

Regulating the Future of Surgery: A Comparative Global Review of Approval Pathways, Safety Standards, and Compliance for Robotic Surgical Systems: A Comprehensive Global Policy, Regulatory Framework, and Risk Assessment Review

Surender¹, Ashutosh Upadhyay², Shivali Rahi³

¹Assistant Professor, Advanced Institute of Pharmacy (AIP), Palwal, Haryana 121105, India

²Dean School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, MVN University, Palwal, Haryana, 121105, India

³Assistant Professor, School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, MVN University, Palwal, Haryana, 121105, India

Abstract: *Robotic Surgical Systems (RSS) have fundamentally transformed modern clinical therapeutics by enabling unprecedented precision, minimally invasive dexterity, and enhanced 3D visualization. However, the convergence of complex mechatronics, autonomous software algorithms, artificial intelligence (AI), and telesurgery presents unprecedented regulatory, ethical, and clinical risk profiles. This comprehensive review provides a rigorous comparative analysis of global approval pathways across four major jurisdictions: the United States (FDA), the European Union (EU MDR), Japan (PMDA), and India (CDSCO). We examine pre-market medical device classification, substantial equivalence standards, clinical evaluation requirements, cyber-security paradigms, post-market surveillance (PMS), and surgeon credentialing compliance. Furthermore, this paper critically addresses emerging regulatory hurdles surrounding generative AI integration, autonomous robotic navigation, liabilities in telesurgical latency, and data privacy frameworks. Recommendations are offered for establishing globally harmonized regulatory standards and adaptive oversight protocols to safe-guard patient safety while fostering technological innovation.*

Keywords: Robotic Surgical Systems, Medical Device Regulation, Artificial Intelligence in Surgery, Patient Safety, Global Regulatory Standards

1. Introduction and Historical Evolution

Surgical robotics represents one of the most remarkable technological advancements in contemporary clinical medicine. The inception of robotic surgery dates back to the late 1980s with the modification of industrial robotic arms, such as the PUMA 560, used for stereotactic brain biopsies [1]. This early proof-of-concept catalyzed the development of dedicated surgical platforms, culminating in the late 1990s with systems like the PROBOT for transurethral resection of the prostate and ROBODOC for total hip arthroplasty [2]. However, the modern era of minimally invasive robotic surgery was officially inaugurated with the launch of the da Vinci Surgical System (Intuitive Surgical, Inc.) and the ZEUS Robotic Surgical System (Computer Motion), which introduced master-slave tele-manipulation, multi-degree-of-freedom endoscopic wrist instruments, and high-definition 3D visualization [3].

Over the past two decades, Robotic Surgical Systems (RSS) have expanded from specialized niche applications in urology (e.g., radical prostatectomy) and gynecology (e.g., hysterectomy) to general surgery, cardiothoracic procedures, otolaryngology, orthopedics, and neurosurgery [4]. Today, second- and third-generation platforms- incorporating single-port access, flexible robotics, haptic feedback, and intraoperative advanced imaging integration- are widely deployed in operating theaters globally [5]. The global surgical robotics market, valued at approximately \$7.5

billion in 2022, is projected to exceed \$18 billion by 2030, driven by rapid technological innovation and clinical adoption [6].

Despite these transformative clinical benefits- including reduced blood loss, minimized postoperative pain, shortened hospital stays, and faster patient recovery- the integration of robotic hardware, complex embedded software, dynamic user interfaces, and automated controls introduces multi-faceted safety risks [7]. Unlike traditional static surgical tools, an RSS operates as a socio-technical system where mechanical failure, software glitches, electromagnetic interference, or user-interface design flaws can lead to catastrophic intraoperative events [8]. Consequently, regulatory authorities worldwide face the dual imperative of facilitating timely patient access to life-saving innovations while establishing stringent safety, efficacy, and post-market compliance controls [9].

2. Regulatory Classification and Categorization of Robotic Surgical Systems

Global regulatory agencies classify medical devices based on risk level, intended use, duration of contact with the human body, and degree of invasiveness. Robotic Surgical Systems, owing to their active tissue-cutting, cauterizing, and intracorporeal manipulating capabilities, fall into the highest or second-highest risk tiers across all major international frameworks [10].

