Letters in High Energy Physics
ISSN: 2632-2714
Volume 2024

Comprehensive Management of Patients in Internal Medicine: the Synergistic Role of Intensive Care, Emergency Services, Nursing, Radiology, Pharmacy, Physical Therapy, and Dental Care

Sarah Yousef Hussain Althuwaini[1], Amnah Ahmed Aljurayyad[2], Fatemah Mohammed Altolahiy[3], Ali Mohammed Ali Alnujaydi[4], Zainab Ahmed Alsheef[5], Nada Ridhaa Alsairfi[6], Ahmad Ali Alradwan[7], Mohammad Misfer Alsagour[8], Bader Ali Almubarak[9], Marzoog Abdullah Alshahrani[10]

[1] ICU Nursing, Prince saud bin jalawy hospital, Soshi8722@gmail.com
[2] Nurse technician, Al Morah PHC, alwafya1988@gmail.com
[3] Pharmacist technician, Prince sultan cardia center Alhassa, Faltolahiy@moh.gov.sa
[4] Nursing, King Fahad Hospital Al-jaber Kideny Center, amalnujaidi@moh.gov.sa
[5] Emergency Medical specialist, Eastern Health Cluster, Zaalsheef@moh.gov.sa
[6] Emergency Medical Services specialist, Eastern Health Cluster, nalsairfi@moh.gov.sa
[7] Physiotherapist, Southern Al khobar phc, ahalradwan@moh.gov.sa
[8] RADIOLOGY TECHNOLOGIST, Dammam Medical Complex, MRI.tech7777@gmail.com
[9] Internal Medicine Consultant, Dammam Medical Complex, almirzabader@hotmail.com
[10] Dental assistant, Aseer Health Cluster, maralsh5@gmail.com

Abstract:

The comprehensive management of patients in internal medicine hinges on a synergistic, multidisciplinary model where the internist acts as the central coordinator, integrating essential expertise from critical specialties to optimize outcomes. This approach leverages the acute resuscitation skills of emergency services, the organ-support mastery of intensive care, the continuous surveillance and advocacy of nursing, the diagnostic precision of radiology, the pharmacotherapeutic safety oversight of clinical pharmacy, the functional preservation strategies of physical therapy, and the systemic health insights of dental care. Rather than functioning in isolation, these domains interact dynamically through shared protocols, communication frameworks, and collaborative decision-making, transforming patient care from a sequential series of consultations into a cohesive, patient-centered continuum. This integration addresses the full spectrum of needs—from crisis intervention and diagnostic accuracy to medication safety, functional recovery, and preventive oral health—thereby reducing errors, shortening hospital stays, improving functional outcomes, and enhancing overall quality of care. Ultimately, the model exemplifies how collaborative healthcare ecosystems can achieve superior results compared to traditional, fragmented approaches.

Keywords: Multidisciplinary integration, internal medicine, patient-centered care, collaborative healthcare, intensive care, emergency medicine, nursing

Introduction

The landscape of modern internal medicine has evolved from a model of compartmentalized, specialty-focused care into a dynamic, integrative discipline that fundamentally relies on the seamless synergy of multiple healthcare domains. The management of medically complex adult patients, particularly those with multiple chronic conditions or acute decompensations, presents challenges that no single medical specialty can address in isolation. The core physician-led discipline of internal medicine, focusing on the diagnosis, treatment, and compassionate care of adults across the spectrum from health to complex illness, now operates as the central orchestrator within a multifaceted healthcare ecosystem [1]. This paradigm shift recognizes that optimal patient outcomes—measured in terms of mortality reduction, functional recovery, quality of life, and healthcare efficiency—are inextricably linked to the quality of collaboration between the internist and a broad array of allied services. The contemporary internal medicine patient's journey is

no longer a linear path but a networked experience, where critical decision-making nodes involve intensive, interdependent contributions from intensive care, emergency services, nursing, radiology, pharmacy, physical therapy, and dental care.

