A Theoretical Study on the Evolution of Modern Epidemiological Concepts in Global Health Research

Mahmudi Syarif Ridho[1]*, Nouv Aqila Bages[2]
[1*]Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta, Indonesia
[2]Universitas YARSI, Indonesia
Email Corresponding Author: mahmudisyarifr@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study aims to explore the theoretical evolution of modern epidemiology within the context of global health research, emphasizing its transition from traditional biomedical paradigms toward more integrative, interdisciplinary, and justice-oriented frameworks. Employing a qualitative descriptive approach through a comprehensive literature review, the research synthesizes findings from peer-reviewed articles, official reports, and theoretical sources published between 2014 and 2025. Data collection involved systematic document analysis and thematic categorization, while the analysis followed an inductive approach to identify emerging concepts and paradigmatic shifts in epidemiological theory and practice. The results reveal five major trends: (1) the persistence yet transformation of biomedical dominance; (2) methodological innovation through big data, AI, and digital epidemiology; (3) the rise of precision epidemiology integrating personalized and population-level insights; (4) the growing centrality of social justice and equity frameworks; and (5) specialized advances in wastewater-based and occupational epidemiology. These findings demonstrate how modern epidemiology is evolving into a multidimensional science that unites biological, technological, and social determinants of health. The study concludes that this evolution not only strengthens theoretical foundations but also enhances the ethical and practical capacity of global health research to address complex and inequitable health challenges. Future directions emphasize developing hybrid theoretical frameworks that balance computational innovation with social responsibility to promote global health equity.

Keywords: modern epidemiology, global health, qualitative research, precision epidemiology, social determinants of health.

INTRODUCTION

The evolution of modern epidemiology has been one of the most transformative intellectual journeys in the history of global health sciences. Originally rooted in the control of infectious diseases, epidemiology has progressively expanded to incorporate the study of social, environmental, and technological determinants of health (Briko, 2018; Briko & Shkarin, 2021). This evolution reflects a paradigm shift from simple observational models toward complex, multidimensional systems that integrate both biological and societal processes. In the era of globalization and digital transformation, the ability of epidemiology to adapt its theoretical and methodological frameworks has become increasingly vital to address emerging health threats worldwide (Muonde dkk., 2024; Reubi, 2020). The evolution of modern epidemiology has been one of the most significant intellectual developments in global health sciences. Initially focused on infectious disease control, it has expanded to include social, environmental, and technological determinants of health. In an increasingly interconnected world, this adaptability is essential for addressing new health challenges. This relevance is evident as global issues such as climate change, rapid urbanization, and cross border mobility intensify health risks. Current challenges including the COVID 19 pandemic and the rise of noncommunicable diseases highlight the need for epidemiological approaches that can inform flexible and responsive health policies.

The urgency of this transformation lies in the changing nature of global disease burdens. Non-communicable diseases (NCDs) now account for more than 70% of global mortality, a shift that challenges the traditional infectious disease–centric models of epidemiology (Atiim & Elliott, 2016; Santosa dkk., 2014). The classical frameworks, developed primarily in the context of epidemics like cholera or tuberculosis, have proven insufficient in capturing the complex interactions among behavioral, genetic, and socio-environmental determinants underlying modern health crises. This gap has prompted scholars to revisit

the theoretical underpinnings of epidemiology and explore its evolution as both a science and a social practice (Corteel, 2025; Valier, 2025).

Recent technological advances have accelerated this shift toward a more integrated understanding of population health. The emergence of big data analytics, artificial intelligence (AI), and machine learning has expanded the methodological horizons of epidemiology, giving rise to what some scholars term "Big Epidemiology" (Bragazzi & Lehr, 2024; Zhao dkk., 2024). These technologies allow the simultaneous analysis of vast datasets combining genomic, environmental, and behavioral information, enhancing the precision of predictive models and the timeliness of interventions (Taheri & Taheri, 2023). However, these innovations also raise critical questions regarding ethics, privacy, and data equity that demand renewed theoretical reflection (Muonde dkk., 2024).

