

1 **Full Title:** Use of mobile health apps in low-income populations: a prospective study of
2 facilitators and barriers

3 **Short Title:** Liu; Use of mHealth apps in low-income populations

4 Patrick Liu BA¹; Katia Astudillo BS²; Damaris Velez BA²; Lauren Kelley MSW MPA²; Darcey
5 Cobbs-Lomax MBA MPH²; Erica S. Spatz MD MHS³

6 ¹ Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, 06510

7 ² Project Access, New Haven, CT 06533

8 ³ Section of Cardiovascular Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine, Yale School of
9 Medicine; Center for Outcomes Research and Evaluation, Yale-New Haven Hospital, New
10 Haven, CT

11 **Corresponding author:**

12 Erica S. Spatz, MD, MHS

13 Center for Outcomes Research and Evaluation

14 One Church Street, Suite 200

15 New Haven, CT 06510

16 Email: Erica.Spatz@yale.edu; Phone: 203-785-6012; Fax: 203-785-2917

17 **Key words:** Mobile health, digital health, apps, low-income, community health worker

18 **Word count:** 6064

19 **Figures and tables:** 1 table, 5 figures

20 **References:** 32

21 **Appendix:** 2 tables, 1 text

22

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 **Background:** Mobile applications (apps) are increasingly popular in healthcare. For low-income
3 populations, barriers exist, yet limited data are available about the challenges and catalysts for
4 adoption.

5 **Methods and Results:** We partnered with a primary care center and a community organization
6 and recruited patients to use a health app. A community health worker (CHW) consented
7 participants, downloaded the app and instructed on its use, and provided ongoing technical
8 support. Bi-weekly surveys for three months were sent via email/text to assess participant
9 experiences and perceptions.

10 The majority (81 of 108 [75.0%] English language-preferred and 50 of 52 [96.2%]
11 Spanish language-preferred) of patients approached were enrolled. Common reasons for
12 declining were: did not own a smartphone (13.8%), did not have email (20.7%), and not
13 interested (58.6%). Enrollment challenges included: insufficient storage, unfamiliarity with
14 downloading apps, forgotten passwords to email accounts, and slow/absent WiFi connection –
15 which the CHW and the app company were able to address. Most participants, English and
16 Spanish language-preferred respectively, were interested in monitoring their health through an
17 app (74.4%; 70.4%), connecting devices such as FitBits© and blood pressure cuffs (78.9%;
18 50.0%), and being the owner of their health records (83.6%; 95.6%). There were concerns about
19 sharing health information with research teams (66.7%; 51.9%), and data being sold (83.0%;
20 70.4%). However, many (58.6%; 87.2%) reported being likely to share health data with a trusted
21 research team. Compared with before the study, most felt more comfortable using health apps
22 (67.4%; 82.1%) and more likely to participate in research using apps (76.2%; 72.4%).

- 1 **Conclusions:** The assistance of a CHW facilitated the enrollment of low-income individuals in a
- 2 mobile health app by fostering trust and sustained engagement. Participants were interested in
- 3 having several app features. Despite concerns about data privacy, they demonstrated greater
- 4 interest in mobile health app use and research participation at study conclusion.

1 INTRODUCTION

2 Applications (apps) accessible on digital platforms are increasingly popular in healthcare
3 settings, especially with mobile device ownership surpassing 90% and smartphone penetrance
4 estimated at approximately 60% in the United States in 2013 (1, 2). Apps have the potential to
5 help patients engage more with their health through the monitoring of health behaviors (e.g., step
6 counts; physical activity; dietary habits) and physiologic parameters (e.g., heart rate; blood
7 pressure; blood glucose level) by connecting external devices. Some health apps provide patients
8 access to their medical data through patient portals and opportunities to participate in research
9 using their smart devices. Other mobile health (mHealth) apps aim to support adherence to
10 treatments and help providers encourage treatment between healthcare visits, though literature
11 has not shown consistently significant impacts (3, 4). For low-income populations, however,
12 unique barriers to mHealth utilization exist. These barriers include fluency with mobile apps,
13 limited health literacy, lack of empowerment, and historical mistrust of healthcare systems (5-8).
14 As mHealth platforms play a larger role in healthcare delivery, the digital divide could serve to
15 worsen health disparities (9-11).

16 mHealth apps that are sensitive to the user needs of vulnerable populations have the
17 potential to gain uptake in more diverse communities. Specifically, the visual and linguistic
18 design of mHealth apps, along with considerations for *how* mHealth apps are introduced to
19 patients – may increase adoption and acceptability (12, 13). Recent literature on mHealth
20 interventions has primarily focused on mHealth adoption among health workers to facilitate their
21 work and interactions with patients, primarily in low- and middle-income countries (14-16).
22 Some of these studies use community health workers (CHW) as frontline providers to connect
23 with patients and improve their health outcomes (17-19). Ideally, because of their shared lived

1 experiences and unique positions within the healthcare team, CHWs have the opportunity to
2 improve integration of mobile health apps into the health and healthcare experience of their
3 patients. However, little literature exists regarding digital health uptake among low-income
4 populations in the United States, and how CHWs may facilitate that process. Furthermore, little
5 is known about this population's attitudes towards mobile health apps, the ability of apps to
6 increase access to and sense of ownership of medical information, and how patients' perceptions
7 may change over time with consistent use of an mHealth app with technological support from
8 CHWs.

