



GLOBAL DISEASE MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORKS AND THEIR APPLICATION TO VIETNAM: A SYSTEMS-BASED REVIEW

Trung Vuong BUI¹, Chi Hieu DO²

¹University of Transport and Communications, Vietnam

²Hanoi Amsterdam High School for the Gifted, Vietnam

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra31379>

DOI No: 10.36713/epra31379

ABSTRACT

Disease management has evolved from reactive treatment into an integrated system combining prevention, early detection, clinical intervention, surveillance, patient self-management, and population-level response. This study examines the core components of contemporary disease management and their applicability to Vietnam. A qualitative integrative review and conceptual synthesis were conducted using literature on evidence-based public health, chronic disease management, self-management, community intervention, and disease surveillance. Three findings emerge. First, effective disease management depends on integrating clinical care with preventive and public-health functions rather than treating them as separate activities. Second, modern disease management operates as a continuous cycle of prevention, detection and assessment, intervention, monitoring, patient engagement, community action, and post-event evaluation. Third, Vietnam has an institutional foundation for applying this approach through its surveillance system, provincial Centers for Disease Control, hospitals, laboratories, and community-based public-health activities. However, stronger data integration, risk-based surveillance, preparedness, primary healthcare capacity, public communication, and equitable digital transformation are required. The study argues that Vietnam should develop disease management as an adaptive health-system architecture rather than a set of isolated programmes, thereby improving preparedness, continuity of care, resource allocation, and resilience against communicable and non-communicable diseases.

KEYWORDS: Disease Management; Public Health; Disease Surveillance; Centers for Disease Control; Healthcare System; Vietnam.

1. INTRODUCTION

Disease management has become a central component of modern healthcare because health systems must address diverse and interconnected risks. Historically, medical care was largely reactive: intervention began after symptoms appeared and focused on treating individual patients. Contemporary healthcare increasingly emphasises prevention, early diagnosis, continuous monitoring, patient participation, community intervention, and coordinated public-health action. This transition represents a shift from episodic treatment towards systematic management of health risks across the disease trajectory.

The development of disease management is closely associated with evidence-based medicine and evidence-based public health. Public-health interventions are increasingly expected to reflect evidence concerning effectiveness, population needs, implementation feasibility, and health outcomes (Briss et al., 2000; Kohatsu et al., 2004). At the same time, chronic and multiple conditions have exposed the limitations of systems organised around isolated episodes of care. Long-term disease management requires monitoring, behavioural modification, continuity across providers, and active patient participation (Anderson, 2010; Parekh et al., 2011).

Disease management therefore extends beyond clinical treatment to include primary prevention, screening, risk assessment, diagnosis, treatment, rehabilitation, surveillance,

patient education, preparedness, outbreak response, and evaluation. This broad interpretation is especially relevant because health systems face infectious threats while simultaneously managing diabetes, cardiovascular disease, cancer, obesity, and other chronic conditions. Digital tools such as electronic health records, telehealth, wearable devices, real-time surveillance, and data analytics may strengthen these functions, but their value depends on institutional integration, accessibility, privacy protection, and cybersecurity.

These issues are directly relevant to Vietnam. The country has developed surveillance mechanisms involving healthcare facilities, laboratories, local health authorities, and provincial Centers for Disease Control (CDCs). Yet these mechanisms must be more closely connected with clinical care, prevention, preparedness, and community engagement to operate as a coherent disease-management system. This study therefore synthesises the principal components of contemporary disease management and examines how they can be adapted to Vietnam through a systems perspective in which prevention, detection, treatment, surveillance, participation, and recovery function as interdependent elements.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. From Reactive Treatment to Integrated Disease Management

The historical development of disease management reflects major advances in medical knowledge and public-



health organisation. Sanitation and clean water were early precursors to modern public health, while germ theory created a scientific basis for targeted prevention and treatment. Antibiotics and vaccination subsequently strengthened the ability of health systems to control infectious diseases. The eradication of smallpox further demonstrated that effective disease control depends not only on individual clinical treatment but also on coordinated surveillance, vaccination, community participation, and international cooperation.

