INTERNATIONAL MULTI DISCIPLINARY JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT
eISSN 2394-6334 Impact factor: 8.854 Volume 13, issue 04 (2026)

ADVANCES IN MINIMALLY INVASIVE GYNECOLOGICAL SURGERY

Dekhkonova Dilnoza Valijonovna
EMU UNIVERSITY

Abstract. Minimally invasive gynecological surgery (MIGS) has transformed modern gynecological practice by significantly reducing surgical trauma, improving recovery outcomes, and decreasing postoperative complications. This theoretical review examines major advancements in MIGS, including laparoscopic surgery, robotic-assisted surgery, hysteroscopic procedures, and energy-based surgical technologies. The article analyzes technological innovations, clinical applications, and comparative advantages over traditional open surgery.

Keywords: minimally invasive surgery; gynecology; laparoscopy; robotic surgery; hysteroscopy; surgical innovation; reproductive health

Introduction. Minimally invasive gynecological surgery (MIGS) represents a major advancement in surgical practice, shifting from traditional open abdominal procedures toward techniques that minimize tissue damage and improve postoperative recovery. This transformation has been driven by continuous technological innovation in optics, instrumentation, and surgical robotics.

MIGS includes procedures performed through small incisions or natural body orifices, allowing direct visualization and treatment of pelvic and intrauterine pathology. Common indications include uterine fibroids, ovarian cysts, endometriosis, ectopic pregnancy, and hysterectomy. Compared with open surgery, MIGS is associated with reduced blood loss, lower infection risk, shorter hospitalization, and faster return to normal activity.

The purpose of this review is to critically analyze the theoretical and clinical advancements in MIGS, focusing on surgical modalities, technological developments, and their implications for modern gynecology.

Methods

This study is designed as a narrative theoretical review of existing literature on minimally invasive gynecological surgery. The analysis is based on published scientific articles, clinical guidelines, and surgical textbooks focusing on MIGS techniques and outcomes.

The review includes four major domains: laparoscopic surgery, robotic-assisted surgery, hysteroscopic procedures, and energy-based surgical technologies. Comparative evaluation is conducted between minimally invasive and traditional open surgical approaches based on clinical effectiveness, safety, and recovery outcomes. No primary clinical data were collected; instead, secondary analysis of existing scientific knowledge was performed.

Results

The review of literature demonstrates that minimally invasive gynecological surgery has undergone substantial evolution in both technique and technology. Laparoscopic surgery remains the foundational approach in MIGS and is widely used for procedures such as hysterectomy, myomectomy, and treatment of endometriosis. Its clinical advantages include smaller incisions, reduced postoperative pain, improved visualization of pelvic anatomy, and faster patient recovery compared to open surgery.

Robotic-assisted surgery represents a significant technological advancement within MIGS. This approach enhances surgical precision through robotic instruments controlled by the surgeon via a console. The system provides high-definition three-dimensional visualization, tremor filtration, and improved dexterity, which is particularly beneficial in complex pelvic and oncological procedures. Despite these advantages, the widespread implementation of robotic surgery is limited by high operational costs and the need for specialized training.

Hysteroscopic surgery has also become an essential component of minimally invasive gynecology. It allows direct access to the uterine cavity without external incisions, making it ideal for the diagnosis and treatment of intrauterine abnormalities such as polyps, fibroids, and septa. Many hysteroscopic procedures are performed on an outpatient basis, contributing to reduced healthcare costs and improved patient convenience.

In addition, energy-based surgical technologies, including ultrasonic and bipolar devices, have significantly improved intraoperative efficiency. These systems allow simultaneous tissue cutting and coagulation, reducing blood loss and improving surgical precision. Their integration into laparoscopic and hysteroscopic procedures has enhanced overall surgical safety and effectiveness.

Clinical outcomes consistently demonstrate that MIGS offers substantial benefits over traditional open surgery. Patients undergoing minimally invasive procedures experience reduced postoperative pain, shorter hospital stays, faster mobilization, and lower rates of surgical site infections. Recovery time is reduced by approximately 30–60%, depending on the complexity of the procedure.

