

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

Approach in Inputs & Outputs Selection of Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) Efficiency Measurement in Hospital: A Systematic Review

M Zulfakhar Zubir^{1,3}, A Azimatun Noor^{3,*}, AM Mohd Rizal³, A Aziz Harith³, M Ihsannuddin Abas⁵, Zuriyati Zakaria¹, Anwar Fazal A.Bakar²

¹ Medical Development Division, Ministry of Health Malaysia, Putrajaya, Malaysia
² Medical Practice Division, Ministry of Health Malaysia, Putrajaya, Malaysia
³ Department of Public Health Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
⁴ Occupational and Aviation Medicine Department, University of Otago Wellington, New Zealand
⁵ Department of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin, Terengganu, Malaysia

* Corresponding author: azimatunnoor@ppukm.ukm.edu.my

13th October 2023

Abstract

Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) has been employed as a performance evaluation tool in the evaluation of efficiency and productivity in numerous fields. This includes hospitals in particular as well as the broad healthcare industry. This review examines 89 papers that discuss the use of DEA in hospitals, paying particular attention to approaches for choosing inputs and outputs as well as the most recent developments in DEA studies. English articles with empirical data from year 2014-2022 (Web of Science, Scopus, PubMed, ScienceDirect, Springer Link, and Google Scholar) were extracted based on PRISMA methodology. DEA Model parameters were specified based on previous studies and approaches were identified narratively. The approaches can be grouped into four: (1) Literature review, (2) Data availability, (3) Systematic method and (4) Expert judgement. The approaches were applied as

30 one strategy either by itself or in combination with others. This review's emphasis on approaches used
31 in hospital may constrain its conclusions. There might be another strategy or method used to select the
32 input and output for a DEA study in a different area or strategies based on different viewpoints. The
33 trend for DEA application were quite similar to previous studies. There is no evidence that one model
34 fits all DEA model parameters better than another. Based on the reviewed literature, we offer some
35 recommendations and methodological principles for DEA studies.

36

37 Keywords: Data Envelopment Analysis, Hospital, Efficiency, Inputs, Output.

38

39

40 **Introduction**

41

42 Efficiency is a term that does not need to be introduced in the world of economics. Following the
43 seminal works of Farrell in 1957, which showed the measurement of efficiency as one that accounts for
44 all inputs and outputs while avoiding index number issues and demonstrating how it may be calculated
45 in practice. Indeed, the studies of efficiency gained much interest not only from statisticians and
46 economists but a wider range audience [1]. These include those in the healthcare and medicine areas.
47 There is no consensus on the best method to measure efficiency. Measurement techniques such as Data
48 Envelopment Analysis (DEA), Stochastic Frontier Analysis (SFA), Pabon Lasso, and Ratio Analysis
49 are among the various methodologies used for efficiency studies in health facilities [2–4]. In the Global
50 Programme on Evidence for Health Policy Discussion Paper Series by World Health Organization
51 (WHO) unveiled their own method for evaluating the effectiveness of healthcare systems. They
52 explicitly specified the broad set of goals of the health system, including responsiveness (both level and
53 distribution), fair finance, and health inequality, in addition to the more conventional goal of population
54 health, in contrast to past work in this field [5]. While in another report, the WHO measures the health

55 system's performance by introducing a measure of national health systems' success in attempting to
56 meet three broad goals: good health, responsiveness to the population's expectations, and fairness of
57 financial contribution [6]. Even with that, there is controversy and critique on the method used while
58 there is an agreement on making those assessments correctly focus, analyse more critically, more
59 positively, and aid in a crucial conversation between health systems stakeholders [7–9]. In a more recent
60 years, DEA has been used to measure the efficiency of 180 countries based on six key dimensions of
61 healthcare systems namely clinical outcomes, health adjusted life years, access, equity, safety, and
62 resources [10].

63 Thus, the stakeholders must understand there cannot be efficiency metrics that are universally
64 applicable and appropriate for all healthcare systems. It is vital to have a thorough grasp of the
65 institutional arrangements, data, and measurements in order to choose suitable measures, resources, and
66 other parts of the health system, and a framework is designed. in keeping with the analysis. It should be
67 noted that the optimal method to apply performance measurement is not to determine the one simple
68 adjustment that can be made in a supporting role to enhance one of the health system outcomes, but to
69 employ it as a means of gauging performance more broadly among the various system components
70 [11,12].

71 Numerous indicators, ranging from measures that compare activities to measures that compare
72 expenses, are available to determine if limited resources for health are being used most effectively. The
73 use of quantitative metrics in evaluating hospital performance is primarily of interest. Additionally, a
74 wide variety of indicators were utilized to assess the quality of hospital services [13,14]. Efficiency
75 comparisons can be transparently compared using techniques based on strong economic theory. Two of
76 the most popular techniques for calculating the effectiveness of health care are data envelopment
77 analysis (DEA) and stochastic frontier analysis (SFA) [11]. Over the past 40 years since the earliest
78 study by Nunamaker in 1983, these techniques have been applied extensively in published applications
79 in healthcare settings [15–19]. Especially DEA despite the known theoretical and methodological
80 limitations had gained interest from researchers to address these limitations and development of

81 multiple methods which integrate DEA with other statistical techniques and methodologies to improve
82 efficiency evaluation [20,21].

83

84

85 **1.1 DEA as an efficiency analysis tool in hospital**

86

87 DEA is a mathematical technique for assessing the relative efficiency of homogenous decision-making
88 units (DMUs) with many inputs and numerous outputs. It was originally created within the operations
89 research and econometrics disciplines. The disadvantage of DEA is that it is non-parametric and
90 deterministic, which indicates that outliers are more noticeable. The effectiveness of a DMU is then
91 evaluated in comparison to the effectiveness of every other member of the group: The most effective
92 DMUs are those at the efficiency frontier, which have maximum outputs produced by using the same
93 level of inputs as all other DMUs [17,22]. In the DEA literature, this is a well-known CCR model
94 (Charnes, Cooper, and Rhodes) or Constant Return to Scale (CRS) assumption as the input-output
95 correlation can be examined even in the absence of congestion effects of any kind. In other words, the
96 output may increase in a precise linear relationship with the inputs [10,23]. This model and assumption
97 were further extended by Banker with the BCC model (Banker, Charnes, and Cooper) and variable
98 returns to scale (VRS) assumption which assumes that economies' scales shift as the DMU's size grows
99 [23,24].

100 Aside from the model type and return to scale assumption, DEA also considers the model orientation
101 either input-oriented or output-oriented. The assumption behind input orientation is that a DMU can
102 control more inputs than outputs. The opposite argument, however, might be made: that given their
103 ability for inputs to raise their organization's efficiency, the organizations can increase their outputs
104 [23,25]. When calculating a DMU's or an organization's efficiency using DEA, it's critical to note the
105 inputs and outputs. The selection and combination of both must be precise, thorough, pertinent, and
106 appropriate in order to accurately depict the hospital's functions and satisfy the needs of stakeholders

107 who are evaluating the hospital's efficiency [18,21]. In addition to this, advanced analysis had been
108 incorporated in DEA which includes further models of CCR and BCC, longitudinal or window analysis
109 including The Malmquist index, statistical analysis such as regression and bootstrapping method
110 [20,23,25–27].

111

112

113 **1.2 Input and output selection in hospital DEA application**

114

115 Numerous studies have been published to demonstrate the usefulness and potential of DEA in
116 evaluating hospital efficiency[28–31]. Although creating hypotheses by comparing DEA ratings across
117 several hospital studies is helpful, there are significant drawbacks.

- 118 • varying input and output metrics throughout various time frames
- 119 • the DEA score distribution is so skewed that relying on the standard measures of central
120 tendency will be inaccurate
- 121 • the study's output metrics diverge greatly from one another
- 122 • hospital production models and types that differ greatly

123 However, there have been creative and innovative studies conducted at the hospital level that may be
124 helpful to decision-makers [23,32]. The methodology of DEA has been the subject of dozens of review
125 studies on hospital application. General applications of DEA to health care performance
126 measurement[15,16,18], categorization or clustering of DEA technique [20,33], comparing DEA
127 analysis between other methods, between countries or between two periods [28,30,34,35], or new
128 knowledge and new approach on the assessment of DEA [17,21].

129 A systematic literature review (SLR) uses organized, transparent, and replicable techniques at each
130 stage of the process to completely discover and synthesize literature that is relevant to a certain subject.
131 It adheres to a protocol (detailed plan) that predetermines its main goals, ideas, and techniques.

132 Decisions and actions are meticulously recorded so that readers can follow them and assess the
133 reviewer's methodology [36]. Despite the large number of studies on the use of DEA in hospitals, efforts
134 to comprehensively examine these studies are still missing and warrant more investigation. This article
135 identifies and describes DEA research in hospitals in an effort to close the knowledge gap.

136 What is the approach to choose the optimal input and output for measuring DEA efficiency is the major
137 research topic that served as the foundation for the current article's systematic literature review? This
138 study's primary emphasis is on the approach or way of selecting the input and output adopted by
139 researchers in the application of DEA. Hospitals received special attention because they are among the
140 institutions whose efficiency is hardest to gauge because of their dynamic nature of service production
141 and variation across providers [25,37,38]. To the best of our knowledge, no research has previously
142 looked into or investigated the approach in selecting input and output with a focus on DEA hospital
143 applications. Due to this, we carried out this research. In addition, this study observed the current trend
144 in analysing hospital efficiency using DEA.

145 The remainder of this essay is structured as follows: The methodology section and the PRISMA
146 Statement (Preferred Reporting Items Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis) methods are described
147 in the second section. The scientific literature is methodically reviewed and synthesised in the third
148 section, and the approach used to select the input and output for DEA in hospitals are examined and
149 evaluated in the fourth section. Limitation and conclusion are outlined in the final section.

150

151

152 **Methodology**

153

154 This section discusses the process used to find articles on DEA that are relevant to gauging hospital
155 efficiency. We employed the PRISMA methodology, which consists of resources (Web of Science,
156 Scopus, PubMed, ScienceDirect, Springer Link, and Google Scholar) used to conduct the SLR,

157 eligibility and exclusion criteria, review process steps (identification, screening, eligibility), and data
158 abstraction and analysis.

159

160

161 **2.1 PRISMA**

162

163 PRISMA is a minimal set of elements for reporting in systematic literature reviews and meta-analyses
164 that are supported by evidence. PRISMA is primarily concerned with reporting reviews that assess the
165 effects of interventions, but it can also serve as a foundation for reporting SLR with goals other than
166 assessing interventions [39]. Future researchers should be provided with a comprehensive manual on
167 the SLR methodological approach. The first step in SLR is to create and validate the review procedure,
168 publication standard, and reporting standard/guidance, which are manuals of systematic plans that direct
169 researchers on what should be taken into account throughout the review [40].

170

171

172 **2.2 Journal databases**

173

174 Six databases were used to search for articles published from 2014 until 2022 and these were Web of
175 Science, Scopus, PubMed, ScienceDirect, Springer Link, and Google Scholar. There are noticeable
176 performance variations across the search engines analysed, demonstrating that there is no ideal search
177 method. Their effective usage consequently necessitates that searcher are well-trained, can assess a
178 system's strengths and shortcomings, and can decide where and how to search based on that information.
179 We chose the six databases because they may offer a carefully curated medical database with features
180 and tools that help with recall and a wide range of options to maximize precision [41,42].

181

182

183 **2.3 Identification**

184

185 The systematic review procedure included four steps. During the first stage, search terms were
186 identified. We performed a search based on prior research using the terms “efficiency*”,
187 “performance*”, “productivity*”, “benchmark*”, “hospital*”, “data envelopment analysis”, and
188 “DEA”.

189


190

191 **2.4 Screening**

192

193 We established inclusion and exclusion criteria. To start, only journals with articles containing
194 empirical data are chosen, therefore review articles (SLR and SR), book series, books, chapters in
195 books, and conference proceedings are all disregarded. Second, the search attempts excluded non-
196 English publications and concentrated only on items written in English, avoiding any ambiguity or
197 difficulty in translation. Thirdly, in terms of the chronology, a period of 9 years is chosen (between
198 2014 and 2022), which is long enough to see changes in research and publications that are connected.
199 The period selected also aims as a continuation of the previous study by O’Neill et al. (1984 to 2004),
200 Cantor & Poh (1994 to 2017), and Kohl et al. (2005 to 2016). The final number of articles for the quality
201 appraisal stage were 89. A PRISMA (Fig 1) diagram provides a detailed description of the entire search
202 procedure.

