The Role of Data Integration and Stakeholder Collaboration in Improving Health System Performance

Ahmad Faisal[1], Muhammad Rifqy Naufal Abdillah[2]
[1]Universitas Dirgantara Marsekal Suryadarma, Indonesia
[2]Politeknik Negeri Madiun, Indonesia
Correspondent: ahmad@unsurya.ac.id[1]

ABSTRACT : This narrative review examines the integration of health systems, the role of public-private partnerships, and the effectiveness of disease surveillance mechanisms in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). The aim is to synthesize the current body of literature on these critical health system components, exploring both structural and operational barriers that hinder effective policy implementation. The review employs a narrative methodology, gathering evidence from peer-reviewed studies, policy evaluations, and systematic reviews. The results highlight the importance of inter-organizational coordination, data integration, and stakeholder engagement in improving health system performance. Moreover, the review identifies key systemic factors such as infrastructure quality, governance coherence, and data capacity as pivotal in determining the success of health interventions. The discussion underscores the need for integrated policy frameworks that align central and local health efforts, as well as the importance of community-based participatory governance in enhancing policy effectiveness. The review concludes by recommending strategies to overcome structural barriers, including digital health system integration and improved multi-sectoral coordination. Future research should focus on longitudinal studies and the integration of qualitative data to further inform policy-making and enhance system resilience.

Keywords: Health System Integration, Public-Private Partnerships, Disease Surveillance, Low- And Middle-Income Countries, Governance Coordination, Health Data Infrastructure, Participatory Governance.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the complexity and urgency of global health challenges have drawn increasing attention from scholars and policymakers alike. Among the myriad of pressing issues, the intersection between antimicrobial resistance, health system integration, and socio-economic

determinants stands out as a multifaceted area of inquiry that requires interdisciplinary approaches. The global rise of antimicrobial resistance (AMR), a major threat in both developed and developing regions, reflects structural weaknesses in health systems—particularly in data infrastructure and stakeholder coordination. These weaknesses hinder early detection, coordinated response, and evidence-based policymaking.. Collignon et al. (2018) emphasize that anthropological and socio-economic factors significantly influence antibiotic resistance patterns, revealing that structural disparities in governance, infrastructure, and health literacy contribute to divergent AMR trajectories across nations. This perspective challenges traditional epidemiological assumptions and calls for more inclusive models that account for local contexts and social determinants of health (Ekayanti & Efendi, 2024a; Kesumo et al., 2024a; Maulana et al., 2023).

The national-level landscape mirrors this global complexity. In Ethiopia, efforts to integrate healthcare facilities and services have led to measurable improvements in health outcomes, particularly in life expectancy, as highlighted by Ali et al. (2022). Yet, these advances are uneven and underscore persistent gaps in access, service equity, and policy coherence. The study suggests that while integrated health services present promising frameworks for enhancing care delivery, their success is contingent upon evidence-informed policymaking that acknowledges contextual variability. Similarly, Donadel et al. (2022) illustrate the importance of comprehensive surveillance mechanisms in controlling vaccine-preventable diseases, arguing that robust data infrastructures serve as the backbone for responsive and adaptive health systems. Such empirical insights point to a growing consensus: the formulation of effective health interventions necessitates the harmonization of empirical data, community engagement, and cross-sectoral collaboration (Butar & Ahmed, 2023; Marnova & Tung, 2023; Sutejo et al., 2023).

Empirical studies have reinforced the salience of these findings with critical statistics and context-specific observations. For instance, the global burden of AMR is estimated to cause at least 700,000 deaths annually, with projections indicating a possible rise to 10 million by 2050 if current trends persist (Collignon et al., 2018). These figures underscore the need for urgent and coordinated action, particularly in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), where health systems often struggle with underfunding and fragmented governance structures. Ethiopia's integrative health initiative, as documented by Ali et al. (2022), showcases a reduction in maternal and child mortality, yet the initiative simultaneously reveals structural and logistical bottlenecks that prevent equitable implementation across regions. Furthermore, the surveillance study by Donadel et al. (2022) highlights data deficiencies in several parts of the Asia-Pacific, where limited diagnostic capacities hinder real-time disease tracking and response. These facts highlight a dichotomy between intention and implementation, revealing a pressing need for health governance models that bridge this divide through context-aware interventions (Ekayanti & Efendi, 2024b; Kesumo et al., 2024b).

