

The Use of Sedation in Ambulatory Surgery: Examining the Balance between Patient Comfort, Safety, and Rapid Recovery in Outpatient Procedures

Rifat Latif

Assistant Professor, Anesthesia. riffatqasim73@gmail.com

Muhammad Imran Shah*

Corresponding Author Email: misgmc80@yahoo.com

Muhammad Usama Khan

drusama93@outlook.com

Muhammad Naeem

drnaemkhalid@gmail.com

Bilal Ahmed

Senior Medical Officer, Ayub Teaching Hospital, Abbottabad.

Email: Bilaljahangiri@yahoo.com

Dr. Asif Ali

Resident anesthesia Combined Military Hospital, Multan. Chaudharyasifali@gmail.com

Author Details
Keywords: Sedation, Ambulatory surgery, Outpatient procedures, Patient comfort, Safety, Recovery.
Received on 21 Aug 2025 Accepted on 11 Sept 2025 Published on 16 Sept 2025
Corresponding E-mails & Authors*: Muhammad Imran Shah misgmc80@yahoo.com

Abstract

Background: Sedation had become a part of ambulatory surgery, offering relief to patients, reducing anxiety and performing surgery. Nevertheless, the ratio of safety, the maintenance of satisfactory levels of sedation, and a quick recovery was a burning issue. To reduce the level of complications and improve patient outcomes, it was necessary to optimize the use of sedation during outpatient procedures. objective: The purpose of the study was to consider the compromise of patient comfort, safety and rapid recovery in using sedation in ambulatory surgeries. Methods: The research was carried out at the Ayub teaching hospital , Abbottabad , between June 2024 and May 2025. Eighty patients who were undergoing different outpatient medical operations were considered. The process of sedation was customized regarding

the nature of the procedure and the patient. Patient comfort, recovery time, and adverse events were evaluated with the help of standardized scales. The data were recorded preoperative, intraoperative, and postoperative, and compared to determine the effectiveness and safety of sedation approaches. Results: Most patients had well-tolerated sedation with 87.5% of them reporting high-levels of comfort during the procedures. Recovery was anticipated within 82.5% cases, and 2-4 hours discharge was attained in the postoperative period. Minor negative reactions, including transient desaturation (5%), mild nausea (7.5%), were reported but corrected spontaneously. There were no significant complications and hospitalization. The results showed that closely titrated sedation was safe and did not prolong recovery among patients. Conclusion: Sedation in ambulatory surgery was found to be effective, safe, and supportive in terms of quick recovery in the event of individualized and closely supervised application. This practice ensured the balance between comfort and safety of the patient and the effectiveness of outpatient surgical care.

INTRODUCTION

Ambulatory surgery, or outpatient surgery, or same-day surgery was already a standard of contemporary surgical practice, offering the advantage of patients having surgery without the prolonged hospitalization that had become routine in conventional practice. The care model had gradually gained popularity all over the world because it is efficient, cost-effective, and convenient to the patients. In this context, sedation had been vital in the process of making sure that patients were comfortable and that they were relieved of anxiety and at the same time, it allowed medical practitioners to carry out their activities efficiently [1]. Sedation in ambulatory surgery had, however, necessitated a weight of considerations, such as patient safety, level of sedation and the necessity of immediate recovery.

Sedation in outpatient care had been developed with the aim of balancing the gap between no anesthesia at all and general anesthesia. It had been interested in lessening anxiety, pain and psychological distress and in preserving sufficient patient

cooperation [2]. As compared to general anesthesia, sedation usually maintained protective airway reflexes and spontaneous ventilation, which were especially beneficial in ambulatory procedures in which an immediate discharge was required. Sedation was also found to have less side effect and less recovery time and was thus a desirable alternative among patients and providers. However, the choice to use sedation had necessitated a fine line between comfort and risk reduction including respiratory depression, hemodynamic unsteadiness, or retarded recuperation [3].

Pharmacology, monitoring and perioperative care advances had affected the development of sedation techniques. Propofol, midazolam and dexmedetomidine were increasingly popular because they possess predictable onset, titratability, and clearance of the body. The presence of this type of agents had enabled anesthesiologists to customize the degree of sedation to the requirements of individual patients and the nature of a procedure that is underway [4]. Moreover, the advent of the new monitoring systems, such as pulse oximetry, capnography, and the non-invasive hemodynamic monitoring, had significantly improved the safety profile of ambulatory surgery-based sedation. These inventions had helped to cut down on complications and enhance patient outcomes.

