Frontiers in Biomedical Technologies Vol. 13, No. 1 (Winter 2026) 285-289

SHORT REPORT(S)

The Future of Surgery: Embracing Robotic Systems in Surgical Practice

Mehrdad Ghaderi [1*], Mehdi Bakhtiarian [2]

[1] *Electrical and Computer Department, Technical and Engineering Faculty, Mohaghegh Ardabili University, Ardabil, Iran*

[2] *Department of Computer Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Islamic Azad University, Urmia Branch, Urmia, Iran*

*Corresponding Author: Mehrdad Ghaderi

Received: 02 May 2025 / Accepted: 20 July 2025

Email: mehrdadghaderi254315@gmail.com

Abstract

Robotic surgery has transitioned from a phenomenon to the norm in the medical field, particularly in minimally invasive surgery. Robotic-assisted surgery offers greater precision, quicker recovery, and better patient outcomes, but issues like astronomical costs, technical issues, and ethical issues prevent its adoption. Robotic surgery's advantages—greater precision, less invasive procedures, and better clinical outcomes—are outlined here while addressing issues to its adoption. New technologies like AI integration, autonomous technology, and tele-surgery are revolutionary but will have to be accompanied by strong regulatory frameworks. Technologists', clinicians', and policy makers' collaboration is important to patient safety and equitable access as robot surgery advances.

Keywords: Robot Surgeon; Machine Intelligence; Application of Machine Intelligence; Modern Surgery.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.18502/fbt.v13i1.20793

1. Introduction

The integration of robotic systems into surgical practice has been one of the most groundbreaking advances in modern medicine [1]. Over the past two decades, robotic-assisted surgery has progressed from a novel concept to a cornerstone of minimally invasive surgery, offering unparalleled precision, reduced recovery times, and improved patient outcomes [1]. As we stand at the doorstep of a new technological revolution, it is crucial to look critically into the position of robotic systems in surgery, their present limitations, and what the future holds for the healthcare industry. This editorial attempts to express some of the fundamental questions: How have robotic systems improved surgery outcomes? What are the hindrances to their use in each case? And what are the technical, ethical, and regulatory challenges that need to be addressed as we move toward more autonomous and AI-driven surgical systems?

2. A revolution in Surgery and the Emergence of Robotic Surgery

The origin of robotics in surgery harks back to the PUMA 560, developed during the 1980s for first-generation use in neurosurgical biopsies, but by the time the FDA had approved the da Vinci Surgical System in 2000, the floodgate had already been opened for modern robotic-assisted surgery [2]. From imaging, feedback, and haptic tools, along with tool improvement across the centuries, robotic platforms found themselves knocking at the door of urology, gynecology, and cardiothoracic surgery. The da Vinci system's wristed instruments and 3D high-definition vision enable surgeons to perform accurate and subtle operations with unparalleled precision and dexterity, better than traditional laparoscopy [3,4]. The accuracy is particularly advantageous in procedures like prostatectomies, where robotic instruments enable tremor-free motion in confined spaces, preserving nerve function and reducing complications. That robotic-assisted laparoscopic prostatectomy (RALP) had significantly lower rates of positive surgical margins compared to open surgery and improved cancer control [5].

Despite its benefits, robotic surgery faces several limitations:

- High Costs: The initial investment and ongoing maintenance create financial barriers, especially in low-resource settings.
- Training Requirements: Surgeons require extensive training to achieve proficiency, complicating adoption.
- Technical Constraints: Issues such as latency in telesurgery and limited haptic feedback can impair surgical performance.

Operational risks also merit careful consideration [6]:

- Technical malfunctions, including system failures and software errors, can result in delays or the cancellation of surgical procedures.

- Surgical complications stemming from robotic limitations, such as the inability to respond effectively to unexpected bleeding, may require a shift to traditional open surgery, further complicating patient management.

