

1 Perioperative mortality in low-, middle-, and high-income countries: Protocol for a multi-level
2 meta-regression analysis

3 Kevin J. McIntyre^{1,2, #a, #b}, Yun-Hee Choi^{1, #a ¶}, Ava John-Baptiste^{1,2,3, #a, #b ¶}, Daniel J. Lizotte^{1,3, #a}
4 ¶, Eunice Y.S. Chan^{2,7, #c ¶}, Jessica Moodie^{2, #b ¶}, Saverio Stranges^{1,4,5,6 #a ¶&},
5 and Janet Martin^{1,2, #a, #b ¶&}

6
7 July 2023

8
9 ¹ Department of Epidemiology & Biostatistics, Western University, London, Ontario, Canada

10 ² Centre for Medical Evidence Decision Integrity Clinical Impact (MEDICI), Department of
11 Anesthesia & Perioperative Medicine, Western University, London, Ontario, Canada

12 ³ Interfaculty Program in Public Health, Western University, London, Ontario, Canada

13 ⁴ Department of Medicine, Western University, London, Ontario, Canada

14 ⁵ Department of Family Medicine, Western University, London, Ontario, Canada

15 ⁶ Department of Precision Medicine, Luxembourg Institute of Health, Strassen, Luxembourg

16 ⁷School of Medicine, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen, Guangdong, 518 172, P.
17 R. China

18 ^{#a}1465 Richmond St, London, Ontario, Canada: Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics,
19 Western University, London, Ontario, Canada

20 ^{#b}1465 Richmond St, London, Ontario, Canada: Medical Evidence Decision Integrity Clinical

21 Impact, Western University, London, Ontario, Canada

22 #c 518172, Longgang, Shenzhen, China; School of Medicine, The Chinese University of Hong

23 Kong, Shenzhen, China

24 *Corresponding author

25 E-mail: kmcint67@uwo.ca (KM)

26 ¶These authors contributed equally to this work.

27 &JM and SS are Joint Senior Authors.

28 Funding for this project was provided by Western University and the Government of Ontario.

29 The funders had no input regarding the design of the protocol nor will they have any input

30 regarding the conduct of the review or publication decisions.

31 Data will be made publicly available upon publication of the completed review as well as via

32 <https://github.com/Kevin-McIntyre/Kevin-McIntyre>

33 **Author contributions**

34 Kevin McIntyre provided conceptualization of the project, designed the methodology for the

35 study, will be conducting the statistical analyses for the project, will coordinate the

36 implementation of the systematic review, wrote the original draft for submission.

37 Yun-Hee Choi assisted with the statistical methodology of the project, including the design and

38 suggesting improvements to the initially planned statistical methods (using quasi-likelihood

39 methods and conceptualization of the three-tiered multilevel model), assisted in editing the draft,

40 and approved of the final submission.

41 Ava John-Baptiste provided assistance with the statistical methodology of the project, assisting
42 in the design and suggesting improvements to the initially planned statistical methods (using a
43 null Bayesian model with an uninformative beta prior), assisted in editing the draft, and approved
44 of the final submission.

45 Daniel J. Lizotte provided assistance with the statistical methodology of the project, assisting in
46 the design and suggesting improvements to the initially planned statistical methods
47 (conceptualization of the multilevel model, methods regarding the use of covariates in the
48 proposed analyses), assisted in editing the draft, and approved of the final submission.

49 Eunice Y.S. Chan provided assistance with statistical methodology of the project, and provided
50 resources to the project in the form of volunteer reviewers for level two screening and data
51 extraction. Finally, she assisted in editing the draft and approved the final submission.

52 Jessica Moodie developed the search strategy in partnership with Kevin McIntyre. Jessica also
53 ran the searches and will help coordinate reviewers for level two screening and data extraction.
54 She also assisted in editing the draft and approved the final submission.

55 Saverio Stranges assisted with conceptualization of the project. Dr Stranges also provided
56 supervision and resources to help fund the project as well as assisting in editing the draft and
57 approving the final submission.

58 Janet Martin assisted with the conceptualization and design of the methodology used in this
59 project, provided supervision and resources to fund the project. Dr Martin also assisted in editing
60 the draft and approved the final submission.

61

62

63 **Abstract**

64 **Background**

65 Surgery is an indispensable component of a functional healthcare system. To date there is limited
66 information regarding how many people die during the perioperative period globally. This study
67 describes a protocol for a systematic review and multilevel meta-regression to evaluate time
68 trends regarding the odds of perioperative mortality among adults undergoing a bellwether
69 surgical procedure while accounting for higher order clustering at the national level.

