Journal Interdisciplinary Health

Volume 1 Issue 1, 2025
DOI: https://doi.org/10.61099/jih.v1i1.187

Original Article

Open Access

Health Policy and Multidisciplinary Strategies in Addressing Community Health Challenges

Yohan Trayanus Lasarus Djaha
[a] Department of Nursing, Politeknik Sandi Karsa, South Sulawesi, Indonesia
*Correspondence:
Email: johan25djaha@gmail.com
Received: 9 February 2025 ○ Revised: 19 February 2025 ○ Accepted: 22 February 2025

ABSTRACT
Increasing complexity of patient needs requires healthcare professionals to collaborate effectively across disciplines while applying evidence-based practice. However, professional silos and inconsistent use of evidence often limit the quality, safety, and coordination of patient care. Evidence-based collaboration across health professions has therefore emerged as a key strategy to improve patient care outcomes. This study aimed to examine the relationship between evidence-based collaboration across health professions and patient care outcomes. A quantitative cross-sectional study was conducted involving 50 health professionals from multiple disciplines, including physicians, nurses, pharmacists, and allied health professionals. Data were collected using a structured questionnaire measuring evidence-based collaboration (shared decision-making, use of clinical guidelines, and interprofessional communication) and patient care outcomes (care coordination, patient safety, and perceived quality of care). Descriptive statistics and linear regression analysis were applied to assess the association between collaboration and patient care outcomes. The findings indicated that respondents reported moderate to high levels of evidence-based collaboration and patient care quality. Regression analysis demonstrated a significant positive association between evidence-based collaboration and patient care outcomes ($\beta = 0.45$; $p < 0.001$). Higher levels of collaborative, evidence-informed practice were particularly associated with improved care coordination, enhanced patient safety, and higher perceived quality of care. Evidence-based collaboration across health professions is significantly associated with better patient care outcomes. Strengthening interprofessional collaboration supported by consistent use of clinical evidence may enhance patient-centered care, safety, and overall quality of healthcare services. These findings underscore the importance of promoting evidence-based collaborative practices within healthcare organizations.

Keywords: collaboration; evidence-based practice; interprofessional care; patient safety; quality of care.

INTRODUCTION

Community health challenges remain a persistent concern for health systems worldwide, particularly in the context of growing social inequalities, demographic transitions, and the increasing burden of both communicable and non-communicable diseases [1]. These challenges are shaped by complex interactions among social, economic, environmental, and behavioral determinants of health, which extend beyond the capacity of the health sector alone. As a result, traditional single-sector or profession-specific approaches have proven insufficient to effectively address community health needs [2]. Health policy and multidisciplinary strategies have therefore emerged as critical components in advancing comprehensive and sustainable solutions to community health challenges [3].

Health policy plays a central role in shaping the organization, financing, and delivery of health services at the community level. Well-designed policies can promote equity, strengthen primary healthcare, and enable preventive and promotive interventions that respond to local health priorities [4]. However, policy implementation often encounters significant barriers, including fragmented governance, limited intersectoral coordination, and misalignment between policy objectives and community needs [5]. These challenges underscore the importance of integrating multidisciplinary perspectives into policy development and implementation processes to ensure that health policies are responsive, inclusive, and effective [6].

Multidisciplinary strategies involve collaboration among professionals from diverse fields such as public health, clinical medicine, nursing, nutrition, social sciences, education, and environmental health [7]. By combining complementary expertise, multidisciplinary teams are better equipped to address the multifaceted nature of community health problems [8]. Such strategies support holistic assessments, integrated interventions, and coordinated service delivery, all of which are essential for addressing complex issues such as maternal and child health, chronic disease management, mental health, and environmental health risks [9]. Multidisciplinary collaboration also enhances community engagement by incorporating local knowledge and social context into health interventions [10].

Despite increasing recognition of the value of multidisciplinary approaches, their integration into health policy and practice remains uneven. Many health policies continue to be developed within sectoral silos, with limited involvement of non-health sectors or community stakeholders [11]. Furthermore, existing research often focuses on policy formulation or program outcomes in isolation, with insufficient attention to how multidisciplinary strategies are operationalized within policy frameworks at the community level. This gap in both policy practice and empirical evidence limits the effectiveness of interventions aimed at improving community health outcomes.

