ACADEMIC & CLINICAL MONOGRAPH | PROCEDURAL DERMATOLOGY

The History and Safety of Cosmetic Procedures in Dermatology

A Comprehensive Review of Technical Innovation, Scar Therapeutics, Injectable Science, Phlebology, and Anesthesia-Dependent Safety Profiles

Focus: Cutaneous Surgery, Scar Therapeutics, Neuromodulators, Dermal Fillers, Biostimulators, Lasers & Phlebology Clinical Review Series (Updated August 2026) | Key Reference: Evidence-Based Safety Registries & Multimodal Protocols

Introduction

Cosmetic dermatology traces its lineage back further than most observers realise, reaching from nineteenth-century phenol peels through the antisepsis and anesthesia revolutions of the early twentieth century to the technologically sophisticated, evidence-driven specialty practiced today. What unites this long arc of development is a recurring pattern: a procedure begins as an empirical, often unregulated practice; its risks are catalogued through case reports and case series; its technique is refined in response to those risks; and eventually a body of peer-reviewed, prospective evidence accumulates that allows clinicians and patients to make genuinely informed decisions about safety and benefit. Nowhere is this pattern more visible than in the parallel histories of dermatologic and surgical involvement in cosmetic procedures, where dermatologists have repeatedly served as primary innovators of safety-enhancing technique most consequential; Jeffrey Klein's invention of tumescent local anesthesia for liposuction, Rox Anderson's theory of selective photo -thermolysis, Alastair and Jean Carruthers' discovery of cosmetic use for botulinum toxin, and the development of advanced multimodal scar therapeutics.

This monograph traces the history and reviews the peer-reviewed safety and bibliometric literature for fourteen procedures and domains central to modern Procedural Cosmetic Dermatology: chemical peeling, laser surgery, botulinum toxin neuromodulation, soft-tissue dermal fillers, bio-stimulatory injectables (PLLA and CaHA), scar revision and advanced scar therapeutics, liposuction, face lifts (rhytidectomy), blepharoplasty (upper and lower eyelid rejuvenation), fat grafting and transfer, hair transplantation, endovenous laser closure, sclerotherapy, and ambulatory phlebectomy. For each, we outline the key historical developments that produced the modern technique, then review complication rates, mechanisms of injury, modifying factors, and academic leadership as documented in the dermatologic, plastic surgery, and vascular surgery literature. We close with two comparative analyses: first, a review of the peer-reviewed literature comparing complication rates for facelift surgery performed under local/tumescent versus general anesthesia, and second, a broader comparison of cosmetic surgery safety, liposuction in particular, between dermatologists and plastic surgeons in the United States, drawing on malpractice-claims data, state-mandated adverse-event reporting, and prospective outcome surveys.

Throughout, a consistent theme emerges: anesthesia depth, operator training, technique standardization, and appropriate patient selection are far more reliable predictors of complication risk

than any single procedure category or specialty designation. The historical record shows each procedure's safety improving over time not through abandonment of technique but through incremental refinement; smaller instruments, more dilute anesthetic solutions, rigorous anatomical understanding, and standardized protocols developed and tested in the peer-reviewed literature.

1. Chemical Peeling

History

Chemical peeling is arguably the oldest cosmetic intervention discussed in this essay, with documented use of caustic and exfoliating agents for skin rejuvenation dating to informal, non-medical practice in ancient times. Structured medical use of phenol for post-acne scarring was first documented by dermatologists George Miller MacKee and Florentine Karp in the early 1900s, though phenol and croton oil combinations circulated largely among lay 'peelers' and beauty practitioners through the 1920s to 1950s before being formally incorporated into medical practice. Adolph Brown patented a phenol-croton oil formula in 1959, and plastic surgeon Thomas Baker published the first systematic description of a phenol peel protocol in 1961, followed by the classic 1962 Baker-Gordon formula—3 mL of 88% liquid phenol, 2 mL water, eight drops of liquid soap (Septisol), and three drops of croton oil, which became the gold standard for deep chemical peeling for nearly four decades (Baker, 1962). For most of that period, an 'all-or-none' dogma held that the peel's depth and effect were essentially fixed once the formula was applied.

This dogma was overturned by Gregory Hetter's landmark four-part study published in 2000, which demonstrated that peel depth is determined primarily by croton oil concentration rather than phenol concentration, and that the classic Baker-Gordon formula used substantially higher concentrations of both agents than were necessary for efficacy, exposing patients to avoidable risk (Hetter, 2000, Parts I–IV). This finding allowed the development of modified, lower-concentration formulas that could be titrated to the specific anatomical area, skin type, and desired depth of injury, meaningfully improving the safety profile of deep chemical peeling while preserving its efficacy for static wrinkles, severe photoaging, and field cancerization. In parallel, superficial and medium-depth peeling agents – glycolic acid, salicylic acid, lactic acid, and trichloroacetic acid (TCA) – were developed and standardized through the latter twentieth century, giving dermatologists a graduated toolkit spanning superficial exfoliation to deep dermal resurfacing.

Safety Evidence

Peels are classified as superficial, medium, or deep according to the level of skin injury induced, and this classification underlies both efficacy and risk (Rendon et al., 2010). The literature broadly supports the safety of properly performed peels, particularly at the superficial end of the spectrum. A retrospective study of patients with Fitzpatrick skin types III through VI receiving superficial peels for melasma, post-inflammatory hyperpigmentation, acne, and photoaging found a relatively low complication rate when peels were performed appropriately by dermatologists (Vemula et al., 2018). This finding is clinically important because skin of colour has historically been considered at elevated risk for peel-related dyspigmentation, and the study's authors specifically concluded that superficial peels performed in a

standardized manner by dermatologists carry a comparatively low complication rate even in patients with darker skin types.

Deeper peels, particularly those using higher TCA or phenol concentrations, carry materially greater risk, and the historical literature documents several serious, even life-threatening complications. Case reports describe cardiac arrhythmias occurring during phenol peeling, attributable to phenol's direct cardiotoxic effects when absorbed systemically in sufficient quantity (Gross, 1984); this is one of the reasons full-face phenol peels are typically performed with cardiac monitoring and paced application across facial subunits rather than single continuous application. Other documented complications include rare toxic shock syndrome following chemical face peeling (Dmytryshyn et al., 1983), and a focused case review of chemical burns resulting from erroneous home application of 50% TCA underscored that peels intended for medical supervision carry distinct risk when performed outside a clinical setting (Liu et al., 2016). Overall, peel-related morbidity correlates strongly with peel depth, patient skin type, and physician training, while superficial and appropriately modified medium-depth peels performed by trained dermatologists carry a highly favorable safety margin.

2. Laser Surgery (Skin Resurfacing)

History

Laser technology entered dermatology soon after Theodore Maiman's invention of the ruby laser in 1960, with dermatologist Leon Goldman becoming the first physician to test its effects on human skin in 1963. Early continuous-wave lasers, including argon and CO2 systems introduced in the 1970s, were used for tissue coagulation and cutting but lacked precision, often producing collateral thermal damage and unpredictable scarring. The field's defining conceptual breakthrough came in 1983, when dermatologists R. Rox Anderson and John Parrish published their theory of selective photo -hermolysis in Science, demonstrating that a specific wavelength of light delivered for a duration shorter than the target chromophore's thermal relaxation time could destroy that target – melanin, hemoglobin, or water – while sparing surrounding tissue (Anderson & Parrish, 1983). This principle underlies essentially all modern cutaneous laser therapy and enabled the development of lasers tailored to vascular lesions, pigmented lesions, tattoos, and hair removal, as well as skin resurfacing.

Pulsed and scanned CO2 lasers, targeting water as their chromophore, became the dominant resurfacing technology in the 1990s for rhytids, photoaging, and acne scarring, followed by erbium:YAG systems offering more precise ablation with less residual thermal damage. Traditional ablative resurfacing with these systems was highly effective but came with substantial recovery time, often two weeks or more, and a meaningful risk of scarring and dyspigmentation, particularly in darker skin types, which limited patient acceptance. This drove the development of non-ablative resurfacing in the late 1990s, which spared the epidermis but delivered less dramatic clinical improvement. The synthesis of these two approaches arrived with fractional photo thermolysis, formally described by dermatologists Dieter Manstein and R. Rox Anderson in 2004, in which the laser beam is delivered as an array of microscopic treatment zones separated by untreated skin, allowing rapid re-epithelialization from the surrounding tissue reservoir while still achieving meaningful dermal remodeling (Manstein et al., 2004).

Fractional technology has since become the dominant resurfacing modality because it substantially narrows the tradeoff between efficacy and recovery time.

Safety Evidence

A comprehensive review of fractional resurfacing complications found that although fractional technology represents an improved safety standard relative to earlier continuous ablative approaches, fractionated ablative resurfacing still carries a meaningfully higher rate of severe side effects than non-ablative fractional treatment (Metelitsa & Alster, 2010). This distinction, ablative fractional systems trading some of the safety advantage of fractionation for greater efficacy, is corroborated by recent literature indicating that ablative fractional lasers carry a higher risk of adverse events such as scarring and post-inflammatory hyperpigmentation than non-ablative fractional systems, particularly in patients with darker skin types. A review focused specifically on skin of color concluded that fractional resurfacing is safe and effective for various dermatologic indications in darker skin when conservative parameters and pre-/post-treatment protocols are observed (JCAD, 2019).

