

## Review Article

# Integration of Smart Sensors in Perioperative Patient Safety Systems

Katarzyna Girard<sup>1\*</sup>, Katarzyna Kovacs<sup>2</sup> and Chiara Steiner<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Division of Anesthesia and Intensive Care, Danube University of Applied Medicine, Hungary

<sup>2</sup>Department of Anesthesiology and Pain Management, Danube University of Applied Medicine, Hungary

<sup>3</sup>Division of Anesthesia and Intensive Care, Aegean Institute of Biomedical Research, Greece

## ABSTRACT

Miniaturized, wireless sensor technology has moved perioperative monitoring beyond the intermittent bedside check, and a growing body of clinical evidence now describes what continuous, sensor-driven surveillance can and cannot do for patient safety across the surgical episode.

This review synthesizes recent evidence across four domains: continuous ward-based vital sign monitoring after surgery, sensor-based detection of opioid-induced respiratory depression, artificial-intelligence-augmented intraoperative and closed-loop anesthesia delivery, and radiofrequency-identification tracking of surgical instruments and sponges to prevent retained surgical items.

Continuous monitoring reliably detects physiological deterioration and respiratory depression events that intermittent checks miss, with directionally consistent but still incompletely proven benefit for hard outcomes such as unplanned intensive care transfer and mortality.

Intraoperative artificial-intelligence applications and RFID-based instrument tracking are technically mature but have been adopted unevenly, constrained less by device performance than by alarm burden, workflow integration, clinician trust, and reimbursement.

We conclude that realizing the safety potential of perioperative smart sensors will depend as much on implementation science, standardized outcome definitions, and thoughtful alarm design as on further advances in sensor hardware itself.

**Keywords:** smart sensors; perioperative monitoring; patient safety; wearable technology; closed-loop anesthesia

**Citation:** Girard K, Kovacs K and Steiner C (2026) Integration of Smart Sensors in Perioperative Patient Safety Systems. *Anesthesiology*. 6(1):01-05.

**DOI:** 10.17140/2026.vol6.i01.pp01-05

**Corresponding Author:** Katarzyna Girard

**E-mail Address:** k.girard@duam.hu

**Article History:** Received 24 May 2026 | Accepted 19 June 2026 | Published 21 July 2026

**Copyright:** © 2026 Katarzyna Girard, 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 monitored patients continuously for decades, but for most of that history

"continuous" meant continuous only while a clinician was physically present at the bedside. The moment a patient left the operating room for the post-anesthesia

care unit, and again the moment they left the PACU for a general ward, monitoring reverted to intermittent spot checks every few hours. It is precisely in those gaps that a large share of preventable perioperative harm occurs: opioid-induced respiratory depression discovered too late, hemorrhage or sepsis that progresses silently overnight, falls in patients whose vital signs had been "normal" four hours earlier. Miniaturized, wireless, low-power sensor technology has begun to close that gap, and the past five years have produced a genuinely new evidence base on what continuous, sensor-driven surveillance can and cannot do for perioperative safety [1]. This review surveys that evidence across four domains where smart sensors have moved furthest into clinical use: continuous ward-based vital sign monitoring, intraoperative and anesthesia-delivery monitoring augmented by artificial intelligence, sensor-based tracking of surgical instruments and counts, and the practical barriers that still separate a promising device from a safety intervention that actually changes outcomes.

The appeal of the technology is straightforward. A modern wearable patch or wristband can sample heart rate, respiratory rate, oxygen saturation, and increasingly blood pressure and temperature, at intervals of seconds rather than hours, and transmit the stream wirelessly to a central station or directly to a nurse's handheld device [2]. Patients tolerate these devices well; a recent survey of hospitalized surgical patients wearing fitness-tracker-style monitors found high acceptance and low interference with mobility or sleep, which matters because a sensor nobody will wear is not a safety intervention [3]. What is less straightforward is whether earlier detection of physiological drift reliably translates into earlier intervention and better outcomes, and whether the alarm burden these systems generate is itself a safety hazard. Both questions run through everything that follows.