203 **Fig 1. PRISMA diagram of the search process**



204

205

206 2.5 Quality appraisal

207

208 To make sure that the methodology and analysis of the chosen studies were done in a satisfactory
 209 manner, the quality appraisal stage was carried out. For this purpose, we used two quality appraisals
 210 tools that cover knowledge transfer [35,43] and economic evaluations and efficiency measurement
 211 [44,45]. The fifteen-point scale developed by Mitton et al. covered the following topics: evaluation of
 212 the literature and identifying research gaps; research question and design, validity, and reliability; data
 213 collecting; population and sampling; and analysis and reporting of results. These criteria were given a
 214 score of 0 for not being present or reported, 1 for being present but of low quality, 2 for being present
 215 and of mid-range quality, or 3 for being present and of high quality [43]. While The four dimensions
 216 covered by the Varabyova and Müller checklist were reporting, external validity, bias, and power. The
 217 quality assessment checklist's items were all given a score of 0 (no/unclear) or 1. (yes). One item was
 218 specific to research using a second-stage analysis since it addressed the potential sources of bias in the
 219 study. Studies that did not undertake a second-stage analysis received a maximum score of 13, while
 220 studies that did receive a second-stage analysis received a maximum score of 14. Only the items relevant
 221 to that study's design were used to determine the maximum score (100%) for each study [45].

222 We are not aware of any such established standards for evaluating the planning or execution of research
223 on healthcare efficiency indicators. Thus, in order to be more robust and minimize bias, we choose to
224 evaluate the scientific soundness of the chosen research using two tools. For more reliability, all of the
225 chosen publications were separately evaluated by two co-authors from different institutions using both
226 tools. In the event of a disagreement, a third reviewer was asked to evaluate the work.

227

228

229 **2.6 Data extraction and analysis**

230

231 The articles underwent evaluation and analysis. Focused efforts were made on particular studies that
232 addressed the study purpose. Reading the abstracts first, then the entire articles, allowed for the data
233 extraction. (in-depth). To determine the approach in selecting input and output for hospital DEA study,
234 content analysis was used in conjunction with quantitative and qualitative analysis. A data extraction
235 form with entries for year of publication, country of study, type of hospitals studied, number of
236 hospitals, number of observations (DMUs), model types, return to scale, model orientation, type of
237 efficiency measured, inputs and outputs, number of models tested, application of second stage analysis
238 in the study, and approach used in selecting inputs/outputs, was used to collect data from the selected
239 studies.

240

241

242 **2.7 Statistical analysis**

243

244 The agreement between two raters (co-authors) in evaluating the studies was measured using Intra-class
245 correlation (ICC). By comparing the variability of various evaluations of the same subject to the overall
246 variation across all ratings and all subjects, ICC evaluates the dependability of ratings. The evaluations

247 are quantitative. The ICC coefficient value for the Mitton et al.'s fifteen-point scale and Varabyova and
248 Müller economic evaluations and efficiency measurement are 0.956 and 0.984 respectively. No articles
249 were eliminated at this point because the review was in qualitative and quantitative, however articles
250 with high quality ratings were given more consideration in the data analysis and result interpretation.

251

252

253 **Results**

254

255 Eighty-nine papers that met the criteria for inclusion were all retrospective studies that were published
256 between 2014 and 2022. A summary of all the specifics of the listed research may be found in Appendix
257 A and Appendix B.

258

259

260 **3.1 Efficiency analysis**

261

262 Efficiency analysis in DEA focus on the data by measuring the performance set of DMUs. The
263 definition of DMU is generic and broad. In this review it focuses on the “hospital”. Technical
264 efficiency, scale efficiency, pricing efficiency, and allocative efficiency are the four main ideas of
265 efficiency [25]. While other describe efficiency as technical, pure, scale, allocative, cost, and
266 congestion. DEA able to perform efficiency analysis at single point of time and over time [26]. Thus,
267 the data can be cross sectional (single period) or longitudinal (panel data). In longitudinal analysis DEA
268 measure efficiency by two methods which are, Malmquist Productivity Index (MPI) and Window
269 Analysis (WA).


270 The majority of the papers that were included (29 of 89, 32.58%), evaluated hospital
271 performance solely on the basis of Pure Technical Efficiency (PTE) [46–74]. Pure Technical Efficiency

272 (PTE) is the effectiveness with which an input set is utilised to produce an output on the VRS frontier
 273 [50,69]. In other words, a hospital is considered technically efficient if it generates the greatest amount
 274 of output from the fewest number of inputs. The (overall) Technical Efficiency (TE) is the product of
 275 Scale Efficiency (SE) and PTE [75,76]. TE is the efficiency measured under the CRS production
 276 frontier. While scale efficiency measures how far a unit strays from an optimal scale (which is the area
 277 where there are CRS in the relationship between outputs and inputs) [77,78]. As a result, it can be
 278 written as:

279 Technical Efficiency (TE), $\theta_{CCR} = \text{Pure Technical Efficiency (PTE), } \theta_{BCC} \times \text{Scale Efficiency}$

280 The Fig 2 illustrates geometrically the concepts of efficiency measurement in DEA

281 **Fig 2. Concepts of efficiency measurement in Data Envelopment Analysis**



282

283

284 Twenty nine percent (26 of 89, 29.21%) of the included studies measured the (overall) Technical
 285 Efficiency (TE) [77–102] and 26.97% (24 of 89) [75,76,103–124] used TE, PTE and SE in their

286 evaluation. While the rest of the studies evaluated their efficiency by the combination of TE and PTE
287 and some not stated clearly the type of efficiency measured (for details see Appendix C).

288

289

290 **3.2 Model parameters**

291

292 Four considerations must be specified by researcher or user in order to apply DEA: the model type, the
293 technological assumption of the delivery process, the model orientation, and the input-output
294 combination [113,122]. This model can be further analysed or extended via second stage analysis or
295 integrated with other statistical analysis to attain better efficiency measurement, to explain the variation
296 or difference in organization performance or to evaluate the productivity of organization over certain
297 time [92,111,120]. The data type is also important, as it showed how the performance were analysed
298 over certain time period.

299

300

301 **3.2.1 Model type**

302

303 DEA has been applied to evaluating the performance of a wide range of entities engaged in a wide range
304 of activities in a wide range of circumstances. Thus, lead to many models and extensions to explain the
305 intricate and frequently unknowable relationships between the various inputs and outputs that are
306 involved in organization activities or productions [107,125]. The models described as basic DEA model
307 and extensions model. While others detailed the model as Radial, Non-Radial and Oriented, Non-Radial
308 and Non-Oriented, and Radial and Non-Radial [23,126]. The majority of the research that were included
309 used Radial DEA models (72 of 89, 80.90%) [46,48–52,54–62,65–77,79,80,82–86,89–94,96–100,102–
310 116,118–124,127–130]. BCC, CCR or combination of both models were the specific model utilized in

311 measuring efficiency via radial change of input and output values. In contrast, only seven studies
312 (7.87%) [47,53,63,64,95,101,131] used Non-Radial and Oriented model. While four studies (4.49%)
313 [81,87,88,125] used Non-Radial and Non-Oriented model. This Non-Radial model, instead of adhering
314 to a proportionate change of input/output, deals with slacks directly. One study used Radial and Non-
315 Radial [78] and one study applied combination of Radial with Non-Radial and Oriented model [117]
316 to measure efficiency. While four studies [132–135] did not clearly state the model used in their paper
317 (for details see Appendix D).

318

319

320 **3.2.2 Model orientation**

321

322 Orientation indicates the input or output orientation in measuring efficiency. In other words, either
323 output expansion or input decrease is the primary evaluation goal. More than half of the studies
324 (55.06%, 49 of 89) [46–48,50–54,58,60,64–69,71–73,75–77,80,91–94,96,98,99,103–107,109–
325 111,113–116,118,121,124,127,128,130,135] applied input-orientated DEA models. The researchers
326 indicated that the choice of input orientation was made to be in line with the fact that the majority of
327 healthcare units aim to minimize inputs given a goal level of output. In other words, the organization
328 had little or no control over the output [46,51,110]. About a quarter of the studies (25.84%, 23 of 89)
329 [49,55–57,59,61,62,70,74,79,82–86,102,108,112,117,119,122,123,134] expressed the opposite. The
330 organization should be able to produce more output given that the input is fixed and not easily
331 increase. Thus, output-orientated DEA models are more appropriate in their settings [79,83,84]. Five
332 studies (5.62%) [81,87,88,100,125] applied Non-Orientated DEA models, while three studies (3.37%)
333 [95,101,129] used the combination of both input & output orientated DEA models. The rest of the
334 studies [63,78,89,90,97,120,131–133] did not clearly state which orientation were used in their
335 measurement (for details see Appendix E).

336

337

338 **3.2.3 Return to scale assumption**

339

340 Regarding the return to scale assumption, about one third of the studies (35.96%, 32 of 89)
341 [75,76,79,92,102–125,127–130] applied combination of both CRS and VRS assumptions in evaluating
342 efficiency. The researchers seek to contrast the efficiency score measured in order to get better
343 understanding of the organization. Also gave further insight on how they can use each assumption in
344 improving their hospital services [102,109,114]. Another one third (32.58%, 29 of 89) [46–74] of the
345 studies utilized VRS assumption and implied that the outputs of organizations (DMUs) changes
346 significantly (increase/decrease) with inputs. While eighteen studies (20.22%) [77,80,82–86,89–
347 91,93,94,96–101] relied on the CRS assumption that the outputs of their organizations (DMUs) vary
348 (increase/decrease) in a manner similar to that of the inputs (for details see Appendix F).

349

350

351 **3.2.4 Input and output selection**

352

353 It is essential for a meaningful evaluation to choose appropriate inputs and outputs. Finding
354 characteristics that best describe the investigated process or production is one of the most crucial
355 responsibilities. All relevant resources should be incorporated into the inputs, and the outputs should
356 outline the organizations (DMUs) administrative goals [53,105]. The characteristics of suitable inputs
357 and outputs can vary depending on the situation. Although it is crucial to select the appropriate inputs
358 and outputs, data availability is also one of the considerations that need to be noted by the researcher.
359 There are recommendations have been set up to assist researchers in locating suitable measures
360 [77,132,134]. This will be discussed further as the main objective of this review.

361 There are classification of inputs and outputs to aid researchers in measuring efficiency.

362 Namely, capacity-related, labour-related, and expenses-related. Or capital investment, labour and

363 operating expenses. Some researcher further identified this classification into sub-categories. The
 364 outputs can be classified as inpatient services, outpatient services and effectiveness (quality)
 365 component. While other categorized outputs into activity-related (inpatient and outpatient) and quality-
 366 related (effectiveness dimension) [20,21,25,32]. In this review we classified and sub-classified the input
 367 & output as displayed in Table 1 and the details of each sub-classification frequency distribution and
 368 percentages as in Table 2 and Table 3.

369

370

371 **Table 1. Input and Output Categories used in the studies**

Input	Percentage (%)	Output	Percentage (%)
Capacity-related:	30.06	Production-related	94.30
Beds	24.85	Inpatients	42.62
Capital assets	5.21	Outpatients	24.83
		Adjusted scores	13.42
Cost-related:	15.34	Combination	12.08
Total costs	7.06	Monetary	4.70
Medication & service costs	5.21	Imaging & Laboratory	2.35
Labour costs	2.15		
Equipment costs	0.92	Quality-related	5.70
		Patients	72.22
Staff-related:	52.76	Staffs	27.78
Doctors	17.18		
Nurses	13.19		
Clinical staffs	10.74		
Non-clinical staffs	7.98		
Combination	3.68		
Other specific output:	1.84		

372

373

374 **Table 2. Complete list of input used**

Input	Frequency	Percentage(%)
Capacity-related:		
Number of general beds	73	74.49
Number of facility types (area, space)	10	10.20
Number of medical equipment	5	5.10
Number of acute beds	4	4.08

Adjusted beds value (ratio, log value)	4	4.08
Number of total assets	2	2.04
Cost-related:		
Total operating costs	14	28
Fixed costs	7	14
Service costs	5	10
Consumable costs	5	10
Total labour costs	4	8
Combination	4	8
Medication costs	3	6
Clinical staff costs	2	4
Capital costs	2	4
Beds cost	2	4
Non-clinical staff costs	1	2
Medical equipment costs	1	2
Staff-related:		
Number of Specialist, Physician, Doctor, GP, Dentist	38	22.09
Number of Nurses, Midwives, Nursing staffs	30	17.44
Number of Medical staffs	23	13.37
Number of Non-clinical staffs	18	10.47
Full Time Equivalent Specialist, Physician, Doctor, GP, Dentist	16	9.30
Full Time Equivalent Nurses, Midwives, Nursing staffs	11	6.40
Number of combination of staffs	9	5.23
Full Time Equivalent Non-clinical staffs	8	4.65
Full Time Equivalent Medical staffs	6	3.49
Number of Allied Health staffs	5	2.91
Ratio of Doctors	2	1.16
Ratio of Nurses	2	1.16
Full Time Equivalent combination of staffs	2	1.16
Number of combinations of Medical staffs	1	0.58
Combination of staffs Log value	1	0.58
Others:		
Number of admissions	1	16.67
Average Length of Stay	1	16.67
Annual revenue	1	16.67
Discharge Log value	1	16.67
Inpatient discharge rate	1	16.67
Population	1	16.67

375

376

377 **Table 3. Complete list of output used**

Output	Frequency	Percentage(%)
Production-related:		
Number of Outpatients	50	16.78
Number of Inpatients (admission, discharge)	33	11.07
Total number of operations	28	9.40

