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ABSTRACT

Objective This scoping study has been conducted to map the literature and provide a descriptive synthesis on the barriers and facilitators of the integration of oral health into primary care.

Methods Grounded in the Rainbow conceptual model and using the Levac et al six-stage framework, we performed a systematic search of electronic databases, organisational websites and grey literature from 1978 to April 2016. All publications with a focus on the integration of oral health into primary care were included except commentaries and editorials. Thematic analyses were performed to synthesise the results.

Results From a total of 1619 citations, 58 publications were included in the review. Barrier-related themes included: lack of political leadership and healthcare policies; implementation challenges; discipline-oriented education; lack of continuity of care and services and patients' oral healthcare needs. The facilitators of integration were supportive policies and resources allocation, interdisciplinary education, collaborative practices between dental and other healthcare professionals, presence of local strategic leaders and geographical proximity.

Discussion and public health implications This work has advanced the knowledge on the barriers and facilitators at each integration domain and level, which may be helpful if the healthcare organisations decide to integrate oral health and dental services into primary care. The scoping review findings could be useful for both dental and medical workforce and allied primary healthcare providers. They could also guide the development of healthcare policies that support collaborative practices and patient-centred care in the field of primary care.

BACKGROUND

Over the last decades, the concept of integration has been implemented as a multidisciplinary care pathway in many health organisations to increase the effectiveness of care for patients with special clinical needs and problems, such as elders and patients with cognitive or physical disabilities.1-6 The integrated care approach has mainly emerged in primary healthcare settings to provide and maintain universal access to a broad range of healthcare services. However, this patient-centred care model faces challenges and resistance in adoption for some domains or disciplines such as oral health and dentistry.7 In fact, the integration of oral health into primary care is still at the stage of initiative in many countries. Recently, the American Academy of Family Physicians has supported the integration of oral health into primary care as delineated by the Oral Health Delivery Framework.8 This framework refers to multidisciplinary collaborative practices for risk assessment, oral health evaluation, preventive interventions as well as communication and education. It was developed by an interdisciplinary team of health and oral healthcare providers, representatives of professional associations and public health advocates as well as policy-makers and care consumers. However, this concept is still relatively new and needs to be examined in its comprehensive perspective. As defined by Gröne and Garcia-Barbero, integrated care is ‘bringing together inputs, delivery, management and organisation of services related to diagnosis, treatment, care, rehabilitation and health promotion’.9 Furthermore, the adoption of integrated care models

Strengths and limitations of this study

► This scoping review identified the barriers and facilitators of the integration of oral health through a comprehensive analysis of the literature using a theoretical framework.
► The implications of these findings will allow the development of targeted strategies that could increase the integration of oral health into primary care by eliminating common barriers and enhancing facilitators.
► The nature of the scoping review did not allow the grading of the evidence since a quality evaluation of the included studies has not been conducted. This could be an objective for a further systematic review.
in healthcare systems necessitates identifying barriers, sharing knowledge and delivering necessary information to policy-makers.

As presented in the published protocol, a comprehensive scoping review funded by the Canadian Institutes for Health Research has been conducted by Emami’s research team to answer several research questions on the concept of the oral health care approach. The scoping review findings have been divided and prepared for presentation into two publications. This paper presents specifically the results on the barriers and facilitators. The findings have been divided and prepared for presentation into two publications. This paper presents specifically the results on the barriers and facilitators. The findings in regard to policies, applied programmes and outcomes will be presented in the subsequent publication.

METHODS

The method outlined by Levac et al., an extension of the Arksey and O’Malley scoping review method, has been used to conduct the review. Since the methods employed in this scoping review have been presented in detail previously, they are described only briefly here. The Levac et al. methodological framework comprises six stages: (1) identifying the research question, (2) searching for relevant studies, (3) selecting studies, (4) charting and collating the data, (5) summarising and reporting the results and 6) consultation with stakeholders to inform the review.

Research question

The following research question has been formulated for this part of the review: What are the barriers and the facilitators of the integration of oral health into primary care in various healthcare settings across the world?

Search strategy

A detailed search strategy was designed with the help of an expert librarian at Université de Montreal, using specific MeSH terms and keywords to capture the relevant literature on the topic of interest. We created groupings of keywords and medical subject headings that were combined with the Boolean terms ‘OR’ and ‘AND’ and ‘NOT’. The search strategy was developed for Medline via Ovid interface (table 1) and was revised for each of the other electronic platforms such as: Ovid (Medline, Embase, Cochrane databases), National Center for Biotechnology Information (PubMed), EBSCOhost (Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature), ProQuest, Databases in Public Health, Databases of the National Institutes of Health (health management and health technology), Health Services and Sciences Research Resources, Health Services Research and Health Care Technology, Health Services Research Information Central, Health Services Research Information Portal, Health Services Technology Assessment Texts and Healthy People 2020. For this last platform, we used the Healthy People Structured Evidence Queries, which are preformulated PubMed searches for Healthy People 2020 (HP2020) objectives. These ongoing updated queries have been developed by experts, librarians and stakeholders in the field of public health to achieve HP2020 objectives to easily search the evidence-based public health literature.

Identifying relevant studies and eligibility criteria

Publications in English or French from 1978 to April 2016 were reviewed. We included all research studies irrespective of study design in which the integration of oral health into primary care is the primary focus of the publication. We excluded publications such as commentaries, editorials and individual points of view, but we searched their references for the original studies. Two researchers (HH, EE) independently screened the titles and abstracts of each citation and identified eligible articles for full review. Disagreement between reviewers was discussed and resolved by consensus. All potentially relevant studies were retained for full-text assessment. Data extraction was conducted independently by the same reviewers using a data extraction form, designed according to the study’s conceptual framework.

