

Care Coordination During Pandemic Surge Conditions: Appointment Systems, Record Integrity, and Continuity of Service Delivery

Sylvia Stella Favour Peteranaba^{1*}, Helen Ekwi Osinem², Florence Eribenne³, Olakunle Saheed Soyege⁴

¹Independent Researcher, Favourpeteranaba@gmail.com

²Jos University Teaching Hospital (JUTH), Nursing Services Department, Jos, Nigeria
helenosinem@gmail.com

³Bay Cove Human Services, Boston, MA, USA, feribenne1980@gmail.com

⁴Independent Researcher, Pretoria, South Africa, ossoyege@gmail.com

*Corresponding Author: Sylvia Stella Favour Peteranaba, Favourpeteranaba@gmail.com

Abstract

Pandemic surges place exceptional strain on healthcare systems by disrupting access, overloading clinical capacity, fragmenting referral pathways, and increasing the risk of incomplete or delayed information exchange. This review examines how patient care coordination can be preserved under such conditions, with emphasis on appointment management, record integrity, continuity of essential services, telehealth, and resilient surge-response design. A structured narrative review approach was used to synthesize evidence published up to 2021 from diverse international settings, including studies from Nigeria and other African countries, alongside research from Europe, Asia, Australia, and North America. The review found that effective coordination depends on risk-based appointment prioritization, reliable digital triage, interoperable and accurate health records, closed-loop referrals, flexible workforce deployment, and protected pathways for routine and chronic care. Telehealth and alternative service channels emerged as important mechanisms for sustaining access, but their effectiveness is conditioned by infrastructure, digital literacy, governance, privacy protection, and the availability of escalation routes for patients requiring in-person assessment. The evidence further shows that pandemic resilience is strongest where emergency preparedness is integrated with ordinary service delivery rather than treated as a parallel system. The review concludes that continuity, information integrity, and coordinated access are mutually reinforcing components of resilient healthcare delivery. It recommends investment in interoperable digital platforms, standardized escalation protocols, real-time capacity monitoring, workforce cross-training, secure data-sharing frameworks, and systematic recovery plans for deferred care. These priorities are essential for protecting vulnerable populations during prolonged system disruption. Future research should prioritize implementation studies across resource-constrained settings and evaluate digital coordination tools for equity, usability, safety, and sustained performance across successive health emergencies.

Keywords: Patient care coordination; Pandemic surges; Appointment systems; Record integrity; Telehealth; Healthcare resilience

Introduction

1.1 Pandemic Surges and Healthcare Service Disruption

Pandemic surge conditions expose health systems to simultaneous epidemiological, operational and informational pressures that can destabilize ordinary patterns of service delivery. Rapid increases in infectious disease caseloads force hospitals and ambulatory services to redirect staff, beds, diagnostic capacity and administrative attention toward emergency response, frequently compressing the resources available for routine care. A systematic review covering 81 studies across 20 countries found broad reductions in healthcare utilization during the early COVID-19 period, with especially marked declines in visits, admissions, diagnostic services and therapeutic activity, demonstrating that surges disrupt both demand and supply across care pathways (Moynihan et al., 2021). For care coordination, these shifts create immediate problems in scheduling, referral sequencing, follow-up and the timely movement of clinical information between providers.

Appointment systems are particularly vulnerable when surge management requires cancellation, postponement, or conversion of face-to-face encounters. In the United States, many adults reported delaying or avoiding urgent and routine medical care because of COVID-19-related concerns, indicating that service disruption may arise from patient behavior as well as institutional restrictions (Czeisler et al., 2020). Such reductions can generate accumulated appointment backlogs, missed reassessments, and delayed escalation of symptoms, while simultaneously increasing the administrative burden of rescheduling patients according to clinical urgency.

Hospital utilization patterns similarly show how pandemic surges can distort access to non-pandemic care. Analysis of United States admissions documented sharp declines in non-COVID-19 hospitalizations across diagnostic categories during the initial pandemic period, with incomplete recovery for several acute conditions even after overall admissions began to rebound (Birkmeyer et al., 2020). In northern Italy, admissions for acute coronary syndromes fell substantially during the outbreak, raising concern that patients with time-sensitive cardiovascular conditions were not reaching hospitals when intervention was required (De Filippo et al., 2020). These patterns illustrate how disrupted entry into care can undermine coordination between emergency departments, specialist teams, laboratories and inpatient services.

Diagnostic continuity was also affected. In the Netherlands, a pronounced reduction in new cancer diagnoses occurred during the epidemic, reflecting interruption across screening, primary-care presentation and diagnostic pathways (Dinmohamed et al., 2020). When diagnostic encounters are deferred, record integrity becomes operationally important because delayed test results, incomplete referral histories or fragmented documentation can complicate subsequent prioritization and treatment planning.

Routine management of chronic illness faced comparable pressures. A global survey of healthcare professionals from 47 countries reported substantial changes in chronic disease care, including reduced access and widespread substitution of virtual communication for conventional encounters (Chudasama et al., 2020). Although remote delivery preserved elements of continuity, rapid transitions required dependable appointment tracking, accessible longitudinal records and mechanisms for identifying patients whose conditions could not be managed safely at a distance.

The consequences were also evident in maternal and neonatal services. Evidence from Nepal showed that lockdown conditions were associated with reduced institutional births and deterioration in selected intrapartum and neonatal outcomes, illustrating how emergency measures can affect essential services beyond the immediate disease response (Ashish et al., 2020). Such findings

underscore the importance of maintaining coordinated pathways for high-risk and time-critical care even when facilities face exceptional demand.

African experiences further demonstrate that surge-related disruption is shaped by health-system capacity and wider social conditions. South Africa's pandemic response combined restrictive public-health measures with efforts to manage substantial health and economic pressures, revealing the complexity of maintaining services under changing conditions (Ikwegbue et al., 2021). In Nigeria, evidence of economic strain and changing household responsibilities highlights how financial stress can alter families' ability to absorb disruptions and sustain access to necessary services (Ezeani & Sabbah, 2021).

Accordingly, pandemic surges should be understood not simply as episodes of excessive clinical demand but as system-wide coordination shocks. Appointment platforms, referral processes, health records, communication channels and continuity mechanisms become interdependent safeguards against patients being lost between services. Their resilience determines whether delayed care remains traceable, whether clinical information follows the patient accurately, and whether essential treatment can continue despite severe operational pressure.

1.2 Care Coordination Under Operational Pressure

Care coordination under pandemic surge conditions is fundamentally an operational problem of managing interdependence while clinical demand, staffing patterns, information flows and service capacity change simultaneously. Effective coordination requires organisations to preserve communication across emergency departments, inpatient units, primary care, laboratories, pharmacies and community services while reallocating resources toward rapidly expanding caseloads. Comparative analysis of responses in 28 countries shows that resilient systems combined adaptive capacity, workforce flexibility, integrated information functions and preservation of essential services rather than concentrating exclusively on the immediate outbreak (Haldane et al., 2021). This systems perspective is crucial because disruptions at one point of care can propagate through referrals, diagnostics, discharge arrangements and follow-up schedules.

Operational pressure also changes how responsibilities are distributed. Case managers and multidisciplinary teams may need to accelerate discharge planning, coordinate transitions remotely, identify patients at heightened risk and maintain communication with families and post-acute providers despite restricted physical access. Pandemic case-management guidance therefore emphasized tele-case management, surge capacity, discharge planning and transitions of care as interconnected practices rather than isolated administrative functions (Tahan, 2020). Coordination quality consequently depends on timely clinical information, clearly assigned accountability and escalation mechanisms that prevent patients from becoming lost between services.

Primary care provides a particularly important buffer during surges because it absorbs routine demand while identifying patients requiring escalation. In Cape Town, services were reorganised through screening and streaming, rapid treatment arrangements, community-based testing and home medication delivery for stable chronic-care patients, demonstrating how local redesign can preserve access while separating infection risks (Mash, Goliath & Perez, 2020). Such adaptations require appointment systems and patient records to remain synchronized so that altered pathways do not produce missed reviews, duplicated encounters, or incomplete handovers.

Continuity is equally dependent on relationships between providers. Evidence from Taiwan indicates that continuity and coordination are distinct but complementary dimensions of care, with implications for hospitalization among patients with chronic illness (Chen & Cheng, 2021). Under

surge conditions, this distinction becomes operationally significant: continuity preserves an ongoing therapeutic relationship, whereas coordination organizes activities among multiple professionals, facilities and service levels.

Workforce capability is another determinant of coordination reliability. A Nigerian conceptual model of distributed operations emphasizes competency alignment, digital collaboration, continuous learning and adaptive workforce development as foundations for sustaining performance across dispersed systems (Falemi, Akhigbe & Akin-Oluyomi, 2020). Administrative performance also rests on communication, interpersonal competence, punctuality and team spirit, attributes associated with organizational effectiveness in Nigerian institutions (Onche, Adenekan & Sabboh, 2021). Within healthcare surges, these capabilities translate into accurate scheduling, rapid information exchange, disciplined task handoffs, and responsive coordination across clinical and administrative teams, allowing service continuity to be maintained despite extraordinary operational strain during volatile periods of demand and resource scarcity.

1.3 Review Scope, Purpose, and Objectives

This review examines patient care coordination during pandemic surge conditions, with particular attention to appointment systems, record integrity, and continuity of service delivery across disrupted healthcare environments. Its scope encompasses the organisational, clinical, administrative, and technological mechanisms used to maintain access to care when sudden increases in demand place exceptional pressure on workforce capacity, infrastructure, referral pathways, and information systems. The review considers both acute and routine services, recognising that pandemic response must accommodate emergency priorities without allowing chronic disease management, diagnostic follow-up, medication continuity, maternal care, and other essential services to deteriorate.

The purpose is to critically synthesise how healthcare organisations adapt coordination processes during periods of operational instability and to identify the practices most relevant to preserving safe, timely, and connected care. Particular emphasis is placed on appointment scheduling, triage and prioritisation, patient tracking, documentation accuracy, information accessibility, interprofessional communication, referral continuity, and the use of digital or remote service channels. The review also considers how breakdowns in these functions can produce missed appointments, fragmented records, delayed interventions, duplicated services, and inequitable access.

