The Role of a Multidisciplinary Approach in the Prevention and Management of Heart Disease Insights from Nursing, Public Health, General Medicine, and Laboratory Sciences

Wadha Hassan Alzuraiq[1], Sarah Saad Albishi[2], Eman Abdulrahman Alshalhoob[3], Mujtaba Fawzi Al Jasim[4], Murtadha Abbas Alnajjar[5], Entsar Abdulaziz A. Abdulsabour[6], Hussain Sami Mohammed Alramadhan[7], Hashem Sharaf Al-Shakhss[8], Ali Mohammed Al-Ali[9], Abeer Abdullah Alharbi[10]

[1] Nurse Technician, Al-Khuzama (Koohji) PHC, Email: walzuraiq@moh.gov.sa
[2] Nursing Technician, PHC-Aljessr, Email: seso.s@hotmail.com
[3] Nurse Specialist, Alahsa Health Cluster, Email: amoon1988_1@hotmail.com
[4] Public Health, Qatif Preventive Medicine, Email: mujtaba282@gmail.com
[5] Nursing, Eradah Complex Dammam, Email: man_522@hotmail.com
[6] Health Security, King Abdullah Medical Complex, Email: eabdulsabour@moh.gov.sa
[7] General Practitioner, Email: door_999@hotmail.com
[8] Operating Room Nursing Technician, King Fahd Hospital, Al-Ahsa Health Cluster, Email: hsalshakhs@moh.gov.sa
[9] Operating Room Nursing Technician, King Fahd Hospital, Al-Ahsa Health Cluster, Email: aalali6@moh.gov.sa
[10] Laboratory Technician, King Fahad Medical City, Riyadh, Email: abaalharby@moh.gov.sa

Abstract

Cardiovascular disease (CVD) remains the leading cause of global mortality, necessitating a paradigm shift from a siloed, reactive model of care to a comprehensive, proactive, and integrated approach. This research paper critically examines the indispensable role of a multidisciplinary framework in the prevention and management of heart disease, drawing upon the distinct yet synergistic contributions of Nursing, Public Health, General Medicine, and Laboratory Sciences. The analysis demonstrates that nursing provides the essential bridge to patient-centered care through education, advocacy, and chronic disease management. Public health offers the foundational population-wide strategy via epidemiology, risk stratification, and policy interventions. General medicine acts as the central coordinator for longitudinal care, diagnosis, and treatment optimization. Laboratory sciences underpin evidence-based decisions with precise diagnostic and monitoring data. The paper further explores the conceptual models for integration, identifies significant barriers to interdisciplinary collaboration—including professional hierarchies and ineffective health information systems—and proposes key facilitators, such as interprofessional education and interoperable technology. The central thesis is that the prevention and optimal management of heart disease are unattainable through isolated efforts; superior patient outcomes, enhanced quality of life, and efficient resource utilization are fundamentally dependent on the seamless, collaborative integration of these four core disciplines.

Keywords Multidisciplinary Approach, Heart Disease Prevention, Cardiovascular Disease Management, Interdisciplinary Collaboration, Nursing Roles, Public Health Epidemiology, Primary Care Medicine, Laboratory Diagnostics, Patient-Centered Care, Chronic Care Model.

Introduction

Cardiovascular disease (CVD), with ischemic heart disease at its forefront, remains the undisputed leading cause of mortality and a significant source of global morbidity and disability [1]. For decades, the battle against this pervasive health challenge has been fought on numerous fronts, yet often through fragmented and siloed efforts. The traditional model of care, heavily centered on the general physician or cardiologist intervening after the manifestation of clinical symptoms, has proven necessary but insufficient in curbing the escalating global burden of heart disease [2]. This reactive paradigm, while adept at managing acute events and chronic symptoms, often overlooks the complex, multifaceted genesis of CVD, which is rooted in a intricate interplay of genetic predisposition, physiological processes, behavioral patterns, and broader social, economic, and environmental determinants [3]. The limitations of this unilateral approach have become increasingly apparent, prompting a paradigm shift in both clinical and public health thinking. This shift moves away from isolated specialization towards a more holistic, integrated, and collaborative framework: the multidisciplinary approach.

The very nature of heart disease demands such a comprehensive strategy. It is not a monolithic entity but a progressive condition influenced by a cascade of factors, from subcellular pathological changes to societal-level influences. The journey of a single patient with heart failure, for example, encapsulates this complexity. It begins with risk factors like hypertension and dyslipidemia, often undetected for years, progresses through potentially preventable acute events like myocardial infarction, and culminates in a chronic condition requiring long-term pharmacological management, lifestyle overhaul, and psychological support [4]. No single healthcare professional possesses the breadth of expertise to navigate this entire continuum effectively. Consequently, the multidisciplinary approach has emerged not as a mere alternative, but as an essential, evidence-based standard for achieving superior patient outcomes, enhancing the quality of life, and implementing cost-effective care [5]. This model strategically leverages the distinct yet complementary skills of diverse professionals, creating a synergistic team whose collective impact is far greater than the sum of its individual parts.

The foundation of any effective healthcare system is a robust primary care and general medicine framework, serving as the first point of contact and the longitudinal coordinator of patient care. The general practitioner (GP) or primary care physician acts as the diagnostic detective and the central hub in the multidisciplinary network. Their role is paramount in the early identification of at-risk individuals through systematic risk assessment using tools like the WHO risk charts or the Framingham risk score [6]. They are responsible for initiating and titrating first-line pharmacological therapies, such as antihypertensives and statins, and managing comorbidities like diabetes that significantly exacerbate cardiovascular risk. Furthermore, the GP provides continuity of care, fostering a long-term therapeutic relationship that is crucial for chronic disease management. However, their effectiveness is magnified exponentially when their diagnostic and management plans are informed by and integrated with the expertise of other specialists. They rely on data, interpret clinical signs, and make referrals, making their role interdependent with the rest of the team.

Complementing the clinical focus of general medicine, the field of Public Health provides the indispensable population-wide perspective, addressing the "upstream" determinants of heart disease. Public health strategies operate on the principle that it is more effective and efficient to prevent a disease from occurring in a population than to treat it in individuals after it manifests. This discipline employs epidemiological surveillance to track disease trends, identifies population-level risk factors, and designs, implements, and evaluates large-scale interventions [7]. These interventions include public policy advocacy for tobacco control and trans-fat bans, health promotion campaigns to encourage physical activity and healthy eating, and community-based programs for blood pressure screening and education. Public health efforts create the environmental and social conditions that enable individuals to make healthier choices, thereby reducing the overall incidence of heart disease. This population-based approach alleviates the burden on clinical services and provides the foundational context within which all other clinical interventions operate. The success of a public health campaign, such as a national salt reduction initiative, can be measured by a downstream reduction in hypertension prevalence, which is then managed at the clinical level by GPs and nurses [8].

While public health and general medicine set the stage, the disciplines of Nursing and Laboratory Sciences provide the critical, hands-on execution and the essential scientific evidence that guide clinical decision-making. The nursing profession is the backbone of patient-centered care, bridging the gap between medical diagnosis and the patient's daily lived experience. Nurses are on the frontline, providing continuous monitoring, patient education, and psychosocial support. Their role is particularly vital in empowering patients for self-management, a cornerstone of chronic heart disease care [9]. A cardiac nurse educates a patient on medication adherence, sodium restriction, and symptom monitoring (e.g., daily weight checks for heart failure patients). Furthermore, nurse-led clinics have demonstrated remarkable efficacy in improving risk factor control, reducing hospital readmission rates, and enhancing patient satisfaction [10]. The nurse's holistic view of the patient—considering their physical, emotional, and social needs—ensures that the treatment plan is not only medically sound but also practical and sustainable for the individual.

Underpinning the clinical decisions made by physicians and nurses is the objective, data-driven world of Laboratory Sciences. Often considered the "silent partner" in patient care, the clinical laboratory provides the definitive biomarkers that are crucial for every stage of cardiovascular care. The role of laboratory science begins with risk stratification, using lipid profiles and high-sensitivity C-reactive protein (hs-CRP) assays [11]. It is central to diagnosis, with cardiac troponins (cTnI or cTnT) serving as the gold standard for diagnosing myocardial infarction [12]. It is also critical for monitoring therapy, such as using HbA1c for glycemic control in diabetic patients and monitoring liver function tests during statin therapy. The accuracy, precision, and timeliness of laboratory results directly impact diagnostic accuracy, treatment efficacy, and patient safety. The collaboration between the laboratory scientist and the clinician is vital for interpreting results correctly, especially in complex cases, and for ensuring that the right test is ordered for the right patient at the right time. The evolution of more sensitive and specific biomarkers continues to refine our ability to predict, diagnose, and manage heart disease with greater precision [13].

