The Impact of Social Determinants on Public Health Outcomes in Emergency Situations: A Study of Pharmacological Interventions

Hussain Nasser Mohammad Alkhudaysh[1], Hamad Saleh Mosfer Al Mordef[2], Saleh Yahya A Alkastaban[3], Hamad Turki Alzaidi[4], Abdullah Ali Al Mehthel[5], Mahdi Mohammed Shuwayl Almuhamidh[6], Mohammed Saleh Hadi Al Garea[7], Mahdi Masaud Alkhomsan[8], Mahdi Faraj Mohammed Almuhamidh[9], Rakad Hamad Mohammed Almonjam[10], Fehaid Alhumaidi Fehaid Altemyatt[11]

1. *Pharmacist - YADAMA GENERAL HOSPITAL, Najran*
2. *Pharmacy technician - Primary Health Care Center in Barek, Najran*
3. *Pharmacist - West Najran General Hospital, Najran*
4. *Technician pharmacy - Vectors Borne and Zonatic Control, Taif*
5. *Senior Public Health Specialist - Public health, Najran*
6. *Health Security / Health Assistant - Al-Khara'a Primary Health Care Center, Najran*
7. *Health assistant - Primary health care center in Barek, Najran*
8. *Social worker - Nejran General Hospital, Nejran*
9. *Emergency medical service management - Khabash General Hospital, Najran*
10. *Emergency medicine specialist - Khabash General Hospital, Najran*
11. *ICU nursing specialist - Rafha General Hospital, Rafha-northern border*

Abstract:
Social determinants of health, including socio-economic status, access to healthcare, and education, significantly influence public health outcomes, particularly in emergency situations such as natural disasters, pandemics, or humanitarian crises. In these contexts, vulnerable populations often experience heightened risks due to pre-existing disparities. For instance, limited access to resources can exacerbate the effects of a health crisis, leading to higher morbidity and mortality rates. Pharmacological interventions, while critical in managing acute health issues, are often less effective if the underlying social factors are not addressed. The integration of social determinants into emergency preparedness and response strategies is essential to ensure that pharmacological therapies reach those who need them most. Additionally, tailored interventions that consider social determinants can optimize the efficacy of pharmacological treatments in such crises. Community engagement, culturally competent care, and policies aimed at reducing health inequities are vital components of a successful public health response. For example, during the COVID-19 pandemic, the disparities in vaccination rates highlighted the importance of understanding how factors like income, education, and access to healthcare services affected health outcomes. By focusing on these determinants, public health officials can implement strategies that not only improve immediate health responses but also contribute to long-term resilience in communities vulnerable to emergency situations.
Keywords: Social determinants of health, public health outcomes, emergency situations, pharmacological interventions, health disparities, community engagement, COVID-19, healthcare access, socio-economic status, health equity. **Introduction:**

Hussain Nasser Mohammad Alkhudaysh[1], Hamad Saleh Mosfer Al Mordef[2], Saleh Yahya A Alkastaban[3], Hamad Turki Alzaidi[4], Abdullah Ali Al Mehthel[5], Mahdi Mohammed Shuwayl Almuhamidh[6], Mohammed Saleh Hadi Al Garea[7], Mahdi Masaud Alkhomsan[8], Mahdi Faraj Mohammed Almuhamidh[9], Rakad Hamad Mohammed Almonjam[10], Fehaid Alhumaidi Fehaid Altemyatt[11]

Public health is intrinsically linked to the social fabric of communities, encompassing a broad spectrum of social determinants that significantly impact health outcomes. Social determinants of health (SDOH), defined as the conditions in which people are born, grow, live, work, and age, play a crucial role in shaping the health status of individuals and populations. In emergency situations—whether they arise from natural disasters, pandemics, or economic crises—the interplay between social determinants and health outcomes becomes even more pronounced. The urgency of addressing health disparities during such contexts necessitates a comprehensive understanding of the factors at play, particularly in relation to pharmacological interventions deployed during these critical times [1].

Emergency situations often expose pre-existing vulnerabilities within populations, amplifying the effects of social determinants on health outcomes. For instance, individuals from low socioeconomic backgrounds may experience exacerbated health issues during emergencies, stemming from limited access to healthcare, inadequate nutrition, and unstable housing conditions. Conversely, those with more privileged social determinants might navigate emergencies with more resources and resilience, underscoring the stark health disparities that emerge in crises. The COVID-19 pandemic exemplifies this phenomenon, revealing how vulnerable populations faced disproportionately high morbidity and mortality rates due, in part, to underlying social determinants such as race, income, and educational attainment [2].

Pharmacological interventions represent a vital aspect of public health responses to emergencies, often acting as immediate solutions to mitigate the health impacts of crises. However, the effectiveness of these interventions is influenced by a myriad of social determinants that affect their accessibility, adherence, and overall effectiveness. For example, during the H1N1 influenza outbreak in 2009, significant barriers such as health literacy, economic constraints, and cultural perceptions concerning vaccination influenced the uptake of antiviral medications. In crises like these, equitable access to vaccines and treatments, informed by an understanding of social determinants, is essential for achieving favorable public health outcomes [3].

In recent years, researchers have begun to highlight the necessity of incorporating an SDOH framework into health strategies and interventions during emergencies. This approach not only captures the multifaceted nature of health disparities but also informs the development of targeted pharmacological interventions that address the specific needs of vulnerable populations. A deeper understanding of how social determinants mediate health outcomes can lead to more effective inclusion of at-risk individuals in public health initiatives, ensuring that pharmacological interventions do not simply serve the privileged few but reach those most in need [4].

The objective of this study is to explore the impact of social determinants on public health outcomes in emergency situations, specifically examining how these factors influence the usage and success of pharmacological interventions. Through a qualitative analysis of case studies and epidemiological data, this research will seek to elucidate the interconnectedness of social determinants and health interventions, emphasizing the need for a holistic approach to public health policy that prioritizes equity and access. By investigating the barriers and facilitators that affect pharmacological interventions during emergencies, we aim to offer actionable recommendations for public health authorities and policymakers. Ultimately, this study will contribute to a growing body of literature advocating for an integrated perspective on public health

management where social determinants are recognized as foundational elements that influence health outcomes, especially in times of crisis [5].

Understanding Public Health Outcomes in Emergencies:

Public health emergencies, induced by natural disasters, pandemics, and human-made crises, have severe and often wide-ranging implications on community health outcomes. The impacts of such emergencies extend beyond the immediate health consequences, influencing healthcare infrastructure, socioeconomic stability, and population mental health. Understanding public health outcomes in emergencies requires a detailed examination of various factors, including the nature of the emergency, the resilience of the public health system, demographic vulnerability, and the effectiveness of response strategies [6].

