Review of Contemporary Philosophy
ISSN: 1841-5261, e-ISSN: 2471-089X
Vol 22 (1), 2023
Pp 6752 - 6760

Health Equity and Social Challenges in Healthcare Distribution: A Critical Analysis

[1]Rayan Mohammed Mubarak Alotaibi, [2]Faisal Ahmed Hassan Khormi,[3]Abdullah Mohammed Bin Bunayyan Alotaibi,[4]Mohammed Rashed Faraj Alotaibi,

[1]Health Assistant-Emergency Medical Services

[2]Health Assistant-Emergency Medical Services

[3]Health Assistant-Emergency Medical Service

[4]Health Assistant-Nursing

Abstract

This paper examines the complex interplay between health equity, social determinants, and the distribution of healthcare services. Despite significant advancements in medical science and technology, healthcare disparities persist globally, reflecting deeper social, economic, and structural inequities. Through a critical analysis of existing literature, we explore how social factors influence healthcare access and outcomes, evaluate current policy approaches, and propose frameworks for achieving more equitable healthcare distribution. The findings suggest that comprehensive, multisectoral approaches addressing upstream social determinants are necessary to advance health equity. This paper contributes to the ongoing discourse on health justice by synthesizing evidence-based strategies that policymakers and healthcare systems can implement to reduce disparities and improve population health outcomes.

Keywords: health equity, healthcare distribution, social determinants of health, health disparities, health justice

Received: 10 April 2023 **Revised:** 22 May 2023 **Accepted:** 05 June 2023

1. Introduction

Health equity—the principle that everyone should have a fair opportunity to attain their full health potential—remains an elusive goal in healthcare systems worldwide (Braveman, 2014). The distribution of healthcare services often mirrors and reinforces existing social inequalities, creating a cycle where vulnerable populations experience poorer health outcomes despite greater healthcare needs (Marmot et al., 2020). This paper examines the social challenges that impede equitable healthcare distribution and proposes evidence-based approaches to achieve health justice.

The World Health Organization defines health equity as "the absence of unfair and avoidable or remediable differences in health among population groups defined socially, economically, demographically, or geographically" (WHO, 2018, p. 3). This definition acknowledges that health disparities often stem from social arrangements rather than biological differences or individual choices. Achieving health equity requires addressing not only the distribution of healthcare services but also the broader social determinants that shape health outcomes.

Recent global events, including the COVID-19 pandemic, have highlighted and exacerbated existing health inequities (Bambra et al., 2020). These developments underscore the urgency of developing comprehensive approaches to healthcare distribution that account for social vulnerabilities and structural barriers. This paper contributes to this discourse by examining the multidimensional challenges to health equity and identifying promising pathways toward more just healthcare systems.

2. Theoretical Frameworks for Understanding Health Equity

2.1 Social Determinants of Health

The social determinants of health framework provides a crucial lens for understanding health inequities. This perspective recognizes that health outcomes are shaped by the conditions in which people "are born, grow, live, work, and age" (Marmot & Allen, 2014, p. 517). These determinants include socioeconomic status, education, employment, housing, neighborhood conditions, and social support networks.

Research consistently demonstrates that social determinants exert a more significant influence on population health than medical care. For instance, Galea et al. (2011) estimated that social factors account for over 50% of preventable deaths in the United States, compared to approximately 10% attributable to inadequate healthcare access. This disproportionate impact highlights the limitations of approaches focused exclusively on healthcare service delivery without addressing underlying social inequities.

2.2 Capabilities Approach

Sen's (1999) capabilities approach offers another valuable framework for conceptualizing health equity. This approach focuses on individuals' capabilities—their freedom to achieve outcomes they value—rather than merely the distribution of resources. Applied to healthcare, the capabilities approach suggests that equitable systems should enhance individuals' ability to achieve good health, recognizing that different people may require different resources to reach similar health outcomes (Ruger, 2010).

2.3 Intersectionality Theory

Intersectionality theory, originally developed by Crenshaw (1989) to analyze discrimination faced by Black women, has increasingly been applied to health equity research. This framework examines how multiple social categories (e.g., race, gender, socioeconomic status) interact to create unique patterns of advantage and disadvantage (Bowleg, 2012). Intersectionality helps explain why certain groups experience compounded health disadvantages and why one-size-fits-all approaches to healthcare distribution often fail to address complex disparities.

