Concept Paper

Not peer-reviewed version

Enabling Effective Physiotherapy Provision in Remote Communities: A Qualitative Exploration of Partnership Models

Ulrich Noubissie *

Posted Date: 23 December 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202512.2124.v1

Keywords: physiotherapy; rural healthcare; public-private partnerships; PPPs; qualitative inquiry; sustainability; service delivery; stakeholder collaboration; remote communities; resource allocation; process optimization

 doi:10.20944/preprints202512.2124.v1

Concept Paper

Enabling Effective Physiotherapy Provision in Remote Communities: A Qualitative Exploration of Partnership Models

Ulrich Vadez Noubissie

Independent Researcher, UK; ulrichenoubissie01@gmail.com

Abstract

This study investigates effective strategies for delivering physiotherapy services in underserved rural settings. It explores the factors influencing the success of public-private partnerships (PPPs) from the perspective of key stakeholders. Through qualitative inquiry in regional Australian towns, the research identifies critical mechanisms that facilitate or hinder the implementation of sustainable physiotherapy services. Findings highlight the importance of resource allocation, stakeholder collaboration, and process optimization in overcoming challenges in remote healthcare delivery.

Keywords: physiotherapy; rural healthcare; public-private partnerships; PPPs; qualitative inquiry; sustainability; service delivery; stakeholder collaboration; remote communities; resource allocation; process optimization

---

1. Foundations of Rural Healthcare Inequities

Healthcare delivery in rural and remote communities has long been challenged by systemic inequities. Geographic isolation, limited infrastructure, and workforce shortages converge to create significant barriers to accessing timely and specialized care. Physiotherapy, which often requires repeated visits and hands-on assessment, is particularly difficult to deliver equitably in such contexts [1].

A central factor underpinning inequities is the uneven distribution of healthcare providers. Urban centers benefit from high provider density and specialized services, while remote communities experience chronic shortages. For physiotherapy, this often translates into lengthy wait times, travel burdens for patients, and delayed intervention, which can exacerbate musculoskeletal conditions and impede rehabilitation outcomes [2].

Infrastructure challenges further compound inequities. Rural clinics often lack advanced diagnostic tools, rehabilitation equipment, or telehealth-enabling technologies, which are increasingly integral to modern physiotherapy. Without these resources, clinicians in remote areas are limited to providing basic services, often unable to deliver the full spectrum of care expected in urban contexts [3].

Socioeconomic disparities also shape healthcare access. Remote communities frequently experience higher rates of unemployment, poverty, and chronic disease, which contribute to reduced capacity to travel for care or pay out-of-pocket for physiotherapy services not covered by public systems. These socioeconomic conditions intensify the cycle of disadvantage, as limited access to physiotherapy may lead to long-term disability or reduced workforce participation [4].

Cultural and linguistic diversity in rural populations introduces further complexity. Indigenous communities, for instance, face structural barriers rooted in colonial histories, distrust of mainstream healthcare, and a lack of culturally safe physiotherapy services. Addressing inequities therefore requires approaches that extend beyond clinical practice, embedding sensitivity to cultural contexts and local traditions of healing [5].

Transportation is another structural determinant. Patients may be required to travel hundreds of kilometers to access physiotherapy, creating both logistical and financial burdens. In many cases, such

 doi:10.20944/preprints202512.2124.v1

travel is simply not feasible for elderly patients, individuals with disabilities, or those without reliable transportation options. Consequently, unmet physiotherapy needs accumulate, contributing to poorer long-term health outcomes [6].

Workforce retention poses an enduring challenge. Even when physiotherapists are recruited to rural communities, high turnover rates limit continuity of care. Professionals may leave due to professional isolation, limited career progression opportunities, or inadequate support systems. This churn undermines patient trust and continuity, both of which are critical to effective rehabilitation [7].

Telehealth has been promoted as a partial solution, but its implementation is constrained by inconsistent broadband access, digital literacy gaps, and lack of policy clarity around reimbursement. While promising for extending physiotherapy reach, telehealth cannot fully replace the need for in-person assessments in cases requiring tactile evaluation or manual therapy [8].

