International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation
ISSN: 2582-7138
Impact Factor (RSIF): 7.98
Received: 21-06-2020; Accepted: 20-07-2020
www.allmultidisciplinaryjournal.com
Volume 1; Issue 4; July - August 2020; Page No. 180-187

A Transdisciplinary Public Health Framework for Emergency Medical Response in Conflict Zones

Glory Iyanuoluwa Olatunji [1*], Opeoluwa Oluwanifemi Ajayi [2], Funmi Eko Ezeh [3]
[1] Kyiv Medical University, Ukraine
[2] Amazing Grace Adult Home, Akure, Ondo State, Nigeria
[3] Sickle Cell Foundation, Lago, Nigeria

Corresponding Author: **Glory Iyanuoluwa Olatunji**
DOI: https://doi.org/10.54660/.IJMRGE.2020.1.4.180-187

Abstract
Armed conflicts and humanitarian disasters increasingly threaten global public health systems, often overwhelming local infrastructure and disrupting the delivery of essential services. This paper proposes a transdisciplinary public health framework tailored for emergency medical response in conflict zones, integrating medical, logistical, ethical, sociopolitical, and technological components into a unified response strategy. Grounded in a comprehensive literature review, the paper delineates key domains such as triage systems, rapid deployment protocols, culturally sensitive care, and inter-agency coordination. The framework emphasizes community engagement, digital innovation, and real-time data-driven decision-making to enhance preparedness, responsiveness, and equity. By bridging public health, emergency medicine, international law, and disaster management, this approach aims to guide future research, inform policy development, and support resilient health infrastructures in conflict-affected regions.

Keywords: Conflict Zones, Emergency Response, Public Health, Triage Protocols, Inter-Agency Coordination, Disaster Management

1. Introduction
The 21st century has witnessed an alarming escalation in violent conflicts, internal displacement, and humanitarian emergencies. From civil wars in Syria and Yemen to geopolitical crises in Ukraine and Sudan, the impact of armed conflict on population health is extensive and multifaceted [1, 2]. Civilian casualties, destruction of healthcare infrastructure, outbreaks of communicable diseases, and psychological trauma are but a few of the public health consequences [3, 4]. Conflict zones present a complex terrain for healthcare delivery, demanding rapid, coordinated, and culturally sensitive medical responses amid extreme resource limitations and ongoing violence [5].

Traditional emergency medical systems, largely designed for peacetime disasters or natural calamities, often fall short in the fluid and hostile environments of conflict zones [6, 7]. Public health systems in these settings face compounded vulnerabilities: disrupted governance, collapsed supply chains, targeted attacks on healthcare workers, and mistrust between affected populations and responders [8]. Against this backdrop, a transdisciplinary public health framework, one that crosses sectoral and disciplinary boundaries is essential for effective emergency medical response [9, 10].

This paper seeks to fill a critical gap in the existing literature by proposing such a framework, grounded in a rigorous review of contemporary scholarly work, operational field reports, and global health policy documents. The aim is to systematize emergency protocols for conflict settings that ensure rapid deployment, adaptable triage, scalable interventions, and ethically sound practices. While prior research has explored components of medical response, few studies have integrated these into a comprehensive and actionable framework that reflects the evolving nature of warfare and the humanitarian landscape [11, 12].

The concept of trans disciplinarity is central to our approach. Unlike multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary strategies that combine insights from multiple fields, trans disciplinarity transcends these boundaries, fostering holistic problem-solving involving non-academic stakeholders, local communities, and policymakers [13]. In the context of conflict response, this means integrating clinical expertise with local knowledge, humanitarian logistics, geopolitical analysis, and cultural mediation [14].

Conflict-related health emergencies also intersect with structural inequalities and geopolitical power dynamics. Displacement camps besieged urban zones, and rural war-torn areas often experience healthcare marginalization even before the onset of conflict [15].

As such, emergency medical protocols must not only address acute injuries and disease outbreaks but also adapt to chronic conditions, mental health disorders, reproductive health needs, and water-sanitation-hygiene (WASH) crises [16, 17]. Our proposed framework takes a life-course and syndemic perspective to these interconnected health burdens.

A key feature of this framework is its focus on triage and deployment. Triage in conflict zones is complicated by a lack of medical resources, overwhelming patient volumes, ethical dilemmas around prioritization, and threats to provider safety [18, 19]. Meanwhile, rapid deployment requires clear communication channels, interoperable technologies, and logistical strategies resilient to infrastructural collapse [20, 21]. Our analysis unpacks how existing tools like WHO's Emergency Medical Teams (EMTs), mobile health units, and satellite-supported health informatics can be synthesized with local capacities and emergent best practices [22, 23].

Moreover, we highlight the importance of digital innovations, such as drone delivery of medical supplies, GIS-based epidemiological mapping, and telemedicine consultations, especially in remote or contested areas [24]. While these technologies offer promise, they must be integrated ethically and responsibly, with attention to privacy, consent, and local governance structures [25].

