www.idosr.org
Kabazzi, 2025
©IDOSR PUBLICATIONS
ISSN: 2550-7931
International Digital Organization for Scientific Research
IDOSR JOURNAL OF APPLIED SCIENCES 10(3):142-148, 2025.
https://doi.org/10.59298/IDOSRJAS/2025/103.142148
IDOSRJAS1030000

Narrative Review of Aging and Long-Term Care Systems

Kabazzi Douglas T.

Department of Pharmaceutics Kampala International University Uganda
Email: t.kabazzi@studwc.kiu.ac.ug

ABSTRACT

The aging of populations worldwide presents complex challenges for health and social systems, necessitating sustainable and equitable long-term care (LTC) models. This narrative review explores the conceptual foundations, financing mechanisms, service delivery models, workforce dynamics, and quality frameworks that shape aging and long-term care systems across different countries. Drawing from international evidence, the paper examines public and private financing arrangements, including tax-based and social insurance models, highlighting disparities in access and quality of care between and within nations. Service delivery structures, home-based, community-based, and institutional care, are analyzed for their effectiveness in promoting independence, dignity, and social inclusion among older adults. The review underscores the importance of a skilled and adequately trained LTC workforce, gender considerations in caregiving, and evolving policies aimed at equity, accessibility, and person-centered approaches. Furthermore, the study discusses emerging reform strategies such as integrated care, nursing home alternatives, and home- and community-based services that align with global commitments to "aging in place." Comparative insights from OECD, European, and Asian models reveal that sustainable LTC systems require coordinated governance, diversified financing, and continuous quality improvement. The review concludes that the future of long-term care depends on comprehensive policy frameworks, innovative community-based solutions, and strengthened data systems to support informed decision-making and enhance the well-being of aging populations.

Keywords: Aging; Long-Term Care Systems; Health Policy; Integrated Care; and Elderly Health.

INTRODUCTION

Aging refers to a continuous set of biological, psychological, and social changes in an individual as they advance in age. Aging continues in each human during their entire life, although the rate of these changes varies across individuals (s), sex, race, culture, and place [1]. Aging in individuals with cognitive disorders is accelerated; the capability of an elderly person in carrying out their daily activities and cognitive capabilities decreases at a higher rate compared to their younger adult counterparts. Care is the assistance and support in performing one or more daily activities as defined by the elderly person or their guardian [5]. Caring for elderly people is one of the global challenges. Various models of care are needed while considering cultural preferences and specifications for the caring process. This article outlines how different countries establish policies for elderly and aging care to provide opportunities for learning and enhancing elderly care systems [3]. Care is the assistance and support in performing one or more daily activities as defined by the elderly person or their guardian. Caring for elderly people is one of the global challenges. Different countries establish policies for elderly and aging care in order to provide opportunities for learning and enhancing elderly care systems.

Conceptual Foundations of Aging and Long-Term Care

The aging of the population currently is one of the foremost challenges facing society [3]. In both developing and industrialized countries, the demographic revolution associated with the aging of the baby-boom generation coupled with increased life expectancy poses not only considerable challenges for families, elders, and society at large, but also economic implications that have been highlighted by influential projections commissioned by the

United Nations and the European Commission, examining the notion that longer life expectancy also may correspond to better life quality comprise one of the most pressing concerns of modern times [2]. Furthermore, increasing elderly dependency ratios coupled with growing multi-morbidity in many societies necessitate a reconsideration of how chronic diseases, their associated care requirements, and the long-term financial sustainability of such care affect the reliance on informal care, resuming capacity, and length of hospitalization before a nursing home becomes unavoidable [3]. Long-term care is an essential health system component that provides basic assistance for daily tasks, enabling individuals to maintain independence and function at home or in other community settings [12]. The need for care rises dramatically with age, necessitating diverse arrangements for financing and managing these services [11]. This brief review examines the organization and financing of long-term care systems in selected countries, focusing on the core elements that define their structure [14]. The provision and financing of long-term care services vary significantly across OECD nations, with substantial regional heterogeneity between urban and rural areas [10]. Most countries have developed their systems within the framework of tax-financed, universally accessible health services, whereas some primarily rely on market-based arrangements that mainly provide tax deductions toward the cost of private insurance [15].