The historical progression of epidemiology can be traced through three major eras: the pre-bacteriological, post-bacteriological, and modern periods (Briko, 2018). Each stage represents a deepening of conceptual understanding, from focusing solely on pathogens to considering broader population-level processes. The advent of mathematical modeling—exemplified by the SIR (Susceptible-Infected-Recovered) model—marked a significant turning point, introducing formal systems of representation that enabled predictions and guided public health interventions (Corteel, 2025) . These models became foundational to contemporary epidemiological reasoning and remain relevant in the study of both infectious and chronic diseases.

Beyond methodological advancements, the sociological dimension of epidemiology has gained prominence in recent decades. Scholars like (Reubi, 2017, 2020) have emphasized the "epidemiological reason," an analytical framework that situates epidemiology within broader biopolitical and social contexts. This perspective highlights how global health governance, surveillance practices, and data infrastructures shape not only disease outcomes but also societal perceptions of risk and responsibility. Such insights underscore the inseparability of epidemiology from the political and cultural forces that sustain it.

Despite its progress, modern epidemiology continues to face critical challenges. Theoretical fragmentation, inconsistent terminology, and limited integration of non-Western perspectives hinder the field's global coherence (Briko & Shkarin, 2021). Moreover, while technological innovations promise unprecedented analytic capabilities, they also risk amplifying disparities between high- and low-resource settings if not grounded in equitable frameworks (Taheri & Taheri, 2023). The need for a more inclusive and theoretically robust epidemiology is therefore more pressing than ever.

One of the persistent gaps in the literature lies in reconciling the epidemiological transition theory with contemporary empirical evidence. While the theory successfully explains the shift from infectious to non-communicable diseases, it often overlooks the socio-political and environmental dimensions of health transitions (Santosa dkk., 2014). Recent global crises, including the COVID-19 pandemic, have demonstrated that infectious diseases remain intertwined with chronic conditions, forming complex syndemics that demand integrative models (Shrestha dkk., 2020). Thus, the evolution of epidemiology must encompass both biological and socio-structural determinants of health.

The globalization of health has also reshaped epidemiological priorities and practices. Cross-border disease transmission, climate change, and socioeconomic inequalities have necessitated a globalized approach to data sharing and collaborative modeling (Atiim & Elliott, 2016; Reubi, 2017). These developments underscore the importance of integrating epidemiology with disciplines such as sociology, political science, and information technology to develop adaptive, holistic frameworks suited for global health governance (Bragazzi & Lehr, 2024).

Ethical considerations have likewise become central to the discourse on epidemiological modernization. The vast use of personal health data, genomic information, and digital surveillance tools raises profound ethical dilemmas regarding consent, data ownership, and algorithmic bias (Zhao dkk., 2024). Addressing these concerns requires not only technical solutions but also a reexamination of epidemiological epistemology to ensure that technological efficiency aligns with human rights and equity (Muonde dkk., 2024).

From a theoretical standpoint, the intersection of qualitative and quantitative approaches represents another frontier of epidemiological evolution. Qualitative methodologies, long marginalized in the

field, now play a pivotal role in contextualizing numerical patterns within lived experiences and social realities (Bannister-Tyrrell & Meiqari, 2020). Their integration enhances the interpretive power of epidemiological findings, especially in understanding disparities and cultural dimensions of health behavior.

Moreover, the rapid digitalization of health surveillance systems has transformed epidemiology into a data-intensive science. Predictive analytics and AI-driven modeling can forecast disease outbreaks with remarkable accuracy, but they also require theoretical frameworks capable of handling uncertainty and dynamic complexity (Zhao dkk., 2024). Thus, theory and technology must evolve in tandem to prevent epistemological reductionism and ensure that data-driven approaches remain socially grounded (Bragazzi & Lehr, 2024).

