ANESTHESIOLOGY

Openventio PUBLISHERS

Review Article

Next-Generation Monitoring Systems for Personalized Perioperative Care

Marek Antoniou[1*], Diego Marques[2] and Henrik Solberg[3]

[1]*Department of Surgical Sciences, Aegean Institute of Biomedical Research, Greece*
[2]*Department of Critical Care Medicine, Aegean Institute of Biomedical Research, Greece*
[3]*Department of Perioperative Medicine, Nordic Institute of Anesthesiology and Critical Care, Finland*

ABSTRACT

Perioperative monitoring is shifting from intermittent, population-thresholded measurements toward continuous, patient-specific signals that machine-learning models increasingly try to forecast rather than merely display.

This review examines four converging strands of that shift: closed-loop anesthesia delivery built on refined depth-of-anesthesia measurement, continuous noninvasive hemodynamic monitoring and the predictive hypotension algorithms trained on its waveforms, wearable and wireless sensors extending vigilance onto the surgical ward, and the multimodal data-fusion efforts attempting to unify these separate streams into a single patient model.

Closed-loop hypnotic titration achieves tighter control of anesthetic depth than manual dosing in several trials, continuous noninvasive pressure monitoring now performs acceptably against invasive references in stable patients, and wearable ward sensors are feasible and well tolerated, but hypotension-prediction algorithms have drawn methodological scrutiny over feature entanglement, and outcome-level evidence across all four domains remains comparatively immature.

Persistent barriers are as much organizational as technical: alarm fatigue, uneven workflow integration, vendor interoperability, and unequal access to the informatics infrastructure that multimodal integration requires.

We conclude that realizing genuinely personalized perioperative monitoring will depend on prospective outcome trials and organizational readiness at least as much as on further algorithmic refinement.

Keywords: *perioperative monitoring; closed-loop anesthesia; hypotension prediction; wearable sensors; hemodynamic monitoring*

Citation: Antoniou M, Marques D and Solberg H (2025) Next-Generation Monitoring Systems for Personalized Perioperative Care. Anesthesiology. 5(1):01-05.

DOI: 10.17140/2025.vol5.i01.pp01-05

Corresponding Author: *Marek Antoniou*

E-mail Address: *m.antoniou@aibr.gr*

Article History: *Received 11 August 2025 | Accepted 07 September 2025 | Published 30 September 2025*

Copyright: *© 2025 Marek Antoniou, et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited (**https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/**).*

INTRODUCTION

Anesthesiologists have long worked with a monitoring

toolkit built around discrete, intermittent, and population-derived thresholds: a pulse oximeter reading, a non-invasive blood pressure cuff cycling every three to five minutes, a processed-EEG number meant to stand in for hypnotic depth across every patient in the operating room. That toolkit kept patients safe for decades, but it was never designed to answer the question clinicians actually care about at the bedside — is this particular patient, with this particular physiology, drifting toward harm right now. Over the past several years the field has begun to close that gap. Continuous noninvasive hemodynamic devices, wearable sensors that follow the patient out of the operating room and onto the ward, and machine-learning algorithms trained to forecast hypotension or arousal before either becomes clinically obvious have moved from proof-of-concept papers into commercial products and, in some centers, routine practice [1]. The throughline connecting these disparate technologies is personalization: rather than reacting to a single abnormal number against a fixed cutoff, next-generation systems attempt to model an individual trajectory and intervene, or prompt intervention, before a threshold is even crossed.

This review surveys where that shift stands today. We look first at depth-of-anesthesia monitoring and the closed-loop systems built on top of it, then at the noninvasive hemodynamic devices that have made beat-to-beat pressure and flow measurement possible without an arterial line, then at wearable and wireless sensor platforms extending vigilance into the postoperative ward, and finally at the predictive analytics — most prominently hypotension-prediction algorithms — that are reframing monitoring from a descriptive exercise into a forecasting one. We close by considering what is still missing before these tools can be called mature standards of care rather than promising adjuncts.

DEPTH OF ANESTHESIA MONITORING AND CLOSED-LOOP SYSTEMS

Processed-EEG indices such as the bispectral index were introduced to reduce the risk of intraoperative awareness and to titrate hypnotic dosing more precisely than end-tidal agent concentration alone allows, but their single-number output has always represented a compromise: a composite score derived from population averages applied to a frontal montage that says relatively little about an individual patient's baseline cortical activity, age-related EEG changes, or comorbid neurological status. Newer approaches, reviewed extensively in recent literature, push toward richer signal processing — raw EEG waveform display alongside the index, spectral edge frequency, and burst-suppression ratio — that let clinicians see the underlying electrophysiology rather than trust a black-box number, and toward age-adjusted or patient-specific calibration that acknowledges an 80-year-old's EEG bears little resemblance to a 30-year-old's under the same anesthetic depth [1].

