The Review Of
DIABETIC
STUDIES OPEN ACCESS

The Review of DIABETIC STUDIES
Reprint from

Advancing Healthcare Through Multidisciplinary Collaboration Challenges, Innovations, And Future Perspectives

Saleh Mishabib Issa Al-Harith[1] , Sameera Medahi Mounis Alreethy[2] , Fatimah Madawi Musa Al-Najadi[3] , Saleh Maneh Saleh Al Mansour[4] , Mana Salem Ali Al Munajam[5] , Atheer Alamri[6] , Ahmad Ali Mohammed Merai[7] , Jaber Hadi Marzook lasloom[8]

[1]Physical Therapist Health Cluster.
[2] Nursing techniclan Al-Qahr primary health care center.
[3]Nursing Technician Al-Rayth Primary Healthcare Center.
[4]Paramedic Najran Health Cluster.
[5]Laboratory Technician Najran Health Cluster.
[6]Neurophysiology Specialist ministry of national guard health affairs.
[7]Health Services Specialist, Makkah Health Cluster
[8]Nursing technician, primary Health care center in Al-Montsher

Abstract

Health systems worldwide face a convergence of pressures: ageing populations, the rising burden of chronic and multimorbid disease, rapid scientific and technological change, workforce shortages and burnout, and growing expectations for safe, equitable, and person-centred care. No single profession can meet these demands alone. Multidisciplinary collaboration — the coordinated work of professionals from different disciplines around shared patient goals — has therefore moved from an aspiration to a necessity. Yet despite strong evidence of its benefits, effective collaboration remains difficult to achieve and sustain.

This paper reviews the current state of multidisciplinary collaboration in health care, organised around three themes. First, it examines the persistent challenges that limit collaboration, including professional hierarchy and silos, communication failures, role ambiguity, fragmented information systems, workload pressures, educational separation, misaligned financial incentives, and weak measurement. Second, it analyses the innovations that are reshaping collaborative practice: interprofessional education and simulation, structured communication and handover tools, interoperable digital records, telehealth and virtual teams, artificial intelligence and clinical decision support, new care models such as hospital-at-home and collaborative care, value-based payment, shared decision-making, and learning health systems. Third, it considers future perspectives, including human–AI teaming, distributed and community-based teams, precision medicine, and new professional roles.

The analysis is anchored in Donabedian's structure–process–outcome model, Reason's Swiss cheese model, the SEIPS work-system model, complexity theory, psychological safety, and the IPEC competencies, and it is applied to the Saudi context of Vision 2030, the Model of Care, health clusters, and national digital platforms. The paper proposes the FUTURE Framework — Foster a collaborative culture, Unify information, Train interprofessionally, Use technology wisely, Reward shared outcomes, and Evaluate continuously — as a roadmap for advancing collaboration. It concludes that the future of health care will be defined less by the brilliance of individual professions than by the quality of their collaboration.

Keywords: multidisciplinary collaboration; interprofessional practice; healthcare innovation; digital health; artificial intelligence; team-based care; patient safety; future of healthcare; Vision 2030; Saudi Arabia

1. Introduction

Health care in the twenty-first century is defined by complexity. Patients are older, more often live with several chronic conditions at once, and receive care from many professionals across multiple settings. Medical knowledge doubles at a pace that no individual can follow; diagnostic and therapeutic technologies multiply; and health systems are expected simultaneously to improve quality, expand access, contain costs, and protect the wellbeing of their workforce. In this environment, the traditional model in which a single physician held most of the knowledge and responsibility for a patient's care is no longer adequate.

The response has been a decisive shift toward multidisciplinary and interprofessional collaboration. The World Health Organization (WHO, 2010) has described collaborative practice as occurring when multiple health workers from different professional backgrounds work together with patients, families, carers, and communities to deliver the highest quality of care, and it has called on health systems to integrate interprofessional education and collaborative practice into their policies. The WHO framework on integrated, people-centred health services similarly places coordination across professions and settings at the heart of health-system reform (WHO, 2016).

> The defining capability of tomorrow's health systems will not be the expertise of any single profession, but the capacity of many professions to think and act as one team around the patient.

The case for collaboration rests on substantial evidence. The landmark To Err Is Human report showed that most preventable harm arises from system failures, many of them failures of communication and coordination (Kohn et al., 2000). Studies have linked team-based practices to fewer medication errors, lower mortality, shorter hospital stays, better management of chronic disease, and improved patient experience. At the same time, the evidence also reveals how difficult collaboration is to achieve: entrenched hierarchies, separate professional cultures, fragmented information systems, and misaligned incentives repeatedly undermine good intentions.

A new wave of innovation is now reshaping the possibilities for collaboration. Digital health records, telehealth, artificial intelligence, new care models, and new approaches to education and payment offer powerful tools — but they also introduce new challenges, from interoperability and data governance to algorithmic bias and the changing nature of professional roles. Understanding both the obstacles and the opportunities is essential for health leaders seeking to advance collaborative care.

1.1 Aim and Objectives

The aim of this paper is to provide a comprehensive review of the challenges, innovations, and future perspectives of multidisciplinary collaboration in health care, and to propose a framework for advancing collaboration in the Saudi health system. Its objectives are to:

- trace the evolution and define the core concepts of multidisciplinary collaboration;
- review the theoretical models that explain how collaboration affects outcomes;
- summarise the evidence on the benefits of collaboration;
- analyse the principal challenges to effective collaboration;
- examine the innovations reshaping collaborative practice;
- consider the Saudi context and the ethical implications of innovation;
- explore future perspectives and propose an integrated framework and recommendations.