The clinical literature on multicenter fractional CO2 resurfacing has similarly emphasized that while standard ablative resurfacing produced significant side effects historically, fractional ablative technology achieves an improved balance between efficacy and safety, allowing many of the aesthetic gains of traditional ablative resurfacing with a shorter, more predictable recovery course (Alster, 2012). Taken together, the literature supports laser resurfacing as safe and effective exclusively when performed by clinicians with comprehensive training in laser physics, tissue optics, and skin histology. Risk scales predictably along two axes: degree of ablation and patient skin type.

3. Botulinum Toxin (Cosmetic Facial Neuromodulation)

History & Academic Leadership

The aesthetic application of botulinum toxin represents one of the most transformative innovations in modern aesthetic medicine, originating entirely from clinical discovery within dermatology and ophthalmology. In the late 1980s, Canadian ophthalmologist Dr. Jean Carruthers observed the smoothing of glabellar frown lines in patients undergoing blepharospasm treatment with botulinum toxin type A. Recognizing its potential for cosmetic rejuvenation, she collaborated with her husband, dermatologist Dr. Alastair Carruthers, to conduct the pioneering clinical trials that established the safety, dosing parameters, and efficacy of neuromodulators for facial rhytides. Their founding study, published in 1992 in The Journal of Dermatologic Surgery and Oncology, established the clinical standard for cosmetic neuromodulation (Carruthers & Carruthers, 1992) and catalyzed a worldwide paradigm shift toward minimally invasive facial rejuvenation.

Subsequent dermatologic literature built the foundational evidence base for upper, mid, and lower facial dynamic wrinkle treatment, micro-dosing techniques, and long-term safety profiling. A landmark 2025 bibliometric analysis of 1,728 research articles published on aesthetic botulinum toxin worldwide (Wong et al., Aesthetic Surgery Journal Open Forum, 2025) evaluated global publication trends and methodological quality among the top 100 most-cited publications. The findings conclusively established that Dermatologic Surgery was the leading journal by total publication volume in the field, followed by

Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery and Aesthetic Surgery Journal. Notably, dermatologist Dr. Alastair Carruthers was identified as the field's leading researcher, authoring 16 top-cited milestone papers that accumulated 1,310 citations.

These findings are strongly corroborated by recent independent bibliometric evaluations of the field. A 2024 bibliometric analysis of botulinum toxin in dermatology from 2000 to 2023 published in the Journal of Cosmetic Dermatology (Zhou et al., 2024) confirmed that dermatology literature has driven the evolution of clinical indications, multi-modal combination therapies, and safety optimization protocols. Similarly, visual knowledge mapping of aesthetic medicine management and legal research by Deng et al. (2024) and global 25-year trend analyses by Lu et al. (2026) confirm that procedural dermatology remains the primary academic pillar of aesthetic neuromodulation. While botulinum toxin usage appears rarely in family practice literature, comprehensive bibliometric indexing reveals that primary care contributions consist almost entirely of descriptive clinical reviews of secondary and medical use rather than original primary research or foundational safety trials.

Safety Evidence

Cosmetic botulinum toxin injections possess an exceptional, decades-long safety profile when administered by clinicians trained in facial anatomy, muscular dynamics, and precision reconstitution. Adverse events in dermatologic practice are overwhelmingly mild, localized, and completely reversible within weeks. Commonly reported minor side effects include localized erythema, transient pinpoint ecchymosis, and mild post-treatment headache. Serious complications, such as blepharoptosis (0.5–1.0%), brow malposition, or diplopia, stem from improper injection placement, excessive dilution volume, or lack of anatomical knowledge regarding diffusion vectors into adjacent functional muscles. In standardized dermatologic practice, precise micro-aliquot dosing, correct anatomical landmarking, and conservative reconstitution protocols render systemic toxicity virtually non-existent, establishing cosmetic botulinum toxin as one of the safest procedural interventions in medical aesthetics.

4. Soft-Tissue Dermal Fillers

History & Bibliometric Leadership

The evolution of injectable soft-tissue augmentation spans more than four decades, progressing from early animal-derived products (such as injectable bovine collagen in the 1980s) to modern biodegradable biomaterials, including cross-linked hyaluronic acid (HA), calcium hydroxylapatite (CaHA), and poly-L-lactic acid (PLLA). Throughout this transition, dermatologic surgeons served as primary clinical investigators, conducting the rheological characterizations, tissue integration studies, and multi-plane anatomical trials that established contemporary filler science.

Dermatology's dominant scientific contribution to soft-tissue augmentation is robustly verified by objective bibliometric literature. A comprehensive 2024 bibliometric and visualized analysis entitled 'The Research Trend of Soft Tissue Filler Injection from 2000 to 2022' (Liao et al., Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery Global Open, 2024) retrieved 1,370 valid research documents published across 284 international journals. The study revealed that Dermatologic Surgery emerged as the undisputed leading journal in the entire field, publishing the highest number of research articles (151 publications) and ranking as the

most frequently co-cited journal worldwide. It was followed by the Journal of Cosmetic Dermatology (134 publications) and Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery (94 publications). Furthermore, an expansive 25-year global bibliometric study of injectable aesthetic medicine spanning 2000 to 2025 (Lu et al., Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery Global Open, 2026) similarly documented that Dermatologic Surgery and core aesthetic surgery journals form the primary academic foundation for filler safety and procedural evolution. Across both global bibliometric analyses, no distinct original research contributions from family practice or general practice literature were identifiable.

Safety Evidence

Soft-tissue filler injections are widely recognized as safe and highly effective for restoration of volume loss, contour harmonization, and structural facial support. The vast majority of treatment-related side effects are transient and mild, including localized edema, tenderness, and bruising. However, the expansion of filler procedures globally has highlighted the critical necessity of advanced anatomical expertise to mitigate and manage severe, technique-dependent adverse events.

The most critical procedural hazard in soft-tissue augmentation is accidental intra-arterial embolization or compression, which can lead to rapid alar or cutaneous necrosis and, in severe cases involving retrobulbar anastomosis, visual compromise. Dermatologists have played a decisive leadership role in authoring international consensus guidelines on vascular safety, pioneering high-dose pulsed hyaluronidase reversal protocols, standardizing blunt micro-cannula techniques, and establishing real-time ultrasound-guided anatomical vascular mapping. Furthermore, long-term dermatologic safety registries demonstrate that non-biodegradable permanent fillers carry significantly elevated rates of delayed-onset foreign-body granulomas and chronic biofilm formation compared to temporary cross-linked hyaluronic acid gels. By adhering to meticulous aseptic technique, conservative anatomical planes (supraperiosteal or deep subcutaneous), and immediate reversal protocols, procedural dermatologists achieve exceptionally low complication rates.

5. Biostimulatory Injectables (Poly-L-Lactic Acid & Calcium Hydroxylapatite)

History & Dermatologic Innovation

Bio-stimulatory injectables represent a fundamental paradigm shift in aesthetic medicine, transitioning procedural goals from passive space-filling volumisation to active tissue regeneration via targeted neo-collagenesis, elastogenesis, and physiological dermal remodeling. The clinical development, histological validation, and procedural standardization of biostimulators have been driven primarily by procedural dermatologists:

- **Poly-L-Lactic Acid (PLLA) and Reconstructive Origins:** PLLA was initially utilized in biodegradable surgical sutures and orthopaedic implants before being formulated as an injectable microparticle biostimulator (New-Fill / Sculptra). In the late 1990s and early 2000s, dermatologists spearheaded clinical trials investigating PLLA for severe human immunodeficiency virus (HIV)–associated facial lipoatrophy (the landmark VEGA and Blue Pacific studies). Dermatologists including Dr. Danny Vleggaar (Netherlands) and Dr. Cheryl Burgess (USA) established that PLLA microparticles (40–63 µm) induce a controlled, subclinical histiocytic tissue response, stimulating host macrophage

activation and fibroblast proliferation to produce endogenous type I collagen over 6 to 24 months (Vleggaar, 2005; Burgess & Quiroga, 2005). These reconstructive breakthroughs directly enabled FDA approval for HIV lipoatrophy in 2004 and subsequent cosmetic approval for facial volume loss in 2009.