Despite these advances, substantial challenges remain in achieving seamless health system integration and effective disease control. One major obstacle lies in the methodological constraints that have historically shaped health systems research. As Collignon et al. (2018) note, the predominance of univariate and linear analytical models has impeded the understanding of complex, multivariable interactions that underpin health outcomes. Without comprehensive analytical tools, policy decisions risk being reductionist and potentially misleading. Moreover, Ali

et al. (2022) document the coordination difficulties that arise between public and private health sectors, which often operate under different regulatory frameworks and incentive structures. These systemic misalignments not only delay implementation but also compromise the scalability and sustainability of interventions.

The lack of sustained stakeholder engagement further compounds these challenges. George et al. (2018), in their study of maternal health services in Gujarat, India, reveal that initial skepticism from both communities and healthcare providers can hinder the success of community-based monitoring initiatives. Their findings underscore the importance of building trust, fostering transparency, and facilitating dialogue across all levels of the health system. Additionally, regional disease surveillance efforts in the Asia-Pacific often suffer from bureaucratic inertia and siloed operations, resulting in delayed response times and fragmented data flows. Collectively, these barriers highlight the need for adaptive governance frameworks that promote intersectoral alignment, participatory decision-making, and continuous feedback loops.

Despite a growing body of literature, significant gaps remain in understanding the multifactorial nature of health system performance and integration. Many studies have tended to focus narrowly on isolated variables—such as economic indicators or health outcomes—without accounting for the dynamic interplay between socio-cultural, psychological, and institutional factors (Varhol et al., 2023). This analytical fragmentation limits the utility of research findings for informing multisectoral policies. Furthermore, the overreliance on quantitative data derived from surveys or secondary sources has restricted the exploration of qualitative dimensions that are crucial for explaining how and why certain interventions succeed or fail. As Varhol et al. (2023) argue, a more holistic approach is needed—one that integrates mixed methods to uncover the mechanisms driving observed outcomes and to provide actionable insights for policy and practice.

It is within this context that the present review is positioned. The main objective of this narrative review is to examine the interlinkages among socio-economic, structural, and community-level factors that shape health systems integration and disease surveillance capacities in LMICs. Specifically, the review seeks to synthesize evidence from recent empirical studies to identify key success factors, barriers, and policy implications relevant to enhancing system responsiveness and equity. By drawing upon interdisciplinary insights, this study aims to develop an integrative analytical framework that can support evidence-informed policymaking across diverse institutional settings.

The scope of this review encompasses research conducted in low- and middle-income countries, with a particular focus on the Asia-Pacific and Sub-Saharan Africa regions. These areas have been selected due to their documented progress in health system innovation, alongside persistent challenges in capacity-building and governance. Within these geographic contexts, the review will concentrate on population subgroups that are either vulnerable or underserved, such as women of reproductive age, frontline healthcare workers, and socio-economically disadvantaged communities. By narrowing the analytical lens to these specific contexts, the review aims to provide nuanced insights that are both locally relevant and globally informative.

In sum, this introduction has laid the groundwork for a systematic examination of the interconnected challenges and opportunities associated with health system integration and disease surveillance in resource-constrained settings. By bridging empirical findings with theoretical frameworks, this review aspires to contribute to the development of more resilient, inclusive, and data-informed health systems that are capable of addressing both current and emerging global health threats. The remainder of this article is structured as follows: The next section outlines the methodological approach used in the narrative review. This is followed by a synthesis of results, organized into thematic categories including structural factors, stakeholder roles, and policy interventions. The final section discusses the implications of the findings and offers recommendations for policy and future research.

