

Frameworks for measuring population health: a scoping review

Sze Ling Chan^{1,2}, Clement Zhong Hao Ho³, Nang Ei Ei Khaing⁴, Ezra Ho⁴, Candelyn Pong^{1,2}, Calida Chua⁵, Zongbin Li⁶, Trudi Lim⁷, Sean Shao Wei Lam^{1,2}, Lian Leng Low^{2,3,8-10}, Choon How How^{10,11}

¹Health Services Research Centre, SingHealth, Singapore

²Health Services and Systems Research, Duke-NUS Medical School, Singapore

³Centre for Population Health Research and Implementation, SingHealth Regional Health System, Singapore

⁴Health Services Research, Changi General Hospital, Singapore

⁵Care and Health Integration, Changi General Hospital, Singapore

⁶Preventive Medicine Residency, National University Health System, Singapore

⁷School of Computing and Information Systems, Singapore Management University, Singapore

⁸Post-Acute and Continuing Care, Outram Community Hospital, Singapore

⁹Department of Family Medicine and Continuing Care, Singapore General Hospital, Singapore

¹⁰SingHealth Duke-NUS Family Medicine Academic Clinical Program, Singapore

¹¹SingHealth Office of Regional Health, Changi General Hospital, Singapore

Short title: Population health measurement frameworks

No. of tables: 2

No. of figures: 3

No. of words: 3330

Corresponding author:

Dr Chan Sze Ling

Senior Research Fellow

Health Services Research Centre, SingHealth

20 College Road, Academia

Discovery Tower, Level 6

Singapore 169856

Tel: +65 6576 7143

Email: chan.sze.ling@singhealth.com.sg

Abstract

Introduction: Many regions in the world are using the population health approach and require a means to measure the health of their population of interest. Population health frameworks provide a theoretical grounding for conceptualization of population health and therefore a logical basis for selection of indicators. The aim of this scoping review was to provide an overview and summary of the characteristics of existing population health frameworks that have been used to conceptualize the measurement of population health.

Methods: We used the Population, Concept and Context (PCC) framework to define eligibility criteria of frameworks. We were interested in frameworks applicable for general populations, that contained components of measurement of health with or without its antecedents and applied at the population level or used a population health approach. Eligible reports of eligible frameworks should include at least domains and subdomains, purpose, or indicators. We searched 5 databases (Pubmed, EMBASE, Web of Science, NYAM Grey Literature Report, and OpenGrey), governmental and organizational sites on Google and websites of selected organizations using keywords from the PCC framework. Characteristics of the frameworks were summarized descriptively and narratively.

Results: Forty-eight frameworks were included. The majority originated from the US (42%), Canada (23%) and Europe (23%). Apart from 1 framework developed for rural populations and 2 for indigenous populations, the rest were for general urban populations. The numbers of domains, subdomains and indicators were highly variable. Health status and social determinants of health were the most common domains across all frameworks. Different frameworks had different priorities and therefore focus on different domains.

Conclusion: Key domains common across frameworks other than health status were social determinants of health, health behaviours and healthcare system performance. The results in

this review serve as a useful resource for governments and healthcare organizations for informing their population health measurement efforts.

Words: 299

Keywords: health status, determinants of health, healthcare performance

Introduction

Since its emergence in the 1990s, population health has become an increasingly prominent concept in public health discourse, governance, and research. In their seminal paper, Kindig and Stoddart defines population health as an approach to understanding health that transcends the individual, focusing on interrelated factors and conditions shaping the health of a population, including the environment, social and cultural forces, and lifestyle choices (1). In other words, health cannot be fully understood without a contextualisation of socioeconomic and other factors that are shaped by environments and communities (2). This paradigm shift originated during the 1970s-80s and emerged in response to the growing body of evidence on social determinants of health, and shifting social attitudes concerned with social justice and equity (3). In contrast to the traditional biomedical model that focused on individual risk factors of diseases, a population health approach adopts an upstream and preventive approach to achieving health outcomes.

Population health indicators provide a means for governments and organisations to monitor public health, evaluate interventions, and guide population health policies. Summary measures such as life-expectancy are commonly used to measure the health of a population and for benchmarking against others but are limited on their own (4). With health and its antecedents being complex and multifaceted constructs, the selection of relevant population health indicators is not straightforward. In a scoping review of population health indices, only 7 out of 27 indices had a theoretical or conceptual foundation guiding the aggregation of indicators in a meaningful way (5).

A framework should therefore precede indicator selection (4). Frameworks provide a structure by which to organise the dynamic and interrelated factors between individuals and their environment, and through which to develop hypotheses about how such relationships affect health outcomes over time (6). For instance, the widely accepted Canadian Institutes of

Health Research population health framework provides an integrated view of health through upstream forces, proximal causes of health, life course processes, disparities across sub-populations, health services, and health outcomes, as well as the indicators and indices used to measure them (7). Others may differ depending on their purpose and definition of health and population health.

The usage of a population health framework is necessary as it provides a theoretical grounding and context for selection of indicators and clarifies the role of each indicator (5). Indeed, this is a step many governments and organizations have taken in their population health efforts. There have been reviews on population health indicators (5,7,8). However, to our knowledge there is no work that organises and clarifies this growing body of literature.

