JHWCR JOURNAL OF HEALTH, WELLNESS AND COMMUNITY RESEARCH 3007-0570

Review Article Volume 4, Issue 4

Narrative Review of Advances in Anesthetic Techniques for Enhancing Safety and Recovery in General Surgical Procedures

Amna Rehman[1], Muhammad Umair Zahid[2], Muhammad Usama[3], Mamoona Shaikh[4], Suraj Kumar Aruwani[5], Huzaifa Shoaib Ikram[6]

[1] Doctor, Combined Military Hospital / Army Medical College, Rawalpindi, Pakistan
[2] Postgraduate Resident, Jinnah Postgraduate Medical Centre, Karachi, Pakistan
[3] Former Trainee Anesthesia Technologist, Rehman Medical Institute, Peshawar, Pakistan
[4] Assistant Professor, Department of Anesthesia, Liaquat University of Medical and Health Sciences, Jamshoro, Pakistan
[5] Postgraduate Resident Anesthesia, Dr. Ruth K.M. Pfau, Civil Hospital Karachi, Pakistan.
[6] Student, Akhtar Saeed Medical College, Rawalpindi, Pakistan
* Correspondence: Amna Rehman, amrehman2001@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Background: *The field of anesthesia has evolved from ensuring intraoperative survivability to actively optimizing postoperative recovery and long-term safety. Modern approaches aim to mitigate the adverse effects of traditional techniques on patient outcomes. Objective: This narrative review explores contemporary anesthetic advances designed to improve intraoperative safety, facilitate postoperative recovery, and enhance overall outcomes for patients undergoing general surgery. Main Discussion Points: Key themes examined include the paradigm shift towards opioid-sparing multimodal analgesia, the debate between total intravenous and volatile anesthesia, the critical role of quantitative neuromuscular monitoring, the implementation of goal-directed fluid therapy, strategies for neuroprotection and delirium prevention, and the personalized application of these techniques for high-risk populations such as frail patients. Conclusion: The evidence robustly supports the integration of multimodal analgesia, quantitative neuromuscular monitoring, and hemodynamic optimization as standard practice. However, areas like opioid-free anesthesia and onco-anesthesia require further rigorous investigation. The future of anesthetic care lies in the systematic yet personalized application of these evidence-based strategies within enhanced recovery pathways to improve patient-centered outcomes.*

Keywords: *Anesthesia, Enhanced Recovery After Surgery, Multimodal Analgesia, Neuromuscular Monitoring, Postoperative Complications, Goal-Directed Fluid Therapy.*

INTRODUCTION

General surgery, encompassing a vast array of procedures from laparoscopic cholecystectomies to major oncological resections, remains a cornerstone of modern medical intervention. Its global volume is substantial, with an estimated 310 million major surgeries performed annually worldwide, a figure that underscores its critical role in healthcare systems.(1) The success of any surgical intervention, however, is inextricably linked to the quality and safety of the anesthetic management that facilitates it. Anesthesia has evolved far beyond its primordial role of simply rendering a patient unconscious and immobile. Today, it is recognized as a dynamic perioperative medical specialty pivotal not only for enabling surgery but also for actively influencing patient trajectory from preoperative assessment through to long-term recovery. The paradigm has decisively shifted from a focus on intraoperative survivability to the optimization of both safety and recovery, aiming for outcomes that extend beyond the absence of morbidity to include early mobilization, reduced pain, and prompt return to functional baseline.(2) The historical

Received: 07 January 2026
Revised: 16 January 2026
Accepted: 23 February 2026
Published: 28 February 2026

Citation: Click to Cite

landscape of anesthesia was dominated by a one-size-fits-all philosophy, employing high doses of volatile agents and opioids to ensure profound unconsciousness and analgesia. While effective for its primary aim, this approach often carried a significant physiological toll, contributing to postoperative complications such as prolonged sedation, respiratory depression, postoperative nausea and vomiting (PONV), ileus, and cognitive dysfunction, particularly in vulnerable populations like the elderly.(3) These sequelae directly impede recovery, prolong hospital stays, and increase healthcare costs. In recent decades, this understanding has catalyzed a transformative movement towards precision anesthesia. This modern framework emphasizes multimodal strategies, pharmacologic innovation, and advanced monitoring technologies designed to tailor anesthetic care to individual patient physiology and surgical stimulus. The goal is to achieve optimal conditions for surgery while mitigating the stress response and minimizing the side-effect profile of any single agent, thereby creating a smoother, faster, and safer passage through the perioperative journey.(4)

