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

Vol. 10-No.4 (2024) pp. 2590-2599
http://www.ijcesen.com

ISSN: 2149-9144

Research Article

Collaboration Between Clinical Physicians and Public Health Teams in Managing Infectious Disease Outbreaks

Mohammed Ahmed Al-Anzi[1]*, Sarah Bader Alenazi[2], Khaled Ali A Azeb[3], Alaa Ahmad Aljabbab[4], Bader Awwadh Aloufi[5], Sukaina Aljeelani Mohammed Fal[6], Alziyaidi Hassan Mohammed Z[7], Abdulrahman Rehan Saad Alyami[8], Alqahtani Mesfer Abdullah A[9], Ahmed Yahya Ahmed AlAqil[10], Faisal Ali M Alshammari[11]

[1]Family Medicine Consultant, Maternity and Children Hospital, Arar, Northern Borders Region, Saudi Arabia,
* **Corresponding Author Email:** Malanazi152@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5007-7850

[2]Family Medicine Specialist, Primary Health Care Centers, Arar, Northern Borders Region, Saudi Arabia,
Email: dr.sarahalsuwaylimi999@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5907-7850

[3]General Physician, Community Health Department, Al-Quwayiyah General Hospital, First Riyadh Health Cluster, Al-Quwayiyah, Riyadh Region, Saudi Arabia,
Email: Khaledazeb1@gmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5807-7850

[4]General Physician, Northern Borders Health Cluster, Arar, Northern Borders Region, Saudi Arabia,
Email: Dr.alaa1411@gmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5707-7850

[5]Public Health Specialist, Al-Miqat General Hospital, Madinah Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Madinah, Madinah Region, Saudi Arabia,
Email: badr05565@hotmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5607-7850

[6]Nursing Specialist, Public Health Department, Madinah Health Cluster, Madinah, Madinah Region, Saudi Arabia,
Email: falsukina@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5507-7850

[7]Public Health Technician, Ministry of Health Branch, Abha, Aseer Region, Saudi Arabia,
Email: hassanzaid011@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5407-7850

[8]Epidemiology Technician, Preventive Medicine Department, Dammam, Eastern Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: Alyami91192@gmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5307-7850

[9]Public Health Epidemiologist, Ministry of Health, Riyadh, Riyadh Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: maaqmaaq1415@gmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5207-7850

[10]Public Health – Epidemiology Specialist, Preventive Medicine Department, Dammam, Eastern Region, Saudi Arabia,
Email: homtt234@gmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5007-7850

[11]General Practitioner (Resident Physician), Hafar Al-Batin Central Hospital, Hafar Al-Batin, Eastern Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: Falshammari75@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5107-7850

Article Info:

DOI: 10.22399/ijcesen.4093
Received : 10 June 2024
Accepted : 29 July 2024

Keywords

Collaboration,
Clinical Physicians,
Public Health Teams,
Infectious Disease Outbreaks,
Early Detection,
Surveillance

Abstract:

Effective management of infectious disease outbreaks requires seamless collaboration between clinical physicians and public health teams. Clinical physicians play a crucial role in the early detection and diagnosis of infectious diseases, serving as the front-line responders who interact directly with patients. Their observations and clinical data are vital for identifying emerging health threats. By sharing patient information and outbreak patterns with public health teams, clinical physicians can help ensure that public health surveillance systems are alert to new developments. In turn, public health teams provide clinicians with essential guidance and resources, including treatment protocols, vaccination campaigns, and public health advisories, thus creating a two-way communication system vital for timely and effective response strategies. Furthermore, collaboration between these two entities is essential for implementing preventive measures and crafting community-wide interventions. Public health teams rely on data

from clinical physicians to establish epidemiological trends and assess the impact of outbreaks on the healthcare system. This collaboration also enables targeted educational efforts aimed at healthcare providers and the public, promoting best practices for infection control and prevention. Additionally, joint training sessions and emergency preparedness drills can arm both clinical physicians and public health officials with the tools needed to respond swiftly and effectively to outbreaks. The synergy between clinical practice and public health not only enhances the immediate response but also contributes to long-term strategies that build resilience against future infectious disease threats.

1. Introduction

The landscape of global health in the 21st century is perpetually shaped by the threat of infectious disease outbreaks. From the sudden, explosive emergence of novel pathogens like SARS-CoV-2 to the persistent, smoldering challenges of tuberculosis, malaria, and seasonal influenza, these events test the resilience of health systems worldwide. The COVID-19 pandemic, which has resulted in over **775 million confirmed cases and approximately 7 million deaths globally** as reported by the World Health Organization (WHO) in mid-2024, serves as a stark and sobering testament to the devastating potential of infectious diseases [1].

Historically, the relationship between these two domains has been characterized by a "siloed" approach, with limited communication and a lack of integrated systems. This disconnect has proven costly. For instance, during the 2014-2016 Ebola outbreak in West Africa, initial delays in case reporting from clinical settings to public health authorities significantly accelerated transmission chains, contributing to over 28,000 cases and 11,000 deaths [2]. Similarly, the early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic highlighted challenges in data sharing; clinicians were overwhelmed with patients while public health agencies struggled to obtain real-time, structured clinical data to model the pandemic's trajectory and allocate resources efficiently [3].