- **Calcium Hydroxylapatite (CaHA) Hyperdilution & Skin Quality:** Originally approved in 2006 as an opaque structural bolus filler composed of 30% synthetic CaHA microspheres (25–45 µm) suspended in a sodium carboxymethylcellulose (CMC) carrier gel, CaHA was transformed into a pure regenerative biostimulator through dermatologic research. Dermatologists (including Dr. Yana Yutskovskaya, Dr. Sabrina Fabi, Dr. Mitchel Goldman, Dr. Kimberly Butterwick, and Dr. Gabriela Casabona) pioneered and published the foundational clinical protocols for dilute (1:1) and hyper-dilute (>=1:2 up to 1:4 with saline and lidocaine) CaHA injection (Yutskovskaya et al., 2014; Fabi et al., 2021). By uncoupling the immediate volumizing effect of the CMC carrier gel from the long-term bio-stimulatory action of the microspheres, dermatologists expanded CaHA's utility to superficial subdermal vectoring across the face, neck, décolletage, and body to treat dermal elastosis and skin laxity without creating unwanted volume.
- **Histological and Extracellular Matrix (ECM) Validation:** Rigorous split-face, biopsy-controlled clinical studies published in the dermatology literature confirmed that hyper-diluted CaHA and PLLA do not merely cause passive scar fibrosis; they stimulate physiological tissue regeneration. Histomorphologic studies by Professor Yana Yutskovskaya and colleagues (2014, 2017) demonstrated that CaHA microspheres induce substantial synthesis of type I and type III collagen, neo-elastogenesis (restoring elastic fibre architecture), proteoglycan deposition, and active angiogenesis, resulting in measurable increases in dermal thickness and mechanical elasticity.

Safety Evidence & Technique Standardization

The historical safety profile of biostimulatory injectables illustrates how dermatologic research identified initial complications and systematically eliminated them through refined reconstitution protocols, altered injection planes, and standardized post-treatment regimens:

- **Eradication of Early PLLA Nodule Morbidity:** In the early 2000s, initial PLLA protocols utilized low reconstitution volumes (3–4 mL) with immediate injection and superficial dermal placement, resulting in unacceptably high rates of late-onset non-inflammatory subcutaneous papules and nodules (10–30%). Dermatologists systematically redefined the protocol by increasing hydration volumes to 8–10 mL (plus 1–2 mL lidocaine), ensuring uniform microparticle dispersion (Vleggaar et al., 2014; Palm et al., 2021); allowing vials to hydrate for 24 to 48 hours to prevent micro-clumping; restricting placement strictly to the immediate subcutaneous plane or supra-periosteal space; and establishing the mandatory post-procedure 'Rule of 5s' massage regimen (massaging the treated areas for 5 minutes, 5 times daily, for 5 days). Following the adoption of these standardized dermatologic guidelines, multicenter prospective surveys confirmed that the incidence of subcutaneous nodules dropped to <1% (Palm et al., 2021).
- **Vascular Safety and Cannula Protocols with Hyper-dilute CaHA:** In hyper-diluted forms, the reduced viscosity of CaHA allows smooth retrograde delivery through blunt-tip micro-cannulas (22G–25G) into the immediate subdermal interface. Because the material is diluted and delivered

across broad vectors rather than in concentrated boluses, the risk of intravascular embolization or focal vascular compression is substantially lower than with undiluted structural gels (Goldie et al., 2020; Fabi et al., 2021).

- **Management of Delayed-Onset Adverse Events:** Long-term safety registries in Dermatologic Surgery and the Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology confirm that biostimulators carry an outstanding safety profile when performed by specialists with comprehensive knowledge of facial layers and vascular anatomy. In the rare event of delayed-onset immune nodules or foreign body granulomas, dermatologic consensus algorithms (incorporating intralesional 5-fluorouracil, pulsed triamcinolone, and fractional laser-assisted delivery) provide rapid resolution without surgical excision.

6. Scar Revision & Advanced Scar Therapeutics

History & Dermatologic Innovation

Scar revision and comprehensive scar therapeutics have evolved into an increasingly prominent, highly sophisticated domain of procedural and cosmetic dermatology. Historically, scar management was restricted largely to surgical excision, geometric scar revisions (Z-plasty, W-plasty), or serial intralesional corticosteroid injections. While surgical re-excision remains valuable in selected cases, it frequently carries an inherent risk of recurrent cicatricial widening, hypertrophic relapse, or vector distortion if underlying mechanical tension and vascularity are not addressed.

Over the past two decades, procedural dermatologists transformed the paradigm of scar treatment from invasive structural re-excision to non-incisional, multimodal tissue remodeling, laser fenestration, and biological modulation:

- **Fractional Ablative Laser Fenestration & Burn Scar Rehabilitation:** Dermatologic surgeon Dr. Jill S. Waibel (Miami Dermatology and Laser Institute) pioneered the groundbreaking use of fractional ablative CO2 and Erbium:YAG laser fenestration for severe hypertrophic burn scars, traumatic contractures, and surgical deformities (Waibel et al., 2013; Anderson et al., 2014). By drilling thousands of microscopic vertical thermal injury zones (MTZs) deep into rigid, contracted scar tissue, fractional laser fenestration physically releases mechanical contracture tension, promotes heat-shock protein expression, and stimulates rapid physiological matrix metalloproteinase (MMP) remodeling—restoring range of motion, softening fibrotic cords, and dramatically improving texture without requiring open excision or skin grafting.
- **Vascular Laser Synergy & Angiogenesis Modulation:** Dermatologists established the essential role of vascular-targeted energy devices, specifically the 595 nm Pulsed Dye Laser (PDL) and 1064 nm Nd:YAG, in early and mature scar management. By selectively photothermolysing proliferating microvascular networks via hemoglobin absorption, vascular lasers induce endothelial apoptosis, tissue hypoxia, and down-regulation of pro-fibrotic cytokines (such as TGF-beta1), effectively halting hypertrophic progression, clearing stubborn erythema, and flattening raised scars (Alster & Tanzi, 2007).
- **Laser-Assisted Drug Delivery (LADD) & Antimetabolite Infiltration:** Dermatologists pioneered Laser-Assisted Drug Delivery (LADD), utilizing fractional laser micro-channels to deliver topically applied

antimetabolites (e.g., 5-fluorouracil [5-FU], bleomycin) and low-dose triamcinolone directly into dense scar dermis. Combining intralesional 5-FU (a pyrimidine analogue inhibiting fibroblast proliferation) with triamcinolone acetonide was validated in dermatologic trials as dramatically reducing steroid-induced dermal atrophy and telangiectasia while achieving superior scar flattening (Fitzpatrick, 1999; Waibel et al., 2013).

- **Neuromodulator-Assisted Tension Relief:** Dermatologists introduced early post-operative botulinum toxin type A injections into muscles underlying fresh surgical closures. By temporarily paralyzing local mimetic musculature during early wound healing, neuromodulation eliminates repetitive mechanical shear stress across the incision line, significantly suppressing TGF-beta1 expression and preventing widened or hypertrophic scar formation (Carruthers & Carruthers; Gassner et al.).
- **The Academic Reference Standard ('The Scar Book'):** The definitive multidisciplinary benchmark in modern scar science, The Scar Book: Formation, Mitigation, Rehabilitation, and Prevention (Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2017), was conceptualized and edited by two military procedural dermatologists: Dr. Andrew C. Krakowski (founder of the Kids' S.T.A.R. program) and Dr. Peter R. Shumaker (Chairman of Dermatology, Naval Medical Center San Diego). Their military and pediatric clinical experience treating blast trauma, severe burns, and extensive surgical scars established the international gold standard for multi-modal scar rehabilitation.

Safety Evidence & Interdisciplinary Referral Patterns

The clinical safety and efficacy of dermatologic scar therapeutics are supported by extensive prospective literature. Multimodal protocols combining vascular lasers, fractional ablation, and targeted antimetabolites demonstrate exceptionally low complication rates (<1% adverse events), with negligible risk of systemic toxicity, delayed ulceration, or recurrence (Waibel et al., 2013; Krakowski & Shumaker, 2017).

Because scar revision in dermatologic practice relies on non-invasive energy devices and microscopic biological modulation rather than secondary scalpel re-excision (which risks compounding the original cicatricial deficit), procedural dermatologists now receive extensive secondary and tertiary referrals from plastic surgery, general surgery, and orthopaedics for the salvage of complex, hypertrophic, painful, or contracted surgical scars. The integration of advanced scar therapeutics cements procedural dermatology as an indispensable discipline in modern surgical and aesthetic medicine.

7. Liposuction

History

Liposuction's modern history began in 1974, when Italian gynecologist Arpad Fischer and his son Giorgio Fischer developed a blunt-tunneling technique for fat removal, first formally described in 1977. French surgeons Yves-Gérard Illouz and Pierre Fournier advanced the technique later in the decade, with Illouz developing the 'wet technique', pre-injecting saline and hyaluronidase to reduce bleeding, while Fournier favored a 'dry technique' (Illouz, 1983; Coleman, 1999). By the early 1980s, American dermatologists (including Prof Rick Glogau, under whom New Zealand dermatologic surgeon Paul

Salmon trained) traveled to Paris to observe Illouz's technique directly, and began performing liposuction. In the dermatology setting, this was adapted specifically to local anesthesia, in sharp contrast to plastic surgery where it was almost exclusively performed under general anesthesia in inpatient or hospital operating suites. This early period under general anesthesia was marked by frequent excessive bleeding, prolonged recovery, and sometimes disfiguring skin irregularities, reflecting both the large-bore cannulas then in use and the absence of an anesthesia technique matched to the procedure's specific physiology.

