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	THE RISE OF DIGITAL SELF-DIAGNOSIS: TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION AND ITS SOCIAL AND HEALTHCARE SYSTEM IMPLICATIONS
DOI	https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.2(50).2026.5252
RECEIVED	19 February 2026
ACCEPTED	17 April 2026
PUBLISHED	04 May 2026
LICENSE	The article is licensed under a **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.**

THE RISE OF DIGITAL SELF-DIAGNOSIS: TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION AND ITS SOCIAL AND HEALTHCARE SYSTEM IMPLICATIONS

Marta Omiecińska *(Corresponding Author, Email: martaomiecinska@gmail.com)*
Międzyleski Specialist Hospital of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0002-3134-8141

Monika Stępińska
University Clinical Center of the Medical University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0008-0347-2704

Alicja Maciejewska
Independent Public Health Care Complex in Pruszków, Pruszków, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0009-6903-2434

Maja Kaczor
National Medical Institute of the Ministry of the Interior and Administration, Warsaw, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0001-8218-5429

Weronika Trynkiewicz
Ludwik Rydygier Specialist Hospital, Kraków, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0008-2267-7166

Zuzanna Rybka
University Clinical Center, Medical University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0001-4056-8800

Julia Żak
Czerniakowski Hospital, Warsaw, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0008-3383-8025

Emilia Lenkiewicz
National Medical Institute of the Ministry of the Interior and Administration, Warsaw, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0001-4822-8157

Karolina Dąbrowska
Wojewódzki Szpital w Łomży, Łomża, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0002-9053-2002

Jakub Winiarczyk
Independent Public Health Care Complex in Pruszków, Pruszków, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0008-8163-5580

ABSTRACT

The rapid expansion of digital health technologies has transformed how people seek, interpret, and use medical information. Tools supporting self-diagnosis—such as online symptom checkers, AI-based chatbots, wearable biosensors, and mobile health applications—are now widely used across healthcare systems. This review examines the clinical, ethical, and societal implications of these developments.

A structured search of PubMed/MEDLINE, Google Scholar, and the Cochrane Library identified peer-reviewed studies published between 2010 and 2025 evaluating consumer-oriented diagnostic technologies. Eligible studies addressed diagnostic performance, behavioral outcomes, regulation, health literacy, and equity. Due to methodological heterogeneity, results were synthesized narratively.

Evidence suggests that digital self-diagnosis tools provide several benefits, including improved access to health information, earlier symptom assessment, triage support, and greater patient engagement. These advantages may be particularly important in resource-limited settings and during periods of healthcare system strain. However, notable concerns remain. Diagnostic accuracy varies considerably, and triage advice may be overly cautious or occasionally inappropriate. Additional risks include increased health anxiety, exposure to misinformation, data privacy issues, and the potential to exacerbate existing social inequalities. Moreover, the current evidence base is uneven, with limited real-world validation and insufficient research on long-term behavioral and professional impacts.

Digital self-diagnosis represents a lasting structural change rather than a temporary trend. Its effective integration into healthcare systems will require stronger regulatory oversight, greater investment in digital health literacy, and interdisciplinary research addressing clinical effectiveness, ethical governance, and equity. Careful management is necessary to ensure that technological innovation strengthens—rather than undermines—the quality and fairness of medical care.

KEYWORDS

Digital Health, Self-Diagnosis, Symptom Checkers, Artificial Intelligence, Mhealth, Wearable Devices

CITATION

Marta Omiecińska, Monika Stępińska, Alicja Maciejewska, Maja Kaczor, Weronika Trynkiewicz, Zuzanna Rybka, Julia Żak, Emilia Lenkiewicz, Karolina Dąbrowska, Jakub Winiarczyk. (2026) The Rise of Digital Self-Diagnosis: Technological Innovation and Its Social and Healthcare System Implications. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science*. 2(50). doi: 10.31435/ijitss.2(50).2026.5252