Conceptual framework

The Rainbow model was used as a conceptual model to guide the scoping study. This model is based on the integrative functions in primary care and includes level-specific domains: clinical integration (micro level), organisational and professional integration (meso level) and system integration (macro level). Furthermore, in this multilevel model, functional and normative integration assure the link between the other three domains.

Data charting and collating

To ensure the consistency of the data extraction, this stage was conducted by three reviewers (HH, EE, RS) followed by consensus. The data were classified into two tables, according to the type of the publications: (1) research reports; (2) policies, strategic plans and other relevant publications. In the first step, extracted data and related meaning units were grouped into two categories: barriers and facilitators. According to Tesch (1990), a meaning unit is ‘a segment of text that is comprehensible by itself and contains one idea, episode or piece of information’.

Then a constant comparison of the codes was conducted and the themes were identified. In the second step, these categories were divided into specific levels and domains according to the study’s conceptual framework. At this stage, a triangulation was conducted by the scoping review team (HH, EE, RS, FG, YC, LL, CB) and themes were discussed and revised.

Summarising and reporting the results

A qualitative approach was used to synthesise the study’s findings. This involved a descriptive and thematic analysis of the results based on the conceptual framework.

Stakeholder consultations

We engaged the knowledge users and stakeholders in the entire process of the review through preliminary reviews...
### Table 1 Medline search strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Searches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>exp Dental Health Services/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Oral Health/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dentistry/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Oral Medicine/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>exp Preventive Dentistry/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>exp Dental Facilities/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>exp Diagnosis, Oral/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Stomatognathic Diseases/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>exp Mouth Diseases/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>exp Tooth Diseases/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pediatric Dentistry/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>exp Dentists/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Community Dentistry/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>(dentist* or stomatology or Dental Prophylaxis or Fluoridation or Oral Hygiene or Oral Health or Dental Facilities or Dental Clinic* or Dental Office* or Oral Diagnosis* or Mouth Disease* or Tooth Disease* or Dental Disease* or Dental Health Service* or Dental Services* or pedodontics).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, keyword heading word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12 or 13 or 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>exp Primary Health Care/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Primary Care Nursing/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Primary Nursing/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Physicians, Primary Care/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>(Primary care or Primary Health Care or Primary healthcare or Primary Nursing).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, keyword heading word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>16 or 17 or 18 or 19 or 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>exp 'Delivery of Health Care, Integrated'/*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>exp Community Health Services/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>(community care or community health care or community healthcare).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, keyword heading word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>22 or 23 or 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Community Integration/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>systems integration/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>(Integrat* or Interprofessional or multidisciplinary* or interdisciplin* or cooperat* or collaborat* or coordination*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, keyword heading word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>((Cross or multi or inter) adj (profession* or Disciplin*)).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, keyword heading word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>26 or 27 or 28 or 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>15 and 21 and 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>limit 31 to (English or French)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>(15 and 25 and 30) not 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>limit 33 to (English or French)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of a few published articles, as well as discussions on the study research question. The stakeholders included representatives of academic healthcare organisations, policy decision-makers and primary healthcare professionals working in rural and remote communities, as well as patients’ representatives.

RESULTS
Characteristics of the publications
The databases and grey literature searches yielded 1619 records (figure 1). After removal of duplicates, 1583 publications went through title and abstract screening, of which 95 were included for full review. After adding nine publications from the hand search of references, a total of 104 articles were included in the final analysis. Among the total reviewed articles, 58 publications (tables 2 and 3) reported on the barriers and/or facilitators of oral health integration into primary care. These publications were from 18 countries across the world: the USA, Australia, Canada, France, Sweden, Norway, Switzerland, Nepal, Bangladesh, Indonesia, Tanzania, Nigeria, Thailand, Peru, Brazil, New Zealand, the UK and Iran.

The majority of research studies were published in the last decade and were conducted in the USA. Table 2 presents the characteristics of the selected original research studies (n=37). The research studies included pilot and demonstration projects, qualitative and quantitative studies. The latter included two randomised controlled trials (RCTs). The publications in regard to policy analyses/white papers, oral healthcare programme descriptions (n=21) are presented in table 3.

The publications reported barriers and facilitators on the three levels of integration as described by Leutz et al: linkage (n=41); coordination (n=11) and full integration (n=6). Only seven publications from three countries reported on the long-term barriers of fully integrated models of primary oral care.

Furthermore, the types of integration reported in the literature were mostly at the linkage level and included screening to identify emerging needs, understanding and responding to the special needs of identified vulnerable population groups such as children and elders, referrals and follow-up and providing information to patients.

Themes
A total of 10 themes and 9 subthemes at the macro, meso and micro level emerged from the review. These themes covered all the domains found in the theoretical model. The most frequently reported barrier was related to primary healthcare providers’ competencies at the micro level and in the domain of clinical integration. The two other most reported barriers were the low political priority in the system integration domain, at the macro level, as well as the lack of funds in the organisational integration domain, at the meso level. The most frequently reported facilitators included collaborative practices in the functional domain and financial support in the system integration domain, at the macro level.

Barriers in the integration of oral health into primary care
Lack of political leadership and healthcare policies
Lack of political leadership, poor understanding of the oral health status of the population and low prioritisation of oral health on the political agenda as well the absence of appropriate oral health policies were identified as barriers for integrated care at the macro level.