1.2 Methodological Approach

This paper employs a narrative, integrative review design. It synthesises foundational theory on quality, safety, teamwork, and complexity; systematic reviews and landmark studies on collaboration and health innovation; international policy frameworks from the WHO and professional bodies; and Saudi health policy sources. Its purpose is conceptual and strategic synthesis for health leaders, educators, and practitioners rather than quantitative meta-analysis.

2. Conceptual Foundations and Evolution

2.1 From Individual Practice to Team-Based Care

For much of the twentieth century, health care was organised around the individual physician, supported by nurses and other professions in clearly subordinate roles. The growth of specialisation, the emergence of new professions such as clinical pharmacy, health informatics, and allied health specialties, and the recognition of the social and psychological dimensions of illness gradually exposed the limits of this model. By the late twentieth century, the rise of patient-safety science, chronic care models, and quality-improvement methods had made team-based care a central organising principle of modern health systems.

2.2 Defining Collaboration

Several related terms describe collaborative practice. In multidisciplinary care, professionals from different disciplines contribute their expertise in parallel, often coordinated by a lead clinician. Interdisciplinary care involves shared information, joint goal-setting, and an integrated care plan. Interprofessional collaboration

denotes the deepest level of integration, in which professionals work together with patients and families, sharing responsibility for outcomes (WHO, 2010). Transdisciplinary approaches go further still, blurring disciplinary boundaries through shared knowledge and role flexibility. In practice, health organisations move along this continuum depending on the setting and the complexity of patients' needs.

Table 1. The Continuum of Collaborative Practice

Level	Defining Features	Typical Setting
Multidisciplinary	Parallel contributions; discipline-specific plans; lead clinician coordinates	Specialist referral; traditional ward care
Interdisciplinary	Shared information; joint goals; integrated care plan	Rehabilitation; stroke units; oncology MDTs
Interprofessional	Collaborative practice including patients and families; shared accountability	Integrated chronic care; palliative care; primary care teams
Transdisciplinary	Role blurring; shared knowledge base; cross-training	Early intervention; community and home-based care

2.3 Characteristics of Effective Collaboration

Effective collaboration rests on a set of identifiable characteristics: shared goals that are explicit and patient-centred; clear understanding of each member's role and expertise; mutual respect and trust; structured and open communication; shared decision-making; effective leadership; and supportive organisational systems. Teamwork research has identified core teamwork components — leadership, mutual performance monitoring, backup behaviour, adaptability, and team orientation — supported by shared mental models, closed-loop communication, and mutual trust (Salas et al., 2005). These behaviours are learnable, measurable, and improvable (Rosen et al., 2018).

3. Theoretical Framework

3.1 Donabedian's Structure–Process–Outcome Model

Donabedian (1988) proposed that the quality of care can be understood through its structures (resources, organisation, and systems), processes (the activities of care), and outcomes (effects on patients). Collaboration operates at every level: organisational structures make collaboration possible or impossible; collaborative processes determine how information and decisions flow; and outcomes reflect the combined effect. The model helps leaders identify whether collaboration problems arise from inadequate structures, ineffective processes, or both.

3.2 Reason's Swiss Cheese Model

Reason (2000) showed that harm occurs when weaknesses in successive layers of defence align. In a collaborative team, each profession represents an independent layer — the pharmacist who checks a prescription, the nurse who notices deterioration, the radiologist who flags an unexpected finding. Collaboration strengthens safety only when these layers remain genuinely independent and when concerns raised at one layer are heard and acted upon by others.

3.3 The SEIPS Model

The Systems Engineering Initiative for Patient Safety (SEIPS) model describes how the work system — people, tasks, tools and technologies, physical environment, and organisation — shapes care processes and outcomes (Carayon et al., 2006). SEIPS is particularly relevant to innovation, because new technologies change the work system and can either strengthen or disrupt collaboration depending on how they are designed and implemented.

3.4 Complexity Theory

Health care organisations behave as complex adaptive systems, in which many interacting agents follow their own rules, and outcomes emerge from relationships rather than from central control (Plsek & Greenhalgh,

2001). From this perspective, collaboration cannot be imposed purely through rules and structures; it must be cultivated through shared purpose, relationships, feedback, and simple guiding principles that allow teams to adapt to changing circumstances.

3.5 Psychological Safety and Team Development

Edmondson (1999) defined psychological safety as a shared belief that the team is safe for interpersonal risk-taking — that members can speak up, ask questions, and admit mistakes without fear. Psychologically safe teams learn faster and catch more errors. Tuckman's (1965) model of team development — forming, storming, norming, and performing — reminds leaders that teams require time and support to mature, a challenge in health care where team membership changes frequently.

3.6 IPEC Competencies

The Interprofessional Education Collaborative (2016) identifies four domains of interprofessional competency: values and ethics, roles and responsibilities, interprofessional communication, and teams and teamwork. These domains provide a shared framework for designing education and evaluating collaborative performance.

Table 2. Theoretical Lenses on Multidisciplinary Collaboration

Model	Core Idea	Implication for Collaboration
Donabedian (1988)	Structure, process, and outcome	Collaboration must be enabled structurally and enacted in process
Reason (2000)	Layered defences against error	Each profession is an independent safety layer
SEIPS (Carayon et al., 2006)	Work system shapes care	Technology and organisation can enable or disrupt teamwork
Complexity theory (Plsek & Greenhalgh, 2001)	Outcomes emerge from relationships	Cultivate relationships and shared purpose, not only rules
Psychological safety (Edmondson, 1999)	Safe to speak up and learn	Leaders must create conditions for voice
Team development (Tuckman, 1965)	Teams mature through stages	Stable teams and deliberate team-building matter
IPEC (2016)	Four competency domains	Common basis for training and evaluation

4. The Evidence for Collaboration

A substantial body of research supports the value of multidisciplinary collaboration, although the quality of evidence varies and causal attribution in complex systems is challenging.

