Artificial Intelligence: Transforming the Future of Robotic Surgery

Kella.Devika; E. Varshitha; Ch. Bhargavi; Dr. P. Bhanuji Rao

Publication Date: 2025/03/27

Abstract: Minimally Modern invasive medicine is developing remarkably; robotic surgery uses computer-operated robotic technology to increase accuracy, vision, and surgical efficiency. By enabling real-time analysis, decision-making, and automatic support throughout operations, artificial intelligence (AI) magnifies these benefits even more. Al-driven robotic systems are increasingly embraced offering improved patient outcomes including reduced recovery times, minimal complications, and enhanced precision in many different medical disciplines including neurosurgery, cardiothoracic, gynaecological, gastrointestinal, urological, orthopaedic, and oncology operations. Among artificial intelligence's contributions to robotic surgery are motion control, haptic feedback, and picture identification, thereby optimizing surgical precision and results. Still, problems including cybersecurity risks, integration challenges, and regulatory obstacles call for innovation and adaptation. Future advancements include increased robotic autonomy, customized surgical solutions, and AI-powered training simulations---which open the road for safer, more patient-specific surgical treatment-based on Emphasizing its potential to totally disrupt existing healthcare procedures, this paper explores the transforming impact of AI-enhanced robotic surgery, its clinical applications, advantages, challenges, and shifting scene of medical robotics.

***Keywords**: Artificial Intelligence, Surgical Procedures, Challenges, Future Prospects.*

How to Cite: Kella.Devika; E. Varshitha; Ch. Bhargavi; Dr. P. Bhanuji Rao (2025), Artificial Intelligence: Transforming the Future of Robotic Surgery. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 10(3), 1155-1161. https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25mar997

I. INTRODUCTION

Modern medicine has been revolutionized by minimally invasive robotic surgery, a technique employing computer-operated robotic arms. It reduces tremors, offers superior vision and higher precision than conventional laparoscopic surgery. Less blood loss, fewer incisions, faster recovery, and less patient suffering follow from this (1). Artificial intelligence (AI) is the state of technology whereby one may learn, reason, and make judgments without direct programming. AI is finding expanding use in sectors including medical imaging analysis and diagnosis in healthcare (2). Key areas where artificial intelligence is having a major influence are also drug discovery and development (3) and robot-assisted surgery (4). Robotic surgery combined with artificial intelligence presents enormous possibilities to raise accessibility, efficiency, and accuracy. The present development of robotic surgical systems driven by artificial intelligence is investigated in this work together with their advantages, difficulties, and future possibilities. Robotic surgery first emerged in the 1980s when the PUMA robot (5) was introduced. Originally mostly intended for remote operation, early robotic surgical devices let doctors carry out treatments from a distance. Advances over time produced increasingly sophisticated robotic arms with improved control and accuracy. One important turning point in the profession was the FDA's 2000 approval of the da Vinci Surgical System (6). Driven by advances in machine learning and the availability of vast medical datasets, artificial intelligence's application in healthcare has fast increased recently. At first, artificial intelligence applications concentrated on jobs including patient outcome prediction and cancer detection picture analysis (7, 8, 9). Early applications of artificial intelligence in robotic surgery concentrated on automating processes such tissue dissection and suturing. These tools were meant to improve consistency and light the surgeon's burden (4,10). Image identification and segmentation are among the modern artificial intelligence-driven robotic surgical systems' abilities. By real-time picture analysis of the surgery area, artificial intelligence systems assist doctors make better decisions by spotting tumors, blood arteries, and significant structures (11,12). AI helps design and maximize the movement of surgical tools by means of motion control and path planning, therefore producing more accurate and smooth operations (13). By use of the robotic system, haptic feedback allows artificial intelligence to enhance the surgeon's sense of touch by means of tissue texture and resistance (14,15).

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25mar997

II. ADVANCEMENTS IN ROBOTIC SURGERY: CLINICAL APPLICATIONS AND PATIENT OUTCOMES-

Robotic surgery improves patient outcomes throughout urology, cardiothoracic, gynecology, neurology, and orthopedics. It lowers complications, increases accuracy, shortens recovery times, and minimizes blood loss. For a prostatectomy, for instance, it offers greater control and lowers side effects including incontinence. In heart operations, it enables gentler, less intrusive treatments. Robotic surgery generally results in faster recovery, less discomfort, and shorter hospital stays, therefore enhancing results and patient satisfaction.

