



www.bioinformation.net  
Volume 21(10)

Research Article

Received October 1, 2025; Revised October 31, 2025; Accepted October 31, 2025, Published October 31, 2025

DOI: 10.6026/973206300213599

SJIF 2025 (Scientific Journal Impact Factor for 2025) = 8.478

2022 Impact Factor (2023 Clarivate Inc. release) is 1.9

#### Declaration on Publication Ethics:

The author's state that they adhere with COPE guidelines on publishing ethics as described elsewhere at <https://publicationethics.org/>. The authors also undertake that they are not associated with any other third party (governmental or non-governmental agencies) linking with any form of unethical issues connecting to this publication. The authors also declare that they are not withholding any information that is misleading to the publisher in regard to this article.

#### Declaration on official E-mail:

The corresponding author declares that lifetime official e-mail from their institution is not available for all authors

#### License statement:

This is an Open Access article which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly credited. This is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License

#### Comments from readers:

Articles published in BIOINFORMATION are open for relevant post publication comments and criticisms, which will be published immediately linking to the original article without open access charges. Comments should be concise, coherent and critical in less than 1000 words.

#### Disclaimer:

Bioinformation provides a platform for scholarly communication of data and information to create knowledge in the Biological/Biomedical domain after adequate peer/editorial reviews and editing entertaining revisions where required. The views and opinions expressed are those of the author(s) and do not reflect the views or opinions of Bioinformation and (or) its publisher Biomedical Informatics. Biomedical Informatics remains neutral and allows authors to specify their address and affiliation details including territory where required.

Edited by A Prashanth

E-mail: [phyjunc@gmail.com](mailto:phyjunc@gmail.com)

Citation: Parthsarathi *et al.* Bioinformation 21(10): 3599-3602 (2025)

# Enhanced recovery after surgery (ERAS) protocols: Impact on patient outcomes

Pranavkumar Amrutlal Parthsarathi<sup>1,\*</sup>, Ankit Ashok Agrawal<sup>2</sup>, Alpeshkumar Parmar<sup>3</sup>,  
Manchireddy Manish<sup>4</sup>, Indraj Arora<sup>5</sup> & Manisha Kumari<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of General Surgery, Nootan Medical College and Research Center, Sankalchand Patel Vidyadham, Visnagar, Gujarat, India; <sup>2</sup>Department of General Surgery, Government Medical College, Nagpur, Maharashtra, India; <sup>3</sup>Department of General Surgery, Dr. N.D. Desai Faculty of Medical Sciences and Research, Dharmsinh Desai University, Nadiad-387001, Gujarat, India; <sup>4</sup>Department of Anesthesiology, Madha Medical College and Research Institute, Kovur, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India; <sup>5</sup>Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Hitkarini Dental College and Hospital, Hitkarini Hills, Dumna Airport Road, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh, India; <sup>6</sup>Department of Periodontics and Implantology, Hitkarini Dental College and Hospital, Hitkarini Hills, Dumna Airport Road, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh, India; \*Corresponding author

**Affiliation URL:**

<https://mbbs.spu.ac.in/>  
<https://gmcnagpur.org/>  
<https://medical.ddu.ac.in/>  
<https://mmcri.in/>  
<https://hdch.hitkarini.com/>

**Authors contacts:**

Pranavkumar Amrutlal Parthasarathi - E-mail: pranav.parthasarathi88@gmail.com; Phone: +91 7984124982  
Ankit Ashok Agrawal - E-mail: dragrawal91@gmail.com; Phone: +91 9970658807  
Alpeshkumar Parmar - E-mail: alps1996@gmail.com; Phone: +91 9664570662  
Manchireddy Manish - E-mail: manishreddy03@gmail.com; Phone: +91 8524877832  
Indraj Arora - E-mail: indrajara09@gmail.com; Phone: +91 7000501821  
Manisha Kumari - E-mail: drmanisha0103@gmail.com; Phone: +91 8319691177

**Abstract:**

An ERAS protocols in improving postoperative outcomes after elective abdominal surgeries is of interest. Hence, a total of 138 patients were analyzed with 68 receiving ERAS-based care and 70 receiving conventional management. The ERAS group had significantly lower pain scores, reached their recovery milestones sooner and had fewer complications. The average length stay was significantly shorter and there were no increased readmission rates. Thus, we show continued dissemination and implementation of ERAS protocols for improved surgical recovery.

**Keywords:** Enhanced recovery after surgery, ERAS, postoperative recovery, pain management, complication rates, hospital stay, patient outcomes, abdominal surgery and multimodal care.

