

1 *Research Article*

2 **Access to internet, smartphone usage, and acceptability of mobile health**  
3 **technology among cancer patients**

4 **Rashmika Potdar <sup>a</sup>, Arun Thomas <sup>b</sup>, Matthew DiMeglio <sup>c\*</sup>, Kamran Mohiuddin <sup>d</sup>,**  
5 **Djeneba Audrey Djibo <sup>e</sup>, Krzysztof Laudanski <sup>f, g</sup>, Claudia M. Dourado <sup>h</sup>, John**  
6 **Charles Leighton <sup>h</sup>, Jean G. Ford <sup>b</sup>**

7  
8 a.) Department of Hematology and Oncology, Geisinger Medical Center, Danville, PA, USA

9 b.) Department of Internal Medicine, Einstein Health Network, Philadelphia, PA, USA

10 c.) DO/MBA Student, Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, USA

11 d.) Department of Emergency Medicine, Einstein Health Network, Philadelphia, PA, USA

12 e.) Department of Research, Einstein Health Network, Philadelphia, PA, USA

13 f.) Department of Anesthesiology and Critical Care, Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania,  
14 Philadelphia, PA, USA

15 g.) Leonard Davis Institute of Health Economics, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA,  
16 USA

17 h.) Department of Hematology and Oncology, Einstein Health Network, Philadelphia, PA, USA

18

19 \* Correspondence: Matthew DiMeglio, MBA (matthewdi@pcom.edu), Tel: (609) 839-7820

20

21 **Author Email Addresses:**

22 Rashmika Potdar (rpotdar@geisinger.edu)

23 Arun Thomas (thomasa@einstein.edu)

24 Matthew DiMeglio (matthewdi@pcom.edu)

25 Kamran Mohiuddin (mohiuddink@einstein.edu)

26 Djeneba Audrey Djibo (adjibo@icloud.com)

27 Krzysztof Laudanski (klaudanski@gmail.com)

28 Claudia Dourado (DouradoC@einstein.edu)

29 John Leighton (LEIGHTOJ@einstein.edu)

30 Jean Ford (fordjean@einstein.edu)

31

32 **Abstract:**

33 **Purpose:**

34 The use of mobile health (mHealth) technologies to augment patient care, enables providers to  
35 communicate remotely with patients enhancing the quality of care and patient engagement. Few  
36 studies addressed barriers to its implementation, especially in medically underserved populations.

37 **Methods:**

38 A cross-sectional study of 151 cancer patients was conducted at an academic medical center in the  
39 United States. A trained interviewer performed structured interviews regarding the barriers and  
40 facilitators of patients' current and desired utilization of technology for healthcare services.

41 **Results:**

42 Of the 151 participants, 35.8% were male and ages ranged from 21-104 years. Only 73.5% of  
43 participants currently have daily access to internet, and 68.2% currently own a smartphone capable  
44 of displaying mobile applications. Among all participants, utilization of a daily mHealth application  
45 was significantly higher in patients with a college-level degree (OR; 2.78,  $p<0.01$ ) and lower in older  
46 patients (OR; 0.05,  $p<0.01$ ). Differences in utilization when adjusted for current smartphone use and  
47 daily access to internet were nonsignificant. Among smartphone users, the desire to increase cancer  
48 knowledge was associated with a higher likelihood of utilizing a mHealth application (OR; 261.53,  
49  $p<0.01$ ).

50 **Conclusion:**

51 The study suggests the access to mobile technology is the predominant determinant of utilization.  
52 Healthcare organizations should consider these factors when launching patient engagement platforms.

53 **Keywords:**

54 mobile health, mHealth, mobile applications, cancer, health disparities

55 **1. Introduction**

56 As mortality rates continue to decrease among cancer patients in the United States, health care  
57 systems are faced with a growing population with complex medical, psychological, and social needs  
58 (1). This has caused comprehensive care that extends years beyond treatment initiation. However,  
59 lapses in care continue to persist and much progress is needed to improve quality among cancer  
60 survivors (2). Mobile health (mHealth) technology has served as a tool that can potentially address  
61 these needs and encourage active participation among patients in a variety of care settings including  
62 cancer-related care (3–5).

