

Title: Exploring the impact of integrated health and social care services on child health and wellbeing in underserved populations: a systematic review

Authors: Chris Bird¹, Lorraine Harper², Syed Muslim³, Derick Yates¹, Ian Litchfield²

¹ Birmingham Women's and Children's NHS Foundation Trust

² Institute of Applied Health Research, University of Birmingham

³ Primary Care Corporation, Qatar

Word count (3012)

Abstract:

Objective: To explore the evidence for interventions that integrate child health and social care and support programmes and the impact they have on child health and wellbeing.

Data sources: The Cochrane Library, Ovid Medline, Ovid Embase, Ovid Emcare, Ovid Health Management Information Consortium (HMIC) database, and Ovid Social Policy and Practice, Proquest Psychinfo and Ebscohost Cinahl.

Eligibility: Peer-reviewed original research that described an intervention integrating health care and social support or care interventions for children and young people (CYP) up to the age of 18 years in high-income countries. All databases were searched from inception to August 2023.

Data extraction and synthesis: 16 studies were identified: 4 RCTs, 5 quantitative studies, 5 qualitative studies and 2 mixed methods studies. A narrative review and quality check of included studies was performed. Study heterogeneity meant a meta-analysis could not be completed.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Results: Five qualitative, five quantitative, two mixed methods and four randomised controlled trials were included. We identified three main models of delivering integrated health and social care services: targeted support for vulnerable groups, where the provision of packages of interventions focussed on target populations showed potential for decreasing the need for social support in the long-term but with limited evidence for reducing referrals into other services. They were more successful in meeting specific objectives such as lower rates of smoking, and reducing repeat pregnancies; collaborative health and social support were typically collocated services which improved collaborative working but with little impact on workload, job satisfaction, or service delivery; and school centred health and social care, which improved some aspects of CYP wellbeing and physical health but with concerns they added to teacher workload.

Conclusions: Integrated health and social support programmes offer promising solutions to addressing health inequity in children and young people in underserved populations. However, more robust and consistent study designs are needed to guide researchers and policy makers in their implementation and evaluation.

PROSPERO registration CRD42023399907

Keywords: Integrated care services; Children and young people; Health and social care; Health inequalities

What is already known on this topic.

- Integrated care that is equipped to mitigate at least some of the social determinants of health is considered key to improving health inequalities in children and young people in underserved populations.

- Despite increasing investment in integrating health and social support there is little evidence of which models of delivery are most effective in which circumstances nor of the precise impact on target groups and the wider healthcare system.

What this study adds

- We identified three models of integrating health and social support: Packages of interventions targeted at specific groups; Collaborative (and collocated) health and social support; and School-centered health and social care interventions.
- Results across the three models offered promise of improved care and support for the underserved, referral rates into other services tended to be lower and packages interventions achieved positive results for specific objectives. However, findings were inconsistent, drop-out rates were high, and there are concerns over sustainability without sufficient resources.

How this study might affect research, practice and policy

- Embedding iterative co-production in future research and interventions could improve engagement and outcomes and it's important that further works explores their cost effectiveness and implications for other elements of health and care services.
- Appropriate resources and a longer-term commitment to promoting integrated health and social support is needed to fully understand the strengths and weaknesses of the offer and maximise the potential benefits.

Introduction

Children, young people (CYP) and their families living in high income countries face mounting challenges to their health and well-being, as the prevalence of chronic conditions, obesity, and mental ill health

continues to increase (1). These challenges are exacerbated in underserved populations i.e., minoritized and economically-deprived communities (2, 3), by a range of socio-economic and cultural pressures that inhibit access and utilisation of primary or preventative health care services (4-7). This has led to a widespread rise in children's attendances to emergency departments frequently due to conditions that could be more effectively treated in community settings (8-12).

The need for more responsive, culturally sensitive care for CYP from underserved populations has led to efforts in North America, Europe and Australia to prioritise more localized service delivery that integrates several strands of health and social care and places a greater emphasis on public and preventative health (13-19). The integrated services that have emerged are delivered by various combinations of health care providers, social care practitioners, community advocates, and public institutions, and situated in a range of central and localised clinical and locality-based settings (20, 21). Together they share the aim of providing widely accessible health and social care for CYP and their families that can help treat and manage acute and chronic health care alongside the necessary social support that can help mitigate the social determinants of ill-health such as poor housing, domestic violence, or food poverty (21, 22).

However, despite widespread investment in these systems in countries such as the United Kingdom (23), evidence of the benefits of integrating health and social care remains inconsistent, particularly amongst underserved CYP (24, 25): Little is known of which integrated models are most effective, including the precise combination of services, the specific outcomes they improve, or the impact on the surrounding health economy (26, 27). This systematic review is the first that has collated and examined the impact of these integrated health and social care services on CYP in underserved populations. It suggests a typography of the various service models employed and presents the qualitative and quantitative evidence of the effectiveness of each.

Methods

Study design

This work consists of a mixed methods systematic review of qualitative and quantitative studies (28). We used the PerSPEcTiF model to frame the review question (see Table 1) (29) and followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guideline (30). The study is registered on PROSPERO (International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews: CRD42023399907) (31).

Search strategy

The review question was designed using the PerSPEcTiF question framework, to enable the search to best identify a set of relevant abstracts of interest, and the database search structure followed a Population, Exposure, Outcomes (PEO) approach (see Supplementary File 1). The following databases were searched: Cochrane Library, Ovid Medline, Ovid Embase, Ovid Emcare, Ovid Health Management Information Consortium (HMIC) database, Ovid Social Policy and Practice, Proquest Psychinfo and Ebscohost Cinahl.

