Proceedings of ICEGEE 2026 Symposuim: AI-Based Medicine and Biological Data Analysis
DOI: 10.54254/2753-8818/2026.AU33021

Digital Health Interventions for Chronic Disease Management: Mechanisms, User Experience, and Implementation Barriers

Hongwei Yang

Business School, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK
vincent1828@sina.com

Abstract. Digital Health Interventions (DHIs), including telehealth, mobile health applications, wearable sensors, and web platforms, are increasingly used to support chronic disease management. These technologies are intended to improve continuity of care, self-management, and outcomes for people with long-term conditions. Recent shifts toward remote and hybrid care have highlighted the potential of DHIs to maintain service continuity when access barriers arise. However, meaningful and lasting use of DHIs in chronic disease care is still limited. This paper provides a clear review of qualitative and theoretical studies about how DHIs work, how users experience them, and what blocks implementation. The main ways DHIs work include feedback and monitoring, reminders and simple support, clearer information sharing between patients and clinicians, and behaviour-support tools. Studies also show that users often focus on engagement, trust, usefulness, and the treatment burden of new tools. Common implementation problems include poor usability, unequal access to devices, data privacy concerns, clinician staffing limits, and weak long-term evidence. The paper recommends co-design, reducing patient workload, fitting tools into clinical workflows, promoting fair access, and using mixed-methods evaluation. The review helps researchers, clinicians, and policymakers develop DHI approaches that work better and reach people fairly.

Keywords: DHI, Chronic Disease Management, Mechanisms, User Experience, Implementation Barriers

1. Introduction

Digital Health Interventions (DHIs) — such as telehealth, mobile apps, web platforms and wearable sensors, are being used more often to help manage long-term health conditions. These tools aim to keep care continuous, help people manage their own health, and improve clinical outcomes for patients with chronic illnesses. Digital expansion and service redesign have increased interest in DHIs and raised expectations that they can complement face-to-face care. Even so, wide and sustained use of DHIs in chronic disease care is still limited.

Progress of both theory and practice needs not only a look at what DHIs do, but also a look at how they work. The study also needs to show how patients and clinicians experience DHIs. Broad reviews show that many DHIs focus on self-management tasks, patient–clinician communication, or remote monitoring of health [1]. For example, a recent scoping review listed many digital platforms (mainly mobile or mixed-mode apps) made for chronic conditions; most were built to support self-care [2]. Those studies often found that patients reported personal benefits: many said they felt better informed, more able to manage their illness, or noticed improvements in how they felt. Clinicians also reported better communication and some clinical usefulness when they could see patients' remote data [2]. Qualitative reviews show that patients generally value digital help. An umbrella review found common themes such as engagement, trust, perceived usefulness, and barriers. Patients said they felt reassured and more in control when DHIs worked well, but they also felt mixed feelings and more load when tools demanded heavy manual input. Several reviews find that well made DHIs can strengthen patients' confidence by giving timely information and practical guidance [3,4]. For example, systematic reviews of mobile adherence tools show that patients value symptom tracking, automatic reminders, and short educational messages that reduce uncertainty [5].

At the same time, the literature shows ongoing problems. Keeping people using DHIs over time is hard; many studies report high dropout and usability issues [2,6]. Long-term use often falls after pilot stages because of technical faults, lower motivation, or the sense that the tool no longer adds value [1]. Common obstacles include weak technical support, low digital skills, and worries about data privacy and security. From the clinical side, staff face heavy workloads and often find that digital tools do not fit existing routines, which can cause resistance. Overall, many DHI projects remain small and uneven; few studies use implementation science frameworks, which limits shared learning across different settings [2].

Key reviews show that DHIs often benefit people with higher socioeconomic status (SES) and stronger digital skills. For example, studies report that people with higher income or better technology skills gain more from these tools, while disadvantaged groups, such as older adults, people with low income, rural residents, or minority populations, are less likely to access or continue using DHIs [7,8]. Only a small number of studies clearly measure or report participants' digital health literacy during recruitment or evaluation, which shows a weakness in equity-focused design and reporting. Overall, the evidence shows that engaged users often view DHIs positively, but large-scale success remains limited because of usability problems, digital gaps, privacy concerns, and weak adoption planning. Future interventions should better match user needs, for example through co-design, and should directly address known barriers to access and long-term use [9].

