Page 3760 - 3780 **DOI:** *https://doi.org/10.63108/IJLMH.13157*

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 9 | Issue 5

2026

© 2026 *International Journal of Law Management & Humanities*

Follow this and additional works at: https://www.ijlmh.com/
Under the aegis of VidhiAagaz – Inking Your Brain (https://www.vidhiaagaz.com/)

This article is brought to you for free and open access by the International Journal of Law Management & Humanities at VidhiAagaz. It has been accepted for inclusion in the International Journal of Law Management & Humanities after due review.

In case of **any suggestions or complaints**, kindly contact **support@vidhiaagaz.com**.

To submit your Manuscript for Publication in the **International Journal of Law Management & Humanities**, kindly email your Manuscript to **submission@ijlmh.com.**

Precision Medicine Across Borders: Maneuvering Paradigms of Global Medical Tourism in a Digitally Driven Healthcare Environment

RISHI SINGH[*] AND PRAKHAR KANUNGO[**]

ABSTRACT

Medical tourism is a rapidly evolving global industry, spurred by advances in the field of robotic surgery, which offers precision and reduced recovery time and draws patients across borders seeking medical care. With an emphasis on liability, jurisdictional concerns, standards of care, and data privacy constraints faced by international patients, this study evaluates the important legal difficulties surrounding cross-border robotic surgeries. The integration of telemedicine further augments this dynamic, facilitating pre-surgical consultations with, and post-surgical check-ups of, patients, while raising prominent issues of data security and compliance with privacy regulations such as the GDPR and HIPAA. Pivotal to this inquiry is the variance in patient rights across host countries, coupled with the obligations of healthcare providers to communicate fully the procedural risks involved in robotic surgery. For instance, for a Russian patient traveling to India for robotic spinal surgery, disparities in informed consent protocols and standards of care, together with potential linguistic hindrances, present distinct challenges in meeting legal requirements and ensuring patient comprehension. Additionally, because domestic policies often do not cover surgeries performed abroad, patients can face substantial out-of-pocket expenses as well as the tedious process of pursuing compensation in a foreign jurisdiction. The study highlights the intricacies of determining jurisdiction in cross-border medical disputes, which frequently turn on the location of the surgery as against the patient's home country. Drawing on these results, the paper advocates global harmonized standards governing robotic surgery in medical tourism and telemedicine frameworks that enable secure and legally compliant communication with patients. Such reforms are crucial for eliminating the legal ambiguities inherent in the expanding field of international healthcare and for ensuring that robot-assisted surgery remains both safe and accessible to medical tourists around the world.

Keywords: *Medical Tourism, Robotic Surgery, Cross-border Healthcare, Telemedicine*

[*] Author is a Student at ILS Law College, Pune, Maharashtra, India.
[**] Author is a Student at ILS Law College, Pune, Maharashtra, India.

© 2026. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

I. Introduction

Advances in technology and global interaction in medical services have paralleled new growth in the value of medical tourism. The sector was valued at around $10.1 billion in 2020, with an annual growth rate of 12.1% between 2021 and 2027,[1] notwithstanding setbacks from the COVID-19 pandemic. Regions such as Europe, Asia-Pacific, and North America are the leading destinations for medical tourism, in countries like Thailand, Turkey, India, South Korea, and Germany.[2] Demand is driven by the promise of better healthcare services, cost advantages, and access to advanced treatments that may not be available locally.

Medical tourism is, by definition, traveling internationally for medical care, which may range from elective surgery to reproductive treatment and diagnostics. In recent times, patients have looked to cross-border healthcare to avoid long waiting lists in their countries of origin and to reach otherwise unavailable advanced procedures, including robotic surgery. The risks are real: complications among bariatric medical tourists have been reported to be much higher than among patients treated locally in Canada (42.2–56.1% against 12.3%).[3]

Medical tourism is often in high demand among people who want to reduce the cost of treatment while maintaining high quality. For instance, heart bypass or angioplasty can be done at significantly lower cost in India, Thailand, Singapore, or Mexico than in the United States.[4]

Medical procedure	United States	India	Jordan	Mexico	Thailand	Singapore
Heart bypass	$123,000	$7,900	$14,400	$27,000	$15,000	$17,200
Angioplasty	$28,200	$5,700	$5,000	$10,400	$4,200	$13,400
Heart valve replacement	$170,000	$9,500	$14,400	$28,200	$17,200	$16,900
Hip replacement	$40,364	$7,200	$8,000	$13,500	$17,000	$13,900
Breast implants	$6,400	$3,000	$4,000	$4,500	$3,500	$8,400
Rhinoplasty	$6,500	$2,400	$2,900	$3,800	$3,300	$2,200
Liposuction	$5,500	$2,800	$1,400	$3,000	$2,500	$2,900

[1] I. Tileva, *How Technologies Will Affect the Future of International Medical Tourism*, Vestnik Permskogo Nacional'nogo Issledovatel'skogo Politehničeskogo Universiteta. Social'no-Èkonomičeskie Nauki, no. 3 (2021), https://doi.org/10.15593/2224-9354/2021.3.22.

[2] *Id.*

[3] D.H. Kim et al., *Financial Costs and Patients' Perceptions of Medical Tourism in Bariatric Surgery*, 59 Can. J. Surgery 59 (2016), https://doi.org/10.1503/cjs.004215.

[4] *International Medical Treatment Prices*, Medical Tourism Association, https://www.medicaltourism.com/compare-prices (prices quoted from 2021) (last visited Nov. 4, 2026); *see generally* S.P. Davison et al., *The Price of Medical Tourism: The Legal Implications of Surgery Abroad*, 142 Plastic & Reconstructive Surgery 1075 (2018).

© 2026. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

Medical procedure	United States	India	Jordan	Mexico	Thailand	Singapore
Tummy tuck	$8,000	$3,500	$4,200	$4,500	$5,300	$4,650

Table 1: Differences in the costs of medical procedures between countries, illustrating the economic reasons that lead patients to go abroad for healthcare

This paper explores the intricate interplay of medical tourism, robotic surgery, and telemedicine. It examines how these innovations are changing the face of healthcare delivery around the world, the trajectories of their market growth, and the challenges and implications they present for equitable access to healthcare.

