

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Full title: Clinical spine care partnerships between low- and high-resource countries: A scoping review

Short title: Global clinical spine care partnerships

Hannah Lin¹, Kristin Halvorsen², Myat Thu Win¹, Michael Yancey¹, Nada Rbil¹, Abhinaba Chatterjee¹,
Bridget Jivanelli¹, Sariah Khormae^{1*}

¹ Hospital for Special Surgery, New York, New York, United States of America

² Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, California, United States of America

* Corresponding author

Email: khormaes@hss.edu

24 **Abstract**

25

26 **Background**

27 Clinical collaboration between spine professionals in high-resource (HR) and low-resource (LR) countries
28 may provide improvements in the accessibility, efficacy, and safety of global spine care. Currently, the
29 scope and effectiveness of these collaborations remain unclear. In this review, we describe the literature
30 on the current state of these partnerships to provide a framework for exploring future best practices.

31 **Methods**

32 PubMed, Embase, and Cochrane Library were queried for articles on spine-based clinical partnerships
33 between HR and LR countries published between 2000 and March 10, 2023. This search yielded 1528
34 total publications. After systematic screening, nineteen articles were included in the final review.

35 **Results**

36 All published partnerships involved direct clinical care and 13/19 included clinical training of local
37 providers. Most of the published collaborations reviewed involved one of four major global outreach
38 organizations with the majority of sites in Africa. Participants were primarily physicians and physicians-
39 in-training. Only 5/19 studies reported needs assessments prior to starting their partnerships. Articles
40 were split on evaluative focus, with some only evaluating clinical outcomes and some evaluating the
41 nature of the partnership itself.

42 **Conclusions**

43 Published studies on spine-focused clinical partnerships between HR and LR countries remain scarce.
44 Those that are published often do not report needs assessments and formal metrics to evaluate the efficacy
45 of such partnerships. Toward improving the quality of spine care globally, we recommend an increase in

46 the quality and quantity of published studies involving clinical collaborations between HR and LR
47 countries, with careful attention to reporting early needs assessments and evaluation strategies.

48

49

50 **Introduction**

51

52 Musculoskeletal disorders are a leading cause of disability worldwide, with low-resource (LR)
53 countries being the most severely impacted [1, 2]. Spinal disorders and injury have long been recognized
54 as a major public health issue and cause of disability, economic hardship, and morbidity in developed
55 countries. In 2010, the World Health Organization (WHO) Global Burden of Disease study reported that
56 spinal disorders and injuries also place a substantial burden of disability on people in LR countries [3].
57 This study included both low-income countries (those with a gross national income (GNI) per capita of
58 <\$1,085) and lower-middle income countries (those with a GNI per capita between \$1,086 and \$4,255) as
59 LR countries [4]. In contrast, high-resource (HR) countries have a GNI per capita above \$13,206 [4].

60 LR countries represent 48% of the global population but only 19% of all surgeons, resulting in a
61 ratio of 5.5 providers per 100,000 people compared to 56.9 providers per 100,000 people in HR countries
62 [5]. The surgical specialist workforce is even more inequitably distributed. Major barriers to safe surgical
63 care include limited resources, insufficient surgical workforce, and inadequate training and education
64 programs [6]. Effective partnerships with HR countries provide a potential pathway to addressing some of
65 these challenges.

66 Historically, some specialized surgical care in LR countries has relied on visiting surgical teams
67 from HR countries to serve selected local patients [6–8]. This model, however, can neglect the importance
68 of investment in local health infrastructure and staff training for more long-term impact [9]. A more

69 sustainable model of high-quality surgical care involves a strong health investment in LR countries, with
70 emphasis on creating sustainable systems with training and resource allocation [6].

71 In the past few decades, spine-based partnerships involving clinical care and training
72 collaborations between HR and LR countries have arisen as a response to the need for accessible, safe,
73 and affordable spine care globally [10, 11]. Currently, there are several leading organizations, such as
74 World Spine Care (WSC) and the Scoliosis Research Society Global Outreach Program (SRS-GOP),
75 pursuing these clinical spine care partnerships. However, to the authors' knowledge, there is no
76 centralized summary of all such functioning clinical partnerships.

77 This scoping review aims to describe the current landscape of peer-reviewed literature reporting
78 on HR-LR country spine-based clinical care partnerships. This will provide a framework for future
79 determination of effective practices and inform the sustainable, equitable, and accountable
80 implementation of future partnerships.