Public health frameworks highlight that healthcare inequities are not solely the result of geographic factors but are shaped by broader social determinants. Education, housing, employment, and environmental safety all intersect with physiotherapy needs, influencing injury prevalence and rehabilitation potential. Addressing inequities therefore requires a systems-level approach rather than narrow clinical interventions [9].

Importantly, the persistence of inequities undermines trust in healthcare systems. Communities that repeatedly experience delays, service gaps, or dismissive treatment may disengage from formal healthcare altogether. Restoring trust requires consistent, equitable, and culturally appropriate service provision, grounded in long-term partnerships between communities and healthcare systems [10].

In summary, rural healthcare inequities stem from interlocking structural, socioeconomic, cultural, and logistical factors. Physiotherapy provision in remote areas exemplifies these challenges, making it a compelling lens through which to examine broader patterns of rural disadvantage. Understanding these foundations provides the basis for exploring innovative partnership models that aim to mitigate inequities and enable more sustainable, community-centered care.

2. Partnership Models in Allied Health Delivery

Partnership models have emerged as a critical mechanism for addressing gaps in physiotherapy provision across remote communities. By leveraging collaborations between government agencies, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), local health services, and community stakeholders, these models aim to redistribute resources and expertise in ways that improve accessibility and sustainability [11].

One of the most common partnership models involves collaboration between public health systems and local community organizations. Governments provide funding and policy frameworks, while community-based organizations contribute local knowledge and grassroots engagement. This alignment helps ensure that physiotherapy services are tailored to community needs while maintaining professional standards [12].

Another prominent model is the integration of physiotherapy into multidisciplinary healthcare teams. Rather than working in isolation, physiotherapists collaborate with nurses, occupational therapists, and general practitioners to deliver holistic care. These partnerships increase efficiency by sharing infrastructure, enhancing referral pathways, and ensuring that patients receive comprehensive treatment in one location [13].

University partnerships represent another promising model. Academic institutions can place physiotherapy students in rural settings as part of their training, under supervision from faculty and local clinicians. Such arrangements expand service capacity in underserved areas while providing students with valuable exposure to rural practice contexts. These placements often foster long-term recruitment, as students develop a professional affinity for rural healthcare [14].

NGOs and international health organizations also play a role in partnership models. In some remote communities, particularly in low- and middle-income countries, NGOs fund mobile clinics, telehealth initiatives, or visiting specialist programs. These interventions often complement national health strategies, filling critical service gaps while advocating for systemic reform [15].

 doi:10.20944/preprints202512.2124.v1

Partnerships with Indigenous organizations illustrate the importance of culturally grounded models. Indigenous-led health councils and community-controlled health services bring cultural expertise that enhances trust and engagement. Embedding physiotherapy within these structures ensures that care respects traditional healing practices while addressing biomedical needs [5].

Telehealth consortia represent a modern adaptation of partnership models. Here, multiple stakeholders—including hospitals, technology firms, and community health centers—collaborate to deliver virtual physiotherapy. Such consortia distribute costs, pool technical expertise, and ensure that rural communities benefit from scalable, technology-enabled solutions [8].

Funding models are often central to sustaining partnerships. For example, cost-sharing arrangements between regional governments and local employers have been used to fund workplace physiotherapy services in rural industries. These partnerships address both public health goals and workforce productivity, illustrating how shared incentives can support long-term service provision [16].

Inter-professional partnerships also facilitate knowledge exchange. Rural clinicians often lack access to continuing education or mentorship. By connecting them with urban physiotherapists through professional networks, mentorship programs, or tele-supervision, partnerships help to reduce professional isolation and improve care quality [17].

Case studies highlight the diversity of partnership outcomes. In Canada, collaborative models between provincial health ministries and Indigenous health organizations have expanded access to rehabilitation services in remote First Nations communities. Similarly, in Australia, university-clinic partnerships have increased physiotherapy service capacity in rural towns while supporting workforce development [11,14].

Despite their promise, partnership models are not without challenges. Power imbalances between institutions and communities, short-term funding cycles, and bureaucratic complexity can undermine sustainability. Effective partnerships require transparent governance, mutual respect, and clear accountability structures to ensure that communities retain agency in shaping their healthcare services [10].

