DOI: 10.47799/pimr.1402.26.129

Ultrasound-Guided Regional Anesthesia: Has It Become the New Standard?

Nikhil Mudgalkar[1*]

[1]**Professor, Department of Anesthesia, Prathima Institute of Medical Sciences, Telangana, India**

[*]***Corresponding Author:***
Nikhil Mudgalkar
E-MAIL: drniks2000@yahoo.com

Date of Submission: 22-08-2026 **Date of Review: 25-08-2026** **Date of Acceptance: 25-08-2026**

ABSTRACT

None

Regional anesthesia has undergone a remarkable transformation over the past two decades. The introduction of portable, high-resolution ultrasound into everyday clinical practice has changed how anesthesiologists identify nerves, visualize needles, administer local anesthetics, and manage complications. Ultrasound-guided regional anesthesia (UGRA) has evolved from an advanced technique used by enthusiasts into an increasingly routine component of anesthetic practice. The question now is not whether ultrasound has changed regional anesthesia, but whether it should be regarded as the new standard of care.[1]

Traditional landmark- and nerve-stimulation-based techniques rely largely on indirect identification of neural structures. Ultrasound, in contrast, permits direct visualization of anatomy and, when performed appropriately, real-time observation of needle advancement and local anesthetic spread. This potentially allows the anesthesiologist to tailor the block to individual anatomy rather than relying exclusively on predetermined surface landmarks.[2]

Several advantages have contributed to the widespread adoption of UGRA. Ultrasound can facilitate identification of nerves, fascial planes, vessels, pleura, and other relevant structures. It may improve block performance, reduce the need for needle redirection, and facilitate selective deposition of local anesthetic. Importantly, ultrasound may also enhance the ability to recognize anatomical variations before needle insertion. In an era increasingly focused on patient safety, this additional anatomical information is very important.[3, 4]

Yet the transition from "useful technology" to "standard of care" requires a higher threshold of evidence. The presence of an ultrasound image does not automatically guarantee a safer or more effective block. Successful UGRA depends on operator knowledge, sonoanatomy, needle visualization, hand-eye coordination, appropriate equipment, and the ability to recognize and respond to complications. A poorly performed ultrasound-guided block may be no safer than a well-executed landmark technique.[5]

Moreover, ultrasound has not eliminated the fundamental risks associated with regional anesthesia. Local anesthetic systemic toxicity, nerve injury, bleeding, infection, and inadvertent injection into unintended structures remain possible. Ultrasound may help reduce certain risks, but it cannot substitute for careful patient selection, appropriate dosing, meticulous technique, monitoring, and preparedness for complications.[6]

Another important consideration is the learning curve. Competence in UGRA is not achieved simply by acquiring an ultrasound machine. Anesthesiologists must understand image optimization, probe handling, sonoanatomy, needle visualization, local anesthetic pharmacology, and the limitations of ultrasound. Simulation, supervised clinical experience, structured assessment, and continuing education are likely to be more important than the technology itself.[7, 8]

There is also a danger of allowing technology to create a false sense of security. Ultrasound provides information, but clinicians must interpret that information correctly. For example, visualization of the needle tip can be

challenging, particularly when the needle is aligned poorly with the ultrasound beam. Failure to distinguish the needle shaft from its tip may lead to unintended advancement. Similarly, visualization of local anesthetic spread should not be interpreted as proof that an injection is safe. Continuous aspiration, incremental injection, appropriate injection pressures where available, and vigilance remain essential.[9]

The question of whether UGRA is the "new standard" may therefore be better reframed. Perhaps ultrasound should not replace all other approaches but should become the preferred technique whenever appropriate expertise and equipment are available. This distinction is important. A standard should represent a level of care that is consistently achievable and demonstrably beneficial, rather than simply reflecting technological progress.[10]

There are also circumstances in which ultrasound may not be immediately available or may not be the most practical approach. Emergency situations, resource-limited environments, unusual anatomical circumstances, or procedures in which traditional techniques are highly reliable may require alternative strategies. An anesthesiologist who understands only ultrasound-guided techniques may be less adaptable than one who understands both ultrasound and conventional approaches.

