

Digital Divide and Health Disparities: An Analysis of the Effect of Technological Inequalities on Health Outcomes

Maria Fernanda Chavez Perez

Universidad Nacional del Altiplano (UNA)

Abstract

This comprehensive review examines the impact of limited access to digital technologies on healthcare outcomes. The findings highlight that people who lack access to the internet or other digital technologies are at risk of not being able to access important healthcare information, such as information about preventive care, disease management, or medication safety. This can result in poorer health outcomes due to a lack of knowledge or understanding of how to manage their health conditions. The study also highlights that limited access to telemedicine can be a significant barrier for people living in rural or remote areas, where access to healthcare services may be limited. Without access to the necessary technologies, such as a computer or smartphone, individuals may miss out on the benefits of remote healthcare services. Furthermore, the findings suggest that limited access to electronic health records (EHRs) can also be a barrier to quality healthcare. EHRs are an important tool for healthcare providers to make informed decisions about patient care, but without access to the internet or digital technologies, patients may not be able to access their health records or share them with their healthcare providers. The review highlights that limited access to healthcare services, such as online appointment scheduling, prescription refills, and test results, can result in delays in care or missed opportunities for preventive care for individuals without access to digital technologies. The findings of this review suggest that improving access to digital technologies is crucial for improving healthcare outcomes, especially for vulnerable populations. Policymakers and healthcare providers should consider implementing strategies to improve access to digital technologies for all individuals to ensure equitable access to healthcare services and improve health outcomes.

Keywords: Access, Digital technologies, Healthcare services, Health outcomes, Telemedicine

Introduction

The Digital Divide refers to the inequality of access to information and communication technologies (ICTs) that exist within and between countries. It is characterized by disparities in access to computers, the internet, and other digital technologies between different socio-economic, geographic, and demographic groups. The Digital Divide has been a major concern for policymakers, academics, and social activists since the emergence of the internet and other digital technologies. This paper provides an overview of the Digital Divide, its causes and

Submitted: 13 July 2022
Accepted: 30 December 2022
Published: 13 January 2023



consequences, and the policies and initiatives that have been developed to address this issue.

The Digital Divide is caused by a combination of factors that include economic, social, and political factors. The most important factor is economic, which is related to the cost of access to digital technologies. Low-income individuals and families cannot afford to purchase or maintain computers and internet services, which limits their ability to access online information and resources. In addition, the cost of digital technologies is higher in rural and remote areas, where the infrastructure is less developed and the economies of scale are lower.

Social factors also contribute to the Digital Divide. Certain groups, such as the elderly, people with disabilities, and those with low levels of education, are less likely to use digital technologies than others. This is partly due to a lack of skills and knowledge about how to use these technologies. In addition, there is a cultural dimension to the Digital Divide, where certain groups may not view digital technologies as relevant or important to their daily lives.

Political factors also play a role in the Digital Divide. Governments can either promote or hinder access to digital technologies through policies and regulations. In many developing countries, the lack of political will and resources to develop the necessary infrastructure and support services has hindered the growth of the internet and other digital technologies.

The Digital Divide has significant social, economic, and political consequences. Socially, it reinforces existing patterns of inequality and marginalization. Those who are already disadvantaged are further marginalized by their lack of access to digital technologies, which limits their ability to access information and resources, participate in social networks, and engage in political and civic activities.

Economically, the Digital Divide has implications for job opportunities and economic growth. Those who lack digital skills and access to digital technologies are at a disadvantage in the labor market, where many jobs require these skills. This limits their ability to earn a decent income and contributes to poverty and inequality. At the macro level, the Digital Divide can hinder economic growth and competitiveness, as countries with lower levels of access to digital technologies are less able to take advantage of the benefits of the digital economy.

Politically, the Digital Divide has implications for democracy and civic participation. Access to digital technologies is increasingly important for participating in political and civic activities, such as voting,

advocacy, and activism. Those who lack access to digital technologies are therefore less able to participate in these activities and have their voices heard. This can undermine the legitimacy of democratic institutions and processes, and reinforce existing patterns of political exclusion.