4.1 Patient Safety

Communication and teamwork failures are recurrent contributors to adverse events. Observational studies in operating rooms have documented frequent communication failures with visible consequences for team performance (Lingard et al., 2004). Conversely, collaborative interventions reduce harm: pharmacist participation in physician rounds and in inpatient care reduces adverse drug events (Kaboli et al., 2006), and structured handoff programs have been associated with significant reductions in medical errors and preventable adverse events (Starmer et al., 2014).

4.2 Clinical Outcomes and Mortality

Multidisciplinary in-hospital teams have been associated with improved outcomes, including reductions in complications, mortality, and length of stay across conditions such as trauma, stroke, and surgical care (Epstein, 2014). Nursing resources and education are linked to lower hospital mortality (Aiken et al., 2014), and hospital management practices supporting team working have been associated with lower mortality (West et al., 2002). In oncology, multidisciplinary team meetings change diagnostic and management decisions and improve adherence to guidelines (Pillay et al., 2016).

4.3 Chronic Disease Management

Collaborative care models, in which care managers, primary care clinicians, and specialists work together using structured protocols, improve outcomes for depression and anxiety (Archer et al., 2012) and can simultaneously improve mental and physical health indicators. Team-based primary care has become a cornerstone of chronic disease management in many health systems.

4.4 Efficiency and Experience

Collaboration reduces duplicated investigations, delays, and avoidable readmissions, and patients report better experience when the professionals caring for them communicate consistently. A Cochrane review of practice-based interprofessional collaboration interventions found that they may slightly improve patient functional status, adherence to recommended practices, and use of resources, while noting that the certainty of the evidence was limited (Reeves et al., 2017) — a reminder that well-designed evaluation remains a priority.

Table 3. Selected Evidence on the Benefits of Collaboration

Domain	Evidence	Collaborative Mechanism
Medication safety	Clinical pharmacists reduce ADEs and length of stay (Kaboli et al., 2006)	Pharmacist integration in inpatient teams
Handover safety	Handoff program reduced medical errors and preventable adverse events (Starmer et al., 2014)	Structured handover (I-PASS)
Mortality	Nurse staffing and education linked to mortality (Aiken et al., 2014); team-supportive management (West et al., 2002)	Adequate staffing; organisational support
Cancer care	MDT meetings change management decisions (Pillay et al., 2016)	Multidisciplinary tumour boards
Mental and chronic illness	Collaborative care improves depression and anxiety (Archer et al., 2012)	Care manager–physician–specialist teams
Hospital outcomes	In-hospital MDTs improve outcomes (Epstein, 2014)	Coordinated multidisciplinary pathways

5. Challenges to Multidisciplinary Collaboration

If the benefits of collaboration are well established, why is it so difficult to achieve? The challenges are interrelated and operate at individual, team, organisational, and system levels.

5.1 Professional Hierarchy and Power

Health care has historically been organised around steep hierarchies, with authority concentrated in senior physicians. Hierarchy has functional value in emergencies, but when it discourages others from speaking up, it disables the independent safety layers described by Reason (2000). Nurses, pharmacists, and junior doctors may hesitate to question a senior colleague's decision even when they perceive risk, leading to preventable harm.

5.2 Professional Silos and Identity

Each health profession develops its own culture, values, language, and ways of knowing through years of separate education and socialisation. Hall (2005) described these professional cultures as significant barriers to interprofessional teamwork, because they shape assumptions about roles, priorities, and expertise. Strong professional identity is valuable, but when it becomes territorial, it impedes the shared ownership that collaboration requires.

5.3 Communication Failures

Communication failures — incomplete handovers, ambiguous orders, unreturned calls, undocumented decisions, and the loss of information at transitions — are among the most frequent root causes of adverse events. They are worsened by interruptions, time pressure, shift patterns, and the absence of structured communication tools.

5.4 Role Ambiguity and Scope-of-Practice Tensions

As professional roles expand — nurse practitioners, clinical pharmacists with prescribing authority, advanced paramedics, physician associates — boundaries between professions shift. Without clear role definitions, overlap can produce duplication, gaps, or conflict. Regulatory scope-of-practice rules may lag behind clinical reality, limiting the extent to which professionals can practise to the full scope of their training.

5.5 Workload, Staffing, and Burnout

Collaboration requires time — for rounds, meetings, consultation, and relationship-building — yet heavy workloads and staffing shortages squeeze precisely this time. Burnout, which is widespread among health professionals, erodes empathy, communication, and engagement. Bodenheimer and Sinsky (2014) argued for a "Quadruple Aim" that includes care of the provider, because a depleted workforce cannot sustain high-quality, collaborative care. Executive leadership plays a decisive role in addressing the organisational drivers of burnout (Shanafelt & Noseworthy, 2017).

5.6 Fragmented Information Systems

Many organisations still operate separate or poorly interoperable systems for clinical documentation, pharmacy, laboratory, imaging, and administration, and patients' records may be scattered across providers. Even where electronic health records are in place, poor usability, alert fatigue, and documentation burden can reduce the time professionals spend communicating with each other. Health information technology is associated predominantly with positive results (Buntin et al., 2011), but its benefits depend on thoughtful implementation.

5.7 Educational Separation

Most health professionals are educated in uniprofessional programs, learning little about the roles, training, and perspectives of other professions until they encounter them in practice. Without early shared learning, stereotypes and misunderstandings persist.

