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Estimated need for surgery worldwide based on prevalence of diseases: a modelling strategy for the WHO Global Health Estimate

John Rose, Thomas G Weiser, Phil Hider, Leona Wilson, Russell L Gruen, Stephen W Bickler

Summary

Background Surgery is a foundational component of health-care systems. However, previous efforts to integrate surgical services into global health initiatives do not reflect the scope of surgical need and many health systems do not provide essential interventions. We estimate the minimum global volume of surgical need to address prevalent diseases in 21 epidemiological regions from the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010 (GBD).

Methods Prevalence data were obtained from GBD 2010 and organised into 119 disease states according to the WHO’s Global Health Estimate (GHE). These data, representing 187 countries, were then apportioned into the 21 GBD epidemiological regions. Using previously defined values for the incident need for surgery for each of the 119 GHE disease states, we calculate minimum global need for surgery based on the prevalence of each condition in each region.

Findings We estimate that at least 321·5 million surgical procedures would be needed to address the burden of disease for a global population of 6·9 billion in 2010. Minimum rates of surgical need vary across regions, ranging from 3383 operations per 100 000 in central Latin America to 6495 operations per 100 000 in western sub-Saharan Africa. Global surgical need also varied across subcategories of disease, ranging from 131 412 procedures for nutritional deficiencies to 45·8 million procedures for unintentional injuries.

Interpretation The estimated need for surgical procedures worldwide is large and addresses a broad spectrum of disease states. Surgical need varies between regions of the world according to disease prevalence and many countries do not meet the basic needs of their populations. These estimates could be useful for policy makers, funders, and ministries of health as they consider how to incorporate surgical capacity into health systems.
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Introduction Surgical care has a role in treating a broad spectrum of diseases in the alleviation of human suffering.1 It is required at all ages; from neonates with congenital anomalies to elderly people with cataracts. Surgery can be preventative, as in reducing HIV transmission through circumcision, or curative, as in many cancers. It is often a component of acute emergency care, such as bowel perforations and trauma, as well as the treatment of chronic diseases such as osteoarthritis and inflammatory bowel disorders. Additionally, surgical care is important in the diagnosis and supportive care of numerous conditions. For example, patients with renal failure require dialysis access and may eventually be candidates for kidney transplantation. In recognition of these many roles, researchers and economists now acknowledge that surgical care is a fundamental component of health care and contributes to overall social and economic development.2,3

Previous efforts to integrate surgical services into global health have failed to recognise the scope of surgical need. Traditionally, surgical initiatives in global health were implemented as disease-specific vertical interventions to meet targeted needs in resource-poor settings of the world.4,5 More recent efforts to expand the breadth of such services include the WHO’s Emergency and Essential Surgical Care programme6 and the World Bank’s Disease Control Priorities project,7 both of which promote the implementation of essential packages of interventions at first-level hospitals in low-income and middle-income countries (LMICs). However, research now shows that surgical care is required in the treatment of nearly all disease states of the global burden of disease, strengthening the argument that these services must be integrated into health systems at all levels and for diverse clinical problems.8,9 This integration complicates the existing lack of access to surgical care estimated to affect 4·8 billion people worldwide.10

Defining the role of surgery in health systems remains a difficult problem in global health. Specifically, there is a need to define its role across a spectrum of diseases and what minimum levels of surgical intervention might be. In this report, we use prevalence data for diseases and conditions described by the Global Burden of Disease, Injuries, and Risk Factors Study 2010 (GBD 2010) to estimate the minimum need for surgery in each of the GBD regions of the world.
Table 1: Estimated need for surgical procedures in 2010, by regions of the world

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Population, 2010</th>
<th>Estimated total surgical need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolute procedures volume</td>
<td>Procedures per 100 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andean Latin America</td>
<td>53 477 058</td>
<td>2 017 949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australasia</td>
<td>25 896 634</td>
<td>1 209 068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>43 514 856</td>
<td>2 210 372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Asia</td>
<td>80 138 328</td>
<td>3 476 808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Europe</td>
<td>119 065 155</td>
<td>6 566 891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Latin America</td>
<td>231 138 168</td>
<td>7 820 648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>96 543 102</td>
<td>6 038 802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia</td>
<td>1 397 940 667</td>
<td>57 821 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>207 162 843</td>
<td>10 290 575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>355 720 887</td>
<td>21 858 830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-income Asia Pacific</td>
<td>178 098 403</td>
<td>9 422 832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-income North America</td>
<td>340 096 725</td>
<td>15 805 859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Africa and Middle East</td>
<td>446 025 798</td>
<td>19 874 651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>9 942 806</td>
<td>447 554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asia</td>
<td>610 448 769</td>
<td>25 794 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>1 612 194 931</td>
<td>72 919 681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Latin America</td>
<td>60 208 017</td>
<td>2 953 854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>70 498 978</td>
<td>3 590 736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical Latin America</td>
<td>201 818 241</td>
<td>7 226 989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>416 007 051</td>
<td>22 323 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>336 175 439</td>
<td>21 835 624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global total</td>
<td>6 893 112 854</td>
<td>321 505 362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Incident rates of surgical procedures

