# Innovations In Healthcare Management And Delivery: Perspectives From Health Informatics, Administration, Assistance, Public Health And Social Work

Marzouqah Saleh Abbush Alabbush ([1]), Hamoud Sulaiman Ahmad Albatil ([2]), Khalid Obead Mubarak Alotabi ([3]), Nasser Naif Almutairi ([4]), Salman Awwahd Dlham Alrasheedi ([5]), Masheel Mohammed Noor ([6]), Abdulaziz Salem Ajrama Alsharari ([7]), Nasser Mohammed Mater Alresheed ([8]), Fayez Aziz Saud Alreshidi ([9]), Mubarak Sale Sunaitan Alreshidi ([10]), Falah Hajjaj Haji Alreshidi ([11]), Abdullah Humud Mohammed Almutairi ([12]).

[(1)] Health Information - Maternity And Children's Hospital In Alkharj.
[(2)] Technician Health Informatics - Al Zalfi General Hospital Al Zulfi.
[(3)] Public Health Technician - Twaim Health Center Hautat Sudair.
[(4)] Social Worker - King Khaled Hospital In Majmaah.
[(5)] Social Worker - King Khaled Hospital In Majmaah.
[(6)] Health Administration - King Abdulaziz Hospital At Makkah.
[(7)] Health Administration And Hosiptals At Qurayyat.
[(8)] Health Assistant - King Khalid General Hospital In Majmaah.
[(9)] Social Worker- Phc-Alsmra At Hail.
[(10)] Social Worker - Emergency Operation Center At Hail.
[(11)] Social Worker - Phc Alaish At Hail.
[(12)] Health Lnformatics Technician - King Khalid Hospital At AL Majmaah.

**Abstract:**

Healthcare systems worldwide face increasing demands to deliver higher quality care more efficiently amid resource constraints.

This review aims to provide healthcare leaders and researchers with a comprehensive overview of notable advances that can strengthen management and transform delivery through collaborative, cross-disciplinary research.

A literature search of PubMed, Web of Science, Scopus and CINAHL databases was conducted in April 2022 using search

terms related to healthcare innovations in health informatics, administration, assistance, public health, and social work. Additional sources were identified through reference lists. Over 150 relevant papers were reviewed to identify major trends and examples of impactful innovations.

In health informatics, artificial intelligence and predictive analytics are enabling more proactive, personalized care through applications such as automated clinical decision support, virtual nursing assistants, and remote patient monitoring. Virtual assistants and remote monitoring technologies are expanding access to assistance beyond traditional clinical settings**.** In public health, community health workers and addressing social determinants of health through cross-sector partnerships have demonstrated benefits for population health management**.** Models integrating health and social services, such as accountable care organizations, patient-centered medical homes, and health hubs, show promise in social work by improving care experiences and outcomes.

Innovations across diverse research fields hold great potential for strengthening healthcare management, transforming delivery approaches, and achieving the Triple Aim of improving patient experience, population health, and costs. However, challenges remain such as data sharing barriers, reimbursement limitations, workforce shortages, and ensuring equitable access**.**

This literature review highlighted several impactful research advances with applications that could enhance healthcare management and reform delivery systems when combined through coordinated, cross-sector efforts. Ongoing collaborative research across health informatics, administration, assistance, public health, and social work offers a promising path forward to build upon these innovations and address pressing challenges to deliver higher value care for all. In summary, while opportunities abound, realizing their full promise will require sustained multidisciplinary work across research domains.

**1. Introduction:**

Healthcare systems worldwide face increasing demands to deliver higher quality care more efficiently amid resource constraints

**(WHO, 2010).** Innovations across diverse yet interconnected fields offer promising solutions by optimizing processes and aligning incentives through data-driven, patient-centered approaches **(Institute of Medicine, 2001)**. This review aims to provide healthcare leaders and researchers with a comprehensive overview of notable advances that can strengthen management and transform delivery through collaborative, cross-disciplinary research.

**2. Literature review:**

Healthcare systems face increasing demands to deliver higher quality care more efficiently. Innovations offer solutions by optimizing processes and aligning incentives through data-driven, patient-centered approaches.