Number of Inpatients	23	7.72
Number of Emergency Outpatients	22	7.38
Number of Inpatient days	14	4.70
Bed Occupancy Rate (BOR)	12	4.03
Inpatient adjusted value (Casemix, price, ratio)	12	4.03
Discharge adjusted value (Casemix)	11	3.69
Number of General & Emergency Outpatients	10	3.36
Average Length of Stay (ALOS)	9	3.02
Total revenue	8	2.68
Ratio adjusted value	7	2.35
Number of Daycare patients	6	2.01
Number of birth deliveries (normal, caesarean)	6	2.01
Number of laboratory & radiology (services, examinations)	5	1.68
Number of operations	4	1.34
Outpatient adjusted value (Casemix, price, ratio)	4	1.34
Number of Total patients	3	1.01
Number of Family Medicine outpatients	2	0.67
Number of Obstetric outpatients (ANC, PNC)	2	0.67
Number of emergency outpatient surgeries	2	0.67
Bed Turnover Rate (BTR)	2	0.67
Bed Turn Over Interval (TOI)	2	0.67
Number of surgeries (Minor, Major)	2	0.67
Log adjusted value	2	0.67
Score adjusted value	2	0.67
Operating income	2	0.67
Inpatient income	2	0.67
Number of diagnostic (visits, procedures)	2	0.67
Number of Medical Outpatients	1	0.34
Number of Allied Health Outpatients	1	0.34
Average number of admission & discharge	1	0.34
Number of Special patients	1	0.34
Number of total examinations	1	0.34
Discharge adjusted value (Casemix)	1	0.34
Death adjusted value (Casemix)	1	0.34
Outpatient revenue	1	0.34
Examination revenue	1	0.34
Quality-related:		
Mortality rate (infant, adult, specific diseases)	9	50.00
Revisit rate (outpatient, emergency)	3	16.67
Number of students	2	11.11
Patient's satisfaction score	1	5.56
Staff's satisfaction score	1	5.56
Number of medical inquiries	1	5.56
Management's score	1	5.56

378

379

380 **3.2.4.1 Capacity-related input**

381

382 Most frequently, the size, capacity, or functioning of a hospital as a health service is determined by the
383 number of fully staffed hospital or operational beds. 75 of the 89 (84.27%) studies included the number
384 bed (i.e., general, ICU, special) as input in their analysis [48–55,57–62,64–74,76,78–93,95–101,103–
385 109,112–116,118,119,121–125,128–131,133–135]. Seven of these 75 studies (9.33%) utilized
386 variation of multiple beds as their inputs either by type of bed, bed cost, or ratio of bed
387 [61,66,71,78,98,101,129]. While 12 of these 75 (16.00%) studies combine both beds and capital assets
388 as their capacity-related input [70,78,85,89,90,101,103,106,109,122,125,133]. One study only used
389 capital assets as their input but combine with cost-related assets, this may explain why this study did
390 not use beds as part of input like other studies [56]. The most prevalent capacity-related input in the
391 studies was the number of general beds, followed by the number of facility types and finally the number
392 of medical equipment.

393

394

395 **3.2.4.2 Cost-related input**

396

397 Among the listed research, cost-related inputs were the least utilised inputs. Out of the 89 studies, only
398 31 (34.83%) applied in the studies. Three of these 31 studies, specifically used cost-related inputs only
399 in their research [63,102,120]. While majority of these 31 studies (90.32%) utilized combination of
400 either capacity-related inputs and staff-related inputs in their research [46–48,51,56,62–64,70,75–
401 79,83,91,94,95,101,102,109,111,112,114,116,120,125,129,130,132,133]. The most often used cost-
402 related input in the research was the total operating cost, followed by the fixed costs, finally both service
403 costs and consumable costs.

404

405

406 **3.2.4.3 Staff-related input**

407

408 Almost all of the studies utilized staff-related inputs (93.26%, 83 of 89) [46–55,57–62,64–90,92–
409 119,121–125,127–131,134,135]. Out of these 83 studies, two studies combined used the number of
410 staff (staff-related) and the labour cost (cost-related) their input [75,78]. The six studies that did not
411 included staff-related input, substitute cost-related (either labour cost or operating cost) as their proxy
412 in their analysis [56,63,91,120,132,133]. The staff-related input values varied among the observed
413 papers. Most of the studies used arithmetic number (actual), followed by Full Time Equivalent and ratio
414 of specific value. The number of doctors, followed by number of nurses and number of clinical staffs,
415 was the most prevalent staff-related input in the studies.

416

417

418 **3.2.4.4 Production-related output**

419

420 Looking at the output, almost all of the studies used production-related output (98.88%, 88 of 89) [46–
421 92,94–125,127–135]. Eight studies applied combination of production-related output with quality-
422 related output [61,73,84,87,95,98,128,133]. The number of outpatients were the most prevalent
423 production-related output among the studies. The number of inpatients (admission, discharge) were the
424 second most prevalent, followed by the total number of operations and the number of inpatients.

425

426

427 **3.2.4.5 Quality-related output**

428

429 The application of quality-related outputs was varied and were not prominent as the production-related
430 output. Nine studies used quality-related output [61,73,84,87,93,95,98,128,133]. One study specifically
431 applied only quality-related in their research, which match with the researcher objective [93]. The most

432 often applied quality-related output was mortality rate (infant, adult, specific diseases), followed by
433 revisits rate (outpatients, emergency) and number of students.

434

435

436 **3.2.5 Extended analysis & data type**

437

438 Among the studies, 80 (89.89%) conducted extended analysis in their research [46–56,58–64,66–
439 69,71–77,79–94,96–98,101–116,118–125,128–135]. The type of data applied were almost equally
440 distributed among the studies 51 (57.30%) [47,49,52,58–60,67,70–73,75–77,79,80,83–
441 85,88,91,92,94,96,97,100,101,103,105–109,111,112,114–116,120–122,124,125,127,129–135] used
442 panel data and 38 (42.70%) [46,48,50,51,53–57,61–
443 66,68,69,74,78,81,82,86,87,89,90,93,95,98,99,102,104,110,113,117–119,123,128] used cross
444 sectional data in their research. Forty extended analyses were identified within the included studies.
445 Each study may apply one or multiple extended analysis (some mentioned as “stages”). Out of 80
446 articles that applied extended analysis, 46 studies integrated two or more extended analysis in their DEA
447 measurement [46,47,51–54,58,60,63,64,67,68,71,73–75,77,79,80,83–86,88,91–94,96,101,102,107–
448 109,114–116,119–121,128,130,131,133–135]. The maximum number of extended analyses observed
449 within the studies were five [67,92,94]. The main extended analysis used in hospital efficiency
450 assessment was regression analysis (29.11%, 46 of 158) followed by production function analysis
451 (16.46%, 26 of 158), statistical analysis (15.82%, 25 of 158) and resampling methods (15.82%, 25 of
452 15). The complete list of the specific analysis to each classification is presented in Table 4.(for details
453 see Appendix B)

454

455 **Table 4. Complete list of extended analysis**

Extended analysis	N	%	Extended analysis	N	%
Regression analysis	46	29.11	Production function analysis	26	16.46

Tobit regression	26	16.46	Malmquist Productivity Index	21	13.29
Ordinary Least Squares regression	11	6.96	Window analysis	3	1.90
Truncated regression	5	3.16	GML ^a Index	1	0.63
Generalized Estimating Equations regression	1	0.63	gMMP ^b Index	1	0.63
Linear regression	1	0.63			
Multinomial Logit regression	1	0.63	Resampling methods	25	15.82
Beta regression	1	0.63	Bootstrap method	24	15.19
			Monte Carlo simulation	1	
Statistical analysis	25	15.82			
Mann–Whitney U test	5	3.16	Performance measurements	13	8.23
Wilcoxon signed-rank test	4	2.53	Benchmarking method	7	4.43
Kruskal-Wallis test	4	2.53	Stochastic frontier analysis	2	1.27
F-test	2	1.27	Isodata analysis	1	0.63
T-test	2	1.27	Super efficiency analysis	1	0.63
Paired T-test	1	0.63	Fitting adjustment	1	0.63
Central Limit Theorem	1	0.63	Pabon Lasso technique	1	0.63
Li-test	1	0.63			
Chi-square test	1	0.63	Corelation analysis	11	6.96
Repeated measures ANOVA	1	0.63	Spearman’s rank correlation	8	5.06
Theil index	1	0.63	Pearson's correlation	2	1.27
Unpaired T-test	1	0.63	Grey’s correlation	1	0.63
Univariate analysis	1	0.63			
			Clustering analysis	8	5.06
Matching methods	3	1.90	Cluster analysis	6	3.80
Propensity score matching	3	1.90	k-means clustering	1	0.63
			MST-kNN clustering algorithm	1	0.63

456

457 ^a global Malmquist-Luenberger

458 ^b generalized metafrontier Malmquist productivity

459

460

461 **3.3 Approach in selection of input and output**

462

463 In selecting input and output for DEA with regards to hospital, various approaches or method adopted
 464 by the researchers. All the 89 studies used previous study or literature review as a sole basis or part of
 465 their method in selecting input and output. Few studies precisely mentioned using local DEA efficiency
 466 study at their respective country as the reference for input and output selection. Some of the studies
 467 used combination of approaches. 63 studies (70.79%) used only literature review as their approach in
 468 selecting the input and output [46–48,50–55,59,60,62,64–78,81,82,85,86,89–92,94,96–
 469 98,101,103,105,108,110,111,113,115–122,124,125,127,128,130,132–135]. While the rest used
 470 literature review in combination with other approaches. The combination was varied among the studies.

471 The dominant combination approach identified was literature review & data availability (13.48%, 12 of
 472 89) [56,57,79,83,104,106,107,112,114,123,129,131], followed by literature review & systematic
 473 method (5.62%, 5 of 89) [58,61,84,102,109] and literature review & DMU limitation (5.62%, 5 of 89)
 474 [49,80,87,95,99]. The maximum combination was four, which one study mentioned in their article
 475 [88]. The complete list of the specific approach presented in Table 5
 476

477 **Table 5. Classification of approach in selection of input and output**

Approaches	N	%
Literature review	63	70.79
Literature review	60	67.42
Local studies literature review	3	3.37
Literature review & data availability	12	13.48
Literature review & data availability	11	12.36
Local studies literature review & data availability	1	1.12
Literature review & systematic methods	5	5.62
Literature review & Delphi method	2	2.25
Literature review & Promethee method	1	1.12
Literature review & Bibliometric analysis	1	1.12
Literature review & Variance filter analysis	1	1.12
Literature review & DMU limitation	5	5.62
Literature review & expert judgement	3	3.37
Literature review, data availability, expert judgement & DMU limitation	1	1.12

478

479

480 **Discussions**

481

482 Anyone unfamiliar with the subject will find the DEA universe's size to be intimidating. It is practically
 483 impossible to read every previous study to gain knowledge from their experiences, even when limiting
 484 the literature to healthcare applications. To accomplish the goals of this study, 89 studies underwent
 485 thorough scrutiny. Nunamaker published the first health application utilising DEA to investigate

486 nursing services, and Sherman published the second DEA paper to assess the medical and surgical
487 departments of seven hospitals [136,137]. Since then, Over the past forty years, DEA applications in
488 health have evolved. The calibre of the studies has increased as access to resources and information
489 technology has advanced [23,25,138,139].

490

491

492 **4.1 Approaches taken by researchers in selection of input and** 493 **output of DEA for hospital efficiency measurement** 494

495 DEA is frequently used to assess the relative effectiveness of a group of institutions like businesses,
496 hospitals, universities, and government agencies. In conventional analysis, such judgements might take
497 many different forms. In hospitals setting, production of healthcare is distinct from manufacturing.
498 Raw materials are physically transformed into finished goods in a conventional factory. There is no
499 participation or co-production because the customer is not present. It is challenging to identify the
500 appropriate variables because patients are involved in the process. Furthermore, in healthcare it is not
501 just about performance and efficiency, the effectiveness (quality component) is equally important
502 [87,93,128]. Although there is no standard set of input and output in DEA studies, there are several
503 guidelines, analytic procedures or principles to help researchers choose the best variables in their study
504 [140–144].

505

506

507 **4.1.1 Literature review** 508

509 A literature review is still used today and is thought to be one of the most effective techniques to place
510 a study within the body of knowledge. Be it in the form of narrative review, rapid review, scoping
511 review or systematic review. It acts as a foundation or building block for knowledge advancement,

512 theory development, and identify areas of improvement [145–147]. Literature reviews were the most
513 prevalent approach for selection of input and output for hospital efficiency study using DEA. Our
514 reviews showed that all studies applied literature review as sole approach or part of combination
515 approach. None of the studies stated exactly on the methodology of literature review done except few
516 studies that define they only taken studies from their local country [50,86,105,123]. The reason for
517 researchers to specify this is one of their objectives was to compare their findings with local previous
518 studies. DEA is a non-parametric technique that relies entirely on the observed input-output
519 combinations of the sampled units and do not necessitate any presumptions regarding the functional
520 structure of the link between inputs and outputs [77,115]. Thus, this gives the advantage for researchers
521 to select input and output based on literature review as DEA will measure the efficiency value which
522 depend on the study objective even though it might give a less significant value [140,143].