The present study addresses these multifaceted challenges by synthesizing the theoretical evolution of epidemiology in the context of modern global health. It aims to elucidate how shifts in epistemology, methodology, and technological capability have shaped the field's current trajectory. In doing so, this article contributes to a deeper understanding of epidemiology not merely as a set of techniques but as a dynamic, evolving discipline embedded within social and historical processes (Valier, 2025).

The main problem motivating this theoretical exploration is the lack of coherence among contemporary epidemiological frameworks. While empirical studies abound, their theoretical foundations often remain fragmented or outdated, leading to inconsistencies in global health research (Ahlbom, 2021). By revisiting the historical and conceptual development of epidemiology, this article seeks to bridge the gap between empirical practice and theoretical sophistication.

The central aim of this article is therefore to provide a comprehensive theoretical overview of how epidemiology has evolved from its classical roots to its modern interdisciplinary form. It emphasizes the integration of social theory, computational modeling, and ethical reflection as essential components of the discipline's future development (Corteel, 2025). The findings are expected to enrich both theoretical discourse and practical applications in global health research.

Ultimately, this theoretical study aspires to strengthen the intellectual foundations of modern epidemiology. By tracing its evolution and identifying the challenges and opportunities ahead, it contributes to shaping a more holistic, adaptive, and socially responsive science of population health. The practical benefit of this work lies in guiding policy, informing education, and fostering interdisciplinary collaboration toward a more equitable and resilient global health system.

METHOD

This study employs a qualitative research design with a descriptive approach through a comprehensive library-based study (literature review). The qualitative-descriptive method was chosen to explore the theoretical evolution of modern epidemiology and its implications for global health research. This design enables a detailed understanding of the concepts, epistemologies, and paradigms that underpin epidemiological thought without the constraints of empirical data collection. Qualitative research provides the flexibility and interpretive depth necessary to trace conceptual transformations over time (Bingham, 2023; Pratt, 2025). The descriptive approach, in particular, allows the researcher to present findings systematically, emphasizing patterns, relationships, and conceptual progressions observed in the literature (Abraham & P, 2024; Doyle dkk., 2019).

A theoretical study requires this qualitative descriptive design because it focuses on interpreting ideas and frameworks rather than generating numerical evidence, making interpretive analysis essential for capturing the depth of conceptual development.

The data used in this study are derived exclusively from secondary sources, including peer-reviewed journal articles, theoretical books, official health organization reports, and authoritative scientific documents published between 2014 and 2025. The inclusion of recent sources ensures that the discussion reflects current trends and methodological innovations in epidemiology and qualitative inquiry (Bandaranayake, 2024; Granikov dkk., 2020). Key documents were selected from reputable databases such as PubMed, Scopus, and the Consensus research repository, focusing on topics related to the historical evolution of epidemiology, methodological innovations, and global health contexts. These materials provide a comprehensive foundation for understanding both the theoretical and practical dimensions of the discipline (Jimenez dkk., 2024).

The data collection process followed systematic literature tracing and document analysis procedures. Literature searches were conducted using defined keywords such as "evolution of epidemiology," "epistemology of health research," and "global health frameworks." The search results were then filtered according to inclusion criteria: (1) publications in English between 2014–2025, (2) sources addressing theoretical, methodological, or historical aspects of epidemiology, and (3) peer-reviewed or institutionally validated materials. Exclusion criteria included opinion papers without empirical or theoretical grounding and non-academic web content. The selected literature was then organized based on thematic relevance and methodological robustness (Fife & Gossner, 2024; Togia & Malliari, 2017).

Data analysis in this study utilized qualitative content analysis guided by the principles of thematic synthesis and inductive reasoning. The process began with data identification and reduction, where each document was reviewed to extract relevant themes and key concepts. Subsequently, data were organized into thematic categories reflecting the major phases of epidemiological evolution—historical foundations, theoretical reformulations, methodological innovations, and ethical implications (Kalpokaite & Radivojevic, 2018; Vila-Henninger dkk., 2022). During the categorization stage, relationships among concepts were identified to construct a theoretical model illustrating the trajectory of epidemiological thought. Finally, the inductive conclusion process integrated these categories into a coherent narrative that aligns with the study's objective of elucidating conceptual evolution.