To estimate the global need for essential surgical procedures based on prevalence of diseases in each GBD region, we required national or multinational data against which to benchmark the relation between the prevalence of discrete disease states and the use of surgical services. Surgical encounters therefore needed to be rigorously and consistently documented in a national dataset with ICD coding for diagnoses and procedures. Another requirement was a well financed national health-care system with universal access for an entire population where it could be generally assumed that surgical care is provided when needed. Lastly, we needed a setting and strategy that would minimise the amount of unnecessary surgery captured in the analysis.

New Zealand satisfied the above criteria while also achieving excellent health outcomes with efficient use of resources. It has a strong, nationalised health-care system with universal access and a publicly-supported national repository of hospital discharge information from all public sector hospitals. In 2010, overall life expectancy was 80.7 years in New Zealand and 80.2 in high-income countries (HICs) overall. Similarly, maternal mortality was 12 per 100 000 livebirths whereas in HICs overall it was 15 per 100 000 livebirths. Under-5 mortality was also comparable at 6.4 per 1000 livebirths in New Zealand and 5.5 per 100 000 livebirths in HICs overall. These outcomes were also achieved with comparatively low cost. In 2010, total expenditure for health per capita in New Zealand was 25% lower (US$3 260) than in other HICs ($4 325). Lastly, the national rate of surgery is among the lowest of all HICs even when including estimates of operations from the private sector (6270 per 100 000 in 2012), minimising the effect of cosmetic or potentially unnecessary surgery. For these reasons, New Zealand was
an optimum setting from which to derive a standard for surgical care.

We used previously-defined index rates of procedure for each disease state of the GHE from New Zealand.\(^9\) Rates of procedure were defined as the likelihood of each disease state requiring an inpatient surgical procedure in one calendar year. Rates of procedure were calculated by compiling ICD-10 codes from the New Zealand National Minimum Dataset. Using the primary cause of admission, we aggregated hospitalisations into disease states according to the WHO GHE and determined whether or not the admission was associated with an operation in a binary fashion (i.e., present or absent). Surgical procedures were defined as any procedure requiring general or neuroaxial anaesthesia. Using these results and New Zealand disease and condition prevalence from the GBD 2010 study, we determined the incident rate of procedures per disease prevalence. A more detailed description of methods is available by Hider and colleagues.\(^10\)

The analysis of index rates of surgical procedures in New Zealand was structured to err on the conservative side by restricting the analysis to the inpatient setting. Additionally, the analysis did not include inpatient surgical procedures performed outside the public sector, procedures performed under local anaesthesia, outside the operating room, or multiple procedures (i.e., reoperations) during the same hospital admission. These procedures were excluded because there could be a non-trivial proportion of surgical volume that is not clinically indicated and supply-sensitive surgery can contribute to wide variation in rates of surgery between countries.\(^2\) In some settings, the component of overall surgical volume that is performed on an outpatient basis approximates to 40–50% of total surgical procedure volume.\(^2\) Collectively, the above precautions ensure the most conservative analysis possible for minimum rates of procedures.

**Analysis**

To estimate the number of procedures needed in each epidemiological region, we extrapolated the need for surgical care for all disease states in our dataset. We accomplished this in two steps, outlined in the following equation. First, we multiplied the unique standardised incident rate of procedure (ROP) for each disease state (i) by the prevalence counts (Prev) of each disease state (i). Second, we summed the absolute volume of surgical procedures needed for all disease states within a subcategory and then for all subcategories (n) within a region. CIs for procedure volumes were not calculated.

\[
\text{Cumulative estimated need for surgical procedures} = \sum_n \left( ROP_i \times \text{Prev}_i \right)
\]

Lastly, we normalised the cumulative volume of procedures needed in each region by that region’s population in 2010 and reported the overall rate of surgery per 100 000 population. Populations for each disease subcategory
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Results

In 2010, we estimate that 321.5 million inpatient surgical procedures were needed to address the global burden of disease. This number of operations amounts to a global per capita surgical need of 4664 per 100 000. The volume of need across the three broad categories of disease was: 64.2 million for communicable, maternal, perinatal, and nutritional conditions; 208.8 million for non-communicable diseases; and 48.8 million for injuries.

