cosmetics

MDPI

Review

The Use of Robotic Systems in Aesthetic/Cosmetic Plastic Surgery—A Review

Valentin I. Sharobaro *, Anastasiya S. Borisenko *, Yousif M. Ahmed Alsheikh *, Alexey E. Avdeev and Nina A. Lysenko

Department of Plastic Surgery, I.M. Sechenov First Moscow State Medical University, Moscow 119435, Russia; avdeev_a_e@staff.sechenov.ru (A.E.A.); idont-know@mail.ru (N.A.L.)

* Correspondence: sharobarovi@mail.ru (V.I.S.); dr_borisenko@mail.ru (A.S.B.); yousifmq2@gmail.com (Y.M.A.A.); Tel.: +7-9161257548 (V.I.S.); +7-9067361500 (A.S.B.); +7-9778862191 (Y.M.A.A.)

Abstract

Background: Robot-assisted surgery has become increasingly used across multiple specialties; however, its integration into aesthetic plastic surgery remains limited. Individualized patient requirements, such as concealed scar placement, superficial soft tissue dissection, and patient-specific docking angles, are major challenges to its adoption, unlike in other specialties. This review aimed to evaluate the current use of robotic systems in plastic surgery, with a particular focus on aesthetic procedures, operative outcomes, and existing technological limitations. Methods: Multiple databases, including PubMed, Scopus, and Google Scholar, were extensively searched to identify studies published between 2011 and 2026. Data on robotic platforms, operative duration, rehabilitation outcomes, and aesthetic indications were extracted and analyzed. Robotic systems such as da Vinci, Symani, MUSA, and ARTAS demonstrated feasibility across reconstructive subspecialties. However, their clinical application remains limited, as purely aesthetic procedures are rare, highlighting a significant lack of standardized docking methods and dedicated instruments. Results: The data show that robotic platforms offer great advantages, such as precision and minimally invasive access; however, their high costs, bulky instrumentation, and limited docking methods represent barriers to their adoption in aesthetic surgery. Conclusions: Robot-assisted aesthetic plastic surgery remains in the early stage of development. Further research is required to establish reproducible docking standards and expand its clinical indications. Advancements in single-port systems, artificial intelligence integration, and surgeon training will facilitate broader clinical implementation.

Keywords: robotic plastic surgery; aesthetic robotic plastic surgery; robot-assisted plastic surgery; robotic docking methods; minimally invasive robotic cosmetic surgery; docking methods in aesthetic surgery

Check for updates

Academic Editor: Enzo Berardesca

Received: 13 March 2026
Revised: 10 April 2026
Accepted: 16 April 2026
Published: 17 April 2026

Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license.

1. Introduction

In recent years, the demand for aesthetic surgery has increased as more patients seek medical procedures to enhance their appearance through consultation with plastic surgeons. Contemporary standards of beauty continue to evolve, driving the development of new surgical methods and techniques aimed at constantly enhancing outcomes, minimizing complications, shortening recovery time, and concealing scars to achieve more natural results. Technologies such as lasers are increasingly used for soft tissue dissection and have

demonstrated advantages over conventional techniques [1,2]. Although robotic systems are still in the early stages of development in aesthetic surgery, efforts are ongoing to expand their clinical application [3,4].

The progress of robotic systems in plastic surgery remains slower than that of other technologies because of the challenges associated with their clinical integration. The main limiting factors include the lack of standardized docking methods, high procedural costs, and the limited availability of specialized surgical instruments [5,6].

The main challenge lies in achieving proper docking of the robotic system to ensure a safe access angle, a clear field of view, and optimal cosmetic outcomes with minimal visible scarring. Patient anatomical factors must also be considered, including body mass index, age, excess skin, neck length, and breast size, as these variables may affect instrument rotation, particularly in procedures involving the neck region.

Currently, standardized docking methods for aesthetic plastic surgery are limited, except for those described in prior studies, which will be discussed later in this article [6].

This narrative review aimed to analyze the use of robotic systems in plastic surgery, including the types of robotic applications, operative duration, hospital length of stay, and rehabilitation period, while providing context for the limited integration and research on robotic technology in aesthetic plastic surgery.

2. Materials and Methods

We conducted a literature review to evaluate the application of robotic systems in plastic surgery. Searches were performed in Scopus, PubMed, and Google Scholar for articles published between 2011 and 2026. Articles relevant to the objectives of this study were selected to provide context for the current state of robotic technology in aesthetic plastic surgery, including its reported advantages and future integration prospects. The following keywords were used: “robotic plastic surgery”, “aesthetic robotic plastic surgery”, “robot-assisted plastic surgery”, “robotic docking methods”, “minimally invasive robotic cosmetic surgery”, and “docking methods in aesthetic surgery”.

3. Robotic Systems Used in Plastic Surgery

Selecting the appropriate robotic system is a critical factor determining availability and effectiveness. Some systems are used more frequently than others due to their technological advantages or size.

Multiple robotic surgical systems are currently used in plastic surgery, including the da Vinci, Symani, MUSA, and ARTAS systems [7–37] (Table 1).

Other notable surgical robots, such as the Versius, Shurui Single-Port System, and Senhance Surgical System, have demonstrated distinct efficacy and advantages.

