MEDWIN PUBLISHERS
Committed to Create Value for Researchers

Journal of Quality in Health Care & Economics
ISSN: 2642-6250

The Role of Social Bonds in Facilitating Shared Investments and Resource Allocation: Addressing the "Wrong Pocket Problem" in Public Health and Healthcare

McCart AL*

Department of Health Management and Systems Sciences, School of Public Health and Information Sciences, University of Louisville, USA

***Corresponding author:** Andrew L. McCart, PhD, FACHE, Assistant Professor, Associate Director, Health Management Programs, Department of Health Management and Systems Sciences, University of Louisville, 485 East Gray Street, Louisville, KY 40202, USA, Email: andrew.mccart@louisville.edu

Review Article
Volume 8 Issue 2
Received Date: November 25, 2024
Published Date: April 04, 2025
DOI: 10.23880/jqhe-16000437

Abstract

The "wrong pocket problem" presents a significant barrier to advancing public health and healthcare initiatives by disincentivizing investments due to misaligned financial incentives. This review explores how social bonds-encompassing trust, communication, reciprocity, and shared goals—are pivotal for fostering cross-sector collaboration and addressing these misalignments. The analysis draws on social bond theory, collaborative governance models, and network theories to highlight how social bonds facilitate resource sharing and align stakeholder incentives. Case studies, such as housing-first initiatives and opioid crisis interventions, illustrate the transformative potential of these collaborations in improving health outcomes and reducing costs. Despite these successes, gaps remain in understanding the role of informal social bonds, the sustainability of shared investments, and the variability of outcomes across contexts. This review calls for further research into innovative funding models and leadership strategies to enhance the effectiveness of social bonds in addressing systemic inefficiencies. By fostering social bonds, stakeholders can overcome financial silos, promote sustainable investments, and improve population health outcomes, advancing equity and economic efficiency in public health and healthcare systems.

Keywords: Social Bonds; Wrong Pocket Problem; Cross-Sector Collaboration; Public Health Investments; Resource Allocation

Abbreviations

CMS: Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services; ACOs: accountable care organizations; CBPR: community-based participatory research; SDOH: social determinants of health; CBPR: community-based participatory research; ACH: Accountable Communities for Health; CCNC: Community Care of North Carolina

Introduction

The "wrong pocket problem" represents a significant barrier to implementing public health interventions. This issue arises when one organization bears the costs of an intervention while another organization or sector realizes the resulting benefits. Such misalignment can disincentivize investment in programs with long-term societal benefits. A

classic example is a public health initiative aimed at reducing smoking rates. While public health agencies must provide upfront funding for such programs, the financial savings—such as reduced healthcare costs—primarily benefit insurers and healthcare providers in the long term.

Addressing misaligned financial incentives is critical for ensuring efficient allocation of public health resources. Misaligned incentives can lead to underfunding interventions with significant societal value, creating inefficiencies and missed opportunities for improving population health [1]. Shared investments among public health, housing, and healthcare sectors are vital to optimizing health outcomes and reducing costs. Collaborative approaches that bridge financial and operational silos across these sectors have potential for achieving cost savings and enhancing public health impact.

Social bonds—trust, shared values, and mutual accountability—play a pivotal role in fostering cross-sector collaboration. These bonds help organizations with differing missions or financial priorities align their efforts toward shared goals. By leveraging social bonds, organizations can create an environment where collaboration flourishes, ultimately leading to more effective and equitable resource distribution [2]. The image below shows how social impact bonds collaborate between investors, intermediaries, providers, third-party validators, payors, and needy parties [3].

The purpose of this review is twofold. First, it aims to explore how social bonds facilitate shared investments and resource allocation across public health and healthcare sectors. Trust, open communication, and shared priorities enable meaningful partnerships that address challenges such as the wrong pocket problem. Case studies of successful community-based health interventions offer insights into how social bonds can drive impactful collaborations. Second, the review seeks to identify gaps in the existing literature and propose potential research directions. One underexplored area is the development of metrics to evaluate the effectiveness of social bonds in cross-sector partnerships. Additionally, there is a pressing need for longitudinal studies to assess the sustained impact of social bonds on health outcomes and cost savings.

This review contributes to a deeper understanding of the mechanisms that foster collaboration across sectors by examining these aspects. It underscores the importance of addressing misaligned financial incentives and leveraging social bonds to optimize population health and economic efficiency. Future research can further advance this knowledge, guiding the development of innovative strategies for sustainable public health investment and cross-sector partnerships.

Conceptual Frameworks

Social bond theory provides a foundational framework for understanding how solid interpersonal or inter-organizational relationships can foster cooperation and goal alignment, facilitating collaboration [4]. In public health, these social bonds are critical in bridging sectors with misaligned incentives, creating pathways for shared investments and coordinated efforts [2], The essential elements of social bond theory include trust, communication, reciprocity, and shared goals, each contributing uniquely to effective collaboration. Trust builds credibility and reduces perceived risks in cross-sector partnerships, fostering stakeholder confidence [5]. Communication ensures transparency and alignment, allowing partners to navigate complex projects effectively [6]. Reciprocity, characterized by the mutual exchange of resources, sustains partnerships by ensuring all parties benefit from the collaboration. Shared goals, such as those promoted by accountable care organizations (ACOs), drive unified action by providing stakeholders with a clear and collective vision.

