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ABSTRACT

Telepathology enables a pathologist to examine physically distant tissue samples by microscope operation over a communication link. Communication links can impose time delays which cause difficulties in controlling the remote device. Such difficulties were found in a microscope teleoperation system. Since the user interface is critical to pathologist's acceptance of telepathology, we redesigned the user interface for this system, built two different versions (a keypad whose movement commands operated by specifying a start command followed by a stop command and a trackball interface whose movement commands were incremental and directly proportional to the rotation of the trackball). We then conducted a pilot study to determine the effect of time delays on the new user interfaces. In our experiment, the keypad was the faster interface when the time delay is short. There was no evidence to favor either the keypad or trackball when the time delay was longer. Inexperienced participants benefited by allowing them to move long distances over the microscope slide by dragging the field-of-view indicator on the touchscreen control panel. The experiment suggests that changes could be made to the trackball interface which would improve its performance.

INTRODUCTION

Teleoperation enables a user to control a physically distant operation via commands sent over a communication link. As computer and communication costs drop and the cost of a human expert continues to increase, human experts may begin to routinely use remotely controlled equipment in order to perform their work. From his or her office, a pathologist sitting at a workstation could control a physically remote microscope in order to examine tissue samples of a patient who is across town, across the country, or even in space. Thus, a pathologist can render a timely opinion for a patient who is physically remote. The expert's time is more productive since travel to the remote location is unnecessary. Also, timely opinions can reduce costs for patients in rural hospitals who typically must stay extra days until the expert arrives or for the tissue samples to be shipped to the pathologist. However, in order to be truly effective, control of the microscope must be simple and not interfere with examining the sample. Thus, the user interface is critical to the acceptance of a telepathology workstation for day to day use.

A teleoperated pathology system has been designed by Corabi Telemetrics International. It consists of two parts, a pathologist's workstation linked via telephone and satellite to a computer controlled microscope (see figure 1). A video camera attached to the microscope transmits a high definition TV image of the sample via satellite. Interaction between the pathologist's workstation and the microscope occurs in real-time. (Scanning the sample at high magnification and transmitting a digitized slide to the workstation for later review is impractical because of the storage volume required.) However, the communication link between the remote microscope and the workstation can impose time delays which cause difficulties in controlling the remote device. The Corabi system currently has about a 1.5 second delay between the pathologist issuing a motion command and the microscope beginning to move. Furthermore, the current user interface does not mitigate the time delay problems.

Figure 1 - Simplified diagram of an existing telepathology system.

The pathologist uses a custom keypad to enter motion commands for microscope movement, magnification selection, focus, and illumination. The pathologist monitors the results of these commands on the high resolution display. Operation of the workstation is hindered by two major problems: 1) the lack of feedback as to global position on the slide and 2) the overshoot introduced by the time delay in any continuous operation such as moving. To position the microscope the pathologist presses a key to begin movement in one of the eight cardinal compass directions; when an interesting cell group is observed the pathologist presses a key to stop. Because the microscope controller and the communications link impose a delay, this results in an overshoot. The pathologist may have difficulty backtracking to the area of the slide that is of interest.

One way to attack the time delay problem is to
eliminate it. Indeed, the experiment shows that if the time delay were reduced to about one-half second an interface similar to the existing one works well. However, we wished to study the mitigating effects of alternate user interfaces. There are two reasons to explore alternate interfaces. First, one possible use for the Corabi system is to provide telepresence in space which imposes an inherent delay in the communications link. Second, was the belief that a well designed user interface could compensate for these delays. Since rapid response time hardware generally costs more than slower hardware, compensating for delays in the user interface could result in significant savings in the final cost of the system.

PREVIOUS WORK

The telepathology system is an example of a supervisory control system. A supervisory control system is characterized by a human operator issuing instructions which are executed by the computer controls. In general, the feedback provided to the user is computer generated from sensors at the task end, and the operator does not receive any direct feedback. The telepathology system fits the multi-loop model of supervisory control [3]. This supervisory control model is characterized by a separate human interaction system (the pathologist's workstation) and task interaction system (the microscope controller).