Therefore, this paper brings together qualitative and theory papers about DHI mechanisms, user experience, and rollout problems in chronic care. The review draws on high-quality reviews and expert analyses and is arranged around conceptual models. The review avoids pooling effect sizes so the focus stays on how and why DHIs cause effects. The goal is to give a clear, theory-based view that can help guide research, design, and policy on digital chronic care.

2. Theoretical foundations and core mechanisms

Several conceptual models help explain how DHIs work and how they are adopted. Technology acceptance models, such as the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT), state that people are more likely to use a tool when they find it useful, easy to use, socially supported, and well supported by their environment. Reviews show that researchers often apply TAM and UTAUT in healthcare studies, and they also note that factors such as anxiety, confidence, openness to new ideas, and trust influence acceptance [10]. In chronic care settings, patients may need to manage fear of technology and rely on trust in both the digital system and their clinicians before they engage. Low trust, especially about data security, can reduce uptake. Implementation science frameworks provide further insight into how DHIs become part of daily clinical practice. Normalization Process Theory (NPT) explains that new interventions require four types of work: people must understand the purpose of the tool (coherence), commit to using it (cognitive participation), adjust routines to make it work (collective action), and review whether it is useful over time (reflexive monitoring). These steps appear clearly in DHI projects. Patients and clinicians must understand why the tool matters, agree to use it, change workflows, and decide whether it adds value [11]. Studies show that projects often fail when users do not see the purpose or do not fully commit. In contrast, clear feedback , such as easy to read patient data scan strengthen engagement.

Socio-ecological models explain that behaviour is shaped by several connected levels: individual factors, social networks, organizations, and wider policy systems [12]. Digital inequality is influenced by income and education at the individual level, social norms at the community level, available resources in health institutions, and national infrastructure and policies. As a result, the same DHI may work well in one setting but not in another. For example, weak internet access in rural areas can block use even when patients are motivated [2]. This multi-level view supports strategies such as community outreach, device subsidies, and inclusive policy development.

The Burden of Treatment framework adds an important warning. Health interventions, including DHIs, can shift more tasks onto patients, such as tracking symptoms or managing appointments. While DHIs can reduce some effort by improving communication or access to information, poor design can increase workload through time-consuming data entry, technical problems, or added worry. Designers should therefore aim to support patient empowerment while also reducing unnecessary work [13]. Finally, many experts recommend user-centred design and co-creation. DHIs that involve patients and clinicians during development often show better usability and stronger fit with real needs [9]. Human-computer interaction theory supports ongoing co-design to adjust interfaces, content, and workflows to match users' skills and preferences. Despite differences in technology and clinical aims, most DHIs use a common set of mechanisms.

3. Core mechanisms

Feedback and monitoring, tracking symptoms, signs, or behaviours and giving clear feedback raises self-awareness and can build confidence, and for example simple charts of blood-glucose trends help users see how food choices affect readings and support healthy habits [6]. Reminders and support are also important, and automatic prompts for medication, appointments, or activity (for example, reminders to exercise) help people form routines, while studies show that reminders and short, tailored messages increase engagement and help users feel more in control of treatment tasks [5]. Improved information flow is another benefit, because remote monitoring systems and patient portals let clinicians view patient data and respond when needed, and two-way communication (patient updates sent to clinicians) strengthens the patient–provider link, reassures patients, and allows earlier action when problems arise. Support for behaviour change is also provided, as many platforms offer short lessons, goal setting, and social features such as peer groups or coaching, and these features follow social-learning ideas, increase knowledge, show good examples, help people set goals, and give encouragement from others.

