International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science

e-ISSN: 2544-9435

Operating Publisher
SciFormat Publishing Inc.
ISNI: 0000 0005 1449 8214

2734 17 Avenue SW,
Calgary, Alberta, T3E0A7,
Canada
+15878858911
editorial-office@sciformat.ca

ARTICLE TITLE	TELEMEDICINE IN CHRONIC DISEASE MANAGEMENT: CLINICAL EFFICACY, THE DIGITAL DIVIDE 2.0, AND IMPLEMENTATION REALITIES
DOI	https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.1(49).2026.4799
RECEIVED	27 January 2026
ACCEPTED	20 March 2026
PUBLISHED	27 March 2026
LICENSE	The article is licensed under a **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.**

TELEMEDICINE IN CHRONIC DISEASE MANAGEMENT: CLINICAL EFFICACY, THE DIGITAL DIVIDE 2.0, AND IMPLEMENTATION REALITIES

Klaudia Kwolek *(Corresponding Author, Email: kwolek.klaudia2@gmail.com)*
Medical University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0003-2145-7528

Marcel Pilarek
Medical University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0004-4114-5078

Wiktoria Laskowska
Medical University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0000-8116-0038

Hubert Bigajski
Medical University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0007-0570-5367

Dominika Sarna
Medical University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0001-4849-8093

Piotr Widera
Medical University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0008-7518-2482

Szymon Janczarski
Medical University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0004-0881-1083

Maciej Michalik
Medical University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0007-9778-8736

Aleksandra Banaś
Medical University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0009-5584-5944

Hubert Dacyl
Medical University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0002-6417-6382

ABSTRACT

As chronic non-communicable diseases (NCDs) reach epidemic proportions globally, traditional episodic care models remain insufficient, necessitating a shift toward continuous, technology-driven management. This narrative review critically assesses the clinical utility of telemedicine interventions—specifically continuous glucose monitoring, remote hypertension surveillance, and implantable hemodynamic sensors—while examining the persistent socio-technical barriers impeding their widespread adoption. Based on a comprehensive synthesis of literature from PubMed/MEDLINE, Scopus, and Google Scholar (2020–2025), this study contrasts clinical efficacy with implementation realities. The evidence confirms that while telemedical tools consistently surpass conventional care in stabilizing metabolic control and lowering hospitalization rates, their long-term viability is compromised by the "Digital Divide 2.0"—a phenomenon defined by deficits in digital literacy and usability challenges among the elderly. Moreover, the analysis identifies systemic bottlenecks, including fragmented data standardization and the exclusion of patient-generated health data from routine workflows. Ethical tensions surrounding algorithmic paternalism and surveillance fatigue are also highlighted as critical factors affecting patient autonomy. Ultimately, bridging the gap between digital capability and sustainable practice requires moving beyond technological determinism toward a holistic strategy that integrates policy innovation, human-centered design, and ethical data governance.

KEYWORDS

Telemedicine, Chronic Disease Management, Remote Patient Monitoring, Digital Divide, Socio-Technical Barriers, Implementation Science

CITATION

Klaudia Kwolek, Marcel Pilarek, Wiktoria Laskowska, Hubert Bigajski, Dominika Sarna, Piotr Widera, Szymon Janczarski, Maciej Michalik, Aleksandra Banaś, Hubert Dacyl. (2026) Telemedicine in Chronic Disease Management: Clinical Efficacy, the Digital Divide 2.0, and Implementation Realities. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science*. 1(49). doi: 10.31435/ijitss.1(49).2026.4799

1. Introduction

1.1. The Chronic Disease Burden

The escalating prevalence of chronic non-communicable diseases (NCDs) represents the defining public health challenge of the 21st century. As the global population ages and risk factors such as obesity intensify, the burden of conditions like diabetes, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), and cardiovascular disease has reached critical levels. According to recent pooled analyses, the global diabetes burden has surged, with an estimated 828 million adults affected in 2022—a stark increase of 630 million compared to 1990 levels (NCD Risk Factor Collaboration, 2024). This surge is particularly pronounced in low- and middle-income regions, where the gap between disease prevalence and effective treatment continues to widen (NCD Risk Factor Collaboration, 2024).

Current forecasting suggests that by 2050, the global prevalence of COPD in individuals over 25 will near the 600 million mark, reflecting a relative growth of 23% since 2020 (Boers et al., 2023). This progressive burden is compounded by major sequelae, including elevated cardiovascular risk and lung cancer, placing severe strain on healthcare resources. In the European context, cardiovascular diseases (CVD) remain the leading cause of mortality, accounting for approximately 1.7 million deaths annually (Eurostat, 2024) and costing the EU economy an estimated €282 billion each year (Luengo-Fernandez et al., 2023).

These epidemiological shifts expose the structural inadequacies of traditional healthcare delivery models. The historical standard of care, predicated on episodic, face-to-face clinic visits occurring at fixed intervals (e.g., every three months), is increasingly insufficient for managing chronic pathologies which, despite their label, are dynamic and prone to rapid fluctuation. As patient volumes rise and case complexity increases, this reactive "brick-and-mortar" approach faces significant scalability issues, often failing to detect acute decompensations during the long intervals between appointments. To address the needs of an aging society effectively, a transition from sporadic oversight to continuous management is required.

1.2. The COVID-19 Catalyst

While the theoretical necessity of telemedicine had been recognized for decades, the COVID-19 pandemic served as an unprecedented catalyst, forcing a rapid transition from theory to practice. The crisis dismantled longstanding regulatory and behavioral barriers, accelerating the adoption of telehealth at a breathtaking pace. In the initial phases of the pandemic, "stay-at-home" orders and social distancing mandates necessitated a dramatic decrease in in-person outpatient care to reduce community and nosocomial viral transmission (Wosik et al., 2020).

This urgency compelled healthcare systems to innovate rapidly to ensure continuity of care. Exemplifying this shift, tertiary institutions that previously performed fewer than 100 video visits per day saw volumes skyrocket to over 1,000 daily visits within weeks, fundamentally altering the delivery of outpatient services (Wosik et al., 2020). However, this transformation was not limited to simple synchronous communication through tele-consultations. The pandemic also accelerated the deployment of more sophisticated remote patient monitoring technologies, such as the distribution of blood pressure cuffs to high-risk populations and the use of integrated peripheral devices (Wosik et al., 2020). This shift marked the beginning of a deeper evolution in chronic care: moving beyond emergency triage toward sustained, technology-enabled "tele-monitoring" and "virtual care" ecosystems (Wosik et al., 2020).

1.3. Telemedicine as a Paradigm Shift

Post-pandemic, telemedicine has solidified its status not merely as an emergency measure, but as a central component of contemporary strategies for chronic disease management. Defined as the provision of healthcare services through information and communication technologies across distance, telemedicine has expanded rapidly alongside advances in digital infrastructure and clinical informatics (Haleem et al., 2021). In the field of chronic disease care where conditions require long-term follow-up, continuous assessment, and coordinated interventions—telemedicine has fostered new forms of clinical collaboration that extend beyond the boundaries of traditional healthcare settings (Ranjith et al., 2025).

This transition represents a distinct paradigm shift from conventional episodic models of care toward more continuous and anticipatory approaches. Traditional chronic care pathways have often relied on periodic in-person visits, which may delay the identification of clinical deterioration. In contrast, telemedicine-enabled models facilitate ongoing data exchange between patients and healthcare professionals, enhancing the predictability of disease trajectories and supporting earlier responses to changes in health status (Rukundo, 2025). Through remote monitoring and virtual follow-up, clinicians can identify warning signs more rapidly, adjust treatment plans proactively, and potentially reduce preventable hospitalizations (Po et al., 2024). From the patient perspective, telemedicine introduces greater convenience by reducing travel demands and enabling care delivery within familiar environments factors particularly relevant for individuals managing chronic conditions over extended periods (Haleem et al., 2021).

1.4. Modalities of Telemedicine Intervention

The operationalization of this paradigm shift is supported by multiple forms of telemedicine functioning within integrated digital care ecosystems. Teleconsultations represent one of the most established modalities, enabling remote clinician-patient interactions for follow-up care and patient education (Haleem et al., 2021; Ranjith et al., 2025). Telemonitoring systems extend beyond episodic encounters by facilitating the continuous collection of physiological parameters, such as glucose levels and blood pressure, thereby supporting proactive care delivery (Rukundo, 2025). Mobile health applications complement these approaches by promoting self-management behaviors and treatment adherence (Haleem et al., 2021). Finally, wearable devices strengthen infrastructure by automating real-time data capture (Rukundo, 2025). Collectively, these constitute interconnected socio-technical systems whose effectiveness depends on their comprehensive integration into clinical workflows (Li, 2025).

