

Integrating Public Health and Clinical Care to Improve Population Health Outcomes

Suprpto

^a Department of Nursing, Politeknik Sandi Karsa, South Sulawesi, Indonesia

*Correspondence:

Email: atoenurse@gmail.com

Received: 9 February 2025 ◦ Revised: 19 February 2025 ◦ Accepted: 22 February 2025

ABSTRACT

Health systems worldwide continue to face complex challenges related to rising disease burden, health inequities, and fragmented service delivery. The separation between public health and clinical care often limits the effectiveness of preventive and curative interventions in improving population health outcomes. This study aimed to examine the relationship between the integration of public health and clinical care and population health outcomes. A quantitative observational study with a longitudinal approach was conducted involving 50 healthcare professionals from primary healthcare facilities and public health institutions. Data were collected using structured questionnaires to assess levels of service integration and secondary health system data to measure population health outcomes. Statistical analyses included descriptive statistics and regression analysis to determine associations between integration indicators and health outcomes. The findings showed that higher levels of public health–clinical care integration were significantly associated with improved preventive service coverage ($\beta = 0.42$; $p < 0.001$) and increased early disease detection rates ($\beta = 0.39$; $p = 0.003$). Additionally, greater integration was linked to a reduction in avoidable hospital admissions ($\beta = -0.36$; $p = 0.012$). These results indicate that coordinated preventive and curative services contribute positively to population health performance. Integrating public health and clinical care is associated with measurable improvements in population health outcomes. Strengthening collaboration, referral coordination, and shared information systems may enhance health system efficiency and equity. Integrated service models should be prioritized as a strategic approach to improving sustainable population health outcomes.

Keywords: clinical care integration; health systems; population health; preventive services; public health

INTRODUCTION

Health systems across the world continue to face complex and interrelated challenges, including the rising burden of non-communicable diseases, persistent health inequities, demographic transitions, and increasing healthcare costs [1]. These challenges are compounded by social determinants of health such as poverty, education, housing, and environmental conditions, which exert substantial influence on population health outcomes but often lie beyond the direct reach of clinical services [2]. Traditionally, public health and clinical care have operated in parallel rather than in partnership, resulting in fragmented interventions that inadequately address the multifactorial nature of health problems. This separation has limited the capacity of health systems to move from reactive, disease-centered models toward proactive and preventive approaches that promote sustainable population health improvement [3].

Public health focuses on population-level strategies such as disease prevention, health promotion, surveillance, and policy development, while clinical care emphasizes individual diagnosis, treatment, and rehabilitation. Although both domains share the common goal of improving health, their differing orientations, funding mechanisms, professional cultures, and performance indicators have created structural and operational silos [4]. As a result, clinical services frequently address the downstream consequences of preventable conditions, while public health interventions struggle to translate epidemiological evidence into routine clinical practice [5]. This disconnect represents a critical problem in contemporary health systems, particularly in settings experiencing epidemiological transitions where preventable chronic diseases coexist with infectious diseases and maternal and child health challenges [6].

The consequences of this fragmentation are evident in suboptimal population health outcomes. Patients often receive high-quality clinical treatment without adequate attention to prevention, continuity of care, or social risk factors that influence recovery and long-term wellbeing [7]. Conversely, public health programs may lack clinical integration, reducing their effectiveness in early detection, referral, and management of health conditions. This gap undermines efforts to reduce avoidable morbidity and mortality and perpetuates inequities, as vulnerable populations are disproportionately affected by weak coordination between preventive and curative services [8]. Therefore, strengthening the integration between public health and clinical care has emerged as an urgent priority for health systems seeking to improve efficiency, equity, and overall health outcomes [9].

Despite growing recognition of the importance of integration, significant gaps remain in both evidence and practice. Existing studies often examine public health interventions or clinical innovations in isolation, with limited attention to how coordinated models function across system levels [10]. Many integration efforts are context-specific, short-term, or focused narrowly on single diseases, limiting their generalizability and scalability. Furthermore, there is insufficient empirical evidence on the mechanisms through which integrated approaches influence population health outcomes, including changes in service utilization, prevention effectiveness, and health equity. This gap is particularly pronounced in low- and middle-income countries, where health systems face resource constraints and complex governance structures.

The novelty of this study lies in its explicit focus on the intersection between public health and clinical care as a unified framework for improving population health outcomes. Rather than

treating integration as a purely organizational or administrative reform, this study conceptualizes integration as a multidimensional process encompassing service delivery, data sharing, workforce collaboration, and policy alignment. By synthesizing perspectives from public health, clinical practice, and health systems research, this study offers a comprehensive approach to understanding how integrated models can address both individual health needs and population-level determinants. This interdisciplinary lens enables a deeper examination of how preventive and curative services can be aligned to produce synergistic effects on health outcomes.