Public and Private Financing Mechanisms

Public long-term care financing is prevalent in many OECD countries, including those in the European Union, Canada, Japan, and several others [5]. In a significant subset of countries, public long-term care financing is complemented by private, out-of-pocket payments. In a smaller group of countries, no existing legal entitlement to public financing for long-term care exists: the United States and Korea fall within this latter category [6]. Public long-term care financing takes different forms. Countries predominantly operate on a social insurance basis Germany, Japan, and the Netherlands, for example. Others have public financing structures established as general taxation (e.g., Nordic countries, the United Kingdom) or specific taxes on aged population services (e.g., France). In Japan, a combination of social insurance and general taxation funds public long-term care, and in Korea, the established framework relies primarily on social insurance [18]. Likewise, the United States utilises multiple national and local private systems (e.g., Medicaid, Medicare, welfare services, and tax incentives) without a universal public entitlement or common financing framework [16].

Service Delivery Models

In many countries, elderly people have health delivery systems developed specifically for them, while there is high variability in delivery methods and healthcare services for the elderly in the world [7]. Long-term care services (LTCS) have also been categorized into three service delivery models, namely, home-based model, community-based model, and institutional model. Home-based care (HBC) is a service delivery model providing care to people at their home with the help of health staff or other trained workers [9]. Maintenance of health and independence of elderly people through several healthcare practices, such as health information preaching, medication delivery, essential equipment delivery, and exposure to outside activities, is the main objective of HBC. Community-based model adopted in many countries is an option where home care support is not sufficient [15]. This option aims to deliver services to elderly people in the local community with temporary institutional care, while institutionalized care implies delivering services to the elderly in one specific place, such as residential homes or a hospital.

Workforce and Training in Long-Term Care

A growing body of literature indicates that the ability of a long-term care (LTC) system to meet demand depends to a significant degree on the size and skill set of the workforce [13]. Through the years, workforce and training policies for LTC have elicited varying degrees of formal development, often lagging behind with respect to the evolution of demand, the state of employment elsewhere, and changing care needs. While demand for care is expected to expand considerably as the population continues to age, the overall availability of caregivers is projected to diminish, a trend that is likely to be accompanied by a further erosion of training capacity [8]. A variety of circumstances must be taken into account when determining the precise relationship between the supply and quality of caregivers on the one hand and the nature and organization of training on the other. Socio-demographic factors, labour market conditions, patterns of formal and informal care-giving, and the specific needs and preferences of the population in question all play a role in shaping that relationship[7]. Care responsibilities are assumed disproportionately by women, as are workforce development initiatives in a number of countries, meaning that gender issues, both at home and in the market, are especially pertinent [9]. Equally important are considerations of the way in which LTC is organized and funded, given the implications of alternative arrangements for the number of caregivers employed and the paths through which individuals obtain training[8].

Equity, Access, and Quality of Care

Health inequities experienced by older persons, particularly those belonging to minoritized groups, are well documented [2]. Advancing health equity requires attention to dynamic individual, group, and system-level factors that intersect to contribute to disparities. Risk factors for inequitable care include frailty and health

vulnerabilities, policy-driven care practices, and the expansion of systems to accommodate complex needs often met by private providers [8]. Disparities in access to care and health outcomes are particularly evident among minoritized older populations. Furthermore, there is a lack of synthesis on care experiences and outcomes within long-term care homes. Evidence regarding differences in care-related outcomes for minoritized populations in residential long-term care compared to more dominant groups, as well as intersecting influences on health equity, has been reviewed [9]. Access to care among older adults varies by socioeconomic status, ethnicity, and rural-urban location. Barriers include disparities in healthcare services, especially for ethnic minorities and those in rural areas [11]. Reforms in health policies aim to promote equity and improve care quality for the elderly. Addressing social determinants of health is crucial to achieving equitable and high-quality care for aging populations [10].