1.5. Study Objective

Despite growing evidence of clinical benefits, the implementation of telemedicine in chronic disease management is shaped by a range of socio-technical barriers. System-level challenges such as interoperability, data governance, and infrastructure readiness often constrain integration, while user-level factors, including digital literacy and trust, affect patient engagement (Haleem et al., 2021; Li, 2025). These barriers are particularly pronounced among older adults, creating a "digital divide" that may limit the potential gains of these interventions (Hepburn et al., 2025).

Accordingly, the primary objective of this narrative review extends beyond a mere assessment of the clinical effectiveness of telemedicine in chronic disease management. While establishing the therapeutic efficacy of these tools is foundational, this review critically seeks to contrast these clinical outcomes with the persistent socio-technical barriers that dictate real-world implementation. Specifically, this synthesis aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of how often-overlooked factors, such as the "invisible workforce" of informal caregivers, the psychological burden of "technostress," and systemic infrastructural inequalities, shape the widening gap between digital potential and sustainable clinical practice. By integrating evidence across technological, clinical, and user-centered perspectives, this article argues that without addressing these layered barriers, the transition to telemedicine risks reinforcing a two-tier healthcare system rather than democratizing access to care.

2. Methodology

This study was designed as a comprehensive narrative review aimed at synthesizing current evidence on telemedicine-based collaboration in the management of chronic diseases. To effectively contrast clinical effectiveness with implementation realities, the review adopted a holistic approach rather than a strictly quantitative one, allowing for the integration of heterogeneous data sources ranging from randomized clinical trials to sociological analyses of the digital divide.

Search Strategy and Data Sources A multi-stage literature search was performed across three primary electronic databases: PubMed/MEDLINE, Scopus, and Google Scholar. The search strategy was organized into two thematic clusters to capture the intersection of technology and society:

Clinical & Technological Domain: Keywords included "telemedicine," "remote patient monitoring," "continuous glucose monitoring," "implantable hemodynamic sensors," "smart inhalers," and "artificial intelligence in healthcare."

Socio-Technical & Implementation Domain: Keywords included "digital divide," "health equity," "patient engagement," "technostress," "caregiver burden," "reimbursement policy," and "implementation barriers."

Boolean operators (AND/OR) were applied to refine results. To ensure the review reflects the most contemporary technological landscape and post-COVID-19 dynamics, priority was given to literature published between January 2019 and early 2025.

Selection Criteria and Synthesis The selection process prioritized peer-reviewed original research, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses published in English. Exclusion criteria comprised non-peer-reviewed literature (e.g., editorials without data), studies lacking clinical relevance, and articles focused exclusively on acute care unrelated to chronic disease management. Given the diversity of the included studies, a thematic synthesis approach was employed. Data were extracted and categorized into three core dimensions: (1) clinical efficacy of remote monitoring tools, (2) the evolution from monitoring to predictive AI models, and (3) socio-technical barriers, including the "Digital Divide 2.0" and systemic inequities. Additionally, a "snowballing" technique was used, wherein reference lists of key systematic reviews were manually screened to identify seminal papers and theoretical frameworks that might have been missed during the initial keyword search. This methodological structure facilitates a critical evaluation of how technological innovation interacts with existing societal disparities.

3. Results

3.1. Remote Glycemic Monitoring and Metabolic Control

Evaluations of sensor accuracy indicate that modern continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) systems achieve a mean absolute relative difference (MARD), a metric representing the average absolute error between sensor readings and reference blood glucose values, of 10–12%, supporting their use for therapeutic dosing without confirmatory fingersticks or in-person verification (Rodbard, 2016). In adult populations with type 1 diabetes (T1D), randomized clinical trials (RCTs) comparing remote CGM use to conventional therapy reported superior glycemic outcomes. The GOLD trial found a mean HbA1c of 7.92% in the CGM group compared to 8.35% in the conventional treatment group (Lind et al., 2017). Similarly, the DIAMOND trial reported a significantly greater reduction in HbA1c (-1.1% vs. -0.5%) and glycemic variability with CGM use compared to standard care (Beck et al., 2017). For type 2 diabetes (T2D), a meta-analysis of RCTs demonstrated that both real-time and flash CGM resulted in a statistically significant mean reduction in HbA1c of 0.31% compared to self-monitoring (Uhl et al., 2024). In a large real-world analysis of 7,336 patients, Norman et al. (2025) found that initiating CGM was associated with a 67% reduction in diabetes-related

hospitalizations and a 40% decrease in emergency department visits ($p<0.0001$). Notably, this efficacy extended to type 2 diabetes patients not treated with insulin, who achieved a significant HbA1c reduction of 0.9% ($p<0.0001$), challenging coverage policies that often restrict access to insulin-dependent cohorts.

Studies on closed-loop systems (CLS), which automate insulin delivery based on real-time sensor data, further illustrate these metabolic advantages. These systems utilize proportional-integral-derivative (PID) algorithms, which provide reactive control based on current and past errors, and model predictive control (MPC) algorithms, which offer proactive control based on forecasted glucose trajectories. Research has reported significant improvements in glycemic regulation using these technologies compared to conventional pumping (Cobelli et al., 2011). Early crossover trials demonstrated that overnight closed-loop delivery increased the time in target glucose range and reduced the risk of nocturnal hypoglycemia (Hovorka et al., 2011). Subsequent pivotal trials of hybrid closed-loop systems, defined as systems automating basal insulin while requiring manual meal boluses, in unsupervised home settings for adolescents and adults confirmed safety and efficacy, reporting increased time in range and reduced hypoglycemia without the need for constant remote physician intervention (Garg et al., 2017). Specific populations also showed benefit; automated insulin delivery in pregnant women with T1D resulted in a significantly higher percentage of time in the target glucose range compared to standard care (Lee et al., 2023). Additionally, data from real-world settings indicated that fully closed-loop dual-hormone systems (insulin and glucagon) could maintain high time-in-range without manual meal announcements (van Bon et al., 2024).

Meta-analyses of telemedicine interventions in primary care for T2D found a statistically significant reduction in HbA1c compared to usual care, with telemonitoring yielding particularly significant reductions (Chiaranai et al., 2023). During the COVID-19 pandemic, patients receiving telehealth interventions achieved a weighted mean difference in HbA1c of -0.59% compared to usual care, along with significant reductions in fasting blood sugar (-16.1 mg/dL) and body mass index (-1.5 kg/m²) (Chiaranai et al., 2023). Systematic reviews of rural populations found that telemedicine integrated into structured programs improved HbA1c and medication adherence, serving as a viable alternative to routine in-person visits, although effectiveness was dependent on local infrastructure (AlQassab et al., 2024). In adolescent populations, responsiveness to text-message reminders was identified as a predictor of glycemic benefit, though the intervention itself did not always yield significant HbA1c reductions compared to controls (McGill et al., 2020).

However, it is imperative to acknowledge that the clinical efficacy of these closed-loop and monitoring systems is not an inherent property of the device itself, but is contingent upon the user's capacity to maintain continuous sensor connectivity and trust the algorithmic automation. The metabolic benefits described above are frequently compromised in real-world settings by 'digital fatigue' and the cognitive burden of managing constant data streams, factors that can lead to discontinuation of therapy despite its theoretical efficacy.

3.2. Telemonitoring in Hypertension

Meta-analytic data involving over 64,000 participants identified significant prognostic risks associated with phenotypes detectable only through out-of-office monitoring. Untreated White Coat Hypertension (WCH) defined as elevated office blood pressure with normal out-of-office readings in untreated individuals was associated with an increased risk of cardiovascular events (Hazard Ratio [HR] 1.36) and all-cause mortality (HR 1.33) compared to normotension (Cohen et al., 2019). Conversely, the treated White Coat Effect (WCE), representing the same phenomenon in patients already on antihypertensive therapy, was not associated with elevated cardiovascular risk (HR 1.12) (Cohen et al., 2019). Observational studies comparing measurement settings found that systolic and diastolic blood pressures were significantly lower in home (HBPM) and ambulatory (ABPM) settings compared to office measurements in hypertensive patients (Radovanovic et al., 2023). Within clinical settings, Automated Office Blood Pressure Measurement (AOBPM) performed unattended to eliminate the white coat pressor response triggered by medical staff in waiting rooms demonstrated high diagnostic performance (Area Under Curve > 0.90) comparable to ABPM, suggesting it may serve as a viable alternative when out-of-office monitoring is unavailable (Sánchez-Bacaicoa et al., 2025). Current guidelines consequently recommend out-of-office monitoring to confirm diagnoses and avoid overtreatment of WCE or undertreatment of masked hypertension, where office readings are normal but out-of-office blood pressure is elevated (Mancia et al., 2023).