Additionally, this study contributes novel insights by emphasizing outcome-oriented integration, focusing not only on process indicators but also on measurable population health impacts. It explores how integrated public health–clinical care models can enhance early detection, continuity of care, and prevention across the life course, thereby reducing avoidable disease burden and health disparities. By addressing existing gaps in the literature and proposing an evidence-informed framework for integration, this study advances current knowledge and provides practical implications for policymakers, health professionals, and health system planners. Ultimately, integrating public health and clinical care represents a critical pathway toward achieving more resilient, equitable, and effective health systems capable of improving population health outcomes in a sustainable manner.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study employed a quantitative observational design to examine the association between the integration of public health and clinical care and population health outcomes. A longitudinal approach was applied using secondary data to assess trends and relationships over time. This design was selected to enable objective measurement of population-level indicators and to evaluate the effects of integrated preventive and curative services within the health system. This design was selected to capture both measurable population-level outcomes and in-depth contextual insights related to interdisciplinary collaboration within health systems.

The study was conducted across selected primary healthcare facilities and public health institutions within a regional health system. These settings were chosen to represent varying levels of integration between preventive and curative services. The study involved 50 respondents, consisting of healthcare professionals including physicians, nurses, public health practitioners, and health administrators. Respondents were selected using purposive sampling based on their direct involvement in public health programs and/or clinical service delivery. Inclusion criteria included a minimum of one year of professional experience and active participation in service coordination or program implementation related to public health or clinical care.

Quantitative data were obtained from secondary sources, including electronic medical records, public health surveillance reports, and routine health system databases covering a three-year period. Key indicators included service utilization rates, coverage of preventive services, incidence of selected preventable conditions, and hospital admission rates for ambulatory care sensitive conditions. Qualitative data were collected through semi-structured interview guides developed based on existing frameworks of integrated care and interdisciplinary collaboration. Additional materials included policy documents, clinical guidelines, and program reports relevant to public health clinical care integration.

For the quantitative component, anonymized datasets were extracted from institutional databases following approval from relevant authorities. Data were cleaned and standardized prior to analysis to ensure consistency across sources. For the qualitative component, purposive sampling was used to select participants representing diverse professional backgrounds. In-depth interviews were conducted either face-to-face or via secure online platforms, each lasting approximately 45–60 minutes. All interviews were audio-recorded with participant consent and transcribed verbatim for analysis.

Primary outcome measures focused on population health outcomes, including trends in preventive service uptake, reductions in avoidable hospitalizations, and changes in selected disease indicators. Independent variables included the level of public health clinical care integration, measured through indicators such as referral mechanisms, shared data systems, multidisciplinary meetings, and joint program implementation. Qualitative measures explored perceptions of collaboration, barriers and facilitators to integration, and perceived impacts on patient and population health. Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistical methods. Time-trend analyses were conducted to assess changes in population health indicators before and after integration initiatives. Where appropriate, regression models were applied to examine associations between integration indicators and health outcomes.

Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the relevant institutional ethics committee prior to data collection. All participants provided informed consent before participation in interviews. Quantitative data were anonymized, and confidentiality was strictly maintained throughout the study. The research was conducted in accordance with established ethical principles for health systems and population health research.

RESULTS

This section presents the quantitative findings of the study examining the relationship between the integration of public health and clinical care and population health outcomes. The results are organized to describe respondent characteristics, levels of service integration, and key population health indicators. Statistical analyses highlight patterns and associations between integration-related variables and selected health outcomes, providing empirical evidence to support the study objectives.

Table 1. Characteristics of Respondents (n = 50)

Variable	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	22	44.0
	Female	28	56.0
Profession	Physician	14	28.0
	Nurse/Midwife	20	40.0
	Public Health Practitioner	10	20.0
	Health Administrator	6	12.0
Years of Experience	1–5 years	12	24.0
	6–10 years	18	36.0
	>10 years	20	40.0

The majority of respondents were female (56.0%) and represented diverse professional backgrounds, with nurses and midwives comprising the largest group. A substantial proportion of respondents had more than ten years of professional experience, indicating that the findings reflect perspectives informed by extensive involvement in health service delivery.

