The author reported no conflicts of interest.

The *Journal* policy requires editors and reviewers to disclose conflicts of interest and to decline handling or reviewing manuscripts for which they may have a conflict of interest. The editors and reviewers of this article have no conflicts of interest

**REPLY:
REGIONALIZATION:
ONE GENOTYPE,
MULTIPLE
PHENOTYPES
Reply to the Editor:**

I greatly appreciate the contribution of Zheleva and Overman¹ to the ongoing discussion about regionalization of care for children with congenital heart disease. This discussion began with my recognition that the results of atrioventricular septal defect repair in Sweden were dramatically improved when care was regionalized from 4 centers to 2 centers.² Vervoort³ expanded on this concept and encouraged us to focus on regionalization of care for these children on a global level. He pointed out the confounding issues of revenue, pride, and politics. Specifically, he brought up several barriers involved in establishing new congenital cardiac surgical centers in low- and middle-income countries.

Zheleva and Overman¹ have expanded on the issues for low- and middle-income countries. They have brought to our attention real problems currently occurring in countries where reimbursements are based only on volume and not linked to quality. Clearly, regionalization must be accompanied by outcome tracking and transparency as we have painfully learned both in England and in the United States.

That being said, there is no question that in very general terms outcomes are better at larger regional centers than at multiple small centers competing for the same private-pay patients or government reimbursements. Regionalization of care will look very different in low- and middle-income countries based on whether programs are funded by the government through universal health care, private payers, or a combination of both. This will be especially true in countries that have great inequalities in wealth. Given the tremendous differences in governmental structures in low- and middle-income countries, I am sure that the organizational format and financial support for congenital heart surgery centers will be dramatically different from country to country. However, I am confident that an underlying strategy of regionalization of care for these children will have the highest chance of providing optimal quality at the lowest cost.

An undercurrent that may help unify the philosophy of caregivers is the ever-increasing vitality and participation in the World Society for Pediatric and Congenital Heart

Surgery. Recent World University teaching forums have attracted pediatric cardiac surgeons and cardiologists from around the world to free teaching sessions by experts in the field. This contributes to our feeling that we are a global community entrusted with caring for children with congenital heart disease.

As I mentioned in the title of this letter, we should have one “genotype”: A goal of regionalization that will be accomplished by multiple “phenotypes,” depending on the unique vagaries of the individual countries. With each “phenotype,” the quality of care and outcomes must be quantified and publicly reported.

Carl L. Backer, MD
Section of Pediatric Cardiothoracic Surgery
UK HealthCare Kentucky Children’s Hospital
Lexington, Ky

References

1. Zheleva B, Overman DM. Regionalization in low- and middle-income countries: principles and promise. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2022;163:e63.
2. Backer CL. Commentary: regionalization = excellence. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2021;161:2157.
3. Vervoort D. Centralization and regionalization of congenital heart surgery in a globalized world. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2021;161:e481.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtcvs.2021.03.119>

**REPLY FROM AUTHOR:
BRIDGING THE
PUBLIC-PRIVATE
DIVIDE
Reply to the Editor:**

As countries worldwide make great strides on the global health agenda, the burden of noncommunicable diseases, such as cardiovascular diseases, becomes ever so apparent. Each year, nearly 200,000 child deaths from congenital heart defects could be prevented with access to cardiac care, whereas more than 300,000 children contract rheumatic heart disease each year, and more than 4 million children already live with rheumatic heart disease.^{1,2} I thank Zheleva and Overman for their thoughtful commentary,³ sharing their experiences with pediatric cardiac care capacity building in Brazil, China, India, Malaysia, and Vietnam through Children’s HeartLink. Specifically, they highlight the importance and unique dynamics of public, private, and mixed care delivery and funding for pediatric cardiac surgical services in low- and middle-income countries. Indeed, a public-private divide impedes progress of the global health agenda, and thoughtful early integration will be critical to efficiently and effectively scaling pediatric cardiac surgery in variable-resource contexts.⁴