Collaborative governance models further enhance cross-sector collaboration by emphasizing stakeholder inclusivity, co-decision-making, and joint ownership of initiatives [7]. These frameworks provide structured mechanisms for managing multi-stakeholder coalitions and aligning organizational priorities. For example, integrated care models have demonstrated how collaborative governance can address inefficiencies and overcome the "wrong pocket problem," where costs and benefits are distributed unevenly across organizations [8]. Social bonds are integral to these governance mechanisms, underpinning trust and reciprocity, facilitating smoother decision-making, and equitable resource allocation [5], multi-stakeholder coalitions in community health initiatives often rely on governance models to align disparate priorities, effectively leveraging shared resources to achieve common objectives [2].

Resource dependence and network theories complement social bond theory by providing insights into how organizations leverage interdependencies to meet shared goals. Resource dependence theory explains that organizations form relationships to access critical resources they lack internally, fostering collaborations that address mutual needs [9]. For instance, hospitals and public health agencies often collaborate to bridge funding gaps and optimize care delivery, creating synergies that benefit both parties [1], Network theory highlights the role of interconnected relationships in enhancing resource flow and operational efficiency [10]. Networks of care, such as partnerships between healthcare providers and housing

organizations, exemplify this theory by facilitating shared investments to improve patient outcomes and reduce costs.

These frameworks—social bond theory, collaborative governance, resource dependence, and network theories—underscore the importance of relationships, shared goals, and structured decision-making in fostering effective cross-sector collaborations. By leveraging these principles, organizations can overcome structural barriers like the wrong pocket problem, optimize resource allocation, and achieve significant public health improvements.

The "Wrong Pocket Problem" in Public Health and Healthcare

The "wrong pocket problem" refers to the financial misalignment when an entity invests in a public health intervention but does not receive economic benefits directly. This leads to underfunding or insufficient investment in critical programs [1], for example, hospitals may allocate resources to address social determinants of health, such as improving housing stability. However, the cost savings from reduced emergency room visits or hospitalizations benefit government programs like Medicaid rather than the hospitals themselves. Similarly, in vaccination programs, local governments often fund immunization efforts, while the cost savings from reduced illnesses primarily accrue to private insurers [11]. Another example is housing-first initiatives, where hospitals cover housing costs to stabilize homeless populations, but the resulting healthcare savings benefit insurers more than the hospitals [12].

The consequences of this financial misalignment are significant and pose barriers to funding preventive care. While cost-effective, preventive interventions often struggle for funding over time because public health agencies typically bear the initial costs, while long-term savings benefit the healthcare system. Additionally, cost-shifting between sectors creates disincentives for collaboration. For example, one sector may invest in programs that yield cost reductions in another, leading to underinvestment in critical areas like chronic disease prevention and contributing to increased long-term healthcare expenditures [13]. This fragmented funding structure undermines population health and perpetuates public health and healthcare system inefficiencies. Stakeholders' perceptions of social impact bonds, the benefits, and challenges can be seen in the diagram below, sharing lessons learned from sixteen social impact bonds in the United Kingdom [14].

Cross-sector collaboration is crucial for addressing these challenges by aligning incentives through shared investments. Collaborative models pool resources and equitably distribute benefits among stakeholders, promoting sustainable investments in public health [2], Accountable care organizations (ACOs) exemplify this approach by integrating public health and healthcare delivery systems to share financial risks and rewards across participating entities [8], Furthermore, shared savings programs established by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) incentivize healthcare providers to use cost-saving preventive measures by offering financial rewards for meeting quality benchmarks [15]. These examples demonstrate the importance of aligning economic incentives to foster cross-sector collaboration, improve population health outcomes, and reduce overall costs.

Role of Social Bonds in Overcoming the Wrong Pocket Problem

Trust, communication, and reciprocity play crucial roles in fostering collaboration and overcoming the misaligned incentives inherent in the "wrong pocket problem" in public health and healthcare initiatives. Trust is the foundation for cross-sector partnerships, enabling entities to pool resources and effectively align incentives. When trust is present, the perceived risks of investing in shared outcomes are reduced, fostering transparency in financial dealings and decision-making [2,16]. Successful partnerships, such as the Camden Coalition of Healthcare Providers, demonstrate how trust-based collaboration among hospitals, insurers, and community organizations can reduce hospital readmissions and healthcare costs [17]. Similarly, the BUILD Health Challenge showcases how trust empowers community health coalitions to foster shared investments and improve health outcomes in underserved neighborhoods [18].

Effective communication and shared goals are also pivotal in aligning stakeholder priorities and enhancing collaboration. Open communication ensures clarity on financial responsibilities, expected outcomes, and mutual benefits, thereby reducing barriers to cooperation [19]. Structured communication channels within accountable care organizations (ACOs) have been instrumental in promoting alignment among diverse stakeholders [20]. Furthermore, shared visions and missions help stakeholders prioritize resource allocation toward preventive care programs addressing social determinants of health. For example, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation's Culture of Health initiative highlights how shared goals can align investments in community health improvement projects [21,22].

Reciprocity and mutual accountability further strengthen the willingness of stakeholders to co-invest and commit to shared outcomes. Reciprocal relationships encourage shared funding, as demonstrated by the Community Care of North Carolina program, which integrated healthcare and social services to achieve cost savings and improved outcomes

[23]. Accountability mechanisms, such as governance models incorporating shared savings agreements and performance-based contracts, help ensure stakeholders remain committed to their financial and operational responsibilities [1], Collaborative dashboards further promote accountability by tracking shared outcomes and ensuring transparency among partners [6].