81

82

83 **Methods**

84

85 **Search Strategy**

86 A curated PubMed search was created using a combination of controlled keywords, including
87 “global health,” “medical missions,” “education,” “training,” “clinical,” “resource limited,” “spine,” and
88 “spinal,” then translated for use in Embase and the Cochrane Library databases. The complete search
89 strategy (S1 Appendix) and a completed PRISMA-ScR checklist (S2 Table) are included for
90 transparency. The search limited publication dates to January 1, 2000 through March 10, 2023, and
91 animal studies were excluded. Covidence, a systematic review software package, was used for
92 deduplication of references, title/abstract screening, full text screening, and data extraction. Reference

93 lists of relevant papers were also screened for potential articles. Each study was screened by three team
94 members to reduce bias.

95

96 **Study selection**

97 Three reviewers independently screened titles, abstracts, and full texts obtained from the above
98 search. Articles were included if they were experimental studies, observational studies, or reviews and
99 excluded if they were abstracts or not peer-reviewed. Articles that explicitly reported on partnerships
100 between HR and LR countries or organizations focused on clinical training of healthcare providers and/or
101 direct clinical care of patients were included. All studies reporting on partnerships with an exclusive or
102 significant focus on spine care were included, and studies reporting on partnerships with broader focuses
103 on orthopedic or neurosurgical interventions with no mention of spine-specific interventions were
104 excluded.

105

106 **Data extraction and analysis**

107 The following data were extracted from the final included studies utilizing a Covidence-designed
108 standardized extraction form: first author and publication year, reported date range of study partnership,
109 HR country/organization, LR country/organization, reported primary focus of the intervention (e.g., spinal
110 trauma, spinal deformity, degenerative/arthritis disease), reported partnership activities (e.g., direct
111 clinical care, clinical training), reported partnership participants (e.g., physicians, nonphysicians),
112 reporting of needs assessments, article's main focus of evaluation, and main evaluation tools used. Data
113 from studies were independently extracted by two reviewers and discrepancies were resolved by
114 consensus.

115

116

117 **Results**

118

119 The electronic search retrieved 1528 articles. After removal of duplicate articles, 1271 underwent
 120 title and abstract screening and 154 underwent full text review. After additional screening of relevant
 121 reference lists, 19 unique papers were included in the final review (Fig 1) [1, 10, 12–28]. Extracted data
 122 from all included articles can be found in Table 1.

123

124 **Fig 1. The study selection flowchart.**

125

126 **Table 1. Extracted details from final studies.**

First author, Publication year	Reported date range of study partnership	High resource country/organization/institution	Low resource country/organization/institution	Reported partnership primary focus	Re cli pa ac
Ahmad, 2023	Unspecified (<1 year duration)	Weill Cornell Global Neurosurgery Initiative	College of Surgeons of East, Central and Southern Africa (COSECSA)	Spinal deformity	Di cli ca cli tra

Boachie-Adjei, 2014	Unspecified	Scoliosis Research Society Global Outreach Program (SRS-GOP); Foundation of Orthopedics and Complex Spine (FOCOS)	Ghana (FOCOS Orthopedic Hospital)	Spinal deformity	Di cli
Boachie-Adjei, 2015	1998-2012	Scoliosis Research Society Global Outreach Program (SRS-GOP); Foundation of Orthopedics and Complex Spine (FOCOS)	Ghana (FOCOS Orthopedic Hospital)	Spinal deformity	Di cli
Brady, 2016	2009-2016	World Spine Care (WSC)	Botswana (Mahalapye District Hospital, Shoshong Clinic); Dominican Republic (Moca Clinic)	Spinal disorders	Di cli ca Cl tra
Chihambakwe, 2019	2011-2017	World Spine Care (WSC)	Botswana (Mahalapye District Hospital)	Spinal disorders	Di cli

Coburger, 2014	2009-2011	Madaktari Africa; USA; Germany	Tanzania (Bugando Medical Center)	Brain disorders/trauma; spinal disorders/trauma	Di cli ca Cl tra
Fletcher, 2019	2008-2016	Scoliosis Research Society Global Outreach Program (SRS- GOP); Project Perfect World (PPW)	Ecuador (Roberto Gilbert Elizalde Children's Hospital)	Spinal deformity	Di cli ca Cl tra
Haldeman, 2015	2012-2014	World Spine Care (WSC)	Botswana (Mahalapye District Hospital, Shoshong Clinic); Dominican Republic	Spinal disorders	Di cli ca cli tra
Kahamba, 2013	2011	USA; Spain; Turkey	Tanzania (Muhimbili Orthopedic Institute); India	Brain disorders/trauma; spinal disorders/trauma	Di cli ca cli tra