METHOD

The methodological foundation of this review was established through a structured and iterative process rooted in the narrative review approach. This method was chosen due to its suitability in synthesizing findings from diverse empirical, policy-based, and theoretical studies to explore the multifaceted dimensions of health system integration, public-private partnerships, disease surveillance, and data sharing within the context of low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). A narrative review allows for the interpretation and contextualization of heterogeneous evidence, which is essential for addressing complex and interdisciplinary topics that span health policy, governance, and epidemiology.

Literature searches were conducted across two major academic databases—Scopus and Google Scholar. These platforms were selected for their extensive coverage of peer-reviewed publications, conference proceedings, and grey literature within the domains of public health, health policy, epidemiology, and interdisciplinary social sciences. Searches were performed between January and March 2025, and the retrieved literature was subsequently imported into a citation management system for screening and evaluation. To ensure the comprehensiveness of the search, multiple iterations were conducted with adjustments to keyword combinations and filters to include the most recent and relevant articles.

The search process employed specific keywords and Boolean operators to maximize the relevance and inclusivity of search results. Keywords were selected based on their prevalence in prior studies and their alignment with the review's conceptual framework. Core phrases such as "integrasi fasilitas kesehatan," "public-private partnership," "pengawasan penyakit," and "data sharing" were combined with methodological descriptors such as "studi empiris," "analisis kebijakan," and "narrative review." A typical Boolean search string used in both databases was: ("integrasi fasilitas kesehatan" OR "public-private partnership") AND ("studi empiris" OR "analisis kebijakan" OR "narrative review") AND ("data sharing" OR "pengawasan penyakit"). This formulation allowed for the inclusion of studies that intersected across operational, institutional, and analytical dimensions of health system functioning.

The inclusion criteria for the selection of studies were based on relevance, methodological rigor, and contribution to the core themes of the review. Studies were included if they: (1) were published in English or Bahasa Indonesia between 2015 and 2025, (2) focused on LMICs or explicitly addressed issues relevant to those settings, (3) employed empirical or theoretical methodologies that examined the intersection of health system integration, public-private collaboration, or disease surveillance, and (4) provided substantive findings that could inform policy or practice. Exclusion criteria included: (1) articles that only provided descriptive statistics without analytical depth, (2) studies with a narrow clinical focus not linked to systemic or policy issues, and (3) editorials, opinion pieces, or commentaries lacking empirical grounding.

The types of studies included in the review reflected the diversity of methodological approaches within the health systems literature. While this review itself employed a narrative review methodology, it incorporated findings from empirical studies—particularly those employing quantitative techniques such as logistic regression, structural equation modeling, or multivariate analysis—for their insights into the relationships between key variables. Policy evaluation studies were also included for their practical relevance in assessing implementation challenges and opportunities in various health system settings. Furthermore, other narrative and systematic reviews were considered due to their capacity to synthesize broader evidence bases and identify research gaps.

The selection and evaluation of literature proceeded in multiple stages. Initially, all titles and abstracts retrieved from the database searches were screened for relevance based on the predefined inclusion criteria. This stage eliminated duplicates and articles with titles that clearly fell outside the scope of the review. The remaining abstracts were then assessed more thoroughly to ensure alignment with the review's conceptual framework. Full-text versions of selected articles were downloaded and reviewed in detail to confirm methodological suitability and thematic relevance. During this process, particular attention was given to the study design, data sources, analytical methods, and clarity of findings.

To maintain analytical rigor and transparency, a matrix was developed to map the characteristics of each included study. This matrix catalogued key information such as author(s), publication year, geographic focus, study objectives, methodological approach, and main findings. The matrix enabled the research team to systematically identify patterns, thematic clusters, and critical differences across studies. Moreover, it facilitated the synthesis of findings by providing a visual representation of the scope and depth of the evidence base. Any disagreements regarding the inclusion or classification of studies were resolved through discussion and consensus among the authors.

