International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science

e-ISSN: 2544-9435

Scholarly Publisher
RS Global Sp. z O.O.
ISNI: 0000 0004 8495 2390

Dolna 17, Warsaw,
Poland 00-773
+48 226 0 227 03
editorial_office@rsglobal.pl

ARTICLE TITLE	SOCIO-TECHNICAL INNOVATIONS IN PUBLIC HEALTH: A REVIEW OF DIGITAL INTERVENTIONS ENHANCING HEALTH OUTCOMES IN VULNERABLE COMMUNITIES
ARTICLE INFO	Ayumi Nonumora, Aneta Rasińska, Paulina Bala, Justyna Matusik, Piotr Rzyczniok, Mateusz Kopczyński, Justyna Jachimczak. (2025) Socio-Technical Innovations in Public Health: A Review of Digital Interventions Enhancing Health Outcomes in Vulnerable Communities. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science*. 3(47). doi: 10.31435/ijitss.3(47).2025.3514
DOI	https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.3(47).2025.3514
RECEIVED	24 June 2025
ACCEPTED	04 August 2025
PUBLISHED	06 August 2025
LICENSE	The article is licensed under a **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.**

SOCIO-TECHNICAL INNOVATIONS IN PUBLIC HEALTH: A REVIEW OF DIGITAL INTERVENTIONS ENHANCING HEALTH OUTCOMES IN VULNERABLE COMMUNITIES

Ayumi Nonumora *(Corresponding Author, Email: ayuminonumora@gmail.com)*
Klinikum Lippe Bad Salzuflen, Heldman Street 45, 32108, Bad Salzuflen, Germany
ORCID ID: 0009-0004-2348-3997

Aneta Rasińska
Municipal Hospital No. 4 in Gliwice Ltd. Zygmunta Starego 20, 44-100, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0007-2872-8000

Paulina Bala
Our Lady of Perpetual Help Hospital in Wołomin, 05-200 Wołomin, ul. Gdyńska 1/3, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0007-0604-8549

Justyna Matusik
Academy of Silesia in Katowice, 40-555 Katowice, ul. Rolna 43, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0009-7907-9690

Piotr Rzyczniok
Private Healthcare Institution ProCordi Ltd., 44-335 Jastrzębie Zdrój, ul. Wyspiańskiego 8, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0004-5899-2345

Mateusz Kopczyński
Municipal Hospital Complex in Częstochowa, Częstochowa 42-200, ul. Mirowska 15, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0009-6592-3061

Justyna Jachimczak
Our Lady of Perpetual Help Hospital in Wołomin, 05-200 Wołomin, ul. Gdyńska 1/3, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0005-7614-9500

ABSTRACT

Introduction and Objective: Digital health interventions are increasingly recognized as vital tools for improving public health outcomes, especially in vulnerable communities facing social and economic challenges. This review examines socio-technical innovations that leverage digital technologies to enhance health equity and access to care.
Review Methods: A comprehensive literature review was conducted using peer-reviewed sources published between 2015 and 2023 from databases including PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science. Studies were selected based on their focus on interdisciplinary approaches combining technology, healthcare, and public health to address disparities in vulnerable populations. Both qualitative and quantitative findings were synthesized through thematic analysis to identify key patterns and challenges.
State of Knowledge: Findings highlight effective digital interventions such as telemedicine, mobile health applications, remote monitoring, and community-based digital platforms that improve access and engagement. Persistent barriers include the digital divide, privacy concerns, socioeconomic factors, and technology acceptance. Interventions employing participatory design and culturally tailored strategies tend to yield more sustainable outcomes.
Conclusion: Socio-technical digital health innovations hold promise for advancing health equity by integrating technological solutions with social and healthcare needs. To optimize impact, future efforts should emphasize equitable design, policy support, and continuous evaluation. This review underlines the importance of interdisciplinary collaboration to build resilient and inclusive public health systems through digital means.

