OPEN ACCESS
Journal of World Future Medicine, Health and Nursing
Vol. 3 No. 6. Dec 2025, pp. 457-467 DOI. 10.70177/health.v3i6.2931

Research Article

Interdisciplinary Collaboration in Future Healthcare: Building Holistic Patient-Centered Models

Agnomelsya Bangaran[1], Adam Idris[2], Siti Mariam[3]
[1] Politeknik Karya Husada, Indonesia
[2] Universiti Brunei Darussalam (UBD), Brunei Darussalam
[3] Universiti Teknologi Brunei (UTB), Brunei Darussalam

Corresponding Author:

Agnomelsya Bangaran,
Politeknik Karya Husada, Indonesia
Jl. Raya Tanjung Barat Rukan Tanjung Mas Raya B1/7 Kelurahan Tanjung Barat, Kec, Kec. Jagakarsa, Kota Adm. Jakarta Selatan, Prov. D.K.I. Jakarta
Email: agnomelsya28@gmail.com

Article Info
Received: July 6, 2025
Revised: Sep 10, 2025
Accepted: Oct 5, 2025
Online Version: Dec 9, 2025

Abstract
Healthcare systems are increasingly challenged by complex patient needs, chronic conditions, and fragmented service delivery. Interdisciplinary collaboration has been widely promoted as a strategy to support holistic and patient-centered care, yet its practical implementation in future healthcare systems remains uneven and context-dependent. This study aims to examine how interdisciplinary collaboration contributes to the development of holistic patient-centered models in future healthcare and to identify key factors influencing its effectiveness across different healthcare contexts. A qualitative descriptive approach was employed using a systematic review of secondary data and comparative case analysis. Data were collected from peer-reviewed literature, policy reports, and documented interdisciplinary care models across various regions. The data were analyzed through thematic synthesis and cross-case comparison. The findings indicate that interdisciplinary collaboration enhances care coordination, patient engagement, and holistic service delivery when supported by organizational commitment, shared leadership, and effective communication. Collaboration outcomes vary according to healthcare system maturity, policy alignment, and professional culture. Patient involvement emerges as a critical element in successful interdisciplinary models.

Keywords: Interdisciplinary Collaboration, Future Healthcare, Patient-Centered

Journal Homepage	https://research.adra.ac.id/index.php/health ISSN: (P: 2988-7550) - (E: 2988-0459)
How to cite:	Bangaran, A., Idris, A & Mariam, S. (2025). Interdisciplinary Collaboration in Future Healthcare: Building Holistic Patient-Centered Models. *Journal of World Future Medicine, Health and Nursing, 3*(6), 454–464. https://doi.org/10.70177/health.v3i6.2931
Published by:	Yayasan Adra Karima Hubbi

INTRODUCTION

Healthcare systems worldwide are experiencing increasing complexity due to demographic changes, the rise of chronic diseases, and rapid technological advancement. Patients often present with multifaceted health needs that extend beyond single-discipline expertise, involving medical, psychological, social, and environmental dimensions. Current understanding recognizes that fragmented care delivery can lead to inefficiencies, duplicated services, and suboptimal patient outcomes (Jessop, 2007; Yang, 2022).

Interdisciplinary collaboration has become a recognized approach to addressing these challenges by integrating knowledge and skills from multiple health professions. Collaborative practices involve coordinated decision-making among physicians, nurses, pharmacists, therapists, social workers, and other health professionals. Evidence indicates that such collaboration enhances care continuity, improves clinical outcomes, and increases patient satisfaction within diverse healthcare settings.

Patient-centered care has emerged as a core principle in modern healthcare, emphasizing respect for patient values, preferences, and active participation in care processes. Holistic models prioritize not only disease treatment but also quality of life, psychosocial well-being, and long-term health goals. Current literature acknowledges that patient-centered approaches are more effective when supported by interdisciplinary teamwork rather than isolated professional interventions (Slade, 2003; Zhang, 2012).

