Original Article
DOI: https://doi.org/10.70749/ijbr.v3i5.1415

INDUS JOURNAL OF BIOSCIENCE RESEARCH
https://induspublishers.com/IJBR
ISSN: 2960-2793/ 2960-2807

Bridging the Surgical Gap: Evaluating Access to Safe, Timely and Affordable Surgical Care in Low- and Middle-Income Countries (LMICs)

Abali Wandala[1], Anas Fadlelseed Ahmed Fadlelseed[2], Maria Himayat[3], Abdalla Osman Abdelwahab Abdalla[4], Amgad Fadlelseed Ahmed Fadlelseed[4], Jamshaid Ur Rehman[5]

[1]Universidad Adventista del Plata, Entre-Rios, Parana, Argentina.
[2]Biodental Special Clinic, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
[3]Department of Pediatrics, Northwest General Hospital, Hayatabad, Peshawar, Pakistan.
[4]Cork University Hospital, Cork, Ireland.
[5]Allied Hospital 2 Faisalabad/ Faisalabad Medical University, Pakistan.

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Surgical Care, Lmics, Timely Access, Post-Operative Complications, Quasi-Experimental Design, Health Disparities, Surgical Outcomes, Health Policy

Correspondence to: Abali Wandala, Department, Universidad Adventista del Plata, Entre-Rios, Parana, Argentina. Email: wfabali@gmail.com

Declaration
Authors' Contribution: All authors equally contributed to the study and approved the final manuscript.

Conflict of Interest: No conflict of interest.

Funding: No funding received by the authors.

Article History
Received: 02-03-2025 Revised: 14-04-2025
Accepted: 09-05-2025 Published: 25-05-2025

ABSTRACT

The quasi-experimental research assesses the impact of early, inexpensive, and safe surgical care on post-operative outcomes for low- and middle-income country (LMIC) patients. The study compares honest care with an improved intervention planned to maximize access and reduce delay in treatment. Quasi-experimental design was employed to select a sample of 240 patients operated from LMIC hospitals, on whom recovery time, surgical complications, and other associated variables were recorded. Statistical tests including independent samples t-test, chi-square test, and binary logistic regression were applied to examine group differences and predictors of surgical outcomes after controlling for confounders. Evidence shows that early surgery improves recovery time significantly, minimizes post-operative complications, and predicts better patient outcomes. The evidence recognizes broader gaps in surgical access and calls for training of the workforce, arrangement, and policy improvements to close surgical differences in LMICs. This article presents vital evidence in support of targeted interventions in enhancing surgical care quality and accessibility in low-resource environments. This research highlights the importance of safe, timely surgical care in improving outcomes in low- and middle-income countries. Quasi-experimental findings show enhanced recovery and fewer complications with improved care. Early intervention independently predicts better outcomes, emphasizing efficiency and risk stratification. The study supports broader health system reform through NSOAPs, advocating workforce development, decentralization, and innovative models like mobile units and telemedicine. These strategies aim to expand surgical access, especially in underserved rural areas, promoting equity and better health for all.

INTRODUCTION

Surgical care is currently a core part of health systems across the world, and it is responsible for the management of an huge range of conditions such as trauma, cancer, inherited diseases, and obstetric complications. Nevertheless, in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), surgical care is totally under ordered and not accessible for millions of people. It has been approached that close to five billion individuals worldwide have insufficient access to safe, timely, and affordable surgical and anesthesia services, with the greatest unmet needs being found in the LMICs where there is limited healthcare set-up and resources[1, 2] This inequality leads to unnecessary death, disability, and huge economic loss to patients and health systems. Household out-of-pocket payments are generally catastrophic, increasing poverty and worsening health discriminations. Poor surgical services arranging within national health plans also leads to the above problems, likely resulting in careless application of resources and combination of surgery into primary health care systems. It is thus important to increase the surgical capacity within the LMICs both for individual health and overall socioeconomic development and poverty alleviation. Unified integration of surgical care into health policy will demand political will, intersectoral approach, and sustainable supporting structures to realize workable shares. Unless action is taken, the global deficit in surgical care will continue to increase and disproportionately affect the most disadvantaged.

In LMICs, the surgical burden of illness is huge and involves infections, obstetric conditions, cancer, and injuries that need surgery. Surgical pathology contributes

to almost 30% of the worldwide disease burden, but LMICs have severe shortages of trained anesthetists and surgeons and fundamental infrastructure facilities, particularly rural areas [3, 4]. This results in millions of untreated pathology or chronic delays exacerbating health outcomes. Besides, unsafe surgical practice because of inadequate equipment and inadequate perioperative care lead to preventable complications and mortality. Insufficient training facilities and brain drain of well-trained health workers from LMICs to better-off economies impair human resources shortages and undermine capacity building. Addressing these system-level issues through advanced training programs and retention strategies is essential for ensuring reasonable access to safe surgery. Enhanced working conditions and medical education could be a motivating factor to ensure retention of health workers in the most needed areas. Regional and global partnerships can facilitate knowledge exchange and technical assistance to build local surgical capacity.

Availability, accessibility, affordability, and quality define access to surgical care. Surgical services are central in urban hospitals in LMICs and hence are inaccessible to rural populations because of cost and distance [1, 5] Over 33 million individuals annually have catastrophic health expenditure incurred by surgical care, strong several into poverty. Indirect costs such as transportation and loss of income also hinder prompt care-seeking. Further, the compromised quality of surgical care is also too often undermined by poor facilities and training with resulting postoperative complications. Inaccessibility of good data on surgery outcomes and patient safety in these facilities impairs the problem of improving the quality of care. Practical checking and evaluation mechanisms must be used to track progress and to guide evidence-based interventions. Transfer of surgery care and improved outreach to communities has the potential to improve equity in care provision. Effort should also address social determinants of health that affect patient outcomes and surgery access.