III. NEUROSURGERY

As the demand for minimally invasive brain and spine procedures grows, robotic surgery is increasingly used in neurosurgery. It helps with lesion localization, planning access to deeper brain areas, and maintaining the surgeon's hand stability. Intuitive haptic feedback enhances precision by enabling fine adjustments to the robotic arm with minimal effort. Currently, there are three types of robotic systems used in neurosurgery: tele surgical robots, surgeon-supervised robots, and handheld shared/control systems (16). Neuromate (the first FDA-approved robotic device), Pathfinder, NeuroArm, Spine Assist, and Renaissance are widely used robotic systems in neurosurgery (17). These robotic systems are highly effective for stereotactic procedures, such as inserting DBS electrodes, biopsying deep tumors, placing depth electrodes for stereo encephalography (SEEG), and positioning microcatheters for targeted chemotherapy in gliomas. When combined with neuroendoscopy, this technology helps navigate narrow access pathways with precision, without deviation (18).

➢ *Cardiothoracic Surgery*-

Especially with the DaVinci system, robotic surgery is extensively applied in cardiothoracic surgery. It lets surgeons execute coronary revascularization—that is, TECAB (Totally Endoscopic Coronary Artery Bypass)—where a robot harvests left internal thoracic artery (LITA) from a robot and grafted into the left anterior descending (LAD) artery, both on a beating and arrested heart (19). In mitral valve surgery, robotic surgical systems such as da Vinci and AESOP have been demonstrated to drastically minimize mortality and complications, lower the risk of atrial fibrillation and pleural effusion, and shorten the hospital stay (20, 21, 22, 23). Robotic surgery can also be used to correct atrial septal abnormalities, remove main cardiac malignancies, and help to precisely implant left ventricular leads (24,25,26).

➢ *Gynaecology*-

Offering superior vision, greater manipulation, simpler dissection, and faster recovery (27), the da Vinci surgical robotic system has been demonstrated to outperform conventional methods in difficult gynecological procedures including hysterectomy with bilateral salpingo-oophorectomy. Similar advantages come from robotic myomectomy, which increases hand precision and control during surgery. This allows surgeons to remove bigger or more myomas using minimally invasive approaches and produces more accurate operations. Robotic myomectomy thus becomes a better substitute for conventional techniques (28–30). Endometriosis has also been treated successfully using robotic surgery. It lets surgeons precisely remove endometrial tissue with least disturbance to neighboring organs by providing improved accuracy and control. Often difficult to access in conventional surgery, the robotic system offers greater vision of the pelvic area. This makes it a more sought-after approach for managing endometriosis since it produces faster recovery times for patients, less problems, and more efficient therapies (31). Particularly during the pre-sacral space dissection, mesh positioning, and intracorporeal suturing, robot-assisted laparoscopic Sacro colpopexy—used to treat post-hysterectomy vaginal vault prolapse in obese patients—offers improved vision and precision. Better pelvic support and postoperative sexual performance follow from it as well (32,33). Additional gynecological surgical uses of robotic technology include robot-assisted tubal re-anastomosis, cervical cerclage, vesicovaginal repair, recto-vaginopexy, and Burch colposuspension (34–40).

➢ *Gastrointestinal Surgery*-

For disorders involving the stomach, liver, gallbladder, pancreas, small intestine, adrenal glands, colon, and more, therapeutic robotic surgery is now being used in gastrointestinal (GI) surgery (41). Case reports show how gastrointestinal operations use da Vinci or ZEUS robotic equipment. For stomach cancer, for instance, a gastrectomy where D2 lymph node dissection's intricacy first prohibited the use of robotics. Robot-assisted silicone-gastric banding, applied as a treatment for obesity (42), is another robotic GI surgery. Furthermore showing better outcomes with no postoperative leaks or anastomotic failures is robot-assisted gastric bypass surgery (43). Though no notable therapeutic benefits were noted, nissen fundoplication has also been performed utilizing surgical robots. Nonetheless, it can be said that the sophisticated robotic methods now in use allow exact dissection in packed abdominal cavies with low blood loss, hence improving the general clinical results (44).

➢ *Urologic Surgery*-

The pelvis's depth and minute anatomical features make it difficult for the surgeon to access the target location (45). In operations including prostatectomies, nephrectomies, and adrenalectomies (46), robotic surgical systems find value. Furthermore, they allow minimally invasive treatments for utero-pelvic junction blockage (47). Reduced blood loss, shorter postoperative catheterization period, faster restoration of urine continence, faster mean return time of erection and lower risk of complications (48) have been shown by robotic radical cystoprostatectomy. Other surgeries performed with robotic help include sub-inguinal varicocele excision, spermatic cord innervation removal, and vasectomy reversals (49).