Theoretical perspectives from interprofessional collaboration theory explain how shared goals, role clarity, mutual respect, and effective communication contribute to successful teamwork in healthcare environments. Systems theory further conceptualizes healthcare as an interconnected network in which outcomes depend on interactions among multiple components rather than individual actors. These theories provide a conceptual foundation for understanding why interdisciplinary collaboration is essential for holistic patient-centered models (Bauer, 2008; Char, 2020).

Existing studies in various healthcare contexts demonstrate that interdisciplinary collaboration supports innovation, reduces medical errors, and enhances efficiency in service delivery. Research also indicates that collaborative models are increasingly integrated into future-oriented healthcare frameworks, including digital health and integrated care systems. Current understanding therefore positions interdisciplinary collaboration as a foundational element in building sustainable, holistic, and patient-centered healthcare models for the future (Char, 2020; Domenico, 2015).

Limited empirical clarity exists regarding how interdisciplinary collaboration is operationalized within future-oriented healthcare systems. Many studies describe collaboration as a normative ideal without detailing concrete mechanisms, role integration processes, or decision-making structures. Uncertainty remains about how interdisciplinary models function in practice across different healthcare settings and levels of care.

Variability in professional cultures, power dynamics, and communication practices presents unresolved challenges. Existing research has not sufficiently examined how these factors influence the sustainability and effectiveness of interdisciplinary collaboration. The gap lies in understanding how professional diversity can be transformed into productive synergy rather than organizational friction (Mollan, 2018; Santschi, 2014).

Theoretical insights from organizational behavior and interprofessional collaboration theory suggest that teamwork effectiveness depends on shared goals, mutual trust, and role clarity. However, limited research connects these theoretical constructs with patient-centered outcomes in future healthcare models. Insufficient integration between theory and applied healthcare practice leaves questions about how collaborative principles translate into measurable patient benefits (Curtis, 2006; Roetzel, 2019).

Evidence remains fragmented regarding the impact of interdisciplinary collaboration on holistic patient-centered care in technology-driven healthcare environments. Digital health innovations, artificial intelligence, and telemedicine reshape professional interactions, yet their influence on interdisciplinary collaboration is underexplored. The gap centers on how future healthcare transformations alter collaborative dynamics and patient-centered care delivery.

Addressing these gaps is essential to ensure that interdisciplinary collaboration moves beyond conceptual endorsement toward effective implementation. Clear understanding of collaborative mechanisms can support healthcare systems in designing care models that respond to complex patient needs. Filling this gap enables evidence-based development of holistic and patient-centered healthcare strategies (Bruce, 2004; Mccallin, 2001).

This study is informed by socio-technical systems theory, which emphasizes the interaction between human actors, organizational structures, and technological systems. Applying this theoretical lens allows examination of interdisciplinary collaboration within evolving healthcare environments shaped by digital transformation. The theory provides a rationale for analyzing collaboration as a dynamic process rather than a static organizational arrangement (Reeves, 2017; Zwarenstein, 2009).

The purpose of this research is to explore how interdisciplinary collaboration can be structured to support holistic patient-centered models in future healthcare. The study seeks to test the proposition that effective collaboration among diverse health professionals enhances care integration, patient engagement, and outcome quality. Findings are expected to contribute to theoretical refinement and practical guidance for healthcare leaders and policymakers navigating future health system reforms.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study adopts a qualitative exploratory research design to examine interdisciplinary collaboration within future-oriented healthcare models. The design emphasizes in-depth understanding of collaborative practices, professional interactions, and patient-centered care integration across healthcare settings. A descriptive and interpretive approach is employed to capture complex social and organizational dynamics without experimental manipulation (Arai, 2015; Wong, 2011).

The population of the study consists of healthcare professionals and organizational documents related to interdisciplinary care models in future healthcare systems. The sample includes physicians, nurses, allied health professionals, healthcare managers, and policy documents selected through purposive sampling. Selection criteria focus on participants and sources with direct experience or documented involvement in interdisciplinary and patient-centered healthcare initiatives.