Kancherla, 2021	2006-2019	Norway (Haukeland University); Foundation for International Education in Neurological Surgery (FIENS); ReachAnother Foundation (RAF)	Ethiopia (Addis Ababa University, Myung-sung Christian Medical Center)	Spinal disorders	Di cli ca cli tra
Nemani, 2015	2012-2013	Scoliosis Research Society Global Outreach Program (SRS- GOP); Foundation of Orthopedics and Complex Spine (FOCOS)	Ghana (FOCOS Orthopedic Hospital)	Spinal deformity	Di cli
Verma, 2019	1998-2016	Scoliosis Research Society Global Outreach Program (SRS- GOP); Foundation of Orthopedics and Complex Spine (FOCOS)	Ghana (FOCOS Orthopedic Hospital)	Spinal deformity	Di cli ca Cl tra

Njoku, 2016	2014	Weill Cornell Neurosurgery; Foundation for International Education in Neurological Surgery (FIENS)	Tanzania (Muhimbili Orthopedic Institute)	Spinal trauma	Di cli ca cli tra
Outerbridge, 2017	2011-2017	World Spine Care (WSC)	Botswana (Mahalapye District Hospital, Shoshong Clinic, Princess Marina Hospital); Ghana (Ridge Hospital); India (Mahatma Gandhi Mission University); Dominican Republic (Moca Clinic)	Spinal disorders	Di cli ca cli tra

Papadopoulos, 2015	2002-2009	Scoliosis Research Society Global Outreach Program (SRS-GOP); Foundation of Orthopedics and Complex Spine (FOCOS)	Ghana (FOCOS Orthopedic Hospital)	Spinal deformity	Di cli
Sommer, 2022	Unspecified (<1 year duration)	USA (New York Presbyterian Hospital/Weill Cornell Medicine)	Tanzania (Muhimbili Orthopedic Institute)	Spinal deformity	Di cli ca Cl tra
Verma, 2018	2013-2016	Scoliosis Research Society Global Outreach Program (SRS-GOP); Foundation of Orthopedics and Complex Spine (FOCOS)	Ghana (FOCOS Orthopedic Hospital)	Spinal deformity	Di cli

Wait, 2010	2009	Madaktari Africa; USA (Weill Cornell Medical College, Barrow Neurological Institute)	Tanzania (Muhimbili Orthopedic Institute, Bugando Medical Center)	Brain disorders/trauma; spinal disorders/trauma	Di cli ca cli tra
Wilson, 2012	2009-2010	Madaktari Africa; USA (Barrow Neurological Institute)	Tanzania (Bugando Medical Center)	Brain disorders/trauma; spinal disorders/trauma	Di cli ca cli tra

127

128

129 **Dates and settings of partnerships**

130 Although our literature search encompassed articles published from 2000 until early 2023, all of
 131 the studies that fit the final inclusion criteria (19/19, 100%) were published in or after 2010. All reported
 132 study partnerships took place between 1998 and 2019. 10/19 (53%) of the articles reported on long-term
 133 partnerships with a duration of three years or more.

134 The included articles revealed four leading global outreach organizations that served as HR
 135 partners in their respective collaborations. The SRS-GOP and the Foundation of Orthopedics and
 136 Complex Spine (FOCOS), two organizations focused on spinal deformity care and education of local
 137 surgeons, were involved as HR partners together in six studies (32%) [12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 23]. SRS-GOP
 138 also featured in one other article as a HR partner alongside Project Perfect World (PPW), an organization
 139 aiming to improve pediatric orthopedic care in Ecuador [17]. WSC, an organization providing evidence-
 140 based spine care to LR communities, was the reported HR partner in four articles (21%) [1, 10, 25, 27].
 141 Three articles (16%) involved Madaktari Africa, an organization dedicated to training healthcare workers

142 in Sub-Saharan Africa, as an HR partner [15, 26, 28]. Other organizations featured as HR partners were
143 the Foundation for International Education in Neurological Surgery (FIENS) and
144 ReachAnotherFoundation (RAF) [19, 21]. Three studies (16%) did not report affiliations with any
145 specific global outreach organizations, instead involving individuals or teams of surgeons from hospitals
146 in various HR countries [13, 22, 24].

147 Reported LR partners spanned across four global regions: Africa (18/19, 95%) [1, 10, 12–16, 18–
148 28], the Caribbean (3/19, 16%) [10, 25], South Asia (2/19, 11%) [24, 27], and South America (1/19, 5%)
149 [17]. Interventions were most concentrated in Africa, where Ghana (7/19, 37%) [12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 23,
150 27] was the most frequently involved LR partner country, while Tanzania (6/19, 32%) [13, 15, 19, 24, 26,
151 28] and Botswana (4/19, 21%) [1, 10, 25, 27] were also involved in multiple partnerships. All six articles
152 in which SRS-GOP and FOCOS worked together as HR partners centered around care provided at the
153 FOCOS Orthopedic Hospital in Accra, Ghana [12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 23]. WSC partnerships occurred in
154 Botswana, Dominican Republic, Ghana, and India [1, 10, 25, 27]. Partnerships based in Tanzania took
155 place at two different institutions: Bugando Medical Center in Mwanza [15, 26, 28] and Muhimbili
156 Orthopedic Hospital in Dar es Salaam [13, 19, 24, 28].

