

Elective Surgery Before, During and After the COVID-19 Pandemic in England 2015 - 2022: A

Database Study

Sandra Remsing¹, Katharine Reeves¹, Felicity Evison¹, Dion Morton², Peter Chilton³, Paul Bird^{1,4},
Samuel Watson³, Kamlesh Khunti⁵, Richard Lilford^{3*}

1. Institute of Translational Medicine, University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation Trust,
Birmingham B15 2TH
2. Institute of Cancer and Genomic Sciences, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston B15 2TT
3. Institute of Applied Health Research, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston B15 2TT
4. West Midlands Academic Health Science Network, Birmingham B15 2TH
5. College of Life Sciences, University of Leicester, Leicester LE1 7RH

* Corresponding author: Prof Richard Lilford, r.j.lilford@bham.ac.uk

Keywords: COVID; Hospital admission; Elective surgery Equity

ABSTRACT

Objective

To track elective surgery activity before, during and after the COVID-19 pandemic in England. To examine for hypothesised differences in use of independent vs NHS hospitals, and more urgent vs less urgent operations over the pre- and post-COVID time windows.

Design

We extracted data from the Hospital Episodes Statistics database from 1st April 2015 to 30th April 2022. This database contains all emergency and elective patient admissions, outpatient appointments and A&E attendances funded by the NHS in England.

Setting

NHS and Independent hospitals in England.

Participants

Adult patients (over 18 years) admitted for elective surgery between April 2015 and April 2022, who were classified as being in priority groups 3 or 4.

Main Outcomes

Total operations, operations by hospital type, and NHS England priority ranking.

Results

The data show that there was a large reduction in the number of elective operations during lockdown with incomplete recovery thereafter. Also the proportion of more urgent surgeries and surgeries in independent hospitals increased in the post-COVID vs pre-COVID time windows.

Conclusion

Under conditions of high-demand, higher value elective surgery procedures are awarded increasing priority and the Independent sector bears a larger share of the load.

BACKGROUND

Waiting lists for planned surgery have increased rapidly during the COVID pandemic. As of July 2022, 377,689 people had been waiting more than a year for elective surgery in England.(1) In this study we examine the effect of COVID on access to planned surgery. We examined access over the COVID and post-COVID time windows with respect to the historic (pre-COVID) data.

Our purpose is to investigate the following questions:

1. What are the time-trends in operations before, during and after the COVID pandemic?

Ideally, the post-COVID numbers would be higher than pre-COVID to compensate for reductions over the COVID period. However, there are many reasons why operation rates may not recover, despite increased demand in the post-COVID time window. These reasons include ongoing staff shortages and possible demoralisation/ exhaustion among the workforce.

2. Does the proportion of NHS-funded elective surgery shift towards the independent sector under high demand? Since operations on NHS-funded patients take place in independent providers as well as NHS owned hospitals, we hypothesised that the independent sector would act as an over-flow provider for the NHS in times of stress and increasing waiting lists.

In that case, we would expect to observe higher proportions of elective surgeries in independent providers compared to NHS providers in the post-COVID time window.

3. Under high demand, does the service discriminate in favour of higher value / more urgent procedures? Elective surgeries are classified into four priority groups by NHS England's Surgical Prioritisation Criteria, described in Supplementary Table S1.(2) In this paper, we focus on priority groups 3 and 4. If the service is prioritising effectively, then priority should be afforded to the higher priority operations post-COVID. This should show up as higher proportions of the more urgent category in the post-COVID time window compared to the pre-COVID time window.

There have also been reports of discrimination against some groups in access to elective surgery.(3)

We therefore record differences in proportions of surgery across socio-economic and ethnic groups. However, this data has to be interpreted with caution for reasons given in the discussion. We also examine trends in surgery rates and socioeconomic group with the caveat that we describe below. For completeness we also look at outcomes of surgery, but again causal inferences must be treated with caution.