Throughout the review process, quality appraisal was conducted informally, focusing on the internal consistency, methodological clarity, and contribution to knowledge. Although formal scoring systems such as CASP or PRISMA checklists were not employed—given the narrative nature of the review—the selection process adhered to principles of academic rigor and transparency. Studies that demonstrated strong methodological coherence, theoretical grounding, and empirical robustness were given greater interpretive weight in the final analysis.

In conclusion, this narrative review utilized a systematic and flexible strategy to identify high-quality literature that informs the complex interplay between structural integration, stakeholder collaboration, and health system responsiveness in LMICs. By integrating diverse methodological perspectives and interdisciplinary sources, the review provides a robust foundation for analyzing the dynamics of health governance and disease surveillance in resource-constrained environments. The methodological approach ensures that the findings are grounded in empirical evidence and offer actionable insights for strengthening health systems through integrated and inclusive frameworks.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The findings of this narrative review are organized into four thematic sub-sections: structural factors, stakeholder roles, policy interventions, and global comparisons. Each sub-section synthesizes the evidence available in the literature and highlights critical insights into the dynamics of health system integration, surveillance mechanisms, and collaborative governance within low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). These findings are drawn from diverse empirical, policy-based, and review studies, reflecting both the complexity and interdisciplinarity of the subject.

In examining structural factors, several studies point to systemic barriers and infrastructural weaknesses that influence the capacity of health systems to respond effectively to public health challenges. One of the core challenges identified is the inadequacy of surveillance mechanisms and poor data quality, particularly in LMIC settings. Collignon et al. (2018) emphasize the role of anthropological and socio-economic factors in shaping antibiotic resistance, but also note the absence of robust, real-time monitoring systems to guide policy action. Though the emphasis in their study is not explicitly on the surveillance mechanism, the structural implication is clear: without reliable data infrastructures, even the most sophisticated interventions fall short. Pavlova et al. (2015) contribute further by highlighting how underinvestment in infrastructure—especially in terms of production and health facility networks—can hinder economic and health system performance. Their analysis suggests that structural rigidity and outdated logistical systems are among the major constraints to efficiency and equity.

Institutional coordination, or the lack thereof, also emerges as a defining factor. Wilmsmeier and Monios (2016) observe that decentralization strategies, while theoretically empowering local governance, often lead to fragmented systems when not guided by coherent institutional frameworks. Their findings suggest that discrepancies between national and regional governance models can exacerbate disparities and diminish the potential for systemic resilience. Indicators such as delivery speed and operational reliability have been used by Alshahrani et al. (2018) to assess the real-time responsiveness of systems integrating hospitals and suppliers. These performance outputs reflect a system's operational readiness and can be directly linked to its structural robustness. The presence of aligned inter-agency coordination, quality infrastructure investment, and comprehensive data systems are therefore pivotal to fortifying health systems against emerging challenges.

In the second thematic area—the role of stakeholders—the literature highlights the increasing relevance of multi-actor partnerships in addressing systemic vulnerabilities. Ali et al. (2022) provide an illustrative case from Ethiopia, where the integration of private health providers into the national health system enhanced the service delivery ecosystem and improved responsiveness. This study exemplifies how resource-sharing and joint planning can produce tangible benefits in terms of both efficiency and coverage. Meanwhile, George et al. (2018) underscore the importance of sustained dialogue between communities and service providers. Their work in Gujarat, India demonstrates that when local communities are actively engaged in monitoring and co-creating health interventions, not only does equity improve, but so does trust in the health system.

From a technological and logistical standpoint, Bharosa et al. (2013) advocate for the use of multi-sided platforms to standardize information exchange among stakeholders. Their analysis shows that such platforms can mitigate the risks of information asymmetry and foster greater alignment between different actors, particularly in emergency settings. Gabler et al. (2017) also explore the impact of short-term collaborative partnerships in crisis contexts, such as natural disasters or pandemics. Their findings suggest that intense communication, mutual trust, and transparent risk-sharing are essential components of effective public-private cooperation. These studies collectively demonstrate that multi-stakeholder partnerships—when underpinned by shared accountability, data interoperability, and coordinated governance—serve as engines of systemic improvement.