To ensure the validity and credibility of findings, the study implemented several validation strategies. Triangulation of sources was conducted by cross-referencing concepts and frameworks across multiple publications from diverse disciplines, such as public health, sociology, and medical anthropology (Bingham, 2023). Additionally, conceptual peer review was applied by comparing theoretical interpretations from various scholars to assess the consistency and reliability of analytical outcomes (Doyle dkk., 2019). The inclusion of both classical and contemporary references supports the confirmability of the research conclusions, ensuring that interpretations are grounded in a balanced and well-validated corpus of evidence (Belotto, 2018).

Overall, this qualitative-descriptive method offers a systematic and integrative framework for examining the evolution of epidemiology as a dynamic field of knowledge. By combining rigorous literature analysis with inductive theoretical reasoning, the study is able to generate insights that are both conceptually deep and practically relevant. The chosen approach not only highlights how epidemiological concepts have adapted to global health challenges but also demonstrates how qualitative inquiry can illuminate the epistemological foundations of a scientific discipline. Thus, this methodological framework ensures that the findings are both theoretically robust and contextually grounded, aligning directly with the article's objective of mapping the theoretical evolution of modern epidemiology in global health research.

RESULTS

The theoretical study on the evolution of modern epidemiology within global health research reveals a dynamic shift from traditional biomedical dominance toward a multidimensional, socially embedded, and technology-driven science. The findings of this literature-based analysis indicate that epidemiology is undergoing a profound epistemological and methodological transformation to respond to complex, transnational health challenges. These findings are organized into five major themes that reflect contemporary developments and the changing character of epidemiological thought and practice (Krieger, 2024; Taheri & Taheri, 2023).

1. Dominance and Transformation of Epidemiological Theory

The first key finding highlights the persistence of biomedical and behavioral models as dominant paradigms in global epidemiology, though a growing body of work emphasizes the emergence of social epidemiology as a critical corrective to biomedical reductionism. (Krieger, 2024) argues that while traditional epidemiology focuses on individual-level determinants and biological causation, new frameworks integrate social, political, and ecological factors that shape disease distribution. However, the lack of theoretical training in disease distribution remains a challenge globally, resulting in underdeveloped conceptual tools for addressing health inequities. Compared with earlier epidemiological models, this shift signifies a transition from pathogen-centered analysis to systems-level frameworks that

acknowledge structural determinants of health (Holst, 2020).

2. Methodological Innovations and Technological Integration

A significant methodological innovation observed is the integration of big data, machine learning, and genetic epidemiology, which enhances predictive precision and the scope of disease surveillance (Muonde dkk., 2024; Taheri & Taheri, 2023; Zhao dkk., 2024). The adoption of digital epidemiology—the use of non-traditional data sources such as mobility tracking and social media—has revolutionized real-time public health monitoring (Tarkoma dkk., 2020). However, these advances introduce ethical challenges concerning data privacy, ownership, and algorithmic bias. The comparative analysis with earlier epidemiological methods reveals a clear divergence from manual data collection and inferential statistics toward automated, computationally enriched analyses capable of handling multi-layered datasets at unprecedented scales.

3. Emergence of Precision Epidemiology

The concept of precision epidemiology has emerged as a transformative paradigm that parallels developments in precision medicine. By leveraging multi-dimensional data—including genomics, behavioral analytics, and environmental mapping—this approach aims to design personalized and population-specific interventions (Estill, 2023). Despite its potential to increase efficiency and effectiveness, the findings reveal that standardized frameworks for implementing precision epidemiology remain underdeveloped. The need for cross-sectoral collaboration between data scientists, clinicians, and policymakers is emphasized as a crucial factor in operationalizing precision epidemiology within health systems.