Absolute volumes of surgical procedure need varied by several orders of magnitude between epidemiological regions (table 1). Surgical need ranged from 447,554 in Oceania to 72,919,681 in south Asia. The regions with the largest volume of need were also the regions with the largest populations—namely, south Asia, east Asia, and southeast Asia (table 1, figure A). Minimum rates of surgical need per population also varied between regions. After normalising the absolute volume according to population size in each region, the lowest rate of surgical need was in central Latin America and the highest, with almost a two-fold difference, was in western sub-Saharan Africa (table 1). The next highest rates of surgical need per population were in central sub-Saharan Africa and eastern sub-Saharan Africa (table 1). The median rate of need per capita at the regional level was 4669 operations per 100,000 in Australasia.

The need for surgical procedures within regions was also heterogeneous and differed substantially from one region to the next (figure B). For example, surgical procedures for infectious and parasitic diseases accounted for 0.3% of procedures in western Europe (lowest), 3.0% in Andean Latin America (median), and 3.2% in south Asia (highest). The need for surgical procedures also varied between disease subcategories and individual disease states (table 2). Global volume of procedure need for the 22 disease subcategories was lowest for nutritional deficiencies and highest for unintentional injuries. The subcategories with the next greatest absolute need were musculoskeletal diseases and maternal conditions (table 2). There was also variation within disease subcategories. For example, within the subcategory of malignant neoplasms, the need for surgical procedures differed by as much as two orders of magnitude between types of cancer (table 3). A full description of need for 119 disease states is available in the appendix.

See Online for appendix

region in 2010 were extracted from publicly available descriptive statistics at the World Bank.25
35·3% in western sub-Saharan Africa (highest). Similarly, surgical procedures for maternal conditions varied from 2·1% in western Europe (lowest) to 7·5% in Andean Latin America (median) to 20·4% in eastern sub-Saharan Africa (highest).

Heterogeneity between regions is also evident in reviewing the single disease subcategory accounting for the greatest proportion of surgical procedures within each region. Accordingly, the disease subcategory with the greatest surgical need was unintentional injuries in the Caribbean (32·1%), infectious and parasitic diseases in western sub-Saharan Africa (35·3%), and maternal conditions in southeast Asia (15·7%). Figure B displays the heterogeneity for all 22 disease subcategories across the 21 GBD regions.

**Discussion**

The global estimated need for surgical procedures is large and cuts across a broad spectrum of GHE disease states. Surgery is essential for addressing basic health needs globally, although the degree varies between epidemiological regions of the world and between disease subcategories. Our findings provide the first estimation of need for surgical services that is sensitive to each region's unique epidemiological profile (panel). These data fundamentally challenge the notion that surgical need can be met through vertical programming or room or population.27 Although this metric is useful in evaluating service use and efficiency, it does little to assess whether current services are meeting the needs of the population when significant proportions of patients do not access health-care services. Our method links hospital use with prevalence of diseases to bridge this gap and could be useful as a supplementary metric of coverage. Furthermore, as social and economic conditions improve in LMICs, demographic changes and epidemiological transitions inevitably ensue. As the prevalence of non-communicable disease rises, ministries of health can use our method to follow trends in prevalence of diseases and anticipate impending surgical needs within the health-care system.

Another potential use for this method is to compare estimates of surgical output with estimates of overall surgical need to ascertain the unmet component of surgical need. Based on global data from 2012, Weiser and colleagues use multiple imputations of counts to estimate that the global volume of surgical procedures is large and growing, estimated to be 234·3 million per operating room or population.22,26 According to their results, rates of surgery at the country level range from less than 100 per 100000 in parts of Africa to greater than 20000 per 100000 in parts of Europe. Our estimation of global minimum surgical need at 4664 per 100000 globally, is a conservative estimate which rounds to 5000 procedures per 100000 as a possible target for the initial development of surgical infrastructure. For some regions, such as western sub-Saharan Africa with a rate of surgical need estimated at 6495 per 100000, this global rate will be insufficient. However, we consider it a modest initial goal that, if adopted by funding agencies and ministries of health, could lead to profound improvements in population health.