International health programs in recent years considered incorporating surgical care into the health system as a priority. The 2015 Lancet Commission for Global Surgery and World Health Assembly Resolution WHA68.15 set a target of universal coverage for safe, accessible, and timely surgical care by 2030 [1] [2]. Policy changes incorporate surgery as part of universal health coverage and equity. Nonetheless, other LMICs face challenges such as fewer resources, other competing health needs, and no data, which constrain progress. NGO-donor-government collaborations are required to unite resources and technical expertise. Collaborations can offer scalable and workable capacity building of surgery programs appropriate to the local realities of LMICs. Programs aligned with national health priorities and local ownership enhance the likelihood of success. Systematic evidence sharing and support are required to keep surgery on the global health agenda.

New technologies and strategies also have a great potential to bridge the gap in surgery in LMICs. Telemedicine, mobile surgical teams, and task-shifting, where non-physician clinicians are trained to perform selected surgical procedures, can bridge geographical and manpower barriers [6, 7] Another key area is strengthening supply chains so that essential surgical equipment and commodities are never out of stock. This maintains service quality and safety. Investment in health information systems can facilitate enhanced data collection and resource management, enabling better planning and policy-making. Strong political will, citizen participation, and locally implemented interventions that overcome local barriers to access to surgery are, nonetheless, crucial for the successful delivery of such interventions. By leveraging a mix of innovation and classical health system development, the LMICs can take a major leap toward bridging the gap in access to surgery and toward healthier populations. Capacity development is complemented by constant monitoring and reaction to local realities. Patient-centered models of care can also assist in the creation of trust and utilization of surgical services in vulnerable groups.

Surgical Care in Global Health

Surgical involvements form the support of health systems in all models of universal care globally, including a broad range of medical procedures required for the management of complicated diseases ranging from traumatic pathology, malignancies, congenital abnormalities, to obstetric conditions among pregnant women. The job of surgical care doesn't just include saving lives through surgery; surgical procedures are routine in prevented long-term disability and enhancing the overall quality of patients' lives. It is really a lifesaving measure, but surgical care is frequently overlooked when priority and investment in global health priorities have been otherwise, previously centered on infectious diseases and prevention[4, 8] Therefore, persistent inequality in access and quality is perpetuated, especially in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), where surgical disease burden is most extreme. Over the last era, the international health community has increasingly recognized that timely and safe surgical care is a universal human right and an integral part of universal health coverage (UHC). Surgical illness contributes to a large percentage of the global burden of disease, and millions of deaths and disabilities annually could be prevented or alleviated by proper surgical care.

The World Health Organization, among other global organizations, has stressed the point that surgery need not be considered a luxury or an adjunct service anymore but a part and parcel of efficient health systems [9][[10]Participating surgical care into global health plans is essential to bridging the gap between need and access, and ultimately minimizing avoidable morbidity and mortality [11]There is an urgent need for surgical care in LMICs given various overlapping factors such as increased trauma from road traffic accidents, infectious diseases that need surgery, and obstetric conditions like obstructed labor and hemorrhage. In spite of this enormous demand, most LMICs have serious constraints in healthcare infrastructure, human capacity, and availability of resources, leading to insufficient surgical services that do not meet population demands. The divide between surgical need and supply creates a wide divide in health equity with unequal impacts on rural and poor

communities because of access deficiencies. This inequality fuels poverty and unhealthy outcomes cycles and that is why integration of surgical care as a core goal in national health policies is necessary [12, 13].

Filling the hole in surgery in international health requires a general appreciation of the crossing role that surgery is able to contribute towards the achievement of broader health goals. The function of effective surgical care is to specifically contribute towards maternal and child mortality reduction through the provision of major emergency obstetric services. It is also aiding in infectious disease management through surgical correction of complications and increasingly aiding in the treatment of non-communicable conditions such as cancers and cardiovascular diseases that require surgical intervention [14, 15]. Thus, capacity building in surgical systems supports the Sustainable Development Goals through equitable health delivery and economic advancement. Prioritizing investment in surgery can have the potential to generate change in health systems, and surgery is thus a priority area for action on global health for universal health coverage and enhanced population well-being [16]Enhanced surgical capacity also supports enhanced resilience of health systems, facilitating stronger public health crisis management responses. Furthermore, combining surgery with other health care services encourages combined treatment of the patient, enhancing overall health results and system performance.

Consequences and Barriers to Surgical Access

Lack of proper and safe surgical care in a timely manner has severe and extensive consequences for patients, relatives, and the health systems in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). Without surgical interventions, the conditions of the patients remain unresolved, and the patients experience prolonged suffering, disabling illnesses, and early death and therefore cause overall disease burden to the afflicted community. These effects not only diminish the quality of life but also damage economic productivity because they limit individuals to work and be in a position to contribute to society, thereby creating more cycles of poverty among vulnerable people [17]The social cost of not curing surgical disease is larger than individual, adding to already strained health care systems that will have to deal with unnecessary complications. Furthermore, families themselves suffer emotionally and incur losses of income through care for disabled or chronically ill family members. The multi-faceted impact emphasizes the value added by expanded surgical access to promote health and healthier, more resilient populations.

LMICs largely because of insufficient access to extra obstetric care such as cesarean transfers. Obstructed labor and postpartum flow, two conditions that require urgent surgical intervention or else the conditions are life-threatening, have experienced rises in delays or failure to deliver these interventions because of unavailability of operating facility. These bleak findings invalidate progress toward global development goals, including Sustainable Development Goal 3 for maternal death reduction worldwide [18].Thus, inadequate surgical access at birth remains to perpetuate health disparities and deny at-risk populations their increased chances for survival. Road accidents, violence between individuals, and occupational injury are a major source of trauma that contributes greatly to the surgical disease burden in the LMICs. Trauma facilities are either insufficient or poorly resourced to cope with the high volume. If the patients are not operated on early, they either unnecessarily die or get severely disabled, with destruction for families and communities. The absence of surgical trauma services also causes poverty in such areas since injured people can no longer earn money and need prolonged care or assistance [19]. These gaps in trauma surgical services must thus be addressed to minimize mortality and enhance rehabilitative benefits.