The necessity for collaboration is not merely theoretical but is quantitatively demonstrated by successful interventions. A study of the 2015 MERS-CoV outbreak in South Korea found that hospitals that established integrated response teams, comprising both clinicians and public health officials, reduced the time from symptom onset to isolation by 40% compared to those operating in silos [4]. Furthermore, the global effort to combat HIV/AIDS has shown remarkable success where clinical care and public health strategies have converged. The "Treatment as Prevention" (TasP) model, a clinical strategy, is also a core public health intervention. UNAIDS reports that as of 2023, **29.8 million of the 39 million people living with HIV were accessing antiretroviral therapy**, a achievement made possible by robust public health programs for testing, linkage to care, and adherence support, working hand-in-hand with clinical providers [5].

The collaboration manifests across several critical domains. First, in **surveillance and data sharing**, clinicians report notifiable diseases, while public health provides analytics and trend interpretation, enabling a feedback loop that informs both clinical practice and community guidance. The integration of Electronic Health Records (EHRs) with public health registries is a pivotal step in this process [6]. Second, in **outbreak investigation and containment**, clinicians identify and treat cases, while public health teams perform contact tracing, quarantine monitoring, and community-level interventions to break chains of transmission. Third, in **communication and messaging**, consistent, evidence-based information from a unified front—combining the trusted voice of the clinician with the authoritative platform of public health—is essential for combating misinformation and ensuring public adherence to control measures [7].

Despite its proven benefits, this collaboration faces persistent barriers. These include a lack of shared information technology systems, jurisdictional complexities, competing priorities (acute care vs. preventive care), and cultural differences between the rapid-response, individual-focused clinical world and the methodical, population-focused public health sphere [8]. The chronic underfunding of public health infrastructure, particularly in non-crisis times, further exacerbates these challenges [9].

The recent Mpox (formerly monkeypox) outbreak in 2022 demonstrated both the progress made and the remaining gaps. In many countries, rapid information sharing between sexual health clinics (clinical) and national public health institutes allowed for swift characterization of the outbreak and targeted vaccination campaigns [10]. However, disparities in access to diagnostics and vaccines between high-income and low-income countries revealed enduring inequities that require a globally collaborative approach [11, 12].

2. Why Collaboration is Non-Negotiable in Modern Outbreak Response

The limitations of a siloed system were catastrophically exposed during the early phases of the COVID-19 pandemic. Clinical physicians in hospital emergency departments and intensive care units found themselves on the defensive, overwhelmed by a surge of patients with a poorly understood illness. They were tasked with providing individual patient care without the broader, population-level context needed to protect themselves, manage resources, and anticipate patient needs. A study of frontline clinicians in New York City during the first wave revealed that over 80% reported a critical lack of timely information from public health authorities regarding testing criteria, transmission dynamics, and evolving clinical management guidelines [13]. This information gap led to delays in isolation, inadequate personal protective equipment (PPE) protocols, and accelerated nosocomial transmission, effectively turning healthcare facilities into amplification points for the virus.

Concurrently, public health teams were operating with a profound data deficit. While clinicians were collecting vital real-world data on patient demographics, symptom profiles, comorbidities, and outcomes, this information was often trapped within individual hospital electronic health records (EHRs), inaccessible to the epidemiologists modeling the pandemic's trajectory. Public health agencies relied on lagging indicators, such as mortality data and aggregated case counts, which provided a picture of the outbreak that was days or weeks old. This lack of integrated, real-time data hampered their ability to provide accurate forecasts, target containment measures effectively, and offer evidence-based guidance back to the clinical community. The Director-General of the World Health Organization, Dr. Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, repeatedly emphasized the need for "solidarity and sharing" of data and resources as the cornerstone of an effective response, a call that highlighted the global scale of this collaborative failure [14].

The consequences of this disconnect are quantifiable, extending beyond the immediate tragedy of patient lives lost. A retrospective analysis estimated that even a one-week earlier implementation of non-pharmaceutical interventions (e.g., social distancing, mask mandates) in the United States could have reduced mortality in the first wave by over 50% [15]. This delay was not merely a political failure but also a systemic one, rooted in the inability to rapidly synthesize clinical observations into decisive public health action. The economic toll, estimated to be in the trillions of dollars globally, further underscores that the cost of inaction and disunity far exceeds the investment required to build integrated, resilient health systems [16].

However, the imperative for collaboration is not solely a lesson learned from failure; it is a principle validated by success. The global eradication of smallpox stands as a historic testament to the power of a unified approach. The strategy, famously described as "surveillance and containment," relied entirely on the seamless interplay between clinical and public health functions. Clinicians were trained to recognize and diagnose smallpox cases, acting as the sensitive surveillance network. Once a case was identified, public health teams would swiftly move in to conduct ring vaccination, isolating cases and vaccinating all potential contacts in the surrounding community. This coordinated effort, which targeted resources with precision based on clinical intelligence, was what ultimately succeeded where mass vaccination alone had not [17].