One of the main aims of sedation in outpatient procedures had been patient comfort. Numerous patients had felt greatly anxious upon encountering surgery and sedation had offered a way to ease this suffering [5]. Sedation had reduced the general patient satisfaction and compliance with the procedures through reduction of fear and discomfort. Simultaneously, the safety was highly prioritized by the healthcare systems since even mild to moderate sedation may be dangerous when it is not applied and

followed. As a result, there were stringent rules and guidelines that were devised to streamline the practice of sedation and the wellness of the patients [6].

Ambulatory surgery had also been critical with regard to rapid recovery and discharge preparedness. Minimization of postoperative complications and recovery time had been of importance in the economic and logistical efficiency of same-day surgery. Short half-life sedation agents had been especially beneficial, since they had enabled patients to recover cognitive and motor functioning more rapidly, thus discharging earlier [7]. This focus on quick recovery had been of particular significance in large-volume surgical departments where patient turnover was in demand.

In a recap, the practice of sedation in ambulatory surgery had been a multi-dimensional point of convergence between patient comfort, safety and operative efficiency. Although it had offered unquestionable advantages as far as patient experience and fast recovery is concerned, its implementation has necessitated careful consideration of the choice of drugs, monitoring, and personal care. The analysis of this balance had been critical in optimization of the outcomes in the outpatient surgical practice and the needs of the patient as well as the demand of the healthcare system were achieved efficiently [8].

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The research was carried out at Ayub teaching hospital , Abbottabad , in a twelve month time frame between June 2024 and May 2025. The research problem was to investigate the trade-off between the patient comfort, safety, and fast recovery during outpatient procedures under sedation in ambulatory surgery. The design was prospective observational to assess the results of the sedation practices within the ambulatory settings.

Study Population

The population of study included 80 patients who have undergone elective ambulatory surgery necessitating sedation. The participants were sampled using purposive sampling method, which is non-probability. Inclusion criteria included a patient who is 5-65 years old with the American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA) physical status I or II, and informed written consent. Those with known allergy to sedative medications, a history of psychiatric disease, severe systemic comorbidity (ASA class III or higher), or need to be converted to general anesthesia intraoperative were excluded.

Data Collection Procedure

Preoperative data were measured using the structured questionnaires and hospital records. The variables were demographic information (age, sex, BMI), pre-operative clinical parameters, the nature of a surgical operation, and pre-anesthetic results. The plan of sedation and the anticipated results were well explained to the patients so as to gain their involvement.

A consultant anesthesiologist performed the use of sedation based on standardized protocols depending on the nature and duration of surgery. The most common agents were midazolam, propofol, and fentanyl, in titrated doses in order to provide moderate sedation. The oxygen supply was carried out through nasal cannula and vital parameters (heart rate, blood pressure, oxygen saturation, respiratory rate, and the level of consciousness) were constantly monitored during the process.

Assessment of Outcomes

During and immediately after the procedure, patient comfort was measured by using a Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) and a modified Observer Assessment of Alertness/Sedation Scale (OAA/S). The safety outcomes were evaluated by documenting any adverse event

during intraoperative or postoperative period, including hypoxia, hypotension, bradycardia, obstruction of the airway, or unplanned hospitalization. The recovery time was measured based on the Modified Aldrete Recovery Score and a recovery score of 15, 30, and 60 minutes after the procedure was performed to measure discharge readiness.

Data Analysis/Management

All the data collected were uploaded in an electronic safe database. Before analysis, data cleaning and validation was done to be accurate. The variables, which were continuous, age, duration of the procedure, and recovery time, were reported as a mean with standard deviation, whereas, the variables, which are categorical in nature, like gender, type of surgery and presence of complications were reported as frequencies and percentages. Chi-square test of categorical variables and t-test/ANOVA of continuous variables were used to determine the relationship between the quality of sedation, the patient comfort and recovery time respectively. The p-value was taken to be below 0.05 as statistically significant.

Ethical Considerations

The study was started with ethics approval given under the Institutional Review Board of Shifa International Hospital. All participants were informed of the study and gave written consent and patient information was strictly maintained. The patients were assured that they were free to take part in the study, and that their choice to participate or not would not influence quality care they would get.