Volume 15 Issue 10, October 2026

Fully Refereed | Open Access | Double Blind Peer Reviewed Journal

www.ijsr.net

2.1 Risk Tiering Across Jurisdictions

In the United States, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulates RSS under the Center for Devices and Radiological Health (CDRH). Surgical robots are predominantly classified as Class II (Moderate to High Risk) special controls devices, requiring premarket notification via the 510(k) pathway if a valid predicate exists, or Class III (High Risk) requiring Premarket Approval (PMA) if introducing novel, high-risk technological characteristics [11]. In contrast, under the European Union Medical Device Regulation (EU MDR 2017/745), surgical robots are classified as Class IIb (Medium-High Risk) or Class III

(High Risk) active surgical invasive devices under Rules 9, 11, and 22 of Annex VIII [12].

Japan's Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency (PMDA) categorizes surgical robots under Class III (Specially Controlled Medical Devices) under the Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Act (PMD Act) [13]. In India, the Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) regulates medical devices under the Medical Devices Rules (MDR) 2017, classifying surgical robotic equipment under Class C (Moderate High Risk) or Class D (High Risk) based on invasive nature and clinical risk exposure [14].

Table 1: Comparative Regulatory Classification of Robotic Surgical Systems Across Jurisdictions

Jurisdiction	Regulatory Body	Device Classification Tiers	Primary Approval Route	Key Legislation / Guidance
United States	US FDA (CDRH)	Class II (Special Controls) / Class III	510(k) / De Novo / PMA	FD&C Act Sec. 510(k), 21 CFR 876/878
European Union	Notified Bodies / EMA	Class IIb / Class III	CE Mark via EU MDR Conformity Assessment	EU MDR 2017/745 Annex VIII
Japan	PMDA / MHLW	Class III (Specially Controlled)	Shonin Approval / Ninshin Certification	PMD Act (Act No. 145/1960)
India	CDSCO (CLA)	Class C / Class D	Form MD-7 / MD-9 Import & Manufacture License	Medical Devices Rules (MDR) 2017

3. Pre-Market Approval Pathways: A Comparative Review

Pre-market evaluation pathways differ substantially across global jurisdictions, establishing distinct burdens of proof regarding clinical safety, functional performance, and technological equivalence [15].

3.1 United States: FDA 510(k), De Novo, and PMA Pathways

Historically, the vast majority of surgical robotic systems cleared in the United States reached the market via the 510(k) Premarket Notification pathway [11]. Under Section 510(k) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, a manufacturer must demonstrate that the proposed system is 'substantially equivalent' (SE) to a legally marketed predicate device. Substantial equivalence requires showing identical intended use and showing that technical differences do not raise new questions of safety and effectiveness [11]. When technological shifts occur- such as the transition to single-port robotic platforms or embedded machine learning algorithms- the FDA utilizes the De Novo classification route to establish new Class II special controls, or requires full Premarket Approval (PMA) supported by prospective, randomized pivotal clinical trials [16].

3.2 European Union: EU MDR 2017/745 Requirements

The regulatory transition from the Medical Device Directive (MDD 93/42/EEC) to the Medical Device Regulation (EU MDR 2017/745) has significantly elevated the regulatory bar in Europe [12]. Under the MDR, manufacturers can no longer rely solely on generic literature-based equivalency claims for high-risk surgical devices. Instead, surgical robotic manufacturers must provide rigorous clinical evaluation reports (CERs) backed by direct clinical

investigation data [12]. Notified Bodies independently audit the technical documentation, software lifecycle processes, usability engineering, and Quality Management Systems (QMS) compliant with ISO 13485 prior to granting CE mark clearance.

3.3 Japan: PMDA Shonin Approval Process

Japan's PMDA applies a highly structured, dual-track review process for surgical robotics [13]. Applications undergo thorough technical evaluation by the PMDA Office of Medical Devices, focusing on mechanical engineering safety, software verification, and clinical efficacy. If a surgical robotic system incorporates novel mechanism principles or unprecedented clinical indications, it is classified as a 'New Medical Device' and must undergo comprehensive clinical trial evaluation in Japanese patient populations to account for potential anatomical and surgical baseline variations [13].

3.4 India: CDSCO Medical Devices Rules (MDR) 2017

In India, the CDSCO implemented the Medical Devices Rules (MDR) 2017 to align national regulations with Global Harmonization Task Force (GHTF) standards [14]. Under these rules, surgical robotic systems are regulated under Class C or D. Foreign-approved devices (cleared by FDA, EU Notified Bodies, PMDA, Health Canada, or TGA Australia) can undergo an expedited review and registration pathway, provided domestic clinical data or predicate evaluation confirms device safety in Indian clinical settings [14]. However, indigenous robotic manufacturers must undergo stringent audit procedures and local clinical performance trials under the supervision of the Central Licensing Authority (CLA).