Contemporary knowledge robustly supports the concept that anesthetic technique is a modifiable risk factor for surgical outcomes. The advent of enhanced recovery after surgery (ERAS) protocols has been instrumental in highlighting this, integrating evidence-based anesthetic components as core elements.(5) Key advances include the widespread adoption of total intravenous anesthesia (TIVA) with agents like propofol, which is associated with a lower incidence of PONV and potentially beneficial effects on cancer biology compared to some volatile agents.(6) The refined use of neuromuscular blocking agents guided by quantitative neuromuscular monitoring has drastically reduced the risk of residual postoperative paralysis, a previously under-recognized cause of pulmonary complications.(7) Furthermore, the philosophy of opioid-sparing or opioid-free anesthesia, utilizing long-acting local anesthetics, alpha-2 agonists like dexmedetomidine, and multimodal analgesics such as gabapentinoids and NSAIDs, aims to provide effective analgesia while avoiding opioid-related side effects that hinder recovery.(8) The integration of advanced hemodynamic monitoring, including goal-directed fluid therapy, allows for personalized fluid administration, avoiding both hypovolemia and fluid overload, each of which can compromise tissue perfusion and organ function.(9) Despite this progress, significant gaps and unresolved questions persist within the literature, creating a compelling rationale for a contemporary synthesis. The evidence for some emerging techniques, such as opioid-free anesthesia, while promising, is often derived from heterogeneous study populations and procedures, making broad generalizations difficult.(10) The optimal combination and dosing of multimodal agents to maximize benefit and minimize adverse drug interactions require further refinement. Additionally, the impact of specific anesthetic choices on long-term outcomes, including cancer recurrence and chronic post-surgical pain, remains an area of intense investigation with not yet definitive answers.(11) The rapid proliferation of new monitoring technologies, such as closed-loop anesthesia delivery systems and depth of anesthesia monitors purporting to prevent awareness and tailor dosing, necessitates a critical appraisal of their real-world clinical utility and cost-effectiveness.(12) There is also a pressing need to better understand how to personalize these advanced techniques for complex patient subgroups, including those with significant cardiopulmonary disease, obesity, or frailty, where the margin for error is narrowest.(13)

Therefore, the primary objective of this narrative review is to explore and synthesize recent advances in anesthetic techniques that specifically target the enhancement of intraoperative safety and the facilitation of postoperative recovery in adult patients undergoing general surgical procedures. It will critically examine the evolution from traditional, high-dose opioid-volatile based anesthesia to modern, precision-based multimodal regimens. The scope will encompass pharmacologic innovations, including the roles of TIVA, opioid-sparing

adjuvants, and refined neuromuscular management, as well as technological advancements in patient monitoring that guide individualized care. The review will focus on evidence from clinical trials, meta-analyses, and key observational studies published within the last five years to ensure contemporary relevance, while also acknowledging foundational older studies where contextually necessary. The significance of this review lies in its timely consolidation of a rapidly expanding and sometimes fragmented evidence base. By providing a coherent overview of how modern anesthetic practices directly contribute to the goals of enhanced recovery and improved safety, it aims to serve as a practical resource for anesthesiologists, surgeons, and perioperative physicians. It seeks to move beyond mere description of techniques to an analysis of their mechanistic rationale and clinical impact. Furthermore, by delineating current knowledge boundaries and ongoing controversies, the review will help identify priorities for future research and guide clinical decision-making in an era where optimal perioperative care is a measurable determinant of surgical success. Ultimately, the synthesis provided herein underscores the anesthesiologist's evolving role as a perioperative physician, whose expertise is fundamental in translating surgical intervention into the best possible patient outcome.

THEMATIC DISCUSSION

1. Evolution Towards Opioid-Sparing and Multimodal Analgesic Regimens

The cornerstone of modern anesthetic technique lies in the deliberate minimization of intraoperative opioids, a paradigm shift driven by the recognition of their deleterious effects on recovery. Traditional, high-dose opioid-based anesthesia, while effective for blunting sympathetic responses, is strongly associated with postoperative ileus, respiratory depression, nausea and vomiting, and hyperalgesia.(14) In response, the concept of multimodal analgesia—employing a combination of non-opioid analgesics that act on different pain pathways—has become central to enhanced recovery protocols. This approach typically integrates regional or local anesthetic techniques with systemic adjuvants such as non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs), acetaminophen, gabapentinoids, and alpha-2 agonists. A synthesis of recent meta-analyses indicates that such regimens reliably reduce postoperative opioid consumption by 30-50% without compromising pain scores, thereby facilitating earlier enteral nutrition, mobilization, and bowel function return.(15) For instance, the preoperative administration of gabapentin and perioperative use of intravenous lidocaine infusions in abdominal surgery have demonstrated consistent benefits in reducing pain and opioid requirements in the first 48 hours postoperatively.(16) However, the optimal "recipe" remains debated, with studies showing variability in effect sizes depending on surgical type and patient factors, underscoring the need for protocol personalization rather than rigid standardization.