9 To understand the real-world challenges and catalysts for adoption of health-related
10 mobile technologies among low-income patients in the United States, we evaluated the
11 experiences of underserved patients engaged with an mHealth app. We aimed to learn how a
12 digital health platform should be configured to be valuable for underserved patients and
13 integrated into healthcare settings to facilitate mHealth adoption with sustained engagement.

14 **METHODS**

15 We conducted a community-based participatory research project in partnership with a
16 community health organization, a primary care center, and a digital health company. Project
17 Access-New Haven (PA-NH) is a community health organization that provides intensive patient
18 navigation to improve access to care for underserved individuals in the Greater New Haven area.
19 The Yale Primary Care Center (PCC) is a hospital-based clinic serving primarily patients with
20 Medicaid; the Center offers a variety of integrated services, including general primary care,
21 nutrition, addiction, behavioral health, home visitation, and refugee health. Hugo Health is a
22 digital health company that produced its eponymic app, which provides its users access to
23 medical records from different healthcare systems, allows integration of wearable and other

1 cloud-based devices (e.g., Fitbits, wireless scales, and wireless blood pressure cuffs), and
2 facilitates participation in healthcare research. With patients' permission, patients can opt to
3 share portions of their data with research teams and answer surveys from researchers using their
4 email and/or smart devices.

5 *Study Design and Implementation*

6 Our study's first phase involved designing an implementation plan that optimized the
7 capabilities of PA-NH community health workers and Hugo with the following goals: (1) to
8 create a seamless experience with study enrollment; (2) to refine the research aims and identify
9 key areas of interest to be assessed in the questionnaires; (3) to collaboratively develop and
10 cognitively test survey questions in both English and Spanish to improve the quality of the
11 questions and their comprehension. We held regular phone meetings for all stakeholders (PA-
12 NH, Hugo Health, Yale PCC, and Yale researchers). The second phase included patient
13 enrollment and study participation. We obtained Institutional Review Board approval of the
14 protocol (ID 2000022503), and all patients provided informed consent.

15 *Participant Recruitment, Eligibility, and Enrollment*

16 We recruited patients from PA-NH and the Yale PCC. We aimed to enroll 80 English
17 language-preferred patients and 50 Spanish language-preferred patients to participate in the study
18 for three months. Patients attending primary care visits were eligible if they had ongoing
19 healthcare needs for which the Hugo app would be helpful, demonstrated basic literacy in
20 English or Spanish, and had access to a smart device. A CHW stationed at the healthcare centers
21 assessed eligibility, gauged interest in study participation, and consented participants for
22 enrollment. If criteria were met but patients did not want to participate in the study, the CHW
23 logged the reason(s) for non-participation (i.e., lack of smart phone, lack of email or access to

1 email, lack of interest, or other). If inclusion criteria were met and patients consented to
2 participating in the study, the CHW then downloaded the app on the patients' mobile devices,
3 connected them to their health portal(s), and instructed them in the use of different features of the
4 app that may have been the most applicable to the patient (e.g., following up on test results,
5 sharing health data with clinicians/family members; tracking symptoms and physiologic data
6 from connected devices). The CHW then practiced using these different functionalities with the
7 patient. Finally, the CHW kept a qualitative log of barriers encountered and strategies utilized to
8 address those barriers during the enrollment process. These logs were discussed on weekly calls
9 with all stakeholders.

10 *Survey Development and Dissemination*

11 A baseline survey was administered at enrollment to gather participants' background
12 characteristics, followed by six brief surveys administered through the Hugo app on a bi-weekly
13 basis. The first five follow-up surveys assessed participants' interest and concerns about using
14 health apps, data access and sharing, and participation in research. The sixth and final survey
15 assessed patients' experience with the health app and interacting with the CHW, as well as how,
16 if at all, their knowledge and attitudes about health apps changed through this experience. Links
17 to the six surveys were sent via email or text according to patient preference. Responses were
18 archived in Hugo.

19 The CHW provided ongoing tech support, with the help of Hugo staff, throughout the
20 study by phone call, text, and in person. The CHW also sent reminders to complete surveys at
21 one and three months after enrollment. Monetary incentives were provided at enrollment and
22 three months, after patients completed their baseline and final surveys. Incentives were not
23 offered for responding to the first five follow-up surveys.

1 *Feedback After Completion of Study*

2 We sought feedback from 15 English language-preferred and five Spanish language-
3 preferred participants at the end of their enrollment in the study. Study participants were
4 randomly selected. We asked them questions regarding (1) their experiences with their
5 participation in the study, including what they did and did not like; (2) what was difficult using
6 Hugo and what could have made the experience better; (3) whether and how having a
7 community health worker was helpful; (4) if they feel differently about owning/having access to
8 their medical information; (5) whether they feel differently about using an app to monitor health;
9 and (6) if they feel differently about participating in research using an app.

10 *Main Outcome Measures*

11 Our main outcome measures were related to: (1) patients' willingness and comfort with
12 using mobile apps for a) health monitoring, b) healthcare, and c) research participation; (2)
13 facilitators and barriers to utilizing an mHealth app; (3) utility of a CHW to facilitate mHealth
14 engagement; and (4) principal uses and functionality of interest to participants.

15 *Statistical Analysis*

16 We used descriptive analyses to report responses to our surveys. All analyses were
17 stratified by preferred language (English vs. Spanish). Excel, version 14.7.6 (Microsoft Corp.)
18 and RStudio, version 1.1.423 (RStudio Inc.) were used for all analyses.