The Versius system has 5 mm articulated instruments, compact robotic arms, and integrated machine learning capabilities. The Shurui Single-Port System has demonstrated low complication rates and minimal intraoperative blood loss. The Senhance Surgical System has shown clinical feasibility, low rates of adverse events, and shorter operative times [38–40].

Although these systems have not yet been applied in plastic surgery, elucidating their existence, technical advantages, and potential applications for guiding future research and innovation in the field is important.

Table 1. Type of robot use based on subspecialty and procedure.

Subspecialty/Procedure	Primary Robots Used	Number of Papers	Typical Applications
Breast reconstruction	da Vinci (Xi, SP, Si)	8	Nipple-sparring mastectomy, DIEP/LD flap harvest, and immediate reconstruction
Microsurgery	Symani Surgical System	8	Vascular anastomosis, nerve coaptation, and free flap inset
Lymphedema reconstruction/supermicrosurgery	Symani, MUSA/Microsure	3	Lymphovenous anastomosis, vascularised lymph node transfer
Flap harvest/flap-based reconstruction	da Vinci (Xi, SP, Si, S)	6	Latissimus dorsi, DIEP, and rectus abdominis harvest for breast/chest wall
Head and neck reconstruction	da Vinci (Xi, Si)	3	TORS with free flaps, robotic neck dissection, and facial/neck procedures
Facial aesthetic/reconstructive	da Vinci (Xi, Si)	4	Rhytidectomy, platysmaplasty, retroauricular neck mass resection, abdominoplasty, browlift
Hair transplantation	ARTAS	3	Intelligent algorithms, and optimised graft placement

Description: This table analyses the use of different robotic systems based on the subspecialty, which is an important factor to consider when selecting robotic systems. DIEP, deep inferior epigastric perforator; LD, latissimus dorsi; TORS, transoral robotic surgery; MUSA, microsurgical assistant.

4. Length of Operation

The length of the operation is a critical consideration when evaluating robotic systems, as longer procedures may increase surgical costs and extend operating times. However, operating times tend to decrease with practice and experience. We analysed the available literature on surgical outcomes and operative durations (Table 2).

Table 2. Operation duration based on subspecialty.

Subspecialty	Number of Papers	Description
Breast reconstruction	5	Moderate-to-long operative time, decreases with experience, longer for complex flaps
Microsurgery/extremity	2	Longer anastomosis time, reasonable overall duration, short setup for some harvests
Lymphedema/supermicrosurgery	1	Prolonged anastomosis vs. manual, improves with experience
Head and neck reconstruction	4	Significantly longer operative times for complex cases, shorter for simpler dissections

Description: This table analyses the outcomes of multiple papers discussing the length of operations based on the subspecialty.

In breast reconstruction, the mean operative time was 400.4 min, while the robotic operative time was only 85.8 min. The flap harvest time was decreased from 2 h to almost 1 h during the study period, as reported in [41,42].

The median combined mastectomy and reconstruction operative time was 307.0 min [7].

Endoscopic latissimus dorsi operating time was 34.5 ± 12.9 min, and robotic operating time was 75.9 ± 30.7 min, decreasing to a level comparable to that of the endoscopic method as the surgeon gained experience. Meanwhile, another study reported the console time

for deep inferior epigastric perforator flap reconstruction to be 68.8 min with a decreasing pattern [10–26].

Microsurgical anastomosis is a longer procedure. One study reported that the average time for finishing the arterial anastomosis was 36.7 ± 10.9 min, while another paper reported 25.3 ± 12.3 mins when compared to conventional methods, but the time required to finish the anastomosis decreased with experience and time [13–21].

Lymphedema anastomosis time decreased from 33 to 16 min with increased practice and surgical experience, demonstrating a substantial improvement in procedural efficiency [23].

Transoral robotic surgery was associated with reduced operative time in selected settings. However, some studies reported total operative times ranging from 814 to 1132 min, with a reconstruction time of approximately 591.2 min in patients with cancer who underwent free flap reconstruction. Other studies reported a total operative time of 710 min. Furthermore, robot-assisted neck dissection demonstrated a mean console time of 160 ± 15 min [30,31,43,44].

5. Rehabilitation Period and Length of Stay

Rehabilitation outcomes vary by specialty but generally show favorable results, making this an important factor to consider when implementing new technologies. Several studies have shown promising results (Table 3).

Table 3. Rehabilitation period and length of stay based on subspecialty.

Subspecialty	Number of Papers	Results
Breast reconstruction	4	Moderate-to-long operative time, decreases with experience, longer for complex flaps
Microsurgery/extremity	3	Longer anastomosis time, reasonable overall duration, short setup for some harvests
Lymphedema/supermicrosurgery	1	Prolonged anastomosis vs. manual, improves with experience
Head and neck reconstruction	4	Significantly longer operative times for complex cases, shorter for simpler dissections

Description: This table discusses the results of multiple studies regarding rehabilitation period outcomes in different subspecialties.

In breast reconstruction, the robotic group demonstrated a shorter mean hospital stay (7.92 ± 1.20 days) compared with conventional methods (8.77 ± 1.74 days). Additionally, a mean follow-up period of 19.1 ± 15.6 months was reported without any postoperative complications [10,45].