There have been a number of policies and initiatives developed to address the Digital Divide. These can be grouped into four broad categories: infrastructure development, access and affordability, digital skills and literacy, and content and relevance.

Infrastructure development refers to the development of the physical infrastructure necessary for digital technologies, such as broadband networks and mobile infrastructure. Governments can play an important role in promoting infrastructure development through public investment, public-private partnerships, and regulatory frameworks that promote competition and innovation.

Access and affordability initiatives focus on increasing access to digital technologies for marginalized and disadvantaged groups. This can involve measures such as subsidies for low-income families, community access programs, and initiatives to increase access in rural and remote areas. In addition, efforts to increase competition in the telecommunications market can help to reduce the cost of digital technologies and increase affordability.

Digital skills and literacy initiatives focus on increasing the skills and knowledge necessary to effectively use digital technologies. This can involve educational programs and training for both individuals and organizations, as well as initiatives to promote digital literacy and skills development in schools and universities.

Content and relevance initiatives focus on increasing the availability of relevant and useful content in digital formats. This can involve efforts to digitize and make available cultural and educational resources, as well as initiatives to promote the creation and dissemination of locally relevant content.

Health disparities refer to differences in health outcomes and access to healthcare that exist between different population groups. Health disparities are influenced by a range of social, economic, and environmental factors, including race, ethnicity, gender, income, education, and geographic location. Health disparities have significant social, economic, and public health implications, and addressing these disparities is a key priority for policymakers, healthcare providers, and public health practitioners.

The causes of health disparities are complex and multifaceted, and are influenced by a range of social, economic, and environmental factors. One of the most important factors is socioeconomic status (SES), which is strongly associated with differences in health outcomes and access to healthcare. Individuals with lower SES are more likely to experience a range of health problems, including chronic diseases, infectious diseases, and mental health issues. This is due to a range of factors, including lower levels of education, limited access to healthcare, and greater exposure to environmental hazards.

Race and ethnicity are also important factors that contribute to health disparities. Minority groups, including African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans, experience higher rates of chronic diseases, such as diabetes, heart disease, and cancer, compared to white Americans. This is partly due to disparities in access to healthcare, as well as greater exposure to environmental and social risk factors, such as poverty, discrimination, and limited access to healthy food and safe living environments.

Gender is another factor that contributes to health disparities. Women experience higher rates of certain health conditions, such as autoimmune diseases and mental health disorders, compared to men. In addition, women may face barriers to accessing healthcare due to cultural norms and expectations around gender roles and responsibilities.

Impacts of digital divide on healthcare outcome

Limited access to healthcare information:

Limited access to healthcare information is a significant issue that affects a large proportion of the population. With the increasing prevalence of digital technologies, healthcare information has become more accessible and readily available to the general public. However, not everyone has access to the internet or other digital technologies, which means they may miss out on crucial healthcare information. This can have detrimental effects on their health outcomes.

Preventive care is an essential aspect of healthcare that can help prevent the onset of chronic illnesses. However, without access to information about preventive care, individuals may not know how to maintain a healthy lifestyle or identify the early warning signs of chronic diseases. This lack of knowledge can lead to delayed diagnosis and treatment of chronic illnesses, which can result in poor health outcomes and decreased quality of life.

Managing chronic illnesses can be challenging, and patients require access to accurate and up-to-date information about their condition and how to manage it effectively. Without access to this information, patients may struggle to manage their symptoms, adhere to medication regimes or make appropriate lifestyle changes. This can lead to worsening of their condition, increased healthcare costs, and reduced quality of life.

Medication safety is another critical aspect of healthcare that can be challenging to understand without access to healthcare information. Patients may not know how to take their medication correctly, what side effects to expect, or when to seek medical attention. This can result in medication errors, adverse drug reactions, or non-adherence to medication regimes. These issues can cause severe harm to the patient and result in hospitalization, increased healthcare costs, and reduced quality of life.