The principal objectives are to evaluate the operational pressures that compromise coordination; examine how appointment systems are redesigned under surge conditions; assess the importance of reliable, accessible, and interoperable patient records; analyse strategies for sustaining essential services across care settings; and identify resilience, policy, and research priorities for future emergencies. By integrating these dimensions, the review provides a structured basis for understanding how healthcare systems can preserve coordinated care while responding to changing demand, constrained resources, and heightened clinical risk.

1.4 Significance for Resilient Healthcare Delivery

Resilient healthcare delivery depends on the capacity of health systems to absorb disruption, adapt operational processes, and sustain essential services without compromising safety, equity, or continuity. Pandemic surge conditions expose weaknesses that may remain less visible during routine operations, particularly where appointment management, patient information, referral

pathways, and workforce coordination are fragmented. Examining these functions is therefore significant because resilience is not determined solely by emergency bed capacity or infectious disease response; it also depends on whether ordinary care can continue while resources are redirected toward rapidly changing priorities.

Reliable appointment systems are central to this resilience because they support prioritisation, reduce avoidable congestion, and help organisations distinguish between care that can be deferred and care requiring immediate attention. Equally, record integrity ensures that clinicians and administrators can access accurate histories, test results, medication information, and referral details when patients move across services or providers. Where records are incomplete, delayed, or inaccessible, surge pressures can magnify clinical risk, duplication, and loss to follow-up.

Continuity of service delivery further strengthens resilience by protecting patients whose needs persist irrespective of the emergency. Chronic disease management, maternal care, mental health support, diagnostics, medication access, and rehabilitation services require adaptable pathways that can function alongside outbreak response. The significance of coordinated continuity therefore extends beyond operational efficiency to patient safety, trust, and equitable access.

A resilience-oriented perspective also informs preparedness planning. It encourages healthcare organisations to build interoperable information systems, flexible staffing arrangements, alternative service channels, escalation protocols, and recovery mechanisms before crises occur. Understanding how these components interact under pressure provides a practical basis for designing health systems capable of maintaining coordinated, responsive, and patient-centred care throughout future public health emergencies. Such preparedness also reduces recovery delays by enabling services to return efficiently to routine operations following prolonged periods of exceptional system-wide disruption.

2. Care Coordination During Pandemic Surges

2.1 Coordination Models Across Care Settings

Coordination across care settings during pandemic surges requires a model capable of connecting patients, professionals, information, and resources across primary, secondary, tertiary, community, and home-based services. Integrated care is therefore best understood as a multilevel architecture rather than a single intervention. The Rainbow Model of Integrated Care distinguishes clinical integration at the patient level, professional and organizational integration at the meso level, and system integration at the macro level, linked by functional and normative mechanisms. This framework is particularly relevant during surges because pathway changes must remain coherent across facilities while preserving informational and relational continuity (Valentijn et al., 2013).

Operationally, effective models combine multidisciplinary assessment, shared care planning, case management, referral coordination, medication management, and communication across organizational boundaries. Evidence synthesized across integrated-care reviews shows that successful approaches commonly rely on multidisciplinary teams, care planning, case management, transitional support, and mechanisms that place patients' needs at the centre of service configuration

(Briggs et al., 2018). During pandemic pressure, these components enable systems to redistribute care without severing responsibility for follow-up, diagnostics, treatment adjustment, or recovery.

A practical example is Singapore's Right-Site Care Programme, which transferred suitable chronic-disease management from specialist outpatient services to a community family medicine clinic while retaining specialist consultation when necessary. Shared electronic medical records and multidisciplinary case conferences supported coordination between hospital and community teams. Such arrangements illustrate how clinical responsibility, interoperable information, and planned movement between settings can reduce fragmentation when hospital capacity becomes constrained (Ang et al., 2019).

African experience similarly demonstrates the value of integrating services around patient needs rather than maintaining isolated disease programmes. South Africa's Integrated Chronic Disease Management model combined HIV and hypertension care within primary healthcare facilities, using existing service infrastructure to manage multiple chronic conditions. Although clinical effects were modest, the model demonstrated the feasibility of reorganizing parallel programmes into a more coordinated platform, an approach with particular relevance when surge conditions require staff, appointments, and treatment capacity to serve several patient groups simultaneously (Ameh et al., 2017).

Referral systems provide the connective structure for vertical coordination. Nigerian evidence from primary healthcare centres in Oyo State found substantial knowledge of referral principles among health workers but weaker practical utilization, with limitations involving communication, feedback, transport, and linkage mechanisms. These weaknesses are consequential during pandemic surges because referral without feedback can leave receiving and originating facilities with incomplete knowledge of patient status, increasing the likelihood of repeated assessment, delayed follow-up, or discontinuity after transfer (Oluseye et al., 2019).

Integrated models also depend upon conditions extending beyond referral pathways. A realist synthesis of programmes for community-dwelling frail adults found that multidisciplinary competence, person-centred care, stakeholder communication, caregiver involvement, information technology, financial support, and organizational alignment interact to determine whether integration functions as intended. This suggests that coordination during crises must be designed as an adaptive network in which clinical processes, digital infrastructure, and governance arrangements reinforce one another rather than operate independently (Ahmed et al., 2021).

At the institutional level, coordinated delivery requires leadership capable of harmonizing policy, technology, and accountability across participating organizations. Research on regional integration in Southern Africa emphasizes the importance of ethical leadership, policy implementation, infrastructure, and cooperation in sustaining complex integration agendas. Applied to healthcare, these principles support clear authority, shared standards, and accountable decision-making when hospitals, primary-care facilities, laboratories, community providers, and public-health agencies must act collectively under changing conditions (Enaifoghe, Dlamini & Agwuna, 2020).

Complex-system integration further depends on interoperability, capacity balancing, and coordinated control across interconnected components. Systems modelling of national-grid

integration illustrates how reliability depends on aligning infrastructure, storage, information, regulation, and distributed operational resources rather than optimizing isolated components. In pandemic care coordination, an analogous systems perspective reinforces the need to connect appointment platforms, patient records, referral channels, workforce allocation, and service capacity so that movement between care settings remains visible, traceable, and clinically governed safely throughout periods of exceptional demand (Adeniji et al., 2019).

2.2 Surge Pressures on Patient Care Pathways

Pandemic surges place patient care pathways under pressure by simultaneously increasing acute demand, constraining workforce capacity, disrupting routine appointments, and altering the sequence through which patients move from presentation to diagnosis, treatment, referral, and follow-up. These pressures are particularly consequential when health systems must separate infectious and non-infectious pathways while preserving timely access to essential services. In South Africa, pandemic response exposed risks to routine primary care, maternal and child health, HIV, tuberculosis, and noncommunicable disease services, demonstrating how emergency prioritisation can destabilise established service pathways when resources are redirected (Nyasulu & Pandya, 2020).

Pathway disruption often begins before patients reach facilities. Fear of infection, mobility restrictions, transport difficulties, and uncertainty about service availability can delay help-seeking and intensify disease severity at eventual presentation. Reports from Italy documented delayed access to paediatric emergency care during the early pandemic, illustrating how avoidance behaviour can transform initially manageable conditions into more urgent clinical problems and complicate subsequent coordination (Lazzerini et al., 2020). Once demand is deferred, healthcare organisations may face concentrated backlogs requiring renewed triage, rescheduling, and prioritisation.

Diagnostic and treatment pathways are especially vulnerable because they depend on sequential, time-sensitive interactions between primary care, diagnostics, specialist consultation, and treatment services. A global systematic review of cancer care identified widespread interruptions involving outpatient visits, diagnostic procedures, surgery, radiotherapy, systemic treatment, personnel availability, and supply chains, showing that disruption at one stage can propagate across the entire trajectory of care (Riera et al., 2021). In the United Kingdom, modelling of delays within urgent cancer referral pathways further demonstrated that postponement at the referral stage could adversely affect survival, reinforcing the clinical importance of protecting time-critical transitions during surges (Sud et al., 2020).

Pressure is also experienced at the community level. In Uttar Pradesh, India, lockdown conditions sharply reduced provision and utilisation of maternal, child-health, and nutrition services, while frontline workers reported increased workloads, shortages, travel constraints, and fear of infection. Adaptations such as home delivery and telephone communication restored some activities but did not fully remove access barriers (Nguyen et al., 2021). Such evidence highlights the need for flexible pathways capable of shifting between facility-based, community, and remote delivery without losing patient visibility.

Psychosocial vulnerability can further complicate pathway navigation, particularly where household stress, behavioural difficulties, or weakened support structures affect engagement with formal services. Nigerian evidence concerning adolescent psycho-sociological risks illustrates the broader importance of social context when designing responsive support and referral arrangements (Balogun & Sabboh, 2021). Under surge conditions, patient pathways therefore require dynamic triage, reliable records, clear referral ownership, active follow-up, and mechanisms for identifying deferred patients before temporary disruption becomes prolonged discontinuity or avoidable clinical deterioration. These pressures intensify inequities across already constrained systems.

3. Appointment Systems and Patient Access

3.1 Scheduling Adaptations During Demand Surges

Pandemic surge conditions place exceptional pressure on patient care pathways because demand increases at the same moment that staffing, physical space, diagnostic capacity, transport, and routine scheduling become constrained. Pathway disruption rarely occurs at a single point; rather, pressure accumulates from initial help-seeking through triage, consultation, investigation, referral, treatment, discharge, and follow-up. Balogun et al. (2021) found that women accessing reproductive, maternal, newborn, and child health services in Lagos encountered substantial barriers during COVID-19 restrictions, including inability to leave home and transport difficulties. Such barriers demonstrate how external restrictions can interrupt access before patients enter formal clinical systems, leaving appointment queues and referral pathways to absorb deferred demand later.