Coalition Building for Effective Community Engagement

The article "Community Voice in Cross-Sector Alignment: Concepts and Strategies from a Scoping Review of the Health Collaboration Literature" examines how community engagement influences the effectiveness and sustainability of cross-sector health collaborations [24]. Recognizing that social determinants of health (SDOH) play a crucial role in shaping health outcomes, the authors explore strategies for incorporating community perspectives into initiatives that connect healthcare, public health, and social services. Drawing from the cross-sector alignment theory of change developed by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, the study emphasizes the importance of shared purpose, governance, data integration, and financing structures that reflect community needs.

Through a systematic scoping review of 36 studies, the authors identify two primary approaches to community voice: passive and active. Passive strategies, such as community forums, health needs assessments, and consumer experience surveys, involve collecting input from community members but limit their decision-making power [24], while these approaches are widely used, they often fail to promote lasting engagement or systems change. In contrast, active strategies—such as participatory decision-making, leadership roles for community members, targeted training, and community-led coalitions—provide greater influence and ownership to the community. These strategies require more investment but offer stronger potential for sustainable impact.

The review highlights significant challenges in implementing active community engagement, including organizational reluctance to share power, the need for financial and logistical support, and the potential burden placed on community participants. Despite these barriers, the authors argue that prioritizing active strategies can lead to more equitable and effective health interventions. They recommend that organizations provide financial compensation, training, and leadership opportunities to community members while fostering trust and long-term collaboration. The study concludes that future research should further explore the relationship between active community voice and improved health outcomes, ensuring that cross-sector collaborations move beyond short-term engagement toward sustainable, community-driven change [24].

Julianne Holt-Lunstad's article in World Psychiatry [25] explores the critical role of social connection in mental and physical health, emphasizing its influence on well-being, disease risk, and mortality. Research shows that strong social relationships lower the risk of mental disorders, chronic diseases, and premature death, while social isolation and loneliness significantly increase these risks. The COVID-19 pandemic intensified global concerns about a "loneliness epidemic," prompting policy responses from governments and organizations worldwide. Despite growing recognition, public awareness of the health risks associated with social disconnection remains low, and challenges persist in defining, measuring, and addressing the issue effectively.

Social connection plays a protective role in mental health by reducing the likelihood of depression, anxiety, and cognitive decline. Studies indicate a bidirectional relationship between loneliness and depression, where isolation increases depressive symptoms, and depression, in turn, leads to greater social withdrawal. Strong social engagement also lowers the risk of dementia, though evidence on loneliness and cognitive health remains mixed [25], Occupational settings reflect similar patterns, as lack of social support contributes to burnout and psychological distress, particularly in high-stress professions such as healthcare.

The impact of social connection extends beyond mental health to physical health outcomes. Studies confirm that low social connection is linked to a higher risk of cardiovascular disease, stroke, hypertension, and diabetes. The American Heart Association has recognized social disconnection as a significant health risk, comparable to smoking and obesity. Additionally, patients with strong social ties exhibit better self-care behaviors, medication adherence, and reduced hospitalizations. Perhaps most strikingly, meta-analyses reveal that social isolation increases the risk of early death by up to 50%, highlighting its profound impact on longevity.

Despite clear evidence, several challenges hinder progress in addressing social disconnection. The lack of standardized terminology and measurement creates inconsistencies across studies, limiting the effectiveness of interventions. Although programs such as social prescribing, digital interventions, and community engagement initiatives show promise, more rigorous evaluations are needed to assess their long-term impact. Emerging societal trends, including remote work, urbanization, and digital interactions, further contribute to the decline in face-to-face social engagement, underscoring the urgency of proactive solutions.

To mitigate these risks, public health strategies must integrate social connection as a key determinant of health, much like diet and exercise. Targeted interventions should be developed for different life stages, addressing the unique social needs of youth, older adults, and vulnerable populations. Workplaces, schools, and healthcare settings must prioritize social well-being, recognizing its role in overall health outcomes. Additionally, technology should be used thoughtfully to enhance rather than replace meaningful social interactions. Holt-Lunstad concludes that social connection is not just a social issue but a public health imperative, and without intervention, rising trends of loneliness and isolation may contribute to worsening health crises worldwide.

The article "Diverse Community Leaders' Perspectives About Quality Primary Healthcare and Healthcare Measurement: Qualitative Community-Based Participatory Research", by Culhane-Pera KA, et al. [26] examines how diverse urban community leaders perceive quality primary healthcare and the impact of financial reimbursement models on healthcare equity. Conducted in the Minneapolis–Saint Paul area, the study engaged leaders from seven communities—Black/African American, LGBTQTS, Hmong, Latino/a/x, Native American, Somali, and White—through community-based participatory research (CBPR). The study aimed to highlight perspectives often excluded from policy decisions regarding healthcare quality measurement [26], The findings identified three key themes.

- First, quality clinics should implement structures and processes that support healthcare equity by recognizing historical trauma, structural racism, and social determinants of health (SDOH). Participants emphasized that clinics need culturally responsive care, real representation of community members in decision-making, and improved access through integrated services and system navigation support. Clinics should also develop equity dashboards to track and address healthcare disparities.
- Second, effective primary care requires respectful, trusting, and culturally appropriate relationships between patients and providers. Long-term patient-provider relationships, training for staff to mitigate unconscious bias, and culturally relevant health education were identified as essential components of quality care. Participants highlighted the need for patient-centered communication, community-based health promotion strategies, and clinic environments that are safe, welcoming, and affirming of diverse identities.
- Finally, current quality-based funding models perpetuate health inequities, as financial reimbursement tied to performance metrics disproportionately disadvantages clinics serving marginalized populations. Participants criticized the existing system for rewarding clinics in wealthier communities while underfunding those that serve high-need populations. They advocated for alternative models that adjust payments based on community-specific social needs rather than clinical performance alone.

