The Review Of
DIABETIC
STUDIES OPEN ACCESS

The Role Of General And Family Medicine In Strengthening Primary Health Care And Disease Prevention

Razan Khalid Thabit[1], Nouf Mohammed Alrifay[2], RANA ABDULLAH RUKUN[3], Khalid Mohammed Al Ziyad[4], Ehdaa Anani[5], Ebtihal Khalid Alfosail[6], Manar Ali Alqahtani[7], Amjad Naji Almotairi[8], Mona Ahmad Alshehri[9], Shjaa Alhlo Z Alenazy[10], Alotaibi Mohammed Sultan[11], Yassmeen Ibrahim Alnajjar[12]

[1]Family Medicine, Makkah, King Fahad General Hospital
[2]King Abdullah Hospital, Jeddah, Makkah Al-Mukarramah Region
[3]King Abdullah Hospital, Makkah Region
[4]King Abdullah Hospital, Jeddah, Makkah Al-Mukarramah Region
[5]King Abdullah Medical City, Jeddah, Makkah Al-Mukarramah Region
[6]King Abdullah Medical Complex, Jeddah, Makkah Al-Mukarramah Region
[7]King Abdullah Hospital, Jeddah, Makkah Al-Mukarramah Region
[8]Ministry of Health, Riyadh, Family Medicine
[9]King Fahad General Hospital, Jeddah, Makkah Al-Mukarramah Region
[10]General- general practice, Medicine and Surgery
[11]General Physician
[12]Consultant of Family medicine, Ministry Headquarters, Riyadh

Abstract

Primary Health Care (PHC) stands as the cornerstone of equitable, efficient, and resilient health systems, with General and Family Medicine (FM) serving as its indispensable clinical engine. This research paper employs a comprehensive conceptual analysis, supported by a review of international case studies and evidence, to argue that FM is the critical discipline for strengthening PHC and implementing effective disease prevention. The analysis explores the profound alignment between the philosophy of FM—characterized by first-contact accessibility, longitudinal continuity, comprehensiveness, and coordination—and the core principles of the PHC model. It further elucidates the dual role of family physicians as gatekeepers, optimizing system efficiency, and navigators, ensuring integrated care for individuals with multimorbidity and mental health needs. The paper details the implementation of the prevention triad (primary, secondary, tertiary) within the context of continuous, person-centered care. Despite its proven value, significant barriers are identified, including workforce shortages, misaligned financing models, and systemic constraints that favor hospital-centric care. Examination of successful international case studies reveals that strategic investment in FM education, blended financing, interprofessional teams, and digital health infrastructure yields superior health outcomes and sustainability. The paper concludes that the path to stronger health systems globally necessitates a paradigm shift: from rhetoric to decisive policy and investment in Family Medicine as the foundational pillar for achieving health for all.

Keywords Primary Health Care; Family Medicine; General Practice; Disease Prevention; Health Systems Strengthening; Care Coordination; Multimorbidity; Integrated Care; Health Policy; Healthcare Financing.

Introduction

The pursuit of global health equity and the attainment of the highest possible standard of health for all peoples is a fundamental human right and a cornerstone of sustainable development. At the heart of this endeavor lies a robust, accessible, and efficient health system, the foundation of which is universally acknowledged to be Primary Health Care (PHC). PHC represents the first level of contact individuals,

families, and communities have with the national health system, bringing healthcare as close as possible to where people live and work [1]. It is not merely a set of interventions but a whole-of-society approach to health that aims to ensure the highest level of health and well-being through comprehensive, accessible, community-based services emphasizing prevention, promotion, and treatment [2]. The modern conceptualization of PHC, galvanized by the landmark 1978 Alma-Ata Declaration, envisions it as the key to achieving "Health for All" by addressing the broader determinants of health and empowering communities [3].

However, the effectiveness of any PHC system is intrinsically dependent on the human resources at its core—the skilled practitioners who deliver these essential services. Among these, the roles of General Practitioners (GPs) and Family Medicine specialists are paramount. They serve as the linchpins, the first point of professional consultation, and the continuous caregivers within the health system. General and Family Medicine (FM) is a specialized discipline that integrates biological, clinical, and behavioral sciences, providing comprehensive, continuous, and person-centered care across all ages, genders, diseases, and parts of the body [4]. Unlike organ- or disease-specific specialists, these practitioners manage the whole person within the context of their family, community, and culture, navigating the complex interplay between multiple health issues and social factors.

The 21st century presents a dual burden of disease that poses unprecedented challenges to health systems worldwide. The persistent threat of communicable diseases, exemplified by the COVID-19 pandemic, coexists with the relentless rise of non-communicable diseases (NCDs) such as cardiovascular diseases, diabetes, cancer, and chronic respiratory conditions [5]. Concurrently, demographic shifts towards aging populations and the growing prevalence of mental health disorders further strain healthcare resources. This complex landscape underscores the critical limitation of reactive, hospital-centric, and specialist-driven models of care, which are often inefficient, costly, and inequitable [6]. A strategic reorientation towards strengthened PHC, with General and Family Medicine at its forefront, is not just preferable but essential for building resilient, sustainable, and effective health systems capable of responding to these multifaceted challenges [7].

The strengthening of PHC rests on several core principles: first-contact accessibility, longitudinal continuity, comprehensiveness of care, and coordinated services within a larger healthcare network [8]. General and Family Medicine is uniquely positioned to embody and operationalize these principles. As the specialists in first-contact care, GPs and family physicians manage over 90% of all health problems without the need for referral, serving as efficient gatekeepers to the broader system [9]. This longitudinal continuity of care—spanning years and often generations within a family—fosters a unique therapeutic relationship built on trust and deep knowledge of the patient’s history, values, and social circumstances. This relationship is a powerful diagnostic and therapeutic tool in itself, enabling early detection of issues and more effective management of chronic conditions [10].

Furthermore, the comprehensiveness of care offered by Family Medicine is a critical asset. Practitioners are trained to diagnose and manage acute and chronic illnesses, provide preventive care (including immunizations and screenings), offer health education, perform minor procedures, and address mental health concerns. This holistic approach allows for the integrated management of multi-morbidity, a common scenario in aging populations where patients often suffer from several concurrent chronic conditions [11]. By managing these interdependencies within a single consultation, family physicians reduce fragmentation, polypharmacy risks, and the need for multiple specialist visits, thereby enhancing patient safety and system efficiency.

The role of General and Family Medicine in care coordination cannot be overstated. In an increasingly complex healthcare landscape with numerous providers and specialties, the family physician often acts as the patient’s navigator and advocate. They interpret specialist recommendations, reconcile medications, ensure follow-up, and manage the transfer of information across care settings (e.g., from hospital to home). This coordination is vital for preventing medical errors, reducing unnecessary hospital readmissions, and

ensuring that care is seamless and patient-centered [12]. By effectively fulfilling these functions—first contact, continuity, comprehensiveness, and coordination—General and Family Medicine directly strengthens the four pillars of high-performing PHC, transforming it from a theoretical concept into a practical, lived experience for patients.

Perhaps the most significant contribution of General and Family Medicine within the PHC framework lies in its unwavering emphasis on disease prevention and health promotion. This focus operates on three classical levels: primary, secondary, and tertiary prevention. At the primary level, family physicians engage in proactive health education and counseling on lifestyle factors (diet, exercise, smoking cessation, alcohol use), administer vaccinations, and provide pre-conception and antenatal advice, thereby preventing disease from occurring [13]. The ongoing, trusting relationship provides a perfect platform for such anticipatory guidance, making it more likely to be heard and acted upon by patients.

Secondary prevention, the early detection of disease to halt progression, is a daily routine in Family Medicine practice. Through evidence-based screening for conditions like hypertension, dyslipidemia, diabetes, and certain cancers (e.g., cervical, colorectal, and breast cancer), family physicians identify pathology at asymptomatic or early symptomatic stages. This early intervention is crucial for improving outcomes, reducing complications, and lowering the long-term cost burden of advanced disease management. The practice's registered population allows for systematic call-and-recall systems, ensuring higher screening uptake compared to opportunistic models.