3. Minimally Invasive Approach: Advantages and Unresolved Concerns

The most significant advantage of robotic surgery lies in its minimally invasive nature, which results in reduced postoperative pain, lower rates of infection, and expedited recovery times attributable to smaller incisions. In an era where healthcare systems emphasize cost-effectiveness alongside quality, the ability for patients to resume normal functions more swiftly is a notable benefit [2,7]. Robotic-assisted procedures typically result in shorter hospital stays and fewer complications compared to traditional open surgery. In the field of urology, robotic-assisted laparoscopic prostatectomy (RALP) has been correlated with decreased blood loss, improved urinary continence, and enhanced recovery of sexual function post-procedure. Likewise, in gynecologic surgery, robotic hysterectomy has been shown to significantly reduce both postoperative pain and blood loss when compared to conventional laparoscopic techniques [6, 8]. These findings suggest the potential for robotic systems to enhance the overall quality of surgical care.

However, these advantages must be considered alongside several limitations [2, 6]:

- Selection Bias: Many studies on robotic surgery are conducted by highly skilled surgeons at specialized centers, which may not accurately reflect outcomes in more generalized clinical settings.

- Lack of Long-Term Outcome Data: While evidence supports faster short-term recovery, some studies indicate that long-term outcomes between robotic and conventional laparoscopic techniques may be comparably effective.

-Procedural Limitations: Robotic systems may not be suitable for all types of surgeries, particularly those that require extensive tactile feedback or the ability to adapt rapidly to intraoperative changes.

4. Challenging the Cost and Training of Robotic Surgery

While robotic surgery presents numerous clinical advantages, its high costs and steep learning curve pose significant barriers to widespread adoption. The initial investment for a da Vinci surgical system exceeds $2 million, with additional annual maintenance fees estimated at around $150,000 and disposable instrument costs ranging from $1,500 to $3,000 per procedure [3, 8]. These financial burdens create substantial strain, particularly in low-resource settings.

In addition to these initial costs, long-term financial considerations include [9,10]:

- Infrastructure upgrades, such as modifications to operating rooms and IT system integration.

- Ongoing maintenance and software updates to ensure optimal functionality.

- Replacement costs for obsolete systems, which add to the overall financial commitment.

The training required for robotic surgery further complicates its adoption. Surgeons must complete between 20 to 50 cases to attain proficiency. This necessitates costly simulation training and mentorship during proctored procedures. Moreover, the lack of haptic feedback inherent in robotic systems necessitates greater reliance on visual cues, often resulting in extended adaptation periods. Additionally, training for the broader surgical team—including nurses and anesthesiologists—adds another layer of complexity to the integration of robotic systems [3,11].

Operational risks also merit careful consideration [12, 13]:

- Technical malfunctions, including system failures and software errors, can result in delays or the cancellation of surgical procedures.

- Surgical complications stemming from robotic limitations, such as the inability to respond effectively to unexpected bleeding, may require a shift to traditional open surgery, further complicating patient management.

5. Technical and Ethical Challenges of Robotic Surgery

Despite significant advancements, robotic surgery is confronted with persistent technical constraints that can impede its effectiveness and safety. These include [5,14]:

- Latency in Telesurgery: Delays in signal transmission can adversely affect real-time decision-making, potentially compromising surgical outcomes.

- Limited Haptic Feedback: Surgeons predominantly rely on visual cues due to the lack of tactile sensation, which can increase their cognitive load and hinder precise manipulation.

- Inability to Autonomously Respond to Complications: Current robotic systems cannot independently manage intraoperative complications such as excessive bleeding or anatomical variations, which may require immediate intervention.

In addition to these technical challenges, the integration of robotic systems into surgical practice raises important ethical and legal concerns:

- Liability Issues: Questions arise regarding accountability in the event of surgical errors—should responsibility lie with the surgeon, the device manufacturer, or the software developer?

- Equitable Access: The deployment of robotic surgery may exacerbate healthcare disparities, particularly if access to these advanced systems remains limited in low-resource regions.