Evidence-based public-health frameworks reinforced the principle that interventions should be selected according to demonstrated effectiveness rather than convention alone (Briss et al., 2000; Kohatsu et al., 2004). Meanwhile, longer life expectancy and changing disease patterns increased the importance of chronic care. Chronic conditions require sustained coordination rather than short-term intervention, while multiple chronic conditions intensify the need for integrated treatment pathways (Anderson, 2010; Parekh et al., 2011). Contemporary disease management therefore combines acute care with prevention, monitoring, self-management, and continuity of care.

2.2. Prevention, Early Detection, and Risk Assessment

Prevention is the first layer of disease management. Primary prevention reduces disease occurrence through vaccination, sanitation, health education, healthy lifestyles, environmental protection, and behavioural risk reduction. Secondary prevention seeks early detection through screening and routine examination so that intervention can occur before severe complications develop. Evidence-based public health provides the basis for choosing preventive measures and allocating limited resources efficiently (Briss et al., 2000).

Risk assessment links detection to action. It involves evaluating disease severity, transmissibility, vulnerability, comorbidities, environmental exposure, and behavioural factors. At the individual level, risk stratification informs personalised treatment; at the population level, it enables public-health agencies to identify vulnerable groups, determine priorities, and target intervention.

2.3. Treatment, Monitoring, and Continuity of Care

Clinical intervention remains essential, but it is increasingly embedded within a broader continuum. Treatment may include medication, surgery, rehabilitation, behavioural therapy, dietary modification, physical activity, and psychological support. For chronic conditions, long-term adherence and monitoring are as important as initial treatment selection. Electronic records and digital monitoring can support longitudinal observation and information exchange across healthcare organisations.

Coordination becomes particularly important when patients have multiple chronic conditions and receive treatment from several providers (Parekh et al., 2011). Fragmented care can produce duplication, inconsistent decisions, medication conflicts, and unnecessary expenditure. Disease-management systems must therefore connect primary care, specialist services, hospitals, and community support around patient needs rather than organisational boundaries.

2.4. Patient Self-Management and Community Participation

Modern disease management recognises patients as active participants. Self-management includes monitoring symptoms, adhering to medication, modifying lifestyle, recognising warning signs, and communicating with healthcare providers. Brady et al. (2000) emphasise the importance of embedding self-management support in clinical practice, while Brady (2012) identifies strategies that help patients manage long-term conditions. This perspective is consistent with defining health partly as the capacity to adapt and self-manage (Huber et al., 2011).

Community conditions also shape health behaviour and outcomes. Family support, education, local infrastructure, and access to community resources influence whether patients can sustain recommended behaviours. Fisher et al. (2005) show the importance of ecological approaches to chronic disease self-management. Consequently, effective disease management requires interaction among healthcare organisations, families, schools, communities, and public authorities.

3. METHODOLOGY

The analysis followed three stages. First, the cited literature was reviewed to identify major concepts in evidence-based public health, chronic care, multiple chronic conditions, self-management, and community intervention. Second, disease-management activities were classified into seven functional domains: prevention; detection and assessment; treatment and intervention; monitoring and surveillance; patient engagement; public-health and community action; and recovery and evaluation. Third, this framework was mapped onto the Vietnamese context by examining the roles assigned to CDCs, hospitals, laboratories, local health authorities, communities, and national-level health institutions.

The study does not estimate the causal effects of individual interventions or compare national performance statistically. Instead, it evaluates the institutional and process-level compatibility between internationally established disease-management principles and the organisational mechanisms described for Vietnam. The findings should therefore be interpreted as a conceptual framework for health-system development rather than evidence of comparative effectiveness.