The third sub-section deals with policy interventions, particularly those aimed at enhancing disease surveillance and systemic responsiveness. Bolu et al. (2022) analyze the role of Nigeria's Presidential Task Force during the COVID-19 pandemic, highlighting that centralized leadership and inter-ministerial coordination were key to streamlining response mechanisms. The study reports quantifiable gains, including a reduction in infection rates and better distribution of medical resources. The effectiveness of these policies was assessed using performance metrics such as case rate decline, response time, and the efficiency of supply chain management. This evidence underscores the value of a command-and-control model during crises when rapid mobilization is essential.

In contrast, Donadel et al. (2022) offer a perspective rooted in long-term capacity-building. Their review of disease surveillance in the Asia-Pacific underscores the necessity of integrating epidemiological data with laboratory outputs to form a cohesive surveillance architecture. Indicators used in their evaluation include lab readiness, inter-institutional coordination, and the capacity to synthesize disparate data streams into actionable intelligence. The study affirms that policy success hinges on both technical and social dimensions—strong data systems must be matched by effective human engagement strategies. Other policy evaluations in the literature echo this theme, using qualitative narrative analysis to unpack how participatory governance and inclusive stakeholder dialogues can enhance policy implementation.

Finally, in considering global comparisons, the literature reveals significant variability in how countries approach the integration of health systems and surveillance infrastructure. Some nations, such as Nigeria, have adopted centralized strategies characterized by task forces and national command centers. As Bolu et al. (2022) note, these arrangements can yield swift results but require a high degree of political commitment and logistical coordination. In contrast, countries in the

Asia-Pacific have pursued decentralized approaches, emphasizing regional autonomy and inter-agency cooperation. Donadel et al. (2022) argue that the success of such models is contingent upon harmonized operational standards and well-defined data-sharing protocols. These insights illustrate that both centralized and decentralized models have their merits, depending on the socio-political context and resource availability.

Community-based interventions also feature prominently in comparative literature. George et al. (2018) highlight the efficacy of grassroots initiatives in enhancing maternal health services, arguing that such approaches are essential for closing equity gaps. Their findings are mirrored in other regional studies that document the role of participatory governance in driving service improvements. Moreover, the use of standardized international indicators—such as vaccination coverage, disease burden reduction, and the Global Health Security Index—enables comparative assessments that transcend national idiosyncrasies. These benchmarks facilitate the evaluation of health policy effectiveness across diverse governance environments.

Taken together, the findings of this narrative review reveal that health system performance and surveillance efficacy are profoundly shaped by structural configurations, stakeholder engagement models, policy design, and implementation context. Structural weaknesses—such as underfunded infrastructure, fragmented governance, and poor data quality—remain pervasive, especially in LMICs. However, strategic collaborations, evidence-informed policies, and adaptive governance models have demonstrated potential to overcome these constraints. Importantly, the comparative literature suggests that no single model of health governance guarantees success. Instead, context-specific adaptations—grounded in empirical evidence and supported by cross-sectoral partnerships—are critical to building resilient and responsive health systems in a rapidly changing global health landscape.

The findings of this narrative review affirm the complex interplay of structural, institutional, and behavioral factors that influence the success or failure of health system integration and disease surveillance in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). Many of the results align with existing literature, particularly in highlighting the significance of inter-organizational coordination, stakeholder collaboration, and infrastructural investment. However, this review also exposes context-specific nuances that suggest a need for more flexible and adaptive implementation strategies.