Availability of Services across Populations

Availability of long-term care (LTC) services is uneven in high-income countries, ranging from little to no access, through general assistance in co-financing, to broad government coverage [15]. Access by older persons with lower income and education, an often-limited private support network, and physical and cognitive disabilities is a common problem across industrialised nations [8]. The proportions of older people receiving some form of LTC continue to be unsatisfactorily low, limiting both their quality of life and the reductions possible in institutional stays [13]. Exacerbating unmet needs are low-targeting and common services available through community-based programmes, disability specifics that are not age-dimensioned by such services, and unmet needs assessment and recommendations in older people's perceptions. Required reforms transpire [24]. The international consultative established consensus identifies needs assessment as an essential intervention area for initiating improvement [11].

Quality Measurement and Improvement

Long-term care (LTC) quality measures, critical for financial oversight and service improvement, elude a single definition, hindering assessment of measurement systems. Criteria for effective LTC quality measures encompass relevance, clarity, reliability, sensitivity, amenability to improvement, and feasibility [13]. LTCC establishes a framework delineating various measure types: systems, processes, outcomes, and experience; the relevant characteristics of each type; and the interdependencies among the types throughout the continuum of LTC service delivery [12]. An evidence-based system addressing various dimensions like user-centeredness and efficiency bears greater significance than standardized service output metrics [25]. Demand for expanded autonomy and flexibility in allowance expenditure alongside emerging care service technology underscores the need for continuous monitoring of LTC system operation and accomplishment of intended care objectives in residential services [15]. Quality metrics, survey items, inquiry protocols, enhancement methods, and administrative-level data factors represent the comprehensive classification of LTC quality measurement and augmentation [16]. Quality assessment in assisted living facilities remains fundamental, yet challenges involving detail and scope persist. Staffing shortages coupled with generalides enfeebling training for serious illness limit achievement of quality objectives like educational advancement and family decision-making. Quality assessment frameworks outline the dimensions deemed essential: resident security, outcomes, care provision, personnel outlook, and environmental attributes. The capacity to identify disparities in the accomplishment of vital objectives throughout services and provide evidential substantiation warranting further exploration stands as a primary aspiration [13].

Patient-Centered and Family-Centered Care

Patient-centered and family-centered approaches prioritize the needs and preferences of patients and their family members in healthcare decision-making and delivery [8]. Such efforts reflect a shift from a focus solely on clinical quality or service utilization to prioritizing the patient experience and family involvement as central aims of high-quality care [14]. Means of engaging patients and families include considering their preferences and values in treatment plans, sharing information about diagnoses and options in ways they can understand, eliciting questions to clarify their goals, and reviewing care plans weekly or monthly. Family-centered approaches likewise address the unique perspectives of facilitators, barriers, and desires among family members who support patients in health and well-being maintenance [15]. Loneliness and social isolation strongly affect patients' physical and mental health, making socialization an essential component of holistic, patient-centered care, especially for older adults. Individualized and personable [16] care that conveys genuine warmth and compassion and serves as a form of companionship is especially crucial for this demographic; it promotes quality of life, resilience to stress, and reduces the risk of cognitive decline. Reporting systems that unite multiple providers involving patients and families are valuable for conveying such factors systematically [18].

Policy Interventions and Reform Experiences

Diverse interventions and reform activities have targeted long-term care systems internationally, including policies aiming to improve the organization and financing of long-term care 16. The experience of countries in this area highlights several types of long-term care policy interventions, three of which merit particular attention:

integrated care and community-based services, nursing home reform and alternatives, and home- and community-based services [5]. Each of these six reform areas is in varying degrees of development, indicating that mixed approaches can assist systems under a broad range of circumstances [20]. Integrated care and community-based services are chosen by some countries to help older populations with complex conditions and their caregivers. These systems organize interprofessional teams that provide health, social, and other community support services in integrated packages, an approach that can benefit people with chronic illnesses, frailty, mild cognitive impairment, and dementia [6]. Evidence suggests that integrated models contribute to improved access to care, reduced unmet needs, better-quality care, enhanced user experience, greater overall well-being, diminished overmedication among people with dementia, and increased caregiver well-being. Integrated care models have emerged for older populations with complex needs in a number of countries worldwide, including Germany and New Zealand [17].