63 The integration of mobile health (mHealth) applications in cancer care have been widely  
64 discussed and proposed roles include augmenting clinical processes, managing chemotherapy-  
65 related side effects, and supporting drug adherence (6,7). The current role of mHealth in oncology  
66 has been limited to self-management, and the quality of cancer-related mobile applications varies  
67 drastically (8,9). A recent study found that while the acceptance of mHealth technology was high  
68 among cancer patients, adoption of such technology is low. Factors predictive of the use of mHealth  
69 in this population included rural residency and a new diagnosis of cancer, indicating that geography  
70 and education are driving motivators for mHealth utilization (10).

71 Mobile health has also been proposed as a potential tool to reduce health disparities among  
72 underserved populations through improved health literacy, medication adherence, and clinical  
73 outcomes (11). Low health literacy has been associated with several poor health outcomes and  
74 partially explains the racial and socioeconomic disparities in care (12,13). While the data regarding  
75 the efficacy of implementing mHealth initiatives are low quality and scarce, the current data that  
76 exists is promising (5,8). A recent meta-analysis of mHealth-based interventions among breast  
77 cancer patients found that interventions consistently improved quality-of-life measures among these  
78 patients, albeit the data on the psychological effect of these interventions is less conclusive (14).  
79 However, another meta-analysis reported in pain, fatigue, and other psychological outcomes among  
80 cancer survivors utilizing mHealth-based interventions (15). This suggests that the data on the  
81 efficacy of mHealth on both cancer survivorship and those undergoing treatment is still an emerging  
82 and exciting area of research.

83 This purpose of this study was to investigate factors associated with a willingness to utilize a  
84 mHealth application for general health maintenance among a cohort of cancer patients at an  
85 academic medical center that services a very socioeconomically diverse and medically under-served  
86 population. This study was initially launched as a quality improvement project seeking new patient  
87 engagement platforms. We hypothesized that while the acceptability of a mHealth application for  
88 cancer-related health information will be quite high, it will be limited by education-related factors  
89 and current technology use patterns. Specifically, we believe that (1) patients without current daily  
90 internet will be less accepting of a mHealth application and (2) patients that currently lack a  
91 smartphone will be less accepting of a mHealth application than their counterparts with this  
92 technology.

## 93 **2. Materials and Methods**

### 94 *2.1 Study Design and Participants*

95 This is a cross-sectional study of cancer patients attending the outpatient clinic and infusion  
96 center at an academic medical center in Philadelphia. The target population was adults with  
97 Inclusion criteria consisted of (1) age greater than 18 years, (2) diagnosis of malignancy, and (3)  
98 willingness to participate. Before administration, the survey was evaluated by the institutional  
99 review board (IRB) at the host institution and was deemed IRB exempt. Data was collected over a  
100 1-month period in 2018.

### 101 *2.2. Survey Development*

102 This survey was designed by one of the authors (R.P.). The survey consisted of basic  
103 demographic information (age, gender, highest education, and marital status) followed by a series of  
104 questions regarding access to the internet and mobile technology. Previous use of mHealth  
105 applications as well as desired use of mHealth applications was also evaluated. All questions were  
106 arranged in yes/no format for simplicity. Also, the participants were asked to answer the questions  
107 irrespective of current technology use (*i.e.* using a mobile application on a smartphone in  
108 participants currently without a smartphone).

109 The survey was initially tested among a pilot population of 76 participants and subsequently  
110 expanded to a target of 150 participants. The sample size was determined using an a priori power

111 analysis estimating a 20% mean difference in mHealth acceptability based on educational  
112 achievement with a Type I error rate of 0.05% and Type II error rate of 20%. Analysis indicated that  
113 99 patients would be required to detect this difference.

