

BÖLÜM 8

SEZARYEN AMELİYATLARINDA ÇEVRESEL SÜRDÜRÜLEBİLİRLİK UYGULAMALARI VE GELECEK PERSPEKTİFLERİ

Gökçen AYDIN AKBUĞA ¹
Funda TOSUN GÜLEROĞLU ²

GİRİŞ

Nüfus artışı ve teknolojik gelişmeler, doğal kaynakların tükenme riskini artırmış, bu da sürdürülebilirlik kavramını ön plana çıkarmıştır. Sürdürülebilirlik, bugünün ihtiyaçlarını karşılarken geleceğin kaynaklarını korumayı amaçlayan, sosyal, çevresel ve ekonomik boyutları içeren bir yaklaşımdır (1). Sürdürülebilirlik kavramında en temel amaç; kaynakların korunması ve nesillerin devamlılığının sağlanmasıdır (2).

Sürdürülebilirlik açısından kritik önem taşıyan birçok alan vardır ve bunlardan biri de yüksek enerji tüketimi nedeniyle sağlık sektörüdür (2). Sağlık hizmeti veren tesisler, yüksek miktarda sera gazı (GHG) emisyonuna yol açabilmeleri ve aşırı hava olayları ile uzun vadeli iklim tehditlerinden etkilenen bireylere bakım sunmaları nedeniyle iklim değişikliğine karşı ilk ve son savunma hattı konumundadır. Bu nedenle sağlık hizmetlerinin sürdürülebilirlik amacı taşıyan uygulamalara yer vermesi önemlidir. Sürdürülebilirlik uygulamalarının popülerlik kazanması ile birlikte birçok uygulama sağlık hizmetleri kapsamında da yerini almaya başlamıştır. Özellikle çevre dostu politikalarla enerji verimliliğini artıran yeşil hastane uygulamalarının yaygınlaşması hız kazanmıştır. Yeşil hastaneler, sürdürülebilir malzemeler kullanarak atıkları azaltmayı ve çevresel etkileri en aza indirmeyi hedefler. Aynı zamanda maliyet avantajı da sağlayarak sağlık hizmetlerinin

¹ Doç. Dr., Yozgat Bozok Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Fakültesi, Cerrahi Hastalıklar Hemşireliği AD., gokcen.aydin@yobu.edu.tr, ORCID iD: 0000-0003-3839-7317

² Doç. Dr., Yozgat Bozok Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Fakültesi, Doğum ve Kadın Hastalıkları Hemşireliği AD., funda.guleroğlu@yobu.edu.tr, ORCID iD: 0000-0001-6765-3346

KAYNAKLAR

1. Çavmak Ş, Çavmak D, Yaşa Özeltürkay E. Sağlık hizmetlerinde sürdürülebilirlik düzeyini belirleyen faktörlerin önceliklendirilmesi. *Verimlilik Dergisi*. 2024;58(2): 263-282. <https://doi.org/10.51551/verimlilik.1386655>
2. Tamer G. Sağlık örgütlerinde kurumsal sürdürülebilirlik. *International Academic Studies on Natural and Health Sciences. Gece Akademi*. 2020.
3. Hoşgör H. Yeşil hastane konsepti ve Türkiye deneyimi. *Sağlık Bilimleri ve Meslekleri Dergisi*. 2014;1(2): 75-84.
4. Dönmez YC, Aslan A, Yavuz van Giersbergen M. Environment-friendly practices in operating rooms in Turkey. *Journal of Nursing Research*. 2019;27(2): e18.
5. Angolile CM, Max BL, Mushemba J, et al. Global increased cesarean section rates and public health implications: A call to action. *Health science reports*. 2023;6(5): e1274.
6. Osterman M, Hamilton BE, Martin JA, et al. Births: Final Data for 2021. *Natl Vital Stat Rep*. 2023;72: 1–53. Erişim Adresi: <https://stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/122047> Erişim Tarihi: 24.08.2025
7. World Health Organization. WHO publishes surgical sub-group membership for caesarean section recommendations. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2025. Available from: <https://www.who.int/news/item/13-05-2025-who-publishes-surgical-sub-group-membership-for-caesarean-section-recommendations> Available date: 15.08.2025
8. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Caesarean sections 2021. Paris: OECD. Available from: <https://www.oecd.org/en/data/indicators/caesarean-sections.html> Available date: 10 December 2024
9. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Nüfus Etütleri Enstitüsü. 2018 Türkiye Nüfus ve Sağlık Araştırması. Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Nüfus Etütleri Enstitüsü, T.C. Cumhurbaşkanlığı Strateji ve Bütçe Başkanlığı, TÜBİTAK; 2019.
10. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Nüfus Etütleri Enstitüsü. 2003 Türkiye Nüfus ve Sağlık Araştırması. Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Nüfus Etütleri Enstitüsü, Sağlık Bakanlığı ve Avrupa Birliği; 2004.
11. Ulgü MM, Birinci S, Ensari TA, et al. Cesarean section rates in Turkey 2018-2023: Overview of national data by using Robson ten group classification system. *Turkish journal of obstetrics and gynecology*. 2023; 20(3): 191.
12. Küçük M. Striking rise of cesarean section rates in Türkiye: there is a need for a whole new perspective. *The Pan African Medical Journal*. 2024; 48(6): 1-7.
13. World Health Organization. (2015). WHO statement on caesarean section rates. WHO Press. Available from: https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/161442/WHO_RHR_15.02_eng.pdf Available date: 15.08.2025
14. Boerma T, Ronsmans C, Melesse DY, et al. Global epidemiology of use of and disparities in caesarean sections. *The Lancet*. 2018;392(10155): 1341-1348. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(18\)31928-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31928-7)
15. Betrán AP, Torloni MR, Zhang JJ, et al. WHO Statement on Caesarean Section Rates. *BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology*. 2016;123(5): 667–670. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-0528.13526>
16. Keag OE, Norman JE & Stock SJ. (). Long-term risks and benefits associated with caesarean delivery for mother, baby, and subsequent pregnancies: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLOS Medicine*. 2018;15(1), e1002494. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1002494>
17. Sobhy S, Arroyo-Manzano D, Murugesu N, et al. Maternal and perinatal mortality and complications associated with caesarean section in low-income and middle-income countries: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet*. 2020; 396(10249): 1341–1353. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)31182-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31182-4)
18. Vogel JP, Betrán AP, Vindeoghel N, et al. Use of the Robson classification to assess caesarean section trends in 21 countries: A secondary analysis of two WHO multicountry surveys. *The Lancet Global Health*. 2015; 3(5): e260–e270. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X\(15\)70094-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(15)70094-X)
19. Güner U. Çevresel sürdürülebilirlik. 2020. Trakya Üniversitesi Fen Fakültesi.

