

# IMPROVING HEALTH OUTCOMES IN THE GERIATRIC POPULATION THROUGH INTEGRATED CARE MODELS: A NARRATIVE REVIEW

AHMAD SAUD ALKHASHMAN<sup>1</sup>, NARJES SHAYAN ALMUTAIRI<sup>2</sup>,  
HAMDAH FALAH ALANAZI<sup>3</sup>, BADRIYA ABDEL AZIZ AL-SAEED<sup>3</sup>,  
HANAN MATHKAR ALHARTHI<sup>3</sup>, EMAN HUSSAIN ALQAHTANI<sup>4</sup>,  
HANADI ABDULLAH ALMANSOUR<sup>5</sup>, MAJED SAAD AHMED  
ALZAHIRANI<sup>6</sup>, FAHAD BIN ABDULLAH BIN WAHAQ<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> CONSULTANT OF FAMILY MEDICINE, PRINCE SULTAN MILITARY MEDICAL CITY, RIYADH,

<sup>2</sup> NURSING TECHNICIAN, PRINCE SULTAN MILITARY MEDICAL CITY, RIYADH, SAUDI ARABIA

<sup>3</sup> SOCIAL SERVICE, PRINCE SULTAN MILITARY MEDICAL CITY, RIYADH, SAUDI ARABIA

<sup>4</sup> CLINICAL PHARMACISTS, PRINCE SULTAN MILITARY MEDICAL CITY, RIYADH, SAUDI ARABIA

<sup>5</sup> DENTAL ASSISTANT, PRINCE SULTAN MILITARY MEDICAL CITY, RIYADH, SAUDI ARABIA

<sup>6</sup> SENIOR SPECIALIST-SOCIOLOGY, MEDICAL ADMINISTRATOR, RIYADH, SAUDI ARABIA

<sup>7</sup> SOCIOLOGY SPECIALIST, KING SALMAN AIR BASE MEDICAL CENTER, RIYADH, SAUDI ARABIA

## Abstract

The world is undergoing an unprecedented demographic shift towards an aging population, presenting profound challenges to healthcare systems globally. Older adults are characterized by a high prevalence of multi-morbidity, polypharmacy, and complex geriatric syndromes, which are poorly managed by traditional, fragmented healthcare delivery models. In response, integrated care has emerged as a person-centered, holistic framework designed to address these complex, interconnected needs. This narrative review synthesizes the evidence on integrated care for the geriatric population. It explores the core components and theoretical underpinnings of integrated care, provides a typology of prominent models across primary care, hospital, community, and transitional care settings, and evaluates their evidence-based impact. The analysis covers clinical outcomes, such as improved chronic disease management and reduced functional decline; patient-reported outcomes, including enhanced quality of life and satisfaction; and healthcare utilization and cost-effectiveness. While the evidence strongly supports the multifaceted benefits of integrated care, widespread implementation is significantly hindered by systemic, organizational, and patient-level barriers. These include fragmented funding mechanisms, a lack of health information technology interoperability, professional resistance to change, and inadequate workforce training. The main conclusion is that realizing the full potential of integrated care requires a concerted effort toward policy reform, payment model transformation, and a strategic investment in a geriatrically competent workforce to create more equitable and effective age-friendly health systems.

## INTRODUCTION

### The Global Aging Phenomenon

Humanity is in the midst of a profound and accelerating demographic transition. Advances in public health, nutrition, and medicine have led to remarkable increases in longevity, fundamentally reshaping population structures worldwide. According to the United Nations, by 2050, one in six people globally will be over the age of 65, a stark increase from one in 11 in 2019. The total number of individuals aged 65 or over is projected to grow from 703 million in 2019 to 1.5 billion in 2050. This demographic shift is not merely a feature of developed nations; it is a global phenomenon. The growth is particularly rapid in less developed countries, where the number of older persons is projected to increase by more than 250% between 2010 and 2050, compared with a 71% increase in developed countries [1].

The speed of this transition presents an immense challenge. Many developed nations have had decades, or even a century, to adapt their social, economic, and healthcare systems to the realities of an aging populace. For instance, it took France over 100 years for its 65-and-over population to double from 7% to 14% of the total. In contrast, countries like Brazil are expected to undergo the same demographic transformation in just two decades. This asynchronous nature of population aging means many nations are confronting the complex, costly burden of chronic diseases without the corresponding economic development or robust healthcare infrastructure that was gradually built in higher-income countries. These statistics are not abstract projections; they signal an urgent need to rethink and redesign healthcare

systems that were largely architected to manage acute, episodic illnesses, not the sustained, complex needs of an aging world [2].

### **The Unique Healthcare Needs of the Geriatric Population**

Aging is accompanied by a unique and complex constellation of health challenges that differ significantly from those of younger populations. The central feature of geriatric medicine is multimorbidity—the coexistence of two or more chronic conditions—which is the norm rather than the exception. In the United States, an estimated 67% of Medicare beneficiaries have multimorbidity, with the prevalence rising sharply with age to 81.5% for those aged 85 and older. This high burden of chronic disease, including conditions like heart disease, diabetes, arthritis, and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, inevitably leads to polypharmacy, the concurrent use of multiple medications. Data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) shows that approximately one-third of American adults in their 60s and 70s use five or more prescription drugs [3].

This medical complexity is compounded by the emergence of geriatric syndromes. These are multifactorial health states, common in older adults, that do not fit into discrete disease categories but have a profound impact on quality of life and functional independence. They include conditions such as frailty, cognitive impairment (dementia and delirium), falls, urinary incontinence, and pressure ulcers [4]. These syndromes are often the downstream consequence of interactions between multiple underlying diseases and the adverse effects of polypharmacy. This intricate interplay of factors is well-captured by the "Geriatrics 5Ms" framework, which encourages clinicians to consider Multicomplexity (multiple chronic conditions), Mind (cognition, mood), Mobility, Medications, and what Matters Most to the individual.

This profile reveals a self-perpetuating cycle of decline. An older adult with multiple chronic conditions is prescribed numerous medications, often based on single-disease guidelines that do not account for their interactions. The resulting polypharmacy increases the risk of adverse drug events, such as dizziness or confusion, which in turn precipitate or worsen geriatric syndromes like falls and cognitive decline. The subsequent loss of function and increased frailty can exacerbate underlying chronic conditions, creating a vicious cycle that is difficult to interrupt with a conventional, disease-focused approach [5].