In this paper, we conducted a scoping review with the aim of providing an overview and summary of the characteristics of existing population health frameworks that have been used to conceptualize the measurement of population health. Specific aims included to understand what domains are included in the frameworks, how or why they were chosen, and what some representative indicators under each domain were.

Methods

This scoping review follows the guidelines described by the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) checklist (9).

Eligibility criteria

The eligibility criteria of *population health measurement frameworks* were guided by the elements of the Population, Concept, and Context (PCC) framework. In the population element, we were interested in frameworks that were applied to general populations, which included subsets by demographic variables (e.g. age or ethnicity). However, we excluded populations which were defined by illnesses or diseases (e.g. stroke or mental health patients), or settings (e.g. workplace, schools).

For the Concept element, frameworks should contain components of measurement of health, with or without its antecedents. Frameworks by definition convey structure, at least in the form of categorization (6). Therefore, eligible frameworks should fulfil this definition. Simple lists of indicators without categories are excluded. Frameworks should also be novel, so mere representations of known literature or frameworks with insufficient explanation, and logic models for specific programs were excluded. For context, frameworks should be applied at the macrolevel, or use a population health approach.

Eligible *reports* of eligible frameworks would need to include at least one of the following dimensions – 1) Domains and subdomains; 2) purpose of the framework; or 3) population health indicators used. Where there were more than 1 report for the same framework, we selected the one with the most relevant and comprehensive information. If another report supplemented information not found in this primary report, we would include both. We included primary articles of any study design, reviews and selected grey literature.

Conference abstracts, theses and dissertations, letters to editors, commentaries, non-English articles, and articles published before 1990 were excluded.

Information sources

We searched MEDLINE (PubMed), EMBASE, Web of Science, NYAM Grey Literature Report and OpenGrey databases. In addition, we searched governmental and organizational sites on Google (site:.gov OR site:.org OR site:.net OR site:.eu) and websites of the following governments and organizations known to have population health initiatives and/or frameworks:

- UK National Health Service (NHS)
- Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ)
- Centres for Disease Control (CDC)
- US Department of Health and Human Services
- Public Health Agency of Canada
- Australian Government Department of Health
- World Health Organization (WHO)
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)
- Public Health England
- European Union (EU) CDC
- National Quality Forum (NQF)
- Health Information Technology, Evaluation, and Quality Center (HITEQ)

Search strategy

We used the keywords ‘framework’ and ‘population health’ from the concept and context elements as search terms, respectively. Depending on the database, we used these

terms as keywords or also included controlled vocabulary that corresponded to them. The keywords or controlled vocabulary were combined using the BOOLEAN operator ‘OR’ and ‘AND’ within and across the PCC elements, respectively. Where possible, filters were applied to select only human studies, English articles and articles published after 1 Jan 1990. The final search of the databases was performed on 01 December 2021. For some databases (Pubmed, EMBASE, Web of Science) we further applied a ‘title/abstract’ filter to improve the specificity of the search results. If we came across reports that mention an eligible framework but did not contain the relevant details to be included, we then searched for reports on that particular framework. We also searched reference lists of included reports.

Selection of sources of evidence

Three reviewers (SLC, CZHH, NEEK) developed and piloted the search strategy. Two stages of screenings were performed to select the sources of evidence. At the first stage, the titles and abstracts of each source was screened and selected for full text review by two reviewers independently. In the second stage, the full texts of articles selected in the first stage were also reviewed by 2 reviewers independently. In both stages, a third reviewer would make the final decision in the event of a conflict.

Data charting process

A data charting form to extract data of interest was developed by one reviewer (SLC) and piloted by another (CZHH). Data from each report was extracted by one reviewer and reviewed by a second reviewer. Any discrepancies were resolved by consensus between the data extractor and reviewer.

Data items

The data items included citation details, details on the framework (e.g. name, country of origin, organization that developed it, type of population it is applicable to, purpose, approach to development, dimensions in framework apart from domains), and the domains and indicators used in the framework, including definitions or descriptions where available. For domains, we recorded up to 2 further levels of sub-domains (total 3 levels).

Synthesis of results

To facilitate summary and presentation of results, some variables were reduced to a smaller number of categories manually by a single reviewer (SLC). These variables were the type of organization developing the frameworks, types of population the framework was applicable to, purpose and dimensions of the framework. Types of organizations were broadly categorized into governmental, academic, non-government organizations, non-profit organizations, intergovernmental organizations, and private foundations. Populations were grouped in to general, rural and indigenous populations. While all population health frameworks are tools for measuring, understanding and then improving population health, they were categorized into one of these three main purposes based on the stated purpose. Finally, dimensions cut across domains and indicators and we focused mainly on a lifespan and equity approach. For the lifespan approach, this generally involve diving into indicators relevant for different life stages and/or breaking down indicators by age groups. For the equity approach this typically involves examining indicators by certain socioeconomic factors. Other specific dimensions mentioned were also included.

Domains and subdomains were also aggregated by concept manually for purposes of visualization. The characteristics of the frameworks were then summarized descriptively using counts and proportions, and median and ranges, as appropriate. The dominant domains

and number of domains, subdomains and indicators were visualized using a word cloud and heatmap, respectively. Other aspects of the frameworks were summarized narratively.

