RSV
ISSN 2674-8584

Received: 13/08/2026 - **Accepted:** 08/09/2026
Vol: 08.09
DOI: 10.66104/12mh8q79
Pages: 1-11

Health Management and Decision-Making: Challenges for Improving Services in the Brazilian Unified Health System

Cláudio Eduardo Sousa Lima
Doutorando em Saúde Pública
Universidad de Ciencias Empresariales y Sociales, Argentina

Domilene Borges Costa
Doutoranda em Saúde Pública
Universidad de Ciencias Empresariales y Sociales, Argentina

Átila Barros Magalhães
Professor
Universidade do Estado do Pará, Brasil

Andreia Cristina Barboza da Silva Morais
Doutoranda em Saúde Pública
Universidad de Ciencias Empresariales y Sociales, Argentina

Marco Eurípedes Martins
Universidade Federal de Uberlândia, Brasil

Josiene Mara Fernandes
Enfermeira e especialista em terapia intensiva pediátrica e neonatal
Universidade Federal de Uberlândia, Brasil

Marco Eurípedes Martins
Universidade Federal de Uberlândia, Brasil

Juliana Mara Silva
Pediatra e intensivista pediátrica
Universidade Federal de Uberlândia, Brasil

Abstract

Health management and decision-making are fundamental components for the organization, performance, and sustainability of health services within the Brazilian

CC BY

RSV
ISSN 2674-8584

Received: 13/08/2026 - **Accepted:** 08/09/2026
Vol: 08.09
DOI: 10.66104/12mh8q79
Pages: 1-11

Unified Health System (Sistema Único de Saúde – SUS). The complexity of population health needs, resource limitations, territorial inequalities, technological transformations, and increasing demands for comprehensive care require managers to make decisions based on reliable information, evidence, professional knowledge, and social realities. This academic essay discusses the main challenges associated with health management and decision-making for improving the quality of services in SUS. The discussion addresses planning, governance, health information systems, financing, human resources, evaluation, technological innovation, regionalization, interprofessional collaboration, and social participation. It also emphasizes that effective management requires the integration of technical rationality with ethical, political, and social dimensions. Decision-making based solely on intuition or isolated indicators may produce interventions disconnected from local needs, while excessive bureaucratization can reduce organizational flexibility. Strengthening management capacity, improving information use, developing qualified leadership, and promoting evidence-informed decisions are essential for increasing efficiency, equity, comprehensiveness, accessibility, and quality throughout the Brazilian public health system.
Keywords: Health management; Decision-making; Brazilian Unified Health System; Public health; Health services.

1. Introduction

Health management represents one of the central dimensions of the organization and functioning of health systems. Managers are responsible for coordinating people, resources, services, technologies, information, and processes in environments characterized by high levels of complexity and uncertainty. In public health, these responsibilities become even more challenging because decisions must reconcile population needs with available resources, legal requirements, political priorities, territorial inequalities, and the principles that guide universal healthcare.

In Brazil, the Brazilian Unified Health System, known as Sistema Único de Saúde or SUS, represents one of the largest public health systems in the world and is organized around universal access, comprehensiveness, equity, decentralization, and social participation. Its institutional architecture involves federal, state, and municipal governments, generating a complex network of responsibilities and relationships. This decentralized structure allows decisions to be adapted to local realities but also creates challenges involving coordination, regionalization, financing, governance, and the distribution of responsibilities among different administrative levels.

Decision-making within SUS cannot therefore be reduced to administrative procedures. Every managerial decision has consequences for access, quality,

CC BY

ISSN 2674-8584

Received: 13/08/2026 - **Accepted:** 08/09/2026
Vol: 08.09
DOI: 10.66104/12mh8q79
Pages: 1-11

efficiency, equity, and the organization of healthcare work. Decisions regarding staffing, service distribution, procurement, referral pathways, infrastructure, technology, and resource allocation may directly affect people's ability to obtain timely and appropriate care. Management consequently becomes a strategic instrument through which constitutional principles are translated into concrete services.

The increasing complexity of population health needs further reinforces the importance of qualified management. Brazil faces demographic ageing, chronic diseases, mental health demands, communicable diseases, social inequalities, territorial disparities, and emerging health threats simultaneously. Health services must respond to these demands while dealing with financial constraints, workforce shortages, technological transformations, and growing expectations from citizens. Managers therefore need technical, analytical, political, ethical, and relational competencies.