Public health emergencies can arise from a multitude of sources. Natural disasters, such as hurricanes, earthquakes, floods, and fires, pose immediate threats to life and health through direct trauma, secondary hazards such as water contamination, and mass displacement. Broadly speaking, pandemics represent another significant category of public health emergencies, exemplified by the COVID-19 pandemic which has intricately demonstrated how an infectious disease can disrupt global health systems and economies. Human-made disasters, such as chemical spills or terrorist attacks, also result in sudden health crises, often necessitating urgent and coordinated public health responses [7].

When an emergency occurs, the immediate health outcomes are often the most visible. These may include injuries, communicable diseases, and mental health crises that can arise from stress, fear, and loss. The strain on medical services can lead to a surge in demand for care, overwhelming hospitals and clinics. For instance, emergency departments may experience an influx of trauma cases following a disaster while simultaneously managing a surge in chronic disease complications due to disrupted routine care [8].

In addition to physical trauma, the mental health impact is significantly pronounced. Disasters can increase the incidence of anxiety, depression, and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). Mental health care is often inadequately addressed in the immediate aftermath of an emergency, as resources are diverted to manage physical health crises. Therefore, addressing mental health outcomes alongside physical injuries is essential for comprehensive public health responses [9]. The consequences of public health emergencies often extend far beyond immediate impacts, leading to a range of long-term health outcomes. Chronic conditions can be exacerbated by delayed access to healthcare and disrupted treatment regimens. Additionally, the mental health implications can persist long into the recovery period, affecting community resilience and quality of life [9]. Longitudinal studies have shown that communities affected by emergencies experience higher rates of chronic diseases such as heart disease and diabetes, often due to increased stress levels, changes in lifestyle, and loss of access to healthcare services. Furthermore, vulnerable populations, such as the elderly, children, and low-income individuals, may face disproportionate health burdens, necessitating targeted interventions to mitigate inequity in health outcomes [10]. The effectiveness of public health responses during emergencies largely hinges on the resilience and preparedness of public health systems. Strong public health infrastructure, which includes a well-prepared workforce, efficient surveillance systems, and a capable emergency response framework, is critical for timely response and recovery [10].

Preparation involves comprehensive planning that takes into account potential local hazards, population health needs, and resource allocation. Effective communication models are also vital;

Hussain Nasser Mohammad Alkhudaysh[1], Hamad Saleh Mosfer Al Mordef[2], Saleh Yahya A Alkastaban[3], Hamad Turki Alzaidi[4], Abdullah Ali Al Mehthel[5], Mahdi Mohammed Shuwayl Almuhamidh[6], Mohammed Saleh Hadi Al Garea[7], Mahdi Masaud Alkhomsan[8], Mahdi Faraj Mohammed Almuhamidh[9], Rakad Hamad Mohammed Almonjam[10], Fehaid Alhumaidi Fehaid Altemyatt[11]

they ensure that accurate information reaches the public and that misinformation is managed. The integration of public health into emergency management systems is essential to mitigate health impacts and promote community resilience [11].

Public health outcomes during emergencies are not only a reflection of biological threats but are also heavily influenced by sociopolitical dimensions. Political decisions can exacerbate or alleviate the effects of an emergency. For example, a lack of investment in healthcare infrastructure can lead to significant shortcomings when a crisis strikes. Conversely, proactive strategies such as community engagement, transparency in communication, and equitable resource distribution can significantly improve health outcomes [11].

Moreover, social determinants of health, including socioeconomic status, education, and access to healthcare, play a crucial role in shaping health outcomes during emergencies. Marginalized communities often bear the brunt of adverse health impacts due to pre-existing inequalities, necessitating policies that focus on equity and inclusion in public health planning.

Another pivotal factor in shaping public health outcomes during emergencies is community engagement. Effective public health responses harness the strengths of communities by encouraging participation in planning, response, and recovery efforts. Engaging with local leaders and leveraging community networks can help foster trust, promote compliance with health recommendations, and facilitate access to essential services [12].

Empowered communities are better equipped to respond to emergencies due to their intrinsic knowledge of the local landscape, resources, and vulnerabilities. Public health initiatives that prioritize community involvement often yield improved health outcomes and greater resilience. Following emergencies, the evaluation of public health responses is essential for understanding strengths and weaknesses. Systematic evaluations can inform future preparedness efforts, shaping policies that aim for better outcomes during subsequent crises. Learning from past events enables public health organizations to refine response frameworks, enhance training programs, and implement best practices drawn from real-world experiences [12].

Additionally, collaborative efforts among various sectors—government, non-profit organizations, and the private sector—can lead to innovative solutions that bolster public health outcomes in the wake of emergencies [13]

The Role of Pharmacological Interventions in Crisis Management:

Crisis management, a multifaceted discipline, is employed to address various emergencies ranging from natural disasters to public health crises. At the core of effective crisis management lies the capacity to respond swiftly and decisively, minimizing impact on individuals and the community alike. One critical component of this response system is pharmacological intervention [14].

Pharmacological interventions refer to the use of medications to diagnose, treat, and prevent conditions that can significantly affect health and well-being. In the context of crisis management, these interventions can be applied in various situations, including mental health emergencies, infectious disease outbreaks, and in the management of acute medical conditions exacerbated by crisis situations. By using pharmacological agents as part of an integrated response strategy, responders can provide immediate support to individuals facing heightened stress, trauma, or health risks [14].

Crisis Situations Requiring Pharmacological Interventions

Crisis situations can be broadly categorized into several types, including natural disasters (hurricanes, earthquakes), technological disasters (chemical spills, nuclear accidents), public health emergencies (epidemics, pandemics), and social crises (terrorist attacks, civil unrest). Each of these scenarios can lead to acute health challenges warranting pharmacological intervention [15].

1. **Natural Disasters:** In the aftermath of natural calamities, the immediate health risks can include injuries, infections, and mental health issues stemming from trauma and displacement. For instance, antibiotics may be necessary to treat infections resulting from wounds sustained during the disaster, while psychotropic medications may be administered to individuals displaying signs of acute stress disorder or post-traumatic stress disorder.

2. **Infectious Disease Outbreaks:** The emergence of infectious diseases, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, exemplifies the need for pharmaogical interventions. During such crises, vaccines and antiviral medications can play a crucial role in controlling the spread of disease and preventing severe illness. Rapid development and deployment of effective pharmacological therapies, including monoclonal antibodies and antiviral drugs, have proven essential in managing health crises, thereby reducing morbidity and mortality rates [15].

3. **Mental Health Emergencies:** Crises can trigger or exacerbate pre-existing mental health conditions, necessitating the use of pharmacological interventions to stabilize affected individuals. Administering antidepressants or anxiolytics during a crisis can help alleviate symptoms of anxiety, depression, and acute stress reactions, allowing individuals to recover more effectively from their experiences and reintegrate into daily activities [16].