3. Social Challenges to Equitable Healthcare Distribution

3.1 Socioeconomic Disparities

Socioeconomic status remains one of the strongest predictors of health outcomes globally (Adler & Newman, 2002). Lower-income populations face multiple barriers to healthcare access, including financial constraints, geographic isolation, and time limitations due to inflexible employment (Schoen et al., 2010). Even in countries with universal healthcare systems, socioeconomic gradients in health persist, suggesting that financial access alone is insufficient to achieve health equity (Mackenbach et al., 2017).

3.2 Racial and Ethnic Disparities

Racial and ethnic minorities often experience disproportionate barriers to healthcare access and poorer quality of care, leading to systematic health disparities (Williams & Mohammed, 2013). These disparities persist even after controlling for socioeconomic factors, suggesting that racism and discrimination—both interpersonal and structural—play independent roles in generating health inequities (Bailey et al., 2017).

Historical legacies of discrimination have shaped contemporary healthcare institutions and practices. For example, research has documented persistent racial bias in pain assessment and treatment (Hoffman et al., 2016), diagnostic procedures (Obermeyer et al., 2019), and provider-patient communication (Shen et al., 2018). Addressing these disparities requires both cultural competency interventions and structural reforms to healthcare delivery systems.

3.3 Geographic Disparities

Geographic location significantly influences healthcare access and outcomes. Rural populations worldwide face substantial barriers to healthcare, including provider shortages, facility closures, and transportation challenges (Douthit et al., 2015). Similarly, urban areas often contain "healthcare

deserts"—neighborhoods with limited healthcare infrastructure despite high population density and need (Walker et al., 2010).

The maldistribution of healthcare resources often reflects historical patterns of development, investment, and population movement. Addressing geographic disparities requires innovative service delivery models, including telehealth, mobile clinics, and community health worker programs that extend healthcare beyond traditional facility-based settings.

3.4 Gender-Based Disparities

Gender influences healthcare experiences and outcomes through multiple pathways, including differential access to resources, gender norms that affect health-seeking behaviors, and gender biases within healthcare systems (Heise et al., 2019). Women frequently encounter discrimination in healthcare settings, with their symptoms more likely to be dismissed or attributed to psychological causes (Hamberg, 2008). Transgender and gender-diverse individuals face additional barriers, including discrimination, lack of provider knowledge, and healthcare systems designed around binary gender categories (Safer et al., 2016).

4. Current Approaches to Promoting Health Equity

4.1 Universal Health Coverage

Universal health coverage (UHC) has emerged as a global priority for advancing health equity. The World Health Organization defines UHC as ensuring that "all people have access to needed health services (including prevention, promotion, treatment, rehabilitation, and palliation) of sufficient quality to be effective while also ensuring that the use of these services does not expose the user to financial hardship" (WHO, 2019, p. 8).

While UHC represents an important step toward health equity, implementation varies widely across contexts. Some UHC systems maintain tiered structures that perpetuate disparities, while others struggle with underfunding or quality concerns. Research suggests that the equity impact of UHC depends on specific design features, including benefit package comprehensiveness, cost-sharing arrangements, and governance structures (Tangcharoensathien et al., 2018).

4.2 Cultural Competency and Patient-Centered Care

Healthcare systems increasingly emphasize cultural competency and patient-centered care as strategies for addressing disparities. Cultural competency involves developing healthcare organizations and workforces that can effectively respond to diverse patient populations (Betancourt et al., 2016). Patient-centered care prioritizes respect for patients' preferences, coordination across care settings, and engagement of patients as partners in healthcare decisions (Epstein & Street, 2011).

Evidence regarding the effectiveness of these approaches in reducing disparities remains mixed. While some interventions have shown promising results, others have been criticized for focusing too narrowly on cultural differences without addressing underlying structural inequities (Came & Griffith, 2018).