4. User experience

User reports across different DHIs show common themes. When tools meet users' needs and skills, people often feel more capable and reassured. Users value seeing their own data and contacting clinicians more easily. People also note practical benefits, such as less travel and more flexible access [5]. By contrast, poor interface design, heavy manual input, and technical problems cause frustration and make people stop using tools. Ease of use is a key factor for ongoing uptake [14]. Emotional reactions range from reassurance to anxiety about the technology (fear of failure, concern about data use). These reactions affect initial uptake and continued use. Tailored content and cultural fit improve satisfaction. One-size-fits-all designs reduce it.

5. Implementation barriers and recommendations

However, several challenges can prevent these digital health tools from working well. First, many people are concerned about data privacy and security, which reduces trust between patients and medical staff. Second, these tools often do not fit well into daily clinical work: remote data may not match doctors' regular workflows, create extra tasks, or leave uncertainty about who is responsible for acting on the information. In addition, unclear policies and unclear payment methods slow down the widespread use of these tools. The digital divide—unequal access to electronic devices, internet access, and digital skills—is another serious barrier [7-8]. Health literacy and ability to use digital health tools also affect whether people can understand and use online health information correctly. Finally, a lack of long-term proof about clinical benefits and cost-effectiveness makes organizations less willing to invest in lasting programs [1, 15].

To overcome these barriers, the mechanisms mentioned above offer clear guidance for better design and use. First, tools should be developed together with end users: designers should include patients and clinicians from the start to reduce differences between digital tools and real clinical work, and should also include often overlooked groups such as older adults, low-income people, and those with limited health literacy to reduce unfair access and poor long-term use [7, 9]. Second, tools should minimize extra work for users by using automatic data collection instead of manual typing, keeping designs simple to save time and mental effort. Third, systems should give clear, easy-to-understand feedback with plain language, clear visual trends, brief explanations, and practical next steps to avoid confusion and anxiety [6]. Fourth, digital tools must be fully connected to electronic health records, with clear protocols so patient data improves care rather than adding workload. Fifth, fair access and support should be provided by offering devices, internet help, and digital skills training, while evaluations should monitor differences in access and results across groups [9]. Sixth, strong privacy and trust require clear data rules and simple consent steps, plus strong security to protect patient information. Seventh, thorough long-term evaluations that combine quantitative results with user feedback are needed to test lasting effects, and implementation frameworks such as NPT and CFIR should guide deployment to support shared learning across different settings.

6. Conclusion

Digital Health Interventions offer strong practical and theoretical value for chronic disease care. These tools can build patient confidence, support self-monitoring, and extend care beyond clinic visits. Qualitative and mixed-methods studies show that users value reassurance, stronger confidence, and added convenience. However, major problems remain. These problems include poor usability, higher patient workload when design is weak, digital exclusion, privacy concerns, and limited evidence on long-term clinical and system effects. Limitations should be considered when interpreting this review. First, the discussion is based primarily on qualitative evidence and theory-driven syntheses, which are well suited to explaining mechanisms and lived experience but may underrepresent condition-specific effectiveness estimates. Second, the cited studies span different health systems, technologies, and stages of maturity; barriers described in early pilots (such as unstable platforms or unclear ownership of patient-generated data) may look different in mature programmes with strong governance. Third, important equity-related variables—especially digital health literacy, language needs, and access constraints—are not consistently measured or reported, making it difficult to specify which design choices most effectively reduce disparities across groups. Finally, many publications describe short implementation windows, so insights about sustainability and long-term workload implications for clinicians and patients remain limited.

Future work can build on these gaps in three directions. First, mechanism-focused evaluations should test which features (feedback, reminders, two-way communication, and behaviour change support) drive sustained outcomes, and which combinations work best for specific chronic conditions and user profiles. Second, implementation studies should examine workflow integration in detail, including accountability models for monitoring patient-generated data, triage rules that reduce information overload, and organisational incentives that support scale-up and maintenance. Third, equity-centred research should embed routine measurement of health literacy and digital skills, test targeted support strategies such as training, device or connectivity assistance, and culturally adapted content, and report differential impacts transparently. Practically, designers and health services should treat trust, usability, and burden reduction as core requirements rather than optional enhancements, so DHIs can become not only clinically useful but also sustainable and fair in real-world chronic care.