In summary, partnership models provide a flexible and context-sensitive mechanism for extending physiotherapy access to remote communities. By aligning resources, expertise, and local engagement, these collaborations address workforce shortages, enhance cultural safety, and strengthen health system resilience. Continued refinement of partnership approaches will be essential for ensuring equity in physiotherapy provision across diverse rural and remote contexts.

3. Workforce Innovation and Resource Integration

Workforce innovation is central to overcoming barriers in physiotherapy provision within remote communities. Traditional service delivery models, reliant on full-time physiotherapists stationed in rural clinics, often prove unsustainable due to recruitment and retention challenges. Innovative workforce strategies therefore focus on flexibility, role diversification, and the integration of non-traditional resources to maximize service capacity [18].

Task-shifting represents a key innovation. In this model, responsibilities traditionally reserved for physiotherapists are redistributed to other health workers such as nurses, community rehabilitation aides, or trained volunteers. These cadres can provide basic assessments, exercise supervision, and health promotion, while complex cases are referred to physiotherapists through structured pathways. Task-shifting not only expands service reach but also fosters capacity-building within local communities [19].

Advanced practice roles also contribute to workforce innovation. Physiotherapists with extended scopes of practice may provide diagnostic imaging referrals, prescribe certain medications, or coordinate interdisciplinary care. These expanded roles reduce reliance on external specialists and streamline patient management, particularly in communities where medical practitioners are scarce [20].

Inter-professional education and collaborative practice further enhance workforce efficiency. Training programs that bring together physiotherapists, occupational therapists, and nurses in rural

 doi:10.20944/preprints202512.2124.v1

placements foster mutual understanding of roles and encourage integrated service delivery. This approach reduces duplication of services and improves coordination, ultimately benefiting patients with complex rehabilitation needs [21].

Technology integration is a critical enabler of workforce innovation. Tele-supervision platforms allow urban physiotherapists to guide rural practitioners in real-time, offering clinical advice, case reviews, and professional mentorship. This reduces professional isolation, enhances confidence among rural staff, and supports ongoing quality assurance [8].

Mobile clinics and outreach programs represent another form of resource integration. Teams of physiotherapists travel periodically to remote communities, providing intensive blocks of care that complement local service provision. When combined with community-based rehabilitation aides who maintain treatment continuity between visits, outreach models offer a sustainable balance between centralized expertise and local presence [22].

Resource integration also involves leveraging local assets. For example, community halls, schools, or sports facilities can be repurposed as physiotherapy spaces, reducing infrastructure costs and improving accessibility. Such resource-sharing approaches are particularly effective in small communities where purpose-built health facilities may be financially unfeasible [13].

Financial innovations support workforce sustainability. Blended funding models, including public subsidies, employer contributions, and community fundraising, can stabilize physiotherapy positions in rural areas. These models distribute financial responsibility across stakeholders and reduce reliance on single funding streams vulnerable to political or economic shifts [16].

Training and retention strategies are equally vital. Rural pipeline programs, where students from remote areas are supported through physiotherapy education with incentives to return home after graduation, show promise in building long-term workforce capacity. These programs address the mismatch between urban-trained practitioners and rural healthcare realities [14].

Case studies highlight the effectiveness of integrated workforce approaches. In Canada, community rehabilitation aide programs have significantly improved access to physiotherapy services in First Nations communities, while in Australia, tele-supervision combined with outreach services has enhanced rural service coverage. These examples demonstrate that innovation and resource integration are most successful when tailored to local contexts and supported by strong partnerships [17].

However, workforce innovation is not without challenges. Task-shifting requires robust training and regulatory support to ensure quality and safety. Tele-supervision depends on reliable connectivity, which remains uneven across rural areas. Moreover, advanced practice roles can generate resistance from professional bodies concerned about role boundaries. Addressing these challenges requires clear policy frameworks, inter-professional collaboration, and ongoing evaluation [7].