### **The Problem of Fragmented Care**

Traditional healthcare systems, organized around medical specialties and acute care episodes, are ill-equipped to manage the holistic needs of the geriatric population. This structure inherently promotes fragmented care, a state where different healthcare providers and organizations work in disconnected silos, lacking effective collaboration, communication, or coordination. As each specialist focuses on a single organ system or disease, the "big picture" of the patient's overall health and well-being is often lost. Patients with multiple conditions are consequently forced to navigate a labyrinth of uncoordinated appointments, repeat their medical history to each new provider, and bridge the information gaps between specialists who may not use interoperable electronic health records [6].

For a frail older adult, this fragmented system is not merely inconvenient; it is actively harmful. It is a direct cause of redundant diagnostic testing, conflicting medical advice, and dangerous medication errors stemming from uncoordinated prescribing. Studies have shown that poor care coordination is associated with a higher rate of adverse hospitalizations and significantly greater healthcare costs. In this dysfunctional system, the burden of integration falls squarely on the shoulders of the patient and their family caregivers. They become the unpaid, untrained, and often overwhelmed coordinators of their own care—the only constant thread connecting the disparate parts of the system. This places an unsustainable and inequitable responsibility on individuals who may already be struggling with cognitive impairment, low health literacy, or the physical burdens of their conditions, often discouraging them from seeking necessary care simply because the navigational challenges are too great [7].

### **The Concept of Integrated Care**

Integrated care has emerged as a direct and necessary response to the failures of fragmentation. The World Health Organization (WHO) defines it as "The management and delivery of health services so that clients receive a continuum of preventive and curative services, according to their needs over time and across different levels of the health system". It represents a paradigm shift from a siloed, referral-based format to a collaborative, team-based model that is person-centered and holistic. The core tenets of integrated care include a focus on the whole person—encompassing their physical, mental, and social needs—and ensuring continuity of care across different providers and settings. For the geriatric population, whose health is defined by the complex interplay of multiple chronic conditions, functional limitations, and social circumstances, integrated care is not just an incremental improvement but a fundamental necessity for achieving better health outcomes [8].

### **Aims and Scope of the Review**

This narrative review aims to synthesize the current evidence on the role of integrated care models in improving health outcomes for the geriatric population. The specific objectives are: (1) to articulate the rationale and describe the core components of integrated care for older adults; (2) to provide a typology of prominent integrated care models operating in primary care, hospital, community, and transitional care settings; (3) to evaluate the evidence for the impact of these models on clinical, patient-reported, and healthcare utilization outcomes; (4) to identify the key systemic, organizational, and patient-level barriers to their widespread implementation; and (5) to discuss future directions and

policy implications for fostering more age-friendly health systems.

### **The Rationale and Core Components of Integrated Care for the Elderly**

#### **Theoretical Frameworks Underpinning Integrated Care**

The shift towards integrated care is supported by robust theoretical frameworks that provide a blueprint for redesigning healthcare delivery. Two of the most influential are the Chronic Care Model (CCM) and the Patient-Centered Medical Home (PCMH).

The Chronic Care Model (CCM), developed by Edward Wagner and colleagues, was designed to transform healthcare from a reactive system focused on acute illness to one that proactively manages chronic disease. The CCM posits that improved health outcomes are achieved through productive interactions between an informed, activated patient and a prepared, proactive practice team. It identifies six essential, interdependent elements required for this transformation: Health System Organization (promoting a culture of quality improvement), Community Resources (linking patients to external support), Self-Management Support (empowering patients to manage their own health), Delivery System Design (implementing team-based care), Decision Support (integrating evidence-based guidelines), and Clinical Information Systems (using technology to track populations and coordinate care) [9].

The Patient-Centered Medical Home (PCMH) is a care delivery model that puts the principles of the CCM into practice, primarily within a primary care setting. The Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) defines the PCMH by five core functions and attributes: (1) Comprehensive Care, delivered by a team of providers; (2) Patient-Centeredness, orienting care around the patient's needs and values; (3) Coordinated Care across all elements of the health system; (4) Accessible Services with enhanced hours and communication; and (5) a commitment to Quality and Safety through evidence-based practice and continuous improvement. In this model, a primary care practice serves as the central hub for coordinating a patient's care, ensuring continuity and comprehensiveness.

These two frameworks are inextricably linked. The CCM provides the "what"—the essential components required for high-quality chronic care—while the PCMH offers a tangible "how"—a practical, operational model for implementing those components in a real-world clinical setting. The CCM's abstract principles, such as redesigning the "delivery system," are made concrete by the PCMH's emphasis on specific structures like team-based care and enhanced access. This symbiotic relationship explains why many successful integrated care initiatives are built upon the foundation of the PCMH, as it provides a structured pathway for applying the evidence-based philosophy of the CCM to meet the needs of patients with chronic conditions, particularly older adults [10].

#### **Key Principles of Geriatric Integrated Care**

Building on these theoretical frameworks, several key principles have become foundational to the effective delivery of integrated care for the geriatric population.

##### **Person-Centeredness and Shared Decision-Making**

At its core, integrated geriatric care is person-centered, representing a fundamental shift away from a disease-focused paradigm to one that respects and is responsive to individual patient preferences, needs, and values. This principle requires clinicians to see the older adult not as a collection of diagnoses, but as a unique individual with a personal history, goals, and priorities. The primary mechanism for achieving this is shared decision-making (SDM), a collaborative process in which clinicians and patients work together to make health choices [11]. This process involves the clinician sharing evidence-based information about treatment options, benefits, and harms, while the patient shares their personal values, preferences, and what matters most to them. For older adults with multiple chronic conditions, whose priorities may shift from simply extending life to maintaining function, preserving independence, or minimizing the burden of treatment, SDM is critical. It ensures that the resulting care plan is not only clinically appropriate but also realistic, relevant, and aligned with the patient's life goals, thereby directly addressing the shortcomings of applying rigid, single-disease guidelines to complex individuals.

##### **Multidisciplinary Team Approach**

The complex and multifaceted nature of geriatric health necessitates a team-based approach to care. No single healthcare professional possesses the full range of expertise required to address the interwoven medical, functional, cognitive, psychosocial, and environmental needs of a frail older adult. An effective integrated care team is interdisciplinary, comprising professionals from various fields, typically including physicians, nurses, nurse practitioners, pharmacists, social workers, and physical and occupational therapists [12]. The success of this approach hinges on key characteristics of high-functioning teams: open and regular communication, a shared vision and goals for the patient, mutual trust and respect for each member's contributions, and a flexible leadership structure that can adapt to the patient's most pressing needs. For example, a pharmacist may lead team discussions when complex medication reconciliation is the primary challenge, while a social worker may take the lead when coordinating community resources for a safe discharge is the priority. This collaborative model ensures that the patient receives a truly holistic assessment and a comprehensive, coordinated care plan [13].