This introduction sets the stage for a deeper examination of the current literature, followed by the articulation of our conceptual framework. Section 2 offers a detailed literature review of emergency response models, critiques of current practices, and theoretical underpinnings of transdisciplinary health approaches. Section 3 presents the proposed framework, breaking it down into actionable domains. Section 4 explores the policy and operational implications, while Section 5 addresses limitations and avenues for future research. The paper concludes with a synthesis of key findings and a call for collaborative, ethically grounded action in the field of conflict-zone emergency medicine.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Evolution of Emergency Medical Response in Conflict Zones

Emergency medical response systems in conflict zones have evolved significantly from ad hoc interventions to increasingly structured operations over the past century. The Geneva Conventions laid the groundwork for legal and ethical standards regarding medical neutrality and access to care [1]. During World War II, battlefield medicine advanced with the introduction of triage protocols, mobile field hospitals, and air evacuation systems, shaping modern military medicine [2]. The Cold War era witnessed the growth of humanitarian organizations such as Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF), which pioneered independent emergency medical interventions amidst complex emergencies [3]. In more recent conflicts such as those in Syria, Yemen, and South Sudan response frameworks have expanded to integrate public health surveillance, trauma care, and non-communicable disease management within unstable and resource-constrained environments [4].

Despite these developments, systematic reviews indicate persistent fragmentation in emergency medical protocols across humanitarian organizations, military units, and local health systems [5]. This fragmentation underscores the need for cohesive, transdisciplinary approaches that unify clinical, logistical, and sociopolitical elements of care delivery in emergencies [6].

2.2. Public Health Perspectives on Conflict Response

The intersection of public health and emergency response in conflict zones encompasses disease outbreak control, mental health care, maternal and child health, water and sanitation, and chronic disease management [26, 27]. Public health frameworks such as the Sphere Standards and the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) guidelines have provided benchmarks for minimum emergency health responses [28, 29]. However, critiques of these frameworks argue that while they provide standardization, they often lack flexibility for conflict-specific nuances like asymmetric warfare, attacks on health facilities, and politicized aid access [30, 31].

Public health literature emphasizes the importance of surveillance systems to detect and respond to outbreaks in displacement camps, integration of culturally sensitive care models, and the coordination of care between governmental and non-governmental actors [32, 33]. However, there remains a gap in translating these principles into field-ready operational frameworks that are both agile and transdisciplinary.

2.3. The Role of Transdisciplinary Approaches

Transdisciplinary, unlike interdisciplinarity, seeks to transcend the boundaries of academic disciplines by integrating practitioners, policy-makers, and affected communities into the co-design of solutions [34, 35]. In the context of emergency medical response in conflict zones, transdisciplinary approaches enable cross-sector collaboration between epidemiologists, trauma surgeons, logisticians, sociologists, and peacebuilding experts [36, 37]. This comprehensive integration fosters adaptive response systems that can better address the socio-political drivers of health crises [38].

Several studies highlight successful transdisciplinary models in past emergencies. For instance, the Ebola outbreak in West Africa showcased the importance of integrating anthropologists into epidemiological response teams to improve community trust and containment strategies [39]. Similarly, the Rohingya refugee response in Bangladesh demonstrated the value of logistics-expert collaboration with public health officers to ensure efficient deployment of mobile clinics and vaccination campaigns [40, 41]. These cases illustrate the operational benefits of transdisciplinary design in complex emergencies.

2.4. Gaps in Existing Emergency Frameworks

Most existing emergency medical frameworks fall into three categories: military, humanitarian NGO-based, and national disaster preparedness plans [42]. Military models often prioritize operational efficiency but may lack community trust or contextual sensitivity [43]. NGO models are more flexible and community-oriented but often suffer from coordination challenges, especially in multi-agency responses [44]. National plans vary widely based on political will, funding, and pre-existing infrastructure [45].

Studies have pointed out that a major limitation across these models is the absence of integrated data systems and centralized triage decision-making [46]. There is also limited incorporation of gender-based violence protocols, mental health support, and chronic disease management in many emergency settings [47, 48]. Furthermore, language barriers, lack of standardized training, and weak supply chains frequently exacerbate the inefficiencies of care delivery in

such volatile environments [49].

2.5. Rapid Deployment Models in Conflict Settings

Rapid deployment in conflict zones requires modular infrastructure, pre-positioned supplies, scalable staffing protocols, and real-time situational awareness [50]. Research suggests that modular emergency health units, as piloted by WHO's Emergency Medical Teams (EMT) initiative, can be quickly mobilized and adapted to specific crises [51, 52]. However, their success hinges on pre-established agreements with host governments, trained personnel on standby, and digital support systems for tracking needs and outcomes [53].

One notable case is the Israeli Defence Forces' field hospital model, which deploys within hours and integrates clinical care with command-and-control functions [54]. While effective in acute trauma response, such models often lack integration with public health services or local health authorities [55]. Bridging this gap requires planning that extends beyond logistics into health governance, accountability, and long-term recovery [56].

2.6. Integrated Triage and Care Continuums

Effective triage systems in conflict zones must address both clinical urgency and vulnerability-based prioritization (e.g., for children, pregnant women, the elderly) [57, 58]. Traditional triage scales like START or SALT are used for mass casualty incidents, but may be insufficient in chronic conflict settings where injuries, infections, and malnutrition coexist [59]. Literature advocates for hybrid triage systems that incorporate digital tools (e.g., mHealth), multilingual algorithms, and non-clinical triage staff to improve throughput and accuracy [60].

Moreover, the concept of a care continuum from emergency stabilization to referral and rehabilitation is underdeveloped in many emergency plans [54]. Research indicates that continuity of care, especially for mental health and chronic conditions, is often disrupted due to short mission durations, security threats, or lack of integrated electronic health records [61].