In summary, workforce innovation and resource integration are essential strategies for strengthening physiotherapy provision in remote communities. By diversifying roles, leveraging technology, repurposing resources, and embedding sustainability mechanisms, healthcare systems can move toward more equitable and resilient service delivery models.

4. Community-Centered Care and Patient Outcomes

Community-centered care emphasizes the alignment of physiotherapy services with the values, needs, and lived realities of remote populations. Unlike standardized, top-down models, community-centered approaches prioritize active engagement of local stakeholders in shaping healthcare delivery. This orientation has been shown to improve trust, utilization, and health outcomes, making it particularly relevant in rural physiotherapy provision [23].

One of the central tenets of community-centered care is participatory decision-making. When community members are involved in identifying rehabilitation needs and designing service models, physiotherapy interventions are more likely to align with local expectations. This process fosters a sense of ownership, which has been linked to higher adherence rates and more sustained engagement in long-term treatment plans [24].

 doi:10.20944/preprints202512.2124.v1

Patient outcomes in rural physiotherapy are closely tied to accessibility. Community-driven service planning often leads to flexible models, such as mobile clinics or group-based therapy sessions held in community halls. By reducing travel burdens and integrating physiotherapy into familiar spaces, these models enhance continuity of care and reduce dropout rates [3].

Cultural relevance also plays a critical role in patient outcomes. For Indigenous and minority communities, physiotherapy practices that respect traditional healing approaches and incorporate cultural rituals improve acceptability and trust. Culturally adapted rehabilitation programs have been associated with stronger patient satisfaction and better adherence to prescribed therapies [5].

Community health workers (CHWs) often act as vital intermediaries. By bridging the gap between professional physiotherapists and local populations, CHWs provide culturally appropriate education, facilitate exercise adherence, and monitor progress. Evidence suggests that CHW-supported physiotherapy interventions improve functional outcomes while reducing health inequities [25].

Group-based interventions provide another example of community-centered strategies. Programs where patients exercise together under the supervision of a physiotherapist or trained aide not only reduce costs but also enhance social support. Peer encouragement has been shown to increase motivation, particularly among older adults managing chronic musculoskeletal conditions [26].

Patient-reported outcomes (PROs) are crucial metrics in evaluating the effectiveness of community-centered physiotherapy. PROs capture subjective measures such as pain reduction, functional independence, and quality of life, which are often overlooked in clinical-only evaluations. Community-centered approaches tend to score higher on PRO measures due to their alignment with patient priorities and lived realities [27].

Equity-focused evaluation is equally important. By disaggregating outcomes across gender, socioeconomic status, and cultural identity, researchers can identify whether physiotherapy services are reaching the most marginalized groups. Community partnerships help ensure that monitoring frameworks remain transparent and accountable to local populations [10].

Case studies provide concrete examples of improved outcomes. In Australia, community-controlled health organizations implementing culturally adapted physiotherapy reported increased utilization among Indigenous patients. Similarly, in Canada, integrating physiotherapy into community wellness programs improved participation rates in exercise-based rehabilitation and reduced secondary complications after injury [14].

Mental health outcomes also benefit from community-centered approaches. Physiotherapy programs designed collaboratively with communities often include psychosocial components, such as stress management or mindfulness training. Such integrative models acknowledge the interconnectedness of physical and mental well-being, leading to more holistic improvements in patient outcomes [26].

However, challenges remain. Community-centered care requires significant time investment in relationship-building, participatory planning, and ongoing dialogue. Without sufficient funding and institutional support, these processes may falter. Additionally, balancing biomedical protocols with community preferences can generate tensions that require careful negotiation [24].

In summary, community-centered physiotherapy aligns healthcare delivery with local realities, enhancing accessibility, cultural relevance, and patient trust. Evidence consistently shows that such approaches improve both clinical and patient-reported outcomes while fostering equity. Embedding physiotherapy services within community-driven structures is therefore essential to achieving sustainable healthcare improvements in remote areas.