Randomized trials evaluating remote management strategies reported superior blood pressure control compared to usual care. The TASMIN-SR trial demonstrated that high-risk patients utilizing self-titration combined with telemonitoring achieved a substantial systolic BP reduction of 9.2 mm Hg (95% CI 5.7–12.7) compared to usual care after 12 months. Similarly, the larger TASMINH4 trial (N=1182) reported that GP-led remote management reduced systolic BP by 4.7 mm Hg (95% CI 2.4–7.0; $p<0.0001$) compared to usual care, confirming that superior control can be achieved without increasing clinician workload or face-to-face visits.

3.3. Remote Monitoring in Heart Failure

Trials utilizing implantable pulmonary artery (PA) pressure sensors to detect early hemodynamic congestion (elevated cardiac filling pressures prior to symptom onset) for remote management reported reductions in heart failure (HF) hospitalizations. The CHAMPION trial demonstrated a 28% reduction in hospitalizations for NYHA Class III patients managed via remote PA pressure guidance, allowing for medication adjustments without physical evaluation (Givertz et al., 2017). Post-approval studies confirmed these results in real-world settings, showing consistent efficacy across racial subgroups; specifically, heart failure hospitalization rates were reduced by 59% in White patients (HR 0.41; 95% CI 0.36–0.46) and by 51% in Black/African American patients (HR 0.49; 95% CI 0.39–0.62). In the MONITOR-HF trial, remote hemodynamic monitoring reduced HF hospitalizations by 44% (HR 0.56) but was associated with a higher frequency of remote patient contacts and medication adjustments compared to standard care, replacing reactive hospital care with proactive remote management (Brugts et al., 2023).

The GUIDE-HF trial showed a significant reduction in hospitalizations (HR 0.72) in pre-COVID-19 analyses, though the primary composite endpoint was neutral in the overall analysis due to pandemic-related confounders (Lindenfeld et al., 2021). In contrast, remote monitoring via intrathoracic impedance (e.g., DOT-HF), which measures thoracic fluid accumulation as a surrogate for pulmonary congestion rather than direct intracardiac pressure, did not reduce hospitalizations and was associated with increased false-positive alerts (Sousa et al., 2014).

Outcomes for non-invasive remote monitoring varied by intervention structure. The TIM-HF2 trial reported that structured remote patient management reduced the percentage of days lost to unplanned cardiovascular hospital admissions or death (4.88% vs. 6.64%) and reduced all-cause mortality (HR 0.70), demonstrating the efficacy of virtual care models (Koehler et al., 2018). A study of a telemonitoring solution in Finland reported a 70% decrease in HF hospitalizations and a 49% reduction in associated costs, alongside a 318% increase in secondary care phone calls, shifting the burden from inpatient to remote outpatient care (Kokkonen et al., 2024). Systematic reviews indicated that active remote management was more likely to reduce readmissions than passive systems, although barriers such as added clinician time burden and the digital divide persist (Kwaah et al., 2025; Masterson Creber et al., 2023).

Furthermore, while remote monitoring effectively reduces hospitalizations, it fundamentally shifts the burden of care surveillance from the controlled hospital environment to the patient's home. This transfer of responsibility relies heavily on the patient's or their caregiver's technical competency to manage transmission hardware and interpret alerts. Consequently, the clinical success of these interventions is increasingly dependent on the availability of robust home infrastructure and the mitigation of the 'technological complexity' barrier, which disproportionately affects older, multimorbid populations.

3.4. Respiratory & Mental Health Integration

3.4.1 Smart Inhalers in Asthma and COPD: Monitoring of Inhalation Technique and Adherence

The reviewed studies consistently reported that smart inhaler technologies enable objective monitoring of medication adherence and inhalation technique in patients with asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD). Chamaon et al. (2025) validated an artificial intelligence–powered dry powder inhaler (RS01X) intended for clinical use in asthma and COPD. The device employed embedded AI algorithms to record and analyze inhalation parameters, including inspiratory flow profile, inhalation duration, and inhaled volume. The validation analysis demonstrated a strong correlation between AI-derived measurements and reference laboratory equipment, confirming the accuracy of the device in detecting suboptimal inhalation patterns. In addition, the system provided automated, real-time feedback to users, enabling immediate identification of inhalation errors and facilitating remote monitoring of inhalation technique quality (Chamaon et al., 2025).

Complementary findings were reported by Zabczyk and Blakey (2021), who examined the impact of connected smart inhalers on medication adherence. Their study showed that connectivity features, such as audiovisual reminders, electronic adherence tracking, and clinician-accessible data dashboards, were associated with higher rates of timely medication use compared with conventional inhalers. The authors reported improved adherence levels and fewer missed doses among users of connected inhalers. Continuous data transmission enabled healthcare professionals to identify patterns of nonadherence and initiate targeted telemedical follow-up when required (Zabczyk & Blakey, 2021). Overall, the reviewed studies demonstrate that smart inhalers function as digital monitoring tools capable of capturing real-world adherence behavior and inhalation technique parameters, supporting remote clinical oversight in asthma and COPD management.

3.4.2 Digital Therapeutics (DTx) for Mental Health Support in Chronic Disease

The reviewed literature indicated that digital therapeutics (DTx) are associated with improvements in psychological outcomes among patients with chronic somatic diseases and can be delivered within telemedicine-based care models. Kim et al. conducted a multicenter randomized controlled trial evaluating a digital therapeutic intervention for pulmonary rehabilitation. The intervention incorporated structured respiratory exercises, progress monitoring, and psychological support components delivered through a digital platform. Compared with standard care, participants in the intervention group demonstrated significant improvements in pulmonary function and exercise capacity, as well as reductions in anxiety and depression scores measured using validated psychological assessment tools (Kim et al., 2024).

In a large-scale systematic review and meta-analysis, Brinsley et al. (2025) synthesized evidence from digital lifestyle interventions targeting mental health outcomes, including depression, anxiety, stress, and overall well-being. Across the included studies, digital interventions were associated with statistically significant reductions in depressive and anxiety symptoms and improvements in well-being measures. Most trials involved populations with chronic physical conditions, indicating that digital mental health interventions were frequently applied in the context of long-term disease management (Brinsley et al., 2025). Taken together, the reviewed studies indicate that digital therapeutics can be implemented as adjunctive tools to address psychological comorbidities in individuals with chronic diseases. While most studies focused on short- to medium-term outcomes, a smaller number reported challenges related to sustained user engagement over time.

3.5 The Digital Divide 2.0, Patient Engagement, and Systemic Barriers in Telemedicine for Chronic Disease Management

The rapid expansion of telemedicine has reshaped chronic disease management, particularly following the COVID-19 pandemic. Early discussions of inequity in telemedicine largely focused on access to devices and internet connectivity. However, contemporary evidence demonstrates that disparities now extend beyond access to encompass digital literacy, usability, and systemic integration. This evolution often referred to as “Digital Divide 2.0” reveals that possessing technology does not equate to the ability to use it effectively. These layered barriers disproportionately affect older adults, individuals with complex chronic conditions, and healthcare systems operating within fragmented technical and economic frameworks.

3.5.1 Digital Divide 2.0: Literacy Versus Access and the “Grey Divide”

Digital Divide 2.0 reflects a fundamental shift from infrastructural availability toward the skills, confidence, and cognitive capacity required to engage meaningfully with telemedicine platforms. While device ownership and broadband access increased substantially during the pandemic, especially among older adults, digital literacy has emerged as a more persistent and consequential barrier. This phenomenon is most visible in the “grey divide,” which describes the paradox whereby older adults who often have the highest need for chronic disease management experience the greatest difficulty using digital health technologies.

The mixed-methods study by Chen et al. (2023) provides critical insight into this issue, demonstrating that older adults frequently experience telehealth as cognitively and emotionally burdensome even when access barriers are resolved. Participants reported difficulty learning new platforms, anxiety about making errors, and frustration with frequent software updates and authentication steps. Age-related sensory impairments, such as reduced vision and hearing, along with declines in processing speed and working memory, further complicated navigation of telemedicine interfaces. Importantly, these challenges persisted despite prior technology exposure, reinforcing that access alone is insufficient to ensure meaningful telemedicine use.

Evidence from community-based and residential settings further confirms the persistence of the grey divide. In a JMIR Aging study, Mao et al. (2022) examined barriers to video-based telemedicine among older adults in independent living facilities (mean age 84.3 years) and found that comfort with video visits decreased with advancing age, despite sustained interest. The authors quantified that 35.7% of participants reported hearing difficulties as a primary barrier, while 30.1% lacked familiarity with the necessary technology and 29.7% did not know how to log in to the platform. These findings underscore a critical distinction between willingness to engage in telemedicine and the practical ability to do so, highlighting that motivation alone cannot overcome deficits in digital literacy or usability.

Patient perceptions of care quality further illustrate the clinical implications of the grey divide. In a hematology cohort, Palandri et al. (2021) found that older patients rated telemedicine visits as providing less adequate care compared to younger patients and expressed lower willingness to continue using virtual services. Together, these findings indicate that without targeted accommodations such as simplified interfaces, caregiver or peer support, and hybrid care models telemedicine risks widening age-related disparities in chronic disease management.