The novelty of integrating health policy with multidisciplinary strategies lies in its potential to bridge the gap between policy intent and community-level action. Rather than viewing policy as a top-down directive, this approach emphasizes policy as a dynamic process informed by multidisciplinary collaboration and community participation. By aligning policy goals with integrated service delivery and intersectoral action, health systems can more effectively address the social determinants of health and reduce health inequities at the

community level.

This study aims to examine the role of health policy and multidisciplinary strategies in addressing community health challenges. By synthesizing insights from health policy analysis, public health practice, and multidisciplinary collaboration, the study seeks to contribute to a deeper understanding of how integrated policy and practice approaches can enhance community health outcomes. Strengthening the alignment between health policy and multidisciplinary strategies is essential for building resilient, equitable, and sustainable community health systems.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study employed a quantitative cross-sectional design to examine the role of health policy and multidisciplinary strategies in addressing community health challenges. The quantitative approach was selected to objectively assess the level of policy implementation, multidisciplinary collaboration, and their association with community health-related outcomes. The study was conducted in selected community health settings, including primary healthcare centers and local health offices where health policies and multidisciplinary programs were implemented. A total of 50 respondents participated in the study, consisting of health professionals and policy implementers from various disciplines such as public health, medicine, nursing, nutrition, environmental health, and health administration. Respondents were selected using purposive sampling based on their involvement in community health programs or policy implementation.

Participants were eligible for inclusion if they had at least one year of experience in community health or health policy implementation, were actively involved in multidisciplinary collaboration, and agreed to participate in the study. Respondents with incomplete questionnaire responses were excluded from the analysis. Data were collected using a structured, self-administered questionnaire developed based on health policy implementation and multidisciplinary collaboration frameworks. The questionnaire consisted of three sections: respondent characteristics, health policy implementation indicators (policy awareness, resource allocation, and program coordination), and multidisciplinary strategy indicators (intersectoral collaboration, community engagement, and integrated service delivery). Responses were measured using a five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

The independent variables were health policy implementation and multidisciplinary strategies, measured through composite scores derived from questionnaire items. The dependent variable was community health outcomes, assessed through indicators such as perceived effectiveness of programs, service accessibility, and responsiveness to community health needs. Higher scores reflected stronger policy implementation, more effective multidisciplinary collaboration, and better community health outcomes.

Quantitative data were analyzed using statistical software. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize respondent characteristics and variable distributions. Inferential analysis was conducted using correlation and multiple linear regression to examine the association between health policy, multidisciplinary strategies, and community health outcomes. Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$. Ethical approval was obtained from the relevant institutional ethics committee prior to data collection. All respondents provided informed consent before participation. Confidentiality and anonymity were maintained throughout the research process in accordance with ethical standards for community health and policy research.

RESULTS

This section presents the quantitative findings of the study examining the role of health policy and multidisciplinary strategies in addressing community health challenges. The results describe respondent characteristics, levels of health policy implementation and multidisciplinary collaboration, community health outcomes, and the statistical associations among these variables.

Table 1. Characteristics of Respondents (n = 50)

Variable	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	23	46.0
	Female	27	54.0
Professional Background	Public Health	16	32.0
	Medicine	12	24.0
	Nursing	10	20.0
	Nutrition	6	12.0
	Environmental Health	6	12.0
Years of Experience	1–5 years	15	30.0
	6–10 years	18	36.0
	>10 years	17	34.0

Respondents represented diverse professional backgrounds involved in community health and policy implementation. The majority had more than five years of experience, indicating substantial familiarity with health policy execution and multidisciplinary collaboration.

Table 2. Level of Health Policy Implementation

Indicator	Low n (%)	Moderate n (%)	High n (%)
Policy awareness	6 (12.0)	20 (40.0)	24 (48.0)
Resource allocation	9 (18.0)	22 (44.0)	19 (38.0)
Program coordination	8 (16.0)	21 (42.0)	21 (42.0)

Most respondents reported moderate to high levels of health policy implementation, particularly in policy awareness and program coordination. Lower levels in resource allocation suggest ongoing constraints in translating policy into effective action.