A variety of linked barriers limit access to surgical care in LMICs. The initial among these is the critical shortage of surgical professionals, such as surgeons, anesthetists, and perioperative nurses. The majority of countries are plagued by low-level training programs, excess migration of professional personnel to wealthier countries, and unequal geographic dispersion of health workers, most of whom are rural communities [20].One of the causes of the challenge includes a shortage of infrastructures, where the majority of the rural hospitals and clinics lack basic facilities such as properly stocked operating rooms, sterilization equipment, and regular anesthetic and medicine supplies. Geographic isolation contributes to access barriers where patients need to go long, costly distances usually along poor roads to visit surgical centers [21].

Financial limitations are the second major barrier to timely access to surgery. In LMICs, zero or minimal coverage for health insurance exists, and therefore, patients might pay the entire cost of surgical care cash-upfront. These payments can be devastating for poor families, compelling them to do without essential health care for other needs or become destitute through debt [22].In addition, quality and safety issues in most operating rooms decrease the level of trust in services offered among citizens. Insufficiency of facilities, infection control strategies, and perioperative monitoring elevates complication and postoperative mortality rates. Ineffective data collection and monitoring systems make surgical quality improvement difficult, leading to a vicious cycle of unsafe care and bad outcomes [23]

Research Objectives

- To evaluate the impact of the implemented surgical intervention program on improving access to safe and timely surgical care in LMICs.
- To assess the effectiveness of task-shifting models in increasing surgical service coverage and reducing patient wait times in underserved areas.
- To measure the reduction in out-of-pocket expenses for patients receiving surgical care following the introduction of affordable surgical delivery strategies.

Significance of the Study and Problem Statement

Surgical access to timely, affordable, and safe care remains a significant challenge in middle- and low-income nations (LMICs), which results in unnecessary rates of preventable mortality and morbidity. This study is worth conducting because it attempts experimentally to evaluate new strategies in closing the surgical gap, thus offering

evidence-based interventions to improve surgical access in poor environments. By the resolution of a few of the challenges such as shortages within the manpower, capacity of infrastructure, and expenses, the outcomes of this study can direct policy-makers, health providers, and international stakeholders on interventions for enhancing surgical service delivery. Most importantly, increasing access to surgery could be capable of reducing disability, saving lives, and alleviating the economic burden that falls on patients and health systems within LMICs.

The problem that this research aims to solve is based on the past history of disparate availability and quality of surgery in LMICs, where tens of millions of individuals are precluded from timely access to simple procedures by system-level obstacles. Despite the acknowledgment that surgery has been a core component of universal coverage across the world, many LMICs continue to face ineffective surgical facilities, insufficient trained staff, and patient-driven catastrophic out-of-pocket spending. This study seeks to experimentally test interventions that bypass these obstacles for better surgical outcomes. There is a need to determine which interventions will improve access and affordability of surgery most effectively in attempting to close the existing surgical gap and improve health equity in these vulnerable populations.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Global Burden of Surgical Disease in LMICs

The burden of surgical disease in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) is vast and represents a major threat to global health equity and development. Increased population growth and demographic and epidemiological transition result in an ever-increasing demand for surgical care, particularly due to rising numbers of non-communicable disease (NCD) and trauma-related injury. It is estimated that surgical disorders now account for nearly 30% of the world's disease burden, but LMIC health systems are yet to adequately respond in a sustainable manner to these requirements [24, 25]. The Lancet Commission on Global Surgery states that an estimated five billion individuals worldwide lack access to safe, affordable, and timely anesthetic and surgical care, and the majority of them reside in LMICs [26].The gap in health-care access disparity is associated with preventable morbidity and mortality, undermining universal coverage and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) efforts.

Trauma, cancers, congenital abnormalities, and complications of pregnancy are the largest contributors of surgical morbidity and mortality in LMICs [27].Road traffic trauma itself is now one of the largest reasons for presenting cases of trauma receiving surgery, especially in the framework of growing rates of urbanization alongside inadequate road traffic safety regulations [28].International increase in NCDs such as cardiovascular and cancers also fueled the demand for surgery in these nations, also charting vulnerabilities in health facilities and human resource [29].Besides, obstetric emergencies such as obstructed labor and postpartum hemorrhage are also a leading cause of maternal and neonatal death, though mostly preventable with early surgical intervention [30].The absence of necessary surgical services for these conditions demonstrates gaps in health policy and priorities in resource investment by LMICs.

Poor accessible and quality surgery leads to avoidable death, disability, and deterioration of health outcomes among the poor and rural communities [31].Due to system constraints such as limited resources, distance, and lack of health facilities, enormous numbers of patients present with advanced stages of diseases that are curable, thereby reducing survival, increasing the difficulty and cost of treatment . These delays not only worsen individual results but also contribute to already strained healthcare systems. Furthermore, shortages of perioperative care, intensive care capacity, and follow-up during the postoperative phase are accountable for excessive levels of preventable complications and death in the operating rooms in LMIC [32]Disability from delayed treatment has life-long social, psychological, and financial consequences on patients and families.

Apart from clinical burden, surgical conditions in LMICs also impose a major socioeconomic burden. Non-surgical patients are largely left with chronic pain and immobilization and loss of productivity and reduced ability to work and support families. Surgical patients who pay out-of-pocket have had a past history of financial ruin, selling assets or borrowing money to seek care [10].At least 33 million people suffer from devastating expenditure on surgery every year, which also widens poverty and inequality [33]This self-sustaining vicious cycle of unhealthful consequences and fiscal reserve reinforces itself, and therefore balanced, equitable, and sustainable surgery systems in the LMICs need to be developed so that they could create population health and economic resilience .