Integrated Care and Community-Based Services

Long-term formal care for older people primarily focuses on acute and post-acute health-care objectives as well as medical conditions. Recent policy discussions have increasingly recognized the relevance of integrated care and community-based services to the long-term care (LTC) system [33]. These topics are intimately linked with the aspiration to redesign publicly funded health-care systems in order to optimize the use of resources. Cost containment or cost-effectiveness have in the past been the only drivers; however, realigning services toward the intrinsic capacities of each older person can be both an ethical imperative and a strategy for efficiency, effectiveness, equity, and resilience. It contributes to a wider policy agenda of promoting healthy aging and "age-friendly" cities and communities [26]. Improving both long-term and post-acute care requires a systems approach and sustained longer-range investments. Such investments must, in turn, interconnect; otherwise, short-term gains in efficiency at one level may be lost due to bottlenecks at another level or improper matching of inputs to needs. Integrated care and community-based services are important components of such a long-term strategy [18]. Communities and supportive environments have a profound effect on intrinsic capacities, yet integration and interconnectivity are least developed at the community level, especially outside institutional settings and particularly with respect to the social determinants of health [20]. Well-implemented integrated care models for older persons living at home can sustain healthy aging and delay or avoid the transition into LTC. Integration and interconnection within the wider LTC system remain crucial; when older persons enter LTC or receive institutional respite care, the approach to care must adapt to individual situations or keep on promoting intrinsic capacity [19]. The transition into LTC often occurs over a lengthy period and through multiple short episodes, yet only the eventual entry into a designated LTC facility is clearly defined and universally agreed upon [27]. The need for institutional long-term accommodation is seldom mentioned in the promotion of integrated care, even though it marks the final stage of a process in which networked services, periodic support, and maintenance of daily routines play essential roles [20]. As soon as attempts to actively promote healthy aging and intrinsic capacities are made at the other end of the trajectory, the situation profoundly changes. Equivalent integrated services apply even within LTC, while at the population level. Only the setting, behavioral shifts, and mutual interactions differ [20]. Integrated care also supports the need for low-intensity, non-institutional assistance that more formally characterizes community-based services; services of this nature, when combined with access to affordable "age-friendly" and "universal" housing and safe transport, define and distinguish active ageing at the infrastructure level[21].

Nursing Home Reform and Alternatives

Regulatory oversight and financial incentives have aimed to ensure high-quality care in nursing homes since the mid-1980s. They have also attempted to encourage a resident-centered approach or "culture change" that respects individual choices and fosters psychosocial well-being, autonomy, and community. Administrators, clinicians, and consumer advocates alike have argued that agency rules and the prescriptive environment distract from efforts to meet these goals [21]. The Joint Commission emphasizes that resident-centered care is the new paradigm. It calls for providers to complete a self-assessment based on nine standards associated with this model, which include resident guidance and choice, independence, social interactions and activities, personalized care plans, a deeper understanding of resident values, and respect for cultural diversity [22]. Numbering more than 16,000 nationwide, nursing homes house approximately 1.5 million residents. They provide primary medical and rehabilitation services, personal care, enriching activities, end-of-life support, and other assistance to those needing help with activities of daily living (ADLs). Unlike hospitals, nursing homes focus on the longer-term needs of residents requiring care beyond home- and community-based options [23]. These facilities serve disabled persons of all ages, but over two-thirds of residents are aged sixty-five or older. Individuals aged eighty-five and older comprise 42% of the nursing-home population. Nearly half of the time spent in nursing homes occurs before age

sixty-five, but entry rates sharply increase at older ages. The average length of stay is approximately 12 months nationwide [16].

Home and Community-Based Services

Home and Community-Based Services provide services in individuals' homes or local community settings to support seniors wishing to age at home [24]. Many people prefer to remain at home, and longer stays often correlate with better physical and mental well-being. Seniors receiving assistance at home may delay entry into a nursing home by a year or more, yielding substantial savings [25]. For example, the median annual cost of a private nursing home room in 2013 was around $83,950; in contrast, 30 hours of help per week costs approximately $30,326 [16]. Home and Community-Based Services assist with daily tasks, promote independence, and enhance socialization. Community resources such as senior centers, meals programs, and transportation help seniors remain in their homes and prevent greater needs for care, and studies indicate they bolster successful Aging in Place [23]. Older adults' desire to remain at home or avoid institutions leads the U.S. Department of Justice to enforce the 1999 Olmstead v. L.C. Supreme Court decision [17]. This ruling deemed the unnecessary institutionalization of qualified individuals with disabilities discrimination under the Americans with Disabilities Act and mandated states to provide community programs. A majority of U.S. public long-term services and supports expenditures continue to be allocated toward institutional care. Federal initiatives like the Money Follows the Person Program and the State Plan Benefit Program further support aging in Place [16].