METHODS

Study design

The aim of this study is to examine the effect of COVID on access to planned NHS-funded surgery overall and at NHS vs independent hospitals and in Priority groups 3 and 4. We do this by plotting the monthly number of procedures before, during and after the COVID lockdowns and recording the percentages in different groups over these three time windows. We report the study in accordance with STROBE criteria.(4)

Setting

The data used for this study were extracted from the Hospital Episodes Statistics (HES) database that contains all emergency and elective patient admissions, outpatient appointments and A&E attendances funded by the NHS in England. All procedures funded by the NHS were included, irrespective of whether they took place in NHS or independent hospitals.

Participants

Admissions for elective surgery (spells) were included if they met the following criteria:

- One of the operation codes from Priority group 3 or 4 listed in Supplementary Table S2 in primary position.
- Operation date between 1st April 2015 and 30th April 2022.

- Not a repeat of a particular operation for a patient.
- Patient age on admission between 18 and 120.
- Admission method is elective (not emergency).

Patients with unknown sex or age, and patients with inconsistent data (e.g. date of death preceding operation date) were excluded.

Variables

Information extracted about each surgical procedure is itemised in Table 1.

Table 1: Data extracted for each operation

Date of operation	[OP_DATE]
Spell ID and Patient ID	
Patient age	[STARTAGE]
Date of admission (start of spell)	[ADMIDATE]
Admission type (emergency, elective etc)	[ADMIMETH]
Patient sex	[SEX]
Patient ethnicity	[ETHNOS]
Index of multiple deprivation quintile (1 = most deprived)	[QUINTILES]
Treatment site This will be used to classify operations as having occurred at an ISTC or NHS provider. Possible organisations types are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NHS Trust Sites (Included) • CCG Sites (excluded) • NHS Primary Care Trust Sites (excluded) • Independent Sector Healthcare Provider Sites (Included) • NHS Care Trust Sites (excluded) • Other/NULL (excluded) 	[SITETRET]
Specialty under which the consultant worked	[TRETSPPEF]
Discharge date	[DISDATE]
Discharge method and discharge destination (to determine whether a patient died in hospital)	[DISMETH, DISDEST]
Charlson's Comorbidity index	

Data sources

Data were extracted from the HES database. Our study was based on adult patients (aged ≥ 18 years old) with selected operation codes. We extracted data over three time windows: April 2015 – March 2000 (pre-COVID); April 2000 – March 2021 (COVID); and April 2021 – April 2022 (post-COVID).

We identified the procedure codes for the most frequently performed procedures from each of these two categories. The list of procedures used in this study, along with their OPCS4 codes, are given in Supplementary Table S2.

Bias

In this study, we focus on the most frequently performed procedures from Priority groups 3 and 4. These procedures may not be representative of all procedures in these groups, but nevertheless provide a picture of the most common operations. We explore the issue of bias further in the discussion.

Study size

In this study, we have included all procedures that satisfy the inclusion criteria. For Priority 3, there were 3,378,611 procedures and for Priority 4, there were 607,259 procedures.

Statistical methods

For groups of patients treated at NHS sites and ISHP sites, we obtained:

- 1) Number of surgeries across the above three time-windows
- 2) Types of surgeries across the three time-windows.

Since the time-windows are of unequal duration, we made all comparisons per unit of time and include the monthly mean number of operations. We plotted the results across the time windows to allow visual inspection and describe the overall trends in operations.

We describe differences between pre and post-COVID proportions of surgeries by ethnic and socioeconomic group. However, it would not be appropriate to test the statistical significance of the

difference between these proportions as we do not have data on the underlying proportions in the population.

In addition, we describe, across time-windows the ages of patients undergoing elective surgery, the comorbidity groups (using Charlson comorbidity scores), 90-day death rates and 90-day emergency readmission rates.

Data access and cleaning methods


Investigators at University Hospitals Birmingham (UHB) have access to pseudonymised, patient-level HES data for the purposes of this study. Data were cleaned using the inclusion criteria listed above and aggregated for reporting purposes. This observational study was registered with the local Clinical Audit Department (Clinical Audit Registration and Management System number 17421). Data were used in line with the data sharing agreement with NHS Digital.