Results

Search results

A total of 48 population health measurement frameworks were included in this review (Figure 1). The details of the frameworks are shown in Table 1. The full list of the domains, subdomains and indicators are provided in supplementary file 1.

Figure 1 PRISMA diagram

Table 1 Details of included frameworks

Ref / Year of publication	Framework name	Country of origin	Name of organization that developed it (Type of organization)	Population	Purpose (categorized)	Dimensions
Arah 2005 (45)	Canadian Health Indicators Framework (modified)	Canada	Canadian Government (Gov)	General/Urban	Measure	Equity
Azzopardi 2018 (12)	Reporting framework for Indigenous adolescents in Australia	Australia	University of Melbourne, Murdoch children's research institute (Acad)	Indigenous	Measure	
Beard 2009 (60)	Framework for considering the influence of socioeconomic and cultural factors on health	Australia	Nothern Rivers University Department of Rural Health (Acad)	Rural	Understand	
Casebeer 1999 (50)	Health indicators framework	Canada	Collaborative initiative of the Alberta Heritage foundation for medical research and Alberta Health (Acad)	General/Urban	Measure	
CDC 2013 (39)	A Schematic Framework for Population Health Planning	US	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services & Centres for Disease Control and Prevention (Gov)	General/Urban	Improve	
CIHI(14)2013 (14)	Canadian Institute for Health Information (CIHI)'s New Health System Performance Measurement Framework	Canada	CIHI (NPO)	General/Urban	Improve	Equity
Etches 2006 (7)	Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) - Institute of Population and Public Health (IPPH) conceptual framework of population health	Canada	CIHR and IPPH (Gov)	General/Urban	Improve	
EU 2015 (29)	Joint Assessment Framework	Europe	European Union (EU)/European Commission (Inter-Gov)	General/Urban	Improve	Lifespan, equity
Evans 1990 (46)	Evans and Stoddart	Canada	University of British Columbia, McMaster University (Acad)	General/Urban	Understand	
Galea 2005 (35)	Conceptual framework for urban health	US	Center for Urban Epidemiologic Studies, New York Academy of Medicine (Acad)	General/Urban	Improve	Equity
Halfon 2002 (15)	Life course health development framework	US	National centre for Infancy and early childhood health policy (Gov)	General/Urban	Understand	Lifespan
Hancock 1999 (37)	Basic Framework for indicators	Canada	Knowledge Development Division, Health Canada (Gov)	General/Urban	Measure	Equity
Hatef 2018 (41)	Maryland	US	Maryland Department of Health (Gov)	General/Urban	Improve	Lifespan

Health Canada 1994 (16)	Framework for action on population health	Canada	Federal/provincial/territorial advisory committee on population health (Gov)	General/Urban	Improve	
Healthy Montgomery 2016 (10)	Healthy Montgomery Core Measures Set	US	Montgomery County Department of Health and Human Services (Gov)	General/Urban	Measure	
Healthy Ireland 2019 (26)	Healthy Ireland (HI) Outcomes Framework	Ireland	Ireland Department of Health (Gov)	General/Urban	Measure	Lifespan
Hillemeier 2003 (23)	Framework for community contextual characteristics	US	The authors in collaboration with the CDC (Gov)	General/Urban	Understand	
Hood 2016 (30)	County Health Rankings	US	University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (Acad)	General/Urban	Understand	Lifespan, equity
Inf-Act 2020 (42)	A Distributed Infrastructure on Population Health (DiPoH)	Europe	Information for Action (InfAct) (Gov)	General/Urban	Mixed	
IOM 2009 (27)	Institute of Medicine (IOM)	US	National Academy of Medicine (formerly IOM until 2015) (NPO)	General/Urban	Measure	Lifespan
IOM 2012 (31)	Healthy People 2020 Leading Health Indicators (Health Outcome Logic Model)	US	National Academy of Medicine (formerly IOM until 2015) (NPO)	General/Urban	Improve	Lifespan
Jeffery 2006 (17)	Box framework for population health indicators	Canada	The authors in collaboration with the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, Prince Albert Grand Council (PAGC) and Athabasca Health Authority (AHA) (Gov/(NPO)	Indigenous	Mixed	
Juarez 2014 (61)	Public Health Exposome Conceptual Model	US	University of Tennessee Health Science Center (Acad)	General/Urban	Understand	Lifespan, equity
Kassler 2017 (52)	Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS)	US	CMS (Gov)	General/Urban	Improve	Sector (clinical care, public health, community & social services)
Kim 2013 (18)	Social Determinants of Infant Mortality/Birth Outcomes Conceptual Framework	US and Western Europe	RAND corporation (NPO)	General/Urban	Understand	Equity
Kramers 2003 (32)	European Community Health Indicators (ECHI)	Europe	European Commission (Gov)	General/Urban	Improve	Lifespan, equity
Krewski 2007 (62)	An integrated framework for risk management and population health	Canada	University of Ottawa (Acad)	General/Urban	Improve	