Information has become particularly important in this context. Health information systems generate large volumes of demographic, epidemiological, clinical, administrative, and financial data. However, the existence of information does not automatically guarantee better decisions. Data must be reliable, timely, interpretable, contextualized, and converted into knowledge that can support planning and evaluation. Strengthening the capacity of managers to interpret and use information is therefore essential for transforming data into effective action.

This academic essay discusses health management and decision-making as strategic dimensions for improving services within SUS. It examines the challenges associated with planning, governance, financing, human resources, information, evaluation, regionalization, technology, social participation, and evidence-informed management. The central argument is that qualification of SUS services depends not only on greater resources but also on the capacity to organize, interpret, coordinate, evaluate, and continuously improve the use of those resources according to population needs and the principles of the Brazilian public health system.

2. Methods

This study was developed as an academic essay based on a narrative and critical examination of scientific and institutional literature concerning health management, decision-making, health systems, public administration, evidence-informed policy, healthcare quality, governance, planning, and the organization of SUS. The discussion incorporates Brazilian legislation and institutional documents together with scientific literature addressing contemporary challenges in health management and the qualification of public services.

CC BY

RSV
ISSN 2674-8584

Received: 13/08/2026 - **Accepted:** 08/09/2026
Vol: 08.09
DOI: 10.66104/12mh8q79
Pages: 1-11

The essay does not present original empirical data and does not constitute a systematic review. Its purpose is conceptual and argumentative, seeking to integrate managerial, organizational, epidemiological, technological, and social dimensions of decision-making within SUS. The references used to support the discussion are presented exclusively at the end of the text, without in-text citations, according to the requested format. The reference list follows APA 7th edition standards.

3. Development

Health management in SUS must initially be understood as a process that goes beyond the administrative control of resources. Management involves planning, coordination, leadership, evaluation, negotiation, communication, regulation, monitoring, and continuous adaptation. The manager operates between institutional objectives and population needs, translating policies and guidelines into organizational practices. Consequently, management competence is directly related to the capacity of services to provide accessible, comprehensive, equitable, and safe care.

The complexity of SUS results partly from its scale and territorial diversity. Brazilian municipalities differ considerably in population size, socioeconomic conditions, geographic characteristics, epidemiological profiles, infrastructure, and availability of health professionals. A management strategy that works in a large metropolitan centre may not be appropriate for a rural or remote municipality. Effective decision-making therefore requires sensitivity to local contexts and the ability to adapt general policies to specific territorial realities.

Decentralization is one of the defining characteristics of SUS. Municipalities play a substantial role in the organization and delivery of healthcare, while states and the federal government perform regulatory, financing, coordination, and technical-support functions. Decentralization can bring decisions closer to citizens and local needs, but it also creates challenges involving intergovernmental coordination. When responsibilities are poorly coordinated, fragmentation may occur and patients may encounter difficulties moving through different levels of care.

Regionalization is therefore essential for strengthening SUS. No municipality can independently provide every type of healthcare service required by its population. Networks of services must be organized across territories so that primary care, specialized services, hospital care, emergency services, rehabilitation, mental health, and other components function as interconnected elements. Decision-making should consequently consider not only the needs of individual facilities but also the functioning of the broader regional healthcare network.

CC BY

RSV
ISSN 2674-8584

Received: 13/08/2026 - **Accepted:** 08/09/2026
Vol: 08.09
DOI: 10.66104/12mh8q79
Pages: 1-11

Planning represents one of the main instruments through which management can transform identified needs into organized action. Effective planning begins with diagnosis of the population and territory, identification of priorities, definition of objectives, allocation of resources, establishment of responsibilities, and development of monitoring mechanisms. Without adequate planning, management may become reactive, responding continuously to immediate demands without addressing structural problems.

However, planning in health services often faces a tension between long-term objectives and urgent operational demands. Managers must simultaneously deal with emergencies, staff shortages, equipment failures, complaints, judicial demands, supply problems, and political pressures. These immediate challenges can consume organizational capacity and reduce the time available for strategic planning. Strengthening management therefore requires structures that protect strategic functions from becoming entirely subordinate to daily crises.

Evidence-informed decision-making is another central challenge. Managers should ideally use scientific evidence, epidemiological data, service indicators, economic information, professional knowledge, and community perspectives when defining interventions. Nevertheless, evidence is rarely sufficient by itself. Decisions must also consider feasibility, ethical implications, available resources, institutional responsibilities, political contexts, and the preferences and needs of the population.

