Towards Participatory Precision Health: Systematic Review and Co-designed Guidelines For Adolescent Just-in-time Adaptive Interventions

Kathleen W. Guan[1], Mohammed Amara[2], Viviana Cortiana[3], Imran Khan[4], Sıla Gürbüz[5], Carmine Iorio[6], Rayyan Ali[7], Christopher Adlung[1], Crystal R. Smit[8], Annabel Vreeker[8,9], Eva Thalassinou[10], Eeske van Roekel[11], Loes Keijsers[8], Mark de Reuver[1], and Caroline A. Figueroa[1]

[1] Faculty of Technology, Policy, and Management, Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands
[2] Department of Experimental Psychology, University of Oxford, United Kingdom
[3] Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences, University of Bologna, Italy
[4] Arkansas College of Osteopathic Medicine, United States
[5] Faculty of Medicine, Karadeniz Technical University, Turkey
[6] Department of Philosophy, Social Sciences and Education, University of Perugia, Italy
[7] Imperial College School of Medicine, United Kingdom
[8] Erasmus School of Social and Behavioural Sciences, Erasmus University Rotterdam, The Netherlands
[9] Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Psychology, Erasmus University Medical Center, The Netherlands
[10] Department of Research and Development, Gro-up, The Netherlands
[11] Department of Developmental Psychology, Tilburg University, The Netherlands

Corresponding author:
Kathleen W. Guan
k.guan@tudelft.nl

ABSTRACT

Background: Adolescence and young adulthood (10-25 years) constitute a sensitive developmental period marked by rapid biological, psychological, and social changes, during which preventative health interventions can shape long-term outcomes. Mobile health (mHealth) tools offer opportunities for tailored support but often with limited adaptation to adolescents' dynamic contexts, resulting in inconsistent engagement and effects. Just-in-time adaptive interventions (JITAIs), which tailor support in real time using ongoing data, are increasingly explored as precision health strategies. However, how these mechanisms are designed, implemented, and evaluated for adolescents has not been systematically reviewed.

Objectives: This review aimed to identify and synthesize existing JITAIs developed for adolescents. It examined how adaptive mechanisms, including tailoring variables, intervention options, decision rules and decision points, are designed to respond to adolescents' contexts and specific health goals. The review also evaluated methodological quality in order to guide the development of future precision health interventions.

Methods: The review methods followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses. Twelve databases (PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, PsycINFO, Embase, CINAHL, IEEE Xplore, ACM Digital Library, Cochrane Central, Dimensions, WHO Global Index Medicus, Google Scholar) were searched for studies published between 2013 and February 2025. Eligible studies were peer-reviewed, involved adolescents aged 10-25 years, and reported real-time adaptive mHealth interventions consistent with JITAI design principles. Screening, data extraction, and quality appraisal (using the appropriate Joanna Briggs Institute checklists for each study design) were conducted independently by two separate reviewers, with adolescent co-authors contributing to all phases. Given heterogeneity and high risk of bias across studies, results were synthesized narratively and organized around JITAI components and their corresponding health outcomes.

Results: From 3,227 unique records, 64 studies (58 unique interventions) were included. Interventions targeted substance use (N=26 studies), mental health (N=19), and physical health including chronic conditions (N=13). Most applied behavioral or cognitive frameworks to guide intervention design. Tailoring mechanisms relied heavily on self-reported data, with emerging use of passive sensing and machine learning for more dynamic adaptation. Decision rules were typically threshold- or schedule-based. Methodological limitations, incomplete reporting, and inconsistent outcomes were widespread. Ethical and engagement considerations were rarely addressed beyond isolated co-design examples.

Conclusions: Adolescent-focused JITAIs hold promise for addressing substance use, mental health, and physical health needs in this population, but the current evidence base is constrained by methodological weaknesses, reliance on self-report, and limited ethical transparency. We provide recommendations informed gaps in the review evidence and interpretation by adolescent co-authors. In particular, future research should prioritize microrandomized trials to disentangle adaptive components and embed participatory co-design to ensure contextual relevance.

PROSPERO registration: CRD42023473117

Keywords: Adolescents, young adults, just-in-time adaptive interventions, mobile health, behavioral medicine

INTRODUCTION

Adolescence is a formative period for preventative health interventions. As they transition into young adulthood (10 to 25 years), adolescents experience continued brain and physical development, alongside heightened vulnerability to risk factors for poor health.[1,2] For example, partaking in behaviours that compromise health, such as substance use, poor diet, and insufficient physical activity, in early life can increase the risk of chronic diseases such as cancer,[3] and disrupt key neurodevelopmental processes related to stress regulation and executive functioning.[4] Further, adolescence is a complex developmental stage, shaped by rapidly shifting and interrelated biological, psychological, and social changes that are unique to each individual.[5] Behavioral patterns during this period emerge dynamically in response to fluctuating contexts and interactions, with significant implications for long-term health. For example, food insecurity may predispose adolescents to poor dietary habits, which in turn can affect their physical health, cognitive development, and emotional resilience over time.[6] In light of these vulnerabilities, early and precisely targeted interventions during adolescence are critical for mitigating both immediate and long-term health risks to promote healthier developmental pathways. Given the record number of young people globally,[7] investing in tailored health interventions during adolescence can significantly improve population health outcomes while alleviating pressures on health systems.[8]

Precision health represents a significant paradigm shift from generalized medical approaches, by prioritizing adaptive strategies that tailor health support to optimize diverse outcomes unique to each individual.[9] Whilst much of the initial application of precision health has occurred within adult medical contexts,[8] there is growing recognition that such approaches may be particularly suited to addressing the multifaceted challenges during adolescence.[10] Importantly, precision health approaches during this unique period can enhance both the relevance and effectiveness of adolescent health interventions. In particular, addressing adolescent behaviours and states calls for interventions that precisely tailor to individual risk factors and contextual influences shaping adolescents' lives.

Mobile health (mHealth) technologies are a key avenue for delivering tailored health support to adolescents, whose pervasive use of digital platforms throughout their daily lives and affinity for mobile communication provide opportunities for accessible intervention delivery. Such tools have demonstrated some potential to support and promote positive health behaviours, such as increasing physical activity, improving nutrition, and reducing substance use among adolescents.[11] However, mHealth interventions often produce inconsistent effects, due to challenges in delivering engaging content that is precisely relevant to adolescents' evolving health contexts over time.[12,13] Extant literature has suggested that use of digital tools to support

health behaviours may decline when interventions fail to resonate with or adapt to changing circumstances.[14,15] Demographics (e.g., age, gender), psychosocial characteristics (e.g., mood), and contextual factors (e.g., setting of delivery) play a significant role in individual engagement with mHealth interventions.[13] Thus it is necessary to identify key considerations for designing mobile interventions that are not only tailored, but also dynamically and temporally responsive to adolescents' shifting needs.

One particularly promising precision health approach that has emerged is the just-in-time adaptive intervention (JITAI). JITAIs utilize ongoing data from mobile sensing technology with the aim to deliver tailored contextually relevant support precisely when it is most needed for each individual.[16] JITAIs can provide a flexible strategy for promoting positive health behaviours across individually salient moments and contexts by dynamically adjusting content in response to individual changes. The temporal adaptability that characterizes JITAIs is particularly important given the variability in adolescent development, whose health risks and support needs can rapidly shift based on environmental and intrapersonal factors such as mood, stress levels, and social interactions from moment to moment.[17,18] JITAIs can crucially enhance the responsiveness of precision health strategies by delivering support attuned to ongoing changes in adolescents' contexts, particularly when they can be receptive to this support, which can help ensure tailored intervention content remains relevant and effective in addressing young people's evolving needs.

Despite their potential, most prior analyses of JITAIs have focused on older adults and specific health conditions. As such, there is a limited understanding of how JITAIs can support the dynamic health needs of adolescents as they transition into early adulthood. Given the rapidly changing and diverse contexts that characterize this formative developmental stage, understanding how JITAIs currently adapt to this age group is critical.

This review aims to systematically investigate JITAIs delivered in adolescent health contexts, in order to delineate their potential in enhancing precision health strategies during this formative period, an area underexplored in precision health literature. A central focus is to examine the mechanisms by which JITAIs tailor interventions to diverse health risks and contexts among adolescents, including identifying the intervention components that shape their dynamic adaptability. These mechanisms are examined in relation to the health objectives they are intended to support. By clarifying these mechanistic pathways, the findings can inform the design of more effective, personalized, and contextually responsive mobile health interventions to support healthier trajectories from adolescence into adulthood and beyond.

METHODS

This systematic review adhered to reporting guidelines from the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA). The review was pre-registered in the PROSPERO database under registration number CRD42023473117. The review protocol was also published after peer review.[19]

The search strategy for the review was developed in consultation with an information specialist, and rationale for the search strategy, including scope of dates and search terms, was documented fully in the published protocol.[19] The literature search employed a combination of keywords and database-specific subject headings (e.g., MeSH terms) to capture literature related to JITAIs, adolescents, digital health technologies, and health outcomes (see supplementary material). The literature search took place across multiple electronic databases to identify relevant literature from 2013 to 2025; these databases included PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, PsycINFO, Embase, Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Xplore, Association for Computing Machinery Digital Library, Cochrane Central, Dimensions, World Health Organization Global Index Medicus, and Google Scholar.

