Integrated Specialized Health Model (ISHM): A Conceptual Policy Framework for Sustainable and Digitally Supported Healthcare Systems

István Biró * and Gábor Fazekas

Posted Date: 14 May 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202505.1032.v1

Keywords: health policy; integrated care; specialization; digital health; artificial intelligence; robotics; system reform; Eastern Europe

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.1032.v1

Article

Integrated Specialized Health Model (ISHM): A Conceptual Policy Framework for Sustainable and Digitally Supported Healthcare Systems

István Biró [1,2,*] **and Gábor Fazekas** [1,2,3]

[1] Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of Szeged, Szeged, Hungary
[2] Doctoral School of Preventive and Experimental Medicine, University of Szeged, Szeged, Hungary
[3] Department of Rehabilitation, Semmelweis University, Budapest, Hungary
* Correspondence: biro.istvan@med.u-szeged.hu

Abstract: Background: This conceptual policy paper addresses key structural challenges in contemporary healthcare systems - namely, fragmentation, capacity imbalance, and technological underutilization. Despite multiple reforms, health systems remain inefficient and inequitable, especially in specialized service delivery. Objective: We introduce the Integrated Specialized Health Model (ISHM), a conceptual framework for the strategic organization of specialized services within an integrated, digitally supported healthcare network. Methods: The ISHM is positioned against international models such as the Patient-Centered Medical Home, Accountable Care Organizations, and Scandinavian regional care systems. It integrates digital interoperability, AI, and robotics within a network-based, modular structure. Results: The model provides benefits in clinical quality, resource efficiency, and patient experience. A pilot implementation pathway is proposed, including shared infrastructure, harmonized protocols, and outcome-based monitoring. ISHM is particularly suited to structurally fragmented or under-resourced systems, such as those in Central and Eastern Europe. Conclusions: ISHM offers a scalable and policy-aligned framework to bridge specialization with integration, and digital innovation with systemic resilience. Its conceptual design supports further empirical validation and policy adoption.

Keywords: health policy; integrated care; specialization; digital health; artificial intelligence; robotics; system reform; Eastern Europe

Introduction

Global healthcare systems are under mounting pressure due to rapidly aging populations, the rising burden of chronic diseases, and escalating expenditures on advanced medical technologies [1–3]. Projections suggest that in many countries, health spending will outpace GDP growth, particularly in societies with large elderly populations [1]. At the same time, over 70% of global mortality is attributable to non-communicable diseases, which demand long-term, resource-intensive care pathways [2].

Despite repeated reform efforts, structural inefficiencies remain pervasive across many healthcare systems. These include fragmented care structures, parallel services, and redundant resource allocation—all of which contribute to capacity imbalances, workforce shortages, and unequal access to high-quality services [3–5]. While various models have sought to address these gaps, they often focus either on integration or specialization, rarely both in a unified and scalable framework.

International frameworks such as the Patient-Centered Medical Home (PCMH), Accountable Care Organizations (ACO), and regionally integrated Scandinavian systems offer valuable insights into coordinated care and cost-efficiency [6–8]. However, they do not provide a systematic solution for integrating highly specialized centers into multidisciplinary care pathways. This is especially

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.1032.v1

problematic in fields such as rehabilitation, oncology, and chronic disease management, where complex needs often intersect with fragmented service delivery [9,10].

The Integrated Specialized Health Model (ISHM) seeks to address this gap by offering a policy-oriented framework for the structured integration of specialized services. It emphasizes coordinated networks of care, standardized operating protocols, and digital interoperability. Moreover, the ISHM explicitly incorporates emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence (AI) and robotics into both care delivery and system management [11,12].

This paper outlines the conceptual foundations of the ISHM, positions it among existing international models, and explores its potential as a flexible and evidence-based solution for strengthening healthcare systems. Special attention is given to its relevance for Central and Eastern Europe, where structural fragmentation and resource constraints persist despite policy efforts toward integration.