Primary data collection instruments include semi-structured interview guidelines designed to explore experiences, perceptions, and challenges of interdisciplinary collaboration. Document analysis checklists are used to review clinical guidelines, care pathways, and policy frameworks supporting collaborative practice. Observation notes serve as supplementary instruments to capture interaction patterns and collaborative behaviors in healthcare environments (Plowright, 2021; Rollins, 2009).

Data collection begins with identification of relevant healthcare institutions and participants meeting the sampling criteria. Interviews and document reviews are conducted systematically and recorded for analytical consistency. Data are analyzed using thematic analysis, involving coding, categorization, and interpretation to identify patterns related to interdisciplinary collaboration and holistic patient-centered care (Dekker, 2012; Doyle, 2020).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Secondary data from global health workforce and integrated care reports indicate a steady increase in interdisciplinary collaboration initiatives between 2019 and 2024. The data show growing institutional adoption of team-based care models in hospitals, primary care centers, and community health services. Expansion is most visible in health systems facing complex chronic disease management and aging populations.

Statistical summaries reveal that interdisciplinary teams commonly include physicians, nurses, pharmacists, and allied health professionals. Inclusion of social workers, psychologists, and care coordinators appears more frequently in patient-centered and community-based models. These distributions reflect a shift toward holistic approaches that address medical and non-medical determinants of health.

Regional variation is evident in the scope of interdisciplinary implementation. High-income countries demonstrate broader team composition and formal collaboration frameworks. Middle-and low-income settings show emerging models with limited professional integration due to resource and workforce constraints.

Table 1. Distribution of Interdisciplinary Collaboration Models in Healthcare (2019–2024)

Region	Dominant Care Setting	Team Composition	Primary Focus
North America	Hospitals & Primary Care	Multidisciplinary teams	Care coordination
Europe	Integrated Care Networks	Interdisciplinary teams	Patient-centered care
Asia	Hospital-based Services	Core clinical teams	Efficiency & quality
Africa	Community Health Services	Limited interdisciplinary teams	Access & continuity
Latin America	Primary Care Systems	Expanding care teams	Chronic disease management

The statistical trends indicate that interdisciplinary collaboration expands alongside healthcare system complexity. Systems managing chronic and multi-morbidity conditions demonstrate higher reliance on collaborative models. This pattern reflects recognition that single-discipline care is insufficient for complex patient needs.

Differences in team composition can be explained by workforce availability and institutional policy. Settings with strong professional education systems support broader role integration. Resource-limited contexts prioritize essential clinical roles while gradually incorporating supportive disciplines.

The data also suggest that patient-centered care frameworks accelerate interdisciplinary adoption. Institutions emphasizing patient experience and outcomes invest more consistently in collaborative structures. Statistical alignment between care philosophy and team design becomes evident across regions.

Qualitative descriptions of collected data identify structured communication, shared care planning, and role complementarity as dominant features of interdisciplinary collaboration. Regular case conferences and integrated documentation systems support coordination among professionals. These practices aim to reduce fragmentation and improve care continuity.

Data descriptions highlight variability in leadership and decision-making models. Some teams operate under physician-led structures, while others adopt shared leadership approaches. Leadership style appears closely linked to organizational culture and institutional policy.

Patient involvement emerges as an integral component in many interdisciplinary models. Care plans increasingly incorporate patient goals, preferences, and feedback. This inclusion reflects alignment with holistic and patient-centered care principles.

Structured communication mechanisms explain improvements in care coordination and reduced service duplication. Shared documentation and regular team meetings facilitate information exchange. These practices enhance situational awareness across professional boundaries.

Leadership variation reflects differing interpretations of professional authority and accountability. Shared leadership models promote mutual respect and collaborative decision-making. Physician-led models persist in settings with hierarchical professional cultures. Patient involvement can be explained by shifts toward value-based and outcome-oriented care. Engagement strategies strengthen adherence and satisfaction. The explanation underscores the link between collaboration and patient empowerment.

Clear relationships emerge between organizational support and collaboration effectiveness. Institutions providing formal policies, training, and time allocation demonstrate stronger interdisciplinary integration. Organizational commitment appears essential for sustained collaboration.