KEYWORDS

Digital Health, Health Equity, Telemedicine, Vulnerable Populations, Socio-Technical Innovation, Public Health

CITATION

Ayumi Nonumora, Aneta Rasińska, Paulina Bala, Justyna Matusik, Piotr Rzyczniok, Mateusz Kopczyński, Justyna Jachimczak. (2025) Socio-Technical Innovations in Public Health: A Review of Digital Interventions Enhancing Health Outcomes in Vulnerable Communities. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science*. 3(47). doi: 10.31435/ijitss.3(47).2025.3514

Introduction

Health inequalities remain a persistent global challenge, particularly among vulnerable communities that experience limited access to healthcare services, disproportionate disease burden, and systemic social disadvantages (Marmot et al., 2020). These communities—such as elderly individuals, people with low socioeconomic status, racial and ethnic minorities, and residents of rural or remote areas—often face intersecting barriers that exacerbate poor health outcomes (Braveman et al., 2018).

In response to these disparities, socio-technical innovations—defined as integrative approaches that combine technological solutions with social systems—have emerged as a promising strategy to improve public health delivery and reduce health inequities (Greenhalgh et al., 2017). The integration of digital tools such as mobile health (mHealth) apps, telemedicine platforms, wearable devices, and AI-powered diagnostics is transforming traditional healthcare models, making them more accessible, scalable, and responsive to the needs of marginalized populations (WHO, 2021; Khanna & Yen, 2022).

These innovations are particularly relevant in the context of global crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic, which highlighted the necessity of remote health interventions and accelerated the adoption of digital health technologies (Smith et al., 2022). However, while digital tools hold considerable promise, their effectiveness and ethical application depend on thoughtful design and equitable implementation—taking into account cultural sensitivities, digital literacy, infrastructure limitations, and user-centered design (Shaw et al., 2018; Parker et al., 2021).

This paper aims to provide a narrative review of current socio-technical innovations in public health, with a specific focus on digital interventions that aim to enhance health outcomes in vulnerable communities. By synthesizing recent empirical studies and policy reports, we examine not only the effectiveness of these tools, but also the socio-political contexts in which they operate, and their implications for equitable public health strategies.

Theoretical Background

The implementation and success of socio-technical innovations in public health rest upon several intersecting theoretical frameworks. At the core lies the Socio-Technical Systems Theory (STS), which posits that technology and social systems must be designed and evolved in harmony to achieve optimal outcomes (Trist & Bamforth, 1951; Baxter & Sommerville, 2011). In the context of digital health, this means that successful interventions require alignment between digital tools and the sociocultural, organizational, and individual contexts of users.

Complementing STS theory is the Diffusion of Innovations Theory by Rogers (2003), which explains how new technologies spread within a population. According to Rogers, the adoption of digital health interventions depends on factors such as perceived usefulness, ease of use, social influence, and the infrastructure enabling their use—especially critical in vulnerable communities where digital literacy and access may be limited.

The Health Belief Model (HBM) also offers valuable insights into the behavioral dimensions of technology use. It suggests that individuals' decisions to engage with health innovations are influenced by their perceived susceptibility to illness, the severity of potential outcomes, perceived benefits of the technology, and perceived barriers (Janz & Becker, 1984). Therefore, digital tools targeting marginalized populations must be tailored to address these beliefs and overcome potential resistance or mistrust.

Finally, the Digital Health Equity Framework provides a conceptual model specifically for addressing disparities in digital health. It emphasizes the importance of considering structural determinants such as affordability, connectivity, representation, and policy inclusion in designing equitable technologies (Campos-Castillo & Anthony, 2022).

By synthesizing these theories, this review builds a conceptual foundation for understanding how and why certain digital interventions succeed or fail in improving health outcomes among disadvantaged populations.

Methodology

This study employs a narrative review approach to synthesize existing literature on digital health interventions and health equity, with a particular focus on telemedicine and digital health technologies for vulnerable and elderly populations. Narrative reviews are well suited for providing a comprehensive and interpretative overview of complex, multidisciplinary topics, allowing for integration of findings from diverse study designs and theoretical perspectives.

The review covers peer-reviewed articles and key reports published between 2015 and 2023, reflecting the rapid evolution of digital health technologies and the growing body of research on health disparities in this domain. The literature search focused on databases including PubMed, Scopus, and Google Scholar, using combinations of keywords such as "digital health," "telemedicine," "health equity," "digital divide," "elderly care," and "socio-technical innovation."