Table 1: Review framework using PerSPEcTiF (Booth et al, 2019)

Full Review Question (using PerSPEcTiF framework)	
Do interventions that integrate child health and social support intervention impact child health and wellbeing?	
Perspective	From the perspectives of both families and CYP who use the service, those who deliver the service and outside observers.
Setting	Interventions where healthcare and social support programmes for children and young people (CYP) are integrated, including qualitative studies, quantitative studies (RCTs, cohort, observational, quasi experimental), no date limit (exclude case reports, reviews, commentary).
Phenomenon of interest/problem	Impacts on a wide range of outcomes on child health (preventive, acute, chronic health issues) and wellbeing (eg school attendance, domestic violence).
Environment	High income countries with a particular focus on interventions in deprived areas, to focus on settings similar to the UK (eg Europe, New Zealand, Australia).

Comparison	Standard care, if a comparator available.
Time	Children and young people (CYP) <18 years, at any point during their childhood (eg infant, pre-school, primary and secondary school age).
Findings	Impacts on child health and wellbeing, eg school attendance, asthma control, including: qualitative – patient/professional value/experience of service; quantitative – cost effectiveness, primary and secondary care use, school attendance. Given the complex nature of these interventions, outcome measures likely to be heterogeneous.

Inclusion criteria

Studies were eligible for inclusion if their focus was integrated health and social care and support approaches, in “underserved populations” defined as those groups possessing “health differences that are avoidable, unnecessary, and unjust” (32). All databases were searched from inception to August 2023 with no limits in relation to study, publication type, language or date of publication were applied. The search identified a combination of relevant subject headings within those databases using a controlled vocabulary; MeSH in Cochrane, Medline and Cinahl. Emtree in Embase and Emcare and APA Thesaurus of Psychological Index Terms in PsychInfo combined with keywords and free text word variations. Proximity operators were used to maximise the efficiency of the search strategy when searching for phrase variations. The full search strategy is available in Supplementary File 1.

Study selection and assessment of quality and bias

Identified studies were collated and managed using Endnote and Covidence software (33, 34). Two independent reviewers (CB and SM) identified relevant papers by reading titles and abstracts and disagreements were resolved through joint review and consensus. Both reviewers assessed study quality and risk of bias, using the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme checklist for qualitative studies (35), the Effective Public Healthcare Panacea Project’s quality assessment tool for quantitative studies (36) and McGill University’s Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool for mixed methods studies(37).

Data Analysis

Data were collated, organised, and analysed according to the shared characteristics of the service they delivered. If the data was available a meta-analysis of patient outcomes would be conducted, in its absence a narrative synthesis using qualitative data augmented with quantitative data where available (29, 37).

Results

Study characteristics

A total of 3,741 studies were imported for screening and four studies were found via hand searches. 1,421 duplicates were removed, 3,701 studies were screened, 43 full text studies were assessed for eligibility and 16 studies were included in the review. Studies were excluded because they were either of an incorrect intervention (n=13), study design (n=4), setting (n=1), outcome (n=1), population (n=1), or reported no results of impact (n=7). These are described in the PRISMA flow diagram (see Figure 1) (30). Five qualitative, five quantitative, two mixed methods and four randomised controlled trials were included. All studies were carried out in Australia, North America, or Western Europe. The characteristics of each study are further described in Table 2.




Figure 1: PRISMA flow diagram

Table 2: Characteristics of included studies

Study, country	Type of integrated service model	Intervention, aims	Study design (Quality assessment (assessment tool))*	Participants	Analysis	Results**
Barnett et al, 2020, USA (38)	Targeted support for CYP and their families	Evaluated impact of 7 “wellness navigators” on families experiencing adverse childhood experiences.	Retrospective, mixed methods – quantitative and qualitative Weak (MMAT)	99 mainly Latinx carer-infant family dyads participated (126 eligible)	Quantitative – number and type of referrals to support services made for each family. Qualitative – providers’ and caregivers’ experience of the intervention	Quantitative – wellness navigators made referrals for 53% of families, with a mean of 5.52 referrals per family (SD=7.93). Referrals mainly for health insurance, childcare and housing. Qualitative – increased access to services, better holistic care
Rinehart et al, 2021, USA (39)	Targeted support for CYP and their families	Evaluated a screening tool to help pediatricians identify CYP attending clinics needing social support.	Retrospective, observational study Weak (EPHPP)	300 families who attended a pediatric clinic and answered screening questionnaire	Description of social needs identified, number of referrals made	Of 300 families screened, 58.7% had at least one unmet need (average 1.4 per family). Commonest issues were home environment (40%), tobacco exposure (29.3%) and food insecurity (20.6%). Referrals were accepted by 80.3% of families who screened positive for need
Browne et al, 2001, Canada (40)	Targeted support for CYP and their families	Evaluated additional support for families on income support and were randomised to	Five-arm, randomised controlled trial	765 families enrolled, 53% of families had dropped out	Impact on parental mood disorders, child behaviour	No difference between arms except 15% more families who had comprehensive care no longer needed social assistance

		comprehensive care (health promotion, employment training and parenting skills) or one of the three interventions compared to self-directed (standard) care.	Moderate (EPHPP)	by year 2 of the 4-year study	disorders, child competence, social independence, use of health and social services	after 12 months compared to families in the self-directed (standard) arm
Drummond et al, 2016, Canada (41)	Targeted support for CYP and their families	Evaluated service delivery models to link low-income families with health and social support. Families were randomised to 1) Family Healthy Lifestyle and Family Recreation (comprehensive) 2) Family Healthy Lifestyle 3) Family Recreation and 4) Standard care.	Randomized, two-factor, single-blind, longitudinal effectiveness trial Strong (EPHPP)	1,168 families receiving state assistance randomized to the 3 different interventions and standard care, 3-year follow-up	Primary outcome – number of family linkages to health and social services. Secondary outcomes – family experience, cost, family health and functioning	No significant difference between intervention and standard care for linkages to all family services but significant difference for child development linkage in Family Healthy Lifestyle alone (RR 3.27, 1.59-6.74) and for health care linkage in comprehensive package (RR 1.27 (1.06-1.51))
Cox et al, 2012, USA (42)	Targeted support for CYP and their families	Description of a medical home model for adolescent mothers and their children providing preventive care, pregnancy and psychosocial outcomes through outreach and services at adjacent hospital.	Prospective, single cohort study Moderate (EPHPP)	181 adolescent mothers followed up at 12 and 24 months	1) Health – number of mother and child health visits 2) Preventive health – contraception use, repeat pregnancies, child immunizations up to date 3) Life skills – mother in	No comparator group but lower percentage of mothers living with their own parents, higher paternal financial support, lower repeat pregnancy rate but lower contraceptive use and no difference on immunization rate compared to published studies cited