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25mar997

➢ *Orthopaedic Surgery-*

In orthopedic surgery, the application of robotics has evolved greatly throughout the years. Robotic total hip arthroplasty (THA) has shown to be rather successful in exactly reconstructing the hip joint, hence improving recovery results over conventional human techniques. Increased accuracy and precision provided by this technology let surgeons reach ideal results more consistently (50). Furthermore, robot-assisted total knee arthroplasty (TKA) helps to effectively preserve soft tissues and bone and to position implants more precisely. Better patient outcomes and faster recovery periods follow from this technology's minimization of tissue damage and enhancement of surgical accuracy (51). Spine surgery also uses robotic technology for exact pedicle screw placement in patients with low-grade spondylisthesis and spinal metastases. This lowers the general load of the operation and improves patient outcomes, therefore lowering the possibility of needing revision surgery (52,53). Although the use of robots in percutaneous fracture reduction and shoulder surgery is currently under experimental study, the first findings are positive. These technologies provide more accuracy and precision, therefore transforming these surgical operations; they also eventually help to improve patient outcomes by means of their greater capacity. Additionally used in several additional surgical settings are robots, including: Finding the best entrance place for intramedullary nails In cadaveric experiments, precisely arranging distal locking bolts is important. In situations of brachial plexus injuries (56–59), safely locating, dissecting, and healing damaged nerves surgical oncology: In cancer treatment, robotic surgery is a multifarious discipline with possible advantages and disadvantages. It poses difficulties even although it could have benefits in some situations, such better precision and faster recuperation times. In terms of short-term results and lowered conversion rates to open surgery, robotic surgery for rectal and esophageal cancer has showed promise, for example. Still, the long-term advantages vs conventional surgery are less evident. Conversely, robotic surgery for bladder and cervical cancer has been connected to worse long-term results. These results underline the need of cautious patient selection and a comprehensive knowledge of the possible hazards and advantages of robotic surgery in cancer treatment (60–63). Robotic surgery for cancer: a benefit for particular operations Robotic help has demonstrated great benefits for some cancer operations include removing part of the rectum (anterior resection) or lung (wedge resection or lobectomy), and removing metastases from the lung (metastasectomy). Robotic technology allows one to do these operations more precisely and with more ease (60–64). The Changing Territory of Robotic Surgery in Oncology. Although robotic surgery has shown potential in some cancer operations, the evidence-based benefits for many more surgical oncology treatments are yet unknown. More study is required to completely investigate the possible advantages and drawbacks of robotic surgery in this sector (65).

IV. ADVANTAGES OF AI INTEGRATION IN ROBOTIC SURGERIES-

➢ *Advantages-*

- Improved accuracy and precision: AI enables surgeons to execute delicate operations with more exactness, hence improving the surgical outcomes (66). AI helps surgeons stay less tired and more focused throughout critical stages of the operation by automating mundane tasks, hence reducing surgeon fatigue (67). • Enhanced safety: AI technologies help to prevent surgical errors by alerting real-time about problems including bleeding or instrument collisions (68,69).

➢ *Obstacles in Integrating AI into Robotic Surgeries-*

- Regulatory obstacles: Approval for robotic surgical systems driven by artificial intelligence is sometimes a slow and difficult procedure. Clear guidelines must be developed by authorities to evaluate the safety and efficiency of these systems and support invention (70). • Integration with current processes: It is challenging to include artificial intelligence robotic systems into present surgical operations. It calls for staff and surgeon more training as well as changes in workflow (71, 72). • Cybersecurity issues: depending too much on artificial intelligence in surgery raises the possibility of system faults or hackers, therefore endangering patients. Maintaining these systems' dependability and safety depends on robust security policies (73, 74).

➢ *Exploring Future Horizons for AI in Robotic Surgery-*

Rapid integration of artificial intelligence into robotic surgery presents great opportunity to transform surgical treatment. These seem to be some encouraging paths forward: Improved autonomy: As artificial intelligence develops, more autonomous robotic surgical systems could be created, therefore allowing surgeons to conduct difficult operations either remotely or with minimum help (75, 76). Still, careful thought of ethical consequences and guarantee of surgeon supervision are absolutely vital. Personalized surgery: By means of patient data analysis and customizing of surgical methods to fit individual demands, artificial intelligence can help to produce more individualized and successful therapies (77, 78). This can call for elements including genetic variances, medical history, and patient anatomy. Advanced surgical training: AI-powered simulations give surgeons realistic settings to perform complex operations and increase their knowledge, therefore strengthening their skills and maybe producing better surgical outcomes. Combining artificial intelligence with virtual reality (VR) might improve the training process even further (79, 80). Micro-robotics studies center on building portable capsule endoscopes for targeted medicine delivery, surgery, and diagnosis (80). These millimetre-sized microrobots can be directed by extracorporeal magnets to carry out specified tasks, such inserting a nitinol clip to control persistent bleeding during a biopsy in porcine animals (81). Four main areas define micro-robotics research: accurate remote control (82), effective propulsion, sharp visualization, and small functionality. In robotic-

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25mar997

assisted technologies, artificial intelligence is improving accuracy, efficiency, and usability of systems. More study is required, though, to demonstrate how effectively artificial intelligence performs on its own for significant surgical operations. Surgeries could have more consistent outcomes as robotic systems grow more autonomous; new fields like micro robots and remote operations indicate huge future possibilities.