The study underscores the disconnect between current quality measurement practices and the lived experiences of diverse communities. The authors argue that health equity should be a fundamental component of quality measurement and that policymakers must incorporate community perspectives in shaping healthcare funding and evaluation frameworks [26], by addressing social determinants and ensuring culturally competent care, healthcare systems can move toward more equitable and effective service delivery. By integrating trust, effective communication, shared goals, and reciprocal accountability into partnerships, organizations can address systemic misalignments in public health and healthcare financing, fostering collaboration and achieving sustainable improvements in health outcomes.

Mechanisms of Social Bond Formation

Formal and informal networks, alongside effective boundary-spanning leadership, play pivotal roles in fostering collaboration and addressing misaligned incentives in healthcare and public health initiatives. Formal networks and partnerships, often established through Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) and joint agreements, provide structured frameworks for collaboration. These documents delineate roles, responsibilities, and protocols for resource sharing, reducing ambiguity, and promoting stakeholder trust [6], For example, the Accountable Communities for Health (ACH) initiative employs formal agreements to align healthcare providers, public health entities, and community organizations toward shared goals, ultimately fostering efficient resource allocation [13], Similarly, initiatives like the Vermont Blueprint for Health showcase how formal partnerships have facilitated integrated care systems, reducing healthcare costs through shared investments in preventive care and chronic disease management [27]. California's Whole Person Care Pilot Program further highlights the role of collaborative agreements in enhancing data sharing and care coordination for underserved populations, effectively addressing misaligned incentives [27].

In contrast, informal networks and personal relationships complement formal structures by fostering trust and communication. Informal relationships often precede formal agreements, creating a foundation of mutual understanding that sustains collaboration over time [5], these personal

connections can expedite decision-making processes and provide mechanisms for resolving disputes, often succeeding where formal agreements might falter [28]. For instance, a study on community health coalitions in North Carolina demonstrated how personal relationships among leaders facilitated resource pooling and joint investments in public health programs [23], The Camden Coalition of Healthcare Providers similarly leveraged informal ties among local healthcare professionals to coordinate resources and address frequent hospital readmissions [17].

Boundary-spanning leadership is critical in bridging gaps between organizations and aligning their goals. Leaders who operate as boundary spanners act as intermediaries, connecting diverse stakeholders, mediating conflicts, and fostering alignment across organizational silos [29].

Programs such as the BUILD Health Challenge highlight the importance of such leadership in aligning diverse entities to improve social determinants of health through collaborative efforts [18], Effective boundary-spanners possess essential traits, including strong interpersonal skills, adaptability, and an ability to communicate effectively across organizational cultures [30]. Their credibility and influence are vital in building trust and securing commitments for shared investments, ensuring the sustainability of collaborative initiatives [31].

By integrating formal agreements, leveraging informal networks, and fostering boundary-spanning leadership, healthcare, and public health, organizations can effectively navigate the complexities of cross-sector collaboration and achieve shared outcomes that address systemic challenges.

Evidence from Case Studies

Cross-sector collaborations provide valuable lessons on overcoming challenges such as the "wrong pocket problem" through the strategic use of social bonds. Several success stories highlight how trust, shared goals, and communication facilitate resource sharing and improved outcomes.

Housing First Initiatives: The Housing First model prioritizes providing permanent housing for homeless individuals as a foundational step toward addressing their healthcare needs. Partnerships between healthcare providers and housing organizations foster trust and shared responsibility for outcomes. These collaborations have reduced hospital readmissions and emergency department visits by stabilizing vulnerable populations. Programs like those implemented in New York City demonstrated significant cost savings and improved health outcomes for homeless individuals with chronic health conditions [32]. The Housing First initiative demonstrates the effectiveness of partnerships between healthcare systems and housing organizations in addressing homelessness and related health issues. By building trust and aligning goals, stakeholders successfully pooled resources, resulting in better health outcomes and reduced emergency department visits and hospitalizations [32].

BUILD Health Challenge: This initiative brings together healthcare organizations, public health agencies, and community-based organizations to address social determinants of health. Trust and shared goals between diverse stakeholders enable programs to tackle food insecurity, housing, and environmental health risks in underserved areas. A BUILD-funded project in Cincinnati focused on asthma prevention by reducing environmental triggers in low-income housing, demonstrating the power of cross-sector collaboration to improve health outcomes.

Project Lazarus: Based in North Carolina, Project Lazarus is an opioid crisis intervention program that builds partnerships among healthcare providers, law enforcement, and community groups. Trust among stakeholders facilitates resource sharing, such as distributing naloxone and implementing educational campaigns, which have reduced opioid overdose deaths in participating communities. The program's success highlights how community-driven collaborations can effectively address public health crises [33]. The graphic below shows the results of Project Lazarus, lower risk of ED Visits for substance abuse and overdoes, positive benefits to patients, and decreased prescriptions from Wilkes County prescribers among overdose deaths [34].