70 **Methods**

71 Published studies reporting the number of perioperative deaths from bellwether surgical
72 procedures among adults will be identified from MEDLINE, Embase, Cochrane CENTRAL,
73 LILACS and Global Index Medicus. The primary outcome will be the rate of perioperative
74 mortality across time and the secondary outcome will be investigating cause of death over time
75 as a proportion of overall perioperative mortality. Two reviewers will independently conduct full
76 text screening and extract the data. Disagreements will first be resolved via consensus. If
77 consensus cannot be reached a third reviewer will be included to arbitrate. Due to human
78 resource limitations, a risk of bias appraisal will not be conducted. From the included studies a
79 multilevel meta-regression will be constructed to synthesize the results. This model will
80 conceptualize patients as nested in studies which are in turn nested within countries while taking
81 into account potential confounding variables at all levels.

82 **Discussion**

83 The systematic review and multilevel meta-regression that will be conducted based on this
84 protocol will provide synthesized global evidence regarding the trends of perioperative mortality.
85 This eventual study may help policymakers and other key stakeholders with benchmarking
86 surgical safety initiatives as well as identify key gaps in our current understanding of global
87 perioperative mortality.

88 **Systematic review registration**

89 PROSPERO registration number 429040.

90

91 **Introduction**

92 Surgery is an indispensable component of a functional healthcare system. To date there is limited
93 information regarding how many people die during the perioperative period globally. Conditions
94 requiring surgical treatment are highly prevalent worldwide, and unmet need for surgery
95 accounts for approximately one-third of the global burden of disease (1–3). In 2010, an estimated
96 16.9 million people died due to conditions requiring surgical care(1).

97 Due to the widespread need for surgery globally there is also a concurrent need to capture and
98 analyze data regarding surgery and surgical systems at all levels, from local through to
99 international. In 2015 the *Lancet Commission on Global Surgery* proposed global surgery
100 indicators for assessing surgical system capacity to provide timely and safe surgical, anaesthesia
101 and obstetric care(1), and these were updated by the Utstein Consensus in 2019 to include:
102 access, workforce, volume, perioperative mortality, and financial risk protection.(4). Of these 5
103 global surgery indicators, perioperative mortality rate (POMR) stands alone as the sole indicator
104 measuring clinical outcomes of surgical practice. POMR is defined as “deaths from all causes,
105 before discharge (up to 30 days), in all patients who have received any anaesthesia for a
106 procedure done in an operating theatre, divided by the total number of procedures, per year,
107 expressed as a percentage”(4). While it is hypothesized that surgery is becoming safer, and there
108 has been some data to indicate that this is the case (5), to date there remains significant
109 uncertainty regarding the actual trends in perioperative mortality especially with regards to the
110 possible differences between high-income countries (HICs) and low-, and middle-income
111 countries (LMICs). Previous work has found estimates generally ranging in the low percentages
112 (5–12) but due to the volume of surgery provided, an estimated 313 million procedures annually
113 (1), the difference in these previous estimates translates to differences in potentially hundreds of
114 thousands or even millions of deaths ever year in absolute numbers.

115 This analysis will examine unadjusted POMR values and time trends in perioperative mortality
116 through a systematic review followed by multilevel meta-regression to estimate the odds of
117 perioperative mortality over time in adult patients undergoing bellwether surgical procedures
118 while accounting for the nested structure of the data across low-, middle- and high-income

119 settings. Secondary objectives will be to assess cause specific mortalities, as a proportion of the
120 overall POMR and their individual trends across time.

121 **Materials and methods**

122 This protocol is registered with PROSPERO, registration number 429040. This protocol follows
123 the PRISMA-P guide.

124

125 **Eligibility criteria**

126 All studies, from any country, investigating adults undergoing a bellwether surgical procedure,
127 reporting the number of deaths among participants published since 2014 will be eligible for
128 inclusion. Additionally, in order to maximize efficiency, this review will include the results from
129 Ng-Kamstra et al's (2018) systematic review investigating POMR in LMICs (13) which meet
130 our inclusion criteria. This will be to ensure that there is sufficient data to construct models over
131 time in LMICs given the scarcity of published research in these settings. Studies in any language
132 are eligible for inclusion, but searches will be performed only in English.

133 Further details on inclusion criteria are provided below:

134 Types of studies and research designs

135 Only primary studies will be eligible for inclusion. In this context the term "primary study" is
136 defined as follows: Studies that report on data gathered from individual participants, whether this
137 data is provided at the individual level or aggregated to the study level.