Insurance policies and separate medical and dental insurance realms were found detrimental to the coordination of services among medical and dental providers in the functional domain. Furthermore, in many countries, the professional legislation policies did not allow the delivery of preventive oral healthcare by non-dental professionals, and this operates as a barrier for integrated care.
Table 2 Main facilitators and barriers of the integration of oral health into primary care according to the research articles identified in the scoping review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors, year/country (reference number)</th>
<th>Type of publication</th>
<th>Setting/target healthcare users</th>
<th>Main barriers to integration</th>
<th>Main facilitators of integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anumanrajadhon et al, 1996/Thailand 16</td>
<td>Demonstration project</td>
<td>Community healthcare centre/Rural communities</td>
<td>▶ Deficient infrastructure and logistics ▶ Financial cost</td>
<td>▶ Interprofessional education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haughney et al, 1998/UK 17</td>
<td>Original research report</td>
<td>General medical and dental practices/General population</td>
<td>▶ Discrepancies in health record systems ▶ Poor care coordination</td>
<td>▶ Colocation and proximity ▶ Collaborative practices ▶ Effective communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helderman et al, 1999/Bangladesh, Indonesia, Nepal, Tanzania 18</td>
<td>Demonstration projects</td>
<td>Community healthcare centres/Rural communities</td>
<td>▶ Conventional dentistry and lack of dentists’ social and behavioural knowledge ▶ Deficient infrastructure and logistics</td>
<td>▶ Interprofessional education ▶ Supportive policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson and Lange, 1999/USA 19</td>
<td>Original research report</td>
<td>Long-term care facilities/Geriatric population</td>
<td>▶ Limited knowledge/training of primary care providers ▶ Implementation constraints ▶ Institutional policies</td>
<td>▶ Nursing staff interest and positive attitude toward oral health ▶ Patients’ perception and oral health needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacEntee et al, 1999/Canada 20</td>
<td>Original research report</td>
<td>Long-term care facilities/Geriatric population</td>
<td>▶ Financial cost of on-site dental clinic ▶ Lack of infrastructure and implementation issues ▶ Lack of professional interest ▶ Limited knowledge/education</td>
<td>▶ Collaborative practices ▶ Local champion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felona and DeVore, 1999/USA 21</td>
<td>Original research report</td>
<td>Primary care nursing centres/Vulnerable population</td>
<td>▶ Lack of referral sources ▶ Unavailability of dental providers ▶ Lack of professional interest ▶ Financial cost</td>
<td>▶ Collaborative practices ▶ Human resources including oral health professionals ▶ Interprofessional education/training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chung et al, 2000/Switzerland 22</td>
<td>Original research report</td>
<td>Nursing homes/Geriatric population</td>
<td>▶ Limited knowledge/training of primary care providers ▶ Lack of professional interest and perception of responsibility ▶ Low institutional priority for oral health</td>
<td>▶ Interprofessional education/training ▶ Collaborative practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond et al, 2003/USA 23</td>
<td>Original research report</td>
<td>Community health/oral health network/School-aged children in underserved communities</td>
<td>▶ Poor support from academic institutions ▶ Lack of goal-oriented human resources ▶ Long-term financial issues</td>
<td>▶ Community support ▶ Collaborative practices ▶ Stakeholders’ common vision and support ▶ Financial support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De La Cruz et al, 2004/USA 24</td>
<td>Original research report</td>
<td>Paediatric practices and family medicine practices/Medicaid eligible children</td>
<td>▶ Practice setting of primary healthcare providers (solo, workload and high-patient volume) ▶ Primary healthcare providers’ self-perceived difficulty for referral</td>
<td>▶ Primary clinicians’ confidence in dental screening ▶ The dental care needs of children at-risk for developing disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cane and Butler, 2004/Australia 25</td>
<td>Demonstration project/Pilot study</td>
<td>Community public health services/Rural and remote communities</td>
<td>▶ Professional legislation policies ▶ Lack of agreement on interprofessional education ▶ Unstructured care coordination</td>
<td>▶ Financial support and adequate resources ▶ Interprofessional education/training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors, year/country (reference number)</th>
<th>Type of publication</th>
<th>Setting/target healthcare users</th>
<th>Main barriers to integration</th>
<th>Main facilitators of integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hallberg et al, 2005/Sweden⁵⁵          | Original research report | Medical practices/Children with disabilities | ▶ Limited knowledge and education of healthcare professionals in regard to oral health  
▶ Attitudes and concerns in regard to shared responsibility  
▶ Deficient organisational support and limited resources | ▶ Working in multidisciplinary teams  
▶ Financial support and adequate resources |
| Maunder and Landers, 2005/UK³⁷         | Original research report | Community pharmacies/General population | ▶ Lack of referral mechanism and unstructured care coordination  
▶ Lack of support for pharmacists on integration into primary healthcare teams | ▶ Interprofessional education/training  
▶ Interdisciplinary meeting  
▶ Pathway file: coordination mechanism |
| Lewis et al, 2005/USA³⁸               | Original research report | Community based-medical practices/Children | ▶ Financial issues and logistics  
▶ Lack of financial incentives for primary care providers  
▶ Limited knowledge and education of healthcare professionals in regard to dental preventive acts  
▶ Attitudes and concerns in regard to shared responsibility  
▶ Lack of time and workload of healthcare professionals | ▶ Coordination mechanism  
▶ Interprofessional education/training and supportive materials  
▶ Dental resources in community  
▶ Interprofessional communication  
▶ Implementations strategies |
| Lowe, 2007/UK⁹⁹                      | Original research report | General medical practices/Geriatric population | ▶ Lack of referral mechanism and unstructured care coordination | ▶ Patients’ oral health needs  
▶ Coordination mechanism  
▶ Proximity |
| Andersson et al, 2007/Sweden¹⁰       | Original research report | Primary healthcare centre/Geriatric population | ▶ Limited knowledge and education of healthcare professionals in regard to oral health  
▶ Cultural gap between dental and medical disciplines, and discipline-oriented education  
▶ Unstructured care coordination  
▶ Lack of reimbursement policies in regard to preventive dental care acts for non-dental healthcare professionals  
▶ Assignment of responsibility and lack of time | ▶ Holistic health perspective of primary care providers  
▶ Interprofessional collaboration |
| Slade et al, 2007/USA¹¹              | Original research report | Private paediatric and family physician practices/Medicaid-eligible children | ▶ NA | ▶ Type of medical practices: paediatric practices  
▶ Large volume practices |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors, year/country (reference number)</th>
<th>Type of publication</th>
<th>Setting/target healthcare users</th>
<th>Main barriers to integration</th>
<th>Main facilitators of integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Riter et al., 2008/USA | Original research report | Primary healthcare centres/Young children | ► Limited knowledge and education of healthcare professionals in regard to oral health  
► Lack of financial incentives (reimbursement policies) for primary healthcare providers  
► Unstructured care coordination | ► Local champions  
► Interprofessional education/training  
► Legislation  
► Building political will and public awareness  
► Support of medical community |