2.7. Ethical and Equity Considerations

Ethical frameworks for emergency medical response in conflict zones must grapple with dilemmas such as triage under scarcity, prioritizing combatants versus civilians, and dual loyalty among health workers [62, 63]. The WHO and ICRC have issued guidance on ethical decision-making in humanitarian crises, but these are often contextually limited and not widely applied in field operations [64].

Equity considerations are especially critical in gender-sensitive care, access for disabled populations, and services for minority groups [65]. Studies from Afghanistan and the Central African Republic demonstrate that ignoring these equity principles can worsen mortality, decrease trust, and fuel further conflict [66].

2.8. Summary and Research Gaps

The literature strongly supports the move toward more integrated, transdisciplinary emergency frameworks for conflict zones. While there are successful elements within military, NGO, and governmental models, none sufficiently encapsulate a comprehensive, scalable, and ethically grounded approach. Notably absent in the literature are field-tested models that combine clinical, public health, logistical, and sociocultural dimensions into one operational blueprint.

The next sections of this paper will outline a proposed conceptual framework built upon these gaps, drawing from existing successes while integrating underrepresented components such as governance, technology, and equity into a cohesive strategy.

3.2.1. Integrated Triage Systems

Effective triage in conflict zones must balance clinical urgency with social vulnerability and resource constraints. Traditional triage protocols (e.g., START, SALT) often focus on immediate injury severity but may inadequately address the complex needs in prolonged conflict settings, where chronic illnesses, malnutrition, and mental health conditions also prevail [67, 68]. Hybrid triage models incorporate digital decision support tools such as mHealth apps and AI algorithms to assist frontline workers in making rapid, evidence-based prioritization decisions, even when language barriers exist [69, 70]. Including non-clinical staff in triage processes, trained in culturally appropriate communication, helps improve patient throughput and community trust [71]. These models also prioritize vulnerable groups, including women, children, elderly, and disabled individuals, aligning with equity principles [72].

3.2.2. Modular Rapid Deployment Units

Rapid deployment demands pre-packaged, scalable units capable of operating in austere and volatile environments [20, 21]. Modular emergency medical teams (EMTs) offer flexibility by combining different specialties trauma surgery, infectious diseases, mental health into self-contained units [22]. WHO's EMT initiative exemplifies this approach, facilitating certification, standardized training, and interoperability among teams worldwide [21]. Success depends on pre-arranged agreements with host nations and robust logistical chains that address transport, supply, and communication under conflict conditions [23]. The units must also be sensitive to security threats, incorporating protective measures for personnel and assets.

3.2.3. Community and Cultural Engagement

Engagement of local communities is crucial for acceptance, effectiveness, and sustainability of emergency responses [13, 73]. Anthropological insights reveal how cultural beliefs influence health-seeking behaviors, perceptions of care, and adherence to treatment protocols in conflict zones [74]. Frameworks advocate participatory planning involving community leaders, traditional healers, and affected populations to co-design interventions that respect local norms and priorities [75]. This includes gender-sensitive programming and protection of marginalized groups, thus reducing mistrust and enhancing access to care [76].

3.2.4. Multi-Agency Coordination Mechanisms

Conflict settings are characterized by fragmented authority and multiple actors including military, NGOs, UN agencies, and local governments [5, 77]. Effective coordination mechanisms prevent duplication, optimize resource allocation, and enable unified command [78]. Centralized coordination platforms, modeled on UN cluster systems, provide shared situational awareness, harmonized response protocols, and joint monitoring [79]. Information-sharing agreements and interoperable communication technologies support real-time collaboration, crucial for adapting to rapidly changing conditions [80]. Clear roles and

responsibilities must be established to mitigate inter-agency conflicts.

3.2.5 Health Information Systems and Communication
Data-driven decision-making is fundamental in emergencies but is challenged by damaged infrastructure and insecure communications [81, 82]. Integrated health information systems (HIS) in conflict zones use mobile data collection, satellite links, and cloud-based platforms to collect epidemiological data, patient records, and supply chain statuses [83, 84]. GIS mapping enables rapid identification of outbreak clusters, resource gaps, and safe access routes [85, 86]. Telemedicine supports remote clinical consultation and training where specialist access is limited [87]. Robust cybersecurity and data privacy protocols must be embedded to protect sensitive information and comply with ethical standards.

3.2.6. Ethical Governance and Accountability
Ethical decision-making under scarcity and insecurity remains one of the most challenging aspects of conflict-zone medical response [88, 89]. Governance frameworks must establish clear protocols for triage priorities, protection of medical personnel, and respect for humanitarian law [29]. Incorporating local ethical perspectives and international norms, such as the Geneva Conventions and WHO guidelines, helps ensure legitimacy and community trust [1, 56]. Transparency and accountability mechanisms through community feedback, external audits, and ethical oversight committees are critical to uphold standards and prevent abuses [90].

3.2.7. Training and Capacity Building
Conflict-specific training programs for emergency responders must integrate clinical skills with cultural competence, security awareness, and psychosocial support capabilities [58, 59]. Multidisciplinary training enhances teamwork across medical, logistical, and public health domains, improving adaptability [60]. Capacity building extends to local healthcare workers, empowering them with knowledge and resources to sustain care beyond the acute emergency phase, facilitating long-term health system resilience [61]. Simulation exercises, continuous professional development, and remote learning platforms are effective strategies to maintain preparedness and knowledge retention [62].