The logical extension of better depth measurement is closed-loop delivery: systems that titrate propofol, remifentanil, or volatile agent infusion automatically based on a continuously updated processed-EEG target, rather than leaving titration entirely to intermittent clinician judgment. Closed-loop anesthesia delivery systems have demonstrated, across a growing body of trials, tighter control of hypnotic depth (more time within a target BIS or similar-index band) and, in several series, reduced total drug consumption compared with manual titration [2,3]. The appeal is not that the algorithm replaces the anesthesiologist's judgment but that it removes the lag inherent in human reaction time and attention-sharing across a busy case — a controller sampling the index every few seconds can respond to drift long before a clinician checking the monitor every few minutes would notice. Comprehensive reviews of automated anesthesia delivery describe systems that already incorporate multiple simultaneous inputs — hypnotic depth, analgesic nociception indices, and neuromuscular blockade — into a single control architecture, effectively multiplexing what used to be three separately managed drug infusions into one integrated feedback loop [4].

What closed-loop systems have not yet solved is context-sensitivity beyond the EEG signal itself. A controller titrating to a BIS target during a period of surgical stimulation transiently absent — during positioning, for instance, or a pause in the operative field — may under- or overshoot if it cannot distinguish a genuinely lighter plane of anesthesia from an artifact of reduced nociceptive input. Integrating nociception monitoring alongside hypnotic-depth monitoring, an approach increasingly described in the multimodal literature, is one way investigators are trying to give these controllers the situational awareness a human anesthesiologist takes for granted [5].

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND PREDICTIVE HEMODYNAMIC ANALYTICS

Perhaps the most consequential shift in perioperative monitoring has been the move from measuring blood pressure to predicting it. Intraoperative hypotension, even at moderate severity and brief duration, has been associated in large retrospective cohorts with acute kidney injury, myocardial injury, and stroke, which has made its prevention — rather than merely its treatment once detected — a priority for the field. Machine-learning-derived hypotension prediction algorithms, trained on high-fidelity arterial waveform features, are designed to flag an impending hypotensive episode several minutes before mean arterial pressure actually crosses a threshold, giving the clinician a window to intervene with fluid, vasopressor, or a change in anesthetic depth before the event occurs rather than after [6].

The evidence for these algorithms is genuinely mixed, and the recent systematic reviews and meta-analyses are notably more circumspect than the initial single-center validation studies. Pooled analyses report sensitivity and specificity that vary considerably across derivation and validation cohorts, and several authors have raised concerns about the internal architecture of proprietary indices — specifically, that some of the input features used to "predict" hypotension are mathematically or physiologically entangled with the pressure being predicted, which can inflate apparent predictive performance in ways that do not necessarily translate into improved patient outcomes [7,6]. That tension — a device that reliably fires an alarm ahead of an event that its own inputs partly define — is not disqualifying, but it does mean that adoption should rest on outcome trials (does using the algorithm reduce hypotension burden and, further downstream, organ injury) rather than on discrimination statistics alone. Emerging work in specific high-risk populations, including major spine surgery, illustrates both the promise and the current limits: predictive hemodynamic tools appear to reduce time spent below individualized pressure targets in some series, but the literature is still young enough that recommendations remain provisional [8].

A related and less contested advance has been the maturation of continuous noninvasive arterial pressure devices, which use volume-clamp photoplethysmography or arterial tonometry to reconstruct a beat-to-beat pressure waveform without an indwelling catheter. These devices have converged toward acceptable agreement with invasive measurement in hemodynamically stable patients, sufficient that continuous noninvasive monitoring is now a reasonable alternative to intermittent cuff measurement for many intermediate-risk cases in which an arterial line would previously have been placed largely for monitoring convenience rather than a clear hemodynamic indication [9,10]. Their value is not confined to detecting hypotension after it happens — the continuous waveform is itself the substrate the predictive algorithms described above are trained on, so better noninvasive waveform fidelity and better predictive analytics are, in practice, developing together rather than as separate technologies [11]. Clinical adoption has nonetheless been uneven, and several groups examining the question directly have concluded that the decision to route a given case toward continuous noninvasive monitoring rather than intermittent cuff measurement still depends heavily on institutional protocol and case-specific risk assessment rather than a settled universal indication [12,13].

WEARABLE AND WIRELESS SENSORS BEYOND THE OPERATING ROOM

Vigilance has traditionally ended at the recovery room door. Once a patient is transferred to a general surgical ward, monitoring reverts to intermittent nursing observations — vital signs checked every four to eight hours unless a track-and-trigger score prompts more frequent review — a pattern of surveillance increasingly recognized as inadequate for detecting the gradual physiological deterioration that precedes many postoperative complications. Failure-to-rescue, the inability to prevent death after a complication rather than the incidence of the complication itself, is disproportionately a problem of delayed recognition, and delayed recognition on the ward is substantially a monitoring-frequency problem.