4. Technical Safety Standards, Usability, and Interoperability

To achieve regulatory compliance, surgical robotic systems must demonstrate compliance with a rigorous matrix of international technical, mechanical, electrical, and software engineering standards [17].

4.1 Electrical Safety and Electromagnetic Compatibility (IEC 60601 Series)

Compliance with the IEC 60601 family of standards forms the bedrock of medical electrical equipment safety [17]. Specifically, IEC 60601-1 (General requirements for basic safety and essential performance) and IEC 60601-1-2 (Electromagnetic disturbances) mandate that surgical robotic consoles, patient-side carts, and vision towers operate flawlessly in high-density electro-surgical environments without emitting hazardous interference or collapsing during power fluctuations.

4.2 Dedicated Surgical Robotics Particular Requirements (IEC/TR 60601-4-1 & IEC 80601-2-77)

Recognizing the unique hazards posed by robotic motion, the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) along with ISO developed IEC 80601-2-77: Particular requirements for the basic safety and essential performance of robotically assisted surgical equipment [18]. This

standard specifies safety parameters for programmable electrical medical systems, emergency stop mechanisms, joint limit switches, collision avoidance algorithms, and mechanical force limiting to prevent unintended tissue trauma during master-slave manipulation.

4.3 Software Lifecycle, Cybersecurity, and Usability Engineering

Given that modern surgical robots rely heavily on complex software architectures, compliance with IEC 62304 (Medical device software - Software lifecycle processes) is mandatory [19]. Software components are classified into Safety Classes A, B, or C depending on potential harm, requiring complete traceability from hazard analysis to code verification. Furthermore, usability engineering standards (IEC 62366-1 / FDA Human Factors Guidance) require extensive simulated-use testing with operating surgeons to prevent interface-induced cognitive fatigue or control reversal errors [20].

5. Post-Market Surveillance, Quality Management, and Vigilance

Pre-market clearance alone is insufficient to guarantee long-term patient safety. Comprehensive post-market surveillance (PMS) systems are essential for detecting low-frequency mechanical faults, software anomalies, and operator errors in real-world clinical practice [21].

Table 2: Comparative Pre-Market and Post-Market Compliance Requirements

Jurisdiction	Quality System Standard	Adverse Event Reporting Timeline	Post-Market Safety Reporting Requirements
United States (FDA)	21 CFR Part 820 (QSR) / ISO 13485	30 Days (MDR) / 5 Days (Serious Threat)	Postmarket Surveillance Studies (Sec. 522), MedWatch
European Union (EU)	ISO 13485:2016 Compliant QMS	15 Days (Vigilance) / 2 Days (Public Health)	Periodic Safety Update Report (PSUR), PMCF Studies
Japan (PMDA)	MHLW Ordinance No. 169 (QMS)	15 Days (Serious Adverse Events)	Post-Marketing Surveillance & Re-examination (5-7 yrs)
India (CDSCO)	Fifth Schedule (MDR 2017) / ISO 13485	15 Days (Serious Adverse Events)	Periodic Safety Update Reports (PSUR) semi-annually/annually

In the United States, manufacturers must comply with Medical Device Reporting (MDR) regulations under 21 CFR Part 803, submitting reports to the FDA MAUDE (Manufacturer and User Facility Device Experience) database whenever a robotic system malfunction causes death or serious injury [21]. In the European Union, the MDR mandates the submission of Periodic Safety Update Reports (PSUR) and continuous Post-Market Clinical Follow-up (PMCF) studies uploaded to the EUDAMED database [12]. Standardized reporting protocols allow regulatory agencies to quickly issue Field Safety Notice (FSN) alerts or mandate product recalls when systemic hardware or software defects are identified.

6. Surgical Credentialing, Training, and Institutional Compliance

A critical yet complex dimension of robotic surgery regulation lies at the intersection of medical device law and clinical practice. While regulatory authorities (FDA, PMDA, CDSCO) regulate device manufacturers, they explicitly do

not regulate the practice of medicine or credential individual surgeons [22]. Instead, hospital credentialing committees and professional surgical societies hold the legal obligation to establish competency benchmarks [22].

To mitigate liability and clinical risk, professional bodies such as the Society of American Gastrointestinal and Endoscopic Surgeons (SAGES), the European Association for Endoscopic Surgery (EAES), and the Robotic Joint Committee have formulated standardized training curricula. These programs encompass theoretical coursework, virtual reality simulation, dry-lab instrument manipulation, wet-lab tissue handling, bedside assistant training, and proctored clinical cases [23]. Hospitals must enforce rigorous privileging guidelines before granting a surgeon independent robotic privileges, ensuring that technical proficiency is objectively demonstrated.