Vermont Blueprint for Health: This state-wide initiative integrates healthcare, public health, and social services to improve population health. Formal agreements between stakeholders establish shared financial and quality benchmarks, ensuring collective accountability for health outcomes. The program's patient-centered medical homes and community health teams have reduced hospital admissions and cost savings through preventive care [35].

CareOregon: CareOregon leverages social bonds by fostering consistent communication and trust among its healthcare and social service providers. This collaboration helps address social determinants of health for Medicaid populations, reducing hospital readmissions and improving care coordination. The initiative's success lies in shared accountability and healthcare integration with social supports like housing and food security.

Accountable Health Communities (AHC) Model: The AHC model bridges public health, healthcare, and social

service organizations by aligning incentives and creating shared funding mechanisms. Trust is established through regular communication and joint priority-setting to address health-related social needs. AHC pilot sites have implemented screening for social determinants of health and referral systems to community resources, reducing emergency department visits and improving chronic disease management [36].

Camden Coalition of Healthcare Providers: This coalition focuses on care coordination for high-utilizing patients, fostering trust and collaboration among hospitals, social service agencies, and local governments. The coalition uses shared data systems to align resources and address systemic health disparities. By targeting frequent emergency department users, the coalition reduced hospital costs and improved care quality through coordinated interventions [17], OneHealth, in Memphis, Tennessee, is modeling its emergency department super-utilization project after the work in the Camden Coalition and published the infographic below (OneHealth).

Community Care of North Carolina (CCNC): CCNC integrates Medicaid services with local healthcare providers and social services to manage chronic illnesses effectively. Social bonds between stakeholders are strengthened through reciprocal funding arrangements and mutual accountability for patient outcomes. The program has achieved significant cost savings and improved care quality by addressing both clinical and social determinants of health.

These examples reveal several critical drivers of success in overcoming the wrong pocket problem. The alignment of shared goals is crucial, as seen in the Accountable Health Communities Model, where regular communication and joint priority-setting between health and social service stakeholders improve resource allocation [36], Continuous communication and trust-building are also essential, as demonstrated by CareOregon, where consistent dialogue enables effective coordination of healthcare and social services, reducing hospital readmissions [37]. However, the absence of strong social bonds presents significant barriers.

A lack of trust often leads to fragmented efforts and limits resource-sharing, as evidenced by challenges within some community health coalitions [5], Institutional silos further hinder collaboration, with initiatives like Medicaid managed care programs suffering from the isolation of agencies and limited shared governance structures [20], Additionally, power imbalances among stakeholders, such as those between large healthcare systems and smaller community organizations, can undermine mutual accountability and impede the development of robust partnerships.

These insights underscore the critical role of trust, shared governance, and equitable relationships in fostering effective cross-sector collaborations that overcome financial and operational barriers to resource-sharing.

Gaps in the Literature

While formal networks and agreements are well-documented in fostering collaboration, the role of informal social bonds still needs to be explored. Informal relationships often serve as catalysts for trust-building and resource-sharing, but their less visible and harder-to-quantify nature poses challenges for thorough examination [16], Research indicates that informal interactions, such as regular conversations or shared professional experiences between leaders, can significantly strengthen collaboration. However, these dynamics still need to be sufficiently studied, particularly in addressing systemic public health challenges like the wrong pocket problem [38]. This gap highlights the need for a deeper understanding of how informal social bonds contribute to decision-making and long-term partnerships.

Another critical research gap lies in the need for more evaluation of the long-term impacts of collaborative investments. Much of the existing literature focuses on short-term outcomes, such as immediate cost savings or enhanced service delivery, without examining the sustainability of these initiatives over time. Longitudinal studies are essential for understanding how social bonds evolve and adapt to challenges, such as funding cuts or leadership changes, which can affect the durability of shared investments [5], For instance, there needs to be more research on the sustainability of multi-sector partnerships to address chronic issues like housing and health integration over extended periods [20], With long-term insights, stakeholders may be able to anticipate and mitigate risks to the continuity of collaborative efforts.

Additionally, there is a pressing need for context-specific studies to evaluate the variability of social bond effectiveness across different settings and sectors. Cultural, economic, and organizational contexts significantly influence the formation and success of social bonds, yet research has primarily concentrated on urban environments, leaving rural and resource-limited areas understudied. Addressing these contextual differences in future research is crucial for providing actionable insights to practitioners in diverse environments. Such studies would enhance understanding of how to tailor collaborative strategies to specific challenges and settings.

Implications for Practice and Policy

Strengthening social bonds within cross-sector collaborations requires deliberate strategies to build trust,

align incentives, and scale successful models. Building trust begins with fostering open communication and creating a culture of transparency among stakeholders. Approaches such as regular joint meetings, shared data platforms, and conflict resolution mechanisms are critical for nurturing trust and ensuring smooth collaboration [6], Collaborative training sessions can also educate stakeholders about mutual goals and shared processes, reinforcing social bonds. For example, community health worker programs have successfully bridged trust gaps between healthcare providers and public health organizations, enhancing their cooperative efforts [39].

Policy interventions are pivotal in aligning incentives and addressing the wrong pocket problem. Like those implemented in Accountable Communities for Health (ACHs), shared funding mechanisms create financial structures that align incentives across healthcare providers, public health entities, and community organizations. These programs establish shared financial and quality benchmarks, fostering cooperative investments [20], Medicaid waivers and pay-for-success contracts mitigate the wrong pocket problem by integrating funding streams with shared outcomes. For instance, Oregon's Coordinated Care Organizations pool resources to improve population health outcomes, effectively reducing cost-shifting and encouraging collective responsibility.

