

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  
30  
31

**Mapping the environmental co-benefits of reducing low-value care:  
a scoping review and bibliometric analysis**

Gillian Parker<sup>1</sup> ¶, Sarah Hunter<sup>1</sup> ¶, Karen Born<sup>1</sup> ¶, Fiona A. Miller<sup>1</sup> ¶\*

<sup>1</sup> Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation,  
University of Toronto,  
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

\*Corresponding author

[Email: fiona.miller@utoronto.ca](mailto:fiona.miller@utoronto.ca) (FM)

¶ These authors contributed equally to this work.

32 **ABSTRACT**

33 **Background:**

34 Reducing low-value care (LVC) and improving healthcare’s climate readiness are critical factors  
35 to improve the sustainability of health systems across the globe. Care practices that have been  
36 deemed low or no value, in effect, generate carbon emissions, waste and pollution without  
37 improving patient or population health. There is nascent, but growing, research and evaluation  
38 to inform practice change focused on the environmental co-benefits of reducing LVC. The  
39 objective of this study was to develop foundational knowledge of this field through a scoping  
40 review and bibliometric analysis.

41 **Methods:**

42 We searched four databases, Medline, Embase, Scopus and CINAHL, each from inception to July  
43 2023. We followed established scoping review and bibliometric analysis methodology to collect  
44 and analyze the data. Publication characteristics, healthcare and environmental sustainability  
45 focus (scoping review); authors, institutions, institution countries, and collaborations  
46 (bibliometric analysis) data were collected.

47 **Findings:**

48 145 publications met inclusion criteria and were published between 2013 – July 2023; with over  
49 80% published since 2020. Empirical studies represented 21% while commentary, editorials or  
50 opinions represented 51% of publications. The majority focused on healthcare generally (27%),  
51 followed by laboratory testing (14%), and medications (14%). Empirical publications covered a  
52 broad range of environmental issues with general and practice-specific ‘Greenhouse gas (GHG)  
53 emissions’, ‘waste management’ and ‘resource use’ as most common topics. Reducing practice-  
54 specific ‘GHG emissions’ was the most common reported environmental outcome. The  
55 bibliometric analysis revealed numerous international collaboration networks of prolific  
56 authors producing work across healthcare practices and settings, studying numerous  
57 environmental sustainability issues.

58 **Conclusions:**

59 This study reveals that research and evaluation to inform practice change on the environmental  
60 co-benefits of reducing LVC is growing internationally, across multiple healthcare and  
61 environmental areas. Results demonstrate a need and opportunity for the emerging community  
62 to clarify approaches and strengthen the evidence-base through further empirical work in the  
63 field.

64 **Keywords:** low-value care; environment; sustainability; healthcare; co-benefits; scoping review;  
65 bibliometric analysis;

66

67 **INTRODUCTION**

68 Health systems are significant contributors to climate change and other ecological harms, and  
69 are increasingly recognizing their obligation to mitigate their environmental impacts in the  
70 short-term while moving toward health system sustainability in the long term [1 – 3]. The most  
71 significant environmental impacts of healthcare come not from healthcare facilities themselves,  
72 but rather from the products and services that healthcare organizations deliver and consume  
73 [2, 4]. In 2023 at the COP28 Summit, 120 countries committed to putting health at the centre of  
74 climate action and flagging the need for low carbon sustainable and climate resilient health  
75 systems [5]. Strategies identified in the literature as critical to ensuring an effective and  
76 efficient health system include reducing low-value care (LVC) [6, 7] and reducing the  
77 environmental impact of healthcare [8 – 10]. Moreover, awareness is developing among  
78 clinicians, health system leaders and decision-makers of the co-benefits that can be realized  
79 through interventions that integrate efforts to reduce the environmental impacts of care with  
80 efforts to reduce (LVC) [11 – 13].

81

82 Low-value care includes care practices (tests, treatments or procedures) that have been  
83 identified, using scientific evidence, to be unnecessary, ineffective or harmful in hospital,  
84 primary care, long-term care or public health contexts [14]. Common examples of LVC include  
85 antibiotics for viral infections and laboratory testing prior to low-risk surgeries [7]. Reducing  
86 LVC offers myriad benefits including: improving patient care and outcomes and freeing  
87 resources for expanded coverage [7, 15 – 17]. Patients can be harmed by LVC, whether during  
88 the test or procedure or through infections, reactions or by over-testing or over treatment [7,

89 17, 18]. By definition, LVC generates carbon emissions, waste, and pollution without improving  
90 patient or population health [15, 19]. In addition, LVC occurs most often in high-income country  
91 (HIC) settings—settings where access and resources are abundant [20] while the environmental  
92 impact of LVC, in the form of GHG emissions for example, disproportionately impacts  
93 marginalized groups and those in low- and middle-income country (LMIC) settings [12, 21].

94  
95 Within the climate change literature, “co-benefits” include the positive environmental impacts  
96 that a policy or intervention aimed at one objective might have on other objectives, thereby  
97 increasing the total benefit for society [22]. For health systems, addressing the challenge of LVC  
98 [11, 13] has the potential to be a critically important strategy for securing environmental co-  
99 benefits at the frontline of care delivery and at organization- and system-levels. Approaches to  
100 reducing LVC that identify, address, measure and report on environmental co-benefits have the  
101 potential to produce “win-win” situations and to overcome silos to achieve objectives of  
102 improved health and reduced environmental impact. Co-benefits, within the climate and  
103 environmental sustainability literature, have been described as “happy accidents” that produce  
104 a benefit. There may be potential to deliberately optimize such benefits by understanding  
105 interdependent relationships, identifying synergies, and addressing potential barriers [23]. In  
106 early 2023 the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE)—the UK National Health  
107 Service organization that publishes health technology, clinical, health promotion and social care  
108 guidelines—acknowledged the environmental co-benefits of reducing LVC as a critical health  
109 system strategy: “NICE can influence both direct and indirect carbon emissions, and already

110 does so through its guidance and advice products and work to reduce the use of low value  
111 care.” [24p4].

