

# THE GLOBAL BURDEN OF DISEASE: GENERATING EVIDENCE, GUIDING POLICY

INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH METRICS AND EVALUATION


UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON



# The Global Burden of Disease: Generating Evidence, Guiding Policy

INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH METRICS AND EVALUATION

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON



This report was prepared by the Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME) based on seven papers for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010 (GBD 2010) published in *The Lancet* (2012 Dec 13; 380). GBD 2010 had 488 co-authors from 303 institutions in 50 countries. The work was made possible through core funding from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. The views expressed are those of the authors.

The contents of this publication may be reproduced and redistributed in whole or in part, provided the intended use is for noncommercial purposes, the contents are not altered, and full acknowledgment is given to IHME. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported License. To view a copy of this license, please visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>.

For any usage that falls outside of these license restrictions, please contact IHME Communications at [comms@healthmetricsandevaluation.org](mailto:comms@healthmetricsandevaluation.org).

Citation: Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation. *The Global Burden of Disease: Generating Evidence, Guiding Policy*. Seattle, WA: IHME, 2013.

Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation  
2301 Fifth Ave., Suite 600  
Seattle, WA 98121  
USA  
[www.healthmetricsandevaluation.org](http://www.healthmetricsandevaluation.org)

Printed in the United States of America

ISBN 978-0-9840910-6-5  
© 2013 Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation



## THE GLOBAL BURDEN OF DISEASE: GENERATING EVIDENCE, GUIDING POLICY

<b>Introduction</b>	5
<b>The GBD approach to tracking health progress and challenges</b>	7
<b>Rapid health transitions: GBD 2010 results</b>	15
<b>Using GBD to assess countries' health progress</b>	42
<b>Conclusion</b>	44
<b>Annex</b>	46

## ABOUT IHME

The Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME) is an independent global health research center at the University of Washington that provides rigorous and comparable measurement of the world's most important health problems and evaluates the strategies used to address them. IHME makes this information freely available so that policymakers have the evidence they need to make informed decisions about how to allocate resources to best improve population health.

To express interest in collaborating, participating in GBD training workshops, or receiving updates of GBD or copies of this publication, please contact IHME at:

Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation  
2301 Fifth Ave., Suite 600  
Seattle, WA 98121  
USA

Telephone: +1-206-897-2800

Fax: +1-206-897-2899

E-mail: [comms@healthmetricsandevaluation.org](mailto:comms@healthmetricsandevaluation.org)

[www.healthmetricsandevaluation.org](http://www.healthmetricsandevaluation.org)

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Global Burden of Disease Study 2010 (GBD 2010) was implemented as a collaboration between seven institutions: the Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME) as the coordinating center, the University of Queensland School of Population Health, Harvard School of Public Health, the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, the University of Tokyo, Imperial College London, and the World Health Organization. This summary draws on seven GBD 2010 papers published in *The Lancet* (2012 Dec 13; 380). GBD 2010 had 488 co-authors from 303 institutions in 50 countries.

The IHME community oversaw the production of this publication. In particular, we thank IHME's Board for their continued leadership. We are grateful to the report's writer Katherine Leach-Kemon; Christopher Murray, Michael MacIntyre, Theo Vos, Rafael Lozano, and William Heisel for content guidance; Summer Ohno for program coordination; Patricia Kiyono for editing and managing production; and Brian Childress for editorial support. This report would not have been possible without the ongoing contributions of Global Burden of Disease collaborators around the world.

Finally, we would like to extend our gratitude to the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation for generously funding IHME and for its consistent support of the Global Burden of Disease research.

## INTRODUCTION

Over the last two decades, the global health landscape has undergone rapid transformation. People around the world are living longer than ever before, and the population is getting older. The number of people in the world is growing. Many countries have made remarkable progress in preventing child deaths. As a result, disease burden is increasingly defined by disability instead of premature mortality. The leading causes of death and disability have changed from communicable diseases in children to non-communicable diseases in adults. Eating too much has overtaken undernutrition as a leading risk factor for illness. These global trends differ across regions, and nowhere is this contrast more striking than in sub-Saharan Africa. Communicable, maternal, nutritional, and newborn diseases continue to dominate throughout sub-Saharan Africa.

The Global Burden of Disease (GBD) approach is a systematic, scientific effort to quantify the comparative magnitude of health loss due to diseases, injuries, and risk factors by age, sex, and geography for specific points in time. The latest iteration of that effort, the Global Burden of Diseases, Injuries, and Risk Factors Study 2010 (GBD 2010), was published in *The Lancet* in December 2012. The intent is to create a global public good that will be useful for informing the design of health systems and the creation of public health policy. It estimates premature death and disability due to 291 diseases and injuries, 1,160 sequelae (direct consequences of disease and injury), and 67 risk factors for 20 age groups and both sexes in 1990, 2005, and 2010. GBD 2010 produced estimates for 187 countries and 21 regions. In total, the study generated nearly 1 billion estimates of health outcomes.

GBD 2010 was a collaborative effort among 488 researchers from 50 countries and 303 institutions. The Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME) acted as the coordinating center for the study. The collaborative strengthened both the data-gathering effort and the quantitative analysis by bringing together some of the foremost minds from a wide range of disciplines. Our intention is to build on this collaborative by enlarging the network in the years to come. Similarly, IHME and its collaborators hope to expand the list of diseases, injuries, and risk factors included in GBD and routinely update the GBD estimates. Continual updates will ensure that the international community can have access to high-quality estimates in the timeliest fashion. Through sound measurement, we can provide the foundational evidence that will lead to improved population health.