The Conceptual Framework of ISHM

The Integrated Specialized Health Model (ISHM) is built on a network-based configuration of specialized healthcare centers that operate in a structurally integrated, interoperable, and strategically coordinated manner [13,14]. The primary objective of this framework is to optimize existing healthcare capacities and prevent the duplication of expensive, labor-intensive infrastructure, which continues to strain financial and human resources across numerous systems [15].

Although many health systems maintain specialized institutions, they often operate in silos without meaningful horizontal or vertical coordination. This fragmentation leads to diagnostic delays, poor continuity of care, higher operational costs, and lower system efficiency. International literature highlights the lack of comprehensive models that examine how specialized centers can function within unified, cross-disciplinary clinical and administrative ecosystems [16,17].

Under ISHM, each center focuses on a clearly defined clinical domain—such as rehabilitation, oncology, geriatrics, or chronic disease management—thus fostering deep expertise and high service quality. However, rather than functioning in isolation, these centers are embedded in a broader, integrated care network. This configuration enables both vertical integration (e.g., between inpatient and outpatient services) and horizontal alignment (e.g., among specialties), thereby increasing the effectiveness of patient pathways [18].

A core element of ISHM is standardized, bi-directional information flow across institutions. This is supported by a shared digital infrastructure that enables real-time data exchange, unified patient records, and AI-assisted decision support [19]. By enabling interoperability and transparent access to care processes, ISHM reduces duplication, medical errors, and inefficiencies.

From a policy perspective, ISHM supports capacity rationalization, equitable access, and workforce sustainability - goals emphasized by European Union health policy guidelines and the World Health Organization's recommendations on integrated service delivery [20,21].

Importantly, ISHM distinguishes itself by its explicit inclusion of emerging technologies. Robotic rehabilitation devices, digital triage tools, and AI-driven analytics are not optional add-ons but foundational components of the system architecture. While these technologies are often deployed in isolation at the institutional level, their systemic integration across care levels is rare, especially in Central and Eastern Europe [22].

Thus, ISHM represents a multidimensional, policy-relevant model that unifies the benefits of specialization with the efficiencies of integration and the potential of advanced technologies. Its design invites empirical implementation, particularly in health systems struggling with fragmentation, inefficiency, and workforce scarcity.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.1032.v1

Positioning ISHM Among International Models

To understand the strategic relevance of the Integrated Specialized Health Model (ISHM), it is essential to compare it with internationally recognized models that aim to improve care quality, integration, and cost-efficiency. Three dominant frameworks serve as comparative benchmarks: the Patient-Centered Medical Home (PCMH), Accountable Care Organizations (ACO), and regionally integrated care systems in Scandinavian countries.

The PCMH model emphasizes patient-centeredness and continuity of care, particularly within primary care settings. It has been successfully implemented in several Western European countries and the United States, resulting in improved patient engagement and care coordination [23,24]. However, its capacity to manage complex, high-intensity cases—such as those requiring specialized rehabilitation, oncology, or geriatrics—is limited by its primarily generalist infrastructure.

ACO models, largely developed in the U.S., integrate outcome-based financing with shared accountability mechanisms to reduce unnecessary interventions and improve care quality [25,26]. While ACOs show success in reducing hospitalizations and optimizing chronic disease management, they do not offer a structured mechanism for integrating highly specialized services across institutions, nor do they incorporate advanced technological innovations in a systematic way.

Scandinavian models represent regionally coordinated healthcare networks that excel in access equity, decentralization, and interoperability. Sweden, Norway, and Denmark have achieved high levels of system-level integration, often supported by unified health information systems and regional governance structures [27,28]. However, these models generally underutilize robotics, AI, and precision technologies, focusing instead on equity and sustainability.

Compared to these models, ISHM introduces four distinct innovations:

1. Explicit structural integration of specialized services, such as rehabilitation, oncology, and geriatrics.
2. Standardized digital interoperability, including AI-based decision support and robotic applications.
3. Flexible modular design, suitable for under-resourced or structurally fragmented health systems.
4. Policy-level implementation framework, aligned with EU health strategy objectives and WHO recommendations.

ISHM does not aim to replace existing models but rather complements and enhances them in contexts where specialization has outpaced coordination. Its design allows it to bridge patient-centered care with high-complexity service delivery, filling a conceptual and operational gap in global health system architecture.