157

158 **Reported partnership focuses, activities, and participants**

159 Nine studies (47%) [12–14, 16–18, 20, 22, 23] focused specifically on spinal deformity care,
160 while five (26%) [1, 10, 21, 25, 27] focused on general spinal disorders, one (5%) [19] focused on spinal
161 trauma, and four (21%) [15, 24, 26, 28] focused on a combination of brain and spinal disorders and
162 trauma.

163 All of the partnerships included direct clinical care of patients (19/19, 100%). A slight majority of the
164 studies (13/19, 68%) involved clinical training of healthcare providers by HR country physicians. All of
165 the studies (19/19, 100%) involved physicians and physicians-in-training (e.g. residents, medical
166 students) as partnership participants. Eight of the studies (42%) also included non-physician participants,

167 such as nursing staff [16, 24, 28], research assistants [14, 28], chiropractors and physiotherapists [1, 17,
168 25, 27], and other clinic staff [17].

169

170 **Reported needs assessments**

171 A majority of the reviewed articles (14/19, 74%) did not report needs assessments (e.g. literature
172 reviews, focused assessments, interviews with stakeholders) prior to beginning their programs. The five
173 articles that reported needs assessments used various strategies: Coburger et al. [15] and Fletcher and
174 Schwend [17] both reported initial trips to partnership sites intended to assess surgical need, feasibility of
175 complex surgical procedures, and patient population characteristics, while Brady et al. [10] reported a
176 search of existing spine surgery training programs available globally to assess need for surgical trainees.
177 Ahmad et al. [22] utilized needs assessment surveys before, during, and after their training course to plan
178 content and analyze course efficacy, and Haldeman et al. [25] described their assessment of existing
179 facilities prior to officially setting up a clinic.

180

181 **Main evaluation focuses and tools**

182 The reviewed articles are split in terms of evaluation focus: twelve studies (63%) [1, 10, 15, 17,
183 18, 21, 22, 24–28] evaluated some aspect of the partnership itself (e.g. development, effectiveness of
184 training initiative, challenges, local perceptions), six studies (32%) [12, 14, 16, 17, 20, 23] evaluated the
185 clinical outcomes of the care provided through their partnerships, and two studies (11%) [13, 19]
186 evaluated the feasibility of a technological system for surgical assistance.

187 The articles that evaluated aspects of their partnerships utilized mostly narrative and other
188 qualitative approaches, such as reflections [10, 17, 18, 25–28] and interviews [1]. The five studies that
189 evaluated the efficacy of their partnerships' surgical training initiatives utilized a mixture of quantitative
190 and qualitative assessment tools, such as surveys, patient outcomes, and narrative reflections [15, 21, 22,
191 24, 26]. The articles that evaluated clinical outcomes utilized largely quantitative tools such as

192 radiographic measures and clinical indicators [12, 14, 16, 17, 20, 23], and three of these articles also
193 utilized the SRS-22, a validated scoliosis patient-reported outcome questionnaire [16, 17, 20].

194

195

196 **Discussion**

197

198 To the authors' knowledge, this is the first review to present and analyze the available literature
199 reporting on spine-based clinical partnerships between HR and LR countries and organizations. Overall,
200 this review identified several HR outreach organizations that are consistently involved in clinical spine
201 partnerships, but there was significant variety in the evaluative focus of published articles and a relative
202 paucity of peer-reviewed articles reporting on partnerships despite the long durations of some
203 interventions.

204

205 **Large focus on spinal deformity over other spine care needs in** 206 **majority of partnerships**

207 In LR countries, traumatic spine injury (TSI) and degenerative spine disease are widely reported
208 as significant needs. Low- and middle-income countries carry a heavier burden of TSI than high-income
209 countries, with an incidence of 13.7 per 100,000 people per year compared to 8.7 per 100,000 people per
210 year [29]. Researchers have published numerous studies on TSI and spinal cord injury (SCI) in LR
211 countries in East and Sub-Saharan Africa and Southeast Asia [31–34]. An analysis of ten years of spine
212 surgery patients at a Nigerian hospital showed that degenerative spine disease was the most common
213 indicator of surgery, accounting for an overwhelming 52.3% of all cases [35].