V. DISCUSSION

Artificial intelligence (AI) incorporation in robotic surgery has changed the medical scene. Better patient outcomes result from AI-powered robotic surgical systems' increased accuracy, safety, and precision. These devices cut surgeon tiredness, automate repetitive chores, and offer real-time alarms to prevent surgical errors. Across several medical fields, including urology, cardiothoracic surgery, gynaecology, neurology, orthopaedics, and surgical oncology, robotic surgery has been effectively used. Robotic devices driven by artificial intelligence have showed potential in difficult surgeries including coronary revascularization, hysterectomies, and prostatectomy. Notwithstanding the advantages, cybersecurity issues must be addressed, integration problems with current systems must be resolved, and laws exist that create obstacles. Enhanced autonomy, individualized surgery, advanced surgical training, and micro-robotics research are future possibilities for artificial intelligence in robotic surgery. As robotic systems grow more autonomous, surgical outcomes could be more consistent. AI-powered robotic surgical systems are poised to transform surgical treatment with continuous research and development by providing better accuracy, efficiency, and accessibility.

VI. CONCLUSION

With unmatched accuracy, efficiency, and patient outcomes across many surgical disciplines, the combination of robotic surgery and artificial intelligence has fundamentally changed contemporary medicine. From gynecology to neurosurgery, cardiothoracic, gastrointestinal, orthopedic, and cancer applications, robotic systems improve surgical capacity while lowering invasiveness. By allowing real-time decision-making, customized therapy, and enhanced safety—all of which AI helps—these advantages are even more pronounced. Notwithstanding obstacles including cybersecurity concerns, integration complexity, and legal restrictions, artificial intelligence-driven robotic surgery has great future possibilities. Safer, more effective, and customized medical interventions willbe made possible by ongoing revolutionizing of surgical treatment by advancements in autonomous systems, individualized techniques, and micro-robotics. The continuous research and development in this area highlight its ability to redefine surgical accuracy and patient care standards worldwide.

REFERENCES

[1]. Mehta A, Cheng Ng J, Andrew Awuah W, Huang H, Kalmanovich J, Agrawal A, Abdul-Rahman T, Hasan MM, Sikora V, Isik A (2022) Embracing robotic surgery in low- and middle-income countries: potential benefits, challenges, and scope in the future. Ann Med Surg (Lond) 84:104803. https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.amsu.2022.104803

[2]. George EI, Brand TC, LaPorta A, Marceaux J, Satava RM (2018) Origins of Robotic Surgery: From Skepticism to Standard of Care. JSLS 22(4): e2018.00039. https:// Doi. org/ 10. 4293/ JSLS. 2018.00039

[3]. Davies B (2000) A review of robotics in surgery. Proc Inst Mech Eng H 214(1):129–140. https:// Doi. org/ 10. 1243/ 09544 11001 535309

[4]. Paul HA, Bargar WL, Mittlestadt B, Musits B, Taylor RH, Kazanzides P, Zuhars J, Williamson B, Hanson W (1992) Development of a surgical robot for cementless total hip arthroplasty. Clin Orthop Relat Res 285:57–66

[5]. Harris S, Arambula-Cosio F, Mei Q et al (1997) The Robot—an active robot for prostate resection. Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part H. N Engl J Med 211:317–325. https://doi.org/10.1243/0954411971534449

[6]. Satava RM (2002) Surgical robotics: the early chronicles: a personal historical perspective. Surg Laparosc Endosc Percu tan Tech 12(1):6–16. https:// Doi. org/ 10. 1097/ 00129 689- 20020 2000-00002

[7]. Lanfranco AR, Castellanos AE, Desai JP, Meyers WC (2004) Robotic surgery: a current perspective. Ann Surg 239(1):14–21. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.sla.0000103020.19595.7d

[8]. Ryan Yimeng L, Alyssa Imperatore Z, Lauryn U, et al. Artificial Intelligence in Surgery, Surgical Subspecialties, and Related Disciplines In: Stanislaw PS, editor. Artificial Intelligence in Medicine and Surgery. Rijeka: IntechOpen; 2023.