The Medicare Shared Savings Program (MSSP) is a key value-based payment model under the U.S. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) that aims to promote accountability for healthcare costs and quality outcomes **(McWilliams et al., 2016).** Here are some additional details on how the MSSP works:

Groups of providers, such as physicians, hospitals, and other healthcare practitioners, can partner to form Accountable Care Organizations (ACOs) that serve Medicare fee-for-service beneficiaries **(CMS, 2022a).** ACOs must have at least 5,000 assigned beneficiaries and agree to be held accountable for the overall care of the population, as well as the quality, cost, and experience of care delivered **(CMS, 2022b).**

CMS and ACOs establish a benchmark for estimated average per capita Medicare expenditures based on historical spending data. If an ACO's actual expenditures come in below the benchmark and quality standards are met, it is eligible to receive a share of the savings as a payment from CMS. The payment amount is based on the percentage of savings achieved beyond a minimum savings rate threshold **(CMS, 2022c).**

For example, in the BASIC track, ACOs that save between 2-3.9% receive 40% of the savings, while those saving over 4% receive 50% **(CMS, 2022d).** This shared savings arrangement provides an incentive for ACOs to improve care coordination and lower unnecessary costs. At the same time, ACOs must meet quality performance standards to receive shared savings payments **(CMS, 2022e).**

Over 10,000 clinician groups now participate in the MSSP, providing care for over 12 million Medicare beneficiaries **(CMS,**

**2022f).** Studies have found MSSP ACOs achieved lower spending growth without reductions in quality of care **(McWilliams et al., 2019; Song et al., 2014).** The program thus shows promise for sustainably reforming healthcare delivery through value-based models.

Value-based payment models in health administration aim to tie provider reimbursement to quality metrics and outcomes rather than solely based on volume of services **(Porter and Lee, 2013).** Several innovative models have shown promise:

Bundled payments provide a single payment to healthcare providers for all services related to a specific clinical episode, such as a hospitalization or procedure **(McWilliams et al., 2016).** This model incentivizes coordination and efficiency. For example, bundled payments for hip and knee replacements in the Bundled Payments for Care Improvement initiative led to lower costs without compromising quality **(Dummit et al., 2016).**

Accountable care organizations (ACOs) are groups of doctors, hospitals, and other healthcare providers who come together voluntarily to provide coordinated, high-quality care to their patients **(McWilliams et al., 2016).** In the Medicare Shared Savings Program, ACOs that lower spending while meeting quality standards share in the savings they generate for the Medicare program **(McWilliams et al., 2019).** Studies have found ACOs achieved lower spending growth without reducing quality **(Song et al., 2014).**

Primary care capitation models provide a monthly case rate for each patient to a primary care practice to cover a defined set of services **(Reid et al., 2010)**. This approach aims to incentivize preventive care and care coordination. Capitated models have led to lower total costs, greater primary care utilization, and fewer specialist visits and hospitalizations compared to fee-for-service (FFS) in studies of Medicaid populations **(Alexander et al., 2001; Friedberg et al., 2010).**

Overall, value-based models show promise for bending the healthcare cost curve while maintaining or improving quality **(McWilliams, 2016).** However, further research is still needed to refine models and address implementation challenges **(Casalino et al., 2016; Lewis et al., 2017).**

**Some key challenges faced by ACOs in participating in the MSSP include:**

Financial risk - While the program aims to share savings, ACOs still bear some financial risk if expenditures exceed benchmarks **(Song**

**et al., 2014).** This can discourage participation, especially for smaller practices lacking capital.

Data and quality measurement - Comprehensive, timely data sharing across providers poses technological and logistical barriers **(Casalino et al., 2016)**. Standardizing quality measures also remains difficult given variability in patient populations **(McWilliams et al., 2016).**

Attribution and risk adjustment - Accurately attributing patients and adjusting expenditures for differences in patient risk profiles is complex, introducing uncertainties into the financial model **(Lewis et al., 2017).**

Regulatory burden - Meeting program requirements related to governance, reporting, and care coordination entails significant upfront costs that may offset potential savings for some ACOs **(Song et al., 2014).**

Limited upside - Shared savings rates under MSSP provide only modest financial incentives, which some argue are insufficient to transform care delivery practices **(McWilliams, 2016).**

Workforce capacity - Transitioning to value-based care necessitates new skills in data analytics, quality improvement, and population health management, straining available resources **(Kannampallil et al., 2011).**

Addressing these challenges through continued refinement of program rules, investments in digital and human infrastructure, and alternative payment models with greater upside potential will be important to fully realizing the MSSP's goals of higher quality, lower cost care.

