INOSR Scientific Research 12(3):69-74, 2025. **ISSN: 2705-1706**
©INOSR PUBLICATIONS **INOSRSR12300000**
International Network Organization for Scientific Research
https://doi.org/10.59298/INOSRSR/2025/1236974

The Role of Public Policy in Engineering Health Innovations

Ngugi Mwaura J.

School of Natural and Applied Sciences Kampala International University Uganda

ABSTRACT

Health innovations, from breakthrough technologies to policy-driven systems reforms, play a pivotal role in advancing global health outcomes. This paper examines the critical intersection between public policy and health innovation, emphasizing how policies act as both enablers and regulators of change within health systems. By analyzing historical developments, stakeholder engagement, regulatory frameworks, and technology transfer mechanisms, the study highlights the foundational role of governance in transforming scientific and technological discoveries into scalable, impactful health solutions. Case studies from low- and middle-income countries, alongside global efforts like the WHO Global Strategy and the African Epidemic Preparedness Initiative, underscore the need for inclusive, sustainable, and collaborative policy approaches. The paper concludes with recommendations for aligning future public policy with adaptive, equity-driven innovation systems to respond effectively to emerging global health challenges.

Keywords: Health Innovation, Public Policy, Health Systems Governance, Technology Transfer, Regulatory Frameworks, Global Health, Health Equity.

INTRODUCTION

Since the late 19th century, the focus on engineering healthy solutions has stemmed from a disruptive idea: using science and technology as tools for health improvements. Research and funding efforts were designed to bolster social and behavioral engineering in public health. A critical question for public policy is whether the benefits from this technology qualify it as innovation. Despite a broader integration of health and policy engineering, examples of public health innovations not based on technology have increased. Various health science stakeholders are being questioned about the role of public policies in developing health innovations. Given the neglect of public policy's role in health engineering and instances of ineffective quick innovations, there is a need to clarify how public policies can effectively engineer health innovations now and in the future. Interaction with other actors in these fields fosters knowledge and innovative solutions to existing problems. Collaborative transformations among policy communities can influence and shape the public policy agenda. The assembly of communities working towards fundamental changes leads to collective innovations that may seem elusive. Supported by formal rules and structures, innovations also rely on the contribution of diverse participants within communities. This study outlines the governance of public policy efforts and the interconnections between public policies and social science-driven health innovations [1, 2].

Historical Context of Health Innovations

Over the past century, many health innovations have emerged, primarily through public entities. However, methods for validating and implementing these innovations have lagged behind. There is a lack of research on how to mobilize institutions for the successful adoption of validated health innovations, particularly from middle- and low-income countries, which receive minimal support for scaling up. Ongoing discussions focus on two areas: technology transfer, adaptation, and scale-up, and more practical political interventions like new health policies. To aid institutions in prioritizing investments in health innovations, this article reviews mechanisms for public policy actors to enable large-scale implementation of validated innovations. The focus will be on health innovations concerning health systems, which include protocols, service delivery models, technologies, data infrastructure, pharmaceuticals, and health information systems. Innovations at the "development stage" involve new products or services impacting

health systems, such as drugs, vaccines, diagnostic tests, medical devices, and service delivery technologies. Meanwhile, "policy stage" innovations encompass policies and regulations affecting health systems, which include subsidies for drugs, new health programs, and large-scale vaccination campaigns. This typology emphasizes the critical role of public policy actors, especially in low- and middle-income nations. Due to the distinct endeavors within each category and the porous boundaries between health systems and public policy, different governance forms are necessary to characterize the arrangements enabling health innovation implementation. Each of the four governance categories will be discussed in detail in the subsequent sections [3, 4].

