



# 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

---

|                      |                                                                                                                                         |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>ARTICLE TITLE</b> | WEARABLE BIOSENSORS IN REMOTE CHRONIC DISEASE MONITORING: A STRUCTURED REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION BARRIERS AND HEALTH EQUITY IMPLICATIONS |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

---

|            |                                                                                                               |
|------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>DOI</b> | <a href="https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.4(52).2026.6394">https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.4(52).2026.6394</a> |
|------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

---

|                 |              |
|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>RECEIVED</b> | 28 July 2026 |
|-----------------|--------------|

---

|                 |                 |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| <b>ACCEPTED</b> | 03 October 2026 |
|-----------------|-----------------|

---

|                  |                 |
|------------------|-----------------|
| <b>PUBLISHED</b> | 14 October 2026 |
|------------------|-----------------|

---

**LICENSE**



The article is licensed under a **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License**.

---

© The author(s) 2026.

This article is published as open access under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), allowing the author to retain copyright. The CC BY 4.0 License permits the content to be copied, adapted, displayed, distributed, republished, or reused for any purpose, including adaptation and commercial use, as long as proper attribution is provided.

# WEARABLE BIOSENSORS IN REMOTE CHRONIC DISEASE MONITORING: A STRUCTURED REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION BARRIERS AND HEALTH EQUITY IMPLICATIONS

**Jakub Juskowiak** (Corresponding Author, Email: j.juskowiak16@gmail.com)  
Poznań University of Medical Sciences, Poznań, Poland  
ORCID ID: 0009-0001-0372-400X

**Zuzanna Julia Komin**  
Pomeranian Medical University, Szczecin, Poland  
ORCID ID: 0009-0001-6284-6410

**Maryan Liasota**  
Pomeranian Medical University, Szczecin, Poland  
ORCID ID: 0009-0006-0266-4849

**Eliza Zofia Kabat**  
Pomeranian Medical University, Szczecin, Poland  
ORCID ID: 0009-0003-6531-967X

**Michalina Justyna Kozłowska**  
Pomeranian Medical University, Szczecin, Poland  
ORCID ID: 0009-0003-9561-2957

**Krzysztof Konopka**  
Pomeranian Medical University, Szczecin, Poland  
ORCID ID: 0009-0003-4055-0074

**Maciej Kamil Majchrzak**  
Pomeranian Medical University, Szczecin, Poland  
ORCID ID: 0009-0007-4739-0092

**Faustyna Magdalena Kołodziej**  
Pomeranian Medical University, Szczecin, Poland  
ORCID ID: 0009-0002-8778-7100

**Alicja Kwiatkowska**  
Pomeranian Medical University, Szczecin, Poland  
ORCID ID: 0009-0003-1027-2114

**Mateusz Lis**  
Pomeranian Medical University, Szczecin, Poland  
ORCID ID: 0009-0006-8441-8296

**ABSTRACT**

**Background** Clinical-grade wearable biosensors offer significant potential for tracking chronic diseases outside the hospital. However, while the hardware itself is highly accurate, the medical field still struggles with the logistical reality of deploying these tools. The structural barriers preventing widespread clinical use, and the ways these hurdles impact overall health equity, lack rigorous synthesis in the current literature.

**Objective** Moving beyond pure hardware accuracy, this analysis maps the practical realities of continuous patient surveillance. It specifically investigates the institutional workflow bottlenecks, hardware usability hurdles, and underlying economic disparities that dictate how monitoring programs actually function for populations managing heart failure, diabetes, or COPD.

**Methodology** Peer-reviewed literature spanning 2018 to 2026 was extracted from PubMed/MEDLINE and Google Scholar. The inclusion criteria deliberately filtered out purely technical validation studies. Instead, the analysis targeted data documenting the logistical friction, long-term adherence failures, and unequal access surrounding continuous glucose monitors, ambulatory cardiac patches, and multi-parameter tracking devices.

**Results** The synthesized data show that severe workflow friction and poor electronic health record interoperability actively block hospital networks from scaling these programs. On the patient side, a distinct "compliance paradox" emerges. High initial motivation frequently collapses into device abandonment, usually triggered by physical skin irritation, convoluted software interfaces, and low technical literacy. The literature also exposes a severe digital divide. A patient's income bracket, geographic location, and advanced age strictly gatekeep their ability to access continuous medical monitoring.

**Conclusion** Healthcare networks cannot rely solely on precise hardware to improve chronic disease management. Deploying continuous monitors successfully requires a fundamental shift toward repairing broken clinical workflows and addressing systemic exclusion. Without structural interventions targeting financial and technical accessibility, digital health initiatives will simply reinforce existing medical inequalities.

---

**KEYWORDS**

Wearable Biosensors, Remote Patient Monitoring, Health Equity, Implementation Barriers, Chronic Disease Management, Digital Divide

---

**CITATION**

Juskowiak, J., Komin, Z. J., Liasota, M., Kabat, E. Z., Kozłowska, M. J., Konopka, K., Majchrzak, M. K., Kołodziej, F. M., Kwiatkowska, A., & Lis, M. (2026). Wearable biosensors in remote chronic disease monitoring: A structured review of implementation barriers and health equity implications. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science*, 4(52). [https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.4\(52\).2026.6394](https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.4(52).2026.6394)

---

**COPYRIGHT**

© The author(s) 2026. This article is published as open access under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), allowing the author to retain copyright. The CC BY 4.0 License permits the content to be copied, adapted, displayed, distributed, republished, or reused for any purpose, including adaptation and commercial use, as long as proper attribution is provided.

---

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Background and Clinical Context

The global healthcare landscape has experienced a profound structural shift. Treating acute infections takes a decreasing amount of clinical resources compared to previous decades. Instead, chronic, non-communicable diseases (NCDs) now dominate daily clinical practice. Conditions like diabetes, heart failure (HF), and COPD drive the vast majority of hospital costs and are responsible for nearly 71% of global mortality (Gautam et al., 2022). In the European Union, chronic care consumes up to 80% of overall healthcare budgets. These baseline costs will most probably rise as demographic aging yields patient cohorts living longer with multiple concurrent illnesses. Preventing these complex cases from deteriorating requires constant clinical vigilance. However, delivering that level of continuous oversight places immense operational pressure on medical facilities that are already operating with severe staffing deficits.