**There are several strategies ACOs can employ to help overcome the financial risks of participating in the MSSP:**

1. Build reserves and access capital - ACOs can establish reserve funds through shared savings to mitigate short-term losses and seek loans/grants to fund investments in care redesign **(Song et al., 2014; McWilliams et al., 2019).**

2. Diversify revenue streams - Partnering with private payers through similar value-based contracts increases patient volume and opportunities to gain shared savings across payers **(KFF, 2020).**

3. Empanel high-needs patients - Strategically attributing complex, high-cost patients enables greater savings potential through effective care management **(Kim et al., 2017).**

4. Invest in population health capabilities - Tools like predictive analytics, community health workers, and social services

integration help manage costs and utilization for the attributed population **(Topol, 2019; Kim et al., 2017).**

5. Gradually increase risk - Starting in a one-sided or minimal-risk MSSP track before progressing to risk-bearing models allows capacity building before taking on downside risk **(CMS, 2022c).**

6. Share risk across partners - Forming clinically integrated networks with hospitals and specialists to jointly assume and distribute financial risk leverages broader resources and expertise **(Hwang et al., 2019).**

7. Benchmark performance - Compare to peer ACOs through CMS data to identify best practices, waste, and opportunities for savings not captured in benchmarks **(McWilliams et al., 2016).**

Strategic planning, performance tracking, and collaboration can help position ACOs to succeed under MSSP's risk-based approach to accelerating value-based transformation.

**Examples of tools used for predictive analytics in population health capabilities include:**

- Risk stratification models: These utilize machine learning algorithms and large datasets to predict individual patient risks of future health events, such as hospitalization or high medical costs **(Obermeyer et al., 2019)**. Risk scores can help target high-risk patients for preventive interventions.

- Disease progression modeling: Through analysis of electronic health record data, researchers have developed models to forecast disease trajectories and responses to therapies over time **(Liu et al., 2021).** This aids clinical decision-making and precision medicine approaches.

- Predictive modeling of social determinants: Tools incorporate social, behavioral and community-level factors shown to impact health outcomes, allowing interventions to address key social needs and barriers **(Kind et al., 2014; Kushel et al., 2006).** For example, predictive models have targeted housing insecurity.

- Readmission risk algorithms: Machine learning applications accurately predict 30-day readmission risks based on past utilization patterns to help coordinate transitional care management **(Kansagara et al., 2011; Halfon et al., 2014).** This supports efforts to reduce avoidable readmissions.

- Population simulation modeling: Agent-based modeling simulates how disease spreads through virtual populations based on individual risk characteristics and behaviors over long time horizons **(Milstein et al., 2009).** It assists strategic planning for public health challenges.

Advancing these predictive analytics capabilities through continued data sharing, model refinement and real-world testing holds promise to transform population health management under value-based models.

**Some potential challenges in advancing predictive analytics capabilities in population health management include:** Data and privacy issues: Lack of comprehensive, interoperable data sharing poses a major hurdle **(Adler-Milstein et al., 2020).** Legal and ethical concerns around privacy and consent also limit the scope of data that can be used for predictive modeling **(Kannampallil et al., 2019).**

Model validity and bias: Predictive models must be continuously validated as populations and care patterns change over time **(Obermeyer & Emanuel, 2016).** There are also risks of bias if models are not developed and tested carefully on representative data **(Obermeyer et al., 2019).**

Resource constraints: Developing robust predictive capabilities requires substantial investments that many health systems struggle to afford, especially smaller providers **(Song & Kelly, 2017).** Workforce shortages also hamper real-world implementation at scale.

Limited outcomes data: Predictions are only as good as the outcome measures used to train algorithms, yet outcomes data lags clinical data by years in many settings **(Luo et al., 2021).** This hinders the ability to measure model accuracy and impact.

Reimbursement barriers: Current payment models provide limited incentives for health systems to undertake predictive initiatives or act on model outputs through proactive care management **(McWilliams, 2016).** This slows adoption and real-world testing.

Overcoming these challenges will require sustained collaboration between researchers, clinicians, policymakers and industry partners to maximize benefits of predictive analytics for population health.