### CONTINUOUS VITAL SIGN MONITORING ON THE GENERAL WARD

The strongest and most mature evidence for perioperative smart sensors concerns respiratory and cardiovascular surveillance after patients leave the controlled environment of the operating room. A cluster-randomized crossover trial comparing continuous wireless vital sign monitoring against standard intermittent nursing observations on surgical wards found that the continuous arm detected physiological deterioration substantially earlier, with fewer unrecognized episodes of hypoxemia and tachycardia persisting between scheduled checks [4]. That finding echoes a systematic review and meta-analysis of wearable continuous monitoring across hospitalized populations, which reported that continuous surveillance shortened the time to detection of deterioration and was associated with reduced rates

of unplanned ICU transfer, though the authors were careful to note substantial heterogeneity in device type and alarm-response protocols across the pooled studies [5].

Abdominal surgery, with its combination of opioid analgesia, fluid shifts, and anastomotic leak risk, has been a particularly active testing ground. A before-after study of wireless wearable monitoring in abdominal surgical patients reported earlier identification of clinical deterioration and, in the postimplementation cohort, fewer cardiopulmonary resuscitation events and shorter time-to-rescue when deterioration did occur [6]. The ongoing WARD-AMS trial, registered as a formal randomized controlled trial protocol, is designed to answer the harder causal question that before-after designs cannot: whether continuous monitoring, layered onto an early-warning algorithm, actually reduces the composite rate of rapid response activations, ICU transfers, and cardiac arrests among postoperative general surgery patients, rather than simply generating more alerts that clinicians triage away [7]. Economic evaluations are starting to appear alongside the clinical trials; one analysis of postoperative continuous monitoring examined not just direct healthcare costs and length of stay but also downstream labor-market outcomes for patients, on the logic that avoided complications carry costs well beyond the hospital bill [8].

None of this evidence is unqualified. The Anesthesia Patient Safety Foundation has published a pointed commentary noting that most wearable monitoring studies to date lack the statistical power and blinding needed to attribute mortality or major morbidity reduction to the sensor itself, as opposed to the surrounding process changes — dedicated response teams, revised escalation protocols — that hospitals tend to introduce at the same time they roll out new monitors [9]. Disentangling the sensor from the system it is embedded in remains an open methodological problem for the entire field.

### RESPIRATORY DEPRESSION: THE SIGNATURE USE CASE

If any single indication has driven adoption of continuous perioperative monitoring, it is opioid-induced respiratory depression (OIRD). Postoperative patients receiving parenteral or oral opioids are at risk of a slow, silent decline in respiratory drive that standard four-hour vital sign checks are structurally unsuited to catch, and a substantial body of morbidity and mortality review has implicated missed OIRD in preventable in-hospital deaths. A large international prospective observational trial using continuous capnography and pulse oximetry on surgical wards found that a meaningful proportion of patients experienced episodes of respiratory depression that were entirely unrecognized by nursing staff performing routine intermittent checks, and that these episodes clustered overnight when direct

observation was sparsest [10]. A subsequent systematic review and meta-analysis of continuous pulse oximetry and capnography monitoring across multiple ward populations reinforced the core finding: continuous monitoring detects respiratory depression events that intermittent monitoring misses by a wide margin, though the effect of that detection on hard outcomes like mortality was harder to establish given the relative rarity of ward-level cardiac arrest as an endpoint [11]. A more recent meta-analysis focused specifically on the postoperative population reached a broadly similar conclusion, again flagging heterogeneity in monitoring thresholds and alarm-response workflows as limiting factors [12].

