International Journal of Life science and Pharma Research
Content Available at www.ijlpr.com ISSN: 2250-0480

OPIOID-FREE ANESTHESIA: CURRENT CONCEPTS, CLINICAL EVIDENCE, AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Anand Mohan Jha[1], Dr.Prathibha Kumari[2], Malathi Anil Kumar[3], Sanjeev Kumar Jha[4*]

[1]Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, M. L. S. M. College, Darbhanga ,Lalit Narayan Mithila University, Darbhanga, Bihar.
[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Chemistry, R.B.S. College, Andaur, Samastipur, Lalit Narayan Mithila University, Darbhanga.
[3]SanjayGandhi Institute of Trauma and Orthopaedics, Jayanagar 1st Block east, Byrasandra, Bangalore 11.
[4]Sr. Assistant Professor & Head, P. G. Department of Chemistry, M. L. T. College, Saharsa, B. N. Mandal University Madhepura, 852201, Bihar.*

Article History: Received: 02.12.2025 Revised: 04.01.2025 Accepted: 12.01.2026

Abstract

The practice of anesthesia is gradually changing as clinicians seek methods to reduce opioid-related adverse effects and improve postoperative recovery. In this context, opioid-free anesthesia (OFA) has gained attention as a multimodal approach that avoids the use of intraoperative opioids and instead relies on non-opioid analgesics, regional anesthesia techniques, and various adjuncts to maintain adequate analgesia and hemodynamic stability. This narrative review aims to summarize current evidence on the pharmacological basis, clinical applications, and perioperative outcomes associated with OFA. It evaluates the effectiveness of OFA in reducing opioid-related complications, examines its safety and feasibility across different surgical populations, and discusses its integration within enhanced recovery after surgery (ERAS) protocols. Several studies report a reduction in postoperative nausea and vomiting, ileus, opioid-induced hyperalgesia, respiratory depression, and prolonged postoperative opioid use with OFA. However, variations in study design, patient selection, and anesthetic protocols have led to inconsistent conclusions regarding its advantages over opioid-sparing techniques. This review critically discusses the benefits, limitations, and ongoing controversies surrounding OFA, with particular focus on patient-centered outcomes and practical considerations in routine clinical practice. The potential role of OFA in addressing the broader opioid crisis is also considered. Finally, the need for standardized protocols, long-term outcome data, and individualized analgesic strategies is highlighted to guide future research and clinical application.

Keywords: *Opioid-free anesthesia; Multimodal analgesia; Perioperative pain management; Enhanced recovery; Non-opioid analgesics*

***Corresponding Author**
Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Jha

DOI: https://doi.org/10.22376/ijlpr.v16i1.2025

INTRODUCTION

Opioids have long been the mainstay of perioperative analgesia because of their strong antinociceptive effects and ease of titration. For many years, the use of intraoperative opioids was regarded as an essential component of balanced anesthesia, helping to maintain hemodynamic stability and blunt surgical stress responses. However, increasing awareness of opioid-related adverse effects and their association with postoperative morbidity has led clinicians to critically re-evaluate this traditional approach [1]. Complications such as postoperative nausea and vomiting, ileus, pruritus, urinary retention, respiratory depression, and opioid-induced hyperalgesia can significantly delay recovery and increase healthcare utilization. Moreover, perioperative opioid exposure has been recognized as a possible contributor to persistent postoperative opioid use, thereby adding to the wider public health burden of opioid dependence. In response to these concerns, contemporary anesthetic practice has gradually shifted toward strategies aimed at minimizing or completely avoiding perioperative opioid use. Opioid-free anesthesia (OFA) has emerged as one such strategy, defined by the avoidance of opioids during the intraoperative period and the use of a multimodal combination of non-opioid analgesic agents and techniques [2]. These commonly include N-Methyl-D-aspartate receptor antagonists, α-2 adrenergic agonists, local anesthetics, non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, acetaminophen, magnesium sulfate, and regional anesthesia techniques. The fundamental principle of OFA is to target multiple nociceptive pathways simultaneously, thereby