Integrating Nursing, Public Health, Medicine, and Laboratory Sciences

The conceptual framework for this research is built upon the foundational premise that the prevention and management of heart disease is a complex, multi-level challenge that cannot be adequately addressed by a single discipline. This framework synthesizes core principles from systems theory, the chronic care model, and the socio-ecological model to visualize how Nursing, Public Health, General Medicine, and Laboratory Sciences interact synergistically across different levels of prevention and care [14]. Systems theory posits that the behavior of a complex system arises from the interactions and interdependencies of its component parts, and that optimizing the whole system requires a focus on these relationships rather than on the isolated components alone [15]. Applying this to cardiovascular care, the healthcare system is viewed as an integrated whole where the output—improved patient and population outcomes—is directly determined by the quality of collaboration and communication between its professional parts. A failure in one component, such as a delay in laboratory reporting or a gap in patient education, can destabilize the entire system, leading to diagnostic errors, poor adherence, and adverse events.

This integrated model operates dynamically across the entire spectrum of prevention. At the **primordial and primary prevention** stage, Public Health leads the charge by creating health-promoting environments through policy, legislation, and mass education, aiming to prevent the emergence of risk factors in the population [16]. Simultaneously, General Medicine conducts individual risk assessments, while Laboratory Sciences provide the biomarker data (e.g., lipid profiles, blood glucose) that quantify this risk. The nurse in a primary care setting then translates this population-level knowledge and individual risk data into actionable, personalized lifestyle counseling for the patient. This creates a feedback loop where public health data informs clinical practice, and clinical findings can, in turn, inform public health priorities. The framework illustrates that prevention is not a solitary act but a coordinated endeavor where population-level strategies create a supportive context for individual-level clinical interventions to thrive.

Moving along the disease continuum to **secondary prevention** (early detection and treatment), the interactions between the disciplines become more intense and time-sensitive. Here, the framework highlights Laboratory Sciences as a critical initiator of the care pathway, with diagnostic tests like cardiac troponins and B-type Natriuretic Peptide (BNP) providing the objective evidence of disease [17]. This data triggers a rapid response from General Medicine, where the physician interprets the results in the context of the clinical presentation to make a definitive diagnosis and formulate a treatment plan. The Nursing discipline then activates its acute care protocols, providing immediate clinical management, monitoring for complications, and initiating patient education about the new diagnosis. The framework posits that the speed and accuracy of this interdisciplinary loop—from lab result to medical diagnosis to nursing action—are critical determinants of patient survival and the preservation of cardiac function.

The framework's robustness is further tested and demonstrated in the realm of **tertiary prevention** (managing established disease to prevent complications and deterioration). This long-term phase requires a deeply integrated, chronic care model where the patient is an active participant in a sustained partnership with the healthcare team [18]. In this stage, the role of General Medicine evolves into that of a long-term conductor and coordinator of care, managing complex pharmacotherapy and referring to specialists as needed. The physician’s treatment decisions, however, are continuously informed by data. Laboratory Sciences provides ongoing monitoring through tests like International Normalized Ratio (INR) for patients on warfarin, renal function tests to adjust medications like ACE inhibitors, and HbA1c to guide diabetes management—all of which are crucial for preventing the progression of cardiovascular damage and avoiding drug-related adverse events [19].

It is in tertiary prevention that the Nursing role expands to its fullest, operationalizing the chronic care model at the grassroots level. Nurses act as the linchpin, ensuring continuity and providing the comprehensive support necessary for chronic disease self-management. They bridge the instructions from the physician and the data from the lab into a coherent, understandable, and practical plan for the patient. This includes detailed education on medication adherence, symptom recognition (e.g., monitoring for edema or shortness of breath), dietary management, and psychosocial support [20]. Nurse-led clinics and telehealth follow-ups are concrete manifestations of this framework in action, demonstrating how nursing leadership within the multidisciplinary team can reduce hospital readmissions and improve quality of life [21]. The framework illustrates that without this nursing component, the best medical plans and the most accurate lab data may fail to be implemented effectively in the patient's daily life.

Underpinning this entire framework is the constant, bidirectional flow of information. Public Health informs the other disciplines with epidemiological data on local disease prevalence and community resources, enabling more culturally competent and effective patient care. Conversely, aggregated, anonymized clinical and laboratory data from thousands of patients, when fed back to public health authorities, becomes a powerful tool for surveillance, tracking the effectiveness of public health interventions, and identifying emerging trends in cardiovascular risk factors and disease outcomes [22]. This creates a macro-level feedback loop that completes the cycle of continuous quality improvement for the entire health system. A critical element of this conceptual framework is the central, active role of the patient and family, who are not passive recipients of care but core members of the multidisciplinary team. The ultimate success of the integrated approach hinges on effective patient engagement and empowerment. Each discipline contributes uniquely to this empowerment. The Public Health sector empowers communities through awareness campaigns. The General Physician empowers the individual through shared decision-making about treatment options. The Laboratory provides the objective measures that empower the patient with knowledge about their own physiological state. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the Nurse empowers the patient through self-management education and sustained motivational support, equipping them with the skills and confidence to manage their condition day-to-day [23]. The framework, therefore, is not just a model of professional collaboration but a patient-centric ecosystem designed to support the individual's journey through the healthcare syste [24].

A Public Health Perspective on Heart Disease

Cardiovascular disease (CVD) represents a paramount global public health challenge, with its epidemiology painting a picture of both pervasive burden and profound inequality. From a public health standpoint, understanding the distribution and determinants of heart disease across populations is the foundational step upon which all effective prevention and control strategies are built. Ischemic heart disease and stroke remain the leading causes of death worldwide, responsible for an estimated 19.1 million deaths annually, a figure that underscores the persistent and massive scale of the problem [25]. However, this global toll is not distributed uniformly. A dramatic epidemiological transition has unfolded over recent decades, with over three-quarters of CVD deaths now occurring in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) [26]. This shift highlights the complex interplay of rapid urbanization, globalization of unhealthy lifestyles, and strained healthcare systems, demonstrating that heart disease is inextricably linked to broader social and economic development patterns. The public health perspective moves beyond viewing CVD as a collection of individual cases, instead framing it as a population-wide epidemic driven by modifiable risk factors that can be systematically addressed through policy, environmental change, and system-level interventions.

The seminal contribution of epidemiology to cardiology has been the rigorous identification and quantification of these modifiable risk factors. Large-scale, longitudinal studies like the Framingham Heart Study established the very concept of "risk factors," providing evidence that conditions like hypertension, high cholesterol, and smoking were powerful predictors of future cardiac events [27]. This work was powerfully expanded upon by the INTERHEART study, a landmark global case-control investigation which demonstrated that nine potentially modifiable risk factors—smoking, dyslipidemia, hypertension, diabetes, abdominal obesity, psychosocial factors, low fruit and vegetable intake, lack of physical activity, and alcohol consumption—account for over 90% of the population-attributable risk for a first myocardial infarction in men and women across all major geographic regions [28]. This finding is a cornerstone of public health, as it provides irrefutable evidence that the global heart disease epidemic is largely preventable. It shifts the focus from inevitable fate to a clear agenda for action, identifying specific targets for public health campaigns, clinical guidelines, and health policy.

To translate this knowledge into actionable strategy, public health and clinical medicine rely on the process of risk stratification. This involves estimating an individual's probability of experiencing a CVD event over a specific period, typically 10 years, by integrating multiple risk factors into a single risk score. Widely used tools like the Pooled Cohort Equations (PCE) from the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association (ACC/AHA) or the SCORE2 model used in Europe incorporate variables such as age, sex, systolic blood pressure, cholesterol levels, smoking, and diabetes status to categorize individuals into risk tiers (e.g., low, borderline, intermediate, or high) [29]. This stratification is a critical public health function as it enables the efficient and cost-effective allocation of limited healthcare resources. It ensures that intensive lifestyle interventions and preventive pharmacological therapies, such as statins or antihypertensives, are prioritized for those at the highest risk, thereby maximizing the impact of preventive efforts and moving the paradigm from one-size-fits-all to targeted, personalized prevention.