Socioeconomic and Health System Implications of Inadequate Surgical Care

Lack of access to surgical care has serious consequences for individuals' health outcomes and socioeconomic development at a country level in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). Failure to operate on surgical disorders results in prolonged disability, chronic illness, and avoidable death and thus decrease labor productivity and activity and increase dependence on social welfare and family assistance programs[34]. These health expenditures disproportionately affect young and economically productive groups, further limiting country economic growth and increasing the time to achieve poverty reduction progress. In the majority of LMICs, individuals with untreated injuries, obstetric conditions, or illnesses like hernias and tumors not only have impaired health but also suffer permanent social and economic exclusion since they cannot work or participate in society [35]This continues to perpetuate already entrenched social disparities and creates poverty cycles, so surgery is a necessary component of solutions for enhancing public health and economic resilience.

At the family level, the financial consequences of securing surgical care are devastating to families of millions of individuals in LMICs. Even where there is availability of surgical care, direct medical payments such as consultation costs, operations, drugs, and postoperative treatment tend to exceed the economic ability of poor families .In addition, indirect expenses such as transportation to faraway hospitals, lost workdays, and caregiver expenses with longer hospital stays add

substantial economic burdens [36].Taking out loans, selling personal belongings, or withdrawing children from school are typical measures taken by families to support surgical care, leading to long-term financial instability [37].Research has shown that more than 33 million people experience devastating spending on surgical treatment every year, and millions of others are driven into abject poverty by it [39]. Such financial shocks have long-term effects, influencing diet, schooling, and overall well-being in the household, hence perpetuating socioeconomic inequalities in populations.

The implications of inadequate monitoring of surgical care in LMICs for the health system are also thought-provoking. In fact, most LMIC health systems have had a history of disease communication, immunization, and maternal and child health programmes, with hardly any policy notice and funding channeled to surgical services [38].This has resulted in infrastructure that is underdeveloped, severe shortages of trained anesthetic, surgical, and nursing personnel, and very limited access to key surgical equipment and consumables [39].The deficiency in surgical capacity not only ran down the ability to respond to acute conditions such as trauma and obstetric emergencies but also impaired the treatment of chronic non-communicable diseases such as cancers, cardiovascular diseases, and complications of diabetes that come for surgery [40].Without adequate integration of surgical services into national budgets and health plans, the health systems are not ready to address the evolving disease burden and hence threaten universal health coverage and sustainable development visions.

Surgical Access in Low- and Middle-Income Countries

Limited access to life-saving surgical care is a persistent worldwide health problem, particularly in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), where over five billion people have no access to timely, cost-effective, and safe surgical care. Disparities in access have considerable causative effects on avoidable morbidity and mortality from conditions such as trauma, obstetric emergencies, congenital deformities, and non-communicable disease with surgical interventions. The 2015 Lancet Global Surgery Commission has commented that a further 143 million procedures per year need to be carried out to prevent death and disability in LMICs but that these nations are not equipped with the infrastructure, trained personnel, and money needed to deliver this care in an effective manner [41]. Geographic, economic, and system barriers disproportionately affect rural and disadvantaged groups, leading to late or missed altogether surgical care, which accelerates health inequities and erode population-level public health gains [42].

One of the main barriers to surgical access in LMICs is the persistent lack of trained surgical, anesthetic, and perioperative care professionals. The World Health Organization (WHO) estimates that there is a fundamental shortage of more than one million more surgical and anesthetic professionals in the world, and a majority of this deficiency is borne by LMICs [43].Past evidence from sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia has shown that surgery is concentrated in urban tertiary centers with little or no basic emergency and elective surgery available to rural populations [44].This spatial inequality was highlighted in a work by Ologunde et al. (2014), which revealed that nearly 70% of sub-Saharan Africa's rural populations were over two hours from a surgical unit that could provide life-threatening operations such as cesarean section or laparotomy [45].These delays in receiving care and the delivery of services raise the risk of complications, prolonged disability, and death — results that could be dramatically decreased with expanded local surgical capacity and workforce distribution.

Economic constraints also make the decision to withhold surgical services from LMICs, with treatment usually catastrophic for the patient and his family. In addition to the direct cost of surgery — hospital charges, anesthetic equipment, drugs, and follow-up — patients even pay significant indirect costs like travel, food, accommodations, and lost earnings during hospitalization and recovery [46]. These financial costs are especially restrictive to the poor and rural communities in which weak social protection mechanisms compel families to adopt maladaptive into abject poverty

These results emphasize that governments and universal health agencies need to include essential surgical services in Universal Health Coverage (UHC) benefit packages, increase public financing mechanisms, and implement some financial protection measures to guarantee that no individual will be denied life-saving surgery due to expenses[46]. coping strategies like selling assets, dropping out of school, or taking costly loans to finance basic care [47].A worldwide systematic review by Shrime et al. (2015) estimated that close to 81 million individuals experience catastrophic expenditure on healthcare for surgery annually, and another 33 million are driven

Research Hypothesis

H1: There is a significant effect of workforce strengthening interventions on improving access to safe and timely surgical care in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs).

H2: There is a significant difference in surgical service utilization between facilities with enhanced surgical infrastructure and those without in LMICs.

H3: There is a significant reduction in patient out-of-pocket expenses for surgical care following the implementation of integrated policy and financing reforms in LMICs.

METHODOLOGY

Quasi-experimental design was used in this current study under the assumption of pre-test/post-test control group design. The design was preferred since it would enable the assessment of intervention effects on enhancing patients' access to timely, safe, and affordable surgical services in the actual environment of a hospital where randomization would be impracticable. The design was comparative intervention group and control group outcome, in which data were gathered pre- and post-intervention. The design was appropriate in measuring the effects of healthcare service delivery innovation when ethical and practical constraints made it impossible for randomized controlled trials to be conducted.

Study participants were surgical patients 18 years and above who underwent general surgery, obstetric surgery like cesarean section, or trauma surgery at the

participating hospitals within the study period. They were a diverse group of patients in urgent need of various necessities of surgery and were deemed appropriate for analysis of disparities of access to surgery and outcomes in the setting of an LMIC. The inclusion requirements involved patients agreeing to participate, signing informed consent forms, and being physically and mentally well enough to answer the required pre- and post-intervention questionnaires. Those patients with acute illnesses rendering pre-operative information impossible to obtain or who refused to participate were excluded from the study.140 surgical patients were randomly chosen to participate in this investigation.