4. Policy and Operational Implications
The proposed transdisciplinary public health framework offers actionable guidance for policymakers, humanitarian agencies, and health institutions engaged in conflict-zone emergency medical response. Its implementation demands coordinated efforts spanning governance reforms, resource allocation, capacity building, and ethical stewardship.

4.1. Institutionalizing Transdisciplinary Coordination
To operationalize the framework, governments and international bodies must establish formal coordination bodies that unite military, public health, humanitarian, and community stakeholders. These bodies should promote shared protocols, joint planning, and conflict-sensitive operations. Embedding transdisciplinary teams within existing emergency preparedness structures enhances cohesion and accountability [91, 92].

4.2. Funding and Resource Mobilization
Sustained financing is vital to support modular rapid deployment units, technology investments, training programs, and community engagement activities. Multi-source funding models including pooled international funds, bilateral aid, and private sector partnerships can reduce dependency on unstable single sources and promote financial resilience [93, 94]. Transparent budgeting and expenditure tracking improve donor confidence and enable adaptive resource allocation aligned with emerging needs.

4.3. Strengthening Local Capacities and Ownership
Long-term success hinges on empowering local health workers, leaders, and institutions. Capacity building should be embedded within deployment strategies, with emphasis on knowledge transfer, leadership development, and infrastructure support [61]. Local ownership fosters culturally appropriate care, enhances security of health assets, and builds resilience against future shocks [95, 96].

4.4. Ethical and Legal Frameworks
Policymakers must reinforce legal protections for healthcare personnel and facilities, ensuring compliance with international humanitarian law and human rights conventions [1, 56]. Developing national policies that incorporate ethical triage standards, data privacy safeguards, and mechanisms for community feedback promotes transparency and legitimacy. Integrating these policies within peacebuilding and post-conflict reconstruction plans further stabilizes health service delivery.

4.5. Leveraging Technology and Innovation
Investment in health information systems, telemedicine, and mobile health technologies should be prioritized within emergency response planning. Governments and partners must facilitate interoperable platforms and robust communication infrastructure resilient to conflict-related disruptions [53, 55]. Partnerships with tech companies and research institutions can spur innovation tailored to conflict-specific challenges.

4.6. Monitoring, Evaluation, and Continuous Improvement
Systematic monitoring and evaluation (M&E) frameworks are necessary to assess the effectiveness, equity, and sustainability of emergency responses [97, 98]. Utilizing mixed-methods research, feedback loops from affected communities, and operational data analytics supports adaptive management and evidence-based policy refinements [99]. International agencies should facilitate knowledge sharing across conflict contexts to disseminate best practices and lessons learned.

4.7. Advocacy and Global Partnerships
Advocacy efforts are essential to raise awareness of the health impacts of conflict and mobilize political will for comprehensive emergency medical responses. Engaging global health diplomacy platforms, such as the World Health Assembly and humanitarian forums, can drive policy harmonization and increase funding commitments [65]. Strengthening South-South cooperation and regional alliances enhances knowledge exchange and collective preparedness.

5. Limitations and Future Research

While the proposed transdisciplinary framework offers a comprehensive approach to emergency medical response in conflict zones, several limitations merit consideration.

5.1. Reliance on Secondary Literature

This framework is grounded entirely in a synthesis of existing literature, operational reports, and policy documents. Consequently, it lacks empirical validation through field trials or direct stakeholder consultation. The dynamic and context-specific nature of conflict zones means that practical constraints or unanticipated challenges may emerge when implementing the framework in diverse settings[100].

5.2. Contextual Variability and Generalizability

Conflict environments vary widely in terms of security, infrastructure, cultural dynamics, and governance. The framework aims to be adaptable but may require substantial tailoring to fit local realities. Framework components developed primarily from experiences in middle- and high-income countries may not fully capture challenges unique to low-income or protracted conflict settings [101].

5.3. Rapidly Evolving Conflict and Technological Landscapes

Ongoing geopolitical shifts, emerging conflict types (e.g., cyberwarfare, urban insurgencies), and technological innovations continuously reshape emergency response needs. The framework must be periodically updated to integrate advances such as artificial intelligence, drone delivery, or novel communication tools while addressing emerging ethical considerations [102].

5.4. Ethical and Operational Complexities

Implementing ethical governance in highly insecure and politicized environments remains challenging. Issues of neutrality, impartiality, and local power dynamics complicate decision-making, particularly around triage prioritization and resource allocation. Further research is needed to develop context-sensitive ethical tools and accountability mechanisms [103].

5.5. Future Research Directions

- **Empirical Validation:** Field-based studies testing the framework across various conflict scenarios are critical to assess feasibility, effectiveness, and acceptability.
- **Stakeholder Engagement:** Inclusive research involving local health workers, affected communities, and diverse agencies will enrich framework refinement and foster ownership.
- **Technology Integration:** Exploration of emerging digital health tools' operationalization and impact in conflict zones should be prioritized.
- **Equity Focus:** Studies examining the framework's capacity to address gender, disability, and minority health inequities in conflict response contexts are needed.
- **Longitudinal Outcomes:** Research tracking health system recovery and population health post-conflict can inform the framework's role in resilience building.