The public health approach to tackling the burden identified through epidemiology is multi-faceted, operating across different levels of society. A foundational model for this is the "health impact pyramid," which posits that the greatest population-wide impact comes from interventions that address socioeconomic determinants and change the environmental context to make healthy choices default and accessible [30]. At this base level, public health works to influence policies that improve education, reduce poverty, and ensure food security, recognizing that socioeconomic status is a fundamental driver of

CVD disparities. More directly, structural interventions include legislative and regulatory actions. Mandatory salt reduction policies in processed foods, the elimination of industrial trans fats from the food supply through legislation, and comprehensive tobacco control measures—including high taxation, plain packaging, and smoke-free laws—are among the most effective public health strategies for reducing population-level risk [31]. These interventions do not rely on individual behavior change but instead create a healthier environment for all, thereby shifting the entire population's distribution of risk factors like blood pressure and cholesterol downward.

Complementing these broad environmental changes are clinical preventive interventions and organized health promotion campaigns. Public health systems play a key role in establishing and promoting access to screening programs for hypertension, dyslipidemia, and diabetes, often targeting specific age groups or high-risk populations. Furthermore, mass media and community-based health education campaigns are crucial for raising awareness, increasing health literacy, and shaping social norms. Campaigns that promote physical activity, discourage smoking, and encourage healthy eating work to create a culture of prevention and generate public support for healthier policies [32]. While their individual-level effect may be smaller than that of structural interventions, they are essential for empowering individuals to take action and for ensuring that clinical services offered by general practitioners and nurses are met with an informed and motivated public. This synergy between population-wide messaging and individual clinical care is a hallmark of an integrated public health approach.

Underpinning all these efforts is the critical function of public health surveillance. Robust, ongoing surveillance systems are the "radar" that tracks the epidemic. Initiatives like the Global Burden of Disease (GBD) study and the WHO's STEPwise approach to surveillance (STEPS) systematically collect, analyze, and disseminate data on CVD mortality, morbidity, and risk factor prevalence [33]. This data is indispensable for monitoring trends, evaluating the impact of interventions, identifying emerging threats (such as the rising prevalence of obesity and diabetes), and revealing health inequities. For instance, surveillance data can pinpoint regions or sub-populations with unusually high rates of hypertension or smoking, allowing for targeted resource allocation and policy-making. Without this continuous epidemiological feedback loop, public health actions would be based on guesswork, and health systems would be unable to measure their progress or adapt their strategies to a changing landscape.

Despite significant advances, the public health perspective on heart disease continues to confront major challenges and evolve into new frontiers. A persistent and critical challenge is the issue of health equity. Epidemiological data consistently reveals stark and unjust disparities in CVD burden and outcomes linked to socioeconomic status, race, ethnicity, and geography. A true public health approach must, therefore, extend beyond overall population averages to explicitly target the reduction of these inequities. This requires tailored interventions that address the social determinants of health—such as housing, education, and access to healthy food—and remove barriers to care for the most vulnerable populations [34]. Furthermore, the science of risk stratification is continuously advancing. While traditional risk scores are powerful, they have limitations, particularly in younger individuals, women, and diverse ethnic groups. The future of stratification lies in refining these models by incorporating novel biomarkers, such as high-sensitivity C-reactive protein (hs-CRP) or lipoprotein(a), and imaging modalities like coronary artery calcium (CAC) scoring, which can reclassify risk and guide more personalized prevention decisions [35].

Nursing Roles in Prevention, Early Detection, and Patient Education

Within the multidisciplinary framework for heart disease management, the nursing profession fulfills a role that is both expansive and indispensable, serving as the critical bridge between medical science and the patient's lived experience. Nurses operate across the entire spectrum of care, from primordial prevention to long-term tertiary management, with their impact being most profoundly felt in the realms of prevention, early detection, and patient education. Their unique position, characterized by prolonged and repeated patient contact, affords them a holistic view of the individual that encompasses not only physiological parameters but also psychological, social, and behavioral dimensions. This patient-centered ethos is the cornerstone of modern nursing practice and is fundamental to achieving meaningful and sustainable outcomes in cardiovascular care [36]. The role of the nurse has evolved far beyond mere task execution to encompass that of an autonomous practitioner, a skilled educator, a vigilant monitor, and a trusted advocate, making them a central pillar in the fight against heart disease.

In the domain of **primary prevention**, nurses are at the forefront of mitigating risk factors in otherwise healthy individuals. In primary care settings, school health programs, and community clinics, nurses conduct comprehensive risk assessments, measuring blood pressure, calculating Body Mass Index (BMI), and taking detailed lifestyle histories. They are instrumental in delivering personalized, evidence-based counseling on smoking cessation, nutrition, physical activity, and weight management [37]. For instance, a practice nurse can use motivational interviewing techniques to support a patient in their journey to quit smoking, or work with a family to develop a heart-healthy diet plan. This proactive, educational role empowers individuals to make informed choices about their health, thereby preventing the onset of risk factors like hypertension and dyslipidemia. Furthermore, community health nurses engage in public health promotion, organizing workshops and screening drives that raise awareness about cardiovascular health at a population level, effectively acting as the operational arm of public health initiatives within local communities.

Transitioning to **secondary prevention**, which focuses on the early detection and treatment of disease, the nursing role becomes increasingly complex and critical. Nurses are often the first point of contact for patients presenting with vague or early symptoms. Their clinical acumen is vital for recognizing potential warning signs of cardiac conditions, such as unexplained fatigue, shortness of breath on exertion, or chest discomfort, and ensuring timely referral for further diagnostic evaluation [38]. In hospital settings, nurses managing patients with acute coronary syndromes are responsible for rapid assessment, administration of prescribed medications like nitroglycerin and aspirin, continuous hemodynamic monitoring, and pain management. They are the guardians of patient safety during high-stakes situations, identifying and responding to arrhythmias or signs of hemodynamic instability. This vigilant monitoring and early intervention are crucial for limiting myocardial damage, preventing complications, and improving survival rates, solidifying their role as essential members of the acute cardiac care team.

The pinnacle of nursing impact is often realized in the sphere of **tertiary prevention** and chronic disease management, where the goal is to prevent complications, disability, and recurrence in patients with established heart disease. Here, the nurse transforms into a chronic care manager and a champion for patient self-management. Following a cardiac event like a myocardial infarction or a diagnosis of heart failure, patients are often overwhelmed by a complex regimen of medications, dietary restrictions, and activity modifications. The nurse, through structured education and sustained support, demystifies this complexity. They provide detailed, understandable information about the purpose and side effects of each medication (e.g., antiplatelets, beta-blockers, ACE inhibitors), the principles of a low-sodium diet for heart failure management, and the importance of daily weight monitoring to detect fluid overload early [39]. This education is not a one-time event but a continuous process of reinforcement and assessment, ensuring knowledge is retained and applied.

The efficacy of this nursing-led model is powerfully demonstrated by the success of nurse-led clinics and disease management programs for chronic conditions like heart failure and coronary artery disease. These structured programs, often coordinated by Advanced Practice Nurses, provide specialized follow-up care that is proactive and patient-centered. Studies have consistently shown that such programs lead to significant improvements in key outcomes, including a reduction in all-cause mortality and heart failure-related hospital readmissions, enhanced medication adherence, and improved quality of life [40]. In these clinics, nurses titrate medications according to pre-established protocols, manage symptoms via telehealth check-ins, and provide a consistent and accessible point of contact for patients and their families. This continuity of care fosters a strong therapeutic relationship, builds patient trust, and ensures that subtle clinical declines are identified and addressed promptly before they escalate into a full-blown crisis requiring hospitalization.

Underpinning all these clinical and educational activities is the application of robust theoretical frameworks that guide effective nursing practice. Models such as the Health Belief Model and the Transtheoretical Model (Stages of Change) provide nurses with a structured understanding of patient behavior [41]. By assessing a patient's perceived susceptibility to complications, their belief in the benefits of a new behavior, and their readiness to change, nurses can tailor their educational and motivational strategies to be maximally effective. For example, a patient in the "precontemplation" stage regarding exercise requires a different approach than one in the "preparation" stage. This theoretical grounding elevates nursing interventions from well-intentioned advice to strategic, evidence-based practice, increasing the likelihood of successful and long-lasting patient behavior change.