Kumah 2020 (24)	Ghana's Holistic Assessment Tool	Ghana	Ghana's Ministry of Health (Gov)	General/Urban	Mixed	Lifespan, equity
LA County 2017 (13)	Los Angeles (LA) Key indicators of health	US	LA County Department of Public Health (Gov)	General/Urban	Improve	Lifespan
NQF 2014 (33)	National Quality Forum (NQF) population health indicators	US	NQF (NPO)	General/Urban	Improve	Lifespan
OECD 2021 (28)	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Framework for health system performance assessment	International	OECD (Inter-Gov)	General/Urban	Measure	Lifespan
Oleske 2009 (63)	Oleske epidemiologic model for the delivery of health care services	US	<i>Not reported</i>	General/Urban	Understand	
PHCPI 2022* (43)	Primary Healthcare Performance Initiative (PHCPI) conceptual framework	International	World Health Organization (WHO), World Bank Group, and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, in partnership with Ariadne Labs and Results for Development Institute (Inter-Gov/NGO/Acad)	General/Urban	Mixed	Equity
PHE 2021 (19)	Labonte model	UK	Public Health England (PHE) (Gov)	General/Urban	Improve	Equity
Robine 2002 (11)	Euro-REVES 2	Europe	Euro-REVES group (Acad)	General/Urban	Measure	
Roos 1995 (44)	Population Health Information System	Canada	Manitoba Centre for Health Policy and Evaluation (Acad)	General/Urban	Understand	Lifespan
Sadana 2002 (51)	WHO Multi-Country Survey	Switzerland	WHO (Inter-Gov)	General/Urban	Measure	Lifespan
Santana 2020(38)	EURO-HEALTHY Population Health Index model	Europe	Centre of Studies in Geography and Territorial Planning (Acad)	General/Urban	Measure	Equity
Schoen 2006 (34)	National scorecard for the US health system	US	Commonwealth Fund Private foundation	General/Urban	Measure	Equity
Schulz 2004 (20)	Social Determinants of Health and Environmental Health Promotion	US	School of Public Health, University of Michigan (Acad)	General/Urban	Understand	Equity
SfHIP 2022* (21)	San Francisco Framework for assessing population health and equity	US	San Francisco Health Improvement Partnership (SfHIP) (Gov/Acad)	General/Urban	Understand	Equity
Shah 2017 (22)	Health Equity Framework	US	Harris County Public Health, Texas (Gov)	General/Urban	Improve	Equity
Stiefel 2012 (48)	Triple Aim	US	Institute for Healthcare Improvement (NPO)	General/Urban	Measure	Lifespan
ten Asbroek 2004 (53)	Dutch performance indicator framework	Netherlands	Department of Social Medicine, Academic Medical Centre, University of	General/Urban	Measure	

UK Department of Health 2022* (25)	Public Health Outcomes Framework	UK	Amsterdam; Dutch Ministry of Health, Welfare, and Sports (Gov/Acad) Department of Health (Gov)	General/Urban	Improve	Lifespan
Vila 2006 (40)	Wisconsin County Health Rankings	US	University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute (Gov/Acad)	General/Urban	Measure	Lifespan
Webster 2013 (36)	Healthy Cities Indicators	Europe	WHO European Healthy Cities Network (Inter-Gov)	General/Urban	Mixed	
Wolfson 1994 (49)	Population Health Model (POHEM)	Canada	Statistics Canada (Gov)	General/Urban	Understand	Lifespan

*These are websites and the year is based on the date of access

Acad: academic, Gov: government, Inter-gov: inter-government, NGO: non-government organisation, NPO: non-profit organisation

Characteristics of population health measurement frameworks

Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics of the key characteristics of the frameworks. Majority of the frameworks originated from the US (41.7%), Canada (22.9%) and Europe (22.9%). None were from Asia. Most were published between 2001 and 2020 (77.1%). Governmental (including intergovernmental) and academic organizations accounted for majority of framework development (85.4%). Only three frameworks were developed for specific populations (2 for indigenous and 1 for rural), while the rest were for the general or urban population. In terms of purpose, the frameworks were fairly evenly distributed across the three categories. Two-thirds of the frameworks mentioned some dimension, and these were also distributed quite evenly between lifespan and equity approaches.

Table 2 Summary of key characteristics of frameworks

Characteristics	N (%)
Year of publication	
2000 and before	6 (12.5)
2001 to 2010	17 (35.4)
2011 to 2020	20 (41.7)
2020 onwards	5 (10.4)
Country of origin	
US	20 (41.7)
Canada	11 (22.9)
Europe	11 (22.9)
International	2 (4.2)
Australia	2 (4.2)
US and Western Europe	1 (2.1)
Ghana	1 (2.1)
Type of organization framework originated from	
Governmental	19 (39.6)
Academic	12 (25.0)
Non-profit organization	6 (12.5)
Intergovernmental	4 (8.3)
Governmental/academic	3 (6.3)
Governmental/non-profit organisation	1 (2.1)
Intergovernmental/academic/non-governmental organisation	1 (2.1)
Private foundation	1 (2.1)
Population framework is applied to	
General/urban	45 (93.8)
Indigenous	2 (4.2)
Rural	1 (2.1)
Purpose	
Improve	16 (33.3)
Measure	15 (31.2)
Understand	12 (25.0)
Measure/improve	2 (4.2)
Measure/understand	2 (4.2)
Understand/improve	1 (2.1)
Dimensions	
None	16 (33.3)
Lifespan	14 (29.2)
Equity	12 (25.0)
Lifespan and equity	5 (10.4)
Sector	1 (2.1)

Domains and subdomains

Figure 2 shows the numbers of domains, sub-domains and indicators for each framework. Majority of the frameworks have between 1 to 5 domains (68.8%) but have more level 2 sub-domains (31.2% have 6-10, 27.1% have 11-20 and 18.8% have >20). The median number of domains and level 2 subdomains are 4 (range 2 – 14) and 9.5 (range 0 - 65), respectively. Half of the frameworks do not have level 3 subdomains. Of those that do, most have >10 (75%). The median number of indicators is 19.5 (range 0 – 255). Twenty-one of the frameworks did not have indicators (43.8%). Of those that do, majority have >20 indicators (85.2%).