					school/graduated, mother in employment, received state aid, father providing financial support	
Garg et al, 2015, USA (43)	Targeted support for CYP and their families	Evaluated WE CARE screening tool for mother-infant dyads which screened for six basic needs (child care, food security, household heat, housing, parent education, employment) and initiated referrals to community resources for unmet needs	Cluster randomised controlled trial Weak (EPHPP)	366 families from deprived area of Boston, 42 in each cluster (4 intervention, 4 standard care) with infants followed up to approximately 12 months	Primary outcome was number of referrals to a community resource made for infants by age of 12 months	68% of families in both arms had \geq 2 unmet basic needs. More mothers in WE CARE arm received a referral compared to standard care (70% vs 8%, OR 29.6, 14.7-59.6) while more mothers in WE CARE arm enrolled in a community resource (39% vs 24%, OR 2.1, 1.2-3.7).
Jones et al, 2020, UK (44)	Targeted support for CYP and their families	Evaluated impact of health and social support offer to young parents (16-24 years) from 17 weeks pregnancy to fit first 1,001 days of child's life (offer comprised midwives, family facilitators, nursery nurses, speech and language therapists).	Retrospective cohort study Weak (EPHPP)	Young parents aged 16-24 from 17 weeks of pregnancy, 568 families over 2 years	Smoking, alcohol and diet during pregnancy, breastfeeding, screening for adverse childhood events, number and outcome of referrals to social services	68.2% families completed JIGSO programme; median midwife visit 6 antenatal and 3 postnatal; 25.5%v clients stopped smoking during pregnancy (6% standard care), no improvement in breastfeeding rates, improved confidence in parenting, significant association between children discharged from social services and number of JIGSO visits

Garg et al, 2023, USA (45)	Targeted support for CYP and their families	Intervention comprised a screening tool for seven basic needs (child care, education, employment, food security, household heat, housing, language) and access to a patient navigator versus standard care	Type 1 hybrid effectiveness cluster randomised controlled trial Weak (EPHPP)	878 parent-child dyads who presented for a newborn assessment at a participating community healthcare centre and followed up until 3 years of age	Evaluated number of families referred to patient navigators and services referred for; impact on adherence to well child visits and immunisation uptake; impact on ED attendances and hospitalisations	Only 28.9% of families were screened for needs, of whom 20% were referred to a patient navigator – one of the three intervention clusters was excluded due to contamination. There was no significant difference for adherence to well child visits and ED visits and hospitalisations were significantly higher in the intervention arm
Purcal et al, 2011, Australia (46)	Collaborative health and social support	Evaluated whether direct funding for partnerships improve integration of early years programmes (0-5 years) in 41 centres combining health and social support across Australia.	Retrospective, mixed methods – quantitative and qualitative Weak (MMAT)	Staff surveyed at 41 “early years” centres at 2 time points and follow-up interviews (10 centres, 222 interviews)	Experience of partnership, partnership activities	Initial survey response rate 20%, second wave response rate 81% - integrated working perceived to improve but detailed survey questions showed significant change only for referring clients between agencies and interagency training.
Martinussen et al, 2017, Norway (47)	Collaborative health and social support	Evaluated social and healthcare workers’ experience of integrating health and social care for CYP following reorganisation of “early years” services.	Survey Weak (EPHPP)	Questionnaires delivered to all employees delivering the service (response rate 83%)	Experience on job demands and resources, collaboration, burnout and job satisfaction	Decreased conflict and improved collaboration but no change in workload or job satisfaction

Saxe-Custack et al, 2018, USA (48)	Collaborative health and social support	Explored caregiver experiences of co-locating a paediatric clinic in a farmer's market with a healthy food prescription for CYP.	Qualitative study Strong (CASP)	32 caregivers attending a paediatric clinic	Caregivers' experience of the programme	Families valued location close to home, the food prescriptions aided food security and prompted healthier eating habits but some parents perceived the prescription as lacking choice
Murillo et al, 2022, USA (49)	Collaborative health and social support	Evaluated how a medico-legal partnership affected paediatric practice, with a lawyer co-located in a paediatric clinic.	Qualitative study Moderate (CASP)	20 paediatricians, 20 parents/guardians	Experience of paediatricians and families working with co-located lawyer	Greater awareness and understanding of social determinants of health and health-harming legal needs
Eisenburg et al, 2022, Holland (50)	School centred health and social care	Evaluated changes to quality of life and psychosocial problems among CYP at schools in a deprived area of Amsterdam through funding to integrate health and social support.	CYP surveyed at time intervals (longitudinal) Weak (EPHPP)	614 CYP aged 7-13 years from 5 schools over 2 years	CYP quality of life measured using KIDSCREEN-10 questionnaire	Health related quality of life improved but no difference for physical or psychosocial wellbeing. Scores went down after funding ended.
Eisenburg et al, 2023, Holland (51)	School centred health and social care	Evaluated changes to quality of life and psychosocial problems among CYP at schools in a deprived area of Amsterdam through funding to integrate health and social support.	Qualitative study Strong (CASP)	Interviews with 15 school principals, minutes from 16 meetings between school principals, policy officers	Which initiatives chosen by schools, what impact these had and how they differed.	Improved teaching climate, health and socioemotional health; unclear if impact on health and poverty; negative impact on school workload, coordination of care and parent involvement in education.