#### 114 *2.3 Data Collection*

115 Eligible participants were approached and given explanations regarding the purpose,  
116 significance, and methods of the study. After receiving consent, a trained interviewer performed  
117 structured interviews using the survey as a guide. Study data were collected and managed using  
118 Research Electronic Data Capture (REDCap) tools hosted at the study site (16).

#### 119 *2.4 Statistical Analysis*

120 The data were analyzed using Statistica® Version 13.0 (TIBCO Software Inc.) and Graphpad®  
121 PRISM 6.0 (Graphpad Software Inc.). Demographic variables were characterized by descriptive  
122 statistics. Chi-Square test for association was utilized for categorical variables. Statistical  
123 significance was defined as  $p < 0.05$  on a two-tailed distribution. Finally, adjusted odds ratios from  
124 logistic regression analysis were presented to identify the effects of demographic information and  
125 survey answers on a patient's willingness to utilize an application for monitoring their health  
126 condition. Adjusted odds ratio reported as (OR; mean,  $CI_{95\%}$ ,  $p$ -value).

### 127 **3. Results**


128 A total of 151 participants were approached and all participants consented to the survey (100%  
129 response rate). The demographic information of participants is summarized in Table 1. The mean  
130 age of participants was  $62.3 \pm 14.4$  years of age and consisted of 35.8% male. Race demographics  
131 were not collected after the pilot population was expanded, but the pilot population consisted  
132 primarily of minority groups (83.1%). While 60.3% of participants had a high school degree or less,  
133 39.7% obtained at least an undergraduate degree with 5.9% of total participants achieved additional  
134 education (Table 1).

135 The response distribution of selected survey items is outlined in Table 2. Interestingly, only  
136 73.5% of survey respondents have daily access to internet services. Individuals without internet  
137 tended to be older (mean age of  $71.9 \pm 11.2$  vs.  $58.8 \pm 13.9$ ) and less educated (12.5% with a college  
138 degree vs. 49.5%) than their counterparts with internet. Similar characteristics were seen in

139 individuals that lacked either a mobile phone or smartphone (Table 2). Among the 106 individuals  
140 that currently own a smartphone, 60.4% use phone that operates iOS software (iPhone®) and 39.6%  
141 use a phone that operates Android software (Samsung®, LG®, etc.). The frequency of previous,  
142 defined as over the past 6 months, mobile access to general health and personal health information  
143 was similar (53% and 51.7% respectively). However, 59 participants (39.1% of total) neither  
144 accessed general nor personal health information while 66 participants (43.7% of total) utilized both  
145 forms of health technology (Table 2).

146 Future-oriented survey items (items 12 through 16) evaluated different aspects of integrating  
147 mHealth technology into practice and were met with modest support overall. However, acceptance  
148 was significantly different based on current technology utilization. Among individuals without  
149 access to the internet, the mean acceptance rate of future-oriented items was 7.5%. This pattern was  
150 also demonstrated in individuals lacking a mobile phone (4.2%) and smartphone (2.3%) (data not  
151 shown).

152 Regarding demographic factors influencing the willingness to utilize a mobile application for  
153 daily health monitoring, acceptance was significantly associated with both age and educational  
154 achievement (table 3). Willingness to utilize a mHealth application was highest in individuals <50  
155 years of age (83.3% favorable) and lowest in individuals >80 years of age (82.4% unfavorable).  
156 Logistic regression revealed that age groups 61-70 (OR; 0.24, 0.07-0.90,  $p<0.01$ ), 71-80 (OR; 0.05,  
157 0.01-0.23,  $p<0.01$ ), and >80 years (OR; 0.04, 0.01-0.22,  $p<0.01$ ) were significantly less likely to  
158 utilize a daily mHealth application than individuals <50 years (Figure 1A). 71.7% of individuals with  
159 at least a college degree were favorable of a mHealth application compared to 41.8% of individuals  
160 without a college education (OR; 2.78, 1.25-5.88,  $p<0.01$ ) (Table 3 & Figure 1A). No significant  
161 differences in race, gender, or marital status were identified. However, differences among age groups  
162 and education were eliminated when adjusting for current smartphone use (Figure 1B).