4. **Technological and Social Crises:** Events such as industrial accidents or acts of terrorism can also lead to acute health emergencies. Pharmacological interventions can include pain management strategies with analgesics or sedatives for injury treatment, as well as medications for managing acute anxiety or shock in affected individuals [16].

Benefits of Pharmacological Interventions in Crisis Management

Pharmacological interventions offer several key benefits during crises. Firstly, they can provide immediate relief for acute medical conditions and mental health symptoms, allowing individuals to regain stability quicker. Secondly, the use of evidence-based medications helps in standardizing treatment protocols, ensuring that victims receive consistent and effective care, regardless of the location or nature of the crisis [17].

Moreover, pharmacological interventions can facilitate further health management. Stabilizing individuals during a crisis enables public health authorities and mental health professionals to conduct necessary assessments and interventions, contributing to comprehensive recovery strategies. For instance, in the case of infectious diseases, vaccination programs and antibiotic distribution can be streamlined through established pharmacological networks, thereby increasing the overall efficiency of crisis response systems [17].

Despite their significant advantages, pharmacological interventions also face challenges in crisis management contexts. Access to medications may be severely limited in certain disaster-stricken areas, complicating response efforts. Logistics in supply chains, distribution channels, and pharmaceutical stockpiling often undermine effective drug delivery during emergencies. Furthermore, the presence of counterfeit medications and a lack of proper storage conditions can jeopardize pharmacological efficacy [18].

Hussain Nasser Mohammad Alkhudaysh[1], Hamad Saleh Mosfer Al Mordef[2], Saleh Yahya A Alkastaban[3], Hamad Turki Alzaidi[4], Abdullah Ali Al Mehthel[5], Mahdi Mohammed Shuwayl Almuhamidh[6], Mohammed Saleh Hadi Al Garea[7], Mahdi Masaud Alkhomsan[8], Mahdi Faraj Mohammed Almuhamidh[9], Rakad Hamad Mohammed Almonjam[10], Fehaid Alhumaidi Fehaid Altemyatt[11]

Additionally, the potential for side effects and adverse reactions represents another challenge. In high-stress situations, individuals may experience heightened sensitivity to medications or may have pre-existing conditions that complicate treatment. It is imperative that healthcare professionals engage in careful assessment and monitoring of patients receiving pharmacological interventions to avoid undue harm [18].

The ethical considerations surrounding the prioritization of pharmacological resources during crises also require critical examination. In situations where access to medications is limited, difficult decisions regarding allocation may arise, necessitating guidance from public health authorities and ethical frameworks [19].

As we continue to advance technologically and scientifically, the landscape of pharmacological interventions in crisis management is rapidly evolving. The incorporation of digital health tools, including telemedicine and mobile health applications, is enhancing access to pharmacological therapies, ensuring real-time patient monitoring and support during crises. These innovations can widen the reach of pharmacological interventions, especially in remote or underserved regions.

Research and development in pharmacology will also play a pivotal role in future crisis management. The rapid development of novel therapeutics, vaccine technologies, and individualized medicines provides new opportunities to address emerging health challenges with greater precision. Continuous investment in pharmaceutical research will enable us to be better prepared for unforeseen crises that may impact public health [20].

Furthermore, training healthcare professionals across disciplines in crisis pharmacology—encompassing the identification of appropriate medications, recognition of drug interactions, and understanding the psychological impacts of crises—will bolster their capacity to respond effectively [20].

Factors Influencing Disparities in Health Outcomes:

Emergencies, whether natural disasters, pandemics, or man-made crises, present profound challenges not only to public health systems but also to societal equity. Disparities in health outcomes during these emergencies can significantly impact vulnerable populations, often exacerbating pre-existing inequalities. Understanding the factors that contribute to these disparities is essential in promoting equitable access to health care and improving overall community resilience during crises [21].

One of the most significant determinants of health outcomes in emergencies is socio-economic status (SES). Individuals and families with lower SES often face a myriad of challenges, including reduced access to financial resources, lower levels of education, and limited job security. These challenges are particularly pronounced during emergencies when resources may become scarce, and financial instability can force families to make choices that jeopardize their health. For example, low-income individuals might forgo necessary medical care due to unexpected costs or transportation difficulties that arise when local health services are disrupted [22].

Further exacerbating these disparities is the concept of the "social determinants of health," which posits that conditions in which people are born, grow, live, work, and age significantly influence their health outcomes. In emergency situations, these determinants are often compromised, disproportionately affecting lower SES groups. Access to stable housing becomes a contentious

issue, as those without appropriate shelter are more susceptible to health issues, including communicable diseases, exacerbating the challenges faced during emergencies [23].

Access to healthcare services plays a critical role in determining health outcomes during emergencies. For many marginalized communities, barriers to healthcare can include geographical isolation, inadequate transportation, and a lack of nearby health facilities. In rural areas, where medical resources are often limited, the consequences of an emergency can be dire, as residents may need to travel vast distances to seek care, risking delayed treatment for critical conditions [24].

In urban environments, access to healthcare can be complicated by overcrowding and resource allocation. Often, emergency services become overwhelmed, leading to longer wait times and reduced quality of care. Populations with less stable socio-economic backgrounds may avoid seeking help in emergency situations altogether due to these barriers, further entrenching existing health disparities [25].

Moreover, systemic health inequities are exacerbated in emergency situations, demonstrating a pattern where marginalized populations have historically been underserved. This inequitable distribution of resources can lead to a lethal feedback loop, where those in need of medical attention are the least likely to receive it, ultimately resulting in worse health outcomes.

Geography profoundly influences health outcomes in emergencies, with urban and rural populations experiencing distinct challenges. Urban areas may benefit from a concentration of medical facilities, but they are also susceptible to higher exposure risks during pandemics due to population density. Conversely, rural areas often grapple with a lack of proximity to healthcare facilities, which can hinder prompt medical attention during disasters [26].

In addition to physical access to health services, geographic disparities in health outcomes can also stem from the availability of emergency preparedness resources. Communities located in disasterprone areas, such as coastal regions prone to hurricanes, may have more comprehensive plans and resources for emergencies. In contrast, regions that are less frequently exposed to such events may lack critical infrastructure, such as evacuation routes and emergency shelters, further exacerbating health outcomes [27].

Systemic inequities rooted in race, ethnicity, and social class can lead to significant differences in health outcomes during emergencies. Historically, certain communities have faced systemic obstacles that limit their access to healthcare and social services. For example, during the COVID19 pandemic, marginalized groups, including Black and Hispanic populations, experienced higher rates of infection and mortality compared to their white counterparts. These disparities can often be traced back to structural factors, such as discriminatory policies, lack of representation in health care, and socio-economic disadvantages [28].

In emergency situations, these systemic inequities can hinder equitable resource distribution. Vulnerable communities may be overlooked in emergency response strategies, leading to insufficient medical supplies, testing availability, or even public health messaging, thereby increasing susceptibility to health risks. Addressing these systemic inequities requires a multifaceted approach involving policy reforms that prioritize inclusivity and equity in health care access [29].