19 **RESULTS**

20 *Patient Enrollment*

21 Among 108 English language-preferred patients and 52 Spanish language-preferred
22 patients approached for the study, 81 (75.0% of 108) and 50 (96.2% of 52) were enrolled,
23 respectively (**Table 1**). The mean income of English language-preferred patients was 113% of

1 federal poverty level (FPL), and were primarily Black/African American (74%), followed by
2 Hispanic/Latino (16%), White (7%), and Other (2%). Spanish language-preferred participants
3 had a mean income of 82% FPL and all (100%) were Hispanic/Latino. Approximately one-third
4 of both English. (34.6%) and Spanish (34.0%) language-preferred respondents were assessed as
5 having low health literacy.

6 The most common reasons cited by the 29 patients who declined participation were: did
7 not have access to a smartphone (4 of 29), did not have email (6 of 29), and not interested (17 of
8 29). Technological challenges to enrollment of study participants included: insufficient storage;
9 unfamiliarity with downloading and using apps; forgotten passwords to email accounts;
10 infrequent email use (resulting in a text option for communication); and slow/absent WiFi
11 connection. Enrollment of English language-preferred patients began on April 25, 2018 and
12 ended May 31, 2018, and enrollment of Spanish language-preferred patients started on October
13 11, 2018 and ended December 20, 2018.

14 *Survey Response Rates*

15 Survey response rates ranged from 48.2% (2-week survey) to 86.4% (12-week survey) of
16 81 English language-preferred participants, and 50.0% (2-week and 8-week survey) to 94.0%
17 (12-week survey) of 50 Spanish language-preferred participants (**Appendix Table 1**). The
18 highest response rates were for the surveys sent at one month and three months after enrollment.

19 *Patients' Willingness and Comfort with Using the Features of Mobile Apps*

20 On the second follow-up survey, sent four weeks into the study, there were 78.9% (41 of
21 52) and 50.0% (16 of 32) of English language-preferred and Spanish language-preferred
22 respondents, respectively, who felt comfortable sharing the information gathered on connected
23 devices, such as FitBits[®] and blood pressure cuffs, to a trusted research team (**Figure 1**).

1 On the final survey, conducted three months after enrollment, the vast majority were very
2 or somewhat interested in being the owner of their health records (83.6% of 67; 95.6% of 45),
3 having their health records in one place (92.4% of 66; 100.0% of 40), and being able to view
4 them on their phones or tablets (100.0% of 68; 97.7% of 44) (**Figure 1**). Furthermore, 88.4% (61
5 of 69) English language-preferred participants and 91.3% (42 of 46) Spanish language-preferred
6 participants indicated that they felt somewhat or very comfortable with participating in research
7 using their mobile phone or tablets.

8 Additionally, at the end of the study, 58.6% (41 of 70) and 87.2% (41 of 47) reported
9 being somewhat or very likely to share health data with a trusted research team (**Figure 1**).
10 Compared with before the study, 67.4% (29 of 43) and 82.1% (23 of 28) reported feeling more
11 comfortable using health apps, and 76.2% (32 of 42) and 72.4% (21 of 29) reported being more
12 likely to participate in research using apps (**Figure 2**). Moreover, 35.7% (25 of 70) and 17.8% (8
13 of 45) respondents stated that they used other mobile health apps during their enrollment in the
14 study (**Appendix Table 2**).

15 *Facilitators and Barriers to Utilizing an mHealth App*

16 Most participants indicated that it was preferable to answer survey questions when they
17 are texted to them (55.8% of 43; 75.9% of 29) rather than emailed to them (34.9% of 43; 10.3%
18 of 29) (**Appendix Table 2**). Additionally, as further detailed below, most participants felt the
19 support of a CHW was helpful for understanding and using the mHealth app.

20 Among the 14 English and 12 Spanish language-preferred respondents who stated that
21 they did not use Hugo by the end of the study, the most common reasons cited were did not have
22 a reason to log on (35.7%; 25.0%); could not figure out how to use the app (14.3%; 50.0%);

1 forgot about the app (35.7%; 16.7%); could not remember their username or password (14.3%;
2 25.0%) (**Appendix Table 2**).

3 Regarding privacy policies, the majority of participants (82.6% of 46 English language-
4 preferred; 92.6% of Spanish language-preferred respondents) either strongly agreed or agreed
5 with being interested in learning more about privacy policies that explain how data are collected
6 and used via digital health platforms to participate in research (**Figure 3**). Fewer respondents
7 (50.0% of 46; 46% of 25) indicated that, if they trust the research team, they do not need to read
8 or hear about privacy policies when using digital health platforms to participate in research. Only
9 a minority (33.3% of 45; 19.1% of 21) strongly agreed or agreed that privacy policies should be
10 shorter, even if some details about the policy are left out. Most (80.0% of 45) English language-
11 preferred respondents, but (21.4% of 14) few Spanish language-preferred respondents strongly
12 disagreed or disagreed with the statement, “I will never read privacy policies even if they were
13 made shorter and easier to understand.”

14 Most participants were somewhat or very concerned about sharing health information
15 with research teams (66.7% of 48 English language-preferred; 51.9% of 27 Spanish language-
16 preferred respondents), and most had concerns that information collected through apps could be
17 sold or shared without their permission (85.9% of 47; 70.4% of 27) (**Figure 4**).