				and researchers		
Sanford et al, 2020, Australia (52)	School centred health and social care	Evaluated role of 5 link nurses working in 7 primary and 2 secondary schools to improve access to health care, health promotion, links to social support.	Qualitative study Strong (CASP)	Teacher focus groups (x4), 14 participants from 9 schools, nursing focus group (x1)	Experience of teachers and nurses of the intervention	Improved care navigation, nurses provide bridge between services, better sharing of information, identification of unmet needs (eg mental health)
Sanford et al, 2022, Australia (53)	School centred health and social care	Explored nurse and learning support staff experiences in implementing an integrated school-nursing model.	Qualitative study Strong (CASP)	Learning Support Team focus groups (x4) from 6 schools, nursing focus group (n=5)	Experience of Learning Support Team workers and nurses of the intervention	Challenges defining role of nurse, importance of involving all stakeholders early

*CASP = Critical Appraisal Skills Programme checklist for qualitative studies; EPHPP = Effective Public Healthcare Panacea Project's quality assessment tool for quantitative studies; MMAT = Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool

** RR = relative risk; OR = odds ratio

Integrated health and social care models

We identified three types of integrated health and social care services: *Targeted support for CYP and their families*, where specified groups with additional needs were identified and then receive a range of health and care interventions (38-45); *Collaborative health and social support*, involving health and social care organisations work together to deliver shared and complementary services (46-49); and *School centred health and social care*, in which health and social care services embedded or directly linked to educational facilities (50-53). A summary of the key characteristics of each of the types of integrated care model can be found in Table 3 and below we summarise the results of the studies identified within each.

Table 3: Summary of the models of integrated health and social care designed to support underserved CYP

Integrated model	Definition	Location	Key characteristics	Content of intervention(s)
<i>Targeted support for CYP and families</i>	A service based that identified a particular target group or population and then offered one, or a combination of several interventions that combined health and social care intended to impact a pre-specified outcome	Clinical, community, or domestic settings	Identification of those with direct responsibility for CYP health i.e., individual CYP, their carers, and/or families. Single, or a package of, interventions delivered by multiple care organisations reflective of clinical and social need of target groups	Individual packages include numeracy and literacy education, employment training, parenting skills, health promotion, smoking cessation, vaccination, contraception
<i>Collaborative health and social support</i>	An integrated service provided by health and social care organisations and their practitioners offered to localised populations	Predominantly collocated in a shared (community) health care facility	The sharing of key aims, infrastructure, and financial responsibilities across health and social care organisations	A wide range of (preventative) health and social care and support. Including clinical care, legal counselling, lifestyle advice, oral hygiene, and mental health services
<i>School centred health and social care</i>	Health and social care services embedded or otherwise linked with the delivery of primary and secondary education to populations that include CYP from underserved groups	Predominantly delivered within primary and secondary school premises	Health and social care practitioners and/or public health initiatives embedded within or linked to local schools	Programmes that connect CYP and their parents with social and culturally sensitive (preventative) health care and support. Including advice on healthy lifestyle behaviours, support for well-being and signposting to health and social care services

Targeted support for CYP and their families

Target groups consisted of CYP and their families (39-41), or (young) mothers with infants (38, 42-45). They were identified via bespoke screening tools (43, 45), through their existing or previous use of social care or support (38), and an actual or proxy measure of low-income or deprivation (39-41). The interventions were typically delivered in community based care centres or clinics (38, 39, 43-45), or in two instances the CYP's home (42, 44). Four studies targeted CYP and their families, three were recognised as requiring additional needs by direct or proxy measure of deprivation (39-41) and one by previous contact with social care services (38).

At a single clinic in a deprived district in East Harlem just under 60% of participants had at least one unmet need relating to housing, tobacco exposure, or food insecurity with 80% successfully referred to the appropriate social support as a result (39). A multi-arm randomised controlled trial (RCT) set in Canada identified vulnerable families by a locality-based deprivation score that accessed a range of interventions including various combinations of health promotion, parenting skills, and employment training, with the published interim analysis indicating that those receiving the intervention were less likely to need social assistance 12 months later (40). A second RCT, also in Canada, recruited participants from locality-based deprivation scores described the impact of a range of family-based lifestyle and recreational interventions with significant improvements in engagement with child development services (RR 3.27, 1.59-6.74) and health care (RR 1.27 (1.06-1.51) (41). However, over half of families receiving the intervention dropped out after two years and the authors observed that integrating the work of the existing agencies did not address longstanding shortages in service capacity (41). Barnett et al reported that Latinx carer-infant dyads identified by previous contact with social support subsequently had increased referrals to organisations providing health insurance, childcare and housing (38).

Two studies targeted young mothers (42, 44): One, set in the USA, that integrated support from hospital staff and social workers into a “medical home” model and reported they were less likely to live with their own parents, have a repeat pregnancy and received greater paternal financial support (42). The other study set in Wales (UK) consisted of health and social support from a team of midwives, family facilitators, nursery nurses, and speech and language therapists (44). They reported reduced smoking rates, and improved confidence in parenting though no increase in breastfeeding (44).

Two related studies targeted mothers (of any age) and their infants with unmet needs (43, 45). They found that those identified using the tool were significantly more likely to receive a referral to community (social) services, though only half of those actually received additional support (43). Adapting the screening tool to incorporate multiple languages and linking participants with a patient-peer navigator increased the likelihood of an ED visit or hospitalisation (45).

Collaborative health and social support

The facilitated collaborations consisted of community-based co-located social support and health care services set in Australia (46), USA (48, 49), and in Norway an organisational-level collaborative service (47). Purcal et al’s Australian study of state funding for integrating professional health and social support found a significant increase in inter-agency referrals but no impact on planning, service delivery or co-location, according to senior managers, managers and frontline staff (46).

Two single-centred, US-based studies described social support interventions co-located in paediatric clinics: one provided a fresh food prescription though families felt that they aided food security but also felt the options were constrictive and would have preferred vouchers (48). In the second a paediatric clinic provided a lawyer to tackle health-harming legal needs such as those relating to housing, utilities, guardianship, education and benefits (49). The qualitative data indicated greater confidence and trust, from CYP and families, in clinical staff, who in turn reported improved awareness and understanding of the social determinants of their patients' health (49). Martinussen et al's survey of Norwegian health professionals following the re-organisation of services to better integrate social care found improved collaboration but did little to improve job satisfaction or reduce workload (47).