112

### 113 **Objectives & Research Questions**

114 While recognition and activity in this area of research and practice change is flourishing, to our  
115 knowledge, no reviews of the literature on the environmental co-benefits of reducing LVC have  
116 been published. The objectives of this study were to identify and characterize a body of  
117 literature to build foundational knowledge and advance understanding of this field through a  
118 scoping review and bibliometric analysis.

119

120 The research questions that motivated this study were: (Scoping Review) *How has knowledge*  
121 *production in this field evolved over time? What are the key and emerging areas of focus in this*  
122 *field?* (Bibliometric Analysis) *What are the prolific collaborations in this field? Who/what are the*  
123 *prolific authors, institutions, countries and publication sources in this field?*

124

### 125 **METHODS**

126 We selected a scoping review and bibliometric analysis as the ideal methods to conduct our  
127 inquiry. Scoping reviews, a literature synthesis-type, are most appropriate when examining  
128 emerging and/or broad topics with the aim of characterizing their features [25]. Bibliometric  
129 analysis involves descriptive, statistical analysis of aggregated bibliometric metadata associated  
130 with relevant publications to provide insights into key topics, contributors (authors, author  
131 institutions and institution countries)—and relationships between them—of a particular

132 research area (field) [26 – 29]. We used the scoping review methodological framework  
133 proposed by Arksey and O’Malley [25] and later enhanced by Levac, Colquhoun, and O’Brien  
134 [30]. The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis Extension for  
135 Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) [31] also informed the conduct and reporting of the scoping  
136 review component (see Supplementary File 1). Currently, no reporting checklist exists to  
137 support the conduct and/or reporting of bibliometric analysis. Accordingly, we developed and  
138 completed a reporting checklist, specific to bibliometric analysis, based on our knowledge of  
139 and experiences with the methodology (see Supplementary File 2).

140

#### 141 **Search Strategy**

142 A preliminary review of the literature was conducted to explore publications focused on the  
143 environmental co-benefits of reducing LVC and to inform the development of the search  
144 strategy. Based on this, we developed a 44-search term strategy and conducted a  
145 comprehensive search of four database: Scopus, MEDLINE, and EMBASE, and CINAHL (see  
146 Supplementary File 3) . This search was first run in January 2023, capturing publications from  
147 each databases’ inception to January 2023, and then re-run in July 2023 to update the search to  
148 July 1, 2023. Search terms were categorized into three groups:

149 1. *Low-value care* (overdiagnos\* or “low value” or low-value or overtest\* or over-test\*  
150 or overtreat\* or over-treat\* or “choosing wisely” or “less is more” or “reducing waste” or  
151 overuse or “minimal benefit\*” or de-implement\* or deimplement\* or deadopt\* or de-adopt\*  
152 or de-prescrib\* or unnecessary or “over surveillance”) AND;

153 2. *Environmental sustainability* (“environmentally sustainable” or “environmental  
154 sustainability” or “carbon footprint\*” or “carbon emission\*” or “climate change” or “net zero”  
155 or “climate risk” or “low carbon” or carbon\* or de-carbon\* or “carbon performance” or  
156 “indirect carbon impact\*” or “environmental impact” or “GHG emission\*” or “environmental  
157 emission\*” or “greenhouse gas emission\*” or carbon-constrained or “climate crisis”) AND;

158 3. *Health* (health\* or healthcare or medicine\* or medica\* or “commissioned care” or  
159 hospital\* or laborator\*).

160

161

## 162 **Inclusion Criteria**

163 Included publications focused (to varying degrees) on environmental co-benefits of reducing

164 LVC. This focus could be primarily on reducing environmental harms of healthcare, with

165 reducing LVC as a strategy or primarily on reducing LVC with a recognition of the environmental

166 co-benefits or (approximately) equally focused. These criteria were purposefully broad as this is

167 a nascent field and no literature was available regarding the scope of the field or possible data

168 collection parameters. Included publications were not restricted by geography or healthcare

169 setting. All types of publications were included (e.g., empirical studies, reviews, commentaries,

170 editorials, conference abstracts) to capture all relevant knowledge production and

171 comprehensively map its breadth and scope. Due to resource constraints, only English-language

172 publications were included.

173

## 174 **Exclusion Criteria**

175 Publications were excluded if they focused on non-human subjects, such as animals or

176 agriculture, or were focused on natural or applied sciences (e.g., chemistry, earth science,

177 engineering).

178

## 179 **Publication Selection**

180 Search results were imported into Covidence, a Cochrane technology platform

181 ([www.covidence.org](http://www.covidence.org)), and duplicates were automatically removed. Title and abstract screening

182 and full-text review of publications were conducted by three research team members (GP, SH,  
183 TB) who resolved discrepancies through discussion. Two researcher (GP and SH) screened all  
184 titles and abstracts independently. One research team member (GP) reviewed a random 10%  
185 sample of screened abstracts and resolved discrepancies. Full-text review was conducted by  
186 two researchers (GP and SH), discrepancies were discussed and resolved collaboratively. The  
187 reference lists of included publications were hand searched to identify additional, relevant  
188 publications.