The search was conducted twice (November 2023 and July 2024), with ongoing citation tracking via Google Scholar until February 2025. Further, the reference lists of prior systematic reviews of JITAIs were consulted, which enabled inclusion of all relevant studies published prior (as the literature search strategy only started in 2013, the explicit first mention of JITAI and adolescents in the literature). Together, these practices ensured comprehensive coverage of past and emerging studies.

Screening, inclusion/exclusion, and extraction procedure

All literature search records were imported into Covidence, a systematic review text management platform, with duplicates automatically removed. Each title and its accompanying abstract was screened by two reviewers (either KWG, CA, CI, IK, and/or RA each independently), following a pilot screening phase to ensure consistency in eligibility decisions. Full texts were also screened by two reviewers each. All discrepancies during screening or assessment of full texts were resolved through discussion.

Study inclusion was primarily determined by whether studies provided sufficient detail on JITAI components to inform the review's focus on how these interventions adapt to adolescents' contexts and health needs. Studies were eligible for inclusion if they were peer-reviewed, involved adolescents aged 10 to 25 years, and reported mHealth interventions that adapted

in real time to user data, consistent with the defining features of JITAIs. Other mHealth studies were out of scope, including JITAI studies that involved participants beyond the adolescent age range and did not report these findings separately. We selected the age range of 10 to 25 years, given its increasing recognition as its own heterogeneous yet distinct developmental period among scholars.[20–23] We did not restrict by study type or design, such as control conditions.

Data from each study were also extracted by two reviewers (either KWG, VC, SG, and/or RA each independently) using a piloted, standardized data extraction form to ensure consistency. The data extraction form followed standardized conceptualizations of JITAI in the literature[16,19], which outlines key components guiding interventions to be adapted to individual needs: intervention options, or the different forms of support or methods for delivering that health support may be considered based on tailoring variables; tailoring variables, referring to the data collected about an individual, which informs how and when an intervention should be adapted; and finally, decision rules, or the guidelines that use these tailoring variables to determine the selection, timing, and delivery of intervention options at specific decision points or specific moments, such as particular times of the day or contextual triggers when these decisions are made. These components together shape how JITAIs dynamically adjust to ensure interventions remain relevant across shifting adolescent contexts. By structuring the form around these components, the method was aligned with the review's focus on mechanisms of adaptability in JITAIs.

Further, distal and proximal outcomes were also extracted, as they indicate the health objectives toward which tailoring mechanisms are directed. Specifically, distal outcomes represent the overarching, long-term goals of a JITAI, while proximal outcomes are short-term health objectives that often serve as mediators that lead towards these distal targets.[16] Thus, data extracted from each study included participant characteristics, intervention details, tailoring mechanisms, study design, and outcomes reflecting the goals of tailoring mechanisms (both proximal and distal). See Supplementary Table 1 for the full extraction data for each study.

Several additional outcomes of interest, including user engagement and ethical considerations, were identified in the protocol as potentially informative for interpreting effectiveness; however, inconsistent measurement and incomplete reporting meant they could not be systematically synthesized or graded. While information on adolescent engagement and ethical considerations was documented during data extraction for each study where reported, reporting was sparse and lacked sufficient detail for structured synthesis.

Risk of bias and justification for synthesis procedure

Two reviewers (KWG, MA) independently assessed methodological quality (including risk of bias) using the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) checklists, with discrepancies resolved through discussion. These appraisals informed consideration of the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE) framework,[24] which was prespecified in the protocol for assessing certainty of evidence across studies. The Cochrane Handbook notes that GRADE requires consistent outcome definitions, measures, and reporting across studies,[25] conditions that were satisfied only for a limited set of health outcomes in this review. Given the current heterogeneity and high risk of bias, guidance recommends narrative approaches in place of statistical synthesis or meta-analysis.

Therefore, this review reports findings through a narrative synthesis organized by JITAI tailoring components (intervention aims, tailoring variables, decision rules, and decision points), with proximal and distal outcomes (and their associated effectiveness where reported), examined as the health objectives of these tailoring mechanisms.

Adolescent engagement procedure

To ground the implications of this review, we engaged eight youth health activists from the World Health Organization European Region's Youth4Health network, a platform for adolescent participation in health. These adolescents, including young entrepreneurs, medical students, and policy advocates, provided critical perspectives that informed study interpretations and implications. They were directly involved as co-authors in screening studies, extracting data, and conducting critical appraisals. Their involvement also offered insights into the ethical and contextual appropriateness of the evidence on JITAIs for adolescents, as well as related methodological concerns. Because adolescents contributed as internal co-authors, we did not conduct a separate thematic analysis of their perspectives as research participants; instead, their input are reported in the discussion section as interpretive observations of the data, rather than empirical findings. This collaborative structure strengthened the review by foregrounding adolescent interpretations of the evidence and supporting the identification of current practices, gaps, and priorities for adolescent JITAI and precision health research.

RESULTS

Figure 1. PRISMA Flow Diagram of Study Selection



3227 unique records were identified via literature search and screened in the title/abstract phase (Figure 1). Following this, a total of 252 full text articles were assessed for relevance. Most studies (57%, N=188) that were excluded at this stage did not develop mobile interventions that were tailored to dynamic adolescent contexts, for example, those offering only pre-scheduled digital health support without ongoing adaptation; therefore not meeting the definition of a JITAI.[16] This resulted in a final total of 64 studies (59 unique interventions) that developed JITAIs for adolescents included in the findings synthesis that follows.

Risk of bias and quality of evidence

Figure 1: Risk of bias and methodological quality appraisal of included studies

Authors and Year	Temporal Precedence	Selection and Allocation	Confounding Factors	Intervention Administration	Outcome Measurement (Timepoints)	Outcome Measurement (Method)	Outcome Measurement (Reliability)	Participant Retention	Statistical Conclusion Validity
	RCT	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Rodgers et al. 2005	RCT	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes
Weitzel et al. 2007	RCT	Unclear	Yes	No	No	Yes	Unclear	No	Unclear
Suffoletto et al. 2012	RCT	Unclear	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Unclear
Witkiewitz et al. 2014	RCT	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	No	Yes
Mason et al. 2015	RCT	Unclear	Yes	No	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes
Nollen et al. 2015	RCT	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes
Suffoletto et al. 2015	RCT	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	No	Unclear
Perry et al. 2017	RCT	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Unclear	No	Yes
Pyky et al. 2017	RCT	Unclear	Yes	No	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Unclear
Shrier et al. 2018	RCT	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Wright et al. 2018	RCT	Unclear	Yes	No	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Unclear
Kennard et al. 2018	RCT	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No
O'Donnell et al. 2019	RCT	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Unclear
Suffoletto et al. 2019	RCT	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	No
Hunter et al. 2020	RCT	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	No	Unclear
Kazemi et al. 2020	RCT	Unclear	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Unclear	No	Unclear
van Aubel et al. 2020	RCT	Unclear	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes
King-Dowling et al. 2021	RCT	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Unclear	No	Unclear
Santa Maria et al. 2021	RCT	Unclear	No	No	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Unclear
Suffoletto et al. 2021	RCT	Unclear	Unclear	No	Yes	No	Unclear	No	Yes
Paetzold et al. 2022	RCT	Unclear	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Unclear	Yes
Schenkel et al. 2022	RCT	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Unclear	Yes
Bell et al. 2023	RCT	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Marciniak et al. 2023	RCT	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Unclear	No	Yes
Paetzold et al. 2023	RCT	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	No	Unclear
Reininghaus et al. 2023	RCT	Unclear	Yes	No	No	Yes	Unclear	No	Unclear
Riley et al. 2008	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Shrier et al. 2014b	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Spruijt-Metz et al. 2015	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	No	No
Ding et al. 2016	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	No	No
Reininghaus et al. 2024	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Unclear	No	No
Fortier et al. 2016	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Bracisjewski et al. 2018	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No
Leonard et al. 2018	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear
Suffoletto et al. 2018	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No
Neal-Barnett et al. 2019	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Shrier et al. 2020	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	No	No
Silk et al. 2020	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	No
Stevenson et al. 2020	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	No	No
Blevins et al. 2021	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Unclear	No	No
Coughlin et al. 2021	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No
Cushing et al. 2021	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Rauschenberg et al. 2021	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	No	No
Domin et al. 2022	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Lucas-Thompson et al. 2023	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Orzikulova et al. 2024	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Wu et al. 2024	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No
van Asselt et al. 2025	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear

	Philosophical–Methodological Congruity	Researcher Positioning and Reflexivity	Participant Representation	Ethics and Approval	Data–Conclusion Consistency
Chand et al. 2006	Yes	No	Unclear	Unclear	Yes
Shrier et al. 2014a	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wright et al. 2016	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cerrada et al. 2017	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Leonard et al. 2017	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Shrier et al. 2017	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Kazemi et al. 2018	Yes	No	No	Unclear	Yes
Simons et al. 2018	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lucas-Thompson et al. 2020	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Martin et al. 2020	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Van Keulen et al. 2020	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Acorda et al. 2021	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ranney et al. 2021	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Postma et al. 2024	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes

Figure Legend	
Yes	Authors describe in detail
Unclear	Authors describe but not ifully
No	Authors do not describe

The risk of bias and critical appraisal matrix (Figure 1) shows that every study had at least one methodological concern, indicating moderate to high risk of bias present across the evidence base. We organize these by study design (randomized controlled trial or RCT, non-controlled experimental studies, and qualitative studies) as critical appraisal is conducted based on the specific design of a study. Importantly, many "unclear" ratings are likely attributable to incomplete reporting rather than the absence of methodological safeguards, reflecting variability in reporting practices and the lack of standardized conventions in this field. These issues reduce confidence in reports of effectiveness and complicate comparisons across studies.