School centred health and social care

Of the four studies identified, two evaluated a single intervention in Australia that comprised of linked nurses within primary and secondary schools situated within economically disadvantaged locations in Australia evaluating (52, 53); and two in the Netherlands exploring the impact of central funding on a range of small scale health and social care packages determined by primary school leaders (50, 51).

The Australian qualitative studies explored the views of nursing link workers and teachers and learning support workers working together in primary and secondary schools in Australia (52, 53). Both school and nursing staff reported that care navigation improved, with better information sharing and identification of unmet needs (eg mental health) but there were challenges in defining the nurses' roles and how they worked alongside school support staff (52, 53) .

The two studies that evaluated the 2-year programme in the Netherlands, where government provided €125,000 to schools in economically disadvantaged areas to fund their choice of interventions with the premise they would integrate health and social support for CYP aged 7-13 years (50, 51). The first described the results of a longitudinal survey of pupils which indicated that health related quality of life and psychosocial problems improved, and though the scores used to measure wellbeing displayed little variation over time, they did drop off once funding ended (50). The second study of stakeholder perceptions, described perceptions of improved wellbeing, physical health and classroom behaviour, though the school leaders were concerned about sustained impact due to the impact of interventions on teacher workload, and coordination of care (51).

Discussion

General findings

This review provides valuable and novel insight into the various attempts at integrating health and social care for the benefit of CYP and families from underserved populations. Of the papers identified, various integrated service offers emerged, and we were able to produce a typology that categorised the studies we identified into three different models of service delivery. *Targeted support for CYP and their families*: Which first involved identification of vulnerable groups and then the subsequent provision of packages of interventions targeted at their specific needs showed potential for decreasing the need for social support in the long-term, but with limited evidence for improving intervention specific outcomes such as referrals into other services, lower rates of smoking, reduced repeat pregnancies and greater likelihood of discharge from social services. *Collaborative health and social care* found some improvement in collaboration between previously disparate services, but no impact on workload, job satisfaction or service delivery. There was limited evidence of the benefits of co-locating social support in paediatric clinics, and collocated legal assistance offered promise. *School centred health and social care* improved some aspects of CYP wellbeing and physical health,

but senior educational staff reported that additional funds failed to improve school and social care support and increased teacher workload.

Specific findings

Targeted support for CYP and families

Target groups were readily identified but the evidence of the various approaches used to identify these groups was inconsistent, with some improvements reported in streamlining referrals into other services (39, 40, 43, 45), reducing the number of repeat pregnancies (44), or smoking (48). Similar approaches targeting deprived families (though without integrating health and social care), have also shown promise in promoting healthy behaviours for example raising awareness of oral health and reduced obesity (20, 54-56).

The lack of more definitive evidence of such health and social care interventions designed to impact the underserved might be attributed in part to broader systemic difficulties in engaging with these groups due to their frequent changes of address; lack of trust in centralised authorities, and language and cultural barriers (57). To overcome some of these pervasive socio-cultural barriers to accessing health and social care there is a need to recognise the value of using alternative means of improving the outreach to the most vulnerable such as housing associations (58), (59) or homelessness charities (60). Having done so, co-design initiatives of health and social care interventions can become more meaningful and genuinely increase ownership of the intervention whilst reducing the stigma of accessing support (61). Future interventions might also be better supported by embedding peers or community connectors in the delivery or facilitation of the service, to help address the persistent issues of mistrust and engagement with mainstream health and social support services (62, 63).

Collaborative health and social support

The studies we uncovered reported limited benefits of collaborative health and social care including more effective referral into social support services and increased job satisfaction (46-49). The majority of previous work that has explored inter agency collaborative working has focused on creating teams of primary and secondary care clinicians (64, 65). What remains less well understood is how best to combine health and social care services (24, 25).

The colocation of existing services is widely recognised as a successful way of integrating multi-disciplinary health care teams: improving communication, understanding and mutual learning (66, 67). However, professional partnership working requires bridging differences in training, aims, and work practices of health and social care practitioners (68). If the integration of health and social care services is to be sustained in the long-term then fundamental issues around professional identities and boundaries need to be addressed (69). This requires changes in training and education to better ensure such partnership working remains safe and effective (70) with techniques such as inter-disciplinary observation recognised as an aid to fostering mutual respect, greater job satisfaction and workforce retention (71-74).

School centred health and social care

Delivery of health and wellbeing through schools has been promoted globally for several decades and was recognised as part of the World Health Organisation's 1986 Charter on Health Promotion which asks that schools constantly strengthen their capacity as a "healthy setting for living, learning and working" (75). In the studies we identified, attempts at achieving similar aims involved either integrating health and social care practitioners into the school workforce (52, 53), or by using

additional funds to finance a number of health promotion interventions around diet and exercise (50, 51). That both approaches reported positive effects on health and well-being but with negative consequences on teacher workload (50-53) reflects the findings of other types of school-based health interventions (76, 77). In these cases they reported promising improvements in anxiety, mental health, asthma management and vision screening (76) but with the impact on educational outcomes and constraints of staff resource hindering sustainability (77). There is also a more fundamental issue that such school-based interventions fail to address, which is that their attempts at reaching underserved populations is predicated on their regular attendance at school, which is usually below national averages (78) but since COVID-19 the number of children in the UK from disadvantaged backgrounds regularly attending school has fallen (79).

Strengths and limitations

This systematic review was prospectively registered and the identification of studies conducted with reference to best practice by two researchers working independently (30, 80). Despite the comprehensive search strategy identifying 16 papers the overall quality of the evidence was poor, only four of the studies were RCTs (40, 41, 43, 45) and there was little data on outcomes and impact over the medium and long term,. The findings were further limited by high drop-out rates (40-42, 44, 45) and a lack of homogeneity even with model types precluded a formal meta-analysis and any meaningful comparison of the effectiveness of the three model types.