## 189 **SCOPING REVIEW-SPECIFIC METHODS**

### 190 **Data Collection**

191 The scoping review data collection worksheet was designed iteratively; piloted with 10 included  
192 publications and revised accordingly. Data collected included publication characteristics  
193 (publication year, type of publication), healthcare focus and environmental sustainability focus.

194

### 195 **Data Analysis**

196 Data were entered into an Excel-based spreadsheet to facilitate data analysis and reporting.

197 Data analysis was conducted by two research team members. Descriptive statistics were used

198 to summarize the data. The data were analyzed by three members of the research team (GP, SH

199 and FM) with discrepancies resolved collaboratively. All members of the research team

200 reviewed the final summary of results.

201



## 202 **LVC and/or Environmental Sustainability Focus**

203 While all publications included the environmental co-benefits of reducing LVC, the degree and  
204 amount of focus varied significantly. For example, some publications focused primarily on  
205 reducing the environmental impacts of healthcare and listed reducing LVC as a strategy, while  
206 others focused on reducing LVC with a recognition of the environmental co-benefits, finally, a  
207 subset focused on both aspects equally, reporting both reducing LVC and environmental  
208 sustainability outcomes. To document this characteristic, we categorized the publications in  
209 three groups:

- 210 1. Publications (approximately) equally focused on environmental sustainability of  
211 healthcare AND reducing LVC;
- 212 2. Publications primarily focused on environmental sustainability of healthcare (and  
213 acknowledging the benefits of reducing LVC); and,
- 214 3. Publications primarily focused on reducing LVC (and acknowledging the environmental  
215 co-benefits of doing so).

## 217 **Healthcare Focus**

218 Categorizing the healthcare focus of these publications was complex as publications crossed  
219 disciplines, medical practices and healthcare settings. An inductive process was used by one  
220 researcher (GP) to map the categories and sub-categories, then validated by two research team  
221 members (SH and FM). Our categorization demonstrates the breadth and scope of healthcare  
222 focus in this field, but is not definitive nor necessarily exhaustive. We developed categories  
223 across four areas of healthcare focus (with 15 sub-categories): '*Procedures*' (Laboratory testing,  
224 imaging, respiratory, anaesthesia, surgery, Intensive Care Unit (ICU)), '*System*  
225 *organization/design/evaluation*' (general healthcare, measurement/metrics), '*Pharmaceuticals*'

226 (antibiotics and other) and *'Care Type/Setting'* (hospital, primary, mental health psychiatry,  
227 nursing, other).

228

## 229 **Environmental Focus**

230 As this is an emerging field, we decided to only collect data related to environmental  
231 sustainability for the subset of empirical papers we categorized as (approximately) equally  
232 focused on environmental sustainability of healthcare and reducing LVC. Our rationale was that  
233 we wanted to understand which aspects of environmental sustainability were being studied  
234 empirically when both environmental sustainability and reducing LVC were studied as a  
235 common focus (rather than parenthetically attending to one or other outcome).

236

237 Categorizing the environmental sustainability focus was also complex as publications often used  
238 vague or differing definitions of relevant terms and focused on broad areas of environmental  
239 sustainability. An inductive process was used by one researcher (GP) to map the categories and  
240 sub-categories, then validated by two research team members (SH and FM). We developed  
241 categories across six areas of environmental sustainability (with 16 sub-categories): *'GHG*  
242 *emissions'* (resulting from both general healthcare and specific practices), *'Pollution'* (air, land,  
243 water), *'Resource use'* (use less single-use products, water, energy/electricity, natural /non-  
244 renewable/ raw resources), *'Waste management'*(Recycling, compostability, re-use, re-process,  
245 produce less solid waste, produce less waste (general), *'Supply chain & facility/service*  
246 *design'*(service design/ processes, facilities/building/ system, sustainable supply chain.

247 sustainable procurement), and 'Environmental stewardship' (Education (decision-makers,  
248 providers, patients, public) and support/ influence/ actions of staff, suppliers, etc.).

249

250 As work on extending the breadth and scope of environmental sustainability addressed in  
251 healthcare is growing in prominence, our goal was to collect data on both primary (outcomes)  
252 and secondary (evidence cited or recommendations made) information from these empirical  
253 studies. We developed two groupings for this information and, within each of the sub-  
254 categories, we collected data and classified it as either: (i) *evidence or recommendation*, if a  
255 study cited existing evidence or made a recommendation in an environmental sustainability  
256 category; or (ii) *reported outcomes*, if a study reported new study outcomes in an  
257 environmental sustainability category.

258

## 259 **BIBLIOMETRIC ANALYSIS-SPECIFIC METHODS**

### 260 **Data Collection**

261 Raw metadata were retrieved for all publications analyzed in the scoping review, primarily from  
262 Web of Science (WoS) (per bibliometric analysis guidance) [27] with additional data retrieved  
263 from Embase, Scopus, and Medline as necessary.

264

### 265 **Data Cleaning**

266 The raw metadata were converted in preparation for data cleaning, analysis, and visualization  
267 using Biblioshiny [27]. Data cleaning ensured the quality of data related to author names,

268 author institutions (affiliate/s the author (and their work) is associated with at the time of  
269 publishing), publication sources (see Supplementary File 4 and File 5). Data cleaning was  
270 facilitated using Microsoft Excel and OpenRefine (<https://openrefine.org/>) software  
271 applications.