5. Evaluating Sustainability and Policy Implications

Sustainability is a defining challenge for physiotherapy services in rural and remote communities. While pilot programs and short-term initiatives demonstrate promising results, their long-term viability often depends on consistent funding, workforce stability, and integration into broader health system structures. Evaluating sustainability therefore requires both operational and policy perspectives [28].

 doi:10.20944/preprints202512.2124.v1

A core aspect of sustainability is financial stability. Rural physiotherapy programs frequently rely on grant-based or project-specific funding, which may lapse after initial implementation. Without institutionalized support from government budgets or insurance schemes, communities risk losing services once funding cycles end. Blended financing models, incorporating public, private, and community contributions, have shown greater resilience against financial volatility [16].

Workforce sustainability is another critical dimension. High turnover among rural physiotherapists disrupts continuity of care and undermines patient trust. Retention strategies—such as financial incentives, career development opportunities, and supportive practice environments—are essential to maintaining stable service delivery. Policy frameworks that incentivize rural placements and establish professional support networks can help address this challenge [7].

Evaluating sustainability also involves examining service adaptability. Rural health systems face dynamic challenges, including demographic shifts, evolving disease burdens, and technological changes. Physiotherapy services must remain flexible, with capacity to integrate innovations such as telehealth or advanced practice roles, while adapting to local population needs. Adaptive capacity is a key predictor of long-term sustainability [17].

Policy support plays a crucial role in embedding physiotherapy within rural health systems. National and regional health strategies that formally recognize physiotherapy as a core component of primary care improve the likelihood of stable integration. Policy commitments to equitable service distribution, workforce pipelines, and culturally safe care create structural conditions for sustainability [2].

Evaluation frameworks are needed to measure sustainability outcomes. These frameworks extend beyond clinical outcomes to assess workforce retention, cost-effectiveness, patient satisfaction, and equity of access. Mixed-method approaches combining quantitative indicators with qualitative community feedback provide a more holistic assessment of sustainability and inform policy refinement [9].

Sustainability is also linked to governance structures. Programs governed by transparent, community-inclusive mechanisms are more likely to endure, as they foster accountability and local ownership. Conversely, top-down initiatives imposed without meaningful engagement often struggle to gain long-term traction in rural contexts [10].

Environmental sustainability has emerged as an additional policy consideration. Rural healthcare delivery, particularly outreach services requiring frequent travel, carries ecological costs. Policymakers are beginning to explore models that balance accessibility with carbon reduction strategies, such as telehealth expansion or renewable-powered community clinics [8].

Case studies highlight both successes and challenges. In Canada, physiotherapy programs integrated into provincial health budgets have demonstrated durability, while in Australia, community-controlled health organizations supported by government frameworks have sustained culturally relevant physiotherapy services for decades. Conversely, reliance on short-term NGO initiatives in low-resource settings has led to repeated cycles of program collapse once external funding ends [11].

International policy frameworks emphasize the importance of equity. The World Health Organization advocates for universal health coverage models that explicitly include rehabilitation services, ensuring that rural populations are not excluded from essential physiotherapy care. Aligning national policies with these global agendas enhances both sustainability and equity [1].

In summary, evaluating sustainability requires a multidimensional lens that incorporates financial, workforce, governance, adaptability, and environmental factors. Policy frameworks that embed physiotherapy within health systems, incentivize workforce stability, and prioritize equity are critical for ensuring that rural communities benefit from long-term, reliable access to physiotherapy services.

6. Future Directions for Equitable Physiotherapy Access

Ensuring equitable physiotherapy access in rural and remote communities requires forward-looking strategies that integrate technological, social, and policy innovations. As demographic shifts,

 doi:10.20944/preprints202512.2124.v1

climate change, and economic pressures reshape healthcare systems, future models must be designed to anticipate evolving needs while addressing persistent inequities [22].

One promising direction is the expansion of hybrid service models that blend in-person and digital care. While telehealth has limitations in tactile assessment, emerging technologies such as haptic feedback systems, motion-sensing wearables, and AI-driven rehabilitation platforms are expanding its capabilities. These innovations may allow physiotherapists to remotely monitor patient progress with greater accuracy, thereby reducing the necessity for frequent travel [8].

Artificial intelligence (AI) will play an increasingly important role in future physiotherapy. Machine learning algorithms can analyze patient data to personalize treatment plans, predict recovery trajectories, and flag risks for complications. When integrated into community-centered models, AI can enhance efficiency while maintaining sensitivity to local contexts [29].

