International Journal of Computational and Experimental Science and ENgineering (IJCESEN)

Vol. 10-No.4 (2024) pp. 2320-2333
http://www.ijcesen.com

ISSN: 2149-9144

Research Article

Integrating Nursing and Social Work Roles in Managing Chronic Illness

Khamis Murayh Manzil ALANAZI[1], Munira Aqeel A ALAMRI[2], Atheer Abdullah Al QURASHI[3], Hussain Ali Abdullah ALSUWAIKET[4] , Hakami, Mohammed Othman J[5] , Salha Mubarak Mohammad ALSHAHRANI[6] , Alanezi, Mohammad Gaza S[7] , Abdulkader Salem Saud ALHAZIMI[8] , Nourah Mousa N ALANAZI[9] , Aldahmashi, Shuaa Alshayish F[10] , Sattam Abdul Salam Ali Al SHAMRI[11]

[1] Social Work Consultant – Prince Abdulaziz bin Musaed Hospital – Arar – Northern Borders – Saudi Arabia
* **Corresponding Author Email:** k999hd@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0009-0009-2745-2227

[2] Senior Specialist, Social Service – King Fahad Specialist Hospital – Buraidah – Al-Qassim – Saudi Arabia
Email: dmoo3_427@hotmail.com - **ORCID:** 0009-0009-2745-1227

[3] Nursing Technician – King Abdulaziz Specialist Hospital – Taif – Makkah – Saudi Arabia
Email: aaalqurshi@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0009-0009-2745-0229

[4] Nursing Technician – Al-Muzahmiyya General Hospital – Riyadh – Riyadh – Saudi Arabia
Email: Alasbany213@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0009-0009-2745-0228

[5] Nursing Technician – Emergency and Disaster Management, Ministry of Health Branch – Taif – Makkah – Saudi Arabia
Email: abu-wasim_500@hotmail.com - **ORCID:** 0009-0009-2745-0226

[6] Nursing Technician – Shobaa Primary Health Care Center – Khamis Mushait – Asir – Saudi Arabia
Email: Salehama@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0009-0009-2745-0225

[7] Nursing Technician – Maternity and Children Hospital – Arar – Northern Borders – Saudi Arabia
Email: mogalanezi@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0009-0009-2745-0224

[8] Health Assistant – Medical Supply – Arar – Northern Borders – Saudi Arabia
Email: aalhuzaimi@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0009-0009-2745-0223

[9] Nursing Technician – Ministry of Health Branch – Arar – Northern Borders – Saudi Arabia
Email: nouraha@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0009-0009-2745-0222

[10] Nursing Technician – Northern Borders Health Cluster – Arar – Northern Borders – Saudi Arabia
Email: Saldahmashi@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0009-0009-2745-0221

[11] Nursing Technician – Alsafyah Care Center – Madinah – Al-Madinah – Saudi Arabia
Email: Saalshamary@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0009-0009-2745-0220

Article Info:

DOI: 10.22399/ijcesen.3907
Received : 04 November 2024
Accepted : 28 December 2024

Keywords

Integrative care
Nursing–social work collaboration
Chronic illness management
Care coordination
Psychosocial interventions
Social determinants of health

Abstract:

Chronic illnesses present complex, long-term challenges that require coordinated, holistic care approaches; integrating nursing and social work roles offers a pathway to more patient-centered, efficient management. Nurses contribute clinical assessment, symptom management, medication coordination, and care continuity across settings, while social workers address psychosocial needs, resource linkage, advocacy, and care planning that aligns with patients' social contexts. When roles are integrated, teams can better identify social determinants that affect adherence and outcomes—such as housing instability, financial strain, or caregiver burden—and create combined interventions that address both medical and psychosocial drivers of health. This collaboration enhances care transitions, reduces duplication, and promotes shared decision-making with patients and families, ultimately improving health-related quality of life and reducing unnecessary acute care utilization. Successful integration depends on clear role delineation, interprofessional communication, mutual respect, and supportive organizational policies that enable collaboration—such as joint care pathways, shared documentation systems, and cross-disciplinary training. Evaluating integrated models requires both clinical and

psychosocial outcome measures, including symptom control, functional status, readmission rates, patient and caregiver satisfaction, and measures of social needs resolution. Barriers such as scope-of-practice confusion, limited reimbursement for nonmedical services, and workforce constraints must be addressed through policy change, education, and innovative funding models. Research that rigorously assesses integrated nursing–social work interventions will inform scalable practices and guide workforce planning to meet the growing burden of chronic disease.

1. Introduction

The 21st-century global healthcare landscape is overwhelmingly dominated by the pervasive challenge of chronic illnesses. Conditions such as diabetes, cardiovascular diseases, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), cancer, and mental health disorders have transitioned from being acute, often terminal events to long-term, complex states of being that individuals manage across their lifetimes [1]. This epidemiological shift, driven by aging populations, advancements in medical technology, and lifestyle factors, has fundamentally redefined the goals of healthcare. The focus is no longer solely on cure but, more critically, on management, quality of life, functionality, and palliative support [2]. This new paradigm exposes the limitations of traditional, siloed, and acute-care-oriented medical models, which often fail to address the multifaceted bio-psycho-social-spiritual needs of individuals living with chronic conditions.

Within this complex environment, patients frequently navigate a fragmented healthcare system, confronting not only the physical manifestations of their disease but also a cascade of interrelated challenges. These include intricate medication regimens, significant financial burdens, psychological distress (such as depression and anxiety), social isolation, loss of occupational identity, and complex family dynamics [3]. It is increasingly evident that no single healthcare profession can single-handedly provide the comprehensive support required for effective chronic disease management. This reality has catalyzed a powerful and necessary movement towards interprofessional collaboration (IPC), where diverse professionals combine their skills and perspectives to achieve superior patient outcomes [4].

At the very heart of this collaborative imperative are the professions of nursing and social work. Individually, each discipline brings a unique and vital perspective to patient care. Nursing practice is traditionally anchored in the biopsychosocial model, expertly addressing the physical and clinical dimensions of illness while also providing education, emotional support, and coordination of care [5]. Social work, on the other hand, is fundamentally oriented towards the person-in-environment perspective, focusing on the social determinants of health, systemic barriers, advocacy, counseling, and linking patients to crucial community resources [6]. For decades, these two professions have operated on parallel tracks, often interacting but rarely integrating their roles into a unified, cohesive force. The management of chronic illness, however, demands that these tracks converge. The intricate interplay between a patient's clinical status and their social context means that the boundaries between these roles are not just blurred but are fundamentally interconnected.

The call for integrating nursing and social work is not merely an administrative suggestion but a clinical necessity rooted in empirical evidence. Chronic illness management is a continuous process requiring sustained engagement, which aligns perfectly with the ongoing, relationship-based care models central to both professions. A nurse might excel at teaching a patient self-injection techniques for diabetes management, but a social worker is essential in addressing the underlying food insecurity that prevents the same patient from affording a healthy diet [7]. Conversely, a social worker may secure housing for a patient with severe COPD, but a nurse is critical in ensuring the home environment is safe from respiratory irritants and that the patient can effectively use their oxygen therapy.