In the modern context, the management of the HIV/AIDS epidemic provides a powerful, ongoing example. The "Treatment as Prevention" (TasP) model is a quintessential clinical-public health intervention. From the clinical side, providing antiretroviral therapy (ART) to people living with HIV suppresses their viral load, restoring their health and preventing progression to AIDS. From the public health perspective, this viral suppression simultaneously eliminates the risk of sexual transmission, turning a clinical treatment into a powerful population-level prevention tool. The success of this strategy is entirely dependent on collaboration: public health programs facilitate widespread testing and linkage to care, while clinicians provide the continuous treatment and monitoring that makes prevention possible. UNAIDS credits this synergistic approach as a cornerstone of the global effort to end the AIDS epidemic by 2030 [18].

Furthermore, the threat landscape itself is evolving in ways that demand a collaborative response. Zoonotic spillover events, where pathogens jump from animals to humans, are increasing due to deforestation, climate change, and agricultural intensification. The emergence of diseases like Nipah virus, Avian Influenza (H5N1), and novel coronaviruses requires a "One Health" approach, which integrates human medicine, veterinary medicine, and environmental science. Within this framework, the clinical-public health partnership is the essential human health component. Clinicians, particularly those in rural or hotspot areas, are the sentinels who may identify the first cryptic cases of a novel illness. Their immediate reporting to public

health authorities triggers a rapid investigative response that can include animal tracing and environmental sampling, potentially containing an outbreak at its source before it achieves pandemic potential [19].

In conclusion, the complexity, scale, and velocity of modern infectious disease outbreaks have rendered the historical divide between clinical medicine and public health untenable. The clinical realm provides the critical, ground-truthed data and executes individual patient care, while the public health realm provides the analytical framework, strategic direction, and population-wide interventions. One cannot function optimally without the other. As the World Health Organization's International Health Regulations (IHR) emphasize, core capacity requirements for outbreak response are inherently collaborative, mandating strong linkages between healthcare facilities and national public health institutes [20]. Therefore, investing in and formalizing this collaboration is not a matter of choice but a fundamental prerequisite for national and global health security in an era of perpetual biological threats.

3. The Distinct and Complementary Roles of Clinical Medicine and Public Health

However, the clinical scope has inherent limitations in the context of a population-wide crisis. The physician's mandate is to provide the best possible care for the individual in their immediate care, which can sometimes appear to conflict with public health priorities. For instance, during the COVID-19 pandemic, the principle of "first do no harm" was intensely focused on the individual patient, making it challenging to rapidly adopt policies like restricting family visits or re-using PPE, which were deemed necessary for the greater public good. Furthermore, the clinical data generated—detailed patient narratives, lab results, and imaging studies—is rich but often unstructured and locked within proprietary Electronic Health Record (EHR) systems. Without a streamlined mechanism for aggregation and analysis, this "ground truth" data remains an untapped resource for understanding the broader outbreak. A clinician's success is measured in patient outcomes—lives saved, illnesses cured—and their time is a scarce resource dedicated to direct patient care, leaving little capacity for data reporting or population-level analysis [21].

Public health operates on a macroscopic scale. Its core functions, as defined by the Institute of Medicine, are assessment, policy development, and assurance. In practice, this translates to systematic data collection and surveillance to identify health trends (assessment), creating evidence-based recommendations and policies to promote health (policy development), and ensuring that essential health services are available to the entire population (assurance) [22]. The public health professional is concerned with rates, proportions, and trends. Their "patients" are neighborhoods, cities, and nations.

During an outbreak, the public health apparatus swings into action with a population-level toolkit. Key activities include:

- **Epidemiological Surveillance:** Tracking the spread of the disease, identifying hotspots, and analyzing transmission patterns.
- **Contact Tracing:** Identifying and monitoring individuals exposed to a confirmed case to break chains of transmission.
- **Health Communication:** Developing and disseminating clear, consistent messages to inform the public, combat misinformation, and promote protective behaviors.
- **Policy and Strategy:** Recommending or mandating interventions such as quarantine, isolation, social distancing, and vaccination campaigns.
- **Laboratory Coordination:** Ensuring widespread and efficient diagnostic testing capacity and monitoring for pathogen evolution.

The strength of public health is its breadth, but its limitation is its distance from the individual patient experience. Public health guidelines are necessarily generalized to be applicable to large populations. A recommendation for a 10-day isolation period is based on population-level data on viral shedding, but it may not account for the unique socio-economic circumstances of an individual who cannot miss work or a single parent unable to isolate from their children. This gap between policy and practical reality can only be bridged through input from clinicians who understand these on-the-ground challenges. Furthermore, public health agencies are often chronically underfunded and operate in the background, making it difficult to rapidly scale up capacity during a crisis and leading to slow, overburdened responses that frustrate frontline clinicians expecting immediate support [23].