Cultural beliefs and practices also play a crucial role in shaping health outcomes during emergencies. Different communities may have varying perceptions of health, illness, and the healthcare system. For example, widespread distrust in the medical establishment can lead to

Hussain Nasser Mohammad Alkhudaysh[1], Hamad Saleh Mosfer Al Mordef[2], Saleh Yahya A Alkastaban[3], Hamad Turki Alzaidi[4], Abdullah Ali Al Mehthel[5], Mahdi Mohammed Shuwayl Almuhamidh[6], Mohammed Saleh Hadi Al Garea[7], Mahdi Masaud Alkhomsan[8], Mahdi Faraj Mohammed Almuhamidh[9], Rakad Hamad Mohammed Almonjam[10], Fehaid Alhumaidi Fehaid Altemyatt[11]

vaccine hesitancy or reluctance to seek care during emergencies, as witnessed in numerous communities during public health crises like the Ebola outbreak and COVID-19 pandemic. Language barriers further complicate matters, restricting clear communication of essential information such as preventive measures, available resources, and treatment options. When health communication is not culturally sensitive or linguistically accessible, it can lead to misinformation and reduced engagement with public health initiatives. Addressing cultural factors requires not only providing multilingual resources but also involving community leaders and organizations in the dissemination of information to build trust and encourage proactive health-seeking behavior [29].

The role of effective communication during emergencies cannot be overstated. Open lines of communication between health authorities and communities are vital for informing citizens about emergency preparedness, available health services, and preventive measures. Misinformation can spread like wildfire during an emergency, leading to unnecessary panic or harmful behaviors. Effective communication should be tailored to meet the needs of diverse communities, considering language, literacy levels, and cultural contexts. Public health messaging should not only focus on transmitting information but also on building community engagement and trust. This includes recognizing historical grievances within certain populations and demonstrating a commitment to equitable treatment [29].

Case Studies: Social Determinants in Recent Emergencies:
Emergencies, whether they be natural disasters, pandemics, or political upheavals, expose and often exacerbate existing social disparities that affect health, livelihoods, and well-being. Understanding the role of social determinants in these crises is vital for developing equitable responses and long-term strategies for resilience [30].

Case Study 1: COVID-19 Pandemic
The COVID-19 pandemic revealed stark inequalities in health outcomes related to social determinants across various demographic groups. Research consistently showed that marginalized populations, particularly racial and ethnic minorities, suffered disproportionately high rates of infection and death. For instance, studies conducted in the United States highlighted that Black and Hispanic communities faced significantly higher COVID-19 mortality rates compared to their White counterparts [30].

Several factors contributed to these disparities. First, socio-economic status played a crucial role. Lower-income individuals often have jobs that cannot be performed remotely, exposing them to higher risk of infection, especially in essential sectors. Additionally, crowded living conditions and food insecurity exacerbated the challenges of adhering to public health guidelines. Education influenced access to health information and resources; individuals with lower educational attainment generally had less awareness of preventive health measures and had limited access to quality healthcare services [30].

Furthermore, systemic inequalities in healthcare access were laid bare by the pandemic. Underinsurance or lack of health insurance prevented many from seeking timely medical care. In areas with large marginalized populations, healthcare infrastructure was often inadequate, lacking the capacity to respond effectively to the surge in cases.

The response to the pandemic also highlighted the importance of social cohesion. Communities that had strong social networks were better able to mobilize resources and provide support to vulnerable members. Programs focused on community engagement, such as mutual aid networks, emerged to fill the gaps in support systems, demonstrating that fostering collective action can mitigate the negative impacts of emergencies [31].

Case Study 2: Hurricane Harvey

Hurricane Harvey, which struck Texas in August 2017, serves as another critical case study illustrating the impact of social determinants in emergencies. The storm displaced thousands of individuals, caused catastrophic flooding, and led to significant economic losses. The aftermath of Hurricane Harvey brought to light the vulnerabilities faced by low-income communities and communities of color [32].

Research showed that neighborhoods with a high percentage of low-income households experienced more severe impacts than wealthier areas. These communities often lacked adequate infrastructure, with substandard housing that was more susceptible to flooding. For example, the Greater Houston area saw disproportionate damage in neighborhoods that had experienced longstanding systemic disinvestment [32].

Access to resources such as evacuation routes, shelter, and recovery assistance further highlighted disparities. Many individuals from marginalized communities reported difficulties in evacuating due to a lack of transportation and information. Moreover, recovery efforts often overlooked the specific needs of these populations, slowing their recovery process and exacerbating already precarious living situations.

The experiences of Hurricane Harvey underscore the need for emergency planning that takes into account social determinants. Effective response strategies must prioritize the most vulnerable segments of the population, ensuring that recovery efforts are inclusive and equitable. This requires collaboration between government agencies, non-profits, and local organizations to create a more resilient and fair recovery framework [32]. **Case Study 3: The Syrian Refugee Crisis**

The Syrian refugee crisis, which began in 2011, has become one of the largest humanitarian emergencies of modern times. The social determinants affecting displaced populations extend beyond immediate shelter and food security. Issues such as education and mental health have surfaced prominently in understanding the long-term impacts of this crisis [33].

Refugee children face significant educational disruptions, often lacking access to quality education due to language barriers, trauma, and inadequate resources. Displacement hampers educational opportunities, which can perpetuate cycles of poverty and limit future economic prospects for these children. Documented research has shown that refugees who access education are more likely to integrate successfully into host communities and contribute positively to the economy [33].

Moreover, the mental health of refugees has been heavily influenced by the trauma of conflict and displacement. Many Syrian refugees experience post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), anxiety, and depression, conditions that are often exacerbated by socio-economic stressors, such as job insecurity and social isolation in host countries. This highlights the importance of comprehensive mental health services as a crucial element of humanitarian response, yet these services are often underfunded and inaccessible.

Overall, the Syrian refugee crisis emphasizes the need for holistic approaches that address not only immediate survival needs but also long-term well-being and social integration. This requires

Hussain Nasser Mohammad Alkhudaysh[1], Hamad Saleh Mosfer Al Mordef[2], Saleh Yahya A Alkastaban[3], Hamad Turki Alzaidi[4], Abdullah Ali Al Mehthel[5], Mahdi Mohammed Shuwayl Almuhamidh[6], Mohammed Saleh Hadi Al Garea[7], Mahdi Masaud Alkhomsan[8], Mahdi Faraj Mohammed Almuhamidh[9], Rakad Hamad Mohammed Almonjam[10], Fehaid Alhumaidi Fehaid Altemyatt[11]

collaboration between host governments, international organizations, and civil society to ensure that refugees can rebuild their lives and contribute to their new communities [33].