Another study reported a median length of stay of 12 days. In comparison, the robotic group had a mean length of stay of 10.2 ± 1.5 days with a follow-up period of 18.4 ± 4.6 months, while the endoscopic group had a mean length of stay of 10.8 ± 2.0 days with a follow-up period of 23.0 ± 11.3 months [7,26].

In microsurgery, the length of stay was 15.5 ± 10.8 days with a follow-up duration of 66 ± 27 days [16].

In another study, no complications, such as flap loss, ischemia, or venous thrombosis, were noted during a 143-day follow-up, while in others the patient was discharged on day 6 without complications [12,17].

For lymphedema reconstruction, supermicrosurgical systems such as MUSA/Microsure showed symptom improvement within 1–3 months [23].

Head and neck reconstruction procedures reported a shorter hospital stay with fewer complications, while the average length of stay was 13.5 days, suggesting that this method may shorten hospital stay. Other reports mentioned a length of stay of 5.6 days with follow-up periods of 6.4 and 12.8 months without any complications [30,31,43,44].

6. Aesthetic/Cosmetic Surgery

After reviewing the literature, only a few papers were found that focused specifically on robotic applications in aesthetic plastic surgery [4,22–28].

In 2014, Taghizadeh et al. evaluated the feasibility of using the da Vinci robotic system for platysmaplasty procedures with cadaveric models. The study demonstrated excellent surgical exposure, improved precision, tremor reduction, and easier suturing, indicating promising potential for the use of robotic systems in aesthetic plastic surgery [32].

In 2015, Mohamed et al. performed a retroauricular thyroidectomy combined with concomitant neck-lift surgery. The total operative time was 115 min, including 10 min for docking and 30 min for the neck-lift procedure. The authors reported that the approach was feasible and safe in a carefully selected group of patients with excess cervical skin [46].

Moreover, in 2015, Shin et al. used the ARTAS robotic system in 22 patients who underwent robotic follicular unit extraction for hair restoration. The study reported no significant adverse effects, infections, pain, or excessive scarring, thereby supporting the usefulness of robotic technology in hair restoration, particularly because the system improves harvesting efficiency for multiple hair follicles [35].

In 2016, Rybakin et al. performed upper facial rejuvenation procedures in four patients undergoing forehead lift using the da Vinci surgical system. The study highlighted several advantages of this approach, including high-resolution image display with scalable visualization, a reduction in tremor effects, improved instrument maneuverability, ease of instrument switching, and enhanced surgeon comfort [33].

In 2017, Correa et al. performed diastasis recti plication procedures in five mini-abdominoplasty cases. Conventional surgical instruments were initially used to dissect abdominal wall tissues, after which the da Vinci robotic system was introduced. The authors reported that robotic surgery offered advantages over conventional methods, including high-definition three-dimensional surgical visualization, superior precision, a wider range of instrument motion of the robotic instruments, and improved surgical stability, while allowing the surgeon to operate comfortably in a seated position at the console [47].

In 2024, Borisenko et al. performed the world's first simultaneous robot-assisted lipoabdominoplasty and cholecystectomy using the da Vinci surgical system. In this procedure, trocars were inserted through the flap scheduled for excision after abdominoplasty, eliminating the need for a separate cholecystectomy scar, thereby improving cosmetic outcomes and enabling successful suturing of the diastasis recti [34].

In 2025, the same group established the first reported robotic docking standards for facial aesthetic plastic surgery. Robot-assisted browlift, facelift, and platysmaplasty procedures were performed using the da Vinci system, with multiple access points defined for each procedure based on patient-specific anatomical characteristics. These protocols aimed to ensure safe access to target structures, maintain clear visualization, and improve instrument maneuverability. To date, these remain the only published docking standards for such operations [6].

A comparative study on the application of robotic hair restoration technology versus traditional follicular unit excision (FUE) methods for male androgenetic alopecia was published in 2024 by Zhu et al. [36].

The study compared the ARTAS robotic system with conventional FUE techniques and found no significant differences in efficacy, adverse effects, or complication rates,

indicating that robotic hair transplantation is a safe and effective approach for androgenic alopecia management.

Research and development in robotic hair transplantation technology is ongoing, as discussed in studies by Bae and Thuangtong [37,48,49].

However, current advancements are largely limited to hair transplantation procedures and are not transferable to other robot-assisted aesthetic surgeries involving the face or body. This limitation highlights the need for further research to expand the clinical applicability of robotic technology in aesthetic plastic surgery.

7. Discussion

Despite the advantages of robotic platforms, the current available literature remains very limited; most studies are small case series, feasibility reports or early clinical experiences, requiring more large-scale data. This limits our ability to draw definitive conclusions and to perform deeper analysis; however, the literature is growing by the day and with time more data will be available for analysis.

An important trend about this topic that we observed across multiple papers is that factors such as the learning curve, operative times and efficiency seem to greatly improve with time and surgeon experience; this is important because that suggests that the current limitations are not reflective of the long-term potential of the robotic systems, so the available evidence should be interpreted carefully and we should recognize that robotic systems in aesthetic surgery are still in their early stages of development [11,13,15,42].