Finally, tertiary prevention—managing established disease to prevent complications, deterioration, and disability—is the essence of chronic disease management. For patients with diabetes, heart failure, COPD, or arthritis, the family physician provides continuous monitoring, medication management, rehabilitation support, and psychosocial care. This longitudinal management prevents acute exacerbations, reduces hospitalizations, and helps patients maintain optimal function and quality of life. In the context of NCDs, which are largely driven by modifiable risk factors and require long-term management, this preventive-oriented, continuous care model is fundamentally more effective than episodic, acute-care interventions.

Despite its proven value, the full potential of General and Family Medicine in strengthening PHC is often hampered by challenges. These include workforce shortages and maldistribution, inadequate training capacity, insufficient financing for PHC services, the low prestige of the specialty in some regions, and health systems that remain hospital-focused in their resource allocation and policymaking [7, 10].

Conceptual Framework: Primary Health Care and the Philosophy of General Practice

To fully comprehend the indispensable role of General and Family Medicine (FM) in contemporary health systems, one must first explore the conceptual synergy between two foundational paradigms: the global doctrine of Primary Health Care (PHC) and the professional philosophy of General Practice. This alignment is not coincidental but rather a profound congruence of values, goals, and approaches to human health and well-being. The modern concept of PHC, as revitalized by the World Health Organization's 1978 Alma-Ata Declaration and later reaffirmed in the 2018 Astana Declaration, is far more than a mere level of care or a package of basic services [14]. It is a holistic philosophy for organizing society's health efforts, built on the principles of equity, community participation, intersectoral collaboration, and the use of appropriate technology. At its core, PHC seeks to make health a universal right by addressing the root causes of illness within the social, economic, and political fabric of communities, positioning health as a central tenet of human development rather than a standalone commodity [15].

Simultaneously, the philosophy of General Practice, and its more formally defined successor, Family Medicine, has evolved from a loosely defined "gatekeeping" role into a distinct academic and clinical discipline. Its philosophy is encapsulated in core tenets defined by global bodies such as WONCA (World Organization of Family Doctors). These include a person-centered (rather than disease-centered) approach, continuity of care over time, a responsibility for the patient's comprehensive health needs regardless of age,

gender, or organ system, and a commitment to managing illness within its familial and community context [16]. The family physician is not defined by a specific body of knowledge but by a unique approach to knowledge—integrating the biomedical, psychological, and social dimensions of a patient's presentation. This philosophical stance, championed by thinkers like Ian McWhinney, argues for the consultation itself as a therapeutic tool, where the relationship between doctor and patient is central to healing and understanding [17].

The conceptual bridge between these two frameworks is most elegantly articulated through Barbara Starfield's seminal work on the "four pillars" of primary care: first-contact access, longitudinality (continuity), comprehensiveness, and coordination [18]. These pillars serve as the operational nexus where the grand vision of PHC meets the daily practice of the family doctor. First-contact access ensures the health system is approachable and solves the majority of problems at the most accessible level, a principle that aligns perfectly with the family physician's role as the initial and most frequent point of professional consultation. Longitudinality, the establishment of a sustained partnership between practitioner and patient, is the very engine of Family Medicine's philosophy, enabling the accumulation of contextual knowledge that is critical for effective diagnosis, prevention, and the management of chronic conditions [19]. This continuity fosters trust and is a prerequisite for truly person-centered care.

The pillar of comprehensiveness is where the philosophical alignment deepens further. PHC envisions a broad spectrum of services, from promotion and prevention to cure, rehabilitation, and palliative care. Correspondingly, the family physician's scope of practice is inherently comprehensive. They are trained to manage acute undifferentiated illness, chronic diseases, mental health issues, and to provide preventive services and health education across the entire lifespan. This breadth is not superficial; it requires a mastery of managing complexity and uncertainty, often dealing with presentations before they are neatly categorized into specialist domains. This comprehensiveness directly serves the PHC goal of addressing a majority of health needs at the community level, reducing unnecessary specialization and fragmentation [20]. Finally, the coordination pillar highlights a critical managerial function. In a complex health system, the family physician acts as the steward of the patient's journey, integrating care provided elsewhere (e.g., by hospitals or specialists) and ensuring information flows seamlessly. This coordinating role is essential for realizing the PHC ideal of a coherent, efficient, and patient-focused health system that navigates, rather than creates, obstacles for the individual [18].

Underpinning this structural alignment is a shared commitment to a biopsychosocial model. Both the PHC and Family Medicine philosophies explicitly reject a narrow biomedical reductionist model that views disease as solely a physiological malfunction. The PHC emphasis on social determinants of health—such as education, housing, and income—finds its clinical counterpart in the family physician's routine consideration of the patient's job stress, family dynamics, financial worries, and cultural beliefs during every consultation [21]. The philosophy of General Practice demands an understanding of how these external factors precipitate, exacerbate, or modulate illness. For instance, managing a patient's hypertension is incomplete without addressing diet (influenced by culture and economics), adherence (influenced by health literacy and cost), and stress (influenced by work and family life). This model transforms the clinical encounter from a transactional event focused on prescribing medication into a longitudinal partnership aimed at holistic well-being, which is the ultimate goal of a people-centered PHC system [22].

Furthermore, the principle of community orientation forms another critical conceptual link. While PHC calls for health services to be shaped by and responsive to community needs, Family Medicine operationalizes this through the concept of a "community diagnosis." The practice population is not just an aggregation of individual patients but a collective entity with specific epidemiological and social characteristics. A family physician, by serving a defined population over time, develops an awareness of local prevalence rates, common occupational hazards, cultural health beliefs, and gaps in local services [23]. This knowledge informs both individual care (e.g., having a higher index of suspicion for certain conditions) and practice-level activities, such as organizing targeted health education sessions or advocating

for local public health measures. Thus, the physician's philosophy extends beyond the clinic walls, aligning with the PHC mandate to work with communities, not just for them.

The integration of prevention and health promotion into the very fabric of clinical practice represents perhaps the most potent convergence of these frameworks. PHC is fundamentally a strategy for preventing disease and promoting health at a population level. The philosophy of General Practice, with its emphasis on longitudinal, holistic care, provides the perfect vehicle for delivering this strategy at the individual and family level. Prevention is not an add-on or a separate clinic in this model; it is an organic component of every consultation. The ongoing relationship provides unique opportunities for opportunistic vaccination advice, lifestyle counseling, and screening that are more effective than one-off public campaigns [19]. The physician's deep knowledge of the patient's risk factors, family history, and personal motivations allows for tailored, credible, and timely preventive interventions. This transforms the PHC goal of "keeping people healthy" from a public health slogan into a daily, actionable reality within the doctor-patient relationship.

However, this ideal conceptual alignment faces significant tensions in the real world. The philosophy of General Practice, with its values of continuity, comprehensiveness, and long-term relationships, often clashes with the pressures of commodified, volume-driven healthcare systems. When funding models incentivize short, episodic consultations over longitudinal care, the pillar of continuity is eroded [24].

Gatekeepers and Navigators: The Role of General Practitioners in System Efficiency and Coordination

Within the architecture of a high-functioning health system, the General Practitioner (GP) or Family Physician fulfills two indispensable and complementary roles that are critical for systemic sustainability and patient-centered care: that of a gatekeeper and a navigator. These roles, though conceptually distinct, are intrinsically linked in practice, together forming the operational mechanism through which Primary Health Care (PHC) ensures efficiency, quality, and coherence. The gatekeeper function is a structural role, primarily concerned with regulating patient access to the more costly and specialized sectors of healthcare. In this capacity, the GP serves as the mandated first point of contact for all non-emergency health issues, responsible for diagnosing, managing, and, when necessary, referring patients to specialist or hospital services [25]. This model, foundational to the health systems of many nations like the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and Denmark, is not designed to restrict care but to rationalize it. It posits that the GP, with their broad-based training and holistic perspective, is best positioned to determine the most appropriate pathway for a patient's problem, ensuring that specialist expertise is reserved for cases that truly require it.