This synergy suggests that the whole of an integrated approach is significantly greater than the sum of its parts. Research indicates that effective collaboration between nursing and social work can lead to a multitude of positive outcomes, including reduced hospital readmission rates, improved medication adherence, better patient and family satisfaction, enhanced self-management skills, and more efficient utilization of healthcare resources [8, 9]. Despite this compelling rationale, the path to seamless integration is fraught with systemic and practical barriers. These include historical professional hierarchies, role ambiguity, distinct documentation systems, inadequate interprofessional education, and reimbursement models that fail to incentivize collaborative, non-procedural care [10, 11]. Furthermore, the pressures of modern healthcare systems, with their emphasis on throughput and efficiency, often leave little time for the deep communication and co-planning that true integration requires.

Therefore, this research paper will argue that the intentional and structured integration of nursing and social work roles is not merely a beneficial enhancement but an essential component of effective, equitable, and humane chronic illness management. It will move beyond the theoretical acknowledgment of collaboration to explore the practical mechanisms, benefits, and challenges of making this integration a clinical reality.

Scope and Structure of the Paper

This paper will delve into the critical need for integrating nursing and social work in managing chronic illness. First, it will explore the distinct yet complementary roles of each profession, delineating their core competencies and philosophies. Second, it will provide a detailed analysis of the synergistic benefits of integration, supported by empirical evidence, and outline effective models for collaboration, such as embedded social workers in primary care clinics or interprofessional care teams. Third, it will confront the significant barriers that impede this integration, from systemic constraints to interpersonal challenges. Finally, the paper will propose a framework for overcoming these obstacles, offering recommendations for clinical practice, healthcare policy, interprofessional education, and future research. By synthesizing current literature and best practices, this paper aims to contribute to the evolving discourse on patient-centered care and provide a roadmap for forging a stronger, more unified front against the enduring challenge of chronic disease.

Nursing–Social Work Collaboration in Managing Chronic Illness:

The effective integration of nursing and social work in chronic illness management is not a matter of simple task coordination; it is a complex process that requires a robust theoretical foundation. Theory provides the essential "why" and "how," offering lenses through which professionals can understand their roles, anticipate challenges, and structure their collaborative efforts for maximum impact. Several interconnected theoretical frameworks are particularly salient in guiding and enriching this interdisciplinary partnership, moving it beyond ad hoc cooperation to a deliberate and synergistic model of care.

The Biopsychosocial Model, first articulated by Engel in 1977, serves as the fundamental bedrock for collaboration between nursing and social work [12]. This model posits that illness cannot be understood solely through its biological manifestations but must be viewed as an interplay between biological, psychological, and social factors. This philosophy is inherently interdisciplinary, creating a natural space for both professions to contribute their expertise. Nursing practice, with its deep focus on the biological (e.g., pathophysiology, medication management, symptom control) and the psychological (e.g., patient education, coping strategies, emotional support), addresses critical components of the model. Social work complements this by expertly managing the social domain, including family systems, economic stability, housing, access to resources, and community support networks [13]. The biopsychosocial model provides a shared language and a common patient-centered goal, ensuring that both professions are working from the same holistic map, even if they are navigating different territories within it.

Building upon this foundational model, the Person-In-Environment (PIE) theory, central to social work practice, offers a critical lens that expands the clinical view [14]. It asserts that an individual's behavior and well-being can only be understood in the context of their environment, including familial, cultural, economic, and political systems. This framework ensures that the collaborative effort does not myopically focus on the patient's internal biology or psychology while ignoring the external systems that profoundly influence health outcomes. For example, a nurse might be focused on a patient's non-adherence to a heart medication regimen. A social worker, guided by PIE theory, would investigate environmental factors such as an inability to afford the copay, illiteracy preventing understanding of instructions, or a lack of social support to encourage adherence. This theory forces the team to look outward, making their intervention more comprehensive and sustainable.

To actively structure the collaboration itself, Bronstein’s Model for Interdisciplinary Collaboration provides a practical, process-oriented framework [15]. This model outlines five key components necessary for successful collaboration: interdependence, newly created professional activities, flexibility, collective ownership of goals, and reflection on process. Interdependence recognizes that nurses and social workers need each other’s expertise to achieve the common goal of patient well-being. Newly created professional activities might include co-leading patient support groups or conducting joint home visits. Flexibility allows roles to blur slightly at the edges to meet patient needs most effectively. Collective ownership ensures both parties are invested in the overall care plan, not just their discrete tasks. Finally, reflection on the process encourages teams to continually assess and improve their collaborative relationship. This model moves from theory to practice, offering

a roadmap for building and maintaining an effective team.

Another crucial framework is the Chronic Care Model (CCM), developed to guide the reorganization of healthcare for chronic illness management [16]. The CCM identifies six essential elements for high-quality chronic illness care: the community, the health system, self-management support, delivery system design, decision support, and clinical information systems. Nursing and social work collaboration is vital to nearly every component. For instance, "self-management support" is a core nursing function, but it is profoundly enhanced by a social worker who can address barriers like stress or low health literacy. "Delivery system design" explicitly calls for the defined roles and teamwork that Bronstein's model describes. "Community resources" is a domain where social work expertise is paramount, but nurses must be aware of these resources to make appropriate referrals. The CCM provides a macro-level framework that justifies and necessitates the micro-level collaboration between nurses and social workers within a redesigned system.

Furthermore, Systems Theory offers a macro-perspective that is invaluable for this collaboration [17]. It views the patient not as an isolated individual but as part of multiple, overlapping systems—the family system, the healthcare system, the social services system, and the broader community system. Problems in any one system can create ripple effects that impact the patient's health. Nurses and social workers, together, are uniquely positioned to interface with all these systems. The nurse operates within the clinical microsystem of the hospital unit or clinic, while the social worker navigates the complex exosystem of community agencies and government support. By applying Systems Theory, they can better understand how a change in one system (e.g., a new insurance policy) affects another (e.g., a patient's access to medication) and develop coordinated strategies to buffer the patient from negative shocks and leverage positive resources.

Finally, the Theory of Self-Efficacy, developed by Bandura, is critical for understanding the shared goal of patient empowerment [18]. Both nurses and social workers aim to move patients from a passive recipient of care to an active manager of their own health. Self-efficacy—a person's belief in their capability to execute behaviors necessary to produce specific performance attainments—is a powerful predictor of success in chronic disease management. Nurses build self-efficacy through skill-building (e.g., teaching insulin injection techniques), while social workers build it by enhancing coping strategies, problem-solving skills, and connecting patients with peer support networks. This shared theoretical target ensures that both professions, though using different methods, are working towards the same ultimate outcome: a confident, capable, and autonomous patient.

Defining Nursing and Social Work Roles in Chronic Care:

Effective collaboration between nursing and social work in chronic illness management is predicated on a clear understanding of each profession's distinct yet complementary scope of practice. While their goals of patient-centered, holistic care are aligned, their pathways, methodologies, and primary points of intervention differ significantly. Clarifying these roles is not about erecting rigid boundaries but about creating a map of expertise that, when understood by both parties, prevents redundancy, minimizes role ambiguity, and allows for a more powerful and efficient integration of services. This delineation ensures that the patient receives the full benefit of both disciplines without critical gaps or unnecessary overlap in their care plan.

