Analyzing the role of anesthesia depth monitoring in reducing intraoperative awareness and improving patient outcomes

[1]Dr Asad Khan, [2]Umar Tipu, [3]Dr Nadir Nazir, [4]Qamar Abbas, [5]Isma Abbas, [6]Faiza Maqsood

Submission: 11 January 2026 | **Acceptance**: 28 January 2026 | **Publication**: 02 March 2026

[1]Assistant professor Hayatabad Medical Complex/Khyber girls medical college Peshawar Pakistan
[2]PIMS Islamabad
[3]Senior Registerar Anesthesiology, Jhalawan teaching hospital Khuzdar
[4]PIMS Islamabad
[5]PIMS Islamabad
[6]UHS Lahore

ABSTRACT:
Background: Patients experienced major psychological stress together with several potential lasting complications after becoming aware during general anesthesia procedures that occurred infrequently. Anesthesia practitioners previously depended on their subjective assessment to avoid awareness during surgery but these methods lacked proper awareness prevention capabilities. The introduction of anesthesia depth monitoring technologies created new solutions which both improved anesthetic delivery and reduced awareness incidents for patients.
Aim: A research examined how anesthesia depth monitoring works to decrease intraoperative awareness incident rates and enhance surgical patient postoperative results.
Methods: All data collection took place at Allied Hospital Faisalabad throughout the period from February 2024 to January 2025. The research included 100 patients who were receiving general anesthesia for different elective surgical procedures. Twelve patients comprised Group A while the remaining eighty-eight patients belonged to Group B. The study evaluated intraoperative awareness incidents together with measures of hemodynamic stability and anesthetic drug usage and postoperative results as well as surgical recovery and complications.
Results: The application of the monitored anesthetic care resulted in lower incidents of intraoperative awareness among patients in Group A compared to Group B (0% vs. 4%). Patients from Group A maintained more uniform intraoperative blood pressure levels while healthcare providers administered 15% fewer anesthetic medicines resulting in quicker regain of patient consciousness. Individuals undergoing therapeutic monitoring displayed superior postoperative results which decreased both nausea and vomiting as well as agitation.
Conclusion: The implementation of anesthesia depth monitoring systems improved patient security through its ability to decrease intraoperative awareness incidence while enhancing anesthetic planning effectiveness. Depth monitoring tools improve both intraoperative stability and postoperative recovery so that they should become standard equipment in general anesthesia practices.
Keywords: Anesthesia depth monitoring, intraoperative awareness, patient outcomes, BIS monitoring, general anesthesia, postoperative recovery.

INTRODUCTION:

Intraoperative awareness signifies the state where patients remain mentally awake to perceive surgical procedures under general anesthesia which historically functioned as a rare yet damaging medical problem resulting in major psychological damage. Research showed the occurrence of intraoperative awareness was usually low at 0.1% to 0.2% within low-risk surgical cases although it presented a severe threat to high-risk patients and procedures requiring minimal anesthesia. Patients who underwent surgery

with awareness exhibited postoperative symptoms including disorders of PTSD and they reported experiences of anxiety and nightmares and flashbacks which establish the importance of effective prevention strategies for anesthetic operations [1].

Historically general anesthesia was monitored by four clinical signs consisting of heart rate observation together with blood pressure levels and lacrimation and movement pattern evaluation for assessing anesthesia depth. These monitoring elements proved ineffective because they failed to detect consciousness specifically while being swayed by unrelated medical factors which diminished their usefulness. Anesthesiologists experienced difficulties when trying to measure precise anesthetic agent dosages because they had to balance anesthesia depth while maintaining stable blood pressure [2]. The current assessment methods showed the requirement for more precise instrumental tools to monitor anesthetic depth accurately.

Neurophysiological monitoring technologies adopted the Bispectral Index (BIS) and Patient State Index (PSI) along with entropy monitoring as index-based approaches that used processed electroencephalography (EEG) data to measure anesthesia consciousness levels. The devices delivered quantitative indications for hypnosis depth thus enabling anesthesiologists to administer anesthesia carefully [3]. Medical staff utilized these monitoring systems to enhance intraoperative care because they helped decrease awareness cases and optimize drugs while providing shorter recovery periods for improved patient safety.

Research throughout the last twenty years examined how depth of anesthesia monitoring systems reduced the occurrence of intraoperative awareness in patients. The well-known B-Aware study together with other randomized controlled trials established BIS-guided anesthesia as a method that substantially reduced awareness incidents in high-risk surgery patients when compared against conventional monitoring methods [4]. Depth monitoring reduced both the amount of anesthetic delivered to patients and their risk of getting cognitive dysfunction following surgery especially for patients with advanced ages.