- Risks Associated with AI Integration: Overreliance on machine learning algorithms could lead to automation bias, whereby surgeons might defer critical decision-making to AI without appropriate oversight.

The prospect of autonomous robotic surgery underscores the need for robust ethical standards and regulatory frameworks to ensure the equitable and safe application of these technologies in surgical settings [15, 12] (Table 1).

6. The Future of Robotic Surgery: AI Integration, Miniaturization, and Implementation Challenges

The evolution of robotic surgery is increasingly dependent on its integration with Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning (ML) technologies. AI algorithms demonstrate significant potential across the entire surgical continuum, from preoperative planning to intraoperative execution and postoperative care. Specifically, these systems can enhance surgical outcomes through three key applications [5, 16]:

1. Preoperative Planning: AI-driven predictive analytics enable optimized surgical approaches by analyzing patient-specific anatomical data and predicting potential complications.

2. Intraoperative Decision-Making: Real-time image processing algorithms provide enhanced visualization and precision during surgical procedures.

3. Postoperative Monitoring: Machine learning models facilitate early detection of postoperative complications through continuous data analysis.

While these technological advancements promise to improve surgical efficacy and precision, they also introduce important considerations regarding system reliability and clinical implementation. The potential for overreliance on automated systems, particularly in high-risk surgical scenarios, necessitates careful risk-benefit evaluation. Furthermore, emerging alternatives such as single-port laparoscopy and Augmented Reality (AR)-guided systems present comparable precision with potentially lower costs, suggesting that robotic platforms represent one of several viable technological pathways in modern surgery.

Technological advancements are driving the miniaturization of robotic surgical platforms, with microbots and nanobots representing the next frontier in minimally invasive interventions. These ultra-compact systems offer particular promise in delicate surgical specialties such as neurosurgery and interventional cardiology, where precision is paramount. Additionally, portable robotic systems could significantly improve access to advanced surgical care in remote and resource-limited settings [2,14].

However, the development of these miniaturized platforms must be accompanied by:

- Rigorous preclinical and clinical testing protocols

- Comprehensive regulatory oversight

- Standardized safety evaluation frameworks

Table 1. Comparative Analysis of Surgical Techniques: Robotic Surgery, Traditional Laparoscopy, and Open Surgery Across Precision, Invasiveness, Cost, and Learning Curve

Aspect	Robotic Surgery	Traditional Laparoscopy	Open Surgery
Precision	High (3D vision, wristed instruments)	Moderate (2D view, rigid tools)	High (direct tactile feedback)
Invasiveness	Minimally invasive	Minimally invasive	Highly invasive
Cost	Very high	Moderate	Low
Learning Curve	Steep	Moderate	Low (for basic procedures)
Adaptability	Limited (fixed arm constraints)	Moderate (manual control)	High (full manual control)

Such measures are essential to ensure both the efficacy and safety of these emerging technologies before widespread clinical adoption. The successful implementation of miniaturized robotic systems will require careful consideration of technical limitations, cost-effectiveness, and equitable access to healthcare technologies [17,18].

7. Conclusion

Robotics has already transformed surgery, with more precision, less invasive procedures, and improved patient outcomes. But problems regarding high expense, the learning curve, and ethics must be addressed so that this technology's benefit is made accessible to all. In the coming years, the convergence of AI, miniaturization, and tele-surgery will further transform the practice of surgery. It is up to policymakers, medical professionals, and developers of technology to come together and apply the full scope of robotic surgery so that it can keep working towards improving patient care and outcomes in the future.

References

1- Y. Rivero-Moreno *et al.*, "Autonomous Robotic Surgery: Has the Future Arrived?," *Cureus*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 1–10, (2024), doi: 10.7759/cureus.52243.

2- I. Andras *et al.*, "Artificial intelligence and robotics: a combination that is changing the operating room," *World Journal of Urology*, vol. 38, no. 10. pp. 2359–2366, (2020). doi: 10.1007/s00345-019-03037-6.