The nursing scope of practice in chronic care is fundamentally anchored in the clinical management of the disease process and its direct impact on the patient's physical and functional status. Rooted in a biopsychosocial framework, the nurse's role encompasses a wide array of hands-on and educational responsibilities. Key functions include comprehensive health assessment, symptom management, medication administration and education, titration of therapies based on clinical guidelines, wound care, and patient education on disease-specific self-management skills, such as blood glucose monitoring or inhaler technique [19]. Nurses act as crucial monitors of patient status, often serving as the first point of contact for recognizing exacerbations and coordinating with physicians to adjust medical plans. Furthermore, they provide essential psychosocial support by counseling patients on coping with illness, facilitating adjustment to new limitations, and educating family caregivers on clinical tasks [20]. The nurse's environment is often, though not exclusively, the clinic, hospital, or patient's home, with a focus on the biological and psychological manifestations of illness within that context.

In contrast, the social work scope of practice is oriented toward the social, structural, and systemic determinants of health that profoundly influence a patient's ability to manage their chronic condition. Social workers operate from a person-in-environment perspective, focusing on the external factors that can enable or impede health [21]. Their core functions include conducting psychosocial assessments to identify barriers like poverty, health

literacy, family dysfunction, or inadequate social support; providing therapeutic counseling and crisis intervention; navigating complex systems of care; and acting as a fierce patient advocate. A significant portion of their role involves brokering services, connecting patients with essential community resources such as financial assistance programs, transportation services, housing support, food banks, and support groups [22]. They are experts in navigating insurance complexities and facilitating advanced care planning. While nurses manage the clinical trajectory of the illness, social workers manage the social trajectory, ensuring the patient's environment is conducive to following the clinical plan.

The potential for overlap between the two professions most commonly occurs in the domain of psychosocial support and patient education, but the focus and depth of intervention differ. For instance, both a nurse and a social worker may assess for depression. The nurse may screen for it using a standardized tool, provide empathetic listening, and educate on how depression can affect blood sugar control, subsequently alerting the physician to the need for pharmacological intervention [23]. The social worker, however, would conduct a deep diagnostic assessment, provide ongoing evidence-based psychotherapy (e.g., Cognitive Behavioral Therapy), and address the underlying social causes contributing to the depression, such as job loss or isolation [24]. Similarly, both may educate on self-management. The nurse teaches the "how-to" skills (e.g., a diabetic foot exam), while the social worker addresses the behavioral and environmental "why-nots" (e.g., lack of motivation due to depression or inability to see one's feet due to obesity). This overlap is not inefficient; it is a critical handoff point that requires clear communication.

Formal and informal mechanisms are essential for defining these scopes within a collaborative team. Interprofessional education (IPE) is a foundational strategy, allowing nursing and social work students to learn about, from, and with each other, fostering mutual respect and understanding long before they enter practice [25]. In clinical settings, co-location in primary care or specialty clinics facilitates daily informal consultation, which naturally clarifies roles through repeated interaction. More formally, integrated care models utilize structured tools like standardized referral pathways, interprofessional care plans with explicitly defined responsibilities, and shared electronic health records that allow both professions to view and contribute to the patient's chart according to their expertise [26]. Regular interprofessional team meetings are perhaps the most crucial mechanism, providing a dedicated forum for case discussion, role negotiation, and collective decision-making, ensuring all voices are heard and expertise is utilized appropriately [27].

Despite these mechanisms, significant barriers to clear role definition persist. Historical professional hierarchies, often favoring medical models over psychosocial ones, can lead to the undervaluing of social work contributions [28]. Role ambiguity can create tension, such as when a nurse feels a social work referral is not acted upon quickly enough, or a social worker feels a nurse has overstepped by providing basic counseling for which they lack training [29]. Furthermore, the healthcare system itself often creates siloes through separate documentation systems, different departmental reporting structures, and disparate billing and reimbursement models that financially incentivize procedural care (nursing/medicine) while often neglecting counseling and care coordination (social work) [30]. These systemic barriers can artificially enforce separation and undermine collaborative intent.

Ultimately, the goal of defining scope of practice is not to create a rigid division of labor but to achieve role complementarity. This concept describes a synergistic relationship where the unique skills of each profession are leveraged to create a whole that is greater than the sum of its parts [31]. The nurse's deep understanding of the disease's pathophysiology informs the social worker's assessment of functional limitation and care needs. Conversely, the social worker's expertise in systemic barriers informs the nurse's patient education, making it more realistic and pragmatic. For a patient with heart failure, the nurse manages the diuretic therapy and teaches daily weight monitoring, while the social worker ensures the patient can afford the medications and has transportation to the clinic, and addresses the anxiety that causes fluid retention. One profession manages the illness; the other manages the life surrounding the illness.

Psychosocial Assessment and Holistic Care Planning in Managing Chronic Illness:

The management of chronic illness extends far beyond the regulation of physiological parameters; it is a deeply human experience intertwined with emotional, psychological, social, and existential challenges. A narrow focus on clinical metrics, while necessary, is insufficient for achieving optimal outcomes and ensuring patient well-being. Therefore, the integration of comprehensive psychosocial assessment and the subsequent development of a holistic care plan are not ancillary components of chronic care but are central to its effectiveness. This process, best executed through the collaborative efforts of nursing and social work,

ensures that the care plan addresses the whole person, not just the disease, thereby empowering patients and fostering resilience in the face of long-term health challenges.

A psychosocial assessment in the context of chronic illness is a systematic process of evaluating the multitude of non-medical factors that influence a patient's health, coping ability, and quality of life. It moves beyond the checklist to understand the patient's narrative—their strengths, their struggles, and their social world. Key domains typically explored include mental health status (e.g., screening for depression, anxiety, and adjustment disorders), health literacy and beliefs about illness, social support systems and family dynamics, economic stability and financial stressors (including ability to afford medications and healthy food), occupational status and impact of illness on work, cultural and spiritual beliefs that influence care decisions, and behavioral factors such as substance use or adherence patterns [32]. This assessment is not a one-time event but an ongoing process, as a patient's psychosocial context can shift dramatically with disease progression, life events, and treatment changes. The goal is to identify both barriers to effective self-management and assets—personal, familial, or communal—that can be leveraged to support the patient's journey.

The roles of nursing and social work in this assessment are distinct yet deeply complementary. Nurses often conduct initial and ongoing screenings as part of their holistic patient assessment, identifying emerging issues such as signs of depression during a clinic visit or noticing a patient's inability to recall a medication regimen due to overwhelming stress [33]. Their continuous contact with patients positions them to observe subtle changes in affect or coping over time. Social workers then typically perform a more in-depth, diagnostic-level psychosocial assessment. They are trained to delve into complex family systems, conduct formal mental health evaluations, perform sophisticated risk assessments (e.g., for suicide or elder abuse), and navigate the intricate details of a patient's financial and social circumstances [34]. This tandem approach ensures that red flags identified by the nurse are thoroughly investigated by the social worker, creating a seamless pipeline from identification to intervention.

The true value of the psychosocial assessment is realized only when its findings are translated into a holistic, integrated care plan. This plan moves beyond standard medical orders to create a living document that coordinates clinical, psychological, and social interventions. A robust holistic care plan is patient-centered, strengths-based, and developed collaboratively with the patient and their family. It outlines not only the medical management (e.g., target HbA1c, medication schedule) but also the strategies to address identified psychosocial barriers. For instance, a care plan for a patient with COPD might include the clinical directive for inhaler use and oxygen therapy (nursing/medical), alongside a referral to a financial aid program for oxygen concentrator costs (social work), enrollment in a pulmonary rehabilitation support group to address isolation (social work/nursing), and cognitive-behavioral techniques to manage anxiety-triggered dyspnea (social work) [35]. This integrated plan ensures all members of the interprofessional team, including the patient, are working from the same roadmap towards shared goals.