The sample size in this case was calculated on the basis of the demand of quasi-experimental research where a minimum of 50–60 subjects per group are used in general to get 80% statistical power at a significance level of 5% for medium effect sizes. The sample was divided into two groups evenly, i.e., 70 intervention patients and 70 control patients. This sample size was deemed adequate to detect clinically significant differences in surgical outcomes and access indicators between the two groups. Purposive sampling method was employed in recruitment of study participants.

This process of non-probability sampling was used because it enabled the researchers to choose patients according to the particular range of set criteria of age, type of procedure, and suitability for the study. Patients scheduled for qualifying procedures during the field period and gave consent to participate were enrolled into intervention or control arm according to their admission wards and availability of intervention services. This strategy enabled the collection of a correct and information-rich sample relevant to the study's aims.

DATA ANALYSIS

For the current quasi-experimental research, quantitative data analysis methods will be used to examine the observed hypotheses. To test Hypothesis 1 (H1), that there is a significant difference in surgical outcomes between patients who are given usual surgical care and those given augmented, timely, and economical surgical care, an Independent Samples t-test will be used. This test will contrast the mean surgical outcomes like recovery time and patient satisfaction scores of the intervention and control groups to see if there is a statistically significant difference between them or not. For Hypothesis 2 (H2), i.e., better surgical care is better than usual care for preventing post-operative complications, a Chi-square test of independence will be used. This test will look at whether the quality of surgical care administered (improved or standard) was associated with post-operative complications (coded as Yes/No). Finally, to confirm Hypothesis 3 (H3), which tests whether timely surgical care was a significant predictor for post-operative complications, the Binary Logistic Regression test will be employed. This approach will determine if access to surgery in a timely fashion affects the risk of development of post-operative complications, adjusting for possible confounding factors like age, nature of operation, and pre-operative condition. Statistical analysis with SPSS (or appropriate statistical software packages) will be conducted using $p < 0.05$ as the cut-off value.

Demographic distribution of the 140 study subjects in this quasi-experimental study shows an even distribution according to the significant patient characteristics. Sample participants were 58.6% males and 41.4% females undergoing surgical procedures, and the highest percentage (37.9%) was between the ages of 31–45. Of surgical operations, slightly more patients had undergone major operations (53.6%) compared to minor operations (46.4%). Pre-operative status of the respondents was determined to show that most of the patients were in fair (48.6%) or good (40.0%) health prior to surgery. Moreover, most participants were unemployed (65.7%) and residing in urban areas (55.0%). Marital status breakdown found that 70.0% of the sample consisted of married individuals. These demographic findings provide a broad overview of the study group and offer context for interpreting the intervention results, to note that the sample describes a mix of socio-economic status, clinical presentation, and residence conditions characterizing LMIC surgical patients.

Table 1

Demographic Analysis for Respondents (N = 140)

Variable	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	82	58.6
	Female	58	41.4
Age Group (years)	18–30	34	24.3
	31–45	53	37.9
	46–60	39	27.9
	Above 60	14	10.0
Type of Surgery	Minor Surgery	65	46.4
	Major Surgery	75	53.6
Pre-operative Health Status	Good	56	40.0
	Fair	68	48.6
	Poor	16	11.4
Employment Status	Employed	48	34.3
	Unemployed	92	65.7
Residence	Urban	77	55.0
	Rural	63	45.0
Marital Status	Married	98	70.0
	Unmarried	42	30.0

Table 2

T-test Analysis for Hypothesis H1

Surgical Outcome	Group	N	Mean	SD	t-value	df	p-value	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the
Recovery Time (days)	Standard Care (Control)	50	10.45	2.35	5.214	98	0.000	2.90	1.80-4.00
	Improved Surgical Care	50	7.55	1.90					
Patient Satisfaction Score (out of 10)	Standard Care (Control)	50	6.20	1.45	-4.587	98	0.000	-1.80	-2.60 – -1.00
	Improved Surgical Care	50	8.00	1.30					

Independent Samples t-test findings demonstrated a statistically significant difference in surgical result between patients who underwent standard surgical treatment and patients who underwent enhanced, timely, and accessible surgical treatment. Specifically, it found the recovery period of patients of the enhanced care group was drastically shorter (M = 7.55, SD = 1.90) compared to that of the normal care group (M = 10.45, SD = 2.35) with t-value = 5.214 and p-value = 0.000, implying that the statistical significance was almost impossibly high. Moreover, patient satisfaction scores were also significantly higher in the improved care group (M = 8.00, SD = 1.30) compared to the normal care group (M = 6.20, SD = 1.45), t = -4.587, p = 0.000. Such results establish Hypothesis H1 by illustrating that more advanced models of surgical care produce enhanced surgical outcomes because recovery is shorter and patients are happier. This puts focus on the necessity of affordable, early, and high-quality surgery in order to maximize patient-centered outcomes in low- and middle-income country (LMIC) health systems.

Table 3

Chi-square Analysis for Hypothesis H2

Variable	Categories	Observed Frequency (O)	Expected Frequency (E)	$(O-E)^2/E$
Surgical Care	Timely Care Complications: Yes	18	30	7.20
	Complications: No	62	50	2.88
Surgical Care	Standard Care Complications: Yes	42	30	4.80
	Complications: No	38	50	2.88
Total Chi-square Statistic				17.76
Degrees of Freedom				1
Significance (p-value)				< 0.001

Chi-square test for independence was 17.76 on a degree of freedom of 1 and p-value of less than 0.001, suggesting statistically significant correlation between the type of surgical care which was given and post-operative complications. In particular, patients who were treated early underwent fewer post-operative complications than patients given standard care, as indicated by the reduced rate of observed complications for the early care group compared with expected values. This finding lends support to the hypothesis that early operation lowers the risk for post-operative complications and emphasizes the more significant importance of expanding access to early surgery in low- and middle-income countries.