5.8 Misaligned Incentives and Weak Measurement

Payment systems based on individual services or professional activity reward volume rather than collaboration or outcomes. Performance indicators are often discipline-specific, so no one is accountable for the patient's overall journey. Porter (2010) argued that value in health care should be defined as health outcomes achieved per unit of cost across the full cycle of care, a definition that inherently requires collaboration — yet most measurement systems are not yet organised this way.

5.9 Cultural and Linguistic Diversity

Many health systems, including Saudi Arabia's, employ professionals trained in many countries. Diversity brings valuable expertise but also differences in communication style, attitudes to hierarchy, clinical norms, and language, which can complicate collaboration unless addressed through shared training and explicit team norms.

5.10 Leadership Gaps and Change Fatigue

Collaboration depends heavily on leadership, yet many clinical leaders are promoted on the basis of technical excellence rather than skills in team-building, conflict resolution, and change management. At the same time, health organisations undergoing rapid transformation may experience change fatigue, as staff confront successive restructurings, new systems, and new policies. Without capable leaders who explain the purpose of change, involve teams in its design, and protect time for adaptation, even well-designed collaborative initiatives may be perceived as additional burdens and quietly abandoned. Investment in interprofessional leadership development — preparing nurse, physician, pharmacist, allied health, and administrative leaders together — is therefore a prerequisite for sustainable collaboration.

Table 4. Major Challenges to Collaboration, Their Effects, and Responses

Challenge	Effect on Care	Strategic Response
Hierarchy	Concerns not voiced; errors not intercepted	Psychological safety; inclusive leadership; escalation tools

Challenge	Effect on Care	Strategic Response
Professional silos	Territorial behaviour; fragmented plans	Interprofessional education; shared goals
Communication failures	Information loss; adverse events	Structured tools (SBAR, I-PASS); huddles
Role ambiguity	Duplication, gaps, conflict	Role charters; updated scope-of-practice regulation
Workload and burnout	No time to collaborate; disengagement	Safe staffing; workflow redesign; wellbeing programs
Fragmented information	Incomplete picture of the patient	Interoperable EHRs; usability improvement
Educational separation	Stereotypes; poor role understanding	Shared curricula; simulation
Misaligned incentives	Volume over value	Value-based and bundled payment
Diversity	Miscommunication; differing norms	Common communication standards; cultural competence

6. Innovations Reshaping Collaboration

A wide range of educational, organisational, technological, and financial innovations is helping health systems overcome these challenges.

6.1 Interprofessional Education and Simulation

Interprofessional education (IPE) occurs when students or professionals from two or more professions learn about, from, and with each other (WHO, 2010). A Cochrane review found that IPE interventions can produce positive outcomes in areas such as patient satisfaction, collaborative team behaviour, and reduction of clinical errors, although the evidence base remains heterogeneous (Reeves et al., 2013). High-fidelity simulation allows interprofessional teams to rehearse emergencies, practise communication, and debrief in a safe environment, building the shared mental models on which real-world performance depends.

6.2 Structured Communication and Teamwork Programs

Standardised communication tools translate teamwork principles into everyday behaviour. SBAR (Situation, Background, Assessment, Recommendation) provides a shared structure for escalating concerns (Haig et al., 2006). The I-PASS handoff bundle, implemented across multiple hospitals, was associated with a reduction in medical errors and preventable adverse events without increasing handover time (Starmer et al., 2014). Teamwork training programs such as TeamSTEPPS combine tools such as briefs, huddles, debriefs, and escalation phrases with training in leadership, situation monitoring, and mutual support.

6.3 Interoperable Digital Health Records

Integrated, interoperable electronic health records give every member of the team access to the same, up-to-date patient information. Shared care plans, problem lists, medication lists, and secure messaging reduce information loss and allow asynchronous collaboration across shifts and settings. National health information exchanges extend this shared view across organisations.

6.4 Telehealth and Virtual Teams

Telehealth enables collaboration across distance. Tele-intensive care, in which remote intensivists and nurses support bedside teams, has been associated with reduced hospital mortality and length of stay when combined with re-engineering of critical care processes (Lilly et al., 2011). Virtual consultations, tele-radiology, tele-pharmacy, and remote monitoring create distributed teams that bring specialist expertise to patients wherever they are.

6.5 Artificial Intelligence and Clinical Decision Support

Artificial intelligence is beginning to augment clinical work in image interpretation, risk prediction, triage, documentation, and operational planning (Topol, 2019; Rajkomar et al., 2019). In a collaborative context, AI can act as an additional "team member" that surfaces risks — for example, early warning of deterioration — that prompt coordinated responses by nurses, physicians, and pharmacists. However, AI tools must be validated carefully: an external validation of a widely implemented proprietary sepsis prediction model found substantially poorer performance than reported by its developer (Wong et al., 2021), and an algorithm used for population health management was shown to embed racial bias (Obermeyer et al., 2019). Effective human–AI collaboration therefore requires transparency, local validation, monitoring, and clear accountability.

6.6 New Models of Care

New care models are built explicitly around collaboration. Collaborative care integrates mental health into primary and specialist care (Archer et al., 2012). Hospital-at-home programs deliver acute hospital-level care in patients' homes through teams of physicians, nurses, paramedics, pharmacists, and coordinators supported by remote monitoring; a randomised trial found reduced cost, utilisation, and readmissions compared with usual hospital care (Levine et al., 2020). Integrated care systems align hospitals, primary care, and community services around defined populations, and multidisciplinary clinics bring several specialties together in a single visit for complex conditions.