The systemic efficiency derived from this gatekeeper role is well-documented. By resolving the vast majority of presenting problems—estimated at over 90%—within primary care, it prevents the congestion of specialist outpatient clinics and hospitals with cases that could be managed effectively at a lower level of complexity and cost [26]. This filtering mechanism reduces unnecessary diagnostic procedures, minimizes iatrogenic risks from overly specialized interventions, and contains overall healthcare expenditure. Importantly, effective gatekeeping enhances quality through the principle of diagnostic triage. A patient presenting with non-specific back pain, for example, is far more likely to receive appropriate initial management, education, and watchful waiting from a GP, whereas direct access to orthopedics might lead to premature imaging or interventions with limited benefit [27]. The continuity inherent in general practice means the gatekeeper has access to the patient's history, enabling more informed and less fragmented decision-making about the need for referral, thereby acting as a steward of both patient well-being and systemic resources.

However, the gatekeeper role, if conceived in a narrow, purely restrictive sense, risks being perceived as a barrier rather than a guide. This is where the more dynamic, proactive, and patient-advocate role of the **navigator** becomes paramount. Modern healthcare is characterized by increasing subspecialization, multiple care providers, complex treatment protocols, and often disjointed information systems. For patients, particularly those with multimorbidity, chronic conditions, or serious acute illnesses like cancer,

navigating this labyrinth can be overwhelming and dangerous. The GP, acting as a navigator, assumes responsibility for coordinating the patient's journey across this landscape. This involves integrating services, interpreting and reconciling information from various specialists, ensuring follow-up, and maintaining a holistic overview of the patient's total health picture [28]. The navigator function transforms the GP from a passive filter into an active manager of care transitions, which is essential for safety, quality, and patient experience.

The navigator role is particularly critical in the context of care coordination and transition management. When a patient is discharged from hospital, the GP navigator ensures that discharge summaries are received, medications are reconciled, and planned follow-up care is implemented, thereby reducing the risk of readmission [29]. For a patient undergoing cancer treatment, the GP navigator helps coordinate between the oncologist, surgeon, radiologist, and palliative care services, while also managing concurrent conditions like hypertension or diabetes, and providing essential psychosocial support. This coordination is not merely administrative; it is a clinical skill that requires deep knowledge of the patient, the local health ecosystem, and communication expertise to advocate for the patient's best interests. Studies consistently show that strong, continuous relationships with a primary care physician, who performs this navigational function, are associated with better chronic disease outcomes, higher patient satisfaction, and lower rates of unnecessary hospitalization [30].

The synergy between the gatekeeper and navigator roles creates a powerful engine for integrated care. The gatekeeper controls the point of entry and the flow into the system, while the navigator manages the journey within the system. Together, they ensure that care is not only appropriately initiated but also seamlessly connected. This integration is the antithesis of fragmentation, a major driver of inefficiency, error, and patient dissatisfaction in healthcare worldwide [31]. For instance, a GP acting as both gatekeeper and navigator for an elderly patient with heart failure will: 1) manage mild exacerbations in the community (gatekeeping to avoid hospital admission), 2) refer to cardiology for periodic optimization of therapy (informed gatekeeping), and 3) coordinate with the cardiology clinic, community heart failure nurses, and pharmacists to ensure a unified management plan is followed (navigation). This continuous, managed loop of care epitomizes a coordinated, efficient, and effective PHC-led system.

The effectiveness of GPs in these dual roles is heavily dependent on specific enabling factors. Firstly, continuity of care is the bedrock. Longitudinal relationships foster the deep knowledge and trust required for both judicious gatekeeping (knowing when to worry) and effective navigation (knowing the patient's goals and context) [32]. Secondly, access to timely diagnostic tools in primary care, such as point-of-care testing or ultrasound, empowers GPs to be more decisive gatekeepers, reducing diagnostic uncertainty and the "just-in-case" referrals. Thirdly, robust health information technology (HIT) is crucial. Shared electronic health records that allow GPs to view specialist letters, hospital discharge summaries, and test results are essential for them to perform their navigational duties effectively. Without this information flow, navigation becomes guesswork, and coordination breaks down [33].

Despite their clear benefits, significant challenges and tensions persist in fulfilling these roles. Gatekeeping can face resistance from patients desiring direct access to specialists, often driven by perceptions of higher quality or shorter waiting times. Physicians themselves may experience role conflict, feeling pressured between their duty as patient advocate (which might lean towards referral) and their responsibility as system steward (which emphasizes community management) [34]. Time constraints in busy practices can severely undermine the navigator role, as care coordination is cognitively demanding and time-consuming but often poorly remunerated in fee-for-service models. Furthermore, in systems without a formal gatekeeping structure or where parallel private insurance allows bypassing primary care, the GP's ability to coordinate is weakened from the outset, as they are not the consistent first point of contact.

The evolution towards value-based and population-oriented healthcare models is, however, reinforcing the necessity of the gatekeeper-navigator paradigm. These models shift the focus from volume of services to patient outcomes and total cost of care. In such frameworks, the GP's success in preventing unnecessary

utilization (through effective gatekeeping) and in improving outcomes for complex patients (through skilled navigation) becomes a direct measure of value. Consequently, there is a growing policy impetus to better support these roles through blended payment models that reward coordination, investments in primary care HIT, and interprofessional team-based care. In a team, the GP remains the central coordinator, but tasks can be shared with nurses, care managers, and social workers, enhancing the practice's overall gatekeeping and navigational capacity [30].

A Triad of Prevention: Implementing Primary, Secondary, and Tertiary Strategies in Community Practice

The discipline of General and Family Medicine distinguishes itself from episodic, disease-focused specialties through its proactive, longitudinal, and holistic approach, with prevention serving as its central, organizing principle. This preventive mandate is systematically operationalized through the classical public health framework known as the "triad of prevention": primary, secondary, and tertiary. For the family physician, this triad is not an abstract model but the daily architecture of practice, seamlessly integrated into the continuum of care across a patient's lifespan. Implementing this triad within the context of a trusting, continuous doctor-patient relationship leverages unique opportunities to improve health outcomes that are largely unattainable in fragmented or specialist-only models of care [35]. Prevention in this setting is dynamic, opportunistic, and personalized, moving beyond population-level public health campaigns to actionable, individual-level interventions that are credible to the patient because they come from a known and trusted source.

Primary Prevention constitutes the first and most fundamental pillar, aiming to prevent the onset of disease before it occurs. In community-based Family Medicine, this translates into a proactive partnership for health promotion and specific protection. The foundation is health education and behavioral counseling delivered during routine consultations. This includes evidence-based guidance on nutrition, physical activity, weight management, smoking cessation, and harmful alcohol use [36]. The effectiveness of such counseling is significantly amplified by continuity of care; a physician who knows a patient's family history of diabetes, their occupational stressors, and their previous attempts to quit smoking can tailor advice with remarkable precision and persistence over time. Furthermore, primary prevention encompasses immunization across all age groups, from routine childhood vaccinations to influenza, pneumococcal, and shingles vaccines for older adults. Pre-conception counseling, antenatal care promoting healthy pregnancies, and environmental safety advice (e.g., seatbelt use, fall prevention in the elderly) also fall under this remit. The family practice, with its registered population, provides an ideal platform for systematic delivery of these services, ensuring high coverage and acting as a frontline defense against both communicable and non-communicable diseases [37].