A critical and often undervalued dimension of the nursing role is the provision of **psychosocial support**. A diagnosis of heart disease is a life-altering event that can trigger anxiety, depression, and fear. Nurses, by virtue of their close patient contact, are ideally positioned to assess emotional and psychological well-being. They provide empathetic listening, counsel patients on stress management techniques, and, when necessary, facilitate referrals to mental health professionals [42]. Addressing psychosocial distress is not a secondary concern but an integral component of comprehensive cardiac care, as conditions like depression are known to negatively impact recovery, medication adherence, and overall mortality. Furthermore, nurses play a key role in supporting the patient's family, educating them about the condition and involving them in the care plan, which is crucial for creating a supportive home environment.

The paradigm of chronic care has rightfully shifted towards **patient empowerment and self-management**, and nurses are the primary architects of this process. Empowerment goes beyond simple compliance; it is about equipping patients with the confidence, skills, and knowledge to actively manage their own health. Nurses utilize tools like individualized action plans, which provide clear instructions on what to do if symptoms worsen (e.g., increased shortness of breath, sudden weight gain) [43]. They teach self-monitoring skills, such as how to check pulse rate or track daily symptoms. By fostering this sense of ownership and control, nurses help patients move from a passive recipient of care to an active partner in their health journey, which is fundamental for managing a chronic condition like heart disease over the long term [44].

General Medicine and Clinical Management:

In the intricate tapestry of the multidisciplinary approach to heart disease, the general practitioner (GP) or primary care physician occupies a position of paramount importance, serving as the first point of contact, the longitudinal care coordinator, and the central diagnostician. The role of general medicine in this framework is not confined to a single episode of care but spans the entire continuum of the disease, from primordial prevention to end-of-life care for advanced heart failure. This longitudinal relationship positions the GP as the professional who possesses the most comprehensive understanding of the patient's medical history, risk factor profile, psychosocial context, and personal values. As such, general medicine acts as the crucial "hub" in the wheel of cardiovascular care, integrating inputs from public health initiatives, nursing assessments, and laboratory data to formulate, initiate, and oversee a personalized management plan for the patient [45]. The clinical management provided by the GP is the thread that connects population-level risk stratification to individual-level therapeutic action, ensuring that care is both evidence-based and uniquely tailored.

The journey of cardiovascular care within general medicine begins with **primary prevention and risk stratification**. The GP is responsible for identifying asymptomatic individuals at elevated risk for developing heart disease. This involves systematically collecting data on non-modifiable risk factors (e.g., age, sex, family history) and modifiable ones (e.g., smoking, diet, physical inactivity) and utilizing validated risk prediction tools, such as the Pooled Cohort Equations (PCE) or the SCORE2 model, to quantify a patient's 10-year cardiovascular risk [46]. Based on this stratification, the GP initiates a cascade of interventions. For patients at moderate to high risk, this includes intensive lifestyle counseling and, when appropriate, the prescription of preventive pharmacotherapy, such as statins for dyslipidemia or antihypertensive agents for confirmed hypertension. This proactive role in primary prevention is a cornerstone of public health strategy, as the cumulative impact of effective risk factor management in primary care has the potential to significantly reduce the population incidence of heart disease.

When prevention is unsuccessful or a patient presents with symptoms, the focus of general medicine shifts decisively to **diagnosis and initial management**. The GP's role as a diagnostic detective is critical. They are tasked with differentiating cardiac chest pain from musculoskeletal or gastrointestinal causes, investigating the etiology of dyspnea, and evaluating palpitations. This process involves a meticulous history, a thorough physical examination—including assessment for murmurs, elevated jugular venous pressure, and peripheral edema—and the judicious use of diagnostic tests [47]. The GP coordinates the initial workup, which typically includes ordering an electrocardiogram (ECG), chest X-ray, and basic laboratory studies such as cardiac troponin, B-type Natriuretic Peptide (BNP), and a lipid panel. Based on these findings, the GP makes the initial diagnosis, initiates stabilizing treatment (e.g., with diuretics for heart failure or anti-anginal medication), and determines the urgency and nature of any necessary referral to a cardiologist or other specialist. This gatekeeping and triage function is essential for the efficient and appropriate use of specialized healthcare resources.

Following diagnosis, the GP's role evolves into that of a **long-term care manager and treatment optimizer**, particularly for chronic conditions like hypertension, stable coronary artery disease, and chronic heart failure. In this capacity, the physician is responsible for initiating and titrating guideline-directed medical therapies (GDMT). This includes managing a complex regimen of medications such as antiplatelets, beta-blockers, angiotensin-converting enzyme (ACE) inhibitors, angiotensin II receptor blockers (ARBs), and statins [48]. The process of titration—carefully adjusting medication doses to achieve therapeutic targets (e.g., a specific blood pressure or heart rate) while minimizing side effects—requires ongoing monitoring and follow-up, a task for which the continuity of general practice is ideally suited. The GP ensures that the patient remains on evidence-based therapies over the long term, a critical factor in preventing disease progression and reducing the risk of future cardiovascular events.

A defining feature of modern general medicine in heart disease management is its function as the **coordinator of the multidisciplinary team**. The GP does not work in isolation but serves as the central node that connects the patient to a network of other healthcare professionals. This involves making appropriate referrals to cardiologists for specialized interventions, to cardiac nurses for detailed education and monitoring, to dietitians for nutritional counseling, and to physiotherapists for structured exercise rehabilitation [49]. Furthermore, the GP is responsible for managing comorbidities that significantly impact cardiovascular outcomes, most notably type 2 diabetes and chronic kidney disease. This requires a holistic view of the patient, ensuring that the management of one condition does not adversely affect another and that all aspects of the patient's health are addressed in a cohesive manner. The GP synthesizes recommendations from all specialists into a single, coherent, and manageable care plan for the patient, preventing fragmentation and ensuring that care is seamless.

The implementation of **structured care pathways and chronic disease management models** in primary care has significantly enhanced the ability of general medicine to deliver high-quality cardiovascular care. These pathways, such as those embedded within the Chronic Care Model (CCM), provide a systematic framework for managing populations of patients with heart disease [50]. They often involve the use of patient registries to track outcomes, planned visits for proactive management, clear protocols for nurse involvement, and robust systems for clinical decision support. By standardizing elements of care, these pathways reduce practice variation, improve adherence to clinical guidelines, and free up physician time to focus on more complex clinical decisions. The use of such organized systems demonstrates how general practice is evolving from a reactive model to a proactive, population-health-oriented approach, even within the context of individual patient care.

Despite its central role, the practice of general medicine in heart disease management faces several challenges. A significant one is **therapeutic inertia**—the failure to initiate or intensify therapy when treatment goals are not met [51]. This can stem from clinical uncertainty, overestimation of care quality, or concerns about polypharmacy and patient adherence. Overcoming inertia requires conscious effort, the use of clear treatment protocols, and shared decision-making with the patient. Another critical challenge is ensuring effective **transitional care**, particularly when a patient is discharged from the hospital after an acute event like a myocardial infarction. GPs must quickly reconcile medication changes, understand the in-hospital course, and ensure timely follow-up to prevent readmission, a process often hampered by poor communication between secondary and primary care [52]. Strengthening these communication channels is essential for patient safety and continuity of care.

The future of general medicine in this field is being shaped by technological advancements and a renewed focus on **patient-centered care and shared decision-making**. The integration of electronic health records (EHRs) and clinical decision support tools directly into the GP's workflow can help combat therapeutic inertia and improve guideline adherence. Furthermore, the model of care is shifting from a paternalistic "doctor knows best" approach to a collaborative partnership. Shared decision-making involves engaging the patient in a conversation about the benefits, risks, and alternatives of various treatment options, taking into account their personal preferences and values [53]. This is particularly important in areas where patient preference varies, such as the decision to initiate statin therapy in primary prevention or to pursue more aggressive interventions in end-stage heart failure [53].