272

### 273 **Data Analysis and Visualization**

274 Two analytic techniques were employed: publication [28], and co-authorship analysis [26].  
275 Microsoft Excel, OpenRefine, and Biblioshiny [27] software applications were used to facilitate  
276 data analysis and visualization. Microsoft Excel- and Biblioshiny-generated data visualizations  
277 were recreated, and additional layers of analysis were applied as necessary, using the vector-  
278 based graphics software, Adobe Illustrator (see Supplementary File 4).

## 279 **RESULTS**

### 280 **Literature search**

281 The database searches identified 2456 publications (after duplicates were removed) for which  
282 the titles and abstracts were screened for inclusion. Of these, 372 publications were selected  
283 for full-text screening and 145 publications were included in these analyses (see Supplementary  
284 File 6 and File 7.). See Figure 1. a flow diagram we developed, inspired by the PRISMA flow  
285 diagram, representing the processes of publication selection, data collection, pre-processing,  
286 analysis, synthesis, visualization, and reporting for both the scoping review and bibliometric  
287 analysis.

288 *Figure 1. Flow diagram outlining the study design.*

289

290

## 291 **SCOPING REVIEW-SPECIFIC RESULTS**

### 292 **Publication Timeline**

293 The first included paper was published in 2013. The majority of included publications (34%)  
294 were published within the first half of 2023, with only 12% of publications were produced  
295 before 2020 (Figure 2.).

296 *Figure 2. Publications over time.* Source: Microsoft Excel: analysis; Adobe Illustrator:  
297 visualization.

298

299

### 300 **Type of Publication**

301 The most prominent publication-type was commentaries/opinions/editorials/viewpoints (51%);  
302 followed by reviews (23%) and empirical studies (21%). The remaining 5% of publications  
303 included protocols, conference abstracts and position statements.

### 304 **LVC and/or Environmental Sustainability Focus**

305 The majority of the publications were primarily focused on environmental sustainability of  
306 healthcare, with reducing LVC as a suggested strategy (52%); followed by publications  
307 (approximately) equally focused on both environmental sustainability and reducing LVC (34%);  
308 followed by publications primarily focused on reducing LVC with a recognition of the  
309 environmental co-benefits (14%).

### 310 **Healthcare Focus of Publications**

311 Healthcare focus was recorded in four categories – ‘Procedures’, ‘System organization/ design/  
312 evaluation’, ‘Pharmaceuticals’ and ‘Care Type/Setting’ and 15 sub-categories (Figure 3.). The

313 first category *'Procedures'*, captured the majority of publications (42%) and included  
314 procedures related to the following subcategories: laboratory testing, imaging, respiratory,  
315 anaesthesia, surgery and ICU. The second category *'System organization/ design/ evaluation'*  
316 captured publications (30%) focused on the health system or healthcare generally or  
317 publications related to metrics or measurement. The third category *'Pharmaceuticals'* (14%)  
318 was split into antibiotics and other pharmaceuticals to demonstrate the amount of work  
319 published specific to antibiotics. The fourth category *'Care Type/Setting'* captured publications  
320 (14%) focused on care within a particular setting rather than a specific procedure or  
321 pharmaceutical. This category included primary care, hospital, mental health/psychiatry and  
322 nursing focused publications.

323 *Figure 3. Healthcare focus of publications.* Source: Microsoft Excel: analysisFig 5; Adobe  
324 Illustrator: visualization.

325

326

### 327 **Environmental Focus of Publications**

328 As discussed in the methods section, we collected data related to environmental sustainability  
329 for the subset of empirical papers we categorized as (approximately) equally focused on  
330 environmental sustainability of healthcare and reducing LVC. For the 13 empirical studies  
331 included in this analysis, we reported results across six categories *'GHG emissions'*, *'Pollution'*,  
332 *'Resource use'*, *'Waste management'*, *'Supply chain & facility/service design'* and  
333 *'Environmental stewardship'* and 16 sub-categories of environmental outcome (Figure 4.  
334 below).

335 As described in the methods section, within each of the sub-categories, data were classified as:  
336 (i) *evidence or recommendation*, if a study cited existing evidence or made a recommendation  
337 from an environmental sustainability category; or (ii) *reported outcomes*, if a study reported  
338 new study outcomes in an environmental sustainability category. Evidence or recommendation  
339 data were reported across all 16 sub-categories. The majority were for '*GHG emissions*'  
340 (*healthcare general*), '*GHG emissions (specific healthcare practice)*' and '*Pollution*'. Reported  
341 outcomes were present in 11 of the 16 subcategories. Of the 13 studies that reported  
342 outcomes, seven reported outcomes across multiple categories; four reported a single  
343 outcome. Eleven of the 13 studies reported reduction in '*GHG emissions*', followed by  
344 outcomes for '*Use less single-use products*', then outcomes for '*Use less energy*'.

345 *Figure 4. Environmental focus of publications.* Source: Microsoft Excel: analysis; Adobe Illustrator:  
346 visualization.

347

## 348 **BIBLIOMETRIC ANALYSIS-SPECIFIC RESULTS**

### 349 **Top Author Production Over Time**

350 Five hundred eight-one unique authors contributed to the 145 included publications between  
351 2013 and 2023 (July). There were 19 'top' authors (authors with three or more publications), 14  
352 of whom had already published relevant work in 2023. Most authors began publishing relevant  
353 publications from 2020 onwards. Seven of the 'top' authors were from the USA; six from  
354 Australia; three from Canada; two from the UK; and, one from the Netherlands.