523

524

525 **4.1.2 Data availability**

526

527 DEA relies on homogeneity of the unit's assessment. The DMU are assumed to be producing similar
528 activities or product with similar resources and technology under the same environment. Thus, a
529 common set of similar input and output can be defined . With large datasets in the hospitals, there are
530 needs some consideration to be done. This includes, the data quality, data availability, data scale and
531 types of data [140,142]. Within the studies it is found that, although the researchers applied literature
532 review in selection of input and output, they mentioned it is subjected to data availability. Few methods
533 identified on how the researchers overcome this limitation. First, specifically mentioned that the study
534 only collected data which is available within their scope [88,104,131]. Second, some study omitted the
535 DMU with incomplete data and focus their analysis on DMU with complete data [79,106]. This is one
536 of the advantages of DEA, as DEA only measure the relative efficiency or the production frontier of
537 the units include in the analysis. Third, the researcher applied DEA within specific period of data

538 availability to ensure the desired input and output are complete [56,114]. There is method in dealing
539 with missing of incomplete data in DEA, but non-of the studies reviewed applied of mentioned on it
540 [148,149].

541

542

543 **4.1.3 Systematic method**

544

545 In determining the input and output, researchers can list as many as possible factors. This may result in
546 two major issues. One there will be a long list of input and output and second, if there is limited number
547 of DMU the discriminating power for DEA to measure the efficiency will be affected [140,143]. It is
548 important to choose the important variables and at the same time able to measure the efficiency
549 accordingly. Researchers has been incorporating systematic procedure to judge this process. In the
550 review, four systematic approaches have been identified which are Delphi method, Preference Ranking
551 Organization METHod for Enrichment of Evaluations (PROMETHEE), Bibliometric analysis, and
552 Variance filter [49,58,61,102,109]. The Delphi method is a methodology used in research models that
553 is centred on gathering the most trustworthy consensus of expert opinion for challenging situations.
554 This forecasting method was first presented in the 1950s by Olaf Helmer and Norman Dalkey of the
555 Rand Corporation. It is based on the responses to multiple rounds of questionnaires sent to a panel of
556 experts [150,151]. The Delphi method is a well-known method for researchers to use in measuring
557 efficiency using DEA in various area [152–154]. In 1982, the PROMETHEE method was created for
558 the first time, and in 1985 it underwent further development [155–157]. It is currently regarded as a
559 widely used and usable Multiple Criteria Decision Aid tool including application with DEA [158–161].
560 In comparison to many other MCDM methods, PROMETHEE is a ranking system that is thought of as
561 being simple in conception and computation. It includes weights indicating the relative importance of
562 each criterion as well as a preference function linked to each criterion. One of PROMETHEE's key
563 applications, the ability to select, is used to help the decision-maker select the best possibilities for

564 assessing hospital performance. This gives the ability for researchers to integrate PROMETHEE in
565 DEA application [162–165]. The term bibliometric was coined by Pritchard in 1969. It is an “application
566 of mathematics and statistical methods to books and other media of communication”. In other words,
567 bibliometric analysis evaluates the properties of bibliographic information or metadata from database
568 or collection of documents. With a purpose to increase knowledge of the topic being studied [166,167].
569 Researchers applies bibliometric analysis for various objectives, to identify new trends in journal
570 performance, collaborative styles, and research components; to lay the groundwork for the new and
571 significant advancement of a field; and to making sense of massive amounts of unstructured data in a
572 systematic manner in order to interpret and map the cumulative scientific knowledge and evolutionary
573 nuances of established domains [168,169]. Thus, the usage of bibliometric analysis is applicable in
574 identifying the input and output in DEA studies with regards to the field of healthcare especially
575 hospital. Variance filter is one of the filter methods in Feature Selection. It is the process of deciding
576 which traits are most crucial and keeping them. It helps to lessen noise, lower the model's computational
577 expense, and occasionally boost model performance. In this case which in the crucial input and output
578 listed by the researchers [170,171]. By using the Variance filter (Feature Selection), researchers have
579 the ability to remove variables (input or output) which have little or no impact in the measurement of
580 DMUs efficiency. This method is well accepted in the application of DEA studies [102,172–174].

581

582

583 **4.1.4 Expert judgement**

584

585 The refinement of variables selection (input and output) can be decided by the judgement of expert
586 which can be the researcher, the stakeholders or the decision makers. The value judgment can be said
587 as “logical constructs used in efficiency assessment research that reflect the Decision Makers' (DM)
588 preferences during the efficiency assessment procedure”. This includes the decision to omit variables
589 or the put zero weight in the variable [143,175]. This is again the ability of DEA to measure efficiency

590 based on the needs and requirement of the decision makers. Although it can lead to problem such as
591 bias in selection, omission of input or output that may have significant impact on the efficiency
592 measurement, or putting the wrong weight for input and output. The incorporation of expert or value
593 judgment are motivated by the objective of researchers. There are advantages and disadvantages with
594 respect to the application of DEA. It is important to understand the managerial and statistical implication
595 of applying value judgement in the selection of input and output [176].

596

597 **4.2 Common DEA model parameters in hospital efficiency** 598 **evaluation.**

599

600 **4.2.1 Model type**

601

602 The application of DEA has been undergoing extensive developments and evolution over the time.
603 Thus, numerous models exist to measure efficiency from the basic model to the very specific application
604 of DEA. In this review we found that 80.90% of the included studies applied Radial DEA models.
605 Which includes BCC model (Banker, Charnes and Cooper), CCR model (Charnes, Cooper and Rhodes),
606 and combination of both models. These findings are similar with some of the previous review in
607 healthcare setting [17,21,33]. A Radial DEA model means the major concern is a proportionate change
608 in the input/output values; as a result, slacks (input excesses and output shortfalls still present in the
609 model) are ignored or treated as optional. Although there are limitations with radial model, researchers
610 still use this model as it is a basic model, simple to understand and easier to apply without much
611 requirement on the production criteria of the DMUs [48,80,177].

612

613

614 **4.2.2 Model orientation**

615

616 The selection of DEA orientation depends on several factors or arguments. It can be what the decision
617 maker can control more effectively, what is the nature of the production, or what is the researcher
618 objective from the model [25,32,178]. Healthcare organizations or hospitals in general have limited or
619 less control over their outputs. But it does not mean a DEA efficiency evaluation in hospital must be in
620 input orientation. Our review, found that 55.06% of the articles used input-oriented DEA models.
621 Previous studies also shown similar findings albeit in different proportion [17,20,21]. This can be seen
622 as researchers or hospital managers consider that minimising inputs given a goal level of outputs is
623 more suited for measuring hospital efficiency since hospital have limited control over their outputs.

624

625

626 **4.2.3 Return to scale assumption**

627

628 Since the development of the two fundamental models, there has been debate on which is better (and,
629 consequently, whether to assume CRS or VRS). Hospital managers seek the best method evaluations to
630 measure which input or output are improving their organization's efficiency. The selection of return to
631 scale with regards to hospital depends on the size of hospital [65], the organization factors [76,91], the
632 flow of process of input and output [111,127], technological involvement [82,122], or other related
633 factors. It is crucial to keep in mind that the adoption of an improper return to scale may result in an
634 excessively constrained region of the search for effective DMUs. Thus, the researcher can consider to
635 explore both assumptions to understand the implications of using either one [179]. In the review, we
636 observed most of the studies applied both assumption for comparison reason (35.96%) and followed by
637 VRS assumption (32.58%). In past review, there is a shift towards using CRS to VRS assumption in
638 application of DEA [20,21,33]. It may be said that the majority of assessments of hospital efficiency
639 were made with of view economies of scale exists and that they considered the production function of
640 healthcare to have non-proportionality shifts between inputs and outputs.

641

642

643 **4.2.4 Inputs and outputs choice**

644

645 We already covered the main objective of this review to look at the approaches taken by researcher in
646 selection of their inputs and outputs. The selection of appropriate inputs and outputs is essential for the
647 analysis of DEA to be useful, and we cannot emphasise this point enough. As many previous reviews
648 stated, the quality and quantity of these indicators play a major role in the DEA efficiency analysis
649 [15–18,20,21,30,33]. We observed in term of inputs, majority of the studies (52.76%) used staff-related
650 input as part of the variables in efficiency measurement. This is not surprising considering human
651 resource plays an important role in any organization including hospital. This finding is similar to
652 previous study of DEA and even in other performance related studies on healthcare service [180,181].
653 The unit of analysis of staff-related factors depends on how the organization functioning. In the review
654 mainly we noticed to types either actual number of staff or full time equivalent. The spectrum of staff
655 types was various from the clinical staff to non-clinical staff (Appendix A and B). If we looked at the
656 sub-type of inputs, the number of general beds had the highest prevalence (74.49%). Hospital beds is
657 the basic capital-related input for a hospital. It is one of the key indicators that use for hospital
658 performance, hospital capacity, hospital capability even in comparing health service between country
659 [182–184]. As for the outputs, in general we observed most researchers applied production-related
660 outputs compare to quality related. This occurrence may be said due to it is easier to measure
661 production-based data and give the stakeholders a relatively target to improve upon it. While
662 effectiveness (quality) is not something that healthcare managers would trade-off to improve the
663 efficiency [25,185]. In the review, the number of inpatients, number of our patients and number of
664 operations were the common outputs applied. The widespread use of these variables was no surprised,
665 as it is the bread and butter of hospital services.

666

667

668 **Limitation & conclusion**

669

670 This is the first in-depth systematic review examining the approach in input-output selection of DEA
671 efficiency measurement in hospital. As far as we know, no research has previously examined this. That
672 is the main purpose of this systematic review to provide an overview of the existing approaches. In
673 addition to serve as an update on DEA models that are currently applied for hospital efficiency
674 evaluation. Eighty-nine articles were reviewed and assessed thoroughly with the mentioned objectives.
675 Literature review was dominantly utilized as an approach for selection of inputs and outputs in DEA.
676 Researchers used literature review as a sole method or combined with other approaches to make the
677 selection more robust and vigorous. As the selection of variables in DEA study are very important and
678 may cause different results in efficiency measurement [140]. There is no specific approach or methods
679 that can be point out in selection of variables (input-output) in DEA. That is the advantage and also
680 weakness of DEA [186–188]. It gives the ability for researchers and stakeholders to evaluate efficiency
681 of their organization based on their preference but they need to be aware of the limitation of DEA and
682 potential pitfall [140,143]. This review focus on approaches in hospital settings, this may limit our
683 findings. There might be other approach or method that is use to choose input and output for DEA study
684 in another field or approaches based on other perspectives [189]. The approach in input-output selection
685 should be identified given the ongoing aim of researchers and healthcare professionals to improve
686 healthcare efficiency assessment. It is crucial to consider past, present, and potential developments on
687 this subject in the DEA literature because it plays a vital role in DEA studies. As for the DEA models
688 parameters, there is no evidence of one best model or one fits model as almost all models had been
689 utilized more than twice (Appendix A and B). Our review provides some guideline and methodological
690 principle on DEA study based on established literature. This hopefully will shed some light to hospital
691 managers, healthcare workers, policy makers even students on evaluation of efficiency by DEA.

692

693

694 **Registration and protocol**

695 This study was registered at OSF Registries (<https://osf.io/registries>) all information regarding the
696 registration and study protocol can be access at <https://osf.io/nby9m> or
697 https://osf.io/e7mj9/?view_only=53deec8e6c6946eeaf0ea6fe2f0f212a .

698

699 **Funding**

700 This study had no funding.

701

702 **Author Contributions**

703 MZZ, AAN and AMMR: conception and design of study. MZZ: acquisition of data. MZZ, AAH and
704 MIA: analysis of collected data. MZZ, AAN, AMMR: interpretation of data. MZZ, ANN, AMMR,
705 AAH, MIA, ZZ and AFAB drafting of paper and/or critical revision. MZZ had primary responsibility
706 for final content. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

707

708 **Competing interests**

709 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

710

711 **Data Availability Statement**

712 The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/supplementary material,
713 further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author/s.