The true power of an effective health system is revealed at the intersection of these two domains. This is not a handoff, but a continuous, dynamic feedback loop. The process can be visualized as a cycle:

1. **Signal Detection:** A clinician diagnoses a notifiable disease or detects an unusual case and reports it to public health

authorities. This is the spark that ignites the public health response [24].

2. **Analysis and Strategy:** Public health teams aggregate reports from multiple clinicians, analyze the data to understand the outbreak's scope and characteristics, and develop evidence-based control strategies and clinical guidance.
3. **Feedback and Implementation:** This refined guidance is communicated back to clinicians, informing their diagnostic criteria, treatment protocols, and infection control practices. The clinician then implements this guidance while continuing to care for patients.
4. **Ground-Truthing and Refinement:** Clinicians provide feedback to public health on the practicality and effectiveness of the guidance, report on new clinical manifestations, and continue to submit data, thus closing the loop and allowing for the continuous refinement of the public health response.

A failure at any point in this cycle can be catastrophic. If clinicians fail to report, the outbreak remains invisible. If public health fails to analyze and provide timely feedback, clinicians are left working in the dark. If communication is poor, guidelines are misunderstood or ignored. The H1N1 influenza pandemic of 2009 demonstrated a successful feedback loop. Initial reports from clinicians in Mexico and the United States about a novel influenza virus triggered a global public health response. Genetic sequencing and rapid risk assessment by public health labs allowed for the swift development of a vaccine, and clinical data on the virus's severity, which was initially feared to be high, was continuously fed back to public health agencies, allowing them to calibrate their messaging and response appropriately, ultimately avoiding the worst-case scenarios [25].

Conversely, the collaboration is not just about communicable diseases. The rise of antimicrobial resistance (AMR) is a slow-moving pandemic that perfectly illustrates the need for this partnership. The clinician is responsible for antimicrobial stewardship at the bedside—prescribing the right antibiotic, at the right dose, for the right duration. Public health is responsible for surveillance of resistance patterns across hospitals, regions, and countries, and for implementing infection prevention and control programs to limit the spread of resistant organisms. A study in the *Lancet Infectious Diseases* showed that hospitals with strong, formalized collaborations between clinical antimicrobial stewardship programs and public health departments saw a 25% greater reduction in targeted multidrug-resistant infections compared to those operating independently [26]. This demonstrates that the synergy between the individual-focused clinician and the population-focused public health professional is the bedrock of an effective defense against the most pressing health threats of our time.

4. Synergy in Action:

Surveillance is the cornerstone of public health action, providing the eyes and ears for detecting threats and monitoring their course. Traditionally, this has relied on passive reporting, where clinicians and laboratories complete standardized forms for notifiable diseases and send them to public health departments. This system, while foundational, is often slow, incomplete, and burdensome on frontline healthcare workers. The digital era demands a shift towards **integrated, electronic, and real-time surveillance** that forms the central nervous system of the collaborative response.

The vision for this pillar is a seamless, bidirectional flow of data. On one front, clinical data from Electronic Health Records (EHRs)—including chief complaints, laboratory orders and results, vital signs, and diagnosis codes—can be automatically and securely fed into public health data repositories. The adoption of Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources (FHIR) standards is a critical enabler of this process, allowing disparate systems to "speak" to one another [31]. For example, during the COVID-19 pandemic, the HHS Protect system in the United States attempted to aggregate hospital capacity, ventilator usage, and PPE supply data from thousands of facilities. While challenging, this effort highlighted the potential of near-real-time data to guide federal resource allocation and policy decisions [32].

The second, equally crucial flow is from public health back to the clinician. Processed and analyzed surveillance data must be returned to the frontline in the form of actionable intelligence. This includes interactive dashboards showing local transmission rates, alerts about new variants of concern circulating in the community, and updated guidelines on testing and treatment. A study of a health system in Utah demonstrated that when clinicians were given access to a localized, real-time dashboard of community COVID-19 prevalence, their testing behaviors became more targeted, and they reported feeling more informed and empowered in patient consultations [33]. This transforms the clinician from a passive data reporter into an active, informed participant in the public health mission. Furthermore, this integrated data

ecosystem is vital for syndromic surveillance, where a sudden increase in emergency department visits for influenza-like illness can signal an outbreak days before confirmed laboratory results are available, enabling a swifter public health response [34].

When a signal is detected, the response must be swift, coordinated, and field-based. The second pillar of collaboration involves the formation of **multidisciplinary outbreak investigation and containment teams** that include both clinical and public health personnel. These teams operate as the "boots on the ground," bridging the gap between the hospital ward and the community.

The process begins the moment a clinician diagnoses or suspects a high-consequence infectious disease. Immediate notification of public health triggers the deployment of a joint team. The clinical members, often infection preventionists or infectious disease physicians, provide invaluable expertise on the case's clinical presentation, infection control needs within the healthcare facility, and the patient's movements and contacts while symptomatic in the hospital. The public health members, typically epidemiologists and public health nurses, lead the epidemiological investigation, conducting in-depth interviews with the case to identify contacts in the community, assessing exposure risks, and implementing quarantine or isolation orders.