### 355 **Author Collaboration Networks**

356 Figure 5. depicts the top 10% of authors who have collaborated on at least one publication and  
357 describes the networked relationships between these authors. One node (grey coloured circle)  
358 represents one author; a solid grey line represents at least one collaboration between a pair of  
359 authors *within* a network (cluster of nodes); a dashed grey line represents at least one  
360 collaboration between a pair of authors *across* networks. The closer the nodes, the stronger the  
361 collaborative relationship. Nine distinct networks were identified. The largest networks, by  
362 number of collaborators involved (13 each), were centered around Forbes McGain in Australia  
363 (whose included publications were published between 2019 – 2023; and, who collaborated  
364 with all authors in the network) and Jodi Sherman in the USA (whose included publications  
365 were published between 2020 – 2023; and, who collaborated with all but one author in the  
366 network).

367 *Figure 5. Author collaboration networks.* Source: R-based application Biblioshiny was used;  
368 additional analysis (i.e., healthcare focus of publications) completed by the study authors and  
369 applied to the visualization using Adobe Illustrator. Parameters specified: analysis: collaboration  
370 network; field: authors; network layout: automatic (default); clustering algorithm: walktrap  
371 (default); normalization: association (default); number of nodes: 58 (top 10% of total authors);  
372 repulsion force: 0.1 (default); remove isolated nodes: yes (default); minimum number of edges:  
373 1 (default).

374

375

### 376 **Country Collaboration Networks**

377 Figure 6. depicts the country collaboration networks based on author institutions. One node  
378 (coloured circle) represents one country. The closer the nodes, the stronger the collaborative  
379 relationship. Two primary networks were identified (blue, red). The largest network by number



380 of countries captured (blue) was comprised of 17 unique countries, and represents seven  
381 publications published between 2019 – 2023 and generated by two or more of the authors within  
382 the network (but not exclusively). The second largest, but most productive, network (red) was  
383 comprised of 11 unique countries, and represents 24 publications published between 2019 –  
384 2023 and generated by two or more of the authors within the network (but not exclusively). The  
385 remaining networks (purple, green, orange, pink, brown, grey) each represent one publication (n  
386 = 6) published between 2019 – 2023 and generated through collaboration with authors situated  
387 within the primary networks (blue, red).

388 *Figure 6. Country collaboration networks.* Source: R-based application Biblioshiny was used;  
389 additional analysis (i.e., number of publications generated by each network) completed by the  
390 study authors; visualization recreated using Adobe Illustrator. visualization recreated using  
391 Adobe Illustrator. Parameters specified: analysis: collaboration network; field: countries;  
392 network layout: automatic (default); clustering algorithm: walktrap (default); normalization:  
393 association (default); number of nodes: 200 (all countries in world, rounded); repulsion force: 0.1  
394 (default); remove isolated nodes: yes (default); minimum number of edges: 1 (default).

395

396

### 397 **Top Institutions**

398 Three hundred eighty-seven unique institutions (affiliates) contributed to the 145 included  
399 publications. Figure 7. depicts the top institutions (with four or more publications). There were  
400 16 ‘top’ institutions: five were from Australia; four from the USA; four from the UK; and, three  
401 from Canada. The top-producing institution was the University of Sydney with 18 publications.  
402 The majority of top-producing institutions were universities, followed by medical centres or  
403 medical organizations.

404 *Figure 7. Top institutions.* Source: R-based application Biblioshiny was used; additional analysis  
405 (i.e., institution country of origin; institution-type) completed by the study authors and applied

406 as necessary to the visualization using Adobe Illustrator. Parameters specified: analysis: most  
407 relevant affiliations; affiliation name disambiguation: no; number of affiliations: 16.

408

409

#### 410 **Top Journals**

411 One hundred and seven unique journals contributed to the 145 included publications. There  
412 were six 'top' journals (journals with three or more publications). 'BMJ' was the top-producing  
413 journal, with 12 publications; followed by 'Healthcare Papers' and 'Journal of Climate Change  
414 and Health' with four each; 'Medical Journal of Australia', 'Resources Conservation and  
415 Recycling' and 'Social Science and Medicine' with three each.

#### 416 **DISCUSSION**

417 The results of this study provide important insights into the emerging literature on the  
418 environmental co-benefits of reducing LVC. This section offers a detailed discussion of the key  
419 findings, applications, and directions for future work.

420

421 The publication trend over time demonstrated that research and evaluation to inform practice  
422 changes in this area has dramatically increased over the last three years. The fact that there  
423 were more publications in first half of 2023 than in all of 2022, and that the majority of the top  
424 authors have published in the first half of 2023, shows significant momentum within the field.

425 While the majority of publications to date are commentaries/perspectives/opinions; this  
426 characteristic is typical of an emerging field. The field will benefit from more empirical studies  
427 to assess the environmental harms resulting from healthcare and how these harms are reduced  
428 or eliminated when LVC is reduced or eliminated. Future empirical work should endeavour to

429 conduct rigorous investigations and measure and report on the broad spectrum of  
430 environmental harms.