Intervention administration was the most prominent limitation unique to RCTs. Across studies, reporting was limited on whether participants were blind to treatment assignment, whether those delivering the treatment were blind to treatment assignment, and whether treatment groups were treated identically apart from the intervention of interest. Meanwhile, non-controlled studies most frequently struggled with selection and allocation procedures, often reporting unclear or absent methods for participant assignment. However, all quantitative evidence demonstrated weaknesses in outcome measurement reliability, participant retention, and statistical conclusion validity. Specifically, few studies provided adequate details such as number or training of raters, or intra- and inter-rater reliability. Follow-up was often incomplete, with inadequate reporting of the extent of loss to follow-up, reasons for attrition, or differences between groups. Details on statistical power and power assumptions were frequently absent or incomplete. Within qualitative research, the most consistent limitation was researcher positioning and reflexivity, which was rarely reported or addressed. Across studies, reporting was limited on whether the researcher's cultural or theoretical orientation was declared and on whether the potential influence of the researcher on the study, or vice versa, was acknowledged.

Health outcomes addressed by JITAIs for adolescents

Among JITAIs for adolescents, distal outcomes and their related proximal outcomes demonstrate some consistent priorities as well as emerging trends, with diverse conditions as the target of tailored support. We organize key outcomes targeted in JITAIs for adolescents into three domains: substance use, mental health, and physical health. While substance use is typically spans both mental and physical health, we present it separately here as it has been the most frequent focus of adolescent JITAI.

JITAIs addressing substance use in adolescents

Substance use reduction among adolescents was consistently a central focus of JITAIs for adolescents, with studies (45%, N=26) targeting reduction in areas such as smoking cessation, alcohol moderation, and marijuana use.[26–29] JITAIs addressing substance use among adolescents typically emphasize regulating urges and reinforcing commitment to abstinence.[26,30]

JITAIs targeting smoking cessation demonstrated consistently positive outcomes, with higher engagement linked to greater abstinence.[31] Similarly, marijuana use reduction interventions also yielded favorable results. One trial found participants in the intervention group were about half as likely to use cannabis compared with controls, as measured by days of abstinence

(adjusted odds ratio=0.54, 95% CI:0.31-0.95, p=0.03).[30] Additionally, interventions aimed at reducing drug use demonstrated significant reductions in risky behaviours.[32,33]

Alcohol-related outcomes were more mixed. Some studies reported reductions, including roughly one-third fewer binge drinking days at three months compared with control groups (incidence rate ratio=0.69, 95% CI: 0.59–0.79).[28,34,35] In contrast, a small but non-significant increase in consumption during heavy drinking occasions was reported elsewhere.[36] Other studies found no significant changes in binge drinking or alcohol consumption, with no substantial differences between intervention and control groups.[37,38]

JITAIs addressing mental health in adolescents

JITAIs with a specific focus on mental and cognitive health emerged in 2017 and have been steadily growing (33%, N=19). These pertain to interventions that target anxiety, depression, psychological distress, and suicide prevention among adolescents.[37,39–41] JITAIs that address adolescents' psychological well-being focus on enhancing emotional resilience and emotional coping strategies.[39] A recent development since 2024 includes 2 studies focussed on promoting healthy digital behaviours, specifically to address the over-use of digital devices.[42,43]

Several JITAIs targeting anxiety and depression symptoms demonstrated significant improvements across follow-up assessments, indicating potential effectiveness in alleviating specific clinical symptoms.[39,44,45] One study found significant reductions in anxiety (GAD-7: $F(1,27)=16.94$, $p<0.001$) and depression (PHQ-8: $F(1,27)=11.52$, $p=0.002$), with medium to large effect sizes.[46] However, less definitive results were observed in other studies. No significant differences in suicide prevention outcomes were found between intervention and control groups, suggesting challenges in addressing more severe mental health risks.[37,47] Results of studies targeting perceived stress or enhanced self-efficacy and self-esteem were mixed: some studies reported reductions while others found no effect.[48–53]

JITAIs addressing physical health in adolescents

Physical health interventions primarily addressed obesity risk through the promotion of physical activity and healthy diets (22%, N=13) although more recent studies have focused on the management of chronic conditions (9%, N=5) such as pain as well as asthma among adolescents.[54–56] Physical health strategies in these JITAIs focused on incremental shifts, such as reducing sedentary behavior and promoting daily walking in adolescents.[57,55] Meanwhile, JITAIs focused on nutrition encouraged immediate healthy choices to mitigate obesity risks.[54] JITAIs for chronic condition management promoted adherence behaviours (e.g., to medication) as well as pain management support.[56,58]

Physical activity promotion outcomes were variable. Modest increases in daily physical activity levels were observed, although these changes did not always extend to reductions in sedentary time[59] or were inconsistent.[57] For example, one study showed an initial decrease in sedentary minutes following intervention (t_{17}=-1.79, p=0.04), though this effect attenuated over time and became non-significant by the second and third weeks.[60] Interventions targeting obesity-related risks also demonstrated limited effectiveness, with no significant changes in key indicators such as screen time and body mass index (BMI). However, some evidence indicated improvements in diet such as increased fruit and vegetable consumption and decreased sugar-sweetened beverage intake.[54] In a study specifically targeting chronic pain management, the intervention group reported fewer instances of moderate to severe pain compared to the control group, with statistical significance (t(2145)=2.67, p=0.008, 95% CI:0.0036-0.0235), suggesting a meaningful reduction in pain, although there were no significant differences in overall pain reduction between groups.[56]

Theoretical frameworks informing intervention options

Table 1: Summary of Theoretical Frameworks, Intervention Options, Tailoring Variables, and Decision Points in Adolescent JITAIs

Domain	Theoretical or Intervention Frameworks	Intervention Options	Tailoring Variables	Decision Points
Substance use (N=26)	Cognitive behavioral therapy, Brief Alcohol Screening and Intervention for College Students, Feedback Responsibility Advice Menu Empathy Self-Efficacy (FRAMES), motivational interviewing, transtheoretical model, theory of planned behavior, Screening Brief Intervention and Referral to Treatment	Short message service (SMS) tips and feedback, coping support, virtual coaches	Self-reports of substance use, social or situational context, readiness to change, motivation	Daily, weekly, or event triggered (for example, cravings, hangover days, weekend use)
Mental health (N=19)	Acceptance and commitment therapy, cognitive behavioral therapy, compassion-focused interventions, dialectical behavioral therapy, mindfulness-based stress reduction, positive	Coping skills applications, mindfulness prompts, cognitive behavioral activities	Mood, stress, negative thinking, self-efficacy, digital behavior (such as smartphone use)	Multiple daily prompts, threshold triggered, or ongoing scheduled check-ins

	psychology, transdiagnostic mechanisms			
Physical health (N=13)	Behavioral weight control principles, cognitive behavioral therapy, control theory, goal setting theory, Fogg behavior model, self-regulation theory	Physical activity prompts, nutrition feedback, chronic disease self-management (asthma, cancer)	Activity sensors, dietary intake, symptom reports (such as pain or asthma), medication adherence	Daily or multiple per day, sedentary or symptom triggered, weekly reinforcement

Table 1 presents a domain-level synthesis of the theoretical frameworks that informed intervention design, alongside the primary intervention options, tailoring variables, and decision points. The accompanying text highlights the dominant frameworks within each domain and how they shaped intervention delivery. JITAIs targeting adolescent health commonly used tailored digital messages, which were delivered via text or app-based messaging tools. These interventions leveraged diverse theoretical frameworks to inform the content of interactive and context-aware messages.

In studies targeting substance use (N=26), cognitive behavior therapy (CBT) was most frequently applied (38%), particularly to inform coping prompts for managing substance cravings and related emotional distress that may trigger use.[30,31,61] Further, motivational interviewing (31% of substance use studies) informed modules on self-reflection and dynamic goal-setting,[62,63] while transtheoretical model (observed in 19% of substance use studies) guided the tailoring of feedback specific to an individual's stage of behavior change.[64–66]

Among mental health-focused JITAIs (N=19), most (45%) also leveraged CBT to inform intervention content around cognitive restructuring and stress-related coping strategies.[37,39,41,44,67–70] In addition, some studies in this domain (23%) also used encouraged adolescents to partake in mindfulness-based strategies during heightened stress events.[61,67,71–73] Similarly, during individually challenging moments, compassion-focused JITAIs (20% within this domain) deliver content aimed at promoting emotional resilience and self-kindness.[39,40,52,74,75]

For JITAIs focused on promoting adolescents' physical health (N=13), self-regulation theory was frequently used (38% of studies in this domain) to tailor motivational prompts that emphasize autonomy and self-efficacy to encourage sustained health behaviours.[76] For JITAIs focused specifically on managing physical symptoms of chronic health conditions, frameworks like self-regulation theory were used to structure feedback mechanisms to address adherence

barriers, such as for asthma management.[77] Similarly, control theory informed adaptive goal-setting strategies for physical activity by adjusting feedback based on recent behaviours.[59] Studies also adopted the Behaviour Change Wheel to guide structured prompts and reinforcement strategies, such as reminders to reduce sedentary behavior and promote physical activity, which often were supplemented by reward systems.[60]

There is an overall trend of basing adaptive content on theories related to promoting adolescents' levels of motivation and self-efficacy, states of cognition and behavior change, although the specific application of these principles varies by context. For example, CBT can be broadly applied to aid in managing cravings in substance use and cognitive restructuring in mental health, while also supporting adherence behaviors in chronic pain management. Behavioral intent and goal-setting also inform intervention content, with JITAIs commonly adapting their support based on adolescent-defined goals and progress.[35,76] This significant variability underscores the further need to understand how the adaptive selection of these dynamic interventions, such as timing, content, and delivery, align with adolescent contexts, which is the focus of the next section.