A. Technological innovations driving medical tourism

Robotic surgery is one of the most impressive examples of how technology can transform medical tourism. The first transatlantic robotic telesurgery, for example, was accomplished in 2001 using the ZEUS system.[5] Such systems interpret the surgeon's hand movements under computer control and, by compensating for tremor, make very precise actions possible. Autonomous functions can optimize repetitive tasks, improving the overall efficiency and outcomes of surgery. The global surgical robots market was projected to reach $6.88 billion by the end of 2026, against only $1.46 billion in 2018.[6] This growth reflects increased dependence on robotic technology for complex surgical procedures and gives a competitive edge to leading medical tourism destinations such as South Korea and Turkey.

Telemedicine has emerged as an essential enabler of international medical tourism. It reduces constraints of distance and time by allowing remote consultation, treatment planning, and post-treatment follow-up. During the COVID-19 pandemic, there was a surge in teleconsultations as patients sought alternative routes to healthcare.[7] Telemedicine is particularly helpful for pre-surgical consultations, as it enables the patient and surgeon to discuss options, review medical records, and plan treatment without being present in person. It also integrates well with robotic surgery to make surgical treatment possible from a distance: surgeons can operate robotic devices remotely by relying on fast internet connections and advanced telecommunication networks. Telemedicine also streamlines post-operative care, as patients can receive treatment in their home countries while maintaining contact with their surgical teams abroad.

---

[5] P.J. Choi, R.J. Oskouian & R.S. Tubbs, *Telesurgery: Past, Present, and Future*, CUREUS (2018), https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.2716.

[6] *With 21.4% CAGR, Surgical Robots Market Size Worth USD 6,875.1 Million in 2026*, GLOBENEWSWIRE (Aug. 9, 2022), https://www.globenewswire.com/news-release/2022/08/09/2494714/0/en/With-21-4-CAGR-Surgical-Robots-Market-Size-worth-USD-6-875-1-Million-in-2026.html.

[7] A. Harju & J. Neufeld, *Telehealth Utilization During the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Preliminary Selective Review*, 3 TELEMEDICINE REPS. 38 (2022), https://doi.org/10.1089/tmr.2021.0040.

Even so, the involvement of technology in medical tourism poses ethical concerns. Robotic systems, which generated revenue of $1.045 billion in North America alone in 2018,[8] often prove inaccessible. Furthermore, a focus on international patients can shift pressure onto local health facilities and thus create imbalances in access for local people.

II. Standards of Care and Ethical Dimensions in Robotic Surgery for Foreign Patients

The pace at which robotic surgery has changed the surgical horizon, especially in medical tourism, calls for an understanding of the issues at stake. This part addresses the diversity of international standards, questions of informed consent, and a general approach based on medical ethics, with examples that illustrate these dilemmas.

A. Varying standards in different countries

Healthcare providers are responsible for ensuring uniform standards of care for medical tourists. Robotic surgery has a much smaller margin for error because it depends on advanced technology. Providers must ensure that foreign patients receive at least the same level of care as local patients. The absence of standardized procedures across countries, however, raises issues of patient safety and liability.

i. Training and credentialing

The lack of uniform training programs in robotic surgery is a significant barrier to quality care. An article in the Bulletin of the Royal College of Surgeons of England emphasizes the need for structured training that covers technical and non-technical competencies, evidence-based assessment of proficiency, ongoing assessment, and an international consensus on training standards. These measures will help ensure safe implementation to high standards across subspecialties.[9]

ii. Legal expectations

Legal frameworks for robotic surgery are still in development. It is imperative that countries take the time to plan the use of robotic surgery in a responsible and safe manner. In England, that recognition has come through the Royal College of Surgeons of England's RADAR (Robotic and Digital Surgery) initiative.[10] Many developing nations lack a specific legal

[8] *Surgical Robots Market Size, Share and Industry Analysis | Forecast 2032*, Fortune Business Insights (Dec. 23, 2024), https://www.fortunebusinessinsights.com/industry-reports/surgical-robots-market-100948.
[9] F. Dixon & B. Keeler, *Robotic Surgery: Training, Competence Assessment and Credentialing*, 102 Bull. Royal Coll. Surgeons Eng. 302 (2020), https://doi.org/10.1308/rcsbull.2020.185.
[10] Royal College of Surgeons of England, *Robotic-Assisted Surgery*, https://rcseng.ac.uk/standards-and-research/future-of-surgery/robotics/.

© 2026. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

framework for robotic surgery or have only a vague one, which may lead to confusion about liability when adverse outcomes occur.

A SWOT analysis of robot-assisted surgery in India observes that, unlike the West, where readmissions, prolonged stays, and re-exploration rates are tracked for every surgeon, Indian hospitals "do not have such robust checks and balances," which makes the actual benefit of robotic surgery in the Indian population harder to assess.[11]

B. Ethical dimensions and considerations

i. Duties and obligations of healthcare providers and institutions

Many critical duties and obligations attach to the safe and effective use of robotic surgery. Guidelines call for hands-on training on robotic platforms, certification in advanced surgical techniques, and lifelong professional growth. Some countries, Jordan among them, acknowledge the need for high proficiency and treat training as a minimum safety measure that should not be compromised. Hospitals must also test robotic surgical systems periodically for quality control, through scheduled inspections, software upgrades, and fail-safe analysis, in order to maintain performance and avoid technical failure during surgery.[12]

ii. Informed patient consent

Informed consent is a critical aspect of medical ethics, and it becomes more complicated when treatment takes place in a foreign country. This matters all the more because the technology used in robotic surgery is highly complex. Robotic surgery raises issues with which most patients are unfamiliar: reliance on complex equipment, artificial intelligence assisting surgeons, and risks specific to robotic procedures.

Informed consent is more than a procedural formality; it is an important interaction between healthcare professionals and patients. Studies show that the general public usually perceives robotic surgery as dangerous owing to a lack of understanding of the technology, resulting in lower acceptance as people fear complications.[13] Effective communication about the surgeon's role in robotic surgery helps to dispel these myths. Culture also significantly affects a patient's understanding and perception of informed consent documents. Patients and providers who do not share a first language, for instance, often face linguistic issues that lead to

---

[11] G.S. Bora et al., *Robot-Assisted Surgery in India: A SWOT Analysis*, 36 INDIAN J. UROLOGY 1 (2020), https://doi.org/10.4103/iju.iju_220_19.

[12] A.T. Adaileh & O.A. Al-Araishy, *Compliance with Safety Assurance in Robotic Surgery: An Analytical Study in the Light of Jordanian Medical and Health Liability Law No. (25) of the Year 2018*, 11 GLOB. J. POL. & L. RSCH. 60 (2023), https://doi.org/10.37745/gjplr.13/vol11n66075.