[9]. Pierson HA. Deep Learning in Robotics: A Review of Recent Research [Internet]. [Available from: https://arxiv.org/pdf/1707.07217

[10]. Liu J, Dong X, Yang Y, et al. Trajectory tracking control for uncertain robot manipulators with repetitive motions in task space. Math Problems Eng 2021; 2021:8838927.

[11]. Mehta A, Cheng Ng J, Andrew Awuah W, Huang H, Kalmanovich J, Agrawal A, Abdul-Rahman T, Hasan MM, Sikora V, Isik A (2022) Embracing robotic surgery in low- and middle-income countries: potential benefits, challenges, and scope in the future. Ann Me Surg (Lond) 84:104803. https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.amsu.2022.104803

[12]. George EI, Brand TC, LaPorta A, Marceaux J, Satava RM (2018) Origins of Robotic Surgery: From Skepticism to Standard of Care. JSLS 22(4): e2018.00039. https:// Doi. org/ 10. 4293/ JSLS. 2018.00039

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25mar997

[13]. Davies B (2000) A review of robotics in surgery. Proc Inst Mech Eng H 214(1):129–140. https:// Doi. org/ 10. 1243/ 09544 11001 535309

[14]. Paul HA, Bargar WL, Mittlestadt B, Musits B, Taylor RH, Kazanzides P, Zuhars J, Williamson B, Hanson W (1992) Development of a surgical robot for cementless total hip arthroplasty. Clin Orthop Relat Res 285:57–66

[15]. Harris S, Arambula-Cosio F, Mei Q et al (1997) The Robot—an active robot for prostate resection. Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part H. N Engl J Med 211:317–325. https://doi.org/10.1243/0954411971534449

[16]. Satava RM (2002) Surgical robotics: the early chronicles: a personal historical perspective. Surg Laparosc Endosc Percu tan Tech 12(1):6–16. https:// Doi. org/ 10. 1097/ 00129 689- 20020 2000-00002

[17]. Lanfranco AR, Castellanos AE, Desai JP, Meyers WC (2004) Robotic surgery: a current perspective. Ann Surg 239(1):14–21. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.sla.0000103020.19595.7d

[18]. Ryan Yimeng L, Alyssa Imperatore Z, Lauryn U, et al. Artificial Intelligence in Surgery, Surgical Subspecialties, and Related Disciplines In: Stanislaw PS, editor. Artificial Intelligence in Medicine and Surgery. Rijeka: IntechOpen; 2023.

[19]. Pierson HA. Deep Learning in Robotics: A Review of Recent Research [Internet]. [Available from: https://arxiv.org/pdf/1707.07217

[20]. Liu J, Dong X, Yang Y, et al. Trajectory tracking control for uncertain robot manipulators with repetitive motions in task space. Math Problems Eng 2021; 2021:8838927.

[21]. Okamura AM. Haptic feedback in robot-assisted minimally invasive surgery. Curr Opin Urol 2009; 19:102–7.

[22]. Bergholz M, Ferle M, Weber BM. The benefits of haptic feedback in robot assisted surgery and their moderators: a meta-analysis. Sci Rep 2023; 13:19215.

[23]. Shademan A, Decker RS, Opfermann JD, et al. Supervised autonomous robotic soft tissue surgery. Sci Transl Med 2016; 8:337ra64.

[24]. Rivero-Moreno Y, Rodriguez M, Losada-Muñoz P, et al. Autonomous robotic surgery: has the future arrived? Cureus 2024;16: e52243.

[25]. GumbsAA, Frigerio I, Spolverato G, etal. Artificial intelligence surgery: how do we get to autonomous actions in surgery? Sensors 2021;21: 5526.

[26]. Qureshi YA, Mohammadi B (2018) Robotic esophago-gastric cancer surgery. Ann R Coll Surg Engl 100(6_sup):23–30. https:// doi.org/10.1308/rcsann.supp1.23

[27]. Singh R, Wang K, Qureshi MB, Rangel IC, Brown NJ, Shah Restani S et al (2022) Robotics in neurosurgery: Current prevalence and future directions. Surg Neurol Int 13:373. https://doi. org/10.25259/SNI_522_2022

[28]. . Harky A, Hussain SMA (2019) Robotic cardiac surgery: the future gold standard or an unnecessary extravagance? Braz J Cardiovasc Surg 34(4): XII–XIII. https:// Doi. org/ 10. 21470/ 1678-9741-2019-0194.