The 2015 MERS-CoV outbreak in South Korea provides a powerful case study of this pillar's effectiveness. The outbreak was largely driven by transmission within healthcare facilities. Analysis revealed that hospitals that quickly established integrated command structures, with clear lines of communication and shared decision-making between hospital clinicians and public health officials, were significantly more successful at containing the virus. They achieved faster patient isolation, more comprehensive contact tracing of both patients and hospital staff, and stricter enforcement of infection control protocols, ultimately reducing the secondary attack rate within their institutions [35]. This model of "Hospital Incident Command System (HICS)" integrated with public health authority is now considered a gold standard for managing healthcare-associated outbreaks.

Beyond acute investigation, this pillar also encompasses long-term containment strategies like vaccination campaigns. Here, clinicians (primary care physicians, pharmacists, nurses) are the primary administrators of vaccines, possessing the trust and skills to deliver clinical care. Public health agencies are the strategic planners, managing vaccine supply chains, identifying priority populations, setting up mass vaccination sites, and monitoring coverage rates. The successful rollout of COVID-19 vaccines, despite its challenges, demonstrated this synergy: public health set the strategy and supplied the tools, while clinical partners executed the mission at an unprecedented scale [36].

In an outbreak, information is a critical countermeasure, and misinformation is a parallel contagion. The third pillar, therefore, is the delivery of a **clear, consistent, and credible message** to the public, policymakers, and the media. Divergent messages from clinical and public health leaders create confusion, erode public trust, and undermine adherence to control measures.

The trust dynamic is key here. Surveys, such as those conducted by the Pew Research Center, consistently show that the public places high trust in their personal physicians and nurses [37]. This trust is personal and rooted in a fiduciary relationship. Public health agencies, on the other hand, hold trust based on their perceived authority, expertise, and commitment to the collective good. A unified messaging strategy leverages both forms of trust. When a national public health agency like the CDC issues a recommendation, and it is echoed and explained by local doctors in their clinics and on social media, the message is powerfully reinforced.

The consequences of disunity were starkly evident during the COVID-19 pandemic. Early confusion and occasional contradictions regarding mask-wearing and surface transmission between various authorities created a vacuum filled by misinformation, leading to public skepticism and polarization [38]. In contrast, successful communication campaigns have relied on "messenger alignment." For instance, during the H1N1 pandemic, many localities established joint press briefings featuring both the state epidemiologist and the president of the state medical society. This presented a united front, where the scientific rationale from public health was complemented by the practical, patient-centered interpretation from the clinical leader [39].

This pillar also involves proactive listening. Clinicians serve as a vital feedback channel to public health, relaying the questions, concerns, and misconceptions they hear from their patients. This allows public health communicators to refine their messaging, address specific fears, and produce more effective educational materials. A study on vaccine hesitancy found that public health campaigns designed with direct input from frontline pediatricians were 40% more effective at increasing vaccination intent in hesitant parents than campaigns developed without such input [40]. This

demonstrates that effective communication is not a one-way broadcast from authorities to the public, but a dynamic, collaborative dialogue facilitated by the unique positions of both clinical and public health partners.

5. Lessons from the Frontlines: Case Studies of Success and Failure

The Ebola virus disease outbreak in West Africa stands as a harrowing example of a virtually complete breakdown in the clinical-public health interface, leading to over 28,000 cases and 11,000 deaths. The failure was not merely a lack of resources but a fundamental disconnect at every level. Clinically, the early presentation of Ebola—fever, fatigue, muscle pain—mimics more common diseases like malaria and typhoid. Without a high index of suspicion and effective communication from public health about a potential outbreak, clinicians were not primed to recognize the threat. Consequently, patients were not isolated, leading to rampant nosocomial transmission that effectively decimated the healthcare workforce in some areas. Hospitals became epicenters of transmission rather than centers of containment [41].

From the public health perspective, surveillance systems in Guinea, Liberia, and Sierra Leone were weak and fragmented. There was no mechanism for the timely flow of clinical suspicion from frontline health workers to national and international public health authorities. This led to a critical delay of several months between the first suspected cases and the declaration of a public health emergency of international concern (PHEIC) by the WHO. Once the scale was recognized, the lack of pre-established trust and communication channels between international responders, national governments, and local clinicians created chaos. Public health messages about safe burial practices, for instance, were often developed without sufficient cultural context provided by local community health workers, leading to resistance and further spread [42]. The turnaround time for diagnostic tests was agonizingly slow, leaving clinicians to manage patients without confirmation for days, occupying scarce beds and consuming limited PPE. The epidemic was ultimately controlled only after a massive influx of resources was used to build a collaborative infrastructure, including dedicated Ebola Treatment Units (clinician-led) tightly linked to contact tracing teams (public health-led) [43].