RESULTS

Participants

The disbursement of participants is shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Disbursement of participants



We identified 2,624,440 Priority 3 surgeries in time-window 1; 238,990 in time-window 2; and 515,181 in time-window 3 (Table 2). For Priority 4, the corresponding figures are 488,502; 41,886 and 76,871 (Table 3). Counts of operations performed over time can be visualised in Figure 2.

Table 2: Total operations and outcomes for Priority 3

Priority 3						
	Pre-COVID Apr 15 - Mar 19		COVID Apr 20 - Mar 21		Post-COVID Apr 21 - Apr 22	
	Total	Monthly mean	Total	Monthly mean	Total	Monthly mean
Operations (total = 3,378,611)	2,624,440	54,676	238,990	19,916	515,181	39,629
Provider	n	%	n	%	n	%
NHS	2,073,273	79.00%	166,022	69.51%	323,686	62.92%
ISHP	551,100	21.00%	72,829	30.49%	190,781	37.08%
Sex	n	%	n	%	n	%
Male	1,085,864	41.38%	98,229	41.10%	214,053	41.55%
Female	1,538,576	58.62%	140,761	58.90%	301,128	58.45%
Comorbidities	n	%	n	%	n	%
0	1,689,054	64.36%	161,375	67.52%	339,741	65.95%
1-3	216,807	8.26%	17,013	7.12%	38,317	7.44%
4+	718,579	27.38%	60,602	25.36%	137,123	26.62%
Deaths from any cause (within 90 days)	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total	9,919	0.38%	1,069	0.45%	1,959	0.38%
Emergency readmissions (within 90 days)	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total	141,541	5.39%	12,566	5.26%	27,015	5.24%
Age (years)	Median (IQR)		Median (IQR)		Median (IQR)	
	71(60-79)		71(60-78)		72(62-79)	
LOS (days)	Median (IQR)		Median (IQR)		Median (IQR)	
	0(0-2)		0(0-1)		0(0-1)	
Ethnicity (n, %)	n	%	n	%	n	%
Black	45,435	1.73%	3,640	1.52%	8,616	1.67%
Mixed/other	40,063	1.53%	5,109	2.14%	8,814	1.71%
South Asian	102,939	3.92%	8,093	3.39%	19,048	3.70%
Unknown	407,384	15.52%	58,468	24.46%	133,061	25.83%
White	2,028,619	77.30%	163,680	68.49%	345,642	67.09%
Deprivation (n, %)	n	%	n	%	n	%
Quintile 1 (most deprived)	439,294	16.74%	38,948	16.30%	83,840	16.27%
Quintile 2	491,645	18.73%	43,765	18.31%	94,246	18.29%
Quintile 3	550,714	20.98%	49,684	20.79%	107,813	20.93%
Quintile 4	568,106	21.65%	52,635	22.02%	113,327	22.00%
Quintile 5 (most affluent)	557,580	21.25%	52,488	21.96%	112,796	21.89%
Unknown	17,101	0.65%	1,470	0.62%	3,159	0.61%
Operation	n	%	n	%	n	%
Arthroplasty of joint	65,990	2.51%	4,741	1.98%	10,815	2.10%
Endoscopic resection of prostate	56,398	2.15%	5,277	2.21%	8,554	1.66%
Hernia repair	121,966	4.65%	8,285	3.47%	18,780	3.65%

Hip replacement	325,739	12.41%	23,478	9.82%	57,876	11.23%
Knee replacement	343,144	13.07%	19,642	8.22%	52,359	10.16%
Lens replacement (cataracts)	1,307,179	49.81%	133,333	55.79%	293,702	57.01%
Total abdominal hysterectomy	120,171	4.58%	15,474	6.47%	23,080	4.48%
Total cholecystectomy	283,853	10.82%	28,760	12.03%	50,015	9.71%