Table 1. Illustrative surge-pressure map across patient care pathways

Pathway stage	Principal surge pressure	Potential service consequence	Coordination requirement
Initial access	Mobility and service restrictions	Delayed presentation	Accessible scheduling and outreach
Triage	Competing infectious and routine demand	Longer assessment queues	Risk-based prioritisation
Diagnostics	Reduced laboratory or imaging capacity	Delayed clinical decisions	Test tracking and escalation
Referral	Specialist and transport constraints	Interrupted care transitions	Closed-loop referral monitoring
Treatment	Workforce and capacity shortages	Deferred interventions	Dynamic resource allocation
Follow-up	Backlogs and altered appointments	Loss to continued care	Active patient recall systems

Once patients reach facilities, altered triage requirements and infection-control procedures can change the speed and sequence of care. Hartnett et al. (2020) documented a marked reduction in emergency department visits in the United States during the early pandemic, suggesting that avoidance and changing service-use patterns affected access even for conditions ordinarily requiring urgent assessment. In Australia, O'Reilly et al. (2021) showed that emergency departments simultaneously had to distinguish suspected COVID-19 cases, manage infection risks, and identify

patients at higher risk of deterioration, illustrating the additional coordination burden created when conventional emergency pathways must incorporate parallel infectious-disease processes.

Primary care is equally vulnerable because it functions as the entry point for chronic disease management, preventive services, prescriptions, and referrals. Coma et al. (2020), examining 288 primary care practices in Catalonia, identified substantial pandemic-related changes across multiple quality-of-care indicators. Reduced face-to-face activity and altered clinical priorities can create diagnostic delay, missed monitoring, incomplete referrals, and accumulated follow-up needs, particularly among patients requiring repeated encounters. Evidence from the United Kingdom similarly demonstrated large reductions in contacts for several physical and mental health conditions, reinforcing concern that reduced utilization may represent unmet need rather than reduced morbidity (Mansfield et al., 2021).

This pressure is intensified when laboratory turnaround, imaging access, medication supply, or specialist availability deteriorates simultaneously, because delays become cumulative. A postponed consultation may defer testing; deferred testing may postpone referral; and referral delay may move treatment beyond its clinically preferred window. Effective surge management therefore requires pathway-level oversight capable of detecting where queues are forming and where vulnerable patients face the probability of being lost to follow-up.

Pressure becomes more acute where pre-existing health-system constraints limit opportunities for rapid substitution. Enbiale et al. (2021) reported disruption of essential health services across primary and tertiary facilities in Ethiopia's Amhara Region during pandemic preparation and response. When facilities redirect personnel, rooms, supplies, and administrative attention toward outbreak management, routine services may become compressed, generating bottlenecks between initial assessment and definitive care. These bottlenecks also challenge record integrity because rescheduled appointments, redirected patients, and altered referral destinations must remain accurately documented if subsequent providers are to reconstruct the patient's pathway.

At the system level, continuity depends on the capacity to redistribute workload without losing clinical priority. Research on optimized load distribution in complex hybrid systems demonstrates the value of matching limited resources dynamically to variable demand and maintaining reliability through coordinated allocation (Sunday & Omoegun, 2019). Applied cautiously to healthcare operations, the same systems principle highlights why surge pathways require flexible appointment capacity, escalation rules, workforce redeployment, and real-time visibility of service availability rather than static scheduling assumptions.

Routine care is therefore sustained most effectively when alternative routes are deliberately embedded into pathway design. A systematic review identified telehealth, modified workflows, staff flexibility, patient communication, and organizational adaptation among important mechanisms supporting routine care during COVID-19, while technological limitations, workforce pressures, and interrupted access remained persistent barriers (Lieneck, Herzog & Krips, 2021). Surge-sensitive care pathways should consequently combine risk-stratified appointment systems, dependable clinical records, active referral tracking, remote-contact options, and explicit responsibility for postponed patients. Such architecture allows services to distinguish safe deferral

from dangerous delay, preserve information across transitions, and progressively recover accumulated demand without allowing temporary operational pressure to become prolonged discontinuity of care.

3.2 Digital Triage and Appointment Prioritization

Digital triage became a critical coordination mechanism during pandemic surges because health systems needed to identify clinical urgency before patients entered already congested facilities. Effective digital triage combines structured symptom assessment, risk stratification, routing, and appointment prioritization so that scarce face-to-face capacity is reserved for patients most likely to benefit from immediate evaluation. In the United States, digitally automated pre-hospital triage was deployed to classify patients remotely and direct them toward appropriate care settings, illustrating how algorithm-supported screening can reduce unnecessary facility attendance while preserving access for higher-risk cases (Lai et al., 2020).

Appointment prioritization depends on the accuracy with which digital systems distinguish low-risk presentations from conditions requiring timely escalation. Machine-learning models applied to emergency department triage data demonstrated improved prediction of critical-care outcomes and hospitalization compared with conventional triage approaches, suggesting that data-driven tools can enhance prioritization when clinical demand exceeds routine assessment capacity (Raita et al., 2019). However, algorithmic ranking should complement rather than replace professional judgment because input quality, population characteristics, missing data, and changing disease patterns can alter predictive performance.

Symptom checkers became especially prominent during COVID-19 because they offered rapid, remote assessment at population scale. Evaluation of Australian symptom-checking applications found considerable variation in diagnostic and triage accuracy, with some tools providing inappropriate recommendations for urgent conditions. This variability is operationally important because under-triage may delay necessary care, whereas over-triage can intensify pressure on emergency and specialist services that prioritization systems are intended to protect (Hill, Sim & Mills, 2020). Similar evidence from Hong Kong showed that online symptom checkers had insufficient sensitivity to function as substitutes for established emergency triage, although they could contribute useful pre-arrival information and support workflow preparation (Yu et al., 2020).

Pandemic-specific systems also require sufficiently reliable classification of infection risk. Comparative assessment of ten web-based COVID-19 symptom checkers demonstrated wide differences in their ability to discriminate probable COVID-19 cases, highlighting the importance of validation before digital outputs are incorporated into appointment allocation or referral decisions (Munsch et al., 2020). Where tools are embedded within scheduling platforms, their outputs should therefore trigger transparent escalation rules, clinician review for ambiguous cases, and mechanisms for reassessment when symptoms evolve.

African experience demonstrates both the value and contextual requirements of digital triage. Nigeria's Wellvis platform used an eight-question risk-assessment tool based on national surveillance definitions to categorize users and provide guidance on subsequent actions. Such mobile approaches can reduce pressure on telephone lines and offer scalable first-contact

assessment, particularly when physical access is constrained (Owoyemi et al., 2021). More broadly, evidence from sub-Saharan Africa indicates that telehealth can support diagnosis, referral, contact tracing, and continued access to care, although infrastructure, financing, digital literacy, governance, and technological capacity influence implementation effectiveness (Manyati & Mutsau, 2021).

Digital prioritization also rests on a longer trajectory of computer-assisted clinical decision support. Nigerian research on automated mammographic analysis showed that image-processing algorithms could flag suspicious regions for closer professional review, illustrating how computational systems can support the identification and prioritization of clinically significant findings rather than functioning as autonomous decision-makers (Ejofodomi et al., 2014). This principle is directly relevant to surge coordination: digital tools are most defensible when they amplify scarce clinical attention and make prioritization more systematic without displacing accountability.

For appointment systems, digital triage should therefore operate as an integrated coordination layer linking symptom assessment with scheduling, clinical records, referral pathways, and follow-up. Priority categories need to reflect urgency, vulnerability, anticipated deterioration, infectious risk, and whether care can be delivered remotely. Systems must also record the basis for prioritization so that subsequent clinicians can understand why an appointment was accelerated, deferred, or converted to virtual care. During surges, automated recall and reassessment are particularly important because a patient initially classified as low risk may deteriorate while waiting. Robust digital triage consequently requires validated algorithms, interoperable data, equitable access alternatives, clinician oversight, and continuous monitoring for systematic under-prioritization or exclusion of vulnerable populations.

4. Record Integrity and Information Continuity

4.1 Maintaining Accurate Patient Health Records

Maintaining accurate patient health records during pandemic surges is a core requirement for safe coordination because clinical decisions depend on information that remains complete, current, internally consistent, and attributable as patients move between emergency, inpatient, outpatient, community, and virtual services. Electronic records can improve accessibility, yet digitization does not automatically guarantee quality. A foundational review of EHR data quality identified completeness, correctness, concordance, plausibility, and currency as distinct dimensions that must be assessed systematically rather than treating accuracy as a single property (Weiskopf & Weng, 2013).

Surge conditions magnify these requirements. Rapid admissions, redeployment of staff, temporary care locations, altered workflows, and high documentation volumes create opportunities for omissions, delayed entries, duplicate registration, and incorrect linkage of results. An audit undertaken during the COVID-19 pandemic at a London teaching hospital found that important diagnoses were frequently absent from structured problem lists even when present in free-text notes, demonstrating how incomplete structured documentation can obscure clinically relevant information at the point of care (Poulos et al., 2021). Accurate records therefore require disciplined reconciliation between narrative notes, coded fields, medication lists, laboratory results, and diagnostic histories.

Evidence from Saudi Arabia further illustrates the problem. Evaluation of COVID-19 inpatient records found substantial discrepancies in case identification when ICD-10 coding was compared with laboratory evidence, while symptoms were often captured more fully in unstructured notes than structured fields. Such variation can distort patient classification, surveillance, and downstream decision-making unless hospitals implement validation rules and documentation review during periods of exceptional workload (Binkheder et al., 2021).