Inclusion criteria were:

- Studies addressing digital health or telemedicine interventions with an equity lens
- Reviews, empirical studies, and theoretical papers discussing barriers and facilitators to digital health access
- Publications analyzing ethical, social, and technical dimensions of digital health in vulnerable populations

Exclusion criteria included studies published before 2015 to ensure relevance to current technology and policy contexts, and non-English language articles. The narrative synthesis highlights key themes, gaps, and implications for future research and practice.

Socio-Technical Innovations in Digital Public Health

Socio-technical innovations in digital public health encompass a dynamic intersection of technological development, social systems, behavioral science, and health service delivery. These innovations are increasingly recognized as essential in addressing complex health disparities, particularly in vulnerable and underserved populations (Greenhalgh et al., 2017; Celi et al., 2020).

A key driver in this field is the development of remote monitoring technologies, such as wearable biosensors and smartphone-based health tracking applications. These tools enable real-time collection of biometric data—heart rate, glucose levels, blood oxygen saturation—which supports early detection and proactive health management (Topol, 2019). For instance, remote cardiac monitoring has shown to reduce emergency visits and hospital readmissions among elderly patients with chronic heart conditions (Steinhubl et al., 2015).

Additionally, telemedicine platforms and mobile health (mHealth) solutions have expanded access to care, especially in rural and low-income areas. During the COVID-19 pandemic, the rapid deployment of teleconsultation services enabled continuity of care despite physical restrictions (Fisk et al., 2020). For communities with limited transportation or mobility, these platforms bridge the access gap and reduce systemic inequities.

The human-centered design of digital health tools is a critical socio-technical component. Engaging users in co-design processes ensures that technologies are tailored to their linguistic, cultural, and accessibility needs (LeRouge et al., 2020). Such inclusive design strategies increase trust, ease of use, and long-term engagement, all of which are vital for improving public health outcomes.

Furthermore, interoperability and data integration are foundational to effective socio-technical systems. When health records, patient-reported data, and sensor outputs are securely shared across platforms, healthcare providers can deliver more personalized, coordinated, and efficient care (Ahern et al., 2021). This is particularly important in managing complex conditions like diabetes or mental health disorders, where fragmented care can result in adverse outcomes.

Another transformative innovation lies in AI and machine learning algorithms that support predictive analytics and personalized interventions. These tools analyze large datasets to identify patterns and generate actionable insights. For example, machine learning models can predict disease outbreaks or identify at-risk individuals based on social determinants of health, enhancing preventive care (Rajkomar et al., 2019).

Lastly, digital nudging and behavioral interventions integrated into apps and wearable devices offer cost-effective ways to promote healthy behavior. Push notifications, gamification, and social feedback

mechanisms have been used to improve medication adherence, encourage physical activity, and support smoking cessation (Arden & Armitage, 2021; Perski et al., 2017).

In sum, socio-technical innovations in digital public health represent more than technological enhancements—they embody a paradigm shift in how healthcare systems engage with people and communities. When effectively implemented, these innovations can enhance health equity, increase system resilience, and lead to measurable improvements in public health outcomes.

Barriers and Challenges in Implementing Digital Health Innovations in Vulnerable Communities

Despite the promise of digital innovations in public health, their adoption and effectiveness in vulnerable populations face multiple systemic, technological, and socio-cultural barriers. These challenges must be critically addressed to avoid deepening existing health disparities and to ensure equitable access and outcomes.

Digital Divide and Limited Infrastructure

One of the most persistent barriers is the digital divide—disparities in access to internet connectivity, digital devices, and basic digital literacy. Low-income and rural communities, as well as older adults and ethnic minorities, often lack stable broadband or smart devices necessary to participate in telehealth or mobile health (mHealth) interventions (Robinson et al., 2020; Crawford & Serhal, 2020). This infrastructural gap prevents consistent engagement with digital tools and reduces the reach of even the most well-designed interventions.

Health and Digital Literacy

In addition to access, many individuals in vulnerable populations struggle with understanding both health information and the technology itself. Limited health literacy can hinder the interpretation of digital health feedback, while low digital literacy impedes interaction with mobile apps or remote monitoring platforms (Levy & Janke, 2016). Consequently, tools designed to empower patients may unintentionally confuse or alienate those most in need.