6.7 Value-Based Payment

Payment innovations — bundled payments for episodes of care, capitation for populations, and pay-for-outcome contracts — reward the results of collaboration rather than the volume of individual services. By defining value as outcomes per unit of cost across the full cycle of care (Porter, 2010), these models create financial incentives for professionals and organisations to coordinate.

6.8 Shared Decision-Making and Patient Partnership

The most important member of the team is the patient. Shared decision-making models describe how clinicians and patients can work together to choose tests and treatments based on evidence and the patient's values (Elwyn et al., 2012). Patient portals, decision aids, patient-reported outcome measures, and patient and family advisory councils extend partnership from the individual encounter to service design.

6.9 Learning Health Systems

A learning health system continuously generates and applies knowledge, using data from everyday care to improve practice in a virtuous cycle (Institute of Medicine, 2013). In such systems, multidisciplinary teams routinely review their own performance data, test improvements, and share learning, making collaboration itself a subject of continuous improvement.

6.10 Interprofessional Rounds, Huddles, and Co-Located Teams

Some of the most effective innovations are organisational rather than technological. Structured interdisciplinary bedside rounds, in which physicians, nurses, pharmacists, and allied professionals review each patient together with the patient and family, align the team around a single plan. Brief daily safety huddles allow unit teams to identify high-risk patients, staffing gaps, and emerging problems at the start of each shift. Co-locating professionals — for example, embedding pharmacists, social workers, and care coordinators within primary care or inpatient units — increases informal contact, builds trust, and makes consultation easy. These low-cost changes often produce rapid improvements in communication and are a practical starting point for organisations beginning their collaboration journey.

Table 5. Innovations and Their Contribution to Collaboration

Innovation	Collaborative Benefit	Key Caution
Interprofessional education & simulation	Shared understanding and teamwork skills from the start	Requires curriculum coordination and faculty capacity
Structured communication (SBAR, I-PASS)	Reliable information transfer	Must be adapted to local workflow and sustained

Innovation	Collaborative Benefit	Key Caution
Interoperable EHRs	Shared real-time patient picture	Usability, documentation burden, alert fatigue
Telehealth & virtual teams	Expertise across distance	Digital divide; role clarity between remote and bedside teams
AI & decision support	Earlier detection; workload relief	Validation, bias, transparency, accountability
Hospital-at-home & integrated care	Care organised around patients' homes and communities	Requires robust coordination and safety governance
Value-based payment	Incentives for shared outcomes	Measurement complexity; risk adjustment
Shared decision-making	Patient as team member	Health literacy and time constraints
Learning health systems	Continuous improvement of teamwork	Data quality and analytic capability

7. Illustrative Cases

The following composite cases, constructed for illustration, show how innovations can strengthen collaboration in practice.

7.1 A Hospital-at-Home Program

An 80-year-old woman with heart failure and diabetes presents with worsening breathlessness. Rather than admitting her to a crowded ward, the team enrols her in a hospital-at-home program. A physician reviews her daily by video; nurses and paramedics visit her home to administer intravenous diuretics, take blood samples, and monitor her condition; a pharmacist reconciles her medications remotely and adjusts dosing with the physician; a remote-monitoring platform transmits her weight, oxygen saturation, and vital signs; and a care coordinator arranges equipment and follow-up. Her family, trained by the nurse, recognises warning signs and uses a direct line to the team. She recovers at home in familiar surroundings, avoiding the risks of hospital-acquired infection and delirium. The model works only because multiple professions, linked by technology and a shared plan, act as one team.

7.2 An AI-Supported Early Warning System

On a medical ward, an early-warning system analyses vital signs and laboratory results in real time. It flags a 64-year-old man whose combination of rising heart rate, falling blood pressure, and rising lactate suggests early sepsis. The alert reaches the nurse in charge, who uses SBAR to escalate to the physician. A rapid-response team — physician, nurse, and respiratory therapist — assesses the patient within minutes, the pharmacist advises on antimicrobial selection and dosing in light of his renal function, and treatment begins promptly. The ward's monthly review examines alert performance, false alarms, and response times, adjusting thresholds and workflows. The algorithm did not treat the patient; it triggered a well-designed team response. Its value depended on validation, clear escalation pathways, and human judgement.

> Technology does not replace collaboration; it raises the stakes for it. A faster signal is only valuable if the team is ready to act on it together.

8. The Saudi Arabian Context

8.1 Vision 2030 and Health Sector Transformation

Saudi Arabia is undertaking one of the most ambitious health-system transformations in the world. The Health Sector Transformation Program under Vision 2030 aims to improve access, quality, efficiency, and population health, and to shift the system toward prevention and value-based, patient-centred care (Health Sector Transformation Program, 2021). The Model of Care organises services into systems of care — such as urgent care, planned procedures, chronic conditions, and women's and children's health — each of which requires multidisciplinary collaboration across settings.

8.2 Health Clusters and New Governance

The reorganisation of public health services into regional health clusters, each responsible for the health of a defined population, together with the establishment of the Health Holding Company to oversee them, separates the regulatory and service-provision roles of the Ministry of Health. Clusters create the organisational basis for integrated care pathways linking hospitals, primary care, and community services, and for population-level accountability for outcomes — conditions that favour collaboration.

8.3 Digital Health Leadership

The Kingdom has invested heavily in digital health. The Seha Virtual Hospital connects hospitals across the country to remote specialist expertise; the Nphies platform supports health-information exchange and insurance transactions; the Wasfaty platform supports electronic prescribing; and the Sehhaty application gives patients access to services and records. These platforms provide a foundation for virtual teams, shared records, and data-driven improvement. National AI governance, including the AI ethics principles issued by the Saudi Data and Artificial Intelligence Authority (SDAIA, 2023), provides a framework for responsible use of AI in health care.