714

715 **References**

716

- 717 1. Farrell MJ. The Measurement of Productive Efficiency. *J R Stat Soc Ser A*. 1957;120: 253.
718 doi:10.2307/2343100
- 719 2. Bahadori M, Izadi AR, Ghardashi F, Ravangard R, Hosseini SM. The Evaluation of Hospital
720 Performance in Iran: A Systematic Review Article. *Iran J Public Health*. 2016;45: 855.
721 Available: /pmc/articles/PMC4980339/
- 722 3. Hafidz F, Ensor T, Tubeuf S. Efficiency Measurement in Health Facilities: A Systematic Review
723 in Low- and Middle-Income Countries. *Applied Health Economics and Health Policy* 2018
724 16:4. 2018;16: 465–480. doi:10.1007/S40258-018-0385-7
- 725 4. Hussey PS, de Vries H, Romley J, Wang MC, Chen SS, Shekelle PG, et al. A Systematic Review
726 of Health Care Efficiency Measures. *Health Serv Res*. 2009;44: 784–805. doi:10.1111/J.1475-
727 6773.2008.00942.X
- 728 5. Tandon A, Murray C, Lauer J, Evans DB. Measuring Overall Health System Performance for
729 191 Countries. 2000. Available: <https://www.who.int/publications>
- 730 6. World Health Organisation. The World Health Report 2000 Health Systems: Improving
731 Performance. 2000. Available: <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/924156198X>
- 732 7. McKee M. The World Health Report 2000: 10 years on. *Health Policy Plan*. 2010;25: 346–348.
733 doi:10.1093/HEAPOL/CZQ032
- 734 8. Navarro V. The World Health Report 2000: Can Health Care Systems Be Compared Using a
735 Single Measure of Performance? *Am J Public Health*. 2002;92: 31. doi:10.2105/AJPH.92.1.31
- 736 9. Coyne JS, Hilsenrath P. The World Health Report 2000: Can Health Care Systems Be
737 Compared Using a Single Measure of Performance? *Am J Public Health*. 2002;92: 30.
738 doi:10.2105/AJPH.92.1.30
- 739 10. Benneyan J, Ceyhan M, Sunnetci A. Data Envelopment Analysis of National Healthcare
740 Systems and Their Relative Efficiencies. The 37th International Conference on Computers and
741 Industrial Engineering, pp251–261. 2007.
- 742 11. Jonathan Cylus, Papanicolas I, Smith PC. Health Systems Efficiency How to make
743 measurement matter for policy and management. *Organização Mundial da Saúde*, editor.
744 *Organização Mundial da Saúde*; 2016. Available:
745 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK436888/>
- 746 12. Papanicolas I, Rajan D, Karanikolos M, Soucat A, Figueras J 1959-. Health system performance
747 assessment A framework for policy analysis. 2022. Available:
748 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240042476>
- 749 13. Rasi V, Delgoshae B, Maleki M. Identification of common indicators of hospital performance
750 evaluation models: A scoping review. *J Educ Health Promot*. 2020;9.
751 doi:10.4103/JEHP.JEHP_563_19

- 752 14. Rahimi H, Khammar-nia M, Kavosi Z, Eslahi M. Indicators of Hospital Performance Evaluation:
753 A Systematic Review. *International Journal of Hospital Research*. 2014;3: 199–208. Available:
754 http://ijhr.iuims.ac.ir/article_10152.html
- 755 15. Hollingsworth B, Dawson PJ, Maniadakis N. Efficiency measurement of health care: a review
756 of non-parametric methods and applications. *Health Care Management Science* 1999 2:3.
757 1999;2: 161–172. doi:10.1023/A:1019087828488
- 758 16. Hollingsworth B. Non-Parametric and Parametric Applications Measuring Efficiency in Health
759 Care. *Health Care Management Science* 2003 6:4. 2003;6: 203–218.
760 doi:10.1023/A:1026255523228
- 761 17. Giacotti M, Pipitone V, Mauro M, Guglielmo A. 20 Years of Studies on Technical and Scale
762 efficiency in the Hospital Sector : a Review of Methodological Approaches. 2016.
- 763 18. Hollingsworth B. The measurement of efficiency and productivity of health care delivery.
764 *Health Econ*. 2008;17: 1107–1128. doi:10.1002/HEC.1391
- 765 19. Fazria NF, Dhamanti I. A Literature review on the Identification of Variables for Measuring
766 Hospital Efficiency in the Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA). *Unnes Journal of Public Health*.
767 2021;10: 1–15. doi:10.15294/UJPH.V10I1.38253
- 768 20. O’Neill L, Rauner M, Heidenberger K, Kraus M. A cross-national comparison and taxonomy of
769 DEA-based hospital efficiency studies. *Socioecon Plann Sci*. 2008;42: 158–189.
770 doi:10.1016/J.SEPS.2007.03.001
- 771 21. Cantor VJM, Poh KL. Integrated Analysis of Healthcare Efficiency: A Systematic Review.
772 *Journal of Medical Systems* 2017 42:1. 2017;42: 1–23. doi:10.1007/S10916-017-0848-7
- 773 22. Charnes A, Cooper WW, Rhodes E. Measuring the efficiency of decision making units. *Eur J*
774 *Oper Res*. 1978;2: 429–444. doi:10.1016/0377-2217(78)90138-8
- 775 23. Cooper WW, Seiford LM, Zhu J. *Handbook on Data Envelopment Analysis*. Cooper WW,
776 Seiford LM, Zhu J, editors. Boston, MA: Springer US; 2011. doi:10.1007/978-1-4419-6151-8
- 777 24. Benneyan JC, Sunnetci A, Mehmet E. Data envelopment analysis models for identifying and
778 benchmarking the best healthcare processes. *International Journal of Six Sigma and*
779 *Competitive Advantage*. 2008;4: 305–331. doi:10.1504/IJSSCA.2008.021842
- 780 25. Ozcan YA, Tone K. *Health Care Benchmarking and Performance Evaluation*. Boston, MA:
781 Springer US; 2014. doi:10.1007/978-1-4899-7472-3
- 782 26. Bogetoft P, Otto L. *Benchmarking with DEA, SFA, and R*. 2011;157. doi:10.1007/978-1-4419-
783 7961-2
- 784 27. Aljunid S, Moshiri H, Ahmed Z. *Measuring Hospital Efficiency: Theory and Methods*. Casemix
785 Solutions Sdn Bhd, Kuala Lumpur; 2013.
- 786 28. Xu GC, Zheng J, Zhou ZJ, Zhou CK, Zhao Y. Comparative Study of Three Commonly Used
787 Methods for Hospital Efficiency Analysis in Beijing Tertiary Public Hospitals, China. *Chin Med J*
788 (Engl). 2015;128: 3185. doi:10.4103/0366-6999.170279

- 789 29. Ravaghi H, Afshari M, Isfahani P, Bélorgeot VD. A systematic review on hospital inefficiency in
790 the Eastern Mediterranean Region: Sources and solutions. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2019;19: 1–
791 20. doi:10.1186/S12913-019-4701-1/TABLES/2
- 792 30. Eklom B, Callander E. A Systematic Review of Hospital Efficiency and Productivity Studies:
793 Lessons from Australia, UK and Canada. 2020 [cited 3 Nov 2022]. doi:10.21203/RS.3.RS-
794 123445/V1
- 795 31. Fitriana, Hendrawan H. Analisis Efisiensi dengan Data Envelopment (DEA) di Rumah Sakit dan
796 PUSKESMAS. CV. Amerta Media; 2021.
- 797 32. Irwandy. Efisiensi dan Produktifitas Rumah Sakit: Teori dan Aplikasi Pengukuran dengan
798 Pendekatan Data Envelopment Analysis. CV. Social Politic Genius (SiGn); 2019.
- 799 33. Kohl S, Schoenfelder J, Fügener A, Brunner JO. The use of Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) in
800 healthcare with a focus on hospitals. *Health Care Management Science* 2018 22:2. 2018;22:
801 245–286. doi:10.1007/S10729-018-9436-8
- 802 34. Amini S, Karami Matin B, Didehdar M, Alimohammadi A, Salimi Y, Amiresmaili M, et al.
803 Efficiency of Iranian Hospitals Before and After Health Sector Evolution Plan: A Systematic
804 Review and Meta-Analysis Study. *Front Public Health.* 2021;9.
805 doi:10.3389/FPUBH.2021.727669
- 806 35. Ravaghi H, Afshari M, Isfahani P, Bélorgeot VD. A systematic review on hospital inefficiency in
807 the Eastern Mediterranean Region: Sources and solutions. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2019;19: 1–
808 20. doi:10.1186/S12913-019-4701-1/TABLES/2
- 809 36. Littell JH, Corcoran J, Pillai V. Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis. *Systematic Reviews and*
810 *Meta-Analysis.* 2008;9780195326543: 1–210.
811 doi:10.1093/ACPROF:OSO/9780195326543.001.0001
- 812 37. E. A, Juni MH, A.M. R. A Systematic Review of Hospital Inputs and Outputs in Measuring
813 Technical Efficiency Using Data Envelopment Analysis. *International Journal of Public Health*
814 *and Clinical Sciences.* 2018;5: 17–35. Available:
815 <http://publichealthmy.org/ejournal/ojs2/index.php/ijphcs/article/view/563>
- 816 38. Cook WD, Zhu J. Classifying inputs and outputs in data envelopment analysis. *Eur J Oper Res.*
817 2007;180: 692–699. doi:10.1016/J.EJOR.2006.03.048
- 818 39. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA
819 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *The BMJ.* 2021;372.
820 doi:10.1136/BMJ.N71
- 821 40. Mohamed Shaffril HA, Samsuddin SF, Abu Samah A. The ABC of systematic literature review:
822 the basic methodological guidance for beginners. *Quality & Quantity* 2020 55:4. 2020;55:
823 1319–1346. doi:10.1007/S11135-020-01059-6
- 824 41. Gusenbauer M, Haddaway NR. Which academic search systems are suitable for systematic
825 reviews or meta-analyses? Evaluating retrieval qualities of Google Scholar, PubMed, and 26
826 other resources. *Res Synth Methods.* 2020;11: 181–217. doi:10.1002/JRSM.1378
- 827 42. Bramer WM, Giustini D, Kramer BM, Anderson P. The comparative recall of Google Scholar
828 versus PubMed in identical searches for biomedical systematic reviews: a review of searches
829 used in systematic reviews. *Syst Rev.* 2013;2: 115. doi:10.1186/2046-4053-2-115/TABLES/5

- 830 43. Mitton C, Adair CE, McKenzie E, Patten SB, Perry BW. Knowledge Transfer and Exchange:
831 Review and Synthesis of the Literature. *Milbank Q.* 2007;85: 729. doi:10.1111/J.1468-
832 0009.2007.00506.X
- 833 44. Alatawi A, Ahmed S, Niessen L, Khan J. Systematic review and meta-analysis of public hospital
834 efficiency studies in Gulf region and selected countries in similar settings. *Cost Effectiveness*
835 *and Resource Allocation.* 2019;17: 1–12. doi:10.1186/S12962-019-0185-4/TABLES/4
- 836 45. Varabyova Y, Müller JM. The efficiency of health care production in OECD countries: A
837 systematic review and meta-analysis of cross-country comparisons. *Health Policy (New York).*
838 2016;120: 252–263. doi:10.1016/J.HEALTHPOL.2015.12.005
- 839 46. Czypionka T, Kraus M, Mayer S, Röhring G. Efficiency, ownership, and financing of hospitals:
840 The case of Austria. *Health Care Manag Sci.* 2014;17: 331–347. doi:10.1007/S10729-013-
841 9256-9/TABLES/15
- 842 47. Berger M, Sommersguter-Reichmann M, Czypionka T. Determinants of soft budget
843 constraints: How public debt affects hospital performance in Austria. *Soc Sci Med.* 2020;249:
844 112855. doi:10.1016/J.SOCSCIMED.2020.112855
- 845 48. Wang X, Luo H, Qin X, Feng J, Gao H, Feng Q. Evaluation of performance and impacts of
846 maternal and child health hospital services using Data Envelopment Analysis in Guangxi
847 Zhuang Autonomous Region, China: A comparison study among poverty and non-poverty
848 county level hospitals. *Int J Equity Health.* 2016;15: 1–6. doi:10.1186/S12939-016-0420-
849 Y/TABLES/5
- 850 49. Zhu J, Song X. Changes in efficiency of tertiary public general hospitals during the reform of
851 public hospitals in Beijing, China. *Int J Health Plann Manage.* 2022;37: 143–155.
852 doi:10.1002/HPM.3309
- 853 50. Gao Q, Wang D. Hospital efficiency and equity in health care delivery: A study based in China.
854 *Socioecon Plann Sci.* 2021;76: 100964. doi:10.1016/J.SEPS.2020.100964
- 855 51. Peng Z, Zhu L, Wan G, Coyte PC. Can integrated care improve the efficiency of hospitals?
856 Research based on 200 Hospitals in China. *Cost Effectiveness and Resource Allocation.*
857 2021;19: 1–12. doi:10.1186/S12962-021-00314-3/TABLES/6
- 858 52. Schneider AM, Oppel EM, Schreyögg J. Investigating the link between medical urgency and
859 hospital efficiency – Insights from the German hospital market. *Health Care Manag Sci.*
860 2020;23: 649–660. doi:10.1007/S10729-020-09520-6/FIGURES/2
- 861 53. Zarrin M, Schoenfelder J, Brunner JO. Homogeneity and Best Practice Analyses in Hospital
862 Performance Management: An Analytical Framework. *Health Care Manag Sci.* 2022;25: 406–
863 425. doi:10.1007/S10729-022-09590-8
- 864 54. Li Y, Lei X, Morton A. Performance evaluation of nonhomogeneous hospitals: the case of
865 Hong Kong hospitals. *Health Care Manag Sci.* 2019;22: 215–228. doi:10.1007/S10729-018-
866 9433-Y/METRICS
- 867 55. Patra A, Ray PK. Operational efficiency analysis of public hospital systems of india: Application
868 of data envelopment analysis. *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing.* 2018;590:
869 415–424. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-60483-1_43/COVER