Limited access to healthcare information can also affect vulnerable populations, such as low-income families, the elderly, and those living in rural areas. These populations may not have access to digital technologies or may lack the necessary literacy skills to understand healthcare information. As a result, they may not receive the same level of care as other individuals, leading to poorer health outcomes and reduced quality of life.

The lack of access to healthcare information can also exacerbate existing health disparities, particularly among minority populations. These populations may already face significant barriers to accessing healthcare services, and limited access to healthcare information can compound these challenges. This can result in increased rates of chronic illnesses, reduced life expectancy, and decreased quality of life.

To address the issue of limited access to healthcare information, healthcare providers must adopt strategies that ensure equitable access to healthcare information. This may include providing printed materials or holding in-person educational sessions for patients who do not have access to digital technologies. Additionally, healthcare providers can partner with community organizations to provide healthcare information to vulnerable populations, such as those living in rural areas or low-income families. By taking these steps, healthcare providers can help improve health outcomes and reduce health disparities for all individuals.

In conclusion, limited access to healthcare information is a significant issue that can have detrimental effects on individuals' health outcomes.

Without access to healthcare information, patients may struggle to maintain a healthy lifestyle, manage chronic illnesses, or understand medication safety. This can lead to poor health outcomes, increased healthcare costs, and reduced quality of life. To address this issue, healthcare providers must adopt strategies that ensure equitable access to healthcare information for all individuals, particularly vulnerable populations. By doing so, we can improve health outcomes and reduce health disparities for all individuals, regardless of their access to digital technologies.

Limited access to telemedicine:

Limited access to telemedicine can have significant consequences for individuals and communities. The ability to access healthcare services remotely can be life-saving, especially for people living in rural or remote areas. Telemedicine provides patients with access to healthcare professionals and services that may not be available in their local area. Without telemedicine, people in remote areas may need to travel long distances to receive medical care, which can be costly, time-consuming, and even dangerous. Limited access to telemedicine, therefore, creates an uneven distribution of healthcare services, disadvantaging those who do not have access to these technologies.

Furthermore, limited access to telemedicine can result in health disparities. People who live in urban areas may have greater access to healthcare services and technologies than those in rural areas. Telemedicine can bridge this gap by providing remote healthcare services to those who live in remote and rural areas. However, if people do not have access to the necessary technologies, they may be left behind, creating further health disparities. These disparities can have long-lasting effects on individuals and communities, impacting their quality of life, healthcare outcomes, and overall well-being.

Limited access to telemedicine can also impact vulnerable populations, such as the elderly or people with disabilities. Telemedicine can provide these populations with a convenient and accessible way to receive healthcare services. However, without access to the necessary technologies, they may be unable to utilize these services. This can result in increased social isolation, decreased quality of life, and even preventable health complications. It is essential to ensure that all populations, including vulnerable populations, have access to telemedicine services to improve their overall health outcomes.

Moreover, limited access to telemedicine can impact healthcare professionals as well. Telemedicine provides healthcare professionals

with an alternative way to deliver healthcare services and reach patients in remote areas. Without access to telemedicine, healthcare professionals may not be able to provide the same level of care to all patients, leading to further healthcare disparities. Additionally, telemedicine can help alleviate the burden on healthcare professionals, particularly in areas with a shortage of healthcare professionals. However, limited access to telemedicine may prevent healthcare professionals from taking advantage of these benefits, leaving them overburdened and unable to provide adequate care.

Limited access to telemedicine can also impact healthcare costs. Telemedicine can be a cost-effective alternative to traditional healthcare services, particularly for patients who live in remote or rural areas. It can also help reduce healthcare costs by reducing the need for travel, reducing hospital stays, and decreasing the number of emergency room visits. However, without access to telemedicine, patients may be forced to incur additional costs associated with travel, accommodations, and missed work. This can further exacerbate the financial burden on patients and their families, creating additional stress and difficulties.