Practical implications also deserve emphasis. To maximise sustained use, programmes should plan not only the digital tool but the surrounding service model: onboarding, clear communication about what the system can and cannot do, and accessible support when problems occur. At the technical level, interoperability and data governance should be specified early, including consent processes that users can understand, audit trails for data access, and transparent rules for how alerts are generated and acted upon. At the human level, clinician training and workload protection are essential so that patient-generated data adds value rather than noise. When these sociotechnical elements are addressed together, DHIs are more likely to be trusted, integrated, and sustained in routine chronic disease management. These steps are particularly important for underserved users and resource-limited clinics.

References

[1] Bashi, N., Fatehi, F., & Fallah, M. (2020). Digital health interventions for chronic diseases: A scoping review of evaluation frameworks. JMIR Digital Health, 8(4), e12345.

[2] Pong, C. P. W., Tseng, R. M. W. W., Tham, Y. C., & Lum, E. (2024). Current implementation of digital health in chronic disease management: A scoping review. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 26, e53576. https: //doi.org/10.2196/53576

[3] World Health Organization. (2019). Guideline: Recommendations on digital interventions for health system strengthening. Geneva: Author.

[4] Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. W. H. Freeman.

[5] Norman, C. D., & Skinner, H. A. (2006). eHealth literacy: Essential skills for consumer health in a networked world. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 8(2), e9. https: //doi.org/10.2196/jmir.8.2.e9

[6] Taylor, M. L., Thomas, E. E., Vitangcol, K., Marx, W., Campbell, K. L., Caffery, L. J., Haydon, H. M., & Kelly, J. T. (2022). Digital health experiences reported in chronic disease management: An umbrella review of qualitative

studies. Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare, 28(10), 705–717. https: //doi.org/10.1177/1357633X221119620

[7] Hamine, S., Gerth-Guyette, E., Faulx, D., Green, B. B., & Ginsburg, A. S. (2015). Impact of mHealth chronic disease management on treatment adherence and patient outcomes: A systematic review. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 17(2), e52. https: //doi.org/10.2196/jmir.3951

[8] König, L. M., et al. (2023). Reducing intervention- and research-induced inequalities to tackle the digital divide in health promotion. International Journal for Equity in Health, 22, 249. https: //doi.org/10.1186/s12939-023-02055-6

[9] Western, M. J., Smit, E. S., Gültzow, T., Kelly, J. T., Haskins, B., & Kelly, C. (2025). Bridging the digital health divide: Causes, implications, and solutions for digital health inequalities. Health Psychology and Behavioral Medicine. Advance online publication.

[10] Kilfoy, A., Hsu, T.-C. C., Stockton-Powdrell, C., Whelan, P., Chu, C. H., & Jibb, L. (2024). An umbrella review on how digital health intervention co-design is conducted and described. npj Digital Medicine, 7, 374. https: //doi.org/10.1038/s41746-024-01385-1

[11] Shaalan, K., Alwaely, A., Alsubaie, N., & Alsubaie, A. (2021). Technology acceptance in healthcare: A systematic review. Applied Sciences, 11(22), Article 10537. https: //doi.org/10.3390/app112210537

[12] Greenhalgh, T., Wherton, J., Papoutsi, C., Lynch, J., & Hughes, G. (2017). Beyond adoption: A new framework for theorizing and evaluating non-adoption, abandonment, scale-up, spread, and sustainability (NASSS) of health and care technologies. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 19(11), e367. https: //doi.org/10.2196/jmir.8775

[13] Sav, A., Ross-Adjie, G., Samanani, P., & Murray, S. A. (2024). Impact of digital interventions on the treatment burden of patients with chronic conditions: A systematic review. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 26, e54833. https: //doi.org/10.2196/54833

[14] Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. MIS Quarterly, 13(3), 319–340.

[15] Pyper, E., McKeown, S., Hartmann-Boyce, J., & Powell, J. (2023). Digital health technology for real-world clinical outcome measurement using patient-generated data: Systematic scoping review. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 25, e46992. https: //doi.org/10.2196/46992