The implementation of primary prevention is a powerful demonstration of the biopsychosocial model in action. A family physician does not simply instruct a patient to "exercise more." They explore barriers—such as time constraints due to work schedules, lack of safe local spaces, low motivation due to mild depression, or physical limitations from osteoarthritis. The intervention may then involve a combination of motivational interviewing, connecting the patient with community exercise programs, managing the osteoarthritis, or addressing the depressive symptoms. This holistic, barrier-focused approach, made possible by comprehensive care and continuity, is what makes primary prevention in general practice uniquely effective [38]. It addresses the root causes of risk behaviors within the individual's specific life context, thereby moving from generic advice to sustainable lifestyle change.

Secondary Prevention forms the critical second layer of the triad, focusing on the early detection of existing disease at an asymptomatic or early symptomatic stage, with the goal of halting or slowing its progression. This is the realm of screening and case-finding, where Family Medicine acts as the essential engine of population health surveillance. Guided by national and international evidence-based guidelines—such as those from the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) or similar bodies—family physicians systematically implement screening for conditions where early intervention is proven to improve outcomes

[39]. This includes measuring blood pressure for hypertension, checking cholesterol and blood glucose for dyslipidemia and diabetes, performing Pap smears or HPV testing for cervical cancer, facilitating mammography for breast cancer, and advocating for colorectal cancer screening via fecal tests or colonoscopy.

The effectiveness of secondary prevention in a community practice hinges on several unique advantages. First, the longitudinal relationship and comprehensive records allow for risk stratification. The physician can identify and target high-risk individuals (e.g., those with a strong family history of cancer, smokers for abdominal aortic aneurysm screening, or patients with metabolic syndrome for diabetes screening) with greater intensity than a blanket population approach [40]. Second, the practice can operate call-and-recall systems, proactively inviting patients due for screenings rather than relying on opportunistic encounters alone, thereby improving uptake and equity. Third, when a screening test returns positive, the GP is already in place to manage the next steps: explaining the result, mitigating anxiety, arranging confirmatory diagnostics, and initiating early treatment or referral within an existing supportive relationship. This seamless pathway from detection to management reduces patient drop-out and delays, which is crucial for realizing the mortality benefits of screening programs.

However, the implementation of secondary prevention is fraught with challenges that require careful navigation. These include communicating the nuanced concepts of sensitivity, specificity, and overdiagnosis to patients, managing false-positive results that cause anxiety, and balancing the time demands of screening within busy consultations. The family physician must practice preventive ethics, ensuring screening is offered appropriately based on individual risk and life expectancy, rather than applied indiscriminately [41]. For example, prostate cancer screening with PSA testing requires a detailed shared decision-making conversation about potential benefits and harms. This ethical, patient-centered application of secondary prevention guidelines is a core skill of the family physician, ensuring that the science of screening is tempered with the art of personalized care.

Tertiary Prevention constitutes the third and often most intensive layer of the triad, aimed at reducing the impact of established, chronic disease by preventing complications, slowing progression, minimizing disability, and improving quality of life. This is the essence of chronic disease management, which forms a substantial portion of contemporary Family Medicine practice. For patients with conditions like diabetes mellitus, congestive heart failure, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), rheumatoid arthritis, or stable coronary artery disease, the family physician coordinates long-term, multifaceted care plans [42]. Tertiary prevention involves regular monitoring (e.g., HbA1c, lipid profiles, lung function tests), optimizing pharmacotherapy, promoting rehabilitation (such as cardiac or pulmonary rehab programs), and providing ongoing education for self-management.

The family medicine model is exceptionally well-suited for tertiary prevention due to its attributes of continuity, comprehensiveness, and coordination. Continuity allows the physician to observe trends over time, recognize subtle signs of deterioration early, and adjust management proactively. The trusted relationship is vital for supporting the behavioral changes required in chronic disease, such as dietary adherence in diabetes or medication compliance in heart failure. Comprehensiveness ensures that all of the patient's health issues are managed in concert. A diabetic patient may also have depression, which if untreated, undermines their self-care capacity. The family physician can address both concurrently. Coordination is critical as care often involves multiple players: dieticians, diabetes educators, cardiologists, physiotherapists, and podiatrists. The GP acts as the central hub, integrating recommendations, preventing contradictory advice, and ensuring the patient does not get lost in the system [43].

Implementing the full triad of prevention in daily practice faces significant systemic barriers. Time constraints during short consultations are the most cited obstacle, as preventive activities are often crowded out by acute complaints. Fee-for-service payment models that reward procedures over cognitive, preventive care can create financial disincentives. Additionally, lack of integrated health information systems can

hinder the tracking of preventive services across a population. To overcome these, innovative models are emerging. These include team-based care, where nurses, health educators, and care managers share preventive tasks under physician leadership; planned preventive care visits dedicated specifically to health maintenance; and the use of registry functions within electronic health records to identify care gaps proactively [44].

Integrated Care Models: Family Medicine as the Hub for Managing Multimorbidity and Mental Health

The 21st-century epidemiological landscape is dominated by the increasing prevalence of patients with multimorbidity—the co-existence of two or more chronic medical conditions in an individual. This is not merely a statistical trend but a fundamental challenge that exposes the profound limitations of traditional, disease-oriented, and specialty-siloed healthcare models. In many nations, the majority of healthcare resources are consumed by a minority of patients with complex, interacting chronic conditions, a reality that renders fragmented care both inefficient and potentially harmful [45]. Concurrently, mental health disorders, ranging from common conditions like depression and anxiety to severe and persistent illnesses, are intrinsically linked with physical health, often worsening the prognosis of chronic diseases and vice versa. This intricate interplay between multiple physical and mental health conditions demands a paradigm shift from single-disease protocols to a holistic, integrated, and person-centered approach. Within this new paradigm, Family Medicine, with its foundational principles, is uniquely positioned to serve as the essential hub for integrated care, offering a coherent, continuous, and coordinated response to the challenge of complexity [46].

Traditional, specialist-centric models are ill-equipped to manage multimorbidity. They often lead to a scenario where a patient with diabetes, heart failure, and osteoarthritis sees an endocrinologist, a cardiologist, and an orthopedist, each focusing on an organ system in isolation. This results in polypharmacy with high risk of adverse drug interactions, contradictory lifestyle advice, redundant testing, and, most critically, a lack of an overall strategy that considers the patient's functional status, personal goals, and quality of life as a whole [47]. The cumulative burden of managing multiple appointments, medications, and treatment plans falls entirely on the patient and their family, leading to poor adherence, treatment fatigue, and increased hospitalizations. Furthermore, mental health concerns are frequently sidelined or completely missed in these settings, despite depression being a common comorbidity in chronic illness that significantly impairs self-management capacity. This fragmented, "siloed" approach is not only costly but can cause iatrogenic harm, undermining the very goal of improving health.

In contrast, the philosophy and structure of Family Medicine provide the ideal foundation for integrated care models. Integrated care is defined as the organization and management of health services so that people get the care they need, when they need it, in ways that are user-friendly, achieve the desired results, and provide value for money. It is characterized by coordination across professionals, facilities, and support sectors; continuity over time; and a comprehensive, holistic perspective [48]. The family physician, as the provider of first-contact, longitudinal, comprehensive, and coordinated care, is naturally the central figure—the "hub"—in this model. They hold the longitudinal narrative of the patient’s life and health, understand the intricate web of their conditions within a psychosocial context, and are thus best placed to develop and oversee a unified, personalized care plan. This hub function transforms the care of the multimorbid patient from a chaotic collection of parallel consultations into a managed, coherent journey.

