

1 **Article type:** Research article

2 **Title:** Interdisciplinary perspectives on multimorbidity in Africa: developing an expanded
3 conceptual model

4 **Authors:** Justin Dixon^{1,2*#}, Ben Morton^{3,4#}, Misheck J. Nkhata^{5#}, Alan Silman^{6#}, Ibrahim G.
5 Simiyu^{4#}, Stephen A. Spencer^{3,4#}, Myrna Van Pinxteren^{7#}, Christopher Bunn^{8,9†}, Claire
6 Calderwood^{1,10†}, Clare I.R. Chandler^{2†}, Edith Chikumbu^{8†}, Amelia C. Crampin^{8,11,12†}, John R.
7 Hurst^{13†}, Modou Jobe^{14†}, Andre Pascal Kengne^{15†}, Naomi S. Levitt^{7†}, Mosa Moshabela^{16†},
8 Mayowa Owolabi^{17†}, Nasheeta Peer^{15†}, Nozgechi Phiri^{8†}, Sally J. Singh^{18†}, Tsaone Tamuhla^{19†},
9 Mandikudza Tembo^{1,10†}, Nicki Tiffin^{19†}, Eve Worrall^{20†}, Nateiya M. Yongolo^{4,21†}, Gift T.
10 Banda^{3,4‡}, Fanuel Bickton^{3,22‡}, Abbi-Monique Mamani Bilungula^{23‡}, Edna Bosire^{24,25‡}, Marlen
11 Stacy Chawani^{3,26‡}, Beatrice Chinoko^{3‡}, Mphatso Chisala^{8‡}, Jonathan Chiwanda^{27‡}, Sarah
12 Drew^{28‡}, Lindsay Farrant^{29‡}, Rashida A. Ferrand^{1,10‡}, Mtisunge Gondwe^{3,4‡}, Celia L.
13 Gregson^{1,28‡}, Richard Harding^{30‡}, Dan Kajungu^{31‡}, Stephen Kasenda^{8‡}, Wincelous Katagira^{32‡},
14 Duncan Kwaitana^{33‡}, Emily Mendenhall^{34‡}, Adwoa Bemah Boamah Mensah^{35‡}, Modai
15 Mnenula^{36‡}, Lovemore Mupaza^{37‡}, Maud Mwakasungula^{38‡}, Wisdom Nakanga^{8,39‡}, Chiratidzo
16 Ndhlovu^{40‡}, Kennedy Nkhoma^{30‡}, Owen Nkoka^{8,9‡}, Edwina Addo Opare-Lokko^{41‡}, Jacob
17 Phulusa^{3‡}, Alison Price^{8,11‡}, Jamie Rylance^{2‡}, Charity Salima^{42‡}, Sangwani Salimu^{3,4‡}, Joachim
18 Sturmberg^{43,44‡}, Elizabeth Vale^{45‡} and Felix Limbani^{3*}

19 #Equally contributing first authors, listed alphabetically

20 †Equally contributing article working group, listed alphabetically

21 ‡Equally contributing workshop collaborator group, listed alphabetically

22

23 **Affiliations:**

24 1. The Health Research Unit Zimbabwe, Biomedical Research and Training Institute, Harare,
25 Zimbabwe

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

- 26 2. Department of Global Health and Development, London School of Hygiene and Tropical
27 Medicine, London, UK
- 28 3. Malawi-Liverpool-Wellcome Programme, Chichiri 3, Blantyre, Malawi
- 29 4. Department of Clinical Sciences, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool, UK
- 30 5. SHLS Nursing and Midwifery, Teesside University, Middlesborough, UK
- 31 6. Nuffield Department of Orthopaedics, Rheumatology and Musculoskeletal Sciences, Oxford
32 University, Oxford, UK
- 33 7. Department of Medicine and Chronic Disease Initiative for Africa, Faculty of Health
34 Sciences, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa
- 35 8. Malawi Epidemiology and Intervention Research Unit, Lilongwe, Malawi
- 36 9. College of Social Sciences, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, Scotland, UK
- 37 10. Department of Clinical Research, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine,
38 London, UK
- 39 11. Department of Population Health, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine,
40 London, UK
- 41 12. School of Health and Wellbeing, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK
- 42 13. UCL Respiratory, University College London, London, UK
- 43 14. MRC Unit The Gambia at LSHTM, Banjul, The Gambia
- 44 15. Non-communicable Diseases Research Unit, South African Medical Research Council,
45 Cape Town and Durban, South Africa
- 46 16. School of Nursing and Public Health, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa
- 47 17. Centre for Genomic and Precision Medicine, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria
- 48 18. Department of Respiratory Sciences, University of Leicester, Leicester, UK
- 49 19. South African National Bioinformatics Institute, University of the Western Cape, Cape
50 Town, South Africa

- 51 20. Department of Vector Biology, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool, UK
- 52 21. Kilimanjaro Clinical Research Institute, Moshi, Tanzania
- 53 22. Department of Rehabilitation Sciences, The Kamuzu University of Health Sciences,
54 Blantyre, Malawi
- 55 23. Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, University of Kinshasa, Kinshasa,
56 Democratic Republic of Congo
- 57 24. Brain and Mind Institute, Aga Khan University, Nairobi, Kenya
- 58 25. SAMRC Developmental Pathways for Health Research Unit, University of the
59 Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa
- 60 26. Health Economics and Policy Unit, The Kamuzu University of Health Sciences, Blantyre,
61 Malawi
- 62 27. Department of Non-communicable Diseases, Ministry of Health, Lilongwe, Malawi
- 63 28. Musculoskeletal Research Unit, Translational Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School,
64 University of Bristol, Bristol, UK
- 65 29. School of Public Health and Family Medicine, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of
66 Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa
- 67 30. Cicely Saunders Institute, Florence Nightingale Faculty of Nursing Midwifery and
68 Palliative Care, King's College London, London, UK
- 69 31. Makerere University Centre for Health and Population Research, Makerere University,
70 Kampala, Uganda
- 71 32. Makerere Lung Institute, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda
- 72 33. Department of Family Medicine, The Kamuzu University of Health Sciences, Blantyre,
73 Malawi
- 74 34. Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, Washington, DC,
75 USA

76 35. Department of Nursing, College of Health Sciences, Kwame Nkrumah University of
77 Science and Technology, Kumasi, Ghana

78 36. College of Medicine, University of Malawi, Blantyre, Malawi

79 37. Island Hospice and Healthcare, Harare, Zimbabwe

80 38. Malawi NCD Alliance, Malawi

81 39. Deanery of Clinical Sciences, College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine, University of
82 Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

83 40. Internal Medicine Unit, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Zimbabwe,
84 Harare, Zimbabwe

85 41. Greater Accra Regional Hospital, Faculty of Family Medicine, Ghana College of
86 Physicians and Surgeons, Accra, Ghana

87 42. Achikondi Women and Community Friendly Health Services, Lilongwe, Malawi

88 43. School of Medicine and Public Health, Faculty of Health and Medicine, University of
89 Newcastle, Newcastle, Australia

90 44. Foundation President of the International Society of Systems and Complexity Sciences for
91 Health

92 45. University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa

93

94 ***Correspondence to:**

95 Justin Dixon

96 Department of Global Health and Development, London School of Hygiene and Tropical
97 Medicine, 15-17 Tavistock Place, Kings Cross, London WC1H 9SH, United Kingdom