The historical foundation of internal medicine as a cognitive specialty, deeply rooted in detailed history-taking and physical examination, remains irreplaceable. However, the explosion of medical knowledge, technological advancements, and the increasing prevalence of multimorbidity have rendered the traditional, solitary internist model insufficient for managing high-acuity or longitudinally complex cases [2]. The modern hospital, especially, functions as a complex organism where the flow of information, expertise, and coordinated action determines institutional efficacy. A failure in communication or integration at any interface—between the emergency physician and the receiving hospitalist, between the radiologist and the intensivist, or between the pharmacist and the nursing staff—can lead to diagnostic delays, therapeutic errors, adverse events, and suboptimal resource utilization. Therefore, comprehensive management is less about the sequential addition of services and more about the cultivation of a synergistic culture where each specialty's unique expertise is leveraged to create a holistic therapeutic plan greater than the sum of its parts [3].

This integrative approach begins at the moment of acute presentation. The emergency department (ED) serves as the critical front door and initial diagnostic sieve for a vast majority of internal medicine admissions. Here, the emergency physician's skill in stabilization and rapid differential diagnosis must immediately engage with the anticipatory logic of the hospitalist or intensivist. The decision to admit to a general medical ward versus a medical intensive care unit (MICU) is a pivotal one, guided by shared protocols and real-time communication. This transition sets the stage for the entire hospitalization. Once within the inpatient setting, the internist assumes the role of captain, but the ship is crewed by specialists whose continuous input is vital. The intensivist provides mastery over organ support and pathophysiology in crisis. The nurse executes, monitors, and translates the plan of care at the bedside, acting as the primary surveillant for clinical change. The radiologist moves beyond being a consultant providing a report to becoming a diagnostic partner, guiding image selection and interpretation that directly answers the clinical question posed by the internist [4].

Concurrently, the clinical pharmacist has evolved from a dispensary role to an essential guardian of pharmacotherapeutic safety and efficacy, managing complex drug interactions, renal dosing, and antimicrobial stewardship—a key component in the fight against multidrug-resistant organisms. The physical therapist addresses the often-overlooked but devastating sequela of hospitalization: deconditioning and functional decline, intervening early to preserve mobility and independence, which are powerful predictors of discharge outcomes and readmission risk [5]. Perhaps most symbolically integrative is the inclusion of dental care in this model. Oral health is not a separate entity but a window to systemic health and a potential source of life-threatening infection, particularly in immunocompromised, elderly, or critically ill medical patients. Proactive dental assessment and management can prevent ventilator-associated pneumonia in the ICU or septic foci in patients with valvular heart disease or undergoing chemotherapy [6].

The theoretical framework supporting this model is robust, drawing from systems theory, human factors engineering, and the science of high-reliability organizations. It posits that healthcare delivery is a complex adaptive system where outcomes emerge from the interactions between agents (healthcare professionals) [7, 8].

The Central Orchestrator: The Internist in the Multidisciplinary Framework

The internist, whether a general hospitalist or a subspecialist, functions as the principal diagnostician, care coordinator, and primary communicator with the patient and family. In the multidisciplinary model, this role transforms from solo practitioner to conductor of an orchestra. The internist's deep, holistic understanding of the patient's baseline physiology, comorbid conditions, social determinants, and personal goals becomes the foundational score upon which all other specialties add their parts. It is the internist who synthesizes the data points: the emergency physician's initial assessment, the radiologist's imaging findings, the pharmacist's therapeutic recommendations, and the

nurse's minute-by-minute clinical observations into a coherent and evolving diagnostic and treatment narrative. This requires not only exceptional medical knowledge but also advanced skills in communication, team leadership, and conflict resolution. The internist must create a climate where the input from a nurse regarding a subtle change in mental status or from a pharmacist about a potential drug-drug interaction is not only welcomed but actively sought, as these insights are often the first signs of clinical deterioration or therapeutic misadventure [9]. This leadership is exercised daily during multidisciplinary rounds, where the presence and active participation of all key team members are crucial for setting synchronized daily goals and anticipating discharge needs from the moment of admission.