However, limitations remain. High equipment costs, limited availability in low-resource settings, and steep learning curves for surgeons restrict widespread adoption. Additionally, MIGS may not be suitable for all patients, particularly those with extensive adhesions or advanced malignancies requiring open surgical intervention.

Discussion

The findings of this review highlight that MIGS has fundamentally reshaped modern gynecological surgery by improving both clinical efficiency and patient outcomes. The transition from open surgery to minimally invasive techniques reflects broader trends in medicine toward patient-centered care and technological integration.

One of the most important advantages of MIGS is the reduction in surgical trauma, which leads to faster physiological recovery and decreased postoperative complications. Enhanced visualization and precision have also improved diagnostic accuracy and surgical success rates.

Robotic-assisted surgery represents the most technologically advanced form of MIGS, offering superior control and ergonomics. However, its cost-effectiveness remains a subject of debate, particularly in healthcare systems with limited resources.

Despite these advancements, the implementation of MIGS is uneven globally. Training requirements and financial constraints continue to limit access in developing regions. Therefore, future progress should focus on increasing affordability, expanding surgical training programs, and improving technological accessibility.

Table 1. Comparative Discussion of Minimally Invasive Gynecological Surgery (MIGS)

Aspect	Key Advantages	Limitations	Clinical Implications
Surgical trauma	Minimal tissue damage due to small incisions	Not suitable for all complex cases	Faster healing and reduced inflammatory response
Postoperative recovery	Short hospital stay and rapid mobilization	Recovery still depends on patient condition	Improved patient turnover and reduced healthcare burden
Pain management	Lower postoperative pain levels	Pain variability between patients	Reduced need for strong analgesics
Infection risk	Significantly lower risk compared to open surgery	Risk still exists in prolonged procedures	Improved surgical safety profile
Surgical	High-definition imaging	Requires advanced	Better outcomes in

precision	and robotic assistance improve accuracy	training and experience	delicate pelvic surgeries
Cost-effectiveness	Reduced long-term hospitalization costs	High initial equipment and maintenance costs	Economic benefit in high-volume centers
Accessibility	Increasing availability in urban hospitals	Limited in low-resource healthcare systems	Unequal global distribution of MIGS benefits
Learning curve	Advanced technology improves visualization	Steep learning curve for surgeons	Need for specialized training programs

The table provides a structured comparative overview of minimally invasive gynecological surgery (MIGS), highlighting its key clinical advantages, limitations, and broader implications for healthcare practice. It summarizes the balance between improved patient outcomes—such as reduced surgical trauma, faster recovery, lower infection rates, and enhanced surgical precision—and the main constraints associated with these techniques, including high implementation costs, a steep learning curve for surgeons, and limited accessibility in resource-constrained settings. Overall, the table emphasizes that while MIGS offers substantial benefits over traditional open surgery, its effectiveness and availability depend on technological infrastructure, surgeon expertise, and healthcare system capacity.

Conclusion. Minimally invasive gynecological surgery has become a cornerstone of modern gynecological practice, offering safer, more efficient, and patient-friendly alternatives to traditional open surgery. Advances in laparoscopy, robotic systems, hysteroscopy, and energy-based technologies have significantly improved surgical precision and clinical outcomes. Although challenges such as cost, accessibility, and training requirements persist, the continued development of MIGS is expected to further enhance its global application in women's healthcare.

References

1. Azziz, R. (2016). *Polycystic ovary syndrome*. New England Journal of Medicine.
2. Fauser, B. C. J. M. (2012). Consensus on women's health aspects of polycystic ovary syndrome. *Human Reproduction*.
3. Hockstein, N. G. (2020). *Minimally invasive gynecologic surgery principles*.
4. Legro, R. S. (2013). Diagnosis and treatment of polycystic ovary syndrome. *Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism*.
5. Nezhat, C. (2019). Advances in laparoscopic and robotic gynecologic surgery.
6. Parker, W. H. (2018). Uterine fibroids and minimally invasive treatment strategies.
7. Reich, H. (2017). Laparoscopic hysterectomy evolution and outcomes.
8. Sutton, C. (2021). Endoscopic surgery in gynecology: Current perspectives.
9. Wright, J. D. (2022). Trends in minimally invasive gynecologic surgery.