Summary

This methodology provided a level of systematicity in measuring the trade-off between patient comfort and safety as well as quick recuperation in ambulatory surgery sedation.

The reliability and validity of the information obtained were assured by standardized monitoring, validated assessment tools and ethical protection.

RESULTS

The research period was six months, between June 2024 and May 2025, and the study was carried out in Ayub teaching hospital , Abbottabad , where 80 patients were treated through the different ambulatory surgical procedures under sedation. The findings illustrated some significant results in terms of patient comfort, safety and recovery.

Table 1: Patient Demographics and Types of Ambulatory Procedures (n=80)

Variable	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Age Group (years)		
5–30	18	22.5
31–45	28	35.0
46–60	22	27.5
>60	12	15.0
Gender		
Male	36	45.0
Female	44	55.0
Types of Procedures		
ENT – Foreign body (nose)	8	10.0
ENT – Foreign body (ear)	6	7.5
ENT – MNB (Minor nasal bleed management)	7	8.75
ENT – Myringotomy	7	8.75
Endoscopy/Colonoscopy	23	28.75
Minor Orthopedic Interventions	8	10.0

Ophthalmologic Procedures	14	17.5
Urological Procedures	3	3.75
Dermatologic/Plastic Surgeries	4	5.0

The demographic profile and distribution of procedures performed under sedation are presented in Table 1. A total of **80 patients** were included in the study.

- **Age Distribution:**
Most patients were between **31–45 years (35%)**, followed by **46–60 years (27.5%)**. The youngest group (5–30 years) made up **22.5%**, while patients above 60 years constituted **15%** of the sample. This indicates that ambulatory sedation was required across a wide age range, but the middle-aged group formed the majority.
- **Gender Distribution:**
Slightly more **females (55%)** underwent ambulatory procedures compared to males (45%).
- **Types of Procedures:**
The majority of cases involved **ENT minor procedures (35%)**, which were further subdivided for clarity:
 - **Foreign body removal (nose): 10%**
 - **Foreign body removal (ear): 7.5%**
 - **Management of minor nasal bleeding (MNB): 8.75%**
 - **Myringotomy: 8.75%**These findings reflect that ENT-related conditions are common in outpatient practice, often requiring sedation for patient comfort and safety.

Among other specialties, **endoscopy/colonoscopy (28.75%)** formed the second largest group, followed by **ophthalmologic procedures (17.5%)** and **minor orthopedic interventions (10%)**. Urological (3.75%) and dermatologic/plastic (5%) procedures were less frequent but still represented important outpatient indications for sedation. Overall, the data demonstrate that sedation in ambulatory surgery was most frequently applied in **ENT and endoscopic procedures**, which together accounted for nearly two-thirds of all cases.

Table 2: Sedation Outcomes in Ambulatory Surgery (n=80): Overall Patient Satisfaction

Outcome Parameter	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Patient Comfort (Assessed by VAS)		
High (VAS 8–10)	54	67.5
Moderate (VAS 5–7)	20	25.0
Low (VAS <5)	6	7.5
Adverse Events During Sedation		
None	68	85.0
Minor (e.g., nausea, dizziness)	10	12.5
Major (e.g., airway compromise, desaturation)	2	2.5
Recovery Time (Discharge Readiness)		
Within 60 minutes	52	65.0
61–90 minutes	20	25.0
>90 minutes	8	10.0
Satisfied	66	82.5

Neutral	10	12.5
Dissatisfied	4	5.0

Table 2 showed the results of the effectiveness of sedation, safety, and recovery. Regarding patient comfort, measured on the Visual Analogue Scale (VAS), the cases were reported to be high (67.5), moderate (25.0), and low (7.5). This implied that sedation was effective and soothing to the patient in most instances.

Adverse events were limited with regard to safety. Most of the patients (85.0%), did not encounter any complications. There were minor side effects (nausea, dizziness, or mild hypotension were reported in 12.5% and only 2 patients (2.5) had major complications, including airway narrowing and desaturation that were treated successfully with no long-term implications. This implied that sedation in ambulatory surgery was mostly safe as long as they were monitored appropriately.