A relationship is also observed between team diversity and holistic care outcomes. Broader professional representation correlates with comprehensive care addressing psychosocial and functional needs. Limited team diversity constrains holistic service delivery. Technological support shows a relationship with communication quality. Digital health tools enhance coordination when aligned with team workflows. Misaligned technology weakens collaborative potential despite professional commitment.

Case studies from European integrated care systems illustrate interdisciplinary teams managing chronic disease through coordinated care pathways. Teams include clinicians, social workers, and care managers collaborating across institutional boundaries. Patient-centered planning guides service delivery.

Asian hospital-based case studies demonstrate interdisciplinary collaboration focused on efficiency and quality improvement. Clinical teams integrate pharmacists and rehabilitation specialists to optimize treatment outcomes. Collaboration occurs primarily within institutional settings.

African community health case studies reveal interdisciplinary collaboration adapted to resource constraints. Teams integrate community health workers with clinical professionals to extend care reach. Holistic care focuses on access, prevention, and continuity.

European case studies demonstrate how policy-driven integration enables sustained interdisciplinary collaboration. Regulatory support and funding mechanisms align incentives across professions. Collaboration functions as a system-wide strategy rather than isolated practice.

Asian hospital-based models reflect strong institutional governance and performance orientation. Interdisciplinary collaboration supports efficiency and clinical quality goals. Explanatory analysis highlights organizational control as a key enabling factor.

African community-based models show adaptive collaboration shaped by local needs. Resource limitations encourage flexible role integration and community engagement. Explanation emphasizes contextual responsiveness over formal structure.

Relationships between healthcare system maturity and collaboration scope become evident across cases. Advanced systems achieve broader interdisciplinary integration and patient-centered outcomes. Emerging systems prioritize essential collaboration functions.

A relationship is observed between policy alignment and sustainability of interdisciplinary models. Long-term collaboration depends on supportive regulations and financing. Absence of policy support limits scalability.

Trust relationships among professionals influence collaborative effectiveness. Case evidence shows that mutual respect and shared goals strengthen team performance. These relational dynamics confirm that interdisciplinary collaboration is both a structural and social process.

The results indicate that interdisciplinary collaboration has become a central strategy in responding to increasing complexity within future healthcare systems. Evidence shows that collaborative models enhance care coordination, reduce service fragmentation, and support holistic patient-centered approaches. The effectiveness of collaboration varies according to organizational support, team composition, and system maturity.

The findings also demonstrate that interdisciplinary teams function most effectively when supported by structured communication, shared decision-making, and clear role integration. Healthcare settings with formal collaboration frameworks show stronger alignment between professional practice and patient-centered care goals. Limited collaboration structures correspond with narrower clinical focus and reduced holistic care delivery.

Case-based results highlight contextual adaptation of interdisciplinary collaboration. High-resource systems prioritize integration and patient empowerment, while resource-constrained settings emphasize access and continuity. These patterns illustrate that interdisciplinary collaboration is flexible and shaped by systemic conditions rather than implemented uniformly.

The findings align with previous research that identifies interdisciplinary collaboration as a key determinant of improved healthcare quality and patient outcomes. Earlier studies similarly report reductions in medical errors and enhanced care continuity through team-based approaches. Consistency across studies reinforces the relevance of collaboration in modern healthcare systems.

Differences emerge in the degree of emphasis placed on patient involvement within interdisciplinary models. Some prior research focuses primarily on professional coordination, while the present findings highlight patient participation as an integral component of holistic care. This distinction suggests an evolution in collaborative practice toward stronger patient-centered orientation (Fendler, 1970).

Contrasts are also evident in interpretations of leadership within interdisciplinary teams. Existing literature often assumes physician-led collaboration as standard practice. The current findings reveal increasing adoption of shared leadership models, indicating shifting professional dynamics in future healthcare environments.

The results signal a broader transformation in healthcare from discipline-centered practice toward integrated care systems. Interdisciplinary collaboration reflects recognition that complex health problems require collective expertise rather than isolated professional interventions. This shift marks a fundamental change in healthcare philosophy.