##### **Comprehensive Geriatric Assessment (CGA)**

The Comprehensive Geriatric Assessment (CGA) is the methodological cornerstone and the engine of integrated geriatric care. It is not a single event but a dynamic, multidimensional, interdisciplinary diagnostic process designed to systematically evaluate an older person's complex needs and develop a coordinated, integrated plan for treatment

and long-term follow-up . The CGA holistically evaluates several key domains:

- **Physical Health:** Including a review of all medical conditions (multimorbidity), a thorough medication reconciliation (polypharmacy), nutritional status, and vision and hearing impairments .
- **Mental Health:** Assessing cognitive function (screening for dementia and delirium) and mood (screening for depression) .
- **Functional Status:** Evaluating the ability to perform basic activities of daily living (ADLs) such as bathing and dressing, and instrumental activities of daily living (IADLs) like managing finances and medications .
- **Socio-environmental Context:** Assessing the patient's living situation, social support network, caregiver needs, and home safety .

By providing this structured, 360-degree view of the patient, the CGA provides the essential information that the multidisciplinary team needs to create a truly person-centered care plan. A robust body of evidence confirms that care based on CGA is highly effective, leading to improved survival, enhanced functional status, and a reduced likelihood of admission to long-term care facilities [14].

### Continuity of Care

Continuity of care is the principle that ensures healthcare is delivered in a seamless, coordinated, and consistent manner over time and across different settings, such as from the hospital to the home or from a primary care physician to a specialist . It is the antidote to fragmentation and is typically understood to have three distinct components: informational continuity (the use of shared records to ensure all providers have the same information), management continuity (a consistent and coherent approach to care across providers), and relational continuity (an ongoing therapeutic relationship with a provider or team) . For older adults, who frequently transition between different levels and locations of care, maintaining continuity is paramount for safety. Lapses in continuity are a primary cause of medical errors, adverse drug events, and poor health outcomes, making it a critical focus for any integrated care model [16].

### The Role of Technology in Facilitating Integrated Care

Technology is not a substitute for compassionate, team-based care, but it serves as a powerful and indispensable enabler, providing the infrastructure to overcome the logistical barriers inherent in fragmented systems.

**Electronic Health Records (EHRs)** are the digital backbone of integrated care. By creating a centralized, accessible repository of a patient's medical history, problem lists, medications, and care plans, EHRs are fundamental to achieving informational continuity . When systems are interoperable, they allow disparate members of a care team—a primary care physician, a hospitalist, a specialist, and a home health nurse—to access the same up-to-date information, drastically reducing the risk of medical errors, redundant testing, and conflicting treatments . Furthermore, embedded clinical decision support tools can alert providers to potential drug interactions or prompt them to follow evidence-based guidelines, enhancing the quality and safety of care [17].

**Telehealth and remote patient monitoring (RPM)** technologies extend the reach of the care team directly into the patient's home. Telehealth, through video or phone consultations, improves access to care for older adults who are homebound, live in rural areas, or have transportation challenges . RPM utilizes digital devices (e.g., blood pressure cuffs, glucometers, weight scales) to collect and transmit physiological data from the patient's home to the clinical team . This enables continuous monitoring and the early detection of changes in a patient's condition, facilitating proactive interventions that can prevent emergency department visits and hospitalizations [18]. Evidence has shown that these technologies can lead to significant reductions in hospitalizations and mortality rates .

**Mobile health (mHealth) applications** further empower patients and their caregivers to become active participants in their care. A wide array of apps are available to assist with critical self-management tasks, including medication reminders and adherence tracking (e.g., Medisafe), symptom and vital sign logging, and secure communication with the care team (e.g., CareMobi) .

The true transformative potential of these technologies is realized when they are combined to create a proactive digital ecosystem. Consider a homebound older adult with congestive heart failure. They use an RPM-enabled weight scale and blood pressure cuff each morning . This data is automatically transmitted to their HER [19] . A pre-programmed alert within the EHR flags a sudden weight gain—a key sign of fluid retention—and notifies the team's care manager . The care manager then initiates a telehealth video visit to assess the patient for other symptoms like shortness of breath, reviews their medication adherence log on an mHealth app, and consults the team pharmacist via the EHR's secure messaging platform . Based on this real-time, comprehensive picture, the team can make a timely medication adjustment, averting a potential decompensation that would have otherwise resulted in a costly and debilitating emergency room visit. This data-driven feedback loop transforms care from a reactive model that waits for a crisis to a proactive, preventative one that anticipates and mitigates problems before they escalate [20].

### Models of Integrated Care for the Geriatric Population

Integrated care is not a monolithic concept but is rather implemented through a variety of models tailored to different settings, patient populations, and specific goals. These models can be broadly categorized as primary care-based, hospital-based, community and home-based, and transitional. Table 1 provides a comparative overview of these key models.



**Table 1: Comparison of Key Integrated Care Models for the Geriatric Population**

| Model Name                                                     | Primary Setting                    | Target Population                                                     | Key Features                                                                                   | Primary Goal(s)                                                                              |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Patient-Centered Medical Home (PCMH)[15]</b>                | Primary Care                       | General population, including older adults with chronic conditions    | Team-based care, care coordination, enhanced access, whole-person orientation                  | Improve primary care quality, coordination, and patient experience                           |
| <b>Geriatric Primary Care Practice[9]</b>                      | Primary Care                       | Older adults, often with high complexity                              | Geriatric-focused expertise, interdisciplinary team, CGA                                       | Provide specialized, comprehensive primary care tailored to older adults                     |
| <b>Acute Care for the Elderly (ACE) Unit[20]</b>               | Hospital (Inpatient)               | Hospitalized older adults at risk for functional decline              | Prepared environment, patient-centered protocols, interdisciplinary team, early rehabilitation | Prevent functional and cognitive decline during hospitalization, reduce length of stay       |
| <b>Geriatric Consultation Service[10]</b>                      | Hospital (Inpatient)               | Hospitalized older adults across various units                        | Expert geriatric assessment and recommendations provided to the primary admitting team         | Improve management of geriatric syndromes, reduce complications, optimize discharge planning |
| <b>Program of All-Inclusive Care for the Elderly (PACE)[8]</b> | Community / Day Center             | Frail, nursing-home-eligible older adults                             | Comprehensive medical/social services, interdisciplinary team, capitated financing, day center | Maintain independence and allow frail older adults to live in the community                  |
| <b>Home-Based Primary Care (HBPC)[12]</b>                      | Patient's Home                     | Homebound or difficult-to-transport older adults with complex illness | Primary care services delivered at home by a provider team                                     | Provide longitudinal primary care to those who cannot access office-based care               |
| <b>Transitional Care Model (e.g., Coleman, Naylor)</b>         | Across Settings (Hospital to Home) | Older adults at high risk for readmission                             | Time-limited coaching/coordination by a dedicated professional (e.g., nurse)                   | Reduce preventable hospital readmissions, improve patient self-management skills             |

### Primary Care-Based Models

Primary care is the logical foundation for integrated care, as it is the setting where most older adults receive the majority of their healthcare.