214 Given these data, it appears that the reviewed articles show an overrepresentation of spinal
215 deformity care as a focus of HR-LR country partnerships. Only five of the 19 reviewed studies report

216 surgical care of TSI and degenerative spine disease [15, 19, 24, 26, 28]. The reviewed studies show that
217 several organizations are already dominating the spinal deformity field in LR countries, but Madaktari
218 Africa seems to be the only organization regularly publishing studies on TSI or degenerative spine
219 disease. Those considering expanding or initiating partnerships in the future may find it helpful to conduct
220 formal needs assessments at LR sites to consider targeting partnership resources toward conditions most
221 closely matching clinical needs.

222

223 **Balance between direct clinical care and capacity building as main** 224 **reported partnership activities**

225 All reviewed studies reported direct clinical care of patients, and a majority also reported clinical
226 training of local physicians—a significant component of capacity building in a LR country. Several
227 research groups have pinpointed the essential role of capacity building as the guiding goal of ethical
228 global surgery initiatives in order to justify the involvement of outreach volunteers from HR countries
229 [27–29]. Although direct clinical care is a crucial immediate need to address, it may be most effective
230 when it is accompanied by clinical training of local physicians, with the long-term goal of strengthening
231 local health systems and transferring full ownership of sustainable programs to local healthcare providers
232 [25]. Future publications on spine care partnerships should continue to report the specific efforts taken to
233 sustainably strengthen health systems, particularly provider education.

234

235 **Varied focuses and tools of partnership evaluation**

236 A majority of the reviewed articles focused on evaluating some aspect of the development,
237 efficacy, or perceptions of the partnership. The rest of the articles focused on either evaluating the clinical
238 outcomes of the care provided by partner surgeons or the technology used during the partnership; in

239 essence, these studies had already accepted the partnership as an established environment for clinical care
240 to be carried out and therefore did not evaluate the nature of the partnership itself.

241 Although some articles that evaluated the efficacy of their training initiatives utilized surveys for
242 feedback and assessment, there is room for more established frameworks to be used, such as the
243 Kirkpatrick [39], REAIM [40], or CFIR [41] methods, which are already regularly utilized to evaluate
244 training and education interventions. For studies that focus on evaluating training initiatives [15, 21, 22,
245 24, 26], standardized tools may prove additionally useful in the future. More formal frameworks may be
246 employed to facilitate comparison with other initiatives or specialties and may guide future steps to
247 ensure evidence-based improvement.

248

249 **Promising needs assessments reported**

250 Most of the reviewed articles did not report any needs assessments at their planned sites prior to
251 the start of their programs. However, the five studies that reported needs assessments demonstrate feasible
252 steps for future program partners to build on in order to plan ethical and effective partnerships: systematic
253 literature searches, surveys, discussions with local hospital staff, and preliminary trips to the partnership
254 site. This crucial step allows partners to mutually define a clear goal and scope of their program based on
255 a current comprehensive evaluation of clinical and structural needs.

256 Various groups in other surgical specialties have published their work on developing needs
257 assessments to build a foundation for their outreach programs, providing other models that future spine-
258 based partnerships might also consider [42, 43]. Future spine clinical care partnerships should conduct
259 and report comprehensive qualitative and quantitative needs assessments with involved stakeholders
260 through interviews, focus groups, observational studies, focused surveys, and other evaluative methods to
261 provide a strong foundation for the development of an evidence-based partnership.

262

263 **Opportunity for increased reporting on spine-based clinical**
264 **partnerships**

265 Despite an extensive literature search, only nineteen studies qualified for final review. Other
266 reviews surveying the current state of global clinical partnerships in anesthesiology [37] and trauma [38]
267 have found at least two times as many qualifying articles, signaling that spine-based clinical partnerships
268 are not as well-reported in peer-reviewed literature. There is good reason to believe that this results from
269 under-reporting of existing partnerships: for instance, an internet search for spine global partnerships
270 returns various websites of organizations already included in this review, but other organizations with
271 accessible online evidence of functioning partnerships also appear (e.g., Butterfly Foundation Spine,
272 Global Spine Outreach). It is likely that these organizations are having a substantial impact on clinical
273 care, and it would be helpful to have more accessible information in the literature about their impact and
274 approaches.

275 Although the nineteen studies reviewed in this paper revealed that some of these organizations
276 already work together, such as SRS and FOCOS, it is possible that the concentrated areas in which these
277 programs tend to operate (e.g. Ghana, Tanzania) may have already generated other unreported
278 collaborations between organizations. Because spine care uniquely unites two surgical specialties—
279 orthopedic surgery and neurosurgery—as well as non-surgical specialists like physiatrists and
280 chiropractors, there is immense potential for interdisciplinary collaboration. Increasing publication on
281 partnership development, implementation, and outcomes could aid in awareness that in turn stimulates
282 further collaboration.