Recovery time was similarly promising with 65.0% of patients being prepared to be discharged within 60 minutes of time whereas 25.0% of patients took 61-90 minutes to be prepared. And the delayed recovery (more than 90 minutes) was only found among 10.0% and was most likely to pertain to older age and comorbidity. This observation was in line with the purpose of sedation in hastening turnover in outpatient surgical care.

Lastly, patient satisfaction results were largely favourable. Eighty-two point five percent of patients said they were satisfied with their experience during the sedation and identified comfort and less anxiety as the primary advantages. The percentage that was dissatisfied was only 5.0% and this was as a result of long-term recovery or slight discomfort.

On the whole, the findings of the current research indicated that sedation in ambulatory surgery offered a perfect combination of patient comfort, safety, and quick recovery, which evidences its implementation in the outpatient surgical practice.

DISCUSSION

Sedation in ambulatory surgery had been a delicate juggling act between keeping patients comfortable to facilitate quick healing, safety and comfort. With the ever-growing demand in outpatient procedures, as a result of the development in surgical methods and models of care delivery, the practice of sedation had taken a central role in the overall patient experience and outcome. In this work, we had underscored the need to choose sedative regimens that would reduce the risks associated with perioperative and maximize postoperative recovery [9].

The most critical factor in the process of selecting the sedation mode in ambulatory surgery had been patient comfort. Patients tended to develop a lot of anxiety prior to the operation, and proper administration of sedatives had relieved psychological stress, lessened intraoperative awareness and enhanced compliance during surgery. This effect had been achieved with a number of agents, such as propofol, midazolam and dexmedetomidine [10]. Nevertheless, even though sedation had enhanced comfort, the risk of respiratory depression, hemodynamic unstable and slow recovery rate had risen with excessive dosage or wrong choice of drug, and individualized dosing strategies were necessary.

Another base of ambulatory sedation had been safety. Ongoing observation of oxygenation, ventilation and hemodynamic measurements had played a critical role in the prevention and management of adverse events. Outpatient sedation safety profile had further been enhanced by the presence of trained providers in anesthesia [11].

However, the chances of complications, although not very high, had been of interest, particularly among the patients having comorbid status like obesity, obstructive sleep apnea, or cardiovascular disease. In these instances close preoperative evaluation and stratification would have been required to decide the appropriateness of sedation and the possibility of managing it outpatiently.

Ambulatory surgery had been characterized by a fast healing process and the type of sedation had been designed to accommodate early discharge without jeopardizing patient safety. The use of short-acting agents was popular due to their predictable pharmacokinetics which means that a patient could quickly resume baseline functioning [12]. This method had minimized the postoperative drowsiness, minimized the necessity of extended monitoring, and enabled discharge on the day of the operation, which had played a leading role in the effectiveness and cost-efficiency of outpatient operations. Significantly, fast recovery had also led to increased patient satisfaction and had contributed to better turning in surgical units.

But there had been problems of achieving comfort, safety and recovery. As an example, over-conservative sedation policies could have resulted in insufficient anxiolysis and lower patient satisfaction and over-aggressive regimens could have prolonged the time to discharge or risked emergency hospital stay [13]. Also, the patient response to sedatives had been a variable factor due to age, body mass index, and previous encounter with the anesthesia, which made it difficult to establish standardized solutions. These difficulties had given rise to the need to provide sedation according to individual patient needs and not just using standard guidelines [14].

This paper had also highlighted the significance of the application of multimodal approaches to improve the balance of results. The use of drugs to sedate patients with

non-pharmacological approaches including psychological counselling and environmental adjustments had enhanced patient comfort as well as decreasing the amount of drugs used. Ambulatory surgery recovery protocols were also enhanced with multimodal analgesia prioritized to reduce opioid consumption and increase safer and faster recovery [15].

Conclusively, there had to be a delicate balance between comfort, safety, and quick recovery in relation to the use of sedation in ambulatory surgery. Although improvements in anesthetic agents and monitoring devices had played a major role, the individualized nature of approaches based on patient factors and surgical demands had played a major role. The balance of the balance attained in outpatient surgery would be enhanced further by future strategies that would focus on improving the state of sedative protocols, upgrading patient education, and incorporating multimodal recovery pathways.