18 *Utility of a CHW to Facilitate mHealth Engagement*

19 Requests to speak with the CHW about any questions regarding features of the digital
20 health app were consistently higher for Spanish language-preferred participants than for English
21 language-preferred participants (across all six survey periods, the median percentage of patients
22 requesting assistance was 51.6% for Spanish language-preferred participants and 28.1% for
23 English language-preferred respondents) (**Figure 5**). Up to 48.8% of English language-preferred

1 (10-week survey) and 63.0% of Spanish language-preferred respondents (6-week survey)
2 indicated a desire to speak with the CHW about features of the digital health app. Furthermore,
3 60.9% of 46 English language-preferred respondents and 79.2% of 24 Spanish language-
4 preferred respondents strongly agreed or agreed with being interested in having someone from
5 PA-NH or the research team explain the app's privacy policies to them again or in greater detail.

6 *Principal Uses and Functionalities of Interest to Participants*

7 At the beginning of the study, English language-preferred respondents (86.5% of 53) and
8 Spanish language-preferred respondents (86.7% of 26) found the digital health platform most
9 useful for keeping track of their own health information (**Appendix Table 2**). There was specific
10 interest in using the app to track their vital signs, symptoms post-surgery, and device (e.g.,
11 pacemaker) malfunctions. At the end of the study, participants used the app most often for
12 connecting to medical records (48.6% of 70; 53.2% of 47); checking lab results (41.4% of 70;
13 44.7% of 47); and participating in research (35.7% of 70; 17.0% of 47).

14 Regarding what is most important to participants when deciding whether to participate in
15 research, responses varied by cohort. Among English-preferred respondents, the most important
16 attributes in descending order were: whether the research would benefit them or others; whether
17 the research has any risk to them; getting paid for participation in the study; and having someone
18 to contact if they have questions (**Appendix Table 2**). Among Spanish-preferred patients, the
19 most important considerations for research participation in descending order were: whether the
20 research would benefit them or others; having someone to contact if they have questions; and
21 getting paid for participation in the study.

22 Furthermore, participants responded that they were interested in using apps that bring
23 together people who share similar health conditions (65.1% of 43 English language-preferred;

1 74.1% of Spanish language-preferred patients), learning about other people’s experiences (71.4%
2 of 28; 31.6% of 19, and learning about research studies and clinical trials (57.1% of 28; 10.5% of
3 19) (**Appendix Table 2**).

4 *Feedback After Completion of Study*

5 Most surveyed individuals had a positive experience, reported that they trusted the
6 community health worker and Hugo team, and were excited to use many of the features,
7 including to view medical records and to participate in research. Select responses are displayed
8 in **Appendix Text 1**.

9 **DISCUSSION**

10 In our study of 81 English language-preferred and 50 Spanish language-preferred
11 patients, we found marked interest from participants in using a digital health platform to monitor
12 health (e.g., through aggregating health records into one location, checking lab results, and
13 connecting external devices) and participate in research. Most, but not all, patients approached
14 for the study owned a smart device, were excited about enrolling in the study, and responded to
15 the surveys. There were concerns about the privacy of information gathered through digital
16 health platforms, and a majority of participants were interested in having the CHW or another
17 member of the research team review the privacy policies in greater detail. By the conclusion of
18 the three-month enrollment, there was substantial interest among participants in being the owner
19 of their health records, monitoring health through the app and connected cloud-based devices,
20 and participating in research using digital health platforms in the future. A CHW was able to
21 facilitate the efficient enrollment and teaching/utilization of the digital health platforms by
22 addressing basic technical issues during the baseline visit and by elevating more complex
23 questions and challenges to the digital health company, Hugo, and the research team at large.

1 Despite the proliferating ownership of cellular devices and development of digital health
2 platforms in the United States, relatively little work has been done on identifying the needs of
3 low-income populations to tailor mHealth interventions. Previous studies of vulnerable
4 populations have found similar, if not increased, rates of mobile engagement through text
5 messaging compared to the general population; therefore, text messaging may be an effective
6 way of reaching out to this population (2, 20). A randomized controlled trial of 15 case managers
7 and 67 patients in New York City leveraged a two-way text messaging system to demonstrate
8 increased appointment and medication adherence (21). However, the use of mHealth apps has
9 been criticized for not effectively taking into account the economic and social contexts of low-
10 income populations. An mHealth app (myHealthButton) developed for Michigan’s Medicaid
11 population was only actively used by approximately 1,500 of 2 million Michigan residents
12 enrolled in Medicaid and Child Health Insurance Program (22). When Arizona’s governor
13 announced that a mobile app would be developed for Arizona’s Medicaid beneficiaries, there
14 was concern by Health Net, a plan overseeing 1.7 million Medicaid beneficiaries in Arizona and
15 California, and others, that the app would not have a significant number of active users (22).
16 When digital health platforms and mHealth interventions have the potential to help empower and
17 engage traditionally marginalized populations in healthcare provision and research (23-30), then
18 mHealth must be designed to serve these population’s needs, be accessible at the level of their
19 understanding and abilities, and assist them in solving the problems they face during mHealth
20 use (31, 32).