1. Introduction

The emergence of digital health technologies has significantly transformed the ways in which medical information is accessed and disseminated. Traditionally, medical knowledge was concentrated within professional institutions and mediated almost exclusively by healthcare providers. In contrast, contemporary digital infrastructures have fostered a decentralized environment in which individuals can independently obtain health-related information (Cohen et al., 2020; Meskó, 2022). Online platforms and digital tools now enable continuous access to specialized content that was once largely confined to professional domains (Lucas, 2015; Meskó, 2022). This process of disintermediation permits non-professionals to circumvent conventional gatekeeping structures through the use of interactive symptom assessment tools, mobile applications capable of transforming smartphones into diagnostic instruments (e.g., digital stethoscopes or electrocardiogram devices), and virtual peer-support communities (Cohen et al., 2020). As a result, the clinician's role is increasingly shifting from that of primary knowledge authority toward that of an advisor assisting patients in interpreting and contextualizing an expansive, and not always regulated, information landscape (Cohen et al., 2020; Mitchell & Kan, 2019).

The prevalence of self-directed diagnostic practices has expanded markedly and continues to grow. Empirical data indicate that more than one-third of adults in the United States consult online sources with the explicit aim of identifying potential medical conditions (Farnood et al., 2020; Millenson et al., 2018). Comparable patterns have been observed internationally. In Australia, for example, a substantial majority of consumers report searching the internet to better understand experienced symptoms (Robertson et al., 2014).

Similarly, in Germany, a large proportion of the population relies on online searches to inform health-related decisions (Radionova et al., 2023). This trend is also reflected in clinical practice: a significant number of general practitioners report encountering patients who present with diagnoses formulated on the basis of digital information (Farnood et al., 2020).

The growing reliance on digital self-diagnosis tools carries important clinical and societal implications. From a clinical perspective, symptom-checking applications may enhance triage processes and support the management of chronic diseases, particularly in contexts characterized by limited healthcare resources (Cohen et al., 2020). Nonetheless, these potential advantages must be weighed against notable limitations. Studies have demonstrated that the diagnostic accuracy of such tools frequently falls short of that achieved by trained clinicians, raising concerns regarding patient safety (Robertson et al., 2014). In addition, excessive engagement with online health information may contribute to heightened anxiety. Misinterpretation of digital content can result in delayed professional consultation or inappropriate medication use. On a broader level, digital health technologies are reshaping the physician–patient relationship, encouraging a more participatory model of care while simultaneously risking the reinforcement of existing social inequalities, particularly where disparities in digital literacy and access persist (Wetzel et al., 2022).

Despite the rapid expansion of consumer-oriented diagnostic technologies, the evidence base underpinning their safety and effectiveness remains limited. Current literature is frequently characterized by methodological heterogeneity and inconclusive findings regarding real-world performance (Millenson et al., 2018). Notably, many evaluations rely on simulated scenarios rather than examining outcomes in everyday consumer contexts. Furthermore, although theoretical discussions concerning the transformation of professional roles are abundant, there is comparatively little empirical research addressing healthcare professionals' lived experiences and the longer-term consequences for workload and professional identity (Radionova et al., 2023). Existing studies also tend to emphasize discrete, short-term behavioral outcomes, while insufficiently exploring the influence of digital tools on more complex dimensions of health behavior, including emotional regulation and social engagement (Olmen, 2022).

2. Methodology

A structured literature search was conducted in PubMed/MEDLINE, Google Scholar, and the Cochrane Library to identify peer-reviewed studies on digital self-diagnosis and consumer-oriented diagnostic technologies published between 2010 and 2025.

The search strategy combined Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) and free-text terms, including: "digital health", "self-diagnosis", "symptom checker", "AI chatbot", "mHealth", "wearable devices", "diagnostic accuracy", "health literacy", "cyberchondria", "data privacy", and "digital divide". Boolean operators (AND, OR) were used to refine the results (e.g., "self-diagnosis AND symptom checker", "AI chatbot AND diagnostic accuracy").

Studies were included if they evaluated consumer-facing tools designed for symptom assessment, preliminary diagnosis, or automated health monitoring, and addressed clinical performance, behavioral outcomes, ethical implications, or regulatory aspects. Editorials, conference abstracts without full data, and studies limited to clinician-only decision-support systems were excluded.

Relevant articles were screened by title and abstract, followed by full-text review. Due to methodological heterogeneity, findings were synthesized narratively.