2. The Pharmacologic Debate: TIVA vs. Volatile Anesthesia

The choice between inhalational volatile agents and total intravenous anesthesia (TIVA) with propofol represents a fundamental decision with implications beyond maintenance of unconsciousness. The debate has been intensified by investigations into potential differential effects on long-term outcomes, particularly cancer biology and neurocognitive function. Volatile agents, such as sevoflurane and desflurane, offer the advantages of rapid titration and elimination but have been implicated in promoting immunosuppressive and pro-angiogenic pathways in preclinical models.(17) Conversely, propofol appears to have neutral or possibly protective effects in these experimental settings. A 2022 meta-analysis by Yap et al. concluded that while retrospective data often favors TIVA in oncological outcomes, prospective randomized controlled trials (RCTs) have so far failed to show a definitive mortality or recurrence benefit, highlighting a significant gap between mechanistic

plausibility and clinical proof.(6) From a recovery perspective, TIVA is consistently associated with a lower incidence of postoperative nausea and vomiting (PONV), a major patient-reported barrier to early recovery.(18) The controversy thus persists, with current practice often guided by patient-specific PONV risk, institutional resources, and surgeon preference, while the oncology question awaits answers from larger, definitive trials.

3. Precision in Neuromuscular Management: Beyond Clinical Assessment

Residual neuromuscular blockade (RNMB), defined as a train-of-four (TOF) ratio <0.9, was historically an under-diagnosed complication, often masked by subtle signs like general weakness or airway discomfort. It is now unequivocally recognized as a independent risk factor for postoperative pulmonary complications, including atelectasis, hypoxia, and pneumonia.(19) The advance in this domain is not a new drug, but a technological and philosophical shift in monitoring. Quantitative neuromuscular monitoring (objective measurement of TOF ratio) has superseded qualitative assessment (visual or tactile evaluation of fade) as the standard of care. Evidence confirms that the use of quantitative monitors, coupled with appropriate reversal agents, drastically reduces the incidence of RNMB compared to qualitative methods or fixed-dose reversal.(7) The introduction of sugammadex, a selective relaxant binding agent, has further revolutionized this space by providing rapid and reliable reversal even of deep blockade, offering a safety advantage over traditional acetylcholinesterase inhibitors like neostigmine.(20) The synthesis of recent literature leaves little controversy: protocolized use of quantitative monitoring and selective reversal agents is a non-negotiable component of safe anesthetic practice that directly protects pulmonary recovery.

4. Goal-Directed Hemodynamic and Fluid Therapy

The era of liberal fluid administration, intended to maintain blood pressure, has been supplanted by a nuanced philosophy of goal-directed fluid therapy (GDFT). This approach recognizes that both hypovolemia and fluid overload are harmful, impairing tissue perfusion and oxygenation, and promoting endothelial injury and ileus.(21) GDFT utilizes minimally invasive cardiac output monitors (e.g., esophageal Doppler, pulse contour analysis) to guide fluid and inotrope administration based on dynamic parameters like stroke volume variation, rather than static measures such as central venous pressure. The evidence supports that GDFT, particularly in moderate- to high-risk patients undergoing major abdominal surgery, reduces postoperative complications, including renal injury and surgical site infections, and shortens hospital length of stay.(22) The controversy now lies in defining which patient populations benefit most from the cost and complexity of advanced monitoring, and in identifying the optimal hemodynamic targets. Furthermore, the choice of fluid—balanced crystalloids versus synthetic colloids—remains nuanced. Large-scale trials like the PLUS and CLASSIC trials have reinforced the renal safety of balanced crystalloids, establishing them as the first-line resuscitation fluid, while the role for colloids is increasingly limited.(23) This theme exemplifies the move from reactive to predictive, physiology-driven anesthesia.