**Box 1: History of the Global Burden of Disease and innovations in GBD 2010**

The first GBD study was published as part of the World Development Report 1993. This original study generated estimates for 107 diseases, 483 sequelae (non-fatal health consequences), eight regions, and five age groups.

The authors' inspiration for the study came from the realization that policymakers lacked comprehensive and standardized data on diseases, injuries, and potentially preventable risk factors for decision-making. A second source of inspiration was the fact that disease-specific advocates' estimates of the number of deaths caused by their diseases of interest far exceeded the total number of global deaths in any given year. GBD authors chose to pursue a holistic approach to analyzing disease burden to produce scientifically sound estimates that were protected from the influence of advocates.

The GBD 1990 study had a profound impact on health policy as it exposed the hidden burden of mental illness around the world. It also shed light on neglected health areas such as the premature death and disability caused by road traffic injuries. Work from this study has been cited over 4,000 times since 1993.

The study also sparked substantial controversy. Many disease-specific advocates argued that the original GBD underestimated burden from the causes they cared about most. The use of age weighting and discounting also caused extensive debates. Age weighting assumed that a year of life increased in value until age 22, and then decreased steadily. Discounting counted years of healthy life saved in the present as more valuable than years of life saved in the future. Also controversial was the use of expert judgment to estimate disability weights (estimations of the severity of non-fatal conditions). As a result of this feedback and consultation with a network of philosophers, ethicists, and economists, GBD no longer uses age weighting and discounting. Also, GBD 2010 updated its methods for determining disability weights and used data gathered from thousands of respondents from different countries around the world.

GBD 2010 shares many of the founding principles of the original GBD 1990 study, such as using all available data on diseases, injuries, and risk factors; using comparable metrics to estimate the impact of death and disability on society; and ensuring that the science of disease burden estimation is not influenced by advocacy.

Despite these similarities, GBD 2010 is broader in scope and involved a larger number of collaborators than any previous GBD study. While the original study had the participation of 100 collaborators worldwide, GBD 2010 had 488 co-authors. Thanks to that network, the study includes vast amounts of data on health outcomes and risk factors. Researchers also made substantial improvements to the GBD methodology, described in detail in the "Methods" section and in the published studies. Among these improvements, highlights include using data collected via population surveys to estimate disability weights for the first time, greatly expanding the list of causes and risk factors analyzed in the study, detailed analysis of the effect of different components of diet on health outcomes, and reporting of uncertainty intervals for all metrics. GBD 2010 researchers reported uncertainty intervals to provide full transparency about the weaknesses and strengths of the analysis. Narrow uncertainty intervals indicate that evidence is strong, while wide uncertainty intervals show that evidence is weaker.

## THE GBD APPROACH TO TRACKING HEALTH PROGRESS AND CHALLENGES

For decision-makers striving to create evidence-based policy, the GBD approach provides numerous advantages over other epidemiological studies. These key features are further explored in this report.

### A CRITICAL RESOURCE FOR INFORMED POLICYMAKING

To ensure a health system is adequately aligned to a population's true health challenges, policymakers must be able to compare the effects of different diseases that kill people prematurely and cause ill health. The original GBD study's creators developed a single measurement, disability-adjusted life years (DALYs), to quantify the number of years of life lost as a result of both premature death and disability. One DALY equals one lost year of healthy life. DALYs will be referred to by their acronym, as years of healthy life lost, and years lost due to premature death and disability throughout this publication. Decision-makers can use DALYs to quickly assess the impact caused by conditions such as cancer versus depression using a comparable metric. Considering the number of DALYs instead of causes of death alone provides a more accurate picture of the main drivers of poor health. Thanks to the use of this public health monitoring tool, GBD 2010 researchers found that in most countries as mortality declines, disability becomes increasingly important. Information about changing disease patterns is a crucial input for decision-making, as it illustrates the challenges that individuals and health care providers are facing in different countries.

**One DALY equals one lost year of healthy life.**

In addition to comparable information about the impact of fatal and non-fatal conditions, decision-makers need comprehensive data on the causes of ill health that are most relevant to their country. The hierarchical GBD cause list, seen in the Annex, has been designed to include the diseases, injuries, and sequelae that are most relevant for public health policymaking. To create this list, researchers reviewed epidemiological and cause-of-death data to identify which diseases and injuries resulted in the most ill health. Inpatient and outpatient records were also reviewed to understand the conditions for which patients sought medical care. For example, researchers added chronic kidney disease to the GBD cause list after learning that this condition accounted for a large number of hospital visits and deaths.

GBD provides high-quality estimates of diseases and injuries that are more credible than those published by disease-specific advocates. GBD was created in part due to researchers' observation that deaths estimated by different disease-specific studies added up to more than 100% of total deaths when summed. The GBD approach ensures that deaths are counted only once. First, GBD counts the total number of deaths in a year. Next, researchers work to assign a single cause to each death using a variety of innovative methods (see the "Methods" section). Estimates of cause-specific mortality are then compared to estimates of deaths from all causes to