The decisive breakthrough came in 1985, when dermatologist Jeffrey Klein introduced the tumescent technique: the subcutaneous infiltration of very large volumes of highly dilute lidocaine (as low as 0.05–0.1%) combined with epinephrine and sodium bicarbonate, delivered before fat extraction (Klein, 1987, 1990). Klein demonstrated that this dilution allowed the total dose of lidocaine to be safely increased five-fold above the previously accepted 7 mg/kg maximum (up to 35–55 mg/kg), because the large infiltrated volume was absorbed slowly and because much of the lidocaine was removed along with the aspirated fat, while simultaneously providing complete anesthesia sufficient to perform the entire procedure without general anesthesia, and producing near-bloodless surgical fields through the vasoconstrictive effect of epinephrine. Dermatologic surgeons rapidly adopted the tumescent technique, and early safety series, 9,478 cases in 1988 and 15,336 cases in 1995, documented zero deaths and remarkably low complication rates using the new approach (Bernstein & Hanke, 1988; Hanke et al., 1995). The American Academy of Dermatology became the first specialty society to publish formal Guidelines of Care for Liposuction, reflecting dermatology's early leadership in establishing safety standards for the procedure (Lawrence et al., 2000).

Safety Evidence

Multiple peer-reviewed studies document an unparalleled safety record for tumescent liposuction specifically. A landmark national survey of 261 dermatologic surgeons performing more than 66,000 tumescent liposuction procedures reported a serious adverse event rate of 0.68 per 1,000, with no associated deaths (Housman et al., 2002), a striking figure given the procedure's volume and the invasiveness of large-volume fat removal. By contrast, liposuction performed under general anesthesia has been linked to continuing fatalities, prompting calls for further scrutiny of that anesthesia modality specifically (Coldiron, 2012). A census-based survey of cosmetic surgeons similarly documented fatal outcomes concentrated in procedures performed under deeper sedation or general anesthesia and involving larger aspirate volumes (Grazer & de Jong, 2000), and a widely cited New England Journal of Medicine case series specifically identified pulmonary thromboembolism and lidocaine or fluid-overload toxicity as leading causes of liposuction-related death, both of which are substantially mitigated by the pharmacokinetics and reduced systemic circulatory stress of the tumescent technique (Rao, Ely, & Hoffman, 1999).

The mechanistic explanation for this anesthesia-dependent risk gradient is consistent across the literature: general anesthesia requires longer operative and recovery times, involves greater positional immobility increasing venous thromboembolism risk, and removes the physiologic feedback (patient-reported pain or discomfort) that can alert an operator to excessive fluid shifts, peritoneal proximity, or lidocaine toxicity during a purely local procedure. Because tumescent local anesthesia relies on slow

absorption and a large diluted volume, it also produces intraoperative hemostasis without the blood-loss risk associated with earlier dry or lightly wet techniques. These outcome data explain why liposuction's specialty-comparison literature consistently favors office-based tumescent technique.

8. Face Lifts (Rhytidectomy)

History

Modern facelift surgery began in 1919, when French surgeon Passot published one of the first formal papers describing facial skin elevation and re-draping for rejuvenation, initiating a wave of technique papers throughout the 1920s. Suzanne Noël, an influential early contributor to aesthetic surgery, authored one of the earliest texts on aesthetic facial procedures. For roughly the next half-century, facelift technique remained confined to the subcutaneous plane, elevating and re-draping skin alone, without addressing the deeper musculofascial structures of the face, an approach that produced results prone to early relapse because skin tension alone cannot indefinitely counteract gravitational and structural aging.

The field's defining anatomical breakthrough came in 1976, when French surgeons Paul Tessier, Vladimir Mitz, and Martine Peyronie described the superficial musculoaponeurotic system (SMAS): a continuous fibromuscular layer, superficial to the parotid fascia, that envelops the facial mimetic musculature and is contiguous with the platysma muscle of the neck (Mitz & Peyronie, 1976). This discovery, building on earlier work by Swedish surgeon Tord Skoog describing subfascial dissection in 1969, established that surgical manipulation of this deeper fascial layer, rather than skin alone, could produce longer-lasting, more structurally sound rejuvenation, and it directly enabled modern SMAS-based techniques (plication, imbrication, flap elevation, deep-plane dissection). Subsequent anatomical work, including Furnas's 1989 description of the facial retaining ligaments, further refined soft-tissue surgical planning. In dermatologic surgery, the deep anatomical expertise gained through Mohs micrographic surgery reconstruction (elevating large transposition and rotation flaps, handling cutaneous vascular networks, and avoiding motor branches) translated directly into the mastery of superficial and SMAS-plane rhytidectomy under local tumescent anesthesia.

Safety Evidence & Anesthesia Comparison: Local vs General Anesthesia

Facelift surgery has evolved through multiple technique generations—subcutaneous, SMAS plication, SMAS-ectomy, deep-plane, and composite approaches, each carrying a distinct complication profile. A systematic review and meta-analysis pooling 183 studies of SMAS-based techniques found that deep-plane and high lateral SMAS techniques had slightly higher rates of temporary facial nerve neurapraxia (1.52–1.85%), significantly greater than SMAS plication, while risk of permanent injury did not differ significantly among techniques; deep-plane techniques also carried higher rates of major hematoma (Rezaei et al., 2019). Across the broader literature, hematoma remains the most frequently reported complication (accounting for 25–35% of reported adverse events), followed by minor scarring, neurapraxia, and seroma.

Because facelift is performed under a wide range of anesthesia protocols, from oral anxiolysis with local infiltration to full general endotracheal anesthesia, a distinct body of literature has examined whether

anesthesia depth independently affects complication rates, particularly venous thromboembolism (VTE). A 2026 scoping review of facelift surgery performed under local anesthesia, covering 21 studies and 7,115 procedures, found an overall complication rate dominated by hematoma (2.35%) and reported that, relative to general anesthesia, local anesthesia was associated with fewer thromboembolic events and greater intraoperative hemodynamic stability (ScienceDirect, 2026). A multicenter survey of 74 surgeons performing facelifts exclusively under oral anxiolysis and local diluted lidocaine, without intravenous sedation or general anesthesia, similarly found a negligible VTE incidence, attributed principally to the avoidance of general anesthesia and to shorter operative times (Santos et al., 2014). Single-center reviews of over 600 facelifts under local anesthesia report zero cases of pulmonary embolism (Abboushi et al., 2012).

Critically, a prospective multicenter analysis of 11,300 facelift patients drawn from the CosmetAssure database found an overall major complication rate of 1.8% for standalone facelifts, whereas facelifts combined with other cosmetic procedures, which more often require general anesthesia and longer operative times, had a substantially higher complication rate of 3.7% (Gupta et al., 2016). This points to procedure bundling, prolonged operative duration, and deep anesthesia as independent drivers of risk, validating the dermatologic practice model of standalone procedures under local anesthesia.

9. Blepharoplasty (Upper and Lower Eyelid Rejuvenation)

History & Technical Evolution

The term blepharoplasty was coined in 1818 by German ophthalmologist Karl Ferdinand von Gräfe to describe eyelid reconstruction, building upon ancient surgical descriptions of upper eyelid skin excisions recorded by the Byzantine physician Aëtios of Amida in the sixth century and Albucasis in the eleventh century. In the early twentieth century, aesthetic upper eyelid surgery advanced through empirical skin excisions popularized by cosmetic surgical pioneers, including Charles Conrad Miller (1907) and French surgeon Suzanne Noël (1926).

The anatomical foundation of modern blepharoplasty was established in 1951 by plastic surgeon Salvador Castañares, who systematically classified the distinct fat compartments of the periorbital region—identifying the medial and central fat pads of the upper eyelid, alongside the medial, central, and lateral fat pads of the lower eyelid (Castañares, 1951). Following Castañares's mapping, standard blepharoplasty for several decades was characterized by radical, multi-tissue resections: wide ellipses of skin, full-strip orbicularis oculi muscle excision, and aggressive preaponeurotic fat debulking. In lower blepharoplasty, external subciliary skin-muscle flap excisions predominated. While these aggressive approaches flattened redundant folds, they caused significant long-term iatrogenic morbidity, including severe hollowed 'A-frame' upper eyelid deformities, orbicularis denervation leading to impaired blink dynamics and chronic exposure keratopathy, and cicatricial lower eyelid retraction, rounding of the lateral canthus, and ectropion.

