



Non-Surgical Aesthetics: Expanding Procedural Volumes and Shrinking Clinical Accountability

Salih Kılıç¹ · Betül Gözel¹



Received: 29 January 2026 / Accepted: 25 February 2026 / Published online: 10 March 2026
© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, part of Springer Nature and International Society of Aesthetic Plastic Surgery 2026

Level of Evidence V This journal requires that authors assign a level of evidence to each article. For a full description of these Evidence-Based Medicine ratings, please refer to the Table of Contents or the online Instructions to Authors www.springer.com/00266.

Dear Editor

Aesthetic medicine and surgery are currently experiencing a period of sustained global expansion. In recent decades, there has been a marked increase in the prevalence of both elective aesthetic surgery and non-surgical procedures. This trend has seen a notable escalation in recent years. Large-scale international registry data confirm a marked rise in minimally invasive aesthetic interventions worldwide, reflecting a durable shift in patient demand and practice patterns rather than a transient market fluctuation [1].

This procedural expansion is taking place in a larger economic environment that is favoring aesthetic services more and more. Revenues from professional services in aesthetic practice often surpass general physician income benchmarks in a variety of economic contexts, according to recent global analyses, highlighting the strong financial incentives propelling procedural growth [2]. Simultaneously, market analysts have observed a transformation in consumer spending behaviors, with aesthetic improvement emerging as a fundamental aspect of regular consumer

expenditure in the expansive beauty sector [3]. These forces have jointly transformed the administration, expansion, and promotion of minimal invasive aesthetic therapies.

In this context, many noninvasive and minimally invasive aesthetic treatments are considered low risk, reversible, and maintenance-oriented. This has allowed them to be used not just in medical spas, but also in hybrid commercial environments. Market forecasts indicate that these settings will undergo substantial growth in the coming years, primarily driven by the increasing demand for minimally invasive aesthetic treatments [4]. However, as access to these treatments becomes more widespread, the clinical implications of this delivery model necessitate closer examination.

From a plastic surgical perspective, the distinction between invasive and non-surgical procedures is of limited relevance when considering long-term outcomes. Facial and soft tissues respond best to repeated exposure to treatments rather than to labels. Soft-tissue planes, compartment behavior, lymphatic drainage, and vascular responsiveness can all be changed by injectables, biostimulatory agents, and energy-based modalities. Although these alterations are frequently minor at first, they have a big impact on long-term outcomes and potential reconstructive options.

Plastic surgeons increasingly encounter patients with delayed complications after years of non-surgical treatments. These patients often lack documentation, complicating decision-making and attribution of responsibility.

The clinical significance of delayed presentations is demonstrated by published case reports that detail filler-related adverse events that manifest years after the initial injection. Subsequent studies by Lee and colleagues revealed cases of acute inflammatory activation of

✉ Salih Kılıç
salih.kilic@balikesir.edu.tr

Betül Gözel
tcbetulgozel@gmail.com

¹ Department of Plastic, Reconstructive and Aesthetic Surgery
Faculty of Medicine, Balıkesir University, Balıkesir, Türkiye

previously quiescent granulomas and late-onset filler migration with foreign body granuloma formation at distant sites [5]. Notably, patients presented long after the initial procedures, which complicated diagnosis and treatment. Similar presentations are not uncommon in plastic surgery practice. In our own clinical experience, we have encountered patients presenting with delayed nodules, indurated masses, or inflammatory swellings years after non-surgical filler treatments performed elsewhere. In select cases, surgical excision revealed histopathological findings consistent with multiple foreign body granulomas accompanied by active and chronic abscess formation, underscoring the potential for non-surgical procedures to generate clinically significant long-term sequelae requiring surgical intervention.

A major concern from these observations is the fragmentation of accountability. Non-surgical aesthetic procedures are frequently delivered without structured follow-up or continuity of care. When complications emerge later, they are often managed by surgeons not involved in the original interventions. This decentralization raises important ethical and professional questions regarding responsibility for outcomes and reconstructive burden.

Marketing narratives that emphasize reversibility merit particular caution. While certain materials may be chemically degradable, clinical reversibility is not guaranteed. The structural alteration of tissue planes, persistent fibrosis, and compromised surgical conditions may persist despite degradation or removal of injected materials. Consequently, interventions initially presented as temporary have the potential to exert lasting effects on future surgical feasibility and outcomes.

These clinical concerns are linked to the economic structures that support minimally invasive aesthetics. Revenue-driven expansion, subscription-style maintenance, and high-volume delivery models normalize repeated intervention and diffuse responsibility for delayed consequences. In this context, adverse outcomes are seen as isolated events rather than cumulative effects. The long-term burden is often transferred to tertiary care systems and plastic surgeons.

The growth of non-surgical aesthetics calls for rethinking professional responsibility. Evaluating quality should include long-term outcomes, delayed complications, and preservation of future options. Standardized

documentation, clearer accountability, and more comprehensive informed consent processes are essential.

As non-surgical aesthetic practices continue to expand, their long-term clinical consequences are becoming increasingly evident within the domain of plastic surgery. The occurrence of delayed complications, altered tissue behavior, and limitations on future reconstructive options has become a predictable outcome of cumulative intervention, rather than a rare event. In the absence of a clearly delineated framework for responsibility and long-term outcome assessment, aesthetic medicine is susceptible to an increase in procedural volume accompanied by a concomitant regression in clinical accountability.

Funding The authors declare that no funds, grants, or other support was received during the preparation of this manuscript.

Declarations

Competing interests The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

References

1. Triana L, Palacios Huatuco RM, Campiglio G, et al. Trends in surgical and nonsurgical aesthetic procedures: a 14-year analysis of the International Society of Aesthetic Plastic Surgery—ISAPS. *Aesth Plast Surg.* 2024;48:4217–27. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00266-024-04260-2>.
2. Lim P. An exploratory global framework for comparing professional aesthetic practice revenue: non-surgical and surgical provider scenarios across 35 countries. *Eur J Plast Surg.* 2026;49:4. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00238-025-02388-1>.
3. Why the beauty industry is booming. *The Economist.* 2026. <https://www.economist.com/business/2026/01/20/why-the-beauty-industry-is-booming>. Accessed 21 January 2026
4. Technavio. Medical spa market analysis, size, and forecast 2026–2030. Technavio Market Research. 2025. <https://www.technavio.com/report/medical-spa-market-analysis>. Accessed 21 January 2026.
5. Kim H, Cho SH, Lee JD, Kim HS. Delayed onset filler complication: two case reports and literature review. *Dermatol Ther.* 2017;30(5):10.1111/dth.12513. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dth.12513>.

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.