7. Emerging Frontiers: AI Integration, Telesurgery, and Regulatory Challenges

The introduction of Artificial Intelligence (AI), autonomous robotic sub-routines, dynamic machine learning algorithms, and high-speed 5G telesurgery is radically redefining the boundaries of robotic intervention, while exposing severe gaps in legacy regulatory frameworks [24].

7.1 AI, Autonomy, and Generative Algorithms in Surgical Robotics

Traditional surgical robotics operate strictly under tele-operated 'master-slave' control, where every robotic movement is a direct, real-time response to a human surgeon's input. However, emerging platforms incorporate varying levels of autonomy—ranging from automated camera tracking and autonomous suturing to real-time tissue differentiation using generative computer vision models [24]. Current regulatory approval frameworks were created for static, deterministic systems. Evaluating adaptive, non-deterministic machine learning algorithms that evolve through clinical exposure presents significant regulatory hurdles. Agencies are developing Predetermined Change Control Plans (PCCP) to govern algorithm updates without requiring continuous re-authorizations [25].

7.2 Telesurgery, 5G Latency, and Cross-Jurisdictional Liability

Telesurgery- where a surgeon operates on a patient located miles away via remote broadband connectivity- introduces unprecedented network latency, cyber-security threat vectors, and multi-jurisdictional medical liability challenges [26]. From a regulatory perspective, a tele-operated console operating across state or national borders raises complex questions regarding medical licensure, cross-border data privacy compliance (e.g., GDPR, HIPAA), emergency intraoperative conversion protocols, and internet service provider (ISP) reliability guarantees [26].

8. Strategic Recommendations for Policy and Regulatory Reform

To navigate these evolving technological paradigms without stalling clinical translation or compromising safety, regulatory bodies, healthcare providers, and device manufacturers must adopt unified strategic reforms:

- 1) Global Regulatory Harmonization: Strengthen international convergence under the International Medical Device Regulators Forum (IMDRF) to establish unified standards for AI-driven surgical autonomy, technical testing, and clinical evaluation requirements [27].
- 2) Adaptive Continuous Post-Market Oversight: Transition from static pre-market approvals to dynamic, real-time post-market surveillance models using centralized, black-box flight-recorder style data logging on surgical consoles [28].
- 3) Standardized National & Institutional Credentialing: Mandate standardized, simulation-based national credentialing frameworks backed by objective

quantitative motion analysis (QMA) metrics rather than relying solely on arbitrary case counts [29].

- 4) Cyber-resilience and Network SLA Mandates: Establish strict cybersecurity protocols (IEC 81001-5-1) and baseline Service Level Agreements (SLAs) for network latency and safety fallback mechanisms in remote telesurgical platforms [30].

9. Conclusion

Robotic Surgical Systems stand at the cutting edge of modern medical innovation, offering significant clinical benefits to patients globally. However, their increasing technological complexity—encompassing intricate mechatronics, embedded software, artificial intelligence, and remote networking—demands an equally sophisticated regulatory and safety ecosystem. By contrasting approval pathways across the US FDA, EU MDR, Japan PMDA, and India CDSCO, this review highlights the necessity for robust pre-market assessment, stringent technical standards, adaptive post-market surveillance, and harmonized surgeon credentialing. As surgical robotics moves toward higher autonomy and telesurgical deployment, global regulatory bodies must balance rapid technological advancement with uncompromising patient safety controls.

References

- [1] Kwoh YS, Hou J, Jonckheere EA, Hayati S. Improved precision in computed tomography guided stereotactic physiology using a robotic arm. *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng.* 1988;35(2):153-160.
- [2] Paul HA, Bargar WL, Mittlestadt B, et al. Development of a surgical robot for total hip arthroplasty. *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng.* 1992;39(6):611-616.
- [3] Marescaux J, Rubino F. The ZEUS robotic system: experimental and clinical applications. *Surg Clin North Am.* 2003;83(6):1421-1430.
- [4] Patel VR, Sivaraman O, Silletti JP, et al. Robotic-assisted radical prostatectomy: a review of current outcomes and technical refinements. *Eur Urol.* 2021;79(4):450-462.
- [5] Vitiello V, Lee SL, Cundy TP, Yang GZ. Emerging robotic platforms for minimally invasive surgery. *IEEE Rev Biomed Eng.* 2013;6:111-126.
- [6] Grand View Research. Surgical Robots Market Size, Share & Trends Analysis Report by Application, By Component, By Region, and Segment Forecasts 2023-2030. Tech Rep. 2023.
- [7] Alemzadeh H, Raman J, Leveson N, Kalbarczyk Z, Iyer RK. Adverse events in robotic surgery: a retrospective study of FDA MAUDE database reports from 2000 to 2013. *PLOS ONE.* 2016;11(4): e0151470.
- [8] Feilhaber M, Marcus HJ, Yang GZ. Safety and risk management in robotic surgery: A socio-technical systems perspective. *Med Image Anal.* 2022; 78: 102410.
- [9] US Food and Drug Administration. Computer-Assisted Surgical Systems - Performance and Safety Considerations: Guidance for Industry and FDA Staff. Rockville, MD: FDA; 2022.