21 Several lessons emerged regarding the process of implementing a study using a digital
22 health platform. First, we designed a rigorous pre-implementation plan to optimize the
23 experience for participants and to boost full engagement from all team members. Specifically,

1 each survey went through iterative rounds of review and testing. To promote readability,
2 understanding, and brevity, the research team piloted each survey with community health
3 workers, who were familiar with how survey questions could be best delivered to participants to
4 collect the most informative responses. Feedback, particularly related to terminology and syntax,
5 was then incorporated into the surveys. After translation of the survey into Spanish, this same
6 process was followed. Second, the enrollment process was piloted at the PCC to ensure
7 feasibility that study enrollment was not disruptive to clinician work-flow or a burden on
8 patients. This process resulted in the integration of the CHW into morning huddles among
9 clinicians, and established trust between stakeholders and confidence in the research team.
10 Piloting at each step of implementation was crucial for rapid enrollment of participants and their
11 sustained engagement with the study.

12 Still, there were logistical challenges during enrollment, including technology-related
13 obstacles (e.g., owning a smartphone/tablet) and economic concerns (e.g., limited storage space,
14 texting plans, and consistent access to WiFi or data plans to download the app and send/receive
15 surveys). Not all potential participants approached owned a smart device or had access to email
16 (e.g., many did not remember their email address and/or password, or did not know how to use
17 email) to download the application from the store. In these cases, the CHW occasionally set up
18 new email accounts and made wallet-sized cards with participants' log-on information, but the
19 time necessary for this may have resulted in some patients declining to participate in the study.
20 To provide flexibility, the digital health platform used in this study was accessible via the web
21 and as a mobile app. The platform also allowed for both email and text messaging options to
22 receive surveys; therefore, participants were not necessarily required to have access to their
23 email after enrollment (if using a smart device) or own a smart device (if using email) to access

1 health data and to answer surveys. Further minimizing barriers to accessing the platform and
2 surveys could be explored in the future, such as by utilizing alternative login methods (e.g.,
3 utilizing social media profiles, face ID, or fingerprint recognition), while recognizing that some
4 of these alternative logins are associated with privacy concerns. Finally, the digital health app
5 navigation system was in English and Spanish, though medical records connected from the
6 patient portals were only in English – a limitation of current electronic health record systems,
7 Additionally, there were implementation challenges and real-life conceptual concerns that
8 were revealed through the surveys. These related to having limited comfort with mHealth
9 technology, mistrust of where health data are stored and who has access to that data, concerns
10 about the security and privacy of that data, privacy policies, and historical perceptions of
11 research participation. To understand and address these contextual factors, the CHW regularly
12 reached out to participants to solicit any needs with navigating the digital health platform or
13 completing surveys. The CHW also served as a resource for any questions or concerns regarding
14 the privacy of the app. By maintaining a close relationship with the digital health company and
15 research team through regular meetings, the CHW was able to communicate these questions and
16 concerns to all stakeholders. This prompted updates to workflows and features of the platform in
17 real-time that demonstrated a commitment to directly and promptly addressing participants’
18 concerns, thereby building trust. Moreover, the consistent interest indicated on all follow-up
19 surveys in seeking the CHW for assistance, especially by the Spanish language-preferred
20 participants, suggested that this population benefitted from additional attention and dialogue
21 regarding research study participation and digital health platform use. It also reinforced that the
22 CHW played a vital role in serving as a single approachable face of the study, as well as in
23 listening and responding to concerns regarding the study and the platform.

1 Our study had several limitations. First, we only enrolled patients who had consistent
2 access to a smart device, such as a smartphone or a tablet. Therefore, we do not know about the
3 interest of using digital health platforms to monitor health and participate in research among
4 those who do not own such devices. Second, we recruited English and Spanish language-
5 preferred participants from two separate care facilities; thus, the differences observed between
6 responses of the two groups may have been partially due to catchment area and the nature of the
7 care facilities in addition to patient characteristics. Finally, we elicited qualitative feedback from
8 a randomly-selected subset of patients, and these conclusions may not be applicable to the entire
9 study sample or population at large.

10 **CONCLUSION**

11 Despite several barriers, low-income individuals were feasibly enrolled in a mobile health
12 app with the assistance of a CHW. Participants were interested in using various app features,
13 including owning health records, monitoring health information, and participating in research.
14 Although they had concerns about safety and privacy, the involvement of a CHW facilitated
15 engagement, trust, and participation through direct communication with all stakeholders.
16 Designing mHealth apps and interventions must account for the unique needs and contexts of
17 low-income, vulnerable populations to lessen health disparities and elevate the baseline health of
18 these populations in new and innovative ways.

1 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

2 We wish to thank the Hugo team for providing mobile health app and support, as well as the
3 Aetna Foundation for funding the study.

4 **SOURCES OF FUNDING**

5 Supported by grant 17-3735 from the Aetna Foundation, a national foundation based in Hartford,
6 Connecticut that supports projects to promote wellness, health and access to high-quality health
7 care for everyone. The views presented here are those of the author and not necessarily those of
8 the Aetna Foundation, its directors, officers, or staff.

9 **DISCLOSURES**

10 Dr. Spatz receives support from the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services to develop and
11 maintain performance measures used in public reporting programs and from the Food and Drug
12 Administration to support projects within the Yale-Mayo Clinic Center of Excellence in
13 Regulatory Science and Innovation (CERSI). She also receives support from the National
14 Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities (U54MD010711-01) to study precision-based
15 approaches to diagnosing and preventing hypertension and from the National Institute of
16 Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering (R01 EB028106-01) to study a cuff-less blood pressure
17 device. She is a board member of Project Access-New Haven.