| Tenenbaum et al., 2008/France | Original research report | Private practitioner-hospital health network/Population with limited access to care | ► Lack of structured care coordination and referral systems  
► Limited interprofessional collaboration  
► Assignment of responsibility  
► Lack of financial incentives | ► Interprofessional education/training |
| Pronych et al., 2010/USA | Original research report/Pilot | Long-term care facilities/Geriatric population | ► Professionals’ lack of interest, time constraints  
► Attitudes and concerns in regard to shared responsibility | ► Oral healthcare coordinator  
► Interprofessional education/training |
| Close et al., 2010/USA | Original research report | Primary healthcare practices/Children ≤3 years old | ► Limited training of healthcare professionals in regard to technical dental acts  
► Lack of structured care coordination and referral systems  
► Attitude and resistance of office personnel  
► Implementation issues (eg, time, staff turnover) | ► Technical training of primary healthcare providers for preventive acts  
► Implementation of coordination strategies |
| Wooten et al., 2011/USA | Original research report | Prenatal care centres/Pregnant women | ► Limited knowledge and education | ► Interprofessional education/training  
► Proximity and referral resources |
| Skeie et al., 2011/Norway | Original research report | Child health clinics/infants and toddlers | ► Limited knowledge and education  
► Time constraints of primary healthcare providers | ► Population oral health needs  
► Interprofessional communication  
► Interprofessional education/training |
| Hajizamani et al., 2012/Iran | Original research report | Public healthcare centres/General population | ► Lack of primary healthcare providers’ knowledge on oral health and their duties towards oral healthcare | ► Interprofessional education/training  
► Collaborative practices |
| Rabiei et al., 2012/Iran | Original research report | Public healthcare centres/General population | ► Limited knowledge and education of primary healthcare providers | ► Interprofessional education/training |
| Brownlee B, 2012/USA | Original research report | Community health centres/General population | ► Limited education and training of primary healthcare providers  
► Cost of sustainable programmes  
► Time constraints of primary healthcare providers  
► Change in leadership  
► Shortage of healthcare workforce | ► Medical/dental champion/leaders  
► Colocation  
► Implementation of structured care coordination and supportive electronic record system  
► Financial support and strategies for revenue  
► In-reach programme targeting population at risk |
### Table 2  Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors, year/country (reference number)</th>
<th>Type of publication</th>
<th>Setting/target healthcare users</th>
<th>Main barriers to integration</th>
<th>Main facilitators of integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sams et al, 2013/USA<sup>10</sup>      | Original research report | Centres of Medicare and Medicaid services/Children | ► Opposition from dental profession  
► Healthcare professionals’ lack of interest  
► Administrative issues  
► Lack of personnel  
► Limited budget for reimbursement of non-dentist providers | ► Compatibility with other Medicaid programmes  
► Reimbursement for multiple services of non-dental care professionals  
► Interprofessional education/training |
| Olayiwola et al, 2014/USA<sup>42</sup> | Original research report | Medical and dental practices/General population | ► Financial cost  
► Delivery barriers  
► Inadequate services linkage | ► Colocation and proximity  
► Community partnerships with academic institutions and key stakeholders  
► Interprofessional education/training  
► Supportive policies and collaboration  
► Implementation of coordination strategies and patients’ engagement |
| Braimoh et al, 2014/Nigeria<sup>43</sup> | Original research report | Local governments’ primary healthcare centres/General population | ► Lack of primary healthcare workers’ education and training in regard to oral health  
► Shortage of healthcare workforce  
► Lack of equipment and inadequate infrastructure  
► Limited funds | ► Colocation  
► Local leader  
► Interprofessional education/training  
► Provision of resources and adequate infrastructure |
| Pesaressi et al, 2014/Peru<sup>44</sup> | Original research report | Health centres of Ministry of Health/Infants and their caregivers | ► Limited knowledge of primary healthcare professionals on the importance of oral health  
► Primary healthcare professionals’ perceived responsibility in regard to oral health | ► Interprofessional training and education  
► Primary healthcare professionals’ willingness to advise on oral health |
| Mitchell-Royston et al, 2014/USA<sup>45</sup> | Original research report | Healthcare centres/Children ≤12 years old | ► Limited training of healthcare professionals in regard to oral healthcare | ► Oral health champion  
► Collaborative practices and team approach  
► Interprofessional training and education  
► Adequate care coordination and referral system  
► Use of tools such as standardised electronic health records to incorporate oral prevention into primary care workflow  
► Reimbursement policies for non-dental providers for oral health services  
► Supportive policies and collaboration of key stakeholders |
### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors, year/country (reference number)</th>
<th>Type of publication</th>
<th>Setting/target healthcare users</th>
<th>Main barriers to integration</th>
<th>Main facilitators of integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| De Aguiar et al, 2014/Brazil | Original research report | Municipalities’ primary healthcare centres/General population | ► Limited skills and training of healthcare professionals in regard to dental acts  
► Lack of human resources  
► Attitude and concerns in regard to the responsibility for oral healthcare  
► Workload and time constraints of primary healthcare providers | ► Supportive policies and resources  
► Interprofessional collaboration  
► Regulations in regard to primary healthcare providers’ scope of practice and tasks  
► Acknowledge of the care effectiveness |
| Hummel et al, 2015/USA | White paper/Case studies | Primary healthcare centres/ Vulnerable and at risk population | ► Historical fragmentation of oral and general healthcare  
► Barriers to sharing clinical information  
► Lack of training of primary care providers in regard to oral health  
► Time constraints and workflow of primary care providers  
► Lack of evidence-based guidelines  
► Lack of financial incentives and payment policies for primary care practices  
► Discipline-oriented perspective in regard to the scope of practice | ► Consumer advocacy and collaboration of key stakeholders including patients and caregivers  
► Dissemination of validated screening and assessment tools  
► Care coordination and structured referral process  
► Team and incremental approach  
► Use of health information technology  
► Interprofessional education/training  
► Quality and performance measurements  
► Local champion |
| Langelier et al, USA/2015 | Original research report | Federally qualified healthcare centres/ Vulnerable population groups | ► Limited funds  
► Low priority for oral health  
► Limited resources and shortage of workforce  
► Incompatibility of previously built electronic medical and dental record systems  
► High cost of an adequate infrastructure | ► Adequate care coordination and referral system  
► Use of standardised electronic health records  
► Engagement of both public and private dental and non-dental providers in primary care  
► Collaborative practices  
► Communities tailored programs  
► Patients’ needs  
► Colocation and proximity  
► Financial support and supportive environments |
| Barnett et al, 2016/Australia | Original research report | Community primary care centres/Rural communities | ► Primary care professionals discipline-oriented perspective in regard to the scope of practice  
► Lack of structured referral process and ‘one-way communication’  
► Limited knowledge and education | ► Primary care professionals’ confidence and competencies in providing emergency dental care  
► Primary care professionals’ perceptions of patient needs  
► Interprofessional education and training  
► Collaboration |