Monitoring these patients remains the core problem. The traditional 15-minute clinic visit simply proves inadequate in chronic care because it provides only a momentary glimpse into the patient's actual state of health. Checking in every few months prevents physicians from detecting the gradual, day-to-day

physiological deterioration happening at home. That decline usually remains undetected until an acute crisis forces the patient into the emergency department. The high rate of heart failure readmissions illustrates the cost of acting too late (Gautam et al., 2022). The same blind spots exist in diabetes care. Routine in-clinic blood tests easily miss the overnight hypoglycemic dips or post-prandial spikes that silently cause long-term vascular damage (Thakur et al., 2025). By the time these hidden fluctuations reflect in a quarterly HbA1c result, irreversible physiological harm might have already occurred. Bridging this gap requires continuous data, driving the medical field's rapid pivot toward remote patient monitoring (RPM).

## **1.2 The Shift to Clinical-Grade Wearables**

In recent years, the term "wearables" predominantly meant commercial fitness bands used to count steps. That paradigm has largely shifted. The market has decisively pivoted toward clinical-grade biosensors. Rather than acting as consumer novelties, these tools pass strict regulatory hurdles for diagnostic accuracy and data privacy, explicitly designed to integrate seamlessly into existing medical workflows. Engineers have miniaturized the hardware to the point where patients can wear sensors invisibly under their clothing, shower with them, and transmit vital signs passively via Bluetooth without interrupting their daily routines.

Devices like the Dexcom G7 and Freestyle Libre 3 have redefined the standard of care for diabetes. They feed real-time interstitial glucose metrics and trend alerts directly to patients and their care teams (Thakur et al., 2025). Within cardiology, adhesive patches like the iRhythm Zio XT or BardyDx CAM detect arrhythmias with significantly greater success than older, 24-hour Holter monitors (Gautam et al., 2022). Multi-parameter sensors are also gaining prominence. Tools like the BioIntelliSense BioButton constantly track respiratory rates, temperature, and movement to detect early decompensation in post-operative cases. Together, this hardware constitutes the Internet of Medical Things (IoMT), a network that streams real-world patient physiology directly into the hospital's servers.

## **1.3 Moving Beyond Tech: Real-World Adoption and Equity**

Perfect hardware does not equal perfect patient care. When deployed in actual clinics, these biosensors encounter substantial operational resistance. Hardware flaws rarely cause this "implementation gap." Instead, the hindrances are almost entirely logistical and human. If a remote monitoring program wants to survive its first year, it must integrate into routine clinical workflows without overburdening the triage nurses, while also demonstrating clear financial viability to hospital administrators. Furthermore, if physicians are forced to navigate poorly designed software interfaces, or if they are overwhelmed by thousands of false-positive alarms, they will simply disengage from the data altogether.

Introducing these tools into everyday practice triggers an immediate ethical warning regarding digital exclusion. Wearable biosensors risk widening existing health gaps if only wealthy, tech-savvy patients with high-speed internet can actually use them. The digital divide manifests in multiple ways. It excludes elderly heart failure patients who cannot read small smartphone interfaces, and it presents linguistic barriers for non-native speakers. True digital health equity means looking beyond the technical specifications of a sensor to address the structural issues that dictate which demographics receive prescriptions initially.

## **1.4 Research Gap and Rationale**

The existing literature shows imbalance. Most digital health research focuses on validating device efficacy, practically omitting the logistical limitations of actually deploying it in a high-volume clinical setting (Smuck et al., 2021). The vast majority of papers validate sensor accuracy or favour small, heavily funded pilot trials. These controlled academic environments, however, bear little resemblance to under-resourced community clinics dealing with diverse patient populations and financial constraints. Consequently, the field significantly lacks rigorous studies that consider the routine operational barriers of scaling these programs or track the vulnerable groups systematically left behind.

This literature blind spot creates serious hurdles for clinicians and policymakers trying to modernize medicine. In transitioning healthcare environments, medical professionals need a pragmatic assessment of global evidence to avoid repeating the exact same mistakes with unequal tech distribution. That reality prompted this review. It deliberately adopts a macro-level perspective to evaluate the socio-technical side of RPM, mapping the practical barriers alongside the ethical equity concerns.

### **1.5 Aim of the Review**

This paper assesses the practical clinical reality of wearable biosensor implementation for chronic disease. Rather than questioning whether the technology itself functions, the analysis investigates the systemic and social factors determining why these monitoring programs ultimately succeed or fail. The specific objectives are to:

- Identify the exact structural bottlenecks within clinical workflows that prevent medical institutions from adopting remote monitoring networks.
- Investigate the mechanisms driving long-term device abandonment, focusing heavily on the friction created by physical wearability issues, unintuitive software architecture, and restricted technical literacy.
- Trace the boundaries of the digital divide to demonstrate how a patient's age, geographic isolation, and financial reality actively restrict their access to continuous clinical surveillance.

By synthesizing peer-reviewed data spanning 2018 to 2026, this review constructs an actionable, evidence-driven framework. The core objective is to equip healthcare administrators and prescribing physicians with the structural strategies necessary to deploy monitoring networks that succeed across all patient populations, rather than just the most privileged. Connected medicine will never act as a democratizing force in healthcare as long as the fundamental systems delivering it remain structurally compromised.

## **2. Methodology**

### **2.1 Research Design**

This analysis employs a narrative synthesis structure driven by a sociotechnical framework. The focus is put on the practical barriers, behavioral compliance patterns, and equity gaps inherent to remote patient monitoring. While the final output remains narrative to accommodate qualitative and systemic data, the underlying retrieval and screening protocols adhere closely to the structural logic of the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines to guarantee procedural transparency.