Public Policy Frameworks

Various policy frameworks aim to address health innovations. Key challenges must be tackled before investments in health innovation can become a priority in developing countries. These include securing financial investments from government and private sectors, establishing user-centric, affordable health innovations, fostering a research ecosystem to accelerate disruptive innovation, and enhancing the adoption of health innovations. Over two decades ago, nations committed to the Millennium Development Goals, which saw mixed progress towards global health equity, neglecting critical health facets essential for human development. Consequently, the United Nations launched the "Global Strategy for Women's, Children's and Adolescents' Health" in 2016 to confront these health issues holistically. Non-communicable diseases pose a significant threat to development and contribute heavily to global disease burdens and economic losses. Studies have called for a sustainable, system-based strategy for an innovative food policy, complemented by an ecosystem approach to foster food system innovations. Co-design and negotiation in policy-making can enhance local ownership and ensure coherence and sustainability. Such frameworks can also serve as effective negotiation tools, enhancing foresight to anticipate policy challenges and enable coordinated responses at multiple levels [5, 6].

Stakeholders in Health Innovation

Public health fosters collaborations across academia, health services, industries, and government to enhance health and wellbeing. The COVID-19 pandemic showed that coordinated responses need a holistic strategy for designing and distributing preventive products and medical countermeasures. Traditional methods can fall short, while adaptive partnerships that utilize various ecosystem actors can swiftly create effective plans. Preventive products that allow for continuous adaptation can be modified to address viral mutations without compromising biosecurity. Preparedness planning and governance help ensure equitable access to these products. Competing products must coexist, requiring adaptable systems for localized manufacturing. To meet health goals amidst competition, self-organized collaborations must modularize the coexistence of competing health product ecosystems. Engaging diverse stakeholders—including communities, innovators, and policymakers—can build responsive health systems where innovative approaches work cohesively. Understanding and forging health-promoting environments demand unity rather than diverging goals. Partnerships that include social innovators and researchers are crucial for leveraging expertise and advancing health. Global scientists have mobilized to design and develop health-promoting infrastructure effectively [7, 8].

Regulatory Environment

Public policy is essential for the health innovation system. It can help to implement, commercialize, and diffuse health innovations. Public policy can stimulate the emergence of new health innovations, and promote their adoption in the system as well. Such policies include but are not limited to regulations, guidelines, and recommendations that are formulated and implemented by public organizations. Public policy can regulate the activities of clinics, hospitals, and insurers. It can also help develop binding guidelines and recommendations. However, public organizations may lack the authority to directly steer the decisions of these actors vis-à-vis new health interventions. Many countries have comprehensive regulatory frameworks for determining how health innovations can be implemented. Such frameworks are often used by public organizations to regulate health innovation adoption. Countries may also develop explicit health guidelines to steer the implementation of innovations. However, in addition to regulations and guidelines, there are many other types of public policies that have not been thoroughly studied for their role in the adoption of innovations by the health system. For example, many countries have, or should have, guidelines or recommendations developed by the state that indicate best practices. The absence of such guidance may hamper the adoption of innovations. Many policies that are relevant to the adoption of innovations take the form of recommendations. Recommendations and guidelines are different in terms of levels of authority and obligation. Guidelines and recommendations may play similar roles in steering health innovation adoption. When deciding on the adoption of a new treatment, doctors may ask "What are the guidelines?" and "What are the recommendations?" [9, 10].

Funding and Investment

Research into health innovation typically requires a long-term investment strategy, systematically analyzing a wide range of options. In this comprehensive literature review, aside from public policies, major companies' license agreements and investment plans are analyzed. Seeking the right balance between long-term investment and short-term but quick returns on investments is difficult, also for the big companies, partly because approving or denying investment opportunities is often done at a high level. In the application of health innovations, the workflow usually starts with interests or requirements being put aside. During a more detailed examination, a formulation can take shape, either in-house, or often with an external consultancy. Then comes the search for innovations, either from in-house, but also from smaller companies. The process continues with investments in new purchasing equipment, consultation for installing it, etc.; training of personnel; and the operational phase of using it. Meanwhile, second thoughts might arise regarding risks and security, which is usual business, but for an innovation planner, it can hamper approval of the plan. A worse-case scenario is the thought that maybe the entire budget of 50 million Euros was better dumped on a good VR platform instead. But even with a positive outcome of the analysis, research and development (R&D) and licensing opportunities have a long and bumpy route ahead before reaching the public end-users, the doctors and patients. Health-related innovations, like all innovations, come in various scales. By scale here is meant from micro, for example a new bio-chip for an earlier detection of tuberculosis, TBC; to macro, WHO worldwide policies in detecting and treating epidemics or pandemics. Below will be discussed the R&D of a project using a small innovation that is already on the borderline of failure in a large project with deep pockets, and an application of micro model which found immediately international attention [11, 12].