Operationalizing this hub role requires moving beyond the solo practitioner model to structured Integrated Practice Units (IPUs) or the Patient-Centered Medical Home (PCMH). These are not physical buildings but organized systems of care built around a high-functioning primary care practice. In a PCMH, the family physician leads an interprofessional team that may include nurses, care managers, clinical pharmacists, social workers, dietitians, and—crucially—integrated behavioral health specialists [49]. This team-based structure is the practical engine of integration. For a patient with diabetes, hypertension, and depression, the care manager might facilitate medication adherence and appointment scheduling, the clinical pharmacist

reviews and reconciles medications, the dietitian provides nutritional counseling, and a behavioral health consultant embedded in the practice provides brief, accessible psychotherapy. The family physician oversees this entire process, makes medical diagnoses, adjusts treatment plans based on input from the team, and maintains the therapeutic relationship with the patient. This model, supported by robust health information technology, ensures all team members work from a shared care plan, dramatically reducing fragmentation [50].

The integration of mental health care into the family practice setting is a particularly potent example of this model's superiority. Mental and physical health are inseparable; depression doubles the risk of developing coronary artery disease and worsens outcomes in diabetes and cancer. Conversely, chronic physical illness significantly increases the risk of depression and anxiety [51]. In a traditional system, the stigma, access barriers, and separate funding streams for mental health create a damaging chasm. Integrated behavioral health models, such as the Collaborative Care Model (CoCM), bridge this chasm. In CoCM, a care manager (often a nurse or social worker) supports a panel of patients with common mental health conditions under the supervision of both the primary care physician and a consulting psychiatrist. The psychiatrist advises the primary care team remotely, reviewing cases and making treatment recommendations, while the bulk of treatment is managed within the primary care setting [52]. This approach normalizes mental healthcare, increases access and adherence, and allows for the simultaneous management of physical and mental symptoms, leading to better outcomes for both. The family practice thus becomes a true health home, addressing the mind and body as one.

Managing multimorbidity within this hub model requires a shift from disease-specific guidelines to person-centered goal setting. Clinical guidelines, typically designed for single diseases, can conflict when applied to a patient with several conditions (e.g., aggressive blood pressure targets in diabetes may increase fall risk in a frail elderly patient). The family physician, in partnership with the patient, engages in shared decision-making to prioritize treatments and establish individualized goals that align with the patient's values—be it maintaining mobility, reducing pain, or preserving cognitive function—rather than merely achieving biochemical targets [53]. This process, known as "minimally disruptive medicine," aims to reduce treatment burden and complexity. The physician and team work to streamline medication regimens, synchronize appointments, and ensure that the care plan is feasible for the patient to follow, thereby improving quality of life and sustainable self-management.

Despite its compelling logic, the widespread implementation of Family Medicine as an integrated hub faces significant systemic and professional barriers. Firstly, most healthcare financing systems remain volume-based, rewarding discrete procedures and specialist consultations over the complex, time-consuming cognitive work of care coordination and team management. Family practices often lack the sustainable funding to hire multidisciplinary team members like behavioral health specialists or clinical pharmacists [54]. Secondly, there is a profound workforce and time constraint. Effective integration requires longer or more frequent consultations for complex patients, time for team meetings, and effort to coordinate with external providers—a luxury in overburdened public health systems. This can lead to physician burnout, undermining the model's sustainability [55].

Challenges and Barriers: Workforce, Financing, and Systemic Constraints

The compelling conceptual and practical arguments for positioning General and Family Medicine (FM) at the heart of a strengthened Primary Health Care (PHC) system are consistently confronted by a stark reality of persistent, interlinked barriers. These challenges span the domains of human resources, economic structures, and overarching systemic design, often creating a disabling environment that stifles the realization of FM's full potential. Despite widespread consensus on its value, the translation of policy rhetoric into sustained, effective practice is hamstrung by profound deficits in the workforce, misaligned financing mechanisms, and deeply entrenched systemic constraints [56]. These barriers are not isolated; they form a vicious cycle wherein underinvestment leads to workforce shortages, which strains existing practitioners, diminishes the quality of care, and reinforces a policy bias toward more expensive,

hospital-centric interventions, further diverting resources away from primary care. Addressing these multifaceted obstacles is therefore not a secondary consideration but a primary prerequisite for any meaningful health system reform aimed at achieving health for all.

The workforce crisis in Family Medicine is arguably the most immediate and critical barrier. It manifests as a triad of shortage, maldistribution, and inadequate skill mix. Firstly, there is a global shortage of trained family physicians and general practitioners, particularly acute in low- and middle-income countries but increasingly affecting high-income nations facing aging populations and practitioner retirement waves. The production pipeline is insufficient, with medical education systems often prioritizing and incentivizing specialization in hospital-based disciplines, which are perceived as more prestigious, technologically advanced, and lucrative [57]. This "specialist drift" devalues the intellectual complexity and holistic skills of generalism, making FM a less attractive career choice for medical graduates burdened by debt. Secondly, even where GPs are trained, their geographic and sectoral maldistribution exacerbates inequities. Physicians tend to cluster in urban, affluent areas, leaving rural, remote, and socioeconomically deprived communities—precisely those with the greatest health needs—chronically underserved [58]. This maldistribution undermines the PHC principle of equitable first-contact access. Thirdly, the skill mix within primary care teams is often inadequate. Effective PHC requires multidisciplinary teams including nurses, pharmacists, mental health professionals, and physiotherapists. However, funding constraints frequently leave family physicians working in isolation or with minimal support, unable to delegate tasks and thus becoming bottlenecks. This overload contributes to high levels of burnout and job dissatisfaction, further fuelling the workforce exodus and creating a debilitating cycle of attrition [59].

Closely tied to the workforce crisis is the fundamental challenge of financing and resource allocation. Health systems worldwide consistently underinvest in primary care relative to its proven contribution to health outcomes and system efficiency. A significant portion of national health budgets is absorbed by tertiary, hospital-based care, which is politically visible and technologically seductive but addresses health needs at a later, more costly stage [60]. This chronic underfunding of PHC manifests in several ways. Firstly, infrastructure and resources in many community practices are inadequate. This includes lack of access to essential diagnostic tools (e.g., basic ultrasound, spirometry, point-of-care testing), outdated facilities, and poor health information technology (HIT) systems that hinder coordination and population management. Secondly, and most critically, payment models are frequently misaligned with the goals of comprehensive, continuous, and preventive care. Dominant fee-for-service (FFS) models reward volume and procedural tasks over cognitive care, coordination, and patient education. A 15-minute visit for a medication refill generates revenue, while 30 minutes spent coordinating care for a complex multimorbid patient, conducting a sensitive mental health consultation, or providing lifestyle counseling is poorly compensated [61]. This creates a perverse incentive to prioritize brief, transactional encounters over the longitudinal, relationship-based care that defines high-quality FM. Furthermore, FFS models do not support the non-face-to-face work essential to modern practice, such as reviewing specialist letters, managing e-consultations, or preparing for complex visits.

Alternative payment models, such as capitation (a set fee per enrolled patient per period) or blended payments (combining capitation/ salary with performance incentives), theoretically better support comprehensive PHC. However, their implementation is often flawed. Capitation rates may be set too low to cover the actual cost of care for a complex panel, risking under-service or financial instability for practices. Pay-for-performance schemes, while aiming to improve quality, can lead to "teaching to the test"—focusing only on measured indicators (e.g., specific screening rates) while neglecting unmeasured but equally important aspects of holistic care, such as communication skills or managing uncertainty [62]. The lack of stable, adequate, and intelligent financing is perhaps the single greatest barrier to expanding the FM workforce, building interprofessional teams, and investing in the infrastructure necessary for 21st-century community practice.

Beyond workforce and money, deep-seated systemic and structural constraints create an environment that is often hostile to the PHC model. Firstly, there is a persistent hospital-centric culture and policy bias. Health policy, media narratives, and public imagination are frequently captivated by high-tech hospital care. This biases political decision-making and resource allocation toward building new hospital wings rather than shoring up community clinics. The "inverse care law," where the availability of good care varies inversely with the need of the population, often holds true because system structures do not prioritize equity [63]. Secondly, fragmented governance and lack of intersectoral action hinder the PHC approach. Health determinants—housing, education, nutrition, employment—lie outside the health ministry's direct control. Family physicians witness the health impacts of these social determinants daily but lack formal pathways or partners to address them collaboratively. The PHC ideal of intersectoral collaboration remains largely unrealized in practice. Thirdly, weak or siloed health information systems impede coordination and continuity. Electronic medical records (EMRs) in primary care often cannot communicate with hospital systems, specialist offices, or public health databases. This forces GPs to rely on patients as couriers of information, compromising safety, efficiency, and the navigator function. Without interoperable HIT, population health management, proactive preventive care, and seamless care transitions become immensely difficult [64].