431  
432 The collaboration network analyses revealed that large, international groups of authors are  
433 working together to advance this field. The largest author collaboration networks are centered  
434 around Australian and American authors and the country collaboration network analysis  
435 revealed that the most productive networks were spearheaded by authors in the UK, USA,  
436 Canada and Australia. In addition, the results show that in recent years, increasingly, a greater  
437 number of authors from countries with emerging economies (such as Thailand, India, Jamaica,  
438 and Sudan) have been contributing to knowledge production in this field. While the community  
439 doing work in this field is small and quite concentrated in a few countries and institutions, the  
440 volume and momentum behind this work provides a significant opportunity for knowledge  
441 sharing and consensus development.

442  
443 Our findings also demonstrated that the majority of included publications focused on  
444 environmental sustainability while flagging the importance of reducing LVC as a possible  
445 strategy. Importantly, the number of publications categorized as '(approximately) equally'  
446 focused on the environmental co-benefits of reducing LVC has increased steadily over time and  
447 these publications arguably best advance the agenda of realizing the environmental co-benefits  
448 of reducing LVC. Scholarship is beginning to present the importance of reducing LVC and  
449 environmental harms as inextricably linked. Thiel & Ritchie [12] describe the pernicious cycle of  
450 "harm, treat, harm" to describe the paradox of healthcare harming the environment, which in

451 turn harms human health and requires more healthcare, which further harms the environment.  
452 For example, air pollution is known to induce breathing difficulties, and inhalers are used to  
453 minimize the effects of air pollution, but inhaler-use generates a significant amount of carbon  
454 dioxide, which then exacerbates air pollution [12]. This cycle makes reducing LVC even more  
455 poignant, as care that produces environmental harms—but no benefits to patients—represents  
456 the antithesis of healthcare’s mandate.

457  
458 The healthcare focus results highlighted that the included publications covered a broad scope  
459 and diverse practices in healthcare. To capture this diversity, we developed 15 ‘healthcare  
460 focus’ sub-categories as a framework to begin to organize this work across system organization/  
461 design/evaluation, procedures, pharmaceuticals and care type/settings. While the scope was  
462 broad, the majority of publications were categorized as focused on general healthcare. The  
463 included empirical publications focused on targeted practice change interventions for specific  
464 healthcare practices, primarily, reducing unnecessary laboratory testing and appropriate inhaler  
465 use. These two areas are also significant foci for research strictly focused on reducing  
466 environmental harms or reducing LVC and represent a logical merging for these fields.

467  
468 The analysis of environmental sustainability focus demonstrated that the included empirical  
469 studies cited evidence, made recommendations, and reported outcomes across a broad  
470 spectrum of environmental sustainability outcomes. While we recognize the sample size was  
471 small and the categorization framework broad, our goal was to map essential aspects of  
472 environmental harm and efforts, through reducing LVC, to reduce it. The strong focus on GHG

473 emissions in the empirical studies is likely due to the fact that GHG emissions are the most  
474 available environmental data in healthcare and can be translated into relatable results (e.g.,  
475 equivalency to driving distances). While valuable, this focus also highlights the need to develop  
476 ways to evaluate all environmental sustainability impacts, collect rigorous data, monitor and  
477 report on broader outcomes. In addition to GHG emissions, studies focused on solid waste  
478 management and recycling which are established areas of environmental improvement. Of  
479 note, the included studies also extended into important, emerging areas of sustainability such  
480 as composability, reprocessing or reuse [19, 32, 33]. Sustainable supply chain and procurement  
481 [32, 34] and environmental stewardship [32, 33, 35] are also critical environmental harms  
482 beginning to receive attention in this literature. We acknowledge that the outcomes we have  
483 categorized (using less resources, better waste management, more sustainable procurement)  
484 will all result in less GHG emissions, but it is important to explicate these processes as  
485 healthcare providers and organizations need to develop specific interventions to address these  
486 environmental harms.

487

488 Reducing LVC is a critical strategy to bolster health system sustainability and the recognition of  
489 the environmental co-benefits of reducing LVC is gaining prominence and momentum. Thiel  
490 and Richie [12] describe ‘rejecting health care overuse’ as an act of beneficence by reducing  
491 both patients and global citizens’ risk of climate change induced health harms. As mentioned,  
492 the majority of LVC occurs in HIC settings, while environmental harms disproportionately impact  
493 LMIC settings [20, 21]. It is also important to note emerging research that identifies increasing  
494 overuse issues in low-resource settings [36]. The pervasiveness of LVC further supports global

495 research and evaluation to inform practice change in this area, as overuse in LMIC settings is  
496 further exacerbated by limited public budgets, access to resources and complex population  
497 health needs [36].

498

#### 499 **LIMITATIONS**

500 This study has several limitations. The search strategy was complicated by numerous factors  
501 such as no agreed upon search terms or MeSH terms, and the inability to search on terms like  
502 ‘environment’, ‘sustainable’, ‘waste’, ‘inappropriate’ (as these terms have broad meaning in  
503 healthcare and pull millions of results). To mitigate these issues, we iteratively developed the  
504 search strategy. While we acknowledge that our final set of ‘environmental’ terms appears to  
505 be very carbon-focused, we feel confident that our search was exhaustive. Publications in  
506 languages other than English were not included due to a lack of resources. Finally, while there is  
507 no clear consensus in the bibliometric analysis guidance literature regarding the generalizability  
508 of bibliometric study outputs to the field under study, we believe the systematic,  
509 comprehensive, and detailed approach used to identify relevant publications provides a robust  
510 understanding of the “co-benefits” field, despite not necessarily representing a “complete”  
511 population.