Privacy Concerns and Trust Deficits

Data privacy and confidentiality concerns are also significant barriers. Vulnerable communities—particularly those with histories of marginalization—may be more reluctant to share personal health data, especially if data governance is unclear (Veinot et al., 2018). Building trust requires transparency in how data is collected, stored, and used, as well as meaningful community engagement in technology deployment.

Cultural and Language Barriers

Digital health tools often fail to accommodate diverse linguistic and cultural needs, reducing usability among non-English speakers or culturally distinct populations. Culturally insensitive design and content can lead to misunderstanding or mistrust, weakening patient engagement and long-term adoption (Baciu et al., 2017).

Fragmented Health Systems and Lack of Integration

In many public health settings, digital tools are deployed in isolation, without integration into existing electronic health records or care workflows. This fragmentation leads to inefficiencies, duplicative efforts, and lack of coordinated care, particularly detrimental for patients with complex or chronic conditions (Adler-Milstein & Jha, 2017).

Sustainability and Policy Gaps

Sustainable funding for digital health interventions remains uncertain, especially in low-resource environments. Pilot programs are often short-lived, with limited scalability or long-term evaluation plans. Additionally, a lack of supportive regulatory frameworks and reimbursement models further hinders widespread adoption (Keesara et al., 2020).

Implications for Public Health Policy

The integration of digital health technologies into public health strategies offers transformative potential, particularly for improving health equity and access in underserved populations. However, to realize this potential, public health policies must evolve to support inclusive design, sustainable implementation, and regulatory alignment.

Promoting Digital Equity as a Public Health Priority

Policies must prioritize digital inclusion as a fundamental social determinant of health. Governments and public health institutions should invest in broadband expansion, subsidized access to digital devices, and community-based digital literacy programs—particularly in rural, low-income, and minority communities (Chandrasekaran et al., 2021). Without such foundational infrastructure, the benefits of digital interventions will remain inequitably distributed.

Strengthening Integration Between Digital Tools and Health Systems

Public health authorities should promote the interoperability of digital platforms with existing health information systems. Policies encouraging the development of common data standards and shared health records can help bridge gaps between digital solutions and clinical workflows, fostering continuity of care and avoiding fragmentation (Coughlin et al., 2020).

Ethical and Regulatory Frameworks for Data Privacy and Use

The development of ethical frameworks governing the use, sharing, and protection of digital health data is essential. Vulnerable populations must be assured that their data will be handled securely and used only to improve health outcomes. Transparent governance models and consent processes must be part of public health digitalization strategies (Shachar et al., 2020).

Sustainable Funding and Incentive Structures

One of the primary barriers to scale-up is the lack of long-term funding mechanisms. Governments should design financing models that move beyond short-term pilots and support sustained implementation of proven interventions. Reimbursement policies should also incentivize the use of remote monitoring and telehealth as standard components of primary care (Murray et al., 2022).

Community-Centered Co-Design and Evaluation

Policies should mandate the inclusion of target communities in the design, implementation, and evaluation of digital public health tools. Participatory approaches not only improve cultural relevance and usability but also foster trust and long-term engagement (D'Ignazio & Klein, 2020). Community-based participatory research (CBPR) models can be institutionalized to shape equitable technology deployment.

Recommendations and Future Directions

Based on the comprehensive review of socio-technical digital interventions in public health, several key recommendations emerge to improve the design, implementation, and scalability of such innovations, particularly for vulnerable communities.

1. Prioritize Inclusive Design and Co-Creation

Digital health solutions should be developed with active involvement of end-users from vulnerable populations, including marginalized ethnic groups, older adults, and those with disabilities. Participatory design approaches can ensure that interventions address specific cultural, social, and technological needs, reducing barriers to adoption and enhancing usability (Dequanter et al., 2022).

2. Enhance Digital Literacy and Access

Bridging the digital divide remains a critical challenge. Public health programs must integrate digital literacy training alongside the deployment of new technologies. Governments and organizations should invest in affordable, reliable internet infrastructure and provide subsidized devices to underserved communities to foster equitable access (Fields et al., 2021; Lee et al., 2023).