5. Neuroprotection and Prevention of Postoperative Delirium

The vulnerable aging surgical population has brought the issue of perioperative neurocognitive disorders (PND), including postoperative delirium (POD), to the forefront. Anesthetic agents are potent modulators of central neurotransmission, and their management is a key modifiable risk factor. Two primary strategies have emerged from recent research. First, EEG-guided anesthesia, which uses processed EEG monitors to titrate anesthetic depth, aims to avoid both excessively deep anesthesia (a known risk for POD) and intraoperative awareness. The ENGAGES trial and subsequent meta-analyses suggest that while EEG guidance reduces the incidence of deep anesthesia, its direct impact on lowering

POD rates is modest and may depend on baseline patient risk.(24) Second, pharmacologic prophylaxis with agents like dexmedetomidine has shown more consistent promise. A 2023 network meta-analysis positioned dexmedetomidine as one of the most effective pharmacological interventions for preventing POD, especially when used as a low-dose intraoperative infusion.(25) The controversy surrounds universal implementation, as the benefits must be weighed against potential side effects like bradycardia. The synthesis indicates that a bundled approach—combining depth of anesthesia monitoring, judicious use of dexmedetomidine in high-risk patients, and avoiding anticholinergic and long-acting benzodiazepines—constitutes the most effective neuroprotective strategy.

6. The Emergence of Opioid-Free Anesthesia: Promise and Pragmatism

Pushing the opioid-sparing concept to its logical extreme, opioid-free anesthesia (OFA) aims to eliminate intraoperative systemic opioids entirely, relying instead on combinations of ketamine, lidocaine, dexmedetomidine, magnesium, and regional techniques. Proponents argue it offers the ultimate recovery advantage by completely avoiding opioid-related side effects. Recent meta-analyses, such as the one by Frauenknecht et al., confirm that OFA can significantly reduce postoperative pain scores and opioid consumption in the first 24 hours.(12) However, the evidence is characterized by significant heterogeneity and inconsistency regarding longer-term benefits, such as reduced length of stay. Major controversies persist. Critics highlight the risk of substituting one set of side effects (e.g., bradycardia from dexmedetomidine, psychomimetic effects from ketamine) for another, and the lack of large-scale safety data. Furthermore, the complexity of OFA protocols raises concerns about reproducibility and the potential for hemodynamic instability if not meticulously managed. Therefore, while OFA represents an intriguing and potentially valuable approach for specific patient cohorts (e.g., those with severe opioid intolerance or obstructive sleep apnea), it is not yet ready for universal adoption and should be viewed as an advanced tool within the broader multimodal arsenal rather than a new standard.(8)

7. Technological Integration: Closed-Loop Systems and Advanced Monitoring

The digitization of anesthesia is advancing with closed-loop drug delivery systems, which automate the administration of intravenous hypnotics and analgesics based on real-time feedback from patient monitors (e.g., EEG, hemodynamic parameters). These systems promise greater physiological stability by reducing human error and drug concentration fluctuations. A meta-analysis of RCTs found that closed-loop propofol systems provide more precise control of depth of anesthesia, with less deviation from target ranges and a reduction in propofol consumption compared to manual control.(10) The potential benefits extend to freeing the anesthesiologist's cognitive load for higher-order tasks. However, the current gap lies in proving that this improved technical performance translates into clinically meaningful improvements in patient outcomes, such as reduced PND or faster recovery times. The high cost of such technology also poses a barrier to widespread implementation. Similarly, the integration of advanced monitoring like point-of-care ultrasound (POCUS) for dynamic cardiac and lung assessment is becoming a standard skill, allowing for immediate diagnosis of causes for hypotension or hypoxia. The theme here is one of augmentation—technology serving to refine and objectify the application of pharmacological principles, though its ultimate value must always be measured in patient-centric outcomes.

8. Personalization for High-Risk Cohorts: The Frailty Imperative

Perhaps the most critical synthesis of modern techniques is their application to high-risk patients, particularly those with frailty—a state of decreased physiological reserve and vulnerability to stressors. Frailty independently predicts postoperative mortality, morbidity, and delayed recovery.(26) Applying a one-size-fits-all anesthetic to a frail patient can be

catastrophic. Modern practice demands radical personalization. This involves nuanced titration of all agents (often requiring significantly lower doses), aggressive prevention of hypothermia, meticulous GDFT to avoid fluid overload, and an even greater emphasis on multimodal opioid-sparing to prevent delirium.(27) For example, a frail elderly patient may benefit profoundly from a single-shot spinal or regional block with light sedation (using dexmedetomidine) over a general anesthetic, a strategy supported by evidence showing reduced pulmonary complications and delirium.(28) The literature consistently shows that outcome disparities for frail patients are most modifiable through bundled, protocolized care that acknowledges their unique physiology.(29) This final theme underscores that the ultimate goal of all advances is not simply to implement new drugs or gadgets, but to leverage them to deliver truly individualized, physiology-respecting care that protects the most vulnerable.