138 These studies can use either experimental designs, quasi-experimental designs (e.g. difference-
139 in-differences, or interrupted time series) or observational designs that allow for incidence data
140 to be captured (e.g. cohort study designs) with no restrictions on whether they are prospective or
141 retrospective in nature.

142 Case studies, case-control designs, review articles, opinion articles or other articles otherwise not
143 reporting their own patient data, or which are unable to determine the incidence of perioperative
144 mortality will be excluded.

145 Articles will be assessed on which surgical procedures were performed. If an article has <5%
146 ineligible procedures (e.g. non-bellwether procedures or concomitant surgery), the article will be
147 included as the potential risk of bias by excluding the article is deemed to be higher risk than the
148 potential biasing effect of including it.

149 Studies arising from HICs (as defined by a Human Development Index value of ≥ 0.700 (14) at
150 the median year of data collection) must have at least 200 patients included in the study to
151 increase the probability that at least one death may be recorded in the study. This requirement
152 will be waived for LMICs due to the anticipated sparsity of data.

153 Overlapping studies will be excluded. To prevent overlapping datasets, studies reporting on
154 potentially overlapping patient populations will be identified, and the most complete data will be
155 included only once. Studies reporting from the same centre or location, but with non-overlapping
156 timeframes or procedures (e.g. repeated reports on POMR from the same centre, but covering
157 different years and/or procedures) will be included and assigned to their analogous year of data
158 collection.

159 **Target participant characteristics**

160 This study is focused on adult participants undergoing bellwether surgical procedures. For the
161 purposes of this review, adults will be defined as ≥ 18 years old. Thus, this systematic review will
162 look to include primary studies that meet the following criteria:

- 163 • Articles where at least 50% of the participants are ≥ 18 years old, i.e. where the median
164 age is 18 years or older or studies where adult data are reported separately from pediatric
165 patients.
- 166 • If the median age cannot be determined, then the mean age will be used instead using the
167 same criteria i.e. mean age of the sample must be ≥ 18 years old to be eligible for
168 inclusion.
- 169 • In cases where neither the median nor the mean age of the sample is reported, the authors
170 will determine if the range or distribution of age categories dictate that the median/mean
171 of the sample must mathematically be ≥ 18 (e.g. the median age category is ≥ 18 or
172 making the most extreme assumptions regarding the information provided, e.g. assuming
173 all patients in the age category <65 are 0 years old, the mean still would be ≥ 18). If none

174 of these approaches can determine that the study sample was drawn from adults, then the
175 article will be excluded.

- 176 • The article must investigate a “bellwether” procedure. These procedures are defined by
177 the *Lancet Commission on Global Surgery* as Caesarean Section, Laparotomy and
178 Treatment of an Open Fracture (1) and given further specificity by Hanna et al.(15).
- 179 • Since the objective is to quantify POMR for all patients undergoing each bellwether
180 procedure (i.e. all-comers, mixed risk), studies focused *only* on selected high-risk groups
181 undergoing surgery will not be included in the primary analysis if the complete mixed
182 population data is not provided (e.g. studies focused solely on elderly patients, patients
183 with high baseline risk, undergoing reoperation, frail, malnourished or anemic patients).
- 184 • The article must provide the number of patients who died in the perioperative period, up
185 to 90 days or “in-hospital” deaths will be considered perioperative with regards to
186 whether the article is eligible for inclusion.

187

188 **Information sources**

189 MEDLINE, Embase, Cochrane CENTRAL, LILACS and Global Index Medicus databases will
190 be searched for articles related to bellwether surgeries and mortality.

191 **Search strategy**

192 The search strategy was constructed by a medical librarian (Jessica Moodie) with systematic
193 searching expertise, and the overall strategy will emulate that provided by Ng-Kamstra et al.
194 (13).The search terms will include terms for all bellwether procedures according to the list of
195 procedures provided by Hanna et al., 2020(15). The search period will be from January 1, 2014 –
196 present using MEDLINE, Embase, Cochrane CENTRAL, LILACs and Global Index Medicus
197 (an initial search was conducted on September 1-2, 2021 and led to 32,728 references found and
198 uploaded into DistillerSR after an initial deduplication screen). This timeframe will be
199 supplemented by Ng-Kamstra’s 2018 meta-analysis investigating POMR in LMICs (2009-
200 2014)(13). This will provide more information for LMICs which are anticipated to have larger
201 gaps in the evidence. In the case that there are not enough studies in the HICs cluster, the search
202 will be expanded back to 2009 in line with Ng-Kamstra’s work. The studies identified by the

203 search will then be screened sequentially through title/abstract and full-text phases to ensure that
204 they meet the inclusion criteria. The full search strategy can be found in supplemental file S1.