Ferrel and Sheridan [1] studied such a system which was designed to control a robotic lunar vehicle from the earth. The Earth-Moon distance imposed a three second round trip delay in command feedback. They found that the only control strategy which worked was to have the operator issue a command and wait for feedback as to the result of this command (move-and-wait strategy). Indeed, all other strategies resulted in an unstable system in which the errors of the operators were magnified by their attempts to correct them. In addition, they reported that "the operator can commit only to a small incremental movement". Ferrel and Sheridan noted that operators switched to a move-and-wait strategy as the system delay times increased over one second.

Lawrence Stark [5] reported on a study of time delays using a joystick to manipulate a remote robot. He found task times increased dramatically with delay as operators adopted a move-and-wait strategy. Next, a real-time computer simulation of the robot was added. This allowed operators to manipulate the simulation in real-time and then the actual robot was commanded to duplicate the simulation's actions. In this case, task times were equal regardless of the actual delay. Both of the previous studies were designed for systems in space where high precision of movement is paramount. However, in telepathology real-time interaction is more important.

Keil-Slawik, Plaisant, and Shneiderman [2] studied supervisory control as an instance of remote direct manipulation. This study focused on the Corabi telepathology workstation and found that the remote environment introduced four complicating factors: time delays, incomplete feedback, feedback from multiple sources, and unanticipated interference, such as the microscope being manually adjusted at the remote site. For a more complete description of telepathology see Weinstein [6,7].

INTERFACE DESIGN DESCRIPTION

The telepathology system user interface was redesigned with attention being paid to compensating for time delays and limited feedback. Next, a prototype pathologist's workstation was implemented on an IBM AT. Two alternate versions of the redesigned user interface were implemented on the workstation: a keypad interface and a trackball interface. Both interfaces use a touchscreen for the control screen and are based on the principles of direct manipulation as described in [4]. Key features of these new interfaces are:

1. Placing the microscope controls on a touchscreen equipped computer display. This permits rapid prototyping of the microscope controls by changing the video image displayed on the monitor and the target map used to translate touchscreen actions into button presses.
2. Including a static black and white "slide overview" image on the control panel screen (see Figure 2).

![Figure 2 - Touchscreen Control Panel](image)

3. Adding to each version an auxiliary input device which allowed the pathologist to operate the most frequently used controls (movement and focus adjustment) without moving his eyes from the high resolution microscope image to the microscope control screen. The first version used a keypad for the auxiliary control while the second used a three-button trackball.

For the trackball based interface the following additional changes were made:

1. Allowing coarse positioning of the microscope by dragging the field-of-view indicator from its current position on the "slide overview" to a new position. This allows long distance moves to be made with assured final position.
2. Replacing the start/stop keypad with a trackball for fine positioning. Moving the trackball issues a movement command which is proportional to the distance and in the direction that the trackball has been
rotated. Small moves using the trackball are incremental in nature and easily reversible. We theorized that the trackball interface would allow faster operation at longer time delays by providing incremental distance based movement commands rather than time based movement commands. The keypad interface was expected to be fastest at the short delay because the final position of the microscope is very close to the current position for the combination of microscope speed and delay in the experiment.

3. Assigning the two fine focus commands (in & out) and the "stop" command to the three buttons on the trackball interface in order to allow the pathologist to keep looking at the high resolution display while issuing these commands. Preliminary testing showed that the "stop" button was essential when limiting overshoot.

Since the telepathology system is quite expensive and we could not obtain one, another IBM-AT was programmed to emulate the microscope. The microscope simulator was implemented so that it had programmable delays for all control commands. This allows studying the effects of different time delays for each interface. Since there was not enough computer power to animate a true tissue sample, the microscope simulator used colored rectangles to simulate cells. This decision allowed for real-time animation of the slide movement which was essential to the experiment.

EXPERIMENT DESCRIPTION

In order to investigate the effects of time delays on user interfaces for the telepathology system and gather data to refine our user interface design, we conducted an experiment which was between groups for two different user interface types (keypad & trackball) and with each participant operating the microscope at three different time delays: short (.5 sec.), medium (2.5 sec.), and long (4.5 sec.).