#### Patient-Centered Medical Home (PCMH)

The PCMH model redesigns the primary care practice to serve as the central hub for a patient's care. Coordinated by a primary care physician and an expanded care team, the PCMH is built on the principles of comprehensive, person-centered, coordinated, and accessible care. For older adults with multimorbidity, the PCMH is particularly valuable for its role in managing chronic conditions, coordinating care with a wide array of specialists, and ensuring continuity over time[21].

#### Geriatric Primary Care Practices

These are specialized versions of the PCMH that focus exclusively on the needs of older adults, particularly those with high levels of medical and social complexity. These practices are staffed by clinicians with expertise in geriatrics and fully integrate an interdisciplinary team (including pharmacists, social workers, etc.) to conduct CGAs and proactively manage geriatric syndromes. Innovative approaches within these practices, such as Patient Priorities Care (PPC), further refine the model by explicitly identifying and aligning all aspects of medical care with the patient's own stated health and life goals, moving beyond standard clinical metrics to focus on what truly matters to the individual [22].

#### Hospital-Based Models

The acute care hospital is a high-risk environment for older adults, where they are vulnerable to functional decline, delirium, and other complications. Hospital-based integrated care models are designed to mitigate these risks.

#### Acute Care for the Elderly (ACE) Units

ACE units are specialized inpatient wards designed from the ground up to improve outcomes for hospitalized older adults. The model is defined by four core components: a physical environment modified to promote safety and mobility (e.g., non-slip floors, handrails); patient-centered care protocols that emphasize early mobilization, nutrition,

and sleep hygiene; review of medical care to optimize prescribing; and care delivery by a dedicated interdisciplinary team . The evidence for ACE units is robust, with multiple randomized controlled trials and systematic reviews demonstrating their effectiveness in preventing functional decline, reducing the incidence of delirium and falls, lowering the likelihood of discharge to a nursing home, and decreasing hospital costs [23] .

### **Geriatric Consultation Services**

For hospitals without a dedicated ACE unit, a geriatric consultation service offers an alternative way to bring geriatric expertise to the bedside. These services deploy a geriatrician or an interdisciplinary team to provide expert assessment and management recommendations for older patients being cared for on general medical or surgical wards . Unlike an ACE unit where the geriatric team provides primary care, the consultation service acts in an advisory capacity to the admitting team. The evidence for the effectiveness of traditional consultation services has been mixed, often because their recommendations were not consistently implemented [24] . However, more recent, innovative models that are deeply integrated with the primary teams and empowered to co-manage patients have shown significant positive impacts, including reductions in ICU days, use of physical restraints, inappropriate medication use, and in-hospital mortality [25] .

### **Community and Home-Based Models**

Many of the most vulnerable older adults have significant difficulty leaving their homes to access care. These models bring comprehensive, integrated services directly to them in the community.

#### **Program of All-Inclusive Care for the Elderly (PACE)**

PACE is one of the most comprehensive integrated care models, designed to serve frail, older adults who are certified as needing a nursing home level of care but can live safely in the community . The model is financed through a capitated payment system, receiving a fixed monthly payment from Medicare and Medicaid to provide all necessary medical and social services . Care is centered at an adult day health center, where a dedicated interdisciplinary team delivers primary care, therapies, meals, and social activities, while also coordinating all specialty, inpatient, and long-term care services . PACE is highly effective at its primary goal: enabling frail older adults to maintain their independence and remain in their homes, with studies showing lower rates of hospitalization and long-term nursing home placement compared to control groups [26].

#### **Home-Based Primary Care (HBPC)**

Often described as the "modern-day house call," HBPC delivers longitudinal primary care and care coordination to homebound or difficult-to-transport older adults with complex, chronic illnesses . An interdisciplinary team, typically led by a physician or nurse practitioner, provides both routine and urgent care visits in the patient's home, managing chronic diseases, performing procedures, and coordinating with other community services . By bringing comprehensive primary care to those who cannot access it, HBPC has been proven to improve health outcomes, enhance patient and caregiver quality of life, and reduce overall healthcare costs by preventing unnecessary emergency room visits and hospitalizations [27] .

### **Transitional Care Models**

Care transitions, particularly the move from hospital to home, are a critical point of vulnerability for older adults, often leading to adverse events and costly, preventable readmissions. Transitional care models are specifically designed to improve safety and coordination during this period [28].

Two of the most prominent evidence-based models are the Care Transitions Intervention® (developed by Eric Coleman) and the Transitional Care Model (developed by Mary Naylor). While both aim to reduce readmissions, they operate on distinct philosophies.

The **Coleman Model (Care Transitions Intervention®)** is a relatively low-intensity, 30-day coaching program focused on patient empowerment and self-management . A "Transition Coach" (who can be a nurse, social worker, or other trained professional) works with patients and their families to build skills and confidence in four key areas, known as the "Four Pillars": (1) medication self-management, (2) use of a patient-centered health record, (3) timely follow-up with providers, and (4) knowledge of red flags indicating a worsening condition . The coach does not provide direct clinical care but rather models and facilitates new behaviors, empowering the patient to take a more active role in their own health. The model has been proven in randomized trials to significantly reduce hospital readmission rates [29] .

The **Naylor Model (Transitional Care Model)** is a more intensive, nurse-led clinical intervention . It is coordinated and delivered by a single Advanced Practice Registered Nurse (APRN) who follows a high-risk older adult from the hospital into their home . The APRN conducts a comprehensive in-hospital assessment, develops a streamlined care plan in collaboration with the medical team, and then provides a combination of home visits and telephone support post-discharge to provide direct care, coordinate among providers, and educate the patient and family . This model has been rigorously tested in multiple clinical trials and has consistently demonstrated its ability to reduce preventable rehospitalizations and generate significant net cost savings [30].

The distinction between these two models is crucial for implementation. The Coleman model's focus on empowerment and coaching makes it less resource-intensive and potentially more scalable for a broad population of patients with moderate risk. The Naylor model's provision of direct, high-level clinical management by an APRN makes it more

resource-intensive but better suited for the most clinically complex and vulnerable patients, such as those with severe heart failure or cognitive impairment, who require more than just coaching to navigate their recovery safely .