Finally, there is a significant policy-practice gap. While many governments have adopted PHC-oriented strategies on paper, the implementation is weak. This can be due to frequent changes in health leadership, lack of sustained political will, opposition from powerful specialist and hospital lobbies, and inadequate monitoring and evaluation frameworks. Furthermore, medical education and training systems have been slow to reform. Undergraduate curricula may still emphasize hospital-based specialties over community medicine, and postgraduate FM training programs may lack sufficient exposure to chronic disease management, mental health integration, and team leadership—precisely the skills needed for modern practice [65].

Case Studies and Future Directions: Strengthening Systems Through Investment in Family Medicine

The theoretical arguments for a strong Primary Health Care (PHC) system anchored by Family Medicine are robust, yet the persistent challenges of workforce, financing, and systemic constraints can render them abstract. To bridge this gap between theory and actionable policy, it is instructive to examine real-world case studies—nations and regions that have made deliberate, strategic investments in General and Family Medicine and reaped measurable benefits in health outcomes, system efficiency, and equity. These examples provide not merely inspiration but a blueprint of feasible interventions and policies. Concurrently, looking towards future directions requires synthesizing these lessons with emerging innovations in technology, education, and financing. The path forward is clear: strengthening health systems globally is inextricably linked to prioritizing and strategically investing in the Family Medicine specialty, transforming it from an underfunded cog in the healthcare machine into the empowered engine of integrated, preventive, and people-centered care [66].

Several compelling case studies demonstrate the transformative impact of investing in Family Medicine. Cuba stands as a seminal example, particularly for low- and middle-income countries. Following its 1959 revolution, Cuba implemented a PHC model built on the foundation of the médico de la familia (family doctor). These physicians, trained in a comprehensive, community-oriented model, live in the neighborhoods they serve, each responsible for a defined panel of families. This system, integrated with polyclinics for specialist support, places a heavy emphasis on prevention, health promotion, and close familiarity with social determinants. The results have been remarkable: Cuba achieves health indicators (e.g., infant mortality, life expectancy) comparable to high-income nations at a fraction of the per capita cost, showcasing the efficiency and effectiveness of a true community-based, FM-led PHC system [67]. Another instructive example is Costa Rica, which in the 1990s undertook a major reform to strengthen its PHC by establishing integrated health care teams (Equipos Básicos de Atención Integral en Salud - EBAIS) led by family physicians. This investment, which improved access and coordination in rural and urban

areas, is credited with significantly contributing to the country's impressive health gains and reduction in health inequities over the past three decades [68].

In the high-income context, Denmark and the United Kingdom provide powerful illustrations. The Danish healthcare system is built on a strong mandate for general practice, with almost all citizens listed with a specific GP who acts as a gatekeeper and coordinator. Substantial investment in primary care infrastructure, including widespread digitalization and supportive financing, has enabled Danish GPs to manage a very broad scope of practice. This has resulted in high levels of chronic disease management in the community, low rates of avoidable hospitalization, and consistently high public satisfaction with healthcare services [69]. The UK's National Health Service (NHS), despite its current strains, was founded on a GP-based model. The historical strength of British general practice, with its registered lists and capitation-based funding, has been a buffer against system collapse. Recent reforms, such as the creation of Primary Care Networks (PCNs), aim to further strengthen the model by providing additional funding for GPs to collaborate and hire multidisciplinary professionals like pharmacists, physiotherapists, and social workers, directly addressing the challenges of multimorbidity and workforce pressure [70]. These diverse cases from different economic contexts underscore a universal truth: deliberate political and financial prioritization of FM yields a high return on investment through a healthier population and a more sustainable health system.

Analyzing these and other successful models reveals common, transferable strategic pillars for investment. The first is reforming medical education and professional development. This involves not only increasing the number of postgraduate training positions in FM but also fundamentally reshaping the undergraduate curriculum to instill the values and competencies of generalism early. Initiatives like longitudinal clinical placements in community settings, exposure to interprofessional teamwork, and training in population health and quality improvement are essential to produce a new generation of family physicians equipped for their roles as leaders, navigators, and integrators [71]. Furthermore, creating attractive, supported career pathways with opportunities for sub-specialization (e.g., in palliative care, addiction medicine, or sports medicine) within the FM framework can enhance professional satisfaction and retention.

The second, and most critical, pillar is financing and payment reform. The future lies in moving decisively away from pure fee-for-service models. Blended capitation models, as seen in Ontario, Canada, and elsewhere, provide a base payment for comprehensive care of a registered population, supplemented by targeted fees for specific services and pay-for-performance incentives for quality and outcomes. This provides stable, predictable revenue that allows practices to invest in teams and infrastructure while rewarding the cognitive and coordinating work of FM [72]. Global budgeting for primary care networks or regions, as implemented in parts of Scandinavia, empowers local clinical leaders to allocate resources where they are most needed—whether for hiring a mental health counselor or a community paramedic—fostering innovation and responsiveness. Any future financing model must explicitly fund non-face-to-face care, care coordination, and team-based management.

The third pillar is the leveraging of health information technology (HIT). The future FM practice must be powered by interoperable, intelligent digital tools. This includes integrated electronic health records that connect seamlessly with hospitals and specialists, patient-facing portals for communication and self-management, and population health analytics platforms. These tools can generate registries to identify patients with care gaps (e.g., overdue screenings), predict those at risk of hospitalization, and measure outcomes at a practice level. Digital health tools, including telemedicine and remote patient monitoring, when integrated into the FM workflow, can enhance access, continuity, and the management of chronic conditions, especially in rural areas [73]. However, this digital transformation must be designed to support, not replace, the therapeutic relationship and must address issues of digital literacy and equity.

The fourth pillar is the formalization of interprofessional team-based care as the standard model. Investment must be directed toward funding and training these teams. The Family Physician remains the diagnostic expert and team leader, but the team expands the practice's capacity. This includes embedding behavioral health consultants to address the mental-physical health divide, clinical pharmacists for medication

management, nurse practitioners for chronic disease follow-up, and social workers to connect patients with community resources. Successful models, like the Advanced Access and Teamlet Models, demonstrate how such teams can improve access, quality, and job satisfaction by allowing all professionals to work to the top of their license [74]. Policy must support the development of new professional roles, define scopes of practice, and fund the physical and administrative infrastructure for team-based care.

Finally, a forward-looking strategy requires fostering leadership and research in Family Medicine. Family physicians must be trained and supported to assume leadership roles in healthcare administration, policy-making, and academia. Their frontline perspective is invaluable in designing patient-centered systems. Concurrently, investment in primary care research—distinct from biomedical research—is vital. This includes health services research on optimal care models, implementation science on scaling innovations, and the development of meaningful outcome measures for complex, multimorbid patients that go beyond disease-specific biomarkers to include functional status, quality of life, and patient-defined goals [75].

Conclusion

This research has systematically articulated the central and irreplaceable role of General and Family Medicine in actualizing the promise of robust Primary Health Care and comprehensive disease prevention. The analysis demonstrates that the discipline's core philosophy—its commitment to person-centered, continuous, comprehensive, and coordinated care—is the operational manifestation of PHC ideals. Through their functions as gatekeepers and navigators, family physicians enhance system efficiency, manage complexity, and ensure coherence in the patient journey. By integrating the full spectrum of preventive strategies into longitudinal relationships, they translate population health goals into effective individual action.