South Korea's experience with Middle East Respiratory Syndrome (MERS) in 2015 is a powerful case study in how a collaborative failure can catalyze profound systemic reform. The MERS outbreak, which resulted in 186 cases and 38 deaths, was primarily driven by superspreading events in large hospitals. The response was hampered by a lack of transparency; the government was initially reluctant to disclose the names of affected hospitals, preventing both public vigilance and inter-hospital coordination. Clinicians were left to manage a novel pathogen with inadequate information and protection. The public health response was criticized as slow and opaque, eroding public trust [44].

This failure became a watershed moment. The South Korean government undertook a comprehensive overhaul of its outbreak response systems, culminating in the creation of a robust framework that was later tested by COVID-19. Key reforms focused directly on strengthening clinical-public health collaboration. These included:

- **Legal Amendments:** New laws granted the Korea Disease Control and Prevention Agency (KDCA) sweeping authority to access data from hospital EHRs, GPS tracking, and credit card transactions for contact tracing.
- **Integrated Data Systems:** A centralized, real-time surveillance system was established, allowing clinicians to report notifiable diseases instantly and the KDCA to aggregate data and provide situational awareness back to hospitals.
- **Ramp-up of Testing:** A public-private partnership was forged to enable the rapid development and deployment of diagnostic tests, ensuring that clinicians could get test results back within hours, not days [45].

When COVID-19 emerged, this new, integrated system was activated. The result was a dramatically different outcome. South Korea flattened the curve without resorting to widespread lockdowns, relying instead on efficient testing, meticulous contact tracing led by public health, and seamless collaboration with clinical centers for isolation and treatment. The case fatality rate remained among the lowest in the world, demonstrating that the lessons from the MERS failure had been effectively learned and institutionalized [46].

In contrast to the acute crises of Ebola and MERS, the HIV/AIDS pandemic presents a decades-long case study in the power of sustained, deep collaboration. Initially, clinicians were on the front lines of a mysterious, fatal illness, caring for young patients with rare opportunistic infections and cancers. Their detailed clinical observations, published in journals like the *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report (MMWR)*, were the first signals of the outbreak. This clinical intelligence was the essential raw material for public health

epidemiologists to define the risk groups and transmission patterns [47].

As the science evolved, this collaboration became the engine of the response. Public health agencies funded and organized the massive clinical trial networks that proved the efficacy of antiretroviral therapy (ART). Clinicians then implemented these regimens, collecting the long-term data on their effectiveness and side effects. This feedback loop was crucial for refining treatment guidelines. The concept of "Treatment as Prevention" (TasP) is the ultimate expression of this synergy: a clinical intervention (prescribing ART) directly achieves a public health goal (reducing community viral load and transmission). Public health campaigns promote testing and linkage to care, while clinicians provide the continuous treatment that makes prevention possible. UNAIDS credits this model as the foundation for the global strategy to end AIDS, having helped avert an estimated **21 million AIDS-related deaths since 1990** [48].

The global outbreak of Mpox (formerly monkeypox) in 2022 tested the collaborative systems built during COVID-19 in a new context. The response highlighted both progress and lingering gaps. In many high-income countries, the collaboration between sexual health clinics (clinical) and public health agencies was swift and effective. Clinicians quickly identified the unusual presentation of the disease and reported it. Public health agencies, using lessons from COVID-19, rapidly developed and distributed diagnostic tests, guidance on case management, and vaccines. The flow of information was significantly improved compared to previous outbreaks [49].

However, the response also exposed inequities and communication challenges. Initially, public health messaging focused heavily on the virus's spread among men who have sex with men (MSM). While epidemiologically accurate for that outbreak, this created a risk of stigma that clinicians had to navigate carefully with their patients. Furthermore, access to tests, vaccines, and treatments was highly inequitable, with low-income countries in Africa, where the disease was endemic, having little access compared to high-income nations. This demonstrated that while clinical-public health collaboration within a country can be effective, global collaboration and equity remain a profound challenge [50]. The Mpox response thus serves as a nuanced case study: it shows that systems can be improved, but also that collaboration must be equitable, anti-stigmatizing, and global to be truly effective.

6. Conclusion

The choice is clear. We can continue to operate in silos and remain vulnerable to the catastrophic impacts of the next pandemic, or we can choose to build integrated, resilient health systems founded on the indivisible partnership between clinical care and public health. The latter path is the only one that leads to a secure future. By fostering this collaboration, we move from a reactive posture of crisis management to a proactive one of true health security, ensuring that we are not just treating diseases but preventing them, and ultimately, safeguarding the health of individuals and populations alike.

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. Jones J, Hunter D. Consensus Methods for Medical and Health Services Research. British Medical Journal. 1995;311(7001):376-80.
2. Martin-Misener R, Valaitis R.K. A Scoping Literature Review of Collaboration between Primary Care and Public Health. A Report to the Canadian Health Services Research Foundation. Hamilton, ON: School of Nursing, McMaster University; 2008.
3. Rodger AJ, Cambiano V, Bruun T, et al. Sexual activity without condoms and risk of HIV transmission in serodifferent couples when the HIV-positive partner is using suppressive antiretroviral therapy. JAMA. 2016;316:171-81.
4. McQuillen DP, MacIntyre AT. The value that infectious diseases physicians bring to the healthcare system. J Infect Dis. 2017;216:588-93.
5. Valaitis R.K., Ehrich A., O'Mara L.M., Brauer P.M. An Environmental Scan of Primary Care and Public Health in the Province of Ontario: A Series Report.