98 Email: justin.dixon@lshtm.ac.uk

99

100 Felix Limbani

101 Malawi-Liverpool-Wellcome Programme, Blantyre 3, PO Box 30096, Malawi

102 Email: flimbani@mlw.mw

103

104 **Keywords:** Multimorbidity, sub-Saharan Africa, global health, interdisciplinarity

105 **Word count:** 5,976 words

106 **Abstract:** 210 words

107 **References:** 42

108 **Tables and Figures:** Tables: 1, Boxes: 3, Figures: 2

109 **Supplement Tables:** 3

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122 **Abstract**

123 Multimorbidity is an emerging challenge for healthcare systems globally. It is commonly
124 defined as the co-occurrence of two or more chronic conditions in one person, but the suitability
125 and utility of this concept beyond high-income settings is uncertain. This article presents the
126 findings from an interdisciplinary research initiative that drew together 60 academic and
127 applied partners working in 10 African countries to critically consider existing concepts and
128 definitions of multimorbidity, to evaluate their utility and limitations, and to co-develop an
129 context-sensitive, interdisciplinary conceptual framing. This iterative process was guided by
130 the principles of grounded theory and involved focus- and whole-group discussions during a
131 three-day concept-building workshop, thematic coding of workshop discussions, and further
132 post-workshop iterative development and refinement. The three main thematic domains that
133 emerged from workshop discussions were: the disease-centricity of current concepts and
134 definitions; the need to foreground what matters to people living with multimorbidity
135 (PLWMM), families, and other stakeholders; and the need for conceptual breadth and
136 flexibility to accommodate the contributions of multiple disciplinary perspectives and
137 heterogeneity within and between different African countries. These themes fed into the
138 development of an expanded conceptual model that centres the catastrophic impacts
139 multimorbidity often has for PLWMM, their families and support structures, for service
140 providers, and for resource-constrained healthcare systems.

141

142 **Introduction**

143 Multimorbidity – commonly defined as the presence of two or more chronic conditions in one
144 person (1) – has been the focus of increasing attention over the last decade. While the bodies
145 of literature were initially weighted towards high-income countries (HICs), multimorbidity has
146 more recently been recognised as a global health challenge that may be especially detrimental

147 in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs).(2–5) The health systems of many LMICs,
148 including in Africa are donor-dependent, organised around single diseases, predominantly the
149 infectious diseases including HIV and tuberculosis (TB) and, despite rapid rises in non-
150 communicable disease (NCD) prevalence, have limited funding for these conditions.(3) This
151 has led to a disparity in quality of care for people with NCDs and a failure to adequately
152 integrate NCD care into programmes for people with chronic infectious diseases.(6)

153

154 An initiative facilitated by the UK Academy of Medical Sciences set high-level priorities for
155 responding to multimorbidity in a global context.(2) and, in collaboration with the Academy
156 of Sciences of South Africa, for sub-Saharan Africa specifically(7). Priorities include research
157 into the patterning, burden, and determinants of disease ‘clusters’;(8–11) improving prevention
158 and treatment of multimorbidity;(12,13) and the development of upstream health systems
159 interventions and care models to better respond to the needs of people living with
160 multimorbidity (PLWMM).(14,15) With current concepts and models of multimorbidity
161 disproportionately based on biomedical research in the global North,(15) these initiatives
162 emphasise the need for a more equitable, Southern-led response, facilitated by changes within
163 the research ecosystem(2,7). This includes the development of South-South and North-South
164 partnerships; cross-disciplinary and cross-sectoral collaborations;(7) and the inclusion of a
165 greater range of perspectives – including those of the social sciences, PLWMM and affected
166 communities, and frontline health workers – to co-develop more effective, equitable and
167 context-sensitive interventions.(5,7)

168

169 Multimorbidity is currently challenging academics and practitioners working across Africa to
170 step beyond entrenched disciplinary and disease ‘siloes’.(16) However, multimorbidity
171 continues to mean different things to different stakeholder groups, reflecting the diversity of

172 disciplines, perspectives, methods, measurement instruments, and geographic vantage points
173 from which they enter this emerging field. Indeed, despite its apparent simplicity and
174 widespread use, the definition of multimorbidity as ‘two or more chronic conditions’ endorsed
175 by the WHO(1) and Academy of Medical Sciences(2) is not only contested but has also been
176 heterogeneously interpreted in terms of which condition combinations ‘count’ as
177 multimorbidity.(17,18) Consequently, it remains challenging to compare multimorbidity
178 across datasets, to communicate across disciplines, and more broadly to ensure a coordinated
179 response within and between African countries and regions. As commentators have noted, the
180 multimorbidity conversation has become preoccupied with the promise of a universal
181 definition, assumed to be a prerequisite for action, but has yielded poor returns.(19) Others
182 have argued that the power of multimorbidity may lie precisely in its resistance to being pinned
183 down to a number or specification of conditions, forcing us instead to consider the whole
184 person in context.(16) This is a compelling proposition, one that speaks to the promise
185 commonly pinned to multimorbidity for delivering on aspirations for holistic, person-centred
186 care.(20) Yet without a common lexicon that enables communication across different
187 disciplines, we may miss the opportunity to build on the current momentum building around
188 multimorbidity to maximise benefits to patients and their carers across geographies, incomes
189 and societal structures.

190

191 Responding to this need, this article presents the findings and outcomes from an
192 interdisciplinary research initiative to interrogate the conceptual underpinnings of
193 multimorbidity research and care in Africa. Grounded in a concept-building workshop in
194 Blantyre, Malawi, the aim was to critically explore current definitions and concepts of
195 multimorbidity; to critically appraise their potential, limitations, and utility; and to work
196 towards a common conceptual model sensitive to the particularities and heterogeneity of

197 African contexts. By folding a wide range of disciplinary perspectives, concerns, and interests
198 into a common framework, the resultant multimorbidity model can, we contend, underpin and
199 orient the cross-disciplinary, Southern-led response that, as described above, will be crucial to
200 realize holistic, person-centred, and context-specific care for PLWMM.

201

202 **Methods**

203 *Research Design*

204 We used an inductive, co-productive research design. Guided by the principles of grounded
205 theory,(21) the research process involved a three-day concept-building workshop in Blantyre,
206 Malawi (June 22-24, 2022),(22) thematic ‘open coding’ of workshop discussions, and further
207 iterative development of a conceptual model following the workshop. Our approach follows
208 the growing interest in “collective experimentation”(23) to address issues of transdisciplinary
209 concern in public and global health,(23–25) of which multimorbidity is arguably a
210 paradigmatic example.