Even though the use of robotic systems in plastic surgery is progressing, several challenges continue to limit their wider adoption in aesthetic procedures.

There were attempts to apply robotic technology in plastic surgery; surgeons primarily performed open surgical procedures, where the robotic system was introduced only after incisions were made and the operative field was exposed using conventional surgical methods.

Robotic systems are designed for use in closed surgical systems through small incisions, under camera guidance with gas insufflation to enhance the field of view for the surgeon, which represents their primary advantage.

The robotic method is indicated for low-body-mass-index patients, younger patients, those who fear scarring with a strong preference to conceal them, those with minimal excess skin as well as for operating in hard to reach areas, all of which are important in aesthetic plastic surgery. Surgical procedures that benefit most from the robotic method are those that require more precise dissection and are located in restricted access regions such as in the neck area [6].

Robotic systems improve cosmetic outcomes in patients through multiple key mechanisms [50].

First, they provide stability and precision by eliminating tremor and motion scaling, providing 3D visualization of the operative field, allowing a higher degree of accuracy and reducing the risk of trauma; such precision facilitates more control of tissues which in turn reduces the damage to soft tissues and improves aesthetic outcomes. Second, the robotic method provides minimal access points to tissues via small incisions in concealed anatomical regions, allowing the surgeon to operate in hard to reach areas while maintaining hidden scars, which is a key point in aesthetic surgery. Third, the minimally invasive nature of this method is associated with less tissue disruption and damage, resulting in lower rates of complications, faster recovery times and shorter hospital stays when compared to conventional methods. Collectively, these advantages favor the clinical use of robotic systems in aesthetic surgery [51].

Since robotic systems are not adopted in aesthetic plastic surgery, basic necessities need to be considered for the systems to be used correctly; for example, establishing docking methods would be the first and most necessary step to implement, and the absence of standardized docking algorithms remains a major limitation because without them, surgeons cannot operate correctly and safely. Few docking protocols currently exist for aesthetic surgical procedures; further development of docking standards is therefore necessary to advance robotic surgery [6].

The existing instruments are bulky and expensive; therefore, single-port robotic systems offer significant potential for aesthetic surgery applications, including platforms such as the da Vinci SP and Shurui Single-Port Systems.

Other factors that would be helpful include smaller instruments and specialized instruments for aesthetic surgery, for example, an adjustable head holder for patients undergoing platysmaplasty, such an instrument would be of immense use for the surgeon, providing comfortable access angles required during the operation, currently, the lack of specialized instruments remains a concern. Further miniaturization and optimization of surgical tools may enhance procedural feasibility and clinical outcomes in this field [33].

Robotic systems are a costly investment that can be up to 2 million dollars per system, due to the high cost of the robots, alternative financial models are offered by the manufacturers to make the systems more accessible and affordable for hospitals and clinics to get hold of them, like leasing, contract-based subscription, or pay-per click model in which the hospital pays per procedure, such models minimize the initial investment capital by the hospitals, making the robotic systems easier to acquire [52].

Based on the analysis by Giuseppe Turchetti et al., robotic systems are associated with high acquisition and maintenance costs, which limit their accessibility for many hospitals and patients [53].

Finally, surgeons must carefully select appropriate access points, maintain a clear field of view, minimize visible scarring, and consider patient-specific anatomical factors to ensure safe surgery and optimal clinical outcomes.

8. Future Directions

Future research will play a crucial role in advancing aesthetic plastic surgery by enhancing the precision, safety, and clinical effectiveness of robotic systems. Continued technological development is expected to improve surgical outcomes while maintaining superior cosmetic results.

Robotic platforms are being globally adopted and continue to expand, reflecting technological advancements and a growing clinical demand; over the past decade such systems transitioned from being used in a very limited scope to becoming increasingly integrated into specialized hospitals and clinics. This trend is expected to continue based on the improvements in system design and increased competition among manufacturers as well as the introduction of next-generation platforms with enhanced technology.

Single-port robotic platforms may usher in a new era in aesthetic surgery; for example the da Vinci Single-Port and Shurui Single-Port systems are particularly suitable for aesthetic plastic surgery because they provide a single access point, thereby minimizing visible scarring while preserving favorable cosmetic outcomes through minimally invasive surgical techniques.

The Shurui Single-Port platform has been shown to be feasible and safe, demonstrating low intraoperative complication rates, minimal blood loss, no surgical conversions, favorable postoperative pain scores, and shorter hospital stays, indicating strong clinical potential [39].

The da Vinci SP system has also demonstrated promising safety and feasibility. Its advantages include improved cosmetic outcomes, reduced postoperative pain, and faster recovery [54].

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) may enhance preoperative planning by enabling faster and more accurate surgical decision-making. AI models and predictive analytics can support real-time perfusion assessment, assist in correct flap selection, and enhance imaging interpretation [55].

Augmented reality and haptic feedback technologies may reduce procedural complexity while improving integration with tissues by providing enhanced sensory feedback for surgeons. The development of user-friendly training systems for plastic surgeons may also improve the accessibility and adoption of robotic technology [56,57].