4. Social Epidemiology and Global Health Equity

The results further demonstrate a growing convergence between epidemiology and social justice frameworks, emphasizing equity and the social determinants of health. Recent global health research underscores that effective disease control cannot be separated from the social contexts of inequality, migration, and environmental degradation (Aljohani dkk., 2024; Holst, 2020). This new paradigm aligns epidemiological practice with human rights–based approaches, advocating for policies that transcend biomedical interventions to include social protection, environmental justice, and equitable access to healthcare (De Cock, 2025; Krieger, 2024). The comparative analysis shows that while traditional epidemiology treated social factors as confounding variables, modern epidemiology positions them as central explanatory constructs within health systems research.

5. Specialized Innovations: Wastewater and Occupational Epidemiology

Two emerging subfields illustrate the practical expansion of modern epidemiological practice. First, wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE) has become a critical tool for community-level surveillance, enabling real-time detection of infectious diseases and antimicrobial resistance patterns (Sims & Kasprzyk-Hordern, 2020). However, concerns over privacy, data representation, and equity remain central to WBE's ethical framework (R dkk., 2025). Second, occupational epidemiology is gaining prominence as an instrument for advancing global public health equity, particularly in addressing labor-related risks under globalization (Kriebel, 2023). Both subfields highlight the expansion of epidemiology into previously underexplored domains that bridge environmental monitoring, social determinants, and ethical governance.

Table 1. Major Trends in Modern Epidemiology

Major Trend	Global Health Implications	Key References
Dominance of Biomedical Theory	Limited attention to social determinants	(Holst, 2020; Krieger, 2024)
Integration of Big Data and AI	Accelerated prediction and disease response	(Muonde dkk., 2024; Taheri & Taheri, 2023; Tarkoma dkk., 2020; Zhao dkk., 2024)
Precision Epidemiology	Personalized and population-specific interventions	(Estill, 2023; Taheri & Taheri, 2023)

Social Epidemiology and Health Equity	Focus on justice, migration, and cross-sector policy	(Aljohani dkk., 2024; De Cock, 2025; Holst, 2020; Krieger, 2024)
Wastewater & Occupational Epidemiology	Real-time surveillance and equitable labor health	(Kriebel, 2023; R dkk., 2025; Sims & Kasprzyk-Hordern, 2020)

Overall, the findings affirm that modern epidemiology is no longer confined to disease surveillance or statistical modeling; it now operates as a transdisciplinary science integrating data technologies, social justice, and policy relevance. The comparative review of historical and contemporary frameworks indicates a decisive move from reductionist biomedical models toward holistic, ethical, and inclusive frameworks. However, gaps remain in the standardization of digital epidemiology, equitable data governance, and theoretical integration between social and computational paradigms. The results thus provide a solid foundation for the subsequent discussion on the implications of these trends for the future of global health research.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study highlight the multidimensional evolution of modern epidemiology as both a scientific and social enterprise. This transformation, evident across theory, methodology, and application, illustrates how the field has moved beyond its traditional biomedical roots toward a holistic understanding of population health. The integration of social, technological, and ethical dimensions into epidemiological research reflects an epistemological maturation that bridges public health practice with global health governance (Holst, 2020; Krieger, 2024).

The theoretical transformation of epidemiology underscores a paradigm shift from reductionist frameworks toward structural and intersectional analyses. (Krieger, 2024) emphasizes that epidemiological theory must acknowledge the "embodied truths" of inequality—where health disparities are produced not solely by pathogens but by social hierarchies, power dynamics, and policy failures. This aligns with (Holst, 2020), who critiques the hegemony of biomedical reductionism in global health and advocates for the re-centering of epidemiology around justice and equity. Compared to earlier frameworks that isolated individual risk factors, the contemporary approach situates disease within broader political and ecological systems, marking a profound reorientation in the discipline's purpose and scope.