3- J. Grasso, "Robot-assisted surgery: Past, present, and future," *Digit. Heal. Telemed. Beyond*, pp. 171–186, (2025), doi: 10.1016/B978-0-443-23901-4.00012-X.

4- Y. Rivero-Moreno *et al.*, "Robotic Surgery: A Comprehensive Review of the Literature and Current Trends," *Cureus*, (2023), doi: 10.7759/cureus.42370.

5- E. P. Rabinovich, S. Capek, J. S. Kumar, and M. S. Park, "Tele-robotics and artificial-intelligence in stroke care," *Journal of Clinical Neuroscience*, vol. 79, pp. 129–132, (2020). doi: 10.1016/j.jocn.2020.04.125.

6- X. Sun, J. Okamoto, K. Masamune, and Y. Muragaki, "Robotic Technology in Operating Rooms: a Review," *Curr. Robot. Reports*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 333–341, (2021), doi: 10.1007/s43154-021-00055-4.

7- F. H. Ghaderi M, Chehre H, "Design and Implementation of a Novel Double-Layered Wavy Mattress for the Prevention and Recovery of Pressure Ulcers: A Feasibility Study," vol. 13, no. 5, October 2023, pp. 489–494, (2023), doi: https://doi.org/10.31661/jbpe.v0i0.2305-1617.

8- S. Chatterjee, S. Das, K. Ganguly, and D. Mandal, "Advancements in robotic surgery: innovations, challenges and future prospects," *J. Robot. Surg*., vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 1–11, (2024), doi: 10.1007/s11701-023-01801-w.

9- A. Mirbagheri, F. Farahmand, S. Sarkar, A. Alamdar, M. Moradi, and E. Afshari, "The Sina Robotic Telesurgery System," in *Handbook of Robotic and Image-Guided Surgery*, Elsevier, (2020), pp. 107–121. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-814245-5.00007-4.

10- R. S. A. B. Perspective, "1 , 2 , 3 , 4*," vol. 54, no. 3, pp. 3037–3091, (2025).

11- E. Ibrahim *et al.*, "Artificial Intelligence and Robotics in Minimally Invasive and Complex Surgical Procedures : A Systematic Review," vol. 17, no. 3, (2025), doi: 10.7759/cureus 81339.

12- R. James, N. A. Kyi, P. Nyein, and E. Huang, "Trust, autonomy, and teaching dynamics in robotic surgery : A mixed-methods study," *Glob. Surg. Educ. - J. Assoc. Surg. Educ.*, vol. 7, (2025), doi: 10.1007/s44186-024-00341-7.

13- C. Guo, Y. He, Z. Shi, and L. Wang, "Artificial intelligence in surgical medicine : a brief review," pp. 2180–2186, (2024).

14- H. Schreuder and R. Verheijen, "Robotic surgery," *BJOG An Int. J. Obstet. Gynaecol.*, vol. 116, no. 2, pp. 198–213, (2009), doi: 10.1111/j.1471-0528.2008.02038.x.

15- M. Diana and J. Marescaux, "Robotic surgery," *British Journal of Surgery*, vol.. 102, no. 2. (2015). doi: 10.1002/bjs.9711.

16- N. Pakkasjärvi, T. Luthra, and S. Anand, "Artificial Intelligence in Surgical Learning," *Surgeries (Switzerland)*, vol. 4, no. 1. pp. 86–97, (2023). doi: 10.3390/surgeries4010010.

17- T. Lane, "A short history of robotic surgery," *Ann. R. Coll. Surg. Engl.*, vol. 100, no. 6_sup, pp. 5–7, (2018), doi: 10.1308/rcsann.supp1.5.

18- G. T. Sung and I. S. Gill, "Robotic laparoscopic surgery: a comparison of the da Vinci and Zeus systems," *Urology*, vol. 58, no. 6, pp. 893–898, (2001), doi: 10.1016/S0090-4295(01)01423-6.