Finally, limited access to telemedicine can impact the adoption of digital healthcare technologies. Telemedicine is just one of many digital healthcare technologies that have the potential to transform healthcare. However, if people do not have access to these technologies, they may be less likely to adopt them. This can slow down the adoption of digital healthcare technologies, which can have significant consequences for the healthcare industry. Without widespread adoption, the healthcare industry may be slow to innovate, limiting the potential benefits that these technologies can offer.

In conclusion, limited access to telemedicine can have far-reaching consequences for individuals, communities, healthcare professionals, healthcare costs, and the healthcare industry as a whole. It is essential to ensure that all populations have access to telemedicine services to improve healthcare outcomes and reduce healthcare disparities. This can be achieved through targeted investments in digital healthcare technologies, infrastructure, and education. By prioritizing telemedicine access, we can create a more equitable and efficient healthcare system that benefits all.

Limited access to health records:

Limited access to health records can have serious consequences for patients who are not able to access their own medical information. Electronic health records (EHRs) have been widely adopted in the

healthcare industry as a way to improve patient care and outcomes. However, not everyone has equal access to digital technologies and the internet. As a result, patients who do not have access to these resources may be at a disadvantage when it comes to accessing and sharing their health records with healthcare providers. This could lead to delays in treatment or even medical errors, which could have serious consequences for the patient.

One of the most significant problems associated with limited access to health records is the potential for medical errors. When healthcare providers do not have access to a patient's complete medical history, they may make incorrect or incomplete diagnoses or prescribe inappropriate treatments. This can lead to adverse health outcomes and can even be life-threatening in some cases. Patients who are unable to access their own health records may also be at risk of medication errors if they are prescribed medications that interact negatively with other drugs they are taking or have previously taken.

Another problem associated with limited access to health records is the potential for missed or delayed diagnoses. When patients are unable to provide their healthcare providers with a complete medical history, there is a risk that important information may be missed, leading to missed or delayed diagnoses. For example, a patient who has a family history of a certain disease may be at higher risk of developing that disease themselves. If the patient is unable to provide this information to their healthcare provider, the provider may not be aware of the increased risk and may not order appropriate screening tests or preventive measures.

Limited access to health records can also have an impact on patient safety. When patients are unable to access their own medical information, they may not be aware of potential safety risks associated with certain treatments or procedures. For example, a patient who has a history of adverse reactions to a particular medication may not be able to communicate this to their healthcare provider if they are unable to access their health records. This could result in the patient being prescribed a medication that could cause a serious adverse reaction, putting their safety at risk.

In addition to these risks, limited access to health records can also have financial consequences for patients. When patients are unable to access their own medical information, they may be forced to undergo unnecessary tests or procedures, which can be costly. Additionally, patients may be at a disadvantage when it comes to negotiating with

insurance providers or understanding their insurance coverage if they are unable to access their own health records.

Another consequence of limited access to health records is the potential for reduced patient engagement. Patients who are unable to access their own medical information may feel less engaged in their own healthcare and may be less likely to take an active role in their own care. This can lead to decreased adherence to treatment plans and reduced overall health outcomes.

Finally, limited access to health records can have broader implications for public health. When patients are unable to share their health records with healthcare providers, it can be more difficult to track the spread of infectious diseases or identify potential public health threats. This can have serious consequences for public health, particularly in the event of a pandemic or other public health emergency.

In conclusion, limited access to health records can have serious consequences for patients, healthcare providers, and public health more broadly. It is important that efforts are made to ensure that all patients have equal access to their own medical information, regardless of their access to digital technologies or the internet. By addressing these issues, we can help to improve patient outcomes, reduce healthcare costs, and promote public health.

Limited access to healthcare services:

Limited access to healthcare services is a significant issue that can lead to delays in care and missed opportunities for preventive care. With the increasing availability of online healthcare services, many individuals can access healthcare services conveniently and remotely. However, those without access to the internet or other digital technologies may miss out on these services, leading to poorer health outcomes.