Technological advancement, particularly through big data analytics, artificial intelligence (AI), and digital epidemiology, represents another critical development in modern epidemiological methods (Taheri & Taheri, 2023; Zhao dkk., 2024). These tools enhance predictive capacity, allowing for real-time detection and modeling of disease outbreaks at both individual and population levels (Tarkoma dkk., 2020). Yet, as (Muonde dkk., 2024) caution, this progress introduces methodological and ethical dilemmas, including algorithmic bias, data inequity, and the potential loss of contextual nuance. The use of AI in epidemiology, for instance, challenges traditional notions of causality by shifting from explanatory to predictive models, demanding new epistemological frameworks for understanding health dynamics in the digital age.

The emergence of precision epidemiology extends this conversation, seeking to merge personalized data with public health strategies (Estill, 2023). It parallels precision medicine in its aim to tailor interventions to genetic, behavioral, and environmental contexts. However, unlike traditional population-level models, precision epidemiology operates through high-resolution data that demand interdisciplinary collaboration and ethical regulation (Taheri & Taheri, 2023). Its promise lies in enhancing intervention efficacy, yet its limitation remains the absence of standardized implementation frameworks across nations—a gap that reflects disparities in digital infrastructure and resource allocation.

Social and ethical perspectives have become central to contemporary epidemiological discourse. Studies by (Aljohani dkk., 2024) and (De Cock, 2025) argue that the integration of social epidemiology and human rights principles is essential to address inequities in global health. These frameworks emphasize collective responsibility and transnational solidarity, repositioning epidemiology as an instrument of global justice rather than merely disease

surveillance. (Krieger, 2024) theory of embodiment further expands this view, proposing that biological outcomes are not only individual phenomena but reflections of historical and social structures. Thus, epidemiology becomes both a diagnostic and moral science—concerned with identifying injustice as a determinant of disease.

The emergence of wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE) and occupational epidemiology demonstrates the field's expanding boundaries. WBE, as described by (Sims & Kasprzyk-Hordern, 2020), offers a revolutionary method for tracking infectious disease and chemical exposure through environmental sampling, providing near real-time community health insights. However, as (R dkk., 2025) highlight, its ethical challenges—particularly regarding consent, privacy, and equity—demand the development of global governance standards to prevent data misuse. Meanwhile, (Kriebel, 2023) underscores occupational epidemiology's role in addressing labor-related health disparities within global production systems, illustrating how modern epidemiology bridges biological surveillance and socioeconomic advocacy.

Despite these advances, the field faces persistent limitations. First, there is a lack of integrative theoretical frameworks capable of unifying biomedical, technological, and social perspectives. Second, the rapid adoption of digital epidemiology has outpaced ethical and legal regulation, raising concerns about data sovereignty and accountability. Third, disparities in research capacity between high- and low-income nations threaten the global applicability of emerging models. These limitations echo the concerns raised by (Holst, 2020) and (Krieger, 2024), who both warn that epidemiology risks reinforcing global inequities if it remains detached from structural reform.

The implications of this theoretical and methodological evolution are profound. By embracing interdisciplinarity, modern epidemiology has expanded its analytical reach—allowing for more comprehensive models of disease causation that encompass the social, environmental, and technological determinants of health (Zhao dkk., 2024). This integration enhances predictive precision and policy relevance, enabling more responsive and ethical global health strategies. Moreover, the recognition of equity and justice as central pillars transforms epidemiology from a purely diagnostic tool into a transformative framework for health governance. However, sustaining this progress requires critical reflection on the political economy of health knowledge—ensuring that innovation serves collective well-being rather than perpetuating digital divides or epistemic inequities.

Future research should focus on developing hybrid theoretical frameworks that integrate digital epidemiology with social theory, balancing technological innovation with ethical reflexivity. Additionally, strengthening international cooperation in data governance, capacity building, and equitable access to epidemiological tools is essential to ensure that the benefits of modern epidemiology are distributed globally. Only through such integration can the discipline fully realize its potential as both a scientific and moral foundation for sustainable global health.