Continued
### Table 2  Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors, year/country (reference number)</th>
<th>Type of publication</th>
<th>Setting/target healthcare users</th>
<th>Main barriers to integration</th>
<th>Main facilitators of integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Smith M and Murray-Thomson W, 2016/New Zealand<sup>46</sup> | Original research report | Government-assisted care/Geriatric frail population | ► Lack of policies on including oral healthcare in residential care facilities  
► Traditional perspectives of dental profession in regard to dental care and limited social commitment | ► Intersectoral collaboration and care planning at system level  
► Upskilling of dental workforce for primary care services  
► Patient empowerment in regard to oral health needs  
► Financial support and supportive environments |
| Arthur and Rozier, 2016/USA<sup>49</sup> | Original research report | Medical practices/Medicaid-eligible children ≤5 years old | ► Limited research on the effectiveness of oral health services provided by non-dental providers  
► Partial reimbursement and requirement for training | ► Implementation of policies by Medicaid programmes |
| Bernstein et al, 2016/USA<sup>51</sup> | Original research report | Federally qualified healthcare centres/Vulnerable population groups | ► Limited time  
► Lack of training and expertise of primary care providers  
► Lack of shared medical and dental records  
► Low priority for oral health care | ► Shared vision between caregivers and administrators  
► Local champion |