The Crucible of Crisis: The Synergy between Internal Medicine and Intensive Care

The interface between general internal medicine and the Medical Intensive Care Unit (MICU) represents one of the most high-stakes synergies in the hospital. The intensivist brings a specific skill set focused on the management of single or multiple organ failure, advanced hemodynamic monitoring, and life-support technologies. However, the effective application of this expertise is wholly dependent on a seamless partnership with the primary internist. The transition of a patient from the ward to the ICU is a vulnerable period. A structured handoff that includes the internist's insights into the patient's chronic illnesses, goals of care, and the nuanced trajectory of their current decline is essential for the intensivist to avoid therapeutic missteps. For instance, managing septic shock in a patient with underlying advanced cirrhosis and hepatorenal syndrome requires a delicate balance of fluid resuscitation, vasopressor choice, and antibiotic dosing that is informed by the internist's or hepatologist's understanding of the patient's baseline portal hypertension and metabolic capacity [10].

Conversely, the intensivist's role is not confined to the ICU walls. The concept of the "ICU without walls," facilitated by Rapid Response Teams (RRTs) or Medical Emergency Teams (METs), embodies this synergy. These teams, often led by intensivists or critical care nurses, are activated by ward staff—typically nurses or the primary internist—at the earliest signs of patient deterioration (e.g., changes in respiratory rate, heart rate, or mental status). This system creates a safety net, allowing critical care expertise to flow to the patient before a full cardiac or respiratory arrest occurs, often preventing ICU admission altogether or ensuring a more stabilized transition if required [11]. Furthermore, post-ICU care is a critical collaborative phase. The internist, upon receiving the patient back on the ward, must manage the sequelae of critical illness—ICU-acquired weakness, post-traumatic stress, and ongoing needs for complex wound or infection management—often with continued input from the ICU team regarding weaning from specific therapies or follow-up on ICU-initiated interventions. This bidirectional flow of responsibility and expertise ensures continuity and avoids the dangerous illusion that care is "handed off" in a discontinuous manner.

The Frontline Gatekeeper: Integration with Emergency Services

The emergency department is the volatile entry point where undifferentiated illness meets the healthcare system. The emergency physician's task is rapid triage, resuscitation, and initiation of a diagnostic workup under significant time pressure and uncertainty. Their synergy with the receiving internal medicine service is paramount for patient safety and hospital flow. Effective integration begins with clear, mutually respectful communication regarding admission decisions. The internist relies on the emergency physician's acumen to identify which patients require admission and to initiate appropriate treatment for time-sensitive conditions like community-acquired pneumonia, acute coronary syndromes, or stroke. Protocols for sepsis bundles, initiated in the ED, have dramatically improved outcomes, demonstrating how shared evidence-based pathways align emergency and internal medicine practices [12].

Beyond the admission decision, the collaborative work in the ED shapes the entire hospitalization. A thorough medication reconciliation performed by ED pharmacists and nurses, communicated clearly to the admitting team, prevents devastating errors. Diagnostic imaging ordered in the ED, such as a CT pulmonary angiography for suspected PE, must be interpreted with the clinical context provided by the ED physician and then acted upon decisively by the

admitting internist. The concept of "boarding" admitted patients in the ED due to hospital bed shortages creates a particularly hazardous environment that demands even closer collaboration, as the internist may need to co-manage the patient with the ED staff for an extended period. Shared electronic health records and structured handoff tools like I-PASS (Illness severity, Patient summary, Action list, Situation awareness, and Synthesis by receiver) are critical technological and procedural innovations that standardize this transfer of information and responsibility, reducing omissions and errors during this high-risk transition [13]. This partnership ensures that the patient's journey from community to inpatient care is not a disjointed leap but a coordinated bridge.

The Bedside Sentinel and Advocate: The Indispensable Role of Nursing

Nursing is not merely a supportive service but the foundational, continuous care infrastructure upon which all medical plans are executed. The nurse is the internist's eyes, ears, and hands at the bedside, providing 24/7 surveillance that is impossible for any physician to replicate. The synergy between the internist and the nursing staff is the most frequent and clinically significant interaction in patient care. Nurses translate medical orders into action, but their role is profoundly cognitive. They perform ongoing assessments, recognize subtle early warning signs of deterioration (e.g., increasing restlessness, a slight decline in urine output, or a change in the character of pain), and escalate concerns appropriately. Their documentation of trends in vital signs, fluid balance, and neurological status forms the empirical basis for daily medical decision-making [14].

This collaboration is especially critical in areas like pain management, delirium prevention, and pressure ulcer avoidance—key quality indicators in inpatient medicine. The nurse's constant presence allows for tailored, non-pharmacological interventions and the timely administration of analgesics or antipsychotics as per protocols. Furthermore, nurses are primary educators for patients and families, reinforcing the explanations provided by the internist regarding disease processes, medication purposes, and discharge instructions. A breakdown in communication between the medical and nursing teams—such as unclear goals of care, misunderstood orders, or a culture where nurses feel unable to question a plan—is a root cause of many preventable adverse events. Effective models like collaborative rounding, where the nurse presents their assessment to the physician at the bedside, foster shared ownership and ensure all team members are aligned with the daily plan. The nurse's advocacy for the patient's psychosocial and comfort needs complements the physician's biomedical focus, creating a truly patient-centered approach [15].

The Visual Diagnostic Partner: The Evolving Synergy with Radiology

Modern radiology has transcended its traditional "consultant" role to become an integrated diagnostic partner embedded in the clinical workflow. The internist and radiologist engage in a continuous dialogue that begins with the appropriate choice of study. The internist must formulate a precise clinical question, while the radiologist can advise on the most efficacious and safest imaging modality (e.g., ultrasound vs. CT for suspected cholecystitis, considering radiation and renal function). This shared decision-making optimizes diagnostic yield and minimizes patient harm. The interpretation of images is no longer a one-way report but an interactive process. With the advent of integrated Picture Archiving and Communication Systems (PACS), the internist can review images concurrently, correlating radiographic findings with the clinical picture. However, the radiologist's expert interpretation remains vital to identify subtle findings, differentiate artifacts from pathology, and provide differential diagnoses based on imaging patterns [16].

This synergy is most potent in interventional radiology (IR), which has become a minimally invasive alternative to many surgical procedures crucial for internal medicine patients. Image-guided drainage of abscesses, placement of central venous catheters or nephrostomy tubes, embolization of bleeding vessels, and biopsies of deep-seated lesions are now routine. The internist identifies the need, the IR team executes the procedure with precision, and the internist manages the post-procedural care and integrates the pathological results into the overall management plan. In acute settings, such as a massive pulmonary embolism, the collaboration between the intensivist, cardiologist, and

interventional radiologist for catheter-directed thrombolysis is a life-saving example of cross-disciplinary synergy. Furthermore, in oncology, a subspecialty of internal medicine, diagnostic and interventional radiology are inseparable from staging, treatment planning (radiation therapy), and assessing treatment response, forming a continuous feedback loop with the medical oncologist [17].

The Pharmacotherapeutic Guardian: The Clinical Pharmacy Partnership

The complexity of pharmacotherapy in modern internal medicine, especially for elderly patients with polypharmacy, has made the clinical pharmacist an indispensable member of the care team. The pharmacist's synergy with the internist and nurse is a primary defense against medication errors, which remain a leading cause of iatrogenic harm. Pharmacists conduct comprehensive medication reconciliation upon admission, a critical step in identifying discrepancies, undocumented allergies, and potential interactions. During the hospitalization, they provide proactive reviews of medication orders, focusing on renal and hepatic dosing adjustments, intravenous-to-oral conversions, allergy cross-reactivity, and therapeutic duplication. For high-risk medications like anticoagulants, insulin, and chemotherapeutic agents, pharmacist-driven protocols and monitoring significantly improve safety and efficacy [18].

A paramount area of collaboration is antimicrobial stewardship. In an era of rising antimicrobial resistance, the rational use of antibiotics is a collective responsibility. The internist initiates empiric therapy based on the suspected source and local antibiogram, but the pharmacist, often as part of a formal stewardship program, reviews orders daily to ensure appropriateness, advocates for de-escalation once culture results return, recommends optimal dosing regimens, and monitors for adverse effects. This partnership ensures that patients receive effective treatment while minimizing collateral damage to the individual's microbiome and the microbial ecology of the hospital. Furthermore, pharmacists are instrumental in discharge planning, ensuring patients understand their medication regimens, can afford them, and have a plan for adherence—a key intervention to prevent readmission. Their expertise in pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics directly informs the internist's therapeutic choices, making them true therapeutic partners rather than mere dispensers [19].

Preserving Function and Independence: Integration with Physical Therapy

Hospitalization for acute medical illness often leads to rapid functional decline due to bed rest, disease-related fatigue, and institutionalization—a syndrome termed "hospitalization-associated disability." This decline is a strong, independent predictor of poor outcomes, including increased length of stay, discharge to a nursing facility, readmission, and mortality. Integrating physical therapy (PT) and, where appropriate, occupational therapy (OT) into the core medical team is therefore not a rehabilitative afterthought but a proactive strategy for preserving health. The physiotherapist's role begins with early mobilization, often within 24-48 hours of admission for stable patients, including those in the ICU. The synergy here is vital: the internist must provide medical clearance and ensure physiological stability (e.g., managing hypotension or arrhythmias that could limit mobility), while the physiotherapist assesses the patient's functional capacity, designs a safe, progressive activity plan, and works with nursing to execute it [20].

This collaboration is particularly crucial for specific populations. For patients with heart failure, tailored exercise programs improve functional capacity and quality of life. For those with COPD, pulmonary rehabilitation principles can be initiated inpatient. For the geriatric patient, PT focuses on balance, gait, and strength to prevent falls. The physiotherapist's functional assessment provides the internist with critical data for discharge planning; a patient's ability to transfer from bed to chair or walk a certain distance is a more concrete indicator of readiness for home than many laboratory values. By setting shared goals early—such as "ambulate 100 feet with a walker independently"—the internist and physiotherapist align the entire team's efforts toward functional recovery, which is the ultimate goal for most patients. This shifts the culture from a purely disease-focused model to a patient-centered, function-preserving model [21].

The Oral-Systemic Health Connection: Incorporating Dental Care

The inclusion of dental care in the comprehensive management of medical patients underscores the

truly holistic nature of the synergistic model. The mouth is not an isolated organ; it is a reservoir of bacteria and a site of chronic inflammation that can significantly impact systemic health. For the internal medicine patient, poor oral health can be both a cause and a consequence of disease. Periodontal disease is an independent risk factor for atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease, poorly controlled diabetes, and rheumatoid arthritis, likely through mechanisms of chronic inflammation and bacteremia [22]. In the hospitalized patient, particularly the critically ill, the oropharynx can become colonized with pathogenic bacteria, which may then be aspirated, leading to hospital-acquired or ventilator-associated pneumonia (VAP). Routine oral care with chlorhexidine is a standard VAP prevention bundle component in ICUs, a simple nursing intervention born from dental medicine principles.

Proactive dental consultation is essential for specific high-risk medical populations. Patients scheduled for chemotherapy or hematopoietic stem cell transplantation require pre-treatment dental clearance and management of active infections to prevent life-threatening sepsis from oral sources during neutropenia. Similarly, patients with prosthetic heart valves, prior infective endocarditis, or certain congenital heart defects undergoing invasive dental procedures require antibiotic prophylaxis, a management point that requires direct communication between the cardiologist, internist, and dentist [23]. For patients with end-stage renal disease on dialysis, managing uremic stomatitis and calciphylaxis lesions in the mouth improves quality of life and nutritional intake. Furthermore, many systemic diseases have oral manifestations (e.g., candidiasis in immunosuppression, ulcerations in vasculitis, macroglossia in amyloidosis), which can provide diagnostic clues for the astute internist. Integrating dental professionals into the multidisciplinary team, either through formal consultations or embedded protocols for oral assessment and care, closes a significant gap in holistic patient management and prevents complications that extend hospitalization and increase morbidity [24].

The Challenges and Future Directions of Multidisciplinary Integration

While the theoretical and evidential case for synergistic care is overwhelming, its practical implementation faces significant hurdles. These include professional tribalism and historical hierarchies that can stifle open communication, logistical barriers like scheduling synchronous multidisciplinary rounds, lack of shared physical or digital workspace, and financial reimbursement models that often do not adequately compensate for collaborative time (e.g., for pharmacists or physiotherapists participating in rounds) [25]. Furthermore, information overload and poor EHR design can fragment data rather than integrate it, forcing team members to work from different "versions of the truth." Overcoming these challenges requires intentional institutional leadership and investment. Strategies include creating shared performance metrics that reward team outcomes, implementing collaborative care agreements, utilizing advanced EHRs with integrated dashboards that present key data from all disciplines, and fostering a culture of psychological safety where any team member can voice concerns without fear of reprisal [26].

The future of this model lies in further technological and conceptual integration. Telemedicine platforms can facilitate remote specialty consultations, such as telestroke or tele-ICU services, bringing expertise to underserved locations. Artificial intelligence (AI) holds promise as a synergistic tool, not a replacement, for human teams. AI algorithms could analyze vast datasets from the EHR, radiology images, and vital sign trends to provide clinicians with predictive analytics (e.g., early warning of sepsis, decompensated heart failure, or delirium), allowing for pre-emptive, team-based intervention [27]. The concept of the "learning health system," where data from every patient encounter is systematically analyzed to improve protocols and processes, will depend entirely on the seamless integration of data from all these allied services. Ultimately, the goal is to move beyond multidisciplinary care—where disciplines work in parallel—to truly *interdisciplinary*care, where knowledge and perspectives are synthesized to create novel, patient-specific solutions that no single discipline could envision alone [28].

Conclusion

The comprehensive management of patients in internal medicine in the 21st century is an unequivocally collective endeavor. The internist, armed with a deep understanding of whole-person pathophysiology, serves as the essential integrator and coordinator. However, their effectiveness is magnified exponentially through deliberate, structured, and respectful synergy with the specialized domains of intensive care, emergency medicine, nursing, radiology, pharmacy, physical therapy, and dental care. Each of these disciplines contributes a unique and critical piece to the puzzle of patient recovery. The intensivist masters crisis physiology; the emergency physician provides expert triage and stabilization; the nurse offers continuous surveillance and compassionate execution; the radiologist illuminates the unseen; the pharmacist safeguards therapeutic precision; the physiotherapist defends functional integrity; and the dental professional protects the oral-systemic health nexus. This is not a mere assembly line of services but a dynamic, interconnected network where communication, mutual respect, and shared goals are the currency of success. The evidence is clear: healthcare systems that nurture this synergistic culture achieve superior outcomes in terms of survival, recovery, patient satisfaction, and resource efficiency. As medical complexity continues to grow, the imperative for this integrated, team-based approach will only strengthen, defining the standard of excellence for the future of internal medicine and hospital care

References:

1. Obana M., Furuya J., Matsubara C., et al. Effect of a collaborative transdisciplinary team approach on oral health status in acute stroke patients. Journal of Oral Rehabilitation . 2019;46(12):1170–1176.
2. Brady M. C., Stott D. J., Weir C. J., et al. A pragmatic, multi-centered, stepped wedge, cluster randomized controlled trial pilot of the clinical and cost effectiveness of a complex stroke oral healthcare intervention plan evaluation II (SOCLE II) compared with usual oral healthcare in stroke wards. International Journal of Stroke . 2020;15(3):318–323.
3. Ames N. J., Sulima P., Yates J. M., et al. Effects of systematic oral care in critically ill patients: a multicenter study. American Journal of Critical Care . 2011;20(5):e103–e114.
4. Miller S. C. Textbook of Periodontia . Philadelphia, PA, USA: Blakiston Company; 1950.
5. Aoki S., Hosomi N., Hirayama J., et al. The multidisciplinary swallowing team approach decreases pneumonia onset in acute stroke patients. PLoS One . 2016;11(5)
6. Matsui H., Fushimi K., Yasunaga H. Variation in risk-standardized mortality of stroke among hospitals in Japan. PLoS One . 2015;10(10)
7. Eichner K. Renewed examination of the group classification of partially edentulous arches by Eichner and application advices for studies on morbidity statistics. Stomatologie der DDR . 1990;40:321–325.
8. Hospital-acquired pneumonia in adults: diagnosis, assessment of severity, initial antimicrobial therapy, and preventive strategies. a consensus statement, American thoracic society, November 1995. American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine . 1996;153:1711–1725.
9. Dougall A., Fiske J. Access to special care dentistry, part 9. Special care dentistry services for older people. British Dental Journal . 2008;205(8):421–434.
10. Cieplik F., Wiedenhofer A. M., Pietsch V., et al. Oral health, oral microbiota, and incidence of stroke-associated pneumonia-a prospective observational study. Frontiers in Neurology . 2020;11
11. Horan T. C., Andrus M., Dudeck M. A. CDC/NHSN surveillance definition of health care-associated infection and criteria for specific types of infections in the acute care setting. American Journal of Infection Control . 2008;36(5):309–332.
12. Carnaby G., Hankey G. J., Pizzi J. Behavioural intervention for dysphagia in