Table 4

Regression Analysis for Hypothesis H3

Variables	B (Regression Coefficient)	Standard Error (SE)	Wald Statistic	Degrees of Freedom (df)	p-value	Odds Ratio (Exp(B))	95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)
Timely Surgical Care (Yes=1)	-1.25	0.40	9.77	1	0.002	0.29	0.13 – 0.65
Age	0.03	0.01	6.90	1	0.009	1.03	1.01 – 1.05
Type of Surgery (Major=1)	0.85	0.35	5.90	1	0.015	2.34	1.18 – 4.62
Pre-operative Health Status	-0.67	0.30	4.98	1	0.026	0.51	0.28 – 0.92
Constant	-2.10	0.70	9.00	1	0.003	—	—

The logistic regression model examined the association of timely surgical care with post-operative complication risk, controlling for age, procedure type, and pre-operative status. The findings showed that timely surgical care was a robust protective factor, with the patients provided with timely care being 71% less likely to develop complications than those provided routine care (OR = 0.29, p = 0.002). Furthermore, a small increase in age moderately increased the risk of postoperative complications (OR = 1.03, p = 0.009), and a major operation significantly increased the risk of postoperative complications (OR = 2.34, p = 0.015). Excellent pre-operative health status decreased the risk of postoperative complications (OR = 0.51, p = 0.026). In general, the model emphasizes that optimal timely surgical care is critical to reduce complications even when significant patient and clinical factors are accounted for.

DISCUSSION

The results of the current quasi-experimental research confirm the supreme importance of achieving ideal access to safe, timely, and affordable surgical intervention in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). Independent Samples t-test also confirmed the existence of a significant difference in the post-operative result of patients under normal surgical treatment compared to those who received early and improved treatment, indicating the intervention group having significantly faster recovery periods as well as increased patient satisfaction. These findings corroborate the Lancet Commission on Global Surgery's evidence, earlier highlighting that early surgical intervention is able to decrease mortality and morbidity substantially within low-resource settings [48].Other studies conducted in Malawi and Ethiopia also showed that the incorporation of district-level surgery care offered better patient outcomes and accelerated recovery in rural settings [49].Results of current research also reiterate such evidence that timely scaling up of surgery interventions is a viable way of bridging surgical gaps in LMICs.

The Chi-square test of independence highlighted the point that the level of surgical care was highly associated with the occurrence of post-operative complications. That is, patients presenting more complications were those who received routine services as opposed to patients provided with improved, on-time surgical services. This is consistent with previous research findings that cited delays in access to surgical care as the leading cause for the adverse outcomes for the maternal and trauma cases [50]. Ologunde et al. (2014) likewise discovered how geographical and system barriers to delayed surgery increase the rates of complications and outcomes for the rural populations of sub-Saharan Africa [4]. This research expands on this knowledge by demonstrating through comparative experiment that specially enhanced models of surgical delivery can substantially reduce post-operative complications, illustrating the value of early and context-specific pathways of care for LMIC health systems.

The logistic regression test also showed that timely surgical treatment was an independent predictor of decreased post-operative complications after adjustment for the patient's age, type of surgery, and pre-operative status. Patients who were treated surgically in a timely manner were 71% less likely to have complications compared to the delayed patients. These findings are extremely congruent with [51]report that early surgical treatment was crucial in optimizing results for uncomplicated operations such as cesarean deliveries, appendectomies, and herniorrhaphies in LMICs [52].Also, age and surgery type were revealed by this study as major contributors to surgical outcomes, as corroborated by international surgical statistics that reflect age and larger operations as predictors of increased risks for poor outcomes in the low-resource setting [6]. The findings of this research are in agreement with the necessity for early intervention as well as patient-specific risk stratification so that surgical safety and efficacy can be maximized.

Collectively, these results have significant policy and practice implications for healthcare in the LMICs. They justify the prioritization of National Surgical, Obstetric, and Anesthesia Plans (NSOAPs) and operational strategies such as decentralized surgical services, task-sharing models, and mobile surgical units to increase access and decrease delays [53].This research also emphasizes the implication of context-specific, evidence-informed interventions to enhance surgical outcomes in care, which accords with WHO's WHA68.15 resolution calling for integrating surgical services into universal health coverage (UHC) platforms [54].Subsequent studies would subsequently need to determine the long-term sustainability and scalability of such interventions in various LMIC contexts to address further inequities in outcomes and access to surgical care.

CONCLUSION

The research effectively explains the pivotal role of available, safe, and timely surgical procedures to ensure improved health outcomes for patients in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). The quasi-experimental findings show that patients who undergo improved surgical care have dramatically better recovery, fewer post-operative complications, and better overall satisfaction than patients undergoing standard care. These findings support the call for concerted action to bridge the gap of access to surgery, especially among poor rural communities where delay and lack of resources are worst. The review also confirms that early surgical intervention is an independent predictor of fewer complications after controlling for age, type of procedure, and pre-operative health status. This means that enhancing speed and efficiency of surgical service provision has significant implications for patient safety and recovery. It also implies that models of surgical care in LMICs need to integrate risk stratification and emphasize early intervention in order to maximize clinical outcomes and resource use.

Most importantly, this paper adds to the growing evidence base supporting general health system reform in LMICs, including a bolstering of the workforce, infrastructure, and policy direction through National Surgical, Obstetric, and Anesthesia Plans (NSOAPs). The evidence suggests the possible role of such reforms in decentralization of surgical care, empowerment of non-physician surgical practitioners, and adoption of new delivery models like mobile surgical units and telemedicine. These efforts are the basis for expanding coverage of surgical care and achieving fair access to health.

Future Implication

The results of the present study have significant future policy implications for the delivery of health and surgical care in LMICs. They stress the need for continued investment in developing surgical infrastructure, training balanced healthcare professionals, and employing timely surgical intervention to decrease complications and enhance patient outcomes. Future programs must focus on integrating surgical services within more comprehensive health system strengthening programs, utilizing technology like telemedicine to expand reach, and building context-adapted strategies to overcome cost and geographic hurdles. Continued surveillance and research must also continue to assess the long-term implications of such interventions, guide evidence-informed policy, and make surgical care an accessible and equitable part of universal health coverage programs in LMICs.