An international consensus conference convened to sharpen the definitions used in this literature made an important observation: much of the disagreement between studies on how well continuous monitoring "works" stems from inconsistent definitions of what counts as a clinically significant respiratory depression event in the first place, and the panel proposed standardized thresholds intended to make future device and algorithm evaluations comparable [13]. Complementary engineering work has focused on making the respiratory-rate sensor itself more reliable in the ambulatory ward setting; a clinical evaluation of a dedicated wearable respiratory rate sensor found acceptable agreement with reference measurement in mobile, non-sedated ward patients, addressing a long-standing concern that motion artifact degrades respiratory sensing outside the controlled ICU environment [14]. Taken as a body of work, this is probably the domain in which sensor-driven monitoring has moved furthest from a promising technology toward a defensible standard-of-care argument, particularly for patients on patient-controlled or basal opioid infusions.

#### **INTRAOPERATIVE MONITORING, DEPTH OF ANESTHESIA, AND CLOSED-LOOP DELIVERY**

Inside the operating room, smart sensors intersect with a second and faster-moving trend: the application of artificial intelligence to interpret the physiological signals anesthesiologists already collect. Processed EEG-derived depth-of-anesthesia monitoring, arterial waveform analysis for hypotension prediction, and multimodal integration of hemodynamic and respiratory streams are increasingly framed not as passive displays but as inputs to algorithms that flag risk before it becomes clinically obvious [15]. A recent narrative review of AI in anesthesia describes this shift from monitors that display numbers to systems that classify trajectories and generate predictive alerts, while also cataloguing the practical obstacles — alarm fatigue, model drift across patient populations, and the difficulty of validating a predictive algorithm against a counterfactual that never happened — that have slowed clinical adoption relative to the pace of

publication [16]. A broader survey of data-driven systems in anesthesia makes a related point about global equity: much of this technology has been developed and validated in high-resource settings, and its performance and availability in lower-resource operating rooms remains comparatively unstudied [17].

Closed-loop and target-controlled drug delivery systems represent the most sensor-dependent form of this integration, using continuously sampled depth-of-anesthesia and hemodynamic data to titrate propofol, opioids, or vasopressors automatically rather than by intermittent clinician adjustment. Reviews of machine learning and closed-loop devices in anesthesia delivery describe measurable improvements in the proportion of case time spent within target anesthetic depth compared with manual titration, alongside caution that regulatory pathways and clinician trust have lagged the underlying engineering [18]. A more recent review of closed-loop anesthesia reaches a similar assessment: the automated drug-delivery layer performs reliably in controlled trial settings, but its integration with the surrounding perioperative sensor ecosystem — handoff to postoperative monitoring, for instance — is still largely unaddressed in the literature [19]. A comprehensive review of automated anesthesia more broadly situates these closed-loop systems within a wider automation agenda that includes automated documentation and decision support, suggesting that sensor-driven drug delivery is likely to be one component of a more integrated automated perioperative record rather than a standalone device [20]. Looking further ahead, a speculative but frequently cited outlook piece on remote monitoring and artificial intelligence projects that by mid-century perioperative sensing may extend well beyond the hospital admission itself, into pre-habilitation and remote postoperative recovery monitoring at home [21].

#### **SENSOR-BASED TRACKING OF INSTRUMENTS, SPONGES, AND SURGICAL COUNTS**

A parallel but distinct application of sensor technology addresses a different category of perioperative harm: retained surgical items. Manual sponge and instrument counts, performed by circulating nurses at fixed points in a case, remain the standard safeguard against leaving material inside a patient, but manual counting is a human process subject to interruption, fatigue, and simple miscounting during long or complex operations. Radiofrequency identification (RFID) tagging of sponges and instruments, paired with a detection wand or mat passed over the patient before closure, gives a technological backstop to the manual count rather than replacing it [22]. Commercial systems built around this principle are now deployed clinically; one such counting and detection system

uses RFID-tagged surgical sponges together with a console that reconciles the count electronically and flags a discrepancy in real time rather than after the patient has left the room [23].