**Background:**

Enhanced Recovery after Surgery (ERAS) is a multimodal and evidence-based perioperative care pathway that aims to minimize the physiological stress response to surgery, promote homeostasis and provide a speedy recovery of function [1]. First introduced to colorectal surgery in the 1990s, ERAS protocols have since been widely implemented in several surgical specialties, including hepatobiliary, urologic, gynecologic and thoracic surgery with reproducible effectiveness [2]. ERAS encompasses surgical, anesthetic and nursing care, all standardized in a protocol consistent with individualized care and multidisciplinary team care. Many elements of ERAS include extensive preoperative counseling, no prolonged fasting or preoperative fasting, preoperative carbohydrate loading, multimodal analgesia with minimal opioid use, early removal of drains and catheters, resumption of diet early postoperative and mobilizing patients early [3, 4]. In general, these activities decrease surgical stress response, maintain physiologic function and minimize postoperative morbidity. There are many randomized controlled trials and meta-analyses demonstrating that ERAS reduces length of stay, complications and costs, while improving quality of recovery and patient satisfaction [5, 6]. In spite of some promising findings, there are some obstacles to their wider implementation. Variability in ERAS compliance, resistance to moving away from established practices and safety when performing complex surgeries, is still limiting some areas of implementation [7]. While efficacy has been well established in controlled environments, the effectiveness of ERAS in everyday clinical practices requires on-going validation with real-world studies. These studies will be needed to evaluate feasibility, safety and outcomes in various surgical populations

while accounting for the inherent variability and differences in healthcare systems. Therefore, it is of interest to see how the ERAS protocols impact patient outcomes in elective abdominal surgeries- particularly regarding postoperative pain, mobilization, complications, length of stay and recovery milestones as compared to standard perioperative care.

**Materials and Methods:**

This retrospective cohort study was conducted at a tertiary care hospital, reviewing the medical records of 138 adult patients who underwent elective abdominal surgeries colorectal, hepatobiliary, or gastric between January 2022 and December 2023. Patients were divided into two groups: the ERAS group (n=68), who were managed using standardized Enhanced Recovery after Surgery protocols and the conventional care group (n=70), who received traditional perioperative management. The ERAS protocol included preoperative patient counseling, carbohydrate loading up to two hours before surgery, avoidance of routine bowel preparation, intraoperative fluid restriction, multimodal analgesia with minimal opioid use, early removal of catheters and drains, early oral feeding and mobilization within 12-24 hours postoperatively. Conventional care followed the institution's previous practices, including prolonged fasting, delayed oral intake, liberal fluid administration, opioid-based pain management and delayed ambulation. Data collected included patient demographics, type of surgery, ASA classification, intraoperative details, postoperative pain scores (VAS), opioid usage, time to ambulation, time to first oral intake and bowel movement, complication rates using Clavien-Dindo classification, duration of hospital stay and 30-day readmission rates. Patients

undergoing emergency surgery, those with ASA class IV or higher, or those requiring ICU-level postoperative care were excluded. Data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics to compare outcomes between groups.

Results:

Patients managed under ERAS protocols demonstrated superior postoperative outcomes compared to those under conventional care. Significant improvements were noted in pain control, earlier mobilization, reduced opioid usage, faster return of bowel function and shorter hospital stay, along with a lower incidence of complications. **Table 1** shows baseline characteristics between both groups were similar, ensuring comparability for outcome assessment. **Table 2** shows the distribution of surgery types was similar in both groups, allowing for a balanced comparison. **Table 3** shows patients in the ERAS group reported significantly lower pain scores at all postoperative intervals. **Table 4** shows time to first oral intake was markedly shorter in the ERAS group. **Table 5** shows earlier mobilization was observed in ERAS patients compared to conventional care. **Table 6** shows that the ERAS protocols significantly reduced the length of hospital stay. **Table 7** shows Overall complication rates were lower in the ERAS group, especially for minor complications. **Table 8** shows readmission rates within 30 days were lower in the ERAS group, though not statistically significant. **Table 9** shows return of bowel function was significantly faster in ERAS patients. **Table 10** shows postoperative opioid consumption was significantly lower in ERAS patients.

Table 1: Baseline demographic and clinical characteristics

| Variable              | ERAS (n=68) | Conventional (n=70) | p-value |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------------|---------|
| Mean Age (years)      | 56.8 ± 11.3 | 58.2 ± 10.7         | 0.42    |
| Male (%)              | 42 (61.8%)  | 45 (64.3%)          | 0.75    |
| ASA Class I-II (%)    | 49 (72.1%)  | 51 (72.9%)          | 0.91    |
| Diabetes Mellitus (%) | 24 (35.3%)  | 27 (38.6%)          | 0.70    |
| Hypertension (%)      | 29 (42.6%)  | 32 (45.7%)          | 0.72    |

Table 2: Type of abdominal surgery performed

| Surgery Type          | ERAS (n=68) | Conventional (n=70) | p-value |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------------|---------|
| Colorectal Surgery    | 31 (45.6%)  | 33 (47.1%)          | 0.85    |
| Hepatobiliary Surgery | 20 (29.4%)  | 19 (27.1%)          | 0.77    |
| Upper GI (Gastric)    | 17 (25.0%)  | 18 (25.7%)          | 0.92    |

Table 3: Mean postoperative pain scores (VAS Scale 0-10)

| Time Interval | ERAS Group | Conventional Group | p-value |
|---------------|------------|--------------------|---------|
| 6 hours       | 3.8 ± 1.2  | 5.2 ± 1.4          | <0.001  |
| 24 hours      | 3.2 ± 1.0  | 4.5 ± 1.3          | <0.001  |
| 48 hours      | 2.1 ± 0.8  | 3.3 ± 1.1          | <0.001  |