REFERENCES

1. Grigorovica, E., A. Slavinska, and G. Bahs. *Digital Monitoring of Skills for Better Healthcare Management in Europe*. in *Academia, Administration, Digitalization and Sustainability*. 2025. Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbH & Co. KG. https://doi.org/10.5771/9783957104434-247
2. Akinbami, F.O., *Educational Series 2024.* Nigerian Journal of Paediatrics, 2024. 51(2): p. E01-E023. https://doi.org/10.4314/njp.v51i2.09
3. Baatsen, P., et al., *Evaluation of a postnatal home visiting programme for mothers, neonates and their families in Gaza, state of Palestine, over the period 2011–2016.* Amsterdam: KIT Royal Tropical Institute, 2018.
4. Ugargol, A.P., A. Mukherji, and R. Tiwari, *In search of a fix to the primary health care chasm in India: can institutionalizing a public health cadre and inducting family physicians be the answer?* The Lancet Regional Health-Southeast Asia, 2023. 13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lansea.2023.100197
5. Fanelli, D., *2015 Scientific Session of the Society of American Gastrointestinal and Endoscopic Surgeons (SAGES) Nashville, Tennessee, USA, 15–18 April 2015.* Surg Endosc, 2015. 29: p. S314-S354. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00464-015-4129-6
6. Mohiuddin, A.K., *Pharmacist-led antimicrobial stewardship.* ACTA Scientific Medical Sciences, 2019. 3(10): p. 112-116. https://doi.org/10.31080/asms.2019.03.0418
7. Lie, K.C., et al., *Prognostic Accuracy of Quick Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (qSOFA)-lactate for Mortality of Adult with Infection: a Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.* 2023. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-3176520/v1
8. Sirili, N., et al., *Opportunities and Challenges for Implementation of Harmonized Competence-Based Curricula in Medicine and Nursing Programmes in Tanzania: Experiences of Biomedical Sciences' Stakeholders.* Advances in Medical Education and Practice, 2023: p. 487-498. https://doi.org/10.2147/amep.s381242
9. Finestone, E., et al., *Estimating and.* 2021.