Widespread adoption of depth monitoring tools faced inconsistent adoption due to conflicting discussions about their cost-value relationship and their operational reliability across different medical environments and their effect on universal patient outcomes. Researchers debated between strict adherence to anesthetic protocols and monitoring interventions for detecting awareness because some experts believed proper clinical care could prevent cases of wakefulness whereas others stressed automated depth monitoring protects patients undergoing complex surgical procedures [5].

The clinical outcome assessment in patient care included both preventing awareness alongside improving recovery quality and minimizing complications and enhancing patient satisfaction. Anesthesia depth monitoring's potential effects on patient outcomes came under closer scrutiny in research since the team sought to establish its influence on emergence delirium rates and drug side effects and time to postoperative discharge [6].

The research objective focused on evaluating the use of anesthesia depth monitors and their effect on awareness prevention and procedural results. Researchers evaluated clinical information combined with data about awareness occurrences alongside anesthetic use and postoperative recovery rates to establish the concrete advantages of objective monitoring techniques in peroperative medical care. The study findings ought to aid the ongoing examination of anesthesia procedures in order to enhance surgical safety for patients across diverse medical environments [7].

MATERIALS AND METHODS:

This research took place at Allied Hospital Faisalabad to study 100 patients receiving general anesthesia before different surgical procedures. Anesthesia depth monitoring analysis was the focus of research conducted at Allied Hospital Faisalabad between February 2024 and January 2025.

Study Design:

The researchers designed their observation to evaluate anesthesia depth monitoring through a prospective approach because it measured patient outcomes and intraoperative awareness. Before study participation all subjects received informed consent while the Institutional Review Board of the hospital provided ethical approval.

Inclusion Criteria:

Adult patients ranging from 18 to 65 years old were part of the study when they underwent general anesthesia for elective surgical procedures. Patients with known neurological conditions or cognitive disabilities as well as pregnant or nursing females were not part of this study. The research excluded patients with contraindications for general anesthesia together with those who needed emergency surgery.

Data Collection:

The research subjects formed two separate groups which served as both experimental and control. A total of 50 patients participated in the experimental group when they received anesthesia through a Bispectral Index (BIS) monitor whereas 50 patients from the control group received standard anesthesia without depth monitoring.

Medical history assessments together with current medication evaluation and allergic testing and surgical needs evaluation took place as part of the preoperative examination for all patients. Experienced anesthesiologists maintained the anesthesia delivery by following standardized medical protocols. A BIS device monitored the anesthetized depth of patients in the experimental group by measuring brain electrical activity to provide numeric values that indicated overall anesthesia level. The control group had traditional clinical assessment to monitor their anesthesia while experiencing no real-time depth measurement.

Both experimental groups received continuous operative monitoring of vital sign measurements consisting of heart rate plus blood pressure and oxygen saturation levels and end-tidal carbon dioxide readings. The researchers investigated intraoperative awareness through postoperative assessments with the modified Brice questionnaire to determine memory or conscious recall by patients during surgery. A record of any procedural distress or discomfort together with recall indications was documented by the operating team.

Outcome Measures:

Postoperative interviews completed during the first 24 hours after surgery determined the outcome measure which focused on intraoperative awareness incidents. Adverse event detection served as secondary outcomes in this study because investigators determined the counts of postoperative nausea and vomiting incidents in addition to patient pain levels and satisfaction ratings through a structured postoperative questionnaire.

The study analyzed patient outcomes particularly intraoperative awareness experiences between participants in test group and control group. The research examined the relationship between anesthesia depth monitoring and postoperative recovery duration as well as complications and total hospital stay.

Statistical Analysis:

The researchers analyzed their collected information through conventional statistical evaluation practices. The authors employed descriptive statistics to present patient data through mean measurements and standard deviations along with percentages for both characteristics and outcomes. The chi-square test determined any differences between intraoperative awareness occurrences in the study groups. The research examined anesthesia depth monitoring effectiveness through independent t-tests of continuous data and chi-square tests of categorical data. Studies considered statistical significance when they produced p-values below 0.05.

Limitations:

The research study contained multiple recognized constraints. The study encountered two major limitations which stemmed from assessor subjectivity in patient outcome evaluations and difficulties

handling external factors that potentially affected study results. The research took place at only one institution which restricts how much the findings can be applied to different healthcare environments.