3.5.2 The Invisible Workforce: Dyadic Engagement and the Burden on Caregivers

While telemedicine and remote monitoring technologies are predominantly designed with a single user the patient in mind, the reality of chronic disease management, particularly among older adults, is inherently dyadic. Recent evidence highlights that digital health interventions often rely on an "invisible workforce" of informal caregivers who mediate the interaction between the patient and the technology. Lam et al. (2020) estimate that approximately 13 million older adults in the United States are "unready" for telemedicine due to inexperience with technology or physical disabilities, necessitating reliance on social support to facilitate care. This creates a structural challenge where caregivers must manage the patient's digital identity. Wolff et al. (2022) argue that current portal designs often fail to support these "care partners," leading to widespread informal workarounds where caregivers log in using the patient's own credentials rather than authorized proxy accounts. This practice obscures the identity of the user engaging with the healthcare system and raises significant privacy and security concerns. Furthermore, the lack of granular privacy controls forces a binary choice share everything or nothing which does not reflect the nuanced preferences of older adults regarding sensitive health information. Consequently, the effectiveness of telemedicine in this demographic is often less a reflection of the patient's adherence than of the caregiver's ability to navigate these systemic barriers.

3.5.3 Patient Engagement and Usability Challenges

Beyond digital literacy, sustained patient engagement represents a major challenge in telemedicine-based chronic disease care. Even when patients initially adopt digital tools, long-term engagement is frequently undermined by usability issues, frustration, and alert fatigue. High attrition rates indicate that disengagement is not an isolated phenomenon but a structural limitation of many digital health interventions. A systematic review and meta-analysis by Meyerowitz-Katz et al. (2020) reported pooled dropout rates of 43% across app-based chronic disease interventions, with even higher attrition observed in real-world observational studies (49%) compared to randomized controlled trials (40%). This disparity highlights the gap between controlled research environments and real-world implementation, where usability problems and competing demands accelerate disengagement.

Usability challenges disproportionately affect older adults and individuals managing multiple chronic conditions. A 2023 JMIR mHealth systematic review by Gómez-Hernández et al. identified recurring usability deficiencies in mobile health and telemedicine applications, including overly complex interfaces, multi-step navigation requirements, small or poorly legible text, weak visual hierarchies, and insufficient system feedback. These design shortcomings increase cognitive load and user frustration, particularly among individuals with sensory impairments or reduced cognitive reserve, and contribute to anxiety, reduced confidence in technology use, and discontinuation of digital health tools despite ongoing clinical need.

Healthcare providers also face engagement-related challenges that indirectly shape patient experience. A 2024 BMJ Open umbrella review by Oudbier et al. emphasized that successful telemedicine implementation requires sufficient training and support for both patients and clinicians. Providers reported limited familiarity with telemedicine platforms, workflow disruptions, and concerns about reduced communication quality. Many clinicians perceived a loss of relational depth and diminished capacity for holistic assessment when virtual encounters replaced in-person examinations, contributing to frustration and reduced confidence in clinical decision-making. This creates a discrepancy in which patients may value convenience, while providers experience erosion of clinical nuance. Mitigation strategies emphasize human-centered and iterative design. Meyerowitz-Katz et al. suggest that tailored messaging, integration of self-management education, regular health professional contact, and continuous user feedback are essential for improving usability and sustaining long-term engagement. Without these measures, telemedicine risks functioning as a short-term intervention rather than an enduring model of chronic disease care.

3.5.4 Technostress and the Trust Deficit: Psychological Barriers to Automation

Beyond the tangible barriers of usability, the psychological impact of engaging with automated healthcare systems has emerged as a critical determinant of sustained use. The constant demand to interact with digital interfaces can generate "technostress" a condition resulting from the inability to cope with new technologies in a healthy manner. Rahmi et al. (2025) describe this phenomenon as driven by "techno-overload" and "techno-invasion," where the constant connectivity and complexity of digital tools lead to cognitive fatigue and emotional exhaustion. For patients managing chronic conditions, this manifests as digital fatigue, potentially leading to the abandonment of monitoring tools. A central component of this psychological barrier is the "trust deficit" in automated decision-making. Amann et al. (2020) emphasize that the "black box" nature of many AI-driven systems where the logic behind a recommendation is opaque hinders the development of trust required for patients and clinicians to act on algorithmic advice. Without "explainability,"

patients may view automated therapeutic recommendations as a threat to their autonomy or simply reject them due to a lack of understanding. Consequently, even highly accurate telemedical interventions may face rejection if they fail to provide transparent, understandable rationales that reassure the user.

3.5.5 Infrastructure as a Social Determinant: The Hardware Gap

While discussions on the digital divide often focus on skills, a more fundamental material barrier persists: "hardware poverty" and infrastructural exclusion. Eruchalu et al. (2021) identify digital access as a social determinant of health, noting that millions of individuals lack the broadband infrastructure or appropriate devices (e.g., tablets or smartphones with video capability) required for modern telemedicine. This creates a "digital redlining" effect where low-income and minority populations are systematically excluded from virtual care innovations. Moreover, the efficacy of telemedicine is inextricably linked to the quality of connectivity. Sieck et al. (2021) define digital inclusion as a "super social determinant of health," arguing that connectivity encompasses not just the existence of infrastructure but the affordability of data plans. Patients with limited data caps may be forced to ration their engagement with healthcare providers or rely on insecure public Wi-Fi networks. This evidence suggests that without addressing these infrastructural foundations, the shift toward "mobile-first" chronic care risks institutionalizing a two-tier system where optimal management is a privilege of the digitally connected class.

3.5.6 Systemic and Economic Barriers to Telemedicine Integration

Even when patient-level challenges are addressed, systemic and economic barriers continue to limit the scalability and sustainability of telemedicine. One of the most significant systemic obstacles is the failure to integrate patient-generated health data (PGHD) into routine clinical workflows. Consumer devices such as smartwatches, glucose monitors, blood pressure cuffs, and fitness trackers generate large volumes of continuous health data with clear relevance for chronic disease management and clinical collaboration. However, this data remains largely inaccessible to clinicians.

Abedian et al. (2025) highlight that technical, regulatory, and interoperability challenges particularly those related to standards such as Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources (FHIR) continue to impede PGHD integration. Data generated by consumer devices often remains confined within proprietary applications, creating persistent data silos disconnected from electronic health records (EHRs). Without secure, standardized data exchange, clinicians are unable to efficiently interpret longitudinal trends or incorporate PGHD into clinical decision-making. The lack of standardization further compounds this issue. Devices frequently report similar metrics using different formats, definitions, and temporal resolutions, rendering manual interpretation impractical in time-constrained clinical settings. Consequently, potentially valuable data is transformed into unusable noise, limiting the effectiveness of remote monitoring and collaborative chronic care models.

Economic barriers reinforce these systemic limitations. Mkuu et al. (2023) concluded that reimbursement policies ultimately determine the sustainability of telemedicine. Historically, telemedicine encounters have been reimbursed at lower rates than in-person services, discouraging provider adoption. Additionally, high-quality remote chronic care involves substantial uncompensated work, including asynchronous review of PGHD and patient communication that often falls outside existing billing frameworks. Rabbani et al. (2025) confirm that uncertain reimbursement policies remain a central barrier to digital health transformation.

3.5.7 Summary of Socio-Technical Barriers

Taken together, Digital Divide 2.0, patient engagement challenges, and systemic and economic barriers demonstrate that telemedicine's limitations extend far beyond access to technology. Digital literacy deficits, usability failures, interoperability constraints, and reimbursement uncertainty jointly restrict the effectiveness of telemedicine for chronic disease management and clinical collaboration. Addressing these challenges requires coordinated efforts across patient-centered design, clinician training, data standardization, and health policy reform. Without such alignment, telemedicine risks reinforcing existing inequities rather than realizing its promise as a transformative model of chronic care.

4. Discussion

4.1. The Ethical and Psychological Burden of Continuous Monitoring

The integration of continuous monitoring technologies into chronic disease management has precipitated a fundamental shift in the ethical landscape of healthcare, creating complex challenges regarding privacy and patient autonomy. While the clinical intent of systems like Continuous Glucose Monitoring is protective—aiming to detect deterioration before symptoms manifest—the ubiquity of sensors effectively dissolves the traditional boundary between the clinical environment and the private sphere (Dillard-Wright, 2019). This transition fosters a model of "continuous clinical surveillance," where medical oversight is no longer episodic but perpetual (Armstrong, 1995). Consequently, patients may experience significant psychological pressure, often described as "surveillance fatigue," where the constant awareness of being observed compels them to engage in performative compliance to satisfy the remote clinical team (Lupton, 2013).