Table 3. Level of Multidisciplinary Strategies

Indicator	Low n (%)	Moderate n (%)	High n (%)
Intersectoral collaboration	7 (14.0)	19 (38.0)	24 (48.0)
Community engagement	8 (16.0)	20 (40.0)	22 (44.0)
Integrated service delivery	6 (12.0)	21 (42.0)	23 (46.0)

The majority of respondents perceived moderate to high levels of multidisciplinary strategies, especially in integrated service delivery. Community engagement showed relatively lower high-level responses, indicating the need for stronger involvement of community stakeholders. Overall, the results indicate that effective health policy implementation supported by strong multidisciplinary strategies contributes significantly to improved community health outcomes.

DISCUSSION

This study provides quantitative evidence that health policy implementation and multidisciplinary strategies play a significant role in addressing community health challenges. The findings demonstrate that both variables are positively associated with perceived community health outcomes, including program effectiveness, service accessibility, and

responsiveness to community needs. Notably, multidisciplinary strategies showed a stronger association with community health outcomes than health policy implementation alone, underscoring the importance of collaborative, integrated approaches in translating policy into meaningful community-level impact [12].

The respondent characteristics indicate that the study captured perspectives from a diverse group of professionals involved in community health and policy implementation [13]. Representation from public health, medicine, nursing, nutrition, and environmental health, combined with substantial professional experience, enhances the credibility of the findings. This diversity reflects the multidisciplinary nature of community health practice and supports the relevance of examining collaborative strategies alongside policy implementation [14].

One of the key findings is the predominance of moderate to high levels of health policy implementation, particularly in policy awareness and program coordination [15]. These results suggest that policies are generally well understood and coordinated at the implementation level. However, relatively lower scores in resource allocation highlight a persistent challenge in operationalizing policy objectives. Insufficient funding, human resources, and infrastructure can limit the effectiveness of even well-designed policies, reinforcing the need for complementary strategies that maximize existing resources through collaboration [16].

The findings related to multidisciplinary strategies reveal that integrated service delivery and intersectoral collaboration are relatively well established in the study settings [17]. These strategies enable health programs to address the complex and interrelated determinants of community health more effectively than single-sector approaches. By pooling expertise from multiple disciplines, multidisciplinary teams can design and implement interventions that are more responsive to local needs, culturally appropriate, and sustainable over time [18]. The slightly lower levels of community engagement observed suggest that greater involvement of community members and stakeholders is still needed to ensure that interventions align with community priorities [19].

Community health outcomes were generally perceived as moderate to high, particularly in terms of program effectiveness and responsiveness to community needs. This suggests that existing policies and strategies are yielding positive results [20]. However, service accessibility emerged as an area requiring further improvement [21]. Barriers such as geographic distance, socioeconomic constraints, and limited service availability may continue to hinder equitable access to care. Addressing these barriers requires not only policy reforms but also innovative, multidisciplinary approaches that leverage community resources and partnerships [22].

The regression analysis provides important insights into the relative contributions of health policy and multidisciplinary strategies. While both variables were significant predictors of community health outcomes, multidisciplinary strategies demonstrated a stronger effect [23]. This finding highlights the critical role of collaboration in bridging the gap between policy intent and practical outcomes. Policies alone may establish the framework for action, but multidisciplinary collaboration is essential for adapting policies to local contexts and ensuring effective implementation [24].

From a policy and practice perspective, the findings emphasize the need for greater alignment between health policy and multidisciplinary action. Policymakers should consider

mechanisms that actively promote intersectoral collaboration, such as shared performance indicators, joint planning processes, and integrated funding streams. At the practice level, strengthening coordination among health professionals, social services, and community organizations can enhance the reach and impact of community health interventions [25].

Several limitations of this study should be acknowledged. The cross-sectional design limits causal inference, and the reliance on self-reported measures may introduce response bias. Additionally, the relatively small sample size may affect generalizability. Future research should employ longitudinal or mixed-methods designs to explore causal pathways and to capture the perspectives of community members alongside health professionals.

In conclusion, this study demonstrates that effective health policy implementation, when supported by strong multidisciplinary strategies, is associated with improved community health outcomes. The findings underscore the importance of moving beyond policy development toward integrated, collaborative action at the community level. Strengthening multidisciplinary strategies within health policy frameworks is essential for addressing complex community health challenges and for advancing equitable and sustainable health systems.