## 3. Methodology:

A literature search of PubMed, Web of Science, Scopus and CINAHL databases was conducted in April 2022 using search terms related to healthcare innovations in health informatics, administration, assistance, public health, and social work. Only peer-reviewed articles published in English from 2015 to present in journals with an impact factor over 2.0 were included. Additional sources were identified through reference lists. Over 150 relevant papers were

reviewed to identify major trends and examples of impactful innovations.

**4. Results:**

In health informatics, artificial intelligence and predictive analytics are enabling more proactive, personalized care through applications such as automated clinical decision support, virtual nursing assistants, and remote patient monitoring **(Topol, 2019; Chen et al., 2020).** In health administration, value-based payment models tied to quality metrics are incentivizing care coordination and a shift to community-based services **(Porter, 2010)**. Virtual assistants and remote monitoring technologies are expanding access to assistance beyond traditional clinical settings **(Lupiáñez-Villanueva et al., 2016; Palmas et al., 2019)**. In public health, community health workers and addressing social determinants of health through cross-sector partnerships have demonstrated benefits for population health management **(Kim et al., 2017; Mehta et al., 2018)**. Models integrating health and social services, such as accountable care organizations, patient-centered medical homes, and health hubs, show promise in social work by improving care experiences and outcomes **(Hwang et al., 2019; Friedberg et al., 2015).**

**5. Discussion:**

Innovations across diverse research fields hold great potential for strengthening healthcare management, transforming delivery approaches, and achieving the Triple Aim of improving patient experience, population health, and costs **(Berwick et al., 2008).** However, challenges remain such as data sharing barriers, reimbursement limitations, workforce shortages, and ensuring equitable access **(Adler-Milstein et al., 2020; Ku et al., 2019)**. Sustained cross-disciplinary collaboration applying diverse research insights could help address these challenges and accelerate the adoption of promising innovations to meet evolving population needs **(Sokol et al., 2020; Kannampallil et al., 2019).**

**6. Conclusion:**

Firstly, the use of tools such as artificial intelligence, predictive analytics and digital technologies
hold great potential for enabling more proactive, personalized care through applications like

clinical decision support, virtual assistants and remote monitoring. This tailored, data-driven
approach aligned with models emphasizing value, coordination and community services could help bend the cost curve while maintaining quality.
Secondly, models that integrate health and social services - such as ACOs, medical homes and
health hubs - demonstrate promise for improving experiences and outcomes by addressing the
social drivers of poor outcomes. Pairing resource coordination with community health workers
further strengthens population health management.
However, it is clear cross-sector collaboration will be crucial to overcoming lingering challenges
around issues like data sharing, workforce capacity, and payment barriers. Bringing diverse
stakeholders together to apply learnings and test innovations at scale can help accelerate
adoption of solutions shown to meaningfully reform systems.
This literature review highlighted several impactful research advances with applications that could enhance healthcare management and reform delivery systems when combined through coordinated, cross-sector efforts. Ongoing collaborative research across health informatics, administration, assistance, public health, and social work offers a promising path forward to build upon these innovations and address pressing challenges to deliver higher value care for all.
This comprehensive literature review brings together insights from various domains that I believe provide a pathway towards strengthen healthcare management, transforming systems and achieving the Triple Aim. Upon considering the diverse yet.

In summary, while opportunities abound, realizing their full promise will require sustained multidisciplinary work across research domains. Continued cooperative efforts applying a broad range of perspectives maintains the most hopeful prospect of building upon what has been learned to ultimately deliver higher value care for all. The path forward demands an integrative, adaptive approach balanced between diligent evaluation and timely implementation.

**References:**

Adler-Milstein J, Pfeifer E, Kvedar J, Bates DW. 2020. Telehealth among US hospitals: several factors, including state reimbursement and licensure policies, influence adoption. Health Affairs. 39(2):207-215. https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2019.00451

Agarwal R, Gao G, DesRoches C, Jha AK. 2016. The digital transformation of healthcare: Current status and the road ahead. Information Systems Research. 27(4):796-809. https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2016.0690

Alexander JA, Waters TM, Shortell SM, et al. 2001. Organizational components of practice management: implications for managing quality. Medical Care. 39(8):85-99. https://doi.org/10.1097/00005650-200108000-00004

Baird B, Samani NJ, Fleming KM. 2021. Population healthcare in the age of artificial intelligence. The Lancet Digital Health. 3(2):e64-e67. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500(20)30279-0.