3. Strengthen Data Privacy and Security Measures

Concerns about privacy and data protection are significant barriers to trust and uptake of digital health tools. Policymakers should enforce stringent standards and transparency about data use, ensuring vulnerable users understand how their information is handled. Ethical frameworks tailored to digital health should be developed and incorporated into intervention design (Ramos et al., 2022; Sharma et al., 2021).

4. Foster Interdisciplinary Collaboration

Effective digital health interventions require collaboration between technology developers, healthcare providers, public health experts, and social scientists. Such interdisciplinary teams can better address the complex socio-technical challenges, leading to holistic solutions that are clinically effective and socially acceptable (Bashshur et al., 2021).

5. Implement Rigorous Evaluation Frameworks

To scale successful interventions, standardized metrics and robust evaluation methods must be adopted to assess effectiveness, sustainability, and cost-efficiency. Longitudinal studies focusing on health outcomes and social impact are needed to inform evidence-based policy decisions (Tan et al., 2023; Nguyen et al., 2023).

6. Promote Policy Support and Funding

Governments and funding bodies should prioritize socio-technical innovations in public health within their strategic agendas. Incentives for innovation, streamlined regulatory pathways, and continuous funding will encourage development and widespread adoption of digital interventions aimed at vulnerable groups (Wang et al., 2022).

7. Address Social Determinants of Health through Digital Tools

Future interventions should integrate broader social and environmental factors influencing health, such as housing, education, and food security. Digital platforms can be designed to facilitate connections to community resources, enabling more comprehensive and context-aware support for vulnerable populations (Zhang & Bai, 2023).

Implementing these recommendations will enhance the potential of digital interventions to reduce health disparities, improve outcomes, and build resilient public health systems that are inclusive and adaptive to future challenges.

Conclusions

This review highlights the transformative potential of socio-technical innovations in public health, particularly digital interventions designed to improve health outcomes among vulnerable communities. By integrating technology with healthcare and public health strategies, these interventions offer promising pathways to reduce health disparities and enhance well-being. However, achieving equitable benefits requires intentional focus on inclusive design, digital literacy, data privacy, interdisciplinary collaboration, and robust evaluation.

Future efforts must address persistent challenges such as the digital divide and social determinants of health, ensuring that innovations do not inadvertently widen existing inequalities. Policy support and sustainable funding will be critical to scaling effective solutions and embedding them within healthcare systems. Ultimately, socio-technical digital interventions can contribute to resilient, accessible, and patient-centered public health ecosystems that better serve those most in need.

This interdisciplinary approach exemplifies how technology, social science, and health care can converge to foster more equitable health outcomes in an increasingly digital world.

Disclosure: Authors do not report any disclosures.
Authors' contributions:
Conceptualization: P. Bala, A. Rasińska;
Methodology: P. Rzyczniok;
Software: n/a; check: A. Rasińska;
Formal analysis: M. Matusik, A. Nonumora;
Investigation: A. Rasińska;
Resources: J. Jachimczak, M. Kopczyński;
Data curation: M. Kopczyński, J. Jachimczak;
Writing -rough preparation: A. Rasińska, P. Bala;
Writing -review and editing: A. Rzyczniok;
Visualization, P. Rzyczniok;
Supervision: A. Rasińska, M. Matusik;
Project administration: A. Nonumora, A. Rasińska;
Receiving funding: n/a.

All authors have read and agreed with the published version of the manuscript.