3. Results and Discussion

Building on this structural transformation, several categories of digital diagnostic tools have emerged.

3.1 Types of Digital Self-Diagnosis Tools

Web-Based Symptom Checkers

Among the first broadly accessible digital diagnostic resources were online symptom checkers, which evolved as interactive alternatives to basic internet searches—often colloquially described as "Dr. Google" (Aboueid et al., 2019; Millenson et al., 2018). Unlike static information retrieval, these systems rely on algorithmic processing and extensive clinical databases to analyze user-reported symptoms (Radionova et al., 2023; Wetzel et al., 2022). Based on entered data, they generate a list of possible diagnoses and provide triage advice, such as recommending urgent care or consultation with a primary care physician (Wetzel et al., 2022).

Utilization rates remain high across multiple healthcare systems (Millenson et al., 2018; Robertson et al., 2014).Despite widespread adoption, the evidentiary support for these platforms is inconsistent. Reported

diagnostic performance varies considerably depending on the specific tool and clinical scenario (Millenson et al., 2018). Additionally, many systems demonstrate a tendency toward conservative triage recommendations, frequently directing users to emergency services even when symptoms are unlikely to require urgent intervention (Cohen et al., 2020).

Artificial Intelligence–Driven Chatbots

A more technologically advanced iteration of digital diagnostic assistance is represented by artificial intelligence (AI)–based conversational agents. In contrast to fixed decision-tree models, these chatbots simulate natural dialogue to gather clinically relevant information (Radionova et al., 2023). Applications such as Babylon Check and Ada employ machine learning approaches, including Bayesian modeling and counterfactual reasoning. In controlled environments using standardized clinical vignettes, some evaluations suggest diagnostic performance comparable to, or in certain cases exceeding, that of physicians (Wetzel et al., 2022).

Nevertheless, the deployment of such systems raises significant ethical and societal concerns, frequently framed as the "black box" phenomenon (Cordeiro, 2021). The internal logic of proprietary algorithms is often opaque, and robust data on effectiveness in routine, unsupervised consumer settings remain limited (Wetzel et al., 2022). Although these tools provide uninterrupted access to medical guidance, they do not replicate core human elements of clinical care, including empathy and experiential judgment, which are central to traditional primary practice (Radionova et al., 2023).

Wearable Technologies and Automated Notifications

The incorporation of wearable biosensors into healthcare has further expanded the diagnostic domain by enabling continuous, passive data collection (Shegog et al., 2020). Devices such as the Apple Watch, Fitbit, and specialized medical wearables including Embrace utilize integrated sensors—accelerometers, gyroscopes, and heart rate monitors—to capture quantifiable physiological parameters (Hollis et al., 2015). Continuous monitoring allows for the detection of deviations that might not be identified during episodic clinical assessments (Shegog et al., 2020).

A key function of these systems is the automated identification of potentially life-threatening abnormalities, such as atrial fibrillation or epileptic seizures (Shegog et al., 2020). While early detection may facilitate prompt intervention, the risk of false-positive alerts is considerable (Petersen et al., 2019). Sustained engagement also poses challenges; discontinuation rates within the first year of use approach one-half of all users (Olmen, 2022; Petersen et al., 2019).

Dedicated Mobile Health Applications (mHealth)

Mobile health applications constitute the most heterogeneous segment of digital self-diagnostic technologies. Estimates suggest that more than 100,000 such applications are available globally (Jutel & Lupton, 2015; Lupton & Jutel, 2015). By leveraging built-in smartphone components—high-resolution cameras and optional hardware attachments—these tools can approximate functions traditionally associated with dedicated medical equipment, including auscultation, microscopy, and electrocardiographic recording (Majumder & Deen, 2019).

Specialized mHealth solutions have emerged across multiple disciplines. In dermatology, applications such as Skin Scan apply image-based analytical methods, including deep learning, to assess photographs of pigmented lesions for features suggestive of melanoma. In ophthalmology, the Peek system enables cost-effective retinal imaging and visual acuity testing via smartphone integration, offering potential benefits in low-resource environments (Majumder & Deen, 2019). Within mental health care, platforms such as ClinTouch allow users to document mood states in real time, generating longitudinal datasets that may assist clinicians in identifying relapse patterns in conditions including depressive and bipolar disorders (Hollis et al., 2015).