This approach has several policy implications for monitoring and evaluation at the country level. WHO previously endorsed a package of six standardised metrics to monitor the delivery of surgical services and among them was the volume of surgical procedures (per operating room or population).27 Although this metric is useful in evaluating service use and efficiency, it does little to assess whether current services are meeting the needs of the population when significant proportions of patients do not access health-care services. Our method links hospital use with prevalence of diseases to bridge this gap and could be useful as a supplementary metric of coverage. Furthermore, as social and economic conditions improve in LMICs, demographic changes and epidemiological transitions inevitably ensue. As the prevalence of non-communicable disease rises, ministries of health can use our method to follow trends in prevalence of diseases and anticipate impending surgical needs within the health-care system.

Another potential use for this method is to compare estimates of surgical output with estimates of overall surgical need to ascertain the unmet component of surgical need. Based on global data from 2012, Weiser and colleagues use multiple imputations of counts to estimate that the global volume of surgical procedures is large and growing, estimated to be 234·3 million per operating room or population.22,26 According to their results, rates of surgery at the country level range from less than 100 per 100000 in parts of Africa to greater than 20000 per 100000 in parts of Europe. Our estimation of global minimum surgical need at 4664 per 100000 globally, is a conservative estimate which rounds to 5000 procedures per 100000 as a possible target for the initial development of surgical infrastructure. For some regions, such as western sub-Saharan Africa with a rate of surgical need estimated at 6495 per 100000, this global rate will be insufficient. However, we consider it a modest initial goal that, if adopted by funding agencies and ministries of health, could lead to profound improvements in population health.

This approach has several policy implications for monitoring and evaluation at the country level. WHO previously endorsed a package of six standardised metrics to monitor the delivery of surgical services and among them was the volume of surgical procedures (per operating room or population).27 Although this metric is useful in evaluating service use and efficiency, it does little to assess whether current services are meeting the needs of the population when significant proportions of patients do not access health-care services. Our method links hospital use with prevalence of diseases to bridge this gap and could be useful as a supplementary metric of coverage. Furthermore, as social and economic conditions improve in LMICs, demographic changes and epidemiological transitions inevitably ensue. As the prevalence of non-communicable disease rises, ministries of health can use our method to follow trends in prevalence of diseases and anticipate impending surgical needs within the health-care system.

Another potential use for this method is to compare estimates of surgical output with estimates of overall surgical need to ascertain the unmet component of surgical need. Based on global data from 2012, Weiser and colleagues use multiple imputations of counts to estimate that the global volume of surgical procedures is large and growing, estimated to be 234·3 million per operating room or population.22,26 According to their results, rates of surgery at the country level range from less than 100 per 100000 in parts of Africa to greater than 20000 per 100000 in parts of Europe. Our estimation of global minimum surgical need at 4664 per 100000 globally, is a conservative estimate which rounds to 5000 procedures per 100000 as a possible target for the initial development of surgical infrastructure. For some regions, such as western sub-Saharan Africa with a rate of surgical need estimated at 6495 per 100000, this global rate will be insufficient. However, we consider it a modest initial goal that, if adopted by funding agencies and ministries of health, could lead to profound improvements in population health.
Weiser and colleagues\(^{22}\) estimate that surgical output at the regional level ranges from 392,358 per year in Oceania to 63-4 million per year in high-income North America, with dramatic disparities between countries and regions even afternormalising for population size (table 4). Some regions perform as many as four times the minimum rates of surgical need (ie, high-income North America, with 15-8 million procedures needed and 63-4 million performed), while others fall far behind (eastern Sub-Saharan Africa, with 21-9 million procedures needed and 63-4 million performed), while others fall far behind (eastern Sub-Saharan Africa, with 21-9 million procedures needed and 63-4 million performed). The greatest limitation to surgical need to increase as frameworks are adapted to new diseases. Another example is bariatric surgery, effective in the treatment of obesity, which is performed to treat a highly prevalent epidemic in HICs that is not included within the GHE taxonomy. Owing to examples such as these, we expect subsequent estimates of surgical need to increase as frameworks are adapted to reflect surgical services. The greatest limitation to exploring the implications of such discrepancies is the paucity of data. To overcome this barrier, we recommend that national registries be developed to capture clinical encounters in LMICs that are consistent with burden of disease categories. An ideal starting point is the framework of four digestive diseases, four maternal-neonatal conditions, and treatable injuries recommended by the Disease Control Priorities, volume 3.\(^{7}\)

Another limitation is that our definition of surgery limits the interpretability of results. The presence of a surgical procedure was defined as a binary variable and does not...
differentiate between the myriad types of surgical procedure, resource use, complexity of care delivery, or health consequences. Although our methods provide a broad estimation of the scope of the surgical need across disease states and geographic regions, they do not have the granularity to help policy makers and health-care administrators make concrete decisions about financing and resource allocation in their current form. Furthermore, our definition of surgery excludes non-operative management of many disease states (eg, bowel obstruction) that occurs on surgical wards. To contribute to the scaling up of surgical services in underserved populations, the current method should be applied to country-level data and explored in closer detail to make estimates relevant for the allocation of human and physical resources.