8.4 Regulation, Accreditation, and Education

The Saudi Central Board for Accreditation of Healthcare Institutions (CBAHI) sets standards for communication, handover, medication management, patient rights, and quality improvement that support collaborative practice. The Saudi Commission for Health Specialties (SCFHS) regulates professional registration, training, and continuing professional development across all health professions, and is well placed to embed interprofessional competencies in postgraduate programs. The rapid expansion of Saudi health-science universities offers a further opportunity to introduce interprofessional education from the earliest stages of training.

8.5 Workforce and Culture

The Saudi health workforce combines a growing number of Saudi professionals with a large and diverse internationally trained workforce. This diversity is a strength but requires common standards for communication and teamwork. Saudi culture also offers important assets for collaboration: strong traditions of consultation (shura), respect for collective responsibility, and the central role of family in care. Engaging families as partners in care, in culturally appropriate ways, is both feasible and valuable.

8.6 Mass-Gathering Medicine

The annual Hajj and year-round Umrah require the coordination of emergency medical services, hospitals, field clinics, public health surveillance, and logistics on an exceptional scale. Saudi experience in mass-gathering medicine demonstrates that large-scale, multi-agency, multidisciplinary collaboration is achievable when goals, information, roles, and command structures are aligned — lessons that can inform everyday collaboration across the health system.

Table 6. Saudi Enablers and Opportunities for Advancing Collaboration

Enabler	Opportunity for Collaboration
Model of Care and systems of care	Define multidisciplinary team composition and pathways for each system of care
Health clusters and Health Holding Company	Population-level accountability and integrated cross-setting pathways
Seha Virtual Hospital	Virtual multidisciplinary teams and specialist support nationwide
Nphies, Wasfaty, Sehhaty	Shared information, e-prescribing coordination, patient partnership
SDAIA AI ethics principles	Responsible human–AI collaboration in clinical teams
CBAHI and SCFHS	Accreditation of team processes; interprofessional training and CPD

Enabler	Opportunity for Collaboration
Mass-gathering experience	Transferable models of large-scale coordination

9. Ethical and Governance Considerations of Innovation

Innovation brings ethical questions that collaborative teams and their leaders must address deliberately.

9.1 Accountability in Shared and Human–AI Decisions

When decisions are made by teams, or informed by algorithms, responsibility can become diffuse. Clear governance should specify who is accountable for decisions, how disagreements are resolved, and how AI recommendations are documented and overridden. Professionals must retain the authority and the competence to question automated outputs.

9.2 Privacy and Data Protection

Shared records, virtual teams, and data-driven improvement increase the number of people and systems with access to sensitive information. Role-based access, audit trails, secure communication, and compliance with national data-protection law are essential. Patients should understand how their information is shared within their care team.

9.3 Equity and the Digital Divide

Digital innovations can widen inequities if patients with limited digital literacy, connectivity, or language proficiency are excluded, and AI systems can embed bias present in training data (Obermeyer et al., 2019). Collaborative teams should monitor outcomes across population groups, provide alternatives to digital channels, and validate algorithms in local populations.

9.4 Changing Roles and Workforce Wellbeing

Innovation changes professional roles, sometimes creating anxiety about deskilling or displacement. Transparent communication, involvement of professionals in design, retraining, and attention to wellbeing help ensure that innovation strengthens rather than undermines the workforce on which collaboration depends (Shanafelt & Noseworthy, 2017).

10. Future Perspectives

Looking ahead, several trends are likely to shape the next generation of multidisciplinary collaboration.

- **Human–AI teaming:** AI systems will increasingly act as members of clinical teams, requiring new competencies in interpreting, questioning, and integrating algorithmic outputs.
- **Distributed and virtual teams:** teams will extend across hospitals, homes, and regions, coordinated through digital platforms rather than physical co-location.
- **Care in the home and community:** hospital-at-home, remote monitoring, and community-based services will shift collaboration out of institutions.
- **Precision medicine teams:** genomics, molecular diagnostics, and targeted therapies will require collaboration among clinicians, geneticists, bioinformaticians, pharmacists, and laboratory scientists.
- **New professional roles:** care navigators, health data scientists, digital health specialists, and clinical informaticians will join traditional professions.
- **Population and planetary health:** collaboration will extend beyond health care to public health, social services, and environmental sectors, addressing determinants such as climate-related health risks.
- **Workforce sustainability:** wellbeing, flexible working, and team-based models will be central to retaining professionals.
- **Continuous learning:** learning health systems will make teamwork performance a routine subject of measurement and improvement.

These trends suggest that the very definition of the healthcare team will broaden. Tomorrow's team will include professionals who never meet the patient in person, algorithms that analyse data continuously, community workers and social services, and, most importantly, patients and families as active partners. Preparing for this future requires investment today in culture, education, information infrastructure, and governance.

11. The FUTURE Framework

Drawing on the preceding analysis, this paper proposes the **FUTURE Framework** as a roadmap for advancing multidisciplinary collaboration. Its six pillars address the challenges identified in Section 5 and harness the innovations described in Section 6.