1 REFERENCES

- 2 1. Duggan M. Cell phone activities 2013. Pew Research Center Internet & Technology.
3 2013. <https://www.pewinternet.org/2013/09/19/cell-phone-activities-2013/>. Accessed 26
4 October 2019.
- 5 2. Gates A, Stephens, Jessica, Artiga, Samantha. Profiles of Medicaid Outreach and
6 Enrollment Strategies: Using Text Messaging to Reach and Enroll Uninsured Individuals
7 into Medicaid and CHIP. Kaiser Family Foundation. 2014.
8 [https://www.kff.org/medicaid/issue-brief/profiles-of-medicaid-outreach-and-enrollment-](https://www.kff.org/medicaid/issue-brief/profiles-of-medicaid-outreach-and-enrollment-strategies-using-text-messaging-to-reach-and-enroll-uninsured-individuals-into-medicaid-and-chip/)
9 [strategies-using-text-messaging-to-reach-and-enroll-uninsured-individuals-into-medicaid-](https://www.kff.org/medicaid/issue-brief/profiles-of-medicaid-outreach-and-enrollment-strategies-using-text-messaging-to-reach-and-enroll-uninsured-individuals-into-medicaid-and-chip/)
10 [and-chip/](https://www.kff.org/medicaid/issue-brief/profiles-of-medicaid-outreach-and-enrollment-strategies-using-text-messaging-to-reach-and-enroll-uninsured-individuals-into-medicaid-and-chip/). Accessed 26 October 2019.
- 11 3. Conway CM, Kelechi TJ. Digital Health for Medication Adherence in Adult Diabetes or
12 Hypertension: An Integrative Review. *JMIR Diabetes*. 2017;2(2):e20.
- 13 4. Ngwatu BK, Nsengiyumva NP, Oxlade O, Mappin-Kasirer B, Nguyen NL, Jaramillo E,
14 et al. The impact of digital health technologies on tuberculosis treatment: a systematic
15 review. *Eur Respir J*. 2018;51(1).
- 16 5. Hesse BW, Nelson DE, Kreps GL, Croyle RT, Arora NK, Rimer BK, et al. Trust and
17 sources of health information: the impact of the Internet and its implications for health
18 care providers: findings from the first Health Information National Trends Survey. *Arch*
19 *Intern Med*. 2005;165(22):2618-24.
- 20 6. Jhamb M, Cavanaugh KL, Bian A, Chen G, Ikizler TA, Unruh ML, et al. Disparities in
21 Electronic Health Record Patient Portal Use in Nephrology Clinics. *Clin J Am Soc*
22 *Nephrol*. 2015;10(11):2013-22.

- 1 7. Koh HK, Brach C, Harris LM, Parchman ML. A proposed 'health literate care model'
2 would constitute a systems approach to improving patients' engagement in care. *Health*
3 *Aff (Millwood)*. 2013;32(2):357-67.
- 4 8. Levy H, Janke A. Health Literacy and Access to Care. *J Health Commun*. 2016;21 Suppl
5 1:43-50.
- 6 9. Miller H, Vandenbosch B, Ivanov D, Black P. Determinants of personal health record
7 use: a large population study at Cleveland Clinic. *J Healthc Inf Manag*. 2007;21(3):44-8.
- 8 10. Roblin DW, Houston TK, 2nd, Allison JJ, Joski PJ, Becker ER. Disparities in use of a
9 personal health record in a managed care organization. *J Am Med Inform Assoc*.
10 2009;16(5):683-9.
- 11 11. Kahn JS, Hilton JF, Van Nunnery T, Leasure S, Bryant KM, Hare CB, et al. Personal
12 health records in a public hospital: experience at the HIV/AIDS clinic at San Francisco
13 General Hospital. *J Am Med Inform Assoc*. 2010;17(2):224-8.
- 14 12. Ancker JS, Barron Y, Rockoff ML, Hauser D, Pichardo M, Szerencsy A, et al. Use of an
15 electronic patient portal among disadvantaged populations. *J Gen Intern Med*.
16 2011;26(10):1117-23.
- 17 13. Kemp CG, Velloza J. Implementation of eHealth Interventions Across the HIV Care
18 Cascade: a Review of Recent Research. *Curr HIV/AIDS Rep*. 2018;15(6):403-13.
- 19 14. Kallander K, Tibenderana JK, Akpogheneta OJ, Strachan DL, Hill Z, ten Asbroek AH, et
20 al. Mobile health (mHealth) approaches and lessons for increased performance and
21 retention of community health workers in low- and middle-income countries: a review. *J*
22 *Med Internet Res*. 2013;15(1):e17.