Laboratory Diagnostics and Biomarkers:

In the multidisciplinary ecosystem of cardiovascular care, the discipline of Laboratory Sciences serves as the fundamental source of objective, quantitative data that transforms clinical suspicion into actionable knowledge. Often operating behind the scenes, the clinical laboratory is an indispensable partner in the fight against heart disease, providing the critical evidence that informs decisions at every stage of the patient journey—from initial risk assessment and definitive diagnosis to prognostic stratification and therapeutic monitoring. The evolution of cardiac-specific biomarkers, particularly with the advent of high-sensitivity assays, has revolutionized the landscape of cardiovascular medicine, enabling earlier detection, more accurate diagnosis, and a more personalized approach to patient management [54]. The core mission of laboratory diagnostics is not merely to generate results but to ensure that these results are accurately produced, precisely interpreted, and effectively integrated into the clinical decision-making process, thereby "translating lab insights into clinical action" for the benefit of the patient.

The role of laboratory diagnostics begins long before a symptomatic event occurs, at the stage of **primary prevention and risk stratification**. Routine biochemical tests provide the foundational data upon which cardiovascular risk is calculated. The standard lipid profile—measuring total cholesterol, Low-Density Lipoprotein Cholesterol (LDL-C), High-Density Lipoprotein Cholesterol (HDL-C), and triglycerides—remains a cornerstone for assessing atherosclerotic risk and guiding the initiation and intensity of statin therapy [55]. Beyond lipids, other biomarkers offer additional layers of risk information. Elevated levels of high-sensitivity C-reactive protein (hs-CRP), a marker of systemic inflammation, can identify individuals with elevated cardiovascular risk even in the presence of normal lipid levels, helping to guide decisions for preventive therapy in select intermediate-risk patients [56]. Furthermore, tests for hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c) are crucial for diagnosing diabetes mellitus, a major risk multiplier for heart disease. By providing these objective measures, the laboratory empowers the general practitioner to move beyond subjective assessment and implement evidence-based primary prevention strategies tailored to the individual's specific risk profile.

When a patient presents with symptoms suggestive of an acute cardiac condition, the laboratory transitions to a role of critical urgency and precision in **diagnosis and differential diagnosis**. The single most significant advancement in this arena has been the development and adoption of high-sensitivity cardiac troponin (hs-cTn) assays. Cardiac troponins I and T are proteins specific to cardiac myocytes, and their release into the bloodstream is a definitive indicator of myocardial injury [57]. The high-sensitivity assays can detect minuscule elevations of troponin, allowing for the very early diagnosis of myocardial infarction (MI), often within a few hours of symptom onset. This has led to the development of rapid "rule-out" and "rule-in" algorithms in emergency departments, significantly reducing the time to diagnosis, enabling faster intervention, and improving patient outcomes [58]. For patients presenting with acute dyspnea, the measurement of B-type Natriuretic Peptide (BNP) or N-terminal pro-B-type Natriuretic Peptide (NT-proBNP) is invaluable in differentiating cardiac causes (such as acute heart failure) from pulmonary or other non-cardiac causes, thereby guiding appropriate and timely management [59].

Following a confirmed diagnosis, the laboratory's role expands into **prognostic stratification and therapeutic monitoring**. Biomarker levels provide powerful insights into the likely course of the disease. For instance, the peak level of troponin after an MI correlates with the extent of myocardial damage and is a predictor of both short-term and long-term complications [60]. Similarly, persistently elevated levels of NT-proBNP in a patient with heart failure are strongly associated with an increased risk of rehospitalization and mortality, signaling the need for more aggressive treatment and closer follow-up [61]. This prognostic information is crucial for the multidisciplinary team, as it helps to identify high-risk patients who may benefit from more intensive monitoring, advanced therapies, or specialized follow-up in nurse-led heart failure clinics.

Perhaps one of the most tangible contributions of laboratory science is in the **monitoring of therapeutic efficacy and safety**. The management of chronic cardiovascular conditions is a dynamic process that requires continuous adjustment based on objective data. For patients on lipid-lowering therapy, serial measurements of LDL-C are essential to assess the response to statins or other agents and to titrate doses to achieve guideline-recommended targets [62]. In patients receiving warfarin for conditions like atrial fibrillation or mechanical heart valves, the regular measurement of the International Normalized Ratio (INR) is critical to maintain therapeutic anticoagulation while avoiding the risk of bleeding. Furthermore, the laboratory plays a vital role in ensuring patient safety by monitoring for potential adverse effects of medications, such as conducting renal function tests (creatinine, estimated glomerular filtration rate) and liver enzymes for patients on ACE inhibitors, ARBs, or statins. This ongoing biochemical surveillance allows the general physician to optimize therapy safely and effectively, preventing both under-treatment and drug-related harm.

The interface between the laboratory and the clinical team is a dynamic and critical junction where collaboration is paramount. Effective **interpretation and clinical correlation** are essential to translate a numerical result into a meaningful clinical action. This requires clear communication between the laboratory professionals and the clinicians. For example, an elevated troponin must be interpreted in the clinical context, as it can be raised in conditions other than acute MI, such as myocarditis, pulmonary embolism, or renal failure—a concept known as "troponinemia" [63]. The laboratory scientist can provide invaluable guidance on test limitations, potential interferences, and the appropriate use of different assays. This collaborative partnership ensures that laboratory data is not viewed in isolation but is integrated with the patient's symptoms, physical examination, and other diagnostic findings to form a coherent clinical picture.

The future of cardiovascular laboratory diagnostics is poised for further transformation with the exploration of **novel and emerging biomarkers**. Research is actively investigating markers that reflect different pathophysiological pathways, such as growth differentiation factor-15 (GDF-15) for oxidative stress and inflammation, galectin-3 for cardiac fibrosis and remodeling, and lipoprotein(a) [Lp(a)] as a genetically determined, independent risk factor for atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease [64]. The integration of these novel markers, potentially combined into multi-marker panels, holds the promise of refining risk prediction, identifying specific disease subtypes, and guiding more targeted therapies. Furthermore, the field of "omics"—including genomics, proteomics, and metabolomics—aims to discover new biomarker patterns that could lead to a more personalized and precise approach to cardiovascular medicine, predicting an individual's susceptibility to disease and their response to specific treatments.

Despite its power, the proliferation of biomarkers presents challenges, including the need for **standardization and cost-effectiveness**. Assays for the same biomarker can vary between different manufacturers and laboratories, making it difficult to establish universal reference ranges and cut-off values. International efforts are ongoing to standardize key assays, particularly for troponins and natriuretic peptides, to ensure consistency and comparability of results across healthcare settings. Additionally, with rising healthcare costs, it is imperative to demonstrate that the measurement of novel biomarkers leads to improved patient outcomes that justify the additional expense. Health economic analyses will be crucial in determining which new tests should be adopted into routine clinical practice [65].

Interdisciplinary Collaboration:

Several structured **models of care** have been developed to formalize and promote interdisciplinary collaboration in chronic disease management. The **Chronic Care Model (CCM)** is one of the most influential frameworks, providing a blueprint for improving care in community settings. The CCM emphasizes the creation of a prepared, proactive practice team and an informed, activated patient. It specifically identifies "delivery system design" and "decision support" as key elements, which inherently require the collaboration of physicians, nurses, and other health professionals to provide planned, population-based care [67]. Another prominent model is the **Cardiovascular Team-Based Care model** endorsed by major cardiology societies. This model explicitly defines the roles of each team member—from the cardiologist and primary care physician to the nurse, pharmacist, and dietitian—and emphasizes the importance of collaborative decision-making in developing and executing a comprehensive care plan for conditions like heart failure and stable ischemic heart disease [68]. In acute care settings, **multidisciplinary rounds (MDRs)** serve as a practical model for collaboration. These structured meetings bring together physicians, nurses, pharmacists, and case managers to discuss each patient's status, ensuring that all perspectives are integrated into a daily plan of care, which has been shown to reduce hospital length of stay and improve care coordination [69].

Despite the clear benefits and existence of these models, the path to seamless collaboration is fraught with **systemic and organizational barriers**. A primary obstacle is the traditional **siloed structure** of healthcare systems, where different professions operate within separate departments with distinct administrative hierarchies, budgets, and physical workspaces. This segregation naturally inhibits communication and fosters a culture of tribalism rather than teamwork [70]. Closely related is the barrier of **ineffective communication**, often exacerbated by incompatible health information technology (IT) systems. When the electronic health record (EHR) used by the hospital does not seamlessly communicate with the system used by the primary care clinic or the laboratory information system, critical patient data can be lost or delayed, leading to medical errors and disjointed care [71]. Furthermore, the absence of standardized communication tools, such as SBAR (Situation, Background, Assessment, Recommendation), can lead to misunderstandings and omissions during patient handoffs between professionals and across care settings.