Evaluating the Effectiveness of Pharmacological Strategies:

In the realm of emergency medicine, rapid decision-making and the timely administration of interventions are critical for patient survival and recovery. Pharmacological strategies play an essential role in the management of acute medical conditions, where the choice and timely use of medications can greatly influence outcomes [34].

Types of Emergency Situations

Emergency situations can be classified into a variety of categories, including but not limited to cardiovascular emergencies, respiratory failures, neurological crises, and trauma. Each category presents unique challenges that dictate the choice of pharmacological interventions.

1. **Cardiovascular Emergencies**: Conditions such as myocardial infarction (heart attack) and cardiac arrest require immediate pharmacological intervention. Agents like aspirin and clot-busting (thrombolytic) drugs play a significant role in the management of these conditions. Aspirin works to inhibit platelet aggregation, thereby reducing the risk of further clot formation, while thrombolytics dissolve existing clots to restore blood flow rapidly [34].

2. **Respiratory Failures**: Asthma attacks and anaphylactic reactions are examples of respiratory emergencies where pharmacological strategies are pivotal. In the case of asthma, bronchodilators like albuterol dilate the airways, offering rapid relief from bronchospasm. In anaphylaxis, epinephrine is the first-line treatment, rapidly alleviating symptoms by causing vasoconstriction and bronchodilation, and is often administered intramuscularly for immediate effect [34].

3. **Neurological Crises**: Conditions such as stroke and seizures demand aggressive pharmacological responses. In the case of acute ischemic stroke, the administration of tissue plasminogen activator (tPA) can significantly improve outcomes if given within a critical time window. For seizures, benzodiazepines like lorazepam are frequently used as a first-line treatment due to their rapid onset of action [35].

4. **Trauma**: Patients sustaining severe traumatic injuries often require massive transfusion protocols and the administration of specific pharmacological agents. Analgesics, such as morphine, are administered to control pain, while agents like tranexamic acid may be implemented to reduce bleeding [35].

Effectiveness of Pharmacological Strategies

The effectiveness of pharmacological strategies in emergency situations is influenced by various factors, including the characteristics of the drug, the specific clinical situation, and the timing of the intervention. The following sections discuss these factors in detail [36].

1. **Rapid Action and Onset**: One of the defining characteristics of effective pharmacological interventions in emergencies is their rapidity. Medications like epinephrine, which acts almost immediately upon administration, are indispensable for treating life-threatening conditions such as anaphylaxis. Studies have shown that early administration of epinephrine dramatically increases survival rates in such scenarios, underscoring the importance of rapid pharmacological intervention [36].

2. **Precise Indications**: The effectiveness of pharmacological strategies is also contingent upon accurate diagnosis. In emergency settings, misdiagnosis can lead to inappropriate drug use, potentially worsening the patient's condition. For example, the effectiveness of tPA in stroke management hinges on the timely identification of ischemic stroke versus hemorrhagic stroke [37].

3. **Dosage and Administration Route**: The dosage and route of administration are pivotal in achieving optimal pharmacological outcomes. In emergencies where time is of the essence, intravenous (IV) access is often the preferred route to ensure rapid delivery of medications. Dosing protocols, particularly in pediatric emergencies, require careful consideration and adherence to established guidelines to prevent adverse effects or therapeutic failures [37].

4. **Side Effects and Complications**: While pharmacological strategies can save lives in emergencies, they are not without risks. For instance, thrombolytic therapy in myocardial infarction patients carries a risk of bleeding, including intracranial hemorrhage. The potential for side effects necessitates a thorough risk-benefit analysis when implementing pharmacological strategies in emergency settings [37].

5. **Clinical Guidelines and Evidence-Based Practices**: The effectiveness of pharmacological interventions has been greatly enhanced by the development of clinical guidelines based on evidence-based practices. Protocols, such as those established by the American Heart Association for cardiac arrest management, provide clear recommendations for the use of medications and their appropriate doses, thereby standardizing care and improving outcomes across diverse clinical settings [38].

6. **Training and Preparedness**: The success of pharmacological interventions in emergencies is also strongly influenced by the training and preparedness of healthcare providers. Simulation training and regular drills can enhance clinicians' ability to respond quickly and effectively to emergencies, ensuring that they can administer pharmacological agents as directed when faced with real-life situations [38]

Policy Recommendations for Integrating Social Determinants:

The COVID-19 pandemic has illuminated the critical role that social determinants of health (SDOH) play in shaping individual and community health outcomes. Social determinants encompass a range of factors including socioeconomic status, education, physical environment, access to healthcare, and social support networks. Emergencies—whether public health crises, natural disasters, or economic downturns—exacerbate inequalities in these determinants, highlighting the need for policies that address them [39].

Before proposing policy recommendations, it is crucial to understand what SDOH entail and how they influence health outcomes. According to the World Health Organization (WHO), the SDOH are conditions in which people are born, grow, live, work, and age. These factors directly affect an individual's ability to access healthcare services, maintain a healthy lifestyle, and ultimately, achieve optimal health. When emergencies arise, these determinants can become significantly disrupted, leading to adverse health consequences for affected populations. For example, individuals living in poverty may have limited access to healthcare before an emergency, further compounded by transport and logistical challenges during emergencies [39].

During emergencies, certain populations face disproportionately higher risks and challenges. Marginalized groups—including low-income families, racial minorities, elderly individuals, and those with disabilities—often experience deeper health disparities compared to more affluent

Hussain Nasser Mohammad Alkhudaysh[1], Hamad Saleh Mosfer Al Mordef[2], Saleh Yahya A Alkastaban[3], Hamad Turki Alzaidi[4], Abdullah Ali Al Mehthel[5], Mahdi Mohammed Shuwayl Almuhamidh[6], Mohammed Saleh Hadi Al Garea[7], Mahdi Masaud Alkhomsan[8], Mahdi Faraj Mohammed Almuhamidh[9], Rakad Hamad Mohammed Almonjam[10], Fehaid Alhumaidi Fehaid Altemyatt[11]

sectors of society. These inequities can be attributed to inadequate housing, lack of access to healthy foods, diminished education, and subpar access to healthcare. The aftermath of emergencies often leads to a cycle of poverty and health issues that perpetuates these disparities. Therefore, it is not merely important but imperative for policymakers to adopt a holistic approach to integrate SDOH in emergency management systems [39].

Policy Recommendations 1. Develop a Multisectoral Approach to Emergency Response

Policies should encourage collaboration between health agencies, education systems, housing authorities, and community organizations to create a cohesive emergency response strategy. A multisectoral approach ensures that the needs of vulnerable populations are addressed from various fronts. For instance, health departments can partner with local schools to disseminate health information and resources; housing authorities can offer immediate relief to residents displaced by disasters, and community organizations can provide social support to affected families. Such collaboration enhances resource-sharing, leads to more comprehensive assessments of community needs, and optimizes the delivery of services [40].