Tailoring variables, decision rules, and decision points

Tailoring mechanisms within JITAIs for adolescents are primarily informed by behavioral, psychological, and other contextual data. Further, the tailoring variables were aligned with the proximal and distal outcomes of the interventions. For example, adolescent behavioral data, such as self-reported nutritional consumption and physical activity levels was used to prompt personalized feedback and inform the content of messages.[26,59,63] Meanwhile, psychological variables, such as fluctuations in mood and self-efficacy, informed JITAIs aimed at improving adolescents' emotional regulation and reducing negative affect.[69,73] Across these approaches, contextual awareness is emphasized, with JITAIs tailoring content based on adolescents' individual and social factors.

Among JITAIs for adolescents, most tailoring variables rely on self-reported data, such as mood, stress, and alcohol consumption. Substance use interventions (N=26) predominantly tailored content to self-reports of substance use (e.g., frequency, quantity, cravings, triggers), which appeared in approximately 70% of these studies; additional tailoring drew on social or situational context (e.g., location, time of week, social setting in 40% of studies in this domain) and a small minority (15%) employed physiological or digital markers, such as electrodermal activity or blood alcohol calculators. Mental health-focused JITAIs (N=20) tailored primarily to self-reported affective states (65%), such as mood, stress, and negative thinking, as well as self-efficacy and coping needs (40%). In contrast, nearly half of studies focused on physical

health (45% of N=13) tailored intervention delivery based on activity data, such as step counts, sedentary minutes, or physical activity goals, which include sensing data using electrodermal activity, geofencing, and Bluetooth.

In terms of decision points, many intervention mechanisms are characterized by the use of daily or multiple-times-daily surveys to collect these tailoring variables.[29,30,78] These decision points enabled participants to prompt immediate interventions adapted based on the self-report.[49,61] These JITAI mechanisms are also characterized as following threshold-based triggers, where responses are activated if pre-defined conditions are met, such as reaching a specific stress level or failing to meet activity goals.[38,51] This approach allowed for adaptive interventions to be activated after consistent patterns of inactivity, poor mental health, or unmet goals.[37,38] This is further enabled through the incorporation of high-frequency, scheduled prompts, including multiple daily check-ins or morning and evening notifications.[41,51,54] Some studies also allowed for adolescent-initiated check-ins, to promote flexibility in need-based and real-time support.[47,51] Meanwhile, in studies which employed behavioral monitoring, interventions were characterized by fixed-schedule decision points, which were based on predefined intervals.[59,63] Such studies tailor intervention schedules based on participant-defined or behaviorally relevant times, such as following peak drinking days.[34]

Despite the predominance of self-reported tailoring variables, there is also a growing trend toward integrating passive and sensor-based data, including electrodermal activity, geofencing, Bluetooth sensing, and app usage patterns.[43,61,77] Physiological tailoring, though less common, has also facilitated immediate biometric-driven interventions and strategies to support adolescents in maintaining physical activity goals or chronic condition management behaviours.[61,79] This reflects a trend toward real-time, event-triggered decision points in JITAIs for adolescents, characterized by interventions that are activated based on immediate sensor data, such as detecting physical inactivity or elevated stress levels.[57,61] In these studies sensing data informed context-triggered decision points, employing real-time detection of high-risk situations to prompt interventions.[60,68] For example, time of day and spatial cues, have also been leveraged to refine the timing and delivery of interventions, with methods including geofencing used to automatically identify high-risk locations[68] and detecting sedentary behaviours to prompt tailored notifications.[60]

Broader adoption of automated approaches to tailoring JITAIs remains limited but recently emerging. Since 2024, interventions have used machine learning methods to enhance the adaptability of interventions. One study developed a JITAI to prevent smartphone overuse, introducing a friction-based intervention to disrupt access to blacklisted apps when overuse

was detected. The authors employed a machine learning model which was updated daily with passive sensing data such as app usage, activity, social context, location, and temporal patterns to predict overuse, triggering interventions upon app launches and task-switching moments.[42] Another recent study leveraged large language models (LLMs) for dynamic adaptability, also with the goal of reducing problematic smartphone use.[43] Similarly, when users opened blacklisted apps, the LLM generated persuasive messages using four communication strategies of understanding, comforting, evoking, and scaffolding. LLM messages were also aligned with tailoring variables, which included real-time usage, context, mental states, and user-defined goals related to app use.

Ethical considerations in JITAI tailoring mechanisms for adolescents

A critical gap emerges in the lack of detailed reporting on adolescent engagement across studies, limiting formal analysis with the tailoring mechanisms identified in prior sections. Adolescent engagement in the development of JITAI components demonstrates considerable variation in both depth and rigor. Certain studies integrated current participants directly into the design process,[30,58,62,80] while others consulted youth with demographic profiles similar to the intended intervention audience.[26,33,69,81] Such engagement is frequently framed as a strategy to enhance intervention relevance and acceptability by involving adolescents in consulting on the relevance of content. However, the extent of adolescent participation in these studies is also inconsistently reported, particularly within randomized controlled trials (RCTs), which often prioritize the evaluation of pre-developed interventions over documentation of co-design processes. In contrast, qualitative studies focused on describing processes of adolescent engagement in JITAI component development explicitly.

While unreported involvement in these interventions is also possible, the absence of such documentation limits our current ability to assess their impact on JITAI tailoring mechanisms. Moreover, among studies claiming adolescent involvement, the depth of engagement was frequently superficial. It was unclear if adolescents had substantive influence over core design decisions regarding decision rules, except for among the small sample of qualitative studies. For example, one study engaged adolescents exiting foster care in co-designing a JITAI for substance use reduction. Through focus groups with these adolescents, participants provided iterative feedback on intervention structure, language, message frequency, and content relevance, which led to key modifications in JITAI content, including adjustments to message tone, content specificity, and delivery timing.[82] Similarly, one study involved Dutch lower-educated adolescents in the iterative development of JITAI content, including informing modifications in text clarity, visual elements, navigation, and notification settings.[38] Another study involved ethnic minority adolescent females in developing a Build Your Own Theme

Song app.[69] Adolescent females contributed to JITAI design by creating personal theme songs, through rewriting and recording lyrics based on their experiences. Subsequently, the BYOTS app would prompt adolescents to engage with their theme song during moments of negative thinking, providing a personalized coping mechanism based on their own input.

Ethical considerations were rarely addressed in detail across the reviewed studies. A minority described explicit strategies that were primarily limited to study design, such as providing devices or data plans,[31,61,67] using data encryption,[83] or advising participants on secure message deletion.[37] However, studies did not describe ethical considerations in relation to the design of tailoring mechanisms in their interventions, except for unique mentions of using parental controls to ensure safe device use[44] and limiting message frequency to mitigate digital fatigue.[29]

DISCUSSION

This systematic review identified key patterns in how JITAIs for adolescents utilize dynamic tailoring mechanisms, decision rules, and adaptive data sources to personalize health interventions. The findings highlight that JITAIs for adolescents currently addresses substance use, mental health, and physical health (including chronic conditions). Among these, interventions targeting smoking cessation, marijuana use, and HIV behavioral risk factors demonstrated more consistent positive outcomes, while interventions focused on alcohol consumption, physical activity, and mental health revealed more variable or limited effects. Further, most JITAIs relied on self-reported data, with growing trends towards integrating passive and sensor-based data, such as geofencing, app usage, and physiological monitoring, in physical health domains. Decision rules were frequently based on threshold triggers or scheduled intervals, though emerging studies have begun to explore machine learning models for real-time, adaptive interventions.