Figure 2 Heatmap of number of domains, subdomains and indicators

L2: level 2, L3: level 3

Figure 3 shows the word cloud for the domains. The most common concepts were health, context or social determinants of health, health behaviours, and those related to the healthcare system. For health, most frameworks used summary indicators of health such as mortality and life-expectancy, and indicators of a few selected health conditions. However, four frameworks had longer lists of indicators for specific communicable and non-communicable diseases (10–13). Of note, psychological or mental health risk factors and/or outcomes feature in 25 (52%) of the frameworks, highlighting its emerging importance (10–34).

Figure 3 Wordcloud for framework domains

SDOH: social determinants of health

The social determinants of health domain were present under some label or other in all except the Ghana Holistic Assessment Tool and Euro-REVES 2 framework (11,24). Some of the frameworks elaborate on these factors, with sub-domains and indicators on the physical environment, social environment, and even politics, national and global trends (17,20–23,35–38). For example, the conceptual framework for urban health measures sub-domains such as immigration, globalization and the changing role of government (35). The framework for community contextual characteristics, one of the two frameworks with the largest number of indicators, also measures the economic, employment, education, political, environmental, housing, governmental, transport aspects in the region where the population of interest is located (23). Interestingly, crime features in 10 frameworks, as this affects the physical safety of people in a community (12,13,20,23,25,30,33,38–40). Many frameworks also measure lifestyle and health-related behaviours. Apart from the common ones like diet, physical activity, smoking and alcohol use, some frameworks include sexual behaviour, use of illicit drugs, seatbelt behaviour, immunization or health screening, breastfeeding and induced abortion (10,12,21–23,25,26,30–33,39). One even included measures of parenting practices (13).

A quarter of the frameworks have domains that pertain to the healthcare system or healthcare performance. One example is the OECD framework, which assesses health system performance within the context of other contextual determinants of health (28). Within the construct of healthcare performance, common subdomains are accessibility, capacity, quality, cost and effectiveness (13,27–29,32,34,38,41–45).

A few of the frameworks had specific focuses and therefore unique domains and indicators that are relevant largely for their setting. For example, the reporting framework for indigenous adolescents in Australia contained domains that were largely relevant for that community, such as ‘family, kinship and community health’, which explored family roles and

responsibilities, contact with extended family, removal from family, participation in community events and sense of belonging to the community (12). Another example is the Ghana's Holistic Assessment Tool, which contains indicators for health-related United Nations sustainable development goals (SDGs) such as proportion of deliveries attended by a trained health worker, proportion of children under 5 years sleeping under insecticide treated net, and tuberculosis treatment success rate, and certain endemic communicable diseases such as non-acute flaccid paralysis polio rate (24).

Approach to framework development

Evans and Stoddart developed the first population health measurement framework in 1990 (46) based on a much earlier 1974 Whitepaper titled "A new perspective on the health of Canadians", which recognized the limitations of the healthcare system on improving health status and presented a preliminary framework of the 'health field' (47). Subsequent frameworks were mostly developed from one or a combination of four approaches: 1) adaptation from an existing framework (11,12,19–22,28,31,33,40,43,44,48,49) , 2) environmental scan of existing frameworks and literature review to summarize current knowledge of health determinants (7,14,16,27,29,40,41,43,50–53), 3) consulting and getting inputs from experts and stakeholders (12,14,23,25,26,29,32,34,38,40,41,43,51) and 4) basing on past work, priorities and goals of the organization developing it (7,18,35,36,45,53).

Discussion

Population health has been a popular concept in healthcare for the past 3 decades but interestingly does not have a unanimous definition (1,2,54). The most commonly used definition, which originated from Kindig and Stoddart, defines population health as ‘the health outcomes of a group of individuals, including the distribution of such outcomes within the group’ (1). Nevertheless, people working on ‘population health’ would have different focuses, goals and populations of interest (54). This may explain the large number of population health frameworks we found in this review.

The concept of population health purportedly originated from Canada, so it was unsurprising majority of the frameworks came from Canada and US. Many of these efforts were also motivated by the articulation of the Triple Aims as a goal for the US healthcare system in the late 2000s, in which improving population health was one of them (55).

Health status and social determinants of health were the most common domains across the frameworks. As seen from the word cloud, there were also many other domains that were closely related to and/or could be considered subdomains of one of these domains. This is because different frameworks have different level of detail, and the hierarchy of domains and subdomains are different in level of detail across frameworks. In other words, a subdomain in one framework could be a domain in another, or an indicator in one framework could be a subdomain in another. It is therefore also difficult to summarize domains and subdomains in a simple way across the frameworks.