[13] C. McDonnell, M. Devine & D. Kavanagh, *The General Public's Perception of Robotic Surgery: A Scoping Review*, 23 SURGEON e49 (2025), https://doi.org/10.1016/j.surge.2024.12.001.

© 2026. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

miscommunication about treatment.[14] The healthcare provider is responsible for ensuring that the consent form is both culturally acceptable and easy to read.

iii. Bioethics in robotic surgery

The ethical principles that drive medical practice are particularly relevant to robotic surgery: beneficence, non-maleficence, autonomy, and justice.[15] Beneficence involves acting in the best interest of patients, while non-maleficence requires avoiding harm to them. Surgeons must therefore balance the potential benefits of robotic surgery against its possible risks.

Robotic procedures carry additional risks of technology failure. The Joint Commission divides risks into "those directly related to the use of the robotic system and the general risks of the operative procedure." Citing a consensus statement, it identifies robotic telesurgery, in which the surgeon may be at a distance from the patient, as posing unique risks, since "precise control of the robot depends on the quality of the data connection between the surgeon's console and the operating room robot."[16] An investigation of 14 years of FDA adverse event data on robotic surgery also found that most reports concerned device malfunctions, including electrical arcing of instruments and unintended operation of instruments.[17] Patients suffered injuries or interruptions of their procedures as a consequence of such malfunctions.

Equitable treatment is critical to addressing inequities that may arise from a patient's nationality or socioeconomic background.[18] Policies should ensure that all patients, regardless of background, receive equal and quality care. Respecting patient autonomy is another means of empowering patients to make informed decisions. This entails creating an environment in which patients can freely ask questions and raise concerns without fear of inappropriate pressure from healthcare professionals. Open communication and transparency are fundamental to a more equitable and inclusive healthcare experience for all.

iv. Balancing technological advancements with human oversight

Increased autonomy in robotic systems creates a need for human oversight. Dependence on technology should not undermine the decision-making role of the surgeon. Continued education

---

[14] H. Al Shamsi et al., *Implications of Language Barriers for Healthcare: A Systematic Review*, 35 OMAN MED. J. e122 (2020), https://doi.org/10.5001/omj.2020.40.

[15] *The Four Principles of Biomedical Ethics*, HEALTHCARE ETHICS AND LAW, https://www.healthcareethicsandlaw.co.uk/intro-healthcare-ethics-law/principlesofbiomedethics (last visited Jan. 7, 2025).

[16] *Quick Safety 3: Potential Risks of Robotic Surgery*, JOINT COMM'N (Mar. 2021), https://www.jointcommission.org/resources/news-and-multimedia/newsletters/newsletters/quick-safety/quick-safety-issue-3-potential-risks-of-robotic-surgery/potential-risks-of-robotic-surgery.

[17] H. Alemzadeh et al., *Adverse Events in Robotic Surgery: A Retrospective Study of 14 Years of FDA Data*, 11 PLOS ONE e0151470 (2016), https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0151470.

[18] D.W. Baker, *Achieving Health Care Equity Requires a Systems Approach*, 50 JOINT COMM'N J. QUALITY & PATIENT SAFETY 1 (2024), https://www.jointcommissionjournal.com/article/S1553-7250(23)00269-6/fulltext.

© 2026. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

will keep surgeons competent in both robotic and traditional methods of surgery. Ethical frameworks must also advance with technological development, and discussion among stakeholders, including surgeons, ethicists, legal experts, and policymakers, will continue to be important.

v. Other ethical obligations

- Telesurgery facilitates remote specialist treatment but disrupts the traditional surgeon –patient relationship.[19] The absence of physical presence can prevent the building of trust, weaken emotional support, and affect patients' confidence. Technical lags and language differences may lead to miscommunication, and treatment distributed among multiple surgeons in different locations can be susceptible to disruption. Empathetic communication and a consistent presence by surgeons are necessary to counter these problems.
- The virtual nature of telesurgery can unintentionally depersonalize patients, reducing them to data points rather than individuals with specific needs.[20] Surgeons operating remotely may focus excessively on technical precision, leading to emotional detachment. Fostering patient-centered care and recognizing individual patient journeys is essential to maintaining dignity and trust.
- Telesurgery has unique vulnerabilities, particularly when local teams rely on remote expertise. In the event of technical failure, the local team's ability to handle complications may be limited, increasing risk. Patients should be informed of both teams' capabilities and limitations, as well as of contingency plans, so that they can participate in decision-making. Clear communication about risks and alternatives empowers patients and reduces vulnerabilities.[21]
- Conflicts of interest in telesurgery arise from financial ties to technology manufacturers or from professional affiliations, which may compromise patient care. Surgeons and institutions should publicly disclose such relationships, implement unbiased decision-making policies, and maintain regulatory oversight. Transparent practices and peer assessment are essential to maintaining ethical standards.[22]

---

[19] C.H. Frenkel, *Telesurgery's Evolution During the Robotic Surgery Renaissance and a Systematic Review of Its Ethical Considerations*, 30 SURGICAL INNOVATION 595 (2023), https://doi.org/10.1177/15533506231169073.
[20] *Id.*
[21] F. Fuertes-Guiró & E. Viteri Velasco, *Ethical Aspects Involving the Use of Information Technology in New Surgical Applications: Telesurgery and Surgical Telementoring*, 24 ACTA BIOETHICA 167 (2018), https://doi.org/10.4067/s1726-569x2018000200167.
[22] V. Patel et al., *Technical and Ethical Considerations in Telesurgery*, 18 J. ROBOTIC SURGERY 40 (2024), https://doi.org/10.1007/s11701-023-01797-3.

© 2026. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

III. NAVIGATING JURISDICTION IN CROSS-BORDER ROBOTIC SURGERY DISPUTES

The rise of robotic surgery within medical tourism has underscored the problem of determining the appropriate jurisdiction in legal disputes. At the heart of the problem lie the intertwined concepts of choice of law and choice of venue, which significantly affect the procedures for obtaining legal redress and the venues in which it is sought.[23]

Rules on jurisdiction differ widely from one nation to another. In many cases, the assessment of jurisdiction and applicable law involves principles such as *lex loci delicti* (the law of the place where the act occurred) or *lex loci damni* (the law of the place where the loss occurs). Applying these principles often becomes onerous in robotic surgery because several jurisdictions may be involved.

Consider a cross-border case involving a German patient who undergoes robotic surgery in Singapore. The courts in Germany might assert jurisdiction on the basis that the patient resides in Germany and experiences the effects of the harm there (*lex loci damni*).[24] The courts in Singapore, by contrast, may claim jurisdiction because the surgery was physically performed within their territory (*lex loci delicti*). Further complexities may emerge if the robotic system was operated remotely by a surgeon sitting in a third jurisdiction, such as the United States, as the surgeon's actions were not physically conducted at the surgery site.