### Implementation challenges

**Disputes on education and lack of competencies**

At the meso level, lack of interprofessional education were identified as obstacles to integrated care in many studies. For instance, a study conducted in the USA showed that paediatricians with a low level of competencies had adopted oral healthcare into their routine practice five times less than those with a higher level of competencies. Knowledge, attitudes and skills were the most reported meaning units of competencies of primary healthcare providers, as defined by Bloom and Krathwohl. The lack of knowledge and training in oral healthcare was identified in both dental and non-dental care providers. At the micro level, lack of competencies was translated as lack of knowledge and skills about oral health care in both dental and medical healthcare teams. For instance, a study conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declared carrying out a systematic examination of the oral cavity, while the others expressed their reluctance to do so. In France and Brazil, qualitative studies conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declared carrying out a systematic examination of the oral cavity, while the others expressed their reluctance to do so. In France and Brazil, qualitative studies conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declared carrying out a systematic examination of the oral cavity, while the others expressed their reluctance to do so. In France and Brazil, qualitative studies conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declared carrying out a systematic examination of the oral cavity, while the others expressed their reluctance to do so. In France and Brazil, qualitative studies conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declared carrying out a systematic examination of the oral cavity, while the others expressed their reluctance to do so. In France and Brazil, qualitative studies conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declared carrying out a systematic examination of the oral cavity, while the others expressed their reluctance to do so. In France and Brazil, qualitative studies conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declared carrying out a systematic examination of the oral cavity, while the others expressed their reluctance to do so. In France and Brazil, qualitative studies conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declared carrying out a systematic examination of the oral cavity, while the others expressed their reluctance to do so. In France and Brazil, qualitative studies conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declared carrying out a systematic examination of the oral cavity, while the others expressed their reluctance to do so. In France and Brazil, qualitative studies conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declared carrying out a systematic examination of the oral cavity, while the others expressed their reluctance to do so. In France and Brazil, qualitative studies conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declared carrying out a systematic examination of the oral cavity, while the others expressed their reluctance to do so. In France and Brazil, qualitative studies conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declared carrying out a systematic examination of the oral cavity, while the others expressed their reluctance to do so. In France and Brazil, qualitative studies conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declared carrying out a systematic examination of the oral cavity, while the others expressed their reluctance to do so. In France and Brazil, qualitative studies conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declared carrying out a systematic examination of the oral cavity, while the others expressed their reluctance to do so. In France and Brazil, qualitative studies conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declared carrying out a systematic examination of the oral cavity, while the others expressed their reluctance to do so. In France and Brazil, qualitative studies conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declared carrying out a systematic examination of the oral cavity, while the others expressed their reluctance to do so. In France and Brazil, qualitative studies conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declared carrying out a systematic examination of the oral cavity, while the others expressed their reluctance to do so. In France and Brazil, qualitative studies conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declared carrying out a systematic examination of the oral cavity, while the others expressed their reluctance to do so. In France and Brazil, qualitative studies conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declared carrying out a systematic examination of the oral cavity, while the others expressed their reluctance to do so. In France and Brazil, qualitative studies conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declared carrying out a systematic examination of the oral cavity, while the others expressed their reluctance to do so. In France and Brazil, qualitative studies conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declared carrying out a systematic examination of the oral cavity, while the others expressed their reluctance to do so. In France and Brazil, qualitative studies conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declared carrying out a systematic examination of the oral cavity, while the others expressed their reluctance to do so. In France and Brazil, qualitative studies conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declared carrying out a systematic examination of the oral cavity, while the others expressed their reluctance to do so. In France and Brazil, qualitative studies conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declared carrying out a systematic examination of the oral cavity, while the others expressed their reluctance to do so. In France and Brazil, qualitative studies conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declared carrying out a systematic examination of the oral cavity, while the others expressed their reluctance to do so. In France and Brazil, qualitative studies conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declared carrying out a systematic examination of the oral cavity, while the others expressed their reluctance to do so. In France and Brazil, qualitative studies conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declared carrying out a systematic examination of the oral cavity, while the others expressed their reluctance to do so. In France and Brazil, qualitative studies conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declared carrying out a systematic examination of the oral cavity, while the others expressed their reluctance to do so. In France and Brazil, qualitative studies conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declared carrying out a systematic examination of the oral cavity, while the others expressed their reluctance to do so. In France and Brazil, qualitative studies conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declared carrying out a systematic examination of the oral cavity, while the others expressed their reluctance to do so. In France and Brazil, qualitative studies conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declared carrying out a systematic examination of the oral cavity, while the others expressed their reluctance to do so. In France and Brazil, qualitative studies conducted in Sweden, France, and Brazil found that physicians in a long-term care facility declare...
Table 3  Main facilitators and barriers of the integration of oral health into primary care according to the non-research publications identified in the scoping review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors, year/Country</th>
<th>Type of publication</th>
<th>Setting/ Target healthcare users</th>
<th>Main barriers to integration</th>
<th>Main facilitators of integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tosi, 1987/USA</td>
<td>Programme description</td>
<td>Community healthcare centre/ Populations with special care needs</td>
<td>▶ Poor connection between academic institutions and primary care sector</td>
<td>▶ Interprofessional education/training ▶ Strategic leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nolan et al, 2003/USA</td>
<td>Policy analysis and case studies</td>
<td>Healthcare centres’ low-income population with a focus on children</td>
<td>▶ Professional legislation policies, dental licensing laws and practice acts ▶ Lack of referral mechanism</td>
<td>▶ Strategic leadership and supportive healthcare policies, regulations and reimbursement policies for primary care providers ▶ Education/training ▶ Incremental approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rozier et al, 2003/USA</td>
<td>Programme description</td>
<td>Medical offices/Low-income population with a focus on high-risk children</td>
<td>▶ Lack of knowledge, skills and confidence among primary care providers ▶ Time and work load of primary healthcare providers ▶ Lack of referral mechanism</td>
<td>▶ Interprofessional education/training ▶ Strategic leadership ▶ Supportive healthcare policies and reimbursement policies for primary care providers ▶ Collaboration among various organisations ▶ Financial support and adequate resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wysen et al, 2004/ USA</td>
<td>Programme description</td>
<td>Community health centres/ Low-income children</td>