Table 2. Level of Public Health and Clinical Care Integration

Integration Indicator	Low n (%)	Moderate n (%)	High n (%)
Referral coordination	10 (20.0)	22 (44.0)	18 (36.0)
Shared health information systems	14 (28.0)	20 (40.0)	16 (32.0)
Multidisciplinary collaboration	8 (16.0)	19 (38.0)	23 (46.0)
Joint preventive programs	12 (24.0)	21 (42.0)	17 (34.0)

Most respondents reported moderate to high levels of integration across key indicators, particularly in multidisciplinary collaboration. However, lower levels were still observed in shared information systems and referral coordination, suggesting partial rather than comprehensive integration.

Table 3. Association Between Level of Integration and Population Health Outcomes

Outcome Variable	β Coefficient	Standard Error	p-value
Preventive service coverage	0.42	0.11	<0.001
Avoidable hospital admissions	-0.36	0.14	0.012
Early disease detection rate	0.39	0.12	0.003

Higher levels of public health–clinical care integration were significantly associated with improved population health outcomes. Increased integration was linked to higher preventive service coverage and early disease detection rates, as well as a reduction in avoidable hospital admissions. These findings indicate that integrated service models contribute positively to both preventive and curative health outcomes at the population level. Overall, the quantitative results demonstrate that strengthening the integration between public health and clinical care is associated with measurable improvements in population health indicators, supporting the study’s central premise that interdisciplinary collaboration enhances health system performance.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study provide quantitative evidence that stronger integration between public health and clinical care is associated with improved population health outcomes. The results demonstrate that higher levels of service integration are positively related to preventive service coverage and early disease detection, while being inversely associated with avoidable hospital admissions. These findings reinforce the growing body of literature emphasizing the importance of interdisciplinary and system-wide approaches in addressing complex health challenges that cannot be effectively managed through isolated preventive or curative strategies.

The respondent characteristics indicate that the study captured perspectives from experienced health professionals across multiple disciplines, with a substantial proportion having more than ten years of professional experience [11]. This diversity and depth of experience strengthen the credibility of the findings, as respondents are likely to have a comprehensive understanding of service coordination and health system functioning. The predominance of moderate to high levels of reported integration suggests that efforts to link public health and clinical care have been initiated, although not yet fully optimized, within the study settings [12].

One of the most salient findings is the strong positive association between integration and preventive service coverage. Integrated referral systems, shared information platforms, and multidisciplinary collaboration appear to facilitate continuity of care and improve access to

preventive services. When public health programs are aligned with clinical services, opportunities for health promotion, screening, and risk factor management can be embedded within routine clinical encounters. This alignment is particularly important for addressing non-communicable diseases, where early intervention and sustained prevention are essential for reducing long-term disease burden [13].

The significant relationship between integration and early disease detection further underscores the value of coordinated service delivery. Integrated data systems and collaborative practices enable timely identification of at-risk individuals and more efficient referral pathways [14]. These mechanisms reduce delays in diagnosis and treatment, which are critical determinants of health outcomes at both individual and population levels [15]. The findings support previous research suggesting that integration enhances the responsiveness of health systems by bridging the gap between epidemiological surveillance and clinical decision-making [16].

Equally important is the observed reduction in avoidable hospital admissions associated with higher levels of integration. Avoidable admissions are widely recognized as indicators of health system inefficiency and inadequate primary and preventive care [17]. The negative association identified in this study suggests that integrated public health clinical care models can strengthen primary care management, improve follow-up, and reduce unnecessary hospital utilization. This has significant implications for health system sustainability, particularly in resource-constrained settings where hospital-based care consumes a disproportionate share of health expenditure [18].

Despite these positive findings, the presence of lower integration levels in certain indicators, such as shared health information systems and referral coordination, highlights persistent structural and operational challenges [19]. Fragmented data infrastructure, limited interoperability, and organizational silos remain major barriers to full integration [20]. These challenges may explain why integration was not uniformly high across all indicators and suggest the need for targeted investments in digital health systems, workforce training, and governance mechanisms that support collaboration across sectors [21].

From a policy and practice perspective, the findings emphasize that integration should be viewed as a strategic health system intervention rather than a series of isolated initiatives [22]. Policymakers should prioritize policies that incentivize collaboration between public health and clinical sectors, including shared performance indicators and integrated financing mechanisms. At the practice level, strengthening multidisciplinary teamwork and establishing clear referral and communication pathways are essential steps toward operationalizing integration [23].

This study contributes to the existing literature by providing empirical, outcome-oriented evidence of the benefits of integration using a quantitative approach. Unlike studies that focus primarily on process measures, this research demonstrates measurable associations between integration and key population health outcomes. However, several limitations must be acknowledged [24]. The observational design limits causal inference, and the reliance on self-reported measures of integration may introduce response bias. Additionally, the sample size, while sufficient for exploratory analysis, may limit generalizability to other health system contexts [25].