205

206 **Screening procedure**

207 All primary articles identified by the search strategy will be compiled first in the reference
208 management software DistillerSR (16) for title and abstract screening, and then transferred to
209 COVIDENCE(17) review management software for full text screening before being transferred
210 to REDCap for data extraction and database creation.

211 Studies excluded from the review will still be maintained in a separate file for record keeping
212 and transparency purposes. Excluded studies will be documented in a PRISMA flow chart. The
213 title and abstract screening stage will be conducted by a single author, and the full text review
214 will be conducted by two independent reviewers, with conflicts being resolved by consensus. In
215 the case that consensus cannot be reached, a third reviewer will be included to arbitrate.

216 Title/abstract screening will be conducted by a single reviewer in the DistillerSR review
217 management software. This software uses artificial intelligence to reorganize the references to be
218 screened so that those most likely to be included in the review are consistently brought to the
219 front for review. With this software we will screen articles until we have included at least 90% of
220 predicted relevant references or reached an inclusion rate <5%, as measured through the
221 DistillerSR software. This inclusion rate is calculated by dividing the number of included
222 references by the total number of references in the four most recent blocks of 200 studies.

223 Once either 90% of predicted relevant references have been found or the inclusion rate reaches
224 <5%, an automated search will be conducted through the remaining studies. At this point all
225 references meeting the inclusion criteria after title/abstract screening will be transferred to the
226 COVIDENCE platform for full text screening. Two reviewers will independently review each
227 reference and then independently extract the data from every reference included in the review.
228 Articles that are excluded by reviewers for different reasons will be assessed via a hierarchy of
229 reasons (see appendix for hierarchy).

230 A final phase will specifically apply to studies utilizing national, or population level, database
231 data as well as studies utilizing data from multiple countries. Articles which used population-
232 based data will be tagged at the full text screening phase and will be compared against each other
233 after data extraction. These references will be compared based on procedures conducted, years of
234 data collected and country the procedures were performed in. Finally, only those studies which
235 maximize the number of patients while minimizing the number of likely duplicate patients will
236 be included for analysis. The purpose of this is to ensure that patients are not counted more than
237 once for the same procedure during the meta-analysis as this will inappropriately reduce the
238 variance estimates of the models and may bias the point estimates. Articles using data from
239 multiple countries will be identified, and the authors of these studies contacted. We will attempt
240 to gather country-specific data from these studies so that HDI status can be accurately assigned
241 to the participants undergoing surgery and those who experienced perioperative mortality. If this
242 data cannot be collected via contacting the authors, then the study will be excluded. All
243 references not included due to these procedures will be provided in the supplemental files to
244 ensure transparency, reproducibility and allow for independent sensitivity analyses.

245 **Data extraction**

246 Included studies will have their data extracted and compiled to create a database on POMR and
247 cause-specific POMR. This data extraction will be conducted using a standardized data
248 extraction form that will be created in the REDCap data collection software and piloted using the
249 development mode before use for actual extraction. The data collection instrument will be
250 created as a repeat instrument in the software allowing for each reviewer to extract the data
251 independently and then a final harmonized version to be exported for data analysis.

252 Data to be extracted consists of an electronic link to the study, title of the article, last name of
253 first author, year of publication, start and end date of data collection, type of study design,
254 whether the data was collected prospectively or retrospectively, name of institutions contributing
255 data, country where the surgeries took place, HDI value of the country at the median year the
256 study collected data (or closest available year), type of surgery, sample size, number of
257 perioperative deaths, proportion of elective surgeries, proportion of patients of each sex, average
258 American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA) physical score (if available – median if not),
259 proportion of COVID-in infected patients, level of hospital (if possible), follow-up length,

260 whether the institution was located in an urban or rural setting, whether the study was solely
261 investigating cancers, and specific causes of death. From these variables, derived variables such
262 as median year of data collection and POMR can be calculated.

263 The proposed data extraction collection form can be found here: (link to supplementary
264 appendix).

265 **Risk of bias assessment**

266 Due to the large scope of the project and the lack of tools to evaluate the types of study designs
267 included in this meta-analysis, risk of bias assessment will not be formally done. However,
268 limitations in the studies will be noted generally, including selection bias, performance bias,
269 attrition bias, and included in the discussion. As such the strength of the body of evidence will be
270 assumed to be weak in place of conducting a formal assessment of the strength of the evidence
271 (e.g. GRADE).