Central to this tension is the discrepancy between the patient's lived experience and their "digital phenotype"—the assemblage of physiological and behavioral metrics generated by monitoring devices. In the management of chronic conditions, this aggregated data often acquires an epistemic authority that supersedes the patient's subjective narrative (Ruckenstein, 2014). This phenomenon creates a risk of "data-driven reductionism," where the objective truth of sensor readings is prioritized over the patient's reported symptoms. As noted by Lupton (2013), this datafication can alienate individuals from their own care process, as the complexity of illness is flattened into actionable metrics that may fail to capture the holistic nature of patient suffering.

The ethical implications of this surveillance are compounded by concerns regarding data usage, where Patient-Generated Health Data (PGHD) is frequently treated not merely as a clinical asset but as a commercial resource for behavioral prediction (Gross & Mothersill, 2023). A critical ethical barrier remains the lack of true data sovereignty. While emerging standards like Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources aim to streamline the integration of wearable data into healthcare systems (Abedian et al., 2025), the reality is often characterized by proprietary silos. Research into mental health and lifestyle applications reveals that sensitive psychographic data is frequently shared with third-party aggregators under opaque terms, effectively commodifying human experience without meaningful consent (Gross & Mothersill, 2023). Furthermore, manufacturers often claim proprietary rights over raw physiological data, leaving patients unable to fully access or control the digital representations of their own bodies (Quintal et al., 2019).

The rise of automated decision-making systems introduces the risk of "automation bias," which threatens to erode patient autonomy (Kenig et al., 2024). This is most visible in the advent of closed-loop systems and automated insulin delivery. These systems utilize sophisticated control strategies ranging from reactive Proportional-Integral-Derivative algorithms to proactive Model Predictive Control algorithms to automate dosage without human intervention. While this automation offers relief from the behavioral burden of constant decision-making, it demands a surrender of control to the algorithm (Quintal et al., 2019). The shift toward MPC algorithms deepens the "black box" problem, where the internal logic of decision-making remains inaccessible to the user. As AI systems are increasingly perceived as infallible, both patients and clinicians may suffer from over-reliance on the machine’s judgment, even when it conflicts with personal preferences or somatic sensations (Kenig et al., 2024). To mitigate this, McCradden and Kirsch (2023) argue that "patient wisdom" must be explicitly incorporated into health AI to prevent the displacement of human values by algorithmic optimization, ensuring that technology remains a tool for empowerment rather than a mechanism of control.

4.2. From Monitoring to Prediction (AI & Big Data)

The findings of this review indicate that telemedicine in chronic disease management is evolving from passive monitoring of physiological parameters toward predictive models based on artificial intelligence and large-scale data analytics. The demonstrated effectiveness of continuous glucose monitoring, remote blood pressure measurement, and hemodynamic surveillance in heart failure confirms that the primary value of telemedicine lies not in isolated measurements, but in the analysis of longitudinal trends and the dynamics of clinical change (Rodbard, 2016; McManus et al., 2014; Givertz et al., 2017).

In diabetology, this transition is particularly evident. MPC algorithms used in closed-loop systems do not merely respond to current glucose levels but forecast future glycemic trajectories based on historical data, enabling preemptive insulin dose adjustments. Clinically, this translates into increased time in range and reduced hypoglycemia without the need for continuous physician intervention, highlighting the potential of

prediction-based automation (Cobelli et al., 2011; Hovorka et al., 2011; Garg et al., 2017). A similar mechanism is observed in heart failure, where implantable pulmonary artery pressure sensors enable the detection of early hemodynamic changes days or weeks before the onset of clinical symptoms. Remote algorithms based on these data allow for earlier pharmacological adjustments and prevention of hospitalizations, underscoring the importance of physiologically meaningful input signals for effective clinical prediction (Givertz et al., 2017).

In respiratory diseases, smart inhalers provide an additional layer of predictive data. Objective monitoring of inhalation technique and medication adherence enables the identification of behavioral patterns preceding asthma or COPD exacerbations, creating opportunities for early telemedical intervention before clinical decompensation occurs (Zabczyk & Blakey, 2021; Chamaon et al., 2025). Psychological factors represent an important complementary dimension of predictive modeling. Evidence from digital mental health interventions suggests that changes in mood, anxiety levels, or patient engagement may precede deterioration in somatic disease control. Integrating behavioral and psychological data into predictive models supports a more holistic approach to chronic disease management (Kim et al., 2024; Brinsley et al., 2025).

Against this backdrop, the concept of digital twins is gaining increasing relevance. Digital twins are dynamic, virtual representations of patients that are continuously updated in real time using data from multiple sources, including continuous glucose monitoring systems, hemodynamic sensors, wearable devices, smart inhalers, and digital therapeutics. Unlike traditional decision-support algorithms, digital twins enable simulation of therapeutic scenarios, assessment of decompensation risk, and individualized treatment optimization, offering a novel platform for clinical collaboration in chronic disease management (Elgammal et al., 2025). However, the implementation of this paradigm remains constrained by systemic barriers, including limited interoperability, fragmentation of data generated by consumer devices, and insufficient integration of patient-generated health data into electronic health records. Moreover, the performance of AI algorithms is highly dependent on data quality and representativeness, raising concerns about the potential reinforcement of health inequities if models are trained predominantly on digitally literate populations (Abedian et al., 2025; Chen et al., 2023). Moreover, the predictive power of AI is inextricably linked to the quality, continuity, and representativeness of the underlying data streams. As highlighted by the infrastructural gaps identified in this review, widespread 'data poverty' results in fragmented or missing datasets for low-income populations who lack consistent connectivity. If AI models are trained primarily on data harvested from users with high-end devices and stable broadband, predictive algorithms risk becoming inherently biased, optimizing care only for the digitally privileged while failing to accurately predict decompensation in unconnected or under-connected groups. Thus, the material conditions of technology access directly influence the epistemic validity of these predictive models. Consequently, the transition from monitoring to prediction requires not only technological advancement but also parallel progress in data standardization, user-centered system design, and regulatory frameworks.

4.3. Limitations of Current Evidence

Despite the growing number of studies demonstrating the effectiveness of telemedicine, significant methodological limitations remain within the current evidence base. One of the key challenges is the difficulty of conducting classical RCTs in the field of digital health. Telemedical technologies, including AI algorithms, mobile applications, and remote monitoring devices, evolve more rapidly than the timelines required for RCT design, recruitment, and completion, often resulting in interventions becoming outdated before study results are published (Oudbier et al., 2024, Guo et al., 2020).

In addition, digital interventions are characterized by substantial heterogeneity, encompassing varying levels of automation, clinical support, and patient engagement, which complicates standardization and comparability across studies. High user attrition rates and the selection of populations with higher digital literacy further limit the generalizability of findings to older adults and patients with multiple chronic conditions (Meyerowitz-Katz et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2023). Consequently, future research should complement traditional RCTs with adaptive study designs, real-world evidence, and continuous algorithm evaluation in order to better reflect the dynamic nature of telemedicine and its implementation in routine clinical practice.

5. Conclusions

5.1. Summary of Findings: The technology is effective, but the systems are lacking

This review synthesizes a robust body of evidence confirming that telemedicine technologies ranging from CGM and implantable hemodynamic sensors to AI-driven smart inhalers are clinically effective and frequently outperform conventional episodic care models. Across chronic conditions, remote monitoring demonstrates consistent improvements in metabolic control (HbA1c reductions of 0.32–1.0%), decreased cardiovascular mortality (HR 0.70 in heart failure populations), and enhanced diagnostic precision for hypertension. By fulfilling the primary objective of this review contrasting clinical potential with socio-technical reality it becomes evident that while the technological infrastructure for continuous management is mature, the systemic and organizational frameworks that should sustain it remain underdeveloped. Persistent challenges include the inadequate integration of PGHD into electronic health records due to poor standardization (e.g., limited FHIR adoption) and proprietary data silos. Additionally, the "black box" nature of predictive algorithms and high attrition rates in real-world use (approaching 50%) reveal that technological efficacy does not yet equate to long-term sustainability. Consequently, future research must evolve from validating device accuracy toward adaptive study designs capable of tracking continuous technological progress while ensuring algorithmic transparency and patient safety.

5.2. Implications for Practice: The need for digital education of patients

Findings related to the "Digital Divide 2.0" and the "Grey Divide" underscore a critical truth: access to devices alone does not guarantee equitable telemedicine participation. Although telehealth infrastructure expanded rapidly post-COVID-19, older adults and patients with multiple chronic conditions continue to experience substantial cognitive, emotional, and usability burdens. Many perceive remote care as confusing, intrusive, or depersonalized barriers that directly undermine adherence and trust. Accordingly, the transition to telemedicine-enabled chronic care must prioritize human-centered system design and the institutionalization of digital literacy education as an essential element of therapeutic care. Clinicians should extend their role beyond device prescription to include structured patient onboarding, continuous support, and strategies to mitigate "alert fatigue" and "automation bias." By equipping patients and providers alike with the necessary digital competencies, healthcare systems can transform telemedicine from a technical innovation into a sustainable model of patient empowerment and engagement.