Table 3: Total operations and outcomes for Priority 4


Priority 4						
	Pre-COVID Apr 15 - Mar 19		COVID Apr 20 - Mar 21		Post-COVID Apr 21 - Apr 22	
	Total	Monthly mean	Total	Monthly mean	Total	Monthly mean
	488,502	10,177	41,886	3,491	76,871	5,913
Provider	n	%	n	%	n	%
NHS	435,192	89.09%	31,969	76.44%	55,513	72.22%
ISHP	53,310	10.91%	9,855	23.56%	21,354	27.78%
Sex	n	%	n	%	n	%
Male	198,149	40.56%	17,890	42.71%	31,283	40.70%
Female	290,353	59.44%	23,996	57.29%	45,588	59.30%
Comorbidities	n	%	n	%	n	%
0	412,859	84.52%	35,263	84.19%	64,829	84.33%
1-3	12,834	2.63%	1,194	2.85%	2,076	2.70%
4+	62,809	12.86%	5,429	12.96%	9,966	12.96%
Deaths from any cause (within 90 days)	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total	715	0.15%	118	0.28%	174	0.23%
Emergency remissions (within 90 days)	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total	28,243	5.78%	2,592	6.19%	4,507	5.86%
Age (years)	Median (IQR)		Median (IQR)		Median (IQR)	
	35(26-54)		49(30-72)		45(29-72)	
LOS (days)	Median (IQR)		Median (IQR)		Median (IQR)	
	0(0-0)		0(0-0)		0(0-0)	
Ethnicity (n, %)	n	%	n	%	n	%
Black	18,634	3.81%	1,134	2.71%	2,416	3.14%
Mixed/other	13,183	2.70%	996	2.38%	1,958	2.55%
South Asian	24,209	4.96%	1,873	4.47%	3,586	4.66%
Unknown	97,703	20.00%	8,517	20.33%	16,817	21.88%
White	334,773	68.53%	29,366	70.11%	52,094	67.77%
Deprivation (n, %)	n	%	n	%	n	%
Quintile 1 (most deprived)	108,560	22.22%	8,545	20.40%	15,873	20.65%
Quintile 2	107,587	22.02%	8,584	20.49%	15,986	20.80%
Quintile 3	96,642	19.78%	8,426	20.12%	15,240	19.83%
Quintile 4	91,373	18.70%	8,466	20.21%	15,277	19.87%
Quintile 5 (most affluent)	81,468	16.68%	7,662	18.29%	14,097	18.34%

Unknown	2,872	0.59%	203	0.48%	398	0.52%
Operation	n	%	n	%	n	%
Myomectomy	10,495	2.15%	922	2.20%	1,829	2.38%
Renal stones	46,940	9.61%	5,809	13.87%	8,321	10.82%
Septoplasty, Rhinoplasty & Septorhinoplasty	10,743	2.20%	584	1.39%	1,722	2.24%
Tonsillectomy	79,877	16.35%	5,515	13.17%	10,279	13.37%
Wisdom tooth extraction	271,358	55.55%	15,551	37.13%	31,016	40.35%
YAG laser eye	69,089	14.14%	13,505	32.24%	23,704	30.84%

Time-trends

Figure 2 shows the changing number of Priority 3 and 4, NHS-funded operations taking place in ISHPs and NHS hospitals over the three time windows. The data track the massive drop off in operations at the high points of the pandemic, followed by incomplete recovery.

Figure 2: Operation numbers in NHS and ISHP hospitals over time and by priority ranking








Figure 3: Indexed Operation numbers in NHS and ISHP hospitals over time and by priority ranking



Proportions Treated in NHS vs Independent Hospitals Over Time-Windows

In both priority groups, we can see that there is a shift between operations in NHS hospitals vs independent sector hospitals in the pre- and post-COVID time windows. In Priority 3, 79% of

operations were carried out by NHS providers before COVID and this falls to 63% post-COVID.

Similarly, the percentage falls from 89% to 72% for Priority 4 operations.