providing effective analgesia while reducing opioid-related adverse effects. Interest in OFA has increased substantially over the past decade, particularly within enhanced recovery after surgery (ERAS) protocols that prioritize early mobilization, shorter hospital stay, and improved patient satisfaction [3,4]. Several randomized controlled trials and observational studies have explored the use of OFA across various surgical specialties, including bariatric, colorectal, cardiac, and ambulatory surgery. While some studies have demonstrated benefits such as lower postoperative pain scores and reduced opioid consumption, others have reported concerns related to hemodynamic instability, increased reliance on vasoactive drugs, and unclear long-term outcomes [5]. Given the variability in study designs, patient populations, and anesthetic regimens, along with the absence of standardized protocols, the role of opioid-free anesthesia in routine clinical practice remains controversial. This narrative review aims to critically evaluate current concepts and available clinical evidence related to OFA, highlighting its potential advantages and limitations while outlining future directions for research and clinical application. By integrating recent literature with expert opinion, this review seeks to provide anesthesiologists with a balanced and practical understanding of opioid-free anesthesia within the context of modern perioperative care. Although further high-quality evidence and consensus guidelines are required to support widespread adoption, the potential benefits of OFA-particularly reduced opioid-related side effects and enhanced recovery-cannot be ignored. Careful patient selection remains essential, and individual factors such as comorbidities, type of surgery, and postoperative analgesic requirements should guide decision-making [6]. By remaining up to date with emerging evidence and tailoring anesthetic strategies to individual patients, anesthesiologists can optimize perioperative outcomes. With continued research and collaboration, opioid-free anesthesia may eventually become an integral component of personalized, evidence-based perioperative medicine [7].

OPIOID-FREE ANAESTHESIA: CONCEPT AND RATIONALE

Opioid-free anaesthesia is based on the concept that satisfactory perioperative analgesia can be achieved without the routine use of opioids by acting on multiple pain and stress-response pathways at the same time. Instead of depending on a single group of drugs, this approach relies on multimodal analgesia, combining agents with different mechanisms of action and, when appropriate, regional anaesthetic techniques [8]. The objective is to ensure effective pain control, maintain intraoperative hemodynamic stability, and reduce neuroendocrine stress responses, while minimizing opioid-related adverse effects. The rationale for OFA arises from a deeper understanding of pain physiology and the limitations of opioid pharmacology. Surgical pain is multifactorial, involving peripheral nociceptor stimulation, central sensitization, and inflammatory processes. Although opioids act primarily through central μ-opioid receptors, repeated or high-dose administration has been linked to tolerance, immune modulation, and opioid-induced hyperalgesia [9]. This paradoxical increase in pain sensitivity can lead to higher postoperative pain scores and escalating opioid requirements. OFA aims to break this cycle by targeting pain transmission at different levels of the nervous system. Drugs such as ketamine reduce central sensitization by inhibiting N-methyl-D-aspartate receptors, while α-2 adrenergic agonists, including dexmedetomidine and clonidine, provide analgesia, sedation, and sympathetic suppression. Local anaesthetics, whether given systemically or through regional blocks, interrupt peripheral nerve conduction and attenuate inflammatory responses. In addition, non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and acetaminophen act on prostaglandin-mediated pathways to further enhance analgesia [10]. When used synergistically, these agents can allow effective pain control without the need for opioids. Another key driver of OFA is the increasing focus on patient-centered outcomes. Opioid-related complications such as postoperative nausea and vomiting, delayed bowel function, excessive sedation, and respiratory depression negatively influence patient satisfaction and prolong hospital stay. Avoiding opioids may therefore improve recovery, particularly in ambulatory surgery and enhanced recovery after surgery protocols [11]. This benefit is especially relevant in high-risk groups, including obese patients, those with obstructive sleep apnea, and individuals with chronic opioid exposure. Despite its potential advantages, OFA represents a shift from traditional anaesthetic practice and demands careful patient selection, close monitoring, and adequate familiarity with non-opioid analgesic agents. Adverse effects such as hypotension, bradycardia, and increased vasopressor requirements-particularly with α-2 agonist-based regimens-have been reported. Consequently, OFA should be viewed as an individualized strategy rather than a universal replacement for opioid-based anaesthesia. A clear understanding of its underlying principles is essential for anesthesiologists to integrate OFA safely and effectively into clinical practice.