### **2.2 Data Source and Search Strategy**

Evidence retrieval focused heavily on the intersection of medical-grade biosensors and chronic disease management. PubMed/MEDLINE provided the primary biomedical index. Investigators supplemented this repository with targeted Google Scholar queries to extract interdisciplinary data—specifically, papers from health informatics or medical sociology that often escape standard clinical indexing.

The search architecture combined Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) with standard free-text phrasing. The specific Boolean query was:

("Wearable Biosensors" OR "Remote Patient Monitoring" OR "Wearables" OR "Digital Health Devices") AND ("Chronic Disease" OR "Chronic Illness" OR "Heart Failure" OR "Diabetes" OR "COPD") AND ("Implementation Barriers" OR "Adoption" OR "Patient Compliance" OR "Feasibility" OR "Adherence") AND ("Health Equity" OR "Digital Divide" OR "Socioeconomic Status" OR "Health Disparities").

The temporal search window was restricted to January 2018 through 2026. This timeframe deliberately captures both the maturation of continuous monitoring hardware and the rapid acceleration of decentralized care models prompted by recent global health disruptions.

## 2.3 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Strict eligibility parameters filtered the initial search yield. The selection process prioritized peer-reviewed empirical research and structural reviews assessing clinical-grade tracking hardware (e.g., continuous glucose sensors, multi-parameter arrays, ambulatory ECGs) applied directly to chronic illness. Table 1 defines the exact boundaries of the literature selection.

*Table 1. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria*

| Criterion  | Inclusion Criteria                                                                                                                                                                               | Exclusion Criteria                                                                                                                     |
|------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Study Type | Peer-reviewed empirical data (RCTs, observational studies, feasibility trials), scoping reviews, and systematic reviews.                                                                         | Non-peer-reviewed literature, opinion pieces, editorials, conference abstracts, and corporate white papers.                            |
| Focus      | Wearables applied strictly to longitudinal chronic disease management (e.g., Heart Failure, COPD, Diabetes) containing measurable data on equity, clinical adherence, or institutional friction. | Purely acute inpatient/ICU telemetry, commercial fitness trackers used by healthy cohorts, or isolated technical hardware validations. |
| Database   | Indexed in PubMed/MEDLINE or identifiable via Google Scholar.                                                                                                                                    | Unindexed material outside established academic repositories.                                                                          |
| Language   | Published in English.                                                                                                                                                                            | Published in non-English languages.                                                                                                    |
| Timeline   | Published between 2018 and 2026.                                                                                                                                                                 | Published prior to 2018.                                                                                                               |

## 2.4 Study Selection Process

Screening followed a two-step protocol to isolate relevant data and limit selection bias. After centralizing the initial yield and executing automated deduplication within a reference manager, two researchers independently audited the remaining titles and abstracts against the established parameters. Documents surviving this initial filter progressed to a rigorous full-text evaluation. Whenever reviewers disagreed on a manuscript's inclusion, a third senior investigator mediated the discussion to reach a final consensus.

## 2.5 Data Extraction

A pre-tested, standardized matrix served as the primary extraction tool. Captured metrics spanned basic publication details (author, geography, year, design) to highly specific clinical variables, including target pathologies and demographic profiles. Furthermore, the extraction explicitly isolated the hardware modality (PPG monitors, epidermal patches, interstitial sensors) alongside the primary operational obstacles, recorded therapeutic abandonment rates, and any socioeconomic disparities highlighted by the original investigators.

## 2.6 Thematic Synthesis

The qualitative and highly varied nature of the extracted evidence required an inductive thematic synthesis. Researchers coded the final data pool and organized the findings across three analytical pillars:

**1. Clinical Workflow Disruption:** Capturing systemic friction, such as electronic health record (EHR) integration failures, provider alert fatigue, and broader financial or administrative constraints.

**2. Patient Usability and Adherence:** Detailing the physical and behavioral realities that dictate long-term device retention versus early therapeutic abandonment, with a specific focus on dermal irritation, cognitive load, and software interface complexity.

**3. Demographic and Equity Divides:** Mapping the structural variables controlling technological access, specifically tracing how income brackets, geographic isolation, advanced age, and baseline digital literacy restrict the utilization of connected care networks.

## 3. Results

### 3.1 Structural Overview of the Evidence

Final screening protocols identified 23 core studies spanning publication years 2018 through 2026. This evidence base covers a deliberately wide methodological range. By integrating randomized controlled trials with observational feasibility research, the review captures a critical pivot point in modern medicine. Wearable biosensors have effectively exited the tightly controlled sphere of academic testing. Instead, current literature tracks their collision with standard, decentralized community care, documenting the inevitable friction that follows when theoretical models meet the logistical constraints of everyday public clinics.

Synthesizing these diverse methodologies allows a simultaneous assessment of diagnostic power and ground-level usability. The extracted datasets vary significantly in scale and focus. Some feature large retrospective audits of electronic health records containing numerous distinct patient measurements, specifically designed to map long-term adherence patterns rather than isolated 30-day clinical outcomes. Others consist of highly specific human-factors evaluations measuring physical hardware ergonomics and patient interface interactions. Unsurprisingly, North American and Western European institutions dominate this literature. These health systems historically financed digital infrastructure earlier than other global regions, driving initial remote monitoring adoption. Consequently, the existing evidence base largely reflects the structural realities of heavily resourced, broadband-rich environments, leaving a noticeable research gap regarding wearable deployment in developing global healthcare systems.

Sensor modality naturally divides the extracted research into three chronic disease applications. Continuous glucose monitors (CGMs) drive roughly 40% of the reviewed material. This subset primarily investigates interstitial fluid sensors, specifically the Abbott FreeStyle Libre and Dexcom G7 platforms, during routine type 1 and type 2 diabetes management (Eberle & Stichling, 2021; Thakur et al., 2025). Investigators here track standard glycemic metrics, such as time-in-range and overall variance, while also heavily weighting the behavioral shifts induced by continuous physiological feedback. Patients transitioning from episodic finger-prick testing to continuous tracking fundamentally alter their daily dietary choices and insulin dosing protocols, creating a highly dynamic clinical picture that traditional retrospective HbA1c testing completely misses.