Dermatologic Innovations & Modern Paradigms

The transition toward tissue-preserving, structurally conservative periorbital surgery was driven significantly by dermatologic surgeons who integrated incisional laser physics, outpatient local anaesthetic protocols, and multimodal cutaneous resurfacing:

- **Pioneering Laser Blepharoplasty (1988):** In 1988, dermatologic surgeon Dr. Laurence M. David published the foundational series on Carbon Dioxide (CO2) laser blepharoplasty in The Journal of Dermatologic Surgery and Oncology and Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery (David, 1988; David & Sanders, 1988). David demonstrated that a focused, incisional CO2 laser beam sealed microvascular channels (<=0.5 mm) instantaneously upon incising tissue, providing near-absolute intraoperative hemostasis, enhanced direct visualization of the levator aponeurosis during upper lid dissection, and significant reductions in postoperative ecchymosis, edema, and recovery time.
- **Conservative Skin-Pinch & Muscle-Sparing Upper Blepharoplasty:** Recognizing that upper periorbital aging is driven primarily by superficial cutaneous elastosis rather than deep structural muscle excess, dermatologic surgeons popularized conservative 'skin-only' or minimal-pinch techniques. Preserving the preseptal orbicularis muscle and limiting fat excision strictly to true medial pseudo-herniation maintained the vascular and functional integrity of the upper lid, preserved the dynamic blink reflex, and avoided skeletal hollows.
- **The 'Inside-Out' Multimodal Synergy in Lower Blepharoplasty:** While the lower eyelid transconjunctival approach for fat herniation was originally described in 1924 by French otolaryngologist Julien Bourguet, dermatologists modernized and popularized this access route by coupling it with superficial resurfacing. Rather than making external skin-muscle incisions that risk lower lid malposition, dermatologists established the 'inside-out' paradigm: extirpating or redraping pseudo-herniated fat through the conjunctival fornix while simultaneously treating cutaneous laxity with intraoperative fractionated CO2 laser resurfacing (Alster, 2012) or medium-depth chemical peeling (e.g., Gary Monheit's combined Jessner's–TCA protocols, 1995).
- **Oncologic & Reconstructive Foundation:** Modern dermatologic blepharoplasty draws heavily from high-volume Mohs micrographic surgery. Procedural dermatologists routinely repair complex full-thickness periorbital defects – performing tarso-conjunctival grafts (Hughes flaps), cheek rotation flaps (Mustardé), and local transposition flaps under local anaesthesia – instilling rigorous mastery of eyelid lamellar biomechanics, relaxed skin tension lines (RSTLs), and periorbital microvascular networks.

Safety Evidence & Outcomes Under Local Anaesthesia

Peer-reviewed literature confirms that blepharoplasty performed in an outpatient setting under pure Local Anaesthesia (LA) with or without light oral anxiolysis offers an outstanding safety profile, eliminating the cardiopulmonary and thromboembolic risks of general anaesthesia:

- **New Zealand Procedural Dermatology Clinical Audit (2006–2022):** In a 16-year multi-practitioner clinical audit of 3,615 consecutive advanced cosmetic surgical procedures performed under local anaesthesia and light oral anxiolysis by New Zealand dermatologic surgeons (P. Salmon, G. Bellaney, K. MacDonald), Blepharoplasty & Periorbital Surgery comprised 904 consecutive cases. Clinical

outcomes demonstrated: Surgical Site Infections: 1 case (0.1%); Hospital Admissions: 0 (0.0%); Mortality: 0 (0.0%).

- **Intraoperative Functional Biofeedback:** Administering local infiltration rather than general endotracheal anaesthesia preserves patient consciousness and levator/orbicularis motor control. The surgeon can instruct the patient to open, close, and hold gaze positions during skin excision and aponeurotic crease formation. This active biofeedback allows millimeter-precise adjustment of eyelid excursion and verifies complete closure intraoperatively, preventing postoperative lagophthalmos, crease asymmetry, and corneal exposure keratopathy.
- **Mitigation of Hematoma & Retrobulbar Compartment Syndrome:** Expanding retrobulbar hematoma leading to acute orbital compartment syndrome and optic nerve ischemia is the most vision-threatening complication in eyelid surgery (historically reported in <0.05% across broad surgical series). Local infiltration with dilute adrenaline provides continuous local vasoconstriction. Furthermore, avoiding general anaesthesia eliminates the post-extubation emergence coughing, retching, and acute hypertensive surges that serve as primary triggers for post-surgical periorbital hemorrhage.
- **Outpatient Registry Data:** Mandatory state adverse event reporting systems (Coldiron, 2005, 2012) and broad prospective cosmetic registries confirm that office-based cutaneous procedures performed under local anaesthesia exhibit negligible complication rates compared to multi-procedure cases performed under prolonged general anaesthesia (Gupta et al., 2016).

10. Fat Grafting and Transfer

History

The concept of transplanting a patient's own fat to correct soft-tissue defects predates modern liposuction by nearly a century. German surgeon Gustav Neuber performed what is credited as the first true adipose graft in 1893, transplanting small pieces of fat from the forearm to fill a depressed facial scar caused by osteomyelitis, and specifically noting that small grafts survived better than large ones, an observation about graft-to-surface-area ratio that remains fundamental to fat grafting technique today. Just two years later, in 1895, Viktor Czerny performed the first documented breast reconstruction using autologous fat, transferring a lipoma from the lumbar region to fill a post-mastectomy defect. Despite these promising early results, fat grafting struggled to gain broad acceptance over the following century, in large part because harvesting techniques prior to liposuction produced fat of inconsistent quality and viability, yielding unpredictable graft survival.

The development of liposuction in the 1970s, and particularly Klein's 1985 tumescent technique, transformed fat harvesting by providing a gentler, standardized method of obtaining donor fat with minimal mechanical trauma. Building on this foundation, Sydney Coleman introduced a systematized, three-step protocol in 1987 (published 1992–1995): manual low-pressure lipoaspiration, centrifugation to separate viable adipocytes from blood, oil, and tumescent fluid, and reinjection of small aliquots of fat across multiple tissue planes and passes, a technique termed 'structural fat grafting' or 'lipo-structure' (Coleman, 1995, 2001). Coleman's atraumatic, small-aliquot approach dramatically improved graft survival predictability and transformed fat grafting into the gold standard for autologous soft-tissue

augmentation. Facial fat grafting rose alongside this refinement, while gluteal fat grafting emerged more recently as a distinct, higher-volume application.

Safety Evidence

Autologous fat transfer for facial volumization is universally recognized as a favorable-safety procedure. A systematic review of facial fat grafting concluded that the technique is effective with a low complication profile in experienced hands (Groen et al., 2018). Complications are generally minor (contour irregularity, localized oil cysts); rare instances of intravascular injection are mitigated by modern technique guidelines emphasizing blunt cannulas, low injection pressures, and rigorous knowledge of facial vascular anatomy.

Gluteal fat grafting presents a markedly different risk profile and warrants strict regulatory separation. A task force convened by the Aesthetic Surgery Education and Research Foundation (ASERF), surveying nearly 5,000 surgeons worldwide alongside autopsy records, concluded that gluteal fat grafting was historically associated with the highest mortality rate of any aesthetic surgical procedure (estimated between 1:2,351 and 1:6,214), primarily due to pulmonary fat macro-embolism resulting from inadvertent deep intramuscular injection into the gluteal veins under general anesthesia (Mofid et al., 2017; The Aesthetic Society, 2022). This mortality signal is entirely absent from superficial subcutaneous facial fat transfer performed under local anesthesia. The gluteal data illustrate how task-force-driven, evidence-based responses can improve standards, while underscoring that anatomical site, depth of injection, and anesthesia modality dictate procedural risk.

11. Hair Transplantation

History

Modern hair transplantation has independent origins in Japan and the United States. In 1939, Japanese dermatologist Shoji Okuda described using small circular punches to excise hair-bearing donor skin and implant it into slightly smaller recipient holes in patients with scarring alopecia, reporting a 100% success rate across roughly 200 patients (Okuda, 1939). In 1943, dermatologist Hajime Tamura refined the technique by subdividing larger grafts into groupings of one to three hairs, the conceptual precursor to modern follicular unit transplantation. Independently, New York dermatologist Norman Orentreich began experimenting with punch grafts in the early 1950s, discovering that grafts moved from the balding-resistant occipital scalp to frontal bald areas retained their original growth characteristics, a biological principle he termed 'donor dominance' (Orentreich, 1959). This established the scientific rationale for modern hair restoration surgery.

For several decades, standard 4mm punch grafts remained dominant, until Wayne Bradshaw introduced mini-grafts and micro-grafts in 1984, producing progressively more natural results. This progression culminated in follicular unit transplantation (FUT), using strip harvesting and stereomicroscopic dissection, and subsequently follicular unit extraction (FUE), which harvests individual follicular units directly using micro-punches (0.7–1.0 mm) without a linear donor incision, eliminating linear donor scarring and shortening recovery times.

Safety Evidence

Both FUT and FUE are widely documented in the peer-reviewed literature as safe, well-tolerated outpatient procedures conducted under local tumescent anesthesia (Jain & Doshi, 2022). A scoping review of FUE and FUT complications spanning studies from 1985 through 2022 found large case series reporting overall complication rates of 1.2 to 4.7 percent, with common complications being mild, transient, and self-limiting (temporary edema, postoperative crusting, donor-area folliculitis, or minor numbness resolving over weeks) (Aesthetic Plastic Surgery, 2024). Serious adverse events, such as deep infection or tissue necrosis, are vanishingly rare when standard sterile technique and conservative harvesting densities are respected (Prasad et al., 2022). The progression from Okuda's large punch grafts to contemporary micro-FUE exemplifies how dermatologic refinement has systematically reduced tissue trauma and improved clinical outcomes.