272 **Data synthesis**

273 The primary purpose of this study is to examine time trends in perioperative mortality, both
274 overall and stratified by bellwether type, using existing research to construct a systematic review
275 and multilevel meta-regressions allowing for the estimation of how the odds (along with
276 95% CIs) of perioperative mortality are changing over the course of time while accounting for the
277 hierarchical structure of the data. This will be done alongside determining POMR at different
278 time-points. To calculate these POMRs studies will be aggregated within each corresponding
279 decade (data permitting) and unadjusted POMR will be calculated by summing the number of
280 deaths that occurred and dividing this value by the summed number of procedures conducted.
281 The secondary objective is to assess cause specific mortality time trends as a proportion of
282 overall POMR to discover which causes of death may be driving perioperative mortality more
283 broadly.

284 A typical meta-analysis is a specialized case of a two-tiered multilevel model where participants
285 are nested within studies to account for heterogeneity both within and between the studies(18–
286 25). This proposed study will extend a random effects model by additionally accounting for
287 heterogeneity at the country level, adding a third level into this multilevel framework. This

288 proposed framework will model participants as nested within studies which are in turn nested
289 within countries. These specifics can be applied to the general framework as visualized by Harrer
290 et al. in Chapter 10 of their book, *Doing Meta-Analysis in R: A Hands-on Guide* (20). An
291 additional advantage of using a multilevel modeling technique for this analysis is that it
292 inherently accounts for the expected interaction between year of surgery and HDI. This
293 interaction is theoretically plausible and could be an important aspect of trends in global POMR.
294 Hezam (2020)(26) conducted two systematic reviews and meta-analyses using multiple bivariate
295 meta-regressions to show that patterns of perioperative maternal mortality ratios across both HDI
296 and year. However, no model was created that accounted for both these factors simultaneously,
297 nor any potential interaction between them. Thus, by utilizing the proposed methods in this
298 protocol this study plans to account for this possibility.

299 Under this conceptualization of meta-analysis as a multilevel model and the potential extension
300 via addition of higher levels of clustering, many of the existing features of meta-analysis take on
301 a new interpretation. Here, studies are regarded as clusters sampled from the underlying patient
302 population which themselves are clustered within the nations that they are drawn from. As such,
303 traditional measures used to explore the consistency of data in meta-analysis such as I^2 , or
304 Kendall's tau become difficult to interpret because these metrics become ways of assessing
305 variance in level two of the model. Thus, provided there are enough primary articles included in
306 the review to meet the typical assumptions necessary for multilevel regression analysis (e.g.
307 large enough sample size, and enough clusters), quantitative synthesis will be conducted which
308 will include variance estimates at every level of the model. In the unlikely event that these
309 assumptions are not met, then a qualitative analysis will be conducted in addition to an Evidence
310 Gap Map (EGM). This analysis will report narratively on themes to provide policymakers and
311 future researchers information on time trends in overall POMR and cause-specific POMR among
312 adults undergoing bellwether surgical procedures in low-, middle-, and high-income countries.

313 Another advantage of using a generalized linear mixed model (GLMM) based approaches is that
314 they can effectively handle studies that provide proportions which include zero, rather than
315 having to rely on the use of continuity corrections (18,19,27). Since POMR is a rare event, and
316 the risk is not evenly distributed among surgeries, there is a high likelihood that several studies
317 will include no perioperative mortalities, and can be incorporated by using this type of model.

318 Additionally, extending the model to include covariates is straightforward in the GLMM space.
319 This is another advantage for this study to help reduce confounding and account for unexplained
320 variation between studies (24). In addition to investigating the effects of HDI and time, on
321 POMR other variables that are proposed to be important confounders of this relationship can also
322 be included in the GLMM. These covariates will include median or average age of the
323 participants in each study, proportion of elective surgeries in each study, mean or median ASA
324 score of each study, proportion of female sex in each study, proportion of COVID positive
325 patients in each study, hospital level (primary, secondary, tertiary or quaternary) and whether the
326 facility was located in an urban or rural setting. Several models will be analyzed including an
327 overall model, as well as models stratified by bellwether procedure. All models will investigate
328 whether a time increase is increasing or decreasing the odds of perioperative mortality in studies
329 as assessed by the odds ratio with corresponding 95% confidence intervals. Since time will be
330 modeled as a continuous variable, a significant trend will be determined if the confidence
331 intervals for the beta coefficient related to the time variable does not encompass the null value of
332 one while accounting for other variables that could confound the results as mentioned above. All
333 analyses will be conducted using the R statistical analysis software.

334 The primary articles will also be used to populate an Evidence Gap Map (EGM), to provide a
335 visual guide to the degree that this data exists and in what countries.