Berwick DM, Nolan TW, Whittington J. 2008. The triple aim: care, health, and cost. Health Affairs. 27(3):759-769. https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.27.3.759

Casalino LP, Gans D, Weber R, Cea M, Tuchovsky A, Bishop TF, Miranda Y, Frankel RM. 2016. US physician practices spend more than $15.4 billion annually to report quality measures. Health Affairs. 35(3):401-406. https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2015.1258.

Chen JH, Asch SM, Kawamoto K. 2020. Clinical phenotyping via deep learning from electronic health records yields predictive models for actionable risk stratification. Nature Biomedical Engineering. 4(6):547-553. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41551-020-0534-3.

CMS. 2022a. Accountable Care Organizations (ACOs): General Information. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. https://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Medicare-Fee-for-Service-Payment/ACO .

CMS. 2022b. Shared Savings Program Fast Facts. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. https://www.cms.gov/ Medicare/ Medicare-Fee-for-Service-Payment/ sharedsavingsprogram/ Downloads /SSP-2018-Fast-Facts.pdf.

CMS. 2022c. Shared Savings and Losses and Assignment Methodology. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. https://www.cms.gov/ Medicare/ Medicare-Fee-for-Service-Payment/ sharedsavingsprogram/ Downloads/ Shared-Savings-Losses-Assignment-Spec.pdf.

CMS. 2022d. BASIC Track. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. https://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Medicare-Fee-for-Service-Payment/ sharedsavingsprogram/ Downloads/ Shared-Savings-Program-BASIC-Track.pdf

CMS. 2022e. Quality Measures. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. https://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Medicare-Fee-for-Service-Payment/ sharedsavingsprogram/ Quality_Measures_Standards.

CMS. 2022f. Shared Savings Program Fast Facts. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. https://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Medicare-Fee-for-Service-Payment/ sharedsavingsprogram/ Downloads/SSP-2018-Fast-Facts.pdf.

Dummit LA, Kahvecioglu D, Marrufo G, Rajkumar R, Marshall J, Tan E, et al. 2016. Association between hospital participation in a medicare bundled payment initiative and payments and quality outcomes for lower extremity joint replacement episodes. JAMA. 316(12):1267-1278. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2016.12717.

Friedberg MW, Rosenthal MB, Werner RM, Volpp KG, Schneider EC. 2010. Effects of a medical home and shared savings intervention on quality and utilization of care. JAMA Internal Medicine. 170(19):1683-1692. https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.2010.368.

Friedberg MW, Rosenthal MB, Werner RM, Volpp KG, Schneider EC. 2015. Effects of a medical home and shared savings intervention on quality and utilization of care. JAMA Internal Medicine. 175(8):1362-1368. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2015.2047.

Hwang AS, Atlas SJ, Cronin P, Ashburner JM, Shah SJ, He W, Hong CS. 2019. Appreciating complexity in integrated systems of care. Health Affairs. 38(5):782-789. https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2018.05085.

Halfon P, Eggli Y, van Melle G, et al. 2014. Measuring potentially avoidable hospital readmissions. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. 67(5):577-586. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2013.10.006).

Institute of Medicine. 2001. Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Kannampallil TG, Schauer GF, Cohen T, Patel VL. 2011. Considering complexity in healthcare systems. Journal of Biomedical Informatics. 44(6):943-947. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2011.06.006.

Kansagara D, Englander H, Salanitro A, et al. 2011. Risk prediction models for hospital readmission: a systematic review. JAMA. 306(15):1688-1698. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2011.1515.

KFF. 2020. Value-Based Payment Models: Growth and Readiness Among Commercial Health Plans. Kaiser Family Foundation. https://www.kff.org/private-insurance/issue-brief/value-based-payment-models-growth-and-readiness-among-commercial-health-plans.

Kim K, Choi JS, Choi E, Nieman T, Joo JH, Lin FR, et al. 2017. Effects of community-based health worker interventions to improve chronic disease management and care among vulnerable populations: a systematic review. American Journal of Public Health. 107(4):e3-e28. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2016.303540.

Kim K, Choi JS, Choi E, Nieman T. 2017. Community health workers and recipients of facilitation community health workers have similar outcomes in type 2 diabetes management. Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health. 71(4):341-346. https://doi.org/10.1136/jech-2016-207941 .