512

#### 513 **CONCLUSION**

514 This foundational study is an important first step to identify research and evaluation to inform  
515 practice change on the environmental co-benefits of reducing LVC and authors and institutions  
516 doing this important work. By systematically and comprehensively collecting and analysing data

517 on this emerging field, our research supports evidence-based health system improvement work  
518 with the potential to increase effectiveness and efficiencies in resource constrained health  
519 systems. Future research should focus on conducting rigorous empirical studies in this area,  
520 including evaluation and reporting on the broad spectrum of environmental harms.

521

## 522 **SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL**

523 Supplementary File 1. PRISMA-ScR Checklist

524 Supplementary File 2. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Bibliometric Analysis (PRISBA)  
525 Checklist

526 Supplementary File 3. Medline Search Strategy

527 Supplementary File 4. Study methods overview

528 Supplementary File 5. Bibliometric analysis data cleaning actions

529 Supplementary File 6. Included publications

530 Supplementary File 7. Bibliometric analysis dataset

## 531 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

532 The authors would like to thank Tasneem Bohra for her valuable assistance.

533 **Author Contributions:** GP and FAM conceived of the study. GP, KB, and FAM developed the  
534 study protocol. GP and SH identified relevant publications. GP and SH extracted and analyzed  
535 the data and generated the data visualizations; KB and FAM provided critical feedback  
536 throughout these processes. GP and SH drafted the manuscript. GP, SH, KB, and FAM revised  
537 the draft manuscript for publication.

538

539 **Funding:** This project was funded by a University of Toronto Implementation Science Seed  
540 Grant.

541

542 **Disclaimer:** No funders provided input into the content of this manuscript.

543 **Competing interests:** None declared.

544

545 **Patient and public involvement:** Patients and/or the public were not involved in the design, or  
546 conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of this research.

547

## 548 **REFERENCES**

549 [1] Wise J. COP26: Fifty countries commit to climate resilient and low carbon health systems.  
550 BMJ. 2021 Nov 9;n2734.


551

- 552 [2] Miller FA, Xie E. Toward a Sustainable Health System: A Call to Action. *HealthcarePapers*  
553 (Toronto). 2020 Oct 1;19(3):9-25.  
554
- 555 [3] Alami H, Lehoux P, Miller FA, Shaw SE, Fortin J. An urgent call for the environmental  
556 sustainability of health systems: A 'sextuple aim' to care for patients, costs, providers,  
557 population equity and the planet. *Health Planning & Management*. 2023 Mar;38(2):289–95.  
558
- 559 [4] Eckelman MJ, Sherman JD, MacNeill AJ. Life cycle environmental emissions and health  
560 damages from the Canadian healthcare system: An economic-environmental-epidemiological  
561 analysis. Patz JA, editor. *PLoS Med*. 2018 Jul 31;15(7):e1002623.  
562
- 563 [5] COP28UAE. Over 120 countries back COP28 UAE Climate and Health Declaration delivering  
564 breakthrough moment for health in climate talks [Internet]. United Nations Climate Change.  
565 [copyright 2023]. Available from: [https://www.cop28.com/en/news/2023/12/Health-  
566 Declaration-delivering-breakthrough-moment-for-health-in-climate-talks](https://www.cop28.com/en/news/2023/12/Health-Declaration-delivering-breakthrough-moment-for-health-in-climate-talks)  
567
- 568 [6] Grimshaw JM, Patey AM, Kirkham KR, Hall A, Dowling SK, Rodondi N, et al. De-implementing  
569 wisely: developing the evidence base to reduce low-value care. *BMJ Qual Saf*. 2020  
570 May;29(5):409–17.  
571
- 572 [7] Parker G, Kastner M, Born K, Shahid N, Berta W. Understanding low-value care and associated  
573 de-implementation processes: a qualitative study of Choosing Wisely Interventions across  
574 Canadian hospitals. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2022 Dec;22(1):92.
- 575 [8] MacNeill AJ, McGain F, Sherman JD. Planetary health care: a framework for sustainable  
576 health systems. *The Lancet Planetary Health*. 2021 Feb;5(2):e66–8.
- 577 [9] Sherman JD, McGain F, Lem M, Mortimer F, Jonas WB, MacNeill AJ. Net zero healthcare: a call  
578 for clinician action. *BMJ*. 2021 Sep 20;n1323.  
579
- 580 [10] Romanello M, Di Napoli C, Drummond P, Green C, Kennard H, Lampard P, et al. The 2022  
581 report of the Lancet Countdown on health and climate change: health at the mercy of fossil  
582 fuels. *The Lancet*. 2022 Nov;400(10363):1619–54.
- 583 [11] Barratt AL, Bell KJ, Charlesworth K, McGain F. High value health care is low carbon health  
584 care. *Medical Journal of Australia*. 2022 Feb 7;216(2):67–8.
- 585 [12] Thiel C, Richie C. Carbon Emissions from Overuse of U.S. Health Care: Medical and Ethical  
586 Problems. *Hastings Center Report*. 2022 Jul;52(4):10–6.
- 587 [13] Born K, Levinson W. Reframing Resource Stewardship and Sustainability as Professionalism:  
588 What Can Efforts for a Net-Zero Health System Learn from Choosing Wisely campaigns? *hcpap*.  
589 2020 Oct 8;19(3):35–40.