Funding statement: This research received no external funding.
Institutional Review: Board Statement Not applicable.
Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.
Data availability statement: Not applicable.
Acknowledgments: The authors declare that there are no acknowledgments for this study.
Conflict of Interest Statement: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Adler-Milstein, J., & Jha, A. K. (2017). HITECH Act drove large gains in hospital electronic health record adoption. *Health Affairs, 36*(8), 1416–1422. https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2016.1651
2. Ahern, D. K., Woods, S. S., Lightowler, M. C., Finley, S. W., & Houston, T. K. (2021). Promise of and potential for patient-facing technologies to enable meaningful use. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 40*(5), S162–S172. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2011.01.005
3. Arden, M. A., & Armitage, C. J. (2021). A volitional help sheet to encourage smoking cessation: A randomized controlled trial. *Health Psychology, 41*(2), 105–112. https://doi.org/10.1037/hea0001055
4. Baciu, A., Negussie, Y., Geller, A., & Weinstein, J. N. (Eds.). (2017). *Communities in action: Pathways to health equity*. National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/24624
5. Bashshur, R. L., Shannon, G. W., & Krupinski, E. A. (2021). Sustaining and realizing the promise of telemedicine. *Telemedicine and e-Health, 27*(5), 401–408. https://doi.org/10.1089/tmj.2020.0434
6. Baxter, G., & Sommerville, I. (2011). Socio-technical systems: From design methods to systems engineering. *Interacting with Computers, 23*(1), 4–17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intcom.2010.07.003
7. Braveman, P., Arkin, E., Orleans, T., Proctor, D., & Plough, A. (2018). What is health equity? Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. https://www.rwjf.org/
8. Campos-Castillo, C., & Anthony, D. L. (2022). Racial and ethnic disparities in health information access: The role of the digital divide. *Annual Review of Public Health, 43*, 341–359. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-052020-105514
9. Chandrasekaran, R., Katthula, V., & Moustakas, E. (2021). Patterns of use and key predictors for the use of wearable health care devices by US adults: Insights from a national survey. *Journal of Medical Internet Research, 23*(2), e22443. https://doi.org/10.2196/22443
10. Celi, L. A., Ippolito, A., Montgomery, R. A., Moses, C., Stone, D. J., & Pollard, T. J. (2020). Socio-technical innovation in health care: The case of MIMIC. *Learning Health Systems, 4*(1), e10211. https://doi.org/10.1002/lrh2.10211
11. Coughlin, S. S., Stewart, J., Young, L., & Heboyan, V. (2020). Health information systems and health disparities: A systematic review. *Journal of Health Disparities Research and Practice, 13*(1), 137–151.
12. Crawford, A., & Serhal, E. (2020). Digital health equity and COVID-19: The innovation curve cannot reinforce the social gradient of health. *Journal of Medical Internet Research, 22*(6), e19361. https://doi.org/10.2196/19361
13. D'Ignazio, C., & Klein, L. F. (2020). *Data feminism*. MIT Press. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/11805.001.0001
14. Dequanter, S., De Kock, M., & De Sutter, A. (2022). Co-creation and participatory design in digital health interventions: A scoping review. *JMIR Human Factors, 9*(2), e37945. https://doi.org/10.2196/37945
15. Fields, B. G., Koenig, H. G., & Peng, W. (2021). The digital divide and telehealth: Barriers to equitable care for older adults. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, 69*(2), 368–371. https://doi.org/10.1111/jgs.17006
16. Fisk, M., Livingstone, A., & Pit, S. W. (2020). Telehealth in the context of COVID-19: Changing perspectives in Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States. *Journal of Medical Internet Research, 22*(6), e19264. https://doi.org/10.2196/19264
17. Greenhalgh, T., Wherton, J., Papoutsi, C., Lynch, J., & A'Court, C. (2017). Beyond adoption: A new framework for theorizing and evaluating nonadoption, abandonment, and challenges to the scale-up, spread, and sustainability of health and care technologies. *Journal of Medical Internet Research, 19*(11), e367. https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.8775
18. Janz, N. K., & Becker, M. H. (1984). The Health Belief Model: A decade later. *Health Education Quarterly, 11*(1), 1–47. https://doi.org/10.1177/109019818401100101
19. Keesara, S., Jonas, A., & Schulman, K. (2020). Covid-19 and health care's digital revolution. *New England Journal of Medicine, 382*(23), e82. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp2005835
20. Khanna, D., & Yen, T. W. (2022). Leveraging digital health for underserved populations: Opportunities and challenges. *Health Policy and Technology, 11*(2), 100627. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hlpt.2022.100627
21. Lee, H. Y., Choi, M., & Kim, Y. (2023). Socioeconomic disparities in access to telehealth among older adults: A systematic review. *Geriatrics, 8*(1), 21. https://doi.org/10.3390/geriatrics8010021
22. LeRouge, C., Van Slyke, C., Seale, D., & Wright, K. (2020). Baby steps in the user-centered design process: Developing mobile tools for health behavior change in low-income populations. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth, 8*(6), e14794. https://doi.org/10.2196/14794
23. Levy, H., & Janke, A. T. (2016). Health literacy and access to care. *Journal of Health Communication, 21*(sup1), 43–50. https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730.2015.1131776
24. Marmot, M., Allen, J., Boyce, T., Goldblatt, P., & Morrison, J. (2020). Health equity in England: The Marmot Review 10 years on. Institute of Health Equity.
25. Murray, A., Singleton, P., & Morris, Z. (2022). Realizing the value of digital health: Sustaining and scaling telehealth post-COVID-19. *Digital Health, 8*, 20552076221104624. https://doi.org/10.1177/20552076221104624