Wireless, adhesive-patch or wrist-worn sensors that continuously track heart rate, respiratory rate, and in some cases oxygen saturation have been developed specifically to close this gap, and the evidence base has grown quickly enough to support several scoping reviews. A scoping review of wearable devices for monitoring recovery after abdominal surgery found substantial heterogeneity in device type and outcome reporting but consistent feasibility — patients tolerated the devices well and continuous data streams could be captured on general wards without dedicated monitoring infrastructure [14]. A before-after study of wireless continuous vital sign monitoring in abdominal surgical patients reported earlier detection of clinical deterioration and, in some analyses, reduced escalation to intensive care compared with standard intermittent observation, though before-after designs of this kind remain vulnerable to secular trends and cannot fully isolate the device's own contribution from concurrent changes in ward practice [15]. A broader narrative review of continuous ward monitoring after surgery reaches a similarly qualified conclusion: the physiological rationale and feasibility data are strong, but the outcome evidence — particularly for hard endpoints like mortality and unplanned ICU admission — is still accumulating and comes disproportionately from single-center or non-randomized designs [16].

Two adoption barriers recur across this literature and deserve emphasis because they are organizational rather than technological. The first is alarm fatigue: continuous monitoring generates orders of magnitude more data points than intermittent spot-checks, and unless the alarm thresholds and escalation pathways are tuned to the ward context, nursing staff either become desensitized to frequent low-value alerts or are overwhelmed by the volume of notifications, defeating the purpose of earlier detection. The second is workflow integration — a survey of over a thousand anesthesiologists in Western Europe and the United States found broad enthusiasm for wireless postoperative surveillance in principle but persistent skepticism about whether current devices integrate cleanly enough with existing electronic health records and nursing workflows to be adopted at scale without added burden on already-stretched ward staff [17]. A separate survey of hospitalized patients wearing consumer-grade fitness trackers postoperatively found patients themselves generally receptive to continuous

monitoring, suggesting the barrier is less patient acceptance than institutional readiness [18]. Reviews focused specifically on integrating wearables into formal early-warning-score systems echo the same conclusion: the sensors exist and function adequately, but the clinical and organizational scaffolding to act reliably on their output — validated escalation algorithms, staffing to respond to alerts, and interoperability with hospital information systems — still lags the hardware [19,20].

MULTIMODAL INTEGRATION AND THE PATH TOWARD TRUE PERSONALIZATION

None of the technologies above delivers personalized care in isolation; each addresses one physiological domain — hypnotic depth, hemodynamics, or ward-level vital signs — and treats the others as background. The direction the field is now moving is toward multimodal data fusion, in which depth-of-anesthesia, hemodynamic, respiratory, and even laboratory or genomic data feed a single patient model that updates continuously across the perioperative episode rather than being managed as separate monitoring streams read by separate clinicians at separate times [5]. Framed this way, "personalized" monitoring means something more specific than "individual patient data displayed on individual screens": it means a model that has learned what this patient's stable trajectory looks like and can flag deviation from that trajectory rather than deviation from a population norm.

Recent conceptual work has tried to give this ambition an operational structure rather than leaving it as an aspiration. A narrative mini-review proposing a framework for precision perioperative artificial intelligence organizes the problem into layers — signal acquisition, feature extraction, model inference, and clinical action — and argues that much of the current literature is strong on the middle two layers (there is no shortage of models that predict something from a waveform) and comparatively weak on the first and last: capturing consistently high-quality multimodal signal across heterogeneous operating rooms, and translating a model's output into an action a clinician actually takes at the bedside [21]. That is a useful corrective to a literature that can read as more mature than it is. A model with excellent discrimination in a retrospective validation cohort is not the same thing as a system that changes practice and improves outcomes when deployed prospectively across a heterogeneous patient population, and the gap between those two claims is where much of the current uncertainty in this field actually lives.

Interoperability is the practical bottleneck behind that gap. Depth-of-anesthesia monitors, hemodynamic platforms, and ward-based wearables are typically built by different manufacturers on proprietary data architectures, and a genuinely integrated patient model requires those streams to talk to a common analytic layer — and, ultimately, to the electronic health record — in something close to real time. Institutions that have made progress on multimodal integration tend to be large academic centers with the informatics infrastructure and dedicated personnel to build custom interfaces, which raises a fairness question the literature has only begun to engage with directly: precision monitoring built on this scale of infrastructure risks becoming available preferentially to patients treated at well-resourced centers, exactly the opposite of the equitable, individualized care the technology is meant to deliver.