There is also an inherent limitation to benchmarking rates of procedure in a single country and then extrapolating those rates to other regions because this intrinsically reproduces key assumptions and bias. The association between a disease state and the provision of surgical care depends on contextual factors that might change the safety profile of procedures between settings, such as the availability of banked blood, post-operative ventilators, or the ability to transfer to higher levels of care. Pertinent to our analysis, index rates of procedure were calculated in New Zealand exclusively from the public sector in an effort to produce conservative results. However, if a hypothetical procedure A is performed in the private sector 5% of the time and hypothetical procedure B is performed in the private sector 50% of the time, our modelling strategy based exclusively in the public sector would be unevenly conservative between disease states. In other scenarios, the need for surgery might be tied to disease severity and medical management. For example, hospital admissions for communicable diseases of the GBD required an operation 2-1% of the time in Sweden but 17-0% of the time in South Africa, reflecting underlying differences in disease severity. Owing to the fact that patients in LMICs are more likely to have undertreated infections than those in New Zealand, this aspect of our modelling strategy will underestimate extrapolations of global surgical need, but the extent and variation by disease state is unknown. Future efforts to estimate surgical need should capitalise on ongoing improvements in data access to evaluate the effect of benchmarks from diverse settings on this modelling strategy’s results and explore the variation in rates of procedure between regions.

Finally, our estimations do not ensure the appropriateness of individual surgical services. We extrapolate the frequency with which GHE disease subcategories require a surgical procedure without specifying what procedure that might be or whether the treatment decision was justified according to clinical guidelines and standards of care. This omission is especially important when one disease state has multiple surgical treatment options, such as internal versus external fixation in a context of long-bone fracture or in complicated presentations such as polytrauma and intra-abdominal catastrophes where multiple procedures must be planned and coordinated. Appropriateness criteria are especially important because we do not account for unethical disparities in surgical care within the index country or potentially unnecessary surgery in LMICs. Although appropriateness criteria have been developed by expert consensus panels for a limited number of surgical procedures in HICs, it is beyond the scope of this analysis to address this concern methodologically beyond the careful consideration of a benchmark country already described in our methods.

In light of these limitations, it is worth reiterating that this analysis errs on the side of conservative estimates in multiple ways. For example, we did not account for hospital admissions during which more than one procedure was performed (6% of total procedure volume in New Zealand). Additionally, ICD-10 codes that were missing in the GBD 2010 prevalence data were highly associated with inpatient surgical procedures, accounting for 25% of all surgical procedures in the index country, but these procedures were not included in global estimations due to unavailable GBD 2010 prevalence data in each region. We also know from independent clinical databases that procedures done in private hospitals in the index country can account for up to 25% of procedures in select disease states (eg, knee arthroplasty); because private hospitals do not report procedures in New Zealand’s national minimum dataset, these procedures were also omitted from global extrapolations. We also excluded outpatient procedures, bedside procedures, and surgical procedures under local anaesthesia. For these reasons, it is not surprising that current counts of surgical procedures in New Zealand from Hider and colleagues (7840 procedures per 100 000 population) are nearly double our current estimates for Australasia (4669 procedures per 100 000 population).

Furthermore, we did an almost identical sensitivity analysis in the USA using the Nationwide Inpatient Sample and the GBD 2010 framework and found comparable inpatient rates of procedure for the broad GBD disease categories: 24% for communicable, maternal, and neonatal diseases (vs 16% in New Zealand), 34% for non-communicable diseases (vs 32% in New Zealand), and 35% for injuries (vs 30% in New Zealand). Despite the fact that national procedure output differs significantly between the two countries (29 399 per 100 000 in the USA; 6270 per 100 000 in New Zealand), the comparable scale of these rates of procedure validates the assumption that excess surgery was largely eliminated by our extensive exclusion criteria.

In conclusion, we report a large volume of surgical need, estimated at one procedure per 21 people alive today, with a global rate of surgery of 4664 per 100 000. Although the estimated need varies according to disease epidemiology, there is a remarkable consistency in our estimates across different countries and settings. This method could be useful in advocating for initial targets to meet procedure need. Future research should focus on
improving data quality and availability, validating rates of procedure in different settings, and incorporating measures of population health into policy-oriented frameworks for monitoring and evaluation of surgical capacity in underserved populations.
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