The choice of venue is equally problematic in such scenarios. Patients usually opt to file a claim in their home jurisdiction, whereas defendants, who may include surgeons, hospitals, or manufacturers, argue for their own jurisdiction or the place where the surgery was performed. The choice of venue ordinarily affects the choice of law, and the lack of harmonized global standards aggravates the situation. Patients traveling abroad for medical treatment often face language barriers, cultural differences, and unfamiliar procedural requirements. The matter calls for clear contractual provisions on choice of law and forum selection in medical tourism contracts.[25]

---

[23] Bernard M. Dickens & Rebecca J. Cook, *Legal and Ethical Issues in Telemedicine and Robotics*, 94 INT'L J. GYNECOLOGY & OBSTETRICS 73 (2006), https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijgo.2006.04.023.

[24] Sidonia Maria Săceanu et al., *Telesurgery and Robotic Surgery: Ethical and Legal Aspect*, 5 J. CMTY. MED. & HEALTH EDUC. 355 (2015).

[25] Chukwuka Elendu et al., *The Legal and Ethical Considerations in Cross-Border Telesurgical Procedures*, 87 ANN. MED. & SURGERY 3660 (2025), https://doi.org/10.1097/ms9.0000000000003344.

© 2026. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

A. Role of legal precedents

Legal precedents furnish crucial insights into how courts have resolved jurisdictional conflicts in international medical cases, but the outcomes often highlight how far international law remains unharmonized. They show the varying priority that different jurisdictions give to competing principles, such as the location of the incident, the domicile of the plaintiff, and the domicile of the defendant.

In the European Union, the Brussels I Regulation (now Regulation (EU) No 1215/2012, the Brussels I Recast) and the Rome II Regulation provide organized frameworks for jurisdiction and applicable law in civil and commercial matters. Where the defendant is domiciled in a Member State, jurisdiction under these rules turns on specific criteria, including the defendant's domicile, the place where the harmful event occurred, and the place of performance of the contract.[26] A patient may therefore be able to sue where the injury occurred even though the surgery was performed elsewhere.

In non-EU jurisdictions, the determination of jurisdiction can differ considerably. In Canada, courts ask whether there is a "real and substantial connection" between the dispute and the jurisdiction where the case is brought. In *Club Resorts Ltd. v. Van Breda*, the Supreme Court of Canada identified four presumptive connecting factors in tort: the defendant is domiciled or resident in the province, the defendant carries on business there, the tort was committed there, or a contract connected with the dispute was made there. The plaintiff's presence in the jurisdiction is not, on its own, a sufficient connecting factor.[27] In the United States, the doctrine of *forum non conveniens* permits courts to decline jurisdiction in favor of another forum that appears more appropriate.[28] While this doctrine eases litigation for defendants, it often disadvantages patients, who may be hindered in bringing an action in a distant or foreign jurisdiction.

In robotic surgery, the technology adds further complications. Liability may depend, for instance, on whether the surgeon is physically present where the breakdown of the robotic system occurs or where the injury to the patient happens. Courts must also engage with the extraterritorial dimensions of telesurgery, since actions conducted from a distance question the very basis of jurisdiction founded on physical presence.

---

[26] *Commission Staff Working Document on the Applicability of the Existing EU Legal Framework to Telemedicine Services*, SWD(2012) 414 final (Dec. 6, 2012); Regulation (EU) No 1215/2012, arts. 4, 7, 2012 O.J. (L 351) 1; Regulation (EC) No 864/2007, art. 4, 2007 O.J. (L 199) 40.

[27] *Club Resorts Ltd. v. Van Breda*, 2012 SCC 17, [2012] 1 S.C.R. 572, paras. 86, 90 (Can.).

[28] *Piper Aircraft Co. v. Reyno*, 454 U.S. 235 (1981).

© 2026. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

These principles can be illustrated by a hypothetical. A person domiciled in Jurisdiction A undergoes medical treatment in Jurisdiction B using instruments manufactured in Jurisdiction C. The courts of Jurisdiction A might claim jurisdiction on the basis of an injury suffered within their state, even though neither the treatment nor the manufacturer of the equipment has any direct association with that country. The example reflects the unpredictability of jurisdictional analysis where multiple legal systems are involved.

Numerous jurisdictions lack clear judicial precedents, so that results often depend on the judicial construction of conflict-of-laws rules. This creates uncertainty for both patients and healthcare providers, which makes it essential to have contractual arrangements that address jurisdiction and governing law proactively.

B. Procedural and practical barriers

Procedural differences among jurisdictions further complicate cross-border robotic surgery disputes in medical tourism. The primary hurdle lies in the rules of evidence. Civil law jurisdictions such as Germany and France rely heavily on documentary evidence and judge-led investigation, whereas common law systems, such as those of the United States and the United Kingdom, rely more on oral evidence and cross-examination, with the parties themselves presenting their cases.[29] This difference may further confuse medical tourists seeking legal recourse for complications of robotic surgery performed abroad. A patient from a civil law jurisdiction, for instance, may find the adversarial nature of common law systems daunting, with its reliance on legal counsel and extensive courtroom procedure.

Matters become even more complicated with statutes of limitation, since limitation periods vary among jurisdictions. For example, a patient undergoing robotic surgery in Thailand generally has one year from learning of the wrongful act and the person liable in which to bring a claim, while the regular period in a home country such as Germany is three years.[30] This makes the patient more vulnerable, especially where complications arise long after the surgery, and places pressure on medical tourists to understand unfamiliar legal systems and timelines.[31] Procedural inequalities of this kind pose enormous obstacles to patients' quest for justice. Medical tourists, already affected by the physical and emotional toll of surgical complications, are often further disadvantaged by the complexity of navigating foreign legal systems.

[29] John H. Langbein, *The German Advantage in Civil Procedure*, 52 U. CHI. L. REV. 823 (1985).
[30] Civil and Commercial Code of Thailand § 448; Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch [BGB] [Civil Code] §§ 195, 199 (Ger.).
[31] Adeponle Olayode Adeoye, *Assessing the Associated Medical, Legal, and Social Issues in Medical Tourism and Its Implications for Nigeria*, 45 PAN AFR. MED. J. 145 (2023), https://doi.org/10.11604/pamj.2023.45.145.41104.