163

164 **Figure 1.** Factors associated with willingness to utilize a daily mobile application for health

165 monitoring among all participants (A) and current smartphone users (B) reported as odds ratio.

166 Reference group for education, gender, and age was high school or less, male, and <50 years

167 respectively.

168 A desire to increase cancer-related knowledge was associated with an increased odds of

169 utilizing a daily mHealth application (OR; 261.5, 10.13 – 6748.71,  $p < 0.01$ ). Interestingly, no other

170 features of a mobile application exhibited significant associations despite being similar in nature


171 (Figure 2B). Evaluation of the frequency of each response revealed that of the 81 participants that

172 were willing to use a daily mobile application, 80 (98.8%) also desired an application to increase

173 cancer-related knowledge. Conversely, of the 70 individuals not willing to utilize a daily

174 application, 63 (90.0%) also did not desire an application to increase their cancer-related knowledge

175 (data not shown).



176

177 **Figure 2.** Willingness to utilize a daily mHealth application among smartphone users based on  
178 previous and desired mHealth formats reported as odds ratios. Reference value for each activity was  
179 the negative response (no).

#### 180 **4. Discussion**

181 This study aimed to investigate the factors associated with the willingness to utilize a mHealth  
182 application among a population of cancer patients in a socioeconomically diverse and medically  
183 underserved community. Our study revealed that while the acceptability of mHealth technology was  
184 hindered by age and education-related barriers among all participants, these factors were eliminated  
185 when evaluating current smartphone users and those with daily access to internet. This suggests that  
186 past technology use is highly indicative of adoption of future technology such as a daily mobile  
187 application for cancer-related health. These findings also indicate that access to technology  
188 facilitates health-promotion activities among a predominate minority and socioeconomically diverse  
189 population.

190 Several studies have identified gaps in internet access along sociodemographic boundaries such  
191 that individuals with lower income, lower education, and identify as a racial minority are less likely  
192 to have access to internet services (17,18). These findings, coupled with the abundant literature  
193 linking the prevalence of inadequate health literacy and poor clinical outcomes among African-  
194 Americans, further highlight the need for mHealth applications among minority populations in the  
195 United States (11,12,19).

196 Our study both confirms and expands upon the previous literature. Previous literature has  
197 reported both high acceptability and positive outcome measures among cancer patients utilizing  
198 mHealth-based interventions (9,10,14,20). However, our study has investigated both the  
199 acceptability and feasibility of mHealth-based interventions among a population of predominately  
200 racial minorities and of lower socioeconomic status. While our study reported an overall acceptance  
201 of a mHealth application for health information among cancer patients, we found that our  
202 population faces technology-related barriers at a higher prevalence than the rest of the United States.  
203 The rate of daily internet access among our patient (73.5%) is much lower than a recent Pew  
204 Research estimate of 90% (21). Our population also had a much lower rate of both a mobile phone



205 (84.1%) and smartphone ownership (68.2%) than a recent national estimate of 96% and 81%  
206 respectively (**22**). This highlights a concern regarding implementation of smartphone-based patient  
207 engagement platforms because a large percentage of patients would be excluded from participation.  
208 Considering the existence of many cheap smartphones within the United States, future studies  
209 should investigate both monetary and non-monetary factors related to smartphone adoption among  
210 low-income communities.

211 We found that the desire to increase cancer knowledge was significantly associated with an  
212 increased likelihood of utilizing a daily mHealth application for cancer-related information among  
213 current smartphone users. Interestingly, we found that past mHealth-related use patterns (accessing  
214 personal or general health information on a smartphone) was not associated with the willingness to  
215 utilize a daily mHealth application. This suggests that although current smartphone users may not  
216 have accessed personal or general health information in the past, future mHealth applications that  
217 integrate cancer education with patient health information shows promise in terms of patient  
218 acceptance. This offers an exciting avenue for future patient engagement initiatives.