The potential for scaling successful models relies on tailoring them to specific regional contexts and disseminating best practices. Tools like Community Health Needs Assessments (CHNAs) help identify local challenges and priorities, enabling customized collaborative investments that address unique regional needs [40]. Furthermore, disseminating case studies and establishing knowledge-sharing platforms can facilitate replicating effective practices. National initiatives, such as the National Prevention Strategy, emphasize the importance of cross-sector partnerships that leverage shared resources and expertise to create scalable and impactful solutions [41]. By implementing these strategies, stakeholders can enhance social bonds, align resources, and foster sustainable collaborations for improved population health outcomes.

Monitoring Conflicts of Interest During Social Bond Facilitation

To ensure that service providers avoid conflicts of interest in the context of shared investments and resource allocation, a number strategies can be effective. Organizers can develop explicit guidelines that define conflicts of interest and outline the processes to avoid them. These guidelines should be transparent and easily accessible to all stakeholders, ensuring that every participant understands what constitutes a conflict of interest and the consequences of such conflicts [16], Project managers and organizers can facilitate ongoing communication and implementation of regular training programs. These can be conducted for all involved parties to understand the importance of integrity and transparency in their roles. This training should include case studies and real-life scenarios that help participants recognize potential conflicts of interest and learn how to handle them appropriately [19].

Further, leaders can require all stakeholders to declare any potential conflicts of interest regularly. This could be part of contractual obligations or periodic renewal processes where stakeholders must disclose personal and financial interests that could affect their decision-making. Potential conflicts of interest can further be monitored through third-party auditing. Engage independent third parties to audit and monitor the activities of service providers. This helps ensure that decisions are made in the best interest of the program and not influenced by undisclosed personal or financial interests [5], To minimize the risk of conflicts of interest and collusion, implement a rotation policy for critical decision-making roles within the collaboration. This prevents any individual or group from holding too much power or influence for an extended period [38].

Transparent decision-making processes ensure that all decisions are made through transparent processes that are documented and accessible to all stakeholders. This includes clear documentation of how decisions were made and who was involved in making them [7], Conflict resolution mechanisms can be used for resolving disputes and managing conflicts of interest when they arise. This could include mediation, arbitration, or other forms of conflict resolution that provide a fair process for all parties involved [31], by implementing these strategies, leaders can foster an environment where shared goals and collaboration are prioritized over individual interests, thus minimizing the risk of conflicts of interest in the facilitation of shared investments and resource allocation.

In the context of shared investments and resource allocation as detailed in the article, both investors and local governance play pivotal roles in overseeing and ensuring the success and sustainability of these initiatives.

Investors should be engaged not only as funders but also as active partners in both risk and reward sharing. This involvement should include structuring investments so that investors share in the financial returns generated from successful initiatives, thus aligning their financial incentives with the desired health outcomes [3], Additionally, investors should have representation on governance bodies that make critical decisions regarding project implementation and

monitoring, ensuring that their interests are considered and that project goals align with investor expectations [6], Furthermore, investors are crucial in the development and monitoring of performance metrics, participating actively in setting targets and reviewing outcomes to ensure that investments are achieving the intended social impacts [2].

On the other hand, local governance must take a proactive role in policy development and regulation, establishing clear guidelines that steer the operation of shared investment initiatives and ensuring transparency and public trust [7], Local governments should also focus on capacity building by providing necessary training and resources to all stakeholders involved, thus enhancing the sustainability of the initiatives [5], Moreover, local governance acts as a mediator between investors, service providers, and the community, facilitating community engagement and ensuring that the initiatives align with public needs and gain robust community support [24].

To effectively manage these roles, the establishment of joint oversight committees is recommended. These committees, comprising investors, local government representatives, service providers, and community members, would oversee project implementation, monitor progress, and resolve conflicts, ensuring alignment and adherence to agreed-upon goals [31], Regular and transparent reporting of project outcomes to all stakeholders is also essential, fostering an ongoing dialogue about how to improve outcomes and address any issues [6], Lastly, continuous evaluation of the impact of these initiatives is critical, with investors and local governance working together to assess effectiveness and make necessary adjustments, thereby ensuring that the programs remain relevant and effective in meeting community needs [8].

By integrating these strategies, the roles of investors and local governance in the oversight of shared investments can significantly enhance the effectiveness and sustainability of these initiatives, leading to more innovative and impactful solutions to public health challenges.

Developing Local Intermediaries for Social Bond Facilitation

To develop a facilitating intermediary locally rather than depending on commercial or for-profit organizations, several strategies can be implemented to ensure alignment with community needs and interests. Firstly, leveraging existing Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) can be highly effective. These organizations, already embedded within the community and trusted by its members, can be enhanced with additional resources and training to take on intermediary roles [6], Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) also offer a viable option, combining local government bodies with private, non-profit entities to serve public interests while maintaining accountability [7].

Local government agencies themselves can act as intermediaries by establishing dedicated branches focused on community projects, ensuring direct accountability to the public and integration with community needs [2], Additionally, cooperative models where multiple stakeholders—such as healthcare providers, community leaders, and NGOs—jointly own and govern the intermediary can foster mutual accountability and a sense of ownership among all parties [5], Partnerships with local universities can also provide a robust support system for intermediaries, offering access to research, evaluation tools, and innovative approaches through academic involvement [8], Investing in capacity-building initiatives is crucial, enabling local leaders and organizations to develop skills necessary for managing and operating an intermediary effectively, including financial management, project management, and negotiation skills [38].