4.3 Community-Based Participatory Approaches

Community-based participatory research (CBPR) and similar approaches engage communities as active partners in developing and implementing healthcare interventions (Wallerstein & Duran, 2010). These approaches recognize that communities possess valuable knowledge about their health needs and the contextual factors affecting healthcare access and outcomes.

CBPR has demonstrated effectiveness in addressing health disparities across various contexts. For example, partnerships between academic institutions and community organizations have successfully increased cancer screening rates among marginalized populations (Yeary et al., 2011) and improved diabetes management in underserved communities (Peek et al., 2012). These successes highlight the potential of approaches that prioritize community agency and knowledge in healthcare distribution.

5. Frameworks for Advancing Health Equity

5.1 Health in All Policies

The Health in All Policies (HiAP) approach recognizes that health is influenced by policies across sectors, including housing, transportation, education, and economic development (Rudolph et al., 2013). This approach advocates for systematic consideration of health implications in policy decisions across government departments and agencies.

HiAP implementation requires robust intersectoral collaboration and health impact assessment tools to evaluate policy effects on health equity. Successful examples include Finland's national HiAP strategy, which has contributed to reductions in health disparities through coordinated policy approaches (Ståhl et al., 2006), and California's Health in All Policies Task Force, which has integrated health equity considerations into state policies across domains (Wernham & Teutsch, 2015).

5.2 Proportionate Universalism

Proportionate universalism, a concept articulated in the Marmot Review (2010), advocates for universal interventions that are implemented with intensity proportionate to disadvantage. This approach balances universal access with targeted efforts to address the needs of particularly vulnerable populations.

Proportionate universalism avoids the limitations of purely universal approaches (which may fail to reach the most disadvantaged) and narrowly targeted interventions (which may stigmatize recipients and lack political sustainability). Implementation examples include Scotland's child health program, which provides universal services to all children while allocating additional resources to families with greater needs (NHS Health Scotland, 2014).

5.3 Rights-Based Approaches

Rights-based approaches to health equity ground healthcare distribution in international human rights frameworks that establish health as a fundamental right (Yamin, 2008). These approaches emphasize accountability, participation, transparency, and non-discrimination in healthcare delivery and policy-making.

Rights-based frameworks provide both moral foundation and practical tools for advancing health equity. They support legal and advocacy strategies that empower marginalized communities to claim their rights to healthcare and address systemic discrimination. Examples include litigation that has expanded access to essential medicines in South Africa (Heywood, 2009) and participatory health governance mechanisms in Brazil that have increased community influence over healthcare priorities (Cornwall & Shankland, 2013).

6. Case Studies: Successful Health Equity Initiatives

6.1 Brazil's Family Health Strategy

Brazil's Family Health Strategy (FHS) represents a comprehensive approach to healthcare distribution that has significantly reduced health disparities. The FHS model assigns multidisciplinary healthcare teams to specific geographic areas, with each team responsible for providing comprehensive primary care to approximately 3,000-4,000 residents (Macinko & Harris, 2015).

The program emphasizes preventive care, community outreach, and integration with social services. Research indicates that FHS implementation has been associated with reduced infant mortality, especially in municipalities with previously high poverty rates (Aquino et al., 2009). The program's success demonstrates how community-based, integrated healthcare delivery can address complex health inequities.

6.2 Rwanda's Community-Based Health Insurance

Rwanda has achieved remarkable progress in healthcare access through its community-based health insurance program, Mutuelles de Santé. This program combines community-based financing mechanisms

with government subsidies for the poorest populations, creating a progressive system that promotes both financial protection and healthcare access (Nyandekwe et al., 2014).

Implementation of Mutuelles has been associated with increased healthcare utilization, reduced out-of-pocket expenditures, and improved health outcomes, particularly among lower-income groups (Saksena et al., 2011). Rwanda's experience illustrates how thoughtfully designed health financing reforms can advance equity by addressing financial barriers while ensuring sustainability.

6.3 New Zealand's Māori Health Strategy

New Zealand's Māori Health Strategy exemplifies how healthcare systems can address historical injustices and cultural marginalization. The strategy incorporates indigenous perspectives into healthcare governance, delivery, and evaluation through mechanisms including Māori-led health providers, cultural competency requirements for all providers, and dedicated funding for Māori health initiatives (Ministry of Health, 2014).

