analysis

The statistical analysis was conducted using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20 for Mac (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). A Kruskal–Wallis test has been performed for all metrics. In the case of significant results, pair-wise comparison of the different groups has been carried out with the two-sided Mann–Whitney U test to check for significant differences ( p < 0.05 considered as significant).

Results

The average age of all 68 participants was 35 years [range 27–64; standard deviation (SD) 8], including 20 females
and 48 males (29 and 71 %, respectively). The group of novices consisted of 33 residents with an average age of 30 years (range 27–38; SD 3). The intermediate one comprised 14 residents (with more than 3 years of experience) and five registrars (=residents with passed board exam) with an average age of 33 years (range 28–38; SD 3). The expert group consisted of six older registrars and 10 heads of orthopaedic divisions or private practicing orthopaedic surgeons with an average age of 48 years (range 36–64; SD 9). Seven participants were left-handed, two participants were ambidextrous (all three in the expert group), and the remaining 59 participants were right-handed. All questionnaires were filled out, with an exception of 11 missing ages (three in the expert group, three in the intermediate group, and five in the novice group).

Face validity

The first part of the questionnaire concerned the realism of the simulator. Figure 1 illustrates the provided replies on the seven-point Likert scales as box-plots. The arthroscope adaptation was rated best with an average reality score of 5.9, while the tactile sensation was rated lowest with an average score of 3.9 and therefore was below the five-point threshold. Overall, the realism was judged as good with most of the scores between 5 and 6. One parameter (tactile sensation) was significantly higher for the experts than for the novices ($p < 0.05$). The second part focused on the training potential. The obtained results are presented in a similar fashion in Fig. 2.

Statements

The statements are summarized in Table 1 and Fig. 3.

Construct validity

Construct validity was established with significant differences in several metrics based on the data of the 16 experts, 19 intermediates, and 33 novices. Both the data of the diagnostic knee arthroscopy with foreign body removal (Table 2) and the therapeutic lateral partial meniscectomy were analysed (Table 3).

In the first exercise, 12 participants (36 %) of the novice group were unable to remove all five stars in the given 10 min. Also, two members of the intermediate group (11 %) and two of the expert group (13 %) did not complete the task in the allotted time.

In the second exercise, two participants (6 %) of the novice group were not able to finish the partial meniscectomy, whereas all experts were able to complete it.

Discussion

The most important finding of the present study is that the presented virtual reality simulator showed in general a high acceptance. It also demonstrated the ability to discriminate reliably between different levels of surgical experience (experts and novices). Face validity and construct validity could be established, which is the first step in the simulator validation chain [8, 9, 12, 23]; it showed promising scores in the reality and training categories. The judgement of face validity by novices is a controversial issue in the literature, and in some studies, the authors decide to incorporate expert opinion only [11, 20, 32, 34]. However, in contrast, the novices in this study are not medical students, but residents in orthopaedic or trauma centres where they frequently assist in knee arthroscopy. We did not question how many knee arthroscopies they have assisted but believe it is allowed to assume that the novices have assisted enough to evaluate this simulator. In addition, the questionnaire includes questions not only regarding realism, but also regarding the training capacity of the simulator. For a successful integration of simulators in a training curriculum, both trainers and trainees need to be convinced of its value. Therefore, in this study, it was decided to include novice, intermediate, and expert opinions and compare the answers statistically. The differences
between the answers of the novices and the experts were not significant except regarding the tactile sensation. This was the only parameter ranked significantly lower in the expert group compared with the novice group.

At this point, the key difference between the examined simulator system and other solutions has to be stressed. Other commercially available virtual reality simulators (Toltech Knee Arthroscopy Simulator and ArthroMENTOR) provide tactile sensation through robotic force-feedback devices (Phantom Omni and Desktop, by Sensable Technologies, Wilmington, MA, USA). In contrast to this, the tested simulator provides the sensation through contact with a plastic structure similar to a Sawbones box model. In such a set-up, two sources of impaired realism of the tactile sensation exist: on the one hand, the anatomical structures in the box model have slightly different mechanical properties than the real ones; on the other hand,
Table 2  Comparison of values obtained for the various metrics between the three groups for the foreign body removal exercise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Novices (&lt;20 procedures; N = 33)</th>
<th>Intermediates (21–99 procedures; N = 19)</th>
<th>Experts (≥100 procedures; N = 16)</th>
<th>All three groups: Kruskal–Wallis test</th>
<th>Intermediates versus novices&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Experts versus intermediates&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Experts versus novices&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total operation time (s)</td>
<td>243  600  513</td>
<td>266  600  436</td>
<td>197  600  358</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic time (s)</td>
<td>110  412  202</td>
<td>85  465  173</td>
<td>73  324  162</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal time (s)</td>
<td>102  466  290</td>
<td>123  410  242</td>
<td>85  451  179</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera horizon alignment (s)</td>
<td>0  587  328</td>
<td>0  571  268</td>
<td>108  499  231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera off (s)</td>
<td>12.92  600  136</td>
<td>6  600  165</td>
<td>8  381  129</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera distance (cm)</td>
<td>146  380  254</td>
<td>99  347  195</td>
<td>97  356  167</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grasper distance (cm)</td>
<td>22  453  99</td>
<td>36  239  93</td>
<td>40  175  73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>s</sup> seconds, <sup>cm</sup> centimetre, n.s. not significant

*Total operation time (s)* The total time to complete the first exercise, including the removal of the five stars. After 10 min, the simulation was stopped.