International Comparisons and Lessons Learned

Long-term care (LTC) systems in various countries reveal differences in approaches, as well as lessons and challenges shared across national borders. Some aspects of organization are based on traditions and political philosophies tied to concepts of state and societal responsibility, yet broad functional similarities nevertheless exist [23]. Even countries that seem at first glance to have dissimilar LTC systems reveal noteworthy parallels [24-30]. For example, the national system of formal elderly care established in the Netherlands repudiates privatization in favor of a government-centered approach, while Japan's LTC Insurance Act legislatively recognized an aging society and established publicly funded, privately delivered services based on insurance premiums [1]. Nonetheless, the Netherlands and Japan allow a substantial degree of individual selection of services; pick-up availability remains almost the same for public and private systems, and priority is placed on workforce training, as indicated by an increasing number of training organizations and courses in both countries [24]. A joint working group formed by several international organizations including the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the World Health Organization (WHO), the International Labour Organization (ILO), the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), and HelpAge International compared the LTC systems of eleven countries representing every region of the world; the group viewed ageing as a global phenomenon with several common characteristics worldwide [25].

Methods for Narrative Synthesis in Aging and Long-Term Care

A narrative synthesis approach was adopted to review how countries have organized and financed long-term care systems [20]. To guide the synthesis, a four-part structure was developed that distinguishes between conceptual foundations, organization and financing arrangements; performance across equity, access, and quality dimensions; and a range of policies and reform experiences [25]. Data were extracted from the selected studies into a summary table that captured key information and findings. Broadly, these studies addressed issues of conceptualization and terminology; provided comparative insights related to long-term care organization, financing, and reform; and offered ongoing reflections on the changing policy landscape and future research priorities [31-34].

Implications for Policy, Practice, and Future Research

Aging and long-term care systems will undergo considerable changes that will reflect the changes occurring in macroeconomic fundamentals and in the global welfare system [20, 26]. The analysis has both practical and theoretical implications for health policy and quantitative social research. Decades of research on public policy have discovered some general principles and trends in welfare states [12, 27]. However, only recently have governments and scholars begun taking a serious look at aging and long-term care systems from a comparative point of view. Doing so reveals a rich variety of institutional frameworks, pervaded by divergent, yet coherent, development paths [25].

CONCLUSION

The global rise in aging populations calls for renewed attention to the organization, financing, and delivery of long-term care. This review demonstrates that aging and LTC systems are deeply influenced by demographic, economic, and social factors that vary across countries but share common structural challenges, most notably, ensuring equitable access, maintaining quality standards, and securing financial sustainability. The analysis highlights that while many OECD and high-income nations have made progress in developing universal or insurance-based LTC systems, disparities in service availability, workforce training, and care quality persist.

Integrated and community-based models emerge as effective strategies for promoting independence and reducing institutionalization, aligning with the broader goal of "aging in place." Sustainable reform requires the convergence of policy innovation, workforce development, and societal commitment to valuing older persons. Governments must strengthen governance frameworks, expand social protection, and foster intersectoral collaboration among health, social, and labor systems. Investment in workforce training, digital care solutions, and data-driven performance monitoring is essential to improve accountability and service quality. Furthermore, promoting patient- and family-centered approaches can ensure that long-term care systems uphold dignity, autonomy, and cultural sensitivity. Ultimately, the evolution of aging and long-term care systems must balance efficiency with compassion, integrating public policy, research, and community engagement. By learning from international experiences and adapting best practices to local contexts, societies can build resilient and inclusive care systems that safeguard the health and well-being of older adults in an increasingly aging world.