Furthermore, telemedicine represents a promising application of robotic surgical technology. Remote robot-assisted surgery may allow surgeons to operate on patients across different geographic locations, thereby helping to overcome access barriers. Because robotic surgery is minimally invasive, integrating telemedicine may improve patient outcomes, reduce surgeon cognitive load, increase satisfaction levels, and enhance collaboration between hospitals and surgeons [21,58].

9. Conclusions

The use of robotic systems in plastic surgery is still in the early stages of development, and only a limited number of studies have examined their application in aesthetic plastic surgery.

The advantages of robotic systems have been highlighted in the literature, including minimal visible scarring, lower complication rates, shorter rehabilitation periods, and the ability to operate in anatomically challenging regions with high precision, making robotic technology an important consideration for future implementation in the field.

However, due to the absence of standardized docking methods, further investigation is required, with particular emphasis on developing safe, reliable, and reproducible robotic docking protocols for aesthetic plastic surgery.

With continued innovation, robotic systems may redefine aesthetic plastic surgery as safer, more precise, and more patient-centered.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization: V.I.S. and A.S.B.; methodology: V.I.S., A.S.B., Y.M.A.A. and A.E.A.; investigation: V.I.S., A.S.B. and Y.M.A.A.; writing: V.I.S., A.S.B., Y.M.A.A. and N.A.L.; original draft preparation: V.I.S., A.S.B., Y.M.A.A., A.E.A. and N.A.L.; resources: Y.M.A.A.; review and editing: V.I.S., A.S.B., Y.M.A.A., A.E.A. and N.A.L.; supervision: V.I.S. and A.S.B.; formal analysis: A.E.A. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: None of the authors have any financial interests related to the materials or methods presented.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: This article does not contain any studies on human participants or animals performed by any of the authors. For this type of study, formal consent is not required.

Data Availability Statement: No new data were created or analyzed in this study. Data sharing is not applicable to this article.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Borisenko, A.S.; Sharobaro, V.I.; Avdeev, A.E.; Ahmed Alsheikh, Y.M.; Bairamova, A.S.; Gafurova, O.A.; Smolyannikova, V.A. Application of Thulium Fiber Laser in Plastic Surgery. *Cosmetics* **2025**, *12*, 39. [CrossRef]