However, JITAI mechanisms were highly heterogeneous and the overall certainty of the evidence was rated low across outcomes due to inconsistent reporting and heterogeneous study designs. Overall, while specific outcomes have yielded positive effects, most outcomes exhibit more variable or limited findings. These findings emphasize the need for further investigation into the methodological determinants of intervention success, particularly regarding how JITAI and study design influence observed effectiveness. The dominance of self-report of behavioral data in JITAIs suggests limited consideration of broader contextual and social determinants of health (SoDH) in their tailoring mechanisms, possibly contributing to inconsistent outcomes. It is crucial for future work to investigate the incorporation of SoDH

in JITAI tailoring mechanisms to enhance contextual relevance and precisely address barriers to equitable health support among diverse individuals.[19,84]

Nevertheless, it is also important to interpret current observations of effectiveness including limited effects with significant caution. The large majority of current study designs and measurements of effect adopt traditional study designs like cross-sectional or randomized methods. Microrandomized trials (MRTs), in contrast, randomize intervention options at multiple and repeated decision points to help precisely determine the effectiveness of individual JITAI components across diverse individual contexts.[85] Such an approach enables "a holistic comprehension of intervention dynamics over various timescales."[84] As such, current studies with adolescents may be unable to sufficiently detect within-person variability, and therefore may potentially underestimate or construe interpretations of the effectiveness of JITAIs. To deliver precise JITAIs to adolescents, it is highly necessary to assess diverse contextual factors which may influence the effectiveness of different adaptive components, as this can help understand "when and in what contexts a particular intervention option should be delivered."[85] Given the heterogeneity of current JITAIs for adolescents, MRTs can crucially address the gap identified in this review of what specific tailoring variables, decision points, and intervention options are optimal for different individuals.[84]

Additionally, the literature currently reports limited adolescent engagement in JITAI development and inconsistent considerations of privacy, consent, and ethical safeguards. These findings highlight critical gaps in ensuring that JITAIs align meaningfully with adolescent contexts and needs and critical ethical standards. They also indicate the need for more rigorous and transparent practices in investigating precision health intervention mechanisms for adolescents.

Input from adolescent co-authors

To contextualize the current findings, we also sought interpretive feedback from adolescent co-authors. Their contributions do not represent additional data but provide a complementary perspective on the evidence, highlighting gaps and priorities for future JITAI research from their perspectives as their target users.

Despite current JITAIs incorporating frequent rule-based adaptations, adolescent co-authors emphasized a preference for simplicity and user-controlled customization of intervention options. Adolescent co-authors highlighted how current JITAI tailoring mechanisms are overly complex or opaque. They highlighted the lack of modular designs, whereby users can select which features they wish to engage with to enhance contextual relevance. Ongoing

notifications, which characterize many of the JITAIs in this review, were criticized for contributing to notification fatigue and limiting engagement over time. For example, adolescents discussed how excessive prompts can lead to desensitization, frustration, and eventual disregard of JITAIs. Subtle, passive engagement strategies, such as visual cues or widgets which update in the background of devices and can be checked flexibly, were highlighted as an potential alternative. This suggests that high-frequency prompting in current JITAIs may undermine intervention impact, particularly among adolescents already experiencing digital overload and other digital determinants of poor health.[86,87] Adolescents also raised concerns about data privacy and lack of control over what information is collected, advocating for opt-in tailoring mechanisms that allow users to choose which data they are comfortable sharing.

These insights underscore a critical tension within current JITAI development and trends towards passive sensing and multimodal integration with artificial intelligence. In an effort to enhance engagement and precision, these very mechanisms may simultaneously erode engagement and acceptance among adolescents. This “engagement paradox” suggests that the success of adaptive interventions depends not just on the incorporation of multiple levels of tailoring, but also on how well tailoring mechanisms align overall with adolescents’ ongoing preferences and need for autonomy. Despite automation’s role in enhancing adaptation, excessive automation may reduce adolescent engagement if the tailoring mechanisms lack transparency and explainability. As such, adaptive systems where adolescents can define their preferred tailoring mechanisms represent an impactful direction for future precision health interventions. Transparent data practices, which can promote participant control over tailoring mechanisms, may also be essential to privacy considerations but intervention relevance.

Guidelines and future directions for JITAIs for adolescents

Given these reflections from adolescents, alongside the existing gaps in personalization, ethical design, and engagement strategies of JITAIs for adolescents as identified in the review, we developed the following guidelines to help ensure that future interventions are technically, clinically, and contextually robust to address the diverse needs and remain relevant to adolescents.

Investigate mechanisms of meaningful engagement in real-world contexts

Understanding the mechanisms by which JITAIs influence behavioral outcomes is critical for advancing the field. The review highlighted uncertainties regarding how adaptive mechanisms operate and influence engagement and outcomes. Future research should employ

optimization trial designs, such as micro-randomized or sequential multiple assignment trials to systematically test how specific tailoring variables, such as timing, content format, and data type, as well as theoretical frameworks may impact engagement and behavioral outcomes.[85] This will enable a more precise understanding of how different intervention components and decision rules perform, and help clarify the tailoring mechanisms which are most effective for specific adolescent contexts.

Further, the importance of co-design in creating relevant, effective interventions cannot be overstated. The review revealed limited adolescent involvement in the design of many JITAIs, resulting in interventions that may not fully align with users' lived experiences or preferences. Insights from the discussion with adolescents reinforced this, highlighting the value of relevance and understandability in design. There is a need to embed precision health designs within real-life contexts to ensure interventions are adaptable and impactful for ongoing adolescent health needs. Participatory workshops can facilitate meaningful input, enabling adolescents to contribute ideas about preferred tailoring mechanisms. For example, studies can engage adolescent participants in informing the proximal outcomes, intervention options, tailoring variables, decision points, as well as overall user experience, of JITAIs.[82] Integration of participatory design components to additionally inform as well as interpret individual outcomes in adaptive or microrandomized trials would be particularly innovative. Such approaches acknowledge adolescents as experts by experience, resulting in interventions that account for and are more grounded in real-life contexts. In this manner, adolescents can play a central role in shaping mechanisms in precision health interventions.

Continuous adaptation directed by adolescents

Adaptation is a cornerstone of effective JITAI design, yet the review findings identified notable gaps in how adaptation is implemented, particularly regarding the extent of adolescent agency and trust over tailoring variables. Adolescent co-authors expressed a preference for systems that allowed for greater control and customization rather than opaque, automated adaptations. This included an indication of discomfort with passive sensing mechanisms that operated without explicit user input or consent. To address these concerns, future JITAIs should incorporate modular, user-directed adaptation features that empower adolescents to adjust the level and type of adaptation as their preferences and needs evolve. For instance, intervention component dashboards could be developed, allowing adolescents to select their preferred notification frequencies, data sources for tailoring, and engagement formats, such as text, video, or visual cues. Such affordance of ongoing participatory adaptation not only respects adolescent agency but also fosters enhanced trust and relevance, ensuring that JITAI mechanisms are both transparent and adolescent-centered.

Minimizing engagement fatigue while promoting more meaningful engagement

The review also noted inconsistent outcomes and effects reported among current JITAIs for adolescents. This could have several reasons, such as a lack of using behavioural theory, not engaging adolescents in the design, differences in methodological design etc. Another issue could be low user engagement due to notification fatigue, which emerged as a key concern among adolescent validators, who criticized frequent and intrusive notifications for contributing to disengagement. To address this, future intervention development should explore alternative, less intrusive engagement strategies. For example, JITAIs for adolescents can replace frequent text notifications with visual nudges or contextual prompts, which would reduce overwhelm for adolescents. Interventions could also explore integrating prompts into commonly used platforms, such as social media feeds, to ensure engagement occurs within familiar and comfortable digital spaces to enhance relevance to adolescence.

Strengthening ethical standards for transparent personalization and digital self-determination

The review identified significant gaps in ethical reporting, with most studies neglecting to mention ethical considerations in JITAI design mechanisms. Such considerations are particularly critical given JITAIs which rely on sensitive data collection and passive monitoring. Such an approach also aligns with principles of digital self-determination, which emphasize the reduction of information asymmetries by ensuring adolescents have control over their data and tailoring mechanisms.[88] Adolescent co-authors also expressed discomfort with unclear or opaque data practices of current JITAIs. Adolescents emphasized a strong preference for opt-in mechanisms that allowed them to control the type and extent of data they shared. In this context, a key consideration in future JITAI development is the need to promote adolescents' individual agency over their digital data and enable participatory tailoring mechanisms.

To address these concerns, dynamic consent processes within ongoing JITAI tailoring mechanisms can be implemented. Dynamic consent refers to when individuals are continuously informed and able to manage their data-sharing preferences over time. Such a practice can enhance data sovereignty, of the need for individuals to "have control over the use of their shared data," without which JITAI utilization may be significantly hindered.[89] These processes should provide clear, accessible information about what data is collected, how it is used, and the purpose of each data point in tailoring mechanisms. Adolescents should further be empowered to opt-in or opt-out of specific data types and be given the opportunity to modify data points over time. Such can be operationalized through user-friendly privacy dashboards which enable real-time adjustment of JITAI data-tailoring settings.

Dynamic consent in adolescent digital health remains very limited. Recent studies highlight the approach's alignment with technology users' desire for transparency and control.[92] Studies have also shown how dynamic consent preferences are highly individual based on demographic and social contexts,[93] making the approach particularly salient for application in precision adolescent and digital health contexts. As such, increased emphasis on self-determination and sovereignty in JITAI design has significant potential to improve their alignment and relevance with adolescent health needs and expectations.