219 There are several limitations in this study. This study investigated only a small subset of  
220 patients within a population of predominately low socioeconomic status, so the results are likely not  
221 generalizable to the overall population. While a *post hoc* power analysis indicated that our study  
222 was adequately powered to detect the observed differences, there is always the possibility of  
223 detecting a difference that is not present in the overall population given our sample size. Our study  
224 also only evaluated the willingness of a theoretical mobile application, therefore further research is  
225 required to develop and test a mobile application within this population.

## 226 **5. Conclusions**

227 The potential use of mHealth-based interventions in a socioeconomically diverse population  
228 offers several barriers and opportunities. The relatively lower rates of daily internet access and  
229 smartphone use in a low-income patient population appear to be the largest barrier to mHealth  
230 acceptance, while education and age-related barriers are eliminated when adjusting for current  
231 smartphone use. The desire to increase cancer knowledge was significantly associated with an

232 increased likelihood to utilize a daily mHealth application and offers an opportunity to integrate  
233 patient education with future mHealth-based interventions.

#### 234 **Supplementary Materials**

235 Supplementary File 1. Patient Questionnaire

#### 236 **Author Contributions:**

237 Conceptualization, study design, and methodology, R.P., K.M., C.D., J.L., and J.F; data analysis,  
238 M.D. and K.L.; writing – original draft preparation, M.D. and K.L.; writing – reviewing and editing,  
239 all authors participated.

#### 240 **IRB Statement**

241 The study was approved by the institutional ethics committee at the host institution and was  
242 conducted in concordance with the tenets of the Declaration of Helsinki

#### 243 **Data Availability**

244 Data will be made accessible upon reasonable request and in accordance with institutional review  
245 board data transfer guidelines.

#### 246 **Funding:**

247 This project received no external funding from any public or private sources.

#### 248 **Conflicts of Interest:**

249 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

#### 250 **References**

- 251 1. Jemal A, Center MM, DeSantis C, Ward EM. Global Patterns of Cancer Incidence and Mortality  
252 Rates and Trends. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2010 Aug 1;19(8):1893–907.
- 253 2. Mayer DK, Shapiro CL, Jacobson P, McCabe MS. Assuring Quality Cancer Survivorship Care:  
254 We've Only Just Begun. *Am Soc Clin Oncol Educ Book Am Soc Clin Oncol Annu Meet.*  
255 2015;e583-591.
- 256 3. Bhavnani SP, Narula J, Sengupta PP. Mobile technology and the digitization of healthcare. *Eur*  
257 *Heart J.* 2016 May 7;37(18):1428–38.