The participants were randomly assigned to only one of the two interfaces. After a practice session, they performed five different tasks at each of the three time delays. Tasks were started by the participant pressing the "Start Task" button on the control screen. The participant then manipulated the microscope until the goal was met. Finally, the participant pressed "Save Point" to indicate task completion. The system automatically verified the goal conditions and signaled whether or not they had been met. Time to complete each task was measured by the microscope simulation computer. Tasks were not considered complete until the goal was met and the clock continued to run even if a participant erroneously pressed the "Save Point" button. In each task the goal condition was to position a yellow target rectangle in the center of the microscope screen and then set a given magnification. Changes in magnification required refocusing the microscope. The center of the microscope display was marked by a crosshair. The five tasks were similar across all time delays and a detailed description of them follows:

Task 1 - The target rectangle appeared in the upper right-hand corner of the initial microscope field-of-view. There was no magnification change or refocusing. (Short move to visible target.)

Task 2 - The target rectangle appeared in the lower left-hand corner of the initial microscope field-of-view. Once the target was found, magnification was decreased from 10x to 5x. (Short move with magnification change and focusing.)

Task 3 - The target was located just above the initial microscope field-of-view. Thus, a short distance move was required. No magnification change was required. (Short search for target.)

Task 4 - The target was located just below the initial microscope field-of-view. Once the target was found, magnification was changed from 10x to 20x. (Short search with magnification change and focusing.)

Task 5 - The microscope started in the center of the slide and the target was in the upper right-hand corner. This required a long distance move. Trackball interface users were instructed to drag the field-of-view indicator. A 10x to 20x magnification change was required. (Long search with magnification change and focusing.)

Two experiments were conducted. The first study was conducted with twenty-four inexperienced users to test their performance. All participants who volunteered for this experiment were University of Maryland students. The second study evaluated the performance of three of the authors with 6 repeats of all the tasks using both interface versions. This was to see what the performance of experienced users would be.

RESULTS

Student t-tests were computed on the data. Table 1 shows means and standard deviations for the total time to complete the five tasks at each time delay for each interface version and Figure 3 is a graph of the mean total task time for inexperienced users. For the short time delay, the difference in the means is significant at alpha = .01. No significant difference was found for medium and long time delays. In addition, for the longest time delay the "long search" task was significantly faster with the trackball version. (Trackball mean = 67.75 seconds vs. Keypad mean = 84.58 seconds; t = 2.85; significant at alpha = .01)

Table 2 summarizes the total time means and standard deviations for the experienced users. As with the inexperienced users, the only significant difference for experienced users is for the short time delay. For both experienced and inexperienced users, the keypad interface facilitated faster task completion than the trackball interface when the time delay was short. Experienced users were able to complete the long search at the longest delay in the same time with either interface.
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Table 1. Inexperienced users mean total time and standard deviation for completing tasks in seconds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Trackball</th>
<th>Keypad</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short Delay</td>
<td>122.25</td>
<td>100.67</td>
<td>3.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(18.24)</td>
<td>(14.70)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Delay</td>
<td>194.75</td>
<td>158.67</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(55.23)</td>
<td>(30.43)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Delay</td>
<td>222.33</td>
<td>231.25</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(27.82)</td>
<td>(36.65)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at alpha=.01
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Table 2. Experienced users' mean total time and standard deviations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Trackball</th>
<th>Keypad</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short Delay</td>
<td>84.78</td>
<td>73.17</td>
<td>3.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12.09)</td>
<td>(8.71)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Delay</td>
<td>114.94</td>
<td>107.22</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15.12)</td>
<td>(15.16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Delay</td>
<td>145.94</td>
<td>142.06</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24.61)</td>
<td>(21.34)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at alpha=.01
```

**DISCUSSION**

Our experiment was designed to determine, in the presence of short, medium and long time delays, the effects of two different user interfaces -- trackball and keypad -- for teleoperating a microscope. We collected time-to-complete-task data for both inexperienced and experienced participants.

Our first hypothesis was that the keypad interface would be faster when time delays were short. The results of our experiment support this hypothesis since both inexperienced and experienced users showed significant "total task time" differences in favor of the keypad interface. Three observations of the participants while completing the tasks helps to explain why trackball users tended to take longer to complete tasks at short time delays.

1. A common participant remark was, "It is difficult to judge how far to move the trackball." This comment suggests that the cognitive thought processes with the trackball interface are more complex than that required for a keypad. The keypad only requires pressing the arrow key corresponding to the direction to move whereas the trackball involves thinking about not only which direction to move but also the more difficult process of estimating how far to rotate the trackball. We believe that this problem can be overcome by providing an estimated stop location indicator on the microscope display.

2. Trackball users sometimes did not use the stop key even though it would have been beneficial. They tended to overshoot targets because they did not use the stop key to cancel outstanding trackball movement commands; instead, they let the screen movement continue uninterrupted. Keypad users, on the other hand, always used the stop key when appropriate. Overshooting occurred for inexperienced users because they may not have learned when it was appropriate to use the trackball interface stop key. For experienced users, even though they knew how to use the stop key to prevent overshooting, they sometimes didn't use it because they thought the crosshair would stop on its own inside the target.

3. With short time delays, it was not as important to estimate when to press the stop key because of the quick command response. Therefore, trackball users tended to use the stop key less and, instead, guided the crosshair to the target. This resulted in more overshoots than keypad users.

Our second hypothesis was that the trackball interface would be faster when time delays were long. Our results did not support for this. We assumed that the trackball, compared to the keypad, would allow more accurate and faster positioning in the absence of feedback found in long time delay situations. However, the difficulty in judging trackball movement negated its potential benefit. In all task results, only task 5 (long search) for inexperienced users showed a significant difference in favor of the trackball interface. Since task 5 required the participant to move over a long distance on the microscope slide, task 5 results can be explained as a factor of touchscreen dragging instead of trackball superiority. Trackball participants used the touchscreen control panel to drag the microscope field-of-view to the desired location without using the trackball, whereas the keypad participants used the arrow keys to move to the location. During movement to the desired location, the inexperienced keypad participants needed to stop two or three times in order to get their bearings because the interface did not provide continuous...
position feedback while the microscope was moving. In contrast, trackball users knew the final position of the microscope and did not need intermediate feedback. Therefore, task 5's difference was not a result of the trackball; instead, the touchscreen dragging eliminated the need for trackball users to stop to get their bearings whereas keypad still had to stop. This was supported by the fact that experienced users did not show a significant difference for task 5. Experienced users knew how to use the keypad interface to move to a desired location without stopping to get their bearings. They exploited the following facts: that there was no mechanical delay associating with stopping, that issuing a movement command while moving actually issued a stop command followed by the new movement command, and that the location of the field-of-view was updated with each stop command. These features combined to give an update of the microscope position with each movement key press.

Evidence suggests that inexperienced users who must move the microscope field-of-view considerable distances will work faster if it is possible to use a touchscreen to drag the microscope field-of-view to the desired location as opposed to using a keypad to move. This advantage seems to disappear as users become more experienced with the interface since our experienced participants showed no significant differences for this task.

It is interesting to note that experienced user times were approximately 2/3's of the novice user times. This was due to three factors. First, experienced users had a better idea of how the interfaces operated. They were able to use the stop key to limit overshoots and had a better idea of the ratio between trackball movement and microscope movement. Second, they required less feedback about the microscope's current position. This explains why dragging the field-of-view indicator was not faster for experienced users. Finally, experienced users knew how many focus increments were required for each magnification change and sent focus commands during the magnification change delay. In contrast, only a couple of novice users learned this during the experiment.

CONCLUSIONS
This study found evidence that the keypad interface is preferable to a trackball interface for teleoperating a microscope when time delays are short. For medium and long time delays, there is no evidence to favor one interface over the other. Inexperienced users moving long distances over the microscope slide in a long time delay situation may be assisted by having the ability to drag the microscope field-of-view indicator using a touchscreen; experienced users, however, did not seem to benefit from this feature.

After reflecting on the results of this experiment we decided that the key factor as to which interface worked best was feedback. The novices did well when they had short response time and when dragging the field-of-view indicator. In both of these instances, feedback to the user very closely predicted microscope behavior. This suggests that improved feedback on the trackball version could result in faster times. Specifically, we suggest two improvements to the trackball version. First, providing field-of-view destination feedback for all movement instead of only when dragging the indicator. Second, to provide a destination indicator on the microscope screen whenever the destination is visible. We are currently implementing a new trackball version with these improvements and will test it to see if these additions will improve trackball interface performance.

In summary, understanding the effects of time delays on teleoperation user interfaces may make it feasible in a number of different environments. The Corabi system described in this experiment is basically a remote control of an x-y stage and a television camera. Therefore, in addition to the telepathology, it could be adapted to allow experimenters and physicians access to environments such as space and deep sea which are currently inaccessible to most.
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