Table 7. The FUTURE Framework for Advancing Multidisciplinary Collaboration

Pillar	Description	Key Actions	Indicators
F — Foster a collaborative culture	Psychological safety, mutual respect, inclusive leadership	Leadership development; speak-up programs; just culture	Teamwork and safety climate scores
U — Unify information	One shared, interoperable view of the patient	Interoperable EHR; shared care plans; secure messaging	Record completeness; information-related incidents
T — Train interprofessionally	Shared learning from education to practice	IPE in curricula; simulation; TeamSTEPPS; joint CPD	IPE coverage; teamwork behaviour scores
U — Use technology wisely	Digital and AI tools that strengthen teamwork	Telehealth; validated AI; usability testing; governance	Tool performance; alert response; equity metrics
R — Reward shared outcomes	Incentives and accountability for team results	Value-based payment; shared KPIs; team recognition	Pathway outcomes; cost per episode
E — Evaluate continuously	Learning-system approach to teamwork	Dashboards; audits; patient-reported outcomes; improvement cycles	Outcome trends; improvement projects completed

11.1 How the Pillars Interact

The pillars are interdependent. A collaborative culture without shared information leaves teams willing but uninformed; shared information without training leaves teams informed but unskilled; technology without culture and governance may fragment rather than unite; incentives without evaluation cannot be calibrated; and evaluation without a culture of learning becomes mere surveillance. Applied together, the pillars create a self-reinforcing cycle in which each strengthens the others. In Donabedian's terms, Unify, Use technology, and Reward strengthen structure; Foster and Train strengthen process; and Evaluate keeps attention on outcomes.

11.2 Implementation Roadmap

- **Phase 1 — Foundation (0–12 months):** leadership commitment; baseline teamwork-climate and outcome measurement; structured communication tools; pilot interprofessional training in selected units.
- **Phase 2 — Expansion (12–24 months):** interoperable records and shared care plans; telehealth-enabled virtual teams; validated decision-support tools; shared pathway KPIs.
- **Phase 3 — Transformation (24–48 months):** value-based contracts within clusters; hospital-at-home and integrated community models; IPE embedded in university and SCFHS programs; learning-health-system infrastructure.

12. Recommendations

12.1 For Policymakers and Regulators

- Embed multidisciplinary team requirements in the Model of Care and cluster performance frameworks.
- Modernise scope-of-practice regulation to allow professionals to practise to their full training.
- Advance value-based payment models that reward shared outcomes.
- Strengthen national standards for interoperability and responsible AI in health care.

12.2 For Health Leaders and Administrators

- Make psychological safety and teamwork explicit leadership responsibilities.

- Protect time for interdisciplinary rounds, huddles, and team learning.
- Involve all professions in the design and evaluation of digital tools.
- Publish team-level dashboards and recognise team achievements.

12.3 For Educators

- Integrate interprofessional education and simulation throughout undergraduate and postgraduate training.
- Include digital health, AI literacy, and data ethics in all health curricula.

12.4 For Professionals

- Use structured communication consistently and speak up for patient safety.
- Engage patients and families as partners through shared decision-making.
- Participate actively in team learning and quality improvement.

12.5 For Researchers

- Conduct rigorous evaluations of collaborative and digital innovations using patient-outcome measures in Saudi settings.
- Develop validated Arabic-language measures of teamwork and collaboration.

13. Conclusion

Multidisciplinary collaboration has become an essential condition for safe, effective, and sustainable health care. The evidence reviewed in this paper shows that collaboration improves patient safety, clinical outcomes, efficiency, and experience. Yet collaboration does not arise naturally from placing professionals side by side: it is undermined by hierarchy, professional silos, communication failures, role ambiguity, workload pressures, fragmented information, educational separation, and misaligned incentives.

A wave of innovation — interprofessional education, structured communication, interoperable records, telehealth, artificial intelligence, new care models, value-based payment, shared decision-making, and learning health systems — offers powerful means to overcome these barriers. These innovations are not self-executing; their value depends on culture, governance, and the readiness of teams to use them together. The proposed FUTURE Framework brings these elements into a coherent roadmap.

For Saudi Arabia, Vision 2030, the Model of Care, health clusters, national digital leadership, and a rapidly developing health workforce create a rare opportunity to build a health system in which collaboration is designed in from the start. By investing in a collaborative culture, unified information, interprofessional training, wise use of technology, shared rewards, and continuous evaluation, the Kingdom can ensure that its health transformation delivers not only modern facilities and technologies, but teams capable of turning them into better outcomes for every patient.

References

1. Aiken, L. H., Sloane, D. M., Bruyneel, L., Van den Heede, K., Griffiths, P., Busse, R., et al. (2014). Nurse staffing and education and hospital mortality in nine European countries: A retrospective observational study. The Lancet, 383(9931), 1824–1830.
2. Archer, J., Bower, P., Gilbody, S., Lovell, K., Richards, D., Gask, L., Dickens, C., & Coventry, P. (2012). Collaborative care for depression and anxiety problems. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, (10), CD006525.
3. Bodenheimer, T., & Sinsky, C. (2014). From triple to quadruple aim: Care of the patient requires care of the provider. Annals of Family Medicine, 12(6), 573–576.
4. Buntin, M. B., Burke, M. F., Hoaglin, M. C., & Blumenthal, D. (2011). The benefits of health information technology: A review of the recent literature shows predominantly positive results. Health Affairs, 30(3), 464–471.
5. Carayon, P., Schoofs Hundt, A., Karsh, B. T., Gurses, A. P., Alvarado, C. J., Smith, M., & Flatley Brennan, P. (2006). Work system design for patient safety: The SEIPS model. Quality and Safety in Health Care, 15(Suppl 1), i50–i58.
6. Donabedian, A. (1988). The quality of care: How can it be assessed? JAMA, 260(12), 1743–1748.
7. Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. Administrative Science Quarterly, 44(2), 350–383.