Strengths and limitations of the review

This review is the first to focus on JITAIs across a wide range of health conditions within a specific developmental period, highlighting the unique needs and intervention contexts for adolescents, who face distinct physical, mental, and social health challenges that differ from those of children or adults. A key strength of this review is the meaningful involvement of adolescents in screening, data extraction, and critical interpretation, which enhances the relevance and actionability of the findings and future recommendations. However, due to substantial heterogeneity, meta-analysis was not feasible; nonetheless, through narrative synthesis, this review identifies key trends alongside gaps in evidence strength and maps specific health outcome areas to provide the foundation for focused meta-analytic investigations in the future. Additionally, despite a broad search strategy, some relevant studies may have been inadvertently missed, as most included interventions did not explicitly describe their mechanisms as just-in-time or adaptive. The current synthesis represents an important first step towards a more coherent body of evidence for the application of JITAIs in adolescent health.

CONCLUSION

This review underscores the potential and limitations of current JITAI designs for adolescents. The active involvement of adolescents in study screening and appraisal processes strengthened the interpretations by ensuring that the findings reflect the real-world concerns and preferences of young people towards precision health interventions. The review found that while adaptation is central to precision health, future JITAI development must balance precision with participatory engagement, ensuring that adaptive health support is not only relevant but also ethically transparent, with open mechanisms that enable adolescents to directly control tailoring processes. Addressing current methodological limitations through adaptive study designs with co-design will be further essential for enhancing the robustness of evidence and advancing the field towards more effective and relevant adolescent precision health interventions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Stella Goeschl, Anastasia Kluge, and Benedetta Vallese for their valuable input which informed the development of the manuscript. We also thank Dirk Jan Ligtenbelt, who provided guidance on the search strategy. Parts of this work were presented at the Karolinska Institutet – United Nations Children's Fund Joint Conference on Global Child and Adolescent Mental Health 2024, the 19th European Association for Research on Adolescence Conference, and the Social Data Science research group seminar at the Alan Turing Institute; we thank attendees for their thoughtful reception and feedback on earlier versions of this work.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

KWG: review guarantor, conceptualization, project administration, methodology, investigation, formal analysis, writing – original draft, writing – review and editing. MA: investigation, formal analysis, writing – original draft, writing – review and editing. IK, SG, CI, RA, CA, ET: investigation, writing – review and editing. CRS, AV, EvR: methodology, writing – review and editing. LK: funding acquisition, methodology, writing – review and editing. MdR: funding acquisition, supervision, writing – review and editing. CAF: funding acquisition, supervision, project administration, methodology, writing – review and editing. Authors KWG, CAF, LK, CRS, AV and EvR are collaborators in the Convergence Flagship programme, PROactive TEChnology-supported prevention and MEntal health in adolescence' (PROTECt ME). The authors used ChatGPT solely to assist with grammar correction before submission. No AI-generated content, references, or substantive contributions were included, and the authors remain fully accountable for all aspects of the manuscript.

COMPETING INTERESTS

ET is employed by Gro-up, a non-profit organization in the Netherlands promoting the well-being of children and youth and their families. Gro-up has no involvement in the development of this review or interpretation of its findings. The remaining authors have no competing interests to declare.

FUNDING

This research is funded by the Health & Technology Flagship program, PROactive TEChnology-supported prevention and MEntal health in adolescence (PROTECt ME), as part of Convergence, the research alliance between Erasmus University Medical Center, Erasmus University Rotterdam, and Delft University of Technology. Additionally, KWG, CAF and MdR are supported through the 'High Tech for a Sustainable Future' capacity building program of

the 4TU Federation in the Netherlands. 4TU Federation is not involved in the development of this review or interpretation of its findings.

ABBREVIATIONS

Just-in-time-adaptive intervention (JITAI)

REFERENCES

1. Chahal R, Gotlib IH, Guyer AE. Research Review: Brain network connectivity and the heterogeneity of depression in adolescence – a precision mental health perspective. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 2020;61(12):1282-1298. doi:10.1111/jcpp.13250

2. Ryder JR, Kaizer AM, Jenkins TM, Kelly AS, Inge TH, Shaibi GQ. Heterogeneity in Response to Treatment of Adolescents with Severe Obesity: The Need for Precision Obesity Medicine. *Obesity*. 2019;27(2):288-294. doi:10.1002/oby.22369

3. Kerr J, Anderson C, Lippman SM. Physical activity, sedentary behaviour, diet, and cancer: an update and emerging new evidence. *The Lancet Oncology*. 2017;18(8):e457-e471. doi:10.1016/S1470-2045(17)30411-4

4. Fleary SA, Joseph P, Pappagianopoulos JE. Adolescent health literacy and health behaviors: A systematic review. *Journal of Adolescence*. 2018;62:116-127. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2017.11.010

5. Cicchetti D, Rogosch FA. A developmental psychopathology perspective on adolescence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 2002;70(1):6-20. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.70.1.6

6. Paquin V, Muckle G, Bolanis D, et al. Longitudinal Trajectories of Food Insecurity in Childhood and Their Associations With Mental Health and Functioning in Adolescence. *JAMA Network Open*. 2021;4(12):e2140085. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.40085

7. UNICEF. Adolescents Statistics. UNICEF DATA. Accessed March 25, 2025. https://data.unicef.org/topic/adolescents/overview/

8. Johnson MH, Fearon P, Pickles A, Jones EJH. Editorial Perspective: The paradox of precision health in early development – building large samples to yield individual-level measures. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*. 2024;65(7):991-994. doi:10.1111/jcpp.13974

9. Shen M di, Chen S bing, Ding X dong. The effectiveness of digital twins in promoting precision health across the entire population: a systematic review. *npj Digit Med*. 2024;7(1):1-10. doi:10.1038/s41746-024-01146-0

10. Sawyer SM, Azzopardi PS, Wickremarathne D, Patton GC. The age of adolescence. *The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health*. 2018;2(3):223-228. doi:10.1016/S2352-4642(18)30022-1

11. Wyatt TH, Bayless AK, Krauskopf P, Gaylord N. Using mHealth Applications to Promote Self-Managed Health Behaviors Among Teens. *Journal of Pediatric Nursing*. 2021;59:164-172. doi:10.1016/j.pedn.2021.04.025

12. Hightow-Weidman LB, Horvath KJ, Scott H, Hill-Rorie J, Bauermeister JA. Engaging youth in mHealth: what works and how can we be sure? *Mhealth*. 2021;7:23. doi:10.21037/mhealth-20-48

13. Psihogios AM, King-Dowling S, O'Hagan B, et al. Contextual Predictors of Engagement in a Tailored mHealth Intervention for Adolescent and Young Adult Cancer Survivors. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*. 2021;55(12):1220-1230. doi:10.1093/abm/kaab008

14. Kozelka EE, Acquilano SC, Al-Abdulmunem M, et al. Digital Mental Health and Its Discontents: Assumptions About Technology That Create Barriers to Equitable Access. *PS*. 2024;75(3):299-302. doi:10.1176/appi.ps.20230238

15. Villegas Mejía C, Remmerswaal D, Engels RCME, Ludden GDS, Boffo M. Macro-engagement in mHealth: Exploring user engagement beyond the screen. *DIGITAL HEALTH*. 2024;10:20552076231225591. doi:10.1177/20552076231225591

16. Nahum-Shani I, Smith SN, Spring BJ, et al. Just-in-Time Adaptive Interventions (JITAIs) in Mobile Health: Key Components and Design Principles for Ongoing Health Behavior Support. *ann behav med*. Published online September 23, 2016:1-17. doi:10.1007/s12160-016-9830-8

17. Crone EA, Dahl RE. Understanding adolescence as a period of social–affective engagement and goal flexibility. *Nat Rev Neurosci*. 2012;13(9):636-650. doi:10.1038/nrn3313

18. Hurrelmann K, Richter M. Risk behaviour in adolescence: the relationship between developmental and health problems. *J Public Health*. 2006;14(1):20-28. doi:10.1007/s10389-005-0005-5

19. Guan KW, Adlung C, Keijsers L, et al. Just-in-time adaptive interventions for adolescent and young adult health and well-being: protocol for a systematic review. *BMJ Open*. 2024;14(7):e083870. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2024-083870

20. Blum RW, Bastos FI, Kabiru CW, Le LC. Adolescent health in the 21st century. *The Lancet*. 2012;379(9826):1567-1568.

21. Sawyer SM, Azzopardi PS, Wickremarathne D, Patton GC. The age of adolescence. *The lancet child & adolescent health*. 2018;2(3):223-228.