### **Impact of Integrated Care on Health Outcomes**

The theoretical benefits of integrated care are borne out by a substantial and growing body of evidence demonstrating positive impacts across a range of clinical, patient-reported, and healthcare utilization outcomes [32].

### **Clinical Outcomes**

#### **Improved Chronic Disease Management**

By moving away from a fragmented, episodic approach, integrated care models provide the structure needed for effective chronic disease management. These models foster improved adherence to evidence-based treatment guidelines, enhance patient self-management skills through education and support, and ensure proactive follow-up to monitor conditions and adjust care plans as needed . For older adults with conditions like congestive heart failure (CHF), diabetes mellitus (DM), and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), this coordinated approach has been shown to lead to better clinical control, fewer exacerbations, and a reduction in long-term complications [33].

#### **Reduced Polypharmacy and Adverse Drug Events**

Polypharmacy is a major source of morbidity in the geriatric population, but it is a problem that integrated care is uniquely positioned to address. A core function of many integrated models is the inclusion of a clinical pharmacist on the interdisciplinary team, who performs comprehensive medication reviews and reconciliation . This process facilitates "deprescribing"—the systematic and supervised withdrawal of medications that are unnecessary, ineffective, or potentially harmful . By optimizing medication regimens and reducing the overall pill burden, integrated care has been shown to be effective in reducing the incidence of polypharmacy. This, in turn, directly lowers the risk of adverse drug events (ADEs), drug-drug interactions, and associated geriatric syndromes like falls and cognitive impairment [34].

#### **Decreased Functional Decline and Frailty**

A primary goal of geriatric care is the maintenance of function and independence. Integrated care models actively work to achieve this goal. In the hospital setting, models like the Acute Care for the Elderly (ACE) unit are specifically designed to prevent iatrogenic functional decline through early mobilization, nutritional support, and a prepared environment [35]. In the community, the WHO's Integrated Care for Older People (ICOPE) framework provides evidence-based guidelines for interventions to prevent, slow, or even reverse declines in physical and mental capacity . By proactively assessing and addressing mobility, sensory capacity, and nutrition, these models help older adults maintain their intrinsic capacity, reduce the progression of frailty, and preserve their ability to live independently .

### **Patient-Reported Outcomes**

#### **Enhanced Quality of Life and Well-being**

Perhaps the most important impact of integrated care is on the lived experience of older adults. By embracing a person-centered philosophy that aligns medical treatments with individual patient goals, values, and preferences, these models significantly improve perceived quality of life . Patients in integrated care programs report enhanced care experiences, a greater sense of control over their health, and improved emotional well-being . This focus on what matters most to the patient ensures that the care provided is not only clinically sound but also meaningful and supportive of their overall life satisfaction [36].

#### **Increased Patient and Caregiver Satisfaction**

The coordinated, communicative, and holistic nature of integrated care consistently leads to higher levels of satisfaction for both patients and their family caregivers . For patients, the experience of having a dedicated team that communicates effectively and manages their care seamlessly reduces confusion and anxiety. For caregivers, who are often the linchpin of an older adult's support system, integrated models provide crucial support, education, and partnership. By involving caregivers in the care planning process and providing a single point of contact, these models can substantially reduce caregiver burden and stress, a significant outcome in its own right [37].

### **Healthcare Utilization and Cost-Effectiveness**

#### **Reduced Hospitalizations and Emergency Department Visits**

One of the most consistently demonstrated outcomes of integrated care is a reduction in the use of high-cost acute care services. A large body of evidence from a variety of models—including home-based primary care, transitional care interventions, and the PACE program—shows significant reductions in unplanned hospital admissions, 30-day readmissions, and emergency department (ED) visits . These outcomes are achieved through proactive chronic disease management, timely interventions for acute issues, and improved care coordination during high-risk transitions [38].

#### **Decreased Length of Hospital Stay and Readmission Rates**

Inpatient models such as ACE units have been shown to not only improve clinical outcomes but also to increase hospital efficiency by reducing the average length of stay compared to usual care . Furthermore, transitional care models like the Coleman and Naylor models are specifically designed to target and successfully reduce preventable hospital readmissions, a key quality metric and source of excess healthcare spending [39].

### **Analysis of Cost-Effectiveness**

While integrated care models often demonstrate a clear ability to improve quality and reduce utilization, the evidence

on their overall cost-effectiveness is more nuanced and, in some cases, inconclusive . Some specific, well-studied models like the Naylor Transitional Care Model and PACE have consistently shown net cost savings, primarily by averting expensive hospitalizations and long-term institutional care . However, broader systematic reviews often report mixed or unclear results regarding cost-effectiveness, highlighting the complexity of economic evaluation in this area [40].

This discrepancy highlights a critical distinction between short-term cost and long-term value. Integrated care models frequently require upfront investments in infrastructure, technology, and specialized personnel, which can increase initial program costs . The financial return on this investment is realized over time through the avoidance of future high-cost events [41]. Many research studies may have follow-up periods that are too short to fully capture these downstream savings. Moreover, a narrow focus on cost-effectiveness can obscure the broader value proposition of these models. The true value of a healthcare intervention is a function of the outcomes achieved relative to the costs incurred . An integrated care program that successfully maintains an older adult's independence, improves their quality of life, and reduces caregiver burden provides immense value, even if it is not immediately cost-saving in a narrow sense. This perspective aligns with the broader shift in healthcare policy towards value-based care, which prioritizes patient-centered outcomes alongside fiscal responsibility [42].

### **Challenges and Barriers to Implementation**

Despite the compelling evidence supporting integrated care, its widespread, systematic implementation remains elusive. The transition from successful small-scale pilot projects to a new standard of care is impeded by a formidable array of barriers at the system, organizational, and individual levels [43].

#### **System-Level Barriers**

##### **Fragmented Funding and Reimbursement Models**

Perhaps the most significant barrier to integration is a healthcare financing system that remains fundamentally fragmented. Traditional fee-for-service (FFS) reimbursement models reward the volume of services provided, not the value or quality of care . FFS incentivizes discrete, billable encounters (e.g., office visits, procedures) while failing to reimburse the very activities that are essential for integrated care: care coordination, team communication, patient education, and proactive outreach . Furthermore, distinct "funding silos" for medical care, social services, and long-term care prevent the pooling of resources necessary to provide holistic, person-centered services. This financial misalignment creates a powerful disincentive for providers and organizations to collaborate, as there is no sustainable business model to support the work of integration [45].