Implications for policy and research

In light of growing child poverty rates in high income environments (81, 82), the lack of sustained engagement and high -drop-out rates reported by many of our studies (40-42, 44, 45) highlights the importance of delivering services co-designed with intended users (41, 45, 83). The three typologies

of integrated service we identified are not intended to be a definitive list and others may emerge including hybrid service offerings that combine elements of each. However, the importance of effective system navigation was understood across all models (40, 42-45, 48), and its importance in accessing and engagement with care is widely recognised both in the UK and elsewhere (9, 84-86).

The establishment of a more robust evidence base is inhibited by the current focus on short-term pilots and funding cycles despite complex interventions needing time to become embedded and medium term outputs that extend beyond the limitations of annual funding cycles (15, 87). Their evaluation also needs to incorporate more precise description of the service model, and the measurement of outcomes valued to both service and patient using mixed methodologies and some element of cost effectiveness (88, 89).

Conclusion

While we lack robust evidence of the benefits of integrating health and social support for CYP from underserved populations there are promising signs of positive impacts but to fully understand their potential, more robust evaluation methods are needed of services that are commissioned for longer periods of time and retain maximum flexibility in their attempts to engage with underserved communities.

Author's statement

Acknowledgements

N/A

Contributors

Funding statement

The work was funded by Birmingham Health Partners

Competing interests

None

Patient consent

N/A

Data availability statement

Data are available upon reasonable request. Additional data and materials such as data collection forms, data extraction and analysis templates and can be obtained by contacting the corresponding author.

References

1. Roos LL, Wall-Wieler E, Lee JB. Poverty and Early Childhood Outcomes. *Pediatrics*. 2019.
2. Bonevski B, Randell M, Paul C, Chapman K, Twyman L, Bryant J, et al. Reaching the hard-to-reach: a systematic review of strategies for improving health and medical research with socially disadvantaged groups. *BMC medical research methodology*. 2014;14(1):1-29.
3. Research NIfH. Improving inclusion of under-served groups in clinical research: Guidance from the NIHR INCLUDE project. 2020.
4. Chopra M, Sharkey A, Dalmiya N, Anthony D, Binkin N, Unicef Equity in Child Survival H, et al. Strategies to improve health coverage and narrow the equity gap in child survival, health, and nutrition. *Lancet*. 2012;380(9850):1331-40.
5. Halfon N, Russ SA, Kahn RS. Inequality and child health: dynamic population health interventions. *Curr Opin Pediatr*. 2022;34(1):33-8.
6. WHO statement-by-the-malaria-policy-advisory-group-on-the-urgent-need-to-address-the-high-prevalence-of-pfhrp2-3-gene-deletions-in-the-horn-of-africa-and-beyond.
7. Gilliland JA, Shah TI, Clark A, Sibbald S, Seabrook JA. A geospatial approach to understanding inequalities in accessibility to primary care among vulnerable populations. *PLoS One*. 2019;14(1):e0210113.
8. Hibberd J, , Mistry R, . COVID-19, primary care, and paediatrics: winter is coming. 2020;70:450-.
9. Kossarova L, , Devakumar D, , Edwards N, . The future of child health services: new models of care. 2016.

10. Pianucci L, Longacre ML. Nonurgent Emergency Department Use by Pediatric Patients in the United States. 2022;38:540-4.
11. Edwards G, Brettell R, Bird C, et al. Paediatric contacts with the UK out-of-hours primary care service and contact outcomes: a regional service evaluation. 2020;21:144.
12. Dossetor PJ, Fitzpatrick EFM, Glass K, Douglas K, Watkins R, Oscar J, et al. Emergency Department Presentations by Children in Remote Australia: A Population-based Study. *Glob Pediatr Health*. 2021;8:2333794X21991006.
13. NHS England. The NHS Long Term Plan. 2019.
14. Anderson M, Pitchforth E, Asaria M, et al. LSE–Lancet Commission on the future of the NHS: re-laying the foundations for an equitable and efficient health and care service after COVID-19. 2021;397:1915-78.
15. Curry N, Harris M, Gunn LH, Pappas Y, Blunt I, Soljak M, et al. Integrated care pilot in north-west London: a mixed methods evaluation. *Int J Integr Care*. 2013;13:e027.
16. Belsky J, Melhuish E, Barnes J, et al. Effects of Sure Start local programmes on children and families: early findings from a quasi-experimental, cross sectional study. 2006;332:1476.
17. Wolfe I, Satherley RM, Scotney E, Newham J, Lingam R. Integrated Care Models and Child Health: A Meta-analysis. *Pediatrics*. 2020;145(1).
18. Satherley RM, Lingam R, Green J, Wolfe I. Integrated health Services for Children: a qualitative study of family perspectives. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2021;21(1):167.
19. Jayaratne K, Kelaher M, Dunt D. Child Health Partnerships: a review of program characteristics, outcomes and their relationship. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2010;10:172.
20. Pinto AD, Gandhi KM, Hapsari A, et al. Integrating health and social care for children in Canada. 2022;68:726-8.
21. Garg P, Eastwood J, Liaw ST. A Realist Synthesis of Literature Informing Programme Theories for Well Child Care in Primary Health Systems of Developed Economies. *Int J Integr Care*. 2019;19(3):5.
22. S T, E D, T M. Evaluating early help: a guide to evaluation of complex local early help systems. 2019.
23. England N, Improvement N. Integrating care: next steps to building strong and effective integrated care systems across England. London: NHS England & NHS Improvement. 2020.
24. Reece S, Sheldon TA, Dickerson J, Pickett KE. A review of the effectiveness and experiences of welfare advice services co-located in health settings: A critical narrative systematic review. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2022;296:114746.
25. Zuchowski I, McLennan S. A systematic review of social work in general practice: Opportunities and challenges. *Journal of Evidence-Based Social Work*. 2023:1-41.
26. Baxter S, Johnson M, Chambers D, et al. The effects of integrated care: a systematic review of UK and international evidence. 2018;18:350.
27. Coughlan CH, Ruzangi J, Neale FK, et al. Social and ethnic group differences in healthcare use by children aged 0–14 years: a population-based cohort study in England from 2007 to 2017. 2022;107:32-9.
28. Stern C, Lizarondo L, Carrier J, et al. Methodological guidance for the conduct of mixed methods systematic reviews. 2020;18:2108-18.
29. Booth A, Noyes J, Flemming K, et al. Formulating questions to explore complex interventions within qualitative evidence synthesis. 2019;4:e001107.