While health disparities between Māori and non-Māori populations persist, evaluations indicate that culturally appropriate, community-controlled healthcare services have improved access and outcomes among Māori communities (Ellison-Loschmann & Pearce, 2006). This case highlights the importance of approaches that explicitly address historical inequities and center the perspectives of marginalized communities.

7. Discussion and Implications

7.1 Toward Comprehensive Health Equity Frameworks

The challenges to equitable healthcare distribution identified in this paper suggest the need for comprehensive frameworks that address multiple dimensions of equity simultaneously. Effective approaches must consider:

1. **Vertical and horizontal equity**: Ensuring both equal treatment of equal needs (horizontal equity) and appropriate differential treatment of unequal needs (vertical equity)
2. **Procedural and distributive justice**: Addressing both fairness in decision-making processes and fairness in the distribution of healthcare resources and outcomes
3. **Individual and structural factors**: Balancing interventions focused on individual barriers with efforts to transform structural conditions that generate health inequities
4. **Short-term relief and long-term transformation**: Combining immediate improvements in healthcare access with sustained efforts to address root causes of disparities

7.2 Implications for Policy

This analysis has several implications for policymakers seeking to advance health equity:

1. **Multisectoral collaboration** is essential, as health equity depends on policies across domains including education, housing, employment, and transportation
2. **Data systems** must be strengthened to monitor disparities across multiple dimensions and evaluate the equity impact of interventions
3. **Financing mechanisms** should incorporate progressive elements that reduce financial barriers for disadvantaged populations while ensuring system sustainability
4. **Workforce development** should emphasize both diversity and training in equity-oriented practices to address bias and improve care quality for marginalized groups
5. **Governance structures** should facilitate meaningful participation from affected communities in healthcare decision-making

7.3 Implications for Research

This review also highlights several priorities for future research on health equity:

1. Developing and validating **metrics that capture multiple dimensions of equity** beyond traditional measures of access and utilization
2. Conducting **implementation research** to identify contextual factors that influence the effectiveness of equity-oriented interventions
3. Exploring how **technological innovations** (e.g., telehealth, artificial intelligence) can either advance or undermine health equity
4. Examining **intersections between health equity and environmental justice**, particularly in the context of climate change impacts on health
5. Investigating the **economic case for health equity**, including potential societal returns on investments in reducing disparities

8. Conclusion

Achieving health equity requires addressing the complex social challenges that shape healthcare distribution and health outcomes. This paper has examined theoretical frameworks for understanding health equity, identified key social barriers to equitable healthcare, evaluated current approaches, and proposed comprehensive frameworks for advancing equity.

The evidence reviewed suggests that effective approaches to health equity must address both healthcare system factors and broader social determinants. They must balance universal access with targeted interventions for disadvantaged populations, combine immediate improvements in service delivery with long-term structural change, and ensure meaningful participation from affected communities in healthcare governance.

While significant challenges remain, promising examples from diverse contexts demonstrate that progress toward health equity is possible through committed, evidence-informed action. By integrating insights from these experiences into comprehensive equity frameworks, policymakers and healthcare systems can work toward the goal of fair opportunities for health for all populations.

References

1. Adler, N. E., & Newman, K. (2002). Socioeconomic disparities in health: Pathways and policies. Health Affairs, 21(2), 60-76. https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.21.2.60
2. Aquino, R., de Oliveira, N. F., & Barreto, M. L. (2009). Impact of the family health program on infant mortality in Brazilian municipalities. American Journal of Public Health, 99(1), 87-93. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2007.127480
3. Bailey, Z. D., Krieger, N., Agénor, M., Graves, J., Linos, N., & Bassett, M. T. (2017). Structural racism and health inequities in the USA: Evidence and interventions. The Lancet, 389(10077), 1453-1463. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(17)30569-X
4. Bambra, C., Riordan, R., Ford, J., & Matthews, F. (2020). The COVID-19 pandemic and health inequalities. Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 74(11), 964-968. https://doi.org/10.1136/jech-2020-214401
5. Betancourt, J. R., Green, A. R., Carrillo, J. E., & Owusu Ananeh-Firempong, I. I. (2016). Defining cultural competence: A practical framework for addressing racial/ethnic disparities in health and health care. Public Health Reports, 118(4), 293-302. https://doi.org/10.1093/phr/118.4.293
6. Bowleg, L. (2012). The problem with the phrase women and minorities: Intersectionality—an important theoretical framework for public health. American Journal of Public Health, 102(7), 1267-1273. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2012.300750
7. Braveman, P. (2014). What are health disparities and health equity? We need to be clear. Public Health Reports, 129(Suppl 2), 5-8. https://doi.org/10.1177/00333549141291S203