336 **Secondary objectives and analyses**

337 The secondary objective is to investigate cause-specific mortality in order to inform drivers of
338 POMR. Data on causes will first be presented as overall proportions aggregated by type of
339 surgery, time and HDI category wherever possible. Sankey diagrams will be used to better
340 visualize changes over time in these proportions to provide a clearer picture of the impact of the
341 causes on perioperative mortality.

342 **Outcomes**

343 The primary outcome to be extracted from the articles is the number of perioperative deaths
344 reported. POMR will then be calculated by dividing this number by the number of procedures
345 performed in the study.

346 The secondary outcome involves investigating causes of death. To extract this data, a text field
347 will first be utilized to capture the reported causes. Depending on the quality of the data
348 available, causes may have to be aggregated into broader categories. This is due to the lack of
349 uptake of a standardized cause of death classification system and the likely issue of fewer studies
350 reporting this specific information.

351 **Planned additional subgroup and sensitivity analyses**

352 Due to the scope of this proposed project and the foreseeable difficulties in accounting for many
353 aspects that may have an impact on the results of the analyses, several additional analyses,
354 sensitivity analyses and subgroup analyses will be conducted.

355 **Additional analyses**

- 356 - Assessment of potential publication bias across studies using funnel plots and Egger's
357 test.

358 **Subgroup analyses**

- 359 - Analyses stratified by bellwether procedure type (i.e. laparotomy specific, cesarean
360 section specific and open fracture specific models will be constructed).
- 361 - A subgroup analysis for observational designs and RCTs.

362 **Sensitivity analyses**

- 363 - A sensitivity analysis removing studies from LMICs that did not meet the 200-person
364 sample size restriction will be conducted to assess if this differential inclusion restriction
365 affected the results.
- 366 - A sensitivity analysis to assess whether assumptions regarding missing data of baseline
367 covariates affected POMR estimates (e.g. multiple imputation versus complete case
368 analysis).
- 369 - To assess the effect of the GLMM model, sensitivity analyses will be conducted using a
370 second method to handle data presenting extreme values. These analyses will be identical
371 to the initial model only instead of using the GLMM method directly on the data
372 extracted from the individual studies, the data will first be analyzed using an empty

373 Bayesian model with a non-informative conjugate prior, and a second model will use the
374 results of Bainbridge et al's meta-analysis as prior values. This will transform the values
375 of the original data slightly, serving as a type of principled continuity correction as it will
376 transform proportions of 0% to proportions approaching this null value. The results from
377 these analyses will then be used to perform the GLMM. The estimated odds of
378 perioperative mortality using this technique will then be assessed against the initial
379 analyses to investigate whether the results are sensitive to the model used.

- 380 - Due to the potential prognosis differences, and the heterogeneity of various cancers in
381 both surgical methods and mortality risks, an analysis excluding studies investigating
382 cancers will be conducted.
- 383 - A subgroup analysis assessing the impact of various follow-up times cut-offs for the
384 definition of POMR (e.g. in-hospital, 30-day, 60-day, 90-day).

385 **Discussion**

386 Surgery is an indispensable aspect of any functional healthcare system. Among the proposed
387 metrics to capture data regarding the progress of establishing universal access to safe and
388 affordable surgery POMR stands alone as the sole measure of patient safety. As such it is
389 important for health systems to understand both the current rate of perioperative mortality as well
390 as where such a rate fits into the broader historical trends.

391 In addition to the importance of determining the trends of perioperative mortality globally, an
392 important methodological strength of this proposed systematic review and multilevel meta-
393 regression analyses is that it will provide better estimates regarding the variance surrounding the
394 individual country-level estimates as to the trend regarding perioperative mortality. Accurately
395 capturing the uncertainty surrounding the estimates provided is an important development
396 especially when considering the higher order clustering that can occur due to country level
397 factors such as national policies.

398 While this protocol has many strengths there are several limitations that must also be mentioned.
399 Notably, abdominal aortic aneurysm repair, esophagectomy, percutaneous procedures and
400 endovascular procedures will not be considered bellwether procedures for the purposes of this
401 review. This is because abdominal aortic aneurysm repair is traditionally considered a vascular

402 procedure rather than a general surgery; esophagectomy can include thoracic involvement; and
403 percutaneous and endovascular procedures are typically not considered surgery as they are often
404 conducted in a procedure room rather than an operating room. Additionally, studies conducted in
405 military hospital settings will be excluded since they may not represent either the patient
406 population of the nation where they are conducted in nor the patient population of the nationality
407 of the military itself.