The future of regional anesthesia is therefore unlikely to be a competition between ultrasound and traditional methods. Instead, ultrasound should be viewed as one component of a broader skill set. The modern regional anesthesiologist should be able to combine knowledge of anatomy, surface landmarks, nerve stimulation when appropriate, ultrasound imaging, pharmacology, and clinical judgment. Technology should augment expertise rather than replace it.[11]

The debate also has implications for credentialing and training. Training should extend beyond performing individual blocks to include image acquisition, documentation, recognition of complications, infection prevention, equipment maintenance, and management of failed or incomplete blocks. Competency-based education is likely to be more meaningful than simply counting the number of procedures performed.

Ultimately, the question "Has ultrasound-guided regional anesthesia become the new standard?" does not have a simple yes-or-no answer. Ultrasound has clearly become a defining technology of modern regional anesthesia, and in many clinical settings it should reasonably be considered the preferred approach. However, calling it an absolute universal standard is wrong.

The true standard should be safe, effective, patient-centered regional anesthesia. Ultrasound is an exceptionally powerful tool for achieving that goal, but the quality of care still depends on the anesthesiologist behind the probe. The next stage of regional anesthesia should therefore focus not merely on increasing ultrasound use, but on ensuring that its use is evidence-based, competency-driven, and integrated with sound clinical judgment.

In this sense, ultrasound may indeed have become the new standard—but the real standard should remain excellence in patient care.

References

1. Li J, Krishna R, Zhang Y, Lam D, Vadivelu N. Ultrasound-Guided Neuraxial Anesthesia. Current Pain and Headache Reports. 2020; 24 (10) . Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11916-020-00895-3
2. Froeba G, Seyfried TF. Ultrasound-guided regional anesthesia: are we safe?. Minerva Anestesiologica. 2022; 88 (3) . Available from: https://doi.org/10.23736/s0375-9393.22.16465-5
3. Kim TE, Tsui BCH. Simulation-based ultrasound-guided regional anesthesia curriculum for anesthesiology residents. Korean Journal of Anesthesiology. 2019; 72 (1) :13-23 . Available from: https://doi.org/10.4097/kja.d.18.00317
4. Amaral S, Pawa A. Ultrasound-guided regional anesthesia: present trends and future directions. Brazilian Journal of Anesthesiology (English Edition). 2023; 73 (6) :705-706 . Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjane.2023.09.006
5. Neal JM. Ultrasound-Guided Regional Anesthesia and Patient Safety. Regional Anesthesia and Pain Medicine. 2016; 41 (2) :195-204 . Available from: https://doi.org/10.1097/aap.0000000000000295
6. Liu SS, Ngeow JE, Yadeau JT. Ultrasound-Guided Regional Anesthesia and Analgesia. Regional Anesthesia and Pain Medicine. 2009; 34 (1) :47-59 . Available from: https://doi.org/10.1097/aap.0b013e3181933ec3
7. Marhofer P, Chan VW. Ultrasound-Guided Regional Anesthesia: Current Concepts and Future Trends. Anesthesia & Analgesia. 2007; 104 (5) :1265-1269 . Available from: https://doi.org/10.1213/01.ane.0000260614.32794.7b
8. Marhofer P, Willschke H, Kettner S. Current concepts and future trends in ultrasound-guided regional anesthesia. Current Opinion in Anaesthesiology. 2010; 23 (5) :632-636 . Available from: https://doi.org/10.1097/aco.0b013e32833e2891
9. Bowness J, Taylor A. Ultrasound-Guided Regional Anaesthesia: Visualising the Nerve and Needle. Advances in Experimental Medicine and Biology. 2020; :19-34 . Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-37639-0_2
10. Salinas FV, Hanson NA. Evidence-Based Medicine for Ultrasound-Guided Regional Anesthesia. Anesthesiology Clinics. 2014; 32 (4) :771-787 . Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anclin.2014.08.001

11. Marhofer P, Eichenberger U. Augmented reality in ultrasound-guided regional anaesthesia: useful tool or expensive toy?. British Journal of Anaesthesia. 2023; 131 (3) :442-445 . Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bja.2023.05.022

How to cite this article: Mudgalkar N. Ultrasound-Guided Regional Anesthesia: Has It Become the New Standard?. Perspectives in Medical Research 2026; 14(2):93-95 DOI: 10.47799/pimr.1402.26.129