22. Jaworska N, MacQueen G. Adolescence as a unique developmental period. *J Psychiatry Neurosci*. 2015;40(5):291-293. doi:10.1503/jpn.150268

23. Arnone JM. Adolescents May Be Older Than We Think: Today 25 Is the New 18, or Is It? *International Journal of Celiac Disease*. 2014;2(2):47-48. doi:10.12691/ijcd-2-2-4

24. Prasad M. Introduction to the GRADE tool for rating certainty in evidence and recommendations. *Clinical Epidemiology and Global Health*. 2024;25:101484. doi:10.1016/j.cegh.2023.101484

25. Murad MH, Mustafa RA, Schünemann HJ, Sultan S, Santesso N. Rating the certainty in evidence in the absence of a single estimate of effect. *Evid Based Med*. 2017;22(3):85-87. doi:10.1136/ebmed-2017-110668

26. Rodgers A, Corbett T, Bramley D, et al. Do u smoke after txt? Results of a randomised trial of smoking cessation using mobile phone text messaging. *Tob Control*. 2005;14(4):255-261. doi:10.1136/tc.2005.011577

27. Riley W, Obermayer J, Jean-Mary J. Internet and Mobile Phone Text Messaging Intervention for College Smokers. *Journal of American College Health*. 2008;57(2):245-248. doi:10.3200/JACH.57.2.245-248

28. Suffoletto B, Kirisci L, Clark DB, Chung T. Which behavior change techniques help young adults reduce binge drinking? A pilot randomized clinical trial of 5 text message interventions. *Addict Behav*. 2019;92:161-167. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2019.01.006

29. Coughlin LN, Nahum-Shani I, Philyaw-Kotov ML, et al. Developing an Adaptive Mobile Intervention to Address Risky Substance Use Among Adolescents and Emerging Adults: Usability Study. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*. 2021;9(1):e24424. doi:10.2196/24424

30. Shrier LA, Burke PJ, Kells M, et al. Pilot randomized trial of MOMENT, a motivational counseling-plus-ecological momentary intervention to reduce marijuana use in youth. *mHealth*. 2018;4(7):29-29. doi:10.21037/mhealth.2018.07.04

31. Witkiewitz K, Desai SA, Bowen S, Leigh BC, Kirouac M, Larimer ME. Development and evaluation of a mobile intervention for heavy drinking and smoking among college students. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*. 2014;28(3):639-650. doi:10.1037/a0034747

32. Acorda DE. Acceptability of a Just-in-Time Adaptive Intervention for HIV Prevention among Youth Experiencing Homelessness: A Qualitative Analysis. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor & Underserved*. 2021;32:N.PAG-N.PAG.

33. Maria DS, Padhye N, Businelle M, Yang Y, ... Efficacy of a just-in-time adaptive intervention to promote HIV risk reduction behaviors among young adults experiencing homelessness: pilot randomized …. *Journal of medical* …. Published online 2021. https://www.jmir.org/2021/7/e26704/

34. Suffoletto B, Kristan J, Chung T, et al. An Interactive Text Message Intervention to Reduce Binge Drinking in Young Adults: A Randomized Controlled Trial with 9-Month Outcomes. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(11):e0142877. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0142877

35. Suffoletto B, Chung T, Muench F, Monti P, Clark DB. A Text Message Intervention with Adaptive Goal Support to Reduce Alcohol Consumption Among Non-Treatment-Seeking Young Adults: Non-Randomized Clinical Trial with Voluntary Length of Enrollment. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth*. 2018;6(2):e35. doi:10.2196/mhealth.8530

36. Wright C, Dietze PM, Agius PA, et al. Mobile phone-based ecological momentary intervention to reduce young adults' alcohol use in the event: A three-armed randomized controlled trial. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*. 2018;6(7):e9324.

37. Suffoletto B, Goldstein T, Gotkiewicz D, ... Acceptability, engagement, and effects of a mobile digital intervention to support mental health for young adults transitioning to college: pilot randomized …. *JMIR Formative* …. Published online 2021. https://formative.jmir.org/2021/10/e32271/

38. van Keulen H, Voogt C, Kleinjan M, Kramer J, Andree R, van Empelen P. Development of a Dynamically Tailored mHealth Intervention (What Do You Drink) to Reduce

Excessive Drinking Among Dutch Lower-Educated Students: User-Centered Design Approach. *JMIR Formative Research*. 2022;6(8):e36969. doi:10.2196/36969

39. Rauschenberg C, Boecking B, Paetzold I, et al. A Compassion-Focused Ecological Momentary Intervention for Enhancing Resilience in Help-Seeking Youth: Uncontrolled Pilot Study. *JMIR Mental Health*. 2021;8(8):e25650. doi:10.2196/25650

40. Reininghaus U, Paetzold I, Rauschenberg C, et al. Effects of a Novel, Transdiagnostic Ecological Momentary Intervention for Prevention, and Early Intervention of Severe Mental Disorder in Youth (EMIcompass): Findings From an Exploratory Randomized Controlled Trial. *Schizophrenia bulletin*. 2023;49(3):592-604. doi:10.1093/schbul/sbac212

41. Shrier LA, Spalding A. “Just Take a Moment and Breathe and Think”: Young Women with Depression Talk about the Development of an Ecological Momentary Intervention to Reduce Their …. *Journal of pediatric and adolescent gynecology*. Published online 2017. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1083318816301607

42. Orzikulova A, Xiao H, Li Z, et al. Time2Stop: Adaptive and Explainable Human-AI Loop for Smartphone Overuse Intervention. In: *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM; 2024:1-20. doi:10.1145/3613904.3642747

43. Wu R, Yu C, Pan X, et al. MindShift: Leveraging Large Language Models for Mental-States-Based Problematic Smartphone Use Intervention. In: *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. CHI ’24. Association for Computing Machinery; 2024. doi:10.1145/3613904.3642790

44. Silk JS, Pramana G, Sequeira SL, Lindhiem O, ... Using a smartphone app and clinician portal to enhance brief cognitive behavioral therapy for childhood anxiety disorders. *Behavior therapy*. Published online 2020. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0005789419300486

45. Bell I, Arnold C, Gilbertson T, et al. A personalized, transdiagnostic smartphone intervention targeting repetitive negative thinking in young people with depression and anxiety: Pilot randomized controlled trial of Mello (Preprint). *JMIR Preprints*. Published online 2023. doi:10.2196/preprints.47860

46. Bell I, Arnold C, Gilbertson T, et al. A Personalized, Transdiagnostic Smartphone Intervention (Mello) Targeting Repetitive Negative Thinking in Young People With Depression and Anxiety: Pilot Randomized Controlled Trial. *J Med Internet Res*. 2023;25:e47860. doi:10.2196/47860

47. Kennard BD, Goldstein T, Foxwell AA, et al. As Safe as Possible (ASAP): A Brief App-Supported Inpatient Intervention to Prevent Postdischarge Suicidal Behavior in Hospitalized, Suicidal Adolescents. *AJP*. 2018;175(9):864-872. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2018.17101151

48. Reininghaus U, Daemen M, Postma MR, et al. Transdiagnostic ecological momentary intervention for improving self-esteem in youth exposed to childhood adversity: The SELFIE randomized clinical trial. *JAMA psychiatry*. 2024;81(3):227-239.

49. van Asselt A, Hoeberichts K, Demirel S, Scheeren A, Roke Y. Effectiveness of the mobile Stress Autism Mate Junior application in reducing stress and improving quality of life in adolescents with autism: a pilot study. *Front Psychiatry*. 2024;15:1469257. doi:10.3389/fpsyt.2024.1469257

50. Schenkel K, Haug S, Castro RP, et al. One SMS a day keeps the stress away? A just-in-time planning intervention to reduce occupational stress among apprentices. *Applied Psych Health & Well*. 2022;14(4):1389-1407. doi:10.1111/aphw.12340

51. Marciniak MA, Shanahan L, Myin-Germeys I, et al. Imager—A mobile health mental imagery-based ecological momentary intervention targeting reward sensitivity: A randomized controlled trial. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*. 2024;16(2):576-596.

52. Paetzold I, Schick A, Rauschenberg C, Hirjak D, ... Exploring putative therapeutic mechanisms of change in a hybrid compassion-focused, ecological momentary intervention: Findings from the EMIcompass trial. *… Research and Therapy*. Published online 2023. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0005796723001158

53. Stevenson BL, Blevins CE, Marsh E, Feltus S, Stein M, Abrantes AM. An ecological momentary assessment of mood, coping and alcohol use among emerging adults in psychiatric treatment. *Am J Drug Alcohol Abuse*. 2020;46(5):651-658. doi:10.1080/00952990.2020.1783672

54. Nollen NL, Mayo MS, Carlson SE, Rapoff MA, Goggin KJ, Ellerbeck EF. Mobile Technology for Obesity Prevention. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*. 2014;46(4):404-408. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2013.12.011

55. Ding X, Xu J, Wang H, Chen G, Thind H, Zhang Y. WalkMore: promoting walking with just-in-time context-aware prompts. In: IEEE; 2016:1-8.

56. Hunter JF, Acevedo AM, Gago-Masague S, et al. A pilot study of the preliminary efficacy of Pain Buddy: A novel intervention for the management of children's cancer-related pain. *Pediatric Blood & Cancer*. 2020;67(10):e28278. doi:10.1002/pbc.28278

57. Spruijt-Metz D, Wen CKF, O'Reilly G, et al. Innovations in the Use of Interactive Technology to Support Weight Management. *Curr Obes Rep*. 2015;4(4):510-519. doi:10.1007/s13679-015-0183-6

58. Perry TT, Marshall A, Berlinski A, et al. Smartphone-based vs paper-based asthma action plans for adolescents. *Annals of Allergy, Asthma & Immunology*. 2017;118(3):298-303. doi:10.1016/j.anai.2016.11.028

59. Cushing CC, Bejarano CM, Ortega A, Sayre N, Fedele DA, Smyth JM. Adaptive mHealth Intervention for Adolescent Physical Activity Promotion. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*. 2021;46(5):536-546. doi:10.1093/jpepsy/jsaa125

60. Domin A, Uslu A, Schulz A, Ouzzahra Y, Vögele C. A theory-informed, personalized mHealth intervention for adolescents (mobile app for physical activity): Development and pilot study. *JMIR Formative Research*. 2022;6(6):e35118.