<td>▶ Discipline-oriented perspectives ▶ Professional interest</td>
<td>▶ Local champion and case manager ▶ Colocation ▶ Interprofessional education/training ▶ Financial support ▶ Adequate resources and outreach services by public health sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan American Health Organization/WHO, 2006/ USA</td>
<td>Strategic plan</td>
<td>National and regional programmes and community health centres/12-year-old children worldwide</td>
<td>▶ Lack of coordinated and sustainable strategy ▶ Resistance to change within dental profession</td>
<td>▶ Public health policies, support of key stakeholders and interprogrammatic approach ▶ Providing evidence based on needs assessment ▶ Interprofessional education/training ▶ Multidisciplinary approach ▶ Legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuer, 2007/USA</td>
<td>Programme description</td>
<td>School-based primary medical care/ Children</td>
<td>▶ Time constraints of primary healthcare providers</td>
<td>▶ Colocation ▶ Interdisciplinary care coordination ▶ Legislation in regard to the scope of dental hygienists’ practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens et al, 2007/ USA</td>
<td>Programme description</td>
<td>University-affiliated primary care centres/ Pregnant adolescents</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>▶ Type of primary care: prenatal services ▶ Collaborative practices ▶ Interprofessional education/training and orientation sessions ▶ Systematic care coordination ▶ Local leader ▶ Primary healthcare providers’ rewards and recognition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3  Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors, year/Country</th>
<th>Type of publication</th>
<th>Setting/Target healthcare users</th>
<th>Main barriers to integration</th>
<th>Main facilitators of integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Powell and Din, 2008/USA</td>
<td>White paper</td>
<td>Medical and dental practices/general population</td>
<td>► Poor communication between medical and dental providers</td>
<td>► Standardised electronic health records integrating oral health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► Incompatibility of the electronic medical and dental records</td>
<td>► Interprofessional and cross-discipline education/training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► Ignorance of oral health in best practice guidelines</td>
<td>► Legislation and policies to include preventive dental care in the health system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► Separation of medical and dental treatment in insurance systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► Unstructured care coordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber-Gasparoni et al, 2010/USA</td>
<td>Programme description</td>
<td>University-affiliated community clinic/Infants and toddlers</td>
<td>► Financial cost</td>
<td>► Support, partnership and collaboration of key stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► Interprofessional education/training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kruger et al, 2010/Western Australia</td>
<td>Report/Case study</td>
<td>Rural and remote Aboriginal medical centres/Rural and remote Indigenous communities</td>
<td>► NA</td>
<td>► Colocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► Collaboration and partnership of key stakeholders from service, education and research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► Symbiotic relationship with general health practitioners and supportive environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► Interprofessional communication and collaborative practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► Interprofessional education/training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► Resources and facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pucca et al, 2010/Brazil</td>
<td>Policy analysis</td>
<td>Healthcare network system/General population</td>
<td>► Low political priority for oral health</td>
<td>► Institutionalisation of policies and financial investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► Collaboration and partnership of key stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Unit, South Western Sydney Local Health, 2012/Australia</td>
<td>Strategic plan</td>
<td>Private general practice/Rural and remote communities</td>
<td>► Workforce shortages</td>
<td>► Information management and technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► Fragmented service system</td>
<td>► Administrative procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► Discipline-oriented perspectives</td>
<td>► Training and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantmakers in Health, 2012/USA</td>
<td>Report/Case studies</td>
<td>Healthcare centres/Vulnerable population groups</td>
<td>► Workforce issues</td>
<td>► Reimbursement and incentive policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► Dentists’ negative attitude toward vulnerable population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Service Administrations, 2012/USA</td>
<td>Case presentation</td>
<td>Primary healthcare centres / Early childhood</td>
<td>► Lack of community dental providers</td>
<td>► Alternative dental service providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► Limited public health coverage for dental care</td>
<td>► Communication and partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► Family hesitance/resistance in regard to some preventive dental care</td>
<td>► Education and training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► Lack of training and unfamiliarity of non-dental providers with new procedures</td>
<td>► Insurance and financing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors, year/Country</th>
<th>Type of publication</th>
<th>Setting/Target healthcare users</th>
<th>Main barriers to integration</th>
<th>Main facilitators of integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| NHS Commissioning Board, 2013/UK | Strategic plan/Case studies | NHS primary care dental services /General population | ► Limited budget | ► Local dental networks  
► Supportive policies and collaboration of key stakeholders including policy-makers, commissioners, clinicians, dental public health and academia  
► Care pathway commissioning framework  
► Implementation of coordination strategies such as tool kit for practices  
► Financial support |
| US Department of Health and Human Services, 2014/USA | Strategic document | Healthcare centres/ Vulnerable groups | ► Financial sustainability  
► Time constraints of primary healthcare providers | ► Implementation of oral health core competencies within primary care practices  
► Organisational leadership  
► Organised and multifaceted infrastructure  
► Financial support and strategies for revenue  
► Financial incentives and reimbursement policies for primary healthcare providers  
► Interprofessional education/training |
| Ramos-Gomez, 2014/USA | Programme description | Community health and wellness centres/ Vulnerable, high-risk children ≤5 years old and their caregivers | NA | ► Supportive policies and collaboration of key stakeholders including policy-makers, dental and non-dental care providers and academia  
► Implementation of community outreach coordination  
► Interprofessional education/training  
► Unified family-centred care  
► Electronic medical records |
| Abrams et al, 2014/USA | Strategic plan | Community clinics and private medical offices/ Children in underserved neighbourhoods | ► Limited infrastructure  
► Financial sustainability | ► Supportive policies and collaboration of key stakeholders including community members  
► Coordinated healthcare system  
► Interprofessional training  
► Standardised electronic medical records  
► Incorporation of oral health in insurance health plan and reimbursement policies |
| Pucca et al, 2015/Brazil | Policy analysis | Healthcare network system/ General population | ► Private providers’ interests  
► Fragmented care and education | ► Institutionalisation of policies and financial investments  
► Coordinated sustainable oral health network  
► Educational investment and job marketing  
► Adequate infrastructure and human resources  
► Collaboration of key stakeholders |
| Pourat et al, 2015/USA | Programme description/Policy brief | Community health centres/ Low-income and uninsured population | ► Infrastructure funding | ► Colocation  
► Administrative support and financial incentives to recruit dental providers |
| US Oral Health Strategic Framework 2014–2017, 2016/USA | Strategic plan | Primary healthcare centres/ Vulnerable and underserved population | ► Historical fragmentation of oral and general healthcare  
► Ununified medical and dental records | ► Supportive policies and collaboration of key stakeholders  
► Collaborative practices  
► Cross-discipline education and training  
► Unified patient-centred health centres |
coordination at the micro level and lack of practice guidelines and types of practice at the meso level. Discontinuity in the integrated care process was associated with poor referral systems, deficient interface and poor connection between public health section, primary care and academic institutions. Furthermore, practice types such as in silo practices and contract-based services were reported as barriers for linkage, coordination and integration of services. Some studies showed that solo practices and practices with specific clientele such as infants and toddlers had lower referral rates to dentists than polyclinics with various clientele.