Figure 3 shows the same operation numbers indexed to April 2015. These plots show that independent hospitals more than recovered after COVID and NHS hospitals are yet to return to pre-COVID levels. For Priority 3 operations, there were twice as many in independent hospitals at the start of 2022 as there had been in April 2015 and over three times as many for Priority 4. In NHS hospitals, however, there were half as many for Priority 3 and 4 as there had been in April 2015. This is in the direction hypothesised in the introduction (Question 1).

Prioritisation of Operation Types

Visual inspection of Figures 2 and 3 suggest that the drop in operation rates pre-COVID to post-COVID is of larger magnitude for priority 4 operations than for priority 3 operations. As stated earlier, the proportion of operations in the independent section is much higher for group 4 than for group 3. This is in the direction hypothesised under Question 3 in the introduction.

Table 4 shows the mean monthly percentage change for all operation types from pre-COVID to post-COVID. It is clear that the number of operations reduced for almost all operations types, except for YAG laser eye surgery.

Table 4: Mean monthly differences between pre and post COVID time windows in number of operations

	Mean monthly change	Mean monthly % change
Priority 3		
All	-227.60	6.24%
Arthroplasty of joint	-5.39	11.64%
Lens replacement (cataracts)	-127.75	15.01%
Total cholecystectomy	-19.50	6.85%
Hernia repair	-7.48	12.79%
Hip replacement	-21.13	18.38%
Total abdominal hysterectomy	-4.86	1.05%
Knee replacement	-35.00	52.66%
Endoscopic resection of prostate	-6.50	4.66%

Priority 4		
All	-58.88	3.48%
Septoplasty, Rhinoplasty & Septorhinoplasty	-1.36	11.85%
Myomectomy	-0.71	9.39%
Renal stones	-12.56	0.35%
Tonsillectomy	-10.23	3.21%
Wisdom tooth extraction	-42.71	5.81%
YAG laser eye	8.70	13.60%

Effect of Socio-Economic Level and Ethnic Group

Supplementary Figure S1 shows surgery by deprivation quintile. There is no obvious visual trend by deprivation quintile. Supplementary Figure S2 shows operation numbers by ethnic group for Priority 3 surgeries in NHS hospitals and ISHPs. The same data are presented for Priority 4 surgeries in Supplementary Figure S3. The most noticeable feature is the spike in Priority 4 surgeries among white patients in ISHPs specifically. The spike referred to in Figure 6 seems to be driven by one operation only – YAG laser eye surgery.

Outcomes

The death rate among Priority 3 operations is higher in the COVID period by 0.07%, despite a lower proportion of people with co-morbidities in the COVID time window (Table 3). Nevertheless, there is a slight (0.1%) reduction in emergency readmissions in the COVID period. Deaths and readmissions are both increased in the COVID time window but, in this case, the proportion with co-morbidities increases slightly. The death rate for Priority 4 operations is also higher during COVID than pre-COVID but the comorbidity group proportions remain unchanged.

DISCUSSION

Key results

We found that, overall, operation rates have not recovered to their pre-COVID level. This has obvious implications for the reduction of waiting times and health effects for the population. Our data are silent on the reasons for failure for surgery rates to recover. Conceivably, this is simply part of a secular trend and some support for this idea comes from the trend line observed in Figure 2. Alternatively, and we think more plausibly, the COVID pandemic has done lasting structural damage that include staff shortages observed elsewhere in the economy.(5, 6)

It is clear that the independent sector has absorbed some of the increased demand for elective surgical services. Elsewhere, we have shown that outcomes for NHS-funded patients are better following operations in the independent sector compared to NHS hospitals after propensity score matching and across different risk levels.(7)

We find clear evidence that under conditions of high demand, higher value procedures are awarded increasing priority. Whether this trend has gone far enough is a topic worthy of further study, but it is reasonable to suppose that as the number of these procedures increases, so the cases selected are those which are causing the patient greater distress. Insofar as this is true, the utility gain per operation will rise as the numbers of such operations performed declines – the formal argument is laid out elsewhere.(8)

With regard to socioeconomic and ethnic groups, comparisons must be interpreted with caution because we do not know how denominators may be shifting in the population. In the particular issue of ethnicity, the proportions change because of rapidly changing willingness to declare an ethnic group (Tables 2 and 3). However, there is one signal that stands out from noise and that cannot plausibly be attributed to shifts in underlying proportions in the population – the spike in YAG eye

operations. These are done mainly in White people and in independent hospitals. This enigmatic finding warrants further explanation.