Beyond systemic issues, significant **professional and cultural barriers** can undermine collaborative efforts. Deeply ingrained **professional hierarchies**, often with physicians at the apex, can create an environment where other team members, such as nurses or laboratory scientists, may feel undervalued or hesitant to speak up, even when they possess critical information about the patient [72]. This hierarchy can stifle the open dialogue and mutual respect that are the lifeblood of effective collaboration. Compounding this is a widespread lack of **interprofessional education (IPE)**. Traditionally, healthcare students are educated in professional silos, learning little about the roles, responsibilities, and expertise of their future colleagues. Upon entering practice, they lack the necessary skills in team communication, conflict resolution, and collaborative leadership, making the transition to a team-based model challenging [73]. Finally, the current **reimbursement and funding models** in many healthcare systems often do not adequately support collaborative care. Fee-for-service structures typically reward procedural and visit-based volume rather than the time-consuming activities of care coordination, team meetings, and interprofessional consultation, creating a financial disincentive for investing in collaborative practices [74].

To overcome these formidable barriers, a deliberate focus on key **facilitators and enablers** is required. At the organizational level, leadership must champion a **culture of collaboration** by explicitly valuing teamwork, establishing a shared vision for patient care, and creating flattened hierarchies that empower all team members to contribute fully. This can be supported by **co-location** of services, where feasible, as physical proximity naturally fosters informal communication and relationship-building [75]. Investing in **interoperable health IT systems** is a non-negotiable technological facilitator. Seamless data exchange between EHRs, laboratory systems, and pharmacy networks ensures that every member of the team has access to the same, up-to-date patient information, forming a single source of truth for collaborative decision-making.

At the human level, the most powerful facilitator is the formal integration of **interprofessional education (IPE)** into both academic curricula and continuing professional development. By learning *with, from, and about* each other, healthcare students and practitioners develop mutual respect, break down stereotypes, and build the communication competencies essential for effective teamwork [73]. Implementing structured **communication protocols**, such as daily huddles or standardized handoff tools like SBAR, can dramatically improve the clarity, consistency, and efficiency of information exchange. Finally, the development of **shared care plans and clinical pathways** that are co-designed and agreed upon by all disciplines provides a tangible roadmap for collaboration, clearly outlining roles, responsibilities, and expected outcomes for each team member throughout the patient's care journey.

The ultimate measure of successful interdisciplinary collaboration is its impact on the **patient experience and clinical outcomes**. When the model functions optimally, the patient perceives a seamless, coordinated care experience, rather than a confusing journey through disconnected specialist appointments. They receive consistent, reinforced education from their nurse, general practitioner, and dietitian, which greatly enhances understanding and adherence. Clinical outcomes reflect this synergy: studies consistently show that collaborative care models for heart failure are associated with significant reductions in all-cause mortality and heart failure-related hospital readmissions, improved quality of life, and higher patient satisfaction scores [76]. From a system perspective, effective collaboration reduces duplication of services, minimizes medical errors, and creates a more efficient and resilient healthcare environment [77].

Conclusion

In conclusion, the evidence presented in this research unequivocally affirms that a multidisciplinary approach is not merely beneficial but essential in the contemporary battle against heart disease. The complex, multifactorial nature of CVD, spanning from genetic predisposition to socioeconomic determinants, defies the capacity of any single healthcare discipline. The synergistic integration of Nursing, Public Health, General Medicine, and Laboratory Sciences creates a comprehensive ecosystem of care that addresses the patient's journey across the entire spectrum—from primordial prevention and early detection to acute intervention and long-term chronic disease management. Each discipline brings a unique and irreplaceable perspective: public health sets the strategic stage, general medicine coordinates the clinical response, nursing ensures patient-centered execution, and laboratory science provides the objective data for precision.

However, realizing the full potential of this model requires a deliberate and sustained commitment to overcoming the barriers to interdisciplinary collaboration. Moving from a mere multidisciplinary presence to genuine, synergistic teamwork demands systemic changes, including the reform of professional education through interprofessional learning, the dismantling of traditional hierarchies, and the implementation of integrated health information technologies. The adoption of structured models like the Chronic Care Model and Cardiovascular Team-Based Care provides a proven roadmap for this integration. The ultimate reward for this investment is a healthcare system that is not only more effective and efficient but also more resilient and humane. Therefore, the future of cardiovascular care lies in strengthening the threads that bind these disciplines together, fostering a culture of shared responsibility and collaborative action to achieve the paramount goal: significantly reducing the global burden of heart disease and improving the lives of patients and populations worldwide.

References:

1. Horne B.D., Roberts C.A., Rasmusson K.D., et al. Risk score-guided multidisciplinary team-based Care for heart failure inpatients is associated with lower 30-day readmission and lower 30-day mortality. Am Heart J. 2020;219:78–88. doi: 10.1016/j.ahj.2019.09.004.
2. Serruys P.W., Morice M.C., Kappetein A.P., et al. Percutaneous coronary intervention versus coronary-artery bypass grafting for severe coronary artery disease. N Engl J Med. 2009;360:961–972. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa0804626.
3. Taylor C.J., Ordonez-Mena J.M., Roalfe A.K., et al. Trends in survival after a diagnosis of heart failure in the United Kingdom 2000-2017: population based cohort study. BMJ. 2019;364:l223. doi: 10.1136/bmj.l223.
4. Généreux P., Palmerini T., Caixeta A., et al. SYNTAX score reproducibility and variability between interventional cardiologists, core laboratory technicians, and quantitative coronary measurements. Circ Cardiovasc Interv. 2011;4:553–561. doi: 10.1161/CIRCINTERVENTIONS.111.961862.
5. Cooper L.B., Hernandez A.F. Assessing the quality and comparative effectiveness of team-based care for heart failure: who, what, where, when, and how. Heart Fail Clin. 2015;11:499–506. doi: 10.1016/j.hfc.2015.03.011.
6. European Coronary Surgery Study Group. Long-term results of prospective randomised study of coronary artery bypass surgery in stable angina pectoris. Lancet. 1982;320:1173–1180.
7. Lauck S.B., Lewis K.B., Borregaard B., de Sousa I. What is the right decision for me; integrating patient perspectives through shared decision-making for valvular heart disease therapy. Can J Cardiol. 2021;37:1054–1063. doi: 10.1016/j.cjca.2021.02.022.
8. Metkus T.S., Beckie T.M., Cohen M.G., et al. The heart team for coronary revascularization decisions: 2 illustrative cases. JACC Case Rep. 2022;4:115–120. doi: 10.1016/j.jaccas.2021.12.005.
9. Authors/Task Force members. Windecker S., Kolh P., et al. 2014 ESC/EACTS guidelines on myocardial revascularization: the task force on myocardial revascularization of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) and the European Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery (EACTS) developed with the special contribution of the European Association of Percutaneous Cardiovascular Interventions (EAPCI). Eur Heart J. 2014;35:2541–2619. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehu278.
10. Virani S.S., Alonso A., Aparicio H.J., et al. American Heart Association Council on Epidemiology and Prevention Statistics Committee and Stroke Statistics Subcommittee. Heart disease and Stroke Statistics-2021 update: a report from the American Heart Association. Circulation. 2021;143:e254–e743. doi: 10.1161/CIR.0000000000000950.