[29]. Onnasch JF, Schneider F, Falk V, Mierzwa M, Bucerias J, Mohr FW (2002) Five years of less invasive mitral valve surgery : from experimental to routine approach. Heart Surg Forum 5(2):132–135

[30]. Cosgrove DM 3rd, Sabik JF, Navia JL (1998) Minimally invasive valve operations. AnnThorac Surg 65(6):1535–1539. https:// Doi. org/10.1016/s0003-4975(98)00300-2

[31]. Navia JL, Cosgrove DM 3rd (1996) Minimally invasive mitral valve operations. Ann Thorac Surg 62(5):1542–1544. https:// Doi. org/10.1016/0003-4975(96)00779-5

[32]. Mihaljevic T, Jarrett CM, Gillinov AM, Williams SJ, DeVilliers PA, Stewart WJ et al (2011) Robotic repair of posterior mitral valve prolapse versus conventional approaches: potential realized. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg 141(1):72–80. https:// Doi. org/ 10.1016/j.jtcvs.2010.09.008

[33]. Xiao C, Gao C, Yang M, Wang G, Wu Y, Wang J et al (2014) Totally robotic atrial septal defect closure: 7-year single institution experience and follow-up. Interact Cardiovasc Thorac Surg 19(6):933–937. https://doi.org/10.1093/icvts/ivu263

[34]. Li S, Gao Ch (2017) Surgical Experience of Primary Cardiac Tumour: Single-Institution 23-Year Report. Med Sci Monit 23:2111–2117. https://doi.org/10.12659/MSM.903324

[35]. Amraoui S, Labrousse L, Sohal M, Jansens JL, Berte B, Derval N et al (2017) Alternative to left ventricular lead implantation through the coronary sinus: 1-year experience with a minimally invasive and robotically guided approach. Europace 19(1):88 95. https://doi.org/10.1093/europace/euv430

[36]. Digioia AM (2002) Comparison of a mechanical acetabular alignment guide with computer placement of the socket. J Arthroplasty 17(3):359–364. https:// Doi. org/ 10. 1054/ Arth. 2002.30411

[37]. Diaz-Arrastia C, Jurnalov C, Gomez G, Townsend C (2002) Laparoscopic hysterectomy using a computer-enhanced surgical robot. Surg Endosc Other Interv Tech 16(9):1271–1273. https:// doi.org/10.1007/s00464-002-8523-5

[38]. Advincula AP, Song A, Burke W, Reynolds RK (2004) Preliminary experience with robot-assisted laparoscopic myomectomy. J Am Assoc Gynecol Laparosc 11(4):511–518. https:// Doi. org/ 10.1016/s1074-3804(05)60085-0

[39]. Barakat EE, Bedaiwy MA, Zimberg S, Nutter B, Nosseir M, Falcone T (2011) Robotic-assisted, laparoscopic, and abdominal myomectomy: a comparison of surgical outcomes. Obstet Gynecol 117:256–265. https:// Doi. org/ 10. 1097/ AOG. 0b013 e318207854f

[40]. Lonnerfors C, Persson J (2009) Robot-assisted laparoscopic myomectomy; a feasible technique for removal of unfavourably localized myomas. Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand 88:994–999. https://doi.org/10.1080/00016340903118026