20. World Health Organization. WHO guidance for climate-resilient and environmentally sustainable health care facilities. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2020. Available from: <https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/335909/9789240012226-eng.pdf?sequence=1> Available date: 6 July 2025
21. Robinson PN, Surendran KSB, Lim SJ, et al. The carbon footprint of surgical operations: a systematic review update. *The Annals of The Royal College of Surgeons of England*. 2023;105(8): 692-708.
22. Sung S, Mikes BA, Martingano DJ et al. Cesarean Delivery [Last Update: December 7, 2024.]. StatPearls. Treasure Island (FL): 2025. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK546707/> Available date: 22.08.2025
23. Spil NA, van Nieuwenhuizen KE, Rowe R, et al. The carbon footprint of different modes of birth in the UK and the Netherlands: an exploratory study using life cycle assessment. *BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology*. 2024;131(5): 568-578.
24. Metwali NY, Ahmed RA, Hussain Timraz J, et al. Evidence-Based Strategies to Minimize Unnecessary Primary Cesarean Sections: A Comprehensive Review. *Cureus*. 2024;29;16(11): 74729. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.74729>
25. Rae M, Cox C, Dingel H. Health costs associated with pregnancy, childbirth, and postpartum care. *Peterson-KFF Health System Tracker*. Available from: <https://www.healthsystemtracker.org/brief/health-costs-associated-with-pregnancy-childbirth-and-postpartum-care/> Available date: 19.08.2025
26. Entringer AP, Pinto M, Gomes MASM. Cost-effectiveness analysis of natural birth and elective C-section in supplemental health. *Revista de saude publica*. 2018; 52: 91. <https://doi.org/10.11606/S1518-8787.2018052000373>
27. DeJoy SA, Bohl MG, Mahoney K, et al. Estimating the financial impact of reducing primary cesareans. *Midwifery Womens Health*. 2020;65: 56–63. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jmwh.13010>
28. Negrini R, da Silva Ferreira RD, & Guimarães DZ. Value-based care in obstetrics: comparison between vaginal birth and caesarean section. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth*. 2021;21(1): 333.
29. de Ridder EF, Friedericy HJ, van der Eijk AC, et al. A new method to improve the environmental sustainability of the operating room: healthcare sustainability mode and effect analysis (HSMEA). *Sustainability*. 2022;14(21): 13957. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su142113957>
30. Thiel CL, Woods NC, Bilec MM. Strategies to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Laparoscopic Surgery. *American journal of public health*. 2018;108(S2): 158-164. <https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.2018.304397>
31. Peker K. The Wastage and Economic Effects of Anaesthetic Drugs and Consumables in the Operating Room. *Turkish journal of anaesthesiology and reanimation*. 2020;48(4): 321-327. <https://doi.org/10.5152/TJAR.2019.65632>
32. van Nieuwenhuizen KE, Friedericy, HJ, van der Linden S, e al. User experience of wearing comfort of reusable versus disposable surgical gowns and environmental perspectives: A cross-sectional survey. *BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology*. 2024;131(5): 709-715
33. Eussen MMM, Logghe E, Bluimincx S, et al. Reducing surgical instrument usage: systematic review of approaches for tray optimization and its advantages on environmental impact, costs and efficiency. *BJS Open*. 2025;7: 9(3): 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsopen/zraf030>
34. Roscioli R, Wyllie T, Neophytou K, et al. How we can reduce the environmental impact of our operating theatres: a narrative review. *ANZ Journal of Surgery*. 2024;94(6): 1000- 10 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ans.18770>
35. Özşaker E. Ortopedik cerrahide çevre dostu uygulamalar. *TOTBİD Dergisi*. 2025;24: 194-206. <https://doi.org/10.5578/totbid.dergisi.2025.29>
36. Johnson SM, Marconi S, Sanchez-Casalongue M, et al. Sustainability in surgical practice: a collaborative call toward environmental sustainability in operating rooms. *Surgical endoscopy*. 2024;38(8): 4127–37. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00464-024-10962-0>
37. Leone N, Scozzari G, Olandese F, et al. “O.R. GOES GREEN”: a first step toward reducing our