11. Murphy M.L., Hultgren H.N., Detre K., Thomsen J., Takaro T. Treatment of chronic stable angina: a preliminary report of survival data of the randomized veterans administration cooperative study. N Engl J Med. 1977;297:621–627. doi: 10.1056/NEJM197709222971201.
12. Taylor C.J., Ordonez-Mena J.M., Roalfe A.K., et al. Trends in survival after a diagnosis of heart failure in the United Kingdom 2000-2017: population based cohort study. BMJ. 2019;364:l223. doi: 10.1136/bmj.l223.
13. Leon M.B., Smith C.R., Mack M., et al. Transcatheter aortic-valve implantation for aortic stenosis in patients who cannot undergo surgery. N Engl J Med. 2010;363:1597–1607. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1008232.
14. Taberna M., Gil Moncayo F., Jane-Salas E., et al. The Multidisciplinary Team (MDT) approach and quality of care. Front Oncol. 2020;10:85. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2020.00085.
15. Lindeboom J.J., Coylewright M., Etnel J.R.G., Nieboer A.P., Hartman J.M., Takkenberg J.J.M. Shared decision making in the heart team: current team attitudes and review. Struct Heart. 2021;5:163–167.
16. Otto C.M., Nishimura R.A., Bonow R.O., et al. ACC/AHA guideline for the management of patients with valvular heart disease: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Joint Committee on clinical practice guidelines. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2021;77:e25–e197. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2020.11.018.
17. Kowalczyk A., Jassem J. Multidisciplinary team care in advanced lung cancer. Transl Lung Cancer Res. 2020;9:1690–1698. doi: 10.21037/tlcr.2019.11.33.
18. Holmes D.R., Rich J.B., Zoghbi W.A., Mack M.J. The heart team of cardiovascular care. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2013;61:903–907. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2012.08.1034.
19. Coronary Revascularization Writing Group. Patel M.R., Dehmer G.J., Hirshfeld J.W., et al. ACCF/SCAI/STS/AATS/AHA/ASNC/HFSA/SCCT 2012 appropriate use criteria for coronary revascularization focused update. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2012;59(9):857–881. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2011.12.001.
20. Young M.N., Kolte D., Cadigan M.E., et al. Multidisciplinary heart team approach for complex coronary artery disease: single center clinical presentation. J Am Heart Assoc. 2020;9. doi: 10.1161/JAHA.119.014738.
21. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. National Coverage Determination (NCD) for Transcatheter Aortic Valve Replacement (TAVR) (20.32). 2012. Accessed March 7, 2022.
22. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. National Coverage Determination (NCD) for Transcatheter Mitral Valve Repair (TMVR) (20.33). 2014. Accessed March 8, 2022.
23. Arnold S.V., Spertus J.A., Lei Y., et al. How to define a poor outcome after transcatheter aortic valve replacement: conceptual framework and empirical observations from the placement of aortic transcatheter valve (PARTNER) trial. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2016;68:1868–1877.
24. Gabel M., Hilton N.E., Nathanson S.D. Multidisciplinary breast cancer clinics. Do they work? Cancer. 1997;79:2380–2384.
25. Neumann F.J., Sousa-Uva M., Ahlsson A., et al. 2018 ESC/EACTS guidelines on myocardial revascularization. Eur Heart J. 2019;40:87–165. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehy855.
26. Zhao Y, Wang X. Effect of integrated nursing care based on medical alliance mode on the prevention and treatment of complications and self-efficacy of patients with coronary heart disease after PCI. J Healthc Eng. 2022;(2022):7727953–7727953. doi: 10.1155/2022/7727953.
27. Chang Z, Guo A, Zhou A, Sun TW, Ma L, Gardiner FW, et al. Nurse-led psychological intervention reduces anxiety symptoms and improves quality of life following percutaneous coronary intervention for stable coronary artery disease. Aust J Rural Health. 2020;2(28):124–31. doi: 10.1111/ajr.12587.

28. J Jiang W, Zhang Y, Yan F, Liu H, Gao R. Effectiveness of a nurse-led multidisciplinary self-management program for patients with coronary heart disease in communities: A randomized controlled trial. Patient Educ Couns. 2020;4(103):854–63. doi: 10.1016/j.pec.2019.11.001.

29. Badrooh A, Mozaffari N, Barikani A, Dadkhah B. The effect of individual and group education done by nurses on smoking dependency and smoking cessation motivation in patients with coronary artery disease. Addict Health. 2020;4(12):269–269. doi: 10.22122/ahj.v12i4.286.

30. Awoke MS, Baptiste DL, Davidson P, Roberts A, Dennison-Himmelfarb C. A quasi-experimental study examining a nurse-led education program to improve knowledge, self-care, and reduce readmission for individuals with heart failure. Contemp Nurse. 2019;1(55):15–26. doi: 10.1080/10376178.2019.1568198.

31. Shaya GE, Leucker TM, Jones SR, Martin SS, Toth PP. Coronary heart disease risk: low-density lipoprotein and beyond. Trends Cardiovasc Med. 2022;4(32):181–94. doi: 10.1016/j.tcm.2021.04.002.

32. Shigorowsky MJ, Sebastianski M, Sean McMurtry, Tsuyuki RT, Norris CM. Outcomes of nurse practitioner-led care in patients with cardiovascular disease: A systematic review and meta-analysis. J Adv Nurs. 2020;1(76):81–95. doi: 10.1111/jan.14229.

33. S Shao C, Wang J, Tian J, Tang Y. Coronary artery disease: from mechanism to clinical practice. Coron Artery Dis Ther Drug Discov. 2020;(2020):1–36. doi: 10.1007/978-981-15-2517-9_1.

34. Mizukawa M, Moriyama M, Yamamoto H, Rahman MM, Naka M, Kitagawa T, et al. Nurse-led collaborative management using telemonitoring improves quality of life and prevention of rehospitalization in patients with heart failure a pilot study. Int Heart J. 2019;6(60):1293–302. doi: 10.1536/ihj.19-313.

35. Dobber J, Latour C, Snaterse M, van Meijel, Ter Riet, Scholte op, et al. Developing nurses' skills in motivational interviewing to promote a healthy lifestyle in patients with coronary artery disease. Eur J Cardiovasc Nurs. 2019;1(18):28–37. doi: 10.1177/1474515118784102.

36. Awoke MS, Baptiste DL, Davidson P, Roberts A, Dennison-Himmelfarb C. A quasi-experimental study examining a nurse-led education program to improve knowledge, self-care, and reduce readmission for individuals with heart failure. Contemp Nurse. 2019;1(55):15–26. doi: 10.1080/10376178.2019.1568198.

37. Tangential item: Milanlouei S, Menichetti G, Li Y, Loscalzo J, Willett WC, Barabási AL. A systematic comprehensive longitudinal evaluation of dietary factors associated with acute myocardial infarction and fatal coronary heart disease. Nat Commun. 2020;1(11):6074–6074. doi: 10.1038/s41467-020-19888-2.

38. Wilson item: Jimenez-Torres J, Alcalá-Diaz JF, Torres-Peña JD, Gutierrez-Mariscal FM, Leon-Acuña A, Gómez-Luna P, et al. Mediterranean diet reduces atherosclerosis progression in coronary heart disease: an analysis of the CORDIOPREV randomized controlled trial. Stroke. 2021;11(52):3440–3440. doi: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.120.033214.

39. Gabbard M., Hilton N.E., Nathanson S.D. Multidisciplinary breast cancer clinics. Do they work? Cancer. 1997;79:2380–2384.

40. Ponikowski P, Voors AA, Anker SD, Bueno H, Cleland JG, Coats AJ, Falk V, González-Juanatey JR, Harjola VP, Jankowska EA, Jessup M, Linde C, Nihoyannopoulos P, Parissis JT, Pieske B, Riley JP, Rosano GM, Ruilope LM, Ruschitzka F, Rutten FH, van der Meer P. 2016 ESC guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure: The Task Force for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC). Developed with the special contribution of the Heart Failure Association (HFA) of the ESC. Eur J Heart Fail

2016;18:891–975. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

41. Evans WJ, Morley JE, Argiles J, Bales C, Baracos V, Guttridge D, Jatoi A, Kalantar-Zadeh K, Lochs H, Mantovani G, Marks D, Mitch WE, Muscaritoli M, Najand A, Ponikowski P, Rossi Fanelli F, Schambelan M, Schols A, Schuster M, Thomas D, Wolfe R, Anker SD. Cachexia: a new definition. Clin Nutr 2008;27:793–799. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

42. Riegel B, Dunbar SB, Fitzsimons D, Freedland KE, Lee CS, Middleton S, Stromberg A, Vellone E, Webber DE, Jaarsma T. Self-care research: where are we now? Where are we going? Int J Nurs Stud 2019;103402. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

43. McAlister FA, Stewart S, Ferrua S, McMurray JJ. Multidisciplinary strategies for the management of heart failure patients at high risk for admission: a systematic review of randomized trials. J Am Coll Cardiol 2004;44:810–819. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