Source identification was purposive and bounded by the reference corpus already incorporated into the manuscript rather than by a new database-based systematic search. A source was retained for analytical use when it contributed directly to at least one of the study's core themes: evidence-based public health, chronic-care organisation, multiple chronic conditions, patient self-management, community-level intervention, disease surveillance, or institutional coordination. Historical material was used to establish the evolution of disease management, whereas empirical and conceptual sources were used to identify operational principles and implementation mechanisms. Because the available evidence is heterogeneous in purpose, design, and outcome measurement, the review did not pool effect sizes, calculate a summary treatment effect, or apply meta-analytic weighting. The purpose was analytical integration rather than statistical aggregation.

The unit of analysis was the disease-management function or mechanism described in each source, rather than the



publication as a whole. A structured extraction matrix was used to record the health-system level addressed by each item (individual, clinical service, community, or population), the principal management function, the institutional actors involved, the type of information required for decision-making, and the intended health-system outcome. Coding proceeded primarily through a deductive framework based on the seven functional domains defined above. Within each domain, recurring mechanisms—such as early detection, risk stratification, continuity of care, self-management support, inter-organisational coordination, public communication, and feedback-based learning—were then identified through iterative comparison across sources. This two-stage coding procedure reduced the risk that the synthesis would merely reproduce the structure of individual publications and instead enabled comparison at the level of common health-system functions.

The Vietnam-oriented analysis used a structured conceptual cross-walk between the seven international disease-management domains and the six operational stages identified in the Vietnamese context: surveillance and detection, risk assessment, prevention, preparedness and planning, disease response, and post-event assessment. For each stage, the analysis considered five dimensions: the responsible institutional actor; the information input required; the decision or coordination function performed; the implementation mechanism; and the feedback or learning output generated. Compatibility was interpreted qualitatively as direct alignment, partial alignment, or an implementation gap. These categories were used as analytical guides rather than numerical scores. This procedure made it possible to distinguish between the existence of a formal institutional component—for example, a surveillance or CDC structure—and the degree to which that component is functionally connected to clinical care, community action, risk communication, and subsequent evaluation.

Analytical credibility was strengthened through source triangulation and traceability. Interpretations were retained when a mechanism was supported by convergent evidence from more than one conceptual or empirical source, or when it was explicitly described in the Vietnam-focused source material. Claims that could not be supported at this level were treated as propositions for future research rather than established findings. The synthesis also maintained a clear separation between descriptive evidence (what institutions or disease-management processes are reported to exist), interpretive inference (how these components relate within the proposed systems framework), and normative implication (what could be strengthened in Vietnam). This distinction is important because institutional compatibility does not itself establish effectiveness.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Disease Management as a Continuous System

The first major finding is that contemporary disease management functions as a continuous system rather than a sequence of isolated clinical activities. Prevention reduces disease risk; surveillance and diagnosis identify threats; treatment limits severity; monitoring evaluates progress; patient engagement supports adherence; community intervention

addresses population-level determinants; and evaluation generates evidence for subsequent preparedness. Chronic conditions require continuous monitoring, while infectious outbreaks require recovery and post-event assessment. Disease management therefore operates through feedback loops rather than a linear beginning and endpoint.

4.2. Integration of Clinical and Public-Health Functions

A second finding is the increasing convergence of clinical care and population-based public health. Screening, surveillance, vaccination, risk communication, treatment, and behavioural support interact across the disease trajectory. Clinicians identify individual risk, diagnose illness, provide treatment, and monitor outcomes, while public-health systems detect epidemiological patterns and coordinate prevention. Effective management depends on information moving between these levels. This integration is especially important for chronic disease, because successful self-management depends on education, healthcare access, family support, and continuing communication with providers (Brady et al., 2000; Fisher et al., 2005).

4.3. Application to Vietnam

The Vietnamese application described in the source material can be organised into six operational stages: surveillance and detection, risk assessment, prevention, preparedness and planning, disease response, and post-event assessment. These stages are broadly consistent with the integrated framework identified above.