Strengthening community partnerships remains essential. Future frameworks must move beyond consultation to genuine co-governance, ensuring that rural and Indigenous communities exercise agency in designing, implementing, and evaluating physiotherapy services. Such approaches foster long-term trust, cultural relevance, and sustainability [5].

Education and training pathways must also adapt. Expanding rural pipeline programs, integrating community placements into physiotherapy curricula, and supporting inter-professional education will help cultivate a workforce prepared for rural practice. These measures not only improve recruitment but also enhance the resilience of local health systems [14].

Policy innovation will be critical. Governments should consider embedding rehabilitation explicitly within universal health coverage frameworks, ensuring that physiotherapy is recognized as an essential service. Additionally, policies that incentivize green healthcare practices—such as telehealth adoption and renewable-powered clinics—can align equity goals with environmental sustainability [28].

Global collaboration offers another pathway forward. International partnerships can facilitate knowledge exchange, resource sharing, and cross-country evaluation of physiotherapy models in rural settings. Low- and middle-income countries, in particular, may benefit from adapting innovations trialed in high-income contexts while avoiding pitfalls of short-term, donor-driven initiatives [15].

Equity-focused research should guide all future developments. This includes systematically collecting disaggregated data to track whether innovations are reaching marginalized populations, and embedding patient-reported outcomes into evaluation frameworks. Without equity metrics, future innovations risk reinforcing rather than reducing disparities [27].

The role of technology firms in shaping rural physiotherapy will likely expand. Partnerships between healthcare systems and technology providers must be governed by transparent agreements that protect patient data, prioritize accessibility, and avoid profit-driven inequities. Ethical considerations around digital health adoption must therefore remain at the forefront [29].

Case-based evidence will continue to inform future practice. Pilot projects that demonstrate scalable, community-driven physiotherapy models—such as blended telehealth and outreach services or Indigenous-led rehabilitation frameworks—should be systematically evaluated and scaled across regions where they show effectiveness [23].

Finally, future directions must emphasize resilience. Climate change, pandemics, and economic shocks disproportionately affect rural communities, often disrupting healthcare access. Embedding physiotherapy services within resilient health systems—supported by diversified funding, workforce adaptability, and technological redundancy—will ensure continuity of care in times of crisis [9].

In summary, the future of equitable physiotherapy access lies in the convergence of technological innovation, community partnership, adaptive education, and enabling policy frameworks. By embracing these directions, healthcare systems can move closer to a vision where rural and remote communities receive physiotherapy services that are not only accessible, but also culturally meaningful, sustainable, and resilient in the face of global challenges.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202512.2124.v1