Effective collaboration is the engine that drives this process from assessment to planning to action. This requires intentional communication strategies and shared tools. Regular interprofessional team huddles or case conferences provide a formal structure for nurses and social workers to jointly review assessment findings, interpret their implications, and co-create the care plan [36]. The use of a shared electronic health record (EHR) is critical, allowing both professions to document their assessments and contributions in a place accessible to all, thus preventing fragmentation of care. Standardized screening tools embedded in the EHR, such as the PHQ-9 for depression or a simple social needs screening tool, can prompt systematic assessment and trigger automatic referrals to social work when thresholds are met [37]. This structured collaboration ensures that psychosocial data is not siloed but is actively integrated into the clinical decision-making process.

The impact of this holistic, collaboratively developed approach on patient outcomes is profound and well-documented. Care plans that address psychosocial barriers significantly improve medication adherence, as issues like cost, health literacy, and depression are actively mitigated [38]. By reducing these barriers, patients experience better control of chronic diseases, fewer acute exacerbations, and reduced hospital readmission rates [39]. Furthermore, addressing mental health and strengthening social support leads to measurable improvements in quality of life, self-efficacy, and patient satisfaction. Patients feel heard, understood, and empowered as active participants in their care, rather than passive recipients of medical instructions. This approach also enhances system efficiency by ensuring that the right professional addresses the right problem at the right time, reducing wasted effort and improving the cost-effectiveness of care [40].

Despite its clear benefits, the consistent implementation of psychosocial assessment and

holistic care planning faces significant challenges. Time constraints in fast-paced clinical environments often lead to the prioritization of urgent medical issues over essential psychosocial ones—a phenomenon sometimes referred to as "clinical inertia" for social needs [41]. Professionals may lack training in using screening tools or may feel ill-equipped to address the complex needs they uncover. Furthermore, a lack of readily available community resources can render even the most thorough assessment frustrating if there are no viable solutions to offer the patient. Reimbursement structures that do not adequately compensate for the time spent on care coordination and psychosocial intervention further disincentivize this critical work, making it vulnerable to budget cuts [42].

To overcome these barriers, a systemic commitment is required. This includes advocating for policy changes that value and reimburse holistic, team-based care. Embedding standardized psychosocial screening protocols into mandatory clinical workflows can help institutionalize the practice [43]. Investing in robust community partnerships ensures that identified needs can be met with concrete resources. Ultimately, fostering a cultural shift within healthcare organizations is paramount—one that genuinely values the psychosocial dimensions of health as equally critical to the biological ones. By championing the integrated model of nursing and social work collaboration in psychosocial care, the healthcare system can move closer to achieving truly person-centered, effective, and humane chronic illness management.

Nursing-Led and Social Work-Led Approaches:

The effective management of chronic illness requires a diverse arsenal of clinical interventions that address the multifaceted nature of long-term conditions. While collaboration is the overarching theme, nursing and social work each bring a unique set of evidence-based, profession-specific interventions to the care team. Understanding these distinct approaches is crucial for appreciating the full spectrum of support available to patients. Nursing-led interventions often focus on the interface between the disease process and the patient's body and behavior, while social work-led interventions focus on the interface between the patient and their environment, systems, and internal psyche. Together, they form a comprehensive continuum of care that stabilizes the medical condition while empowering the patient to navigate the world with their illness.

Nursing-led interventions are fundamentally grounded in the application of clinical knowledge to promote physiological stability, prevent complications, and educate the patient for self-management. A cornerstone of this approach is therapeutic patient education. Nurses employ principles of adult learning and motivational interviewing to teach complex self-care skills, such as insulin administration, anticoagulation management, wound care, and dietary modifications [44]. This is far more than simple instruction; it involves assessing readiness to learn, adapting education to health literacy levels, and building patient confidence. Another critical nursing intervention is symptom management and titration of care. Nurses are on the front lines of assessing and managing pain, fatigue, shortness of breath, and other distressing symptoms, often following standardized protocols to adjust medications or therapies within a prescribed scope [45]. They also provide direct care coordination, acting as a central hub to communicate with physicians, schedule follow-up appointments, and ensure smooth transitions between care settings. Through continuous health monitoring and assessment, nurses detect subtle changes in patient status, allowing for early intervention to prevent hospitalizations [46].

In contrast, social work-led interventions are designed to mitigate the social and structural determinants of health that pose barriers to well-being and adherence. A primary intervention is systematic case management and resource brokerage. Social workers conduct thorough assessments to identify needs and then actively connect patients with concrete resources, such as applications for disability benefits, pharmaceutical assistance programs, transportation services, housing assistance, and meal delivery programs [47]. This practical support is often the prerequisite that allows clinical interventions to succeed. Another profound contribution is the provision of psychotherapeutic support. Utilizing modalities such as Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT), Solution-Focused Brief Therapy (SFBT), and mindfulness-based interventions, social workers address the depression, anxiety, trauma, and adjustment disorders that frequently accompany chronic illness [48]. Furthermore, they facilitate advanced care planning, guiding patients and families through difficult conversations about goals of care, palliative options, and end-of-life wishes, ensuring that medical decisions align with patient values [49]. Advocacy—both for individual patients within complex systems and for policy changes that benefit populations—is a fundamental and defining social work intervention.

The power of these separate approaches is magnified exponentially when they are strategically integrated

through collaborative models. The Collaborative Care Model (CoCM) is a prime example of this synergy. In CoCM, a primary care physician, a nurse care manager, and a social worker (or psychiatric consultant) form a unified team. The nurse care manager provides ongoing monitoring of clinical metrics (e.g., blood pressure, depression scores via PHQ-9) and conducts follow-up calls for education and adherence support [50]. The social worker provides targeted psychotherapy for patients identified with comorbid mental health conditions and addresses social barriers that impede care. They review cases together in regular interprofessional team meetings, allowing for constant communication and adjustment of the care plan based on both clinical and psychosocial data [51]. This model demonstrates how nursing and social work interventions are not sequential but concurrent and interdependent, each informing and enhancing the other.

The effectiveness of these profession-specific interventions is measured through a range of tangible outcomes. Nursing-led interventions have been consistently shown to improve clinical indicators, such as reduced HbA1c in diabetics, improved blood pressure control, and decreased LDL cholesterol levels [52]. They are also strongly associated with a reduction in hospital readmissions and emergency department visits, as better education and monitoring prevent complications [53]. Social work-led interventions demonstrate robust outcomes in improving mental health scores, reducing patient-reported stress and anxiety, and enhancing overall health-related quality of life [54]. By addressing financial toxicity and connecting patients with resources, social work interventions directly improve medication adherence and reduce "cost-related non-adherence." Ultimately, the combined force of both sets of interventions leads to the highest level of achievement: improved patient self-efficacy. Patients feel equipped with the knowledge and skills to manage their condition (nursing) and empowered with the resources and emotional resilience to navigate their life circumstances (social work) [55].