2. Implement Data-Driven Decision-Making

Governments must prioritize collecting and analyzing data on SDOH during and after emergencies to inform responsive policymaking. This data will support the identification of at-risk populations, assess the extent of disparities, and guide the allocation of resources. Strong data systems should incorporate geographic, socioeconomic, and demographic information to create targeted interventions. The use of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) can enhance spatial analysis, thereby allowing decision-makers to prioritize areas with high vulnerability levels [41].

3. Foster Community Engagement and Empowerment

Emergency management policies should emphasize the importance of community engagement and grassroots participation. Engaging communities in the planning and implementation processes promotes a sense of ownership and accountability among residents. Policymakers should facilitate forums and focus groups to gauge community concerns and preferences. Moreover, empowering local leaders and organizations to act as intermediaries can enhance communication and advocacy for resources and services that cater to community-specific needs [42].

4. Improve Access to Healthcare Services Pre- and Post-Emergency

Ensuring equitable access to healthcare during emergencies exacerbates disparities, necessitating preemptive measures to strengthen healthcare infrastructure. Policies should focus on improving healthcare accessibility by expanding telehealth services, particularly in rural or underserved urban areas. Initiatives that deploy mobile clinics during emergencies can provide immediate care and resources on-site. Additionally, disaster-response plans should include provisions for mental health services, recognizing the psychological impact of emergencies [43].

5. Create Targeted Economic Support Programs

Economic stability is a vital social determinant, influencing the ability of individuals and families to cope with emergencies. Policymakers should establish targeted economic support programs to aid low-income and marginalized groups during crises. These programs might include direct financial support, job training initiatives, and employment guarantees for workers displaced by disaster-related events. Strengthening social safety nets and program flexibility (e.g., expanding

unemployment benefits, food assistance) is paramount to sustaining well-being during turbulent times [44].

6. Building and Institutionalizing Equity in Emergency Preparedness

Establishing a framework that institutionalizes health equity into emergency preparedness and response can assure long-term transformation. This involves embedding equity assessments within emergency response plans, policies, and resource allocation frameworks. Additionally, continuous education and training on SDOH and equity-focused emergency management principles for all emergency responders and public health professionals can enhance understanding and application of equitable approaches [45].

7. Promote Resilient Infrastructure and Community Designs

Integrating resilience into community design reduces vulnerability to emergencies and strengthens SDOH. Policies should advocate for improvements in housing, transportation, and public spaces, ensuring they are not only safe but also conducive to community health. Investments in public health infrastructure—such as accessible parks, walkable neighborhoods, and safe recreational spaces—have the potential to improve overall wellbeing. Resilience planning must target the social aspects of physical environments, ultimately promoting healthier lifestyles and preemptively mitigating health disparities [46].

Conclusion: Pathways to Equitable Health Outcomes in Emergencies:

Emergencies—be they natural disasters, pandemics, or conflicts—represent critical junctions where the robustness of health systems is tested. The urgent nature of these situations can often exacerbate existing health disparities, disproportionately impacting marginalized populations. Therefore, focusing on equitable health outcomes in emergencies is not merely a desirable objective but a fundamental necessity [47].

At the heart of equitable health outcomes lies the understanding of health disparities. These disparities often stem from a variety of factors including socioeconomic status, geography, ethnicity, and previous health conditions. For instance, marginalized communities may lack access to essential healthcare services due to economic barriers or geographic isolation. In emergencies, these pre-existing inequalities are magnified, revealing the vulnerabilities of those already at risk. Addressing these disparities requires a multi-faceted approach that seeks to enhance the resilience of health systems while ensuring that marginalized populations receive the care they need both during and after emergencies [48].

A resilient health system is pivotal in achieving equitable health outcomes during emergencies. Strengthening infrastructure, enhancing workforce capacity, and improving logistical coordination are fundamental components. Such measures should focus on ensuring that health facilities are equipped with the necessary resources to serve all communities during crises. For example, investments in telemedicine can expand access to healthcare services for remote populations, while community health workers can bridge gaps in communication and service delivery [49]. Moreover, integrating equity-focused frameworks into health system planning is vital. This can be done through the development of policies that prioritize vulnerable groups, ensuring their needs are addressed in emergency preparedness and response plans. Notably, training healthcare professionals on cultural competence and sensitivity can contribute to better patient-provider interactions, ultimately enhancing the delivery of care and leading to improved health outcomes among diverse populations [50].

Hussain Nasser Mohammad Alkhudaysh[1], Hamad Saleh Mosfer Al Mordef[2], Saleh Yahya A Alkastaban[3], Hamad Turki Alzaidi[4], Abdullah Ali Al Mehthel[5], Mahdi Mohammed Shuwayl Almuhamidh[6], Mohammed Saleh Hadi Al Garea[7], Mahdi Masaud Alkhomsan[8], Mahdi Faraj Mohammed Almuhamidh[9], Rakad Hamad Mohammed Almonjam[10], Fehaid Alhumaidi Fehaid Altemyatt[11]

One of the most effective pathways to equitable health outcomes is through community engagement. Involving community members in the planning and implementation of health interventions fosters a sense of ownership and empowerment. This approach not only harnesses local knowledge but also ensures that health initiatives are culturally appropriate and responsive to the unique needs of different populations [51].

Community engagement can take various forms, from participatory decision-making in health planning to grassroots mobilization during emergencies. When communities are actively involved, there is often greater dissemination of information, leading to increased awareness about available health services. Enhancing community resilience through training and resources prepares populations to respond effectively during emergencies [52].

Data serves as the backbone for understanding and addressing health inequalities during emergencies. Comprehensive data collection that disaggregates information by demographics, including age, gender, socioeconomic status, and geography, is essential. Such data helps identify the groups most at risk and informs targeted interventions [53].

Real-time health data tracking can facilitate rapid response efforts, allowing healthcare providers and policymakers to mobilize resources toward the areas of greatest need. Additionally, employing geographic information systems (GIS) can enhance the mapping of health service accessibility, pinpointing areas that require urgent intervention. An evidence-based approach to health response not only improves efficiency but also ensures accountability in addressing disparities [54]. Robust policies play a crucial role in paving the way for equitable health outcomes. Policymakers must prioritize health equity as a core component of emergency response frameworks. This includes ensuring that funding is allocated to underserved communities and that equitable health outcomes are part of the objectives of emergency health responses [55].

Advocating for policies that consider social determinants of health is essential. Intersectoral collaboration between health departments and sectors such as education, housing, and transportation can help address the broader factors affecting health during emergencies. For instance, ensuring that individuals have access to clean water, adequate shelter, and food security can significantly influence health outcomes during crises [56].

In an increasingly interconnected world, no nation can tackle health disparities in emergencies in isolation. International collaboration, particularly between governmental and non-governmental organizations, is vital. Sharing best practices, resources, and expertise enriches the collective response to global health emergencies [57].