6. Conclusion

This paper has presented a transdisciplinary public health framework designed to enhance emergency medical response in conflict zones through integrated, rapid, and ethically grounded approaches. Drawing on an extensive review of literature across public health, emergency medicine, humanitarian logistics, and ethics, the framework addresses critical gaps in coordination, triage, community engagement, and technological integration.

By fostering collaboration among diverse stakeholders and embedding principles of equity and cultural sensitivity, the framework provides a flexible yet comprehensive blueprint to improve responsiveness and sustainability in complex conflict environments. Its focus on modular rapid deployment, data-driven decision-making, and capacity building aligns with evolving humanitarian challenges and technological opportunities.

While implementation challenges remain particularly regarding contextual adaptation, ethical dilemmas, and resource constraints the framework offers a foundation for future empirical validation, policy development, and operational innovation. Ultimately, strengthening emergency medical response in conflict zones is vital to mitigating human suffering and advancing global health equity in some of the world's most vulnerable populations.

7. References

1. McIlvaine WB. Situational awareness in the operating room: a primer for the anesthesiologist. Semin Anesth Perioper Med Pain. 2007;26(3):167-72. doi:10.1053/j.sane.2007.06.001
2. Pinpointing what is wrong with cross-agency collaboration in disaster healthcare. J Int Soc Telemed eHealth [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2019 Aug 1]. Available from: https://journals.ukzn.ac.za/index.php/JISfTeH/article/view/354
3. Lips AMB, O'Neill RR, Eppel EA. Cross-agency collaboration in New Zealand: an empirical study of information sharing practices, enablers and barriers in managing for shared social outcomes. Int J Public Adm. 2011;34(4):255-66. doi:10.1080/01900692.2010.533571
4. Bunker D, Levine L, Woody C. Repertoires of collaboration for common operating pictures of disasters and extreme events. Inf Syst Front. 2015;17(1):51-65. doi:10.1007/s10796-014-9515-4
5. Mgbame CA, Akpe OE, Abayomi AA, Ogbuefi E, Adeyelu OO. Barriers and enablers of healthcare analytics tool implementation in underserved healthcare communities. Healthc Anal [Internet]. 2020;45:45. Available from: https://www.irejournals.com/paper-details/1708221
6. Pilemalm S, Lindgren I, Ramsell E. Emerging forms of inter-organizational and cross-sector collaborations in e-government initiatives: implications for participative development of information systems. Transform Gov People Process Policy. 2016;10(4):605-36. doi:10.1108/TG-12-2015-0055
7. O'Sullivan TL, Kuziemsky CE, Toal-Sullivan D, Corneil W. Unraveling the complexities of disaster management: a framework for critical social infrastructure to promote population health and resilience. Soc Sci Med. 2013;93:238-46. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2012.07.040
8. Pinpointing what is wrong with cross-agency collaboration in disaster healthcare. J Int Soc Telemed