Notwithstanding their promise for expanding access, a substantial proportion of consumer-oriented diagnostic applications are marketed directly to users without comprehensive regulatory evaluation or a clearly established evidence base (Lupton & Jutel, 2015; Millenson et al., 2018). Regulatory developments within the European Union, particularly the implementation of the Medical Device Regulation (EU MDR), aim to subject many previously unregulated applications to stricter classification and oversight as medium- or high-risk medical devices (Majumder & Deen, 2019).

3.2 Reported Benefits of Digital Health Technologies

Accessibility and Convenience

A consistently emphasized advantage in the literature is uninterrupted access to medical information. Continuous availability of digital resources reduces many of the structural barriers inherent to conventional, appointment-based care. For a substantial proportion of users, online platforms function as a swift and readily available initial contact point, delivering a level of convenience that traditional healthcare systems—restricted by office hours and scheduling limitations—are often unable to provide (Farnood et al., 2020).

This immediacy permits individuals to seek clarification or reassurance during working hours or outside routine clinical schedules, frequently through smartphones described as a "doctor in one's pocket" (Lupton & Jutel, 2015). In settings where medical consultations generate direct costs for patients, web-based self-assessment is also regarded as both economically advantageous and time-saving. Access to free preliminary information may reduce the perceived necessity for an initial paid visit, thereby lowering financial and temporal burdens (Farnood et al., 2020).

Early Symptom Recognition and Triage

Digital solutions, particularly symptom checker applications, provide an initial appraisal of health complaints that may expedite subsequent diagnostic steps (Wetzel et al., 2022). These tools are structured to convey an early indication of urgency, assisting users in determining whether emergency services, primary care consultation, or home-based management is most appropriate (Chambers et al., 2019; Radionova et al., 2023).

In periods of acute healthcare strain, such as during the COVID-19 pandemic, such applications demonstrated their capacity to streamline triage processes and guide patients toward suitable care settings, thereby contributing to the prevention of emergency department overcrowding (Radionova et al., 2023). Moreover, wearable technologies and digital biomarkers enable remote, objective monitoring of clinically relevant parameters. Continuous data collection may reveal physiological deviations—such as arrhythmias or glycemic instability—before they culminate in overt clinical emergencies (Seyhan & Carini, 2019).

Patient Empowerment

The shift from a traditionally paternalistic model of care toward a collaborative framework is frequently cited as a defining element of digital health innovation (Meskó et al., 2017). Digital platforms furnish individuals with information and measurable health data, facilitating active participation in disease management (Meskó, 2022). Patients with chronic conditions often report feelings of reassurance and attentive care when supported by digital monitoring systems (Morton et al., 2017). Access to personal health information via electronic portals and applications may enhance patients' sense of ownership and awareness of their medical status (Olmen, 2022). This process of increased responsibility fosters experiential expertise, enabling individuals to engage in more balanced discussions with healthcare professionals and to participate meaningfully in shared decision-making (Petrakaki et al., 2018).

Healthcare Access in Underserved Areas

Digital health technologies are also presented as a response to the global deficit of healthcare professionals and insufficient clinical infrastructure in resource-limited regions (Meskó et al., 2017; Wetzel et al., 2022). In rural environments and low-income countries, where professional medical services may be geographically or financially inaccessible, symptom checkers and mobile health applications can offer an initial level of assessment otherwise unavailable (Mitchell & Kan, 2019; Wetzel et al., 2022).

From a policy perspective, such interventions are increasingly viewed as mechanisms to alleviate workforce shortages and moderate escalating healthcare expenditures by encouraging self-management among populations historically excluded from facility-based services (Robertson et al., 2014).

3.3 Reported Risks and Limitations

Although digital health innovations hold considerable promise, their implementation is accompanied by a range of clinical and societal concerns. The expansion of digital self-care must therefore be critically appraised in light of potential diagnostic inaccuracies, psychological consequences, and the reinforcement of pre-existing inequalities (Fiske et al., 2020).