12. Endovenous Laser Ablation (EVLA) and Endovascular Closure

History & Dermatologic Leadership

For most of the twentieth century, the standard treatment for saphenous vein incompetence was surgical high ligation and stripping, a technique tracing to Friedrich Trendelenburg's nineteenth-century descriptions. Surgical stripping required general or spinal anesthesia, an inpatient or hospital surgical setting, and a prolonged, painful recovery period marked by extensive hematoma formation, wound complications, and long-term recurrence rates. The paradigm shift toward minimally invasive endoluminal closure began in the late 1990s: radiofrequency ablation was introduced around 1998, and in 2001, Robert Bone and Carlos Navarro published the first clinical description of endovenous laser ablation (EVLA), using an 810 nm diode laser delivered through an endovascular fiber-optic catheter to induce thermal collapse and fibrotic occlusion of the incompetent saphenous vein from within the vessel lumen (Bone & Navarro, 2001).

Dermatologists played a central and transformative role in establishing EVLA as a premier, office-based modality. Foremost among international pioneers was dermatologist Dr. Neil S. Sadick, who served as President of the American College of Phlebology (ACP) and published extensive foundational trials that defined modern endovascular treatment protocols (Sadick, 2000, 2005; Sadick & Wasser, 2007). Sadick's landmark four-year prospective studies demonstrated that endovascular laser ablation could be combined seamlessly with ambulatory micro-phlebectomy under pure local tumescent anesthesia in an outpatient setting, achieving saphenous occlusion rates exceeding 95% with minimal patient downtime and virtually eliminating the need for inpatient surgical stripping (Sadick & Wasser, 2007). Furthermore, Sadick's work in evaluating longer laser wavelengths (such as 980 nm, 1320 nm, and 1470 nm targeting water rather than hemoglobin) alongside radial-emitting fiber technologies helped reduce postoperative ecchymosis, pain, and paresthesia, cementing EVLA as the international first-line standard of care (Sadick & Trelles, 2005; Sadick, 2011).

Safety Evidence

A comprehensive review of the phlebology literature demonstrates that EVLA performed under tumescent local anesthesia is both highly durable and exceptionally safe (Almeida & Kaufman, 2020). A

systematic review and meta-analysis of ten randomized controlled trials involving 1,936 patients directly comparing EVLA to conventional surgical ligation and stripping found no significant differences in long-term recurrence rates at one, two, or five years; however, postoperative complications, pain scores, and recovery durations were significantly lower in the endovenous cohort (Kheirelseid et al., 2023). Large-scale reviews of thermal and non-thermal ablation confirm saphenous occlusion rates exceeding 94 to 98 percent (BMC Surgery, 2025).

Complications associated with EVLA are typically minor and self-limiting, including transient ecchymosis, superficial thrombophlebitis (0–7%), and temporary saphenous/sural nerve paresthesia (resolving within 3–6 months in over 90% of cases). The use of perivenous tumescent local anesthesia serves a critical dual safety purpose: providing complete local analgesia while simultaneously acting as a protective 'heat sink' that compresses the vein around the laser fiber and prevents collateral thermal injury to adjacent cutaneous nerves and skin. Endothermal heat-induced thrombosis (EHIT) is rare (<1%) in standardized protocols and managed conservatively. The peer-reviewed evidence establishes EVLA as a triumph of dermatologic and endovascular innovation over invasive hospital surgery.

13. Sclerotherapy

History & Dermatologic Standardization

Sclerotherapy's conceptual roots reach back to seventeenth-century experiments with intravenous chemical irritants, though early techniques were largely abandoned due to unpredictable inflammation and toxicity (Myers, 2019). The modern era of compression sclerotherapy was established in the mid-twentieth century by Irish surgeon George Fegan, who demonstrated that sustained compression bandaging following targeted intravenous injection dramatically improved vein eradication and reduced thrombus formation. Over subsequent decades, dermatologists led the refinement of sclerosing agents, transitioning the field away from corrosive hypertonic saline toward modern synthetic detergent sclerosants, specifically polidocanol and sodium tetradecyl sulfate (STS).

Dr. Neil Sadick and fellow dermatologic phlebologists contributed extensively to the pharmacologic profiling, comparative efficacy, and safety guidelines for contemporary sclerotherapy (Sadick, 1997, 2000, 2003). Sadick's comparative studies established that polidocanol produces significantly less perivascular inflammation, lower post-treatment hyperpigmentation rates, and negligible risk of tissue necrosis compared to older sclerosants, providing the empirical foundation for its widespread international adoption and eventual formal regulatory approvals. In the 1990s and 2000s, the development of ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy (Tessari technique) – physically agitating liquid sclerosant with physiological gas mixtures – further enhanced efficacy for larger tortuous veins by displacing intraluminal blood and increasing endothelial contact time (Sadick, 2005).

Safety Evidence

Sclerotherapy is universally recognized as a first-line treatment for telangiectasias, reticular veins, and residual varicose branches. Long-term prospective safety series report minor adverse event rates of approximately 1.1 to 3.0 percent, with major systemic reactions being exceedingly rare. Common minor side effects include transient hyperpigmentation (which resolves spontaneously in over 80% of cases),

localized telangiectatic matting, and minor superficial thrombophlebitis. An analysis of adverse events reported to the FDA Adverse Event Reporting System (FAERS) confirmed that modern detergent sclerosants carry an outstanding safety profile when administered within standardized dosage thresholds (Nguyen, Nguyen, & Silapunt, 2022).

Safety in foam sclerotherapy is directly tied to total volume and gas composition. Limiting foam volumes to <=10 mL per session virtually eliminates the incidence of transient visual scotomas or micro-embolic phenomena previously reported with large-volume air foams (Rabe & Pannier, 2011). In dermatologic practice, sclerotherapy represents a mature, incrementally perfected outpatient technique with decades of validated safety.

14. Ambulatory Phlebectomy

History & Modern Integration

The extraction of varicose veins through small incisions has ancient antecedents in the writings of Celsus and Galen, who described crude hook-based avulsion techniques without anesthesia. The modern medical procedure, however, was explicitly invented as a refined, minimally invasive technique by Swiss dermatologist Robert Muller in the mid-1950s (Muller, 1966). Dissatisfied with the high recurrence rates and skin staining of sclerotherapy alone, and seeking to avoid the severe tissue trauma of hospital stripping, Muller developed specialized micro-hooks to extract varicose tributory veins through tiny (1–2 mm) stab incisions under local anesthesia, allowing patients to walk immediately after the procedure.

In contemporary procedural dermatology, Dr. Neil Sadick and colleagues developed the standardized multimodal treatment algorithm that pairs endovenous laser ablation of the main saphenous trunk with immediate or staged ambulatory phlebectomy of branch varicosities (Sadick & Wasser, 2007; Sadick, 2005). This integrated approach, performed entirely under local tumescent anesthesia in outpatient surgical rooms, addresses both the hemodynamic source of reflux and the visible varicose clusters in a single setting, achieving superior cosmetic and functional results without hospital admission.

Safety Evidence

The peer-reviewed literature on ambulatory phlebectomy confirms an exceptionally low rate of notable adverse events (Ricci, 1997; Ramelet, 1997). In a randomized controlled trial directly comparing ambulatory phlebectomy to compression sclerotherapy, phlebectomy demonstrated a significantly lower two-year recurrence rate for larger tributary varices (De Roos, Nieman, & Neumann, 2003). Complications are overwhelmingly minor and self-limiting: localized bruising (which resolves within 2–3 weeks), transient paresthesias from micro-cutaneous nerve traction (resolving spontaneously), and imperceptible micro-punctate scarring. Serious complications such as deep venous thrombosis or wound infection occur in less than 0.1 percent of cases in dermatologic series. Ambulatory phlebectomy remains a model of dermatologist-invented ambulatory surgery.

15. Comparative Cosmetic Surgery Safety: Dermatologists vs Plastic Surgeons

Because dermatologists, plastic surgeons, and other specialists perform overlapping cosmetic surgical procedures – liposuction, facelifts, blepharoplasty, fat grafting, biostimulatory/filler injectables, and laser resurfacing – several major peer-reviewed studies in the United States have analyzed whether procedural outcomes and adverse events differ by specialty and operative setting.

Malpractice-Claims Data (PIAA Study)

Using data from the Physician Insurers Association of America (PIAA), a landmark study evaluated malpractice claims for liposuction across medical specialties. While board-certified plastic surgeons performed liposuction at approximately a 3:2 ratio compared to dermatologists, plastic surgeons accounted for a disproportionately massive share of malpractice claims, at a ratio of approximately 113:1 (Coleman, Hanke, Lillis, Bernstein, & Narins, 1999). Office-based liposuction by plastic surgeons generated roughly 50 times as many claims as office-based liposuction by dermatologists, and hospital-based liposuction by plastic surgeons generated roughly 154 times as many claims. The authors attributed this dramatic disparity directly to differences in anesthesia technique: dermatologic training mandates tumescent local anesthesia, whereas hospital-based surgical training historically favored general anesthesia with its attendant risks of perforation, fluid shifts, and thromboembolism.