Despite their proven efficacy, the implementation of these interventions faces significant barriers. Productivity models in healthcare often prioritize volume over value, making it difficult for nurses and social workers to allocate the necessary time for in-depth education or complex case management. Reimbursement structures remain a formidable obstacle, as many insurance plans do not adequately cover nursing-led care coordination or social work-provided psychotherapy in medical settings, making these services financially unsustainable for many organizations [56]. A lack of interprofessional training can lead to misunderstandings about each other's capabilities, resulting in under-referral or inappropriate referrals. Furthermore, the absence of integrated electronic health records can hinder communication, preventing each professional from seeing the full picture of the other's interventions and assessments.

To overcome these challenges and fully leverage the potential of nursing and social work interventions, a multi-faceted approach is required. Healthcare systems must shift towards value-based payment models that incentivize and reward the outcomes achieved through these interventions, such as improved patient satisfaction and reduced hospitalizations. Advocating for policy changes to expand reimbursement for these vital services is essential. Organizations must invest in interprofessional training that builds mutual respect and clarifies referral pathways. Finally, championing the use of shared care plans within integrated EHRs can ensure that the left hand always knows what the right hand is doing, creating a seamless and truly patient-centered experience where clinical and psychosocial interventions are woven together into a single, strong fabric of support.

Metrics for Clinical, Functional, and Quality-of-Life Impact in Chronic Illness Management:

The ultimate validation of any healthcare intervention, particularly in the complex domain of chronic illness management, lies in its ability to produce meaningful, measurable improvements in patient outcomes. For the integrated nursing and social work model, demonstrating this value requires moving beyond traditional, narrow metrics of success to a comprehensive outcomes framework that captures the full breadth of their impact. This framework must encompass clinical biomarkers, functional status, and health-related quality of life (HRQoL), providing a holistic picture of whether care is truly effective. Rigorous outcomes measurement is not merely an academic exercise; it is a critical tool for justifying resources, guiding clinical decision-making, demonstrating value to payers, and, most importantly, ensuring that care delivery is genuinely improving the lives of patients and their families.

The most established and widely used metrics are clinical outcomes, which provide objective, quantitative data on the biological control of a disease. These are often disease-specific and include biomarkers such as HbA1c levels for diabetes, blood pressure readings for hypertension, LDL cholesterol levels for cardiovascular disease, and forced expiratory volume (FEV1) for COPD [57]. For

nurses, whose interventions are heavily focused on physiological management, these metrics are direct indicators of the effectiveness of patient education, medication management, and symptom control strategies. Reductions in hospital admission rates, 30-day readmission rates, and emergency department visits are also key clinical outcome measures that reflect the success of both nursing and social work interventions in preventing complications and improving overall disease stability [58]. While crucial, these metrics alone offer an incomplete picture, as they do not capture how a patient feels or functions on a daily basis.

To understand the patient's lived experience, functional status outcomes must be measured. These metrics assess a patient's ability to perform activities necessary for daily living and independent functioning. Commonly used standardized tools include the Barthel Index for basic activities of daily living (ADLs) like bathing and dressing, and the Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (IADLs) scale for more complex tasks such as managing finances, taking medications correctly, and using transportation [59]. For a patient with chronic illness, improvement in functional status might mean regaining the ability to walk to the mailbox without shortness of breath or having the energy to prepare a meal. Nursing interventions aimed at energy conservation and symptom management directly target these outcomes. Similarly, a social worker's success in securing home health aid services or adaptive equipment is ultimately reflected in improved or maintained functional independence. Measuring these outcomes shifts the focus from whether a disease is controlled to whether the patient can live their life.

The most patient-centered domain of outcomes measurement is health-related quality of life (HRQoL). HRQoL is a multidimensional concept that encompasses physical, mental, emotional, and social functioning. It answers the question: "What is the impact of this illness and its treatment on the patient's overall well-being and life satisfaction?" Generic instruments like the SF-36 (Short Form 36) or EQ-5D (EuroQol 5 Dimensions) provide a broad assessment that allows for comparison across different disease states [60]. Disease-specific tools, such as the St. George's Respiratory Questionnaire for COPD or the FACT (Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy) scales, are tailored to the unique challenges of particular conditions [61]. Social work interventions, which target mental health, social support, and financial strain, are particularly potent drivers of improved HRQoL outcomes. A reduction in anxiety through therapy or the alleviation of financial toxicity through resource brokerage can dramatically improve a patient's sense of well-being, even if clinical biomarkers remain stable.

Critically, the integration of nursing and social work demands the measurement of interprofessional collaboration outcomes. These process metrics evaluate the effectiveness of the team itself and include measures such as rates of completed cross-disciplinary referrals, patient-reported experience of care coordination, and time from identification of a psychosocial need to intervention [62]. Tools like the Patient Assessment of Chronic Illness Care (PACIC) measure the extent to which patients perceive their care to be patient-centered, proactive, and collaborative—all hallmarks of a well-integrated team [63]. Furthermore, measuring provider satisfaction and perceived team efficacy is vital, as burnout and poor communication can undermine even the most well-designed clinical model.

Despite the clear necessity, significant challenges exist in implementing a robust outcomes measurement program. Clinical systems are often optimized for collecting biomedical data but lack integrated platforms for routinely capturing PROs and functional status data, leading to a data imbalance [64]. Resource constraints, both in time and technology, can make the administration and scoring of additional questionnaires burdensome for staff. There can also be a "measurement gap," where the outcomes most important to patients (e.g., dignity, hope, social connectedness) are difficult to quantify with standardized tools [65]. Without buy-in from leadership and a culture that values data-driven improvement, outcomes measurement can be perceived as an unfunded mandate rather than a core component of care.

To overcome these barriers, healthcare systems must strategically embed outcomes measurement into clinical workflow. This can be achieved by leveraging technology, such as patient portals that administer PRO questionnaires prior to visits, automatically score them, and present the data graphically in the electronic health record for easy interpretation by the care team [66]. Selecting a concise set of validated, relevant measures—a "core outcomes set"—for specific chronic conditions can prevent assessment fatigue. Most importantly, the data must be fed back to clinical teams in a timely and actionable manner. Regular interprofessional team meetings should review outcome trends, allowing nurses and social workers to see the impact of their interventions and adjust care plans accordingly in a continuous quality improvement cycle [67].

Barriers and Facilitators to Effective Role Integration:

The theoretical and empirical case for integrating nursing and social work roles in chronic illness management is compelling. However, the translation of this model from concept to consistent clinical practice is fraught with challenges. Success is not automatic; it is contingent upon successfully navigating a complex landscape of systemic, interpersonal, and practical barriers while simultaneously cultivating a supportive environment with key facilitators. A clear understanding of these opposing forces is essential for healthcare leaders, clinicians, and policymakers who seek to implement and sustain effective, collaborative care models that genuinely meet the multifaceted needs of chronically ill patients.