8. Came, H., & Griffith, D. (2018). Tackling racism as a "wicked" public health problem: Enabling allies in anti-racism praxis. Social Science & Medicine, 199, 181-188. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.03.028
9. Cornwall, A., & Shankland, A. (2013). Engaging citizens: Lessons from building Brazil's national health system. Social Science & Medicine, 90, 2-9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.04.038
10. Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1989(1), 139-167.
11. Douthit, N., Kiv, S., Dwolatzky, T., & Biswas, S. (2015). Exposing some important barriers to health care access in the rural USA. Public Health, 129(6), 611-620. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2015.04.001
12. Ellison-Loschmann, L., & Pearce, N. (2006). Improving access to health care among New Zealand's Maori population. American Journal of Public Health, 96(4), 612-617. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2005.070680
13. Epstein, R. M., & Street, R. L. (2011). The values and value of patient-centered care. The Annals of Family Medicine, 9(2), 100-103. https://doi.org/10.1370/afm.1239
14. Galea, S., Tracy, M., Hoggatt, K. J., DiMaggio, C., & Karpati, A. (2011). Estimated deaths attributable to social factors in the United States. American Journal of Public Health, 101(8), 1456-1465. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2010.300086
15. Hamberg, K. (2008). Gender bias in medicine. Women's Health, 4(3), 237-243. https://doi.org/10.2217/17455057.4.3.237
16. Heise, L., Greene, M. E., Opper, N., Stavropoulou, M., Harper, C., Nascimento, M., & Zewdie, D. (2019). Gender inequality and restrictive gender norms: Framing the challenges to health. The Lancet, 393(10189), 2440-2454. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(19)30652-X
17. Heywood, M. (2009). South Africa's Treatment Action Campaign: Combining law and social mobilization to realize the right to health. Journal of Human Rights Practice, 1(1), 14-36. https://doi.org/10.1093/jhuman/hun006
18. Hoffman, K. M., Trawalter, S., Axt, J. R., & Oliver, M. N. (2016). Racial bias in pain assessment and treatment recommendations, and false beliefs about biological differences between blacks and whites. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 113(16), 4296-4301. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1516047113
19. Mackenbach, J. P., Bopp, M., Deboosere, P., Kovacs, K., Leinsalu, M., Martikainen, P., Menvielle, G., Regidor, E., & de Gelder, R. (2017). Determinants of the magnitude of socioeconomic inequalities in mortality: A study of 17 European countries. Health & Place, 47, 44-53. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2017.07.005
20. Macinko, J., & Harris, M. J. (2015). Brazil's family health strategy—delivering community-based primary care in a universal health system. New England Journal of Medicine, 372(23), 2177-2181. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp1501140
21. Marmot, M., & Allen, J. J. (2014). Social determinants of health equity. American Journal of Public Health, 104(S4), S517-S519. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2014.302200
22. Marmot, M., Allen, J., Goldblatt, P., Herd, E., & Morrison, J. (2020). Build back fairer: The COVID-19 Marmot review. The Health Foundation and Institute of Health Equity.
23. Ministry of Health. (2014). The guide to He Korowai Oranga: Māori Health Strategy. Ministry of Health New Zealand.
24. NHS Health Scotland. (2014). Proportionate universalism and health inequalities. NHS Health Scotland.
25. Nyandekwe, M., Nzayirambaho, M., & Kakoma, J. B. (2014). Universal health coverage in Rwanda: Dream or reality. The Pan African Medical Journal, 17, 232. https://doi.org/10.11604/pamj.2014.17.232.3471