Diagnostic Inaccuracies

A frequently reported limitation is the inconsistent and often modest diagnostic performance of symptom checkers when compared with trained clinicians (Chambers et al., 2019). Empirical evidence indicates that healthcare professionals surpass these tools across multiple measures, including the appropriateness and safety of triage recommendations (Wetzel et al., 2022).

Many applications demonstrate a conservative bias, commonly directing users toward emergency services in situations that may not warrant urgent intervention (Chambers et al., 2019; Wetzel et al., 2022). A central challenge lies in the absence of contextual, comprehensive, and individualized understanding that clinicians derive from physical examination and detailed medical history-taking (Radionova et al., 2023; Robertson et al., 2014). In dermatology, for example, certain applications have shown substantial rates of misclassification of skin lesions, raising concerns regarding delayed identification of malignant melanoma (Robertson et al., 2014).

Health Anxiety and Cyberchondria

The extensive availability of online medical content may adversely affect psychological well-being, a phenomenon commonly described as cyberchondria (Radionova et al., 2023). Heightened health anxiety may arise from inaccurate interpretation of digital information and data (Robertson et al., 2014). When symptom checkers or automated monitoring systems generate false-positive results, they can provoke unnecessary concern and initiate repetitive information-seeking behaviors (Farnood et al., 2020; Petersen et al., 2019).

Such dynamics not only generate individual distress but also increase healthcare utilization, as individuals seek professional confirmation for benign findings. This may result in avoidable diagnostic procedures and additional financial strain on healthcare systems (Petersen et al., 2019).

Misinformation and Commercial Bias

The limited transparency and insufficient evidentiary foundation of many consumer-oriented applications represent an additional source of concern (Jutel & Lupton, 2015). Numerous platforms do not clearly articulate the scientific rationale underlying their content, and the information provided may be incomplete or inaccurate (Jutel & Lupton, 2015; Lucas, 2015).

The online environment also includes forms of ineffective or exploitative practices aimed at financially vulnerable individuals (Meskó et al., 2017; Robertson et al., 2014). Digital content may reflect commercial priorities—such as those of pharmaceutical stakeholders—rather than patient-centered interests (Farnood et al., 2020; Petersen et al., 2019). Individuals with limited health literacy may be particularly susceptible to misleading or contradictory information, given the challenges associated with critically evaluating large volumes of digital material (Aboueid et al., 2019; Olmen, 2022).

Privacy Concerns and Data Insecurity

Public trust in digital health solutions is closely linked to robust safeguards for privacy and data security. Nevertheless, apprehension regarding data protection remains a substantial barrier to adoption (Hollis et al., 2015). Health-related information is inherently sensitive, yet many applications collect additional data—such as geolocation and device identifiers—and may share these details with third parties for marketing purposes (Lupton & Jutel, 2015).

The reproducibility and transferability of digital information heighten vulnerability to data breaches, particularly when consumer-facing platforms operate outside regulatory frameworks comparable to those governing traditional healthcare institutions (Mitchell & Kan, 2019). As health data acquire economic value within the broader data economy, the potential shift in control from patients to commercial entities may undermine individual autonomy and erode confidence in healthcare systems (Olmen, 2022).

The Digital Divide and Health Equity

Finally, the widespread adoption of digital health technologies may intensify existing disparities. Evidence suggests that younger, more affluent, and better-educated individuals are more likely to benefit from these innovations (Chambers et al., 2019). In contrast, older adults, persons with disabilities, and individuals with limited financial resources may encounter barriers related to digital literacy or access to appropriate devices (Cordeiro, 2021; Wetzel et al., 2022).

Such inequities may generate imbalances in care pathways, particularly if digital channels are prioritized within triage systems at the expense of in-person services (Chambers et al., 2019). Without deliberate adaptation to the needs of vulnerable populations, digital health interventions risk reinforcing patterns of social exclusion rather than delivering equitable improvements in healthcare access and outcomes (Cordeiro, 2021)

4. Conclusions

The analysis presented in this paper confirms that self-diagnosis supported by digital technologies has become an established and steadily expanding element of contemporary health behavior. It no longer represents a marginal phenomenon but rather reflects a broader structural shift in how individuals relate to medical knowledge and clinical authority. The scale of engagement observed across different healthcare systems indicates that this transformation is durable and likely to intensify as technological innovation progresses.