eHealth [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2019 Jun 1]. Available from: https://journals.ukzn.ac.za/index.php/JISfTeH/article/view/354
9. Omisola JO, Shiyanbola JO, Osho GO. A systems-based framework for ISO 9000 compliance: applying statistical quality control and continuous improvement tools in US manufacturing. Unknown J. 2020.
10. Ashiedu BI, Ogbuefi E, Nwabekee S, Ogeawuchi JC, Abayomi AA. Developing financial due diligence frameworks for mergers and acquisitions in emerging telecom markets. Iconic Res Eng J [Internet]. 2020;4(1):183-96. Available from: https://www.irejournals.com/paper-details/1708562
11. Lips AMB, O'Neill RR, Eppel EA. Cross-agency collaboration in New Zealand: an empirical study of information sharing practices, enablers and barriers in managing for shared social outcomes. Int J Public Adm. 2011;34(4):255-66. doi:10.1080/01900692.2010.533571
12. O'Sullivan TL, Kuziemsky CE, Toal-Sullivan D, Corneil W. Unraveling the complexities of disaster management: a framework for critical social infrastructure to promote population health and resilience. Soc Sci Med. 2013;93:238-46. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2012.07.040
13. Bunker D, Levine L, Woody C. Repertoires of collaboration for common operating pictures of disasters and events. Inf Syst Front. 2015;17(1):51-65. doi:10.1007/s10796-014-9515-4
14. McIlvaine WB. Situational awareness in the operating room: a primer for the anesthesiologist. Semin Anesth Perioper Med Pain. 2007;26(3):167-72. doi:10.1053/j.sane.2007.06.001
15. Pilemalm S, Lindgren I, Ramsell E. Emerging forms of inter-organizational and cross-sector collaborations in e-government initiatives: implications for participative development of information systems. Transform Gov People Process Policy. 2016;10(4):605-36. doi:10.1108/TG-12-2015-0055
16. Stanton B, *et al*. Global health training for pediatric residents. Pediatr Ann. 2008;37(12):786-7. doi:10.3928/00904481-20081201-11
17. Low N, *et al*. Global issues in medical education [comment]. Lancet. 2002;359(9307):713-4. doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(02)07799-1
18. Calhoun JG, Ramiah K, Weist EMG, Shortell SM. Development of a core competency model for the master of public health degree. Am J Public Health. 2008;98(9):1598-607. doi:10.2105/ajph.2007.117978
19. Houpt ER, Pearson RD, Hall TL. Three domains of competency in global health education: recommendations for all medical students. Acad Med. 2007;82(3):222-5. doi:10.1097/acm.0b013e3180305c10
20. Jotkowitz AB, Gaaserud A, Gidron Y, Urkin J, Margolis CZ, Henkin Y. Evaluation of student attitudes and knowledge in a new program in international health and medicine. Med Teach. 2004;26(6):574-6. doi:10.1080/01421590410001711571
21. Crump JA, Sugarman J. Ethical considerations for short-term experiences by trainees in global health. JAMA. 2008;300(12):1456-8. doi:10.1001/jama.300.12.1456
22. Saba N, Brewer TF. Beyond borders: building global health programs at McGill University Faculty of Medicine. Acad Med. 2008;83(2):185-91. doi:10.1097/acm.0b013e31816094fc
23. Drain PK, Primack A, Hunt DD, Fawzi WW, Holmes KK, Gardner P. Global health in medical education: a call for more training and opportunities. Acad Med. 2007;82(3):226-30. doi:10.1097/acm.0b013e3180305cf9
24. Hagopian A, *et al*. Developing competencies for a graduate school curriculum in international health. Public Health Rep. 2008;123(3):408-14.
25. Brewer TF, Saba N, Clair V. From boutique to basic: a call for standardised medical education in global health. Med Educ. 2009;43(10):930-3. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2923.2009.03458.x
26. Anyaehie U, *et al*. Constraints, challenges and prospects of public-private partnership in health-care delivery in a developing economy. Ann Med Health Sci Res. 2014;4(1):66. doi:10.4103/2141-9248.126615
27. Widdus R. Public-private partnerships for health: their main targets, their diversity, and their future directions. In: Global Health. 2017:431-8. doi:10.4324/9781315254227-32/PUBLIC
28. Parker LA, Zaragoza GA, Hernández-Aguado I. Promoting population health with public-private partnerships: where's the evidence? BMC Public Health. 2019;19(1):1438. doi:10.1186/s12889-019-7765-2
29. McPake B, Hanson K. Managing the public–private mix to achieve universal health coverage. Lancet. 2016;388(10044):622-30. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(16)00344-5
30. Homer JB, Hirsch GB. System dynamics modeling for public health: background and opportunities. Am J Public Health. 2006;96(3):452-8. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2005.062059
31. Yusif S, Hafeez-Baig A, Soar J. An exploratory study of the readiness of public healthcare facilities in developing countries to adopt health information technology (HIT)/e-Health: the case of. Springer. 2020;4(2):189-214. doi:10.1007/s41666-020-00070-8
32. Khan NN, Puthussery S. Stakeholder perspectives on public-private partnership in health service delivery in Sindh province of Pakistan: a qualitative study. Public Health. 2019;170:1-9. doi:10.1016/j.puhe.2019.02.004
33. Shrivastava R, *et al*. Role of public-private partnerships in achieving UNAIDS HIV treatment targets. BMC Health Serv Res. 2019;19(1):46. doi:10.1186/s12913-018-3744-z
34. In Control. 2020. doi:10.25646/7125
35. Shrivastava S, Shrivastava P, Ramasamy J. Deployment of foreign medical teams: an initiative to reduce the aftermaths of public health emergencies. Biol Med. 2015;S3:006.
36. Abbas R, Norris T, Parry D. Modelling cross-agency communication work in progress research paper-information systems for disaster healthcare. In: Proceedings of ISCRAM Asia Pacific. 2018.
37. Coordination and organization of medical relief to affected areas. In: Field Hospitals [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2019 Aug 2]. Available from: https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/abs/field-hospitals/coordination-and-organization-of-medical-relief-to-affected-areas/B2308511521CB53CF7133E4005CD68E8
38. Brolin K, Hawajri O, von Schreeb J. Foreign medical