PHARMACOLOGICAL COMPONENTS OF OPIOID-FREE ANESTHESIA

The practice of opioid-free anesthesia depends on the thoughtful integration of several non-opioid drugs that work together to achieve effective analgesia, adequate depth of anesthesia, and stable autonomic control [12]. In the absence of opioids, each drug in the OFA regimen addresses different components of pain perception and the physiological stress response to surgery, thereby ensuring balanced anesthesia. A clear understanding of the pharmacological actions of these agents is crucial to maximize clinical benefit while limiting unwanted effects. Among these agents, N-methyl-D-aspartate (NMDA) receptor antagonists-most notably ketamine—occupy an important role in

many OFA protocols [13]. When administered in subanesthetic doses, ketamine provides significant analgesic and antihyperalgesic effects by suppressing central sensitization and spinal wind-up mechanisms. Its opioid-sparing effect has been well documented across various surgical settings. Furthermore, ketamine's sympathomimetic properties help preserve cardiovascular stability, making it particularly advantageous in patients who are susceptible to perioperative hypotension. α-2 adrenergic agonists such as dexmedetomidine and clonidine also contribute substantially to OFA by offering sedation, analgesia, and anxiolysis through central sympatholysis [14]. Dexmedetomidine, in particular, is frequently favored because it reduces anesthetic requirements and attenuates the surgical stress response without causing respiratory depression. Nevertheless, its potential to induce bradycardia and hypotension necessitates careful dosing and vigilant hemodynamic monitoring. Local anesthetics represent another cornerstone of opioid-free strategies. Their use extends beyond regional anesthesia techniques to include systemic administration. Intravenous lidocaine infusions have been associated with reduced postoperative pain, modulation of inflammatory responses, and faster recovery of gastrointestinal function, especially in abdominal procedures [15]. In addition, regional techniques such as neuraxial blocks and peripheral nerve blocks provide targeted analgesia by directly interrupting nociceptive pathways and are often essential components of a comprehensive OFA approach. Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and acetaminophen form the foundation of baseline analgesia by inhibiting prostaglandin synthesis and influencing central pain processing. When used together, these agents demonstrate synergistic analgesic effects and contribute to a reduction in postoperative opioid consumption. Other adjuncts, including magnesium sulphate-which modulates calcium influx and NMDA receptor activity-and gabapentinoids, which decrease central neuronal excitability, may further strengthen multimodal analgesia in appropriately selected patients [16]. Despite its clear advantages, the pharmacological diversity of OFA adds a layer of complexity to anesthetic management. Drug selection and dosing must be individualized based on patient comorbidities, the nature of the surgical procedure, and available institutional resources. Ultimately, the safe and effective application of opioid-free anesthesia relies on a balanced, patient-centered, and evidence-based integration of pharmacological agents.

CLINICAL EVIDENCE AND PERIOPERATIVE OUTCOMES

Over the last decade, a growing body of clinical research has explored the efficacy and safety of opioid-free anesthesia (OFA) across various surgical populations. Randomized controlled trials, observational studies, and meta-analyses have compared OFA with traditional opioid-based or opioid-sparing approaches, examining perioperative outcomes such as pain control, opioid consumption, recovery profiles, and adverse events. Although the results are heterogeneous, several consistent findings have emerged [17]. Many studies report that OFA significantly reduces postoperative opioid requirements without compromising analgesic efficacy, particularly when combined with regional anesthesia and enhanced recovery after surgery (ERAS) protocols. Reduced opioid exposure has been linked to lower rates of postoperative nausea and vomiting, pruritus, and ileus, facilitating earlier oral intake and mobilization [18]. These improvements are clinically meaningful, as they directly affect patient satisfaction and hospital length of stay. Postoperative pain scores, however, have shown mixed results. Some trials indicate comparable or superior pain control with OFA, whereas others demonstrate no significant difference compared to opioid-based anesthesia. This variability may reflect differences in OFA protocols, surgical procedures, and outcome measurement tools. Notably, several studies suggest that OFA reduces opioid-induced hyperalgesia and promotes improved pain trajectories beyond the immediate postoperative period, indicating potential long-term benefits [19]. Hemodynamic stability remains an important consideration. OFA regimens that include α-2 adrenergic agonists have been associated in some studies with increased intraoperative hypotension and bradycardia, necessitating greater vasopressor use. These effects are often dose-dependent and can generally be managed with careful titration and patient selection. In contrast, ketamine-based protocols demonstrate favorable cardiovascular profiles, particularly in patients with limited physiological reserve. High-risk populations may benefit most from OFA [20]. Obese patients and individuals with obstructive sleep apnea experience fewer respiratory complications due to the avoidance of opioid-induced respiratory depression. Similarly, in bariatric and ambulatory surgery, OFA is associated with enhanced recovery and earlier discharge readiness. However, data on cardiac and major oncological surgeries remain limited, highlighting the need for further research. Despite these encouraging findings, the literature is marked by methodological variability and a lack of standardized definitions for OFA. As a result, definitive conclusions regarding its superiority over optimized opioid-sparing strategies cannot yet be drawn. Large-scale, well-designed comparative trials are essential to establish the role of opioid-free anesthesia in routine perioperative care.