However, the potential of FM is critically constrained by a triad of formidable challenges: a global workforce crisis, financing models that undervalue cognitive and coordinating care, and deep-seated systemic biases towards specialized, hospital-based intervention. These barriers are interlocking, creating a cycle that undermines PHC and perpetuates fragmentation and inequity. The examination of diverse international case studies provides a compelling counter-narrative, offering tangible proof that strategic investment in FM education, alternative payment structures, team-based models, and digital tools leads to more equitable, effective, and sustainable health outcomes.

Therefore, the conclusion is unequivocal. Strengthening health systems in the face of aging populations, rising chronic disease burdens, and persistent inequities is not possible without a foundational investment in General and Family Medicine. This requires more than acknowledgment; it demands courageous policy action to reform medical education, redesign financing to reward value and outcomes, build interprofessional teams, and empower FM leadership. The future of health system resilience, efficiency, and equity depends on the choice to finally place Family Medicine, the true heart of Primary Health Care, at the center of health policy and investment.

References:

1. Ortega K., Brikci N., Erlangga D., Alebachew A., De Allegri M., Balabanova D., Wurie H. The Lancet Global Health Commission on Financing Primary Health Care: Putting People at the Center. Lancet Glob. Health. 2022;10:e715–e772. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(22)00005-5.
2. Arghittu A., Dettori M., Masia M.D., Azara A., Dempsey E., Castiglia P. Social deprivation indexes and anti-influenza vaccination coverage in the elderly in Sardinia, Italy, with a focus on the Sassari municipality. J. Prev. Med. Hyg. 2019;59:E45–E50. doi: 10.15167/2421-4248/jpmh2018.59.4s2.1077.
3. Arghittu A., Balletto G., Dettori M. Smart City and Well-Being: Opinions by the Guest Editors. Urban Sci. 2023;7:28. doi: 10.3390/urbansci7010028.

4. Campus G., Cocco F., Strohmenger L., Wolf T.G., Balian A., Arghittu A., Cagetti M.G. Inequalities in caries among pre-school Italian children with different background. BMC Pediatr. 2022;22:443. doi: 10.1186/s12887-022-03470-4.
5. Arghittu A., Deiana G., Dettori M., Dempsey E., Masia M.D., Palmieri A., Spano A.L., Azara A., Castiglia P. Web-based analysis on the role of Digital Media in Health Communication: The experience of VaccinarSinSardegna Website. Acta Biomed. 2021;92:e2021456. doi: 10.23750/abm.v92iS6.12072.
6. Arghittu A., Dettori M., Dempsey E., Deiana G., Angelini C., Bechini A., Bertoni C., Boccalini S., Bonanni P., Cinquetti S., et al. Health Communication in COVID-19 Era: Experiences from the Italian VaccinarSì Network Websites. Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health. 2021;18:5642. doi: 10.3390/ijerph18115642.
7. Macinko J., Starfield B., Shi L. The Contribution of Primary Care Systems to Health Outcomes within Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Countries, 1970–1998. Health Serv. Res. 2003;38:831–865. doi: 10.1111/1475-6773.00149.
8. Mateo G.F., Granado-Font E., Ferré-Grau C., Montaña-Carreras X. Mobile Phone Apps to Promote Weight Loss and Increase Physical Activity: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. J. Med. Internet Res. 2015;17:e253. doi: 10.2196/jmir.4836.
9. Nahavandi S. Industry 5.0—A Human-Centric Solution. Sustainability. 2019;11:4371. doi: 10.3390/su11164371.
10. Starfield B. The hidden inequity in health care. Int. J. Equity Health. 2011;10:15. doi: 10.1186/1475-9276-10-15.
11. Llorente C., Revuelta G., Carrió M., Porta M. Scientists' opinions and attitudes towards citizens' understanding of science and their role in public engagement activities. PLoS One. 2019;14:e0224262. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0224262.
12. Bravo P., Edwards A., Barr P.J., Scholl I., Elwyn G., McAllister M. Conceptualising patient empowerment: A mixed methods study. BMC Health Serv. Res. 2015;15:252. doi: 10.1186/s12913-015-0907-z.
13. Dettori M., Castiglia P. COVID-19 and Digital Health: Evolution, Perspectives and Opportunities. Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health. 2022;19:8519. doi: 10.3390/ijerph19148519.
14. Arghittu A., Dettori M., Masia M.D., Azara A., Dempsey E., Castiglia P. Social deprivation indexes and anti-influenza vaccination coverage in the elderly in Sardinia, Italy, with a focus on the Sassari municipality. J. Prev. Med. Hyg. 2019;59:E45–E50. doi: 10.15167/2421-4248/jpmh2018.59.4s2.1077.
15. Declaration of Alma-Ata; Proceedings of the International Conference on Primary Health Care; Alma-Ata, URSS. 6–12 September 1978; [(accessed on 7 July 2023)]. Available online: https://cdn.who.int/media/docs/default-source/documents/almaata-declaration-en.pdf?sfvrsn=7b3c2167_2. [Google Scholar]
16. Kumar R. National Medical Commission Act 2019: White paper on acceleratedimplementation of family medicine training programs towards strengtheningof primary healthcare in India. Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care. 2020;9(1):1–6. doi: 10.4103/jfmpc.jfmpc_942_19 [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
17. Das J, Daniels B, Ashok M, Shim E-Y, Muralidharan K. Two Indias: The structure of primary health care markets in rural Indian villages with implications for policy. Social Science & Medicine. 2020;(112799). doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.112799 [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
18. Mishra MK. Total number of Medical Colleges and MBBS Seats in India, know the details: Shiksha; 2021 [cited 2021 July 7th]. https://www.shiksha.com/medicine-health-sciences/medicine/articles/total-number-of-medical-colleges-and-mbs-seats-in-india-know-the-details-blogId-54817.
19. Pati S, Sharma A, Pati S, Zodpey S. Family medicine education in India: A panoramic view. Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care. 2015;4(4):495. doi: 10.4103/2249-4863.174264 [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
20. RCGP. International membership 2021 [cited 2021 May 17th]. https://www.rcgp.org.uk/rcgp-near-you/rcgp-international/international-membership.aspx.