Another 35% of the data focuses on cardiovascular telemetry. Here, the literature prioritizes the diagnostic yield and operational logistics of ambulatory electrocardiogram (ECG) patches like the BardyDx Carnation and iRhythm Zio XT (Sana et al., 2020). Clinicians primarily prescribe these adhesive monitors to track longitudinal heart failure stability or capture occult atrial fibrillation weeks after a cryptogenic stroke. Unlike traditional, bulky 24-hour Holter monitors—which patients frequently remove early due to physical discomfort—these low-profile patches enable up to 14 days of uninterrupted surveillance. This extended monitoring window proves crucial for detecting rare, asymptomatic arrhythmias that episodic clinical testing routinely overlooks.

Multi-parameter wearables account for the final 25%. Devices like the VitalConnect VitalPatch and BioIntelliSense BioButton combine thermistors, accelerometers, and optical sensors to map multiple physiological variables simultaneously. Research surrounding these tools centers heavily on the emerging "hospital-at-home" model and post-hospital discharge surveillance. A primary objective involves combining

respiratory rates, body temperature, and ambulatory movement metrics to predict acute COPD exacerbations. By identifying early markers of physiological decompensation across multiple biological axes, clinical teams can initiate proactive interventions days before the patient requires an emergency hospital readmission (Smuck et al., 2021).

Across all three categories, well-funded academic trials routinely confirm hardware precision. Yet the moment this technology enters routine outpatient care, severe structural barriers emerge. The following sections analyze these sociotechnical roadblocks. The discussion progresses from systemic data integration and alert fatigue to the usability factors driving therapeutic abandonment, culminating in the demographic disparities defining digital health access.

### **3.2 System-Level Barriers in Clinical Practice**

Lack of interoperability between novel biosensors and legacy electronic health record (EHR) systems represents the single most formidable barrier to institutional scaling. Fundamentally conflicting data architectures cause this disconnect. Decades ago, developers optimized legacy EHRs to warehouse sparse, episodic clinical events—a single blood pressure reading, a quarterly HbA1c result, or a typed discharge summary. Continuous monitors completely overwhelm that architecture by generating millions of continuous physiological data points per patient every month (Dinh-Le et al., 2019). Furthermore, hospital IT departments remain highly reluctant to open secure internal firewalls to allow continuous data streaming from third-party wearable clouds, citing severe cybersecurity and patient privacy risks.

Modern interoperability frameworks like HL7 FHIR have not solved the problem. Standard clinical interfaces still fail to efficiently ingest, organize, or visualize these massive telemetry streams in a medically actionable format. To function at all, device manufacturers force medical staff to abandon the primary EHR interface and log into separate, proprietary web portals simply to review an ambulatory ECG strip or analyze a glycemic profile. Qualitative evidence shows this fragmentation severely disrupts clinical efficiency. Navigating multiple screens and maintaining separate authentication credentials demands unpaid administrative effort, forces duplicate documentation, and raises the cognitive burden of a standard, time-constrained patient visit.

This immense volume of continuous physiological data directly precipitates alert fatigue. Separating critical medical deterioration from routine background noise remains remarkably difficult for clinical teams. When basic software applies static threshold parameters to dynamic human biology—such as triggering an alarm whenever a heart rate dips below 50 bpm—false positive rates become unmanageable. Normal nocturnal movement perfectly demonstrates this vulnerability. A sleeping patient rolling over frequently alters an optical sensor's skin contact or temporarily restricts peripheral blood flow. The software instantly registers these mechanical disruptions as a false bradycardia, localized hypoxia, or lethal arrhythmia warning (Smuck et al., 2021).

Flooding a clinical dashboard with mechanical artifacts inevitably leads to clinical inertia. Overwhelmed triage nurses and physicians adapt to the sensory overload by filtering out, muting, or simply ignoring automated notifications. Paradoxically, assigning a continuous monitor can sometimes elevate the risk of missing genuine physiological collapse because valid warning signs disappear beneath a vast amount of mechanical noise. This dynamic also creates intense medical liability concerns, as unreviewed, flagged data points sit on hospital servers waiting for a physician's attention. Successful monitoring networks bypass this danger by financing dedicated data triage layers. Hospitals either employ specialized digital-care nursing teams to manually screen the feeds or license expensive, FDA-cleared machine learning algorithms to eliminate hardware artifacts before the data ever reaches the attending physician (Gautam et al., 2022).

Establishing this vital triage infrastructure creates immediate financial friction. Recent global additions of specific procedural billing codes for remote physiological monitoring have not cured the underlying economic strain. Current reimbursement models rarely offset the massive overhead required to employ

specialized triage personnel, nor do they cover the recurring enterprise software licenses demanded by hardware manufacturers. The core issue frequently involves siloed healthcare budgets. The outpatient department financing the wearable hardware and the software subscriptions is rarely the exact same department that captures the financial reward of preventing an intensive care admission.

Consequently, hospital administrators typically view continuous monitoring networks as immediate, heavy financial liabilities. The actual economic returns of remote care—such as avoiding a vastly expensive ischemic stroke through early arrhythmia detection—accrue over a timeline of several years. Because financial officers struggle to map these long-term, structural savings to short-term quarterly billing cycles, securing permanent institutional funding for proactive surveillance remains a profound challenge.

### **3.3 Patient Adherence and Usability Issues**

Addressing software integration and hospital workflows only resolves institutional bottlenecks. The longitudinal success of remote monitoring ultimately relies on patient behavior outside the clinic. Researchers frequently note a compliance paradox in the data. Upon receiving a clinical wearable, individuals usually demonstrate strong motivation and comprehend the necessity of continuous tracking. However, longitudinal usage metrics reveal a severe decline in adherence after the initial 30 to 90 days. An examination of the trial data indicates this abandonment rarely occurs because a patient loses interest in their health. Rather, the friction is immediate and practical. Individuals discontinue use due to physical pain, software malfunctions, and the heavy psychological weight of constant surveillance.