The quality of decisions is strongly dependent on the quality of information available. SUS possesses several information systems capable of generating data about morbidity, mortality, procedures, hospitalizations, vaccination, primary care, surveillance, financing, and other dimensions. These systems represent an important strategic asset. However, differences in data quality, completeness, timeliness, interoperability, and local capacity to interpret information can limit their usefulness for managerial purposes.

The challenge is therefore not simply to generate more data but to improve the capacity to transform data into intelligence. Managers need to distinguish relevant indicators from secondary information, identify trends, interpret variations, understand denominators, recognize biases, and relate quantitative information to local realities. A reduction in service utilization, for example, may represent improved health, reduced access, or barriers preventing people from reaching services. Numbers acquire meaning only when interpreted within their context.

Health indicators should consequently be incorporated into a continuous management cycle. Data should support diagnosis, planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, and revision. When indicators are used only for reporting requirements, their managerial value is reduced. When they are integrated into decision-making, they can identify problems, monitor progress, reveal inequalities, and support accountability.

CC BY

RSV
ISSN 2674-8584

Received: 13/08/2026 - **Accepted:** 08/09/2026
Vol: 08.09
DOI: 10.66104/12mh8q79
Pages: 1-11

Health financing represents another major challenge. Managers must allocate limited resources across competing needs while maintaining compliance with legal and institutional requirements. Decisions involving budgets can affect staffing, infrastructure, medicines, transportation, information systems, training, and service capacity. Financial management should therefore be integrated with epidemiological and operational planning rather than treated as an isolated administrative function.

Efficiency should also be understood carefully within public health. The objective of efficiency is not simply to reduce expenditure but to obtain the greatest possible health benefit from available resources while preserving equity and quality. A cheaper intervention is not necessarily more efficient if it reduces access, increases complications, or generates additional costs elsewhere in the health system. Good management requires consideration of both immediate and long-term consequences.

Human resources represent perhaps the most important organizational resource in healthcare. Buildings, equipment, technologies, and information systems cannot function effectively without qualified professionals. Managers must therefore address recruitment, retention, workforce distribution, professional development, working conditions, leadership, performance, and well-being. Workforce management is inseparable from service quality.

The distribution of health professionals remains unequal across Brazil. Urban and economically advantaged regions may attract professionals more easily than remote or socially vulnerable territories. These inequalities can compromise access to specialized care and generate excessive pressure on existing teams. Managerial strategies must therefore consider territorial workforce planning and mechanisms capable of supporting professionals in underserved regions.

Working conditions also affect the quality of management and care. Excessive workloads, insufficient staffing, inadequate infrastructure, multiple employment relationships, occupational risks, and emotional demands can reduce professional well-being and contribute to turnover. Managers who seek to improve services must therefore consider the health of workers themselves as an organizational priority.

Leadership is another fundamental dimension. Effective health managers need more than technical knowledge. They must communicate, negotiate, resolve conflicts, coordinate teams, manage change, and build trust. Leadership in public health requires the ability to reconcile different interests while maintaining commitment to institutional principles and population needs.

Interprofessional collaboration is particularly important in SUS because comprehensive care depends on the interaction of different professional competencies. Physicians, nurses, psychologists, pharmacists, dentists, physiotherapists, social workers, community health workers, managers, and many

CC BY

RSV
ISSN 2674-8584

Received: 13/08/2026 - **Accepted:** 08/09/2026
Vol: 08.09
DOI: 10.66104/12mh8q79
Pages: 1-11

other professionals contribute different perspectives to healthcare. Decision-making becomes stronger when these perspectives are integrated rather than organized into isolated professional silos.

Primary health care occupies a strategic position in this process. As the preferred entry point and coordinator of care within health networks, primary care can identify population needs, provide continuous care, coordinate referrals, conduct prevention activities, and monitor chronic conditions. Effective management at this level can reduce fragmentation and improve continuity.

The Family Health Strategy has historically contributed to the reorganization of primary care in Brazil. Its territorial and community orientation provides opportunities for managers to understand population characteristics and organize services according to identified needs. However, its effectiveness depends on adequate staffing, infrastructure, financing, continuity, professional training, and integration with other levels of care.

Quality improvement requires systematic evaluation. Services cannot be considered qualified simply because they operate or achieve high numbers of procedures. Quality includes dimensions such as accessibility, safety, effectiveness, efficiency, timeliness, equity, continuity, comprehensiveness, and patient-centredness. Managers need indicators capable of capturing these dimensions and mechanisms that allow identified problems to generate concrete corrective actions.