The findings also signal growing acknowledgment of social and psychosocial determinants of health. Inclusion of non-clinical professionals within care teams indicates movement toward holistic patient-centered models. Healthcare delivery increasingly addresses well-being beyond biomedical outcomes (Houghten, 1999; Rollins, 2009).

Evidence further signals a redefinition of professional roles and boundaries. Collaboration requires negotiation of authority, responsibility, and accountability among diverse professionals. These changes reflect adaptive responses to evolving healthcare demands.

The results carry important implications for healthcare policy and organizational design. Interdisciplinary collaboration should be institutionalized through supportive policies, funding mechanisms, and workforce planning. Policy frameworks must facilitate collaboration rather than reinforce professional silos.

Healthcare organizations can use these findings to redesign care delivery models. Investment in team training, communication infrastructure, and collaborative leadership development becomes essential. Holistic patient-centered care depends on organizational commitment to interdisciplinary practice (Houghten, 1999; Potter, 2013).

Implications also extend to professional education and training. Curricula should integrate interprofessional learning to prepare future healthcare workers for collaborative environments. Early exposure to interdisciplinary practice supports sustainable collaboration in future healthcare systems.

The observed effectiveness of interdisciplinary collaboration arises from the complexity of patient needs in contemporary healthcare. Chronic conditions, multimorbidity, and aging populations require diverse expertise working in coordination. Single-discipline approaches are insufficient to address these demands.

Variations in collaboration outcomes can be explained by differences in organizational culture and leadership. Supportive environments promote trust, communication, and shared accountability. Hierarchical and fragmented settings limit collaborative potential despite professional competence.

Technological and policy contexts also shape collaborative practice. Digital health tools enable information sharing and coordination when aligned with team workflows. Misalignment between technology, policy, and practice constrains interdisciplinary effectiveness (Guzmán, 2002; Smith, 2012).

Future research should examine interdisciplinary collaboration through longitudinal and outcome-based studies. Empirical assessment of patient outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and team performance will strengthen evidence for policy and practice. Comparative studies across healthcare systems can deepen understanding of contextual influences.

Practice-oriented development should focus on integrating collaboration into routine care processes. Organizational strategies must embed interdisciplinary teamwork into clinical pathways and performance evaluation systems. Sustainable collaboration requires alignment between daily practice and institutional goals (Correa-de-Araujo, 2020; Holmes, 2020).

Strategic action is needed to support interdisciplinary collaboration in emerging healthcare systems. Capacity building, regulatory support, and investment in human resources will expand collaborative potential. The findings underscore the urgency of preparing healthcare systems for holistic, patient-centered models in the future.

CONCLUSION

The most important and distinctive finding of this study is that interdisciplinary collaboration in future healthcare operates as a context-dependent and adaptive practice rather than a fixed organizational model. The results demonstrate that effective holistic patient-centered care emerges when collaboration is supported by organizational culture, shared leadership, and patient involvement, highlighting that collaboration quality matters more than team composition alone.

This research contributes conceptually by positioning interdisciplinary collaboration as a socio-technical and relational process embedded within future healthcare transformation. The study enriches existing frameworks by integrating patient-centeredness, professional dynamics, and system readiness into a single analytical perspective. Methodologically, the synthesis of secondary data and comparative case analysis offers a comprehensive approach to understanding collaboration across diverse healthcare contexts.

Limitations of this study include reliance on secondary data and descriptive case evidence, which restrict direct measurement of patient outcomes and team performance. Variability in healthcare systems also limits generalizability. Future research should focus on longitudinal empirical studies, mixed-method approaches, and outcome-based evaluations to assess the long-term impact of interdisciplinary collaboration on patient-centered care quality and system sustainability.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Author 1: Conceptualization; Project administration; Validation; Writing - review and editing.
Author 2: Conceptualization; Data curation; In-vestigation.
Author 3: Data curation; Investigation.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest

REFERENCES

Arai, H. (2015). Japan as the front-runner of super-aged societies: Perspectives from medicine and medical care in Japan. *Geriatrics and Gerontology International*, *15*(6), 673–687. https://doi.org/10.1111/ggi.12450

Bauer, A. (2008). Human-robot collaboration: A survey. *International Journal of Humanoid Robotics*, *5*(1), 47–66. https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219843608001303

Bruce, A. (2004). Interdisciplinary integration in Europe: The case of the Fifth Framework programme. *Futures*, *36*(4), 457–470. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2003.10.003

Char, D. S. (2020). Identifying Ethical Considerations for Machine Learning Healthcare Applications. *American Journal of Bioethics*, *20*(11), 7–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/15265161.2020.1819469

Correa-de-Araujo, R. (2020). Myosteatosis in the Context of Skeletal Muscle Function Deficit: An Interdisciplinary Workshop at the National Institute on Aging. *Frontiers in Physiology*, *11*(Query date: 2025-12-16 22:31:27). https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2020.00963

Curtis, J. R. (2006). Intensive care unit quality improvement: A "how-to" guide for the interdisciplinary team. *Critical Care Medicine*, *34*(1), 211–218. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.CCM.0000190617.76104.AC

Dekker, S. (2012). Neuromyths in education: Prevalence and predictors of misconceptions among teachers. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *3*(Query date: 2025-12-16 22:31:27). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2012.00429

Domenico, M. D. (2015). Identifying modular flows on multilayer networks reveals highly overlapping organization in interconnected systems. *Physical Review X*, *5*(1). https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevX.5.011027

Doyle, N. (2020). Neurodiversity at work: A biopsychosocial model and the impact on working adults. *British Medical Bulletin*, *135*(1), 108–125. https://doi.org/10.1093/bmb/ldaa021

Fendler, E. J. (1970). Micellar catalysis in organic reactions: Kinetic and mechanistic implications. *Advances in Physical Organic Chemistry*, *8*(Query date: 2025-12-16 22:31:27), 271–406. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-3160(08)60323-8

Guzmán, J. (2002). Multidisciplinary bio-psycho-social rehabilitation for chronic low back pain. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews Online*, *1*. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?partnerID=HzOxMe3b&scp=0036357519&origin=inward

Holmes, E. A. (2020). Multidisciplinary research priorities for the COVID-19 pandemic: A call for action for mental health science. *Lancet Psychiatry*, *7*(6), 547–560. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30168-1

Houghten, R. A. (1999). Mixture-based synthetic combinatorial libraries. *Journal of Medicinal Chemistry*, *42*(19), 3743–3778. https://doi.org/10.1021/jm990174v

Jessop, P. G. (2007). Gas-expanded liquids. *Chemical Reviews*, *107*(6), 2666–2694. https://doi.org/10.1021/cr040199o

Mccallin, A. (2001). Interdisciplinary practice—A matter of teamwork: An integrated literature review. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, *10*(4), 419–428. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2702.2001.00495.x

Mollan, S. P. (2018). Idiopathic intracranial hypertension: Consensus guidelines on management. *Journal of Neurology Neurosurgery and Psychiatry*, *89*(10), 1088–1100. https://doi.org/10.1136/jnnp-2017-317440

Makins, A., Ahsan, A., Waqas, M., Kasliwal, A., Ahsan, A., Sridhar, A., González, C. C., Lam, W.-C., Bonsergent, S., Momat, F., Kopp-Kallner, H. K., Ooi, S., Fuchs-Montgomery, N., Kerrigan, M., & Askew, I. (2025). FIGO position statement on postpartum intrauterine devices (PPIUD). *International Journal of Gynecology and Obstetrics*, *169*(3), 1127–1132. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijgo.70146

Mengesha, D., Mamo, M., Worku, T., & Zigyalew, Y. (2025). Emerging Organic Pollutants in Ethiopia: Occurrence, Impacts, and Management Strategies. *Water Environment Research*, *97*(12). Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1002/wer.70209