The simple requirement of keeping a device adhered to the skin 24 hours a day presents a substantial hurdle. Patches designed for two weeks of continuous wear, such as the Freestyle Libre or Zio XT, depend on powerful acrylic adhesives to withstand sweat, movement, and daily showering. That uninterrupted chemical contact damages the dermal layer. Up to 15% of patients who stop monitoring early do so specifically due to allergic contact dermatitis, severe erythema, or intense localized itching (Steinhubl et al., 2018). Older adults face an elevated risk. As skin ages, it loses moisture and elasticity, making geriatric patients highly vulnerable to painful dermal tearing when a nurse or caregiver removes the patch.

Beyond physical irritation, wearing a medical device visibly on the chest or arm carries genuine social stigma. Qualitative data from recent trials points to strong psychosocial friction. Working professionals and younger demographics often remove their monitors prior to formal events, intimate encounters, or during the summer months. They adopt this behavior to avoid invasive questions from strangers and to escape the mental exhaustion associated with appearing chronically ill in public settings.

Technology creates an equally severe bottleneck. The majority of modern biosensors do not communicate directly with a hospital server. They utilize Bluetooth to route data through the patient's personal smartphone. In trials observing COPD and heart failure management, data transmission drops continuously. The physical sensor rarely malfunctions; the failure almost always occurs at the phone interface. A patient might inadvertently disable Bluetooth, deny the medical application background permissions, or miss a critical operating system update. Sometimes the battery depletes and the re-pairing sequence proves overly complex (Smuck et al., 2021). If restoring the connection requires navigating five different software menus, patients experiencing mild cognitive decline or low technical literacy understandably become frustrated and abandon the hardware entirely.

Continuous tracking also generates a deep psychological toll that clinicians rarely predict during the prescribing phase. In diabetes management, monitoring a digital trendline that tracks every minor glucose shift can induce severe anxiety and obsessive behavior—a state researchers categorize as "device burnout" (Eberle & Stichling, 2021; Thakur et al., 2025). The alerts vibrate constantly, breaking daytime focus and fragmenting sleep architecture. One common safety risk occurs when a screen displays a rapid downward glucose arrow. The patient panics, assumes a hypoglycemic event is imminent, and consumes excess carbohydrates. That overcorrection causes severe rebound hyperglycemia. For these individuals, 24-hour surveillance enforces a permanent patient identity, eroding their quality of life until they intentionally quit the therapy to regain a sense of normalcy.

### 3.4 Health Equity and the Digital Divide: Socio-Economic and Demographic Disparities

A dominant theme runs throughout the 2018–2026 literature: deploying remote monitoring technologies without targeted equity strategies inadvertently exacerbates established health disparities. While the technology sector frequently frames digital medicine as an inherent equalizer, empirical clinical data contradicts this narrative. Clinical-grade wearables are overwhelmingly distributed to younger, affluent, urban populations who already possess the resources to manage complex software (Crawford & Serhal, 2020; Rodriguez et al., 2020). Integrating continuous monitors into standard medical practice without deliberate safeguards constructs a two-tiered system, effectively isolating the most vulnerable patient demographics from the Internet of Medical Things.

Economic status and insurance coverage function as the primary gatekeepers. Advanced tracking patches successfully prevent respiratory failure and hypoglycemic comas, yet the associated hardware costs remain prohibitive. Restrictive private insurance plans and public health networks typically require clinics to document an extensive history of clinical failure prior to funding a cardiac monitor or CGM. An individual may literally need to survive an intensive care admission or sustain permanent organ damage to establish medical necessity. This structural requirement forces a harsh division. Underinsured patients are restricted to reactive, episodic testing until physiological failure occurs. Conversely, affluent individuals bypass this bureaucratic friction, purchasing proactive digital surveillance out-of-pocket through direct-to-consumer channels or premium insurance tiers.

Resolving financial barriers does not eliminate the access gap. Implicit bias during the clinical encounter heavily influences technology allocation. Clinical data points to a persistent prescribing gap in diabetes management. Hispanic and non-Hispanic Black patients secure continuous glucose monitors far less often than White populations. Statistical adjustments for household wealth, primary insurance coverage, and baseline pathology fail to erase this prescription deficit (Odugbesan et al., 2024). The divergence in care frequently begins at the point of prescribing. Implicit assumptions made by medical professionals regarding a patient's technological competence heavily influence device allocation. Ultimately, this implicit bias prevents minority populations from securing advanced tracking technology. Physiological urgency frequently becomes secondary to these demographic preconceptions.

Age introduces an entirely separate obstacle. Conditions such as cardiac arrhythmias, COPD, and heart failure occur mostly in older patients. Yet, the software required to track these exact conditions is rarely built to accommodate older users. Tiny screen fonts and poor visual contrast make daily operation difficult for anyone with presbyopia. Furthermore, the manual dexterity required to peel paper backings off tight medical adhesives immediately alienates patients dealing with routine osteoarthritis (Brewer et al., 2020). Keeping a monitor active for a patient over 75 usually demands heavy, in-person technical support. Since understaffed community clinics cannot dedicate hours of nursing time to continuous device onboarding, older populations are frequently left out of remote monitoring initiatives from the outset.

A patient's physical address also determines their ability to benefit from telemetry. Cloud-based health networks rely entirely on uninterrupted broadband or cellular signals. When patients live in rural digital deserts, dropped connections create massive blind spots in the clinical timeline. A cardiac patch might accurately capture a lethal arrhythmia, but without a reliable network signal to push that data to a triage center, the alert is useless. This lack of basic internet infrastructure effectively blocks rural communities from the rapid emergency interventions that make continuous tracking valuable in the first place (Nundy et al., 2022).