Impact of Policy on Innovation

Extensive research has been conducted on innovation, state innovation capacity, public policy, and patent granting across various fields; however, there is a lack of research specifically focused on public health policy and its quality in relation to state innovation capacity and patent granting. Key concepts in this study stem from previous investigations into healthcare safety and modern health innovations. To explore the relationship between public health policy quality and state innovation capacity, it is crucial to define public health policy within this research context, particularly in middle- and low-income countries facing sudden health crises. The FKIR environment is where public health policies are implemented, aiming to ensure public health safety. The FNQ policy emerged in response to the pandemic, and adjustments to policies following initial implementations are expected. This research zeroes in on public policies that directly influence state innovation. A systematic analysis of how such policies have affected innovations in health and related fields during the pandemic will be provided, highlighting those policies that notably spurred innovations. Policies focused solely on public health goals, such as FNQ's preparation phase, can also promote innovation. However, policies aimed at directly fostering public health innovations often did not integrate well into the policy network. The public health policies addressed can be grouped into three key categories based on generalizations from the data: public health surveillance systems, rules for drug research and development regarding regulatory exemptions and review adjustments, and the protection and monetization of public health innovations. Notably, many innovations originate from research institutions and government entities [13, 14].

Technology Transfer and Commercialization

A wealth of research and engineering expertise exists to address health challenges. Transforming this research to health innovation requires both scientific and engineering innovation in addition to effective identification of market need, regulatory and reimbursement pathway, patenting and working with TTOs, industry partners, venture capital, and investors. Establishing public-private partnerships is of increasing importance as universities tackle translational health challenges that extend beyond academic missions and funding capabilities. A rapid approach to establishing TTO is provided here. In every university, a TTO and/or SRO likely exists to facilitate market translation through patent, licensing, and new company formation. Contentious negotiations and misunderstandings occur, especially at HRSA-supported ACTs that are often initiated by early stage faculty or students new to university intellectual property (IP) policies. Since discussions involve many constituencies, enterprises rampingly in scope, potentially inequitable partnering arrangements, and crowdfunded IP, it is critical upfront to establish a trustworthy relationship. TTO SIG issues a letter to the provost of a new university requesting an executive discussion of clear, adopted guidelines for IP, revenue and relationship sharing, and resource allocations to avoid misunderstandings and distrust [15, 16].

Global Perspectives on Health Innovation Policy

The public policy landscape is varied. Education for the engineers of health innovations across national boundaries means addressing public policy priorities differently, but the global perspective remains

uniform. The Global Observatory for Medical Devices Initiative of WHO and the more recent African Epidemic Preparedness Initiative of the African Union are steps in the right direction, but much remains to be done to mitigate the public health innovation debt. Since at least the SARS outbreak in 2003, a systematic approach to innovation in public health has been put forth, yet scientific outcomes are lagging behind regulatory ones in other health fields like infectious diseases. The Covid-19 pandemic is now giving rise to the Crans Montana Forum, which could be a good place to accelerate the responses to the recommendations made about global policy architecture for public health innovation: "moving from the right to the knowledge to the right to be integrated" to reflect on. In a dynamic of growing interdependencies within a globalized world, increasing mega-challenges at the interface of the social-natural divides trim power into three "harmonizing" reflective dimensions: "be-in-wild"; and "be-ecological" adaptable to tinkering with tailored sensor networks, "be-co-operative" for re-coupling disparate governing stakeholders in sustainable networks, and "be-resilient or self-reliant" using state threshold responses. Cultural ecological endemic health innovation applied to these perspectives has the potential to arouse the co-evolving "reflexiveness" and "form-finding" capacities of local systems in health innovation for levelling the public health field and leaving no one behind. This paper uses these perspectives to articulate a realistic ecotone thematic for the upcoming Global Forum on Health Innovation [17-20].