Developing community leadership programs to train and empower community members to take on significant roles within the intermediary ensures deep connections and relevancy to the community it serves [31], It is also essential to secure sustainable funding from non-profit foundations, government grants, or social impact bonds that prioritize community benefit over profit [3], Transparent governance structures that involve community members in the decision-making process, including regular public meetings and open forums, promote openness and inclusivity [7], Finally, it is vital to regularly evaluate the effectiveness of the intermediary through internal and external reviews, using these insights to adapt and refine strategies to better meet community needs [5], These strategies collectively ensure that the intermediary not only serves the community's needs effectively but also remains rooted in its values and priorities, fostering a sustainable and impactful presence.

Considerations for Smaller Communities

Ensuring the availability of specialized service providers in smaller communities requires a multifaceted approach that includes strategic recruitment, community engagement, sustainable funding, and policy support. To begin, targeted recruitment and incentives are crucial. Smaller communities can attract specialized service providers by offering incentives such as loan forgiveness, competitive salaries, and signing bonuses. Collaborations with medical schools and professional associations to encourage rotations in rural and underserved areas can also expose new professionals to these settings early in their careers, which may increase the likelihood of them choosing to practice in such areas permanently [12].

Integrating telehealth services presents another effective strategy. By providing remote consultations and continuous professional support through telehealth platforms, specialists can extend their reach into smaller communities without needing to relocate, thus overcoming geographical barriers to specialized care [42]. Community engagement is also essential. By involving local community leaders and stakeholders in the planning and recruitment process, communities can ensure that the health services provided align with local needs and cultural expectations. Utilizing community-based participatory research methods can help tailor services to effectively address local health disparities [24].

Developing local capacity by training community health workers and primary care providers in specialized areas can also play a pivotal role. This strategy not only enhances local expertise but also strengthens the health system's resilience by ensuring that basic specialist services are available locally [39], Sustainable funding is another critical component. Securing ongoing support through government grants, private partnerships, and innovative models like social impact bonds can provide the necessary financial resources to maintain and expand specialized services in smaller communities. These funds can help build necessary infrastructure, update technology, and support continuous professional development [2].

Finally, policy advocacy is vital for sustaining these efforts. Advocating for policies that support rural health services and address financial misalignments across health sectors can ensure that investments in healthcare services in smaller communities are sustainable and supported by broader systemic changes [1], by combining these strategies, smaller communities can enhance their appeal to specialized providers, improve access to necessary care, and ultimately achieve better health outcomes. Success in these areas requires coordinated efforts among local governments, healthcare providers, and community stakeholders to create a supportive environment for health professionals [43-47].

Conclusion

Social bonds emerge as a pivotal mechanism for addressing the "wrong pocket problem" in public health and healthcare, where the misalignment of costs and benefits discourages investment in programs with significant societal value. Social bonds bridge the divides between sectors by fostering trust, communication, reciprocity, and shared goals, enabling coordinated efforts and shared investments. This literature underscores the importance of both formal structures, such as MOUs, and informal networks in building robust collaborations that transcend traditional silos. The case studies highlighted successful examples of housing and health integration, opioid crisis interventions, and other cross-sector initiatives, illustrating the transformative potential of well-aligned partnerships.

Future research should investigate social bond-driven collaborations' long-term sustainability and adaptability to evolving challenges, such as leadership transitions and economic shifts. Expanding the focus to underexplored settings, including rural areas and sectors beyond healthcare, will enhance the generalizability and applicability of these findings. Additionally, innovative funding models, such as shared savings programs and collaborative governance frameworks, deserve further exploration to refine strategies that mitigate misaligned incentives.

Fostering social bonds is not merely a strategy but a necessity for advancing public health outcomes and addressing systemic inefficiencies in resource allocation. Policymakers, practitioners, and community leaders stand to benefit from the insights presented, equipping them with actionable pathways to create enduring, impactful collaborations. As the healthcare landscape continues to evolve, leveraging the power of social bonds will remain critical to achieving equity, sustainability, and improved health outcomes for all.

References

1. McCullough JM, Leider JP, Resnick B, Bishai D (2020) Aligning US spending priorities using the health impact pyramid lens. American Journal of Public Health 110(S1): S181–S185.

2. Chandra A, Miller CE, Acosta JD, Weilant S, Trujillo M, et al. (2016) Drivers of health as a shared value: Mindsets, expectations, sense of community, and civic engagement. Health Affairs 35(11): 1959-1963.

3. Carnoy M, Marachi R (2020) Investing for "Impact" or investing for profit? Social impact bonds pay for success, and the next wave of privatization of social services and education. National Education Policy Center, School of Education, University of Colorado, Boulder.

4. Hirschi T (1969) Causes of delinquency. University of California Press.

5. Provan KG, Kenis P (2008) Modes of network governance: Structure, management, and effectiveness. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory 18(2): 229-252.

6. Bryson JM, Crosby BC, Bloomberg L (2015) Creating public value in practice. Taylor & Francis.

7. Ansell C, Gash A (2008) Collaborative governance in

theory and practice. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory 18(4): 543-571.

8. Mays GP, Scutchfield FD, Bhandari MW, Smith SA (2010) Understanding the organization of public health delivery systems: an empirical typology. The Milbank quarterly 88(1): 81-111.