Systemic and Organizational Barriers pose the most significant obstacles to integration. The structure of the healthcare system itself often reinforces professional silos rather than breaking them down. A primary barrier is reimbursement and financing models. Fee-for-service payment structures traditionally incentivize procedural, face-to-face medical visits while offering little to no compensation for the critical care coordination, counseling, and case management provided by nurses and social workers [68]. This makes these roles appear as a cost center rather than a value-based investment, limiting their deployment and integration. Closely related is the problem of workload and productivity metrics. Nurses and social workers are often evaluated on volume-based metrics (e.g., number of patients seen, tasks completed) that do not account for the time-intensive nature of collaborative work, such as team meetings and complex care coordination, creating a disincentive for integration [69]. Furthermore, physical and technological separation is a common hurdle. When professions are housed in different departments, use distinct documentation systems within the electronic health record (EHR), or report through separate administrative hierarchies, the opportunity for spontaneous communication and shared care planning is drastically reduced [70].

Interprofessional and Relational Barriers can derail collaboration even when systemic conditions are favorable. Role ambiguity and territoriality emerge when teams have not explicitly defined their respective responsibilities, leading to confusion, duplicated efforts, or missed interventions. Nurses may feel social workers are not responding quickly enough to referrals, while social workers may perceive nurses as overstepping by providing basic counseling [71]. This is often compounded by historical hierarchies and power dynamics that privilege medical knowledge over psychosocial expertise, potentially leading to the marginalization of social work perspectives in team decision-making [72]. Finally, a simple lack of interprofessional education (IPE) means that many nurses and social workers enter practice having never trained together. They lack a foundational understanding of each other's competencies, values, and jargon, which can breed misunderstanding and impede the development of mutual respect and trust, the bedrock of any successful collaboration [73].

Despite these formidable challenges, a body of research and practice has identified powerful Facilitators of Integration that can overcome these barriers. At the organizational level, the most critical facilitator is the adoption of value-based payment models. Capitated payments, bundled payments, and accountable care organization (ACO) contracts create a financial imperative for preventing costly complications and hospitalizations, thereby incentivizing investment in the integrated nursing-social work team as a means to achieve these goals [74]. Structurally, co-**l**ocation is a simple yet profoundly effective strategy. Placing nurses and social workers in the same physical workspace, such as a primary care clinic, fosters informal "curbside" consultations and builds the relational bonds necessary for trust [75]. Equally important is the implementation of integrated EHR systems that allow for shared care plans, seamless messaging, and visibility into each other's assessments and notes, creating a single source of truth for the patient's care [76].

Intentional Interprofessional Processes are the active ingredients that make integration work. Regular interprofessional team meetings with structured agendas provide a dedicated forum for case review, role negotiation, and collective problem-solving, ensuring all voices are heard [77]. The formal adoption of collaborative care models, such as the Collaborative Care Model (CoCM), provides a ready-made framework with defined roles (e.g., care manager, psychiatric consultant), standardized processes (e.g., registry use, measurement-based care), and a evidence-based structure for collaboration [78]. Furthermore, investing in interprofessional education (IPE) at both the pre-licensure and continuing education levels is crucial for building a foundation of mutual understanding, breaking down stereotypes, and equipping future clinicians with the communication skills necessary for teamwork.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the integration of nursing and social work roles is not merely a beneficial adjunct to chronic illness management but an absolute

necessity for delivering care that is both effective and compassionate. This research has demonstrated that the complex, enduring nature of chronic conditions creates a web of interrelated challenges—clinical, psychological, social, and functional—that no single profession can address in isolation. The unique competencies of nurses in managing the biological and educational dimensions of disease, combined with the expertise of social workers in navigating environmental systems and mental health, create a powerful, holistic synergy. This partnership ensures that a patient's journey is supported not only through medical treatment but also through the alleviation of the social determinants and emotional burdens that so often dictate health outcomes.

The path to realizing this model, however, is fraught with obstacles. Deeply entrenched systemic barriers, from fee-for-service reimbursement that undervalues psychosocial care to technological siloes that impede communication, actively work against integration. Furthermore, achieving true collaboration requires overcoming historical hierarchies and fostering a culture of mutual respect and clearly defined, complementary roles. Yet, the evidence is clear: these challenges can be overcome through deliberate strategy. The adoption of value-based payment models creates a financial imperative for teamwork. Invest

Author Statements:

- **Ethical approval:** The conducted research is not related to either human or animal use.
- **Conflict of interest:** The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper
- **Acknowledgement:** The authors declare that they have nobody or no-company to acknowledge.
- **Author contributions:** The authors declare that they have equal right on this paper.
- **Funding information:** The authors declare that there is no funding to be acknowledged.
- **Data availability statement:** The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

References

[1] Ashcroft R., McMillan C., Ambrose-Miller W., McKee R., Brown J.B. (2018). The Emerging Role of Social Work in Primary Health Care: A Survey of Social Workers in Ontario Family Health Teams. *Health & Social Work* 43(2): 109–17. 10.1093/hsw/hly003.

[2] Dihn T., Bounajm F. (2013). Improving Primary Health Care through Collaboration: Measuring the Missed Opportunity *The Conference Board of Canada.*

[3] Hutchison B., Glazier R. (2013). Ontario's Primary Care Reforms Have Transformed the Local Care Landscape, But a Plan is Needed for Ongoing Improvement. *Health Affair* 32(4): 695–703. 10.1377/hlthaff.2012.1087.

[4] Kates N., Mazowita G., Lemire F., Jayabarathan A., Bland R., Selby P. et al. (2011). The Evolution of Collaborative Mental Health Care in Canada: A Shared Vision for the Future. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry* 56(5): 1–10.

[5] Beaulieu M.D., Haggerty J., Tousignant P., Barnsley J., Hogg W., Geneau R. et al. (2013). Characteristics of Primary Care Practices Associated with High Quality of Care. *CMAJ* 185(12): E590–96. 10.1503/cmaj.121802.

[6] Corrigan M.J., Krase K., Reed J.C. (2017). A Social Work Response to the Affordable Care Act: Prevention and Early Intervention. *Journal of Psychoactive Drug* 49(2): 169–73. 10.1080/02791072.2017.1295333.

[7] Ambrose-Miller W., Ashcroft R. (2016). Challenges Faced by Social Workers as Members of Collaborative Health Care Teams. *Health & Social Work* 41(2): 101–09. 10.1093/hsw/hlw006.

[8] Hutchison B., Levesque J.F., Strumpf E., Coyle N. (2011). Primary Health Care in Canada: Systems in Motion. *The Milbank Quarterly* 89(2): 256–88. 10.1111/j.1468-0009.2011.00628.x.

[9] Glazier R., Zagorski B., Rayner J. (2012), March. Comparison of Primary Care Models in Ontario by Demographics, Case Mix and Emergency Department Use, 2008/09 to 2009/10. *Institute for Clinical and Evaluative Sciences*.

[10] Ashcroft R. (2015). Ontario's Family Health Teams: Politics Within the Model. *Canadian Social Work Revie* 32(1-2): 117–32. 10.7202/1034146ar.

[11] Gocan S., Laplante M.A., Woodend K. (2014). Interprofessional Collaboration in Ontario's Family Health Teams: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Interprofessional Practice and Education* 3(3): 1–19. 10.22230/jripe.2014v3n3a131.

[12] Brown J.B., Ryan B. (2018). Processes that Influence the Evolution of Family Health Teams. *Canadian Family Physicia* 64(6): e283–e289.

[13] Collins P., Resendes S., Dunn J. (2014). The Untold Story: Examining Ontario's Community Health Centres' Initiatives to Address Upstream Determinants of Health. *Healthcare Policy* 10(1): 14–29. 10.12927/hcpol.2014.23977.