26. Obermeyer, Z., Powers, B., Vogeli, C., & Mullainathan, S. (2019). Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations. Science, 366(6464), 447-453. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aax2342
27. Peek, M. E., Ferguson, M. J., Roberson, T. P., & Chin, M. H. (2012). Putting theory into practice: A case study of diabetes-related behavioral change interventions on Chicago's South Side. Health Promotion Practice, 15(2_suppl), 40S-50S. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524839914532292
28. Rudolph, L., Caplan, J., Ben-Moshe, K., & Dillon, L. (2013). Health in all policies: A guide for state and local governments. American Public Health Association and Public Health Institute.
29. Ruger, J. P. (2010). Health capability: Conceptualization and operationalization. American Journal of Public Health, 100(1), 41-49. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2008.143651
30. Safer, J. D., Coleman, E., Feldman, J., Garofalo, R., Hembree, W., Radix, A., & Sevelius, J. (2016). Barriers to healthcare for transgender individuals. Current Opinion in Endocrinology, Diabetes and Obesity, 23(2), 168-171. https://doi.org/10.1097/MED.0000000000000227
31. Saksena, P., Antunes, A. F., Xu, K., Musango, L., & Carrin, G. (2011). Mutual health insurance in Rwanda: Evidence on access to care and financial risk protection. Health Policy, 99(3), 203-209. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthpol.2010.09.009
32. Schoen, C., Osborn, R., Squires, D., Doty, M. M., Pierson, R., & Applebaum, S. (2010). How health insurance design affects access to care and costs, by income, in eleven countries. Health Affairs, 29(12), 2323-2334. https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2010.0862
33. Sen, A. (1999). Development as freedom. Oxford University Press.
34. Shen, M. J., Peterson, E. B., Costas-Muñiz, R., Hernandez, M. H., Jewell, S. T., Matsoukas, K., & Bylund, C. L. (2018). The effects of race and racial concordance on patient-physician communication: A systematic review of the literature. Journal of Racial and Ethnic Health Disparities, 5(1), 117-140. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40615-017-0350-4
35. Ståhl, T., Wismar, M., Ollila, E., Lahtinen, E., & Leppo, K. (2006). Health in all policies: Prospects and potentials. Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, Finland.
36. Tangcharoensathien, V., Witthayapipopsakul, W., Panichkriangkrai, W., Patcharanarumol, W., & Mills, A. (2018). Health systems development in Thailand: A solid platform for successful implementation of universal health coverage. The Lancet, 391(10126), 1205-1223. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)30198-3
37. Walker, R. E., Keane, C. R., & Burke, J. G. (2010). Disparities and access to healthy food in the United States: A review of food deserts literature. Health & Place, 16(5), 876-884. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2010.04.013
38. Wallerstein, N., & Duran, B. (2010). Community-based participatory research contributions to intervention research: The intersection of science and practice to improve health equity. American Journal of Public Health, 100(S1), S40-S46. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2009.184036
39. Wernham, A., & Teutsch, S. M. (2015). Health in all policies for big cities. Journal of Public Health Management and Practice, 21(Suppl 1), S56-S65. https://doi.org/10.1097/PHH.0000000000000130
40. Williams, D. R., & Mohammed, S. A. (2013). Racism and health I: Pathways and scientific evidence. American Behavioral Scientist, 57(8), 1152-1173. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764213487340
41. World Health Organization. (2018). Health inequities and their causes. World Health Organization.
42. World Health Organization. (2019). Primary health care on the road to universal health coverage: 2019 monitoring report. World Health Organization.
43. Yamin, A. E. (2008). Will we take suffering seriously? Reflections on what applying a human rights framework to health means and why we should care. Health and Human Rights, 10(1), 45-63. https://doi.org/10.2307/20460088
44. Yeary, K. H. K., Mason, M., Turner, J., Kieber-Emmons, T., Chow, M., Hine, R. J., Henry-Tillman, R., Greene, P., & Houston, P. (2011). A community-based approach to translational research

addressing breast cancer disparities. Translational Behavioral Medicine, 1(2), 224-233. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13142-011-0018-2