211

212 *Participants and Sampling*

213 The workshop organising committee comprised an interdisciplinary group of public health
214 researchers, clinicians, and social scientists (EB, CIRC, JD, RAF, FL, EM, BM). Potential
215 participants were identified through purposive and snowballing methods between June 2021-
216 March 2022, which are described in greater detail elsewhere.(22) The collaborator group drew
217 together 60 researchers, clinicians, health planners, and policymakers (HIC-based n=19,
218 LMIC-based (n=41), together representing a wide range of disciplinary perspectives, including
219 from (sub-)fields of epidemiology, public health, clinical medicine, and the social sciences
220 ([Figure 1](#)). Given the current concentration of multimorbidity research, and the location of the
221 workshop in Malawi, the regional expertise among the collaborator group stemmed primarily

222 from countries within Southern Africa, with the greatest concentration of experience from
223 Malawi (n=33), South Africa (n=13), and Zimbabwe (n=9). Participants, several of whom were
224 working across multiple countries, also brought experience from Central, Eastern, and Western
225 Africa, together representing experience from 10 African countries (Figure 1). For practical
226 and ethical reasons, we did not directly include PLWMM in the workshop; however, we asked
227 collaborators, including social scientists and civil society and community representatives
228 present, to represent learnings from their interactions to give an understanding of different
229 patient perspectives. A detailed breakdown of participants' institutional location, disciplinary
230 and regional expertise, gender, and career stage, and a reflexivity statement detailing the
231 measures taken to promote equitable partnership within this collaboration is provided in the
232 Supplementary Material.(26)

233 [Insert Figure 1]

234

235 **Figure 1. Regional and disciplinary expertise represented by workshop participants**

236

237 *Workshop design*

238 A detailed account of the workshop design is published elsewhere.(22) The workshop was
239 designed to optimise opportunities for cross-disciplinary discussion. Sessions were organised
240 around four provisional thematic 'domains': (1) concepts and framings of multimorbidity; (2)
241 population-level health data; (3) risk, prevention, and sites of intervention; (4) health systems
242 and care models. Each session began with an 'ignition' talk which outlined current knowledge,
243 gaps, and key questions within each domain. These questions were then addressed by
244 participants through a combination of smaller focus groups aided by flip charts and plenary
245 discussion. In a final session, reviewed and summarised the workshop sessions in plenary,
246 collectively identifying core and cross-cutting themes, before breaking into working groups

247 which advanced agreed themes for further development. This article was led by working group
248 focused on developing a common concept of multimorbidity.

249

250 *Analytical framework*

251 This research was guided by the principles of constructivist grounded theory, which holds that
252 there is no ‘right or wrong’ and that emergent concepts and grounded theories are interpretive
253 descriptions rather than an ‘objective’ account of reality.(21) Accordingly, the assumption
254 underlying the workshop was that there is no privileged disciplinary vantage point from which
255 to conceptualise or frame multimorbidity. Rather, different concepts and understandings
256 foreground different aspects of the challenge multimorbidity presents for current systems, tied
257 to particular knowledge bases, while potentially backgrounding others. This position, which
258 was emphasised throughout the workshop and sustained through the post-workshop concept
259 development, encouraged a diversity of concepts and understandings to be put into
260 conversation, some of which diverged from and exposed the limits of the prevailing biomedical
261 model. At the same time, in embracing difference, we were also able to find synergies and
262 shared commitments. The embrace of both diversity and commonality formed the basis of
263 developing a more cross-cutting, holistic, and ultimately more useful understanding of
264 multimorbidity as it relates to African contexts.

265

266 *Data analysis*

267 As this was an iterative, co-productive process, there was no rigid distinction between the
268 process of ‘data collection’ and ‘analysis’.(21) All participants in the workshop engaged in
269 critical analysis, many formed part of the core writing group, and all are recognised as authors.
270 Source material for analysis included detailed notes of proceedings, including both focus
271 groups and plenary discussions, taken by a team of rapporteurs (GTB, SS, IGS, SAS, NMY).

272 Where necessary, the rapporteurs went back to individuals for clarification, which were
273 absorbed into their notes; all notes were collated and reconciled to produce a unified account
274 of workshop proceedings. Also included for analysis were the flip chart pages composed used
275 during focus groups and the Microsoft Word documents produced using a shared screen during
276 plenary discussion. A working group subsequently engaged in thematic open coding(27) of
277 source documents on a shared drive to identify themes relating to the conceptualisation and
278 framing of multimorbidity. Through regular analysis meetings, the working group iteratively
279 worked towards themes of progressively higher orders of abstraction. The highest level of these
280 themes, which we describe in the results section, were then fed into the development of an
281 expanded model of multimorbidity. Refining this model was itself an iterative process,
282 involving several iterations each of which was shared with the wider collaborator group along
283 with the draft manuscript for further comment, discussion, and refinement.

284

285 *Research ethics*

286 Due to the collaborative research design employed, in which all investigators were participants
287 and vice versa, and all are named co-authors, formal ethical review was not required for this
288 research. This follows recent examples adopting similar co-productive research models to
289 develop cross-disciplinary frameworks and agendas.(24,28) All participants provided either
290 verbal consent or written email consent to taking part in the concept-building workshop, which
291 was captured using an Excel spreadsheet. At the end of the workshop, participants jointly
292 agreed upon research outputs and working groups to take forward prominent themes from the
293 discussions, and all consented to being named as co-authors on this particular output. All
294 participants have reviewed the contents of the manuscript and have approved its final version.
295 The concept-building workshop was subject to the safeguarding mechanisms of the host
296 organisation (Malawi-Liverpool-Wellcome Programme), which included anonymous reporting

297 procedures. We have not made available the detailed rapporteur notes as these would reveal
298 the input of specific contributors. A detailed account of workshop proceedings, ratified and co-
299 authored by all participants, has been published elsewhere.(22)

300

301 **Results**

302 Three overarching themes that represent the group's shared commitments for an African-
303 context-sensitive conceptualisation of multimorbidity emerged: (1) the disease-centricity of
304 prevailing concepts and definitions; (2) that models of multimorbidity need to be grounded in
305 the realities and needs of PLWMM, families, and social networks; (3) the need for flexibility
306 in defining multimorbidity for multimorbidity to be fit for purpose. These themes and their
307 constituent sub-themes are summarised in Table 1.

308 **Table 1. Key themes and sub-themes for conceptualising multimorbidity**

Theme	Sub-Themes
Disease-centricity of current models of multimorbidity	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In medicine and global health, patients are defined by their diseases• The minimalist definition of multimorbidity as two or more long-term conditions promotes a disease-centric view• This definition also promotes narrow consideration of social factors associated with multimorbidity centred on individual behaviour and lifestyle factors• Interventions working with this definition may continue to reinforce or exacerbate the status quo
Need to foreground what matters to PLWMM – their priorities, needs, and social context	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Benefit of focusing less on the disease categories within multimorbidity and more on its common consequences for PLWMM and associated needs• The burden of multimorbidity on families, informal carers, and social networks is crucial to consider in many African contexts• Need for a broader appreciation of the social, structural, and environmental context of multimorbidity• Fragmented, disease-driven systems compound the burden of multimorbidity
Conceptual breadth and flexibility is needed for multimorbidity to be cross-cutting and useful	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A standard, one-size-fits-all definition not a panacea for multimorbidity• Multimorbidity may mean different things, carry different priorities, and be more or less useful in different contexts and at different levels of scale• A broad, flexible understanding that recognises multiple perspectives is needed to be cross-cutting and useful

309 ***Theme 1: Disease-centricity of current concepts***

310 Across the countries represented at the workshop, a key challenge expressed by participants
311 was that populations are living longer and facing increasingly complex disease burdens. Yet,
312 health systems remain built around siloes of expertise based on single diseases. ‘Siloed’
313 approaches were observed to be perpetuated by ‘vertical’ funding models adopted by Northern
314 donors, who have long prioritised acute diseases and chronic infectious diseases, notably HIV
315 and TB (Box 1a). The single-disease approach, it was observed, drives many aspects of health
316 systems from health policy and planning, to research and surveillance, to training and care
317 delivery. It is central to the way health systems performance is monitored and evaluated and,
318 in turn, why single disease care, especially care for those conditions prioritised by donors,
319 continues to receive the majority of resources (Box 1b). Disease-centred thinking is so
320 embedded that it is extremely challenging to step beyond this frame of reference; our systems
321 seem to inevitably pull us back to a focus on diseases (Box 1c). As a result of the fragmentation
322 of systems built around particular diseases, many areas of health including NCD and mental
323 health are under-funded. Moreover, the needs of PLWMM are rarely considered within current
324 systems. This is with the exception of integration of healthcare services for common
325 comorbidities associated with HIV in some settings.