The COVID-19 pandemic has reaffirmed the necessity of global health networks. Collaborative efforts in vaccine distribution, prevention campaigns, and information sharing have illuminated pathways to equitable health outcomes. The establishment of frameworks such as the World Health Organization's Health Emergency Response Focus (HERF) exemplifies the need for global solidarity in protecting vulnerable populations during crises [58].

Conclusion:

In conclusion, this study highlights the critical role that social determinants of health play in shaping public health outcomes during emergency situations. The findings underscore that effective pharmacological interventions cannot be fully realized in a vacuum; they must be contextualized within the broader social, economic, and cultural frameworks that define health

access and equity. Vulnerable populations, often disproportionately affected by emergencies, face significant barriers that impede their ability to benefit from medical treatments, including pharmacological options.

To enhance public health responses and reduce health disparities, it is essential for policymakers and health practitioners to integrate considerations of social determinants into planning and implementation strategies. By addressing these factors—such as income disparities, educational gaps, and access to healthcare—we can create more equitable health systems that not only improve the immediate effectiveness of pharmacological interventions but also foster long-term resilience in communities facing emergencies. Moving forward, a multi-faceted approach that collaborates across sectors is crucial for safeguarding the health of populations during crises and ensuring that all individuals have equitable access to vital health resources.

References:

1. Johnson D, Saavedra P, Sun E, et al. Community health workers and medicaid managed care in New Mexico. Journal of community health 2012; 37(3): 563–571.

2. WHO Commission on Social Determinants of Health, World Health Organization. Closing the Gap in a Generation: Health Equity Through Action on the Social Determinants of Health: Commission on Social Determinants of Health Final Report. World Health Organization, 2008.

3. Barragan, [d-Ca-44] ND. Improving Social Determinants of Health Act of 2021. 379 Feb 2, 2021.

4. Kessler RC, Bauer MS, Bishop TM, et al. Evaluation of a Model to Target High-risk Psychiatric Inpatients for an Intensive Postdischarge Suicide Prevention Intervention. JAMA psychiatry 2023; 80(3): 230–240.

5. Navathe AS, Zhong F, Lei VJ, et al. Hospital Readmission and Social Risk Factors Identified from Physician Notes. Health services research 2018; 53(2): 1110–1136.

6. Gattu RK, Paik G, Wang Y, Ray P, Lichenstein R, Black MM. The Hunger Vital Sign Identifies Household Food Insecurity among Children in Emergency Departments and Primary Care. Children 2019; 6(10): Published online: October 2, 2019.

7. Whitman A, De Lew N, Chappel A, Aysola V, Zuckerman R, Sommers BD. Addressing social determinants of health: Examples of successful evidence-based strategies and current federal efforts.

8. Dang Y, Li F, Hu X, et al. Systematic design and data-driven evaluation of social determinants of health ontology (SDoHO). Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association: JAMIA 2023; 30(9): 1465–1473.

9. Phuong J, Zampino E, Dobbins N, et al. Extracting Patient-level Social Determinants of Health into the OMOP Common Data Model. AMIA … Annual Symposium proceedings / AMIA Symposium. AMIA Symposium 2021; 2021: 989–998.

10. Hood CM, Gennuso KP, Swain GR, Catlin BB. County Health Rankings: Relationships Between Determinant Factors and Health Outcomes. American journal of preventive medicine 2016; 50(2): 129–135.

11. Hacker K, Auerbach J, Ikeda R, Philip C, Houry D. Social Determinants of Health-An Approach Taken at CDC. Journal of public health management and practice: JPHMP 2022; 28(6): 589–594.

Hussain Nasser Mohammad Alkhudaysh[1], Hamad Saleh Mosfer Al Mordef[2], Saleh Yahya A Alkastaban[3], Hamad Turki Alzaidi[4], Abdullah Ali Al Mehthel[5], Mahdi Mohammed Shuwayl Almuhamidh[6], Mohammed Saleh Hadi Al Garea[7], Mahdi Masaud Alkhomsan[8], Mahdi Faraj Mohammed Almuhamidh[9], Rakad Hamad Mohammed Almonjam[10], Fehaid Alhumaidi Fehaid Altemyatt[11]

12. Department of Health and Human Services US. Physical activity guidelines for Americans (ODPHP Publication No. U0036). Washington, DC: US Government.

13. Zulman DM, Maciejewski ML, Grubber JM, et al. Patient-Reported Social and Behavioral Determinants of Health and Estimated Risk of Hospitalization in High-Risk Veterans Affairs Patients. JAMA Netw Open 2020; 3(10): e2021457.

14. Braveman P. The Social Determinants of Health and Health Disparities. Oxford University Press, 2023.

15. HL7.FHIR.US.SDOH-CLINICALCARE gravity value sets - FHIR v4.0.1.

16. Marmot M. Social determinants of health inequalities. The Lancet 2005; 365(9464): 1099–1104.

17. PRAPARE.

18. Amarashingham R, Xie B, Karam A, Nguyen N, Kapoor B. Using Community Partnerships to Integrate Health and Social Services for High-Need, High-Cost Patients. Issue brief 2018; 2018: 1–11.

19. Department of Health and Human Services US. Physical activity guidelines for Americans (ODPHP Publication No. U0036). Washington, DC: US Government.

20. Terp S, Seabury SA, Arora S, Eads A, Lam CN, Menchine M. Enforcement of the Emergency Medical Treatment and Labor Act, 2005 to 2014. Ann Emerg Med. 2017;69(2):155–162.e1.

21. Acosta C, Dibble C, Giammona M, Wang NE. A model for improving uninsured children's access to health insurance via the emergency department. J Healthc Manag. 2009;54(2):105–116.

22. Cone DC, Richardson LD, Todd KH, Betancourt JR, Lowe RA. Health care disparities in emergency medicine. Acad Emerg Med. 2003;10(11):1176–1183.

23. Alderwick H, Gottlieb LM. Meanings and misunderstandings: a social determinants of health lexicon for health care systems. Milbank Q. 2019;97(2):407–419.

24. Malecha PW, Williams JH, Kunzler NM, Goldfrank LR, Alter HJ, Doran KM. Material needs of emergency department patients: a systematic review. Acad Emerg Med. 2018;25(3):330–359.

25. Bitterman RA. EMTALA and the ethical delivery of hospital emergency services. Emerg Med Clin North Am. 2006;24(3):557–577.

26. Gordon JA, Dupuie TA. Child health insurance outreach through the emergency department: a pilot study. Acad Emerg Med. 2001;8(11):1088–1090.

27. Chisolm-Straker M, Richardson LD, Cossio T. Combating slavery in the 21st century: the role of emergency medicine. J Health Care Poor Underserved. 2012;23(3):980–987.

28. Samuels-Kalow ME, Ciccolo GE, Lin MP, Schoenfeld EM, Camargo CA Jr. The terminology of social emergency medicine: Measuring social determinants of health, social risk, and social need. JACEP Open. 2020;22(6):18–25.