Table 1. Illustrative record-integrity controls during pandemic surges

Record-integrity domain	Surge-related vulnerability	Appropriate control	Coordination value
Patient identification	Duplicate or mismatched records	Identifier verification and reconciliation	Prevents wrong-patient decisions
Clinical documentation	Missing or delayed entries	Mandatory critical fields and timestamps	Preserves current clinical status
Diagnostic results	Results attached incorrectly	Automated identity validation	Supports reliable treatment decisions
Medication records	Incomplete reconciliation	Structured medication review	Reduces medication discrepancies
Referral information	Fragmented transfer documentation	Closed-loop record exchange	Preserves continuity across settings
Record amendments	Untraceable corrections	Audit trails and provenance logs	Establishes accountability
System downtime	Parallel paper and digital records	Reconciliation after restoration	Prevents conflicting record versions

In African settings, record accuracy is similarly shaped by infrastructure and user practice. Nigerian health workers using an electronic health system reported advantages including reduced paperwork and transcription errors, but also identified poor internet connectivity, power interruptions, information overload, and incomplete or inaccurate information as implementation challenges. These findings show that record integrity depends on resilient technical infrastructure as well as consistent documentation behaviour (Alobo et al., 2020). South African research likewise identified completeness, consistency, conformity, accuracy, integrity, and timeliness as essential dimensions of EMR quality, while emphasizing staff training, duplicate detection, standards, cleansing, and routine auditing as practical safeguards (Makeleni & Cilliers, 2021).

Routine quality assessment can convert these principles into measurable improvement. Across Kenyan facilities using KenyaEMR for HIV care, structured data-quality assessments compared electronic entries with source records and generated corrective action plans, demonstrating the value of repeated checks for completeness and concordance rather than assuming that digital capture is inherently reliable (Muthee et al., 2018). During pandemic surges, similar audit cycles can target high-risk fields such as allergies, diagnoses, medications, test results, referral status, and discharge instructions.

Technical architecture also matters because records must remain traceable when many professionals update them across settings. Blockchain-based eHealth research has shown how tamper-resistant logs and auditable transactions can strengthen traceability of record manipulation while supporting controlled access to outsourced clinical data (Huang et al., 2021). Comparable principles of distributed verification and transparent transaction histories appear in peer-to-peer blockchain systems, where trustworthy exchange depends on immutable records, authenticated participation, and clearly defined transaction rules (Shittu et al., 2021). In healthcare, however, such technologies should supplement rather than replace sound clinical governance.

Record integrity during surges therefore requires an operational framework that joins people, processes, and technology. Mandatory fields should be limited to clinically essential information; patient identifiers should be verified before orders or results are attached; duplicate records should be actively reconciled; amendments should remain auditable; and time-sensitive entries should be completed as close as possible to the clinical event. Interoperable interfaces must preserve provenance when information moves between appointment, laboratory, pharmacy, referral, and discharge systems. Equally, organizations need contingency procedures for downtime and delayed synchronization so that temporary disruptions do not create parallel, conflicting versions of the patient record. These controls preserve a dependable longitudinal account from which clinicians can prioritize appointments, coordinate transitions, detect deterioration, and sustain continuity despite rapidly changing service conditions safely.

4.2 Interoperability, Privacy, and Data Accessibility

Interoperability, privacy, and data accessibility are inseparable requirements for resilient patient coordination during pandemic surges. When patients move between emergency departments, wards, laboratories, pharmacies, primary care, and remote services, clinicians require access to consistent information without exposing records beyond care purposes. Interoperability therefore extends beyond technical connectivity: it requires shared data structures, terminology, identifiers, governance, and workflows that preserve meaning when information crosses organisational boundaries. Reviews of interoperable electronic health records show that health information exchange can improve information availability and aspects of care quality, although benefits depend on implementation context and measurement design (Dobrow et al., 2019).

Standards-based exchange provides the technical foundation for this continuity. Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources supports modular exchange through common resources and application interfaces, but implementation studies identify persistent challenges involving semantic consistency, security, legacy systems, scalability, and organisational readiness (Ayaz et al., 2021). More broadly, digital medicine depends on interoperability because data trapped in proprietary or isolated systems cannot be reliably combined for clinical decision-making, analytics, or population-level response during emergencies (Lehne et al., 2019).

Privacy becomes more difficult as accessibility expands. Pandemic coordination may require broader and faster data exchange, yet unnecessary disclosure, secondary use, re-identification, and poorly governed access remain significant risks. Medical big-data environments demonstrate that conventional privacy protections can weaken when datasets are combined, making access controls,

purpose limitation, auditing, and accountable governance essential safeguards (Price & Cohen, 2019). Access should therefore be role-based and clinically justified, with emergency permissions documented rather than treated as unrestricted exceptions.

Table 1. Interoperability, privacy, and accessibility controls during surges

Information requirement	Surge-related vulnerability	Appropriate safeguard	Coordination benefit
Cross-facility exchange	Isolated clinical systems	Common exchange standards	Preserves continuity
Patient identification	Duplicate or mismatched records	Shared identifiers	Supports accurate linkage
Rapid clinical access	Delayed retrieval	Role-based access pathways	Accelerates decisions
Confidentiality	Excessive data exposure	Minimum-necessary access	Protects privacy
Emergency permissions	Uncontrolled privilege expansion	Auditable access escalation	Maintains accountability
System disruption	Network or platform failure	Redundancy and synchronization	Prevents information loss

African health systems additionally illustrate how architecture and infrastructure determine whether interoperability becomes operational. A proposed South African national electronic health-record architecture emphasized standards, service interfaces, shared registries, and controlled information exchange as mechanisms for connecting heterogeneous systems while maintaining security and privacy requirements (Tsegaye & Flowerday, 2021). These principles are especially important during surges, when fragmented platforms can delay referrals, obscure test results, and force staff to reconstruct patient histories manually.

Reliable information exchange also depends on resilient infrastructure. Nigerian engineering research on network design demonstrates the broader systems principle that reliability requires coordinated protection, context-sensitive design, and infrastructure capable of maintaining function under variable operating conditions (Adeniji et al., 2020). Applied to healthcare information environments, resilience requires secure networks, redundancy, downtime procedures, and synchronization mechanisms that prevent temporary connectivity failures from becoming permanent information gaps.

5. Continuity of Essential Healthcare Services

5.1 Maintaining Routine and Chronic Care

Maintaining routine and chronic care during pandemic surges requires health systems to preserve longitudinal relationships while reallocating staff, space, and diagnostic capacity toward emergency response. Patients with diabetes, cardiovascular disease, respiratory illness, renal conditions, cancer,

and other long-term disorders remain dependent on medication review, laboratory monitoring, symptom assessment, and timely escalation. In Singapore, chronic-care programmes have been adapted by separating stable patients from those requiring closer supervision, extending prescriptions, using remote review, and coordinating home monitoring, demonstrating how continuity can be protected when conventional clinic attendance becomes difficult (Hong, Chan & Chua, 2020).

Telehealth became an important mechanism for sustaining these functions because it allowed routine consultations and monitoring to continue while reducing avoidable exposure and travel. For non-critical chronic disease populations, video consultations, telephone review, and remote monitoring can preserve clinician–patient contact, although effectiveness depends on technology, patient capability, clinical suitability, and escalation pathways for problems that cannot be managed remotely (Liu et al., 2020). Appointment systems must distinguish between patients suitable for virtual follow-up and those requiring examination, procedures, diagnostics, or urgent face-to-face assessment.

Continuity must also include mental-health and psychosocial care, which may be disrupted when outpatient services are reorganised, or patients experience mobility restrictions. At a Kenyan referral hospital, adaptations included telephone follow-up, longer prescription periods, triage modifications, and efforts to maintain access despite staffing and resource constraints, illustrating the importance of flexible delivery models in low-resource settings (Kwobah et al., 2021). Such arrangements depend on accurate patient registers and reliable follow-up mechanisms so that altered appointment patterns do not result in disengagement.

Table 1. Illustrative framework for maintaining routine and chronic care during pandemic surges

Continuity domain	Surge-related threat	Adaptive mechanism	Coordination requirement
Routine appointments	Cancellation and backlog	Risk-stratified scheduling	Documented review dates
Chronic monitoring	Reduced clinic attendance	Remote monitoring	Escalation thresholds
Medication access	Interrupted prescriptions	Extended dispensing	Medication reconciliation
Mental-health care	Reduced face-to-face access	Telephone or virtual support	Active follow-up
Diagnostics	Reduced testing capacity	Priority-based testing	Result tracking
Vulnerable patients	Loss to follow-up	Targeted outreach	Updated patient registers

The need for sustained psychosocial support is reinforced by Nigerian evidence showing that adolescent mental health is influenced by parenting environments and self-regulatory capacity, factors relevant during periods of social disruption and service restriction (Oyarekua & Sabboh, 2021). Related research among students in Ibadan identified psychosocial conditions associated with moral disengagement, underscoring the value of maintaining school- and community-linked support pathways when institutional routines are interrupted (Sabbah, 2021). Continuity planning should therefore extend beyond biomedical monitoring to services that protect psychological and social functioning.

Safeguarding needs also persist during emergency conditions. Research involving junior secondary school students in Kaduna demonstrates the importance of family and socioeconomic contexts in identifying children who may require psychosocial attention and referral support (Sabbah & Yusuf, 2021). Similarly, evidence from university students in Lagos associates psychological distress with serious mental-health vulnerability, supporting the need for accessible assessment and timely professional support during infectious-disease response (Yusuf & Sabboh, 2021).

Operationally, maintaining routine and chronic care requires risk stratification rather than indiscriminate postponement. Stable patients may be managed through extended prescriptions, remote monitoring, community dispensing, or longer review intervals, whereas deteriorating, newly diagnosed, or clinically complex patients require protected in-person capacity. Appointment records should document deferrals, substitutions, and revised review dates; medication systems should identify impending gaps; and registries should support recall of patients whose care was interrupted. These mechanisms allow organisations to recover backlogs systematically while prioritising those at greatest clinical risk.

Routine-service resilience depends on combining flexible access channels with disciplined information management. Pandemic surge plans should preserve minimum service thresholds for chronic disease, mental health, maternal and child health, rehabilitation, pharmacy, and diagnostic follow-up. Active outreach, interoperable records, medication continuity, and clear escalation criteria enable care teams to maintain longitudinal oversight when conventional pathways are constrained.