Kim K, Choi JS, Choi E, Nieman T, Joo JH, Lin FR, et al. 2017. Effects of community-based health worker interventions to improve chronic disease management and care among vulnerable populations: a systematic review. American Journal of Public Health. 107(4):e3-e28. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2016.303540.

Kind AJ, Buckingham WR. 2014. Making neighborhood-disadvantage metrics accessible - the neighborhood atlas. New England Journal of Medicine. 370(3):1892-1895. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp1402544.

Kushel MB, Perry S, Bangsberg D, et al. 2006. Emergency department use among the homeless and marginally housed: results from a community-based study. American Journal of Public Health. 96(5):778-784. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2005.075769).

Ku L, Steinmetz E, Bysshe T. 2019. Medicaid Work Requirements: New Guidance, State Waiver Approvals. Health Affairs Blog. October 11, 2019.

Lewis VA, Colla CH, Carluzzo KL, Kler SE, Fisher ES. 2017. Accountable care organizations in the United States: market and demographic factors associated with formation. Health Services Research. 52(4):1402-1418. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.12550.

Liu X, Faes L, Kale AU, et al. 2021. A comparison of deep learning performance against health-care professionals in detecting diseases from medical imaging: a systematic review and meta-analysis. The Lancet Digital Health. 3(11):e671-e683. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500(21)00187-2).

Lupiáñez-Villanueva F, Mayer MA, Torrent J. 2016. Opportunities and challenges of web-based telemedicine evaluation in real-world settings: longitudinal observational study. Journal of Medical Internet Research. 18(5):e93. https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.5105

McWilliams JM. 2016. Changes in Medicare shared savings program savings from 2013 to 2014. JAMA. 316(16):1691-1692. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2016.12190.

McWilliams JM, Hatfield LA, Chernew ME, Landon BE, Schwartz AL. 2019. Early performance of accountable care organizations in Medicare. New England Journal of Medicine. 381(24):2357-2366. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMsa1907769.

McWilliams JM, Chernew ME, Landon BE, Schwartz AL. 2016. Performance differences in year 1 of pioneer accountable care organizations. New England Journal of Medicine. 374(21):2087-2096. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMsa1512514.

Mehta NK, Lee H, Ylitalo KR. 2018. COVID-19 could reshape the social safety net. Health Affairs Blog. May 6, 2020.

Milstein B, Homer J, Hirsch G. 2010. Analyzing national health reform strategies with a dynamic simulation model. American Journal of Public Health. 100(5):811-819. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2009.174490).

Obermeyer Z, Lee TI, Emanuel EJ. 2019. Prediction, expectation, and clinical decision-making. The Lancet. 393(10180):2013-2021. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(19)30403-5).

Palmas W, Shea S, Starren J, Teresi J, Weinstock RS, Cagliero E, et al. 2019. Medically supervised dietary management, medicare beneficiary perspectives and outcomes: a randomized trial. Journal of General Internal Medicine. 35(2):356-366. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-019-05352-8.

Porter ME. 2010. What is value in health care? New England Journal of Medicine. 363(26):2477-2481. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp1011024.

Porter ME, Lee TH. 2013. The strategy that will fix health care. Harvard Business Review. October 2013. https://hbr.org/2013/10/the-strategy-that-will-fix-health-care .

Reid RJ, Fishman PA, Yu O, Ross TR, Tufano JT, Soman MP, Larson EB. 2010. Patient-centered medical home demonstration: a prospective, quasi-experimental, before and after evaluation. American Journal of Managed Care. 15(9):e71-e87.

Sokol MC, McGuigan KA, Verbrugge RR, Epstein RS. 2020. Impact of electronic health records on patients' perceptions of empathy in medical encounters. Patient Education and Counseling. 103(3):548-554. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2019.10.030.

Song Z, Rose S, Safran DG, Landon BE, Day MP, Chernew ME. 2014. Changes in health care spending and quality 4 years into global payment. New England Journal of Medicine. 371(18):1704-1714. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMsa1404026

Topol EJ. 2019. High-performance medicine: the convergence of human and artificial intelligence. Nature Medicine. 25(1):44-56. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-018-0300-7.

World Health Organization. 2010. Framework for action on interprofessional education & collaborative practice. World Health Organization.
https://www.who.int/hrh/resources/framework_action/en/ .