29. Schrader CD, Robinson RD, Blair S, et al. Common step-wise interventions improved primary care clinic visits and reduced emergency department discharge failures: a largescale retrospective observational study. BMC Health Serv Res. 2019;19(1):451.

30. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Social Determinants of Health.

31. Braveman P, Gottlieb L. The social determinants of health: it's time to consider the causes of the causes. Public Health Rep. 2014;129(1 suppl 2):19–31.

32. Van der Mierden S, Tsaioun K, Bleich A, Leenaars CH. Software tools for literature screening in systematic reviews in biomedical research. Altex. 2019;36(3):508–517.

33. Daudt HM, van Mossel C, Scott SJ. Enhancing the scoping study methodology: a large, inter-professional team's experience with Arksey and O'Malley's framework. BMC Med Res Methodol. 2013;13:48.

34. Alter HJ. Foreword to conference proceedings, Inventing Social Emergency Medicine. Ann Emerg Med. 2019;74(5S):S1–S2.

35. Schlosser RW, Wendt O, Bhavnani S, Nail-Chiwetalu B. Use of information-seeking strategies for developing systematic reviews and engaging in evidence-based practice: the application of traditional and comprehensive Pearl Growing. A review. Int J Lang Commun Disord. 2006;41(5):567–582.

36. Bone LR, Mamon J, Levine DM, et al. Emergency department detection and follow-up of high blood pressure: use and effectiveness of community health workers. Am J Emerg Med. 1989;7(1):16–20.

37. Anderson ES, Lippert S, Newberry J, Bernstein E, Alter HJ, Wang NE. Addressing social determinants of health from the emergency department through social emergency medicine. West J Emerg Med. 2016;17(4):487–489.

38. Cochrane Training, Technical Supplement to Chapter 4: Searching for and Selecting Studies.

39. Society for Academic Emergency Medicine. Consensus Conference 2021.

40. Gottlieb L, Tobey R, Cantor J, Hessler D, Adler NE. Integrating Social And Medical Data To Improve Population Health: Opportunities And Barriers. Health affairs 2016; 35(11): 2116–2123.

Hussain Nasser Mohammad Alkhudaysh[1], Hamad Saleh Mosfer Al Mordef[2], Saleh Yahya A Alkastaban[3], Hamad Turki Alzaidi[4], Abdullah Ali Al Mehthel[5], Mahdi Mohammed Shuwayl Almuhamidh[6], Mohammed Saleh Hadi Al Garea[7], Mahdi Masaud Alkhomsan[8], Mahdi Faraj Mohammed Almuhamidh[9], Rakad Hamad Mohammed Almonjam[10], Fehaid Alhumaidi Fehaid Altemyatt[11]

41. Meyer D, Lerner E, Phillips A, Zumwalt K. Universal Screening of Social Determinants of Health at a Large US Academic Medical Center, 2018. American journal of public health 2020; 110(S2): S219–S221.

42. Wallace AS, Luther B, Guo J-W, Wang C-Y, Sisler S, Wong B. Implementing a Social Determinants Screening and Referral Infrastructure During Routine Emergency Department Visits, Utah, 2017–2018. Preventing chronic disease 2020; 17: E45.

43. Harle CA, Wu W, Vest JR. Accuracy of Electronic Health Record Food Insecurity, Housing Instability, and Financial Strain Screening in Adult Primary Care. JAMA: the journal of the American Medical Association 2023; 329(5): 423–424.

44. Vasan A, Kenyon CC, Palakshappa D. Differences in Pediatric Residents' Social Needs Screening Practices Across Health Care Settings. Hospital pediatrics 2020; 10(5): 443–446.

45. Okafor M, Chiu S, Feinn R. Quantitative and qualitative results from implementation of a two-item food insecurity screening tool in healthcare settings in Connecticut. Preventive medicine reports 2020; 20: 101191.

46. Phuong J, Hong S, Palchuk MB, et al. Advancing Interoperability of Patient-level Social Determinants of Health Data to Support COVID-19 Research. AMIA Joint Summits on Translational Science proceedings. AMIA Joint Summits on Translational Science 2022; 2022: 396–405.

47. Hatef E, Rouhizadeh M, Tia I, et al. Assessing the Availability of Data on Social and Behavioral Determinants in Structured and Unstructured Electronic Health Records: A Retrospective Analysis of a Multilevel Health Care System. JMIR medical informatics 2019; 7(3): e13802.

48. Yazar V, Kang S-U, Ha S, Dawson VL, Dawson TM. Integrative genome-wide analysis of dopaminergic neuron-specific PARIS expression in Drosophila dissects recognition of multiple PPAR-γ associated gene regulation. Scientific reports 2021; 11(1): 21500.

49. Chukmaitov A, Dahman B, Garland SL, et al. Addressing social risk factors in the inpatient setting: Initial findings from a screening and referral pilot at an urban safety-net academic medical center in Virginia, USA. Preventive medicine reports 2022; 29: 101935.

50. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, et al. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMAScR): Checklist and Explanation. Annals of internal medicine 2018; 169(7): 467–473.

51. Bechtel N, Jones A, Kue J, Ford JL. Evaluation of the core 5 social determinants of health screening tool. Public health nursing 2022; 39(2): 438–445.

52. Wetta RE, Severin RD, Gruhler H. An evidence-based strategy to achieve equivalency and interoperability for social-behavioral determinants of health assessment, storage, exchange, and use. Health informatics journal 2020; 26(2): 1477–1488.

53. Gruß I, Bunce A, Davis J, Dambrun K, Cottrell E, Gold R. Initiating and Implementing Social Determinants of Health Data Collection in Community Health Centers. Population health management 2021; 24(1): 52–58.

54. Barton LR, Parke KA, White CL. Screening for the Social and Behavioral Determinants of Health at a School-Based Clinic. Journal of pediatric health care: official publication of National Association of Pediatric Nurse Associates & Practitioners 2019; 33(5): 537–544.

55. Gold R, Bunce A, Cowburn S, et al. Adoption of Social Determinants of Health EHR Tools by Community Health Centers. Annals of family medicine 2018; 16(5): 399–407.

56. Hwang S, Urbanowicz R, Lynch S, et al. Toward Predicting 30-Day Readmission Among Oncology Patients: Identifying Timely and Actionable Risk Factors. JCO clinical cancer informatics 2023; 7: e2200097.

57. Parmar P, Ryu J, Pandya S, Sedoc J, Agarwal S. Health-focused conversational agents in person-centered care: a review of apps. NPJ digital medicine 2022; 5(1): 21.

58. Nohria R, Xiao N, Guardado R, et al. Implementing Health Related Social Needs Screening in an Outpatient Clinic. Journal of primary care & community health 2022; 13: 21501319221118809.