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25mar997

[41]. Shah J, Vyas A, Vyas D (2014) The history of robotics in surgical specialties. Am J Robot Surg 1(1):12–20. https:// Doi. org/ 10. 1166/ ajrs.2014.1006
[42]. Visco AG, Advincula AP (2008) Robotic gynaecologic surgery. Obstet Gynecol 112:1369–1384. https:// Doi. org/ 10. 1097/ AOG. 0b013e31818f3c17
[43]. Ramavath KK, Murthy PS (2011) Robotic Sacro colpopexy: An observational experience at Mayo clinic, USA. J Gynecol Endosc Surg 2:53–57. https://doi.org/10.4103/0974-1216.85285
[44]. Akl MN, Long JB, Giles DL, Cornella JL, Pettit PD, Chen AH et al (2009) Robotic-assisted sacrocolpopexy: Technique and learning curve. Surg Endosc 23:2390–2394. https:// Doi. org/ 10. 1007/s00464-008-0311-4
[45]. Rodgers AK, Goldberg JM, Hammel JP, Falcone T (2007) Tubal anastomosis by robotic compared with outpatient Mini laparotomy. Obstet Gynecol 109:1375–1380. https:// Doi. org/ 10. 1097/ 01.AOG.0000264591.43544.0f
[46]. Göçmen A, Sanlýkan F (2013) Two live births following robotic assisted abdominal cerclage in nonpregnant women. Case Rep Obstet Gynecol 2013:256972. https:// Doi. org/ 10. 1155/ 2013/ 256972
[47]. Schimpf MO, Morgenstern JH, Tulikangas PK, Wagner JR (2007) Vesicovaginal fistula repair without intentional cystostomy using the laparoscopic robotic approach: a case report. JSLS 11:378–380
[48]. Pietersma CS, Schreuder HW, Kooistra A, Koops SE (2014) Robotic-assisted laparoscopic repair of a vesicovaginal fistula: A time-consuming novelty or an effective tool? BMJ Case Rep. https://doi.org/10.1136/bcr-2014-204119
[49]. Draaisma WA, Nieuwenhuis DH, Janssen LW, Broeders IA (2008) Robot-assisted laparoscopic rectovaginopexy for rectal prolapse: A prospective cohort study on feasibility and safety. J Robotic Surg 1:273–277. https:// Doi. org/ 10. 1007/ s11701-007-0053-7
[50]. Francis SL, Agrawal A, Azadi A, Ostergard DR, Deveneau NE (2015) Robotic Burch colposuspension: a surgical case and instructional video. Int Urogynaecology J 26(1):147–148. https:// Doi. org/10.1007/s00192-014-2471-1
[51]. . Shah J, Vyas A, Vyas D (2014) The history of robotics in surgical specialties. Am J Robot Surg 1(1):12–20. https:// Doi. org/ 10. 1166/ ajrs.2014.1006
[52]. Cadiere GB, Himpens J, Vertruyen M, Favretti F (1999) The world's first obesity surgery performed by a surgeon at a distance. Obes Surg 9(2):206–209. https:// Doi. org/ 10. 1381/ 09608 9299765553539
[53]. Hanly EJ, Talamini MA (2004) Robotic abdominal surgery. Am J Surg 188(4A Suppl):19–26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjsurg. 2004.08.020
[54]. Coratti A, Annecchiarico M, Di Marino M, Gentile E, Coratti F, Giulianotti PC (2013) Robot-assisted gastrectomy for gastric cancer: current status and technical considerations. World J Surg 37(12):2771–2781. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00268-013-2100-z
[55]. . Yu HY, Hevelone ND, Lipsitz SR, Kowalczyk KJ, Hu JC (2012) Use, costs and comparative effectiveness of robotic assisted, lap acroscopic and open urological surgery. J Urol 187(4):1392–1398. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.juro.2011.11.089
[56]. Rassweiler J, Rassweiler MC, Kenngott H, Frede T, Michel MS, Alken P et al (2013) The past, present and future of minimally invasive therapy in urology: a review and speculative outlook. Minim Invasive Ther Allied Technol 22(4):200–209. https:// Doi. org/10.3109/13645706.2013.816323
[57]. Uberoi J, Disick GI, Munver R (2009) Minimally invasive surgical management of pelvic-ureteric junction obstruction: update on the current status of robotic-assisted pyeloplasty. BJU Int 104(11):1722–1729. https:// Doi. org/ 10. 1111/j. 1464- 410X. 2009. 08682.x
[58]. Menon M, Hemal AK, Tewari A, Shrivastava A, Shoma AM, El Tabey NA et al (2003) Nerve-sparing robot-assisted radical cyst prostatectomy and urinary diversion. BJU Int 92(3):232–236. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1464-410x.2003.04329.x
[59]. Parekattil SK, Moran ME (2010) Robotic instrumentation: Evolution and microsurgical applications. Indian Journal of Urology 26(3):395–403. https://doi.org/10.4103/0970-1591.70580
[60]. Digioia AM (2002) Comparison of a mechanical acetabular alignment guide with computer placement of the socket. J Arthroplasty 17(3):359–364. https:// Doi. org/ 10. 1054/ Arth. 2002.30411.
[61]. Khlopas A, Chughtai M, Hampp EL, Scholl LY, Prieto M, Chang TC et al (2017) Robotic-arm assisted total knee arthro plasty demonstrated soft tissue protection. Surg Technol Int 30:441–446.
[62]. Solomiichuk V, Fleisch hammer J, Molliqaj G, Warda J, Alaid A, von Eckard stein K et al (2017) Robotic vs fluoroscopy-guided pedicle screw insertion for metastatic spinal disease: a matched cohort comparison. Neurosurg Focus 42(5): E13. https:// Doi. org/ 10.3171/2017.3. FOCUS1710
[63]. Schröder ML, Staartjes VE (2017) Revisions for screw malposition and clinical outcomes after robot-guided lumbar fusion for spondylolisthesis. Neurosurg Focus 42(5): E12. https:// Doi. org/ 10.3171/2017.3. FOCUS16534
[64]. Bozkurt M, Apaydin N, Işik C, Bilgetekin YG, Acar HI, Elhan A (2011) Robotic arthroscopic surgery: a new challenge in arthro scopic surgery Part-I: robotic shoulder arthroscopy; a cadaveric feasibility study. Int J Med Robot 7(4):496–500. https://doi.org/ 10.1002/rcs.436
[65]. Dagnino G, Georgilas I, Kohler P, Morad S, Atkins R, Dograma dzi S (2016) Navigation system for robot-assisted intraarticular lower-limb fracture surgery. Int J CARS 11:1831–1843. https:// doi.org/10.1007/s11548-016-1418-z