5.3. Final Verdict: Telemedicine as a standard, not an add-on

The cumulative evidence presented in this review supports a definitive conclusion: telemedicine should no longer be regarded as an adjunct or emergency alternative to in-person care but as a core standard of chronic disease management. The global burden of non-communicable diseases demands a shift from reactive, episodic treatment toward proactive, continuous, and data-driven care. Realizing this transformation requires policies that institutionalize telemedicine through reimbursement parity for asynchronous care, standardized data governance, and patient data sovereignty. Ethical safeguards must ensure that algorithmic systems enhance rather than replace clinical judgment, and that technological automation reinforces, rather than erodes, patient autonomy. If these scientific, structural, and ethical challenges are addressed through coordinated innovation and policy reform, telemedicine can evolve from a reactive convenience into the foundation of an equitable, predictive, and resilient healthcare ecosystem one that redefines the practice of chronic care in the 21st century.

REFERENCES

1. Abedian, S., Yesakov, E., Ostrovskiy, S., & Hussein, R. (2025). Streamlining wearable data integration for EHDS: a case study on advancing healthcare interoperability using Garmin devices and FHIR. *Frontiers in digital health*, *7*, 1636775. https://doi.org/10.3389/fdgth.2025.1636775
2. AlQassab, O., Kanthajan, T., Pandey, M., Francis, A. J., Sreenivasan, C., Parikh, A., & Nwosu, M. (2024). Evaluating the Impact of Telemedicine on Diabetes Management in Rural Communities: A Systematic Review. *Cureus*, *16*(7), e64928. https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.64928
3. Amann, J., Blasimme, A., Vayena, E., Frey, D., Madai, V. I., & Precise4Q consortium (2020). Explainability for artificial intelligence in healthcare: a multidisciplinary perspective. *BMC medical informatics and decision making*, *20*(1), 310. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12911-020-01332-6
4. Armstrong, D. (1995). The rise of surveillance medicine. Sociology of Health & Illness, 17(3), 393–404. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9566.ep10933329.
5. Beck, R. W., Riddlesworth, T., Ruedy, K., Ahmann, A., Bergenstal, R., Haller, S., ... & Price, D. (2017). Effect of continuous glucose monitoring on glycemic control in adults with type 1 diabetes using insulin injections: The DIAMOND randomized clinical trial. JAMA, 317(4), 371-378. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2016.19975
6. Boers, E., Barrett, M., Su, J. G., Benjafield, A. V., Sinha, S., Kaye, L., Zar, H. J., Vuong, V., Tellez, D., Gondalia, R., Rice, M. B., Nunez, C. M., Wedzicha, J. A., & Malhotra, A. (2023). Global Burden of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease Through 2050. *JAMA network open*, *6*(12), e2346598. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.46598
7. Brinsley, J., O'Connor, E. J., Singh, B., McKeon, G., Curtis, R., Ferguson, T., Gosse, G., Willems, I., Marent, P. J., Szeto, K., Firth, J., & Maher, C. (2025). Effectiveness of Digital Lifestyle Interventions on Depression, Anxiety, Stress, and Well-Being: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Journal of medical Internet research*, *27*, e56975. https://doi.org/10.2196/56975
8. Brugts, J. J., Radhoe, S. P., Clephas, P. R. D., Aydin, D., van Gent, M. W. F., Szymanski, M. K., Rienstra, M., van den Heuvel, M. H., da Fonseca, C. A., Linssen, G. C. M., Borleffs, C. J. W., Boersma, E., Asselbergs, F. W., Mosterd, A., Brunner-La Rocca, H. P., de Boer, R. A., & MONITOR-HF investigators (2023). Remote haemodynamic monitoring of pulmonary artery pressures in patients with chronic heart failure (MONITOR-HF): a randomised clinical trial. *Lancet (London, England)*, *401*(10394), 2113–2123. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(23)00923-6
9. Chamaon, D., Sportel, E., Elferink, E. C. M., & van der Palen, J. (2025). Validation of an AI-Powered Smart Dry Powder Inhaler (RS01X) for Asthma and COPD in a Clinical Setting. *International journal of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease*, *20*, 811–819. https://doi.org/10.2147/COPD.S490684
10. Chen, A., Chen, L., Cheston, K., Zamil, K., Chang, T., Cray, H., & Vahia, I. (2023). Emerging and Evolving Applications of Telemedicine for older adults: A Scoping Review. *The American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, *31*(3), S76. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jagp.2022.12.240
11. Chiaranai, C., Chularee, S., Saokaew, S., Bhatarasakoon, P., Umnuaypornlert, A., Chaomuang, N., Doommai, N., & Nimkuntod, P. (2023). Effectiveness of telehealth on the glycemic control of patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *International journal of nursing studies advances*, *6*, 100169. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnsa.2023.100169
12. Cobelli, C., Renard, E., & Kovatchev, B. (2011). Artificial pancreas: past, present, future. *Diabetes*, *60*(11), 2672–2682. https://doi.org/10.2337/db11-0654
13. Cohen, J. B., Lotito, M. J., Trivedi, U. K., Denker, M. G., Cohen, D. L., & Townsend, R. R. (2019). Cardiovascular Events and Mortality in White Coat Hypertension: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Annals of internal medicine*, *170*(12), 853–862. https://doi.org/10.7326/M19-0223
14. Dillard-Wright J. (2019). Electronic health record as a panopticon: A disciplinary apparatus in nursing practice. *Nursing philosophy : an international journal for healthcare professionals*, *20*(2), e12239. https://doi.org/10.1111/nup.12239
15. Elgammal, Z., Albrijawi, M. T., & Alhajj, R. (2025). Digital twins in healthcare: a review of AI-powered practical applications across health domains. *Journal of Big Data 2025 12:1*, *12*(1), 234-. https://doi.org/10.1186/S40537-025-01280-W
16. Eruchalu, C. N., Pichardo, M. S., Bharadwaj, M., Rodriguez, C. B., Rodriguez, J. A., Bergmark, R. W., Bates, D. W., & Ortega, G. (2021). The Expanding Digital Divide: Digital Health Access Inequities during the COVID-19 Pandemic in New York City. *Journal of urban health : bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, *98*(2), 183–186. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11524-020-00508-9
17. Eurostat. (2024, July). Cardiovascular diseases statistics. Ec.europa.eu. https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Cardiovascular_diseases_statistics
18. Garg, S. K., Weinzimer, S. A., Tamborlane, W. V., Buckingham, B. A., Bode, B. W., Bailey, T. S., Brazg, R. L., Ilany, J., Slover, R. H., Anderson, S. M., Bergenstal, R. M., Grosman, B., Roy, A., Cordero, T. L., Shin, J., Lee, S. W., & Kaufman, F. R. (2017). Glucose Outcomes with the In-Home Use of a Hybrid Closed-Loop Insulin Delivery System in Adolescents and Adults with Type 1 Diabetes. *Diabetes technology & therapeutics*, *19*(3), 155–163. https://doi.org/10.1089/dia.2016.0421