5.2 Telehealth and Alternative Service Channels

Telehealth and alternative service channels became important for care coordination when pandemic surges restricted physical attendance, reduced facility capacity, and disrupted conventional appointment pathways. Telehealth encompasses synchronous video or telephone consultation, asynchronous messaging, remote monitoring, and digitally supported follow-up, allowing clinicians to maintain contact while limiting unnecessary exposure. During COVID-19, health systems expanded virtual care across outpatient, inpatient, and recovery phases, demonstrating that telehealth can redistribute clinical capacity when physical services are constrained (Wosik et al., 2020).

Evidence synthesized across international studies indicates that telehealth supported screening, diagnosis, treatment, monitoring, and communication during the pandemic, particularly where in-person encounters carried infection risks. Its value, however, depends on appropriate patient

selection, reliable connectivity, clear escalation procedures, and integration with clinical records rather than functioning as a parallel service detached from care pathways (Monaghesh & Hajizadeh, 2020).

In sub-Saharan Africa, telemedicine offers an important means of overcoming distance and workforce shortages, but implementation remains affected by infrastructure limitations, financing, regulation, digital literacy, organizational readiness, and cultural acceptance. Sustainable models therefore require appropriate technologies, governance frameworks, and equitable access mechanisms, including telephone-based options for patients without smartphones or stable broadband (Dodoo, Al-Samarraie & Alzahrani, 2021).

Alternative channels must also account for how patients use digital environments. Nigerian evidence linking social media exposure with adolescent behavioural outcomes illustrates that digital engagement is embedded within broader social influences, requiring healthcare communication to be structured, credible, and sensitive to user context rather than assuming that digital access alone ensures effective engagement (Sabboh & Alausa, 2021). Likewise, research among Nigerian undergraduates highlights the influence of relational environments on individual experiences, reinforcing the importance of maintaining supportive human interaction when services migrate from conventional face-to-face settings (Sabboh & Olugbade, 2021).

6. Resilience, Policy, and Future Preparedness

6.1 Strengthening Integrated Surge Response Systems

Strengthening integrated surge response systems requires more than expanding beds or activating emergency protocols; it requires coordinated adaptation across governance, workforce, information, financing, infrastructure, and routine service delivery. Resilient health systems are distinguished by their ability to absorb shocks, reorganise resources, and continue essential functions while learning from disruption. Lessons from the West African Ebola epidemic show that resilience depends on integrated capacities that enable systems to respond rapidly without abandoning everyday healthcare needs (Kruk et al., 2015).

A surge-ready system must connect emergency preparedness with routine operations. Scoping evidence on infectious-disease outbreaks and natural hazards identifies preparedness planning, flexible workforce arrangements, surveillance, communication, quality improvement, and post-event recovery as recurring components of resilience. These capacities are most effective when developed before crises and embedded within routine structures rather than introduced as temporary emergency mechanisms (Nuzzo et al., 2019). This approach reduces fragmentation between public-health response, hospital operations, primary care, laboratories, pharmacies, and community services.

Information and workforce coordination are particularly important because surge decisions must be made under uncertainty. Comparative analysis of health-system shocks identifies information systems, financing mechanisms, and workforce capacity as three core resilience dimensions, shaped by governance and societal values. Integrated responses therefore require timely situational awareness, clear authority, adaptable staffing, and resource mobilisation mechanisms that can be activated without destabilising other essential services (Hanefeld et al., 2018).

COVID-19 further demonstrated that preparedness cannot be separated from universal service capacity. Fragmented governance between health security and universal health coverage can produce parallel systems, duplicated functions, and vulnerable service gaps. Integrating surveillance, primary care, financing, supply chains, and community engagement strengthens the capacity to manage outbreak demand while protecting routine access for populations whose health needs continue throughout emergencies (Lal et al., 2021).

African experience illustrates the implications. In South Africa, COVID-19 placed pressure on health facilities, workforce capacity, social conditions, and digital infrastructure, reinforcing the need for technology-supported surveillance, coordinated communication, and adaptable service delivery across health-system levels (Mbunge, 2020). Integrated surge systems should therefore combine command structures with decentralised execution, allowing local facilities to modify workflows while remaining connected to shared standards, referral arrangements, and information platforms.

Operational resilience also depends on dependable supporting infrastructure. Nigerian research on solar integration in small-scale manufacturing shows how decentralised energy solutions, storage, financing, technical capacity, and regulatory coordination can strengthen continuity where central infrastructure is unreliable (Sunday & Omoegun, 2018). For healthcare facilities, the same systems logic supports backup power, redundant communications, protected digital platforms, and alternative service channels that prevent infrastructure failure from interrupting appointments, diagnostics, records, or medication access.

Control strategies provide a complementary systems perspective. Research on residential cooling systems demonstrates how adaptive controls, efficiency monitoring, and responsive resource management can improve performance under changing demand conditions (Sunday et al., 2019). Applied to pandemic operations, surge management similarly requires dynamic thresholds for staffing, bed allocation, appointment conversion, laboratory prioritisation, and referral escalation.

6.2 Research, Technology, and Policy Priorities

Future preparedness for pandemic surge conditions requires research, technology, and policy agendas that treat care coordination as an integrated health-system function rather than a temporary emergency workaround. Research priorities should therefore examine how appointment systems, referral pathways, electronic records, telehealth, and workforce deployment perform together under rapidly changing demand. Evidence should move beyond short-term adoption measures toward comparative evaluation of clinical outcomes, access, equity, safety, cost, and recovery of deferred care. Digital health research in Nigeria has already identified the promise of mobile technologies for expanding access while highlighting limitations involving electricity, internet availability, evidence generation, and rural inclusion, indicating that innovation must be evaluated against real implementation conditions (Babatunde et al., 2021).

Technology priorities should emphasize interoperable platforms capable of linking scheduling, triage, laboratory results, medication histories, referrals, and follow-up across organizations. Pandemic experience demonstrated that digital technologies can support surveillance, testing, contact tracing, quarantine, and healthcare delivery when embedded within coordinated policy and

operational structures (Whitelaw et al., 2020). Future systems should therefore favor open standards, modular architectures, resilient connectivity, and secure data exchange rather than isolated applications that cannot communicate across facilities.

Research must also address the limitations and unintended consequences of digital expansion. Reviews of pandemic technologies identify privacy, legal, ethical, workforce, and organizational barriers alongside opportunities created by mobile devices, machine learning, connected sensors, and large datasets. Evaluation frameworks should consequently test not only technical accuracy but also bias, usability, transparency, cybersecurity, public acceptability, and performance across diverse populations (Budd et al., 2020). Such evidence is essential before algorithms are embedded into appointment prioritization or automated escalation pathways.

Policy priorities should align financing and regulation with durable models of digitally enabled care. Early COVID-19 experience in the United States showed that restrictive reimbursement and regulatory arrangements could impede telemedicine adoption, while emergency flexibility rapidly expanded remote-service capacity. Long-term policy should preserve useful innovations while restoring rigorous expectations for quality, privacy, interoperability, and accountability (Keesara, Jonas & Schulman, 2020).

Preparedness policy must equally invest in the workforce that operates these systems. Evidence from Ghana associates inadequate pandemic preparedness with greater stress and burnout among healthcare workers, underscoring that technology cannot compensate for insufficient training, staffing, protective resources, or organizational support (Afulani et al., 2021). Future surge planning should therefore combine digital infrastructure with simulation exercises, cross-training, standardized escalation protocols, and protected workforce capacity. Research funding should prioritize multicountry implementation studies, particularly in resource-constrained settings, while policymakers establish governance arrangements for data sharing, procurement, evaluation, and emergency interoperability. Together, these priorities can make appointment management, record integrity, and continuity mechanisms more adaptable, equitable, and dependable before the next large-scale disruption. This agenda should be reviewed after every emergency exercise and real surge event.

Conclusion

This review examined how healthcare systems can preserve coordinated, safe, and continuous care when pandemic surges disrupt normal service delivery. Its objectives were met by analysing the operational pressures that affect patient pathways, the adaptation of appointment and triage systems, the importance of accurate and interoperable health records, the maintenance of routine and chronic care, and the role of telehealth, resilience planning, technology, and policy. Across these dimensions, the evidence shows that surge conditions do not create isolated service problems; they generate interconnected disruptions that can affect access, referral continuity, diagnostics, treatment, documentation, and follow-up simultaneously.

A central finding is that resilient care depends on integrated coordination rather than emergency capacity alone. Appointment systems must support risk-based prioritisation, digital triage, rescheduling, and active recall. Patient records must remain complete, current, accessible, and

secure across care settings, because fragmented information can magnify clinical risk during transfers and altered workflows. Continuity mechanisms, including telehealth, medication extension, remote monitoring, community-based delivery, and protected in-person capacity, are essential for patients whose health needs persist during public health emergencies.

The review further demonstrates that technology is most effective when supported by governance, workforce readiness, interoperable standards, reliable infrastructure, and clear accountability. Digital tools should therefore augment, not replace, professional judgement and established care relationships. Future preparedness should prioritize integrated surge protocols, real-time capacity monitoring, closed-loop referrals, secure data exchange, workforce cross-training, and explicit recovery plans for deferred care.

Healthcare organizations and policymakers should also invest in routine simulation, evaluate digital systems for equity and usability, strengthen infrastructure redundancy, and fund implementation research across diverse settings. These measures can reduce avoidable disruption, protect vulnerable patients, and ensure that emergency response strengthens rather than fragments the broader health system. Ultimately, resilient service delivery requires preparedness to be embedded within everyday care coordination, not activated only after a crisis begins.