© 2026. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

IV. Liability in robotic surgery malpractice

Robot-assisted surgery has brought major advances in the precision and outcomes of medical procedures. At the same time, increased dependence on robotics introduces further layers of complexity, especially in the event of complications or errors. In medical tourism, where patients travel across borders for robot-assisted surgery, these challenges are compounded. The distribution of liability among surgeons, hospitals, and manufacturers presents significant hurdles. Moreover, discrepancies in legal systems and regulatory policies between the patient's home country and the host country often create uncertainty about whether liability can be pursued and against whom.[32] These concerns call for closer scrutiny of liability in international robot-assisted surgery.

A. Surgeons and professional liability

Surgeons play a central role in robot-assisted procedures and bear high responsibility for the outcome of the surgery. Liability in international robotic surgery is particularly complex, as the surgeon's conduct must meet the standard of care in the host country and possibly in the patient's country of origin. Professional liability also requires the surgeon to be adequately trained and certified in the use of robotic systems. Inadequate training or non-compliance with established protocols may ground an accusation of negligence. For instance, failure to interpret responses from a robotic system correctly, or to respond promptly to a system malfunction, may compromise patient safety and expose the surgeon to liability.[33]

Surgeons must also communicate all the risks and benefits of robotic surgery to patients. This includes accurate and comprehensive information on anticipated complications, the limitations of the system, and the special characteristics of the surgery. Misinformation or failure to provide appropriate information can increase surgeons' liability risk, especially where patients come from foreign backgrounds and may hold different expectations.

B. Hospital and institutional liability

Hospitals play a critical role in enabling the safe use of robotic surgical systems, and liability may arise from different aspects of their operations. In international medical tourism, hospitals face increased attention because of differences in regulatory standards and expectations. The proper functioning of robotic surgical systems requires good maintenance practices, so hospitals should establish detailed maintenance procedures and adhere to manufacturer guidelines.

[32] Philip Mirrer-Singer, *Medical Malpractice Overseas: The Legal Uncertainty Surrounding Medical Tourism*, 70 Law & Contemp. Probs. 211 (2007).

[33] C. Campiglio, *EU Cross-Border Telemedicine: A Partial Harmonisation of Product and Professional Liability?*, 8 Eur. Papers 1539 (2023).

© 2026. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

Neglect of maintenance protocols can lead to significant patient harm and may expose hospitals to liability claims.

Hospitals may also be vicariously liable for the acts of their employed surgeons and personnel. If an employed professional's negligence leads to patient harm, the hospital may be held accountable as the employer. This principle underscores the significance of robust oversight and risk management within institutions offering robotic surgery.[34]

C. Manufacturer and product liability

Manufacturers of robotic surgical systems bear significant responsibility for ensuring that their products are safe and effective. Product liability becomes more critical in international contexts, given the established differences in law and standards between countries. A manufacturer may be liable for a design or material defect or for inadequate quality control. If a robotic arm fails during surgery because of a defect, for instance, the manufacturer can be liable under product liability laws. Such liability is often comparable to that under the EU product liability regime, which imposes strict liability on producers of defective products, and which Directive (EU) 2024/2853 replaces from December 2026.[35]

The manufacturer must also provide explicit and specific guidelines for use. Failure to disclose known dangers or limitations of a robotic system invites liability claims, and proper documentation and educational tools for the correct use of a product are fundamental to countering these risks. The complexity of the software and AI on which robotic systems depend raises new challenges for liability. Errors arising from an algorithm or from a misinterpretation of data are hard to categorize, because the failure cannot be traced clearly either to a manufacturing defect or to operator misuse. Many regulations have not given proper attention to software failure, although the new EU directive now treats software, including AI systems, as a product.[36]

---

[34] M.B. Bagwan et al., *Liability in Robotic Surgery: Legal Frameworks and Case Studies*, 14 J. NEONATAL SURGERY 70 (2025), https://doi.org/10.52783/jns.v14.1659; *see also* C.J. Zonnenberg, *Who Is to Blame? Autonomous Surgical Robots and Liability Issues* (June 29, 2021), http://arno.uvt.nl/show.cgi?fid=159858.

[35] *Key Features of the New EU Product Liability Directive: Increased Potential for Litigation in the Technology, Pharmaceutical and Medical Device Sectors*, MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY (Oct. 21, 2024), https://www.mwe.com/insights/key-features-of-the-new-eu-product-liability-directive; Council Directive 85/374/EEC, 1985 O.J. (L 210) 29; Directive (EU) 2024/2853, 2024 O.J. (L 2853).

[36] Zonnenberg, *supra* note 34; *Key Features of the New EU Product Liability Directive*, *supra* note 35.

© 2026. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

V. Issues with Redressal in Cross-Border Robotic Surgery Disputes: Jurisdictional Perspectives

The advent of robotic surgery as a prominent aspect of medical tourism has led to considerable challenges in legal redress. Patients seeking advanced procedures often travel to countries like India, Thailand, Singapore, and Mexico, which offer cost-effectiveness and cutting-edge technology. The cross-border nature of these treatments, however, creates complex jurisdictional issues, especially in accessing compensation when complications arise. Whereas domestic healthcare frameworks can provide clear legal guidelines, cross-border robotic surgical procedures are characterized by conflicting regulations, diverse procedural methods, and inconsistent compensation schemes. Patients therefore face additional barriers when seeking remedies abroad,[37] including the lack of harmonized legal standards, restricted access to evidence, and constrained compensation mechanisms in destination countries.[38] The analysis of redress mechanisms in key medical tourism destinations below draws on Cortez's study of India, Thailand, Singapore, and Mexico.[39]

A. India

India's increasingly recognized status as a center for cost-effective and high-quality robotic surgery draws numerous patients from abroad.[40] Nevertheless, the mechanisms for addressing grievances about medical malpractice show considerable shortcomings:

Consumer commissions: In 1986, the Indian Parliament enacted the Consumer Protection Act, in line with the United Nations' 1985 consumer protection guidelines; the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 has since replaced it.[41] These bodies are relatively accessible and faster than regular civil proceedings, with cases typically taking two to three years. Their compensation has traditionally centered on economic loss, with noneconomic damages generally not awarded and punitive damages rarely used.[42] That position has since moved. The Supreme Court has recognized compensation for mental agony and physical pain,[43] and awarded Rs. 10,00,000 for