44. Riegel B, Jaarsma T, Stromberg A. A middle-range theory of self-care of chronic illness. ANS Adv Nurs Sci 2012;35:194–204. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

45. Riegel B, Moser DK, Anker SD, Appel LJ, Dunbar SB, Grady KL, Gurvitz MZ, Havranek EP, Lee CS, Lindenfeld J, Peterson PN, Pressler SJ, Schocken DD, Whellan DJ; American Heart Association Council on Cardiovascular Nursing, American Heart Association Council on Cardiovascular Nursing; American Heart Association Council on Clinical Cardiology; American Heart Association Council on Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Metabolism; American Heart Association Interdisciplinary Council on Quality of Care and Outcomes Research. State of the science: promoting self-care in persons with heart failure: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association. Circulation 2009;120:1141–1163. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

46. Lee CS, Bidwell JT, Paturzo M, Alvaro R, Cocchieri A, Jaarsma T, Strömberg A, Riegel B, Vellone E. Patterns of self-care and clinical events in a cohort of adults with heart failure: 1 year follow-up. Heart Lung 2018;47:40–46. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

47. Lainscak M, Blue L, Clark AL, Dahlström U, Dickstein K, Ekman I, McDonagh T, McMurray JJ, Ryder M, Stewart S, Strömberg A, Jaarsma T. Self-care management of heart failure: practical recommendations from the Patient Care Committee of the Heart Failure Association of the European Society of Cardiology. Eur J Heart Fail 2011;13:115–126. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

48. Mahajan R, Stokes M, Elliott A, Munawar DA, Khokhar KB, Thiyagarajah A, Hendriks J, Linz D, Gallagher C, Kaye D, Lau D, Sanders P. Complex interaction of obesity, intentional weight loss and heart failure: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Heart 2020;106:58–68. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

49. World Health Organization Facts Sheet: Primary Health Care. 2018. [(accessed on 2 March 2022)]. Available online: http://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/primary-health-care.

50. World Health Organization Cardiovascular Diseases: Data and Statistics. 2016. [(accessed on 21 November 2019)]. Available online: http://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/noncommunicable-diseases/cardiovascular-diseases/data-and-statistics.

51. World Health Organization Facts Sheet: Cardiovascular Diseases (CVDs) 2021. [(accessed on 16 February 2022)]. Available online: https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/cardiovascular-diseases-(cvds)

52. World Health Organization Facts Sheet: Cardiovascular Diseases. 2016. [(accessed on 21 November 2019)]. Available online: http://www.who.int/en/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/cardiovascular-diseases-(cvds)

53. World Health Organization Global Action Plan for the Prevention and Control of Noncommunicable Diseases 2013–2020. 2013. [(accessed on 16 February 2022)]. Available online: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/94384/9789241506236_eng.pdf;jsessionid=E960247D9234E092B0E4A762ADFACC8A?sequence=1.

54. World Health Organization, Division of Health Promotion, Education, and Communication. Health Promotion Glossary. World Health Organization; Geneva, Switzerland: 1998. [Google Scholar]

55. Gaziano T.A., Galea G., Reddy K.S. Scaling up interventions for chronic disease prevention: The evidence. Lancet. 2007;370:1939–1946. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(07)61697-3. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

56. Yusuf S., Hawken S., Ôunpuu S., Dans T., Avezum A., Lanas F., McQueen M., Budaj A., Pais P., Varigos J., et al. Effect of potentially modifiable risk factors associated with myocardial infarction in 52 countries (the INTERHEART study): Case-control study. Lancet. 2004;364:937–952. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(04)17018-9. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

57. Nichols M., Townsend N., Scarborough P., Rayner M. Cardiovascular disease in Europe 2014: Epidemiological update. Eur. Heart J. 2014;35:2929. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehu299. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

58. World Health Organization Cardiovascular Diseases: Data and Statistics European Regional Office of the World Health Organisation; Geneva, Switzerland: 2016. [Google Scholar]

59. World Health Organization . Framework for Action on Interprofessional Education & Collaborative Practice. World Health Organization Press; Geneva, Switzerland: 2010. [Google Scholar]

60. World Health Organization . State of the World's Nursing 2020: Investing in Education, Jobs and Leadership. World Health Organization; Geneva, Switzerland: 2020. [Google Scholar]

61. Phillips H., Rotthier P., Meyvis L., Remmen R. Accessibility and use of Primary Health Care: How conclusive is the social-economical situation in Antwerp? Acta Clin. Belgica. 2015;70:100–104. doi: 10.1179/0001551214Z.000000000112. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

62. Waller M., Blomstrand A., Högberg T., Ariai N., Thorn J., Hange D., Björkelund C. A primary care lifestyle programme suitable for socioeconomically vulnerable groups-an observational study. Scand. J. Prim. Health Care. 2016;34:352–359. doi: 10.1080/02813432.2016.1248628. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

63. Srivarathan A., Jensen A.N., Kristiansen M. Community-based interventions to enhance healthy aging in disadvantaged areas: Perceptions of older adults and health care professionals. BMC Health Serv. Res. 2019;19:7. doi

64. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services National coverage analysis decision summary.ventricular assist devices for bridge-to-transplant and destination therapy CMS.gov 2013.CAG-00432R. Accessed June 25, 2022.

65. Weinstein J.M., Greenberg D., Sharf A., Simon-Tuval T. The impact of a community-based heart failure multidisciplinary team clinic on healthcare utilization and costs. ESC Heart Fail. 2022;9:676–684. doi: 10.1002/ehf2.13689. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

66. Morris A., Shah K.S., Enciso J.S., et al. The impact of health care disparities on patients with heart failure. J Card Fail. 2022;28:1169–1184. doi: 10.1016/j.cardfail.2022.04.008. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

67. Koene R.J., Prizment A.E., Blaes A., Konety S.H. Shared risk factors in cardiovascular disease and cancer. Circulation. 2016;133:1104–1114. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.115.020406.

[DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

68. Jin C., Sharma A.N., Thevakumar B., et al. Carcinoid heart disease: pathophysiology, pathology, clinical manifestations, and management. Cardiology. 2021;146:65–73. doi: 10.1159/000507847. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

69. Connolly H.M., Schaff H.V., Abel M.D., et al. Early and late outcomes of surgical treatment in carcinoid heart disease. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2015;66:2189–2196. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2015.09.014. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

70. Siontis B.L., Leja M., Chugh R. Current clinical management of primary cardiac sarcoma. Expert Rev Anticancer Ther. 2020;20:45–51. doi: 10.1080/14737140.2020.1711738. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

71. Burgess A.P.H., Dongarwar D., Spigel Z., et al. Pregnancy-related mortality in the United States, 2003-2016: age, race, and place of death. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2020;222:489.e1–489.e8. doi: 10.1016/j.ajog.2020.02.020. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

72. MacDorman M.F., Thoma M., Declcerq E., Howell E.A. Racial and ethnic disparities in maternal mortality in the United States using enhanced vital records, 2016–2017. Am J Public Health. 2021;111:1673–1681. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2021.306375. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

73. Sanghavi M., Rutherford J.D. Cardiovascular physiology of pregnancy. Circulation. 2014;130:1003–1008. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.114.009029. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

74. Lindley K.J., Bairey Merz C.N., Asgar A.W., et al. Management of women with congenital or inherited cardiovascular disease from pre-conception through pregnancy and postpartum: JACC Focus Seminar 2/5. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2021;77:1778–1798. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2021.02.026. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

75. Li R, Chen Y, Ritchie MD, Moore JH. Electronic health records and polygenic risk scores for predicting disease risk. Nat Rev Genet. 2020;8(21):493–502. doi: 10.1038/s41576-020-0224-1. [DOI] [PubMed]

76. Saki M, Najmi S, Gholami M, Ebrahimzadeh F, Pour FJ. The effect of patient-centered education in adherence to the treatment regimen in patients with coronary artery disease. J Vasc Nurs. 2022;1(40):28–34. doi: 10.1016/j.jvn.2021.10.003. [DOI] [PubMed]

77. Beauchamp A, Talevski J, Niebauer J, Gutenberg J, Kefalianos E, Mayr B, et al. Health literacy interventions for secondary prevention of coronary artery disease: a scoping review. Open Heart. 2022;1(9):e001895. doi: 10.1136/openhrt-2021-001895. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed]