

The Ultimate Goal of Human Being Exploring Diseases

Natalie T. Collins*

University of Bristol, Beacon House, Queens Road, Bristol BS8 1QU, United Kingdom

*: All correspondence should be sent to: Dr. Natalie T. Collins

Author's Contact: Dr. Natalie T. Collins, Ph.D., M.Sc., E-mail: ntcollins@outlook.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15354/si.25.re1191>

Funding: No funding source declared.

COI: The author declares no competing interest.

AI Declaration: The author affirms that artificial intelligence did not contribute to the process of preparing the work.

The pursuit of understanding and conquering disease has long been a central theme in human history. This article explores the ultimate goal behind humanity's relentless effort to investigate diseases—not merely to extend life, but to elevate the quality and dignity of human existence. Drawing from philosophical, scientific, and ethical perspectives, we argue that disease exploration transcends biomedical boundaries. It reflects a deep, intrinsic human desire to exert agency over suffering, enhance resilience, foster social equity, and illuminate the human condition. We trace the evolution of disease inquiry from ancient herbalism to genomic medicine and digital health, highlighting how it mirrors progress in both knowledge and compassion. Ultimately, this journey reflects not just a biological imperative but a moral one: to reduce suffering, ensure justice in health, and construct a world where the vulnerabilities of illness are met with understanding, solidarity, and purposeful action. Disease exploration, in essence, is a profound expression of what it means to be human.

Keywords: Human Diseases; Therapeutics; Long-Term Investigation; History; Future

Science Insights, July 31, 2025; Vol. 47, No. 1, pp.1893-1899.

© 2025 Insights Publisher. All rights reserved.



Creative Commons Non Commercial CC BY-NC: This article is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) which permits non-commercial use, reproduction and distribution of the work without further permission provided the original work is attributed by the Insights Publisher.

Disease as a Mirror of Human Vulnerability

DISEASE reveals the fragile foundations of human biology. At the core of this exploration lies an acceptance that life is inherently precarious. From the common cold to terminal cancer, humans experience a range of conditions that threaten their function and continuity. This vulnerability serves not only as a limitation but also as an invitation—an invitation to innovate, to protect, and to adapt. The exploration of disease, therefore, is a proactive engagement with our biological weaknesses. We are not content to simply endure; we

seek to understand, prevent, and treat.

From prehistoric times, humans made observations about disease patterns (Mackenbach, 2005). The remains of Neanderthals show evidence of healed fractures and possible care for the infirm (Jen, 2022). These acts suggest that even in early societies, disease was not solely a personal struggle but a communal one. Cultural practices around healing were often tied to spiritual beliefs, highlighting the role of disease in shaping early human identity and social cohesion. The disease was not just a threat but a teacher, pushing communities to develop care sys-

tems and share knowledge.

As societies evolved, so too did the conceptualization of disease. Ancient Egyptian medical texts, like the Edwin Smith Papyrus, and the medical philosophies of Hippocrates reflected early efforts to rationalize illness (Greene, 1997). Disease moved from being perceived solely as divine punishment to being considered a natural imbalance. This shift was monumental: it laid the groundwork for observation-based science. Disease was no longer a mystery to be feared, but a phenomenon to be studied. This change marks one of the first steps in humanity's long journey toward health literacy and biomedical inquiry.

In the modern era, disease remains a central lens through which humans interpret their physical and existential states. The psychological impact of illness—feelings of helplessness, anxiety, or even transformation—illustrates how deeply intertwined disease is with identity. Illness forces individuals to confront mortality, bodily limitations, and the unpredictability of life (Kottow & Kottow, 2007). These confrontations can lead to despair but also to resilience and re-prioritization. In this way, disease continues to act as a mirror, reflecting not just our frailties but also our strengths.

Ultimately, exploring disease is a way of grappling with the most profound aspects of human existence. It reflects an understanding that while suffering is inevitable, ignorance need not be. The more we learn about the mechanisms, causes, and effects of diseases, the more equipped we are to face them. This pursuit of understanding turns vulnerability into strength, allowing individuals and societies not only to cope with disease but also to transform the experience into a catalyst for growth and empathy.

Scientific Inquiry: Knowledge as Power and Responsibility

Scientific exploration of disease has always been a pursuit rooted in both curiosity and necessity. From the earliest anatomical dissections in ancient Greece to the cutting-edge use of CRISPR gene editing today, the goal has been to decipher the language of illness. Each scientific milestone has brought humanity closer to understanding the origins, trajectories, and possible interventions for diseases (Martínez-Lage et al., 2017). However, with increased knowledge comes increased responsibility. The power to alter the course of illness also entails the obligation to ensure ethical application, societal benefit, and equitable access.

The Enlightenment period ushered in a new era of empirical investigation (Molster et al., 2018). Thinkers like Vesalius, Galileo, and Newton inspired a methodology grounded in observation, experimentation, and reason. In medicine, this translated into the birth of pathology, microbiology, and pharmacology. The discovery of pathogens by Pasteur and Koch demonstrated that diseases had specific, identifiable causes (Sakai & Morimoto, 2022). This was a revolutionary insight that replaced centuries of speculation and mysticism with a clear path for targeted intervention.

Today, technological advancements have vastly expanded our capacity to investigate diseases. Genomic sequencing allows us to read the blueprints of life and understand hereditary disorders (Durmaz et al., 2015). Immunotherapy has revolutionized the treatment of cancer, while machine learning algorithms pre-

dict disease outbreaks before they occur. These tools are not just enhancing our understanding of disease—they are transforming our entire approach to health. Yet, they also present ethical dilemmas around privacy, consent, and the potential for misuse in surveillance or discrimination.

The unequal distribution of scientific benefits is perhaps the most pressing concern. Breakthroughs in treatment often emerge from high-income countries and remain inaccessible to low-income populations. During the COVID-19 pandemic, vaccine nationalism and hoarding by wealthy nations starkly illustrated the imbalance (Pilkington et al., 2022). As such, scientific inquiry into disease must always be accompanied by global collaboration and a commitment to fairness. Knowledge should serve the many, not the few.

Furthermore, the narrative of disease is incomplete without including the patient's voice. Scientific models and data must be humanized through patient-centered research. Real-world experiences, quality of life measures, and community-based participatory research ensure that science reflects not just what is measurable, but what is meaningful. In this sense, the goal of scientific inquiry into disease is not merely to conquer illness but to enrich and dignify the human experience in all its complexity.

Disease and the Pursuit of Social Justice

The burden of disease is unequally distributed across populations, often reflecting deeper social, economic, and political inequalities. Marginalized communities face higher rates of illness, reduced access to care, and greater vulnerability to health crises (Beech et al., 2021). Exploring disease from a justice-oriented perspective requires addressing these disparities. It means recognizing that health is not merely a personal matter but a public and social one, influenced by policies, environments, and histories of exclusion.

Public health interventions must therefore be informed by a commitment to equity. Programs that target disease prevention and treatment must prioritize those most at risk. This includes improving access to nutritious food, clean water, safe housing, and reliable healthcare services. Health justice also entails eliminating systemic racism and discrimination that affect health outcomes. For instance, maternal mortality rates among Black women in the United States remain alarmingly high due to a complex interplay of social determinants and biased medical practices (Howell et al., 2015).

Global health initiatives have underscored the need for solidarity across borders. The spread of infectious diseases like HIV/AIDS, Ebola, and COVID-19 has shown that no country is isolated from the effects of disease (Quinn & Kumar, 2014). A just approach to global health emphasizes vaccine equity, resource sharing, and inclusive decision-making. Organizations such as the WHO and Médecins Sans Frontières demonstrate how international cooperation can mitigate inequalities and improve outcomes in vulnerable regions.

Health justice also extends to the inclusion of traditionally silenced voices in research and policy. Indigenous health knowledge, disability rights perspectives, and lived experiences of patients all offer valuable insights (Rad, 2025). Participatory approaches to health research ensure that the exploration of

disease is not extractive but empowering. Justice in this context means not only eliminating disparities but also redistributing power in how health knowledge is created and applied.

Ultimately, the pursuit of social justice in disease exploration reflects a broader human aspiration: to build a world where everyone has the opportunity to live a healthy, fulfilling life. It is a recognition that our collective humanity is diminished when some suffer needlessly due to preventable and treatable diseases. In this way, justice is not a peripheral concern of medicine—it is its very heart.

The Ethical Imperative in Disease Research

The process of exploring disease is inherently bound to ethics. Questions of consent, risk, benefit, and justice are central to how research is designed and conducted. From clinical trials to experimental therapies, ethical principles must guide decision-making. The history of medicine is fraught with ethical failures—from the Tuskegee syphilis study to non-consensual experimentation—serving as stark reminders of what is at stake (Miteu, 2024).

Modern frameworks like the Declaration of Helsinki and the Belmont Report provide foundational ethical guidelines. These emphasize respect for persons, beneficence, and justice. In practice, this means ensuring informed consent, minimizing harm, and protecting vulnerable populations. Ethics review boards and community oversight mechanisms help safeguard participants, but ongoing vigilance is required to adapt to new challenges, especially in emerging fields like genetic editing and AI-driven diagnostics (Miteu, 2024).

Transparency and accountability are also ethical imperatives. Researchers must disclose conflicts of interest, publish negative results, and communicate findings clearly to the public. Ethical research demands humility: an acknowledgment of uncertainty, a willingness to revise assumptions, and a commitment to truth over prestige (Smith, 2024). The goal is not only to advance knowledge but to do so with integrity and respect.

Additionally, ethical inquiry must consider long-term impacts. Technologies like CRISPR raise concerns about germline modification and intergenerational consequences. Antimicrobial resistance, driven in part by overprescription, exemplifies how short-term solutions can generate long-term crises (Goff & Landecker, 2025). Ethical disease exploration therefore involves foresight and responsibility toward future generations.

In sum, the ethical dimension of disease research reflects our deepest values as a society. It is a way of ensuring that the pursuit of healing remains aligned with the dignity of those it aims to serve. Without ethics, scientific progress risks becoming inhumane; with ethics, it becomes a force for compassion and justice.

Psychological Dimensions of Disease Exploration

Beyond the physical, disease deeply affects the mind. The emotional and psychological impacts of illness—fear, depression, uncertainty—can be as debilitating as the symptoms themselves. Understanding these dimensions is essential for holistic care. It also opens a window into how disease shapes our cognition, behavior, and sense of identity.

Psychological research into disease has expanded significantly, recognizing the bidirectional relationship between mental and physical health. Chronic illnesses like diabetes or cancer often lead to mental health challenges, which in turn can affect disease management and prognosis (Jankowska, 2025). Integrated care models that address both mental and physical needs lead to better outcomes and improved patient satisfaction.

The field of health psychology explores how people perceive, cope with, and adapt to illness. Coping strategies, resilience, social support, and meaning-making all influence the experience of disease. Some patients find purpose and growth through illness, a phenomenon known as post-traumatic growth (Caldirola et al., 2025). Others struggle with existential crises, particularly in the face of terminal conditions.

Exploring disease from a psychological angle also helps dismantle stigma. Conditions like HIV/AIDS, depression, or epilepsy have historically been misunderstood and stigmatized. Educating the public and promoting empathy can reduce discrimination and improve social support. Psychological insight thus contributes not only to individual healing but also to societal inclusion.

Ultimately, understanding the psychological dimensions of disease exploration reinforces the humanity of the patient. It reminds clinicians, researchers, and policymakers that patients are not just biological systems but emotional and social beings. A comprehensive approach to disease must therefore include mental well-being as both a goal and a pathway to healing.

The Economic Impact of Disease and Its Exploration

Disease has profound economic consequences, affecting individuals, families, and nations. Illness reduces productivity, increases healthcare costs, and can plunge households into poverty. On a macroeconomic scale, epidemics and pandemics can cripple industries, disrupt supply chains, and strain national budgets (Petrov et al., 2021). Understanding the economic dimensions of disease is crucial for designing effective health systems and policy responses.

Healthcare expenditures are among the largest budget items in many countries. Chronic diseases like cardiovascular illness and diabetes account for significant portions of healthcare spending. Investments in prevention, early detection, and management can reduce long-term costs. Disease exploration thus serves not only a clinical function but an economic one: ensuring sustainability and efficiency in health systems (Thapa & Camtepe, 2020).

Pharmaceutical research and development are a major industry driven by disease exploration. While it leads to innovation, it also raises concerns about cost, access, and profit motives. High prices for life-saving medications can exclude those most in need. Balancing innovation with affordability is an ongoing challenge, requiring regulatory oversight and international cooperation.

Disease also influences labor markets. The loss of skilled workers due to illness or caregiving responsibilities can reduce economic output. In some regions, health crises decimate entire generations of workers, leading to long-term developmental setbacks (Bloom et al., 2003). Addressing disease through public

health initiatives and workplace health programs is therefore an investment in economic stability.

Ultimately, exploring disease from an economic perspective underscores the interconnectedness of health and prosperity. A healthy population is a productive one. Policymakers, economists, and health professionals must work together to ensure that disease does not become both a symptom and a cause of economic inequality.

Technology and the Future of Disease Exploration

Technological advancements have revolutionized how we understand and treat diseases. From MRI machines to AI diagnostics, innovations have enabled earlier detection, more precise treatment, and better patient outcomes. Technology does not merely serve as a tool but reshapes our approach to health and disease, offering new frontiers in medicine.

AI and machine learning are among the most transformative technologies in modern healthcare. These tools can analyze vast datasets, detect patterns invisible to human clinicians, and predict disease risks with remarkable accuracy. AI-powered diagnostic tools are now used in radiology, pathology, and dermatology, significantly improving speed and accuracy (Faiyazuddin et al., 2025).

Telemedicine has emerged as a powerful equalizer, reducing geographic and economic barriers to care (Nia et al., 2023). It enables rural or underserved populations to access expert consultations without traveling. Especially during the COVID-19 pandemic, virtual care became essential. This shift has prompted health systems to rethink traditional delivery models, incorporating flexibility and accessibility into standard care.

Technologies like genomics and personalized medicine have ushered in a new era of individualized care. By understanding a patient's genetic makeup, clinicians can tailor treatments with greater efficacy and fewer side effects. Such precision medicine holds promise for complex diseases like cancer, autoimmune disorders, and rare genetic conditions (Jamalinia & Weiskirchen, 2025).

However, technology also introduces ethical and practical challenges. Data privacy, algorithmic bias, unequal access, and digital illiteracy can exacerbate disparities. Therefore, the future of disease exploration through technology must be guided by equity and ethical considerations. When harnessed responsibly, technology can amplify our collective ability to combat disease and advance the ultimate goal of a healthier, more equitable society.

Education and Public Engagement in Disease Awareness

Disease exploration cannot remain confined to laboratories and clinics; it must involve the public. Education is a cornerstone of public health, equipping individuals with the knowledge to prevent illness, seek timely care, and support others (Ahmad, 2023). A well-informed public contributes not only to personal health but also to communal resilience.

Health education in schools lays the foundation for lifelong well-being. Teaching children about nutrition, hygiene,

mental health, and disease prevention empowers them to make informed choices. Similarly, adult education through campaigns, community workshops, and media outreach is crucial in promoting vaccination, cancer screenings, and safe behaviors.

Public engagement also plays a key role in destigmatizing diseases. Conditions like HIV, mental illness, or tuberculosis have long suffered from societal bias and misinformation (Majid et al., 2020). Open dialogues, survivor stories, and culturally sensitive messaging help reduce fear and discrimination, fostering a more compassionate public response.

Moreover, involving communities in research initiatives ensures relevance and trust. Citizen science projects and patient advocacy groups contribute valuable insights and help shape health priorities (Rattani & Johns, 2017). When individuals feel seen and heard in the process of disease exploration, the resulting interventions are more likely to be effective and embraced.

Ultimately, education and engagement create a virtuous cycle. Informed individuals support evidence-based policies, demand accountability from healthcare systems, and advocate for equity. Disease exploration is most impactful when it becomes a shared mission—one that includes scientists, clinicians, and the public working together for a healthier future.

Interdisciplinary Collaboration in Disease Understanding

Exploring disease effectively requires the integration of diverse disciplines. No single field holds all the answers. Medicine, biology, sociology, economics, psychology, and even philosophy each offer critical perspectives. An interdisciplinary approach broadens the scope of inquiry and deepens the quality of understanding.

Medical anthropology, for example, reveals how cultural beliefs shape health behaviors. Sociologists examine the influence of social structures on disease distribution (Omobowale, 2022). Psychologists explore coping mechanisms and the mental toll of illness. Economists assess the cost-effectiveness of interventions, and ethicists ensure that decisions respect human dignity.

Collaboration between clinicians and data scientists has become increasingly vital. The rise of big data and bioinformatics means that pattern recognition and computational modeling are key tools in identifying disease trends and predicting outbreaks (Tallon & Dreisbach, 2019). Interdisciplinary teams can rapidly translate findings into actionable strategies.

Public health crises highlight the value of unified expertise. The COVID-19 pandemic required epidemiologists, virologists, behavioral scientists, policy makers, and logisticians to work together (Sahin et al., 2020). Such cross-sector cooperation can inform vaccine development, public messaging, and resource distribution more effectively than siloed efforts.

Fostering interdisciplinary collaboration also encourages humility and innovation. It invites professionals to challenge assumptions, synthesize knowledge, and explore novel solutions. The ultimate goal of disease exploration is too complex for one lens; it demands the richness of multiple perspectives working in harmony.

Toward a Holistic Vision: Disease Exploration

as a Moral Endeavor

Ultimately, the human drive to explore disease is more than a technical or scientific pursuit—it is a moral endeavor. It reflects our collective desire to alleviate suffering, uphold dignity, and seek justice for the most vulnerable. Disease exploration, at its core, is an expression of empathy and responsibility.

This moral dimension is evident in humanitarian missions, global vaccination drives, and efforts to eliminate neglected diseases. These initiatives are not merely about scientific achievement; they are about recognizing the shared humanity that binds us (Harrel et al., 2021). When we strive to understand and cure diseases, we affirm that every life is valuable.

A holistic vision of disease exploration requires integrating compassion into every stage—from research design to patient

care (Qin et al., 2023). It challenges health systems to prioritize people over profits and to deliver care that is not only effective but also respectful and empowering.

Such a vision also calls for reflection on the societal structures that perpetuate disease. Poverty, discrimination, environmental degradation, and political instability are not just contributors to disease—they are diseases in themselves. Addressing them is integral to the goal of a healthier world.

In conclusion, the ultimate goal of exploring disease is not merely biological mastery, but moral progress. It is about forging a future in which scientific innovation is guided by ethical wisdom, and where health becomes a universal right rather than a privilege. In this endeavor, we find not only cures, but also our deepest humanity. ■

Received: April 11, 2025 | Revised: May 26, 2025 | Accepted: June 11, 2025

References

- Ahmad, W. (2023). Engaging the community and building public trust in the control and prevention of public health diseases. In *The Global Health Network Collections*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21428/3d48c34a.a34c28f0>
- Beech, B. M., Ford, C., Thorpe, R. J., Bruce, M. A., & Norris, K. C. (2021). Poverty, racism, and the public health crisis in America. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 9. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2021.699049>
- Bloom, D. E., Canning, D., & Sevilla, J. (2003). The Effect of Health on Economic Growth: A Production Function approach. *World Development*, 32(1), 1–13. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2003.07.002>
- Caldirolì, C. L., Sarandacchi, S., Tomasuolo, M., Diso, D., Castiglioni, M., & Procaccia, R. (2025). Resilience as a mediator of quality of life in cancer patients in healthcare services. *Scientific Reports*, 15(1). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-93008-2>
- Durmaz, A. A., Karaca, E., Demkow, U., Toruner, G., Schoumans, J., & Cogulu, O. (2015). Evolution of genetic techniques: past, present, and beyond. *BioMed Research International*, 2015, 1–7. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/461524>
- Faiyazuddin, M., Rahman, S. J. Q., Anand, G., Siddiqui, R. K., Mehta, R., Khatib, M. N., Gaidhane, S., Zahiruddin, Q. S., Hussain, A., & Sah, R. (2025). The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Healthcare: A comprehensive review of advancements in diagnostics, treatment, and operational efficiency. *Health Science Reports*, 8(1). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/hsr2.70312>
- Goff, A. L., & Landecker, H. (2025). Genome engineering, chemical exposure, and the germline: an ethical synthesis. *The Hastings Center Report*, 55(2), 39–51. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/hast.4977>
- Greene, N. M. (1997). Ancient Egyptian Medicine. *Anesthesia & Analgesia*, 84(3), 706. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1213/00000539-199703000-00061>
- Harrel, E., Berland, L., Jacobson, J., & Addiss, D. G. (2021). Compassionate leadership: essential for the future of tropical medicine and global health. *American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*, 105(6), 1450–1452. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.21-0832>
- Howell, E. A., Egorova, N., Balbierz, A., Zeitlin, J., & Hebert, P. L. (2015). Black-white differences in severe maternal morbidity and site of care. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 214(1), 122.e1-122.e7. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2015.08.019>
- Jamalinia, M., & Weiskirchen, R. (2025). Advances in personalized medicine: translating genomic insights into targeted therapies for cancer treatment. *Annals of Translational Medicine*, 13(2), 18. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21037/atm-25-34>
- Jankowska, P. (2025). The role of stress and mental health in obesity. *Obesities*, 5(2), 20. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/obesities5020020>
- Jen, M. (2022). Prehistoric Medicine: History, Procedures and Practices. *Anthropology*, 10(2), 281. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.35248/2332-0915.22.10.281>
- Kottow, A. R., & Kottow, M. H. (2007). The disease-subject as a subject of literature. *Philosophy Ethics and Humanities in Medicine*, 2(1), 10. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1186/1747-5341-2-10>
- Mackenbach, J. P. (2005). The origins of human disease: a short story on “where diseases come from.” *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, 60(1), 81–86. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.2005.038661>
- Majid, U., Wasim, A., Bakshi, S., & Truong, J. (2020). Knowledge, (mis-)conceptions, risk perception, and behavior change during pandemics: A scoping review of 149 studies. *Public Understanding of Science*, 29(8), 777–799. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963662520963365>
- Martinez-Lage, M., Torres-Ruiz, R., & Rodriguez-Perales, S. (2017). CRISPR/CAS9 Technology: Applications and human disease modeling. *Progress in Molecular Biology and Translational Science*, 23–48. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.pmbts.2017.09.002>
- Miteu, G. D. (2024). Ethics in scientific research: a lens into its importance, history, and future. *Annals of Medicine and Surgery*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1097/ms9.0000000000001959>
- Molster, C. M., Bowman, F. L., Bilkey, G. A., Cho, A. S., Burns, B. L., Nowak, K. J., & Dawkins, H. J. S. (2018). The Evolution of Public Health Genomics: Exploring its past, present, and future. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 6. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2018.00247>
- Nia, N. G., Kaplanoglu, E., & Nasab, A. (2023). Evaluation of artificial intelligence techniques in disease diagnosis and prediction. *Discover Artificial Intelligence*, 3(1). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44163-023-00049-5>
- Omobowale, M. O. (2022). Embedding cultural studies in public health higher education: the role of medical anthropologists. *Pan African Medical Journal*, 41. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11604/pamj.2022.41.271.18226>
- Petrov, A. V., Panova, M. V., Varshavskij, V. R., Kalyakina, I. M., Djais, A. I., & Zatsarinnaya, E. I. (2021). Economic consequences of population morbidity. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International*, 90–99. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.9734/jpri/2020/v32i3831017>
- Pilkington, V., Keestra, S. M., & Hill, A. (2022). Global COVID-19 vaccine inequity: failures in the first year of distribution and potential solutions for the future. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 10. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.821117>
- Qin, X., Wang, B., Zhao, J., Wu, P., & Liu, T. (2023). Learn from the best hospitals: a comparison of the mission, vision and values. *BMC Health Services Research*, 23(1). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-023-09699-8>
- Quinn, S. C., & Kumar, S. (2014). Health inequalities and infectious disease Epidemics: a challenge for global health security. *Biosecurity and Bioterrorism Biodefense Strategy Practice and Science*, 12(5), 263–273. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1089/bsp.2014.0070>

Rad, J. (2025). Health inequities: a persistent global challenge from past to future. *International Journal for Equity in Health*, 24(1). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-025-02526-y>

Rattani, A., & Johns, A. (2017). Collaborative partnerships and gatekeepers in online research recruitment. *The American Journal of Bioethics*, 17(3), 27–29. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15265161.2016.1274800>

Sahin, O., Salim, H., Suprun, E., Richards, R., MacAskill, S., Heilgeist, S., Rutherford, S., Stewart, R. A., & Beal, C. D. (2020). Developing a

preliminary causal loop diagram for understanding the wicked complexity of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Systems*, 8(2), 20. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/systems8020020>

Sakai, T., & Morimoto, Y. (2022). The history of infectious diseases and medicine. *Pathogens*, 11(10), 1147. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/pathogens11101147>

Smith, S. (2024). Ethics in Research: An Overview for novice researchers. *Journal of Leadership Accountability and Ethics*, 21(2). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33423/jlae.v21i2.7062>

Tallon, E., & Dreisbach, C. (2019). Using data science to understand complexity and quantify heterogeneity in the onset and progression of chronic disease. *Biological Research for Nursing*, 21(5), 449–457. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1099800419863161>

Thapa, C., & Camtepe, S. (2020). Precision health data: Requirements, challenges and existing techniques for data security and privacy. *Computers in Biology and Medicine*, 129, 104130. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compbiomed.2020.104130>