---

[37] Adeoye, *supra* note 31.
[38] N. Lunt et al., *Medical Tourism: Treatments, Markets and Health System Implications: A Scoping Review*, OECD Doc. DELSA/HEA/WD/HWP(2011)3 (2011).
[39] Nathan Cortez, *Recalibrating the Legal Risks of Cross-Border Health Care*, 10 Yale J. Health Pol'y L. & Ethics 1 (2010).
[40] *Surgical Robotics in India: Transforming Healthcare with Precision and Innovation*, TechSci Research Blog (June 2025), https://www.techsciresearch.com/blog/surgical-robotics-in-india-transforming-healthcare/4662.html.
[41] The Consumer Protection Act, 1986, No. 68, Acts of Parliament, 1986 (India); The Consumer Protection Act, 2019, No. 35, Acts of Parliament, 2019 (India); *see Indian Med. Ass'n v. V.P. Shantha*, (1995) 6 SCC 651 (India).
[42] Nathan Cortez, *A Medical Malpractice Model for Developing Countries?*, 4 Drexel L. Rev. 217, 231, 233 (2011).
[43] M.S. Chandra & S.B. Math, *Progress in Medicine: Compensation and Medical Negligence in India: Does the System Need a Quick Fix or an Overhaul?*, 19 Annals Indian Acad. Neurology S21 (2016), https://doi

pain and suffering in *Balram Prasad v. Kunal Saha*,[44] and the 2019 Act, like the 1986 Act as amended in 2002, expressly empowers the commissions to grant punitive damages.[45]

Civil litigation: Civil courts in India are known for protracted timelines, with some cases extending over fifteen to twenty years or more.[46,47] Robotic surgery cases are a particular challenge in this system, as the technical evidence is complicated and expert testimony is required. Plaintiffs also struggle to put forward full operational data, as patients often have difficulty obtaining even their medical records from physicians and hospitals.[48]

Compensation framework: Awards for malpractice in India vary widely. The award of Rs. 6,08,00,550 with interest in *Balram Prasad* was the highest ever made in a medical negligence case when it was decided, and what amounts to just and adequate compensation remains unsettled, which leaves the victim of a robotic surgery injury with little certainty about recovery.[49]

B. Thailand

Thailand has positioned itself as one of the leading destinations for medical tourism, including robotic surgery. Despite its advanced healthcare system, the legal avenues for seeking redress remain less developed:

Malpractice laws: Legal experts describe Thai law on medical malpractice as "thin and antiquated," with few statutes, books, or articles to guide the courts, and patients are routinely denied access to basic information about their diagnoses and treatment.[50] Establishing liability in robotic surgery requires thorough operational logs and detailed documentation, so this gap creates a substantial barrier for plaintiffs.

Compensation gaps: Thai courts tend to limit malpractice damages to actual, quantifiable losses and rarely award damages for pain and suffering, and the average malpractice recovery has been reported at less than $2,500. In robotic surgery, where equipment failure or surgical

.org/10.4103/0972-2327.192887.

[44] *Balram Prasad v. Kunal Saha*, (2014) 1 SCC 384 (India).

[45] The Consumer Protection Act, 2019, No. 35, Acts of Parliament, 2019, §§ 39(1)(d), 49(1), 59(1) (India); The Consumer Protection Act, 1986, No. 68, Acts of Parliament, 1986, § 14(1)(d) (India).

[46] Cortez, *A Medical Malpractice Model*, *supra* note 42, at 230.

[47] A.K. Agarwal, *Medical Negligence and Compensation in India: How Much Is Just and Effective?* (Indian Inst. of Mgmt. Ahmedabad, Working Paper No. 2014-03-27, Mar. 2014).

[48] Cortez, *A Medical Malpractice Model*, *supra* note 42, at 234.

[49] Agarwal, *supra* note 47; *see also* Cortez, *Recalibrating*, *supra* note 39, at 32.

[50] Cortez, *A Medical Malpractice Model*, *supra* note 42, at 228.

error may lead to severe and life-altering complications, this can mean a mismatch between the severity of the harm and the compensation available to patients.[51]

Procedural hurdles: Language is a significant burden for foreign litigants. Civil court proceedings are conducted in Thai, and a party who does not understand Thai must provide an interpreter, which adds cost and complexity. Thai civil cases are also decided without a jury.[52]

C. Singapore

Singapore is acknowledged for its rigorous healthcare regulation and sophisticated medical facilities, which make it a compelling location for robotic surgery. Nonetheless, the existing legal framework presents difficulties for malpractice claimants:

Negligence standards: In Singapore, negligence in diagnosis and treatment is assessed under the *Bolam* test, which originated in English law, together with the *Bolitho* addendum. Under this test, a physician's conduct is measured against the practice of a responsible body of peers in the same field.[53] The test is inherently deferential to medical professionals, as it presumes that practices accepted by a responsible group of practitioners are valid. Medical advice, by contrast, is now governed by a separate statutory test, in force since July 1, 2022.[54] The deferential standard gives healthcare providers considerable protection but poses a significant hurdle in robotic surgery cases, where liability may extend beyond the physician to the hospital and the manufacturer of the robotic system, which complicates the determination of fault.

Litigation costs: The "loser-pays" principle generally requires the losing party to pay the opposing side's party-and-party costs, which deters many patients from filing suit. In addition, the prohibition of contingency fees places a heavy financial burden on plaintiffs, who must bear the upfront costs of a lawsuit.[55]

Technological accountability: Liability cannot easily be assigned because these surgeries rest on complex technology. It may be difficult to ascertain whether liability lies with the surgeon, the hospital, or the equipment manufacturer.[56]

---

[51] *Medical Malpractice Claims in Thailand*, SIAM LEGAL, https://siam-legal.com/litigation/medical-malpractice-in-thailand.php; Cortez, *Recalibrating*, *supra* note 39, at 6, 44.
[52] Civil Procedure Code of Thailand § 46; Cortez, *Recalibrating*, *supra* note 39, at 44–45.
[53] K. Shanmugam, *Testing the Bolam Test: Consequences of Recent Developments*, 43 SING. MED. J. 7 (2002).
[54] *Hii Chii Kok v. Ooi Peng Jin London Lucien*, [2017] SGCA 38, [99] (Sing.); Civil Law Act 1909, § 37 (Sing.).
[55] *After the Lawsuit: Who Has to Pay Whom, and How Much?*, SINGAPORE LEGAL ADVICE, https://singaporelegaladvice.com/law-articles/post-litigation-costs; *Law Society of Singapore v. Lau See Jin Jeffrey*, [2017] SGHC 30, [12] (Sing.).
[56] Husein Bani Issa, *Robotic Surgery and the Law: Defining Control and Criminal Responsibility*, 6 J. SOFT COMPUTING & DATA MINING 423 (2025), https://doi.org/10.30880/jscdm.2025.06.01.028.