**Patient's oral healthcare needs**

The review of publications revealed that patients’ decision to accept or refuse integrative care was mainly based on their need perception rather than the assessment of healthcare providers. In an RCT conducted by Lowe et al, current dental problem and not having a regular dentist were the significant predictors for consultation with a non-dental primary care provider. Patients’ problems seem to motivate confident practitioners to provide oral healthcare.

**Facilitators of the integration of oral health into primary care**

**Supportive policies and resources allocation**

Publications on policies and successful integrated programmes highlighted the importance of financial support from governments, stakeholders and non-profit organisations at the macro level. Furthermore, several governmental strategic plans highlighted that partnerships and common vision among governments, communities, academia, various stakeholders and non-profit organisations can act as a facilitator to integration of oral health into primary care in the normative domain. Healthcare policies such as Arizona Hygiene Affiliated Practice Act and Medicaid, reimbursements to trained primary care providers for oral screening, patient education and fluoride varnish applications acted as facilitators to the integration of oral health into primary care in the USA. In Brazil, prioritisation of deployment of the National Oral Health Policy by the federal government demonstrated greater integration of oral healthcare in the unified health system, with coverage for access to oral health for the Brazilian population having grown significantly since 2004.

**Interprofessional education**

Several studies revealed that non-dental professionals agreed on interprofessional education, showing higher willingness to include oral health education in their job schedule and to undertake further training on oral health. Training of paediatricians, family and primary care physicians and community health providers in a preventive dentistry programme in North Carolina (Into the Mouths of Babes), in Seattle (Kids Get Care) and in Washington led to the integration of preventive dental services into their practices.

**Collaborative practices**

This theme included three subthemes: perceived responsibility and role identification, case management and incremental approach. Although many studies reported a lack of oral health knowledge among various healthcare providers, it was also reported that understanding their role in providing oral healthcare could act as a facilitator to engage them in integrated oral healthcare services. According to some studies conducted in North Carolina and Peru, primary care physicians and nurses were able to identify their role and assumed their responsibility in taking care of the oral health of their patients. Besides, integrated primary care in Glasgow reported positive response on the part of professionals towards joint-work practices.

Two pilot studies reported that appropriate case management, including choice and flexibility in service delivery at multiple levels (administrative and/or clinical) could lead to effective coordination and consistency between oral health and other healthcare services. Some programmes such as the Neighborhood Outreach Action for Health (NOAH) oral health programme in Arizona showed success in primary care teamwork when sharing oral healthcare responsibilities with nurses, medical assistants and other members of the team. This success relies on an effective coordinated care and strengthening of referral systems, communication among healthcare workers, as well as task-shifting strategies. The incremental approach was suggested as a successful strategy for integration of oral health into primary care. This approach allowed gradual modification in the workflow based on staff experience and preference.

**Local strategic leaders**

Results of studies conducted in the USA and some developing countries highlighted the strategic role of the local leader in building teamwork and communities’ capacities in the integration of oral health into primary care. In the Rochester Adolescent Maternity Programme, for instance, registered nurses were found as ‘drivers’ in promoting oral health by assessing patients’ dental needs and managing their consultations and referral. Similarly, an oral health coordinator in a pilot project in New Hampshire was identified as a linkage facilitator between nursing and dental human resources.

**Proximity**

Geographical proximity or colocation of dental and medical practices were reported as the main facilitators for interdisciplinary collaboration in various communities. Healthcare professionals have shown interest in the colocation model since it is the first step to merge primary care and dental care and allows establishing a
relationship among the healthcare workforce, showing promising results in the delivery of efficient care addressing both the medical and oral health needs of patients. 55,57,61,71

According to Wooten et al., 35 nurses and certified midwives were more likely to adopt preventive measures and refer patients for specialised care if they had a dental clinic in the primary practice setting.

**DISCUSSION**

Fragmentation in primary healthcare may put at risk vulnerable patients with chronic or acute health problems such as oral health diseases. 1,75,76 However, the integration of oral health into primary care is still at an emerging stage in many countries around the world. Healthcare policy-makers and organisations need high-quality evidence and information to assess their own process gaps and make decisions on its implementation. 77 Despite the large number of publications on primary healthcare integration, a number of knowledge gaps exist in the domain of oral healthcare integration. To our knowledge, this is the first scoping review aimed at synthesising influential factors in the integration of oral health into primary care using a theoretical model of integration. In fact, the concept of integration is complex and needs to be analysed in a multi-level perspective. In this study, we used the Rainbow model of integrated care to conduct the thematic analysis. 13 This framework provided a valuable lens to identify level-specific and domain-specific barriers and facilitators across publications. It allows for a better understanding of the inter-relationships among the dimensions of integrated care from a primary care perspective.

The results of the present scoping review are in line with publications on the challenges faced in the implementation of integrated care. 78-81 Common barriers such as the absence of healthcare policies and supporting strategies, inadequate interdisciplinary training and workload increase seem to depend on both contextual and individual factors rather than the discipline itself. 78-81 However, in this study we identified a discipline-specific barrier: perception of oral healthcare needs. Some publications reported that patients and most of the primary healthcare providers did not attribute value to continuity of care in the field of oral health because oral health conditions are rarely life threatening. 26,33,47 This aspect, which could be critical from the lens of dental professionals, may be explained by lack of knowledge and awareness of the impact of oral health on general health and well-being and could help explain the fact that oral health is seldom on the political agenda. Interprofessional education and collaboration could be effective in raising awareness on the importance of oral health and its integration into primary care. However, recent studies show that implementation of interprofessional health science curricula is also encountering barriers and requires long-term financial and political supports. 82 E-health technologies such as online education, electronic health records and web-patient portals could be used to facilitate the implementation of integrated care. 83

Although some common facilitators such as supportive policies and resource allocation are crucial to mitigate the challenges of integrated care, it seems that the presence of a local leader and proximity have significant impact on making sense of the complex concept of integration, putting collaborative practices in place and involving the stakeholders to make effective and positive change in their organisation.

This scoping review has some strengths and limitations when compared with systematic reviews. Although the scoping review methodology allows the analysis of a broad range of publications, it does not necessitate the quality assessment of publications and grading of evidence. However, scoping reviews provide an avenue for future research and have clinical and public health impact.

**CONCLUSION**

The scoping review findings allow better understanding of conceptually grounded barriers and facilitators at each integration domain and level. The most reported barrier themes included primary healthcare providers’ competencies at the micro level and in the domain of clinical integration. The most frequently reported facilitators included collaborative practices in the functional domain and financial support in the system integration domain at the macro level. The themes identified here permit the conduct of potential future research and policies to better guide integration of oral healthcare practices between dental and medical workforce and allied primary healthcare providers.
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