326

327 Throughout the workshop, participants grappled with the tension that, on the one hand,
328 multimorbidity foregrounds disease concentrations and interactions rather than diseases in
329 isolation. This makes it a potentially powerful concept for re-aligning priorities with the
330 increasingly complex disease burdens affecting many African countries, including the colliding
331 epidemic of communicable diseases and NCDs. On the other hand, the concept of
332 multimorbidity, participants noted, is generally that of a compound disease category, most
333 commonly defined as the presence or absence of two-or-more chronic conditions. As a result,

334 it is still a disease-centred concept. Participants therefore questioned whether this definition
335 was suited for moving us from a scenario in which people are defined by their diseases, to what
336 was often referred to as a more ‘person-centred’ approach (Box 1d and 1e). Concerns raised
337 about a disease-centred lens included that this may promote an overly simplistic, additive view
338 of multimorbidity as the sum of interacting (but ultimately discrete) disease conditions. A
339 related concern was the danger of emphasising the ‘communicability’ versus ‘non-
340 communicability’ of diseases within multimorbidity. Continuing to reinforce this distinction
341 within multimorbidity, it was noted, can perpetuate the tendency to reduce the social context
342 of risk to ‘modifiable lifestyle factors’, a phenomenon that is particularly prominent in the
343 context of NCDs (i.e., smoking, poor diet, sedentism, and substance abuse). As several
344 participants noted, targeting individual behaviour and lifestyles does not amount to a ‘person-
345 centred’ approach and may lead to patient shaming and stigmatisation (Box 1f), whilst
346 deemphasising structural factors such as chronic poverty that constrain people’s life ‘choices’
347 and behaviours.

Box 1. Illustrative excerpts and quotes

- a. “Most of the chronic diseases in sub-Saharan Africa countries such as HIV and TB are managed through vertical programs, which inhibits care for multimorbidity” (Session 1, plenary, rapporteur notes)
- b. “The disease-centric outcomes that drive healthcare systems currently would need to be overhauled in order to respond to multimorbidity.” (Session 5, plenary, rapporteur notes)
- c. “The challenge is that the system we work in does not accommodate a transformation in thinking; it keeps bringing us back to a focus on diseases” (Session 1, plenary, rapporteur notes)
- d. “The definition of two or more conditions may have limitations, and may continue to perpetuate a disease specific approach” (Session 5, plenary, Word document on shared screen)
- e. “We are still using a disease-focused lens to define multimorbidity – tensions versus a person-centred approach” (Session 5, group 5, flip chart excerpt)
- f. “Labelling some of the non-communicable conditions related to multimorbidity, such as hypertension and diabetes, as ‘lifestyle diseases’ creates stigma and shaming” (Session 3, group 2, rapporteur notes)

349

350 ***Theme 2: Need to foreground PLWMM's priorities, needs, and social context***

351 Continuous with theme 1, a particular concern expressed with the disease-based definition of
352 multimorbidity is that it also fails to capture what *matters* to PLWMM. Several points about
353 patients' needs and priorities were highlighted. First, a concern voiced particularly by clinicians
354 was that it often matters far less to people what the diagnoses and their causes are than their
355 consequences and impacts, which become especially complex when it comes to secondary
356 complications. Symptom and treatment burden, functionality, and quality of life were
357 highlighted as important to fold into our understanding of multimorbidity (Box 2a), but it was
358 noted that these are rarely considered within current disease-centred management approaches
359 (Box 2b). While there may be considerable heterogeneity in the lived experience of
360 multimorbidity across different condition combinations, it was also observed that the
361 symptoms, needs and treatment burdens of PLWMM are often not disease-specific and may
362 share similar profiles. Tellingly, when it was put to a vote whether the concept of
363 multimorbidity should draw a distinction between 'communicable' and 'non-communicable'
364 diseases, a significant majority said it should not. Participants were not suggesting that we
365 cease thinking about causes and determinants of multimorbidity, which remain important
366 especially within epidemiology, public health, and clinical medicine, but rather that we ground
367 our concept of multimorbidity in the experiences and priorities of PLWMM.

368

369 Second, participants stressed that when considering the impacts of multimorbidity in many
370 African contexts, it is vital to expand the focus beyond the affected person to the pivotal role
371 that families, informal caregivers and larger support networks play in navigating burdens of
372 illness and treatment and in PLWMM's ability to 'self'-manage (Box 2c). Accordantly, it was
373 argued that while person-centred care is important, we need to be talking about *family*-centred

374 care in this setting (Box 2d). A related consideration when designing multimorbidity care
375 models for African health systems is not to ignore current social realities such as medical
376 pluralism and the existing role of traditional healers. In the absence of such recognition, care
377 models risk recreating Northern global health policies which fail to account for local
378 experiences and African-centred knowledge systems and values.

379

380 Third, widening the lens further still, participants stressed that social, structural and
381 environmental factors are crucial for understanding the patterning, impacts, and experience of
382 multimorbidity. The concept of syndemics was recognised as a useful and well-established
383 theoretical framework for capturing the bio-social causes and consequences of multimorbidity
384 and how health and social challenges noxiously intersect (Box 2e). Social scientists reported
385 from qualitative research that daily socio-economic struggles preceded and exacerbated bodily
386 ailments and symptoms, and that within such fragile arrangements, interruptions to or changes
387 in circumstance could have huge impacts on overall ability to cope, as was recently evidenced
388 during the COVID-19 pandemic. Examples were given from different settings about the
389 challenges PLWMM face: reaching secondary and tertiary health care when residing in rural
390 areas; struggling to mobilise funds to spend on treatment and transport; and losing income
391 when spending time at the clinic or balancing medical appointments with family
392 responsibilities. It was further observed that specialised care organised around single diseases
393 compounds the burden placed on those living with multimorbidity: it shapes which diseases
394 are diagnosed and prioritised, the time and resources that are needed to (self-)manage different
395 conditions, and the added care burden on families and carers (Box 2f and 2g).

396

397

398

399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411

Box 2. Illustrative excerpts and quotes

- a. “The label of multimorbidity is likely to be useful if it includes burden and function, for instance pain, disability, and sleep” (Session 1, group 1, rapporteur notes)
- b. “Clinics rarely account for patient preferences and needs. A patient-centred approach is where health care consciously works around patients’ needs, responding to individual preferences and trying to ensure that patient values guide clinical decisions.” (Session 4, ignition talk, rapporteur notes)
- c. “Family members/community are very important for patients' improvement because they have an influence on the treatment given, in the same way that nutrition post-delivery is mostly influenced by relatives” (Session 1, group 3, rapporteur notes)
- d. “We need to think about family centred care – patient-centred care is important, but there is also a family who has to be involved in the process” (Session 5, plenary discussion, Word document on shared screen)
- e. “Social determinants of health are important – syndemics, the commercial determinants of health, and others. For example, for TB patients, food insecurity, biological predisposition, and access to care have been used to identify patients/potential patients with multimorbidity” (Session 3, group 2, rapporteur notes)
- f. “Most care in urban areas is specialized. This leads to fragmentation, adding a burden to the family and caretakers” (Session 1, group 3, rapporteur notes)
- g. “Individual disease treatment compounds the burden. Patients start prioritising certain conditions and some may go untreated” (Session 1, group 2, rapporteur notes)

412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423

Theme 3: Conceptual breadth and flexibility

The third theme was that, if context is taken seriously, a one-size-fits-all definition of multimorbidity trying to pin down multimorbidity to a specific number or combination of conditions is neither possible nor desirable (Box 3a). The diversity of academic and applied perspectives present at the workshop underscored how counterproductive, even harmful, a narrow definition favouring one discipline or perspective can be. The concept, it was agreed, needs to remain broad, flexible, and able to foreground different things depending on the question being asked, the problem or perspective driving the question, the geographical, epidemiological, and health system context, and indeed the level of scale. Depending on the context, multiple definitions may be needed (Box 3b).