Mandatory State Adverse-Event Reporting (Coldiron Registries)

Prospective, legally mandated adverse-event reporting systems from state departments of health provide objective, population-level safety data. Brett Coldiron's 10-year analysis of Florida's mandatory office-surgery adverse reporting system, supplemented by 6-year data from Alabama, found that cosmetic procedures performed in dermatologists' offices under local or dilute local (tumescent) anesthesia yielded zero reported deaths and a negligible complication rate (1.3% of total state incidents) (Coldiron, 2012). Conversely, cosmetic procedures performed under general anesthesia or deep sedation accounted for close to half of all reported adverse incidents in both states, with plastic surgeons representing the most heavily represented specialty. Coldiron specifically noted that requiring surgical specialty board certification or hospital privileges did not enhance patient safety in the office setting; rather, the avoidance of deep anesthesia and procedure bundling was the true determinant of safety (Coldiron, 2012; Coldiron et al., 2005).

Prospective Outcome Surveys & Synthesis

Direct outcome studies of dermatologist-performed cosmetic procedures confirm these registry findings. Housman and colleagues' national survey of 66,570 tumescent liposuction procedures by 261 dermatologic surgeons recorded a serious adverse event rate of just 0.68 per 1,000 cases with zero deaths (Housman et al., 2002). This extends an unblemished evidentiary record traceable from Bernstein and Hanke's 1988 series (9,478 cases, 0 deaths) and Hanke et al.'s 1995 series (15,336 cases, 0 deaths). In New Zealand, the multi-practitioner audit of 3,615 consecutive advanced cosmetic cases (Salmon, Bellaney, MacDonald, 2006–2022) mirrors these international findings with zero mortality and zero hospital admissions.

The convergence of malpractice data, mandatory state incident reporting, and prospective multicenter surveys leads to an unambiguous clinical conclusion: anesthesia technique (tumescent local vs general/intravenous sedation), anatomical plane, and procedure duration are the primary drivers of cosmetic surgical safety. Dermatologic surgery's adherence to local anesthesia and rigorous tissue handling delivers outcomes that equal or exceed hospital surgical standards.

16. Conclusion

The cosmetic procedures reviewed in this monograph demonstrate that the modern era of aesthetic and cutaneous surgery was largely forged, refined, and validated by dermatologists. From Klein's tumescent anesthesia and Anderson's selective photo-thermolysis to the Carruthers' discovery of cosmetic botulinum toxin, soft-tissue filler rheology, Vleggaar and Yutskovskaya's regenerative biostimulator protocols, Waibel, Krakowski and Shumaker's scar rehabilitation breakthroughs, Hetter's peel mechanics, Orentreich's donor dominance, David's laser blepharoplasty, Muller's phlebectomy, and Sadick's pioneering work in endovenous laser ablation and phlebology, dermatologists have consistently turned invasive, high-risk hospital procedures into safe, reproducible, office-based outpatient interventions.

Across every major aesthetic category, the peer-reviewed evidence proves that patient safety is dictated by anesthesia depth, operator skill, standardized technique, and the avoidance of dangerous procedure bundling, not by royal college monopolies. As regulatory authorities in New Zealand and internationally evaluate the cosmetic landscape, policy must be anchored in this robust scientific evidence: protecting patient access to safe, audited, outpatient procedural dermatology performed under local and tumescent anesthesia.

17. References

Abboushi, N., Yezhelyev, M., Symbas, J., & Nahai, F. (2012). Facelift complications and the risk of venous thromboembolism: A single center's experience. Aesthetic Surgery Journal, 32(4), 413–420.

Almeida, J. I., & Kaufman, J. (2020). Endovenous laser ablation of saphenous veins: Technical aspects and safety profile. Journal of Vascular Surgery: Venous and Lymphatic Disorders, 8(3), 450–459.

Alster, T. S. (2012). Fractional laser skin resurfacing. Journal of Drugs in Dermatology, 11(11), 1274–1287.

Alster, T. S., & Tanzi, E. L. (2007). Hypertrophic scars and keloids: Etiology and management. American Journal of Clinical Dermatology, 8(4), 233–239.

Anderson, R. R., & Parrish, J. A. (1983). Selective photothermolysis: Precise microsurgery by selective absorption of pulsed radiation. Science, 220(4596), 524–527.

Anderson, R. R., Donelan, M. B., Hivnor, C., et al. (2014). Laser treatment of traumatic scars with an emphasis on photothermal fractional ablation: Consensus report. JAMA Dermatology, 150(2), 187–193.

Baker, T. J., & Gordon, H. L. (1962). Chemical face peeling and rhytidectomy: A combined approach for facial rejuvenation. Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, 29, 199.

Bernstein, G., & Hanke, C. W. (1988). Safety of liposuction: A review of 9,478 cases performed by dermatologists. Journal of Dermatologic Surgery and Oncology, 14, 1112–1114.

Bone, R., & Navarro, C. (2001). Endovenous laser: A new minimally invasive method of treatment for varicose veins. Preliminary results using an 810 nm diode laser. Dermatologic Surgery, 27(2), 117–122.

Bourguet, J. (1928). Les hernies graisseuses de l'orbite: Notre traitement chirurgical. Bulletin de l'Académie Nationale de Médecine, 92, 1270–1272.

Burgess, C. M., & Quiroga, R. M. (2005). Assessment of the safety and efficacy of poly-L-lactic acid for the treatment of HIV-associated facial lipoatrophy. Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology, 52(2), 233–239.

Carruthers, J. D. A., & Carruthers, J. A. (1992). Treatment of glabellar frown lines with C. botulinum-A exotoxin. The Journal of Dermatologic Surgery and Oncology, 18(1), 17–21.

Castañares, S. (1951). Blepharoplasty for herniated intraorbital fat: Anatomical basis for a new approach. Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, 8(1), 46–58.

Coldiron, B. (2012). Determining the safety of office-based surgery: What 10 years of Florida data and 6 years of Alabama data reveal. Dermatologic Surgery, 38(2), 171–177.

Coldiron, B., Fisher, A. H., Adelman, E., et al. (2005). Adverse event reporting: Lessons learned from four years of Florida office data. Dermatologic Surgery, 31(9), 1–10.

Coleman, S. R. (1995). Long-term survival of fat transplants: Controlled demonstrations. Aesthetic Plastic Surgery, 19(5), 421–425.

Coleman, S. R. (2001). Structural fat grafting: More than a permanent filler. Clinics in Plastic Surgery, 28(1), 111–119.

Coleman, W. P. III. (1999). The history of liposuction and fat transplantation in America. Dermatologic Clinics, 17(4), 723–727.

Coleman, W. P. III, Hanke, C. W., Lillis, P., Bernstein, G., & Narins, R. (1999). Does the location of the surgery or the specialty of the physician affect malpractice claims in liposuction? Dermatologic Surgery, 25(5), 343–347.

David, L. M. (1988). The laser approach to blepharoplasty. The Journal of Dermatologic Surgery and Oncology, 14(7), 741–746.

David, L. M., & Sanders, G. (1988). CO2 laser blepharoplasty: A comparison to cold steel and electrocautery. Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, 84(2), 216–223.

De Roos, K.-P., Nieman, F. H. M., & Neumann, H. A. M. (2003). Ambulatory phlebectomy versus compression sclerotherapy: Results of a randomized controlled trial. Dermatologic Surgery, 29, 221–226.

Deng, K., Deng, X., Luo, H., et al. (2024). Academic visualization study of aesthetic medicine management and related legal research since 2000. Journal of Cosmetic Dermatology, 23(8), 2697–2710.

Dmytryshyn, J. R., et al. (1983). Toxic shock syndrome associated with chemical face peeling. Archives of Otolaryngology, 109(6), 400–401.

Fabi, S. G., Burgess, C., Carruthers, A., Carruthers, J., Day, D., Goldie, K., Goldman, M. P., et al. (2021). Consensus recommendations for the use of hyperdiluted calcium hydroxyapatite for skin laxity and superficial rhytides of the face and body. Dermatologic Surgery, 47(11), 1459–1466.

Fitzpatrick, R. E. (1999). Treatment of inflamed hypertrophic scars using intralesional 5-FU. Dermatologic Surgery, 25(3), 224–232.

Goldie, K., Peeters, W., Alghoul, M., Butterwick, K., Casabona, G., Chao, Y. Y., Costa, J., Eviatar, J., Fabi, S. G., et al. (2020). Global consensus guidelines for the injection of diluted and hyperdiluted calcium hydroxylapatite for skin tightening. Dermatologic Surgery, 46(Suppl 1), S13–S26.

Grazer, F. M., & de Jong, R. H. (2000). Fatal outcomes from liposuction: Census survey of cosmetic surgeons. Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, 105, 436–446.

Groen, J. W., et al. (2018). Autologous fat transfer for facial rejuvenation: A systematic review on efficacy and safety. Journal of Plastic, Reconstructive & Aesthetic Surgery Open, 16, 12–21.

Gross, B. G. (1984). Cardiac arrhythmias during phenol face peeling. Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, 73(4), 590–594.

Gupta, V., Yeslev, M., Winocour, J., Bamba, R., Rodriguez-Feo, C., Grotting, J. C., & Higdon, K. K. (2016). Preoperative risk factors and complication rates in facelift: Analysis of 11,300 patients. Aesthetic Surgery Journal, 36(1), 1–13.

Hanke, C. W., Bernstein, G., & Bullock, S. (1995). Safety of tumescent liposuction in 15,336 patients: National survey results. Dermatologic Surgery, 21, 459–462.

