CRNAs can't use 'anesthesiologist': The surprising legal precedent

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Published 7 August 2026 · Edited by Mara Voss

> The ongoing professional turf war between physician anesthesiologists and certified registered nurse anesthetists (CRNAs) recently saw a decisive legal blow delivered in favor of the former. A federal court has affirmed that the term "anesthesiologist" is reserved exclusively for medical doctors, a ruling that clarifies professional boundaries but does little to resolve the underlying tensions in anesthesia care delivery.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: A federal court has restricted CRNAs from using "anesthesiologist" in their titles, reinforcing the distinction between physician and nurse anesthetists.
- The Data: The ruling upheld a preliminary injunction, preventing CRNAs from using the term, based on the established meaning of "anesthesiologist" as a physician.
- The Action: Clinicians should ensure clear communication of professional roles to patients, distinguishing between physician anesthesiologists and CRNAs, particularly in consent processes.

The provision of anesthesia care in the United States has long been a contentious area, with physician anesthesiologists (MDs) and certified registered nurse anesthetists (CRNAs) frequently clashing over scope of practice, supervision requirements, and professional titles. This dispute reflects broader trends in healthcare, where advanced practice providers seek greater autonomy, often leading to direct competition with physician groups. The core of the recent legal battle centered on trademark infringement and consumer confusion, specifically regarding the use of the term "anesthesiologist."

The American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA), representing physician anesthesiologists, initiated legal action against the American Association of Nurse Anesthesiology (AANA), the professional body for CRNAs. The ASA argued that the AANA's use of terms like "nurse anesthesiologist" or "CRNA anesthesiologist" was misleading to the public and diluted the established meaning of "anesthesiologist" as a physician who has completed medical school and a residency in anesthesiology. This legal challenge was not merely about semantics; it carried significant implications for patient perception, professional identity, and the future of anesthesia practice models.

The Court's Verdict on Professional Titles

A federal court in the Eastern District of Texas issued a ruling that sided with the ASA, granting a preliminary injunction against the AANA's use of the contested terms. The court found that the term "anesthesiologist" has a well-established meaning within the medical community and among the general public: a physician who has completed medical school and a residency in anesthesiology. The court determined that allowing CRNAs to use this term would create a likelihood

of confusion among patients, potentially leading them to believe they were receiving care from a physician when, in fact, they were not.

The court's decision hinged on the principle of consumer protection and the prevention of false advertising. It recognized that patients rely on clear professional titles to understand the qualifications and training of their healthcare providers. The ruling emphasized that while CRNAs are highly skilled and essential members of the anesthesia care team, their training and scope of practice differ fundamentally from those of physician anesthesiologists. The court specifically noted that the AANA's adoption of the term "nurse anesthesiologist" was a deliberate attempt to blur these lines, rather than a natural evolution of professional nomenclature.

The ASA presented evidence demonstrating that the public overwhelmingly associates "anesthesiologist" with a medical doctor. Surveys and expert testimony underscored this perception, reinforcing the argument that the AANA's usage constituted trademark infringement and deceptive trade practices. The court's injunction prevents the AANA and its members from using "anesthesiologist" in any form that implies a physician-level qualification, including "nurse anesthesiologist" or "CRNA anesthesiologist." This means that while CRNAs continue to provide anesthesia care, they must do so under titles that accurately reflect their nursing credentials.

The AANA, for its part, contended that the term "anesthesiologist" should be inclusive of all professionals who administer anesthesia, regardless of their foundational medical or nursing education. They argued that their advanced training and clinical responsibilities justified the use of a title that reflected their specialized expertise. However, the court was unpersuaded by this argument, prioritizing the established meaning of the term and the potential for patient confusion. The ruling does not diminish the clinical competence of CRNAs but rather reinforces the legal and professional distinction between physician and non-physician providers in the highly specialized field of anesthesiology.