2. Borisenko, A.S.; Sharobaro, V.I.; Avdeev, A.E.; Ahmed Alsheikh, Y.M. Use of Thulium Fiber Laser for Precise Dissection in Facial Rejuvenation Surgery. *Plast. Reconstr. Surg. Glob. Open* **2025**, *13*, e6880. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
3. Selber, J.C. Robotics in plastic surgery: Current applications and future directions. *Plast. Reconstr. Surg.* **2021**, *148*, 790e–795e. [CrossRef]
4. Coelho, M.B.; Peltz, T.S.; Hunt, J.A.; Gianoutsos, M. Robotic surgery in plastic surgery: A review of its potential. *Australas. J. Plast. Surg.* **2024**, *7*, 115362. [CrossRef]
5. Tang, Y.; Dou, B. Cost-effectiveness analysis of robotic surgery in healthcare for older individuals: A systematic review based on randomized controlled trials. *Front. Public Health* **2025**, *13*, 1614654. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
6. Borisenko, A.S.; Sharobaro, V.I.; Avdeev, A.E.; Ahmed Alsheikh, Y.M. Docking Methods for Robot-assisted Rhytidectomy and Platysmaplasty. *Plast. Reconstr. Surg. Glob. Open* **2025**, *13*, e6733. [CrossRef]
7. Ryu, J.M.; Kim, J.Y.; Choi, H.J.; Ko, B.S.; Kim, J.; Cho, J.; Lee, M.H.; Choi, J.E.; Kim, J.H.; Lee, J.; et al. Robot-assisted Nipple-sparing Mastectomy With Immediate Breast Reconstruction: An initial Experience of the Korea Robot-endoscopy Minimal Access Breast Surgery Study Group (KoREa-BSG). *Ann. Surg.* **2022**, *275*, 985–991. [CrossRef]
8. Chen, K.; Zhang, J.; Beeraka, N.M.; Song, D.; Sinelnikov, M.Y.; Lu, P. Robot-assisted nipple-sparing mastectomy and immediate breast reconstruction with gel implant and latissimus dorsi muscle flap: Our initial experience. *Int. J. Med. Robot.* **2023**, *19*, e2528. [CrossRef]
9. Daar, D.A.; Anzai, L.M.; Vranis, N.M.; Schulster, M.L.; Frey, J.D.; Jun, M.; Zhao, L.C.; Levine, J.P. Robotic deep inferior epigastric perforator flap harvest in breast reconstruction. *Microsurgery* **2022**, *42*, 319–325. [CrossRef]
10. Lee, M.J.; Won, J.; Song, S.Y.; Park, H.S.; Kim, J.Y.; Shin, H.J.; Kwon, Y.I.; Lee, D.W.; Kim, N.Y. Clinical outcomes following robotic versus conventional DIEP flap in breast reconstruction: A retrospective matched study. *Front. Oncol.* **2022**, *12*, 989231. [CrossRef]
11. Lee, S. Safety and efficacy of robot-assisted latissimus dorsi flap harvesting for immediate partial breast reconstruction following breast-conserving surgery. *Gland Surg.* **2025**, *14*, 2334–2345. [CrossRef]
12. Kueckelhaus, M. Minimally Invasive Robotic-assisted Perforator-to-Perforator DIEP Flap Breast Reconstruction. *Plast. Reconstr. Surg. Glob. Open* **2024**, *12*, e5800. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
13. Barbon, C.; Grünherz, L.; Uyulmaz, S.; Giovanoli, P.; Lindenblatt, N. Exploring the learning curve of a new robotic microsurgical system for microsurgery. *JPRAS Open* **2022**, *34*, 126–133. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
14. Vollbach, F.H.; Bigdeli, A.K.; Struebing, F.; Weigel, J.L.; Gazyakan, E.; Kneser, U. Using a Microsurgical Robotic Platform for In-flap Anastomosis in Autologous Bipedicular Breast Reconstruction. *Plast. Reconstr. Surg. Glob. Open* **2024**, *12*, e5511. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
15. Besmens, I.S.; Politikou, O.; Giovanoli, P.; Calcagni, M.; Lindenblatt, N. Robotic Microsurgery in Extremity Reconstruction—Experience with a Novel Robotic System. *Surg. Innov.* **2024**, *31*, 42–47. [CrossRef]
16. Struebing, F.; Bigdeli, A.; Weigel, J.; Gazyakan, E.; Vollbach, F.; Panayi, A.C.; Vogelpohl, J.; Boecker, A.; Kneser, U. Robot-assisted Microsurgery: Lessons Learned from 50 Consecutive Cases. *Plast. Reconstr. Surg. Glob. Open* **2024**, *12*, e5685. [CrossRef]
17. Struebing, F.; Boecker, A.; Vollbach, F.; Weigel, J.; Kneser, U.; Bigdeli, A.K.; Gazyakan, E. Robot-assisted microsurgery: A single-center experience of 100 cases. *J. Robot. Surg.* **2024**, *19*, 28. [CrossRef]
18. Watson, J.A.; Könneker, S.; Esposito, G.; Hofmann, L.; Kim, B.-S.; Giovanoli, P.; Lindenblatt, N. Robotic assisted free flap reconstruction of the scalp using the Symani® surgical system. *Acta Neurochir.* **2025**, *167*, 93. [CrossRef]
19. Spille, J.; Wiltfang, J.; Wieker, H. Head and neck free flap reconstruction: A prospective case series with the Symani® surgical system. *J. Craniomaxillofac. Surg.* **2025**, *53*, 1957–1961. [CrossRef]
20. Innocenti, M.; Malzone, G.; Menichini, G. First-in-Human Free Flap Tissue Reconstruction Using a Dedicated Microsurgical Robotic Platform. *Plast. Reconstr. Surg.* **2023**, *151*, 1078–1082. [CrossRef]
21. Gorji, S.; Wessel, K.; Dermietzel, A.; Aitzetmueller, M.; Wendenburg, I.; Varnava, C.; Klietz, M.; Wiebringhaus, P.; Hirsch, T.; Kueckelhaus, M. Fully Telemetric Robotic Microsurgery: Clinical Experience With 23 Cases. *Microsurgery* **2024**, *44*, e31227. [CrossRef]
22. Kueckelhaus, M.; Nistor, A.; van Mulken, T.; Gazyakan, E.; Dastagir, K.; Wieker, H.; Mani, M.; Qiu, S.S.; Sørensen, J.A.; Pons, G.; et al. Clinical experience in open robotic-assisted microsurgery: User consensus of the European Federation of Societies for Microsurgery. *J. Robot. Surg.* **2025**, *19*, 171. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
23. Van Mulken, T.J.M.; Schols, R.M.; Scharmga, A.M.J.; Winkens, B.; Cau, R.; Schoenmakers, F.B.F.; Qiu, S.S.; van der Hulst, R.R.W.J.; MicroSurgical Robot Research Group; Keuter, X.H.A.; et al. First-in-human robotic supermicrosurgery using a dedicated microsurgical robot for treating breast cancer-related lymphedema: A randomized pilot trial. *Nat. Commun.* **2020**, *11*, 757. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
24. von Reibnitz, D.; Weinzierl, A.; Barbon, C.; Gutschow, C.A.; Giovanoli, P.; Grünherz, L.; Lindenblatt, N. 100 anastomoses: A two-year single-center experience with robotic-assisted micro- and supermicrosurgery for lymphatic reconstruction. *J. Robot. Surg.* **2024**, *18*, 164. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