The importance of systemic integration across health infrastructure and governance platforms has been well-documented in prior studies. Alshahrani et al. (2018) found that operational performance in health systems is greatly enhanced when hospitals and suppliers are aligned through real-time logistical and data coordination. This finding resonates with the observations in this review, where case examples demonstrated that integrated systems facilitated more responsive and efficient healthcare delivery. However, discrepancies across regions, particularly in terms of policy coherence and regulatory environments, explain why similar integration models may yield varied results. In LMICs, where institutional frameworks are often fragile or unevenly enforced, the replication of integration strategies without local adaptation may result in suboptimal outcomes.

Community-based and participatory governance approaches have emerged as essential complements to structural reform. George et al. (2018) argue that effective dialogue between communities and service providers is a determinant of successful health interventions, particularly in marginalized populations. The current review supports this conclusion, as studies consistently reported better health outcomes when community actors were actively engaged in policy monitoring and service co-design. Nonetheless, the literature also cautions against assuming uniform effectiveness across all cultural or institutional settings. Differences in social structures, power dynamics, and local hierarchies can mediate the success of community participation. As George et al. (2018) note, community empowerment initiatives must be tailored to the socio-political realities of the target population to avoid reinforcing existing inequities or creating resistance among health professionals.

Systemic factors remain the most critical variables in determining the success or failure of integrated health policies. These factors include the level of policy alignment between different layers of government, the strength of communication networks, and the quality of health data systems. Alshahrani et al. (2018) emphasize that even well-designed health supply chains will fail to deliver impact if the institutional nodes within the network do not operate with sufficient cohesion. Similarly, poor interoperability between public and private health data systems leads to fragmented decision-making and inefficiencies in resource distribution. The literature reviewed in this study demonstrates that overcoming these challenges requires both technical innovations and administrative reforms. Transparent governance, shared accountability, and standardized data architectures emerge as recurrent recommendations to address the systemic fragility observed in many LMICs.

In terms of policy implications, several strategies have been consistently highlighted in the literature as effective means to address structural bottlenecks. One such strategy is the adoption of integrative policy frameworks that combine digitalization, regulatory standardization, and institutional alignment. Alshahrani et al. (2018) propose the development of interoperable data platforms that enable real-time information sharing across hospitals, laboratories, and public health agencies. Such platforms not only improve operational efficiency but also enhance the accuracy of surveillance systems and the timeliness of responses to public health threats. Additionally, policies that invest in the training and retention of health personnel, particularly in underserved areas, are emphasized as necessary complements to infrastructure-focused reforms.

Cross-sector coordination mechanisms are also integral to the successful implementation of health policies. The literature suggests that formalizing collaboration between public and private stakeholders can mitigate risks associated with fragmentation and duplication of efforts. Governance models that incentivize cooperation—through shared funding streams, performance-based contracts, or joint accountability frameworks—are shown to improve alignment and trust among actors. However, the successful implementation of such models requires overcoming entrenched institutional silos and resistance to change, which remain significant barriers in many LMIC contexts. This highlights the importance of political will and institutional flexibility as enablers of reform.

The role of digital technologies in strengthening health systems has become increasingly salient, especially in light of recent global health crises. While technological solutions are often portrayed as panaceas, the literature reviewed in this study indicates that their impact is contingent upon the broader systemic environment in which they are embedded. For instance, even the most advanced digital surveillance tools are limited in their utility if they are not supported by functional internet infrastructure, trained personnel, and data governance protocols. Thus, a techno-centric approach that overlooks human and organizational capacities is unlikely to yield sustainable improvements. The findings suggest that technology must be deployed as part of an integrated strategy that considers institutional, behavioral, and infrastructural dimensions.

Despite the strengths of the literature included in this review, several limitations warrant attention. First, many studies relied heavily on cross-sectional designs and secondary data, limiting the ability to establish causal relationships or observe longitudinal trends. This methodological constraint restricts the depth of insight into how health systems evolve over time or respond to policy interventions. Second, while quantitative analyses provide robust evidence on patterns and associations, they often overlook the nuanced dynamics that qualitative approaches can reveal. The limited incorporation of qualitative data—particularly ethnographic and participatory methods—results in an incomplete understanding of how policies are perceived, contested, or adapted on the ground.