- 258 4. Helbostad JL, Vereijken B, Becker C, Todd C, Taraldsen K, Pijnappels M, et al. Mobile Health  
259 Applications to Promote Active and Healthy Ageing. *Sensors*. 2017 Mar 18;17(3).
- 260 5. McKay FH, Cheng C, Wright A, Shill J, Stephens H, Uccellini M. Evaluating mobile phone  
261 applications for health behaviour change: A systematic review. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2018  
262 Jan;24(1):22–30.
- 263 6. Odeh B, Kayyali R, Nabhani-Gebara S, Philip N. Optimizing cancer care through mobile health.  
264 *Support Care Cancer Off J Multinatl Assoc Support Care Cancer*. 2015 Jul;23(7):2183–8.
- 265 7. Cannon C. Telehealth, Mobile Applications, and Wearable Devices are Expanding Cancer Care  
266 Beyond Walls. *Semin Oncol Nurs*. 2018;34(2):118–25.
- 267 8. Nasi G, Cucciniello M, Guerrazzi C. The role of mobile technologies in health care processes:  
268 the case of cancer supportive care. *J Med Internet Res*. 2015 Feb 12;17(2):e26.
- 269 9. Böhme C, von Osthoff MB, Frey K, Hübner J. Qualitative evaluation of mobile cancer apps  
270 with particular attention to the target group, content, and advertising. *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol*.  
271 2018 Jan 1;144(1):173–81.
- 272 10. Jiang Y, West BT, Barton DL, Harris MR. Acceptance and Use of eHealth/mHealth  
273 Applications for Self-Management Among Cancer Survivors. *Stud Health Technol Inform*.  
274 2017;245:131–5.
- 275 11. Kim H, Goldsmith JV, Sengupta S, Mahmood A, Powell MP, Bhatt J, et al. Mobile Health  
276 Application and e-Health Literacy: Opportunities and Concerns for Cancer Patients and  
277 Caregivers. *J Cancer Educ Off J Am Assoc Cancer Educ*. 2019 Feb;34(1):3–8.
- 278 12. Berkman ND, Sheridan SL, Donahue KE, Halpern DJ, Crotty K. Low health literacy and health  
279 outcomes: an updated systematic review. *Ann Intern Med*. 2011 Jul 19;155(2):97–107.

- 280 13. Kim H, Xie B. Health literacy in the eHealth era: A systematic review of the literature. *Patient*  
281 *Educ Couns*. 2017;100(6):1073–82.
- 282 14. Jongerius C, Russo S, Mazzocco K, Pravettoni G. Research-Tested Mobile Apps for Breast  
283 *Cancer Care: Systematic Review*. *JMIR MHealth UHealth*. 2019 11;7(2):e10930.
- 284 15. Hernandez Silva E, Lawler S, Langbecker D. The effectiveness of mHealth for self-management  
285 in improving pain, psychological distress, fatigue, and sleep in cancer survivors: a systematic  
286 review. *J Cancer Surviv Res Pract*. 2019 Feb;13(1):97–107.
- 287 16. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data  
288 capture (REDCap)—A metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing  
289 translational research informatics support. *J Biomed Inform*. 2009 Apr 1;42(2):377–81.
- 290 17. Tsetsi E, Rains SA. Smartphone Internet access and use: Extending the digital divide and usage  
291 gap. *Mob Media Commun*. 2017 Sep 1;5(3):239–55.
- 292 18. McCloud RF, Okechukwu CA, Sorensen G, Viswanath K. Beyond access: barriers to internet  
293 health information seeking among the urban poor. *J Am Med Inform Assoc JAMIA*.  
294 2016;23(6):1053–9.
- 295 19. Al Sayah F, Majumdar SR, Egede LE, Johnson JA. Associations between health literacy and  
296 health outcomes in a predominantly low-income african american population with type 2  
297 diabetes. *J Health Commun*. 2015;20(5):581–8.
- 298 20. Boceta J, Samper D, de la Torre A, Sánchez-de la Rosa R, González G. Usability, Acceptability,  
299 and Usefulness of an mHealth App for Diagnosing and Monitoring Patients With Breakthrough  
300 *Cancer Pain*. *JMIR Cancer [Internet]*. 2019 Apr 1 [cited 2019 Aug 19];5(1). Available from:  
301 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6462894/>

- 302 21. Anderson M, Perrin A, Jiang J, Kumar M. 10% of Americans don't use the internet. Who are  
303 they? [Internet]. Pew Research Center. 2019 [cited 2019 Aug 19]. Available from:  
304 [https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/04/22/some-americans-dont-use-the-internet-](https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/04/22/some-americans-dont-use-the-internet-who-are-they/)  
305 [who-are-they/](https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/04/22/some-americans-dont-use-the-internet-who-are-they/)
- 306 22. Pew Research Center. Fact Sheet: Demographics of Mobile Device Ownership and Adoption in  
307 the United States [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2019 Aug 19]. Available from:  
308 <https://www.pewinternet.org/fact-sheet/mobile>  
309