CHALLENGES, LIMITATIONS, AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Despite growing interest and increasing clinical adoption, opioid-free anesthesia (OFA) faces several challenges that limit its universal applicability. A major issue is the lack of standardized definitions and protocols. OFA regimens differ widely in drug selection, dosing, and use of regional techniques,

making cross-study comparisons difficult and complicating the formulation of uniform clinical recommendations [21]. This variability contributes to inconsistent outcomes in the literature and hampers evidence interpretation. Hemodynamic instability is another commonly reported limitation, particularly in regimens relying heavily on α-2 adrenergic agonists [22]. Bradycardia and hypotension may require increased use of vasopressors or anticholinergic agents, potentially offsetting the benefits of avoiding opioids [23]. These risks are especially pertinent in elderly patients or those with limited cardiovascular reserve, emphasizing the need for careful patient selection and vigilant intraoperative monitoring. The learning curve associated with OFA is also significant. Anesthesiologists must have a strong understanding of non-opioid analgesic pharmacology and be capable of managing their side effects [24]. Institutional factors, such as availability of regional anesthesia expertise and postoperative monitoring resources, further affect the feasibility of implementing OFA broadly. In resource-limited settings, these challenges may pose significant barriers. From a patient-centered perspective, complete opioid avoidance may not be necessary or beneficial in every case. Emerging evidence indicates that optimized opioid-sparing strategies can achieve similar benefits while minimizing hemodynamic risks. Consequently, OFA is increasingly viewed as a flexible, individualized approach rather than a rigid protocol. Tailoring analgesic plans based on patient comorbidities, surgical complexity, and expected pain intensity is likely to yield the best outcomes. Future research should focus on high-quality randomized trials with standardized OFA definitions and clinically meaningful endpoints [25]. Long-term outcomes, such as chronic postsurgical pain and persistent opioid use, require special attention. Advances in precision medicine-including pharmacogenomics and individualized pain profiling-may further refine patient selection and analgesic strategies. Finally, integrating OFA within enhanced recovery pathways and exploring its role in mitigating the global opioid crisis remain clinically and socially important areas.

ETHICAL, EDUCATIONAL, AND HEALTH SYSTEM IMPLICATIONS OF OPIOID-FREE ANESTHESIA

The growing adoption of opioid-free anesthesia (OFA) raises important ethical considerations related to patient autonomy, informed consent, and responsible perioperative analgesic stewardship. As OFA represents a departure from conventional opioid-based anesthetic practice, it is essential that patients are adequately informed about its underlying rationale, potential benefits, and inherent limitations [26]. In particular, preoperative discussions should address realistic expectations regarding postoperative pain control, the possible need for rescue analgesia, and the overall multimodal pain management plan. Transparent and patient-centered communication is critical to ensure that the avoidance of opioids does not inadvertently result in undertreatment of pain or diminished patient satisfaction. From an ethical standpoint, OFA aligns with the principle of nonmaleficence by seeking to minimize opioid-related harm, while simultaneously supporting beneficence through improved recovery profiles, reduced adverse effects, and enhanced postoperative function [27]. However, achieving this ethical balance requires clinicians to remain vigilant to individual patient needs and to avoid rigid or dogmatic adherence to opioid elimination at the expense of comfort, safety, or clinical judgment. Beyond individual patient care, OFA has broader implications for healthcare systems, professional education, and institutional practice. The safe and effective implementation of OFA necessitates structured training in multimodal analgesia, regional anesthesia techniques, and the pharmacology of non-opioid agents [28]. Anesthesiologists must develop proficiency in titrating drugs such as α-2 adrenergic agonists, N-methyl-D-aspartate receptor antagonists, and intravenous local anesthetics, as well as in anticipating and managing their associated hemodynamic effects [29]. Incorporating OFA principles into anesthesiology residency curricula, fellowship training, and continuing medical education programs may promote consistent practice patterns and reduce variability in clinical outcomes. Institutional protocols and standardized pathways can further support safe implementation by providing guidance on patient selection, monitoring requirements, and postoperative pain management strategies. From a health system perspective, reduced perioperative opioid consumption has the potential to lower rates of opioid-related complications, facilitate earlier mobilization, shorten hospital length of stay, and improve resource utilization, particularly within enhanced recovery after surgery (ERAS) frameworks [30]. These benefits may translate into meaningful cost savings and improved quality-of-care metrics. However, they must be carefully weighed against increased intraoperative monitoring demands, the need for skilled anesthesia personnel, and potential logistical constraints, especially in resource-limited settings. As healthcare systems increasingly emphasize value-based and patient-centered care, OFA may represent an important component of sustainable perioperative medicine when applied judiciously, supported by institutional infrastructure, and guided by evolving clinical evidence.