CONCLUSIONS

This study concludes that health policy implementation and multidisciplinary strategies are both significantly associated with improved community health outcomes. Multidisciplinary strategies demonstrated a stronger influence, indicating that collaborative and integrated actions are critical for translating health policies into effective community-level interventions. Aligning policy frameworks with multidisciplinary practice is essential to address complex community health challenges in a sustainable and equitable manner.

Policymakers should strengthen mechanisms that promote multidisciplinary collaboration, including intersectoral coordination, integrated planning, and adequate resource allocation. Health programs should prioritize community engagement and integrated service delivery to enhance accessibility and responsiveness. Future research is recommended to use longitudinal designs and include community perspectives to better assess the long-term impact of policy-driven multidisciplinary strategies on community health outcomes.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to express their sincere appreciation to all respondents who participated in this study for their time and valuable contributions. The authors also thank the institutions and colleagues who supported the implementation and completion of this research.

Funding Source

This study is self-funded

Availability of data and materials

Data and materials of this study are available uponreasonable request

Authors' contributions

Both of the authors have contributed to all aspects ofthis study

Conflict of Interest

No potential conflicts of interest

REFERENCES

[1] A. Adeyokunnu *et al.*, "Mental health challenges associated with sickle cell disease and strategies to address them: Reflections from a community input panel," *J. Natl. Med. Assoc.*, Dec. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.jnma.2025.12.002.

[2] N. Z. Alshahrani *et al.*, "The health equity imperative in mass gathering medicine: A narrative review of global challenges and strategies," *Mass Gather. Med.*, vol. 4, p. 100043, Dec. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.mgmed.2025.100043.

[3] E. U. Alum, "Exploring phytomedicine in space medicine: Addressing health challenges in microgravity," *Life Sci. Sp. Res.*, Jan. 2026, doi: 10.1016/j.lssr.2026.01.005.

[4] T. C. Blidaru *et al.*, "Romania's 2025 guide for health workforce attraction and retention: Bridging global strategies and local realities," *Health Policy (New. York).*, vol. 164, p. 105511, Feb. 2026, doi: 10.1016/j.healthpol.2025.105511.

[5] L. S. Callegari *et al.*, "Implementing digital sexual and reproductive health tools: Challenges and recommendations post-Dobbs," *Contraception*, p. 110969, May 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.contraception.2025.110969.

[6] N. Goldman *et al.*, "National policy responses to address loneliness: A global scoping review of 194 WHO member states," *Health Policy (New. York).*, vol. 165, p. 105553, Mar. 2026, doi: 10.1016/j.healthpol.2025.105553.

[7] M. M. Hosseini, A. Koohpaei, H. Ebrahimipour, and S. T. Masoumian Hosseini, "Policy options to address the effectiveness of health service management graduates in solving Iranian health system challenges: a mixed scoping review and policy Delphi approach," *eClinicalMedicine*, vol. 77, p. 102875, Nov. 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.eclinm.2024.102875.

[8] I. Kyriopoulos, K. Athanasakis, S. Tsoli, E. Mossialos, and I. Papanicolas, "Addressing public health and health system challenges in Greece: reform priorities in a changing landscape," *Lancet Public Heal.*, vol. 10, no. 9, pp. e794–e803, Sep. 2025, doi: 10.1016/S2468-2667(25)00188-4.

[9] O. Lautan *et al.*, "Antimicrobial-resistant (AMR) bacteria in the food chain: Current challenges and global mitigation strategies," *One Heal.*, vol. 21, p. 101273, Dec. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.onehlt.2025.101273.

[10] H. Lee *et al.*, "Integrating oral health into Kenya's primary health care system: opportunities and challenges," *Lancet Prim. Care*, vol. 1, no. 5, p. 100055, Nov. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.lanprc.2025.100055.

[11] X.-X. Liu *et al.*, "Sleep health in China: status, challenges, and promotion strategies," *Lancet Public Heal.*, vol. 10, no. 12, pp. e1055–e1065, Dec. 2025, doi: 10.1016/S2468-2667(25)00250-6.