The domains and subdomains chosen in different frameworks therefore largely reflects the current knowledge of population health, what influences it, and the focus of the organization(s) developing it. It is unsurprising to see that some key domains appear in many frameworks while different domains expanded to varying detail. For example, social determinants of health features in all frameworks except two frameworks. Some frameworks

have a heavy focus on health status, such as the Healthy Montgomery Core Measures Set, Triple Aim and Euro-REVES 2, with the Euro-REVES 2 framework even measuring activities of daily living and degree of functional limitations (10,11,48). Other frameworks break down the social determinants into considerable detail, such as the framework for community contextual characteristics, life course health development framework, Healthy Cities Indicators, and others (15,18–20,22,23,36–38,40). Several have a heavier focus on healthcare performance, such as the EU Joint Assessment Framework, European Community Health Indicators (ECHI), OECD, the Primary Healthcare Performance Initiative (PHCPI), National scorecard for the US health system (28,29,32,34,43). Others are generally more balanced between the domains.

The results of this scoping review can serve as an evidence base for governments and/or health systems developing their own population health measurement frameworks and selecting indicators for their population health initiatives. They can select and adapt from the frameworks available, and assess the relevance of the range of domains, subdomains and indicators in their context. Populations are largely unique as they are shaped by their local and wider contextual factors. As such, no one framework used in one population or healthcare system is likely directly applicable to another population or healthcare system without adaptation. Population health practitioners can derive any level of detail that matches their interests and requirements from this review, from a broad sense of the literature down to specific indicators.

Settings which are further ahead in the population health journey with existing indicators can also use these results to assess what domains and subdomains have been covered, and where the gaps are. For example, population health is an increasingly important national priority in Singapore and the Ministry of Health is planning several major initiatives to improve the health of the general population (56,57). To achieve this, the Ministry is

working closely with the three major public healthcare clusters in Singapore to develop a set of population health indicators and the evidence base here can help inform the choices. With an initial set of indicators, practitioners can also interrogate their data systems and medical records to determine if they are available or if they need to build prospective data collection tools. This can also be an iterative process for selecting indicators using the results here as a resource. One constraint of the data in its current form though is the difficulty in navigating the long list of domains, subdomains and indicators. In future work, we aim to design a dashboard that allows for interactive exploration of the scoping review data.

There are limitations to this scoping review. Firstly, some frameworks might have been missed due to our language restriction, especially those in Asia. However, many official documents from this region are available in English, so this might not have impacted the search results significantly. Secondly, there are many terms and concepts in the literature that have overlaps with population health, such as public health, urban health, global health, population health management, health equity, health system performance and social determinants of health. Based on our inclusion criteria, concepts like urban health, rural health, community health and global health would be included as they pertain to general populations albeit in different types of settings. Related concepts such as health equity, social determinants of health and health system performance were not the focus of the search and could be part of the frameworks included. However, if a framework was focused on one of these concepts alone without the measurement of health status, then it would be excluded. Some frameworks also focused more on population health management and if it looked more like a logic model for specific interventions then these would also be excluded (58,59). Overall, this review represents a useful collection of frameworks used for measuring the health of a population and its key antecedents. (60)

Conclusion

We found 48 frameworks for the measurement of population health with variable numbers of domains, subdomains and indicators, and depth of detail. The key domains apart from health status were social determinants of health, health behaviours and healthcare system performance. These results serve as a useful resource for governments and healthcare organizations for informing their population health measurement efforts.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Ms Sabrina Liau for her assistance with article screening.

References

1. Kindig DA, Stoddart G. What is population health? *Am J Public Health*. 2003 Mar 1;93(3):380–3.
2. Arah OA. On the relationship between individual and population health. *Med Health Care Philos*. 2009;12(3):235.
3. Valles SA. *Philosophy of Population Health*. Gronfeldt R, editor. New York: Routledge; 2018.
4. McDowell I, Spasoff RA, Kristjansson B. On the classification of population health measurements. *Am J Public Health*. 2004;94(3):388–93.
5. Ashraf K, Ng CJ, Teo CH, Goh KL. Population indices measuring health outcomes: A scoping review. *J Glob Health*. 2019;9(1).
6. Nilsen P. Making sense of implementation theories, models and frameworks. *Implement Sci*. 2015 Apr 21;10:53.
7. Etches V, Frank J, di Ruggiero E, Manuel D. Measuring population health: a review of indicators. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2006;27:29–55.
8. Kaltenthaler E, Maheswaran R, Beverley C. Population-based health indexes: A systematic review. *Health Policy (New York)*. 2004;68(2):245–55.
9. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O’Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Ann Intern Med*. 2018 Sep 4;169(7):467–73.
10. Healthy Montgomery. HEALTHY MONTGOMERY 2016 COMMUNITY HEALTH NEEDS ASSESSMENT. 2016; Available from: https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/healthymontgomery/Resources/Files/Reports/2016_HM_CHNA_Final_June_2_2016.pdf
11. Robine J, Jagger C, Romieu I. Selection of a Coherent Set of Health Indicators for the European Union. Phase II: Final report [Internet]. 2002. Available from: https://reves.site.ined.fr/fichier/s_rubrique/20027/userguide2.en.pdf
12. Azzopardi PS, Sawyer SM, Carlin JB, Degenhardt L, Brown N, Brown AD, et al. Health and wellbeing of Indigenous adolescents in Australia: a systematic synthesis of population data. *Lancet*. 2018 Feb 24;391(10122):766–82.
13. Los Angeles County Department of Public Health. Key Indicators of Health by Service Planning Area [Internet]. 2017. Available from: http://publichealth.lacounty.gov/ha/docs/2015LACHS/KeyIndicator/PH-KIH_2017-secUPDATED.pdf
14. Canadian Institute for Health Information. A Performance Measurement Framework for the Canadian Health System [Internet]. 2013. Available from: https://secure.cihi.ca/free_products/HSP_Framework_Technical_Report_EN.pdf
15. Halfon N, Hochstein M. Life course health development: an integrated framework for developing health, policy, and research. *Milbank Q*. 2002;80(3):433–79.