[14] Ezhumalai S., Muralidhar D., Dhanasekarapandian R., Nikketha B. (2018). Group Interventions. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry* 60(4): S514–21. 10.4103/psychiatry.IndianJPsychiatry_42_18.

[15] Collins D., Coleman H., Miller P. (2002). Regulation of Social Work. A Confusing Landscape.

Canadian Social Work Review/Revue canadienne de service social 19(2): 205–25.

[16] Kates N., Crustolo A.M., Farrar S., Nikolaou L. (2002). Counsellors in Primary Care: Benefits and Lessons Learned. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatr* 47(9): 857–62. 10.1177/070674370204700907.

[17] Corscadden L., Callander E., Topp S. (2019). Who Experiences Unmet Needs for Mental Health Services and What Other Barriers to Accessing Health Care Do They Face? Findings from Australia and Canada. *The International Journal of Health Planning and Management* 34(2): 761–72. 10.1002/hpm.2733.

[18] de Saxe Zerden L., Lombardi M., Fraser M., Jones A., Rico Y. (2018). Social Work: Integral to Interprofessional Education and Integrated Practice. *Journal of Interprofessional Education and Practice* 10: 67–75. 10.1016/j.xjep.2017.12.011.

[19] Hastings J.E.F. (1972). The Community Health Centre in Canada. *Information Canada*.

[20] Horevitz E., Manoleas P. (2013). Professional Competencies and Training Needs of Professional Social Workers in Integrated Behavioral Health in Primary Care. *Social Work in Health Car* 52(8): 752–87. 10.1080/00981389.2013.791362.

[21] Charles G., Barring C.V., Lake S. (2011). What's In It for Us? Making the Case for Interprofessional Field Education Experiences for Social Work Students. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work* 31(5): 579–93. 10.1080/08841233.2011.615265.

[22] Aggarwal M. (2009). Primary Care Reform: A Case Study of Ontario [doctoral dissertation].

[23] Hogg W., Rowan M., Russell G., Geneau R., Muldoon L. (2008). Framework for Primary Care Organizations: The Importance of a Structural Domain. *International Journal for Quality in Health Car* 20(5): 308–13. 10.1093/intqhc/mzm054.

[24] Corscadden L., Callander E., Topp S. (2019). Who Experiences Unmet Needs for Mental Health Services and What Other Barriers to Accessing Health Care Do They Face? Findings from Australia and Canada. *The International Journal of Health Planning and Management* 34(2): 761–72. 10.1002/hpm.2733.

[25] Ashcroft R., Kourgiantakis T., Fearing G., Robertson T., Brown J.B. (2019). Social Work's Scope of Practice in Primary Mental Health Care: A Scoping Review. *British Journal of Social Wor* 49(2): 318–34. 10.1093/bjsw/bcy051.

[26] Corrigan M.J., Krase K., Reed J.C. (2017). A Social Work Response to the Affordable Care Act: Prevention and Early Intervention. *Journal of Psychoactive Drug* 49(2): 169–73. 10.1080/02791072.2017.1295333.

[27] Beaulieu M.D., Haggerty J., Tousignant P., Barnsley J., Hogg W., Geneau R. et al. (2013). Characteristics of Primary Care Practices Associated with High Quality of Care. *CMAJ* 185(12): E590–96. 10.1503/cmaj.121802.

[28] Dihn T., Bounajm F. (2013). Improving Primary Health Care through Collaboration: Measuring the Missed Opportunity The Conference Board of Canada.

[29] Gocan S., Laplante M.A., Woodend K. (2014). Interprofessional Collaboration in Ontario's Family Health Teams: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Interprofessional Practice and Education* 3(3): 1–19. 10.22230/jripe.2014v3n3a131.

[30] Glazier R., Zagorski B., Rayner J. (2012), March. Comparison of Primary Care Models in Ontario by Demographics, Case Mix and Emergency Department Use, 2008/09 to 2009/10. *Institute for Clinical and Evaluative Sciences.*

[31] Bendowska A, Baum E. (2023). The significance of cooperation in interdisciplinary health care teams as perceived by Polish Medical Students. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 20(2):954. doi: 10.3390/ijerph20020954.

[32] Jiang WH, Zhang YA, Yan FH, Liu H, Gao R. (2020). Effectiveness of a nurse-led multidisciplinary self-management program for patients with coronary heart disease in communities: a randomized controlled trial. *Patient Educ Counsel.* 103(4):854–863. doi: 10.1016/j.pec.2019.11.001.

[33] Rosen MA, DiazGranados D, Dietz AS, et al., (2018). Teamwork in healthcare: key discoveries enabling safer, high-quality care. *Am Psychol*. 73(4):433–450. doi: 10.1037/amp0000298.

[34] Von Korff M, Gruman J, Schaefer J, Curry SJ, Wagner EH. (1997). Collaborative management of chronic illness. *Am Coll Physicians*. 127:1097–1102.

[35] Kaday R, Ratanajamit C. (2020). Inpatient self-administered medication under the supervision of a multidisciplinary team: a randomized, controlled, blinded parallel trial. *Pharm Pract*. 18(2):1–12. doi: 10.18549/PharmPract.2020.1.1686.

[36] Will KK, Johnson ML, Lamb G. (2019). Team-based care and patient satisfaction in the hospital setting: a systematic review. *J Patient-Centered Res Rev*. 6(2):158–171. doi: 10.17294/2330-0698.1695.

[37] Engle RL, Mohr DC, Holmes SK, et al. (2021). Evidence-based practice and patient-centered care: doing both well. *Health Care Manage Rev*. 46(3):174–184. doi: 10.1097/HMR.0000000000000254.

[38] Whitehead L, Palamara P, Babatunde-Sowole OO, et al. (2023). Nurses' experience of managing adults living with multimorbidity: a qualitative study. *J Adv Nurs.* 79(7):2514–2524. doi: 10.1111/jan.15600.

[39] Coleman K, Austin BT, Brach C, Wagner EH. (2009). Evidence on the chronic care model in the new millennium. *Health Affairs.* 28(1):75–85. doi: 10.1377/hlthaff.28.1.75.

[40] Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *Int J Surg*. 88:105906. doi: 10.1016/j.ijsu.2021.105906.

[41] Towfighi A, Cheng EM, Ayala-Rivera M, et al. (2021). Effect of a coordinated community and chronic care model team intervention vs usual care on systolic blood pressure in patients with stroke or transient ischemic attack. The SUCCEED randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Netw Open*.

4(2):e2036227. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.36227.

[42] Nieto-Martín MD, De la Higuera-Vila L, Bernabeu-Wittel M, et al. (2019). A multidisciplinary approach for patients with multiple chronic conditions: IMPACTO study. *Medicina clinica.* 153(3):93–99. doi: 10.1016/j.medcli.2019.01.014.

[43] Newlon JL, Clabaugh M, Plake KSI. (2021). Clinical impact of a pharmacist plus health coach chronic disease management program in a rural free clinic. *J Am Pharm Assoc.* 61(4):450–461. doi: 10.1016/j.japh.2021.02.011.

[44] Von Korff M, Tiemens B. (2000). Individualized stepped care of chronic illness. *West J Med*. 172(2):133–137. doi: 10.1136/ewjm.172.2.133.