Importantly, the consequences of this development cannot be framed in exclusively positive or negative terms. Digital self-diagnostic tools simultaneously generate opportunities and vulnerabilities. They may strengthen patient agency, facilitate earlier recognition of clinically relevant symptoms, and contribute to more informed encounters within the clinical setting. At the same time, their limitations—particularly in accuracy, contextual understanding, and transparency—introduce tangible risks to patient safety, psychological well-being, and system efficiency. The coexistence of empowerment and hazard constitutes the defining tension of this field and demands careful navigation rather than polarized assessment.

In light of their growing clinical and societal relevance, the regulatory environment surrounding consumer-oriented diagnostic technologies requires consolidation and clarification. The current landscape, characterized by uneven oversight and variable evidentiary standards, is insufficient for tools that increasingly influence health-related decision-making. Proportionate yet robust governance frameworks are essential to ensure safety, accountability, and the protection of sensitive health data, while preserving space for responsible innovation.

Equally critical is the development of digital health literacy as a core public health objective. The interpretative demands posed by algorithmic outputs and large volumes of online medical information exceed the competencies traditionally associated with general health education. Without systematic support in this domain, digital transformation risks exacerbating disparities rather than mitigating them. Ensuring that individuals possess the skills necessary to critically appraise, contextualize, and appropriately act upon digital health information is indispensable for equitable integration.

Finally, the complexity of digital self-diagnosis necessitates sustained interdisciplinary inquiry. Future research should move beyond short-term performance comparisons and explore long-term behavioral, professional, and systemic implications in real-world settings. Collaboration across clinical medicine, social sciences, data science, ethics, and health policy will be essential to generate evidence capable of guiding responsible implementation. Only through such integrative efforts can the evolving relationship between technology, patients, and healthcare professionals be shaped in a manner that maximizes benefit while minimizing harm.

Acknowledgements

Competing interests: The authors declare that they have no financial or personal relationship(s) that may have inappropriately influenced them in writing this article.

Authors contributions: The authors affirm their contribution to the article's production.