Hetter, G. P. (2000). An examination of the phenol-croton oil peel: Parts I–IV. Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, 105(1), 227–248; 105(2), 752–763; 105(3), 1061–1083.

Housman, T. S., Lawrence, N., Mellen, B. G., George, M. N., Filippo, J. S., Cerveny, K. A., DeMarco, M., Feldman, S. R., & Fleischer, A. B. (2002). The safety of liposuction: Results of a national survey. Dermatologic Surgery, 28(11), 971–978.

Illouz, Y. G. (1983). Body contouring by lipolysis: A 5-year experience with over 3000 cases. Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, 72(5), 591–597.

Jain, R., & Doshi, B. (2022). Complications in hair transplantation: Prevention and management. Clinical Dermatology Review, 6(1), 12–19.

Kheirelseid, E. A. H., et al. (2023). Endovenous laser ablation versus conventional surgery for great saphenous vein incompetence: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Journal of Vascular Surgery: Venous and Lymphatic Disorders.

Klein, J. A. (1987). The tumescent technique for liposuction surgery. American Journal of Cosmetic Surgery, 4, 263–267.

Klein, J. A. (1990). Tumescent technique for regional anesthesia permits lidocaine doses of 35 mg/kg for liposuction. Journal of Dermatologic Surgery and Oncology, 16, 248–263.

Krakowski, A. C., & Shumaker, P. R. (Eds.). (2017). The Scar Book: Formation, Mitigation, Rehabilitation, and Prevention. Philadelphia: Wolters Kluwer / Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.

Lawrence, N., Clark, R. E., Flynn, T. C., & Coleman, W. P. III. (2000). Guidelines of care for liposuction. Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology, 42(3), 438–444.

Liao, Z. F., Cong, L. Y., Li, F. W., et al. (2024). The research trend of soft tissue filler injection from 2000 to 2022: A bibliometric and visualized analysis. Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery Global Open, 12(2), e5579.

Liu, Y., Khachemoune, A., & Rashid, R. (2016). Chemical burns associated with inappropriate trichloroacetic acid application. Journal of Dermatology and Dermatologic Surgery, 20(1), 62–65.

Lu, S., Wei, Q., Zhuang, J., Su, X., Zhang, Z., Liang, Y., & Hu, J. (2026). Global research trends and thematic evolution in injectable aesthetic medicine: A 25-year bibliometric analysis (2000–2025). Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery Global Open, 14(6), e7814.

Manstein, D., Herron, G. S., Sink, R. K., Tanner, H., & Anderson, R. R. (2004). Fractional photothermolysis: A new concept for cutaneous remodeling using microscopic patterns of thermal injury. Lasers in Surgery and Medicine, 34(5), 426–438.

Metelitsa, A. I., & Alster, T. S. (2010). Fractionated laser skin resurfacing treatment complications: A review. Dermatologic Surgery, 36(3), 299–306.

Mitz, V., & Peyronie, M. (1976). The superficial musculo-aponeurotic system (SMAS) in the parotid and cheek area. Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, 58(1), 80–88.

Mofid, M. M., Teitelbaum, S., Suissa, D., et al. (2017). Report on mortality from gluteal fat grafting: Recommendations from the ASERF Task Force. Aesthetic Surgery Journal, 37(7), 796–806.

Monheit, G. D. (1995). The Jessner's + TCA peel: Combined with blepharoplasty. Dermatologic Clinics, 13(2), 277–283.

Muller, R. (1966). Traitement des varices par la phlébectomie ambulatoire. Bulletin de la Société Française de Phlébologie, 19, 277–279.

Myers, K. (2019). A history of injection treatments—II: Sclerotherapy. Phlebology, 34(8), 535–543.

Nguyen, C. N., Nguyen, Q.-B. D., & Silapunt, S. (2022). Analysis of adverse events with sclerosants reported to the United States Food and Drug Administration. Phlebology, 37(9), 655–662.

Noël, S. (1926). La Chirurgie Esthétique: Son Rôle Social. Paris: Masson et Cie.

Okuda, S. (1939). Clinical and experimental study of hair transplantation for scarring alopecia. Japanese Journal of Dermatology and Urology, 46, 537–559.

Orentreich, N. (1959). Autografts in alopecias and other selected dermatological conditions. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 83, 463–479.

Palm, M. D., Mayoral, F., & Weiss, R. (2021). The evolution of poly-L-lactic acid injection technique: Results from a survey of expert injectors. Journal of Drugs in Dermatology, 20(7), 743–748.

Prasad, S., et al. (2022). Safety and outcomes of follicular unit extraction hair transplantation: A prospective study. Journal of Cutaneous and Aesthetic Surgery, 15(2), 145–151.

Rabe, E., & Pannier, F. (2011). Safety and efficacy of foam sclerotherapy: European consensus meeting. Pharmacology, 88(5-6), 253–257.

Ramelet, A.-A. (1997). Complications of ambulatory phlebectomy. Dermatologic Surgery, 23(10), 947–954.

Rao, R. B., Ely, S. F., & Hoffman, R. S. (1999). Deaths related to liposuction. New England Journal of Medicine, 340(19), 1471–1475.

Rezaei, M., et al. (2019). A meta-analysis of complication rates among different SMAS facelift techniques. Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, 144(5), 1058–1068.

Ricci, S. (1997). Ambulatory phlebectomy: Principles and complications. Dermatologic Surgery, 23(10), 941–946.

Sadick, N. S. (1997). Sclerotherapy for varicose and telangiectatic veins. Postgraduate Medicine, 101(3), 137–146.

Sadick, N. S. (2000). A dual-wavelength approach for the treatment of lower-extremity veins: Combined 532 nm and 1064 nm Nd:YAG. Dermatologic Surgery, 26(12), 1123–1128.

Sadick, N. S. (2003). Comparative analysis of polidocanol and sodium tetradecyl sulfate in the treatment of lower extremity telangiectasias. Dermatologic Surgery, 29(8), 816–820.

Sadick, N. S. (2005). Advances in the treatment of varicose veins: Ambulatory phlebectomy, foam sclerotherapy, endovascular laser therapy, and high-frequency radiofrequency. Dermatologic Clinics, 23(3), 515–525.

Sadick, N. S., & Trelles, M. A. (2005). Modern approaches to the treatment of superficial venous insufficiency: Endovenous laser ablation and ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy. Journal of Cosmetic Dermatology, 4(4), 232–239.

Sadick, N. S., & Wasser, S. (2007). Combined endovascular laser with ambulatory phlebectomy for the treatment of superficial venous incompetence: A 4-year perspective. Journal of Cosmetic Dermatology, 6(1), 44–49.

Sadick, N. S. (2011). Modern endoluminal treatments of lower extremity venous insufficiency. Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology, 65(3), 612–622.

Santos, D. Q., Tan, M., Farias, C. L., Swerdloff, J. L., & Paul, M. D. (2014). Venous thromboembolism after facelift surgery under local anesthesia: Results of a multicenter survey. Aesthetic Plastic Surgery, 38(1), 12–24.

Vemula, S., Maymone, M. B. C., Secemsky, E. A., et al. (2018). Assessing the safety of superficial chemical peels in darker skin: A retrospective study. Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology, 79(3), 508–513.

Vleggaar, D. (2005). Soft-tissue augmentation and contour restoration with poly-L-lactic acid: 3-year results in 130 patients. Dermatologic Surgery, 31(11 Pt 2), 1511–1518.

Vleggaar, D., Fitzgerald, R., Lorenc, Z. P., et al. (2014). Consensus recommendations on the use of injectable poly-L-lactic acid for facial and nonfacial volumization. Journal of Drugs in Dermatology, 13(4 Suppl), s44–s51.

von Gräfe, C. F. (1818). De Rhinoplastice. Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung.

Waibel, J. S., et al. (2013). Laser-assisted delivery of 5-fluorouracil for the treatment of hypertrophic scars. Dermatologic Surgery, 39(8), 1184–1191.

Wong, Z. Y., Damavandi, P., Richards, M., Danpanichkul, P., Adegboye, O., Faderani, R., Kanapathy, M., & Mosahebi, A. (2025). Botulinum toxin in aesthetic medicine: A bibliometric analysis of research trends and methodological quality of the top 100 cited publications. Aesthetic Surgery Journal Open Forum, 7, ojae131.

Yutskovskaya, Y., Kogan, E., & Leshunov, E. (2014). A randomized, split-face, histomorphologic study comparing a volumetric calcium hydroxylapatite and a hyaluronic acid-based dermal filler of identical viscosities for skin rejuvenation. Journal of Drugs in Dermatology, 13(9), 1047–1052.

Yutskovskaya, Y. A., & Kogan, E. A. (2017). Improved neocollagenesis and skin mechanical properties after injection of diluted calcium hydroxylapatite in the neck and décolletage: A long-term daring clinical and histologic study. Journal of Drugs in Dermatology, 16(1), 68–74.

Zhou, Z., Huang, F., & Chen, J. (2024). Study on botulinum toxin in dermatology from 2000 to 2023: A CiteSpace-based bibliometric analyses. Journal of Cosmetic Dermatology, 23(10), 3116–3127.