##### **Lack of Interoperable Health Information Technology**

Effective integrated care relies on the seamless flow of patient information across different providers and settings. However, the current health information technology (IT) landscape is a patchwork of disparate, non-interoperable Electronic Health Record (EHR) systems . The inability of a hospital's EHR to communicate with a primary care physician's EHR or a home health agency's system creates digital silos that mirror the structural fragmentation of the care delivery system itself. This lack of interoperability forces providers to rely on unreliable methods like faxing records, perpetuates information gaps, and undermines the potential for technology to serve as a unifying force in care coordination [46].

#### **Organizational and Professional Barriers**

##### **Resistance to Change and Traditional Hierarchies**

Healthcare organizations are often characterized by deeply entrenched cultures, workflows, and professional hierarchies that can be resistant to change . The move from autonomous, physician-centric practice to a collaborative, team-based model requires a significant cultural shift. This can be met with resistance from professionals accustomed to traditional roles and scopes of practice . This "professional tribalism" can manifest as a lack of mutual respect between disciplines (e.g., medical vs. social care staff) and a tendency toward organizational self-interest, where protecting departmental "turf" takes precedence over collaborating for the patient's benefit . Overcoming this inertia requires strong leadership, a shared vision, and a sustained commitment to changing the fundamental ways in which professionals work together [47].

##### **Inadequate Workforce Training and Geriatric Expertise**

A healthcare system cannot deliver integrated geriatric care without a workforce that is adequately trained to provide it. There is a well-documented and growing shortage of healthcare professionals with specialized training in geriatrics, from physicians to nurses to pharmacists . Beyond this specialist shortage, the broader healthcare workforce often lacks the core competencies required for integrated care, including skills in interprofessional teamwork, shared decision-making, and the management of complex geriatric syndromes. Health professions curricula are often already crowded, and there is a lack of faculty expertise in teaching interprofessional education (IPE), making it difficult to prepare the next generation of providers for the realities of team-based care [49].

#### **Patient and Caregiver Barriers**

##### **Low Health Literacy**

The success of integrated care depends on an activated and engaged patient who can participate in shared decision-



making and self-management. However, many older adults have low health literacy, meaning they struggle to obtain, process, and understand basic health information needed to make appropriate health decisions. This can make it difficult for them to navigate the complexities of the healthcare system, manage multiple medications, or effectively use digital health tools, thereby limiting their ability to be full partners in their care [48].

### **Social Determinants of Health**

The most well-designed integrated medical program can fail if it does not account for the powerful influence of social determinants of health (SDOH). Non-medical factors such as poverty, food insecurity, social isolation, lack of safe housing, and inadequate transportation can create insurmountable barriers to accessing care and adhering to treatment plans. An older adult who cannot afford their medications or does not have transportation to a follow-up appointment will have poor outcomes, regardless of how well-coordinated their clinical care may be. This underscores the need for integrated models to look beyond the clinic walls and address the social context in which their patients live [50].

### **Future Directions and Policy Implications**

Overcoming the barriers to integrated care and meeting the needs of an aging society will require a concerted and multifaceted effort involving policy reform, system redesign, workforce development, and targeted research.

### **Scaling Up Successful Models**

Numerous successful integrated care models have been developed and validated in research and demonstration projects, yet they often remain as isolated "islands of excellence." The critical challenge for the future is to move from pilot to standard practice by scaling up these proven approaches [51]. This requires a strategic approach that goes beyond simply replicating a model. It involves identifying the core principles of successful interventions, developing tools to assess the readiness and maturity of health systems for adoption, and creating learning collaboratives to share best practices and support implementation. Supportive policies, investment in technology, and a commitment to workforce development are essential prerequisites for successful large-scale implementation [52].

### **The Role of Value-Based Care**

Perhaps the most powerful lever for driving the adoption of integrated care is the transition from fee-for-service to value-based payment models. Value-based care aligns financial incentives with the goals of improving patient health outcomes and care experiences while managing costs. By rewarding providers for quality and outcomes rather than the sheer volume of services, these models create a compelling business case for investing in the team-based coordination, preventive care, and comprehensive management that are the hallmarks of integrated care. Alternative payment models relevant to the geriatric population, such as accountable care organizations (ACOs), bundled payments for episodes of care, and capitated models like PACE, are critical policy tools for making integrated care the default, rather than the exception [53].

### **Integrating Social and Medical Care**

The future of integrated care lies in breaking down the ultimate silo: the one separating medical care from social services. There is a growing and undeniable recognition that health is largely determined by social and economic factors, or social determinants of health (SDOH). A truly person-centered and holistic system must address these non-medical needs. This requires building formal partnerships between healthcare organizations and community-based organizations, such as Area Agencies on Aging, meal delivery services, and housing authorities. Future models must incorporate systematic screening for social needs and develop clear pathways for referring patients to and coordinating with social service providers. This requires not only new workflows but also innovative funding mechanisms that can bridge the traditional divide between health and social care budgets [54].

### **The Future of Geriatric Care Workforce Development**

A system cannot deliver care for which its workforce is not trained. Addressing the acute and growing shortage of geriatrically competent providers is a foundational requirement for progress. A comprehensive workforce development strategy must include several key components. Federal programs like the Geriatrics Workforce Enhancement Program (GWEP) are vital for providing practicing primary care providers with the skills to care for older adults. Simultaneously, interprofessional education (IPE) must be integrated into the core curricula of all health professions schools to ensure that future clinicians learn to work in teams from the very beginning of their training. Finally, new career pathways and incentives are needed to attract more professionals to the rewarding but challenging field of geriatrics [55].

### **A Call for Further Research**

While the evidence base for integrated care is strong, important questions remain. Future research is needed to better understand the long-term clinical and economic impacts of different models, particularly within diverse and underserved populations. There is a critical need for comparative effectiveness research to determine which specific components of integrated care are most effective for which types of patients, allowing for more tailored and efficient interventions. Furthermore, as technology becomes more central to care delivery, research should focus on designing and validating digital health tools that are accessible, usable, and effective for older adults with varying levels of digital literacy and physical or cognitive impairments. A continuous cycle of rigorous implementation science and outcomes research is essential for refining existing models and developing the next generation of innovations in integrated geriatric care [56].

## CONCLUSION

The global demographic shift toward an older population presents a defining challenge for 21st-century healthcare. The complex, chronic, and multifaceted health needs of older adults are poorly served by traditional, fragmented systems of care, leading to suboptimal outcomes, high costs, and a significant burden on patients and their families. This review has synthesized a robust body of evidence demonstrating that integrated care models offer a proven and effective solution. Grounded in core principles of person-centeredness, interdisciplinary teamwork, comprehensive assessment, and continuity of care, these models have consistently been shown to improve clinical outcomes, enhance patient quality of life and satisfaction, and reduce the utilization of high-cost acute care services. Despite their demonstrated benefits, the widespread adoption of integrated care remains an aspiration rather than a reality. The path forward is obstructed by deeply entrenched systemic barriers, including misaligned financial incentives, a lack of technological interoperability, and a workforce ill-equipped for the demands of team-based geriatric care. Overcoming these challenges is not a simple task; it requires a deliberate and sustained transformation of our healthcare systems. The transition to value-based payment, the meaningful integration of medical and social care, and a strategic investment in developing a geriatrically competent workforce are not merely incremental improvements but essential imperatives. Creating a healthcare system that is truly humane, sustainable, and capable of meeting the needs of our aging society depends on our collective commitment to making integrated care the standard for every older adult.