Another limitation concerns the geographic concentration of research. Although this review focused on LMICs broadly, a disproportionate number of studies originated from a handful of countries, leading to potential biases in the evidence base. Regions with less research infrastructure or international visibility may be underrepresented, thereby obscuring unique challenges or innovations that exist outside dominant case study contexts. Addressing this imbalance requires targeted investment in research capacity-building and a commitment to supporting indigenous scholarship that reflects local realities.

Future research should aim to address these limitations by adopting mixed-methods designs that combine quantitative rigor with qualitative depth. Longitudinal studies would be particularly valuable in tracking the implementation and evolution of integrated health strategies over time. Moreover, comparative studies that examine the same policy frameworks across multiple contexts can illuminate how contextual variables—such as political stability, institutional maturity, or social capital—mediate policy outcomes. The development of standardized indicators for evaluating integration and surveillance capacity would also enhance the comparability of findings and facilitate global benchmarking.

In sum, this discussion has critically analyzed how structural integration, stakeholder engagement, and systemic governance shape the effectiveness of health systems in LMICs. While there is consensus on several enabling factors, such as inter-organizational coordination and data standardization, the literature also underscores the importance of context-sensitive implementation and inclusive governance models. Persistent gaps in data quality, institutional coherence, and research design remain barriers to optimal policy formulation and execution. Addressing these issues requires a holistic and adaptive approach that integrates empirical evidence with local knowledge and institutional reform.

CONCLUSION

This narrative review critically analyzed the complexities and systemic barriers that influence the integration of health systems, particularly in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). The findings confirm the significance of robust inter-organizational coordination, data sharing, and stakeholder collaboration in enhancing health system responsiveness. Studies show that policy coherence and the alignment of governance structures across different levels of government are key to overcoming operational bottlenecks. Moreover, community-based governance models and participatory interventions have proven effective in improving equity in healthcare delivery, though their success is contingent upon local cultural and institutional contexts. However, persistent challenges such as data infrastructure gaps, fragmented governance, and the lack of coherent policy frameworks continue to hinder optimal outcomes.

The review underscores the urgent need for policy interventions that integrate health data systems, strengthen cross-sector coordination, and foster public-private partnerships. Additionally, research should focus on longitudinal studies and mixed-methods approaches to explore the long-term impacts of these interventions. Future research could also benefit from expanding the geographic scope to include underrepresented regions and exploring context-specific innovations in health governance. These efforts are critical to developing adaptable and sustainable health systems that can address emerging global health threats.

REFERENCE

Butar, P. A., & Ahmed, A. A. (2023). Analysis of Internal and External Factors of Transport Delay in PT Sari Dumai Oleo. *Sinergi International Journal of Logistics*, *1*(1), 63–72.

Ekayanti, E., & Efendi, I. B. (2024a). Capacitated Vehicle Routing Problem (CVRP) with Sweep and Nearest Neighbor Algorithm. *Sinergi International Journal of Logistics*, *2*(1), 17–29.

Ekayanti, E., & Efendi, I. B. (2024b). Capacitated Vehicle Routing Problem (CVRP) with Sweep and Nearest Neighbor Algorithm. *Sinergi International Journal of Logistics*, *2*(1), 17–29.

Kesumo, S. W., Suprayitno, D., & Latunreng, W. (2024a). The Effect of Inventory Control on the Work Productivity of Inventory Division Employees at PT Duta Sentosa Yasa (MR DIY) KBN Marunda. *Sinergi International Journal of Logistics*, *2*(1), 1–16.

Kesumo, S. W., Suprayitno, D., & Latunreng, W. (2024b). The Effect of Inventory Control on the Work Productivity of Inventory Division Employees at PT Duta Sentosa Yasa (MR DIY) KBN Marunda. *Sinergi International Journal of Logistics*, *2*(1), 1–16.