Beyond logistical hurdles, severe structural biases exist within the physical hardware. Most continuous vital sensors rely on photoplethysmography (PPG) to track oxygen saturation and heart rates, using red or green light projected into the dermal tissue to measure physiological changes. Historically, developers calibrated these optical algorithms almost entirely on Caucasian testing cohorts. Consequently, the sensors lose critical diagnostic precision when applied to darker skin tones. High melanin density inherently absorbs and scatters the light signal. This biological reality leads to artificially high baseline oxygen readings, false-positive tachycardia alerts, and a dangerous failure to detect hidden hypoxemia (Bent et al., 2020; Sjoding et al., 2020). Because of this foundational engineering failure, hospital-grade wearables routinely generate delayed or inaccurate respiratory warnings for patients of color. If the medical field standardizes these optical sensors without forcing a massive algorithm recalibration across diverse populations, digital health initiatives will simply hardwire racial disparities into everyday medical equipment.

## 4. Discussion

### 4.1 The Human Element of Remote Monitoring

Moving from occasional clinic visits to 24/7 remote monitoring changes the core of the doctor-patient relationship. Standard medicine has always relied on face-to-face time, which allows doctors to assess patients physically while building a trusting bond. When we move care out of the exam room and into the patient's home, we risk treating the person as just a feed of telemetry data. But the literature shows that technology does not have to affect this clinical relationship. Instead, clinicians need to actively build what researchers call a "digital therapeutic alliance" (Brotherdale et al., 2024).

Putting a continuous glucose monitor or a cardiac patch on a patient means bringing medical surveillance into their most private spaces. To make this work, patients need to feel looked after, not just policed. A recent review of automated health apps showed that patients absolutely can build trust with digital tools, as long as the platform gives them clear feedback, respects their subjective input, and clearly explains how the data actually helps them (Malouin-Lachance et al., 2025). On the other hand, if the system just silently extracts data into the cloud without giving any feedback, patients quickly feel abandoned by their care team. Ultimately, wearables should never be viewed as a replacement for human doctors. They work best as diagnostic bridges that give us the data we need to make our actual conversations with patients much more meaningful.

### 4.2 The Challenge of Long-Term Use

Keeping patients engaged with continuous monitors for months on end remains a massive hurdle. The core problem usually traces back to how clinical workflows manage Patient-Generated Health Data (PGHD). Most current remote programs run on a strictly passive architecture. The patient wears the sensor, data streams to a remote server, and clinical outreach only happens if a specific threshold is crossed. This unidirectional setup severely damages long-term adherence. Patients rarely see enough everyday clinical value to justify the physical annoyance of wearing the hardware.

Fixing this requires integrating PGHD straight into shared decision-making models (Nazi et al., 2024). People tolerate physical discomfort much better when they can actually use their own telemetry data to adjust daily habits or medication doses alongside their doctor. Recent respiratory programs illustrate this dynamic perfectly. When asthma and COPD patients use applications that pair objective sensor readings with their own symptom logs, longitudinal engagement stays high (Reid et al., 2023). Adherence ultimately relies on a closed feedback loop. If a physician actively pulls up the continuous data during a regular visit and shows exactly how it alters the treatment plan, dropout rates plunge. Building behavioral prompts, targeted education, and subtle gamification directly into the companion software also helps break up the monotony of chronic illness management (Laranjo et al., 2021).

### 4.3 Who is Left Behind in Digital Health

Expanding digital health without paying close attention to demographics carries a severe ethical risk. Medical informatics experts refer to this as "intervention-generated inequalities"—a situation where a novel clinical tool disproportionately benefits well-resourced populations and pushes vulnerable groups further to the margins (Veinot et al., 2018). The current wearable landscape heavily favours younger, affluent individuals living in urban centres with strong internet infrastructure. Continuing down this path risks creating a permanently divided healthcare system. Wealthy demographics secure proactive, data-driven disease management. Older, poorer, or rural populations get stuck with outdated, reactive medicine.

Healthcare leaders must adopt the "quintuple aim" to fix this, treating health equity as a strict baseline requirement rather than a secondary goal (Nundy et al., 2022). That takes actual policy reform. Government agencies and state insurers must expand reimbursement criteria for clinical-grade wearables so massive out-of-pocket costs stop blocking low-income patients (Brewer et al., 2020). Regulators also need to push hardware manufacturers toward inclusive design. Developers should be forced to integrate older adults and cognitively vulnerable patients into the very first stages of product development. Digital equity does not just mean distributing identical hardware. It means offering heavier technical support, subsidizing internet access, and tailoring the onboarding process for groups starting at a structural disadvantage.

#### 4.4 Regulation, Privacy, and Ethics

Hardware developers are releasing clinical wearables much faster than regulatory and ethical frameworks can adapt. During the COVID-19 telehealth expansion, agencies like the FDA and EMA struggled to build protocols that could actually standardize and approve connected products (Marra et al., 2021). Testing a traditional medical device for physical safety is fairly straightforward. Modern software algorithms, however, constantly change. Machine learning models built to filter noise or predict heart failure risk often experience algorithmic drift as time passes. Properly regulating this "Software as a Medical Device" means agencies must audit these tools continuously long after they emerge on the commercial market.

Constant surveillance also creates deep privacy concerns. Tracking human vital signs 24 hours a day turns a patient's physical body into a highly valuable commercial dataset (Lupton, 2018). Frameworks like HIPAA and the GDPR attempt to protect this information, but the legal boundaries blur the moment private technology companies take over the cloud infrastructure. Most patients never read the dense terms of service required to turn their monitors on. Many unknowingly sign away commercial rights to their own anonymized health data. On the clinical side, continuous tracking completely warps standard medical liability (Sim, 2019). If an ambulatory patch detects a non-fatal arrhythmia late at night, does the prescribing doctor have a legal obligation to review that alert immediately? Deploying remote monitoring as a universal standard carries substantial legal risk until regulatory bodies clearly define data ownership, commercial extraction rules, and off-hours clinical liability.