Limitations

There are always limitations when working with routinely collected healthcare data, mainly that they are not collected for the purpose of audit, service evaluation or research. There are possible coding errors and missing data, however our analysis is purely descriptive and shows the trends over a very large number of operations.

Interpretation

The English NHS is responding to the crisis of rising waiting times by intervening at the supply side and the demand side. At the demand side, the government is producing an app that can direct patients to providers with the lowest waiting lists.(9) A possible problem with this policy is that it assumes that supply can be rapidly expanded to meet increased demand in organisations with currently low waiting times. At the supply side, the government is promoting High Volume Low Complexity Hubs, whose resources are ring-fenced to provide separate packages for elective operations in elective facilities.(10) A call has been announced by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) to conduct a thorough investigation of these Hubs. In due course we will have evidence on whether Hubs can reduce waiting times overall. In the meantime, it would appear that the independent sector is absorbing some of the load of elective surgery, but with less discrimination between more and less urgent cases.

Generalisability

The data used for this study are for the most frequently performed operations in each priority group. Therefore, our conclusions are strictly generalisable across these operation types.

OTHER INFORMATION

Funding

This study was funded by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) Applied Research Collaboration (ARC) West Midlands and the NIHR ARC East Midlands. Views expressed here are not necessarily those of any funder, the NHS, or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Accessibility of protocol, raw data and programming code

The protocol can be shared on request. Raw data and programming code is not available to share due to data sharing agreements with NHS Digital.

Ethics

This database study was registered with the local Clinical Audit Department. The University of Birmingham Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics Ethical Review Committee board ruled that ethical approval could be waived and patient consent was not needed. Data were used in line with the data sharing agreement with NHS Digital.

References:

1. British Medical Association. NHS Backlog Data Analysis 2022 [updated 2022-09-082022-10-06]. Available from: <https://www.bma.org.uk/advice-and-support/nhs-delivery-and-workforce/pressures/nhs-backlog-data-analysis>.
2. NHS England. Clinical validation of surgical waiting lists. London: NHS; 2021. Contract No.: C0760.
3. Moscelli G, Siciliani L, Gutacker N, Cookson R. Socioeconomic inequality of access to healthcare: Does choice explain the gradient? *Journal of Health Economics*. 2018;57:290-314.
4. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *Bmj*. 2007;335(7624):806-8.
5. Iacobucci G. Covid-19: Staff absences are continuing to stretch NHS hospitals, say leaders. *BMJ*. 2022;376:o350.
6. Inman P. Rise of Omicron subvariants sends UK staff absence soaring. *The Guardian*. 2022 2022-07-28.
7. Crothers H, Liaqat A, Reeves K, Watson SI, Gallier S, Khunti K, et al. Outcomes for surgical procedures funded by the English health service but carried out in public versus independent hospitals: a database study. *BMJ Qual Saf*. 2022;31(7):515-25.
8. Lilford R, Girling A, Braunholtz D, Gillett W, Gordon J, Brown CA, et al. Cost-utility analysis when not everyone wants the treatment: modeling split-choice bias. *Med Decis Making*. 2007;27(1):21-6.
9. Smyth C. App will let patients avoid long NHS waits. *The Times*. 2022 2022-08-31.
10. Department of Health and Social Care. Over 50 new surgical hubs set to open across England to help bust the COVID-19 backlogs London: Department of Health and Social Care; 2022 [updated 2022-08-26. Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/over-50-new-surgical-hubs-set-to-open-across-england-to-help-bust-the-covid-backlogs>.