© 2026. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

D. Mexico

Owing to its affordability and proximity to the United States, Mexico is considered one of the prime destinations for medical tourism. Its legal system, however, provides limited avenues for addressing malpractice in robotic surgery:

Compensation limits: In Mexico, the Civil Code requires courts to calculate compensatory damages using a statutory workers' compensation formula found in the Federal Labor Act. Patients who received financial compensation through the national medical arbitration agency, Conamed, between 2001 and 2003 were reported to average only $4,841. This is inadequate in robotic surgery cases, where the damage often includes significant medical costs and long-term care requirements.[57]

Arbitration system: Conamed offers a more accessible and less costly alternative to the regular courts, although it may struggle with the complexity of robotic surgery claims. Its arbitration awards are usually lower than those awarded by a court, and parties who arbitrate must agree not to take the case to court.[58]

Procedural restraints: Mexico is a civil code jurisdiction, and its courts do not use juries or *stare decisis*. This may make outcomes less predictable for foreign patients accustomed to common law procedure.[59]

VI. Integrating Telemedicine: Implications of Remote Pre- and Post-Operative Care in Robotic Surgery and Medical Tourism

Telemedicine refers to the use of digital communication tools, such as video conferencing, secure messaging platforms, and remote monitoring equipment, to offer healthcare at a distance. According to the World Health Organization (WHO), the term "telemedicine" was coined in the 1970s and literally means "healing at a distance."[60] It encompasses the use of communication technology to enable healthcare professionals to access and share medical information about patients remotely. These technologies enable real-time communication, sharing of patient data, and patient monitoring, overcoming geographical barriers and making telemedicine especially valuable for medical tourists.

Telemedicine for preoperative consultations has emerged as an important tool in facilitating robotic surgery for medical tourists. It allows a patient to communicate with physicians across

[57] Cortez, *A Medical Malpractice Model*, *supra* note 42, at 237, 240.
[58] *Id.* at 238–39.
[59] *Id.* at 235–36.
[60] World Health Organization, *Telemedicine: Opportunities and Developments in Member States: Report on the Second Global Survey on eHealth* (2010), https://iris.who.int/items/0365143e-27dc-418e-ad66-ae095df34fda.

borders, usually before making the major decision to travel for surgery. Patients can receive a preliminary assessment of their condition, have their medical history reviewed, and ask questions about their surgery from home. Such consultations help reduce travel costs, streamline surgical planning, and build patient confidence in the chosen healthcare provider.[61]

A. Preoperative consultations

Preoperative telemedicine care prepares patients for robotic surgery. It involves several important components designed to improve surgical outcomes and ensure that the patient is ready for surgery.[62]

First, the patient's medical history is assessed in detail. Patients can forward their medical records, imaging tests, and lab results through secure telemedicine platforms. This information helps the surgical team judge the patient's suitability for surgery and identify risk factors that may affect surgical outcomes.[63] Second, diagnostic assessment is undertaken using advanced telecommunication technologies. The surgeons study the reports submitted, which may include radiological imaging, to plan appropriate surgical interventions and prepare to meet the needs of the patient. The third stage involves educating the patient. Through telemedicine, patients learn about the procedure, its possible hazards, post-surgical expectations, and recovery timelines. These consultations empower patients with information and alleviate their fears, so that ethical and effective informed consent is achieved. Lastly, telemedicine supports electronic informed consent. Using secure digital systems, patients can review and sign consent forms electronically, which assists legal compliance across jurisdictions. Communication and full documentation are fundamental to compliance with the legal requirements of both the patient's country of origin and the healthcare provider's country.

B. Post-operative care across borders

Telemedicine facilitates post-operative care for medical tourists once they return to their home countries after robotic surgery. Virtual follow-ups allow surgeons to observe the progress of recovery and respond promptly to complications. Secure video conferencing helps surgeons review imaging studies, inspect the condition of the surgical site, and adjust medication orders when required. When complications arise, telemedicine enables timely intervention: surgeons

[61] Patel et al., *supra* note 22.
[62] R.R. Bhanvadia et al., *Safety and Feasibility of Telehealth Only Preoperative Evaluation Before Minimally Invasive Robotic Urologic Surgery*, 36 J. ENDOUROLOGY 1070 (2022), https://doi.org/10.1089/end.2021.0819.
[63] E.G. Bignami et al., *Advances in Telemedicine Implementation for Preoperative Assessment: A Call to Action*, 4 J. ANESTHESIA, ANALGESIA & CRITICAL CARE 34 (2024), https://doi.org/10.1186/s44158-024-00172-4.

© 2026. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities

can advise local healthcare providers or suggest corrective measures, minimizing the need for readmission or further travel.

Rehabilitation support is a core component of telemedicine care after surgery. Virtual therapy sessions and recovery counseling are tailored to the patient's response to secure the best possible recovery. Surgeons and rehabilitation specialists collaborate to provide seamless care and to address changes in the patient's status. Post-operative telemedicine also has significant legal complexities. Providers must understand the jurisdictional policies governing telemedicine services, obtain the patient's consent for telemedicine follow-up appointments, and define clearly the bounds of their interventions during post-surgical care in order to manage liability and patients' expectations.

VII. Legal frameworks for patient data privacy

Data privacy and security form the necessary basis for trust in telemedicine. The spread of digital health technologies around the world has heightened the demand for comprehensive legal frameworks to safeguard sensitive patient data from unauthorized access and exploitation. For medical tourists relying on telemedicine, the transnational nature of care necessitates compliance with strict data protection regulations.

The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) are two prominent legal frameworks that set standards for data privacy and security. The GDPR applies mainly to organizations established in the European Union or handling the personal data of individuals in the European Union, whereas HIPAA sets privacy standards for how health information is handled in the United States. Together, these regulations address essential components of data protection, requiring healthcare providers and telemedicine platforms to uphold patient rights and the integrity of data.[64]

A. General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)

One of the most comprehensive frameworks for data protection globally, the GDPR has applied since 2018. It sets out uniform principles for the safeguarding of personal data, and especially of sensitive personal data such as health records.[65] Its key features include:

- **Data minimization and purpose limitation:** Telemedicine providers should collect only the data necessary for specific medical purposes. Further processing must be compatible with the purpose for which the data were initially collected.

[64] Regulation (EU) 2016/679, art. 3, 2016 O.J. (L 119) 1; Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-191, 110 Stat. 1936.
[65] Regulation (EU) 2016/679, arts. 5, 9.