- 870 56. Irwandy, Sjaaf AC, Achadi A, Nadjib M, Ayuningtyas D, Junadi P, et al. The efficiency and
871 productivity of Public Services Hospital in Indonesia. *Enferm Clin.* 2020;30: 236–239.
872 doi:10.1016/J.ENFCLI.2020.06.054
- 873 57. Irwandy, Sjaaf AC. Using data envelopment analysis to improve the hospitals efficiency in
874 Indonesia: The case of South Sulawesi Province. *Indian J Public Health Res Dev.* 2018;9: 214–
875 219. doi:10.5958/0976-5506.2018.00997.X
- 876 58. Asiabar AS, Sharifi T, Rezapour A, Firouzabadi SMAK, Haghghat-Fard P, Mohammad-pour S.
877 Technical efficiency and its affecting factors in Tehran’s public hospitals: DEA approach and
878 Tobit regression. *Med J Islam Repub Iran.* 2020;34: 176. doi:10.47176/MJIRI.34.176
- 879 59. Pirani N, Zahiri M, Engali KA, Torabipour A. Hospital Efficiency Measurement Before and After
880 Health Sector Evolution Plan in Southwest of Iran: a DEA-Panel Data Study. *Acta Inform Med.*
881 2018;26: 106–110. doi:10.5455/AIM.2018.26.106-110
- 882 60. Goudarzi R, Gholamhoseini MT, Hekmat SN, YousefZadeh S, Amini S. The effect of Iran’s
883 health transformation plan on hospital performance: Kerman province. *PLoS One.* 2021;16:
884 e0247155. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0247155
- 885 61. Jahantigh FF, Ostovare M. Application of a Hybrid Method for Performance Evaluation of
886 Teaching Hospitals in Tehran. *Qual Manag Health Care.* 2020;29: 210–217.
887 doi:10.1097/QMH.0000000000000265
- 888 62. Almeida A, Frias R, Pedro Figue J. Evaluating Hospital Efficiency Adjusting for Quality
889 Indicators: An Application to Portuguese NHS Hospitals. *Health Econ Outcome Res.* 2015;1: 1–
890 5. doi:10.4172/2471-268X.1000103
- 891 63. Pereira MA, Ferreira DC, Figueira JR, Marques RC. Measuring the efficiency of the Portuguese
892 public hospitals: A value modelled network data envelopment analysis with simulation.
893 *Expert Syst Appl.* 2021;181: 115169. doi:10.1016/J.ESWA.2021.115169
- 894 64. Ortega-Díaz MI, Martín JC. How to detect hospitals where quality would not be jeopardized
895 by health cost savings? A methodological approach using DEA with SBM analysis. *Health*
896 *Policy (New York).* 2022;126: 1069–1074. doi:10.1016/J.HEALTHPOL.2022.07.010
- 897 65. Fumbwe F, Lihawa R, Andrew F, Kinyanjui G, Mkuna E. Examination on level of scale efficiency
898 in public hospitals in Tanzania. *Cost Effectiveness and Resource Allocation.* 2021;19: 1–10.
899 doi:10.1186/S12962-021-00305-4/TABLES/5
- 900 66. Klangrahad C. Evaluation of Thailand’s regional hospital efficiency: An application of data
901 envelopment analysis. *ACM International Conference Proceeding Series.* 2017;Part F131202:
902 104–109. doi:10.1145/3134383.3134403
- 903 67. Cinaroglu S. Changes in hospital efficiency and size: An integrated propensity score matching
904 with data envelopment analysis. *Socioecon Plann Sci.* 2021;76: 100960.
905 doi:10.1016/J.SEPS.2020.100960
- 906 68. Cinaroglu S. Integrated k-means clustering with data envelopment analysis of public hospital
907 efficiency. *Health Care Management Science* 2019 23:3. 2019;23: 325–338.
908 doi:10.1007/S10729-019-09491-3

- 909 69. Özgen Narcı H, Ozcan YA, Şahin İ, Tarcan M, Narcı M. An examination of competition and
910 efficiency for hospital industry in Turkey. *Health Care Management Science* 2014 18:4.
911 2014;18: 407–418. doi:10.1007/S10729-014-9315-X
- 912 70. Küçük A, Özsoy VS, Balkan D. Assessment of technical efficiency of public hospitals in Turkey.
913 *Eur J Public Health*. 2020;30: 230–235. doi:10.1093/EURPUB/CKZ143
- 914 71. İlgün G, Konca M. Assessment of efficiency levels of training and research hospitals in Turkey
915 and the factors affecting their efficiencies. *Health Policy Technol*. 2019;8: 343–348.
916 doi:10.1016/J.HLPT.2019.08.008
- 917 72. Gok MS, Altındağ E. Analysis of the cost and efficiency relationship: experience in the Turkish
918 pay for performance system. *European Journal of Health Economics*. 2015;16: 459–469.
919 doi:10.1007/S10198-014-0584-6
- 920 73. Şahin B, İlgün G. Assessment of the impact of public hospital associations (PHAs) on the
921 efficiency of hospitals under the ministry of health in Turkey with data envelopment analysis.
922 *Health Care Manag Sci*. 2019;22: 437–446. doi:10.1007/S10729-018-9463-5
- 923 74. Onder O, Cook W, Kristal M. Does quality help the financial viability of hospitals? A data
924 envelopment analysis approach. *Socioecon Plann Sci*. 2022;79: 101105.
925 doi:10.1016/J.SEPS.2021.101105
- 926 75. Fragkiadakis G, Doumpos M, Zopounidis C, Germain C. Operational and economic efficiency
927 analysis of public hospitals in Greece. *Annals of Operations Research* 2014 247:2. 2014;247:
928 787–806. doi:10.1007/S10479-014-1710-7
- 929 76. Ortega-Díaz MI, Ocaña-Riola R, Pérez-Romero C, Martín-Martín JJ. Multilevel Analysis of the
930 Relationship between Ownership Structure and Technical Efficiency Frontier in the Spanish
931 National Health System Hospitals. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17: 1–19.
932 doi:10.3390/IJERPH17165905
- 933 77. Piubello Orsini L, Leardini C, Vernizzi S, Campedelli B. Inefficiency of public hospitals: a
934 multistage data envelopment analysis in an Italian region. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2021;21: 1–
935 15. doi:10.1186/S12913-021-07276-5/TABLES/7
- 936 78. Wu D, Wu DD. Risk-Based Robust Evaluation of Hospital Efficiency. *IEEE Syst J*. 2019;13:
937 1906–1914. doi:10.1109/JSYST.2018.2865031
- 938 79. Nguyen BH, Zelenyuk V. Aggregate efficiency of industry and its groups: the case of
939 Queensland public hospitals. *Empir Econ*. 2021;60: 2795–2836. doi:10.1007/S00181-020-
940 01994-1/TABLES/13
- 941 80. Karma E, Gashi S. Technical efficiency of Kosovo public hospitals. *South Eastern European*
942 *Journal of Public Health (SEEJPH)*. 2022 [cited 20 Jun 2023]. doi:10.11576/SEEJPH-5771
- 943 81. Soares AB, Pereira AA, Milagre ST. A model for multidimensional efficiency analysis of public
944 hospital management. *Research on Biomedical Engineering*. 2017;33: 352–361.
945 doi:10.1590/2446-4740.05117
- 946 82. Garmatz A, Vieira GBB, Sirena SA. Assessing the technical efficiency of Brazil’s teaching
947 hospitals using data envelopment analysis. *Cien Saude Colet*. 2021;26: 3447–3457.
948 doi:10.1590/1413-81232021269.2.34632019

- 949 83. Chowdhury H, Zelenyuk V. Performance of hospital services in Ontario: DEA with truncated
950 regression approach. *Omega (United Kingdom)*. 2016;63: 111–122.
951 doi:10.1016/j.omega.2015.10.007
- 952 84. Yin G, Chen C, Zhuo L, He Q, Tao H. Efficiency Comparison of Public Hospitals under Different
953 Administrative Affiliations in China: A Pilot City Case. *Healthcare (Basel)*. 2021;9.
954 doi:10.3390/HEALTHCARE9040437
- 955 85. Li B, Mohiuddin M, Liu Q. Determinants and Differences of Township Hospital Efficiency
956 among Chinese Provinces. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2019;16.
957 doi:10.3390/IJERPH16091601
- 958 86. Li H, Dong S. Measuring and Benchmarking Technical Efficiency of Public Hospitals in Tianjin,
959 China: A Bootstrap–Data Envelopment Analysis Approach. *Inquiry*. 2015;52.
960 doi:10.1177/0046958015605487
- 961 87. Zarrin M. A mixed-integer slacks-based measure data envelopment analysis for efficiency
962 measuring of German university hospitals. *Health Care Manag Sci*. 2022;26: 138–160.
963 doi:10.1007/S10729-022-09620-5/TABLES/6
- 964 88. Guo H, Zhao Y, Niu T, Tsui K-L. Correction: Hong Kong Hospital Authority resource efficiency
965 evaluation: Via a novel DEA-Malmquist model and Tobit regression model. *PLoS One*.
966 2018;13: e0193266. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0193266
- 967 89. ArulJothi, K N, Irusappan S, Amarnath G, Chandrasekaran S, K SAB, Harishankar M, et al. A
968 CRITICAL DATA ENVELOPMENT ANALYSIS OF HOSPITAL EFFICIENCY IN INDIA. *IJSR -*
969 *International Journal of Scientific Research*. 2016;Volume 5 Issue 2: 63–65. doi:10.36106/IJSR
- 970 90. Rezaee MJ, Karimdadi A. Do Geographical Locations Affect in Hospitals Performance? A Multi-
971 group Data Envelopment Analysis. *Journal of Medical Systems* 2015 39:9. 2015;39: 1–11.
972 doi:10.1007/S10916-015-0278-3
- 973 91. Guerrini A, Romano G, Campedelli B, Moggi S, Leardini C. Public vs. Private in Hospital
974 Efficiency: Exploring Determinants in a Competitive Environment. *International Journal of*
975 *Public Administration*. 2018;41: 181–189. doi:10.1080/01900692.2016.1256892
- 976 92. Cavalieri M, Guccio C, Lisi D, Pignataro G. Does the Extent of Per-Case Payment System Affect
977 Hospital Efficiency? Evidence from the Italian NHS. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. 2014 [cited 20
978 Jun 2023]. doi:10.2139/SSRN.2515772
- 979 93. Campanella P, Azzolini E, Izzi A, Pelone F, De Meo C, La Milia D, et al. Hospital efficiency: how
980 to spend less maintaining quality? *Ann Ist Super Sanita*. 2017;53: 46–53.
981 doi:10.4415/ANN_17_01_10
- 982 94. Dohmen P, van Ineveld M, Markus A, van der Hagen L, van de Klundert J. Does competition
983 improve hospital performance: a DEA based evaluation from the Netherlands. *Eur J Health*
984 *Econ*. 2022 [cited 20 Jun 2023]. doi:10.1007/S10198-022-01529-8
- 985 95. Li RC, Tangsoc JC, See SL, John Cantor VM, Lauren Tan ML, Joy Yu RS. A DEA-based
986 Performance Measurement Mathematical Model and Software Application System Applied to
987 Public Hospitals in the Philippines. *BUSINESS & ECONOMICS REVIEW DLSU Business &*
988 *Economics Review*. 2016;25: 166–196.