16. Canada H. Strategies for Population Health - Investing in the Health of Canadians [Internet]. Ottawa; 1994. Available from: https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2016/sc-hc/H39-316-1994-eng.pdf
17. Jeffery B, Abonyl S, Labonte R, Duncan K. Engaging Numbers: Developing Health Indicators that Matter for First Nations and Inuit People. *Int J Indig Health*. 2006;3(1):44–52.
18. Kim D, Saada A. The social determinants of infant mortality and birth outcomes in Western developed nations: a cross-country systematic review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2013;10(6):2296–335.
19. Health England P. Addressing health inequalities through collaborative action: briefing note.
20. Schulz A, Northridge ME. Social determinants of health: implications for environmental health promotion. *Health Educ Behav*. 2004 Aug;31(4):455–71.
21. SfHIP. San Francisco Framework for Assessing Population Health and Equity [Internet]. [cited 2022 May 27]. Available from: <http://www.sfhip.org/chna/community-health-data/san-francisco-framework-for-assessing-population-health-and-equity/>
22. Shah UA, Hadayia JM, Forys LE. From Principles to Practice: One Local Health Department’s Journey Toward Health Equity. *Health Equity*. 2017 Aug 1;1(1):23–7.
23. Hillemeier MM, Lynch J, Harper S, Casper M. Measuring contextual characteristics for community health. *Health Serv Res*. 2003;38(6 Pt 2):1645–717.
24. Kumah E, Ankomah SE, Fusheini A, Sarpong EK, Anyimadu E, Quist A, et al. Frameworks for health systems performance assessment: how comprehensive is Ghana’s holistic assessment tool? *Glob Health Res Policy*. 2020 Dec 1;5(1):1–12.
25. UK Department of Health. Public Health Outcomes Framework [Internet]. [cited 2022 Jul 12]. Available from: <https://fingertips.phe.org.uk/profile/public-health-outcomes-framework>
26. Government of Ireland. Healthy Ireland Outcomes Framework [Internet]. 2019. Available from: <https://assets.gov.ie/7626/cb95e0dbb01e4a9fb7ce7affd609507e.pdf>
27. Institute of Medicine (IOM). State of the USA Health Indicators: Letter Report. State of the USA Health Indicators. 2009 Jan 1;
28. OECD. Health at a Glance 2021: OECD Indicators. Paris: OECD Publishing; 2021.
29. European Commission. Towards a Joint Assessment Framework in the Area of Health. Work in progress: 2015 update [Internet]. 2015. Available from: <https://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=17033&langId=en>
30. Hood CM, Gennuso KP, Swain GR, Catlin BB. County Health Rankings: Relationships Between Determinant Factors and Health Outcomes. *Am J Prev Med*. 2016 Feb 1;50(2):129–35.
31. IOM (Institute of Medicine). Toward quality measures for population health and the leading health indicators. [Internet]. Washington, DC; 2012. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK202180/pdf/Bookshelf_NBK202180.pdf
32. Kramers PGN. The ECHI project: health indicators for the European Community. *Eur J Public Health*. 2003 Sep 1;13(3 Suppl):101–6.