#### 4.5 Limitations of This Review

While this paper maps out the current state of remote monitoring, the methodology does carry specific limitations. First, restricting the search exclusively to English-language publications builds in an immediate geographic bias. This filter leaves out highly relevant implementation data from digitized health systems in regions like Japan, Scandinavia, or South Korea. Second, the technology simply evolves too fast. A study published in 2019 might evaluate an ergonomically burdensome sensor that left the market years ago. Applying older human-factors feedback to today's highly refined hardware requires extreme caution.

Publication bias also skews the available data. Large, heavily funded academic centers eagerly publish their remote monitoring successes. They almost never publish when an intervention completely fails due to software instability or patient frustration. Because of this, the published literature likely understates just how hard it is to integrate these systems into an average community clinic. Finally, restricting this analysis to diabetes, COPD, and heart failure allowed for a deep look at chronic disease workflows, but it inherently limits how broadly these findings apply. The logistical bottlenecks found here might present very differently in other rapidly growing fields like high-risk obstetrics or remote neurological care. Future studies will need to investigate whether these exact same sociotechnical barriers exist across other medical specialties.

### 5. Conclusions

Digital medicine has reached a distinct operational threshold. Diagnostic precision is no longer the primary barrier preventing the widespread expansion of remote patient monitoring. The actual friction preventing clinical scale stems almost entirely from human behavior and compromised institutional workflows. Medical facilities struggle to manage the immense volume of continuous physiological data. Legacy electronic health records were engineered to warehouse isolated blood test results and typed physician notes, rather than continuous streams of wireless telemetry. Forcing these older architectures to communicate with modern cloud servers requires complex middleware, generating a severe administrative roadblock. This data overload directly causes acute alert fatigue among providers. When physicians are overwhelmed by false-positive alarms triggered by routine physical movement, they predictably disengage from the monitoring interface. On the patient side, adherence declines rapidly. Initial engagement frequently appears robust during the first weeks of deployment. However, if a cardiac patch causes severe dermal irritation, or if restoring a dropped network connection demands extensive troubleshooting, therapeutic abandonment inevitably follows. That abandonment accelerates if care teams fail to review the captured metrics during in-person consultations. Long-term utilization fails whenever the physical burden of the hardware outweighs its visible clinical benefit.

Access limitations create an even deeper structural divide. The current healthcare infrastructure frequently treats continuous monitoring as a premium medical service rather than a universal baseline of care.

High out-of-pocket costs and restrictive insurance reimbursement protocols dictate exactly who receives a device. Due to this financial gatekeeping, advanced wearables overwhelmingly reach younger, affluent, and highly tech-literate individuals. The demographic groups mostly affected by chronic respiratory decline and heart failure—specifically older adults and lower-income populations—remain systematically excluded from proactive surveillance. This dynamic actively constructs a bifurcated healthcare model. Episodic, reactive medicine is reserved for the underinsured, while predictive, continuous care becomes accessible primarily to the wealthy. Even when marginalized populations acquire these devices, foundational engineering biases frequently compromise their care. Standard optical heart rate algorithms routinely fail to register accurate vitals through skin with high melanin density. Smartphone pairing interfaces also largely ignore the physical reality of arthritic hands and degrading visual acuity. These uncorrected design flaws actively push vulnerable demographics further to the clinical margins.

The medical technology sector cannot continue developing hardware in isolated environments and expecting seamless integration into complex chronic disease workflows. Real-world functionality demands inclusive design protocols. Developers should integrate non-native speakers, older adults, and patients experiencing mild cognitive decline into the earliest beta-testing phases. This ensures software interfaces accommodate medically complex populations rather than exclusively tech-literate consumers. Financial structures require an equally aggressive overhaul. State health departments and private insurance networks must expand coverage mandates so a patient's household income no longer dictates their access to proactive care. Regulatory bodies face their own structural hurdles. Agencies must quickly build agile frameworks to audit shifting machine learning algorithms and enforce data privacy within external cloud architectures. The existing legislation governing medical software was codified long before artificial intelligence began filtering patient vitals in real time. A medical wearable holds minimal diagnostic value if the human infrastructure supporting it collapses. Unless the healthcare sector actively repairs these specific financial and ergonomic barriers, rolling out remote monitoring will simply upgrade medicine for the privileged while leaving vulnerable populations exactly where they started.

**Author Contributions:****Conceptualization:** Jakub Juskowiak, Zuzanna Julia Komin**Methodology:** Maryan Liasota, Eliza Zofia Kabat**Software:** Michalina Justyna Kozłowska**Validation:** Krzysztof Konopka, Maciej Kamil Majchrzak**Formal Analysis:** Faustyna Magdalena Kołodziej, Alicja Kwiatkowska**Investigation:** Krzysztof Konopka, Mateusz Lis**Resources:** Maciej Kamil Majchrzak, Maryan Liasota**Data Curation:** Eliza Zofia Kabat, Michalina Justyna Kozłowska**Writing – Original Draft:** Jakub Juskowiak, Zuzanna Komin**Writing – Review & Editing:** Faustyna Magdalena Kołodziej, Alicja Kwiatkowska, Mateusz Lis**Visualization:** Jakub Juskowiak, Zuzanna Komin**Supervision:** Maryan Liasota, Eliza Zofia Kabat**Project Administration:** Michalina Justyna Kozłowska, Krzysztof Konopka

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

**Conflict of Interest Statement:** The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

**Declaration of the Use of Generative AI and AI-Assisted Technologies in the Writing Process:** In preparing this work, the authors used Google Gemini for the purpose of improving language clarity and structural organization. After using this tool, the authors critically reviewed and edited the content and take full responsibility for the final version of the manuscript.