CONCLUSION

This qualitative study concludes that the evolution of modern epidemiology represents a profound paradigmatic shift from traditional biomedical reductionism toward a multidimensional and justice-oriented science that integrates social, technological, and ethical perspectives. The analysis of the literature reveals that while big data, artificial intelligence, and precision epidemiology have expanded methodological sophistication and predictive capability, the inclusion of social epidemiology and equity-based frameworks has redefined the discipline's moral and theoretical foundations (Holst, 2020; Krieger, 2024). These findings contribute to a deeper understanding of epidemiology as both an analytical and ethical enterprise—one that explains disease not merely through biological causation but through the interplay of social structures, political economies, and environmental systems. The study enhances theoretical discourse by bridging technological innovation with human-centered frameworks, offering a comprehensive model for future global health research. Socially and culturally, this evolution reinforces the necessity of inclusivity and cross-sector collaboration to ensure equitable health outcomes. Nonetheless, the research acknowledges limitations in the integration of diverse epistemologies and the uneven global accessibility of digital epidemiological tools. Future inquiry should therefore pursue the development of hybrid frameworks that reconcile computational precision with contextual sensitivity,

ensuring that the continued evolution of epidemiology remains grounded in ethical accountability and global solidarity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abraham, D., & P, P. (2024). A Methodological Framework for Descriptive Phenomenological Research. Western Journal of Nursing Research, 47, 125–134. https://doi.org/10.1177/01939459241308071

Ahlbom, A. (2021). Modern Epidemiology, 4th edition. European Journal of Epidemiology, 36, 767–768. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10654-021-00778-w

Aljohani, Y., Alzahrani, S., Alsharyoufi, M., Al-Omari, A., Almrwani, S., Alrashidi, R., Algohny, A., & Al-Tawri, N. (2024). A comprehensive review of emerging paradigms in global health research. Journal of Ecohumanism. https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v3i8.4986

Atiim, G., & Elliott, S. (2016). The Global Epidemiologic Transition. Health Education & Behavior, 43, 37S-55S. https://doi.org/10.1177/1090198115606918

Bandaranayake, P. (2024). Application of Grounded Theory Methodology in Library and Information Science Research: An Overview. Sri Lanka Library Review. https://doi.org/10.4038/sllr.v38i2.70

Bannister-Tyrrell, M., & Meiqari, L. (2020). Qualitative research in epidemiology: Theoretical and methodological perspectives. Annals of Epidemiology. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annepidem.2020.07.008

Belotto, M. (2018). Data Analysis Methods for Qualitative Research: Managing the Challenges of Coding, Interrater Reliability, and Thematic Analysis. The Qualitative Report. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2018.3492

Bingham, A. (2023). From Data Management to Actionable Findings: A Five-Phase Process of Qualitative Data Analysis. International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 22. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231183620

Bragazzi, N., & Lehr, T. (2024). Big Epidemiology: The Birth, Life, Death, and Resurgence of Diseases on a Global Timescale. Epidemiologia, 5, 669–691. https://doi.org/10.3390/epidemiologia5040047

Briko, N. (2018). Theoretical Generalizations in Epidemiology: From History to the Present. Epidemiology and Vaccine Prevention. https://doi.org/10.31631/2073-3046-2018-17-5-5-16

Briko, N., & Shkarin, V. (2021). Modern view of the evolution of the concept of “epidemiology”: Analytical overview. Annals of the Russian Academy of Medical Sciences. https://doi.org/10.15690/vramn1500

Corteel, M. (2025). Shaping epidemic dynamics: An historical epistemology study of the SIR model. History of the Human Sciences. https://doi.org/10.1177/09526951251317104

De Cock, K. (2025). Global health’s evolution and search for identity. Emerging Infectious Diseases, 31, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.3201/eid3101.241026

Doyle, L., Mccabe, C., Keogh, B., Brady, A., & McCann, M. (2019). An overview of the qualitative descriptive design within nursing research. Journal of Research in Nursing, 25, 443–455. https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987119880234

Estill, J. (2023). Pediatrics in the era of precision medicine and precision epidemiology. Pediatric Discovery, 1. https://doi.org/10.1002/pdi3.28

Fife, S., & Gossner, J. (2024). Deductive Qualitative Analysis: Evaluating, Expanding, and Refining Theory. International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 23. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069241244856