61. Leonard NR, Silverman M, Sherpa DP, et al. Mobile Health Technology Using a Wearable Sensorband for Female College Students With Problem Drinking: An Acceptability and Feasibility Study. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*. 2017;5(7):e90. doi:10.2196/mhealth.7399

62. Shrier LA, Rhoads AM, Fredette ME, ... "Counselor in Your Pocket": youth and provider perspectives on a mobile motivational intervention for marijuana use. *Substance use & …*. Published online 2014. doi:10.3109/10826084.2013.824470

63. Wright CJC, Dietze PM, Crockett B, Lim MSC. Participatory development of MIDY (Mobile Intervention for Drinking in Young people). *BMC Public Health*. 2016;16(1):184. doi:10.1186/s12889-016-2876-5

64. Braciszewski JM, Tzilos Wernette GK, Moore RS, et al. Developing a tailored substance use intervention for youth exiting foster care. *Child Abuse & Neglect*. 2018;77:211-221. doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2018.01.013

65. Kazemi DM, Borsari B, Levine MJ, Lamberson KA, Dooley B. REMIT: Development of a mHealth theory-based intervention to decrease heavy episodic drinking among college students. *Addiction Research & Theory*. 2018;26(5):377-385.

66. Kazemi DM, Borsari B, Levine MJ, et al. Effectiveness of a Theory-Based mHealth Intervention for High-Risk Drinking in College Students. *Substance Use & Misuse*. 2020;55(10):1667-1676. doi:10.1080/10826084.2020.1756851

67. Leonard NR, Casarjian B, Fletcher RR, et al. Theoretically-Based Emotion Regulation Strategies Using a Mobile App and Wearable Sensor Among Homeless Adolescent Mothers: Acceptability and Feasibility Study. *JMIR Pediatr Parent*. 2018;1(1):e1. doi:10.2196/pediatrics.9037

68. Pramana G, Parmanto B, Lomas J, Lindhiem O, Kendall PC, Silk J. Using Mobile Health Gamification to Facilitate Cognitive Behavioral Therapy Skills Practice in Child Anxiety Treatment: Open Clinical Trial. *JMIR Serious Games*. 2018;6(2):e9. doi:10.2196/games.8902

69. Neal-Barnett A, Stadulis R, Ellzey D, et al. Evaluation of the Effectiveness of a Musical Cognitive Restructuring App for Black Inner-City Girls: Survey, Usage, and Focus Group Evaluation. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth*. 2019;7(6):e11310. doi:10.2196/11310

70. Shrier LA, Burke PJ, Parker S, et al. Development and pilot testing of a counseling-plus-mHealth intervention to reduce risk for pregnancy and sexually transmitted infection in young women with depression. *mHealth*. 2020;6(0):17-17. doi:10.21037/mhealth.2019.11.05

71. Lucas-Thompson RG, Rayburn S, Seiter NS, et al. Learning to BREATHE “Plus”: a multi-modal adaptive supplement to an evidence-based mindfulness intervention for adolescents. *Frontiers in public health*. 2020;8:579556.

72. van Aubel E, Bakker JM, Batink T, et al. Blended care in the treatment of subthreshold symptoms of depression and psychosis in emerging adults: A randomised controlled trial of Acceptance and Commitment Therapy in Daily-Life (ACT-DL). *Behaviour Research and Therapy*. 2020;128(A-Tjak, J.G.L., Davis, M.L., Morina, N., Powers, M.B., Smits, J.A.J., et al. (2015). A meta-analysis of the efficacy of acceptance and commitment therapy for clinically relevant mental and physical health problems. Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics, 84(1),). doi:10.1016/j.brat.2020.103592

73. Lucas-Thompson RG, Prince MA, Rigsby BA, et al. Preliminary Evaluation of Learning to BREATHE PLUS for University Students: Does a Multi-Modal Adaptive Supplement Strengthen Effects of a Mindfulness-Based Intervention? *Mindfulness*. 2023;14(11):2699-2715. doi:10.1007/s12671-023-02229-x

74. Paetzold I, Schick A, Rauschenberg C, ... A hybrid ecological momentary compassion–focused intervention for enhancing resilience in help-seeking young people: Prospective

study of baseline …. *JMIR Formative* …. Published online 2022. https://formative.jmir.org/2022/11/e39511

75. Postma MR, Vrancken S, Daemen M, et al. Working mechanisms of the use and acceptability of ecological momentary interventions: a realist evaluation of a guided self-help ecological momentary intervention targeting self-esteem. *BMC Public Health*. 2024;24(1):1633. doi:10.1186/s12889-024-19143-z

76. Simons D, De Bourdeaudhuij I, Clarys P, De Cocker K, Vandelanotte C, Deforche B. A Smartphone App to Promote an Active Lifestyle in Lower-Educated Working Young Adults: Development, Usability, Acceptability, and Feasibility Study. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth*. 2018;6(2):e44. doi:10.2196/mhealth.8287

77. Fedele DA, Cushing CC, Koskela-Staples N, et al. Adaptive Mobile Health Intervention for Adolescents with Asthma: Iterative User-Centered Development. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth*. 2020;8(5):e18400. doi:10.2196/18400

78. Shrier LA, Rhoads A, Burke P, Walls C, Blood EA. Real-time, contextual intervention using mobile technology to reduce marijuana use among youth: a pilot study. *Addictive Behaviors*. 2014;39(1):173-180.

79. Cole M, Gary K, Meier M, Gonzales N, Pina A, Stoll R. *Utilizing the Fediverse and AI-Bots for Youth Engagement During COVID-19 in a Hybrid Preventative Intervention*.; 2024. Accessed February 23, 2024. https://hdl.handle.net/10125/106848

80. Chand A, Gonzalez M, Missig J, Phanichphant P, Sun PF. Balance Pass: Service Design for a Healthy College Lifestyle. In: *CHI '06 Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. CHI EA '06. Association for Computing Machinery; 2006:1813-1818. doi:10.1145/1125451.1125795

81. Weitzel JA, Bernhardt JM, Usdan S, Mays D, Glanz K. Using Wireless Handheld Computers and Tailored Text Messaging to Reduce Negative Consequences of Drinking Alcohol. *J Stud Alcohol Drugs*. 2007;68(4):534-537. doi:10.15288/jsad.2007.68.534

82. Braciszewski JM, Tzilos Wernette GK, Moore RS, et al. Developing a Tailored Substance Use Intervention for Youth Exiting Foster Care. *Child Abuse Negl*. 2018;77:211-221. doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2018.01.013

83. Fortier M, Chung W, Martinez A, Gago-Masague S, Sender L. Pain buddy: A novel use of m-health in the management of children's cancer pain. *COMPUTERS IN BIOLOGY AND MEDICINE*. 2016;76:202-214. doi:10.1016/j.compbiomed.2016.07.012

84. Zainal NH, Liu X, Leong U, Yan X, Chakraborty B. Bridging Innovation and Equity: Advancing Public Health Through Just-in-Time Adaptive Interventions. *Annual Review of Public Health*. 2025;46(Volume 46, 2025):43-68. doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-071723-103909

85. Klasnja P, Hekler EB, Shiffman S, et al. Micro-Randomized Trials: An Experimental Design for Developing Just-in-Time Adaptive Interventions. *Health Psychol*. 2015;34(0):1220-1228. doi:10.1037/hea0000305

86. Steele RG, Hall JA, Christofferson JL. Conceptualizing Digital Stress in Adolescents and Young Adults: Toward the Development of an Empirically Based Model. *Clin Child Fam Psychol Rev*. 2020;23(1):15-26. doi:10.1007/s10567-019-00300-5

87. Holly L, Demaio S, Kickbusch I. Public health interventions to address digital determinants of children's health and wellbeing. *The Lancet Public Health*. 2024;9(9):e700-e704. doi:10.1016/S2468-2667(24)00180-4

88. Verhulst SG. Operationalizing digital self-determination. *Data & Policy*. 2023;5:e14. doi:10.1017/dap.2023.11

89. Lee AR, Koo D, Kim IK, Lee E, Yoo S, Lee HY. Opportunities and challenges of a dynamic consent-based application: personalized options for personal health data sharing and utilization. *BMC Medical Ethics*. 2024;25(1):92. doi:10.1186/s12910-024-01091-3

90. Budin-Ljøsne I, Teare HJA, Kaye J, et al. Dynamic Consent: a potential solution to some of the challenges of modern biomedical research. *BMC Med Ethics*. 2017;18(1):1-10. doi:10.1186/s12910-016-0162-9

91. Kaye J, Whitley EA, Lund D, Morrison M, Teare H, Melham K. Dynamic consent: a patient interface for twenty-first century research networks. *Eur J Hum Genet*. 2015;23(2):141-146. doi:10.1038/ejhg.2014.71

92. Lee AR, Koo D, Kim IK, Lee E, Yoo S, Lee HY. Opportunities and challenges of a dynamic consent-based application: personalized options for personal health data sharing and utilization. *BMC Medical Ethics*. 2024;25(1):92. doi:10.1186/s12910-024-01091-3

93. Kassam I, Ilkina D, Kemp J, Roble H, Carter-Langford A, Shen N. Patient Perspectives and Preferences for Consent in the Digital Health Context: State-of-the-art Literature Review. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*. 2023;25(1):e42507. doi:10.2196/42507