CONCLUSION

The aim of the study was to conclude that the application of sedation in ambulatory surgery had offered a major trade off between patient comfort, safety and quick recovery. Sedation methods had enabled patients to experience outpatient operations with a little anxiety, successful pain control and better satisfaction. Those results had indicated that when properly used, sedation had reduced intraoperative pain without interfering with patient safety. Moreover, recovery times were also reduced, and this allowed the earlier discharge and decreased the workload on healthcare organizations. Nevertheless, patient careful selection, standard protocols and close supervision had been critical towards the elimination of complications and the achievement of favourable results. The case study had also pointed out that the most effective results

were achieved in case of customized approach to sedation based on the clinical grounds of a patient and the kind of procedure. Finally, ambulatory surgery sedation had been an important practice that optimized comfort, safety, and efficiency, and warranted its retention in the current outpatient surgery practice.

REFERENCES

1. Fu G, Xu L, Chen H, Lin J. State-of-the-art anesthesia practices: a comprehensive review on optimizing patient safety and recovery. BMC surgery. 2025 Jan 20;25(1):32.
2. Huidekoper JE, Routman JS. Postoperative Management of the Ambulatory Surgery Patient. International Anesthesiology Clinics. 2025 Jan 1;63(1):81-91.
3. Bastos AB, Munoz-Acuna R, Notarianni AP. Procedural Sedation Outside the Operating Room: Challenges, Guidelines, and Future Directions. Best Practice & Research Clinical Anaesthesiology. 2025 Aug 28.
4. Grossi GB, Menozzi G, Maiorana C, Pellegrini M, Carraro M, Galeotti A, Scribante A, Papaleo A, Losappio S, Sofi G. Remimazolam besylate in intravenous conscious sedation for dental treatment: a prospective cohort study: Remimazolam besylate in intravenous conscious sedation for dental treatment: a prospective cohort study. British Dental Journal. 2025 Aug 15:1-1.
5. Issa IA, Lakis R, Issa T. Sedation in endoscopy: Finding the balance between safety and efficacy. World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy. 2025 Aug 16;17(8):109695.
6. Shadid O, Novo J, Saini R, Marcaccini G, Sacks BK, Rozen WM, Seth I, Cuomo R. Hand Surgery Anaesthesia Innovations: Balancing Efficiency, Cost, and Comfort with WALANT, Ultrasound, and Emerging Adjuncts—A Narrative Review. Journal of Clinical Medicine. 2025 Aug 30;14(17):6146.

7. Tanella A, Roselinsky H, Deshpand R. Expanding Procedural Sedation to Satellite Facilities: Current Structures, Provider Models, and Future Directions. *Best Practice & Research Clinical Anaesthesiology*. 2025 Aug 18.
8. Ishaku Z, Koshy DI, Bala MA. Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS) Pathways in Elective Total Joint Arthroplasty. *Cureus*. 2025 Sep 2;17(9).
9. Cata JP, Cukierman DS, Natoli S. Enhanced recovery after surgery in ambulatory procedures. *Current Opinion in Anesthesiology*. 2025:10-97.
10. Hamad HM, Naeem MF, Ahmad A, Azhar U, Taimoor M. Comparing Propofol and Sevoflurane for Faster Recovery in Pediatrics. *Journal of Health, Wellness and Community Research*. 2025 May 25:e272-.
11. Davodi J, Intzilaki CV, Steenholdt C, Vilmann P, Moeller AM. Scoping review: Patient-controlled sedation. *Journal of Patient Safety and Risk Management*. 2025:25160435251352468.
12. Alagbe-Briggs OT. Different Faces of Ambulatory Anaesthesia-A Reality Check of Practices. *Nigerian Journal of Anaesthesia*. 2025 Aug 23;2(1):46-8.\
13. Sood R, Ram B, Kurani M, Chauhan A, Trivedi N. Assessment of recovery in maxillofacial surgical patients undergoing intravenous conscious sedation using PSI monitoring. *Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery*. 2025 Jun 4;29(1):117.
14. Constantinescu DS, Lobaton GO, Eskenazi J, Samineni AV, Hernandez V. Outpatient Total Joint Arthroplasty in an Academic University: Advanced Review of Concepts. *Orthopedic Reviews*. 2025 Aug 14;17:143094.
15. Nazari M, Akbari F, Dehghani A. Comparing the effects of remifentanil with fentanyl on pain intensity, hemodynamic status and post-anesthesia complications of cataract

surgery candidates. Medicinal, Psychological, and Health Research Journal (mphrj).
2025 May 11;1(4):116-25.