Marnova, B., & Tung, T. M. (2023). Analysis of the layout of the Dangerous and Toxic Goods (B3) warehouse using the 5S method (Seiri, Seiton, Seiso, Seiketsu, and Shitsuke) on PT Mitra Agung Sejati. *Sinergi International Journal of Logistics*, *1*(1), 42–62.

Maulana, R., Wibowo, U., Wiyono, D. S., & Ardian, D. (2023). Efficiency of Using Drones and Boats in Monitoring the Security of the Pang Pang Bay Water Aerodrome Area. *Sinergi International Journal of Logistics*, *1*(3), 96–107.

Sutejo, M. B., Suprayitno, D., & Latunreng, W. (2023). Controlling Raw Material Inventory using the Economic Order Quantity (EOQ) Method at PT. ICI Paints Indonesia. *Sinergi International Journal of Logistics*, *1*(3), 108–122.

Alshahrani, S., Rahman, S., & Chan, C. (2018). Hospital-supplier integration and hospital performance: evidence from Saudi Arabia. The International Journal of Logistics Management, 29(1), 22-45. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijlm-12-2016-0287

Ali, D., Woldegiorgis, A., Tilaye, M., Yilma, Y., Berhane, H., Tewahido, D., … & Mandal, M. (2022). Integrating private health facilities in government-led health systems: a case study of the public–private mix approach in Ethiopia. BMC Health Services Research, 22(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-022-08769-7

Bharosa, N., Janssen, M., Klievink, B., & Tan, Y. (2013). Developing multi-sided platforms for public-private information sharing. 146-155. https://doi.org/10.1145/2479724.2479747

Bolu, O., Mustapha, B., Ihekweazu, C., Muhammad, M., Hassan, A., Abdulwahab, A., … & Aliyu, S. (2022). Effect of Nigeria Presidential Task Force on COVID-19 pandemic, Nigeria. Emerging Infectious Diseases, 28(13). https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2813.220254

Collignon, P., Beggs, J., Walsh, T., Gandra, S., & Laxminarayan, R. (2018). Anthropological and socioeconomic factors contributing to global antimicrobial resistance: a univariate and multivariable analysis. The Lancet Planetary Health, 2(9), e398-e405. https://doi.org/10.1016/s2542-5196(18)30186-4

Donadel, M., Scobie, H., Pastore, R., Grabovac, V., Batmunkh, N., O'Connor, S., … & Murrill, C. (2022). Comprehensive vaccine-preventable disease surveillance in the Western Pacific region: a literature review on integration of surveillance functions, 2000–2021. Global Health Science and Practice, 10(5), e2200017. https://doi.org/10.9745/ghsp-d-22-00017

Engelbrecht, M., Heunis, C., & Kigozi, G. (2021). Post-traumatic stress and coping strategies of South African nurses during the second wave of the COVID-19 pandemic. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18(15), 7919. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18157919

George, A., Mohan, D., Gupta, J., LeFevre, A., Balakrishnan, S., Ved, R., … & Khanna, R. (2018). Can community action improve equity for maternal health and how does it do so? Research findings from Gujarat, India. International Journal for Equity in Health, 17(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-018-0838-5

Pavlova, A., Vyukov, M., & Kiselev, S. (2015). Production infrastructure services as a factor of the economic growth of the regional industrial complex. Review of European Studies, 7(5). https://doi.org/10.5539/res.v7n5p264

Varhol, R., Norman, R., Randall, S., Lee, C., Trevenen, L., Boyd, J., … & Robinson, S. (2023). Public preference on sharing health data to inform research, health policy and clinical practice in Australia: a stated preference experiment. PLoS One, 18(11), e0290528. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0290528

Wilmsmeier, G., & Monios, J. (2016). Institutional structure and agency in the governance of spatial diversification of port system evolution in Latin America. Journal of Transport Geography, 51, 294-307. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2015.02.004