

## INTRODUCTION— FACING THE CHALLENGE OF GLOBAL ANAESTHESIA

We face a massive deficit in global surgical and anaesthetic provision; 5 out of 7 individuals worldwide lack access to safe, affordable surgical and anaesthetic care<sup>1</sup>. Regarding anaesthesia, multiple factors hinder its safe delivery, including a lack of equipment, drugs, trained workforce and infrastructure<sup>1,2</sup>. Tackling the anaesthesia shortfall will be a long term commitment -measures such as anaesthetist training and infrastructure implementation will take years<sup>3,4</sup>. Technological innovation provides a potential solution for ameliorating some of the barriers faced in anaesthesia delivery<sup>5-8</sup>, although it is not without its challenges, as can be seen in the example of the Lifebox Pulse Oximeter; this case study aids in exploring the wider principles underlying successful anaesthetic tech design.

## CASE STUDY: LIFEBOX PULSE OXIMETER

### Development and Design

- Pulse Oximeters are considered essential for the delivery and management of safe anaesthesia<sup>9,10</sup>, however estimates suggest 20% of theatres worldwide (and over 70% in some LMICs) do not have access to a single oximeter<sup>11</sup>
- This influenced Lifebox to specifically design their pulse oximeter for use in low resource settings<sup>12</sup> (Box 1)
- They conducted extensive groundwork—particularly in terms of power sourcing, maintenance and operability —aiming to avoid the “equipment graveyard” faced by up to 70% of medical equipment in LMICs<sup>6</sup> (often due to failed compatibility)
- The ongoing demand, distribution and training by Lifebox would appear testament to the success of their tech design and extensive groundwork<sup>10,13,14</sup> (Box 2)

### BOX 2—PULSE OXIMETER REACH

Since 2011<sup>16</sup>:

- 18,000+ oximeters distributed<sup>14</sup> (n over 90 countries)<sup>13</sup>
- 10 million operations facilitated<sup>16</sup>
- 6000+ individuals trained<sup>14</sup>
- 3000+ hospital partnered<sup>14</sup>



Lifebox's success: avoiding the equipment graveyard<sup>22</sup>

### Box 1—LIFEBOX' PULSE OXIMETER SPECIFICATIONS<sup>15</sup>

- **Durable**
  - 2 year warranty
  - Rechargeable batteries
  - 10h+ runtime
  - Power surge protected
- **Cheap**
  - ≈£200/unit
- **Ease of Operation**
  - Paediatric and adult compatible
  - Instructional DVD (10 languages)
  - Online troubleshooting



Figure : Lifebox Oximeter<sup>21</sup>

### Oximeter Outcome Monitoring

Despite Lifebox's success in terms of oximeter demand and delivery, the project has shortcomings in terms of its **evaluation** :

- Lifebox is a charity<sup>16</sup>, so there may be an element of **bias** in its reporting
- There has been **no global review**—independent or otherwise—of Lifebox oximeter impact on **clinical outcomes** to date
  - 3 country based studies did demonstrate that Lifebox had improved prevalence of oximetry monitoring and earlier detection of hypoxia during anaesthesia<sup>17-19</sup>. However they did not discuss whether the infrastructure was available—e.g. O2 delivery systems, a dedicated anaesthetist on hand - to respond to a hypoxic event, which is the ultimate influence on clinical outcomes and oximeter success
- **Oximeter functionality** must also be considered, e.g. device **longevity** or whether it remains in the same distribution **location**.
  - Lifebox have sent back teams to monitor individual projects —e.g. assessing oximeter use and repairs in Guatemala over 2 years<sup>20</sup>— however this is again on a country basis rather than a universal scale

Of course, in low resource settings, it is likely that long-term follow-up is challenging —particularly if we wish to compare anaesthetic outcomes with those pre-Lifebox, where such data may not have been collected—however, this reiterates the need to incorporate strategies for evaluation during the design process, both to assess functionality and refine future designs.