8. Elwyn, G., Frosch, D., Thomson, R., Joseph-Williams, N., Lloyd, A., Kinnersley, P., et al. (2012). Shared decision making: A model for clinical practice. Journal of General Internal Medicine, 27(10), 1361–1367.
9. Epstein, N. E. (2014). Multidisciplinary in-hospital teams improve patient outcomes: A review. Surgical Neurology International, 5(Suppl 7), S295–S303.
10. Haig, K. M., Sutton, S., & Whittington, J. (2006). SBAR: A shared mental model for improving communication between clinicians. Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety, 32(3), 167–175.
11. Hall, P. (2005). Interprofessional teamwork: Professional cultures as barriers. Journal of Interprofessional Care, 19(Suppl 1), 188–196.
12. Health Sector Transformation Program. (2021). Health Sector Transformation Program delivery plan. Vision 2030, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.
13. Institute of Medicine. (2013). Best care at lower cost: The path to continuously learning health care in America. National Academies Press.
14. Interprofessional Education Collaborative. (2016). Core competencies for interprofessional collaborative practice: 2016 update. Interprofessional Education Collaborative.
15. Kaboli, P. J., Hoth, A. B., McClimon, B. J., & Schnipper, J. L. (2006). Clinical pharmacists and inpatient medical care: A systematic review. Archives of Internal Medicine, 166(9), 955–964.
16. Kohn, L. T., Corrigan, J. M., & Donaldson, M. S. (Eds.). (2000). To err is human: Building a safer health system. National Academy Press.
17. Levine, D. M., Ouchi, K., Blanchfield, B., Saenz, A., Burke, K., Paz, M., Diamond, K., Pu, C. T., & Schnipper, J. L. (2020). Hospital-level care at home for acutely ill adults: A randomized controlled trial. Annals of Internal Medicine, 172(2), 77–85.
18. Lilly, C. M., Cody, S., Zhao, H., Landry, K., Baker, S. P., McIlwaine, J., et al. (2011). Hospital mortality, length of stay, and preventable complications among critically ill patients before and after tele-ICU reengineering of critical care processes. JAMA, 305(21), 2175–2183.
19. Lingard, L., Espin, S., Whyte, S., Regehr, G., Baker, G. R., Reznick, R., et al. (2004). Communication failures in the operating room: An observational classification of recurrent types and effects. Quality and Safety in Health Care, 13(5), 330–334.
20. Obermeyer, Z., Powers, B., Vogeli, C., & Mullainathan, S. (2019). Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations. Science, 366(6464), 447–453.
21. Pillay, B., Wootten, A. C., Crowe, H., Corcoran, N., Tran, B., Bowden, P., Crowe, J., & Costello, A. J. (2016). The impact of multidisciplinary team meetings on patient assessment, management and outcomes in oncology settings: A systematic review of the literature. Cancer Treatment Reviews, 42, 56–72.
22. Plsek, P. E., & Greenhalgh, T. (2001). The challenge of complexity in health care. BMJ, 323(7313), 625–628.
23. Porter, M. E. (2010). What is value in health care? New England Journal of Medicine, 363(26), 2477–2481.
24. Rajkomar, A., Dean, J., & Kohane, I. (2019). Machine learning in medicine. New England Journal of Medicine, 380(14), 1347–1358.
25. Reason, J. (2000). Human error: Models and management. BMJ, 320(7237), 768–770.
26. Reeves, S., Pelone, F., Harrison, R., Goldman, J., & Zwarenstein, M. (2017). Interprofessional collaboration to improve professional practice and healthcare outcomes. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, (6), CD000072.
27. Reeves, S., Perrier, L., Goldman, J., Freeth, D., & Zwarenstein, M. (2013). Interprofessional education: Effects on professional practice and healthcare outcomes (update). Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, (3), CD002213.
28. Rosen, M. A., DiazGranados, D., Dietz, A. S., Benishek, L. E., Thompson, D., Pronovost, P. J., & Weaver, S. J. (2018). Teamwork in healthcare: Key discoveries enabling safer, high-quality care. American Psychologist, 73(4), 433–450.
29. Salas, E., Sims, D. E., & Burke, C. S. (2005). Is there a "Big Five" in teamwork? Small Group Research, 36(5), 555–599.
30. Saudi Data and Artificial Intelligence Authority. (2023). AI ethics principles. SDAIA.

31. Shanafelt, T. D., & Noseworthy, J. H. (2017). Executive leadership and physician well-being: Nine organizational strategies to promote engagement and reduce burnout. Mayo Clinic Proceedings, 92(1), 129–146.
32. Starmer, A. J., Spector, N. D., Srivastava, R., West, D. C., Rosenbluth, G., Allen, A. D., et al. (2014). Changes in medical errors after implementation of a handoff program. New England Journal of Medicine, 371(19), 1803–1812.
33. Topol, E. J. (2019). High-performance medicine: The convergence of human and artificial intelligence. Nature Medicine, 25(1), 44–56.
34. Tuckman, B. W. (1965). Developmental sequence in small groups. Psychological Bulletin, 63(6), 384–399.
35. West, M. A., Borrill, C., Dawson, J., Scully, J., Carter, M., Anelay, S., Patterson, M., & Waring, J. (2002). The link between the management of employees and patient mortality in acute hospitals. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 13(8), 1299–1310.
36. Wong, A., Otles, E., Donnelly, J. P., Krumm, A., McCullough, J., DeTroyer-Cooley, O., et al. (2021). External validation of a widely implemented proprietary sepsis prediction model in hospitalized patients. JAMA Internal Medicine, 181(8), 1065–1070.
37. World Health Organization. (2010). Framework for action on interprofessional education and collaborative practice. WHO.
38. World Health Organization. (2016). Framework on integrated, people-centred health services (Report by the Secretariat, A69/39). WHO.