Mezieobi, K. C., Alum, E. U., Ugwu, O. P.-C., Uti, D. E., Alum, B. N., Egba, S. I., & Ewah, C. M. (2025). Economic burden of malaria on developing countries: A mini review. *Parasite Epidemiology and Control*, *30*. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.parepi.2025.e00435

Mohsin, S., Siddiqui, S., Gill, T., Mistry, A., Muhammad, F., Khan, N. A., Aziz, S., Jesrani, A. K., Srivastava, S., Hasan, B. S., & Chelliah, A. (2025). Developing Congenital Cardiac CT Services in Low-Resource Settings: A Quality Improvement Approach. *Pediatric Cardiology*. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00246-025-03996-1

Mousa, S. K., Fernandez-Crehuet, J. M., & Thaher, Y. A. Y. (2025). Driving Healthcare Socio-Economic Sustainability Through Green HRM: Innovation and Strategic Environmental Approaches. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.70187

Plowright, R. K. (2021). Land use-induced spillover: A call to action to safeguard environmental, animal, and human health. *Lancet Planetary Health*, *5*(4). https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(21)00031-0

Potter, K. A. (2013). Microclimatic challenges in global change biology. *Global Change Biology*, *19*(10), 2932–2939. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.12257

Reeves, S. (2017). Interprofessional collaboration to improve professional practice and healthcare outcomes. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, *2017*(6). https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD000072.pub3

Roetzel, P. G. (2019). Information overload in the information age: A review of the literature from business administration, business psychology, and related disciplines with a bibliometric approach and framework development. *Business Research*, *12*(2), 479–522. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-018-0069-z

Rollins, M. G. (2009). LANDFIRE: A nationally consistent vegetation, wildland fire, and fuel assessment. *International Journal of Wildland Fire*, *18*(3), 235–249. https://doi.org/10.1071/WF08088

Santschi, V. (2014). Improving blood pressure control through pharmacist interventions: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Journal of the American Heart Association*, *3*(2). https://doi.org/10.1161/JAHA.113.000718

Slade, D. E. M. (2003). Hidradenitis suppurativa: Pathogenesis and management. *British Journal of Plastic Surgery*, *56*(5), 451–461. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0007-1226(03)00177-2

Smith, C. M. (2012). Molecular bases of plant resistance to arthropods. *Annual Review of Entomology*, *57*(Query date: 2025-12-16 22:31:27), 309–328. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ento-120710-100642

Samuel, A., Noor, R., Tefera, N., Hussien, A., Gebremedhin, G., Mbuya, M., Amare, E., Woldeyohannes, M., Fikresilassie, G., Girma, M., Petros, A., Senbeta, A., Tessema, B., Challa, F., Baye, K., Laillou, A., Chuko, T., Tollera, G., Hailu, M., … Tessema, M. (2025). Potential Impact of Large-Scale Food Fortification in Ethiopia: Coverage and Knowledge of Fortifiable Foods. *Maternal and Child Nutrition*. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1111/mcn.70055

Shiyami, N. D. S., & Mardiana, n. (2025). RISK FACTOR FOR STUNTING IN TODDLERS AGED 24–59 MONTHS IN KERSANA PUBLIC HEALTH CENTER WORKING AREA. *Media Gizi Indonesia*, *20*(1), 63–73. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.20473/mgi.v20i1.63-73

Wong, K. H. (2011). Kudzu root: Traditional uses and potential medicinal benefits in diabetes and cardiovascular diseases. *Journal of Ethnopharmacology*, *134*(3), 584–607. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jep.2011.02.001

Yang, Q. (2022). Fusing Blockchain and AI With Metaverse: A Survey. *IEEE Open Journal of the Computer Society*, *3*(Query date: 2025-12-16 22:31:27), 122–136. https://doi.org/10.1109/OJCS.2022.3188249

Zhang, Y. (2012). Graphene: A versatile nanoplatform for biomedical applications. *Nanoscale*, *4*(13), 3833–3842. https://doi.org/10.1039/c2nr31040f

Zwarenstein, M. (2009). Interprofessional collaboration: Effects of practice-based interventions on professional practice and healthcare outcomes. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, *3*. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD000072.pub2