Benefits of the ISHM Model

The implementation of the Integrated Specialized Health Model (ISHM) offers a multidimensional set of benefits that address core weaknesses in many contemporary healthcare systems. These benefits can be classified into three major categories: clinical quality, economic efficiency, and patient-centered outcomes.

1. Clinical Quality

ISHM enables the concentration of domain-specific expertise within specialized centers while maintaining horizontal and vertical integration across services. This arrangement improves diagnostic accuracy, reduces information fragmentation, and supports multidisciplinary care planning [29,30]. Through shared digital platforms and AI-assisted decision-making tools, the model facilitates early detection, real-time monitoring, and evidence-based interventions in both acute and chronic care scenarios [31].

2. Economic Efficiency

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.1032.v1

By reducing parallel infrastructure and unnecessary duplication of services, ISHM promotes optimal use of existing resources. It encourages the rational reallocation of workforce and infrastructure capacity, thus alleviating financial strain on health systems [32]. Fragmentation has been repeatedly identified as a primary driver of inefficiency and waste; ISHM counters this by embedding standardization, interoperability, and cross-institutional planning [33].

3. Patient-Centered Outcomes

Patients benefit from clearer care pathways, reduced wait times, and improved service continuity - especially in long-term or complex care situations such as stroke rehabilitation or multimorbidity management [34]. The use of robotic and interactive digital technologies not only expands therapeutic options but also reduces the burden on healthcare professionals, enabling more personalized and effective care [35,36].

ISHM is designed to be scalable and adaptable to different health system contexts. It allows for targeted implementation in resource-limited settings and serves as a platform for continuous innovation and performance monitoring.

By simultaneously addressing quality, efficiency, and patient experience, ISHM contributes to a more resilient and sustainable healthcare ecosystem.

Pilot Implementation Proposal

To facilitate real-world validation and policy translation, we propose a pilot implementation of the Integrated Specialized Health Model (ISHM) within a defined regional healthcare network. This pilot aims to assess operational feasibility, clinical impact, and system-level outcomes under controlled but realistic conditions.

The pilot project would include at least four specialized centers (e.g., neurology, rehabilitation, geriatrics, and chronic disease management), linked through a centralized digital infrastructure. These centers would operate under harmonized clinical protocols and participate in joint planning, data sharing, and outcome monitoring.

Key Objectives of the Pilot:

1. Protocol Harmonization:

Develop and apply standardized care pathways across centers to improve quality, reduce variation, and facilitate data comparability.

2. Digital Integration:

Establish a shared platform with full interoperability, including synchronized electronic health records (EHRs), clinical dashboards, and AI-assisted support tools [37].

3. Cross-Sector Collaboration:

Implement structured multidisciplinary communication and joint decision-making mechanisms between centers and levels of care.

4. Resource Rationalization:

Evaluate and realign infrastructure and workforce capacities to eliminate redundancies and improve allocation efficiency [38].

5. Performance Monitoring:

Define and track outcome indicators such as readmission rates, care delays, patient satisfaction scores, and cost metrics to measure impact.

The pilot should run for a minimum of 12 months, with quarterly evaluations and final outcome analysis. A mixed-methods approach is recommended, combining quantitative measures with qualitative assessments (e.g., staff and patient feedback, implementation barriers).

In the Central and Eastern European context - where institutional fragmentation, resource constraints, and uneven technology access persist - the ISHM pilot can serve as a reference model for

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.1032.v1

scalable transformation. Insights from the pilot would inform national and cross-border policy development aligned with EU priorities on health system modernization and digital innovation [39,40].

Discussion and Policy Implications

The Integrated Specialized Health Model (ISHM) offers a conceptual and operational response to long-standing structural deficiencies in healthcare systems. By aligning specialization with integration, and combining clinical expertise with system-wide coordination, the model presents a new approach to addressing fragmentation, inefficiency, and inequity [41].

From a policy perspective, ISHM supports several high-priority objectives:

- Cost containment and capacity optimization through the elimination of redundant infrastructure.
- Workforce sustainability by realigning labor distribution across interdependent services.
- Digital transformation by embedding AI and robotics into core operational processes.
- Outcome-based financing via clearly traceable, standardized care pathways.