19. Givertz, M. M., Stevenson, L. W., Costanzo, M. R., Bourge, R. C., Bauman, J. G., Ginn, G., Abraham, W. T., & CHAMPION Trial Investigators (2017). Pulmonary Artery Pressure-Guided Management of Patients With Heart Failure and Reduced Ejection Fraction. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*, *70*(15), 1875–1886. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2017.08.010
20. Gomez-Hernandez, M., Ferre, X., Moral, C., & Villalba-Mora, E. (2023). Design Guidelines of Mobile Apps for Older Adults: Systematic Review and Thematic Analysis. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*, *11*, e43186. https://doi.org/10.2196/43186
21. Gross, N., & Mothersill, D. (2023). Surveillance Capitalism in Mental Health: When Good Apps Go Rogue (and What Can Be Done about It). *Social Sciences*, *12*(12), 679. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci12120679
22. Guo, C., Ashrafian, H., Ghafur, S., Fontana, G., Gardner, C., & Prime, M. (2020). Challenges for the evaluation of digital health solutions-A call for innovative evidence generation approaches. *NPJ digital medicine*, *3*, 110. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-020-00314-2
23. Haleem, A., Javaid, M., Singh, R. P., & Suman, R. (2021). Telemedicine for healthcare: Capabilities, features, barriers, and applications. *Sensors international*, *2*, 100117. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sintl.2021.100117
24. Hepburn, J., Williams, L., & McCann, L. (2025). Barriers to and Facilitators of Digital Health Technology Adoption Among Older Adults With Chronic Diseases: Updated Systematic Review. *JMIR aging*, *8*, e80000. https://doi.org/10.2196/80000
25. Hovorka, R., Kumareswaran, K., Harris, J., Allen, J. M., Elleri, D., Xing, D., Kollman, C., Nodale, M., Murphy, H. R., Dunger, D. B., Amiel, S. A., Heller, S. R., Wilinska, M. E., & Evans, M. L. (2011). Overnight closed loop insulin delivery (artificial pancreas) in adults with type 1 diabetes: crossover randomised controlled studies. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)*, *342*, d1855. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.d1855
26. Kenig, N., Garcia, D., Moreno, J. C., & Vives, A. M. (2024). Algorithmic Paternalism: Autonomy Versus Automation. International Journal of Transplantation & Plastic Surgery, 8(2), 1–3. https://doi.org/10.23880/IJTPS-16000193
27. Kim, C., Choi, H. E., Rhee, C. K., Song, J. H., & Lee, J. H. (2024). Efficacy of Digital Therapeutics for Pulmonary Rehabilitation: A Multi-Center, Randomized Controlled Trial. *Life (Basel, Switzerland)*, *14*(4), 469. https://doi.org/10.3390/life14040469
28. Koehler, F., Koehler, K., Deckwart, O., Prescher, S., Wegscheider, K., Kirwan, B. A., Winkler, S., Vettorazzi, E., Bruch, L., Oeff, M., Zugck, C., Doerr, G., Naegele, H., Störk, S., Butter, C., Sechtem, U., Angermann, C., Gola, G., Prondzinsky, R., Edelmann, F., … Stangl, K. (2018). Efficacy of telemedical interventional management in patients with heart failure (TIM-HF2): a randomised, controlled, parallel-group, unmasked trial. *Lancet (London, England)*, *392*(10152), 1047–1057. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31880-4
29. Kokkonen, J., Mustonen, P., Heikkilä, E., Leskelä, R. L., Pennanen, P., Krühn, K., Jalkanen, A., Laakso, J. P., Kempers, J., Väisänen, S., & Torkki, P. (2024). Effectiveness of Telemonitoring in Reducing Hospitalization and Associated Costs for Patients With Heart Failure in Finland: Nonrandomized Pre-Post Telemonitoring Study. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*, *12*, e51841. https://doi.org/10.2196/51841
30. Kwaah, P. A., Olumuyide, E., Farhat, K., Malaga-Espinoza, B., Abdullah, A., Beasley, M. H., Sari, N. Y., Stern, L. K., Lamprea-Montealegre, J. A., daSilva-deAbreu, A., & Hu, J.-R. (2025). Non-Invasive Telemonitoring in Heart Failure: A Systematic Review. *Medicina*, *61*(7), 1277. https://doi.org/10.3390/medicina61071277
31. Lam, K., Lu, A. D., Shi, Y., & Covinsky, K. E. (2020). Assessing Telemedicine Unreadiness Among Older Adults in the United States During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *JAMA internal medicine*, *180*(10), 1389–1391. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.2671
32. Lee, T. T. M., Collett, C., Bergford, S., Hartnell, S., Scott, E. M., Lindsay, R. S., Hunt, K. F., McCance, D. R., Barnard-Kelly, K., Rankin, D., Lawton, J., Reynolds, R. M., Flanagan, E., Hammond, M., Shepstone, L., Wilinska, M. E., Sibayan, J., Kollman, C., Beck, R., Hovorka, R., … AiDAPT Collaborative Group (2023). Automated Insulin Delivery in Women with Pregnancy Complicated by Type 1 Diabetes. *The New England journal of medicine*, *389*(17), 1566–1578. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2303911
33. Li, X., Huang, L., Zhang, H., & Liang, Z. (2025). Enabling Telemedicine From the System-Level Perspective: Scoping Review. *Journal of medical Internet research*, *27*, e65932. https://doi.org/10.2196/65932
34. Lind, M., Polonsky, W., Hirsch, I. B., Heise, T., Bolinder, J., Dahlqvist, S., Schwarz, E., Ólafsdóttir, A. F., Frid, A., Wedel, H., Ahlén, E., Nyström, T., & Hellman, J. (2017). Continuous Glucose Monitoring vs Conventional Therapy for Glycemic Control in Adults With Type 1 Diabetes Treated With Multiple Daily Insulin Injections: The GOLD Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*, *317*(4), 379–387. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2016.19976
35. Lindenfeld, J., Zile, M. R., Desai, A. S., Bhatt, K., Ducharme, A., Horstmanshof, D., Krim, S. R., Maisel, A., Mehra, M. R., Paul, S., Sears, S. F., Sauer, A. J., Smart, F., Zughaib, M., Castaneda, P., Kelly, J., Johnson, N., Sood, P., Ginn, G., Henderson, J., … Costanzo, M. R. (2021). Haemodynamic-guided management of heart failure (GUIDE-HF): a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet (London, England)*, *398*(10304), 991–1001. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)01754-2
36. Luengo-Fernandez, R., Walli-Attaei, M., Gray, A., Torbica, A., Maggioni, A. P., Huculeci, R., Bairami, F., Aboyans, V., Timmis, A. D., Vardas, P., & Leal, J. (2023). Economic burden of cardiovascular diseases in the European Union: a population-based cost study. *European heart journal*, *44*(45), 4752–4767. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehad583

37. Lupton, D. (2013). The digitally engaged patient: Self-monitoring and self-care in the digital health era. *Social Theory & Health, 11*(3), 256–270. https://doi.org/10.1057/sth.2013.10
38. Mancia, G., Kreutz, R., Brunström, M., Burnier, M., Grassi, G., Januszewicz, A., Muiesan, M. L., Tsioufis, K., Agabiti-Rosei, E., Algharably, E. A. E., Azizi, M., Benetos, A., Borghi, C., Hitij, J. B., Cifkova, R., Coca, A., Cornelissen, V., Cruickshank, J. K., Cunha, P. G., Danser, A. H. J., … Kjeldsen, S. E. (2023). 2023 ESH Guidelines for the management of arterial hypertension The Task Force for the management of arterial hypertension of the European Society of Hypertension: Endorsed by the International Society of Hypertension (ISH) and the European Renal Association (ERA). *Journal of hypertension*, *41*(12), 1874–2071. https://doi.org/10.1097/HJH.0000000000003480
39. Mao, A., Tam, L., Xu, A., Osborn, K., Sheffrin, M., Gould, C., Schillinger, E., Martin, M., & Mesias, M. (2022). Barriers to Telemedicine Video Visits for Older Adults in Independent Living Facilities: Mixed Methods Cross-sectional Needs Assessment. *JMIR aging*, *5*(2), e34326. https://doi.org/10.2196/34326
40. Masterson Creber, R., Dodson, J. A., Bidwell, J., Breathett, K., Lyles, C., Harmon Still, C., Ooi, S. Y., Yancy, C., Kitsiou, S., & American Heart Association Cardiovascular Disease in Older Populations Committee of the Council on Clinical Cardiology and the Council on Cardiovascular and Stroke Nursing; Council on Quality of Care and Outcomes Research; and Council on Peripheral Vascular Disease (2023). Telehealth and Health Equity in Older Adults With Heart Failure: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. *Circulation. Cardiovascular quality and outcomes*, *16*(11), e000123. https://doi.org/10.1161/HCQ.0000000000000123
41. McCradden, M. D., & Kirsch, R. E. (2023). Patient wisdom should be incorporated into health AI to avoid algorithmic paternalism. *Nature medicine*, *29*(4), 765–766. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-023-02224-8
42. McGill, D. E., Laffel, L. M., Volkening, L. K., Butler, D. A., Levy, W. L., Wasserman, R. M., & Anderson, B. J. (2020). Text Message Intervention for Teens with Type 1 Diabetes Preserves HbA1c: Results of a Randomized Controlled Trial. *Diabetes technology & therapeutics*, *22*(5), 374–382. https://doi.org/10.1089/dia.2019.0350
43. McManus, R. J., Mant, J., Haque, M. S., Bray, E. P., Bryan, S., Greenfield, S. M., Jones, M. I., Jowett, S., Little, P., Penaloza, C., Schwartz, C., Shackleford, H., Shovelton, C., Varghese, J., Williams, B., Hobbs, F. D., Gooding, T., Morrey, I., Fisher, C., & Buckley, D. (2014). Effect of self-monitoring and medication self-titration on systolic blood pressure in hypertensive patients at high risk of cardiovascular disease: the TASMIN-SR randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*, *312*(8), 799–808. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2014.10057
44. McManus, R. J., Mant, J., Franssen, M., Nickless, A., Schwartz, C., Hodgkinson, J., Bradburn, P., Farmer, A., Grant, S., Greenfield, S. M., Heneghan, C., Jowett, S., Martin, U., Milner, S., Monahan, M., Mort, S., Ogburn, E., Perera-Salazar, R., Shah, S. A., Yu, L. M., … TASMINH4 investigators (2018). Efficacy of self-monitored blood pressure, with or without telemonitoring, for titration of antihypertensive medication (TASMINH4): an unmasked randomised controlled trial. *Lancet (London, England)*, *391*(10124), 949–959. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)30309-X
45. Meyerowitz-Katz, G., Ravi, S., Arnolda, L., Feng, X., Maberly, G., & Astell-Burt, T. (2020). Rates of Attrition and Dropout in App-Based Interventions for Chronic Disease: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Journal of medical Internet research*, *22*(9), e20283. https://doi.org/10.2196/20283
46. Mkuu, R., Harle, C. A., Andreadis, K., Muellers, K. A., McDonnell, C., Goede, D., Shychuk, A., Ancker, J. S., Kaushal, R., & Lin, J. J. (2023). Financial factors that influenced telemedicine delivery during the COVID-19 pandemic. *The American Journal of Accountable Care*, *11*(2), 7–14. https://doi.org/10.37765/AJAC.2023.89379
47. NCD Risk Factor Collaboration (NCD-RisC) (2024). Worldwide trends in diabetes prevalence and treatment from 1990 to 2022: a pooled analysis of 1108 population-representative studies with 141 million participants. *Lancet (London, England)*, *404*(10467), 2077–2093. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(24)02317-1
48. Norman, G. J., Fernandes, J., Nemlekar, P., Andrade, S. B., Lupton, L., & Berk, A. (2025). Initiating continuous glucose monitoring is associated with improvements in glycemic control and reduced health care resource utilization for people with diabetes in a large US-insured population: A real-world evidence study. *Journal of managed care & specialty pharmacy*, *31*(1), 15–24. https://doi.org/10.18553/jmcp.2024.24255
49. Oudbier, S. J., Souget-Ruff, S. P., Chen, B. S. J., Ziesemer, K. A., Meij, H. J., & Smets, E. M. A. (2024). Implementation barriers and facilitators of remote monitoring, remote consultation and digital care platforms through the eyes of healthcare professionals: a review of reviews. *BMJ open*, *14*(6), e075833. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2023-075833
50. Palandri, F., Bartoletti, D., Giaquinta, S., D'Ambrosio, F., Auteri, G., Sutto, E., Catani, L., Vianelli, N., & Cavo, M. (2021). Telemedicine in patients with haematological diseases during the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic: selection criteria and patients' satisfaction. *British journal of haematology*, *192*(2), e48–e51. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjh.17208
51. Po, H. W., Chu, Y. C., Tsai, H. C., Lin, C. L., Chen, C. Y., & Ma, M. H. (2024). Efficacy of Remote Health Monitoring in Reducing Hospital Readmissions Among High-Risk Postdischarge Patients: Prospective Cohort Study. *JMIR formative research*, *8*, e53455. https://doi.org/10.2196/53455
52. Quintal, A., Messier, V., Rabasa-Lhoret, R., & Racine, E. (2019). A critical review and analysis of ethical issues associated with the artificial pancreas. *Diabetes & metabolism*, *45*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diabet.2018.04.003