Patient experience and community perspectives should also influence decision-making. Citizens interact directly with health services and can identify barriers that administrative indicators may not capture. Waiting times, communication difficulties, accessibility, discrimination, fragmented care, and organizational problems may be perceived clearly by users even when conventional indicators suggest adequate performance. Social participation can therefore contribute valuable knowledge to management.

The institutional structure of SUS includes mechanisms of social participation, particularly health councils and health conferences. These spaces are important for democratic governance and accountability. Meaningful participation, however, requires access to understandable information and genuine opportunities to influence decisions. Formal participation without effective influence risks becoming symbolic rather than transformative.

Digital transformation is increasingly influencing health management. Electronic records, telehealth, artificial intelligence, predictive analytics, dashboards, and integrated information systems may improve monitoring and support decision-making. These technologies can help managers identify patterns, anticipate demand, monitor indicators, and coordinate services. However, technological

CC BY

RSV
ISSN 2674-8584

Received: 13/08/2026 - **Accepted:** 08/09/2026
Vol: 08.09
DOI: 10.66104/12mh8q79
Pages: 1-11

adoption must be accompanied by attention to data quality, interoperability, privacy, cybersecurity, ethics, and professional training.

Artificial intelligence introduces additional opportunities and risks. Predictive models may support resource allocation, risk stratification, epidemiological surveillance, and operational planning. At the same time, algorithms can reproduce biases present in their training data or generate recommendations that are difficult for professionals to interpret. Health managers therefore need sufficient technological and ethical literacy to evaluate these tools critically rather than treating algorithmic outputs as automatically objective.

Digital transformation may also increase inequalities if technological resources are distributed unevenly. Municipalities with limited infrastructure, insufficient technical staff, or poor connectivity may have difficulty adopting sophisticated systems. Similarly, populations with limited digital literacy may experience new barriers to accessing services. Technological innovation should therefore be evaluated according to whether it improves equity rather than merely whether it increases technical capacity.

Another important challenge is coordination between management levels. Federal policies may establish national priorities, states may coordinate regional networks, and municipalities may implement services locally. Effective decision-making requires communication among these levels. Fragmented planning can result in duplicated initiatives, gaps in responsibility, inefficient resource use, and inconsistent priorities.

Intersectoral action is also essential because many determinants of health are outside the direct control of health services. Education, housing, sanitation, employment, food security, transportation, public safety, and environmental conditions influence health outcomes. Managers need to develop partnerships with other sectors when addressing complex problems. A health system alone cannot eliminate the social determinants that generate disease and inequalities.

The judicialization of healthcare represents another managerial challenge. Legal demands may require health systems to provide medicines, procedures, technologies, or services that were not included in established planning processes. Managers must respond to individual rights while maintaining population-level equity and responsible resource allocation. This requires transparent criteria, technical evaluation, communication with the judiciary, and mechanisms capable of balancing individual and collective interests.

Emergency preparedness has also become an increasingly important management function. Pandemics, natural disasters, climate-related events, infrastructure failures, and other emergencies can rapidly alter healthcare demand. Preparedness requires surveillance, contingency plans, trained personnel,

CC BY

RSV
ISSN 2674-8584

Received: 13/08/2026 - **Accepted:** 08/09/2026
Vol: 08.09
DOI: 10.66104/12mh8q79
Pages: 1-11

communication systems, supply chains, and coordination between institutions. Managers who invest in preparedness can reduce the impact of crises and protect both populations and healthcare workers.

The experience of recent global health crises demonstrates that management capacity is not simply a bureaucratic attribute. During emergencies, managers must make rapid decisions despite incomplete information. They must balance uncertainty with action, communicate risks, organize resources, protect workers, and adapt protocols. These circumstances highlight the importance of flexible governance structures and organizational learning.

Learning organizations are particularly relevant to the qualification of SUS services. A health service should be capable of identifying errors, evaluating interventions, sharing knowledge, and adapting practices. Instead of treating problems exclusively as individual failures, organizations should examine processes and systems that contribute to undesirable outcomes. This approach can strengthen patient safety and continuous improvement.

Transparency and accountability are also fundamental to public management. Citizens have the right to understand how public resources are allocated and what results are achieved. Transparent indicators, accessible information, and clear communication can strengthen trust in health institutions. Accountability should not be understood merely as punishment for poor performance but as a mechanism for learning, responsibility, and democratic governance.

Ultimately, improving management in SUS requires integration rather than isolated reforms. Better information without qualified managers may not produce better decisions. Additional resources without planning may generate inefficiency. New technologies without governance may introduce risks. Training without improvements in working conditions may have limited effects. The qualification of services depends on the interaction between resources, people, processes, information, leadership, governance, evaluation, and participation.