424 Participants considered the utility of multimorbidity to different disciplinary and stakeholder
425 groups, and how the priorities might shift in different contexts. As highlighted in Theme 2, the
426 primary concern at the clinical and community level is functionality, quality of life, and the
427 burden and complexity shouldered by PLWMM, their family and social networks (Box 3c).
428 Public health researchers, while similarly recognising the need for greater emphasis on function
429 and quality of life, were often more focused on the societal impact of multimorbidity, for which
430 well-defined (though not necessarily disease-centric) measures are needed to facilitate
431 comparison across datasets and to enable identification of patterns, trends, and burden (Box
432 3d). For policymakers and health planners, also deploying multimorbidity at the population
433 level, the concept was viewed as useful for reconfiguring funding streams (e.g., from ‘vertical’
434 to ‘horizontal’ models), for developing new care delivery models (e.g., from disease- to person-
435 and family-centred care), for training and deploying the health workforce, and managing risks
436 among the population. Social scientists and historians pushed for an expansive concept, one
437 connecting the intricacies of lived experience to the ‘upstream’ structural and systemic factors
438 that socially pattern multimorbidity and exacerbate the burden (Box 3e). Finally, while
439 PLWMM were not represented directly, the group noted that multimorbidity was unlikely to
440 translate well into lay models (Box 3f), and that in fact this label could be harmful and
441 stigmatising (Box 1f). Because of these different concerns, we may need to foreground (and
442 background) different aspects of multimorbidity, and recognise scenarios when it is not useful,
443 to maximise its potential and minimise its harms (Box 3g).

444

445 While recognising the impossibility of a narrow one-size-fits-all definition given that
446 multimorbidity is, by nature, heterogenous and context-specific, the collaborator group was
447 nonetheless optimistic about folding the multiple perspectives represented at the workshop into
448 a broadly shared frame of reference to facilitate cross-disciplinary working. Following theme

449 2, it was proposed a focus on common consequences of multimorbidity and associated needs
450 for PLWMM could be one pathway towards conceptual alignment. In the final session of the
451 workshop, a working definition was proposed as: “A clustering of *needs* [added emphasis] and
452 conditions that need to be addressed holistically, rather than in isolation”. Whilst only a starting
453 point, it did draw together major points of agreement during the workshop: the foregrounding
454 of clusters of needs rather than just medical conditions; the importance of a holistic purview;
455 and the critique of compartmentalised approaches. Refining this concept was highlighted as a
456 key aim moving forward.

457

Box 3. Illustrative excerpts and quotes

458

a. “There is no one-size-fits-all concept or framing of multimorbidity – context matters” (Session 5, group 1, flip chart)

459

b. “Some flexibility / ambiguity in definition – or multiple definitions – may be needed” (Session 5, plenary discussion, Word document on shared screen)

460

c. “For academics, policymakers, and public health, the label or definition of multimorbidity is likely to be useful, whereas, for patients, wellbeing and function are more important” (Session 1, group 1, rapporteur notes)

461

462

d. “Well-defined concepts are useful in academia. The label [of multimorbidity] is useful for prevalence/mapping clusters, being able to study interactions between drugs and conditions” (Session 1, group 1, rapporteur notes)

463

464

e. “You can’t do multimorbidity and focus only on medical conditions, there are a lot of things are going on – social, financial, medical. These factors work together and need to be addressed together, including clinical interventions, upstream solutions, downstream solutions, and community interventions.” (Session 4, ignition talk, rapporteur notes)

465

466

f. “It is important to distinguish the medical framework and the patient model. Biomedical and societal framings of symptoms translate poorly into lay terminology – there is not necessarily a term for multimorbidity” (Session 5, plenary discussion, Word document on shared screen)

467

468

g. “Part of the ‘art’ of multimorbidity may be centring diseases, people, and systems at different times and in different places and situations” (Session 5, group 1, rapporteur notes)

469

470

471 Discussion

472 Thematic analysis of workshop proceedings revealed three core themes that are pertinent to the
473 conceptualisation of multimorbidity in Africa: the disease-centricity of current definitions; the

474 need to foreground what matters to PLWMM; and the importance of conceptual breadth and
475 flexibility. Building on this framework, in the following, we place these core themes into
476 conversation with current global health scholarship on multimorbidity, thereby developing an
477 expanded model of multimorbidity that can underpin a coordinated but context-specific
478 response to multimorbidity in Africa.

479

480 Our criticism of dominant constructions of multimorbidity emergent from Theme 1 resonates
481 with several recent commentaries, reviews, and analyses. These have, in different ways, argued
482 that a disease-centred framing of multimorbidity promotes a static, additive rendering of
483 disease that treats illness as the sum of its parts.(16,20,29) One consequence of this disease-
484 centred framing, as Blarikom et al.(16) have argued, is that the multimorbidity conversation
485 has become preoccupied (and indeed, largely paralysed) by the search for standard biomedical
486 definition and common core of conditions. Such a definition may be useful for drawing
487 comparisons between populations and for identifying areas of met and unmet need. However,
488 it may perpetuate a focus on diseases and individual behaviour and therefore ultimately fail to
489 harness the critical potentials of multimorbidity to move beyond the single disease
490 paradigm.(16,20,29) Against this backdrop, it is significant that attempts to adapt – and as one
491 article puts it, “decolonise”(30) – multimorbidity for use beyond HICs highlight the need to
492 move from a focus on diseases associated with ageing to recognise the ‘colliding epidemics’
493 of communicable and NCDs that characterise multimorbidity in LMICs.(3) While this may
494 have important implications for integrating care across historically separated disease domains,
495 the workshop proceedings suggest that ‘decolonising’ multimorbidity means more than
496 adjusting its constituent diseases. Rather, beginning to decolonise the multimorbidity
497 conversation means moving away from models of research and care that define and categorise
498 people by their diseases.