CONCLUSION

Opioid-free anesthesia (OFA) represents a paradigm shift in perioperative pain management, emerging in response to increasing awareness of opioid-related morbidity, prolonged postoperative opioid dependence, and the broader public health implications of opioid overuse. Traditional opioid-centric anesthetic techniques, while effective for analgesia, are frequently associated with adverse effects such as postoperative nausea and vomiting, ileus, respiratory depression, hyperalgesia, and delayed recovery. Consequently, the pursuit of anesthetic strategies that minimize or

eliminate opioid exposure while maintaining adequate analgesia has gained significant momentum in contemporary anesthetic practice. OFA is founded on a multimodal analgesic framework that targets multiple nociceptive and neurohumoral pathways through the judicious use of non-opioid pharmacologic agents and regional anesthetic techniques. Agents commonly employed include α-2 agonists, N-methyl-D-aspartate receptor antagonists, local anesthetics, non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, acetaminophen, magnesium, and gabapentinoids. When integrated with regional anesthesia and enhanced recovery after surgery (ERAS) protocols, OFA has demonstrated the potential to reduce perioperative opioid requirements and mitigate opioid-related adverse events without compromising analgesic efficacy in selected patient populations. Despite these promising findings, the existing body of literature is characterized by substantial heterogeneity in study design, definitions of OFA, anesthetic regimens, and outcome measures. This variability limits the ability to draw definitive conclusions regarding the superiority of OFA over optimized opioid-sparing or opioid-minimizing techniques. Furthermore, concerns related to hemodynamic instability, delayed emergence, drug-specific adverse effects, and logistical challenges in implementation underscore the need for cautious and individualized application rather than indiscriminate or universal adoption. Patient selection remains a critical determinant of success with OFA. While certain populations—such as patients at high risk for opioid-related complications, those with obstructive sleep apnea, or individuals with a history of opioid dependence—may derive particular benefit, opioids continue to play an indispensable role in perioperative analgesia for many surgical procedures and clinical contexts. Therefore, OFA should not be conceptualized as a replacement for opioids, but rather as one component within a broader continuum of multimodal analgesic strategies tailored to patient-specific and procedure-specific factors. Ongoing education and training are essential to ensure the safe and effective implementation of OFA techniques. Clinicians must remain informed about evolving evidence, best practice guidelines, and emerging pharmacologic innovations to optimize patient outcomes. Future research should prioritize standardized OFA protocols, robust comparative trials with opioid-sparing approaches, and the assessment of long-term outcomes, including chronic pain development and functional recovery. In conclusion, opioid-free anesthesia holds considerable promise as an adjunctive strategy in modern anesthetic practice, contributing to improved patient-centered outcomes and responsible opioid stewardship. With careful patient selection, evidence-based application, and continued scientific refinement, OFA has the potential to enhance perioperative safety while supporting a more nuanced and individualized approach to pain management.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Conflict of interest declared none.

AUTHORS CONTRIBUTION

Dr.Anand Mohan Jha contributed to the study conceptualization and supervision. Dr.PrathibhaKumari was involved in data collection and literature review. Dr.Malathi Anil Kumar performed the analysis and interpretation of data. Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Jha contributed to manuscript writing and final editing.

FUNDING

No funding was received for this study.

INFORMED CONSENT

Not Applicable.

ETHICAL STATEMENT

No human or animal studies were performed.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION

All Authors contributed equally.