- 989 96. Valdmanis V, Rosko M, Mancuso P, Tavakoli M, Farrar S. Measuring performance change in
990 Scottish hospitals: a Malmquist and times-series approach. *Health Serv Outcomes Res*
991 *Methodol.* 2017;17: 113–126. doi:10.1007/S10742-016-0151-Y/METRICS
- 992 97. Chen KC, Chen HM, Chien LN, Yu MM. Productivity growth and quality changes of hospitals in
993 Taiwan: does ownership matter? *Health Care Manag Sci.* 2019;22: 451–461.
994 doi:10.1007/S10729-018-9465-3/METRICS
- 995 98. Hung SY, Wu TH. Healthcare quality and efficiency in Taiwan. *ACM International Conference*
996 *Proceeding Series.* 2018; 83–87. doi:10.1145/3239438.3239487
- 997 99. Ho CC, Jiang YB, Chen MS. The healthcare quality and performance evaluation of hospitals
998 with different ownerships-demonstrated by Taiwan hospitals. *Proceedings - 2017 10th*
999 *International Congress on Image and Signal Processing, BioMedical Engineering and*
1000 *Informatics, CISP-BMEI 2017.* 2018;2018-January: 1–4. doi:10.1109/CISP-BMEI.2017.8302292
- 1001 100. Ghahremanloo M, Hasani A, Amiri M, Hashemi-Tabatabaei M, Keshavarz-Ghorabae M,
1002 Ustinovičius L. A novel DEA model for hospital performance evaluation based on the
1003 measurement of efficiency, effectiveness, and productivity. *Engineering Management in*
1004 *Production and Services.* 2020;12: 7–19. doi:10.2478/EMJ-2020-0001
- 1005 101. Khushalani J, Ozcan YA. Are hospitals producing quality care efficiently? An analysis using
1006 Dynamic Network Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA). *Socioecon Plann Sci.* 2017;60: 15–23.
1007 doi:10.1016/J.SEPS.2017.01.009
- 1008 102. Villalobos-Cid M, Chacón M, Zitko P, Inostroza-Ponta M. A New Strategy to Evaluate Technical
1009 Efficiency in Hospitals Using Homogeneous Groups of Casemix : How to Evaluate When There
1010 is Not DRGs? *J Med Syst.* 2016;40: 1–12. doi:10.1007/S10916-016-0458-9
- 1011 103. Babalola TK, Ojugbele HO, Shahwan M, Moodley I. Analysis of factors influencing technical
1012 efficiency of public district hospitals in KwaZulu-Natal province, South Africa. *Hum Resour*
1013 *Health.* 2022;20: 1–10. doi:10.1186/S12960-022-00777-2/FIGURES/2
- 1014 104. Ahmed S, Hasan MZ, Laokri S, Jannat Z, Ahmed MW, Dorin F, et al. Technical efficiency of
1015 public district hospitals in bangladesh: A data envelopment analysis. *Cost Effectiveness and*
1016 *Resource Allocation.* 2019;17: 1–10. doi:10.1186/S12962-019-0183-6/TABLES/5
- 1017 105. Jiang S, Min R, Fang PQ. The impact of healthcare reform on the efficiency of public county
1018 hospitals in China. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2017;17. doi:10.1186/S12913-017-2780-4
- 1019 106. Zhao L, Wang L, Li S, Zhang Y. Evaluation and analysis of hospital efficiency in China based on
1020 macro- and micro-level analyses. *Journal of Public Health (Germany).* 2020;28: 191–197.
1021 doi:10.1007/S10389-019-01048-6/METRICS
- 1022 107. Cheng Z, Tao H, Cai M, Lin H, Lin X, Shu Q, et al. Technical efficiency and productivity of
1023 Chinese county hospitals: an exploratory study in Henan province, China. *BMJ Open.* 2015;5.
1024 doi:10.1136/BMJOPEN-2014-007267
- 1025 108. Jing R, Xu T, Lai X, Mahmoudi E, Fang H. Technical Efficiency of Public and Private Hospitals in
1026 Beijing, China: A Comparative Study. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2019;17.
1027 doi:10.3390/IJERPH17010082

- 1028 109. Zheng W, Sun H, Zhang P, Zhou G, Jin Q, Lu X. A four-stage DEA-based efficiency evaluation of
1029 public hospitals in China after the implementation of new medical reforms. *PLoS One*.
1030 2018;13. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0203780
- 1031 110. Vrabková I, Vaňková I. Efficiency of Human Resources in Public Hospitals: An Example from
1032 the Czech Republic. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18. doi:10.3390/IJERPH18094711
- 1033 111. van Ineveld M, van Oostrum J, Vermeulen R, Steenhoek A, van de Klundert J. Productivity and
1034 quality of Dutch hospitals during system reform. *Health Care Manag Sci*. 2016;19: 279–290.
1035 doi:10.1007/S10729-015-9321-7
- 1036 112. Ali M, Debela M, Bamud T. Technical efficiency of selected hospitals in Eastern Ethiopia.
1037 *Health Econ Rev*. 2017;7: 1–13. doi:10.1186/S13561-017-0161-7/TABLES/9
- 1038 113. Flokou A, Aletras V, Niakas D. Decomposition of potential efficiency gains from hospital
1039 mergers in Greece. *Health Care Manag Sci*. 2017;20: 467–484. doi:10.1007/S10729-016-9365-
1040 3
- 1041 114. Xenos P, Yfantopoulos J, Nektarios M, Polyzos N, Tinios P, Constantopoulos A. Efficiency and
1042 productivity assessment of public hospitals in Greece during the crisis period 2009–2012.
1043 *Cost Eff Resour Alloc*. 2017;15. doi:10.1186/S12962-017-0068-5
- 1044 115. Flokou A, Aletras V, Niakas D. A window-DEA based efficiency evaluation of the public
1045 hospital sector in Greece during the 5-year economic crisis. *PLoS One*. 2017;12: e0177946.
1046 doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0177946
- 1047 116. Str S, Kalogeropoulou M. THE IMPACT OF ECONOMIC CRISIS TO HOSPITAL SECTOR AND THE
1048 EFFICIENCY OF GREEK PUBLIC HOSPITALS. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*.
1049 2016.
- 1050 117. Tiwari SP, Shukla V. DEA: A NEW APPROACH TO MEASURE HOSPITAL OPERATIONS
1051 EFFICIENCY. *International Journal of Technical Research and Applications*. 2015;3: 368–373.
1052 Available: www.ijtra.com
- 1053 118. Yousefi Nayer M, Fazaeli AA, Hamidi Y. Hospital efficiency measurement in the west of Iran:
1054 data envelopment analysis and econometric approach. *Cost Effectiveness and Resource*
1055 *Allocation*. 2022;20: 1–6. doi:10.1186/S12962-022-00341-8/TABLES/2
- 1056 119. Matranga D, Sapienza F. Congestion analysis to evaluate the efficiency and appropriateness
1057 of hospitals in Sicily. *Health Policy (New York)*. 2015;119: 324–332.
1058 doi:10.1016/J.HEALTHPOL.2014.12.012
- 1059 120. Anthun KS, Kittelsen SAC, Magnussen J. Productivity growth, case mix and optimal size of
1060 hospitals. A 16-year study of the Norwegian hospital sector. *Health Policy (New York)*.
1061 2017;121: 418–425. doi:10.1016/J.HEALTHPOL.2017.01.006
- 1062 121. Sultan WIM, Crispim J. Measuring the efficiency of Palestinian public hospitals during 2010-
1063 2015: An application of a two-stage DEA method. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2018;18: 1–17.
1064 doi:10.1186/S12913-018-3228-1/FIGURES/5
- 1065 122. Stefko R, Gavurova B, Kocisova K. Healthcare efficiency assessment using DEA analysis in the
1066 Slovak Republic. *Health Econ Rev*. 2018;8. doi:10.1186/S13561-018-0191-9


- 1067 123. Mujasi PN, Asbu EZ, Puig-Junoy J. How efficient are referral hospitals in Uganda? A data
1068 envelopment analysis and tobit regression approach. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2016;16: 1–14.
1069 doi:10.1186/S12913-016-1472-9/TABLES/6
- 1070 124. Ayiko R, Mujasi PN, Abaliwano J, Turyareeba D, Enyaku R, Anguyo R, et al. Levels, trends and
1071 determinants of technical efficiency of general hospitals in Uganda: Data envelopment
1072 analysis and Tobit regression analysis. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2020;20: 1–12.
1073 doi:10.1186/S12913-020-05746-W/TABLES/9
- 1074 125. Zhang X, Tone K, Lu Y. Impact of the Local Public Hospital Reform on the Efficiency of
1075 Medium-Sized Hospitals in Japan: An Improved Slacks-Based Measure Data Envelopment
1076 Analysis Approach. *Health Serv Res.* 2018;53: 896–918. doi:10.1111/1475-6773.12676
- 1077 126. DEA-Solver-Pro. DEA-Solver-Pro Newsletter No. 20. In: [https://saitech.capoo.jp/en/profile-of-](https://saitech.capoo.jp/en/profile-of-dea-solverpro/)
1078 [dea-solverpro/](https://saitech.capoo.jp/en/profile-of-dea-solverpro/) [Internet]. 2022 [cited 26 Jun 2023]. Available:
1079 <https://saitech.capoo.jp/en/profile-of-dea-solverpro/>
- 1080 127. Sultan WIM, Crispim J. Are public hospitals reforming efficiently in West Bank? *Confl Health.*
1081 2018;12: 1–14. doi:10.1186/S13031-018-0180-Y/TABLES/7
- 1082 128. Alatawi AD, Niessen LW, Khan JAM. Determinants of Technical Efficiency in Public Hospitals:
1083 The Case of Saudi Arabia. *Health Econ Rev.* 2020;10: 1–11. doi:10.1186/S13561-020-00282-
1084 Z/TABLES/4
- 1085 129. Lacko R, Hajduová Z, Gábor V. Data Envelopment Analysis of Selected Specialized Health
1086 Centres and Possibilities of its Application in the Terms of Slovak Republic Health Care
1087 System. *J Health Manag.* 2017;19: 144–158. doi:10.1177/0972063416682634
- 1088 130. Franco Miguel JL, Fullana Belda C, Rúa Vieites A. Analysis of the technical efficiency of the
1089 forms of hospital management based on public-private collaboration of the Madrid Health
1090 Service, as compared with traditional management. *Int J Health Plann Manage.* 2019;34:
1091 414–442. doi:10.1002/HPM.2678
- 1092 131. See KF, Ng YC. Do hospital reform and ownership matter to Shenzhen hospitals in China? A
1093 productivity analysis. *Econ Anal Policy.* 2021;72: 145–155. doi:10.1016/J.EAP.2021.06.008
- 1094 132. Giménez V, Prieto W, Prior D, Tortosa-Ausina E. Evaluation of efficiency in Colombian
1095 hospitals: An analysis for the post-reform period. *Socioecon Plann Sci.* 2019;65: 20–35.
1096 doi:10.1016/J.SEPS.2018.02.002
- 1097 133. Caballer-Tarazona M, Clemente-Collado A, Vivas-Consuelo D. A cost and performance
1098 comparison of Public Private Partnership and public hospitals in Spain. *Health Econ Rev.*
1099 2016;6: 1–7. doi:10.1186/S13561-016-0095-5/FIGURES/4
- 1100 134. Kim Y, Lee KH, Choi SW. Multifaced Evidence of Hospital Performance in Pennsylvania.
1101 *Healthcare (Basel).* 2021;9. doi:10.3390/HEALTHCARE9060670
- 1102 135. Hunt DJ, Link CR. Better outcomes at lower costs? The effect of public health expenditures on
1103 hospital efficiency. *Appl Econ.* 2020;52: 400–414. doi:10.1080/00036846.2019.1646405
- 1104 136. Sherman HD. Hospital efficiency measurement and evaluation. Empirical test of a new
1105 technique. *Med Care.* 1984;22: 922–938. doi:10.1097/00005650-198410000-00005

- 1106 137. Nunamaker TR. Measuring routine nursing service efficiency: a comparison of cost per
1107 patient day and data envelopment analysis models. *Health Serv Res.* 1983;18: 183. Available:
1108 /pmc/articles/PMC1068745/?report=abstract
- 1109 138. Emrouznejad A, Yang G liang. A survey and analysis of the first 40 years of scholarly literature
1110 in DEA: 1978–2016. *Socioecon Plann Sci.* 2018;61: 4–8. doi:10.1016/J.SEPS.2017.01.008
- 1111 139. Emrouznejad A, Cabanda E. *Managing Service Productivity Using Frontier Efficiency
1112 Methodologies and Multicriteria Decision Making for Improving Service Performance.*
1113 Emrouznejad A, Cabanda E, editors. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg; 2014.
1114 doi:10.1007/978-3-662-43437-6
- 1115 140. Dyson RG, Allen R, Camanho AS, Podinovski V V., Sarrico CS, Shale EA. Pitfalls and protocols in
1116 DEA. *Eur J Oper Res.* 2001;132: 245–259. doi:10.1016/S0377-2217(00)00149-1
- 1117 141. Cook WD, Tone K, Zhu J. Data envelopment analysis: Prior to choosing a model. *Omega*
1118 (Westport). 2014;44: 1–4. doi:10.1016/J.OMEGA.2013.09.004
- 1119 142. Emrouznejad A, De Witte K. COOPER-framework: A unified process for non-parametric
1120 projects. *Eur J Oper Res.* 2010;207: 1573–1586. doi:10.1016/J.EJOR.2010.07.025
- 1121 143. Golany B, Roll Y. An application procedure for DEA. *Omega* (Westport). 1989;17: 237–250.
1122 doi:10.1016/0305-0483(89)90029-7
- 1123 144. Chilingirian JA, Sherman HD. Health-care applications: From hospitals to physicians, from
1124 productive efficiency to quality frontiers. *International Series in Operations Research and
1125 Management Science.* 2011;164: 445–493. doi:10.1007/978-1-4419-6151-8_16/COVER
- 1126 145. Robinson P, Lowe J. Literature reviews vs systematic reviews. *Aust N Z J Public Health.*
1127 2015;39: 103. doi:10.1111/1753-6405.12393
- 1128 146. Webster J, Watson RT. *Analyzing the Past to Prepare for the Future: Writing a Literature
1129 Review.* Management Information Systems Research Center, University of Minnesota .
1130 2002;26: 1–11. Available: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4132319>
- 1131 147. Snyder H. Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *J Bus
1132 Res.* 2019;104: 333–339. doi:10.1016/J.JBUSRES.2019.07.039
- 1133 148. Zha Y, Song A, Xu C, Yang H. Dealing with missing data based on data envelopment analysis
1134 and halo effect. *Appl Math Model.* 2013;37: 6135–6145. doi:10.1016/J.APM.2012.11.015
- 1135 149. Kao C, Liu ST. Data envelopment analysis with missing data a reliable solution method.
1136 *Modeling Data Irregularities and Structural Complexities in Data Envelopment Analysis.* 2007;
1137 291–304. doi:10.1007/978-0-387-71607-7_16/COVER
- 1138 150. Dalkey NC, Helmer-Hirschberg O. An Experimental Application of the Delphi Method to the
1139 Use of Experts. https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_memoranda/RM727z1.html. 1962
1140 [cited 17 Jul 2023]. Available:
1141 https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_memoranda/RM727z1.html
- 1142 151. Strielkowski W, Chen T-A. Business Performance Evaluation for Tourism Factory: Using DEA
1143 Approach and Delphi Method. *Sustainability* 2022, Vol 14, Page 9209. 2022;14: 9209.
1144 doi:10.3390/SU14159209