30. Liberati A , Altman DG , Tetzlaff J , et al. The PRISMA Statement for Reporting Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses of Studies That Evaluate Health Care Interventions: Explanation and Elaboration. 2009;6:e1000100.
31. Dutton F , Wolhuter C , Kaur S , et al. 1066 A proposed pilot to integrate health and social care to tackle child inequality: the Sparkbrook Children's Zone, Birmingham. 2022:A56-A.
32. Braveman P. What are health disparities and health equity? We need to be clear. *Public Health Rep.* 2014;129 Suppl 2(Suppl 2):5-8.
33. Foundation VH, . Covidence systematic review software. 2023.
34. Borissov N , Haas Q , Minder B , et al. Reducing systematic review burden using Deduklick: a novel, automated, reliable, and explainable deduplication algorithm to foster medical research. 2022;11:172.
35. Programme CAS, . CASP (Qualitative studies)Checklist. 2022.
36. Healthcare EP, . Panacea Project Quality Assessment Tool for Quantitative Studies.
37. University M, . Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool.
38. Barnett ML , Kia-Keating M , Ruth A , et al. Promoting equity and resilience: Wellness navigators' role in addressing adverse childhood experiences. 2020;8:176-88.
39. Rinehart R , Zajac L , Acevedo J , et al. Integrating a Social Determinants of Health Screener at an Outpatient Pediatric Clinic in East Harlem, New York City. 2021;32:2267-77.
40. Browne G , Byrne C , Roberts J , et al. When the bough breaks: provider-initiated comprehensive care is more effective and less expensive for sole-support parents on social assistance. 2001;53:1697-710.
41. Drummond J , Wiebe N , So S , et al. Service-integration approaches for families with low income: a Families First Edmonton, community-based, randomized, controlled trial. 2016;17:343.
42. Cox JE , Buman MP , Woods ER , et al. Evaluation of Raising Adolescent Families Together Program: A Medical Home for Adolescent Mothers and Their Children. 2012;102:1879-85.
43. Garg A, Toy S, Tripodis Y, Silverstein M, Freeman E. Addressing social determinants of health at well child care visits: a cluster RCT. *Pediatrics.* 2015;135(2):e296-304.
44. Jones SW , Darra S , Davies M , et al. Collaborative working in health and social care: Lessons learned from post-hoc preliminary findings of a young families' pregnancy to age 2 project in South Wales, United Kingdom. 2021;29:1115-25.
45. Garg A, Brochier A, Tripodis Y, Messmer E, Drainoni ML. A Social Care System Implemented in Pediatric Primary Care: A Cluster RCT. *Pediatrics.* 2023;152(2).
46. Purcal C , Muir K , Patulny R , et al. Does partnership funding improve coordination and collaboration among early childhood services? - Experiences from the Communities for Children programme. 2011;16:474-84.
47. Martinussen M , Kaiser S , Adolfsen F , et al. Reorganisation of healthcare services for children and families: Improving collaboration, service quality, and worker well-being. 2017;31:487-96.
48. Saxe-Custack A , Lofton HC , Hanna-Attisha M , et al. Caregiver perceptions of a fruit and vegetable prescription programme for low-income paediatric patients. 2018;21:2497-506.
49. Murillo SN , Rosenthal A , Fenick AM , et al. The Impact of a Pediatric Medical-Legal Partnership on Pediatric Providers: A Qualitative Study. 2022;22:447-53.

50. Elsenburg LK, Abrahamse ME, Harting J. Implementation of a Dutch school-based integrated approach targeting education, health and poverty—a process evaluation. 2022;37.
51. Elsenburg LK, Galenkamp H, Abrahamse ME, et al. Longitudinal changes in quality of life and psychosocial problems of primary school children in a deprived urban neighborhood over the course of a school-based integrated approach. 2023;32:343-52.
52. Sanford C, Saurman E, Dennis S, et al. 'We're definitely that link': the role of school-based primary health care registered nurses in a rural community. 2020;27:76-82.
53. Sanford C, Saurman E, Dennis S, et al. 'What is this about? Let's play this out': the experience of integrating primary health care registered nurses with school learning and support teams. 2022;28:321-9.
54. George A, Sousa MS, Kong AC, Blinkhorn A, Patterson Norrie T, Foster J, et al. Effectiveness of preventive dental programs offered to mothers by non-dental professionals to control early childhood dental caries: a review. BMC Oral Health. 2019;19:1-9.
55. Davison KK, Gavarkovs A, McBride B, Kotelchuck M, Levy R, Taveras EM. Engaging fathers in early obesity prevention during the first 1,000 days: Policy, systems, and environmental change strategies. Obesity. 2019;27(4):525-33.
56. Barnes MD, Hanson CL, Novilla LB, Magnusson BM, Crandall AC, Bradford G. Family-centered health promotion: Perspectives for engaging families and achieving better health outcomes. SAGE Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA; 2020. p. 0046958020923537.
57. Blackwood DH, Walker D, Mythen MG, Taylor RM, Vindrola-Padros C. Barriers to advance care planning with patients as perceived by nurses and other healthcare professionals: A systematic review. Journal of clinical nursing. 2019;28(23-24):4276-97.
58. Cameron A, Lloyd L, Turner W, Macdonald G. Working across boundaries to improve health outcomes: a case study of a housing support and outreach service for homeless people living with HIV. Health & Social Care in the Community. 2009;17(4):388-95.
59. Walsall Together. Walsall Together wins HSJ the Place Based Partnership and Integrated Care Award 2023 [Available from: <https://walsalltogether.co.uk/news-blogs/latest-news/walsall-together-wins-hsj-integrated-partnership-award#:~:text=Walsall%20Together%20wins%20HSJ%20the%20Place%20Based%20Partnership%20and%20Integrated%20Care,-Home&text=Walsall%20Together%20has%20been%20crowned,for%20the%20Citizens%20of%20Walsall>].
60. Kopanitsa V, McWilliams S, Leung R, Schischa B, Sarela S, Perelmuter S, et al. A systematic scoping review of primary health care service outreach for homeless populations. Family Practice. 2023;40(1):138-51.
61. Pote I, Doubell L, Brims L, Larbie J, Stock L, Lewing B. Engaging disadvantaged and vulnerable parents: An evidence review. Early Intervention Foundation. 2019:1-93.
62. Sokol R, Fisher E. Peer support for the hardly reached: a systematic review. American journal of public health. 2016;106(7):e1-e8.
63. NHSE. Core20PLUS5 Community Connectors 2023 [Available from: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/about/equality/equality-hub/national-healthcare-inequalities-improvement-programme/core20plus5/core20plus5-community-connectors/>].
64. Improvement N. Developing people improving care: one year on. 2018.
65. Improvement N. Evidence from NHS improvement on clinical staff shortages. A workforce analysis Updated. 2016.