REFERENCES

1. Asadzadeh M, Maher A, Jafari M, Mohammadzadeh KA, Hosseini SM. A review study of the provision of elderly care services in different countries. Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care. 2022 Feb 1;11(2):458-65.
2. Mortensen J, Tsolova S. Cross Atlantic Exchange to Advance Long-Term Care. Background paper prepared for the European Commission and AARP Joint Conference on Long-term Care, 13 September 2006. Special CEPS Reports, September 2006.
3. Paul-Chima UO, Nneoma UC, Bulhan S. Metabolic immunobridge: Could adipose-derived extracellular vesicles be the missing link between obesity, autoimmunity, and drug-induced hepatotoxicity?. Medical Hypotheses. 2025 Sep 28:111776.
4. Rink C. Integrative Care Models: Impact on an Aging Society. Chelsea Rink. SPNHA Review. 2017;13(1):7.
5. Gregory S, Linz N, König A, Langel K, Pullen H, Luz S, Harrison J, Ritchie CW. Remote data collection speech analysis and prediction of the identification of Alzheimer's disease biomarkers in people at risk for Alzheimer's disease dementia: the Speech on the Phone Assessment (SPeAk) prospective observational study protocol. BMJ open. 2022 Mar 1;12(3):e052250.
6. Lee SH, Chon Y, Kim YY. Comparative analysis of long-term care in OECD countries: focusing on long-term care financing type. InHealthcare 2023 Jan 10 (Vol. 11, No. 2, p. 206). MDPI.
7. Paul-Chima UO, Nnaemeka UM, Nneoma UC. Could dysbiosis of urban air microbiota be an overlooked contributor to pediatric asthma and neurodevelopmental disorders?. Medical Hypotheses. 2025 Sep 12:111758.
8. Mosca I, van der Wees PJ, Mot ES, Wammes JJ, Jeurissen PP. Sustainability of long-term care: puzzling tasks ahead for policy-makers. International Journal of Health Policy and Management. 2016 Aug 17;6(4):195.
9. Kalantari AR, Mehrolhassani MH, Shati M, Dehnavieh R. Health service delivery models for elderly people: A systematic review. Medical Journal of the Islamic Republic of Iran. 2021 Feb 10;35:21.
10. Hussein S, Manthorpe J. An international review of the long-term care workforce: policies and shortages. Journal of aging & social policy. 2005 Nov 1;17(4):75-94.
11. Da Silva CC, Monteil MA, Davis EM. Overweight and obesity in children are associated with an abundance of Firmicutes and reduction of Bifidobacterium in their gastrointestinal microbiota. Childhood Obesity. 2020 Apr 1;16(3):204-10.
12. Scott MM, Ménard A, Sun AH, Murmann M, Ramzy A, Rasaputra P, Fleming M, Orosz Z, Huynh C, Welch V, Cooper-Reed A. Building evidence to advance health equity: a systematic review on care-related outcomes for older, minoritised populations in long-term care homes. Age and Ageing. 2024 Apr 1;53(4):afae059.
13. Carroll C, Sworn K, Booth A, Tsuchiya A, Maden M, Rosenberg M. Equity in healthcare access and service coverage for older people: a scoping review of the conceptual literature. Integrated healthcare journal. 2022 Jan 19;4(1):e000092.
14. Ugwu OP, Okon MB, Alum EU, Ugwu CN, Anyanwu EG, Mariam B, Ogenyi FC, Eze VH, Anyanwu CN, Ezeonwumelu JO, Egba SI. Unveiling the therapeutic potential of the gut microbiota–brain axis: Novel insights and clinical applications in neurological disorders. Medicine. 2025 Jul 25;104(30):e43542.
15. Myers JE. A national survey of geriatric mental health services. American Mental Health Counselors Association Journal. 1983 Apr;5(2):69-74.
16. Malley J. Measuring the quality of long-term care in England. Eurohealth. 2010;16(2):21-4.