Surveillance provides the foundation. Information generated by hospitals, laboratories, local health authorities, CDCs, and other institutions can identify unusual disease patterns and potential outbreaks. Risk assessment then transforms surveillance information into decision-relevant knowledge by considering severity, transmissibility, exposure, vulnerable groups, and environmental factors. Field investigation remains necessary because centralised data may not fully explain local transmission dynamics.

Prevention includes vaccination, hygiene promotion, food safety, vector control, health education, and evidence-based public communication. Preparedness determines whether surveillance findings can be converted into effective action: local health agencies require response plans, trained personnel, medical supplies, laboratory capacity, and coordination protocols before emergencies arise. During an outbreak, rapid coordination between healthcare institutions, government agencies, and communities becomes critical. Post-event assessment should then identify weaknesses, document effective practices, and feed lessons back into future prevention and preparedness.

Public communication should be treated as an operational component of disease management rather than a supporting activity. Accurate and timely information can improve adherence to vaccination, isolation, hygiene, screening, and treatment recommendations, whereas inconsistent messages can reduce public confidence and complicate response measures. For Vietnam, communication protocols should therefore connect national technical guidance with locally appropriate delivery through healthcare providers, schools, community organisations, and local authorities. This is



particularly important when risks are uncertain or changing rapidly, because effective communication must explain both recommended actions and the evidential basis for them.

5. DISCUSSION

The findings suggest that the central challenge in modern disease management is not the absence of individual interventions but the difficulty of integrating them into a coherent system. Prevention, surveillance, clinical treatment, self-management, and public-health response are frequently administered by different organisations. When these components operate independently, information can be delayed, services duplicated, and opportunities for early intervention lost. For Vietnam, strengthening individual hospitals or CDCs alone is therefore insufficient; greater interoperability and coordination are required across organisational levels.

A second implication concerns the simultaneous management of infectious and chronic disease. Outbreak preparedness remains essential because emerging infections can create rapid health and socioeconomic disruption. However, chronic illnesses require equally systematic approaches. Early detection, risk stratification, monitoring, patient education, and coordinated care apply to both domains even though specific interventions differ. A shared management architecture could therefore support more efficient use of health-system resources.

Patient participation is central to such an architecture. Healthcare institutions cannot continuously supervise all behaviours affecting chronic disease. Patients need knowledge and support to monitor symptoms, maintain treatment adherence, and modify relevant behaviours. Evidence on self-management indicates that outcomes depend not only on information provision but also on clinical and community environments that make sustained self-management feasible (Brady et al., 2000; Fisher et al., 2005).

Digital transformation creates important opportunities but should be treated as enabling infrastructure rather than a substitute for institutional capacity. Electronic records, telemedicine, wearable monitoring, and real-time surveillance can improve detection and continuity of care. Yet fragmented databases, digital inequality, limited literacy, privacy concerns, and cybersecurity risks can reduce their effectiveness. In Vietnam, digital modernisation should therefore be combined with investment in primary healthcare, community services, data governance, and equitable access, particularly in rural and remote areas.

An additional implication concerns governance across administrative levels. Integrated disease management requires clear responsibility for data collection, risk interpretation, resource mobilisation, public communication, and clinical escalation. Excessive centralisation may delay responses to local conditions, while excessive fragmentation may produce inconsistent standards and duplicated effort. A more effective arrangement is therefore one in which national institutions establish interoperable standards, technical protocols, and strategic priorities, while provincial and local agencies retain sufficient operational flexibility to respond to epidemiological circumstances. Such vertical coordination is particularly important in Vietnam because surveillance, clinical care, and

community implementation occur through multiple levels of the health system.

Preparedness and institutional learning are equally important. Response planning should precede outbreaks through training exercises, resource inventories, laboratory readiness, communication protocols, and inter-agency coordination. After an event, systematic evaluation should identify delays, resource constraints, information failures, and successful practices. This establishes a learning cycle in which each response strengthens subsequent prevention and preparedness.