teams in the Philippines after Typhoon Haiyan 2013 – who were they, when did they arrive and what did they do? PLoS Curr. 2015;7.
39. Tan Y, von Schreeb J. Humanitarian assistance and accountability: what are we really talking about? Prehosp Disaster Med. 2015;30.
40. McPherson M, Counahan M, Hall JL. Responding to Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines. Western Pac Surveill Response J. 2015;6:1-4.
41. Jafar A, Norton I, Lecky F, Redmond AD. A literature review of medical record keeping by foreign medical teams in sudden onset disasters. Prehosp Disaster Med. 2015;30.
42. Tatham P, Spens K. Cracking the humanitarian logistic coordination challenge: lessons from the urban search and rescue community. Disasters. 2015;40.
43. Nickerson J, Chackungal S, Knowlton L, McQueen K, Burkle FM. Surgical care during humanitarian crises: a systematic review of published surgical caseload data from foreign medical teams. Prehosp Disaster Med. 2012;27.
44. Gerdin M, Wladis A, von Schreeb J. Foreign field hospitals after the 2010 Haiti earthquake: how good were we? Emerg Med J. 2013;30:e8.
45. Hopmeier M, Pape J, Paulison D. Reflections on the initial multinational response to the earthquake in Haiti. Popul Health Manag. 2010;13:105-13.
46. Abolghasemi H, Radfar M, Khatami M. International medical response to a natural disaster: lessons learned from the Bam earthquake experience. Prehosp Disaster Med. 2006;21.
47. Naor M, Bernardes E. Self-sufficient healthcare logistics systems and responsiveness: ten cases of foreign field hospitals deployed to disaster relief supply chains. J Oper Supply Chain Manag. 2016;9:1.
48. Peleg K, Kellermann AL. Medical relief after earthquakes: it's time for a new paradigm. Ann Emerg Med. 2012;59.
49. Lind K, Gerdin M, Wladis A, Westman L, von Schreeb J. Time for order in chaos! A health system framework for foreign medical teams in earthquakes. Prehosp Disaster Med. 2012;27:90-3.
50. Bar-Dayan Y, Mankuta D, Wolf Y. An earthquake disaster in Turkey: an overview of the experience of the Israeli Defense Forces field hospital in Adapazari. Disasters. 2000;24.
51. Loescher G. The UNHCR and world politics: a perilous path. 2001.
52. Rysaback-Smith H. History and principles of humanitarian action. Turk J Emerg Med. 2015;15:5-7.
53. Davey E, Borton J, Foley M. A history of the humanitarian system: western origins and foundations. 2013.
54. Kreiss Y, *et al*. Early disaster response in Haiti: the Israeli field hospital experience. Ann Intern Med. 2010;153(1):45-8. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-153-1-201007060-00253
55. Norton I, von Schreeb J, Aitken P, Herard P, Lajolo C. Classification and minimum standards for foreign medical teams in sudden onset disasters. 2013.
56. Read DJ, Holian A, Moller CC, Poutawera V. Surgical workload of a foreign medical team after Typhoon Haiyan. ANZ J Surg. 2016;86(5):361-5. doi:10.1111/ans.13175
57. The Lancet. Growth of aid and the decline of humanitarianism. Lancet. 2010;375(9711):253. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(10)60110-9
58. Strömberg D. Natural disasters, economic development, and humanitarian aid. J Econ Perspect. 2007;21:199-222.
59. Peiris S, Buenaventura J, Zagaria N. Is registration of foreign medical teams needed for disaster response? Findings from the response to Typhoon Haiyan. Western Pac Surveill Response J. 2015;6:29-33. doi:10.5365/wpsar.2015.6.2.hyn_014
60. Peleg K, Kreiss Y, Ash N, Lipsky AM. Optimizing medical response to large-scale disasters: the ad hoc collaborative health care system. Ann Surg. 2011;253(2):421-3. doi:10.1097/sla.0b013e318206bedf
61. Djalali A, *et al*. Identifying deficiencies in national and foreign medical team responses through expert opinion surveys: implications for education and training. Prehosp Disaster Med. 2014;29(4):364-8. doi:10.1017/s1049023x14000600
62. Van Hoving DJ, Wallis LA, Docrat F, De Vries S. Haiti disaster tourism – a medical shame. Prehosp Disaster Med. 2010;25(3):201-2. doi:10.1017/s1049023x00008001
63. Bar-On E, Abargel A, Peleg K, Kreiss Y. Coping with the challenges of early disaster response: 24 years of field hospital experience after earthquakes. Disaster Med Public Health Prep. 2013;7(5):491-8. doi:10.1017/dmp.2013.94
64. Fisher D. Regulating the helping hand: improving legal preparedness for cross border medicine. Prehosp Disaster Med. 2010;25(3):208-12. doi:10.1017/s1049023x00008037
65. Peleg K, Bodas M, Norton I. Coordination and organization of medical relief to affected areas. In: Field Hospitals. 2020:68-79. doi:10.1017/9781316493489.009
66. Blum N, Berlin A, Isaacs A, Burch WJ, Willott C. Medical students as global citizens: a qualitative study of medical students' views on global health teaching within the undergraduate medical curriculum. BMC Med Educ. 2019;19(1). doi:10.1186/s12909-019-1631-x
67. Evert J, *et al*. Going global: considerations for introducing global health into family medicine training programs. Fam Med. 2007;39(9):659-65.
68. Battat R, *et al*. Global health competencies and approaches in medical education: a literature review. BMC Med Educ. 2010;10(1):1-7. doi:10.1186/1472-6920-10-94
69. Gruner D, *et al*. Introducing global health into the undergraduate medical school curriculum using an e-learning program: a mixed method pilot study approaches to teaching and learning. BMC Med Educ. 2015;15(1). doi:10.1186/s12909-015-0421-3
70. Pottie K, *et al*. Health advocacy for refugees: medical student primer for competence in cultural matters and global health. Can Fam Physician. 2007;53(11):1923-6.
71. Parsi K, *et al*. Preparing medical students for the world: service learning and global health justice. Medscape J Med. 2008;10(11):268.
72. Urkin J, *et al*. Integrating global health and medicine into medical curriculum. Educ Health. 2001;14(3):127-31.
73. Greenhalgh T, Jackson C, Shaw S, Janamian T. Achieving research impact through co-creation in