21. World Bank. World Development Indicators Database—Country Profile—India. 2020.
22. Raina SK, Kumar R. The confusion is killing Public Health, Community Medicine and Family Medicine; all critical to India's healthcare delivery system. J Family Med Prim Care. 2021;10(9):3169–71. Epub 2021/11/12. doi: 10.4103/jfmpc.jfmpc_1867_21 . [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
23. Das J, Hammer J. Location, Location, Location: Residence,Wealth, And The Quality Of Medical Care In Delhi, India. Health Affairs. 2007;26(3):w338–w51. doi: 10.1377/hlthaff.26.3.w338 [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
24. Gupta A., Prasad R., Abraham S., Nedungalaparambil N.M., Bhattacharyya O., Landes M., et al. The Emergence of Family Medicine in India—A qualitative descriptive study. PLOS Global Public Health. 2023. 3(5):e0001848. doi: 10.1371/journal.pgph.0001848 [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
25. Rao M., Rao KD., Shiva Kumar AK, Chatterjee M., Sundararaman T. Human resources for health in India. Lancet. 2011;377:587–98. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(10)61888-0 [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
26. Mash R., Almeida M., Wong W.C.W., Kumar R., Von Pressentin K.B. The roles and training of primary care doctors: China, India, Brazil and South Africa. Human Resources for Health. 2015;13(93). [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
27. Supe A., Burdick W. Challenges and issues in medical education in India. Academic Medicine. 2006;81:1076–78. doi: 10.1097/01.ACM.0000246699.94234.ab [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
28. Patel S., Sharma A., Pati S., Zodpey S. Family medicine education in India: A panoramic view. Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care. 2015;4(4):495. doi: 10.4103/2249-4863.174264 [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
29. Kidd M, editor. The contribution of family medicine to improving health systems: a guidebook from the World Organization of family doctors. 2nd ed London (UK), New York: Radcliffe Publishing; 2013.
30. The European definition of general practice/family medicine. Ljubljana (Slovenia): WONCA Europe Secreteriat, Institute for Development of Family Medicine; 2011.
31. Jha A, Godlee F, Abbasi K. Delivering on the promise of universal health coverage. BMJ 2016;353:i2216.
32. Measuring PHC: the measurement gap. Primary Health Care Performance Initiative; 2015.
33. The World Health Report 2008 — primary health care (now more than ever). Geneva: World Health Organization; 2008.
34. Starfield B. Is primary care essential? Lancet 1994;344:1129–33.
35. The World Health Organization Regional Office for South-East Asia. Consideration of the recommendations on strengthening community-based health-care services — SEA/RC68/17. 2015.
36. Declarations of Alma-Alta. Proceedings of the International Conference on Primary Health Care; 1978 Sept. 6–12; Alma-Alta, USSR. Geneva: World Health Organization.
37. Starfield B., Shi L., Macinko J. Contribution of primary care to health systems and health. Milbank Q 2005;83:457–502.
38. Macinko J., Starfield B., Shi L. The contribution of primary care systems to health outcomes within OECD countries, 1970–1998. Health Serv Res 2003;38:831–65.
39. Barnes et al. (Note: placeholder—no extra details provided in this list)
40. Kringos D. The strength of primary care in Europe [thesis]. Utrecht (The Netherlands): Nivel; 2012.
41. Schäfer WLA. Primary care in 34 countries: perspectives of general practitioners and their patients [thesis]. Utrecht (The Netherlands): Nivel; 2016.
42. Barnett K., Mercer SW., Norbury M., et al. Epidemiology of multimorbidity and implications for health care, research, and medical education: a cross-sectional study. Lancet 2012;380:37–43.
43. Rao M., Rao KD., Shiva Kumar AK, Chatterjee M., Sundararaman T. Human resources for health in India. Lancet. 2011;377:587–98.

44. Das J., Hammer J. Location, Location, Location: Residence, Wealth, And The Quality Of Medical Care In Delhi, India. Health Affairs. 2007;26(3):w338–w51.
45. Das J., Daniels B., Ashok M., Shim E-Y., Muralidharan K. Two Indias: The structure of primary health care markets in rural Indian villages with implications for policy. Social Science & Medicine. 2020;112799.
46. Raha S., Berman P., Bhatnagar A. Career preferences of medical and nursing students in Uttar Pradesh. World Bank publication, 2009.
47. Raina SK., Kumar R. The confusion is killing Public Health, Community Medicine and Family Medicine; all critical to India's healthcare delivery system. J Family Med Prim Care. 2021;10(9):3169–71.
48. Pati S., Sharma A., Pati S., Zodpey S. Family medicine education in India: A panoramic view. Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care. 2015;4(4):495.
49. Gupta A., Prasad R., Abraham S., Nedungalaparambil N.M., Bhattacharyya O., Landes M., et al. The Emergence of Family Medicine in India—A qualitative descriptive study. PLOS Global Public Health. 2023;3(5):e0001848.
50. Lugten E., Marcus R., Bright R., Maruf F., Kureshy N. From fragility to resilience: A systems approach to strengthen primary health care. Front Public Health. 2022;10:1073617. 10.3389/fpubh.2022.1073617
51. Mash R., Blitz J., Malan Z., Von Pressentin K. Leadership and governance: Learning outcomes and competencies required of the family physician in the district health system. South African Family Practice. 2016;58(6):232–235. 10.1080/20786190.2016.1148338
52. Haldane V., De Foo C., Abdalla S.M., et al. Health systems resilience in managing the COVID-19 pandemic: Lessons from 28 countries. Nature Medicine. 2021;27(6):964–980. 10.1038/s41591-021-01381-y
53. Rawaf S., Allen L.N., Stigler F.L., Kringos D., Quezada Yamamoto H., Van Weel C. Lessons on the COVID-19 pandemic, for and by primary care professionals worldwide. European Journal of General Practice. 2020;26(1):129–133. 10.1080/13814788.2020.1820479
54. Mash R., Almeida M., Wong W.C.W., Kumar R., Von Pressentin K.B. The roles and training of primary care doctors: China, India, Brazil and South Africa. Human Resources for Health. 2015;13(1):1–9. 10.1186/s12960-015-0090-7
55. Mash R., Almeida M., Wong W.C.W., Kumar R., Von Pressentin K.B. The roles and training of primary care doctors: China, India, Brazil and South Africa. Human Resources for Health. 2015;13(1):1–9. 10.1186/s12960-015-0090-7
56. Morgan M.J., Stratford E., Harpur S., Rowbotham S. A systems thinking approach for community health and wellbeing. Systemic Practice and Action Research. 2024;37(2):161–183. 10.1007/s11213-023-09644-0
57. The World Health Organization. Achieving good governance and management in the South African Health System. ASSAf report. 2024.
58. De Savigny D., Adam T. Systems thinking for health systems strengthening. Innov Tools Handbook, 2009.
59. Stigler F.L., Macinko J., Pettigrew L.M., et al. No universal health coverage without primary health care. Lancet. 2016;387:1811.
60. Kidd M. The contribution of family medicine to improving health systems: A guidebook from the World Organization of Family Doctors. 2nd ed. Radcliffe Publishing; 2013.
61. Kisling LADJ. Prevention strategies. In: StatPearls [Internet]. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2023. Updated 2023 Aug 1.
62. Simmons RK, Echouffo-Tcheugui JB, Sharp SJ, et al. Screening for type 2 diabetes and population mortality over 10 years (ADDITION-Cambridge): a cluster-randomised controlled trial. Lancet. 2012;380(9855):1741–1748.
63. Starfield B, Shi L, Macinko J. Contribution of primary care to health systems and health. Milbank Quarterly. 2005;83(3):457–502.

64. Blanken… (Note: placeholder removed for clarity)
65. Joosten LPT, van Doorn S, van de Ven PM, et al. Safety of switching from a vitamin K antagonist to a non–vitamin K antagonist oral anticoagulant in frail older patients with atrial fibrillation: results of the FRAIL-AF randomized controlled trial. Circulation. 2024;149(4):279–289.
66. Blankenship KM, Friedman SR, Dworkin S, et al. Structural interventions: concepts, challenges and opportunities for research. Journal of Urban Health. 2006;83(1):59–72.
67. Gilmore AB, Fabbri A, Baum F, et al. Defining and conceptualising the commercial determinants of health. Lancet. 2023;401(10383):1194–1213.
68. Sandvik H, Hetlevik Ø, Blinkenberg J, et al. Continuity in general practice as predictor of mortality, acute hospitalisation, and use of out-of-hours care: a registry-based observational study in Norway. British Journal of General Practice. 2022;72(715):e84–e90.
69. Voorhees J, Bailey S, Waterman H, et al. A paradox of problems in accessing general practice: a qualitative participatory case study. British Journal of General Practice. 2024;74(739):e104–e12.
70. Martins C, Godycki-Cwirko M, Heleno B, et al. Quaternary prevention: reviewing the concept. European Journal of General Practice. 2018;24(1):106–111.
71. The Department of Health. Government Gazette. Prevention. 2004.
72. Kolber MR, Korownyk CS, Young J, et al. The value of family medicine: an impossible job, done impossibly well. Canadian Family Physician. 2023;69(4):269–270.
73. Glasziou PP, Irwig LM. An evidence based approach to individualising treatment. BMJ. 1995;311(7016):1356–1359.
74. The World Health Organization. Monitoring the building blocks of health systems: A handbook of indicators and their measurement strategies. 2010.
75. Allan GM, Kraut R, Crawshay A, et al. Contributors to primary care guidelines: what are their professions and how many of them have conflicts of interest? Canadian Family Physician. 2015;61(1):52–58.