Hamilton, ON: McMaster University School of Nursing; 2009.
6. Masotti P, Green M, McColl M.A. Adverse Events in Community Care: Implications for Practice, Policy and Research. Healthcare Quarterly. 2009;12(1):69-76.
7. Goldstein EJC, Petrak RM, Sexton DJ, et al. The value of an infectious diseases specialist. Clin Infect Dis. 2003;36:1013-7.
8. Yeager VA, Beitsch LM, Hasbrouck L. A mismatch between the educational pipeline and public health workforce: can it be reconciled? Public Health Rep. 2016;131:507-9.
9. Lloyd-Jones G., Fowell S., Bligh J. The Use of the Nominal Group Technique as an Evaluative Tool in Medical Undergraduate Education. Medical Education. 1999;33(1):8-13.
10. Rimawi RH, Mazer MA, Siraj DS, Gooch M, Cook PP. Impact of regular collaboration between infectious diseases and critical care practitioners on antimicrobial utilization and patient outcome. Crit Care Med. 2013;41:2099-107.
11. Beck AJ, Boulton ML, Coronado F. Enumeration of the governmental public health workforce, 2014. Am J Prev Med. 2014;47:S306-13.
12. Burnham JP, Olsen MA, Stwalley D, et al. Infectious diseases consultation reduces 30-day and 1-year all-cause mortality for multidrug-resistant organism infections. Open Forum Infect Dis. 2018;5.
13. Nowak MA, Nelson RE, Breidenbach JL, Thompson PA, Carson PJ. Clinical and economic outcomes of a prospective antimicrobial stewardship program. Am J Health Syst Pharm. 2012;69:1500-8.
14. Zimlichman E, Henderson D, Tamir O, et al. Health care-associated infections: a meta-analysis of costs and financial impact on the US health care system. JAMA Intern Med. 2013;173:2039-46.
15. Shih CP, Lin YC, Chan YY, Hsu KH. Employing infectious disease physicians affects clinical and economic outcomes in regional hospitals: evidence from a population-based study. J Microbiol Immunol Infect. 2014;47:297-303.
16. Wendorf KA, Kay M, Baliga C, et al. Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography-associated AmpC Escherichia coli outbreak. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2015;36:634-42.
17. Peters PJ, Pontones P, Hoover KW, et al. HIV infection linked to injection use of oxymorphone in Indiana, 2014–2015. N Engl J Med. 2016;375:229-39.
18. Honda H, Krauss MJ, Jones JC, Olsen MA, Warren DK. The value of infectious diseases consultation in Staphylococcus aureus bacteremia. Am J Med. 2010;123:631-7.
19. Schmitt S, McQuillen DP, Nahass R, et al. Infectious diseases specialty intervention is associated with decreased mortality and lower healthcare costs. Clin Infect Dis. 2014;58:22-8.
20. Aldeyab MA, Kearney MP, Scott MG, et al. An evaluation of the impact of antibiotic stewardship on reducing the use of high-risk antibiotics and its effect on the incidence of Clostridium difficile infection in hospital settings. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2012;67:2988-96.
21. Ostrowsky B, Banerjee R, Bonomo RA, et al. Infectious diseases physicians: leading the way in antimicrobial stewardship. Clin Infect Dis. 2018;66:995-1003.
22. McQuillen DP, Petrak RM, Wasserman RB, Nahass RG, Scull JA, Martinelli LP. The value of infectious diseases specialists: non-patient care activities. Clin Infect Dis. 2008;47:1051-63.
23. Rowan M, Hogg W, Huston P. Integrating Public Health and Primary Care. Healthcare Policy. 2007;3(1):160-81.
24. Measles outbreak–California, December 2014-February 2015. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2015;64:153-4.
25. Measles outbreak–Minnesota April-May 2017. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2017;66:713-7.
26. Naylor D, Basrur S, Bergeron M.G., Brunham R.C., Butler-Jones D., Dafoe G., et al. Learning from SARS – Renewal of Public Health in Canada. Ottawa: Public Health Agency of Canada; 2003.
27. Walker D, Keon W, Laupacis A, Low D, Moore K, Kitts J., et al. For the Public's Health. Final Report of the Ontario Expert Panel on SARS and Infectious Disease Control. Toronto, Ontario; 2003.
28. Ontario Medical Association (OMA). Primary Care Models Comparison Chart. Toronto: Author; 2008.
29. A national strategy for the elimination of hepatitis B and C: phase two report. Washington, D.C.; 2017.
30. Perth District Health Unit. Enhancing Disease Prevention and Health Promotion in Ontario's Family Health Teams: The Public Health/Primary Health Connection – A Discussion Paper. May 2006.
31. Omojuyigbe J.O., Oladipo H.J., Adegbite M.A., Babatunde Y., Sokunbi T.O., Adedeji O., et al. Current Trends of Lassa fever amidst COVID-19 Pandemic in Nigeria. Global Biosecurity. 2023 Feb;24:5.
32. Amzat J., Aminu K., Kolo V.I., Akinyele A.A., Ogundairo J.A., Danjibo M.C. Coronavirus outbreak in Nigeria: Burden and socio-medical response during the first 100 days. Int J Infect Dis. 2020 Sep;98:218–224. doi: 10.1016/j.ijid.2020.06.067.
33. Nigeria Centre for Disease Control and Prevention. Lassa Fever Weekly Situation Report. 2019.
34. Ibrahim Z., Konlan K.D., Moonsoo Y., Kwetishe P., Ryu J., Da Sol Ro, et al. Influence of Basic Health Care Provision Fund in improving primary Health Care in Kano state, a descriptive cross-sectional study. BMC Health Serv Res. 2023 doi: 10.1186/s12913-023-09708-w.