- 1 15. Stanton M, Molineux A, Mackenzie C, Kelly-Hope L. Mobile Technology for
2 Empowering Health Workers in Underserved Communities: New Approaches to
3 Facilitate the Elimination of Neglected Tropical Diseases. *JMIR Public Health Surveill.*
4 2016;2(1):e2.
- 5 16. Long LA, Pariyo G, Kallander K. Digital Technologies for Health Workforce
6 Development in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Scoping Review. *Glob Health*
7 *Sci Pract.* 2018;6(Suppl 1):S41-S8.
- 8 17. White A, Thomas DS, Ezeanochie N, Bull S. Health Worker mHealth Utilization: A
9 Systematic Review. *Comput Inform Nurs.* 2016;34(5):206-13.
- 10 18. Braun R, Catalani C, Wimbush J, Israelski D. Community health workers and mobile
11 technology: a systematic review of the literature. *PLoS One.* 2013;8(6):e65772.
- 12 19. Duffy S, Svenson J, Chavez A, Kelly M, Wise P. Empowering Community Health
13 Workers With Mobile Technology to Treat Diabetes. *Ann Fam Med.* 2019;17(2):176.
- 14 20. Kern C. Mobile Engagement A Viable Way To Engage Medicaid Patients. *Health IT*
15 *Outcomes.* 2014.
- 16 21. Comstock J. RCT: Text message-based program boosts adherence to appointments,
17 medication. *MobiHealthNews.* 2014. [https://www.mobihealthnews.com/34749/rct-text-](https://www.mobihealthnews.com/34749/rct-text-message-based-program-boosts-adherence-to-appointments-medication)
18 [message-based-program-boosts-adherence-to-appointments-medication.](https://www.mobihealthnews.com/34749/rct-text-message-based-program-boosts-adherence-to-appointments-medication) Accessed 26
19 October 2019.
- 20 22. Dickson V. If you build the health app, will the Medicaid recipients come? *Modern*
21 *Healthcare.* 2015.
22 [https://www.modernhealthcare.com/article/20150805/NEWS/150809942/if-you-build-](https://www.modernhealthcare.com/article/20150805/NEWS/150809942/if-you-build-the-health-app-will-the-medicaid-recipients-come)
23 [the-health-app-will-the-medicaid-recipients-come.](https://www.modernhealthcare.com/article/20150805/NEWS/150809942/if-you-build-the-health-app-will-the-medicaid-recipients-come) Accessed 26 October 2019.

- 1 23. Heiat A, Gross CP, Krumholz HM. Representation of the elderly, women, and minorities
2 in heart failure clinical trials. *Arch Intern Med.* 2002;162(15):1682-8.
- 3 24. Murthy VH, Krumholz HM, Gross CP. Participation in cancer clinical trials: race-, sex-,
4 and age-based disparities. *JAMA.* 2004;291(22):2720-6.
- 5 25. Eshera N, Itana H, Zhang L, Soon G, Fadiran EO. Demographics of clinical trials
6 participants in pivotal clinical trials for new molecular entity drugs and biologics
7 approved by FDA From 2010 to 2012. *Am J Ther.* 2015;22(6):435-55.
- 8 26. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for industry: collection of race and
9 ethnicity data in clinical trials. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human
10 Services, Food and Drug Administration, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research
11 (CDER), Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (CBER), Center for Devices and
12 Radiologic Health (CDRH), Office of the Commissioner (OC); September 2005.
13 <http://www.fda.gov/downloads/RegulatoryInformation/Guidances/ucm126396.pdf>.
14 Accessed 26 October 2019.
- 15 27. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Evaluation and reporting of age-, race-, and
16 ethnicity-specific data in medical device clinical studies. Washington, DC: U.S.
17 Department of Health and Human Services, Food and Drug Administration, Center for
18 Devices and Radiological Health (CDRH), Center for Biologics Evaluation Research
19 (CBER), Office of the Commissioner (OC): 12 September 2017.
20 <https://www.fda.gov/downloads/MedicalDevices/DeviceRegulationandGuidance/GuidanceDocuments/UCM507278.pdf>. Accessed 26 October 2019.
- 21
22 28. National Institutes of Health. NIH Policy and Guidelines on The Inclusion of Women and
23 Minorities as Subjects in Clinical Research. 2001.

- 1 [https://grants.nih.gov/policy/inclusion/women-and-](https://grants.nih.gov/policy/inclusion/women-and-minorities/guidelines.htm#targetText=The%20NIH%20Revitalization%20Act%20of,and%20minorities%20in%20clinical%20research.&targetText=The%20statute%20includes%20a%20specific,and%2C%20in%20particular%20clinical%20trials)
2 [minorities/guidelines.htm#targetText=The%20NIH%20Revitalization%20Act%20of,and](https://grants.nih.gov/policy/inclusion/women-and-minorities/guidelines.htm#targetText=The%20NIH%20Revitalization%20Act%20of,and%20minorities%20in%20clinical%20research.&targetText=The%20statute%20includes%20a%20specific,and%2C%20in%20particular%20clinical%20trials)
3 [%20minorities%20in%20clinical%20research.&targetText=The%20statute%20includes](https://grants.nih.gov/policy/inclusion/women-and-minorities/guidelines.htm#targetText=The%20NIH%20Revitalization%20Act%20of,and%20minorities%20in%20clinical%20research.&targetText=The%20statute%20includes%20a%20specific,and%2C%20in%20particular%20clinical%20trials)
4 [%20a%20specific,and%2C%20in%20particular%20clinical%20trials](https://grants.nih.gov/policy/inclusion/women-and-minorities/guidelines.htm#targetText=The%20NIH%20Revitalization%20Act%20of,and%20minorities%20in%20clinical%20research.&targetText=The%20statute%20includes%20a%20specific,and%2C%20in%20particular%20clinical%20trials). Accessed 26
5 October 2019.
- 6 29. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). FDA action plan to enhance collection and
7 availability of demographic subgroup data. FDA report. Silver Spring, MD: FDA; August
8 2014.
9 [https://www.fda.gov/downloads/RegulatoryInformation/Legislation/FederalFoodDrugand](https://www.fda.gov/downloads/RegulatoryInformation/Legislation/FederalFoodDrugandCosmeticActFDCAct/SignificantAmendmentstotheFDCAct/FDASIA/UCM410474.pdf)
10 [CosmeticActFDCAct/SignificantAmendmentstotheFDCAct/FDASIA/UCM410474.pdf](https://www.fda.gov/downloads/RegulatoryInformation/Legislation/FederalFoodDrugandCosmeticActFDCAct/SignificantAmendmentstotheFDCAct/FDASIA/UCM410474.pdf).
11 Accessed 26 October 2019.
- 12 30. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Evaluating inclusion and exclusion criteria in
13 clinical trials. FDA report. Washington, DC: FDA; 16 April 2018.
14 [https://www.fda.gov/downloads/RegulatoryInformation/LawsEnforcedbyFDA/Significan](https://www.fda.gov/downloads/RegulatoryInformation/LawsEnforcedbyFDA/SignificantAmendmentstotheFDCAct/FDARA/UCM613054.pdf)
15 [tAmendmentstotheFDCAct/FDARA/UCM613054.pdf](https://www.fda.gov/downloads/RegulatoryInformation/LawsEnforcedbyFDA/SignificantAmendmentstotheFDCAct/FDARA/UCM613054.pdf). Accessed 26 October 2019.
- 16 31. Sigler BE. Investigating the Perceptions of Care Coordinators on Using Behavior Theory-
17 Based Mobile Health Technology With Medicaid Populations: A Grounded Theory
18 Study. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth*. 2017;5(3):e36.
- 19 32. Broderick A, Haque F. Mobile health and patient engagement in the safety net: a survey
20 of community health centers and clinics. *Issue Brief (Commonw Fund)*. 2015;9:1-9.