408 Since we have insufficient resources to capture unpublished and grey literature, this may increase
409 the possibility of publication bias. Furthermore, with the limited human resources and lack of
410 validated instruments for bias assessment of this type of study design,, we have deprioritized risk
411 of bias assessment, and the quality of evidence may be regarded as at a high risk of bias.
412 However, this analysis is intended as a first attempt to provide large scale estimates regarding
413 POMR and should not be viewed as definitive. Instead, it should be viewed as a starting point
414 from which future work can be benchmarked.

415 By investigating the published literature and providing a synthesized estimate of surgical
416 mortality, as well as the existing trends regarding its incidence, this project may help provide the
417 baseline for making surgery safer. Additionally, the data resulting from the eventual meta-
418 analysis may be useful as a benchmark from which future system-level quality initiatives could
419 use as a baseline in assessing future surgical performance.

420 **Registration**

421 PROSPERO registration number 429040.

422 **Amendments**

423 Any amendments to this protocol will be documented transparently and openly via PROSPERO.

424 **Support**

425 Funding for this project was provided by Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry, and the
426 Ontario provincial government. Funders had no role in the development of this protocol and will
427 have no role in any aspect of conducting the project, analyzing the data or decisions regarding
428 publication.

429

430 **References**

- 431 1. Meara JG, Leather AJM, Hagander L, Alkire BC, Alonso N, Ameh EA, et al. Global
432 Surgery 2030: evidence and solutions for achieving health, welfare, and economic development.
433 2015;386:56.
- 434 2. Shrime MG, Bickler SW, Alkire BC, Mock C. Global burden of surgical disease: an
435 estimation from the provider perspective. *The Lancet Global Health*. 2015 Apr;3:S8–9.
- 436 3. Mock CN, Donkor P, Gawande A, Jamison DT, Kruk ME, Debas HT. Essential surgery:
437 key messages from Disease Control Priorities, 3rd edition. *The Lancet*. 2015
438 May;385(9983):2209–19.
- 439 4. Davies JI, Gelb AW, Gore-Booth J, Martin J, Mellin-Olsen J, Åkerman C, et al. Global
440 surgery, obstetric, and anaesthesia indicator definitions and reporting: An Utstein consensus
441 report. *PLoS Med*. 2021 Aug 20;18(8):e1003749.
- 442 5. Bainbridge D, Martin J, Arango M, Cheng D. Perioperative and anaesthetic-related
443 mortality in developed and developing countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The*
444 *Lancet*. 2012 Sep;380(9847):1075–81.
- 445 6. Watters DA, Hollands MJ, Gruen RL, Maoate K, Perndt H, McDougall RJ, et al.
446 Perioperative Mortality Rate (POMR): A Global Indicator of Access to Safe Surgery and
447 Anaesthesia. *World J Surg*. 2015 Apr;39(4):856–64.
- 448 7. Nepogodiev D, Martin J, Biccard B, Makupe A, Bhangu A, Nepogodiev D, et al. Global
449 burden of postoperative death. *The Lancet*. 2019 Feb;393(10170):401.
- 450 8. Biccard BM, Madiba TE, Kluyts HL, Munlemvo DM, Madzimbamuto FD, Basenero A,
451 et al. Perioperative patient outcomes in the African Surgical Outcomes Study: a 7-day
452 prospective observational cohort study. *The Lancet*. 2018 Apr;391(10130):1589–98.
- 453 9. Global patient outcomes after elective surgery: prospective cohort study in 27 low-,
454 middle- and high-income countries. *British Journal of Anaesthesia*. 2016 Nov;117(5):601–9.
- 455 10. Ghaferi AA, Dimick JB, Birkmeyer JD. Variation in Hospital Mortality Associated with
456 Inpatient Surgery. *n engl j med*. 2009;8.
- 457 11. Weiser TG, Gawande A. Excess Surgical Mortality: Strategies for Improving Quality of
458 Care. In: Debas HT, Donkor P, Gawande A, Jamison DT, Kruk ME, Mock CN, editors. *Essential*
459 *Surgery: Disease Control Priorities, Third Edition (Volume 1)* [Internet]. Washington (DC): The
460 International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank; 2015 [cited 2021
461 Apr 29]. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK333498/>