These elements correspond closely with EU strategies for resilient health systems and WHO recommendations for people-centered service delivery [42].

ISHM is also compatible with value-based healthcare principles. It encourages transparency in resource use and fosters accountability through measurable indicators, such as patient-reported outcomes and clinical performance benchmarks. These features make it suitable for implementation within performance-linked payment frameworks.

In addition, the model supports proactive service planning. Its digital infrastructure enables predictive analytics and adaptive resource allocation - key features for system resilience during external shocks, such as pandemics or workforce shortages.

Importantly, ISHM is not a "one-size-fits-all" model but a modular framework that can be adapted to diverse national and regional settings. Its flexibility allows phased implementation and scale-up based on local priorities, infrastructure maturity, and political readiness.

Stakeholder engagement - including clinicians, managers, and policymakers—is critical for successful implementation. Legal and regulatory adjustments may also be needed to enable cross-institutional data sharing, performance-based contracting, and integrated governance structures.

Overall, the ISHM should be viewed as a strategic policy instrument to strengthen healthcare systems through evidence-based design, digital integration, and specialized coordination.

Conclusion

The Integrated Specialized Health Model (ISHM) provides a structured, policy-oriented response to the fragmentation and inefficiencies that challenge modern healthcare systems. By uniting specialization with coordinated integration, ISHM offers a framework that improves clinical quality, economic performance, and patient experience simultaneously.

Through its modular design, digital infrastructure, and embedded use of artificial intelligence and robotics, the model facilitates targeted reforms while remaining adaptable to diverse healthcare contexts. It is especially well-suited to regions facing resource constraints, workforce shortages, and institutional disconnection.

As health systems globally seek to become more resilient, equitable, and sustainable, ISHM emerges as a forward-looking solution. Its implementation may enhance system-level accountability, enable performance-based financing, and support the digital transformation of care.

A pilot program is proposed as the next step toward empirical validation. Through careful implementation and continuous evaluation, ISHM may serve as a reference model for strategic health system development—particularly in Central and Eastern Europe, but also in other countries seeking innovative frameworks for integrated and specialized care.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.1032.v1

Author Contributions: All authors contributed to the conception, design, and writing of the manuscript. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Data Availability Statement: All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this published article and its supplementary information files.

Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate: This study did not involve human participants, human data, or human tissue. Therefore, ethical approval and consent to participate were not applicable.

Consent for Publication: Not applicable, as the manuscript does not contain any individual person's data in any form.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

References

1. OECD. Health at a Glance 2023: OECD Indicators. Paris: OECD Publishing; 2023.
2. World Health Organization. Global Health Estimates: Leading causes of death. Geneva: WHO; 2022.
3. European Commission. State of Health in the EU: Companion Report 2021. Brussels: European Commission; 2021.
4. Smith M, Saunders R, Stuckhardt L, McGinnis JM. Best Care at Lower Cost: The Path to Continuously Learning Health Care in America. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2013.
5. Nolte E, Pitchforth E. What is the evidence on the economic impacts of integrated care? Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe; 2014.
6. Berwick DM, Nolan TW, Whittington J. The triple aim: care, health, and cost. Health Aff (Millwood). 2008;27(3):759–69.
7. Fisher ES, Shortell SM. Accountable care organizations: accountable for what, to whom, and how. JAMA. 2010;304(15):1715–6.
8. Cutler DM, Morton FS. Hospitals, market share, and consolidation. JAMA. 2013;310(18):1964–70.
9. Nolte E, McKee M. Caring for people with chronic conditions: A health system perspective. Maidenhead: Open University Press; 2008.
10. Goodwin N, Dixon A, Anderson G, Wodchis W. Providing integrated care for older people with complex needs: lessons from seven international case studies. London: The King's Fund; 2014.
11. Kodner DL, Spreeuwenberg C. Integrated care: meaning, logic, applications, and implications – a discussion paper. Int J Integr Care. 2002;2:e12.
12. Leutz W. Five laws for integrating medical and social services: lessons from the United States and the United Kingdom. Milbank Q. 1999;77(1):77–110.
13. Valentijn PP, Schepman SM, Opheij W, Bruijnzeels MA. Understanding integrated care: a comprehensive conceptual framework based on the integrative functions of primary care. Int J Integr Care. 2013;13:e010.
14. WHO Europe. Framework for action on integrated health services delivery. Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe; 2016.
15. Suter E, Oelke ND, Adair CE, Armitage GD. Ten key principles for successful health systems integration. Healthc Q. 2009;13(Spec No):16–23.
16. Bodenheimer T, Sinsky C. From triple to quadruple aim: care of the patient requires care of the provider. Ann Fam Med. 2014;12(6):573–6.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202505.1032.v1