Future Directions in Public Policy

The engineering and technology sector has had to respond quickly and adaptively to the covid-19 pandemic. To assist in this rapid response, governments turned to public policy solutions provide an overview of preventive measures adopted by countries, including public policy initiatives, legislations, regulations, funding approaches, and international cooperation, to prevent the spread of the virus and minimize its impacts on the economy. The roles of Technologies and Engineering in Public Policy Development and Decision-Making Assisting the drafting of legislation and regulations. Engineers are expected to play a greater role in developing alternatives and providing fuller INFO to accompany a public policy legislation or regulation. In addition, engineers with robust systems thinking and risk analysis backgrounds can play a role in "regulatory impact assessments" required and developed legislations for implementation. Help government agencies obtain funding for aviation safety and public health. Engineering organizations and experts have been enlisted to help regulatory agencies in determining regulations and in selecting projects. In addition, outside experts, including engineers, are often enlisted to help evaluate proposals for funding. Some engineers have gone further to help develop state budgets to support regulatory functions. Engage, improve upon, and defend regulations developed by a public agency. Teams of engineers, scientists, and industry representatives have been engaged to understand fund regulations and their implications, to improve upon recommendations, and/or express reservations or objections [21-24].

CONCLUSION

Public policy plays a central role in engineering health innovations that address pressing health challenges across the globe. From the historical progression of public health initiatives to modern collaborations catalyzed by pandemics and digital health, policies shape how innovations are conceived, financed, regulated, and adopted. Effective policy frameworks must be inclusive, flexible, and forward-thinking, supporting not only technological advances but also systems-level transformations. The integration of social, behavioral, and engineering perspectives ensures that innovations are not only scientifically sound but also socially relevant and scalable. Moving forward, interdisciplinary and international cooperation will be essential to build resilient innovation ecosystems. By reinforcing governance structures, investing in research and development, and encouraging participatory stakeholder models, public policy can transform fragmented innovation landscapes into cohesive and responsive health systems—especially in under-resourced settings. A paradigm that views policy as both infrastructure and catalyst for innovation is necessary to realize equitable and sustainable global health outcomes.

REFERENCES

1. Imrie F, Davis R, van der Schaar M. Multiple stakeholders drive diverse interpretability requirements for machine learning in healthcare. Nature Machine Intelligence. 2023 Aug;5(8):824-9.
2. Alzubaidi L, Al-Sabaawi A, Bai J, Dukhan A, Alkenani AH, Al-Asadi A, Alwzwazy HA, Manoufali M, Fadhel MA, Albahri AS, Moreira C. Towards Risk-Free Trustworthy Artificial Intelligence: Significance and Requirements. International Journal of Intelligent Systems. 2023;2023(1):4459198. wiley.com