The proposed systems perspective is consistent with evidence-based public-health principles because intervention decisions must consider epidemiological evidence together with feasibility, implementation capacity, and population characteristics (Briss et al., 2000; Kohatsu et al., 2004). Vietnam should therefore adapt international principles rather than mechanically import institutional models. The main limitation of this study is its conceptual nature: the source material does not provide comparative data on costs, mortality, surveillance responsiveness, or regional variation. Future research should empirically evaluate provincial surveillance performance, the determinants of patient self-management, preventive programme cost-effectiveness, and the relationship between digital integration and health outcomes.

6. CONCLUSION

Disease management has evolved from reactive treatment into an integrated and adaptive system incorporating prevention, detection, treatment, monitoring, patient participation, community intervention, preparedness, and recovery. Infectious disease threats require rapid surveillance and coordinated public-health action, whereas chronic diseases require continuity of care, behavioural support, and long-term monitoring. In both cases, effectiveness depends on coordination rather than on any single intervention.

Vietnam already possesses important institutional foundations through healthcare facilities, laboratories, surveillance mechanisms, CDCs, and community-based public-health activities. The principal policy challenge is to connect these components more effectively. Priorities include interoperable information systems, risk-based surveillance, preparedness planning, primary healthcare capacity, patient self-management, evidence-based risk communication, and systematic post-event evaluation.

Future reform should therefore move beyond isolated disease-specific programmes towards a coordinated health-system architecture capable of adapting to different categories of risk. Combining scientific evidence, institutional coordination, community participation, and appropriate digital technologies can strengthen Vietnam's capacity to respond to outbreaks while managing the continuing burden of chronic disease. Disease management should ultimately be understood as a continuous process of prevention, detection, response, learning, and adaptation.



REFERENCES

1. Anderson, G. (2010). *Chronic care: Making the case for ongoing care*. R.W.J Foundation.
2. Brady, T. J. (2012). Strategies to support self-management in osteoarthritis. *American Journal of Nursing*, 112, S54–S60.
3. Brady, T. J., Sniezek, J. E., & Conn, D. (2000). Enhancing patient self-management in clinical practice. *Bulletin on the Rheumatic Diseases*, 49(9), 1–4.
4. Briss, P. A., Zaza, S., Pappaioanou, M., Fielding, J., Wright-De Agüero, L., Truman, B. I., Hopkins, D. P., Mullen, P. D., Thompson, R. S., Woolf, S. H., Carande-Kulis, V. G., Anderson, L., Hinman, A. R., McQueen, D. V., Teutsch, S. M., Harris, J. R., & Task Force on Community Preventive Services. (2000). Developing an evidence-based guide to community preventive services – Methods. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 18(1S), 35–43.
5. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2013). 24/7: Saving lives, protecting people. National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion.
6. Fisher, E. B., Brownson, C. A., O'Toole, M. L., Shetty, G., Anwuri, V. V., & Glasgow, R. E. (2005). Ecological approaches to self-management: The case of diabetes. *American Journal of Public Health*, 95, 1523–1535. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2005.066084>
7. Huber, M., Knottnerus, J. A., Green, L., van der Horst, H., Jadad, A. R., Kromhout, D., Leonard, B., Lorig, K., Loureiro, M. I., van der Meer, J. W. M., Schnabel, P., Smith, R., van Weel, C., & Smid, H. (2011). How should we define health? *BMJ*, 343, d4163.
8. Kohatsu, N. D., Robinson, J. G., & Torner, J. C. (2004). Evidence-based public health: An evolving concept. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 27(5), 417–421.
9. Parekh, A. K., Goodman, R. A., Gordon, C., Koh, H. K., & HHS Interagency Workgroup on Multiple Chronic Conditions. (2011). Managing multiple chronic conditions: A strategic framework for improving health outcomes and quality of life. *Public Health Reports*, 126(4), 460–471.