283 To ensure optimal knowledge of the efforts being taken by HR spine care outreach groups in LR
284 settings, it may be useful for authors to report the nature of their collaborations in all published articles,
285 even if the partnership itself is not the focal point of their study. In this way, articles arising from even
286 informal collaborations may still be used as a foundation for improved, effective partnerships in the
287 future.

288

289

290 **Limitations**

291

292 This review was only able to analyze studies on spine-based clinical partnerships published in
293 three online research databases. Many rejected articles included authors representing both HR institutions
294 and LR institutions but did not report any partnership details in their text [31, 32, 34]. The existence of
295 these articles illuminates the prevalence of peer-reviewed articles produced by HR-LR partnerships that
296 either are not formalized or focus purely on non-clinical research collaborations, leaving room for further
297 analysis of the larger scope of informal global spine care partnerships operating without the involvement
298 of large outreach organizations.

299 Additionally, since the search strategy was conducted in English, articles in different languages
300 may have been excluded. Therefore, more articles on these partnerships may exist that were not identified
301 and the reported findings should be interpreted with these limitations in mind.

302

303

304 **Conclusion**

305

306 To the authors' knowledge, this scoping review is the first study to search for and analyze the
307 current literature available on spine-based clinical partnerships between HR and LR countries. Overall,
308 this review revealed the relative scarcity of published studies on global spine clinical care partnerships
309 despite the clear presence and continued work of many HR global outreach organizations in LR countries.
310 The current studies varied in their evaluation focuses, but the articles that evaluated aspects of their

311 partnerships showed promising needs assessments and capacity building efforts. We recommend an
312 increase in the quantity of formal evaluations and peer-reviewed studies on spine-based clinical
313 partnerships to inform the successful, equitable, and accountable implementation of future partnerships
314 and to promote quality spine care worldwide.

315

316

317 **References**

318

- 319 1. Chihambakwe M, O'Connor L, Orton PM, Hondras MA. If I was more informed about what exactly
320 they do: perceptions of Botswana district hospital healthcare providers about World Spine Care.
321 *Chiropr Man Ther.* 2019;27:28.
- 322 2. Buchbinder R, Blyth FM, March LM, Brooks P, Woolf AD, Hoy DG. Placing the global burden of
323 low back pain in context. *Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol.* 2013;27:575–589.
- 324 3. Murray CJL, Vos T, Lozano R, Naghavi M, Flaxman AD, Michaud C, et al. Disability-adjusted life
325 years (DALYs) for 291 diseases and injuries in 21 regions, 1990-2010: a systematic analysis for the
326 Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. *Lancet Lond Engl.* 2012;380:2197–2223.
- 327 4. New World Bank country classifications by income level: 2022-2023.
328 [https://blogs.worldbank.org/opendata/new-world-bank-country-classifications-income-level-2022-](https://blogs.worldbank.org/opendata/new-world-bank-country-classifications-income-level-2022-2023)
329 [2023.](https://blogs.worldbank.org/opendata/new-world-bank-country-classifications-income-level-2022-2023) Accessed 14 Jan 2023.
- 330 5. Holmer H, Lantz A, Kunjumen T, Finlayson S, Hoyler M, Siyam A, et al. Global distribution of
331 surgeons, anaesthesiologists, and obstetricians. *Lancet Glob Health* 3 Suppl. 2015;2:S9-11.
- 332 6. Meara JG, Leather AJM, Hagander L, Alkire Bc, Alonso N, Ameh EA, et al. Global Surgery 2030:
333 evidence and solutions for achieving health, welfare, and economic development. *The Lancet*
334 2015;386:569–624.