The future of SUS will therefore depend partly on its capacity to develop managers who can operate in complex environments. These professionals need to combine epidemiological reasoning, administrative competence, economic understanding, ethical judgment, technological literacy, communication skills, and political awareness. Management education should consequently move beyond traditional administrative models and incorporate the complexity of contemporary public health.

Health management should ultimately be understood as a means of guaranteeing rights rather than merely controlling organizational processes. Every managerial decision influences people's access to healthcare and the capacity of services to respond to population needs. When decisions are informed by evidence,

CC BY

RSV
ISSN 2674-8584

Received: 13/08/2026 - **Accepted:** 08/09/2026
Vol: 08.09
DOI: 10.66104/12mh8q79
Pages: 1-11

guided by equity, supported by reliable information, and connected to territorial realities, management can become a powerful instrument for strengthening SUS.

4. Conclusion

Health management and decision-making are fundamental to the qualification of services within SUS because they determine how resources, people, technologies, information, and organizational processes are coordinated to respond to population needs. The complexity of the Brazilian health system requires managers capable of combining technical knowledge with strategic planning, evidence-informed decision-making, territorial understanding, leadership, interprofessional collaboration, evaluation, and democratic governance. Challenges involving financing, workforce distribution, information systems, regionalization, technological transformation, social inequalities, and coordination between government levels cannot be addressed through isolated interventions.

Strengthening SUS therefore requires investment not only in infrastructure and financing but also in managerial capacity and organizational learning. Decisions should be based on reliable information while remaining sensitive to local realities, social inequalities, professional knowledge, and the experiences of service users. Health management must integrate efficiency with equity, technological innovation with ethics, and administrative responsibility with the constitutional principles of universal, comprehensive, and equitable care. By strengthening these capacities, SUS can improve the quality, accessibility, continuity, and sustainability of its services while remaining responsive to the changing health needs of the Brazilian population.

References

Conselho Nacional de Secretários de Saúde. (2022). *A gestão do SUS*. CONASS.

Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada. (2023). *Políticas sociais: acompanhamento e análise*. IPEA.

Mendes, E. V. (2019). *As redes de atenção à saúde* (2nd ed.). Organização Pan-Americana da Saúde.

Ministério da Saúde. (2023). *Plano Nacional de Saúde 2024–2027*. Ministério da Saúde.

Ministério da Saúde. (2024). *Relatório de gestão 2023*. Ministério da Saúde.

CC BY

RSV
ISSN 2674-8584

Received: 13/08/2026 - **Accepted:** 08/09/2026
Vol: 08.09
DOI: 10.66104/12mh8q79
Pages: 1-11

Organização Pan-Americana da Saúde. (2018). *A atenção à saúde coordenada pela atenção primária no Brasil*. OPAS.

Organização Pan-Americana da Saúde. (2022). *Atenção primária à saúde no Brasil: avanços e desafios*. OPAS.

Paim, J. (2018). Sistema Único de Saúde (SUS) aos 30 anos. *Ciência & Saúde Coletiva, 23*(6), 1723–1728. https://doi.org/10.1590/1413-81232018236.09172018

Paim, J. (2023). *O que é o SUS* (1st ed.). Editora Fiocruz.

Santos, L., & Campos, G. W. S. (2022). SUS Brasil: a região de saúde como caminho. *Saúde em Debate, 46*(Especial 1), 4–10.

Starfield, B. (1994). Is primary care essential? *The Lancet, 344*(8930), 1129–1133. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(94)90634-3

Teixeira, C. F., & Vilasbôas, A. L. Q. (2014). Modelos de atenção à saúde no SUS: transformação, mudança ou conservação? *Saúde em Debate, 38*(Especial), 115–126.

Vaitsman, J., Ribeiro, J. M., & Lobato, L. V. C. (2023). Participação social e governança no Sistema Único de Saúde. *Ciência & Saúde Coletiva, 28*(5), 1309–1318.

World Health Organization. (2021). *Global patient safety action plan 2021–2030: Towards eliminating avoidable harm in health care*. World Health Organization.

World Health Organization. (2022). *Global report on health equity for persons with disabilities*. World Health Organization.

World Health Organization. (2024). *World health statistics 2024: Monitoring health for the SDGs, sustainable development goals*. World Health Organization.

World Health Organization. (2024). *Everybody's business: Strengthening health systems to improve health outcomes*. World Health Organization.

World Health Organization, & Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2020). *The economics of patient safety: From analysis to action*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/5c5c0c3e-en

CC BY