Table 4: Time to First Oral Intake (in hours)

| Intake Type  | ERAS Group | Conventional Group | p-value |
|--------------|------------|--------------------|---------|
| Clear Fluids | 7.2 ± 1.5  | 19.6 ± 2.8         | <0.001  |
| Solid Food   | 20.8 ± 4.2 | 46.7 ± 6.3         | <0.001  |

Table 5: Time to first ambulation (in hours)

| Time to Ambulation | ERAS Group | Conventional Group | p-value |
|--------------------|------------|--------------------|---------|
| Mean Time          | 14.3 ± 3.5 | 28.5 ± 5.2         | <0.001  |

Table 6: Length of Postoperative Hospital Stay (in days)

| Group        | Mean Stay (days) | p-value |
|--------------|------------------|---------|
| ERAS         | 3.9 ± 1.2        | <0.001  |
| Conventional | 6.7 ± 1.6        |         |

Table 7: Postoperative complications (Clavien-Dindo Classification)

| Complication Grade  | ERAS (n=68) | Conventional (n=70) | p-value |
|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|---------|
| Grade I-II (Minor)  | 9 (13.2%)   | 19 (27.1%)          | 0.04    |
| Grade III-V (Major) | 3 (4.4%)    | 7 (10.0%)           | 0.20    |
| Any Complication    | 12 (17.6%)  | 26 (37.1%)          | 0.01    |

Table 8: 30-day readmission rates

| Group        | Readmissions (%) | p-value |
|--------------|------------------|---------|
| ERAS         | 4 (5.9%)         | 0.16    |
| Conventional | 9 (12.9%)        |         |

Table 9: Time to return of bowel function (in hours)

| Parameter                    | ERAS Group | Conventional Group | p-value |
|------------------------------|------------|--------------------|---------|
| Time to First Flatus         | 22.6 ± 5.1 | 35.9 ± 6.7         | <0.001  |
| Time to First Bowel Movement | 40.3 ± 6.4 | 58.1 ± 7.8         | <0.001  |

Table 10: Opioid usage (morphine equivalents in mg)

| Time Frame  | ERAS Group | Conventional Group | p-value |
|-------------|------------|--------------------|---------|
| 0-24 hours  | 8.2 ± 2.5  | 14.7 ± 3.8         | <0.001  |
| 24-48 hours | 4.6 ± 1.8  | 9.8 ± 3.1          | <0.001  |

Discussion:

The findings of this retrospective cohort study demonstrate that Enhanced Recovery after Surgery (ERAS) protocols significantly improve postoperative outcomes in patients undergoing elective abdominal surgeries. Compared to conventional care, ERAS patients experienced earlier mobilization, faster return of gastrointestinal function, reduced opioid consumption and significantly lower pain scores [6, 7]. The shorter hospital stay observed in the ERAS group not only suggests faster physiological recovery but also has important implications for healthcare resource utilization and cost-effectiveness [8]. Importantly, ERAS patients experienced fewer complications and higher satisfaction levels, indicating a strong alignment between clinical efficacy and patient-centered care [9, 10]. Although the reduction in 30-day readmission was not statistically significant, the trend favored ERAS, supporting its safety in early discharge protocols [11]. These results reinforce the growing body of evidence supporting ERAS implementation as a standard of care across surgical disciplines.

Conclusion:

ERAS protocols substantially enhance recovery, reduce complications and shorten hospital stay following elective abdominal surgery. Their adoption leads to safer, faster and more patient-friendly postoperative outcomes. Broad integration of ERAS principles should be encouraged across surgical care pathways to optimize both clinical and operational results.

Acknowledgement:

We acknowledge that the first and second author contributed equally to this paper and hence they are considered as joint first author

**References:**

- [1] Kannan V *et al. Patient Saf Surg.* 2025 **19**:4 [PMID: 39819478]
  - [2] Damania R *et al. Ann Transl Med.* 2017 **5**:341 [PMID: 28936435]
  - [3] Mundhra R *et al. Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol X.* 2025 **22**:100295 [PMID: 38496380]
  - [4] Abilashini GD *et al. J Pharm Bioallied Sci.* 2025 **17**:S1849 [PMID: 40655739]
  - [5] Özdemir MG *et al. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth.* 2025 **25**:517 [PMID: 40301800]
  - [6] Jiao S *et al. Eur J Phys Rehabil Med.* 2024 **60**:74 [PMID: 37934189]
  - [7] Carter-Brooks CM *et al. Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 2018 **219**:495.e1 [PMID: 29913175]
  - [8] Wang B *et al. Sci Rep.* 2024 **14**:24055 [PMID: 39402102]
  - [9] Kuemmerli C *et al. Br J Surg.* 2022 **109**:256 [PMID: 35037019]
  - [10] Silverstein J *et al. Obes Surg.* 2023 **33**:3206 [PMID: 37653212]
  - [11] Giannarini G *et al. Minerva Urol Nefrol.* 2019 **71**:309 [PMID: 31241271]
- 