499

500 The workshop concluded (as summarised in Theme 2) that there is a need to broaden our focus
501 from the diseases that sit within multimorbidity to foreground what really matters to PLWMM
502 in context. Calls for more holistic approaches resound in the multimorbidity literature from
503 both HICs and LMICs and align with theoretical perspectives from multiple disciplines. This
504 includes eco-social theory from epidemiology;(31) the syndemic framework,(32,33) the theory
505 of recursive cascades(34) and burden of treatment theory(13) from the social sciences, and
506 novel applications of complexity theory to multimorbidity within the primary care
507 sciences.(29) Despite this wealth of theory and the recent proliferation of person-centred
508 chronic care models,(14,35) in practice attempts to integrate care have not proven to be
509 especially ‘person-centred’ in practice. Currently advocated-for person-centred care models
510 are still generally designed using vertical disease programmes, for instance South Africa’s
511 Integrated Chronic Disease Management (ICDM) system modelled on the country’s HIV
512 programme.(15,36) Moreover, the common aim of such programmes to ‘activate’ PLWMM’s
513 agency for better health decision-making emphasise individual responsibility, but often fail to
514 respond to high rates of poverty and inequality that compromise the ability of PLWMM to
515 control their exposure to health risks. A growing number of qualitative studies reporting
516 PLWMM’s perspectives have been reported from countries including Malawi,(13) Ghana(37),
517 Ethiopia,(38) and South Africa.(39) These show that PLWMM are unable to take control over
518 their own health if they experience a ‘lack’ of health services, information, and basic
519 necessities. Such lack in turn feeds into a cycle of precariousness that negatively impacts
520 people’s ability to cope, often sending them down a slippery slope – or in complexity theory
521 terms, over ‘tipping points’(29) – towards further disability and decline. Also appealed to but
522 rarely prioritised in practice is the active involvement of caregivers and support networks in
523 the provision of care for PLWMM.(15,40) Here, African social network theories such as

524 Ubuntu – promoting mutual caring through compassion, reciprocity, dignity, and humanity –
525 could be a useful concept, as they potentially cultivate resilience by creating a shared identity
526 between PLWMM and carers, allowing them to flourish even when living in precarity.(40)
527 Starting from where PLWMM are now – their priorities, values, needs, burden, and challenges
528 navigating current healthcare systems – is a more promising way into the development of
529 genuinely person-centred care models than the current retrospective ‘integration’ of different
530 disease programmes. While an elaboration of what this might entail in practice is beyond the
531 scope of this article, it would undoubtedly require careful reconsideration of what, where, how,
532 and by whom care is delivered, likely involving the decentralisation of chronic care through
533 healthcare workers trained in holistic, community-based care models – as elaborated, for
534 instance, within the syndemic care framework.(33,41)

535

536 The main conclusion from Theme 3 was the need for a broad, flexible understanding of
537 multimorbidity for it to be genuinely cross-cutting, folding in the possibility that in some
538 scenarios it may not be so useful at all. This conclusion aligns with a growing body of
539 multimorbidity scholarship running against the grain of the dominant drive to standardise and
540 harmonise a biomedically-defined multimorbidity concept. A recent workshop exploring
541 lessons from South Africa notably concluded that the ‘minimalist’ definition of multimorbidity
542 as two or more chronic conditions, while appealing for its simplicity, is too simple. Any
543 definition, it was argued, needs to take into consideration the causes and consequences of
544 multimorbidity and will need to remain flexible enough to be responsive to different research
545 questions, (inter-)disciplinary contexts, and scenarios.(42) Building on these observations, our
546 findings suggest that a focus on common consequences for PLWMM holds particular promise
547 for bringing different perspectives together around a common frame of reference. If, indeed,
548 the needs and treatment burdens of PLWMM are often not disease specific, such a disease-

549 agnostic focus could bring together disciplines and specialities in a way that has eluded the
550 abstract and seemingly irresolvable attempts to pin down multimorbidity and its causal
551 pathways in pathophysiological terms. The broader point, perhaps, is that the distinction
552 between causes and consequences itself begins to break down once we recentre what matters
553 to PLWMM, from whose perspective ‘consequences’ of a living with MM today may be
554 ‘causes’ of further problems tomorrow.(34) By centring PLWMM and their ability to lead
555 healthy, fulfilling and independent lives, we may better align medical and lay models of
556 multimorbidity, such that it may not only be more cross-cutting and useful but also, perhaps,
557 carry fewer negative connotations as a label. Figure 2 presents an expanded model of
558 multimorbidity that folds in Themes 1, 2 and 3.

559

560 [Insert Figure 2]

561

562 **Figure 2. An expanded conceptual model of multimorbidity**

563

564 This model draws on the multiple theoretical influences of the participant group, including the
565 syndemics framework,(32,33) burden of treatment theory,(13) and complexity theory.(29) It
566 retains within it the basic idea of multimorbidity as involving more than one primary condition,
567 in recognition of the utility of diagnostic categories within public health, epidemiology, and
568 clinical medicine. But it remains agnostic about which kinds and combinations of condition
569 ‘count’ as multimorbidity, instead expanding and bringing into the foreground the
570 consequences of multimorbidity and its distributed burden on PLWMM, families, social
571 networks, health providers, and the healthcare system. The model highlights factors identified
572 by the collaborator group that currently overwhelmingly pull towards the right of the model,
573 that is, that set PLWMM on a slippery (but not inevitable or linear) slope towards secondary

574 complications and potentially catastrophic burdens that are felt across the system. It also casts
575 our attention to the factors that might pull back people towards the left of the model. This
576 includes seemingly small changes to a person's circumstances that may make multimorbidity
577 more manageable for the person affected and their wider networks, even in cases of advanced
578 or complex disease. Given that many secondary complications cannot be reversed, the model
579 suggests the emphasis should be on primary and secondary prevention. More than
580 pharmacological or lifestyle interventions, this demands and rather interventions that take into
581 account the interdependency between PLWMM and family, social network, healthcare
582 providers, the health system, and wider social, structural, and environmental context.

583

584 While the 'maximalist' orientation of this multimorbidity model may lack some of the appeals
585 of a minimalist definition, its dynamic and multidimensional nature enables different questions
586 and disciplinary perspectives to be brought to bear on multimorbidity, including more refined
587 definitions suited for specific questions. At the same time, the model suggests an overarching
588 shift in the kinds of question that we ask and how we answer them. First, a focus on the complex
589 bio-social interactions and impacts of multimorbidity moves us away from the disease-centred,
590 cross-sectional designs from which most knowledge about multimorbidity to date originates
591 (and that have tended to favour pharmacological and behavioural interventions) to disease-
592 agnostic, richly contextual cohort research designs focused on burden, outcomes, and quality
593 of life across the life course. Second, recognition of the multilevel factors at play implies that
594 multimorbidity cannot be fully appreciated through any one disciplinary lens alone. Inter- and
595 trans-disciplinary approaches, as well as holistic stakeholder engagement are needed to
596 understand how biological, socio-cultural, political, economic, and environmental factors
597 intertwine to co-produce multimorbidity; as well as to design holistic, person-centred, and
598 systems-directed interventions. Third, the model implies a more context-specific approach to

599 decide which disciplines and fields of expertise are relevant within the multimorbidity arena.
600 Multimorbidity may result in similar needs and treatment burdens across different condition
601 clusters, but its manifestation may also vary considerably across African settings given the
602 tremendous heterogeneity of social, structural, environmental, and health system contexts.
603 Thus, the knowledge bases and skillsets required to understand and address multimorbidity
604 need to be similarly adaptive.(36) Whilst challenging, this is precisely the kind of context-
605 sensitive approach that multimorbidity compels, offering a more promising pathway towards
606 holistic person-centred care than universal, disease-centred interventions.

607

608 This model and the approach underlying it have several strengths. This was the first workshop
609 to systematically bring together a multidisciplinary group of academic and applied actors to
610 critically consider the meaning and utility of multimorbidity specifically within African
611 settings. This was a bold exercise, not only in multidisciplinary experimentation,(23) but in
612 elevating perspectives from a range of African contexts to reframe the multimorbidity
613 conversation. This work provides a conceptual infrastructure to undergird the North-South and,
614 more importantly, South-South partnerships that have been explicitly recognised as necessary
615 for responding to multimorbidity in the region.(7) This research also had several limitations.
616 First, while the collaborator group advocated for a person-centred perspective on
617 multimorbidity, we were unable to directly include the voices of PLWMM. Further research is
618 needed to gauge the extent to which this model resonates with PLWMM, whose perspectives
619 remain under-represented within the multimorbidity conversation in Africa. The collaborator
620 group was also biased towards Southern Africa, with the largest representation of expertise
621 from Malawi, Zimbabwe, and South Africa, and thus our work disproportionately reflects
622 views from these countries. Finally, our thematic analysis may be biased towards the views of
623 the core working group. Whilst we endeavoured to represent the wider group's perspectives

624 objectively through a rigorous thematic analysis of workshop proceedings, the fact that we
625 were both participants (in the workshop) and observers (analysing proceedings) means that the
626 model may be biased towards our own values and viewpoints.