[66]. Oszwald M, Westphal R, Klepzig D, Khalafi A, Gaulke R, Müller CW et al (2010) Robotized access to the medullary cavity for intramedullary nailing of the femur. Technol Health Care 18(3):173–180. https://doi.org/10.3233/THC-2010-0580
[67]. Lei H, Sheng L, Manyi W, Junqiang W, Wenyong L (2010) A biplanar robot navigation system for the distal locking of intramedullary nails. Int J Med Robot 6(1):61–65. https:// Doi. org/10.1002/rcs. 289
[68]. Mantovani G, Liverneaux P, Garcia JC Jr, Berner SH, Bednar MS, Mohr CJ (2011) Endoscopic exploration and repair of brachial plexus with telerobotic manipulation: a cadaver trial. J Neurosurg 115(3):659–664. https:// Doi. org/ 10. 3171/ 2011.3. JNS10931
[69]. Garcia JC Jr, Lebailly F, Mantovani G, Mendonca LA, Garcia J, Liverneaux P (2012) Telerobotic manipulation of the brachial plexus. J Reconstr Microsurg 28(7):491–494. https:// Doi. org/ 10. 1055/s-0032-1313761
[70]. Kowalewski KF, Seifert L, Ali S, Schmidt MW, Seide S, Haney C et al (2021) Functional outcomes after laparoscopic versus robotic-assisted rectal resection: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Surg Endosc 35(1):81–95. https:// Doi. org/ 10. 1007/ s00464-019-07361-1
[71]. Bongiolatti S, Farronato A, Di Marino M, Annecchiarico M, Coratti F, Cianchi F et al (2020) Robot-assisted minimally invasive esophagectomy: systematic review on surgical and oncological outcomes. Mini-invasive Surg 4:41. https:// Doi. org/10.20517/2574-1225.2020.28
[72]. Ramirez PT, Frumovitz M, Pareja R, Lopez A, Vieira M, Ribeiro R et al (2018) Minimally invasive versus abdominal radical hysterectomy for cervical cancer. N Engl J Med 379(20):1895–1904. https:// Doi. org/ 10. 1056/ NEJMo a1806 395
[73]. Audenet F, Sfakianos JP (2017) Evidence of atypical recurrences after robot-assisted radical cystectomy: a comprehensive review of the literature. Bladder Cancer 3(4):231–236. https://doi.org/10.3233/BLC-170127
[74]. O'Sullivan KE, Kreaden US, Hebert AE, Eaton D, Red Mond KC (2019) A systematic review and meta-analysis of robotic versus open and video-assisted thoracoscopic surgery approaches for lobectomy. Interact Cardiovasc Thorac Surg 28(4):526–534. https://doi.org/10.21037/acs.2019.02.04
[75]. Vijayakumar M, Shetty R (2020) Robotic surgery in oncology. Indian J Surg Oncol 11(4):549–551. https:// Doi. org/ 10. 1007/ s13193-020-01251-y
[76].] Takeuchi M, Kitagawa Y. Artificial intelligence and surgery. Ann Gastroenterol Surg 2024; 8:45.
[77]. Rasouli JJ, Shao J, Neifert S, et al. Artificial intelligence and robotics in spine surgery. Glob Spine J 2021; 11:556–64.
[78]. Choudhury A, Asan O. Role of artificial intelligence in patient safety outcomes: systematic literature review. JMIR Med Inform 2020;8: e18599.
[79]. Rus G, Andras I, Vaida C, et al. Artificial intelligence-based hazard detection in robotic-assisted single-incision oncologic surgery. Cancers 2023; 15:3387.
[80]. Takeuchi M, Kitagawa Y. Artificial intelligence and surgery. Ann Gastroenterol Surg 2024; 8:45.
[81]. Rasouli JJ, Shao J, Neifert S, et al. Artificial intelligence and robotics in spine surgery. Glob Spine J 2021; 11:556–64.
[82]. Choudhury A, Asan O. Role of artificial intelligence in patient safety outcomes: systematic literature review. JMIR Med Inform 2020