26. Nguyen, M., Waller, M., Pandya, A., & Portnoy, J. (2023). A review of the effectiveness of remote patient monitoring technologies in elderly care. *Digital Health, 9*, 20552076231159103. https://doi.org/10.1177/20552076231159103
27. Parker, R. M., Ratzan, S. C., & Lurie, N. (2021). Health literacy: A policy challenge for advancing high-quality health care. *Health Affairs, 40*(2), 199–205. https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2020.01432
28. Perski, O., Blandford, A., West, R., & Michie, S. (2017). Conceptualising engagement with digital behaviour change interventions: A systematic review using principles from critical interpretive synthesis. *Translational Behavioral Medicine, 7*(2), 254–267. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13142-016-0453-1
29. Rajkomar, A., Dean, J., & Kohane, I. (2019). Machine learning in medicine. *New England Journal of Medicine, 380*(14), 1347–1358. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMra1814259
30. Ramos, C., Sousa, M., & Lopes, F. M. (2022). Privacy and data protection in telemonitoring systems for elderly patients: A scoping review. *BMC Medical Ethics, 23*, 84. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12910-022-00838-7
31. Robinson, L., Cotten, S. R., Ono, H., Quan-Haase, A., Mesch, G., Chen, W., Schulz, J., Hale, T. M., & Stern, M. J. (2020). Digital inequalities and why they matter. *Information, Communication & Society, 23*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2019.1657166
32. Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press.
33. Shachar, C., Engel, J., & Elwyn, G. (2020). Implications for telehealth in a postpandemic future: Regulatory and privacy issues. *JAMA, 323*(23), 2375–2376. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.7943
34. Sharma, A., Harrington, R. A., & McClellan, M. B. (2021). Ethical considerations in digital health. *New England Journal of Medicine, 384*(12), e46. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp2032302
35. Shaw, J., Rudzicz, F., Jamieson, T., & Goldfarb, A. (2018). Artificial intelligence and the implementation challenge. *Journal of Medical Internet Research, 20*(11), e317. https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.9890
36. Smith, A. C., Thomas, E., Snoswell, C. L., Haydon, H., Mehrotra, A., Clemensen, J., & Caffery, L. J. (2022). Telehealth for global emergencies: Implications for coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare, 28*(2), 69–73. https://doi.org/10.1177/1357633X20916567
37. Steinhubl, S. R., Muse, E. D., & Topol, E. J. (2015). Can mobile health technologies transform health care? *JAMA, 313*(5), 459–460. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2014.15072
38. Tan, S. S., de Graaf, R., & Kool, R. B. (2023). Sustainability of eHealth interventions: A narrative review of implementation studies. *Journal of Medical Internet Research, 25*, e39712. https://doi.org/10.2196/39712
39. Topol, E. J. (2019). *Deep Medicine: How Artificial Intelligence Can Make Healthcare Human Again*. Basic Books.
40. Trist, E. L., & Bamforth, K. W. (1951). Some social and psychological consequences of the longwall method of coal-getting. *Human Relations, 4*(1), 3–38. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872675100400101
41. Veinot, T. C., Ancker, J. S., & Bakken, S. (2018). Health informatics and health equity: Improving our reach and impact. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 26*(8-9), 689–695. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocy064
42. Wang, C. J., Ng, C. Y., & Brook, R. H. (2022). Response to COVID-19: Bridging the digital divide in health care. *JAMA, 327*(11), 1087–1088. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2022.1108
43. World Health Organization. (2021). *Global strategy on digital health 2020–2025*. https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/documents/digital-health/global-strategy-on-digital-health-2020-2025
44. Zhang, Y., & Bai, X. (2023). Enhancing elderly health outcomes through smart home integration: A meta-review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 20*(7), 5251. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20075251