3. Flessa S, Huebner C. Innovations in health care—a conceptual framework. International journal of environmental research and public health. 2021 Sep 24;18(19):10026. mdpi.com
4. Niang M, Dupéré S, Alami H, Gagnon MP. Why is repositioning public health innovation towards a social paradigm necessary? A reflection on the field of public health through the examples of Ebola and Covid-19. Globalization and health. 2021 Dec;17:1-1.
5. Giuffrè M, Shung DL. Harnessing the power of synthetic data in healthcare: innovation, application, and privacy. NPJ digital medicine. 2023 Oct 9;6(1):186.
6. Paul-Chima UO, Ugwu CN, Alum EU. Integrated approaches in nutraceutical delivery systems: optimizing ADME dynamics for enhanced therapeutic potency and clinical impact. RPS Pharmacy and Pharmacology Reports. 2024 Oct;3(4):rqae024.
7. Larrue P. The design and implementation of mission-oriented innovation policies. OECD science, technology and industry policy papers. 2021 Feb 5.
8. Rhule EL, Allotey PA. Researching social innovation: is the tail wagging the dog?. Infectious diseases of poverty. 2020 Feb 1;9(01):77-81.
9. Ji X, Gao L, Liu H, He S, Zhu B, Chow C, Chen J, Lu Z, Li L. Does public health policy quality foster state innovation capacity? Evidence from a global panel data. Frontiers in Public Health. 2022 Nov 10;10:952842.
10. Zheng X, Cai Y. Transforming innovation systems into innovation ecosystems: The role of public policy. Sustainability. 2022 Jun 20;14(12):7520.
11. Janssen MJ, Torrens J, Wesseling JH, Wanzenböck I. The promises and premises of mission-oriented innovation policy—A reflection and ways forward. Science and public policy. 2021 Jun 1;48(3):438-44. oup.com
12. 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.
13. Bristol-Alagbariya B, Ayanponle OL, Ogedengbe DE. Leadership development and talent management in constrained resource settings: A strategic HR perspective. Comprehensive Research and Reviews Journal. 2024;2(02):013-22. crrjournals.com
14. Tomoh BO, Soyege OS, Nwokedi CN, Mustapha AY, Mbata AO, Balogun OD, Iguma DR. Innovative Programs for Community Health: A Model for Addressing Healthcare Needs Through Collaborative Relationships. Community health. 2024 Nov;42:17. allmultidisciplinaryjournal.com
15. Yen WT, Liu LY, Won E, Testriono. The imperative of state capacity in public health crisis: Asia's early COVID-19 policy responses. Governance. 2022 Jul;35(3):777-98.
16. Dzikuć M, Gorączkowska J, Piwowar A, Dzikuć M, Smoleński R, Kułyk P. The analysis of the innovative potential of the energy sector and low-carbon development: A case study for Poland. Energy Strategy Reviews. 2021 Nov 1;38:100769. sciencedirect.com
17. Abdul S, Adeghe EP, Adegoke BO, Adegoke AA, Udedeh EH. Public-private partnerships in health sector innovation: Lessons from around the world. Magna Scientia Advanced Biology and Pharmacy. 2024;12(1):045-59. researchgate.net
18. 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.
19. Fabre A, Straub S. The impact of public–private partnerships (PPPs) in infrastructure, health, and education. Journal of Economic Literature. 2023;61(2):655-715.
20. Göttgens I, Oertelt-Prigione S. The application of human-centered design approaches in health research and innovation: a narrative review of current practices. JMIR mHealth and uHealth. 2021 Dec 6;9(12):e28102.
21. Sriharan A, Hertelendy AJ, Banaszak-Holl J, Fleig-Palmer MM, Mitchell C, Nigam A, Gutberg J, Rapp DJ, Singer SJ. Public health and health sector crisis leadership during pandemics: a review of the medical and business literature. Medical Care Research and Review. 2022 Aug;79(4):475-86. sagepub.com
22. Edyedu I, Ugwu OP, Ugwu CN, Alum EU, Eze VH, Basajja M, Ugwu JN, Ogenyi FC, Ejemot-Nwadiaro RI, Okon MB, Egba SI. The role of pharmacological interventions in managing urological complications during pregnancy and childbirth: A review. Medicine. 2025 Feb 14;104(7):e41381.

23. Altiparmakis A, Bojar A, Brouard S, Foucault M, Kriesi H, Nadeau R. Pandemic politics: policy evaluations of government responses to COVID-19. West European Politics. 2021 Sep 19;44(5-6):1159-79. tandfonline.com
24. Béland D, Dinan S, Rocco P, Waddan A. Social policy responses to COVID-19 in Canada and the United States: Explaining policy variations between two liberal welfare state regimes. Social Policy & Administration. 2021 Mar;55(2):280-94. marquette.edu

CITE AS: Ngugi Mwaura J. (2025). The Role of Public Policy in Engineering Health Innovations. INOSR Scientific Research 12(3):69-74. https://doi.org/10.59298/INOSRSR/2025/1236974