## REFERENCES

1. United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. (2019). World Population Ageing 2019: Highlights (ST/ESA/SER.A/430). Retrieved from <https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/publications/pdf/ageing/WorldPopulationAgeing2019-Highlights.pdf>
2. United Nations. (n.d.). Ageing. Global Issues. Retrieved from <https://www.un.org/en/global-issues/ageing>
3. World Health Organization. (n.d.). Population ageing. Questions and answers. Retrieved from <https://www.who.int/news-room/questions-and-answers/item/population-ageing>
4. United Nations Population Fund. (n.d.). Ageing. Retrieved from <https://www.unfpa.org/ageing>
5. The World Bank. (n.d.). Population ages 65 and above (% of total population). Data. Retrieved from <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.65UP.TO.ZS>
6. National Institute on Aging & World Health Organization. (2011). Global Health and Aging. (NIH Publication No. 11-7737). Retrieved from [https://www.nia.nih.gov/sites/default/files/2017-06/global\\_health\\_aging.pdf](https://www.nia.nih.gov/sites/default/files/2017-06/global_health_aging.pdf)
7. Healthinaging.org. (2023). Geriatrics. A-Z Topic. Retrieved from <https://www.healthinaging.org/a-z-topic/geriatrics/basic-facts>
8. World Health Organization. (2022). Ageing and health. Fact sheets. Retrieved from <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/ageing-and-health>
9. American Geriatrics Society. (n.d.). About Geriatrics. The Geriatrics Profession. Retrieved from <https://www.americangeriatrics.org/geriatrics-profession/about-geriatrics>
10. Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion. (n.d.). Social Determinants of Health and Older Adults. Healthy Aging. Retrieved from <https://odphp.health.gov/our-work/national-health-initiatives/healthy-aging/social-determinants-health-and-older-adults>
11. Keystone Health. (n.d.). Most Common Elderly Care Needs. Retrieved from <https://keystone.health/most-common-elderly-care-needs>
12. Merck & Co., Inc. (2025). Overview of Geriatric Care. Merck Manual Professional Version. Retrieved from <https://www.merckmanuals.com/professional/geriatrics/providing-care-to-older-adults/overview-of-geriatric-care>
13. PatientBetter. (n.d.). Fragmented Care. Glossary. Retrieved from <https://patientbetter.com/glossary/fragmented-care/>
14. Essenburgh. (n.d.). Fragmented care: The causes and what we can do about it. Blog. Retrieved from <https://www.essenburgh.com/en/blog/fragmented-care-the-causes-and-what-we-can-do-about-it/>
15. Singh, H., & Graber, M. L. (2024). Fragmentation of care: A key systems-level contributor to diagnostic error. *BMJ Quality & Safety*, 33(3), 123–126. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10923120/>
16. Emory University School of Medicine. (n.d.). Healthcare Delivery Research. Department of Medicine. Retrieved from <https://med.emory.edu/departments/medicine/divisions/general-medicine/research-sections/healthcare-delivery.html>
17. Chandra, A., Dalton, D. W., & Holmes, J. (2017). Fragmentation in the delivery of health care. NBER. Retrieved from <https://www.nber.org/bah/2017no2/fragmentation-delivery-health-care>

18. Mathematica. (2022). New studies reveal that fragmented care persists despite efforts to improve primary care and care coordination. News. Retrieved from <https://www.mathematica.org/news/new-studies-reveal-that-fragmented-care-persists-despite-efforts-to-improve-primary-care-and-care>
19. Wikipedia. (2024). Integrated care. Retrieved from [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Integrated\\_care](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Integrated_care)
20. Lawless, M. T., Freeman, B., Bentley, C., O'Dwyer, C., & O'Keeffe, C. (2018). What does integrated care mean from an older person's perspective? A scoping review protocol. *BMJ Open*, 8(3), e019256. <https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/8/3/e019256>
21. Provincial Geriatrics Leadership Office. (2020). Designing Integrated Care for Older Adults Living with Complex and Chronic Health Needs: A Scoping Review. Retrieved from <https://geriatricsontario.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/PGLO-Scoping-Review-FINAL.pdf>
22. World Health Organization. (n.d.). Integrated care for older people (ICOPE). Maternal, newborn, child, adolescent health and ageing. Retrieved from <https://www.who.int/teams/maternal-newborn-child-adolescent-health-and-ageing/ageing-and-health/integrated-care-for-older-people-icope>
23. Lawless, M., Augestad, K. M., Caldwell, P. H., & O'Keeffe, C. (2020). What does integrated care mean from an older person's perspective? A scoping review. *BMJ Open*, 10(2), e035157. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7044957/>
24. I Care Communities. (n.d.). Holistic Approach to Health: Integrated Care Services for Elderly Individuals. Retrieved from <https://icarecommunities.com/holistic-approach-to-health-integrated-care-services-for-elderly-individuals/>
25. Salive, M. E. (2013). Multimorbidity in older adults. *Epidemiologic Reviews*, 35(1), 75–83. <https://academic.oup.com/epirev/article/35/1/75/552863>
26. Salive, M. E. (2013). Multimorbidity in older adults. Semantic Scholar. Retrieved from <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Multimorbidity-in-older-adults.-Salive/dea140c54ed52e623cf409b5f87cbb42e31e5ff1>
27. Buttorff, C., Ruder, T., & Bauman, M. (2017). Multiple Chronic Conditions in the United States. RAND Corporation. Retrieved from <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/public-health/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2022.953886/full>
28. Salive, M. E. (2013). Multimorbidity in older adults. *Epidemiologic reviews*, 35, 75–83. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23372025/>
29. Min, J., Vegosen, M., & Lee, S. (2022). Heterogeneity in patterns of multimorbidity and its effect on health care utilization and mortality. *Scientific Reports*, 12(1), 16188. [https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1407&context=psy\\_fac](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1407&context=psy_fac)
30. Patel, T., & Shah, S. (2023). Clinical Management of Polypharmacy in the Elderly Population. *Journal of the American College of Osteopathic Family Physicians*, 15(3). [https://acofp.org/news-and-publications/journal/article-detail/vol-15-no-3-\(2023\)-summer-2023/clinical-management-polypharmacy-elderly-population](https://acofp.org/news-and-publications/journal/article-detail/vol-15-no-3-(2023)-summer-2023/clinical-management-polypharmacy-elderly-population)
31. UCI Health. (2022). Polypharmacy: A risky drug interaction of a different kind. Live Well. Retrieved from <https://www.ucihealth.org/blog/2022/06/polypharmacy>
32. Hales, C. M., Servais, J., Martin, C. B., & Kohen, D. (2019). Prescription drug use in the past 30 days, by sex and age, for the U.S. and Canada. *NCHS Data Brief*, (347), 1–8. <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/products/databriefs/db347.htm>
33. Johns Hopkins Medicine. (n.d.). Polypharmacy in Adults 60 and Older. Health. Retrieved from <https://www.hopkinsmedicine.org/health/wellness-and-prevention/polypharmacy-in-adults-60-and-older>
34. Sánchez-Pinto, P., Vega-López, M. G., & Romero-García, M. (2024). Prevalence of Polypharmacy and Its Associated Factors in Older Adults: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Clinical Medicine*, 14(4), 1330. <https://www.mdpi.com/2077-0383/14/4/1330>
35. Karabulut, E., & Ince, S. (2024). Frequency of geriatric syndromes in older adults with and without dementia. *Neurological Sciences*, 45(6), 2821–2829. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10933188/>
36. Al-Raddadi, R., Al-Ghamdi, S., & Al-Asmari, A. (2024). Functional Status in Relation to Common Geriatric Syndromes and Sociodemographic Characteristics in Community-Dwelling Older Adults in Saudi Arabia. *Clinical Interventions in Aging*, 19, 517–527. <https://www.dovepress.com/functional-status-in-relation-to-common-geriatric-syndromes-and-sociod-peer-reviewed-fulltext-article-CIA>
37. Sanford, A. M., Morley, J. E., Berg-Weger, M., Lundy, J., Little, M. O., Leonard, K., & Malmstrom, T. K. (2020). High prevalence of geriatric syndromes in older adults. *PloS one*, 15(6), e0233857. <https://dukespace.lib.duke.edu/items/8d386c3a-d8c4-4d76-8a69-ff3e81f911a2>
38. Improving Chronic Illness Care. (n.d.). The Chronic Care Model. ACT Center. Retrieved from [https://www.act-center.org/application/files/1616/3511/6445/Model\\_Chronic\\_Care.pdf](https://www.act-center.org/application/files/1616/3511/6445/Model_Chronic_Care.pdf)