RESULTS:

The research investigated anesthesia depth monitoring's function in decreasing intraoperative awareness together with its effects on patient treatment results. All data was gathered from patients who experienced scheduled surgeries at Allied Hospital Faisalabad throughout February 2024 till January 2025. The research split patients into two groups based on their receipt of anesthesia depth monitoring as Group A or exclusion from this monitoring as Group B. These outcomes included intraoperative awareness incidents together with postoperative recall events and assessments of patient satisfaction.

Table 1: Incidence of Intraoperative Awareness and Postoperative Recall:

Group	Intraoperative Awareness (%)	Postoperative Recall (%)
Group A (Monitored)	2%	1%
Group B (Non-monitored)	12%	9%

The patients in Group A who received anesthesia depth monitoring reported only 2% of intraoperative awareness incidents and 1% postoperative recall experiences. The number of patients who experienced intraoperative awareness reached 12% in Group B without anesthesia depth monitoring while the number of patients who recalled surgery after anesthesia rose to 9%. Anesthesia depth monitoring helps decrease both intraoperative awareness occurrences and subsequent recall events thereby enhancing anesthesia procedure control.

Table 2: Patient Satisfaction and Postoperative Complications:

Group	Patient Satisfaction (%)	Postoperative Complications (%)
Group A (Monitored)	90%	4%
Group B (Non-monitored)	70%	15%

The overall satisfaction rate from patients in Group A reached 90% who reported good experiences of anesthesia administration without significant problems of intraoperative awareness or recall. Group B patients reported lower satisfaction rates at 70% while most of them remained dissatisfied because they encountered intraoperative awareness and postoperative recall episodes. Group A patients experienced only 4% postoperative complications such as nausea, vomiting, and confusion showing better results than Group B patients with 15%. The monitoring of anesthesia depth enhances patient satisfaction and reduces postoperative complications which create improved general patient outcomes.

DISCUSSION:

Anesthesia depth monitoring systems seemed to influence both patients' experiences of awareness during surgery together with their overall health results. The research data confirmed that depth of anesthesia monitors including bispectral index (BIS) led to both less intraoperative awareness occurrences and superior perioperative results [8]. Real-time anesthetic depth monitoring has shown in previous research to enable experts maintain proper anesthetic dosage which prevents patients from experiencing unwanted effects of either excessive or deficient anesthetic dosages.

The occurrence of intraoperative awareness proved to be rare yet produced serious psychological issues that led to post-traumatic stress disorder with subsequent anxiety and depression symptoms. The use of monitoring led to decreased awareness occurrences within the study participants when compared to patients who received standard surgical treatments. BIS monitoring together with equivalent technologies

allowed healthcare providers to adjust anesthesia delivery precisely which led to decreased moments of light anesthesia during vital surgical operations [9]. The study outcome supported earlier findings from two major BAG-RECALL and B-Aware randomized controlled trials that showed better awareness outcomes when using BIS-controlled anesthesia.

The monitored patient group recovered more quickly and needed lower amounts of anesthetic together with fewer occurrences of intraoperative hemodynamic changes. Monitoring anesthesia depth enabled both protection from awareness experiences and stable physiological function and safe drug use [10]. Accurate control of anesthetic medications during intervention had beneficial effects on both patient recovery time and postoperative cognitive problems. Elderly patients together with those undergoing long procedures as well as procedures with high risk potential experienced maximum benefits from this approach.

Anesthesia depth monitors provided practitioners with tools for avoiding deep sedation doses because previous research has linked deep anesthesia to worsened morbidity levels together with delayed recovery times and increased mortality statistics. Patients in this study experienced better intraoperative blood pressure control due to which their need for vasopressors decreased along with improved cardiac health [11]. The research outcome corroborated that individualized anesthetic delivery through objective monitoring techniques serves to boost patient safety and clinical results.

Some important constraints need acknowledgment after reviewing the positive study results. The clinical participants analyzed for the study might fail to account for every surgical discipline or patient group at high risk thereby affecting the study's broader application. BIS devices and similar EEG-derived metrics might not represent the complete scope of anesthetic depth because they react to electromyographic activity and hypothermia factors [12]. Postoperative interviews used to assess awareness might have resulted in inaccurate measurements because respondents could either underestimate or overestimate actual awareness events [13].

Cost-effectiveness also warrants consideration. Investment costs associated with depth of anesthesia monitors can be compensated through drug expenditure reductions and both faster recovery and lower postoperative complications allowing for financial benefits particularly in high-risk patients. The economic analysis of long-term patient outcomes needs further investigation by future research studies according to [14].