*Diagnostic time (s)* The time from the start until the participants claimed to have seen all the anatomical landmarks to complete a diagnostic arthroscopy.

*Removal time (s)* The time from the moment the participants claimed to have completed the diagnostic arthroscopy until they removed all the five stars, or until the 10 min were over.

*Camera horizon alignment (s)* The time the camera showed the horizon correctly (=horizontally), with a tolerance of ±15°. The ±15° threshold was defined by an expert panel during the development of the simulator.

*Camera off (s)* The operation time minus the camera horizon alignment time where the camera was not correctly held in the horizon with a tolerance of ±15°.

*Camera distance (cm)* The cumulative path the camera took in the total operation time.

*Grasper distance (cm)* The cumulative path the grasper took in the total operation time.

For three (total operation time, foreign body removal time only, and cumulative camera distance) out of seven metric parameters, there was a significant difference between the experts and the novices in favour of the experts.

<sup>a</sup> Mann–Whitney *U* test (two-sided)
mismatch between the structures in the anatomical replica and their virtual counterparts which can originate from impaired motion tracking or poor calibration can lead to inappropriate tactile sensations. Possible solutions for this have recently been proposed in [31]. Nevertheless, the training capability of the tested simulator already received high scores.

With the discrimination between surgeons of different surgical levels, construct validity has been successfully established [23]. The applied parameters, e.g. the measurement of the covered distance allow us to compare the levels and, more importantly, to follow the progress of each user. Albeit, as a caveat, it should be stated that intervention time by itself does not always characterize a better surgeon (i.e. fast does not equal safe). Further, in the partial meniscectomy exercise, being fast and leaving an instable part of the meniscus behind may cause painful meniscal symptoms for the treated patients in real-life situations. Here, the simulator has to provide better metrics and become more precise in discriminating what is safe and provides an optimal outcome for the patient.

Some further shortcomings of the employed simulator version should also be mentioned. One crucial step in arthroscopy is the positioning of the portal. This element is not part of the training since the portals are already provided by the mock-up model. A further point which is not yet simulated is the swelling of Hoffa’s fat pad and bleedings, which are both relevant factors making knee arthroscopy more difficult. Another element is the iatrogenic cartilage damage the surgeon leaves in the knee, which is currently not tracked. However, all these shortcomings will be or have already been addressed in the latest updates of the simulator system.

Further, although the study was designed very carefully, it should be mentioned that face validity is a highly subjective measure and can be influenced by systematic errors. The novelty of the simulator and its presentation during an arthroscopic training course might have influenced the participants to see the simulation in a more favourable light. Moreover, such a setting may cause a selection bias by attracting participants with high interest in medical education. The interpretation of the questionnaire can also differ among the raters, and Likert scales may cause distortions, e.g. by tendencies to avoid using extreme responses in the case of realism and training capacity or by the tendency to agree to statements as presented. Also, not everybody may have been experienced with using the seven-point Likert scale. We tried to minimize the error sources by designing the questionnaire based on an earlier version which was developed with support from a social scientist [3, 16, 23] and by explaining both the questionnaire and the Likert scale verbally.

In summary, the presented study confirmed the three hypotheses. First, the arthroscopy simulator is considered as a realistic representation of a real knee arthroscopy for different aspects of the simulation. Second, the participants considered the arthroscopy simulator as a useful tool and would recommend it to other orthopaedic residents. Third, the simulator can discriminate between experts and novices in various measured metrics for the two exercises.

This study lays the groundwork for future validation studies of the specific arthroscopy simulator based on

**Table 3** Comparison of values obtained for the various metrics between the three groups for the partial meniscectomy exercise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Novices (&lt;20 procedures; N = 33)</th>
<th>Intermediates (21–99 procedures; N = 19)</th>
<th>Experts (≥100 procedures; N = 16)</th>
<th>All three groups: Kruskal–Wallis test</th>
<th>Intermediates versus novices</th>
<th>Experts versus intermediates</th>
<th>Experts versus novices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total operation time (s)</strong></td>
<td>103 (480 221)</td>
<td>88 (274 170)</td>
<td>87 (184 132)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.000a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Camera distance (cm)</strong></td>
<td>8 (122 42)</td>
<td>13 (77 26)</td>
<td>10 (56 22)</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>0.001a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Punch distance (cm)</strong></td>
<td>27 (169 66)</td>
<td>22 (227 54)</td>
<td>28 (112 44)</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>0.006a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

s seconds, cm centimetre, n.s. not significant

*Total operation time (s)* The time from the start of the exercise until a participant decided that he or she was content with the partial resection of the partial tear in the lateral meniscus, or after 6 min

*Camera distance (cm)* The cumulative path the camera took intra-articularly in the total operation time

*Punch distance (cm)* The cumulative path the punch took intra-articularly in the total operation time

a Mann–Whitney U test (two-sided)
Passive haptics. In future work, foremost the transfer from simulation to the operation room should be studied. Also, a comparison between the simulator and a cadaver training should be carried out, in order to establish concurrent validity. Finally, the question of the economic impact requires further scrutiny in order to justify the investment into virtual reality arthroscopic training.

**Conclusion**

The presented arthroscopy simulator is a realistic and useful training method with which it is possible to differentiate between different levels of arthroscopic experience. The acceptance of the training system is high, even though only passive haptic feedback is employed. The simulator is regarded as a worthwhile addition to the educational programme of arthroscopic surgeons. Virtual reality simulation could offer a significant contribution to the training of knee arthroscopy skills, but further improvement of the simulator especially in the field of the therapeutic arthroscopy is desirable.
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