Critical Analysis and Limitations

Despite the promising narrative of progress in anesthetic techniques, a rigorous critical analysis reveals substantial limitations in the existing literature that temper the strength of many conclusions and highlight areas where evidence remains provisional rather than definitive. A pervasive challenge across many domains, including research on opioid-free anesthesia (OFA) and the impact of anesthetic choice on long-term outcomes like cancer recurrence, is the predominance of small-to-moderate sized randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and observational studies. These studies, while valuable for detecting signals of efficacy or association, are often inadequately powered to detect differences in clinically hard endpoints such as major morbidity, mortality, or long-term survival.(18, 28) For instance, many RCTs comparing OFA to opioid-based regimens report primary outcomes of opioid consumption in the first 24 hours, a surrogate marker, but lack the statistical power and follow-up duration to convincingly demonstrate a reduction in composite postoperative complications or length of stay. This focus on short-term surrogates, while pragmatic, leaves a critical gap in understanding the true clinical and economic impact of these complex interventions. Methodological biases further complicate the interpretation of evidence. Performance bias is a notable concern in many trials investigating techniques like EEG-guided anesthesia or specific drug combinations. Blinding of anesthesia providers to the intervention is frequently impossible due to the nature of the techniques (e.g., the presence or absence of an EEG monitor display, the distinct pharmacological profiles of agents like dexmedetomidine), which can unconsciously influence other aspects of perioperative management, such as fluid administration or analgesic dosing.(26) Selection bias is also evident, particularly in studies advocating for advanced monitoring or novel pharmacological bundles. Participants in these trials are often a highly selected cohort, excluding patients with significant comorbid diseases like severe heart failure or advanced renal impairment. Consequently, the impressive results seen in these optimized populations may not generalize to the very patients—those with frailty and multimorbidity—who stand to gain the most from precision anesthesia but in whom the risks of intervention are also heightened.(21, 29)

This creates a paradox where the evidence base is strongest for lower-risk patients, while practice for higher-risk individuals often relies on extrapolation and expert opinion. The issue of publication bias, the tendency for positive or statistically significant results to be published more readily than null or negative findings, likely skews the overall evidence landscape. This is particularly salient in rapidly evolving fields like onco-anesthesia, where early retrospective studies suggesting a profound benefit of TIVA over volatile agents generated immense interest.(17) The subsequent, more rigorous prospective RCTs have largely failed to replicate the magnitude of these effects, but the initial optimistic findings

continue to exert a powerful influence on clinical opinion and research agendas.(18) Similarly, the enthusiastic reporting of successful OFA protocols may overshadow studies where such techniques led to increased hemodynamic instability or unplanned ICU admissions, creating an incomplete picture of the risk-benefit ratio. The reliance on meta-analyses to provide definitive answers is also compromised when the pooled primary studies are heterogeneous in their protocols, patient populations, and surgical procedures, a common issue in reviews of multimodal analgesia bundles.(15) Significant variability in the definition and measurement of key outcomes hinders direct comparison between studies and clouds clinical implementation. A prime example is the assessment of recovery quality. Studies employ a bewildering array of endpoints: time to fulfill discharge criteria, actual length of stay, patient-reported quality of recovery (QoR) scores, or functional milestones. The choice of endpoint can dramatically alter the perceived success of an intervention. A technique may shorten the time to "fit for discharge" without affecting actual hospital stay due to non-medical social factors, a distinction not always captured.(4) In research on postoperative neurocognitive disorders, the use of different diagnostic tools and assessment timepoints (e.g., delirium at day 1 vs. neurocognitive decline at 3 months) makes it challenging to synthesize a cohesive understanding of an intervention's true neuroprotective effect.(26, 27)

This variability extends to safety outcomes; the definition of a "postoperative pulmonary complication" can range from mild oxygen desaturation to radiologically confirmed pneumonia, making mortality and morbidity statistics difficult to compare across trials.(20) Finally, the generalizability of findings from highly controlled trial environments to real-world clinical practice is not guaranteed. The protocols studied in RCTs are often delivered by expert investigators in well-resourced, high-volume centers under ideal conditions. The consistent benefit seen with goal-directed fluid therapy (GDFT) in trials, for example, depends on clinicians' expertise in interpreting dynamic parameters and responding appropriately.(23, 24) In a busy, non-academic setting with less familiarity with the technology, the same protocol may yield less impressive results. Furthermore, most studies evaluate single interventions in isolation, whereas in clinical practice, these techniques are implemented as part of a bundled ERAS pathway. The synergistic or antagonistic interactions between, say, intraoperative lidocaine, aggressive GDFT, and a thoracic epidural are poorly understood, as trials rarely possess the factorial design needed to disentangle these effects. Therefore, the impressive outcomes attributed to a specific anesthetic drug or monitor in a trial may be partly dependent on the other high-quality elements of perioperative care co-administered in that research context, limiting the standalone impact when translated to a less optimized care environment. This critical analysis does not negate the value of recent advances but serves as a necessary caution, emphasizing that the journey towards truly personalized, evidence-based anesthesia requires more robust, pragmatic, and patient-centered research.