References

1. Adeniji, I.O., Shittu, H., Opara, I.S. and Shittu, M.A. (2020) 'Grounding system design optimization for medium-voltage distribution networks in emerging power markets', IRE Journals, 3(11), pp. 547–562. DOI: [10.64388/IREV3111-1714040](https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV3111-1714040).
2. Adeniji, I.O., Shittu, H., Opara, I.S., Elumilade, R.A. and Liadi, K.O. (2019) 'Hydrogen as a secondary energy carrier: Modeling its integration in national grids', IRE Journal, 3(1). DOI: [10.64388/IREV311-1713909](https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV311-1713909).
3. Afulani, P.A., Gyamerah, A.O., Nutor, J.J., Laar, A., Aborigo, R.A., Malechi, H., Sterling, M. and Awoonor-Williams, J.K. (2021) 'Inadequate preparedness for response to COVID-19 is associated with stress and burnout among healthcare workers in Ghana', PLoS ONE, 16(4), e0250294. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0250294](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0250294).
4. Ahmed, A., van den Muijsenbergh, M.E.T.C., Mewes, J.C., Wodchis, W.P. and Vrijhoef, H.J.M. (2021) 'Untangling the inter-relatedness within integrated care programmes for community-dwelling frail older people: A rapid realist review', BMJ Open, 11(4), e043280. DOI: [10.1136/bmjopen-2020-043280](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-043280).
5. Aloba, I.G., Soyannwo, T., Ukponwan, G., Akogu, S., Akpa, A.M. and Ayankola, K. (2020) 'Implementing electronic health system in Nigeria: Perspective assessment in a specialist hospital', African Health Sciences, 20(2), pp. 948–954. DOI: [10.4314/ahs.v20i2.50](https://doi.org/10.4314/ahs.v20i2.50).
6. Ameh, S., Klipstein-Grobusch, K., Musenge, E., Kahn, K., Tollman, S. and Gómez-Olivé, F.X. (2017) 'Effectiveness of an integrated approach to HIV and hypertension care in rural South Africa: Controlled interrupted time-series analysis', Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes, 75(4), pp. 472–479. DOI: [10.1097/QAI.0000000000001437](https://doi.org/10.1097/QAI.0000000000001437).
7. Ang, I.Y.H., Ng, S.H.X., Rahman, N., Nurjono, M., Tham, T.Y., Toh, S.A. and Wee, H.L. (2019) 'Right-Site Care Programme with a community-based family medicine clinic in Singapore: Secondary data analysis of its impact on mortality and healthcare utilisation', BMJ Open, 9(12), e030718. DOI: [10.1136/bmjopen-2019-030718](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2019-030718).

8. Ayaz, M., Pasha, M.F., Alzahrani, M.Y., Budiarto, R. and Stiawan, D. (2021) 'The Fast Health Interoperability Resources (FHIR) standard: Systematic literature review of implementations, applications, challenges and opportunities', *JMIR Medical Informatics*, 9(7), e21929. DOI: [10.2196/21929](https://doi.org/10.2196/21929).
9. Babatunde, A.O., Abdulkareem, A.A., Akinwande, F.O., Adebayo, A.O., Omenogor, E.T., Adebisi, Y.A. and Ilesanmi, E.B. (2021) 'Leveraging mobile health technology towards achieving universal health coverage in Nigeria', *Public Health in Practice*, 2, 100120. DOI: [10.1016/j.puhip.2021.100120](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhip.2021.100120).
10. Balogun, C.T. and Sabboh, G.M. (2021) 'Psycho-sociological factors as determinants of juvenile delinquency among adolescents in junior secondary schools in Patani Local Government Area of Delta State, Nigeria', *International Journal of Academic Management Science Research*, 5(10), pp. 34–40.
11. Balogun, M., Banke-Thomas, A., Sekoni, A., Boateng, G.O., Yesufu, V., Wright, O., Ubani, O., Abayomi, A., Afolabi, B.B. and Ogunsola, F. (2021) 'Challenges in access and satisfaction with reproductive, maternal, newborn and child health services in Nigeria during the COVID-19 pandemic: A cross-sectional survey', *PLoS ONE*, 16(5), e0251382. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0251382](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0251382).
12. Binkheder, S., Asiri, M.A., Altowayan, K.W., Alshehri, T.M., Alzarie, M.F., Aldekhyyel, R.N., Almaghlouth, I.A. and Almulhem, J.A. (2021) 'Real-world evidence of COVID-19 patients' data quality in the electronic health records', *Healthcare*, 9(12), 1648. DOI: [10.3390/healthcare9121648](https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare9121648).
13. Birkmeyer, J.D., Barnato, A., Birkmeyer, N., Bessler, R. and Skinner, J. (2020) 'The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on hospital admissions in the United States', *Health Affairs*, 39(11), pp. 2010–2017. DOI: [10.1377/hlthaff.2020.00980](https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2020.00980).
14. Briggs, A.M., Valentijn, P.P., Thiyagarajan, J.A. and Araujo de Carvalho, I. (2018) 'Elements of integrated care approaches for older people: A review of reviews', *BMJ Open*, 8(4), e021194. DOI: [10.1136/bmjopen-2017-021194](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2017-021194).
15. Budd, J., Miller, B.S., Manning, E.M., Lamos, V., Zhuang, M., Edelstein, M., Rees, G., Emery, V.C., Stevens, M.M., Keegan, N., Short, M.J., Pillay, D., Manley, E., Cox, I.J., Heymann, D., Johnson, A.M. and McKendry, R.A. (2020) 'Digital technologies in the public-health response to COVID-19', *Nature Medicine*, 26(8), pp. 1183–1192. DOI: [10.1038/s41591-020-1011-4](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-1011-4).
16. Chen, C.-C. and Cheng, S.-H. (2021) 'Care continuity and care coordination: A preliminary examination of their effects on hospitalization', *Medical Care Research and Review*, 78(5), pp. 475–489. DOI: [10.1177/1077558720903882](https://doi.org/10.1177/1077558720903882).
17. Chudasama, Y.V., Gillies, C.L., Zaccardi, F., Coles, B., Davies, M.J., Seidu, S. and Khunti, K. (2020) 'Impact of COVID-19 on routine care for chronic diseases: A global survey of views from healthcare professionals', *Diabetes & Metabolic Syndrome: Clinical Research & Reviews*, 14(5), pp. 965–967. DOI: [10.1016/j.dsx.2020.06.042](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsx.2020.06.042).
18. Coma, E., Mora, N., Méndez, L., Benítez, M., Hermosilla, E., Fàbregas, M., Fina, F., Mercadé, A., Flayeh, S., Guiriguat, C., Balló, E., Martínez Leon, N., Mas, A., Cordoní, S., Lejardi, Y. and Medina, M. (2020) 'Primary care in the time of COVID-19: Monitoring the effect of the pandemic and the lockdown measures on 34 quality of care indicators calculated for 288 primary care practices covering about 6 million people in Catalonia', *BMC Family Practice*, 21(1), 208. DOI: [10.1186/s12875-020-01278-8](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12875-020-01278-8).

19. Czeisler, M.É., Marynak, K., Clarke, K.E.N., Salah, Z., Shakya, I., Thierry, J.M., Ali, N., McMillan, H., Wiley, J.F., Weaver, M.D., Czeisler, C.A., Rajaratnam, S.M.W. and Howard, M.E. (2020) 'Delay or avoidance of medical care because of COVID-19-related concerns—United States, June 2020', *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 69(36), pp. 1250–1257. DOI: [10.15585/mmwr.mm6936a4](https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6936a4).
20. De Filippo, O., D'Ascenzo, F., Angelini, F., Bocchino, P.P., Conrotto, F., Saglietto, A. et al. (2020) 'Reduced rate of hospital admissions for ACS during Covid-19 outbreak in Northern Italy', *New England Journal of Medicine*, 383(1), pp. 88–89. DOI: [10.1056/NEJMc2009166](https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc2009166).
21. Dinmohamed, A.G., Visser, O., Verhoeven, R.H.A., Louwman, M.W.J., van Nederveen, F.H., Willems, S.M., Merks, M.A.W., Lemmens, V.E.P.P., Nagtegaal, I.D. and Siesling, S. (2020) 'Fewer cancer diagnoses during the COVID-19 epidemic in the Netherlands', *The Lancet Oncology*, 21(6), pp. 750–751. DOI: [10.1016/S1470-2045\(20\)30265-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(20)30265-5).
22. Dobrow, M.J., Bytautas, J.P., Tharmalingam, S. and Hagens, S. (2019) 'Interoperable electronic health records and health information exchanges: Systematic review', *JMIR Medical Informatics*, 7(2), e12607. DOI: [10.2196/12607](https://doi.org/10.2196/12607).
23. Dodoo, J.E., Al-Samarraie, H. and Alzahrani, A.I. (2021) 'Telemedicine use in Sub-Saharan Africa: Barriers and policy recommendations for Covid-19 and beyond', *International Journal of Medical Informatics*, 151, 104467. DOI: [10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2021.104467](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2021.104467).
24. Ejofodomi, O.A., Gideon, E.N., Oladipo, G.O. and Oshomah, E.R. (2014) 'Automated detection of architectural detection in mammograms using template matching', *International Journal of Biomedical Science and Engineering*, 2(1), pp. 1–6. DOI: [10.11648/j.ijbse.20140201.11](https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijbse.20140201.11).
25. Enaifoghe, A., Dlamini, N.P. and Agwuna, L.U. (2020) 'African economic integration development in technological transformation: Assessing the importance of ethical leadership for policy implementation in SADC', *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, 12(6), pp. 11–20. DOI: [10.22610/jeb.v12i6\(J\).3102](https://doi.org/10.22610/jeb.v12i6(J).3102).
26. Enbale, W., Abdela, S.G., Seyum, M., Hundie, D.B., Bogale, K.A., Tamirat, K.S., Feleke, M.B., Azage, M., Nigatu, D. and de Vries, H.J.C. (2021) 'Effect of the COVID-19 pandemic preparation and response on essential health services in primary and tertiary healthcare settings of Amhara Region, Ethiopia', *American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*, 105(5), pp. 1240–1246. DOI: [10.4269/ajtmh.21-0354](https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.21-0354).
27. Ezeani, P.T. and Sabboh, G.M. (2021) 'Psychosocial predictors of the changing role of husbands as breadwinners in a depressed economy in Ibadan Metropolis, Oyo State, Nigeria', *British Journal of Education, Learning and Development Psychology*, 4(2), pp. 31–42. DOI: [10.52589/BJELDP-ZU3KSUJU](https://doi.org/10.52589/BJELDP-ZU3KSUJU).
28. Falemi, A., Akhigbe, R. and Akin-Oluyomi, O.T. (2020) 'A conceptual supply chain talent development model for capability building across distributed operations', *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation*, 1(5), pp. 439–456. DOI: [10.54660/IJMRGE.2020.1.5.439-456](https://doi.org/10.54660/IJMRGE.2020.1.5.439-456).
29. Haldane, V., De Foo, C., Abdalla, S.M., Jung, A.-S., Tan, M.M.J., Wu, S., Chua, A., Verma, M., Shrestha, P., Singh, S., Perez, T., Tan, S.M., Bartos, M., Mabuchi, S., Bonk, M., McNab, C., Werner, G.K., Panjabi, R., Nordström, A. and Legido-Quigley, H. (2021) 'Health systems resilience in managing the COVID-19 pandemic: Lessons from 28 countries', *Nature Medicine*, 27, pp. 964–980. DOI: [10.1038/s41591-021-01381-y](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-01381-y).