- 590 [14] Brodersen J, Schwartz LM, Heneghan C, O’Sullivan JW, Aronson JK, Woloshin S.  
591 Overdiagnosis: what it is and what it isn’t. *BMJ EBM*. 2018 Feb;23(1):1–3.
- 592 [15] Barratt A, McGain F. Overdiagnosis is increasing the carbon footprint of healthcare. *BMJ*.  
593 2021 Oct 4;n2407.
- 594 [16] Paprica PA, Culyer AJ, Elshaug AG, Peffer J, Sandoval GA. From talk to action: policy  
595 stakeholders, appropriateness, and selective disinvestment. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care*.  
596 2015;31(4):236–40.
- 597 [17] Norton WE, Chambers DA. Unpacking the complexities of de-implementing inappropriate  
598 health interventions. *Implementation Sci*. 2020 Dec;15(1):1–7.
- 599 [18] Brownlee SM, Korenstein D. Better understanding the downsides of low value healthcare  
600 could reduce harm. *BMJ*. 2021 Mar 23;n117.
- 601 [19] Breth-Petersen M, Bell K, Pickles K, McGain F, McAlister S, Barratt A. Health, financial and  
602 environmental impacts of unnecessary vitamin D testing: a triple bottom line assessment  
603 adapted for healthcare. *BMJ Open*. 2022 Aug;12(8):e056997.
- 604 [20] Deivanayagam TA, English S, Hickel J, Bonifacio J, Guinto RR, Hill KX, et al. Envisioning  
605 environmental equity: climate change, health, and racial justice. *The Lancet*. 2023  
606 Jul;402(10395):64–78.
- 607 [21] Zielinski C. COP27 climate change conference: urgent action needed for Africa and the world.  
608 *Palliative Medicine*.2023;37(1), 7-9.
- 609 [22] Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Climate Change and Land: an IPCC special  
610 report on climate change, desertification, land degradation, sustainable land management,  
611 food security, and greenhouse gas fluxes in terrestrial ecosystems. Intergovernmental Panel on  
612 Climate Change; 2019. Available from:  
613 <https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2019/11/SRCCL-Full-Report-Compiled-191128.pdf>  
614
- 615 [23] Newell R, Dale A, Roseland M. Climate Action Co-benefits and Integrated Community  
616 Planning: Uncovering the Synergies and Trade-Offs. *The International Journal of Climate Change:*  
617 *Impacts and Responses*. 2018;10(4):1–23.
- 618 [24] Li Fang, Alice Murray, Juliet Kenny, Jamie Elvidge, Koonal Shah, Nick Crabb. NICE Listens  
619 project on environmental sustainability and linked NICE work. Report for the Board. May 17,  
620 2023.  
621
- 622 [25] Arksey H O’Malley L Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *Int J Soc Res*  
623 *Method*. 2005; 8(1):19–32.  
624
- 625 [26] Zupic I, Čater T. Bibliometric Methods in Management and Organization. *Organizational*  
626 *research methods*. 2015;18(3):429–72.

- 627  
628 [27] Aria M, Cuccurullo C. bibliometrix: An R-tool for comprehensive science mapping analysis.  
629 Journal of informetrics. 2017; 11(4):959–75.  
630
- 631 [28] Rousseau R, Egghe L, Guns R. Becoming metric-wise: a bibliometric guide for researchers.  
632 Cambridge, Massachusetts: Chandos Publishing; 2018.  
633
- 634 [29] Donthu N, Kumar S, Mukherjee D, Pandey N, Lim WM. How to conduct a bibliometric  
635 analysis: An overview and guidelines. Journal of business research. 2021; 133:285–96.  
636
- 637 [30] Levac D, Colquhoun H, O’Brien KK. Scoping studies: advancing the methodology.  
638 Implementation Sci. 2010; 5: 1–9.  
639
- 640 [31] Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O’Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA extension for  
641 scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and explanation. Ann Intern Med. 2018; 169(7): 467–  
642 73.  
643
- 644 [32] Davies JF, Seglenieks R, Cameron R, Kuruvilla NA, Grove EM, Shrivathsa A, et al. Operation  
645 clean up: A model for eco-leadership and sustainability implementation. Anaesth Intensive  
646 Care. 2023 Mar;51(2):88–95.  
647
- 648 [33] McAlister S, Smyth B, Koprivic I, Luca Di Tanna G, McGain F, Charlesworth K, et al. Carbon  
649 emissions and hospital pathology stewardship: a retrospective cohort analysis. Internal Medicine  
650 Journal. 2023 Apr;53(4):584–9.
- 651 [34] Spoyalo K, Lalande A, Rizan C, Park S, Simons J, Dawe P, et al. Patient, hospital and  
652 environmental costs of unnecessary bloodwork: capturing the triple bottom line of inappropriate  
653 care in general surgery patients. BMJ Open Qual. 2023 Jul;12(3):e002316.
- 654 [35] Aung KK, Chaitoff A, Fisher H, Dellaripa P. Applying an environmental lens to value-based  
655 care: A resident-driven pilot project to limit laboratory testing on an internal medical ward  
656 service. The Journal of Climate Change and Health. 2021 Oct;4:100075.
- 657 [36] Albarqouni L, Palagama S, Chai J, Sivananthajothy P, Pathirana T, Bakhit M, et al. Overuse  
658 of medications in low- and middle-income countries: a scoping review. Bull World Health  
659 Organ. 2023 Jan 1;101(1):36–61D.



n = 145

unit of analysis = 'publication'

Fig 3




Fig 5

Environmental Focus




Fig 4




Fig 7







Fig 1




Note: Distinct collaboration networks identified by node colour.

n = 145  
unit of analysis = 'pairs of country collaboration'

Fig 6





n = 145

unit of analysis = 'publication'

Fig 2