33. National Quality Forum. Finding Common Ground for Healthcare Priorities: Families of Measures for Assessing Affordability, Population Health, and Person- and Family-Centered Care [Internet]. 2014. Available from: <https://www.qualityforum.org/WorkArea/linkit.aspx?LinkIdentifier=id&ItemID=77001>
34. Schoen C, Davis K, How SKH, Schoenbaum SC. U.S. health system performance: a national scorecard. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2006 Nov;25(6).
35. Galea S, Freudenberg N, Vlahov D. Cities and population health. *Soc Sci Med*. 2005 Mar;60(5):1017–33.
36. Webster P, Sanderson D. Healthy Cities indicators--a suitable instrument to measure health? *J Urban Health*. 2013 Oct;90 Suppl 1(Suppl 1):52–61.
37. Hancock T, Labonte R, Edwards R. Indicators that count! Measuring population health at the community level. *Can J Public Health*. 1999;90 Suppl 1(Suppl 1).
38. Santana P, Freitas Â, Stefanik I, Costa C, Oliveira M, Rodrigues TC, et al. Advancing tools to promote health equity across European Union regions: the EURO-HEALTHY project. *Health Res Policy Syst*. 2020 Feb 13;18(1).
39. U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Community Health Assessment for Population Health Improvement: Resource of Most Frequently Recommended Health Outcomes and Determinants. Atlanta, GA, USA; 2013.
40. Vila PM, Angela Kempf BM, Bridget Booske MC, Athens JK, Patrick Remington ML. 2006 Wisconsin County Health Rankings Full Report. 2006; Available from: https://uwphi.pophealth.wisc.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/316/2017/11/WCHR_2006_FullReport.pdf
41. Hatef E, Lasser EC, Kharrazi HHK, Perman C, Montgomery R, Weiner JP. A Population Health Measurement Framework: Evidence-Based Metrics for Assessing Community-Level Population Health in the Global Budget Context. *Popul Health Manag*. 2018 Aug 1;21(4):261–70.
42. Inf-Act. A Distributed Infrastructure on Population Health (DIPoH) [Internet]. 2020. Available from: <https://www.inf-act.eu/sites/inf-act.eu/files/2020-01/Booklet.pdf>
43. Primary Health Care Performance Initiative. The PHCPI Conceptual Framework [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2022 Jul 15]. Available from: <https://improvingphc.org/phcpi-conceptual-framework>
44. Roos NP, Black CD, Frohlich N, Decoster C, Cohen MM, Tataryn DJ, et al. A population-based health information system. *Med Care*. 1995;33(12 Suppl):DS13–20.
45. Arah OA, Westert GP. Correlates of health and healthcare performance: applying the Canadian health indicators framework at the provincial-territorial level. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2005 Dec 1;5:76.
46. Evans RG, Stoddart GL. Producing health, consuming health care. *Soc Sci Med*. 1990;31(12):1347–63.
47. Lalonde M. A new perspective on the health of Canadians [Internet]. 1974. Available from: <http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/ph-sp/pdf/perspect-eng.pdf>

48. Stiefel M, Nolan K. A Guide to Measuring the Triple Aim: Population Health, Experience of Care, and Per Capita Cost. IHI Innovation Series white paper [Internet]. 2012. Available from: <https://www.ihl.org/resources/Pages/IHIWhitePapers/AGuidetoMeasuringTripleAim.aspx>
49. Wolfson M. POHEM - a framework for understanding and modelling the health of human populations. *World Health Stat Q*. 1994;47(3–4):157–76.
50. Casebeer A, Deis K, Doze S. Health indicator development in Alberta health authorities: searching for common ground. *Can J Public Health*. 1999;90 Suppl 1(Suppl 1).
51. Sadana R, Tandon A, Murray CJ, Serdobova I, Cao Y, Xie WJ, et al. Describing population health in six domains: comparable results from 66 household surveys. 2002.
52. Kassler WJ, Howerton M, Thompson A, Cope E, Alley DE, Sanghavi D. Population Health Measurement at Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services: Bridging the Gap Between Public Health and Clinical Quality. *Popul Health Manag*. 2017 Jun 1;20(3):173–80.
53. ten Asbroek AHA, Arah OA, Geelhoed J, Custers T, Delnoij DM, Klazinga NS. Developing a national performance indicator framework for the Dutch health system. *Int J Qual Health Care*. 2004;16 Suppl 1(SUPPL. 1).
54. Peek CJ, Westfall JM, Stange KC, Liaw W, Ewigman B, Devoe JE, et al. Shared language for shared work in population health. *Ann Fam Med*. 2021 Sep 1;19(5):450–6.
55. Berwick DM, Nolan TW, Whittington J. The Triple Aim: Care, Health, And Cost. <https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2017.35.759>. 2017 Aug 2;27(3):759–69.
56. Ministry of Health Singapore. Promoting overall healthier living while targeting specific sub-populations [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2022 Aug 29]. Available from: <https://www.moh.gov.sg/news-highlights/details/promoting-overall-healthier-living-while-targeting-specific-sub-populations>
57. Ministry of Health Singapore. Healthier you, with Healthier SG [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2022 Aug 29]. Available from: <https://www.healthiersg.gov.sg/>
58. Reeve C, Humphreys J, Wakerman J. A comprehensive health service evaluation and monitoring framework. *Eval Program Plann*. 2015 Dec 1;53:91–8.
59. Loewenson R, Simpson S. Strengthening Integrated Care Through Population-Focused Primary Care Services: International Experiences Outside the United States. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2017 Mar 20;38:413–29.
60. Beard JR, Tomaska N, Earnest A, Summerhayes R, Morgan G. Influence of socioeconomic and cultural factors on rural health. *Aust J Rural Health*. 2009;17(1):10–5.
61. Juarez PD, Matthews-Juarez P, Hood DB, Im W, Levine RS, Kilbourne BJ, et al. The public health exposome: a population-based, exposure science approach to health disparities research. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2014;11(12):12866–95.
62. Krewski D, Hogan V, Turner MC, Zeman PL, McDowell I, Edwards N, et al. An Integrated Framework for Risk Management and Population Health. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10807030701655798>. 2007 Nov;13(6):1288–312.

63. Oleske DM. An Epidemiologic Framework for the Delivery of Health Care Services. *Epidemiology and the Delivery of Health Care Services*. 2009;3–30.




Figure 1

Reference




Figure 2



Figure 3