30. Hanefeld, J., Mayhew, S., Legido-Quigley, H., Martineau, F., Karanikolos, M., Blanchet, K., Liverani, M., Mokuwa, E.Y., McKay, G. and Balabanova, D. (2018) 'Towards an understanding of resilience: Responding to health systems shocks', *Health Policy and Planning*, 33(3), pp. 355–367. DOI: [10.1093/heapol/czx183](https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czx183).
31. Hartnett, K.P., Kite-Powell, A., DeVies, J., Coletta, M.A., Boehmer, T.K., Adjemian, J. and Gundlapalli, A.V. (2020) 'Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on emergency department visits—United States, January 1, 2019–May 30, 2020', *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 69(23), pp. 699–704. DOI: [10.15585/mmwr.mm6923e1](https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6923e1).
32. Hill, M.G., Sim, M. and Mills, B. (2020) 'The quality of diagnosis and triage advice provided by free online symptom checkers and apps in Australia', *Medical Journal of Australia*, 212(11), pp. 514–519. DOI: [10.5694/mja2.50600](https://doi.org/10.5694/mja2.50600).
33. Hong, W.-Z., Chan, G.-C. and Chua, H.-R. (2020) 'Continuing chronic disease care during COVID-19 and beyond', *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association*, 21(7), pp. 991–992. DOI: [10.1016/j.jamda.2020.05.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2020.05.013).
34. Huang, H., Sun, X., Xiao, F., Zhu, P. and Wang, W. (2021) 'Blockchain-based eHealth system for auditable EHRs manipulation in cloud environments', *Journal of Parallel and Distributed Computing*, 148, pp. 46–57. DOI: [10.1016/j.jpdc.2020.10.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpdc.2020.10.002).
35. Ikwegbue, P.C., Enaifoghe, A.O., Maduku, H. and Agwuna, L.U. (2021) 'The challenges of COVID-19 pandemic and South Africa's response', *African Renaissance*, 18(1), pp. 271–292. DOI: [10.31920/2516-5305/2021/18n1a13](https://doi.org/10.31920/2516-5305/2021/18n1a13).
36. Ashish, K.C., Gurung, R., Kinney, M.V., Sunny, A.K., Moinuddin, M., Basnet, O., Paudel, P., Bhattarai, P., Subedi, K., Shrestha, M.P. and Lawn, J.E., (2020). Effect of the COVID-19 pandemic response on intrapartum care, stillbirth, and neonatal mortality outcomes in Nepal: a prospective observational study. *The Lancet Global Health*, 8(10), pp.e1273–e1281. DOI: [10.1016/S2214-109X\(20\)30345-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(20)30345-4).
37. Keesara, S., Jonas, A. and Schulman, K. (2020) 'COVID-19 and health care's digital revolution', *New England Journal of Medicine*, 382(23), e82. DOI: [10.1056/NEJMp2005835](https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp2005835).
38. Kruk, M.E., Myers, M., Varpilah, S.T. and Dahn, B.T. (2015) 'What is a resilient health system? Lessons from Ebola', *The Lancet*, 385(9980), pp. 1910–1912. DOI: [10.1016/S0140-6736\(15\)60755-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(15)60755-3).
39. Kwobah, E., Jaguga, F., Robert, K., Ndolo, E. and Kariuki, J. (2021) 'Efforts and challenges to ensure continuity of mental healthcare service delivery in a low-resource setting during the COVID-19 pandemic—A case of a Kenyan referral hospital', *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 11, 588216. DOI: [10.3389/fpsy.2020.588216](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2020.588216).
40. Lai, L., Wittbold, K.A., Dadabhoy, F.Z., Sato, R., Landman, A.B., Schwamm, L.H., He, S., Patel, R., Wei, N., Zuccotti, G., Lennes, I.T., Medina, D., Sequist, T.D., Bomba, G., Keschner, Y.G. and Zhang, H.M. (2020) 'Digital triage: Novel strategies for population health management in response to the COVID-19 pandemic', *Healthcare*, 8(4), 100493. DOI: [10.1016/j.hjdsi.2020.100493](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hjdsi.2020.100493).
41. Lal, A., Erondy, N.A., Heymann, D.L., Gitahi, G. and Yates, R. (2021) 'Fragmented health systems in COVID-19: Rectifying the misalignment between global health security and universal health coverage', *The Lancet*, 397(10268), pp. 61–67. DOI: [10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)32228-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)32228-5).

42. Lazzerini, M., Barbi, E., Apicella, A., Marchetti, F., Cardinale, F. and Trobia, G. (2020) 'Delayed access or provision of care in Italy resulting from fear of COVID-19', *The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health*, 4(5), pp. e10–e11. DOI: [10.1016/S2352-4642\(20\)30108-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-4642(20)30108-5).
43. Lehne, M., Sass, J., Essenwanger, A., Schepers, J. and Thun, S. (2019) 'Why digital medicine depends on interoperability', *npj Digital Medicine*, 2, 79. DOI: [10.1038/s41746-019-0158-1](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-019-0158-1).
44. Lieneck, C., Herzog, B. and Krips, R. (2021) 'Analysis of facilitators and barriers to the delivery of routine care during the COVID-19 global pandemic: A systematic review', *Healthcare*, 9(5), 528. DOI: [10.3390/healthcare9050528](https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare9050528).
45. Liu, N., Huang, R., Baldacchino, T., Sud, A., Sud, K., Khadra, M. and Kim, J. (2020) 'Telehealth for noncritical patients with chronic diseases during the COVID-19 pandemic', *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 22(8), e19493. DOI: [10.2196/19493](https://doi.org/10.2196/19493).
46. Makeleni, N. and Cilliers, L. (2021) 'Critical success factors to improve data quality of electronic medical records in public healthcare institutions', *South African Journal of Information Management*, 23(1), a1230. DOI: [10.4102/sajim.v23i1.1230](https://doi.org/10.4102/sajim.v23i1.1230).
47. Mansfield, K.E., Mathur, R., Tazare, J., Henderson, A.D., Mulick, A.R., Carreira, H., Matthews, A.A., Bidulka, P., Gayle, A., Forbes, H., Cook, S., Wong, A.Y.S., Strongman, H., Wing, K., Warren-Gash, C., Cadogan, S.L., Smeeth, L., Hayes, J.F., Quint, J.K., McKee, M. and Langan, S.M. (2021) 'Indirect acute effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on physical and mental health in the UK: A population-based study', *The Lancet Digital Health*, 3(4), pp. e217–e230. DOI: [10.1016/S2589-7500\(21\)00017-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500(21)00017-0).
48. Manyati, T.K. and Mutsau, M. (2021) 'Exploring the effectiveness of telehealth interventions for diagnosis, contact tracing and care of Coronavirus Disease of 2019 (COVID-19) patients in sub-Saharan Africa: A rapid review', *Health and Technology*, 11, pp. 341–348. DOI: [10.1007/s12553-020-00485-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12553-020-00485-8).
49. Mash, R., Goliath, C. and Perez, G. (2020) 'Re-organising primary health care to respond to the Coronavirus epidemic in Cape Town, South Africa', *African Journal of Primary Health Care & Family Medicine*, 12(1), a2607. DOI: [10.4102/phcfm.v12i1.2607](https://doi.org/10.4102/phcfm.v12i1.2607).
50. Mbunge, E. (2020) 'Effects of COVID-19 in South African health system and society: An explanatory study', *Diabetes & Metabolic Syndrome: Clinical Research & Reviews*, 14(6), pp. 1809–1814. DOI: [10.1016/j.dsx.2020.09.016](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsx.2020.09.016).
51. Monaghesh, E. and Hajizadeh, A. (2020) 'The role of telehealth during COVID-19 outbreak: A systematic review based on current evidence', *BMC Public Health*, 20, 1193. DOI: [10.1186/s12889-020-09301-4](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-09301-4).
52. Moynihan, R., Sanders, S., Michaleff, Z.A., Scott, A.M., Clark, J., To, E.J., Jones, M., Kitchener, E., Fox, M., Johansson, M., Lang, E., Duggan, A., Scott, I. and Albarqouni, L. (2021) 'Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on utilisation of healthcare services: A systematic review', *BMJ Open*, 11(3), e045343. DOI: [10.1136/bmjopen-2020-045343](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-045343).
53. Munsch, N., Martin, A., Gruarin, S., Nateqi, J., Abdarahmane, I., Weingartner-Ortner, R. and Knapp, B. (2020) 'Diagnostic accuracy of web-based COVID-19 symptom checkers: Comparison study', *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 22(10), e21299. DOI: [10.2196/21299](https://doi.org/10.2196/21299).
54. Muthee, V., Bochner, A.F., Osterman, A., Liku, N., Akhwale, W., Kwach, J., Prachi, M., Wamicwe, J., Odhiambo, J., Onyango, F. and Puttkammer, N. (2018) 'The impact of routine