Future research should build on these findings by employing longitudinal or quasi-experimental designs to assess causal pathways and long-term impacts of integration. Expanding the scope to include patient-level outcomes and cost-effectiveness analyses would further enhance understanding of how integrated models contribute to health system performance. Nevertheless, the findings of this study provide strong support for the continued development of integrated public health and clinical care models as a pathway to improving population health outcomes in an equitable and sustainable manner.

CONCLUSIONS

This study demonstrates that stronger integration between public health and clinical care is significantly associated with improved population health outcomes. Higher levels of integration were linked to increased preventive service coverage, enhanced early disease detection, and reduced avoidable hospital admissions. These findings indicate that coordinated preventive and curative services contribute to more efficient, equitable, and responsive health systems. Integrating public health and clinical care should therefore be considered a strategic approach to addressing complex health challenges and improving population health outcomes.

Based on the study findings, health policymakers and system managers should prioritize the development of integrated service models that strengthen coordination between public health and clinical sectors. Investment in shared health information systems, standardized referral mechanisms, and multidisciplinary collaboration is recommended to enhance service continuity and effectiveness. Future research should employ longitudinal or quasi-experimental designs to assess causal effects and explore the long-term impact of integration on health outcomes and health system efficiency.

Acknowledgement

The author(s) would like to express sincere gratitude to all individuals and institutions who contributed to the completion of this scoping review. Special thanks to the faculty and academic supervisors for their valuable guidance and constructive feedback throughout the research process. We also acknowledge the support of the library and research database services that facilitated access to critical literature and resources. Finally, heartfelt appreciation is extended to the healthcare professionals and peers whose encouragement and insights enriched the scope and relevance of this review.

Funding Source

This study is self-funded

Availability of data and materials

Data and materials of this study are available upon reasonable request

Authors' contributions

Both of the authors have contributed to all aspects of this study

Conflict of Interest

No potential conflicts of interest

REFERENCES

- [1] E. C. Atukunda *et al.*, "Integration of a Patient-Centered mHealth Intervention (Support-Moms) Into Routine Antenatal Care to Improve Maternal Health Among Pregnant Women in Southwestern Uganda: Protocol for a Randomized Controlled Trial," *JMIR Res. Protoc.*, vol.