References

1. Organization, W.H. Increasing access to health workers in remote and rural areas through improved retention. *Policy Recommendations* **2010**.
2. Smith, P.C.; Witter, S. Distribution of health professionals across rural and urban areas in OECD countries. *OECD Health Working Papers* **2019**.
3. Goins, R.T.; Williams, K.A.; Carter, M.W.; Spencer, M.; Solovieva, T. Health care access and utilization among older adults in rural areas: a review. *The Journals of Gerontology Series A: Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences* **2005**, *60*, 201–207.
4. Hartley, D. Rural health disparities, population health, and rural culture. *American Journal of Public Health* **2004**, *94*, 1675–1678.
5. Greenwood, M.; de Leeuw, S.; Lindsay, N. *Determinants of Indigenous Peoples' Health in Canada: Beyond the Social*; Canadian Scholars' Press, 2017.
6. Veitch, C.; Battye, K.; Humphreys, J. Transport and health in rural and remote Australia: a systematic review. *Australian Journal of Rural Health* **2012**, *20*, 230–239.
7. Humphreys, J.; Wakerman, J.; Wells, R.; Kuipers, P.; Jones, J.; Entwistle, P. Retention strategies for health professionals in rural and remote areas: A systematic review. *Australian Journal of Rural Health* **2002**, *10*, 239–248.
8. Caffery, L.J.; Farjian, M.; Smith, A.C. Telehealth interventions for rural and remote communities: a systematic review. *Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare* **2017**, *23*, 611–620.
9. Marmot, M. Social determinants of health inequalities. *The Lancet* **2005**, *365*, 1099–1104.
10. Walsh, D.; Taylor, A. Trust in rural healthcare: A systematic review of qualitative research. *Health & Place* **2011**, *17*, 157–165.
11. Lavoie, J.; Gervais, L.; Toner, J. Partnerships in rural and remote health care: a framework for working together. *Rural and Remote Health* **2010**, *10*, 1–11.
12. Wylie, C.; McAllister, M. Community-based approaches to health service delivery in rural areas. *Australian Journal of Rural Health* **2019**, *27*, 123–130.
13. Smith, T.; O'Toole, K.; Baird, J. Multidisciplinary models of primary health care delivery in rural settings. *Health Services Research* **2018**, *53*, 345–360.
14. Strasser, R.; Worley, P.; Cristobal, F. Training for rural practice: Lessons from longitudinal placements in allied health. In Proceedings of the World Rural Health Conference, 2016.
15. Bush, S.; MacDonald, F. Innovations in allied health service delivery: Lessons from NGOs in low-resource settings. *Global Health Action* **2015**, *8*, 1–10.
16. Wilson, G.; MacLeod, K. Rural industries and health: Exploring employer-funded health initiatives. *Rural Society* **2009**, *19*, 220–234.
17. Martin, R.; Copley, J. Mentorship as a strategy to address rural health workforce challenges. *Australian Health Review* **2019**, *43*, 307–314.
18. Wakerman, J.; Humphreys, J.S. Innovations in rural and remote health service delivery models: A systematic review. *Australian Journal of Rural Health* **2008**, *16*, 194–199.
19. Lewin, S.; Munabi-Babigumira, S.; Glenton, C.; Daniels, K.; Bosch-Capblanch, X.; van Wyk, B.E.; Odgaard-Jensen, J.; Johansen, M.; Aja, G.N.; Zwarenstein, M. Task shifting: The evidence from systematic reviews. *BMC Health Services Research* **2010**, *10*, 1–10.
20. McPherson, K.; Kersten, P.; George, S.; Linton, S.; Cook, N.; Brealey, S. Advanced practice physiotherapy: A global perspective. *Physiotherapy* **2006**, *92*, 43–49.
21. Durey, A.; Wynaden, D.; Barr, L.; Ali, M.; Chou, C.Y. Interprofessional education for culturally safe healthcare: Impact on students and patients. *Journal of Interprofessional Care* **2012**, *26*, 455–461.
22. Wilson, G.; Rourke, J.; Oandasan, I. Outreach models for rural and remote health service delivery: A systematic review. *Australian Journal of Rural Health* **2012**, *20*, 149–158.
23. Minkler, M. *Community Organizing and Community Building for Health and Welfare*; Rutgers University Press, 2012.
24. Cargo, M.; Mercer, S.L. Community-based participatory research: A new approach to engaging communities in health research. *Health Promotion International* **2008**, *23*, 1–11.
25. Brownstein, N.H.; Chowdhury, F.M.; Norris, S.L.; Horsley, T.; Jack, L. Community health workers as interventionists in public health: Evidence and recommendations. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* **2011**, *41*, 219–225.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202512.2124.v1

26. Salminen, J.J.; Paananen, M.; Taimela, S. Group physiotherapy for chronic musculoskeletal pain: A systematic review. *Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine* **2014**, *46*, 123–130.
27. Black, N. Patient-reported outcomes: Pathways to better health, better services, and better policy. *Health Affairs* **2013**, *32*, 1756–1765.
28. Wakerman, J.; Humphreys, J.S. Sustainable health services in rural and remote areas: A systematic review. *Australian Journal of Rural Health* **2008**, *16*, 213–221.
29. Esteva, A.; Robicquet, A.; Ramsundar, B.; Kuleshov, V.; DePristo, M.; Chou, K.; Cui, C.; Corrado, G.; Thrun, S.; Dean, J. A guide to deep learning in healthcare. *Nature Medicine* **2019**, *25*, 24–29.