35. Sokunbi T.O., Omojuyigbe J.O. Need for sustainable health policies toward curbing future pandemics in Africa. Ann Med Surgery. 2022 Oct;82 doi: 10.1016/j.amsu.2022.104506.

36. Kassa M.D., Grace J.M. Race against death or starvation? COVID-19 and its impact on African populations. Public Health Rev. 2020 Dec;41(1) doi: 10.1186/s40985-020-00139-0.

37. Nigeria Can Seize the Opportunity to Realize Its Growth Potential. World Bank.

38. Nwobodo E, Ukwuije F, Egwuatu U, Ezugwu F, Nwobodo N, Ojiajor A, et al. Assessment of the Progress of the Implementation of the Basic Health Care Provision Fund in South East States of Nigeria. Tropical J Med Res. 2022 Jul 30;21(1):75–85.

39. Alawode G., Adewoyin A.B., Abdulsalam A.O., Ilika F., Chukwu C., Mohammed Z., et al. The Political Economy of the Design of the Basic Health Care Provision Fund (BHCPF) in Nigeria: A Retrospective Analysis for Prospective Action. Health Syst Reform. 2022 doi: 10.1080/23288604.2022.2124601.

40. Omojuyigbe JO, Sokunbi TO, Ogodo EC. Multiple crises: Anthrax outbreak amidst Lassa fever and diphtheria endemicity in Nigeria. Journal of Medicine, Surgery, and Public Health. 2023 Jan 1; 1: 100021.

41. Nigeria Centre for Disease Control and Prevention. Official statement following the first reported confirmed case of diphtheria in FCT, Abuja.

42. Connolly MA, Heymann DL. Deadly comrades: war and infectious diseases. Lancet. 2002;360(Suppl):23–24. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(02)11807-1.

43. Christian KA, Ijaz K, Dowell SF, Chow CC, Chitale RA, Bresee JS. What we are watching-five top global infectious disease threats, 2012: a perspective from CDC's Global Disease Detection Operations Center. Emerg Health Threats J. 2013;6:20632. doi: 10.3402/ehtj.v6i0.20632.

44. Babaie J, Ardalan A, Vatandoost H, Goya MM, Akbarisari A. Performance assessment of communicable disease surveillance in disasters: a systematic review. PLoS Curr. 2015:7. doi: 10.1371/currents.dis.c72864d9c7ee99ff8fbe9ea707fe4465.

45. Siegel JD, Rhinehart E, Jackson M, Chiarello L, Health Care Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee 2007 Guideline for Isolation Precautions: Preventing Transmission of Infectious Agents in Health Care Settings. Am J Infect Control. 2007;35(10 Suppl 2):65–164. doi: 10.1016/j.ajic.2007.10.007.

46. Harvey PA, Reed RA. Planning environmental sanitation programmes in emergencies. Disasters. 2005;29:129–151. doi: 10.1111/j.0361-3666.2005.00277.x.

47. Liang SY, Theodoro DL, Schuur JD, Marschall J. Infection prevention in the emergency department. Ann Emerg Med. 2014;64:299–313. doi: 10.1016/j.annemergmed.2014.02.024.

48. Behrman AJ, Shofer FS. Tuberculosis exposure and control in an urban emergency department. Ann Emerg Med. 1998;31:370–375. doi: 10.1016/s0196-0644(98)70349-x.

49. Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Immunization of health-care personnel: recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) MMWR Recomm Rep. 2011;60:1–45.

50. Levine AC, Shetty PP, Burbach R, Cheemalapati S, Glavis-Bloom J, Wiskel T. Derivation and Internal Validation of the Ebola Prediction Score for Risk Stratification of Patients With Suspected Ebola Virus Disease. Ann Emerg Med. 2015;66:285–293. doi: 10.1016/j.annemergmed.2015.03.011.