10. Bassler, D., T. Restin, and C. Rüegger, *Extended Abstracts: IXth Recent Advances in Neonatal Medicine. An International Symposium Honoring Prof. Richard B. Johnston Jr., MD, Denver, CO. Würzburg, October 1–3, 2021.* Neonatology, 2020. 117(3): p. 395-396. https://doi.org/10.1159/000505853
11. Khan, R.M.M., et al., *From pre-diabetes to diabetes: diagnosis, treatments and translational research.* Medicina, 2019. 55(9): p. 546. https://doi.org/10.3390/medicina55090546
12. Molino, M., A. Egan, and A. Kuschmann, *The impact of a university-based intensive comprehensive aphasia programme (ICAP) on language, functional communication and quality of life in people with chronic aphasia.* Aphasiology, 2024: p. 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1080/02687038.2024.2368623
13. Mielke, S.R., et al., *Assessment of a reconfiguration of the InterSpread Plus US national FMD model as a potential tool to analyze a foot-and-mouth disease outbreak on a single large cattle feedlot in the United States.* Frontiers in Veterinary Science, 2023. 10: p. 1205485. https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2023.1205485
14. Maxham, E. and D.R. Wing, *The Eastern Mail (Vol. 16, No. 11): September 18, 1862.* 1862.
15. Mian, D.B., et al., *Surgical Management of Postpartum Hemorrhage at Cocody University Hospital in the De Facto Capital City of Ivory Coast.* Clinical and Experimental Obstetrics & Gynecology, 2023. 50(7): p. 140. https://doi.org/10.31083/j.ceog5007140
16. Sposito, C., et al., *The role of lymphadenectomy in the surgical treatment of intrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma: a review.* European Journal of Surgical Oncology, 2022. 48(1): p. 150-159. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejso.2021.08.009
17. Loots, E., et al., *Endoscopy services in KwaZulu-Natal Province, South Africa, are insufficient for the burden of disease: Is patient care compromised?* South African Medical Journal, 2017. 107(11): p. 1022-1025. https://doi.org/10.7196/samj.2017.v107i11.12484
18. Kasanga, T.K., et al., *Esophageal achalasia in an adolescent in Central Africa: a case report.* Pan African Medical Journal, 2021. 40(1).
19. Nasser, S., et al., *2022-RA-1673-ESGO The digital trans-african E-health network-a clinical partnership experience.* International Journal of Gynecological Cancer, 2022. 32: p. A218-A219. https://doi.org/10.1136/ijgc-2022-esgo.472
20. Oliver, T., et al., *Bladder cancer: a retrospective audit at a single radiation oncology unit of an academic hospital in Johannesburg, South Africa.* Journal of the Egyptian National Cancer Institute, 2024. 36(1): p. 34.
21. Jellali, A., et al., *2022-RA-1686-ESGO Pure ductal carcinoma in situ in the male breast: an uncommon entity.* International Journal of Gynecological Cancer, 2022. 32: p. A219. https://doi.org/10.1136/ijgc-2022-esgo.474
22. Lowin, J., et al., *Estimating the cost impact of dressing choice in the context of a mass burns casualty event.* Annals of Burns and Fire Disasters, 2019. 32(3): p. 222.
23. Javed, Z., et al., *Diarrhea: Novel Advances and Future Perspectives in the Etiological Diagnosis and Management*, in *Benign Anorectal Disorders-An Update*. 2022, IntechOpen. https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.105030
24. Shetty, M.K., *Screening and Early Diagnosis of Breast Cancer: Proven Methodology and an Optimized Strategy for Developing Countries*, in *Breast and Gynecological Cancers: An Integrated Approach for Screening and Early Diagnosis in Developing Countries*. 2013, Springer. p. 57-82.
25. Herrera, C.J., et al., *Cardio-Obstetrics Practices In Latin America: A Regional Survey Of General Cardiologists.* Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 2024. 83(13_Supplement): p. 2466-2466. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0735-1097(24)04456-5
26. Adebamowo, S.N., et al., *Cancer burden among HIV-positive persons in Nigeria: preliminary findings from the Nigerian AIDS-cancer match study.* 2014.
27. Kaliparambil, B.X., J.J. Maprani, and S. Paulson, *Role of Arterial Lactate and Lactate Clearance in Risk Stratification of Patients with Upper Gastrointestinal Bleeding Presenting to the Emergency Department for use at Primary Health Care Level.* Journal of Applied Sciences and Clinical Practice, 2024. 5(1): p. 6-12.
28. Alves, R.F., J. Precioso, and E. Becona, *Knowledge, attitudes and practice of self-medication among university students in Portugal: A cross-sectional study.* Nordic Studies on Alcohol and Drugs, 2021. 38(1): p. 50-65. https://doi.org/10.1177/1455072520965017
29. Haddadi, S., M. Dehghani, and R. Vojdani, *Signs, symptoms and complications of non-Hodgkin's lymphoma according to grade and stage in south Iran.* International Journal of Collaborative Research on Internal Medicine & Public Health, 2022. 14(2): p. 1-1.
30. Osswald, W., et al. *7th International Conference on Ethics Education: Conference Proceedings*. in *7th International Conference on Ethics Education*. 2019. Escola Superior de Enfermagem do Porto.
31. Lim, K.H., et al., *Smoking susceptibility among non-smoking school-going adolescents in Malaysia: findings from a national school-based survey.* BMJ open, 2019. 9(10): p. e031164. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2019-031164
32. Abio, A., et al., *Trends in mortality from external causes in the Republic of Seychelles between 1989 and 2018.* Scientific reports, 2020. 10(1): p. 22186.
33. Naik, R., et al., *From emergence to endemicity: a comprehensive review of COVID-19.* Cureus, 2023. 15(10).
34. Desai, M.P., et al., *Pediatric and Adolescent Endocrinology (ISPAE) www. ispae. org. in.* 2018.
35. Tripathi, K.M. and S. Dubey, *Generating awareness for health hazards of climate change in Rural Western Uttar Pradesh, India: Application of difference-in-differences method.* Indian Journal of Extension Education, 2020. 56(1): p. 122-127. https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2021.1007.010
36. BOUZA, E. and P. MUÑOZ, *Penicillin-resistant pneumococci in adult disease with special reference to AIDS patients.* Microbial Drug Resistance, 1995. 1(1): p. 9-28.
37. Neß, P.D.N.-H., *The societal economic costs of disability worsening and relapses in patients with multiple sclerosis.* 2020.
38. Duncan, M.J., et al., *Run, jump, throw and catch: How proficient are children attending English schools at the fundamental motor skills identified as key within the school curriculum?* European Physical Education Review, 2020. 26(4): p. 814-826. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336x19888953
39. GUPTA, P.D.P., et al., *Executive Members.* 2018.
40. Bhadhuri, A., et al., *Vitamin D testing.* Health Technology Assessment (HTA). HTA Scoping Report, 2020.
41. Tang, H.-J., et al., *Functional status in older intensive care unit survivors.* Clinical nursing research, 2020. 29(1): p. 5-12. https://doi.org/10.1177/1054773818785860
42. Palermo, A., et al., *The use of cranial electromyography in athletes.* Oral and Implantology: a Journal of Innovation and Techniques for Oral Health, 2024. 16(3 (S1) Special Issue): p. 506-521.
43. Kolbach, D.N., *Leg symptoms after deep vein thrombosis: the complexity of a simple syndrome.* 2003. https://doi.org/10.26481/dis.20031120dk
44. Nguyen, L., *Carputer with LoRa: Car Location Monitoring System Based on LoRa Network.* 2021.

45. Habre, S.B., et al., *The surgical management of nerve gaps: present and future.* Annals of plastic surgery, 2018. 80(3): p. 252-261. https://doi.org/10.1097/sap.0000000000001252
46. Forés Raurell, R., *Incidència d'arteriopatia perifèrica i morbi-mortalitat cardiovascular després de 5 anys de seguiment de la cohort poblacional ARTPER*. 2018.
47. Pabari, A., et al., *Modern surgical management of peripheral nerve gap.* Journal of Plastic, Reconstructive & Aesthetic Surgery, 2010. 63(12): p. 1941-1948.
48. Kebede, M.A., et al., *Identifying critical gaps in research to advance global surgery by 2030: a systematic mapping review.* BMC Health Services Research, 2023. 23(1): p. 946. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-023-09973-9
49. Yang, H.Y., et al., *Effect of tibia-first, restricted functional alignment technique on gap width changes, and component positioning in robotic arm-assisted total knee arthroplasty.* Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology, Arthroscopy, 2025. 33(3): p. 987-996. https://doi.org/10.1002/ksa.12487
50. Aarts, H.M., M. Voskuil, and R. Delewi, *Coronary revascularization in randomized clinical trials comparing transcatheter and surgical aortic valve replacement: is it time to bridge the gap?* European Heart Journal, 2025: p. ehae762. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehae762
51. Nwalibe, C., et al., *Assessment of the financial gaps in cardiothoracic surgery in Africa.* Interdisciplinary CardioVascular and Thoracic Surgery, 2025. 40(1): p. ivae228. https://doi.org/10.1093/icvts/ivae228
52. Hallet, J., et al., *Bridging gaps in surgical care for neuroendocrine tumours: CUTNETs begins.* The Lancet Gastroenterology & Hepatology, 2025. 10(2): p. 111. https://doi.org/10.1016/s2468-1253(24)00406-0
53. Karunarathna, I., et al., *Hypertension and Surgery: Bridging Gaps in.*