- 1145 152. Oikonomou N, Tountas Y, Mariolis A, Souliotis K, Athanasakis K, Kyriopoulos J. Measuring the
1146 efficiency of the Greek rural primary health care using a restricted DEA model; the case of
1147 southern and western Greece. *Health Care Manag Sci.* 2016;19: 313–325.
1148 doi:10.1007/S10729-015-9324-4
- 1149 153. Thi Nong NM. An application of delphi and dea to performance efficiency assessment of retail
1150 stores in fashion industry. *The Asian Journal of Shipping and Logistics.* 2022;38: 135–142.
1151 doi:10.1016/J.AJSL.2022.05.001
- 1152 154. Nong TNM. Performance efficiency assessment of Vietnamese ports: An application of Delphi
1153 with Kamet principles and DEA model. *The Asian Journal of Shipping and Logistics.* 2023;39:
1154 1–12. doi:10.1016/J.AJSL.2022.10.002
- 1155 155. Brans J-P. L'ingenierie de la decision, l'laboration d'instruments d'aidea la decision. In
1156 Proceedings of the Colloque sur l'Aidea la Decision. Faculte des Sciences de l'Administration,
1157 Universite Laval, Québec, QC, Canada. 1982. Available:
1158 [https://books.google.com.my/books?hl=en&lr=&id=y4rp7dDqgZcC&oi=fnd&pg=PA183&ots=](https://books.google.com.my/books?hl=en&lr=&id=y4rp7dDqgZcC&oi=fnd&pg=PA183&ots=pdHrJn-_W4&sig=8nuZkvcobLpQP97dewmppGobopE&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false)
1159 [pdHrJn-_W4&sig=8nuZkvcobLpQP97dewmppGobopE&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false](https://books.google.com.my/books?hl=en&lr=&id=y4rp7dDqgZcC&oi=fnd&pg=PA183&ots=pdHrJn-_W4&sig=8nuZkvcobLpQP97dewmppGobopE&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false)
- 1160 156. Doumpos M, Zopounidis C. A multicriteria classification approach based on pairwise
1161 comparisons. *Eur J Oper Res.* 2004;158: 378–389. doi:10.1016/J.EJOR.2003.06.011
- 1162 157. Brans JP, Vincke Ph. Note—A Preference Ranking Organisation Method.
1163 <https://doi.org/101287/mnsc316647>. 1985;31: 647–656. doi:10.1287/MNSC.31.6.647
- 1164 158. Babae S, Bagherikahvarin M, Sarrazin R, Shen Y, Hermans E. Use of DEA and PROMETHEE II
1165 to Assess the Performance of Older Drivers. *Transportation Research Procedia.* 2015;10: 798–
1166 808. doi:10.1016/J.TRPRO.2015.09.033
- 1167 159. Bagherikahvarin M, De Smet Y. A ranking method based on DEA and PROMETHEE II (a rank
1168 based on DEA & PR.II). *Measurement.* 2016;89: 333–342.
1169 doi:10.1016/J.MEASUREMENT.2016.04.026
- 1170 160. de Oliveira MS, Steffen V, de Francisco AC, Trojan F. Integrated data envelopment analysis,
1171 multi-criteria decision making, and cluster analysis methods: Trends and perspectives.
1172 *Decision Analytics Journal.* 2023;8: 100271. doi:10.1016/J.DAJOUR.2023.100271
- 1173 161. Behzadian M, Kazemzadeh RB, Albadvi A, Aghdasi M. PROMETHEE: A comprehensive
1174 literature review on methodologies and applications. *Eur J Oper Res.* 2010;200: 198–215.
1175 doi:10.1016/J.EJOR.2009.01.021
- 1176 162. Alidrisi H. DEA-Based PROMETHEE II Distribution-Center Productivity Model: Evaluation and
1177 Location Strategies Formulation. *Applied Sciences* 2021, Vol 11, Page 9567. 2021;11: 9567.
1178 doi:10.3390/APP11209567
- 1179 163. Abdullah L, Chan W, Afshari A. Application of PROMETHEE method for green supplier
1180 selection: a comparative result based on preference functions. *Journal of Industrial*
1181 *Engineering International.* 2019;15: 271–285. doi:10.1007/S40092-018-0289-Z/FIGURES/5
- 1182 164. Brans JP, De Smet Y. PROMETHEE methods. *International Series in Operations Research and*
1183 *Management Science.* 2016;233: 187–219. doi:10.1007/978-1-4939-3094-4_6/COVER

- 1184 165. Ostovare M, Shahraki MR. Evaluation of hotel websites using the multicriteria analysis of
1185 PROMETHEE and GAIA: Evidence from the five-star hotels of Mashhad. *Tour Manag Perspect*.
1186 2019;30: 107–116. doi:10.1016/J.TMP.2019.02.013
- 1187 166. Aidi Ahmi. *Bibliometric Analysis for Beginners*. UUM Press, Universiti Utara Malaysia; 2022.
1188 Available: <https://aidi-ahmi.com/index.php/bibliometric-analysis-for-beginners>
- 1189 167. Pritchard A. *Statistical bibliography or bibliometrics*. Journal of Documentation. 1969.
- 1190 168. Mejia C, Wu M, Zhang Y, Kajikawa Y. Exploring Topics in Bibliometric Research Through
1191 Citation Networks and Semantic Analysis. *Front Res Metr Anal*. 2021;6: 742311.
1192 doi:10.3389/FRMA.2021.742311
- 1193 169. Donthu N, Kumar S, Mukherjee D, Pandey N, Lim WM. How to conduct a bibliometric
1194 analysis: An overview and guidelines. *J Bus Res*. 2021;133: 285–296.
1195 doi:10.1016/J.JBUSRES.2021.04.070
- 1196 170. Agarwal R. The 5 Feature Selection Algorithms every Data Scientist should know. In:
1197 [https://towardsdatascience.com/the-5-feature-selection-algorithms-every-data-scientist-](https://towardsdatascience.com/the-5-feature-selection-algorithms-every-data-scientist-need-to-know-3a6b566efd2)
1198 [need-to-know-3a6b566efd2](https://towardsdatascience.com/the-5-feature-selection-algorithms-every-data-scientist-need-to-know-3a6b566efd2) [Internet]. 2019 [cited 18 Jul 2023]. Available:
1199 [https://towardsdatascience.com/the-5-feature-selection-algorithms-every-data-scientist-](https://towardsdatascience.com/the-5-feature-selection-algorithms-every-data-scientist-need-to-know-3a6b566efd2)
1200 [need-to-know-3a6b566efd2](https://towardsdatascience.com/the-5-feature-selection-algorithms-every-data-scientist-need-to-know-3a6b566efd2)
- 1201 171. Rasulov Z. Feature Selection — Filter Method. In: [https://medium.com/analytics-](https://medium.com/analytics-vidhya/feature-selection-filter-method-43f7369cd2a5)
1202 [vidhya/feature-selection-filter-method-43f7369cd2a5](https://medium.com/analytics-vidhya/feature-selection-filter-method-43f7369cd2a5) [Internet]. 2021 [cited 18 Jul 2023].
1203 Available: [https://medium.com/analytics-vidhya/feature-selection-filter-method-](https://medium.com/analytics-vidhya/feature-selection-filter-method-43f7369cd2a5)
1204 [43f7369cd2a5](https://medium.com/analytics-vidhya/feature-selection-filter-method-43f7369cd2a5)
- 1205 172. Zhang Y, Yang A, Xiong C, Wang T, Zhang Z. Feature selection using data envelopment
1206 analysis. *Knowl Based Syst*. 2014;64: 70–80. doi:10.1016/J.KNOSYS.2014.03.022
- 1207 173. Wu J, Pan Y, Zhou Z. Assessing environmental performance with big data: A DEA model with
1208 multiple data resources. *Comput Ind Eng*. 2023;177: 109041. doi:10.1016/J.CIE.2023.109041
- 1209 174. Benítez-Peña S, Bogetoft P, Romero Morales D. Feature Selection in Data Envelopment
1210 Analysis: A Mathematical Optimization approach. *Omega (Westport)*. 2020;96: 102068.
1211 doi:10.1016/J.OMEGA.2019.05.004
- 1212 175. Allen R, Athanassopoulos A, Dyson RG, Thanassoulis E. Weights restrictions and value
1213 judgements in Data Envelopment Analysis: Evolution, development and future directions.
1214 *Ann Oper Res*. 1997;73: 13–34. doi:10.1023/A:1018968909638/METRICS
- 1215 176. Thanassoulis E, Portela MC, Allen R. Incorporating Value Judgments in DEA. *Handbook on*
1216 *Data Envelopment Analysis*. 2004; 99–138. doi:10.1007/1-4020-7798-X_4
- 1217 177. Cooper WW, Seiford LM, Tone K. Introduction to data envelopment analysis and its uses:
1218 With DEA-solver software and references. *Introduction to Data Envelopment Analysis and Its*
1219 *Uses: With DEA-Solver Software and References*. 2006; 1–354. doi:10.1007/0-387-29122-
1220 9/COVER
- 1221 178. Coelli TJ, Prasada Rao DS, O’Donnell CJ, Battese GE. An introduction to efficiency and
1222 productivity analysis. *An Introduction to Efficiency and Productivity Analysis*. 2005; 1–349.
1223 doi:10.1007/B136381/COVER

- 1224 179. Smith P. Model misspecification in Data Envelopment Analysis. *Ann Oper Res.* 1997;73: 233–
1225 252. doi:10.1023/A:1018981212364/METRICS
- 1226 180. Bahadori M, Izadi AR, Ghardashi F, Ravangard R, Hosseini SM. The Evaluation of Hospital
1227 Performance in Iran: A Systematic Review Article. *Iran J Public Health.* 2016;45: 855.
1228 Available: /pmc/articles/PMC4980339/
- 1229 181. Rasi V, Delgoshae B, Maleki M. Identification of common indicators of hospital performance
1230 evaluation models: A scoping review. *J Educ Health Promot.* 2020;9.
1231 doi:10.4103/JEHP.JEHP_563_19
- 1232 182. Imani A, Alibabayee R, Golestani M, Dalal K. Key Indicators Affecting Hospital Efficiency: A
1233 Systematic Review. *Front Public Health.* 2022;10: 830102.
1234 doi:10.3389/FPUBH.2022.830102/BIBTEX
- 1235 183. Asbu EZ, Masri MD, Naboulsi M Al. Determinants of hospital efficiency: A literature review.
1236 *Int J Healthc.* 2020;6: 44. doi:10.5430/IJH.V6N2P44
- 1237 184. Cylus J, Papanicolas I, Smith PC. Health system efficiency: How to make measurement matter
1238 for policy and management. *European Observatory Health Policy Series.* 2016;46. Available:
1239 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK436888/>
- 1240 185. Carini E, Gabutti I, Frisicale EM, Di Pilla A, Pezzullo AM, de Waure C, et al. Assessing hospital
1241 performance indicators. What dimensions? Evidence from an umbrella review. *BMC Health
1242 Serv Res.* 2020;20. doi:10.1186/S12913-020-05879-Y
- 1243 186. Peyrache A, Rose C, Sicilia G. Variable selection in Data Envelopment Analysis. *Eur J Oper Res.*
1244 2020;282: 644–659. doi:10.1016/J.EJOR.2019.09.028
- 1245 187. Nataraja NR, Johnson AL. Guidelines for using variable selection techniques in data
1246 envelopment analysis. *Eur J Oper Res.* 2011;215: 662–669. doi:10.1016/J.EJOR.2011.06.045
- 1247 188. Ruggiero J. IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF INPUT OMISSION ON DEA.
1248 <https://doi.org/101142/S021962200500160X>. 2011;4: 359–368.
1249 doi:10.1142/S021962200500160X
- 1250 189. Wagner JM, Shimshak DG. Stepwise selection of variables in data envelopment analysis:
1251 Procedures and managerial perspectives. *Eur J Oper Res.* 2007;180: 57–67.
1252 doi:10.1016/J.EJOR.2006.02.048
- 1253



Figure



Figure