627

628 **Conclusion**

629 In this article, we have analysed focus-and whole-group discussions from a workshop on
630 multimorbidity in African contexts, placed emergent themes into conversation with current
631 thinking on multimorbidity, and developed an expanded model based on the groups' common
632 commitments. While recognising the crucial research that has preceded our work, we believe
633 in the necessity of providing nuance to the available framings of multimorbidity, stressing the
634 importance of understanding the lived experiences of people and their networks, and adding in
635 the socio-economic complexities that impact PLWMM, providers, and the development of
636 systems. Further conceptual and empirical work is needed to draw out the implications of this
637 conceptual model for the heterogenous and multifaceted health systems in Africa. Also open
638 for the test of empirical scrutiny is whether it will prove useful for orienting and mapping
639 different strands of multimorbidity work across disciplines, projects, and interventions, and for
640 contributing to an overall more joined-up response moving forward.

641

642 **Acknowledgements**

643 We are greatly indebted to members of the Africa Multimorbidity Alliance who took part in
644 the concept-building workshop on which this article is based. We are grateful to the
645 administrators and technicians at the Malawi-Liverpool-Wellcome Programme for their efforts
646 in preparing and running the workshop on which this article is based, with particular thanks to
647 Kate Mangulama. We finally wish to express gratitude to the many funders and institutions
648 who supported the travel and attendance of participants.

649

650 **Funding statement**

651 This workshop on which this research was based was funded by the National Institute of Health
652 and Care Research [Multilink Consortium, grant ref. NIHR201708, and the NIHR Leicester
653 Biomedical Research Centre (BRC)], The Wellcome Trust [Multimorbidity and Knowledge
654 Architectures: An Interdisciplinary Global Health Collaboration, grant ref. 222177] and the
655 Department of Respiratory Sciences, University of Leicester, UK, supported by the British
656 Academy and Global Challenges Research Fund [grant ref. GCRFNGR5\1242].

657

658 **References**

- 659 1. The Lancet. Making more of multimorbidity: an emerging priority. The Lancet.
660 2018;391(10131):1637.
- 661 2. The Academy of Medical Sciences. Multimorbidity: a priority for global health
662 research. 2018;(April). Available from: <https://acmedsci.ac.uk/file-download/82222577>
- 663 3. Basto-Abreu A, Barrientos-Gutierrez T, Wade AN, Melo DO De, Souza ASS De,
664 Nunes BP. Multimorbidity matters in low and middle-income countries. Journal of
665 Multimorbidity and Comorbidity. 2022;12:1–10.
- 666 4. Skou ST, Mair FS, Fortin M, Guthrie B, Nunes BP, Miranda JJ, et al. Multimorbidity.
667 Nat Rev Dis Primers. 2022;8(1): 48.
- 668 5. PLOS Medicine Editors. Multimorbidity: Addressing the next global pandemic. 2023.
669 20: e1004229.
- 670 6. Peer N, de Villiers A, Jonathan D, Kalombo C, Kengne AP. Care and management of
671 a double burden of chronic diseases: Experiences of patients and perceptions of their healthcare
672 providers. PLoS One. 1;15.


- 673 7. Academy of Medical Sciences, Academy of Science of South Africa. Improving the
674 prevention and management of multimorbidity in sub-Saharan Africa Workshop report. 2019.
675 Available from: <https://acmedsci.ac.uk/file-download/22652130>
- 676 8. Oni T, Youngblood E, Boulle A, McGrath N, Wilkinson RJ, Levitt NS. Patterns of
677 HIV, TB, and non-communicable disease multi-morbidity in peri-urban South Africa- a cross
678 sectional study. *BMC Infect Dis.* 2015;15(1).
- 679 9. Tamuhla T, Dave JA, Raubenheimer P, Tiffin N. Diabetes in a TB and HIV-endemic
680 South African population: Analysis of a virtual cohort using routine health data. *PLoS One.*
681 2021;16(5): e0251303.
- 682 10. Chowdhury SR, Chandra Das D, Sunna TC, Beyene J, Hossain A. Global and regional
683 prevalence of multimorbidity in the adult population in community settings: a systematic
684 review and meta-analysis. *EClinicalMedicine.* 2023;57: 101860.
- 685 11. Mendenhall E, Kim AW, Panasci A, Cele L, Mpondo F, Bosire EN, et al. A mixed-
686 methods, population-based study of a syndemic in Soweto, South Africa. *Nat Hum Behav.*
687 2022;6(1):64–73.
- 688 12. Alkhatib A, Nnyanzi LA, Mujuni B, Amany G, Ibingira C. Preventing multimorbidity
689 with lifestyle interventions in sub-Saharan Africa: A new challenge for public health in low
690 and middle-income countries. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public*
691 *Health.* 2021; 18: 12449
- 692 13. Chikumbu EF, Bunn C, Kasenda S, Dube A, Phiri-Makwakwa E, Jani BD, et al.
693 Experiences of multimorbidity in urban and rural Malawi: An interview study of burdens of
694 treatment and lack of treatment. *PLOS Global Public Health.* 2022;2(3):e0000139.

- 695 14. Oni T, McGrath N, BeLue R, Roderick P, Colagiuri S, May CR, et al. Chronic diseases
696 and multi-morbidity - A conceptual modification to the WHO ICCC model for countries in
697 health transition. *BMC Public Health*. 2014;14(1):1–7.
- 698 15. Bosire N Edna, Mendenhall Emily, Norris A Shane GJ. Patient-Centred Care for
699 Patients With Diabetes and HIV at a Public Tertiary Hospital in South Africa: An Ethnographic
700 Study. *Int J Health Policy Manag*. 2021;10(9):1–12.
- 701 16. Blarikom E Van, Fudge N, Swinglehurst D. The emergence of multimorbidity as a
702 matter of concern : a critical review. *Biosocieties*. 2023;18:614–631
- 703 17. Diederichs C, Berger K, Bartels DB. The measurement of multiple chronic diseases -
704 A systematic review on existing multimorbidity indices. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*.
705 2022;66(3): 301-11.
- 706 18. Ho ISS, Azcoaga-Lorenzo A, Akbari A, Black C, Davies J, Hodgins P, et al. Examining
707 variation in the measurement of multimorbidity in research: a systematic review of 566 studies.
708 *Lancet Public Health*. 2021;6(8): e587–97.
- 709 19. Lefèvre T, d’Ivernois JF, De Andrade V, Crozet C, Lombrail P, Gagnayre R. What do
710 we mean by multimorbidity? An analysis of the literature on multimorbidity measures,
711 associated factors, and impact on health services organization. *Rev Epidemiol Sante Publique*.
712 2014;62(5): 305–14.
- 713 20. Lynch R, Hanckel B, Green J. The (failed) promise of multimorbidity: chronicity,
714 biomedical categories, and public health. *Crit Public Health*. 2021;32(4): 450–61
- 715 21. Charmaz K. *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative*
716 *research*. London: Sage; 2006.