17. Shippee T, Bucy T, Akosionu O, Skarphol T. QUALITY METRICS IN ALFS: FRAMEWORK, MEASURES, AND IMPLEMENTATION. Innovation in Aging. 2022 Nov 1;6(Supplement_1):281-.
18. Allen D, Scarinci N, Hickson L. The nature of patient-and family-centred care for young adults living with chronic disease and their family members: a systematic review. International journal of integrated care. 2018 May 18;18(2):14.
19. Ugwu CN, Ugwu OP, Alum EU, Eze VH, Basajja M, Ugwu JN, Ogenyi FC, Ejemot-Nwadiaro RI, Okon MB, Egba SI, Uti DE. Medical preparedness for bioterrorism and chemical warfare: A public health integration review. Medicine. 2025 May 2;104(18):e42289.
20. Welch ML, Hodgson JL, Didericksen KW, Lamson AL, Forbes TH. Family-centered primary care for older adults with cognitive impairment. Contemporary Family Therapy. 2022 Mar;44(1):67-87.
21. Applebaum R, Nelson M, Straker JK, Kennedy K. Policy Does Matter: Changing an Unchangeable Long-Term Services System. Journal of Elder Policy. 2020 Jun;1(1):21-38.
22. Mosca I, van der Wees PJ, Mot ES, Wammes JJ, Jeurissen PP. Sustainability of long-term care: puzzling tasks ahead for policy-makers. International Journal of Health Policy and Management. 2016 Aug 17;6(4):195.
23. Cesari M, Sumi Y, Han ZA, Perracini M, Jang H, Briggs A, Thiyagarajan JA, Sadana R, Banerjee A. Implementing care for healthy ageing. BMJ global health. 2022 Feb 1;7(2):e007778.
24. Stewart MJ, Georgiou A, Westbrook JI. Successfully integrating aged care services: a review of the evidence and tools emerging from a long-term care program. International journal of integrated care. 2013 Feb 22;13:e003.
25. Ugwu CN, Ugwu OP, Alum EU, Eze VH, Basajja M, Ugwu JN, Ogenyi FC, Ejemot-Nwadiaro RI, Okon MB, Egba SI, Uti DE. Sustainable development goals (SDGs) and resilient healthcare systems: Addressing medicine and public health challenges in conflict zones. Medicine. 2025 Feb 14;104(7):e41535.
26. Leichsenring K. Integrated care for older people in Europe—latest trends and perceptions. International Journal of Integrated Care. 2012 Jan 30;12:e7.
27. Kaup ML. Culture Change Movement in Nursing Homes/Person-Centered Care/Household Models. The encyclopedia of adulthood and aging. 2015 Dec 9:1-6.
28. Jost TS. Regulation of the quality of nursing home care in the United States. International Journal for Quality in Health Care. 1989 Dec 1;1(4):223-8.
29. Chen YM, Berkowitz B. Older adults' home-and community-based care service use and residential transitions: a longitudinal study. BMC geriatrics. 2012 Aug 10;12(1):44.B
30. Ongesa TN, Ugwu OP, Ugwu CN, Alum EU, Eze VH, Basajja M, Ugwu JN, Ogenyi FC, Okon MB, Ejemot-Nwadiaro RI. Optimizing emergency response systems in urban health crises: A project management approach to public health preparedness and response. Medicine. 2025 Jan 17;104(3):e41279.
31. Geyer J. Notes About Comparing Long-term Care Expenditures Across Countries: Comment on" Financing Long-term Care: Lessons From Japan". International Journal of Health Policy and Management. 2019 Oct 14;9(2):80.
32. Stephan B, Brayne C. Prevalence and projections of dementia. Excellence in dementia care: Research into practice. 2008 Sep 1:9-34.
33. Doran C, Noonan M, Doody O. Life-story work in long-term care facilities for older people: An integrative review. Journal of clinical nursing. 2019 Apr;28(7-8):1070-84.
34. Kokkonen K, Rissanen S, Hujala A. The match between institutional elderly care management research and management challenges-a systematic literature review. Health research policy and systems. 2012 Nov 8;10(1):35.

CITE AS: Kabazzi Douglas T. (2025). Narrative Review of Aging and Long-Term Care Systems. IDOSR JOURNAL OF APPLIED SCIENCES 10(3):142-148. https://doi.org/10.59298/IDOSRJAS/2025/103.142148