310 **Tables**

311 **Table 1.** Demographic Information of Participants ( $N = 151$ )

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b><i>n</i> (%)</b>
<i>Age</i>	
< 50	24 (15.9)
51-60	43 (28.5)
61-70	40 (26.5)
71-80	27 (17.9)
> 80	17 (11.3)
<i>Race (n=76)</i>	
Black	54 (71.1)
White	15 (19.7)
Hispanic	4 (5.3)
Asian	3 (3.9)
<i>Gender</i>	
Male	54 (35.8)
Female	97 (64.2)
<i>Education</i>	
High School or Less	91 (60.3)
College or More	60 (39.7)
<i>Marital Status</i>	
Married	64 (42.4)
Single	74 (49.0)
Divorced	13 (8.6)

312

313

314 **Table 2.** Response Distribution of Selected Survey Items

<b>Item #</b>	<b>Survey Item</b>		<b>n</b>	<b>(%)</b>
1	<i>Do you currently have daily access to the Internet?</i>	Yes	111	(73.5)
		No	40	(26.5)
2	<i>Do you currently own a mobile phone?</i>	Yes	127	(84.1)
		No	24	(15.9)
7	<i>Do you currently own a smartphone?</i>	Yes	103	(68.2)
		No	48	(31.8)
10	<i>In the last six months, have you used your phone to access general health information?</i>	Yes	80	(53.0)
		No	71	(47.0)
11	<i>In the last six months, have you used your phone to access your health care information (e.g. to schedule appointments)?</i>	Yes	78	(51.7)
		No	73	(48.3)
12	<i>Would you want to be able to access general information related to your health/cancer via your smartphone?</i>	Yes	88	(58.3)
		No	63	(41.7)
13	<i>Would you want to receive text messages on your phone related to your health/cancer from your doctor's office?</i>	Yes	93	(61.6)
		No	58	(38.4)
14	<i>Would you want to use your phone to help track your cancer related information via an application or "app" on your smartphone?</i>	Yes	79	(52.3)
		No	72	(47.7)
15	<i>Would you download an application or "app" to your phone to help increase your cancer-related knowledge?</i>	Yes	87	(57.6)
		No	64	(42.4)
16	<i>Would you be willing to use an application or "app" on your phone daily to help monitor your health condition?</i>	Yes	81	(53.6)
		No	70	(46.4)

316 **Table 3.** Comparison of demographic information to the willingness to use an application for daily health monitoring  
 317 (Survey Item #16)

Characteristic	Willing to Utilize Application <i>n</i> (%)	Not Willing to Utilize Application <i>n</i> (%)	Chi-square test of independence ( $\chi^2$ )
<i>Age</i>			
< 50	20 (83.3)	4 (16.7)	$\chi^2$ (4) = 39.7
51-60	29 (67.4)	14 (32.6)	$p < 0.01$
61-70	23 (57.5)	17 (42.5)	
71-80	6 (22.2)	21 (77.8)	
> 80	3 (17.7)	14 (82.4)	
<i>Race (n=76)</i>			
Black	24 (44.4)	30 (55.6)	$\chi^2$ (3) = 2.86
White	5 (33.3)	10 (66.7)	$p = 0.41$
Hispanic	3 (75.0)	1 (25.0)	
Asian	2 (66.7)	1 (33.3)	
<i>Gender</i>			
Male	30 (55.6)	24 (44.4)	$\chi^2$ (1) = 0.12
Female	51 (52.6)	46 (47.4)	$p = 0.73$
<i>Education</i>			
High School or Less	38 (41.8)	53 (58.2)	$\chi^2$ (1) = 13.0
College or More	43 (71.7)	17 (28.3)	$p < 0.01$
<i>Marital Status</i>			
Married	35 (54.7)	29 (45.3)	$\chi^2$ (2) = 0.05
Single	39 (52.7)	35 (47.3)	$p = 0.97$
Divorced	7 (53.9)	6 (46.1)	

318