- carbon footprint in the operating room and hospital. *Updates in surgery*. 2024;76(5):2019–29. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13304-024-01793-8>
38. Trieu E, Ramirez-Caban LC, Shockley ME. Review of sustainable practices for the gynecology operating room. *Current opinion in obstetrics & gynecology*. 2024;36(4): 324–9. <https://doi.org/10.1097/gco.0000000000000965>
39. Wyssusek KH, Keys MT, van Zundert AA. Operating room greening initiatives—the old, the new, and the way forward: a narrative review. *Waste management & research*. 2019;37(1): 3–19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734242x18793937>
40. Gorgun E, Dehipawala S, O'Hara M, Naoumtchik E, et al. Environmental sustainability initiatives in the operating room: a scoping review. *Annals of Surgery Open*. 2024;5(3):e451. <https://doi.org/10.1097/as9.0000000000000451>
41. Pillay L, Winkel KD, Kariotis T. Developing the green operating room: exploring barriers and opportunities to reducing operating room waste. *Medical Journal of Australia*. 2024;221(5):279–84. <https://doi.org/10.5694/mja2.52394>
42. French HM. Blueprint for reducing, reusing, recycling. *Association of Operating Room Nurses Journal*. 1994;60(1):94–8. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0001-2092\(07\)69677-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0001-2092(07)69677-x)
43. Papadopoulou A, Kumar NS, Vanhoostenberghe A, Francis NK. Environmental sustainability in robotic and laparoscopic surgery: systematic review. *British Journal of Surgery*. 2022; 109: 921–932 <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjs/znac159>
44. Shoham MA, Baker NM, Peterson ME, Fox P. The environmental impact of surgery: a systematic review. *Surgery*. 2022;172:897–905. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.surg.2022.04.055>
45. Stall NM, Kagoma YK, Bondy JN, Naudie D. Surgical waste audit of 5 total knee arthroplasties. *Canadian Journal of Surgery*. 2013;56:97–102. <https://doi.org/10.1503/cjs.027111>
46. Inan G, Şatırlar ZÖ. Anestezinin küresel ısınmaya etkisi ve sürdürülebilir anestezi gerçeği. *JARSS Journal of Anesthesia/Anestezi Dergisi*. 2023;31(4). <https://dx.doi.org/10.54875/jarss.2023.57804>
47. Caycedo-Marulanda A, Mathur S. Suggested strategies to reduce the carbon footprint of anesthetic gases in the operating room. *Canadian Journal of Anaesthesia*. 2022;69(2):269–70. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12630-021-02120-0>
48. Kampman JM, Sperna Weiland NH. Anaesthesia and environment: Impact of a green anaesthesia on economics. *Current Opinion in Anaesthesiology*. 2023;36(2):188–95. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACO.0000000000001243>
49. Ang TN, Baroutian S, Young BR, Hyland MM, Taylor M, Burrell R. Adsorptive separation of volatile anaesthetics: a review of current developments. *Separation and Purification Technology*. 2019;211:491–503. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seppur.2018.10.012>
50. Eser NS. Yeşil hastanelerin maliyet avantajı bakımından değerlendirilmesi. *Girişimcilik ve Kalkınma Dergisi*. 2023;18(2):54–64.
51. Çilhoroz Y, Işık O. Yeşil hastane sertifika sistemleri. *Sağlık Bilimleri ve Meslekleri Dergisi*. 2019;6(1):161–9.
52. Liang R, Orchard JW, Robson SJ. The global surgical triple goal: Surgery must improve health, be equitable, and environmentally sustainable. *Journal of Climate Change and Health*. 2025;23:100458. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joclim.2025.100458>
53. Demirdağ H, Ergüzel TT. Akıllı cerrahi: Yapay zekanın cerrahi süreçte kullanımı. *Sağlık & Bilim*. 2024;37.