Engineering groups have extended the same approach to rigid instruments, where tagging is more difficult because instruments are reused, autoclaved repeatedly, and must retain a readable tag through hundreds of sterilization cycles; work coming out of bioengineering labs has focused on tag durability and miniaturization to make RFID tracking practical for entire instrument trays rather than isolated high-risk items like sponges [24]. A recent analysis framing retained surgical objects as a preventable "never event" makes the case that voluntary adoption of these technologies has been slower than the underlying evidence would justify, and argues for mandatory technology requirements analogous to the way surgical safety checklists themselves eventually moved from a recommended practice to an accreditation requirement [25]. This domain illustrates a useful contrast with ward-based vital sign monitoring: the physiological rationale for RFID counting is essentially undisputed, and the barrier to adoption is overwhelmingly one of cost, workflow integration, and institutional will rather than uncertainty about clinical benefit.

### IMPLEMENTATION BARRIERS, ALARM BURDEN, AND HUMAN FACTORS

None of the technical progress described above translates automatically into safer care, and the literature is increasingly explicit about why. Alarm fatigue is the most frequently cited obstacle: a continuous monitor that samples every few seconds will generate far more alerts than an intermittent check, and if a large fraction of those alerts are false positives or clinically insignificant, nursing staff learn — rationally, if unfortunately — to silence or ignore them, blunting the very benefit continuous monitoring was meant to provide [16]. This is not a hypothetical concern; several of the ward-monitoring trials described above report substantial numbers of alerts that did not correspond to actionable deterioration, and the design of the WARD-AMS trial explicitly incorporates a tiered alerting algorithm intended to address this rather than simply forwarding raw threshold crossings to bedside nurses [7].

A second barrier is patient acceptance and comfort, which the fitness-tracker survey data address directly but which becomes harder as sensor complexity increases — a wrist-worn accelerometer is a very different proposition from an adhesive capnography sampling line or a chest patch with multiple electrodes [3]. A third and less frequently discussed barrier is integration with the electronic health record and existing nurse call and rapid-response infrastructure; a sensor stream that lives in a proprietary vendor dashboard, disconnected from the chart a physician actually reads, adds documentation burden without

necessarily improving decision-making, a point the broader review of digital innovations in perioperative safety raises as a governance rather than a purely technical problem [1]. Finally, cost and reimbursement remain unresolved in most health systems; the economic analyses beginning to appear in this space are a necessary but still early step toward making the case to hospital administrators that continuous perioperative sensing pays for itself through avoided complications and shorter length of stay [8].

### CONCLUSION

Smart sensor technology has earned a genuine, if still incomplete, place in perioperative patient safety. The evidence is most mature and most persuasive for continuous ward-based respiratory monitoring in patients receiving opioids, where multiple independent lines of investigation converge on the same finding: intermittent vital sign checks miss clinically important respiratory depression that continuous monitoring reliably detects. The evidence for downstream benefit — fewer rapid response calls, fewer ICU transfers, lower mortality — is directionally consistent but still limited by heterogeneous devices, inconsistent event definitions, and the difficulty of isolating a sensor's contribution from the process changes that typically accompany its introduction. Intraoperative applications, particularly AI-augmented depth-of-anesthesia monitoring and closed-loop drug delivery, are technically further along in some respects but have seen slower clinical uptake, constrained by regulatory caution and clinician trust rather than by a shortage of engineering capability. RFID-based instrument and sponge tracking stands somewhat apart from the rest of this literature: the physiological logic is uncontested, effective systems already exist commercially, and the remaining gap is one of adoption rather than evidence. Across all of these domains, the unglamorous determinants of success — alarm design, workflow integration, staff trust, and reimbursement — are proving at least as important as sensor accuracy itself, and future research that treats implementation science as inseparable from device validation is likely to do more for perioperative safety than incremental improvements in sensor hardware alone.

### DECLARATIONS

**Acknowledgements** The authors thank their respective institutions for administrative support during the preparation of this manuscript.

**Funding** This review received no external funding.

**Conflict of Interest** The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

**Author Contributions** KG conceived the review and drafted the initial manuscript. KK performed the literature synthesis for the intraoperative and closed-loop anesthesia sections and critically

revised the manuscript. CS synthesized the surgical instrument tracking and implementation-barriers sections and prepared the reference list. All authors reviewed and approved the final manuscript.