- 717 22. Banda GT, Bosire E, Bunn C, Chandler CIR, Chikumbu E, Chiwanda J, et al.
718 Multimorbidity research in Sub-Saharan Africa: Proceedings of an interdisciplinary workshop.
719 Wellcome Open Res. 2023;8:110.
- 720 23. Balmer AS, Calvert J, Marris C, Molyneux-Hodgson S, Frow E, Kearnes M, et al.
721 Taking Roles in Interdisciplinary Collaborations: Reflections on Working in Post-ELSI Spaces
722 in the UK Synthetic Biology Community. *Science & Technology Studies*. 2015;28(3):3–25.
- 723 24. Greenhough B, Read CJ, Lorimer J, Lezaun J, McLeod C, Benezra A, et al. Setting the
724 agenda for social science research on the human microbiome. *Palgrave Commun*. 2020;6(1):1–
725 11.
- 726 25. Mendenhall E, Weaver LJ. Socially Determined? Frameworks for Thinking about
727 Health Equity and Wellness. In: Page-Reeves J, editor. *Well-Being as a Multidimensional*
728 *Concept: Understanding Connections Between Culture, Community, and Health*. Lexington
729 Books of Rowman & Littlefield; 2021. p. 450.
- 730 26. Morton B, Vercueil A, Masekela R, Heinz E, Reimer L, Saleh S, et al. Consensus
731 statement on measures to promote equitable authorship in the publication of research from
732 international partnerships. *Anaesthesia*. 2022; 77: 243–7.
- 733 27. Cascio MA, Lee E, Vaudrin N, Freedman DA. A Team-based Approach to Open
734 Coding: Considerations for Creating Intercoder Consensus. *Field methods*. 2019;31(2): 116–
735 30.
- 736 28. Sutherland WJ, Fleishman E, Mascia MB, Pretty J, Rudd MA. Methods for
737 collaboratively identifying research priorities and emerging issues in science and policy.
738 *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*. 2011;2: 238–47.

- 739 29. Sturmberg JP, Getz LO, Stange KC, Upshur REG, Mercer SW. Beyond multimorbidity:
740 What can we learn from complexity science? *J Eval Clin Pract.* 2022;27(5):1187–93.
- 741 30. Roomaney RA, Van Wyk B, Wyk VP Van. Decolonising multimorbidity? research
742 gaps in low and middle-income countries. *Pan African Medical Journal.* 2022;41(140).
- 743 31. Krieger N. Theories for social epidemiology in the 21st century: an ecosocial
744 perspective. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2001;30:668–77.
- 745 32. Singer M, Bulled N, Ostrach B, Mendenhall E. Syndemics and the biosocial conception
746 of health. *The Lancet.* 2017;389(10072):941–50.
- 747 33. Mendenhall E, Kohrt BA, Norris SA, Ndeti D, Prabhakaran D. Non-communicable
748 disease syndemics: poverty, depression, and diabetes among low-income populations. *The*
749 *Lancet.* 2017;389(10072):951–63.
- 750 34. Manderson L, Warren N. “Just One Thing after Another”: Recursive Cascades and
751 Chronic Conditions. *Med Anthropol Q.* 2016;30(4):479–97.
- 752 35. South Africa DOH. Integrated Chronic Disease Management Manual. 2011. Available
753 from: [https://knowledgehub.health.gov.za/system/files/elibdownloads/2023-04/Integrated-](https://knowledgehub.health.gov.za/system/files/elibdownloads/2023-04/Integrated-chronic-disease-management-manual.pdf)
754 [chronic-disease-management-manual.pdf](https://knowledgehub.health.gov.za/system/files/elibdownloads/2023-04/Integrated-chronic-disease-management-manual.pdf)
- 755 36. Dixon et al. Making Morbidity Multiple: History, Legacies, and Possibilities for Global
756 Health. *Journal of Multimorbidity and Comorbidity.* 2023; 13:1-12.
- 757 37. Morgan SA, Eyles C, Roderick PJ, Adongo PB, Hill AG. Women living with multi-
758 morbidity in the Greater Accra Region of Ghana: A qualitative study guided by the Cumulative
759 Complexity Model. *J Biosoc Sci.* 2019 Jul 1;51(4):562–77.

- 760 38. Eyowas FA, Schneider M, Alemu S, Getahun FA. Experience of living with
761 multimorbidity and health workers perspectives on the organization of health services for
762 people living with multiple chronic conditions in Bahir Dar, northwest Ethiopia: a qualitative
763 study. BMC Health Serv Res. 2023 Dec 1;23(1).
- 764 39. Matima R, Murphy K, Levitt NS, BeLue R, Oni T. A qualitative study on the
765 experiences and perspectives of public sector patients in Cape Town in managing the workload
766 of demands of HIV and type 2 diabetes multimorbidity. PLoS One. 2018;13(3):1–19.
- 767 40. Mbokazi N, van Pinxteren M, Murphy K, Mair FS, May CR, Levitt NS. Ubuntu as a
768 mediator in coping with multimorbidity treatment burden in a disadvantaged rural and urban
769 setting in South Africa. Soc Sci Med. 2023 Oct;334:116190.
- 770 41. Dixon J, Mendenhall E. Syndemic thinking to address multimorbidity and its structural
771 determinants. Nature Reviews Disease Primers. Nature Research; 2023;9.
- 772 42. Academy of Science of South Africa, The Academy of Medical Sciences. Addressing
773 the global challenges of multimorbidity – lessons from South Africa. 2016. Available from:
774 [https://acmedsci.ac.uk/file-](https://acmedsci.ac.uk/file-download/3855485#:~:text=In%20recognition%20of%20the%20growing%20challenge%20posed%20by,of%20multimorbidity%20in%20a%20middle-income%20country%20%28South%20Africa%29.6)
775 [download/3855485#:~:text=In%20recognition%20of%20the%20growing%20challenge%20p](https://acmedsci.ac.uk/file-download/3855485#:~:text=In%20recognition%20of%20the%20growing%20challenge%20posed%20by,of%20multimorbidity%20in%20a%20middle-income%20country%20%28South%20Africa%29.6)
776 [osed%20by,of%20multimorbidity%20in%20a%20middle-](https://acmedsci.ac.uk/file-download/3855485#:~:text=In%20recognition%20of%20the%20growing%20challenge%20posed%20by,of%20multimorbidity%20in%20a%20middle-income%20country%20%28South%20Africa%29.6)
777 [income%20country%20%28South%20Africa%29.6](https://acmedsci.ac.uk/file-download/3855485#:~:text=In%20recognition%20of%20the%20growing%20challenge%20posed%20by,of%20multimorbidity%20in%20a%20middle-income%20country%20%28South%20Africa%29.6)




Disciplines and perspectives

- Epidemiology
- Public health
- Health policy and systems
- Health economics
- Bioinformatics
- General medicine
- Emergency medicine
- Nursing
- Community advocacy
- Geriatrics
- Respiratory medicine
- Endocrinology
- Cardiology
- Rheumatology
- Neurology
- Infectious disease
- Anthropology
- Sociology
- History

Figure 1

Panel A: Multimorbidity conceptual model



*Tipping points are thresholds where the overall situation changes suddenly in a way that may not be proportional to inputs / stimulus.

** Burden emergent, distributed and carries different meanings / priorities in different spaces, but may share similarities across different primary condition clusters

***Fluid, non-linear relationship between cause and effect; consequences of prior events may have further knock-on effects that compound or mitigate the burden

Panel B: Factors contributing to greater or lesser burden and complexity***




Figure 2