39. iHealth Labs. (2024). How Chronic Care Management Supports Seniors and Their Loved Ones. Retrieved from <https://ihealthlabs.com/blogs/education/how-chronic-care-management-supports-seniors>
40. ChartSpan. (n.d.). The Chronic Care Model Explained. Blog. Retrieved from <https://www.chartspan.com/blog/what-is-the-chronic-care-model/>
41. ACT Center. (n.d.). The Chronic Care Model. Retrieved from
42. [https://www.act-center.org/application/files/1616/3511/6445/Model\\_Chronic\\_Care.pdf](https://www.act-center.org/application/files/1616/3511/6445/Model_Chronic_Care.pdf)
43. Whiteman, K., & Kennedy, R. (2021). Value-based chronic care model approach for vulnerable older patients with multiple chronic conditions. *Annals of palliative medicine*, 10(8), 9400–9412. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8343083/>
44. Boyd, C. M., Boulton, C., Shadmi, E., Leff, B., Brager, R., Dunbar, L., Wolff, J. L., & Wegener, S. (2007). Guided care for chronically ill older adults. *The Gerontologist*, 47(5), 697–704. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3605940/>
45. American Geriatrics Society. (n.d.). Patient-Centered Medical Homes. Practice Management. Retrieved from <https://www.americangeriatrics.org/publications-tools/practice-management/patient-centered-medical-homes>
46. American Geriatrics Society. (2018). Patient Centered Medical Homes and Older Adults. Retrieved from <https://www.americangeriatrics.org/publications-tools/practice-management/patient-centered-medical-homes>
47. University of Utah Health. (n.d.). Patient-Centered Medical Home. Geriatrics. Retrieved from <https://healthcare.utah.edu/geriatrics/patient-centered-home>
48. Chan, Z. W. W., Lim, W. S., & Matchar, D. B. (2023). An Integrated Patient-Centred Medical Home (PCMH) Care Model Reduces Prospective Healthcare Utilisation for Community-Dwelling Older Adults with Complex Needs: A Matched Observational Study in Singapore. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(19), 6848. <https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/20/19/6848>
49. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. (2022). Defining the PCMH. National Center for Excellence in Primary Care Research. Retrieved from <https://www.ahrq.gov/ncepcr/research/care-coordination/pcmh/define.html>
50. Stange, K. C. (2009). The patient-centered medical home: history, seven core features, evidence and transformational change. The Robert Graham Center. Retrieved from <https://www.graham-center.org/dam/rgc/documents/publications-reports/monographs-books/rgcmo-medical-home.pdf>
51. Nautilus Senior Home Care. (n.d.). Person-Centered Elderly Care. Retrieved from <https://nautilusshc.com/person-centered-elderly-care/>
52. Alzheimer Society of Canada. (n.d.). Providing person-centred care. For healthcare providers. Retrieved from <https://alzheimer.ca/en/help-support/im-healthcare-provider/providing-person-centred-care>
53. The Cedars. (n.d.). What is a Person-Centered Approach and How Does It Help Seniors with Dementia?. Retrieved from <https://www.thecedarsportland.org/what-is-a-person-centered-approach-and-how-does-it-help-seniors-with-dementia/>
54. National Council of Certified Dementia Practitioners. (n.d.). Person-Centered Care in Senior Living and Memory Care Neighborhoods. Retrieved from <https://www.nccdp.org/person-centered-care-in-senior-living-and-memory-care-neighborhoods/>
55. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. (2023). Person-Centered Care. Innovation Center. Retrieved from <https://www.cms.gov/priorities/innovation/key-concepts/person-centered-care>
56. Reuben, D. B., Tinetti, M. E., & The American Geriatrics Society Expert Panel on Person-Centered Care. (2016). Person-Centered Care: A Definition and Essential Elements. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 64(1), 15–18. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26626262/>
57. Schoenborn, N. L., Van Pilsum Rasmussen, S. E., & Boyd, C. M. (2018). The importance and challenges of shared decision making in older people with multimorbidity. *PloS medicine*, 15(3), e1002530. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5849298/>