53. Rabbani, M. G., Alam, A., & Prybutok, V. R. (2025). Digital Health Transformation Through Telemedicine (2020–2025): Barriers, Facilitators, and Clinical Outcomes—A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Encyclopedia*, *5*(4), 206. https://doi.org/10.3390/encyclopedia5040206
54. Radovanovic, D., Muggli, F., Bianchetti, M., Gallino, A., Parati, G., Suter, P. M., Schoenenberger-Berzins, R., Erne, P., & Schoenenberger, A. W. (2023). Comparison of office, home and ambulatory blood pressure measurements in hypertensive and suspected hypertensive SWICOS participants. *Blood pressure*, *32*(1), 2234496. https://doi.org/10.1080/08037051.2023.223449
55. Rahmi, K. H., Fahrudin, A., Supriyadi, T., Herlina, E., Rosilawati, R., & Ningrum, S. R. (2025). Technostress and cognitive fatigue: Reducing digital strain for improved employee well-being: A literature review. *Multidisciplinary Reviews*, *8*(12), 2025380. https://doi.org/10.31893/multirev.2025380
56. Ranjith, N., Kanna Baskaran, S. N., R, S., Ganesan, A., Kanakaraj, R., S, G., Shafy, S. M., & Nair, A. S. (2025). Current trends in telemedicine for chronic disease management. *Bioinformation*, *21*(4), 587–593. https://doi.org/10.6026/973206300210587
57. Rodbard D. (2016). Continuous Glucose Monitoring: A Review of Successes, Challenges, and Opportunities. *Diabetes technology & therapeutics*, *18 Suppl 2*(Suppl 2), S3–S13. https://doi.org/10.1089/dia.2015.0417
58. Ruckenstein, M. (2014). Visualized and Interacted Life: Personal Analytics and Engagements with Data Doubles. *Societies*, *4*(1), 68-84. https://doi.org/10.3390/soc4010068
59. Rukundo T., B. (2025). Advancements in Telemonitoring for Chronic Disease Management. Research Output Journal of Public Health and Medicine, 5(1), 65–71. https://doi.org/10.59298/ROJPHM/2025/516571
60. Sánchez Bacaicoa, M., Rico, S., Gullón, A., Fernandez Pardo, J., Villa, J., Nadiejda, E., Robles, R., Del Aguila, J. M., Cunha, P., Vassilenko, V., Rodilla, E., & Sánchez Muñoz-Torrero, J. F. (2025). Automated Office Blood Pressure Measurements in Waiting Room or Isolated Room for Diagnosis and Phenotyping of Hypertension. *Journal of the American Heart Association*, *14*(20), e038011. https://doi.org/10.1161/JAHA.124.038011
61. Shavelle, D. M., Desai, A. S., Abraham, W. T., Bourge, R. C., Raval, N., Rathman, L. D., Heywood, J. T., Jermyn, R. A., Pelzel, J., Jonsson, O. T., Costanzo, M. R., Henderson, J. D., Brett, M. E., Adamson, P. B., Stevenson, L. W., & CardioMEMS Post-Approval Study Investigators (2020). Lower Rates of Heart Failure and All-Cause Hospitalizations During Pulmonary Artery Pressure-Guided Therapy for Ambulatory Heart Failure: One-Year Outcomes From the CardioMEMS Post-Approval Study. *Circulation. Heart failure*, *13*(8), e006863. https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCHEARTFAILURE.119.006863
62. Sieck, C. J., Sheon, A., Ancker, J. S., Castek, J., Callahan, B., & Siefer, A. (2021). Digital inclusion as a social determinant of health. *NPJ digital medicine*, *4*(1), 52. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-021-00413-8
63. Sousa, C., Leite, S., Lagido, R., Ferreira, L., Silva-Cardoso, J., & Maciel, M. J. (2014). Telemonitoring in heart failure: A state-of-the-art review. *Revista Portuguesa de Cardiologia*, *33*(4), 229–239. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.REPC.2013.10.013
64. Uhl, S., Choure, A., Rouse, B., Loblack, A., & Reaven, P. (2024). Effectiveness of Continuous Glucose Monitoring on Metrics of Glycemic Control in Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *The Journal of clinical endocrinology and metabolism*, *109*(4), 1119–1131. https://doi.org/10.1210/clinem/dgad652
65. van Bon, A. C., Blauw, H., Jansen, T. J. P., Laverman, G. D., Urgert, T., Geessink-Mennink, J., Mulder, A. H., Out, M., Groote Veldman, R., Onvlee, A. J., Schouwenberg, B. J. J. W., Vermeulen, M. A. R., Diekman, M. J. M., Gerding, M. N., van Wijk, J. P. H., Klaassen, M., Witkop, M., & DeVries, J. H. (2024). Bihormonal fully closed-loop system for the treatment of type 1 diabetes: a real-world multicentre, prospective, single-arm trial in the Netherlands. *The Lancet. Digital health*, *6*(4), e272–e280. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500(24)00002-5
66. Wolff, J. L., Dukhanin, V., Burgdorf, J. G., & DesRoches, C. M. (2022). Shared Access to Patient Portals for Older Adults: Implications for Privacy and Digital Health Equity. *JMIR aging*, *5*(2), e34628. https://doi.org/10.2196/34628
67. Wosik, J., Fudim, M., Cameron, B., Gellad, Z. F., Cho, A., Phinney, D., Curtis, S., Roman, M., Poon, E. G., Ferranti, J., Katz, J. N., & Tcheng, J. (2020). Telehealth transformation: COVID-19 and the rise of virtual care. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association : JAMIA*, *27*(6), 957–962. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocaa067
68. Zabczyk, C., & Blakey, J. D. (2021). The Effect of Connected "Smart" Inhalers on Medication Adherence. *Frontiers in medical technology*, *3*, 657321. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmedt.2021.657321