66. Mackie S, Darvill A. Factors enabling implementation of integrated health and social care: a systematic review. *British journal of community nursing*. 2016;21(2):82-7.
67. Bonciani M, Schäfer W, Barsanti S, Heinemann S, Groenewegen P. The benefits of co-location in primary care practices: the perspectives of general practitioners and patients in 34 countries. *BMC health services research*. 2018;18(1):1-22.
68. Schot E, Tummers L, Noordegraaf M. Working on working together. A systematic review on how healthcare professionals contribute to interprofessional collaboration. *Journal of interprofessional care*. 2020;34(3):332-42.
69. Lalani M, Marshall M. Co-location, an enabler for service integration? Lessons from an evaluation of integrated community care teams in East London. *Health & Social Care in the Community*. 2022;30(2):e388-e96.
70. Spaulding EM, Marvel FA, Jacob E, Rahman A, Hansen BR, Hanyok LA, et al. Interprofessional education and collaboration among healthcare students and professionals: a systematic review and call for action. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*. 2021;35(4):612-21.
71. Olson K, Marchalik D, Farley H, Dean SM, Lawrence EC, Hamidi MS, et al. Organizational strategies to reduce physician burnout and improve professional fulfillment. *Current problems in pediatric and adolescent health care*. 2019;49(12):100664.
72. Houston JF, Morgan JE. Paired learning—improving collaboration between clinicians and managers. *Journal of health organization and management*. 2018.
73. Kusnoor AV, Stelljes LA. Interprofessional learning through shadowing: Insights and lessons learned. *Medical teacher*. 2016;38(12):1278-84.
74. Shafran DM, Richardson L, Bonta M. A novel interprofessional shadowing initiative for senior medical students. *Medical teacher*. 2015;37(1):86-9.
75. Lee A, Lo A, Li Q, Keung V, Kwong A. Health promoting schools: an update. *Applied health economics and health policy*. 2020;18:605-23.
76. Levinson J, Kohl K, Baltag V, Ross DA. Investigating the effectiveness of school health services delivered by a health provider: a systematic review of systematic reviews. *PLoS One*. 2019;14(6):e0212603.
77. Herlitz L, MacIntyre H, Osborn T, Bonell C. The sustainability of public health interventions in schools: a systematic review. *Implementation Science*. 2020;15(1):1-28.
78. Ready DD. Socioeconomic disadvantage, school attendance, and early cognitive development: The differential effects of school exposure. *Sociology of Education*. 2010;83(4):271-86.
79. Elliot Major L, Eyles A. Rising school absences: the post pandemic education divide. *British Politics and Policy at LSE*. 2022.
80. Stern C, Lizarondo L, Carrier J, Godfrey C, Rieger K, Salmond S, et al. Methodological guidance for the conduct of mixed methods systematic reviews. *JBIC evidence implementation*. 2021;19(2):120-9.
81. Wickham S, Anwar E, Barr B, et al. Poverty and child health in the UK: using evidence for action. 2016;101:759-66.
82. Takeuchi H, Lee SH, Ivarsson A. Towards optimising children's capability and tackling relative child poverty in high-income countries: the cases of Japan, Sweden and the UK since 2000. *Glob Health Action*. 2022;15(1):2084230.
83. Churchill H, Dunn H. Parental participation and community family support: 'Family Support Hubs' in Northern Ireland and 'Family Hubs' in England. *International Perspectives on Parenting Support and Parental Participation in Children and Family Services*. 268-83.

84. Tierney S, Wong G, Mahtani KR. Current understanding and implementation of ‘care navigation’ across England: a cross-sectional study of NHS clinical commissioning groups. *British Journal of General Practice*. 2019;69(687):e675-e81.
85. NHS England. Delivery plan for recovering access to primary care. 2023.
86. Teggart K, Neil-Sztramko SE, Nadarajah A, Wang A, Moore C, Carter N, et al. Effectiveness of system navigation programs linking primary care with community-based health and social services: a systematic review. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2023;23(1):450.
87. Borglin G. The value of mixed methods for researching complex interventions. *Complex Interventions in Health: An Overview of Research Methods* Abingdon, Oxon, UK: Routledge. 2015.
88. Brand SL, , Thompson Coon J, , Fleming LE, , et al. Whole-system approaches to improving the health and wellbeing of healthcare workers: A systematic review. 2017;12:e0188418.
89. Nuño Solinís R, , Stein KV, . Measuring Integrated Care – The Quest for Disentangling a Gordian Knot. 2016;16.