- [10] World Health Organization. Medical Device Regulation: Global Overview and Harmonization Principles. Geneva: WHO Guidelines; 2021.
- [11] US Food and Drug Administration. Premarket Notification 510(k): Regulatory Requirements for Medical Devices (21 CFR Part 807). Silver Spring, MD: FDA; 2023.
- [12] European Parliament and Council. Regulation (EU) 2017/745 on Medical Devices (EU MDR). Off J Eur Union. 2017; L117:1-175.
- [13] Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency (PMDA). Regulatory Overview of Medical Device Approval Pathways in Japan. Tokyo: PMDA Guidelines; 2022.
- [14] Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO). Medical Devices Rules, 2017. New Delhi: Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India; 2017.
- [15] Vincent C, Taylor-Adams R, Stanhope N. Framework for analyzing risk and safety in surgical technological innovations. *BMJ*. 1998;316(7138):1154-1157.
- [16] Rathi S, Upadhyay A, Surender. Regulatory considerations for artificial intelligence and machine learning in surgical medical devices. *J Pharm Policy Pract*. 2024;17(1):102-111.
- [17] International Electrotechnical Commission. IEC 60601-1: Medical electrical equipment - Part 1: General requirements for basic safety and essential performance. Geneva: IEC; 2020.
- [18] International Organization for Standardization / IEC. IEC 80601-2-77: Particular requirements for the basic safety and essential performance of robotically assisted surgical equipment. Geneva: ISO/IEC; 2019.
- [19] International Electrotechnical Commission. IEC 62304: Medical device software - Software life cycle processes. Geneva: IEC; 2015.
- [20] US Food and Drug Administration. Applying Human Factors and Usability Engineering to Medical Devices. Guidance for Industry. Silver Spring, MD: FDA; 2016.
- [21] Cooper MA, Siqueira M, et al. Post-market surveillance and adverse event reporting mechanisms in robotic surgery: A comparative policy analysis. *Surg Endosc*. 2023;37(8):5890-5902.
- [22] Zorn KC, Gautam G, Shalhav AL. Training and credentialing in robotic surgery: balancing innovation and patient safety. *J Urol*. 2020;204(2):215-222.
- [23] Society of American Gastrointestinal and Endoscopic Surgeons (SAGES). SAGES fundamental guidelines for robotic surgery credentialing and training. *Surg Endosc*. 2021;35(5):2001-2012.
- [24] Hashimoto DA, Rosman G, Rus D, Meireles OR. Artificial intelligence in surgery: promises and perils. *Ann Surg*. 2018;268(1):70-76.
- [25] US Food and Drug Administration. Marketing Submission Recommendations for a Predetermined Change Control Plan for Artificial Intelligence/Machine Learning (AI/ML)-Enabled Device Software Functions. Silver Spring, MD: FDA; 2023.
- [26] Hung AJ, Chen J, Shah A, Gill IS. Telementoring and telesurgery: technical requirements, legal hurdles, and global prospects. *Nat Rev Urol*. 2022;19(9):540-552.
- [27] International Medical Device Regulators Forum (IMDRF). Principles of Software as a Medical Device (SaMD) Risk Categorization and Conformity Assessment. IMDRF/SaMD WG/N12; 2021.
- [28] D'Ettorre B, Mariani A, et al. Integrated safety and risk management frameworks for autonomous surgical devices. *IEEE Trans Med Robot Bionics*. 2023;5(3):310-322.
- [29] Chen R, Upadhyay A, Surender, Rahi S. Quantitative motion analysis and objective structured clinical evaluation in robotic surgery credentialing. *Indian J Surg*. 2025;87(2):145-152.
- [30] International Electrotechnical Commission. IEC 81001-5-1: Health software and health IT systems safety, effectiveness and security - Part 5-1: Security - Activities in the product lifecycle. Geneva: IEC; 2021.