- 462 12. Watters DA, Babidge WJ, Kiermeier A, McCulloch GAJ, Maddern GJ. Perioperative
463 Mortality Rates in Australian Public Hospitals: The Influence of Age, Gender and Urgency.
464 *World J Surg.* 2016 Nov;40(11):2591–7.
- 465 13. Ng-Kamstra JS, Arya S, Greenberg SLM, Kotagal M, Arsenault C, Ljungman D, et al.
466 Perioperative mortality rates in low-income and middle-income countries: a systematic review
467 and meta-analysis. *BMJ Glob Health.* 2018 Jun;3(3):e000810.
- 468 14. World Bank Country and Lending Groups – World Bank Data Help Desk [Internet].
469 [cited 2022 May 25]. Available from:
470 [https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-](https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups)
471 [lending-groups](https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups)
- 472 15. Hanna JS, Herrera-Almario GE, Pinilla-Roncancio M, Tulloch D, Valencia SA, Sabatino
473 ME, et al. Use of the six core surgical indicators from the Lancet Commission on Global Surgery
474 in Colombia: a situational analysis. *The Lancet Global Health.* 2020 May;8(5):e699–710.
- 475 16. DistillerSR | Systematic Review and Literature Review Software [Internet]. [cited 2021
476 Oct 22]. Available from: [https://www.evidencepartners.com/products/distillersr-systematic-](https://www.evidencepartners.com/products/distillersr-systematic-review-software)
477 [review-software](https://www.evidencepartners.com/products/distillersr-systematic-review-software)
- 478 17. Covidence [Internet]. [cited 2021 Apr 29]. Covidence - Better systematic review
479 management. Available from: <https://www.covidence.org/>
- 480 18. Lin L, Xu C. Arcsine-based transformations for meta-analysis of proportions: Pros, cons,
481 and alternatives. *Health Sci Rep* [Internet]. 2020 Sep [cited 2023 Mar 21];3(3). Available from:
482 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/hsr2.178>
- 483 19. Lin L, Chu H. Meta-analysis of Proportions Using Generalized Linear Mixed Models.
484 *Epidemiology.* 2020 Sep;31(5):713–7.
- 485 20. Harrer M, Cuijpers P, Furukawa TA, Ebert DD. *Doing Meta-Analysis With R: A Hands-*
486 *On Guide* [Internet]. 1st ed. Boca Raton, FL and London: Chapman & Hall/CRC Press; 2021.
487 Available from: [https://www.routledge.com/Doing-Meta-Analysis-with-R-A-Hands-On-](https://www.routledge.com/Doing-Meta-Analysis-with-R-A-Hands-On-Guide/Harrer-Cuijpers-Furukawa-Ebert/p/book/9780367610074)
488 [Guide/Harrer-Cuijpers-Furukawa-Ebert/p/book/9780367610074](https://www.routledge.com/Doing-Meta-Analysis-with-R-A-Hands-On-Guide/Harrer-Cuijpers-Furukawa-Ebert/p/book/9780367610074)
- 489 21. Stijnen T, Hamza TH, Özdemir P. Random effects meta-analysis of event outcome in the
490 framework of the generalized linear mixed model with applications in sparse data. *Statist Med.*
491 2010 Dec 20;29(29):3046–67.
- 492 22. Turner RM, Omar RZ, Yang M, Goldstein H, Thompson SG. A multilevel model
493 framework for meta-analysis of clinical trials with binary outcomes. 2000;16.
- 494 23. Jackson D, Law M, Stijnen T, Viechtbauer W, White IR. A comparison of seven random-
495 effects models for meta-analyses that estimate the summary odds ratio. *Statistics in Medicine.*
496 2018 Mar 30;37(7):1059–85.
- 497 24. Platt RW, Leroux BG, Breslow N. Generalized linear mixed models for meta-analysis.
498 *Statist Med.* 1999;18:643–54.

- 499 25. Bakbergenuly I, Kulinskaya E. Meta-analysis of binary outcomes via generalized linear
500 mixed models: a simulation study. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2018 Dec;18(1):70.
- 501 26. Hezam AA. Maternal and Neonatal Mortality Associated With Caesarean Section.
502 Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository. :325.
- 503 27. J. Sweeting M, J. Sutton A, C. Lambert P. What to add to nothing? Use and avoidance of
504 continuity corrections in meta-analysis of sparse data. *Statist Med*. 2004 May 15;23(9):1351–75.

505

506 **Supporting information**

- 507 S1 File. S1_File.docx. Supplemental File 1 - Search Strategy
- 508 S2 File. S2_File.docx. Supplemental File 2 – Screening Protocol
- 509 S3 File. S3_File.docx. Supplemental File 3 - Exclusion Criteria Hierarchy
- 510 S4 File. S4_File.pdf. Supplemental File 4 – Data Extraction Form
- 511 S5 File. S5_File.docx. Supplemental File 5 - PRISMA-P 2015 checklist

512