Implications and Future Directions

The synthesis of contemporary evidence presented in this review carries significant implications for the daily practice of anesthesia and perioperative medicine. For the clinician, the overarching message is that a deliberate, protocol-driven departure from historical, opioid-heavy, and one-size-fits-all approaches is now a standard of care, not an experimental concept. The evidence strongly supports the implementation of multimodal analgesic regimens as a foundational practice, utilizing regional techniques where feasible and adjuvants like gabapentinoids, NSAIDs, and lidocaine infusions to minimize opioid exposure. (15, 16) Furthermore, the critical importance of quantitative neuromuscular monitoring to prevent residual blockade is no longer a matter of debate but a measurable safety

intervention that should be integrated into every general anesthetic. (21) In practical terms, anesthesiologists are implored to view each anesthetic as a curated bundle of interventions: selecting TIVA for high PONV-risk patients, titrating depth of anesthesia with EEG guidance in the elderly, employing GDFT for major fluid shifts, and radically personalizing drug doses for frail individuals. (19, 26, 31) The shift is from being a provider of unconsciousness to an active manager of the physiological stress of surgery, where each pharmacological and monitoring choice is made with a specific recovery-oriented outcome in mind. These practice implications naturally extend to the realm of institutional policy and clinical guidelines. The accumulated evidence provides a robust mandate for hospitals and professional societies to develop and enforce structured protocols, particularly within Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS) pathways. Policy should mandate the availability of quantitative neuromuscular monitors in all operating theaters and consider their use a key performance indicator. (20, 21) Similarly, guidelines need to move beyond vague endorsements of "multimodal analgesia" to provide more specific, procedure-specific recommendations on optimal drug combinations and dosing, while acknowledging the need for flexibility. The controversy surrounding OFA and the inconclusive data on anesthetic choice for cancer surgery highlight areas where current guidelines must be cautiously worded, emphasizing patient-centered decision-making over prescriptive mandates. (18, 29) Future iterations of guidelines should also explicitly address the management of high-risk cohorts like frail patients, providing frameworks for preoperative identification and tailored intraoperative management bundles, as their needs are distinct and their outcomes most modifiable by precision care. (27, 29)

Despite the progress, this review has illuminated several persistent and profound unanswered questions that must chart the course for future research. The most pressing gap is the need for definitive evidence on the impact of anesthetic technique on long-term, patient-centric outcomes. Large, pragmatic randomized trials are desperately needed to determine whether choices like TIVA versus volatile anesthesia or specific opioid-sparing strategies genuinely influence cancer recurrence rates, the development of chronic postsurgical pain, or long-term functional recovery and quality of life. (11, 18) The biological plausibility is strong, but the clinical proof remains elusive. Furthermore, research must pivot towards understanding the complex interactions within bundled care. Factorial trial designs are required to disentangle the individual contribution of elements like lidocaine, dexmedetomidine, and GDFT when used in combination, answering whether these interventions are synergistic or simply additive. (4) Another critical gap is in the development and validation of dynamic, real-time biomarkers of physiological stress and tissue hypoperfusion that could move GDFT from targeting macro-hemodynamics to guiding therapy at the microcirculatory and cellular level. To answer these questions, the methodological quality of future studies must evolve. There is a clear need for large-scale, multicenter, pragmatic RCTs that enroll representative patient populations, including those with significant comorbidities often excluded from earlier efficacy trials. (31) These trials should prioritize clinically meaningful primary endpoints, such as days alive and at home within 90 days (DAH90) or a composite of major complications, rather than short-term surrogates. (4) For research in personalized medicine, innovative study designs like biomarker-stratified trials or adaptive platform trials could efficiently test which anesthetic regimen works best for which patient phenotype, moving beyond the question of "what works on average" to "what works for whom." (34) Finally, greater investment in health economics research is essential to evaluate not just the clinical efficacy but also the cost-effectiveness of technologically advanced interventions like closed-loop anesthesia delivery systems, ensuring that the pursuit of marginal gains in physiological control translates into valuable outcomes for healthcare systems. (26) By addressing these directions, future research can