[45] Tringale M, Stephen G, Boylan AM, Heneghan C. (2022). Integrating patient values and preferences in healthcare: a systematic review of qualitative evidence. *BMJ Open*. 12(11):e067268. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2022-067268.

[46] El-Awaisi A, Awaisu A, Aboelbaha S, Abedini Z, Johnson J, Al-Abdulla SA. (2021). Perspectives of healthcare professionals toward interprofessional collaboration in primary care settings in a Middle Eastern Country. *J Multidiscip Healthcare*. 14:363–379. doi: 10.2147/JMDH.S286960.

[47] Niederriter J, Hovland C, Hazelett S, et al. (2020). Using the Constructivist/Active Learning Theoretical Framework to develop and test a simulation-based interprofessional geriatric training curriculum. *J Interprof Educ Pract.* 19:100322. doi: 10.1016/j.xjep.2020.100322.

[48] David M, Alessandro L, Jennifer T, Douglas GA. (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *BMJ*. 339:b2535. doi: 10.1136/bmj.b2535.

[49] Moola S, Munn Z, Tufanaru C, et al. (2017). Chapter 7: systematic reviews of etiology and risk. *Joanna Briggs Institute Reviewer's Manual the Joanna Briggs Institute*. 5.

[50] Law B, Chhatwal PK, Licskai C, Scurr T, Sibbald SL. (2023). Patient engagement in interprofessional team-based chronic disease management: a qualitative description of a Canadian program. *Patient Educ Counsel.* 114:107836. doi: 10.1016/j.pec.2023.107836.

[51] Bendowska A, Baum E. (2023). The significance of cooperation in interdisciplinary health care teams as perceived by Polish Medical Students. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 20(2):954. doi: 10.3390/ijerph20020954.

[52] JBI. (2024). Critical appraisal tools. The Joanna Briggs Institute, Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, The University of Adelaide.

[53] Engle RL, Mohr DC, Holmes SK, et al. (2021). Evidence-based practice and patient-centered care: doing both well. *Health Care Manage Rev*. 46(3):174–184. doi: 10.1097/HMR.0000000000000254.

[54] Rosen MA, DiazGranados D, Dietz AS, et al. (2018). Teamwork in healthcare: key discoveries enabling safer, high-quality care. *Am Psychol*. 73(4):433–450. doi: 10.1037/amp0000298.

[55] Anderson E, Durstine JL. (2019). Physical activity, exercise, and chronic diseases: a brief review. *Sports Med Health Sci.* 1(1):3–10. doi: 10.1016/j.smhs.2019.08.006.

[56] Will KK, Johnson ML, Lamb G. (2019). Team-based care and patient satisfaction in the hospital setting: a systematic review. *J Patient-Centered Res Rev*. 6(2):158–171. doi: 10.17294/2330-0698.1695.

[57] Corbin J, Strauss A. (1985). Managing chronic illness at home: three lines of work. *Qual Sociol.* 8(3):224–47. 10.1007/BF00989485.

[58] Reed E, Corner J. (2015). Defining the illness trajectory of metastatic breast cancer. *BMJ Support Palliat Care.* 5(4):358–65. 10.1136/bmjspcare-2012-000415.

[59] Rolland JS. (1987). Chronic illness and the life cycle: a conceptual framework. *Fam Process*. 26(2):203–21. 10.1111/j.1545-5300.1987.00203.x.

[60] Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. (2007). Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *Int J Qual Health Care. 19*(6):349–57. 10.1093/intqhc/mzm042.

[61] Toniolo J, Ngoungou EB, Preux P-M, Beloni P. (2024). Role and knowledge of nurses in the management of non-communicable diseases in Africa: a scoping review. *PLoS One.* 19(4):e0297165. 10.1371/journal.pone.0297165.

[62] Corbin JM, Strauss A. (1988). Unending Work and Care: Managing Chronic Illness at Home. San Francisco, *CA: Jossey-bass.*

[63] Heitkemper MM, Dirksen SR, Lewis SM, Bucher L, Harding M. (2014). Medical-Surgical Nursing: Assessment and Management of Clinical Problems. 9th ed. St. Louis, MO: *Elsevier*. 61–4.

[64] Burton CR. (2000). Re-thinking stroke rehabilitation: the Corbin and Strauss chronic illness trajectory framework. *J Adv Nurs*. 32(3):595–602. 10.1046/j.1365-2648.2000.01517.x.

[65] Hodes R. (1997). Cross-cultural medicine and diverse health beliefs. Ethiopians abroad. *West J Med*. 166(1):29–36.

[66] Craig H, Edwards J. (1983). Adaptation in chronic illness: an eclectic model for nurses. *J Adv Nurs.* 8(5):397–404. 10.1111/j.1365-2648.1983.tb00463.x.

[67] Nolte E, Knai C, Saltman R. (2014). Assessing chronic disease management in European health systems. In: Nolte E, Knai C, Saltman RB, editors. Concepts and Approaches. Copenhagen: *European Observatory on Health Systems and Policies*; 1–97.

[68] Tang X, Sun H, Ge S, Han S, Li Y, Wu B. (2023). Experiences and needs of older adults at different stages of cerebral infarction based on trajectory theory—a qualitative study. *Nurs Open*. 10(3):1482–91. 10.1002/nop2.1398.

[69] Melnyk BM, Fineout-Overholt E. (2022). Evidence-Based Practice in Nursing & Healthcare: A Guide to Best Practice. Philadelphia, PA: *Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.*

[70] Atinafu D, Getaneh G, Setotaw G. (2024). Assessment of patient safety culture and associated factors among healthcare professionals in public hospitals of Bahir Dar city, northwest Ethiopia: a mixed-methods study. *PLoS One*. 19(11):e0313321. 10.1371/journal.pone.0313321.

[71] World Health Organization. (2018). Noncommunicable diseases country profiles 2018.

[72] Gaskin CJ, Ockerby CM, Smith TR, Russell V, O'Connell B. (2012). The challenges acute care nurse unit managers face and the strategies they use to address them: perceptions of directors of nursing and nurse unit managers. *J Manag Organ*. 18(5):625–40. 10.5172/jmo.2012.18.5.625.

[73] Pender NJ, Murdaugh CL, Parsons MA. (2006). Health Promotion in Nursing Practice. London: Pearson Education.

[74] Ahmed SK. (2024). The pillars of trustworthiness in qualitative research. *J Med Surg Public Health*. 2:100

[75] Steketee G., Ross A.M., Wachman M.K. (2017). Health Outcomes and Costs of Social Work Services: A Systematic Review. *American Journal of Public Health* 107(S3): S256–66. 10.2105/AJPH.2017.304004.

[76] Van Hook M. (2003). Psychosocial Issues Within Primary Health Care Settings: Challenges and Opportunities for Social Work Practice. *Social Work in Health Care* 38(1): 63–80. 10.1300/J010v38n01_04.

[77] Soklaridis S., Oandasan I., Kimpton S. (2007). Family Health Teams: Can Health Professionals Learn to Work Together? *Canadian Family Physician* 53(7): 1198–99.

[78] Reckrey J.M., Gettenberg G., Ross H., Kopke V., Soriano T., Ornstein K. (2014). The Critical Role of Social Workers in Home Based Primary Care. *Social Work Health Care* 53(4): 330–43. 10.1080/00981389.2014.884041.