25. Lindenblatt, N.; Grünherz, L.; Wang, A.; Gousopoulos, E.; Barbon, C.; Uyulmaz, S.; Giovanoli, P. Early Experience Using a New Robotic Microsurgical System for Lymphatic Surgery. *Plast. Reconstr. Surg. Glob. Open* **2022**, *10*, e4013. [CrossRef]
26. Eo, P.S.; Kim, H.; Lee, J.S.; Lee, J.; Park, H.Y.; Yang, J.D. Robot-Assisted Latissimus Dorsi Flap Harvest for Partial Breast Reconstruction: Comparison with Endoscopic and Conventional Approaches. *Aesthetic Surg. J.* **2023**, *44*, 38–46. [CrossRef]
27. Lai, H.W.; Lin, S.L.; Chen, S.T.; Lin, Y.-L.; Chen, D.-R.; Pai, S.-S.; Kuo, S.-J. Robotic nipple sparing mastectomy and immediate breast reconstruction with robotic latissimus dorsi flap harvest—Technique and preliminary results. *J. Plast. Reconstr. Aesthetic Surg.* **2018**, *71*, e59–e61. [CrossRef]
28. Lai, H.W.; Chen, S.T.; Lin, S.L.; Lin, Y.-L.; Wu, H.-K.; Pai, S.-H.; Chen, D.-R.; Kuo, S.-J. Technique for single axillary incision robotic assisted quadrantectomy and immediate partial breast reconstruction with robotic latissimus dorsi flap harvest for breast cancer. *Medicine* **2018**, *97*, e11373. [CrossRef]
29. Gorphe, P.; Von Tan, J.; El Bedoui, S.; Hartl, D.M.; Auperin, A.; Qassemyar, Q.; Moya-Plana, A.; Janot, F.; Julieron, M.; Temam, S. Early assessment of feasibility and technical specificities of transoral robotic surgery using the da Vinci Xi. *J. Robot. Surg.* **2017**, *11*, 455–461. [CrossRef]
30. Porcuna, D.V.; Soria, C.V.; Poyatos, J.V.; Viarnès, M.P.; López, P.M.; Lluch, C.G.; Suñe, C.H.; Guisasola, C.M.P.; López, C.C. Oropharyngeal free flap reconstruction: Transoral robotic surgery versus open approach. *Laryngoscope Investig. Otolaryngol.* **2023**, *8*, 1564–1570. [CrossRef]
31. Song, H.G.; Yun, I.S.; Lee, W.J.; Lew, D.H.; Rah, D.K. Robot-Assisted Free Flap in Head and Neck Reconstruction. *Arch. Plast. Surg.* **2013**, *40*, 353–358. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
32. Taghizadeh, F.; Reiley, C.; Mohr, C.; Paul, M. Evaluation of robotic-assisted platysmaplasty procedures in a cadaveric model using the da Vinci Surgical System. *J. Robot. Surg.* **2014**, *8*, 63–71. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
33. Rybakin, A.V.; Borovikov, A.M.; Manturova, N.E.; Gladyshev, D.V.; Kamalov, D.M.; Shcherbakov, K.G.; Staisupov, V.J.; Kuzin, D.A. Robotic-Assisted Upper Face Rejuvenation. *Plast. Reconstr. Surg. Glob. Open* **2016**, *4*, e747. [CrossRef]
34. Borisenko, A.S.; Sharobaro, V.I.; Vetshev, F.P.; Avdeev, A.E.; Bilyalov, I.R.; Ahmed Alsheikh, Y.M. Simultaneous Robot-Assisted Lipoabdominoplasty and Cholecystectomy. *Plast. Reconstr. Surg. Glob. Open* **2024**, *12*, e6249. [CrossRef]
35. Shin, J.W.; Kwon, S.H.; Kim, S.A.; Kim, J.Y.; Na, J.I.; Park, K.C.; Huh, C.H. Characteristics of robotically harvested hair follicles in Koreans. *J. Am. Acad. Dermatol.* **2015**, *72*, 146–150. [CrossRef]
36. Zhu, Y.; Yang, K.; Lin, J.; Ni, C.; Zhang, Y.; Li, Z.; Liu, Q.; Zhou, Y.; Lin, J.; Wu, W. A Comparative Study on the Application of Robotic Hair Restoration Technology Versus Traditional Follicular Unit Excision in Male Androgenetic Alopecia. *J. Cosmet. Dermatol.* **2024**, *23*, 4213–4222. [CrossRef]
37. Thuangtong, R.; Suthakorn, J. Design, proof-of-concept of single robotic hair transplant mechanisms for both harvest and implant of hair grafts. *Comput. Struct. Biotechnol. J.* **2023**, *24*, 31–45. [CrossRef]
38. Brownlee, E.M.; Slack, M. The Role of the Versius Surgical Robotic System in the Paediatric Population. *Children* **2022**, *9*, 805. [CrossRef]
39. Li, Z.Y.; Luo, C. Perioperative outcomes of the SHURUI single-port robotic system in urologic surgery: A systematic review and single-arm meta-analysis. *J. Robot. Surg.* **2025**, *19*, 334. [CrossRef]
40. Abendstein, B.; Prugger, M.; Menke, V.; Staib, L.; Salamavicius, N.; Kulis, T.; Willeke, F. The challenge of robotic surgery in oncology: A feasibility study with the Senhance™ Surgical System. *J. Robot. Surg.* **2025**, *19*, 757. [CrossRef]
41. Chung, J.H.; You, H.J.; Kim, H.S.; Lee, B.I.; Park, S.H.; Yoon, E.S. A novel technique for robot assisted latissimus dorsi flap harvest. *J. Plast. Reconstr. Aesthetic Surg.* **2015**, *68*, 966–972. [CrossRef]
42. Selber, J.C.; Baumann, D.P.; Holsinger, F.C. Robotic Latissimus Dorsi Muscle Harvest. *Plast. Reconstr. Surg.* **2012**, *129*, 1305–1312. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
43. Dabas, S.K.; Menon, N.N.; Tiwari, S.; Shukla, H.; Ranjan, R.; Gurung, B.; Bassan, B.B.; Kapoor, R.; Verma, V.; Sharma, P.; et al. Robotic Neck Dissection in Head and Neck Cancer via Modified BABA Technique. *Laryngoscope* **2024**, *134*, 4045–4051. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
44. Monroe, D.; Pyne, J.M.; McLennan, S.; Kimmis, R.; Yoon, J.; Biron, V.L. Characteristics and outcomes of transoral robotic surgery with free-flap reconstruction for oropharyngeal cancer: A systematic review. *J. Robot. Surg.* **2023**, *17*, 1287–1297. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
45. Kuo, W.L.; Wong, A.W.; Tsai, C.Y.; Chen, Y.-F.; Chang, T.N.-J.; Cheong, D.C.-F.; Huang, J.-J.M. Oncoplastic Entirely Robot-Assisted Approach: Incorporating Robotic Surgery in Both Mastectomy and DIEP Flap Reconstruction. *Plast. Reconstr. Surg.* **2025**, *156*, 451e–460e. [CrossRef]
46. Mohamed, S.E.; Saeed, A.; Moulthrop, T.; Kandil, E. Retroauricular robotic thyroidectomy with concomitant neck-lift surgery. *Ann. Surg. Oncol.* **2015**, *22*, 172. [CrossRef]
47. Correa, M.A.F. Minimally invasive robotic abdominoplasty. *Adv. Plast. Reconstr. Surg.* **2017**, *1*, 82–90. [CrossRef]
48. Thuangtong, R.; Anantawilailekha, O.; Prasertsin, P.; Suthakorn, J. Development and evaluation of an integrated image-guided robotic system for hair transplant surgery. *Comput. Struct. Biotechnol. J.* **2025**, *28*, 80–93. [CrossRef]