CONCLUSION

Perioperative monitoring is transitioning from a set of discrete, intermittently sampled numbers compared against fixed population thresholds to a set of continuous, patient-specific signals that machine-learning models increasingly attempt to forecast rather than merely display. Closed-loop anesthesia delivery has demonstrated tighter titration of hypnotic depth than manual dosing typically achieves; continuous noninvasive hemodynamic monitoring has matured to the point that it is a reasonable substitute for invasive arterial monitoring in many intermediate-risk cases; wearable sensors have shown that continuous ward-level vital sign surveillance is feasible and well tolerated; and predictive hemodynamic algorithms have opened a genuinely new mode of monitoring built around anticipation rather than detection. None of these technologies, however, has yet accumulated the kind of large, prospective, outcome-focused evidence that would justify calling any of them a settled standard of care, and the hypotension-prediction literature in particular illustrates how methodological scrutiny can temper enthusiasm generated by early single-center results. The organizational challenges — alarm fatigue, workflow integration, interoperability across vendors, and equitable access to the infrastructure that multimodal integration requires — are, at this point, at least as significant as the remaining technical hurdles. Realizing genuinely personalized perioperative care will depend as much on solving those organizational problems as on further refining the underlying algorithms.

DECLARATIONS

Acknowledgements The authors thank their respective departments for institutional support during the preparation of this review.

Funding This review received no external funding.

Conflict of Interest The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Author Contributions MA conceived the review and drafted the manuscript. DM performed the literature search and contributed to drafting and critical revision. HS contributed to the conceptual

framework, critically revised the manuscript, and approved the final version for submission. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Ethics Statement This is a literature review that did not involve new human or animal data; no ethics approval was required.

Data Availability No new data were generated for this review. All sources discussed are cited and publicly available through their respective publishers.

REFERENCES

1. Yu H, Gao B, Li Y (2026) Depth of anesthesia monitoring: Current evidence, clinical impact, and future directions. Anesthesia and Analgesia Research, DOI:10.1177/03000605261457781.
2. Closed-Loop Anesthesia: Advances in Automated Drug Delivery and Perioperative Monitoring (2026) PMID:41853001.
3. Closed-loop anesthesia: foundations and applications in contemporary perioperative medicine (2023) Journal of Clinical Monitoring and Computing, DOI:10.1007/s10877-023-01111-4.
4. Advances in automated anesthesia: a comprehensive review (2024) Anesthesiology and Perioperative Science.
5. From static to dynamic: Artificial intelligence revolution in perioperative care through multimodal data fusion and closed-loop optimization (2026) PMC13001731.
6. Predictive ability of hypotension prediction index and machine learning methods in intraoperative hypotension: a systematic review and meta-analysis (2024) Journal of Translational Medicine, DOI:10.1186/s12967-024-05481-4.
7. Clinical performance of machine-learning algorithms to predict intraoperative hypotension: a meta-analysis (2025) BMC Surgery, DOI:10.1186/s12893-025-03412-8.
8. The Predictive Paradigm in Perioperative Hemodynamic Management: The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Major Spine Surgery (2025) Journal of Clinical Medicine, DOI:10.3390/jcm15176915.
9. A novel art of continuous noninvasive blood pressure measurement (2021) Nature Communications, DOI:10.1038/s41467-021-21271-8.
10. Noninvasive continuous hemodynamic monitoring. PMC3391359.
11. Hemodynamic monitoring in the era of digital health. PMID:26885656.
12. When should we adopt continuous noninvasive hemodynamic monitoring technologies into clinical routine? Journal of Clinical Monitoring and Computing, DOI:10.1007/s10877-014-9619-x.
13. Non-invasive and continuous arterial pressure monitoring, in Perioperative Hemodynamic Monitoring and Goal Directed Therapy.
14. Wearable devices to monitor recovery after abdominal surgery: scoping review (2022) BJS Open, DOI:10.1093/bjsopen/zrac031.
15. Impact of wearable wireless continuous vital sign monitoring in abdominal surgical patients: before-after study (2024) BJS Open, DOI:10.1093/bjsopen/zrad128.
16. Continuous vital sign monitoring of patients recovering from surgery on general wards: a narrative review (2024) British Journal of Anaesthesia.
17. Wireless wearables for postoperative surveillance on surgical wards: a survey of 1158 anaesthesiologists in Western Europe and the USA. PMC10430871.
18. Postoperative use of fitness trackers for continuous monitoring of vital signs: a survey of hospitalized patients (2025) Journal of Clinical Monitoring and Computing, DOI:10.1007/s10877-025-01273-3.
19. Wearable devices as part of postoperative early warning score systems: a scoping review. PMC11821718.
20. Continuous wireless postoperative monitoring using wearable devices: further device innovation is needed (2021) Critical Care, DOI:10.1186/s13054-021-03805-0.
21. Precision perioperative AI: from signals, images, and records to applications in anesthesia-a narrative mini-review proposing an operational framework (2026) Frontiers in Medicine, DOI:10.3389/fmed.2026.1811197.