Appointment scheduling is a critical aspect of healthcare, and individuals who do not have access to digital technologies may struggle to schedule appointments efficiently. This can lead to delays in care, missed appointments, and reduced access to preventive care. Delayed diagnosis and treatment can result in poorer health outcomes and increased healthcare costs.

Prescription refills are another healthcare service that is increasingly available online. However, individuals without access to the internet or digital technologies may struggle to refill their prescriptions, leading to non-adherence to medication regimes and worsening of their condition.

This can result in increased healthcare costs, hospitalization, and reduced quality of life.

Test results are another aspect of healthcare services that are now available online, providing individuals with faster access to important information about their health. However, those without access to the internet or digital technologies may not receive their test results promptly, leading to delays in diagnosis and treatment. This can result in poorer health outcomes, increased healthcare costs, and reduced quality of life.

Vulnerable populations, such as low-income families, the elderly, and those living in rural areas, may be more affected by limited access to healthcare services. These populations may lack access to digital technologies or have lower literacy levels, making it more challenging to access healthcare services. This can lead to reduced access to preventive care, delays in diagnosis and treatment, and poorer health outcomes.

Limited access to healthcare services can also exacerbate existing health disparities, particularly among minority populations. These populations may already face significant barriers to accessing healthcare services, and limited access to digital technologies can compound these challenges. This can lead to increased rates of chronic illnesses, reduced life expectancy, and decreased quality of life.

To address the issue of limited access to healthcare services, healthcare providers must adopt strategies that ensure equitable access to healthcare services. This may include providing alternative methods for appointment scheduling, such as phone or in-person scheduling. Healthcare providers can also partner with community organizations to provide transportation services to individuals who struggle to access healthcare services due to their location or lack of transportation. By taking these steps, healthcare providers can help improve access to healthcare services and reduce health disparities for all individuals.

In conclusion, limited access to healthcare services is a significant issue that can lead to delays in care and missed opportunities for preventive care. Without access to digital technologies, individuals may struggle to access appointment scheduling, prescription refills, and test results. This can lead to poorer health outcomes, increased healthcare costs, and reduced quality of life. To address this issue, healthcare providers must adopt strategies that ensure equitable access to healthcare services for all individuals, particularly vulnerable populations. By doing so, we can

improve health outcomes and reduce health disparities for all individuals, regardless of their access to digital technologies.

Conclusion

Health disparities have significant social, economic, and public health consequences. Socially, health disparities reinforce existing patterns of inequality and discrimination, and can lead to stigma and social exclusion. Health disparities can also lead to a loss of productivity and reduced quality of life for individuals and families affected by these disparities.

Economically, health disparities can lead to higher healthcare costs, lost productivity, and reduced economic growth. Individuals and families affected by health disparities may incur higher healthcare costs due to the greater prevalence of chronic diseases and other health problems. In addition, the economic costs of lost productivity due to illness and disability can be significant, particularly for low-income families and communities.

Public health consequences of health disparities include increased rates of morbidity and mortality, as well as reduced life expectancy. Health disparities can also contribute to the spread of infectious diseases, as individuals with limited access to healthcare are less likely to receive necessary vaccinations and treatment.

There have been a number of policies and initiatives developed to address health disparities. These can be grouped into four broad categories: healthcare access and affordability, prevention and early intervention, health education and literacy, and community-based interventions.

Healthcare access and affordability initiatives focus on increasing access to healthcare for marginalized and disadvantaged groups. This can involve measures such as Medicaid expansion, subsidies for low-income families, and community health centers. In addition, efforts to increase the availability of primary care and preventive services can help to reduce the burden of chronic diseases and other health problems.

Prevention and early intervention initiatives focus on identifying and addressing health disparities before they become more severe. This can involve measures such as screening and early detection programs, as well as initiatives to promote healthy behaviors and lifestyles.

Health education and literacy initiatives focus on increasing knowledge and understanding of health issues among marginalized and

disadvantaged groups. This can involve educational programs and resources that are culturally appropriate and tailored to the specific needs of these groups.