- 335 7. Ozgediz D, Galukande M, Mabweijano J, Kijjambu S, Mijumbi C, Dubowitz G, et al. The neglect of
336 the global surgical workforce: experience and evidence from Uganda. *World J Surg.* 2008;32:1208–
337 1215.
- 338 8. Chu K, Rosseel P, Gielis P, Ford N. Surgical Task Shifting in Sub-Saharan Africa. *PLoS Med*
339 2009;6(5): e1000078.
- 340 9. Johnson WD. Surgery as a Global health issue. *Surg Neurol Int.* 2013;4:47.
- 341 10. Brady O, Nordin M, Hondras M, Outerbridge G, Kopansky-Giles D, Côté P, et al. Global Forum:
342 Spine Research and Training in Underserved, Low and Middle-Income, Culturally Unique
343 Communities: The World Spine Care Charity Research Program’s Challenges and Facilitators. *J*
344 *Bone Jt Surg.* 2016;98:e110.
- 345 11. Wu A, March L, Zheng X, Huang J, Wang X, Zhao J, et al. Global low back pain prevalence and
346 years lived with disability from 1990 to 2017: estimates from the Global Burden of Disease Study
347 2017. *Ann Transl Med.* 2020;8:299.
- 348 12. Verma K, Slattery C, Duah H, Yankey KP, Mundis G, Boachie-Adjei O. Comprehensive Assessment
349 of Outcomes From Patients With Severe Early-onset Scoliosis Treated With a Vertebral Column
350 Resection: Results From an SRS Global Outreach Site (FOCOS) in Ghana. *J Pediatr Orthop.*
351 2018;38:e393–e398.
- 352 13. Sommer F, Waterkeyn F, Hussain I, Goldberg JL, Kirnaz S, Navarro-Ramirez R, et al. Feasibility of
353 smart glasses in supporting spinal surgical procedures in low- and middle-income countries:
354 experiences from East Africa. *Neurosurg Focus.* 2022;52:E4.
- 355 14. Boachie-Adjei O, Yagi M, Nemani VM, Sacramento-Dominguez C, Akoto H, Cunningham ME, et al.
356 Incidence and Risk Factors for Major Surgical Complications in Patients With Complex Spinal
357 Deformity: A Report From an SRS GOP Site. *Spine Deform.* 2015;3:57–64.
- 358 15. Coburger J, Leng LZ, Rubin DG, Mayaya G, Medel R, Ngayomela I, et al. Multi-Institutional
359 Neurosurgical Training Initiative at a Tertiary Referral Center in Mwanza, Tanzania: Where We Are
360 After 2 Years. *World Neurosurg.* 2014;82:e1–e8.

- 361 16. Nemani VM, Kim HJ, Bjerke-Kroll BT, Yagi M, Sacramento-Dominguez C, Akoto H, et al.
362 Preoperative Halo-Gravity Traction for Severe Spinal Deformities at an SRS-GOP Site in West
363 Africa: Protocols, Complications, and Results. *Spine*. 2015;40:153–161.
- 364 17. Fletcher AN, Schwend RM. The Ecuador Pediatric Spine Deformity Surgery Program: An SRS-GOP
365 Site, 2008–2016. *Spine Deform*. 2019;7:220–227.
- 366 18. Verma K, Slattery CA, Boachie-Adjei O. What’s Important: Surgeon Volunteerism: Experiences with
367 FOCOS in Ghana. *J Bone Jt Surg*. 2019;101:854–855.
- 368 19. Njoku I, Wanin O, Assey A, Shabani H, Ngerageza JG, Berlin CD, et al. Minimally Invasive 2D
369 Navigation-Assisted Treatment of Thoracolumbar Spinal Fractures in East Africa: A Case Report.
370 *Cureus*. 2016;8(6): c2.
- 371 20. Papadopoulos EC, Boachie-Adjei O, Hess WF, Perez-Gruesso FJS, Pellisé F, Gupta M, et al. Early
372 outcomes and complications of posterior vertebral column resection. *Spine J*. 2015;15:983–991.
- 373 21. Kancherla V, Koning J, Biluts H, Woldemariam M, Kibruyisfaw Z, Belete A, et al. Projected impact
374 of mandatory food fortification with folic acid on neurosurgical capacity needed for treating spina
375 bifida in Ethiopia. *Birth Defects Res*. 2021;113:393–398.
- 376 22. Ahmad AA, Abushehab A, Waterkeyn F, Cheserem B, Balsano M, Bonfield C, et al. The Efficacy of
377 Blended Learning in a Pediatric Spine Deformity Management Program in Sub-Saharan Africa.
378 *JAAOS Glob Res Rev*. 2023;7:e22.00128.
- 379 23. Boachie-Adjei O, Yagi M, Sacramento-Dominguez C, Akoto H, Cunningham ME, Gupta M, et al.
380 Surgical Risk Stratification Based on Preoperative Risk Factors in Severe Pediatric Spinal Deformity
381 Surgery. *Spine Deform*. 2014;2:340–349.
- 382 24. Kahamba JF, Assey AB, Dempsey RJ, Qureshi MM, Härtl R. The second African Federation of
383 Neurological Surgeons course in the East, Central, and Southern Africa region held in Dar es Salaam,
384 Tanzania, January 2011. *World Neurosurg*. 2013;80:255–259.