17. European Commission. Digital Health and Care: Transformation through technology. Brussels: EC; 2022.
18. WHO Europe. Health workforce policies in the WHO European Region. Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe; 2023.
19. OECD. Health at a Glance: Europe 2022. Paris: OECD Publishing; 2022.
20. Fazekas G. Robotic therapy in neurorehabilitation. Orv Hetil. 2020;161(9):339–45. [in Hungarian]
21. Starfield B. Primary care and health: a cross-national comparison. JAMA. 1991;266(16):2268–71.
22. Kringos DS, Boerma WG, Hutchinson A, Saltman RB. Building primary care in a changing Europe. Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe; 2015.
23. McClellan M, McKethan AN, Lewis JL, Roski J, Fisher ES. A national strategy to put accountable care into practice. Health Aff (Millwood). 2010;29(5):982–90.
24. Shortell SM, Casalino LP. Health care reform requires accountable care systems. JAMA. 2008;300(1):95–7.
25. Rechel B, Jakubowski E, McKee M, Nolte E. Organization and financing of public health services in Europe. Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe; 2018.
26. Saltman RB, Bankauskaite V, Vrangbaek K. Decentralization in health care: strategies and outcomes. Maidenhead: Open University Press; 2007.
27. Lindgren B. Health economics for a new century: challenges and solutions. Berlin: Springer; 2010.
28. Epstein RM, Street RL. The values and value of patient-centered care. Ann Fam Med. 2011;9(2):100–3.
29. Donabedian A. Evaluating the quality of medical care. Milbank Mem Fund Q. 1966;44(3):166–203.
30. Greenhalgh T, Wherton J, Papoutsi C, et al. Beyond adoption: a new framework for theorizing and evaluating nonadoption, abandonment, scale-up, spread, and sustainability of health and care technologies. J Med Internet Res. 2017;19(11):e367.
31. Berwick DM, Hackbarth AD. Eliminating waste in US health care. JAMA. 2012;307(14):1513–6.
32. Institute of Medicine. Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2001.
33. Bate P, Robert G. Bringing user experience to healthcare improvement: the concepts, methods and practices of experience-based design. Oxford: Radcliffe Publishing; 2007.
34. Fazekas G, Tavaszi I, Tóth A. Experience of using the PABLO® device in upper limb neurorehabilitation. Rehabilitáció. 2022;32(2):12–7. [in Hungarian]
35. Fazekas G. Rehabilitációs robottechnológia a mozgássérültek ellátásában. IME. 2021;20(4):45–9. [in Hungarian]
36. European Commission. Country Health Profiles 2021. Brussels: European Commission; 2021.
37. OECD. Ready for the Next Crisis? Investing in Health System Resilience. Paris: OECD Publishing; 2023.
38. Kumpunen S, Edwards N, Georghiou T, Hughes G. Evaluating integrated care: Why are evaluations not producing the results we expect? London: Nuffield Trust; 2019.
39. Curry N, Ham C. Clinical and service integration: the route to improved outcomes. London: The King's Fund; 2010.
40. European Commission. Europe's Beating Cancer Plan. Brussels: EC; 2021.
41. Porter ME. What is value in health care? N Engl J Med. 2010;363(26):2477–81.
42. Kluge HHP, Jakab Z. Health systems for prosperity and solidarity: addressing the challenges. Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe; 2020.