- data quality assessments on electronic medical record data quality in Kenya', PLoS ONE, 13(4), e0195362. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0195362](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0195362).
55. Nguyen, P.H., Kachwaha, S., Pant, A., Tran, L.M., Walia, M., Ghosh, S., Sharma, P.K., Escobar-Alegria, J., Frongillo, E.A., Menon, P. and Avula, R. (2021) 'COVID-19 disrupted provision and utilization of health and nutrition services in Uttar Pradesh, India: Insights from service providers, household phone surveys, and administrative data', The Journal of Nutrition, 151(8), pp. 2305–2316. DOI: [10.1093/jn/nxab135](https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/nxab135).
56. Nuzzo, J.B., Meyer, D., Snyder, M., Ravi, S.J., Lapascu, A., Souleles, J., Andrada, C.I. and Bishai, D. (2019) 'What makes health systems resilient against infectious disease outbreaks and natural hazards? Results from a scoping review', BMC Public Health, 19, 1310. DOI: [10.1186/s12889-019-7707-z](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-7707-z).
57. Nyasulu, J. and Pandya, H. (2020) 'The effects of coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic on the South African health system: A call to maintain essential health services', African Journal of Primary Health Care & Family Medicine, 12(1), a2480. DOI: [10.4102/phcfm.v12i1.2480](https://doi.org/10.4102/phcfm.v12i1.2480).
58. O'Reilly, G.M., Mitchell, R.D., Mitra, B., Akhlaghi, H., Tran, V., Furyk, J.S., Buntine, P., Wong, A., Gangathimmaiah, V., Knott, J., Moore, A., Ahn, J.R., Chan, Q., Wang, A., Goh, H., Loughman, A., Lowry, N., Hackett, L., Sri-Ganeshan, M., Chapman, N., Raos, M., Noonan, M.P., Smit, D.V. and Cameron, P.A. (2021) 'Outcomes for emergency department patients with suspected and confirmed COVID-19: An analysis of the Australian experience in 2020 (COVED-5)', Emergency Medicine Australasia, 33(5), pp. 911–921. DOI: [10.1111/1742-6723.13837](https://doi.org/10.1111/1742-6723.13837).
59. Oluseye, O.M., Kehinde, D.R., Akingbade, O., Ogunlade, O.L., Onyebigwa, O.O. and Oluwatosin, O.A. (2019) 'Knowledge and utilization of referral system among health care workers in selected primary health care centres in Oyo State, Nigeria', Journal of Community Medicine and Primary Health Care, 31(1), pp. 67–75.
60. Onche, V.O., Adenekan, E.T. and Sabboh, G.M. (2021) 'Influence of personal and professional attributes of secretaries on organisational success of universities in Oyo State, Nigeria', International Journal of Science Academic Research, 2(4), pp. 1355–1359.
61. Owoyemi, A., Ikpe, R., Toye, M., Rewane, A., Abdullateef, M., Obaseki, E., Mustafa, S. and Adeosun, W. (2021) 'Mobile health approaches to disease surveillance in Africa: Wellvis COVID triage tool', Digital Health, 7, 2055207621996876. DOI: [10.1177/2055207621996876](https://doi.org/10.1177/2055207621996876).
62. Oyarekua, T.A. and Sabboh, G.M. (2021) 'Parenting styles and effortful control as predictors of mental health among secondary school adolescents in Akinyele Local Government Area, Oyo State, Nigeria', International Journal of Academic Multidisciplinary Research, 5(10), pp. 108–114.
63. Poulos, J., Zhu, L. and Shah, A.D. (2021) 'Data gaps in electronic health record (EHR) systems: An audit of problem list completeness during the COVID-19 pandemic', International Journal of Medical Informatics, 150, 104452. DOI: [10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2021.104452](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2021.104452).
64. Price, W.N. and Cohen, I.G. (2019) 'Privacy in the age of medical big data', Nature Medicine, 25(1), pp. 37–43. DOI: [10.1038/s41591-018-0272-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-018-0272-7).
65. Raita, Y., Goto, T., Faridi, M.K., Brown, D.F.M., Camargo, C.A. Jr and Hasegawa, K. (2019) 'Emergency department triage prediction of clinical outcomes using machine learning models', Critical Care, 23, 64. DOI: [10.1186/s13054-019-2351-7](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-019-2351-7).

66. Riera, R., Bagattini, Â.M., Pacheco, R.L., Pachito, D.V., Roitberg, F. and Ilbawi, A. (2021) 'Delays and disruptions in cancer health care due to COVID-19 pandemic: Systematic review', *JCO Global Oncology*, 7, pp. 311–323. DOI: [10.1200/GO.20.00639](https://doi.org/10.1200/GO.20.00639).
67. Sabboh, G.M. (2021) 'Psychosocial factors as predictors of moral disengagement among in-school adolescents in Ibadan Metropolis', *International Journal of Academic Information Systems Research*, 5(10), pp. 1–7.
68. Sabboh, G.M. and Alausa, S.S. (2021) 'School climate, self-efficacy, social media and peer pressure as correlates of aggressive behaviour among secondary school adolescents in Ibadan Metropolis, Oyo State, Nigeria', *International Journal of Academic Management Science Research*, 5(11), pp. 43–51.
69. Sabboh, G.M. and Olugbade, D. (2021) 'Influence of teaching styles and parental bonding on academic boredom among undergraduates in Oyo State, Nigeria', *African Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research*, 4(1), pp. 122–133.
70. Sabboh, G.M. and Yusuf, A.O. (2021) 'Influence of psycho-social factors as predictors of child abuse among junior secondary school students in Kaduna Metropolis of Kaduna State', *International Journal of Academic and Applied Research*, 5(8), pp. 18–24.
71. Shittu, H.A., Shittu, M.A., Adeleke, O.J. and Adedokun, O.J. (2021) 'Blockchain-based energy trading models for peer-to-peer renewable microgrids', *International Journal of Research in Electrical and Electronics Engineering*, 4(3), pp. 1–19. DOI: [10.34218/IJREEE_04_03_001](https://doi.org/10.34218/IJREEE_04_03_001).
72. Sud, A., Torr, B., Jones, M.E., Broggio, J., Scott, S., Loveday, C., Garrett, A., Gronthoud, F., Nicol, D.L., Jhanji, S., Boyce, S.A., Williams, M., Riboli, E., Muller, D.C., Kipps, E., Larkin, J., Navani, N., Swanton, C., Lyratzopoulos, G., McFerran, E., Lawler, M., Houlston, R. and Turnbull, C. (2020) 'Effect of delays in the 2-week-wait cancer referral pathway during the COVID-19 pandemic on cancer survival in the UK: A modelling study', *The Lancet Oncology*, 21(8), pp. 1035–1044. DOI: [10.1016/S1470-2045\(20\)30392-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(20)30392-2).
73. Sunday, E.A. and Omoegun, G.O. (2018) 'Integrating solar power solutions in small-scale manufacturing industries in Nigeria', *International Journal of Scientific Research in Science, Engineering and Technology*, 4(8), pp. 832–853. DOI: [10.32628/IJSRSET23102175](https://doi.org/10.32628/IJSRSET23102175).
74. Sunday, E.A. and Omoegun, G.O. (2019) 'Optimizing electrical load distribution for hybrid solar installations in developing economies', *International Journal of Scientific Research in Mechanical and Materials Engineering*, 3(6), pp. 27–47.
75. Sunday, E.A., Omoegun, G.O., Essien, M.A. and Oluokun, O.A. (2019) 'Thermodynamic efficiency and control strategies in residential air conditioning systems', *International Journal of Scientific Research in Civil Engineering*, 3(3), pp. 52–76. DOI: [10.32628/IJSRCE19339](https://doi.org/10.32628/IJSRCE19339).
76. Tahan, H.M. (2020) 'Essential case management practices amidst the novel coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) crisis: Part 1: Tele-case management, surge capacity, discharge planning, and transitions of care', *Professional Case Management*, 25(5), pp. 248–266. DOI: [10.1097/NCM.0000000000000454](https://doi.org/10.1097/NCM.0000000000000454).
77. Tsegaye, T. and Flowerday, S. (2021) 'A system architecture for ensuring interoperability in a South African national electronic health record system', *South African Computer Journal*, 33(1), pp. 79–110. DOI: [10.18489/sacj.v33i1.838](https://doi.org/10.18489/sacj.v33i1.838).
78. Valentijn, P.P., Schepman, S.M., Opheij, W. and Bruijnzeels, M.A. (2013) 'Understanding integrated care: A comprehensive conceptual framework based on the integrative functions

- of primary care', *International Journal of Integrated Care*, 13(1), e010. DOI: [10.5334/ijic.886](https://doi.org/10.5334/ijic.886).
79. Weiskopf, N.G. and Weng, C. (2013) 'Methods and dimensions of electronic health record data quality assessment: Enabling reuse for clinical research', *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 20(1), pp. 144–151. DOI: [10.1136/amiajnl-2011-000681](https://doi.org/10.1136/amiajnl-2011-000681).
80. Whitelaw, S., Mamas, M.A., Topol, E. and Van Spall, H.G.C. (2020) 'Applications of digital technology in COVID-19 pandemic planning and response', *The Lancet Digital Health*, 2(8), pp. e435–e440. DOI: [10.1016/S2589-7500\(20\)30142-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500(20)30142-4).
81. Wosik, J., Fudim, M., Cameron, B., Gellad, Z.F., Cho, A., Phinney, D., Curtis, S., Roman, M., Poon, E.G., Ferranti, J., Katz, J.N. and Tchong, J. (2020) 'Telehealth transformation: COVID-19 and the rise of virtual care', *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 27(6), pp. 957–962. DOI: [10.1093/jamia/ocaa067](https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocaa067).
82. Yu, S.W.Y., Ma, A., Tsang, V.H.M., Chung, L.S.W., Leung, S.-C. and Leung, L.-P. (2020) 'Triage accuracy of online symptom checkers for Accident and Emergency Department patients', *Hong Kong Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 27(4), pp. 217–222. DOI: [10.1177/1024907919842486](https://doi.org/10.1177/1024907919842486).
83. Yusuf, A.O. and Sabboh, G.M. (2021) 'Psychological factors as correlates of suicidal ideation among university students in Lagos State', *International Journal of Academic and Applied Research*, 5(9), pp. 1–7.