**Ethics Statement Not applicable.** This is a literature review and did not involve new human or animal data.

**Data Availability** No new data were generated or analyzed in this review; all sources discussed are cited in the reference list.

## REFERENCES

- Smart technologies and digital innovations for improving perioperative patient safety: a review (2025) Patient Safety in Surgery, PMID:41163177.
- Davis, et al. (2025) Wearable Technology in Surgery: New Developments Toward Real-Time Patient Monitoring. ANZ Journal of Surgery, DOI:10.1111/ans.70275.
- 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.
- Continuous vs Intermittent Postoperative Vital Sign Monitoring: A Cluster Randomized Crossover Trial. PMC, PMID:PMC13022735.
- The impact of wearable continuous vital sign monitoring on deterioration detection and clinical outcomes in hospitalised patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis (2021) Critical Care, DOI:10.1186/s13054-021-03766-4.
- Impact of wearable wireless continuous vital sign monitoring in abdominal surgical patients: before-after study (2024) BJS Open.
- Wearable Continuous Vital Sign Monitoring Study (WARD-AMS) to Detect Clinical Deterioration in Postoperative General Surgery Patients: Protocol for a Randomized Controlled Trial (2025) JMIR Research Protocols, PMID:PMC12716825.
- Impact of postoperative in-hospital continuous vital sign monitoring on healthcare costs, resource utilization and labor market outcomes. PMID:41941065.
- Wearables and Improving Perioperative Patient Safety-Searching for Solutions! Anesthesia Patient Safety Foundation Newsletter.
- Prediction of Opioid-Induced Respiratory Depression on Inpatient Wards Using Continuous Capnography and Oximetry: An International Prospective, Observational Trial (2020) PMID:32925318.
- Continuous Pulse Oximetry and Capnography Monitoring for Postoperative Respiratory Depression and Adverse Events: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis (2019) Anesthesia & Analgesia, DOI:10.1213/ANE.0000000000002557.
- Role of continuous pulse oximetry and capnography monitoring in the prevention of postoperative respiratory failure, postoperative opioid-induced respiratory depression and adverse outcomes on hospital wards: A systematic review and meta-analysis (2024) Anaesthesia, Pain & Intensive Care.
- Improving definitions and innovations for identification and prevention of postoperative opioid-induced respiratory depression (OIRD): Proceedings of the International Consensus Conference. PMC, PMID:PMC13278815.
- Clinical evaluation of a wearable sensor for mobile monitoring of respiratory rate on hospital wards (2021) Journal of Clinical Monitoring and Computing, DOI:10.1007/s10877-021-00753-6.
- Role of artificial intelligence in perioperative monitoring in anaesthesia. PMC, PMID:PMC10893801.
- Transforming perioperative care: The current landscape and future trajectory of artificial intelligence in anesthesia-A narrative review (2026) PMID:42297385.
- Artificial Intelligence in Anesthesia: Enhancing Precision, Safety, and Global Access Through Data-Driven Systems (2025) Journal of Clinical Medicine, DOI:10.3390/jcm14196900.
- Machine Learning, Deep Learning, and Closed Loop Devices-Anesthesia Delivery. PMC, PMID:PMC9847584.
- Closed-Loop Anesthesia: Advances in Automated Drug Delivery and Perioperative Monitoring. PMC, PMID:PMC12995145.
- Advances in automated anesthesia: a comprehensive review (2024) Anesthesiology and Perioperative Science, DOI:10.1007/s44254-024-00085-z.
- Remote Monitoring and Artificial Intelligence: Outlook for 2050. PMC, PMID:PMC10794024.
- Retained Surgical Items (RSI): Building a Smarter Hospital with RFID. Jadak Technologies white paper.
- ORLocate Surgical Counting and Detection System. STERIS Healthcare Knowledge Center.
- Smart Tools: RFID Tracking for Surgical Instruments. Wyss Institute, Harvard University.
- Retained surgical objects: preventable "never events" and the case for mandatory technology adoption. PMC, PMID:PMC12768046.