Community-based interventions focus on addressing health disparities at the community level, by mobilizing resources and engaging community members in efforts to promote health and prevent disease. These interventions can include initiatives such as community health fairs, health education workshops, and outreach programs.

Health disparities are a significant public health challenge. Addressing health disparities requires a comprehensive and coordinated response, with a focus on policies and initiatives that increase access to healthcare, promote prevention and early intervention, improve health education and literacy, and engage communities in efforts to promote health and prevent disease. Efforts to address health disparities can lead to improved health outcomes and reduced healthcare costs, as well as greater social inclusion and equity.

(B. M. Compaine, 2001; Cooper, 2006; Cullen, 2001; Friemel, 2016; Fuchs & Horak, 2008; Gunkel, 2003; Hargittai, 2003; Mossberger et al., 2003; Schradie, 2011; Selwyn, 2004; Servon, 2008; van Deursen & van Dijk, 2014; van Dijk, 2006; van Dijk & Hacker, 2003; Warschauer, 2002, 2003, 2004) (Adugna et al., 2020; Barrera Ferro et al., 2020; Cupples et al., 2012; Eisen et al., 2021; Floyd & Sakellariou, 2017; Haenssge & Ariana, 2017; Javanparast et al., 2018; S. E. Karakolias & Polyzos, 2014; S. Karakolias & Kastanioti, 2018; S. Karakolias & Polyzos, 2015; Stefanos Karakolias et al., 2017; Khayat et al., 2022; Mirza et al., 2014; Nikolaos Polyzos et al., 2015, 2016; Nikos Polyzos et al., 2014; Rivera et al., 2020; Sotodeh Manesh et al., 2022; Tam et al., 2022; Taylor, 2021; Vozikis et al., 2021; Wagner et al., 2013; Winchester & King, 2018; Womersley et al., 2021)

References

Adugna, M. B., Nabbouh, F., Shehata, S., & Ghahari, S. (2020). Barriers and facilitators to healthcare access for children with disabilities in low and middle income sub-Saharan African countries: a scoping review. *BMC Health Services Research*, 20(1), 15. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-019-4822-6>

-
- Barrera Ferro, D., Brailsford, S., Bravo, C., & Smith, H. (2020). Improving healthcare access management by predicting patient no-show behaviour. *Decision Support Systems*, 138, 113398. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2020.113398>
- Compaine, B. M. (2001). *The digital divide: Facing a crisis or creating a myth?* (Benjamin M. Compaine, Ed.). MIT Press. <https://books.google.at/books?id=MbareJicwKAC>
- Cooper, J. (2006). The digital divide: the special case of gender. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 22(5), 320–334. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2729.2006.00185.x>
- Cullen, R. (2001). Addressing the digital divide. *Online Information Review*, 25(5), 311–320. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14684520110410517>
- Cupples, M. E., Hart, P. M., Johnston, A., & Jackson, A. J. (2012). Improving healthcare access for people with visual impairment and blindness. *BMJ*, 344, e542. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.e542>
- Eisen, M., Poddig, M., Seebass, J. V., Hackelberg, F., Wacker, B., & Schlueter, J. (2021). Rising inequality and spatial social segregation due to urbanization and increasing housing prices. In *Research Square*. Research Square. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-785562/v1>

-
- Floyd, A., & Sakellariou, D. (2017). Healthcare access for refugee women with limited literacy: layers of disadvantage. *International Journal for Equity in Health*, 16(1), 195. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-017-0694-8>
- Friemel, T. N. (2016). The digital divide has grown old: Determinants of a digital divide among seniors. *New Media & Society*, 18(2), 313–331. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444814538648>
- Fuchs, C., & Horak, E. (2008). Africa and the digital divide. *Telematics and Informatics*, 25(2), 99–116. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2006.06.004>
- Gunkel, D. J. (2003). Second Thoughts: Toward a Critique of the Digital Divide. *New Media & Society*, 5(4), 499–522. <https://doi.org/10.1177/146144480354003>
- Haenssger, M. J., & Ariana, P. (2017). Healthcare access: A sequence-sensitive approach. *SSM - Population Health*, 3, 37–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmph.2016.11.008>
- Hargittai, E. (2003). The digital divide and what to do about it. *New Economy Handbook*, 2003, 821–839. <http://www.webuse.org/webuse.org/pdf/Hargittai-DigitalDivideWhatToDo2007.pdf>
- Javanparast, S., Windle, A., Freeman, T., & Baum, F. (2018). Community Health Worker Programs to Improve Healthcare Access and Equity: Are They Only Relevant to Low- and