## CONCLUSION

Lifebox illustrates crucial considerations that must be made in the design of wider technologies for successful anaesthesia upscaling (see Box 3). For the long term, the ethics of introducing a technology and the transferability of an innovation (should a new disruptive technology arise) must also be considered. Ultimately though, no single piece of tech—no matter how innovative or well designed—will solve the problem of global anaesthesia; this will require multi-specialist collaboration and investment across all current infrastructural barriers before universal, safe anaesthesia can be realised.

### BOX 3— KEY MESSAGES FOR LOW RESOURCE TECH DESIGN

- Context Based Design
- Easy Maintenance
- Integrates well with current infrastructure
- Training Strategy
- Evaluation Plan

Bibliography: 1. Meara, J. G. et al. Global Surgery 2030: evidence and solutions for achieving health, welfare, and economic development. *Lancet (London, England)* **386**, 569–624 (2015).; 2. Kempthorne, P., Morris, W. W., Mellin-Olsen, J. & Gore-Booth, J. The WFSA Global Anesthesia Workforce Survey. *Anesth. Analg.* **125**, 981–990 (2017); 3. Lipnick, M. S., Bulamba, F., Tendo, S. & Gelb, A. W. The Need for a Global Perspective on Task-Sharing in Anesthesia. *Anesth. Analg.* **125**, 1049–1052 (2017); 4. Federspiel, F. et al. Global surgical and anaesthetic task shifting: a systematic literature review and survey. *Lancet* **385**, S46 (2015); 5. Drum, E. T. & Bould, M. D. Not if, but How? Using Technology and Task-Sharing to Strengthen the Global Anesthesia Workforce. *Anesth. Analg.* **125**, 1095–1097 (2017); 6. Bolton, W. S. et al. Disseminating technology in global surgery. *Br. J. Surg.* **106**, e34–e43 (2019); 7. Howitt, P. et al. Technologies for global health. *Lancet* **380**, 507–535 (2012) 8. Edgcombe, H., Paton, C. & English, M. Enhancing emergency care in low-income countries using mobile technology-based training tools. *Arch. Dis. Child.* **101**, 1149–1152 (2016); 9. WHO | WHO Surgical Safety Checklist. *WHO* (2017) 10. Drum, E. T. Pulse Oximeter: Disruptive Technology or Standard of Care? *A & A case reports* (2016).; 11. Funk, L. M. et al. Global operating theatre distribution and pulse oximetry supply: an estimation from reported data. *Lancet* **376**, 1055–1061 (2010); 12. History of Lifebox. Available at: <https://www.lifebox.org/history-of-lifebox-2/>. (Accessed: 27th January 2019); 13. Enright, A., Merry, A., Walker, I. & Wilson, I. Lifebox: A Global Patient Safety Initiative. *A & A case reports* (2016).; 14. Our Impact - Lifebox. Available at: <https://www.lifebox.org/our-impact/>. (Accessed: 27th January 2019); 15. Purchase oximeter - Lifebox. Available at: <https://www.lifebox.org/purchase-oximeter/>. (Accessed: 27th January 2019); 16. About us - Lifebox. Available at: <https://www.lifebox.org/about-us/>. (Accessed: 27th January 2019); 17. Sama, H. D., Maman, A. F. O. B. & Walker, I. A. Incidence of hypoxia and related events detected by pulse oximeters provided by the Lifebox Foundation in the maternity unit at Sylvanus Olympio University Teaching Hospital, Togo. *J. Anesth.* **29**, 971–973 (2015); 18. Albert, V. et al. Lifebox pulse oximeter implementation in Malawi: evaluation of educational outcomes and impact on oxygen desaturation episodes during anaesthesia. *Anaesthesia* **72**, 686–693 (2017); 19. Enright, A. A friend in need: evaluating the impact of Lifebox in Burkina Faso. *Can. J. Anesth. Can. d'anesthésie* **66**, 139–142 (2019); 22. Most Medical Equipment In Low-Income Countries Is Donated. And Most Of It Doesn't Work. : Goats and Soda : NPR. Available at: <https://www.npr.org/sections/goatsandsoda/2016/09/08/492842274/rage-against-the-busted-medical-machines?t=1548613411066>. (Accessed: 27th January 2019)