© 2026. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

- **Consent and transparency:** Health data may be processed only on a recognized ground, such as the patient's explicit consent or the provision of healthcare by or under the responsibility of a professional bound by secrecy.[66] Telemedicine platforms should explain to patients, in accessible language, the purposes, duration, and scope of the use of their data.
- **Rights of data subjects:** Patients have important rights under the GDPR, such as the right to access their data, to rectify inaccuracies, and to request erasure in certain conditions (the "right to be forgotten").
- **Cross-border data transfers:** For data transfers outside the EU, providers need to implement approved safeguards, such as Standard Contractual Clauses (SCCs), in order to secure equivalent protection in the recipient country.
- **Accountability and compliance:** Organizations need to document their data processing activities, audit them regularly, and carry out Data Protection Impact Assessments (DPIAs) to evaluate the risks of data handling.

Compliance with the GDPR safeguards patients and enhances the reputation of telemedicine companies working in the international health system. Incidents can lead to significant financial losses and reputational damage; hence the need for robust data governance.

B. Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA)

HIPAA, enacted in 1996, is the cornerstone of healthcare data protection in the United States. It provides rules for handling, storing, and transmitting Protected Health Information (PHI).[67] Its major provisions are as follows:

- **Privacy Rule:** Covered entities may use and disclose PHI for treatment, payment, and healthcare operations without the patient's authorization; most other uses require written authorization.[68] Patients have a right to obtain their medical records and have them corrected.
- **Security Rule:** Covered entities must adopt physical, administrative, and technical safeguards to protect Electronic Protected Health Information (ePHI). These include encryption, strong password standards, and user-specific access controls.
- **Breach Notification Rule:** Covered entities must notify affected individuals without unreasonable delay and in no case later than 60 days after discovering a breach, and

[66] Regulation (EU) 2016/679, arts. 5(1)(b), 6, 9(2)(a), 9(2)(h), 9(3).
[67] Nicolas P. Terry, *Under-Regulated Health Care Phenomena in a Flat World: Medical Tourism and Outsourcing*, 29 W. NEW ENG. L. REV. 421 (2007).
[68] 45 C.F.R. §§ 164.506, 164.508 (2025).

© 2026. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

must also notify the relevant agency.[69] The rule allows for clear disclosure and corrective action.

- **Business Associate Agreements (BAAs):** Any third-party service provider dealing with ePHI is required to sign a BAA and follow HIPAA standards.

The strict data protection standards set by HIPAA make telemedicine interactions more secure. Compliance audits, staff training, and certified technology solutions support adherence to these regulations, and the protection of patient data builds trust and supports the ethical provision of telemedicine services.

For telemedicine providers serving international patients, compliance with the GDPR and HIPAA is essential, though the two have different requirements despite common principles on data minimization and patient rights. Providers would need to invest significantly in security infrastructure, conclude clear data-sharing agreements, and adopt a patient-centric approach to data governance. Doing so could help integrate telemedicine services into robotic surgery and medical tourism while upholding legal and ethical standards.

VIII. Policy Recommendations and Proposals

Advancing the field of robotic surgery and medical tourism requires a global approach. A universally established standard for training in robotic surgery would promote standardized care delivery globally. Professional associations should partner with governments in devising accreditation programs and certification requirements, establishing norms for surgeons. An agency for robotic surgery modeled on the Joint Commission would be an efficient means of enhancing global standardization and quality assurance. Automated performance metrics (APMs) could also be integrated into assessment procedures, objectively assuring competencies and outcomes, minimizing disparities, and maximizing training efficiency.[70] A robust legal and ethical framework is attainable. International agreements that determine liability and jurisdiction in robotic surgery for medical tourism, together with transparency in consent procedures, would help resolve cross-border disputes. The risks and benefits of the technology must be conveyed to patients so that they can make informed decisions about its use in robotic surgery.

Telemedicine plays a crucial role in pre- and post-operative care, especially for international patients. Standardized telemedicine practices that comply with data protection laws such as the

[69] 45 C.F.R. §§ 164.404(b), 164.408 (2025).
[70] A.J. Hung, J. Chen & I.S. Gill, *Automated Performance Metrics and Machine Learning Algorithms to Measure Surgeon Performance and Anticipate Clinical Outcomes in Robotic Surgery*, 153 JAMA Surgery 770 (2018), https://doi.org/10.1001/jamasurg.2018.1512.

© 2026. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

GDPR and HIPAA are essential to protect patient information. Machine learning insights integrated into pre-surgical evaluations through telemedicine can enhance decision-making and reduce risks. Patient-centric healthcare models should incorporate multilingual platforms and real-time interpretation services to overcome the language barriers of telemedicine and medical tourism. Furthermore, machine learning algorithms that identify the elements affecting outcomes have the potential to help patients make informed choices about their healthcare. Oversight of technology is crucial and requires frequent evaluation of robotic surgical systems and APM algorithms to ensure their dependability and safety. Healthcare institutions should maintain detailed records of software improvements and system effectiveness, and promote collaborative development of machine learning algorithms to tailor surgical training and predict patient outcomes.

Strong institutional networks need to be built. International collaboration between hospitals and research centers can make the sharing of APM data possible, leading to better training of surgeons and better patient safety worldwide. Public awareness campaigns should emphasize the use of validated technologies, such as machine learning and APMs, in achieving better surgical outcomes. New financial structures, such as insurance coverage for robotic surgery involving machine learning, could reduce the cost of care and encourage the adoption of advanced technologies. Ultimately, sustained funding for research on APM integration and machine learning will improve predictive modeling and raise the standards of patient care.

IX. CONCLUSION

The rapid growth of medical tourism, underpinned by advances in robotic surgery and telemedicine, necessitates a strategic and collaborative approach. Innovations such as automated performance metrics and machine learning present transformative opportunities to enhance surgical precision and patient safety. These advances also bring ethical, legal, and technological challenges that demand comprehensive solutions. By adopting standardized training protocols, bolstering legal frameworks, and using machine learning to personalize surgeon training, the healthcare industry can move toward equitable and high-quality care for all. Telemedicine, enriched by insights from APMs, has the potential to reduce barriers to care and improve outcomes for medical tourists.

Realizing these objectives requires a concerted effort by policymakers, healthcare providers, and technology developers. Together, they must establish a transparent, sustainable, and inclusive framework that harnesses the potential of robotic surgery and medical tourism to deliver substantial benefits to global healthcare systems.

© 2026. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]