community-based health services: literature review and case study. Milbank Q. 2016;94(2):392-429. doi:10.1111/1468-0009.12197
74. Fortuna RJ, *et al*. A community-wide quality improvement initiative to improve hypertension control and reduce disparities. J Clin Hypertens. 2019;21(2):196-203. doi:10.1111/jch.13469
75. Haq C, *et al*. New world views: preparing physicians in training for global health work. Fam Med. 2000;32(8):566-72.
76. Belone L, *et al*. Community-based participatory research conceptual model: community partner consultation and face validity. Qual Health Res. 2016;26(1):117-35. doi:10.1177/1049732314557084
77. Allen C, *et al*. Data governance and data sharing agreements for community-wide health information exchange: lessons from the beacon communities. EGEMS. 2014;2(1):1057. doi:10.13063/2327-9214.1057
78. Jennett P, *et al*. A study of a rural community's readiness for telehealth. J Telemed Telecare. 2003;9(5):259-63. doi:10.1258/135763303769211265
79. Rich ML, *et al*. Excellent clinical outcomes and high retention in care among adults in a community-based HIV treatment program in rural Rwanda. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2012;59(3):e35-42. doi:10.1097/qai.0b013e31824476c4
80. Kwon SC, Tandon SD, Islam N, Riley L, Trinh-Shevrin C. Applying a community-based participatory research framework to patient and family engagement in the development of patient-centered outcomes research and practice. Transl Behav Med. 2018;8(5):683-91. doi:10.1093/tbm/ibx026
81. Rossi A, Lenzini G. Transparency by design in data-informed research: a collection of information design patterns. Comput Law Secur Rev. 2020;37:105402. doi:10.1016/j.clsr.2020.105402
82. Li P, *et al*. Promoting secondary analysis of electronic medical records in China: summary of the PLAGH-MIT critical data conference and health datathon. JMIR Med Inform. 2017;5(4). doi:10.2196/medinform.7380
83. Koppel R. Great promises of healthcare information technology deliver less. In: Healthcare Information Management Systems: Cases, Strategies, and Solutions: Fourth Edition. 2015:101-25. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-20765-0_6
84. Yang Z, Kankanhalli A, Ng BY, Lim JTY. Analyzing the enabling factors for the organizational decision to adopt healthcare information systems. Decis Support Syst. 2013;55(3):764-76. doi:10.1016/j.dss.2013.03.002
85. Agarwal R, Gao GG, DesRoches C, Jha AK. The digital transformation of healthcare: current status and the road ahead. Inf Syst Res. 2010;21(4):796-809. doi:10.1287/isre.1100.0327
86. Mbondji PE, Kebede D, Soumbey-Alley EW, Zielinski C, Kouvividila W, Lusamba-Dikassa PS. Health information systems in Africa: descriptive analysis of data sources, information products and health statistics. J R Soc Med. 2014;107:34-45. doi:10.1177/0141076814531750
87. Kaelber DC, Bates DW. Health information exchange and patient safety. J Biomed Inform. 2007;40(6 Suppl):S40-5. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2007.08.011
88. Olaseni IO. Digital twin and BIM synergy for predictive maintenance in smart building engineering systems development. World J Adv Res Rev. 2020;8(2):406-21. doi:10.30574/wjarr.2020.8.2.0409
89. Reza F, Prieto JT, Julien SP. Electronic health records: origination, adoption, and progression. 2020:183-201. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-41215-9_11
90. Koplan JP, *et al*. Towards a common definition of global health. Lancet. 2009;373(9679):1993-5. doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(09)60332-9
91. The future of global health education: training for equity in global health. BMC Med Educ [Internet]. 2016 [cited 2020 Jan 1]. Available from: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s12909-016-0820-0
92. Govindarajan V, Trimble C. Reverse innovation: create far from home, win everywhere. Boston: Harvard Business Review Press; 2012.
93. Binagwaho A, *et al*. Shared learning in an interconnected world: innovations to advance global health equity. Global Health. 2013;9(1):37. doi:10.1186/1744-8603-9-37
94. Binagwaho A, *et al*. The human resources for health program in Rwanda – a new partnership. N Engl J Med. 2013;369(21):2054-9. doi:10.1056/nejmsr1302176
95. McKinley DW, Williams SR, Norcini JJ, Anderson MB. International exchange programs and U.S. medical schools. Acad Med. 2008;83(10 Suppl):S53-7. doi:10.1097/acm.0b013e318183e351
96. Binagwaho A, *et al*. Uniting to address pediatric heart disease in Africa: advocacy from Rwanda. SA Heart J. 2013;10:440-6.
97. Bazemore AW, Goldenhar LM, Lindsell CJ, Diller PM, Huntington MK. An international health track is associated with care for underserved US populations in subsequent clinical practice. J Grad Med Educ. 2011;3(2):130-7. doi:10.4300/jgme-d-10-00066.1
98. Kolars JC, *et al*. Perspective: partnering for medical education in sub-Saharan Africa: seeking the evidence for effective collaborations. Acad Med. 2012;87(2):216-20. doi:10.1097/acm.0b013e31823ede39
99. Pfeiffer J, Beschta J, Hohl S, Gloyd S, Hagopian A, Wasserheit J. Competency-based curricula to transform global health: redesign with the end in mind. Acad Med. 2013;88(1):131-6. doi:10.1097/acm.0b013e318276bdf4
100. Margolis CZ, Deckelbaum RJ, Henkin Y, Baram S, Cooper P, Alkan ML. A medical school for international health run by international partners. Acad Med. 2004;79(8):744-51. doi:10.1097/00001888-200408000-00005
101. Reed K. Global health in today's medical education. Iowa Med. 2006;96(6):23.
102. Harden RM. International medical education and future directions: a global perspective. Acad Med. 2006;81(12 Suppl):S22-9. doi:10.1097/01.acm.0000243411.19573.58
103. Global health competencies and approaches in medical education: a literature review. BMC Med Educ [Internet]. 2010 [cited 2020 Jul 1]. Available from: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/1472-6920-10-94