REFERENCES

1. Fox M. Is minimally invasive surgery at an inflection point? Bull Am Coll Surg. 2025;110(9):1-6.
2. Jiang WZ, Xu JM, Xing JD, et al. Short-term outcomes of laparoscopy vs open surgery for patients with low rectal cancer: the LASRE randomized clinical trial. JAMA Oncol. 2022;8(11):e223453.
3. Shademan A, et al. Robotic and image-guided surgery: current status and future perspectives. Lancet Digit Health. 2023;5(6):e365-e378. doi:10.1016/S2589-7500(23)00072-4.
4. Sauro KM, Smith C, Ibadin S, Bakunda L, Bajgain B, Bisch S, Nelson G. Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS) guidelines and hospital length of stay, readmission, complications, and mortality: a meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. JAMA Netw Open. 2024;7(6):e2417310. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.17310.
5. Caringi S, Delvecchio A, Casella A, De Palma C, Ferraro V, Filippo R, et al. The da Vinci Single-Port robotic platform in general surgery: a scoping review of current applications and outcomes. J Clin Med. 2025;14(22):8212. Doi: 10.3390/jcm14228212
6. Mitzman B, et al. Minimally invasive surgery deserts: is there a role for robotic assisted surgery? JSLS. 2024;28(3):e2024.00039. doi: 10.4293/JSLS.2024.00039
7. Moustris GP, Hiridis SC, Deliparaschos KM, Konstantinidis KM. Evolution of autonomous and semi-autonomous robotic surgical systems: a review of the literature. Int J Med Robot. 2022;18(1):e2358. doi:10.1002/rcs.2358.
8. Santarelli V, Valenzi FM, Haberal HB, et al. Current status of single port robotic-assisted

reconstructive urology: a systematic review, meta-analysis and structured summary of the available literature. J Robot Surg. 2025;19:349. doi:10.1007/s11701-025-02509-9.

9. Murphy E, Cahill RA. Technological advances in intra-operative navigation: integrating fluorescence, extended reality, and artificial intelligence. J Clin Med. 2025;14(23):8574. doi:10.3390/jcm14238574.
10. Zhang X, Liu Y, Luo W, Guo Y. Application of augmented reality and surgical robotic navigation in total hip and knee replacement. Front Surg. 2025;12:1591756. doi:10.3389/fsurg.2025.1591756.
11. Schulze M, Juergensen L, Rischen R, et al. Quality assurance of 3D printed patient specific anatomical models: a systematic review. 3D Print Med. 2024;10:9. Doi: 10.1186/s41205-024-00210-5
12. Maintz M, Tourbier C, de Wild M, et al. Patient specific implants made of 3D printed bioresorbable polymers at the point of care: material, technology, and scope of surgical application. 3D Print Med. 2024;10:13. Doi: 10.1186/s41205-024-00207-0
13. PicadoTejero D, Mendoza Cerezo L, Rodríguez Rego JM, Carrasco Amador JP, Marcos Romero AC. Recent advances in 3D bioprinting of porous scaffolds for tissue engineering: a narrative and critical review. J FunctBiomater. 2025;16(9):328. Doi: 10.3390/jfb16090328
14. Pham GM. Biologic augmentation in anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction and beyond: a review of PRP and BMAC. J Clin Med. 2025;14(19):6959. doi:10.3390/jcm14196959.
15. Kenig N, Monton Echeverria J, MuntanerVives A. Artificial intelligence in surgery: a systematic review of use and validation. J Clin Med. 2024;13(23):7108. doi:10.3390/jcm13237108.
16. Liu Y, Li Q, Wang X, et al. Machine learning improves prediction of postoperative outcomes after gastrointestinal surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Gastrointest Surg. 2024;28(6):956-965.Doi: 10.1016/j.gassur.2024.03.006
17. Xie X, Tian Y, Huang J, Luo Q, Chen T. Surgery without distance: will 5G-based robot-assisted telesurgery redefine modern surgery? Transl Lung Cancer Res. 2025;14(5):1821-1829. Doi: 10.21037/tlcr-2025-16
18. Patel V, Saikali S, Moschovas MC, et al. Technical and ethical considerations in telesurgery. J Robot Surg. 2024;18:40. doi:10.1007/s11701-023-01797-3.
19. Madan J, Witherell P, Rosen DW. A review of 3D printed medical implant design. 3D Print Med. 2026;12(1):3. Doi: 10.1186/s41205-025-00300-y
20. Varghese C, Harrison EM, O'Grady G, et al. Artificial intelligence in surgery. Nat Med. 2024;30:1257-1268. doi:10.1038/s41591-024-02970-3.