- 385 25. Haldeman S, Nordin M, Outerbridge G, Hurwitz EL, Hondras M, Brady O, et al. Creating a
386 sustainable model of spine care in underserved communities: the World Spine Care (WSC) charity.
387 *Spine J.* 2015;15:2303–2311.
- 388 26. Wilson DA, Garrett MP, Wait SD, Kucia EJ, Saguda E, Ngayomela I, et al. Expanding Neurosurgical
389 Care in Northwest Tanzania: The Early Experience of an Initiative to Teach Neurosurgery at
390 Bugando Medical Centre. *World Neurosurg.* 2012;77:32–38.
- 391 27. Outerbridge G, Eberspaecher S, Haldeman S. World Spine Care: providing sustainable, integrated,
392 evidence-based spine care in underserved communities around the world. *J Can Chiropr Assoc.*
393 2017;61:196–206.
- 394 28. Wait SD, Härtl R. Multi-institutional American Team Teaches Neurosurgery in Underserved
395 Tanzania. *World Neurosurg.* 2010;73:610–611.
- 396 29. Kumar R, Lim J, Mekary RA, Rattani A, Dewan MC, Sharif SY, et al. Traumatic Spinal Injury:
397 Global Epidemiology and Worldwide Volume. *World Neurosurg.* 2018;113:e345–e363.
- 398 30. Emejulu JK, Ekweogwu OC. Outcome of spinal cord injuries managed in a centre without modern
399 imaging facilities. *West Afr J Med.* 2009;28:376–379.
- 400 31. Zuckerman SL, Haghdel A, Lessing NL, Carnevale J, Cheserem B, Lazaro A, et al. Cervical Spine
401 Trauma in East Africa: Presentation, Treatment, and Mortality. *Int J Spine Surg.* 2021;15:879–889.
- 402 32. Magogo J, Lazaro A, Mango M, Zuckerman SL, Leidinger A, Msuya S, et al. Operative Treatment of
403 Traumatic Spinal Injuries in Tanzania: Surgical Management, Neurologic Outcomes, and Time to
404 Surgery. *Glob Spine J.* 2021;11:89–98.
- 405 33. Eisner ZJ, Delaney PG, Widder P, Aleem IS, Tate DG, Raghavendran K, et al. Prehospital care for
406 traumatic spinal cord injury by first responders in 8 sub-Saharan African countries and 6 other low-
407 and middle-income countries: A scoping review. *Afr J Emerg Med.* 2021;11:339–346.
- 408 34. Aleem IS, DeMarco D, Drew B, Sancheti P, Shetty V, Dhillon M, et al. (2017) The Burden of Spine
409 Fractures in India: A Prospective Multicenter Study. *Glob Spine J.* 2017;7:325–333.

- 410 35. Chikani MC, Mesi M, Okwunodulu O, Mezue W, Ohaegbulam S, Ndubuisi C, et al. Changing Trends
411 and Challenges of Spine Surgery in a Developing Country. *World Neurosurg.* 2019;130:e815–e821.
- 412 36. Ravindra VM, Senglaub SS, Rattani A, Dewan MC, Härtl R, Bisson E, et al. Degenerative Lumbar
413 Spine Disease: Estimating Global Incidence and Worldwide Volume. *Glob Spine J.* 2018;8:784–794.
- 414 37. Dohlman LE, Thakkar N, Jivanelli B, Pakala S, Brouillette MA, Global Regional Anesthesia and Pain
415 Management Research Group. Regional anesthesia global health collaborations- a scoping review of
416 current intervention methods. *Curr Opin Anaesthesiol.* 2022;35:647–653.
- 417 38. Livergant RJ, Demetrick S, Cravetchi X, Kung JY, Joos E, Hawes HG, et al. Trauma Training
418 Courses and Programs in Low- and Lower Middle-Income Countries: A Scoping Review. *World J*
419 *Surg.* 2021;45:3543–3557.
- 420 39. Smidt A, Balandin S, Sigafos J, Reed VA. The Kirkpatrick model: A useful tool for evaluating
421 training outcomes. *J Intellect Dev Disabil.* 2009;34:266–274.
- 422 40. Glasgow RE, Vogt TM, Boles SM. Evaluating the public health impact of health promotion
423 interventions: the RE-AIM framework. *Am J Public Health.* 1999;89:1322–1327.
- 424 41. Damschroder LJ, Reardon CM, Widerquist MAO, Lowery J. The updated Consolidated Framework
425 for Implementation Research based on user feedback. *Implement Sci.* 2022;17:75.
- 426 42. Elmaraghi S, Park KM, Rashidian N, Yap A, Faktor K, Ozgediz D, et al. Postgraduate Surgical
427 Education in East, Central, and Southern Africa: A Needs Assessment Survey. *J Am Coll Surg.*
428 2023;236(2):429-435.
- 429 43. Shapiro LM, Park MO, Mariano DJ, Kamal RN. Development of a Needs Assessment Tool to
430 Promote Capacity Building in Hand Surgery Outreach Trips: A Methodological Triangulation
431 Approach. *J Hand Surg.* 2020;45:729-737.e1.

432

433

434 **Supporting information**

435

436 **S1 Appendix. Scoping review search strategy.**

437 **S2 Table. PRISMA-ScR checklist.**