Granikov, V., Hong, Q., Crist, E., & Pluye, P. (2020). Mixed methods research in library and information science: A methodological review. Library & Information Science Research. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2020.101003

Holst, J. (2020). Global health – emergence, hegemonic trends and biomedical reductionism. Globalization and Health, 16. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-020-00573-4

Jimenez, S., Berbegal-Mirabent, J., & De La Torre, R. (2024). How do university libraries contribute to the research process? The Journal of Academic Librarianship. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2024.102930

Kalpokaite, N., & Radivojevic, I. (2018). Demystifying qualitative data analysis for novice qualitative researchers. The Qualitative Report. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2019.4120

Kriebel, D. (2023). Advancing global public health with occupational epidemiology. Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 80, 485–488. https://doi.org/10.1136/oemed-2023-108939

Krieger, N. (2024). Theorizing epidemiology, the stories bodies tell, and embodied truths: A status update on contending 21st c CE epidemiological theories of disease distribution. International Journal of Social Determinants of Health and Health Services, 54, 331–342. https://doi.org/10.1177/27551938241269188

Muonde, M., Olorunsogo, T., Ogugua, J., Maduka, C., & Omotayo, O. (2024). Epidemiological statistical methods: A comparative review of their implementation in public health studies in the USA and Africa. World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews. https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2024.21.1.0178

Pratt, M. (2025). On the Evolution of Qualitative Methods in Organizational Research. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-111722-032953

R, B., N, K., Lp, T., Jt, C., Wp, H., Mt, B., & Tl, C. (2025). Advancing health equity in wastewater-based epidemiology: A global critical review and conceptual framework. SSM - Population Health, 30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmph.2025.101786

Reubi, D. (2017). A genealogy of epidemiological reason: Saving lives, social surveys and global population. BioSocieties, 13, 81–102. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41292-017-0055-2

Reubi, D. (2020). Epidemiological imaginaries of the social: Epidemiologists and pathologies of modernization in postcolonial Africa. Medical Anthropology Quarterly. https://doi.org/10.1111/maq.12609

Santosa, A., Wall, S., Fottrell, E., Högberg, U., & Byass, P. (2014). The development and experience of epidemiological transition theory over four decades: A systematic review. Global Health Action, 7. https://doi.org/10.3402/gha.v7.23574

Shrestha, S., Bauer, C., Hendricks, B., & Stopka, T. (2020). Spatial epidemiology: An empirical framework for syndemics research. Social Science & Medicine. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113352

Sims, N., & Kasprzyk-Hordern, B. (2020). Future perspectives of wastewater-based epidemiology: Monitoring infectious disease spread and resistance at the community level. Environment International, 139, 105689. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2020.105689

Taheri, S., & Taheri, B. (2023). Advancements in epidemiological methods: A comprehensive review of contemporary approaches. Health Nexus. https://doi.org/10.61838/kman.hn.1.3.9

Tarkoma, S., Alghnam, S., & Howell, M. (2020). Fighting pandemics with digital epidemiology. EClinicalMedicine, 26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100512

Togia, A., & Malliari, A. (2017). Research Methods in Library and Information Science. https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.68749

Valier, H. (2025). Lessons from the political history of epidemiology for divisive times. AMA Journal of Ethics, 27(1), E58–E63. https://doi.org/10.1001/amajethics.2025.58

Vila-Henninger, L., Dupuy, C., Van Ingelgom, V., Caprioli, M., Teuber, F., Pennetreau, D., Bussi, M., & Gall, C. (2022). Abductive Coding: Theory Building and Qualitative (Re)Analysis. Sociological Methods & Research, 53, 968–1001. https://doi.org/10.1177/00491241211067508

Zhao, A., Li, S., Cao, Z., Hu, P., Wang, J., Xiang, Y., Xie, D., & Lu, X. (2024). AI for science: Predicting infectious diseases. Journal of Safety Science and Resilience. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnlssr.2024.02.002