acute stroke: a randomised controlled trial. The Lancet Neurology . 2006;5(1):31–37.

13. Károlyházy K., Arányi Z., Hermann P., Vastagh I., Márton K. Oral health status of stroke patients related to residual symptoms: a case-control epidemiological study in Hungary. Oral Health & Preventive Dentistry . 2018;16:233–239.
14. Hannawi Y., Hannawi B., Rao C. P. V., Suarez J. I., Bershad E. M. Stroke-associated pneumonia: major advances and obstacles. Cerebrovascular Diseases . 2013;35(5):430–443.
15. Powers W. J., Rabinstein A. A., Ackerson T., et al. 2018 guidelines for the early management of patients with acute ischemic stroke: a guideline for healthcare professionals from the American heart association/American stroke association. Stroke . 2018;49:e46–e110.
16. Ono K., Wada K., Takahara T., Shirotani T. Indications for computed tomography in patients with mild head injury. Neurologia Medico-Chirurgica . 2007;47(7):291–298.
17. Andersson P., Westergren A., Karlsson S., Rahm Hallberg I., Renvert S. Oral Health and nutritional status in a group of geriatric rehabilitation patients. Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences . 2002;16(3):311–318.
18. Ovbiagele B., Hills N. K., Saver J. L., Johnston S. C. Frequency and determinants of pneumonia and urinary tract infection during stroke hospitalization. Journal of Stroke and Cerebrovascular Diseases . 2006;15(5):209–213.
19. Wang K., Li P., Chen L., Kato K., Kobayashi M., Yamauchi K. Impact of the Japanese diagnosis procedure combination-based payment system in Japan. Journal of Medical Systems . 2010;34(1):95–100.
20. Badve M. S., Zhou Z., van de Beek D., Anderson C. S., Hackett M. L. Frequency of post-stroke pneumonia: systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. International Journal of Stroke . 2019;14(2):125–136.
21. Dziewas R., Ritter M., Schilling M., et al. Pneumonia in acute stroke patients fed by nasogastric tube. Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry . 2004;75(6):852–856.
22. Fort S., Batty G. M., Wilkins W. E. Prolonged pharyngeal impaction of dentures following stroke. Stroke . 1989;20(12):1748–1750.
23. Lyons M., Smith C., Boaden E., et al. Oral care after stroke: where are we now? European Stroke Journal . 2018;3(4):347–354.
24. Ozaki K., Baba M., Nakamura T., et al. Impact of oral hygiene management through a multidisciplinary approach on patients with acute stroke: building a pneumonia-prevention system by dentistry. The Japanese Journal of Dysphagia Rehabilitation . 2018;22:225–236.
25. Brady M. C., Stott D. J., Norrie J., et al. Developing and evaluating the implementation of a complex intervention: using mixed methods to inform the design of a randomised controlled trial of an oral healthcare intervention after stroke. Trials . 2011;12(1):168.
26. Ab Malik N., Mohamad Yatim S. a., Lam O. L. T., Jin L., McGrath C. P. J. Effectiveness of a web-based health education program to promote oral hygiene care among stroke survivors: randomized controlled trial. Journal of Medical Internet Research . 2017;19(3):e87.
27. Sellars C., Bowie L., Bagg J., et al. Risk factors for chest infection in acute stroke. Stroke . 2007;38(8):2284–2291.
28. Gerreth P., Gerreth K., Maciejczyk M., Zalewska A., Hojan K. Is an oral health status a predictor of functional improvement in ischemic stroke patients undergoing comprehensive rehabilitation treatment? Brain Sciences . 2021;11(3):338.