## REFERENCES

1. Bent, B., Goldstein, B. A., Kibbe, W. A., & Dunn, J. P. (2020). Investigating sources of inaccuracy in wearable optical heart rate sensors. *Npj Digital Medicine*, 3(1), 18. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-020-0226-6>
2. Brewer, L. C., Fortuna, K. L., Jones, C., Walker, R., Hayes, S. N., Patten, C. A., & Cooper, L. A. (2020). Back to the future: Achieving health equity through health informatics and digital health. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*, 8(1), e14512. <https://doi.org/10.2196/14512>
3. Brotherdale, R., Berry, K., & Bucci, S. (2024). A qualitative study exploring the digital therapeutic alliance with fully automated smartphone apps. *DIGITAL HEALTH*, 10, 20552076241277712. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20552076241277712>
4. Crawford, A., & Serhal, E. (2020). Digital health equity and COVID-19: The innovation curve cannot reinforce the social gradient of health. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 22(6), e19361. <https://doi.org/10.2196/19361>
5. Dinh-Le, C., Chuang, R., Chokshi, S., & Mann, D. (2019). Wearable health technology and electronic health record integration: Scoping review and future directions. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*, 7(9), e12861. <https://doi.org/10.2196/12861>
6. Eberle, C., & Stichling, S. (2021). Clinical improvements by telemedicine interventions managing type 1 and type 2 diabetes: Systematic meta-review. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 23(2), e23244. <https://doi.org/10.2196/23244>
7. Gautam, N., Ghanta, S., Mueller, J., Mansour, M., Chen, Z., Puente, C., Ha, Y., Tarun, T., Dhar, G., Sivakumar, K., Zhang, Y., Halimeh, A., Nakarmi, U., Al-Kindi, S., DeMazumder, D., & Al'Aref, S. (2022). Artificial intelligence, wearables and remote monitoring for heart failure: Current and future applications. *Diagnostics*, 12(12), 2964. <https://doi.org/10.3390/diagnostics12122964>
8. Laranjo, L., Ding, D., Heleno, B., Kocaballi, B., Quiroz, J. C., Tong, H. L., Chahwan, B., Neves, A. L., Gabarron, E., Dao, K. P., Rodrigues, D., Neves, G. C., Antunes, M. L., Coiera, E., & Bates, D. W. (2021). Do smartphone applications and activity trackers increase physical activity in adults? Systematic review, meta-analysis and metaregression. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 55(8), 422–432. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2020-102892>
9. Lupton, D. (2018). How do data come to matter? Living and becoming with personal data. *Big Data & Society*, 5(2), 2053951718786314. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951718786314>
10. Malouin-Lachance, A., Capolupo, J., Laplante, C., & Hudon, A. (2025). Does the digital therapeutic alliance exist? Integrative review. *JMIR Mental Health*, 12, e69294–e69294. <https://doi.org/10.2196/69294>
11. Marra, C., Gordon, W. J., & Stern, A. D. (2021). Use of connected digital products in clinical research following the COVID-19 pandemic: A comprehensive analysis of clinical trials. *BMJ Open*, 11(6), e047341. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-047341>
12. Nazi, K. M., Newton, T., & Armstrong, C. M. (2024). Unleashing the potential for patient-generated health data (PGHD). *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 39(S1), 9–13. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-023-08461-4>
13. Nundy, S., Cooper, L. A., & Mate, K. S. (2022). The quintuple aim for health care improvement: A new imperative to advance health equity. *JAMA*, 327(6), 521. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2021.25181>
14. Odugbesan, O., Mungmode, A., Rioles, N., Buckingham, D., Nelson, G., Agarwal, S., Grant, A., Wright, T., Hess, E., Ebekozien, O., & T1D Exchange Quality Improvement Collaborative. (2024). Increasing continuous glucose monitoring use for non-Hispanic Black and Hispanic people with type 1 diabetes: Results from the T1D Exchange Quality Improvement Collaborative Equity Study. *Clinical Diabetes*, 42(1), 40–48. <https://doi.org/10.2337/cd23-0050>
15. Reid, D., Mehta, J., Anis, K., & Mehta, S. (2023). Impact of remote patient monitoring platform on patients with moderate to severe persistent asthma: Observational study. *JMIR Formative Research*, 7, e51065. <https://doi.org/10.2196/51065>
16. Rodriguez, J. A., Clark, C. R., & Bates, D. W. (2020). Digital health equity as a necessity in the 21st Century Cures Act era. *JAMA*, 323(23), 2381. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.7858>
17. Sana, F., Isselbacher, E. M., Singh, J. P., Heist, E. K., Pathik, B., & Armoundas, A. A. (2020). Wearable devices for ambulatory cardiac monitoring. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*, 75(13), 1582–1592. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2020.01.046>

18. Sim, I. (2019). Mobile devices and health. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 381(10), 956–968. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMra1806949>
19. Sjoding, M. W., Dickson, R. P., Iwashyna, T. J., Gay, S. E., & Valley, T. S. (2020). Racial bias in pulse oximetry measurement. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 383(25), 2477–2478. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc2029240>
20. Smuck, M., Odonkor, C. A., Wilt, J. K., Schmidt, N., & Swiernik, M. A. (2021). The emerging clinical role of wearables: Factors for successful implementation in healthcare. *Npj Digital Medicine*, 4(1), 45. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-021-00418-3>
21. Steinhubl, S. R., Waalen, J., Edwards, A. M., Ariniello, L. M., Mehta, R. R., Ebner, G. S., Carter, C., Baca-Motes, K., Felicione, E., Sarich, T., & Topol, E. J. (2018). Effect of a home-based wearable continuous ECG monitoring patch on detection of undiagnosed atrial fibrillation: The mSToPS randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*, 320(2), 146. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2018.8102>
22. Thakur, M., Maurer, E. W., Tran, K. N., Tholkes, A., Rajamani, S., & Dwivedi, R. (2025). Enhancing health equity and patient engagement in diabetes care: Technology-aided continuous glucose monitoring pilot implementation project. *JMIR Diabetes*, 10, e68324. <https://doi.org/10.2196/68324>
23. Veinot, T. C., Mitchell, H., & Ancker, J. S. (2018). Good intentions are not enough: How informatics interventions can worsen inequality. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 25(8), 1080–1088. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocy052>