9. Pfeffer J, Salancik GR (1978) The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective. Harper & Row.

10. Granovetter M (1973) The strength of weak ties. American Journal of Sociology 78(6): 1360-1380.

11. Schoen C, Davis K, How SKH, Schoenbaum SC (2006) U.S. health system performance: A national scorecard. Health Affairs 25: 1.

12. Doran KM, Misa EJ, Shah NR (2013) Housing as health care — New York's boundary-crossing experiment. New England Journal of Medicine 369(25): 2374-2377.

13. Bachrach D, Pfister H, Wallis K, Lipson M (2016) Addressing patients' social needs: An emerging business case for provider investment. The Commonwealth Fund.

14. Webster R (2014) Do social impact bonds work?.

15. (2020) Shared savings program. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS).

16. Bryson JM, Crosby BC, Stone MM (2015) Designing and implementing cross-sector collaborations: Needed and challenging. Public Administration Review 75(5): 647-663.

17. Brenner J (2023) Lessons Learned from the Camden Coalition's Work with High Needs, High Complexity Patients. Population Health Management 26(4): 227-229.

18. (2019) Building Healthier Communities Together: A report on the BUILD Health Challenge model and impact. BUILD Health Challenge.

19. Aarons GA, Hurlburt M, Horwitz SM (2014) Advancing a conceptual model of evidence-based practice implementation in public service sectors. Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research 38(1): 4-23.

20. Lewis VA, Fisher ES, Colla CH (2020) Explaining sluggish savings under accountable care. New England Journal of Medicine 377(19): 1809-1811.

21. Kania J, Kramer M (2011) Collective impact. Stanford Social Innovation Review 9(1): 36-41.

22. (2020) Culture of Health initiative. Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

23. Berkowitz SA, Parashuram S, Rowan K, Andon L, Bass EB, et al. (2018) Association of a care coordination model with health care costs and utilization. JAMA Network Open 1(7): e184359.

24. Petiwala A, Lanford D, Landers G, Minyard K, et al. (2021) Community voice in cross-sector alignment: concepts and strategies from a scoping review of the health collaboration literature. BMC Public Health 21(1): 712.

25. Holt-Lunstad J (2024) Social connection as a critical factor for mental and physical health: evidence, trends, challenges, and future implications. World Psychiatry 23(3): 312-332.

26. Culhane-Pera KA, Pergament SL, Kasouaher MY, Pattock AM, Dhore N, et al. (2021) Diverse community leaders' perspectives about quality primary healthcare and healthcare measurement: qualitative community-based participatory research. Int J Equity Health 20: 226.

27. (2018) Vermont's bold experiment in community-driven health care reform. The Commonwealth Fund.

28. Isett KR, Mergel IA, LeRoux K, Mischen PA, Rethemeyer RK (2011) Networks in public administration scholarship: Understanding where we are and where we need to go. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory 21(suppl_1): i157-i173.

29. Williams P (2002) The competent boundary spanner. Public Administration 80(1): 103-124.

30. Ernst C, Chrobot-Mason D (2011) Boundary spanning leadership: Six practices for solving problems, driving innovation, and transforming organizations. McGraw Hill Professional pp: 302.

31. Quick KS, Feldman MS (2011) Distinguishing participation and inclusion. Journal of Planning Education and Research 31(3): 272–290.

32. Padgett DK, Henwood BF, Tsemberis SJ (2016) Housing first: Ending homelessness, transforming systems, and changing lives. Psychiatr Serv 67(12): 1385.

33. Albert S, Brason FW, Sanford CK, N Dasgupta, J Graham, et al. (2011) Project Lazarus: Community-based overdose prevention in rural North Carolina. Pain Medicine 12(Suppl 2): S77-S85.

34. Lancaster M, Brason FW (2014) Project Lazarus: A

community-wide response to managing pain. SlideServe.

35. Jones CD (2016) Vermont's Blueprint for Health: The impact of community health teams on hospital admissions. Journal of General Internal Medicine 31(2): 302-308.

36. Alley DE, Asomugha CN, Conway PH, Sanghavi DM (2016) Accountable Health Communities—Addressing social needs through Medicare and Medicaid. New England Journal of Medicine 374(1): 8-11.

37. Gottlieb LM (2016) Moving upstream: Policy strategies to address social determinants of health. Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved 27(2): 273-289.

38. Berardo R, Scholz JT (2010) Self-organizing policy networks: Risk, partner selection, and cooperation in estuaries. American Journal of Political Science 54(3): 632-649.

39. Berwick DM, Nolan TW, Whittington J (2008) The triple aim: Care, health, and cost. Health Affairs 27(3): 759-769.

40. Kindig D, Stoddart G (2003) What is population health? American Journal of Public Health 93(3): 380-383.

41. Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion (ODPHP) (2021) National prevention strategy: Fact sheets. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

42. Wakeman SE, Barnett ML (2018) Primary care and the opioid-overdose crisis—Buprenorphine myths and realities. New England Journal of Medicine 379(1): 1-4.

43. Vermont Blueprint for Health (2016) Accountable communities for health: Sustainability and financing. Vermont Department of Health.

44. California Department of Health Care Services (2020) Whole Person Care Pilot Program Report.

45. Dugyala S San Francisco Public Press (2017) Comparing 4 social impact bond projects.

46. Jacobs DE, Wilson J, Dixon SL, Smith J, Evens A (2009) The relationship of housing and population health: a 30-year retrospective analysis. Environmental health perspectives 117(4): 597-604.

47. Paul GC (2023) Hirschi's social bond theory explained. Helpful Professor.