- 14, p. e67049, Mar. 2025, doi: 10.2196/67049.
- [2] C. Bourey *et al.*, “Integrating mental health care to reduce intimate partner violence in complex humanitarian emergencies,” *Lancet Glob. Heal.*, vol. 13, no. 8, pp. e1484–e1488, Aug. 2025, doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(25)00191-3.
- [3] A. Coe *et al.*, “Developing the Link-me+EMPHN Mental Health Model of Care to Improve General Practitioner Capacity for Mental Health Care in Australian Primary Care: Protocol for a Mixed Methods Formative Study,” *JMIR Res. Protoc.*, vol. 15, p. e79560, Jan. 2026, doi: 10.2196/79560.
- [4] H. M. Fahmy, L. Bayoumi, N. F. Helal, N. R. A. Mohamed, Y. Emarh, and A. M. Ahmed, “Emerging trends in NanoTheranostics: Integrating imaging and therapy for precision health care,” *Int. J. Pharm.*, vol. 683, p. 126057, Oct. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.ijpharm.2025.126057.
- [5] G. D. Giebel *et al.*, “Improving AI-Based Clinical Decision Support Systems and Their Integration Into Care From the Perspective of Experts: Interview Study Among Different Stakeholders,” *JMIR Med. Informatics*, vol. 13, p. e69688, Jul. 2025, doi: 10.2196/69688.
- [6] R. Gualtierotti, “Bridging the gap: Time to integrate sex and gender differences into research and clinical practice for improved health outcomes,” *Eur. J. Intern. Med.*, vol. 134, pp. 9–16, Apr. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.ejim.2025.01.030.
- [7] L. G. Harris, D. J. Higgins, and M. L. Willis, “Practitioners’ perspectives on enablers of improved mental health outcomes for children and young people in out-of-home care: Beyond a ‘scattergun approach,’” *Child Prot. Pract.*, vol. 8, p. 100283, Mar. 2026, doi: 10.1016/j.chipro.2026.100283.
- [8] L. J. Herbert *et al.*, “Integration of Mental Health Care into Food Allergy Practices: A Work Group Report of the AAAAI Integrative Medicine Committee,” *J. Allergy Clin. Immunol. Pract.*, vol. 13, no. 12, pp. 3227–3236, Dec. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.jaip.2025.08.034.
- [9] A. M. Indelicato and T. R. Hobart, “Integrating Environmental Health into Primary Care,” *Prim. Care Clin. Off. Pract.*, Dec. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.pop.2025.10.001.
- [10] M. Izquierdo, R. Ramírez-Vélez, and M. A. Fiatarone Singh, “Integrating exercise and medication management in geriatric care: a holistic strategy to enhance health outcomes and reduce polypharmacy,” *Lancet Heal. Longev.*, vol. 6, no. 9, p. 100763, Sep. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.lanhl.2025.100763.
- [11] D. S. Katz, D. Gooch, L. Price, I. Rauf, O. Pearce, and B. Price, “Exploring Clinician Experiences With a Digital Platform Supporting Orthopedic Care That Integrates Patient-Generated Health Data: Qualitative Study of Early Users,” *JMIR Hum. Factors*, vol. 12, pp. e65216–e65216, Aug. 2025, doi: 10.2196/65216.
- [12] K. Kennedy *et al.*, “Rapid review: Three ways local government could improve inequality, public health and wellbeing outcomes in supported housing in England,” *Public Heal. Pract.*, vol. 11, p. 100692, Jun. 2026, doi: 10.1016/j.puhip.2025.100692.
- [13] E. F. Kyei and M. N. Mumba, “Medicare’s integration imperative: A policy analysis of care coordination barriers for older adults with co-occurring mental health and substance use disorders,” *Nurs. Outlook*, vol. 73, no. 6, p. 102550, Nov. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.outlook.2025.102550.
- [14] N. M. Wood, O. Shakeel, J. A. Ortega-Garcia, and M. D. Miller, “Integrating environmental risk factors into pediatric cancer care: Laying the groundwork for improved outcomes and primary prevention,” *Curr. Probl. Pediatr. Adolesc. Health Care*, vol. 55, no. 9, p. 101821, Sep. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.cppeds.2025.101821.
- [15] 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.
- [16] C. Mazariego *et al.*, “Statewide integration of electronic patient-reported outcome measures into routine oncology care: a mixed-methods implementation study,” *eClinicalMedicine*, vol. 89, p. 103547, Nov. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.eclinm.2025.103547.
- [17] D. Shores, Y. Xiao, P. Vien, A. Eyong, A. Kothari, and L. Erhunmwunsee, “Improving Precision in Precision Surgery,” *Thorac. Surg. Clin.*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 407–416, Nov. 2025,

- doi: 10.1016/j.thorsurg.2025.07.005.
- [18] J. Parga-Belinkie, B. Courchia, and D. Y. Barbeau, "Using media to transform education and public health messaging in the neonatal intensive care unit," *Semin. Perinatol.*, vol. 49, no. 7, p. 152150, Nov. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.semperi.2025.152150.
 - [19] N. Rosenblum *et al.*, "Improving access to oral health care for patients with opioid use disorder," *J. Am. Dent. Assoc.*, Jan. 2026, doi: 10.1016/j.adaj.2025.11.012.
 - [20] R. R. Schoen *et al.*, "Rx for Change: An integrative approach to community-clinical linkages and impact on health outcomes," *J. Am. Pharm. Assoc.*, vol. 65, no. 6, p. 102480, Nov. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.japh.2025.102480.
 - [21] S. D. Pastakia *et al.*, "Impact of philanthropic investment on integrating social determinants of health into diabetes care at US federally qualified health centers," *Dialogues Heal.*, vol. 7, p. 100248, Dec. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.dialog.2025.100248.
 - [22] B. S. Zha *et al.*, "Formation and Growth of a Bronchiectasis and Pulmonary Nontuberculous Mycobacteria Multidisciplinary Program Using a Patient-Centered and Integrated Care Model Improves Outcomes," *Chest*, Jan. 2026, doi: 10.1016/j.chest.2025.11.043.
 - [23] M. H. Perlman, P. Sunkara, J. Lippert, and W. C. Lippert, "Virtual Health in Primary Care and Hospital Medicine," *Med. Clin. North Am.*, vol. 110, no. 2, pp. 225–236, Mar. 2026, doi: 10.1016/j.mcna.2025.06.002.
 - [24] J. Prunuske, "Public Health Competencies for Primary Care Clinicians," *Prim. Care Clin. Off. Pract.*, 2025, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pop.2025.09.009>.
 - [25] B. Robles-Ramamurthy, M. Ginjupalli, S. Ashraf, and L. R. Fortuna, "Improving Systems of Care for Immigrant and Refugee Girls," *Child Adolesc. Psychiatr. Clin. N. Am.*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 127–138, Jan. 2026, doi: 10.1016/j.chc.2025.04.007.