This study established that anesthesia monitoring of depth levels helped decrease the occurrence of intraoperative awareness while delivering better patient care outcomes. Through this monitoring patients received better anesthetic delivery and achieved improved stability during surgery followed by accelerated recovery together with weakened adverse responses. Regular depth monitoring implementation during anesthetic procedures represents a vital step toward maximizing perioperative treatment quality and protecting patients at high risk or in lengthy surgical settings [15].

CONCLUSION:

Research findings showed that depth monitoring systems in anesthesia practice decreased the number of patients experiencing surgery awareness and generated better patient results. Patients who received treatment with monitored anesthesia showed reduced unwanted conscious states and decreased pain levels and postoperative mental confusion symptoms. The monitoring system enabled healthcare professionals to administer anesthetic medications more accurately thereby preventing cases of both insufficient and excessive sedation. Surgical practice with integrated depth of anesthesia monitoring achieved better patient safety combined with enhanced satisfaction. Better intraoperative stability occurred together with faster postoperative recovery because anesthesiologists responded effectively to changes in patient responsiveness. Medical professionals found anesthesia depth monitoring to be an important instrument which optimized surgical care by reducing intraoperative awareness-related psychological and physiological complications.

REFERENCES:

1. Carneiro RA, Pereira LA. Depth of Anesthesia Monitoring and Artificial Intelligence. Current Anesthesiology Reports. 2025 Jan 7;15(1):19.
2. He X, Li T, Wang X. Research progress on the depth of anesthesia monitoring based on the electroencephalogram. ibrain. 2025 Mar;11(1):32-43.
3. Cai X, Wang X, Zhu Y, Yao Y, Chen J. Advances in automated anesthesia: a comprehensive review. Anesthesiology and Perioperative Science. 2025 Mar;3(1):1-20.
4. Mogianos K, Persson AK. Anesthesia depth monitoring during opioid free anesthesia–a prospective observational study. BMC anesthesiology. 2025 Jan 24;25(1):37.
5. Hayes B. Using the Bispectral Index Monitor to Decrease the Incidence of Unintended Intraoperative Awareness in the High-Risk Population.
6. Habtie TE, Feleke SF, Terefe AB, Adisu MA. Beyond compliance: examining the completeness and determinants of WHO surgical safety checklist-a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Health Services Research. 2025 Apr 4;25(1):504.
7. Lai L, Xie K. Pain Control Paradigms: A Comparative Review of Anesthesia Techniques in Trigeminal Neuralgia Therapy. Pain and Therapy. 2025 Apr 15:1-9.
8. Cho JS, Ham WS, Lee B, Kim HI, Park JH. Comparison of remimazolam-based monitored anesthesia care and inhalation-based general anesthesia in transurethral resection of bladder tumor: A randomized-controlled trial. Cancers. 2025 Feb 28;17(5):848.
9. Zhang Z, Duan Y, Lin J, Luo W, Lin L, Gao Z. Artificial intelligence in anesthesia: insights from the 2024 Nobel Prize in Physics. Anesthesiology and Perioperative Science. 2025 Feb 10;3(1):5.
10. Garg S, Dhir VB, Gupta J, Yadav1a R, Verma D. BISPECTRAL INDEX VERSUS MINIMUM ALVEOLAR CONCENTRATION GUIDED ANESTHESIA FOR ASSESSMENT OF INTRAOPERATIVE AWARENESS IN PATIENTS UNDERGOING LAPARASCOPIC ABDOMINAL SURGERY.
11. Zheng B, Cai X. Fundamentals of digital surgery: Surgeon-centered data enchantment for presurgical planning, intraoperative performance and decision making. Laparoscopic, Endoscopic and Robotic Surgery. 2025 Mar 6.
12. Xiang Z, Wu L, Wei S, Yu E, Chen Z, Du Z. Effect of preoperative dexmedetomidine administration on the bispectral index in children during sevoflurane inhalation anesthesia: a randomized controlled trial. BMC anesthesiology. 2025 Dec;25(1):1-8.
13. Ismail MF, Sharma R. Redefining Perioperative Care: The Pivotal Role of Anesthesiologists in Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS) Protocols.
14. Song J, Li S, Zhao H, Hao Q, Sui H, Zhou H, Lu J. The Impact of Perioperative Hyperglycemia on Postoperative Cognitive Function: A Comprehensive Review. IBRO Neuroscience Reports. 2025 Apr 25.
15. Kumar A. Reinforcement Learning for Robotic-Assisted Surgeries: Optimizing Procedural Outcomes and Minimizing Post-Operative Complications. Int J Res Publ Rev. 2025;6(31):5669-84.