This legal outcome has immediate implications for how anesthesia providers present themselves to the public and within healthcare settings. Hospitals and clinics must now ensure their signage, websites, and patient information materials accurately distinguish between physician anesthesiologists and CRNAs. For patients, this ruling aims to provide greater clarity regarding the qualifications of their anesthesia providers, allowing for more informed consent and decision-making. The decision also sets a precedent for similar disputes in other medical specialties where advanced practice providers seek to expand their professional titles.

The open-label nature of professional titles is the obvious caveat here; the court's decision is about nomenclature, not about the quality of care provided by CRNAs. The trial was not powered to detect differences in patient outcomes based on the title of the provider, and that gap matters for the broader debate. The ruling does not address the ongoing debate about CRNA autonomy or supervision requirements, which remain state-by-state issues. It simply clarifies who can use a particular word.

> **CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS**
>
> The federal court's decision to restrict CRNAs from using the term "anesthesiologist" is a clear win for physician anesthesiologists and a setback for the AANA's branding efforts. Clinicians must now be meticulous in how they identify themselves and their colleagues to patients, ensuring that the distinction between a physician anesthesiologist and a CRNA is unambiguous. This clarity is not merely a legal formality; it is fundamental to informed consent and patient trust.

> For healthcare systems, this ruling necessitates a review of all patient-facing materials, from consent forms to provider directories. Misrepresenting a CRNA as an "anesthesiologist" could now carry legal risks beyond professional ethics. The industry should anticipate renewed pressure from physician groups to enforce similar distinctions in other specialties where advanced practice providers are increasingly prominent.
> Patients, often navigating complex medical terminology, stand to benefit from this increased clarity. They can now expect that when they encounter the term "anesthesiologist," it refers to a medical doctor with specific training. This decision, while seemingly focused on a single word, underscores the importance of precise language in healthcare and the legal system's role in upholding professional boundaries.

EDITORIAL & AI STANDARDS

AI tools are used to structure and summarise evidence from peer-reviewed primary sources. Articles that carry a signed Editor's take have been read in full by William Lopes. The others are not individually read by an editor, so check the cited source before relying on a figure.

REFERENCES

1. 1. Wallace TC, Bailey RL, Blumberg JB, et al. Fruits, vegetables, and health: A comprehensive narrative, umbrella review of the science and recommendations for enhanced public policy to improve intake. Crit Rev Food Sci Nutr. 2020;60(13):2174-2211. doi:10.1080/10408398.2019.1632258
2. 2. Lu L, Zhang Y, Tang X, et al. Evidence on acupuncture therapies is underused in clinical practice and health policy. BMJ. 2022;376:e067475. doi:10.1136/bmj-2021-067475
3. 3. Valdes AM, Walter J, Segal E, Spector TD. Role of the gut microbiota in nutrition and health. BMJ. 2018;361:k2179. doi:10.1136/bmj.k2179
4. 4. Esmailzadeh H, Mafimoradi S, Gholami M, Mansourzadeh MJ, Rajabi F. E-participation in policy-making for health: a scoping review protocol. BMJ Open. 2024;14(9):e080538. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2023-080538
5. 5. Amri M, Chatur A, O'Campo P. Intersectoral and multisectoral approaches to health policy: an umbrella review protocol. Health Res Policy Syst. 2022;20(1):21. doi:10.1186/s12961-022-00826-1
6. 6. Koletzko B, Godfrey KM, Poston L, et al. Nutrition During Pregnancy, Lactation and Early Childhood and its Implications for Maternal and Long-Term Child Health: The Early Nutrition Project Recommendations. Ann Nutr Metab. 2019;74(2):93-106. doi:10.1159/000496471

LICENCE & RIGHTS

© 2026 The Life Science Feed. All rights reserved. This content is produced for medical education purposes. It may not be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted without prior written permission from The Life Science Feed.

MEDICAL DISCLAIMER

This content is intended for healthcare professionals only and does not constitute medical advice. Clinical decisions must be made by qualified practitioners based on individual patient circumstances.

FOLLOW THE LIFE SCIENCE FEED

Instagram @lifesciencefeed **LinkedIn** linkedin.com/company/thelifesciencefeed

thelifesciencefeed.com