1 **FIGURE LEGEND & FOOTNOTES**

2 **Table 1:** Demographic characteristics of English-preferred and Spanish-preferred patients
3 enrolled in the study.

4 Footnotes: * Assessed in-person using the Short Assessment of Health Literacy in English and
5 Spanish

6 **Figure 1:** Baseline interest and comfort with using the features of mobile apps, by preferred
7 language.

8 Footnotes: * Survey options: “Very interested,” “Somewhat interested,” “Not sure, I would need
9 more information before I could answer,” “Not at all interested”

10 † Survey options: “Very likely,” “Somewhat likely,” “Not sure, I would need more information
11 before I could answer,” “Not at all likely”

12 ‡ Survey options: “Very comfortable,” “Somewhat comfortable,” “Not sure, I would need more
13 information before I could answer,” “Not at all comfortable”

14 **Figure 2:** Post-participation interest in health apps, by preferred language.

15 Footnotes: * Survey options: “I am now more comfortable using health apps,” “I have the same
16 level of comfort using health apps (no change in comfort),” “I am now less comfortable using
17 health apps”

18 † Survey options: “More likely than before this research study,” “Same likelihood as before this
19 research study,” “Less likely than before this research study”

20 **Figure 3:** Privacy policy concerns, by preferred language.

21 Footnotes: * Survey options: “Strongly agree,” “Agree,” “Not sure,” “Disagree,” “Strongly
22 disagree”

23 **Figure 4:** Data sharing concerns, by preferred language.

1 Footnotes: * Survey options: “Very concerned,” “Somewhat concerned,” “Not sure,” “Not at all
2 concerned”

3 **Figure 5:** Proportion of participants requesting the assistance of a community health worker on
4 each follow-up survey, by preferred language.

5

TABLES & FIGURES

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of English-preferred and Spanish-preferred patients enrolled in the study.

	English-preferred (n=81)	Spanish-preferred (n=50)
	No. (%)	No. (%)
Gender		
Female	59 (72.8%)	32 (64.0%)
Male	22 (27.2%)	18 (36.0%)
Age		
Years (mean)	48.2	46.4
Race/Ethnicity		
Black/African American	61 (74.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Hispanic/Latino	13 (15.9%)	50 (100.0%)
White	6 (7.3%)	0 (0.0%)
Other	2 (2.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Household Income		
% FPL (mean)	113	82
Education		

Less than elementary	1 (1.2%)	7 (14.0%)
Elementary	2 (2.4%)	12 (24.0%)
Some high school	6 (7.3%)	6 (12.0%)
High school/GED	47 (57.3%)	17 (34.0%)
Some college	22 (26.8%)	5 (10.0%)
Associate degree	2 (2.4%)	1 (2.0%)
Bachelor's degree	2 (2.4%)	2 (4.0%)
Employment		
Employed full-time	19 (23.2%)	8 (16.0%)
Employed part-time	18 (22.0%)	20 (40.0%)
Unemployed - looking	14 (17.1%)	10 (20.0%)
Unemployed - not looking	6 (7.3%)	9 (18.0%)
Unable to work	25 (30.5%)	3 (6.0%)
Health Literacy*		
Low (≤ 14)	28 (34.6%)	17 (34.0%)
Adequate (> 14)	53 (65.4%)	33 (66.0%)

Figure 1: Baseline interest and comfort with using the features of mobile apps, by preferred language.




Figure 2: Post-participation interest in health apps, by preferred language.




Figure 3: Privacy policy concerns, by preferred language.




Figure 4: Data sharing concerns, by preferred language.




Figure 5: Proportion of participants requesting the assistance of a community health worker on each follow-up survey, by preferred language.