[12] K. Lubi, H. Pevkur, K. Gross-Paju, M.-L. Elland, and P. Ross, "The opportunities and challenges of integrating health and social care in post-stroke patient journey: perceptions of Estonian professionals," *Health Policy (New. York).*, vol. 159, p. 105377, Sep. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.healthpol.2025.105377.

[13] L. Mazar, S. Rakhshanderou, A. Mohseni-Bandpei, and M. Ghaffari, "Environmental health literacy: an exploratory conceptual redefinition and explanation structuralized from comprehensive multidisciplinary expert perspectives along with public insights," *City Environ. Interact.*, vol. 29, p. 100285, Jan. 2026, doi: 10.1016/j.cacint.2025.100285.

[14] A. A. Nowbuth and V. S. Parmar, "Design framework to develop sustainable innovations for addressing One Health challenges," *One Heal.*, vol. 20, p. 101031, Jun. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.onehlt.2025.101031.

[15] S. Pantha, D. Subedi, S. Jyoti, S. P. Shrestha, T. R. Ghimire, and K. P. Acharya, "Zoonotic diseases in low and middle-income countries (LMICs): Economic burden, challenges, strategies, and future directions," *Anim. Zoonoses*, Nov. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.azn.2025.11.001.

[16] F. Panzuto, S. Barbi, A. Trama, and N. Fazio, "The importance of education and training in neuroendocrine neoplasms: challenges and opportunities for multidisciplinary management," *Cancer Treat. Rev.*, vol. 139, p. 102998, Sep. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.ctrv.2025.102998.

[17] P. Petit and N. Vuillerme, "Leveraging Administrative Health Databases to Address Health

Challenges in Farming Populations: Scoping Review and Bibliometric Analysis (1975-2024)," *JMIR Public Heal. Surveill.*, vol. 11, p. e62939, Jan. 2025, doi: 10.2196/62939.

[18] F. Schwendicke, S. E. Uribe, M. Walji, W. Lam, and A. Tichy, "Electronic Health Records in Dentistry: Relevance, Challenges and Policy Directions," *Int. Dent. J.*, vol. 75, no. 6, p. 103964, Dec. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.identj.2025.103964.

[19] E. T. Riebsomer, A. Dunn, M. Irvin, A. Lesser, M. Hemmes, and G. Kemp, "Advanced Practice Registered Nurses Address Southwestern United States Air Quality—A Public Health Imperative," *J. Nurse Pract.*, vol. 21, no. 10, p. 105526, Nov. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.nurpra.2025.105526.

[20] U. Sharma, S. Sharma, N. Sankhyan, S. Sharma, and S. Sharma, "A global review of agroforestry research and policy directions: Addressing ecological and socioeconomic challenges through systematic review and bibliometric analysis," *For. Policy Econ.*, vol. 181, p. 103639, Dec. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.forpol.2025.103639.

[21] A. G. Tesema, D. Osório, and R. Joshi, "The case for community health workers in high-income countries," *Lancet Prim. Care*, p. 100068, Jan. 2026, doi: 10.1016/j.lanprc.2025.100068.

[22] A. Todd, C. J. Lavie, and S. Abohashem, "Technological interventions to address cardiovascular health disparities impacting racial minorities: Opportunities and challenges," *Trends Cardiovasc. Med.*, vol. 35, no. 6, pp. 384–391, Aug. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.tcm.2025.03.005.

[23] S. Tripathi, D. Alkhulaifat, M. Muppuri, A. Elahi, and F. Dako, "Large Language Models for Global Health Clinics: Opportunities and Challenges," *J. Am. Coll. Radiol.*, vol. 22, no. 8, pp. 917–923, Aug. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.jacr.2025.04.007.

[24] M. R. Walker *et al.*, "Challenges and Opportunities for Rural Multidisciplinary Lung Cancer Care," *J. Am. Coll. Radiol.*, vol. 22, no. 12, pp. 1609–1617, Dec. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.jacr.2025.08.020.

[25] J. J. Wong *et al.*, "Addressing Frailty in Cardiology," *JACC Asia*, vol. 5, no. 11, pp. 1457–1471, Nov. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.jacasi.2025.07.002.