49. Bae, T.W.; Jung, Y.C.; Kim, K.H. Needle Transportable Semi-Automatic Hair Follicle Implanter and Image-Based Hair Density Estimation for Advanced Hair Transplantation Surgery. *Appl. Sci.* **2020**, *10*, 4046. [CrossRef]
50. AlKarboli, Y.; Abara, N.; Alotaibi, A.; Shamsah, A.; Pagan, A.; Acharya, P.; Mudunuri, T.; Imam, B.; Rose, R.S.; Jangid, G.; et al. Exploring the Use of Robotics in reconstructive and Plastic Surgery: A Comprehensive perspective. *Cureus* **2025**, *17*, e96571. [CrossRef]
51. Awad, L.; Reed, B.; Bollen, E.; Langridge, B.J.; Jasionowska, S.; Butler, P.E.M.; Ponniah, A. The emerging role of robotics in plastic and reconstructive surgery: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J. Robot. Surg.* **2024**, *18*, 254. [CrossRef]
52. Cost of Robotic Surgery Remains Complex Equation, ACS. Available online: https://www.facs.org/for-medical-professionals/news-publications/news-and-articles/bulletin/2026/february-2026-volume-111-issue-2/cost-of-robotic-surgery-remains-complex-equation (accessed on 5 April 2026).
53. Turchetti, G.; Palla, I.; Pierotti, F.; Cuschieri, A. Economic evaluation of da Vinci-assisted robotic surgery: A systematic review. *Surg. Endosc.* **2012**, *26*, 598–606. [CrossRef]
54. Caringi, S.; Delvecchio, A.; Casella, A.; De Palma, C.; Ferraro, V.; Filippo, R.; Stasi, M.; Tralli, N.; Manzia, T.M.; Tedeschi, M.; et al. The da Vinci Single-Port Robotic Platform in General Surgery: A Scoping Review of Current Applications and Outcomes. *J. Clin. Med.* **2025**, *14*, 8212. [CrossRef]
55. Greige, G. Recent Advancements in Robotic-assisted Plastic Surgery Procedures: A Systematic Review. *Plast. Reconstr. Surg. Glob. Open* **2025**, *13*, e6745. [CrossRef]
56. Novo, J.; Seth, I.; Mon, Y.; Soni, A.; Elkington, O.; Marcaccini, G.; Rozen, W.M. Use of Robotic Surgery in Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery: A Narrative Review. *Biomimetics* **2025**, *10*, 97. [CrossRef]
57. Cai, J.; Qi, X. Robot-Assisted Surgical Technology in Plastic Surgery: Evolution, Clinical Applications, and Future Perspectives. *Aesthetic Plast. Surg.* **2026**, *50*, 470–478. [CrossRef]
58. Picozzi, P.; Nocco, U.; Puleo, G.; Labate, C.; Cimolin, V. Telemedicine and Robotic Surgery: A Narrative Review to Analyze Advantages, Limitations and Future Developments. *Electronics* **2024**, *13*, 124. [CrossRef]

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.