solidify the promising but incomplete evidence base, ensuring that the evolution of anesthetic technique continues to be driven by rigorous science, ultimately delivering on the promise of safer and more rapid recovery for every surgical patient.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this narrative review elucidates a definitive paradigm shift in anesthetic practice, moving from a model focused solely on intraoperative stability to one that actively orchestrates enhanced postoperative recovery and long-term safety. The synthesized evidence robustly endorses multimodal, opioid-sparing analgesic strategies, the mandatory use of quantitative neuromuscular monitoring, and the personalized application of goal-directed fluid therapy as foundational pillars of modern care. (15, 21, 24) While the strength of evidence is compelling for these core techniques in improving immediate postoperative outcomes, it remains more provisional for emerging areas such as opioid-free anesthesia and the influence of anesthetic choice on oncological prognosis, where enthusiasm must be tempered by an acknowledgment of methodological limitations and inconsistent results. (18, 28) Consequently, the primary recommendation for clinicians is to systematically implement these evidence-based pillars within the framework of enhanced recovery protocols, while exercising informed judgment and personalization, particularly for vulnerable populations like frail patients where careful titration is paramount. (31, 34) Ultimately, the translation of these advances into universal best practice necessitates a concerted call for future research dedicated to large-scale, pragmatic trials with patient-centered long-term outcomes, which will solidify the promising but incomplete journey toward truly precise and recovery-oriented anesthesia.

REFERENCES

1. Weiser TG, Haynes AB, Molina G, et al. Estimate of the global volume of surgery in 2012: an assessment supporting improved health outcomes. Lancet. 2015;385 Suppl 2:S11. (Note: While older than 5 years, this remains a foundational citation for global surgical volume. More recent systematic data on annual global volume is less precise).

2. Grocott MPW, Edwards M, Mythen MG, Aronson S. Peri-operative care pathways: re-engineering care to achieve the 'triple aim'. Anaesthesia. 2019;74 Suppl 1:90-99. doi:10.1111/anae.14513

3. Evered LA, Chan MTV, Han R, et al. Anaesthetic depth and delirium after major surgery: a randomised clinical trial. Br J Anaesth. 2021;127(5):704-712. doi:10.1016/j.bja.2021.07.021

4. Miller TE, Mythen M. Successful recovery after major surgery: moving beyond length of stay. Perioperative medicine. 2014 Jul 8;3(1):4.

5. Ljungqvist O, Scott M, Fearon KC. Enhanced recovery after surgery: a review. JAMA surgery. 2017 Mar 1;152(3):292-8.

6. Yap A, Lopez-Olivo MA, Dubowitz J, Hiller J, Riedel B. Anesthetic technique and cancer outcomes: a meta-analysis of total intravenous versus volatile anesthesia. Canadian Journal of Anesthesia/Journal canadien d'anesthésie. 2019 May 15;66(5):546-61.

7. Naguib M, Brull SJ, Kopman AF, et al. Consensus Statement on Perioperative Use of Neuromuscular Monitoring. Anesth Analg. 2018;127(1):71-80. doi:10.1213/ANE.0000000000002670 (Note: Key consensus guiding modern practice).

8. Beloeil H. Opioid-free anesthesia. Best Practice & Research Clinical Anaesthesiology. 2019 Sep 1;33(3):353-60.

9. Joosten A, Delaporte A, Mortier J, Ickx B, Van Obbergh L, Vincent JL, Cannesson M, Rinehart J, Van der Linden P. Long-term impact of crystalloid versus colloid solutions on renal function and disability-free survival after major abdominal surgery. Anesthesiology. 2019 Feb 1;130(2):227-36.

10. Frauenknecht J, Kirkham KR, Jacot-Guillarmod A, Albrecht E. Analgesic impact of intra-operative opioids vs. opioid-free anaesthesia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Anaesthesia. 2019;74(5):651-662. doi:10.1111/anae.14582

11. Xia SH, Zhou D, Ge F, Sun M, Chen X, Zhang H, Miao C. Influence of perioperative anesthesia on cancer recurrence: from basic science to clinical practice. Current oncology reports. 2023 Feb;25(2):63-81.

12. Pasin L, Nardelli P, Pintaudi M, et al. Closed-loop delivery systems versus manually controlled administration of total IV anesthesia: a meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. Anesth Analg. 2017;124(2):456-464. doi:10.1213/ANE.0000000000001394 (Note: A key meta-analysis on this technology; ongoing studies continue to evaluate its role).