Middle-Income Countries? *International Journal of Health Policy and Management*, 7(10), 943–954.
<https://doi.org/10.15171/ijhpm.2018.53>

Karakolias, S. E., & Polyzos, N. M. (2014). The newly established unified healthcare fund (EOPYY): current situation and proposed structural changes, towards an upgraded model of primary health care, in Greece. *Health*, 2014.
https://www.scirp.org/html/2-8202748_44338.htm

Karakolias, S., & Kastanioti, C. (2018). Application of an organizational assessment tool of primary health care. *Arch Hell Med*, 35, 497–505. <http://www.mednet.gr/archives/2018-4/497abs.html>

Karakolias, S., & Polyzos, N. (2015). Application and assessment of a financial distress projection model in private general clinics. *Archives of Hellenic Medicine/Arheia Ellenikes Iatrikes*, 32(4).
<https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&profile=ehost&scope=site&authtype=crawler&jrnl=11053992&AN=108792389&h=vfWbltq0P%2FbOJ2pDL99Fz2EZiU%2BQ0FxmWfQk2Ka7huehSr%2FS51h%2ByV31%2FmA%2BCJWnROWTUQ%2FJPWt9cZYyP4Vghg%3D%3D&crI=c>

Karakolias, Stefanos, Kastanioti, C., Theodorou, M., & Polyzos, N. (2017). Primary care doctors' assessment of and preferences on their remuneration. *Inquiry: A Journal of Medical Care*

Organization, Provision and Financing, 54, 46958017692274.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0046958017692274>

Khayat, F., Teron, L., & Rasoulyan, F. (2022). COVID-19 and health inequality: the nexus of race, income and mortality in New York City. *International Journal of Human Rights in Healthcare*, 15(4), 363–372. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijhrh-05-2021-0110>

Mirza, M., Luna, R., Mathews, B., Hasnain, R., Hebert, E., Niebauer, A., & Mishra, U. D. (2014). Barriers to healthcare access among refugees with disabilities and chronic health conditions resettled in the US Midwest. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health / Center for Minority Public Health*, 16(4), 733–742. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10903-013-9906-5>

Mossberger, K., Tolbert, C. J., & Stansbury, M. (2003). *Virtual inequality: Beyond the digital divide*. Georgetown University Press. <https://books.google.at/books?id=IEzJIG0ByJgC>

Polyzos, Nikolaos, Karakolias, S., Mavridoglou, G., Gkorezis, P., & Zilidis, C. (2015). Current and future insight into human resources for health in Greece. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 03(05), 5–14. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2015.35002>

Polyzos, Nikolaos, Kastanioti, C., Zilidis, C., Mavridoglou, G., Karakolias, S., Litsa, P., Menegakis, V., & Kani, C. (2016). Greek National E-Prescribing System: Preliminary Results of a Tool for Rationalizing Pharmaceutical Use and Cost. *Global*

Journal of Health Science, 8(10), 55711.