REFERENCES

1. Aboueid, S., Liu, R. H., Desta, B. N., Chaurasia, A., & Ebrahim, S. (2019). The use of artificially intelligent self-diagnosing digital platforms by the general public: Scoping review. *JMIR Medical Informatics, 7*(2), e13445. https://doi.org/10.2196/13445
2. Chambers, D., Cantrell, A. J., Johnson, M., Preston, L., Baxter, S. K., Booth, A., & Turner, J. (2019). Digital and online symptom checkers and health assessment/triage services for urgent health problems: Systematic review. *BMJ Open, 9*(8), e027743. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-027743
3. Cohen, A. B., Mathews, S. C., Dorsey, E. R., Bates, D. W., & Safavi, K. (2020). Direct-to-consumer digital health. *The Lancet Digital Health, 2*(4), e163–e165. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500(20)30057-1
4. Cordeiro, J. V. (2021). Digital technologies and data science as health enablers: An outline of appealing promises and compelling ethical, legal, and social challenges. *Frontiers in Medicine, 8*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmed.2021.647897
5. Farnood, A., Johnston, B., & Mair, F. S. (2020). A mixed methods systematic review of the effects of patient online self-diagnosing in the "smart-phone society" on the healthcare professional-patient relationship and medical authority. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making, 20*(1), 253. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12911-020-01243-6
6. Fiske, A., Buyx, A., & Prainsack, B. (2020). The double-edged sword of digital self-care: Physician perspectives from northern Germany. *Social Science & Medicine, 260*, 113174. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113174
7. Hollis, C., Morriss, R., Martin, J., Amani, S., Cotton, R., Denis, M., & Lewis, S. (2015). Technological innovations in mental healthcare: Harnessing the digital revolution. *British Journal of Psychiatry, 206*(4), 263–265. https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.113.142612
8. Jutel, A., & Lupton, D. (2015). Digitizing diagnosis: A review of mobile applications in the diagnostic process. *Diagnosis, 2*(2), 89–96. https://doi.org/10.1515/dx-2014-0068
9. Lucas, H. (2015). New technology and illness self-management: Potential relevance for resource-poor populations in Asia. *Social Science & Medicine, 145*, 145–153. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.11.008
10. Lupton, D., & Jutel, A. (2015). "It's like having a physician in your pocket!" A critical analysis of self-diagnosis smartphone apps. *Social Science & Medicine, 133*, 128–135. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.04.004
11. Majumder, S., & Deen, M. J. (2019). Smartphone sensors for health monitoring and diagnosis. *Sensors, 19*(9), 2164. https://doi.org/10.3390/s19092164
12. Meskó, B. (2022). COVID-19's impact on digital health adoption: The growing gap between a technological and a cultural transformation. *JMIR Human Factors, 9*(3), e38926. https://doi.org/10.2196/38926
13. Meskó, B., Drobni, Z., Bényei, É., Gergely, B., & Győrffy, Z. (2017). Digital health is a cultural transformation of traditional healthcare. *mHealth, 3*, 38–38. https://doi.org/10.21037/mhealth.2017.08.07
14. Millenson, M. L., Baldwin, J. L., Zipperer, L., & Singh, H. (2018). Beyond Dr. Google: The evidence on consumer-facing digital tools for diagnosis. *Diagnosis, 5*(3), 95–105. https://doi.org/10.1515/dx-2018-0009
15. Mitchell, M., & Kan, L. (2019). Digital technology and the future of health systems. *Health Systems & Reform, 5*(2), 113–120. https://doi.org/10.1080/23288604.2019.1583040
16. Morton, K., Dennison, L., May, C., Murray, E., Little, P., McManus, R. J., & Yardley, L. (2017). Using digital interventions for self-management of chronic physical health conditions: A meta-ethnography review of published studies. *Patient Education and Counseling, 100*(4), 616–635. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2016.10.019
17. van Olmen, J. (2022). The promise of digital self-management: A reflection about the effects of patient-targeted e-health tools on self-management and wellbeing. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19*(3). https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19031360
18. Petersen, A., Tanner, C., & Munsie, M. (2019). Citizens' use of digital media to connect with health care: Socio-ethical and regulatory implications. *Health: An Interdisciplinary Journal for the Social Study of Health, Illness and Medicine, 23*(4), 367–384. https://doi.org/10.1177/1363459319847505
19. Petrakaki, D., Hilberg, E., & Waring, J. (2018). Between empowerment and self-discipline: Governing patients' conduct through technological self-care. *Social Science & Medicine, 213*, 146–153. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2018.07.043
20. Radionova, N., Ög, E., Wetzel, A.-J., Rieger, M. A., & Preiser, C. (2023). Impacts of symptom checkers for laypersons' self-diagnosis on physicians in primary care: Scoping review. *Journal of Medical Internet Research, 25*, e39219. https://doi.org/10.2196/39219
21. Robertson, N., Polonsky, M., & McQuilken, L. (2014). Are my symptoms serious Dr Google? A resource-based typology of value co-destruction in online self-diagnosis. *Australasian Marketing Journal, 22*(3), 246–256. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ausmj.2014.08.009
22. Seyhan, A. A., & Carini, C. (2019). Are innovation and new technologies in precision medicine paving a new era in patients centric care? *Journal of Translational Medicine, 17*(1), 114. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12967-019-1864-9
23. Shegog, R., Braverman, L., & Hixson, J. D. (2020). Digital and technological opportunities in epilepsy: Toward a digital ecosystem for enhanced epilepsy management. *Epilepsy & Behavior, 102*, 106663. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yebeh.2019.106663
24. Wetzel, A.-J., Koch, R., Preiser, C., Müller, R., Klemmt, M., Ranisch, R., Ehni, H.-J., Wiesing, U., Rieger, M. A., Henking, T., & Joos, S. (2022). Ethical, legal, and social implications of symptom checker apps in primary health care (CHECK.APP): Protocol for an interdisciplinary mixed methods study. *JMIR Research Protocols, 11*(5), e34026. https://doi.org/10.2196/34026