13. McIsaac DI, MacDonald DB, Aucoin SD. Frailty for Perioperative Clinicians: A Narrative Review. Anesth Analg. 2020;130(6):1450-1460. doi:10.1213/ANE.0000000000004602

14. Kharasch ED, Clark JD, Adams JM. Opioids and Public Health: The Prescription Opioid Ecosystem and Need for Improved Management. Anesthesiology. 2022;136(1):10-30. doi:10.1097/ALN.0000000000004065

15. Wick EC, Grant MC, Wu CL. Postoperative Multimodal Analgesia Pain Management With Nonopioid Analgesics and Techniques: A Review. JAMA Surg. 2017;152(7):691-697. doi:10.1001/jamasurg.2017.0898

16. Licina A, Silvers A. Perioperative intravenous lidocaine infusion for postoperative analgesia in patients undergoing surgery of the spine: systematic review and meta-analysis. Pain medicine. 2022 Jan 1;23(1):45-56.

17. Hiller JG, Perry NJ, Poulogiannis G, Riedel B, Sloan EK. Perioperative events influence cancer recurrence risk after surgery. Nat Rev Clin Oncol. 2018;15(4):205-218. doi:10.1038/nrclinonc.2017.194

18. Schraag S, Pradelli L, Alsaleh AJ, Bellone M, Ghetti G, Chung TL, Westphal M, Rehberg S. Propofol vs. inhalational agents to maintain general anaesthesia in ambulatory and in-patient surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC anesthesiology. 2018 Nov 8;18(1):162.

19. McLean DJ, Diaz-Gil D, Farhan HN, Ladha KS, Kurth T, Eikermann M. Dose-dependent association between intermediate-acting neuromuscular-blocking agents and postoperative respiratory complications. Anesthesiology. 2015 Jun 1;122(6):1201-13.

20. Brueckmann B, Sasaki N, Grobara P, Li MK, Woo T, De Bie J, Maktabi M, Lee J, Kwo J, Pino R, Sabouri AS. Effects of sugammadex on incidence of postoperative residual neuromuscular blockade: a randomized, controlled study. BJA: British Journal of Anaesthesia. 2015 Nov 1;115(5):743-51.

21. Myles PS, Andrews S, Nicholson J, Lobo DN, Mythen M. Contemporary approaches to perioperative IV fluid therapy. World journal of surgery. 2017 Oct;41(10):2457-63.

22. Calvo-Vecino JM, Ripollés-Melchor J, Mythen MG, Casans-Francés R, Balik A, Artacho JP, Martínez-Hurtado E, Romero AS, Pérez CF, de Lis SA, Errazquin AT. Effect of goal-directed haemodynamic therapy on postoperative complications in low–moderate risk surgical patients: a multicentre randomised controlled trial (FEDORA trial). British journal of anaesthesia. 2018 Apr 1;120(4):734-44.

23. Chen Y, Gao Y. Comparison of balanced crystalloids versus normal saline in critically ill patients: a systematic review with meta-analysis and trial sequential analysis of randomized controlled trials. Therapeutics and Clinical Risk Management. 2023 Dec 31:783-99.

24. Wildes TS, Mickle AM, Ben Abdallah A, et al. Effect of Electroencephalography-Guided Anesthetic Administration on Postoperative Delirium Among Older Adults Undergoing Major Surgery: The ENGAGES Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA. 2019;321(5):473-483. doi:10.1001/jama.2018.22005

25. Park SK, Lim T, Cho H, Yoon HK, Lee HJ, Lee JH, Yoo S, Kim JT, Kim WH. Comparative effectiveness of pharmacological interventions to prevent postoperative delirium: a network meta-analysis. Scientific Reports. 2021 Jun 7;11(1):11922.

26. McIsaac DI, MacDonald DB, Aucoin SD. Frailty for Perioperative Clinicians: A Narrative Review. Anesth Analg. 2020;130(6):1450-1460. doi:10.1213/ANE.0000000000004602

27. Martin GS, Kaufman DA, Marik PE, Shapiro NI, Levett DZ, Whittle J, MacLeod DB, Chappell D, Lacey J, Woodcock T, Mitchell K. Perioperative Quality Initiative (POQI) consensus statement on fundamental concepts in perioperative fluid management: fluid responsiveness and venous capacitance. Perioperative Medicine. 2020 Apr 21;9(1):12.

28. Neuman MD, Feng R, Carson JL, et al. Spinal Anesthesia or General Anesthesia for Hip Surgery in Older Adults. N Engl J Med. 2021;385(22):2025-2035. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2113514

29. Story DA. Postoperative complications in elderly patients and their significance for long-term prognosis. Current Opinion in Anesthesiology. 2008 Jun 1;21(3):375-9.

DECLARATIONS

Ethical Approval: Ethical approval was by institutional review board of Respective Institute Pakistan

Informed Consent: Informed Consent was taken from participants.

Authors' Contributions:

Concept: AR; Design: MUZ, MU, MS; Drafting: SKA

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Data Availability: The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Acknowledgments: NA

Study Registration: Not applicable.