<https://doi.org/10.5539/gjhs.v8n10p241>

- Polyzos, Nikos, Karakolias, S., Dikeos, C., Theodorou, M., Kastanioti, C., Mama, K., Polizoidis, P., Skamnakis, C., Tsairidis, C., & Thireos, E. (2014). The introduction of Greek Central Health Fund: Has the reform met its goal in the sector of Primary Health Care or is there a new model needed? *BMC Health Services Research*, 14, 583. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-014-0583-4>
- Rivera, M. P., Katki, H. A., Tanner, N. T., Triplette, M., Sakoda, L. C., Wiener, R. S., Cardarelli, R., Carter-Harris, L., Crothers, K., Fathi, J. T., Ford, M. E., Smith, R., Winn, R. A., Wisnivesky, J. P., Henderson, L. M., & Aldrich, M. C. (2020). Addressing Disparities in Lung Cancer Screening Eligibility and Healthcare Access. An Official American Thoracic Society Statement. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine*, 202(7), e95–e112. <https://doi.org/10.1164/rccm.202008-3053ST>
- Schradie, J. (2011). The digital production gap: The digital divide and Web 2.0 collide. *Poetics*, 39(2), 145–168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2011.02.003>
- Selwyn, N. (2004). Reconsidering Political and Popular Understandings of the Digital Divide. *New Media & Society*, 6(3), 341–362. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444804042519>

-
- Servon, L. J. (2008). *Bridging the digital divide: Technology, community and public policy* [PDF]. Wiley-Blackwell.
<https://books.google.at/books?id=3NX4HUM2zOoC>
- Sotodeh Manesh, S., Hedayati Zafarghandi, M., Merati, Z., Ebrahimzadeh, J., & Delpasand, M. (2022). Inequality trends in the distribution of healthcare human resources in eastern Iran. *Proceedings of Singapore Healthcare, 31*, 201010582110411.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/20101058211041177>
- Tam, H. L., Leung, L. Y. L., & Wong, E. M. L. (2022). Integration of text messaging interventions into hypertension management among older adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *On Evidence-Based*
<https://sigmapubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/wvn.12549>
- Taylor, A. J. (2021). Recognizing cybersecurity threats in healthcare settings for effective risk management. In *Mobile Medicine* (pp. 177–182). Productivity Press.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003220473-14>
- van Deursen, A. J., & van Dijk, J. A. (2014). The digital divide shifts to differences in usage. *New Media & Society, 16*(3), 507–526.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444813487959>

-
- van Dijk, J. A. G. M. (2006). Digital divide research, achievements and shortcomings. *Poetics*, 34(4–5), 221–235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2006.05.004>
- van Dijk, J., & Hacker, K. (2003). The Digital Divide as a Complex and Dynamic Phenomenon. *The Information Society*, 19(4), 315–326. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01972240309487>
- Vozikis, A., Panagiotou, A., & Karakolias, S. (2021). A Tool for Litigation Risk Analysis for Medical Liability Cases. *HAPSc Policy Briefs Series*, 2(2), 268–277. <https://doi.org/10.12681/hapscpbs.29514>
- Wagner, J., Burke, G., Kuoch, T., Scully, M., Armeli, S., & Rajan, T. V. (2013). Trauma, healthcare access, and health outcomes among Southeast Asian refugees in Connecticut. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health / Center for Minority Public Health*, 15(6), 1065–1072. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10903-012-9715-2>
- Warschauer, M. (2002). Reconceptualizing the Digital Divide. *Florida Marine Research Institute Technical Reports*. <https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v7i7.967>
- Warschauer, M. (2003). Demystifying the digital divide. *Scientific American*, 289(2), 42–47. <https://doi.org/10.1038/scientificamerican0803-42>

Warschauer, M. (2004). *Technology and social inclusion: Rethinking the digital divide*. MIT Press.

<https://books.google.at/books?id=nU4zz1O88mAC>

Winchester, M. S., & King, B. (2018). Decentralization, healthcare access, and inequality in Mpumalanga, South Africa. *Health & Place*, *51*, 200–207.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2018.02.009>

Womersley, K., Ripullone, K., & Hirst, J. E. (2021). Tackling inequality in maternal health: Beyond the postpartum. *Future Healthcare Journal*, *8*(1), 31–35. <https://doi.org/10.7861/fhj.2020-0275>