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Abstract

Health informatics interventions pose a particular risk of producing intervention-generated inequalities by disproportionately benefiting more advantaged people. We discuss characteristics of interventions known to produce IGIs, explain why health informatics interventions are particularly vulnerable to this phenomenon, and describe safeguards that can be implemented to improve health equity through attention to equity issues at four phases of the “intervention cycle”: efficacy, uptake, service access/provision, and usage/adherence. Key safeguards involve developing interventions that focus on “upstream” factors leading to poor health, and that are at least as effective in health disparities populations as in other groups, and potentially even more effective. Additionally, adoption of equity-aware strategies to facilitate access, uptake, and adherence are critical. We conclude with a discussion of evaluation and measurement approaches that will ensure that IGIs are recognized and studied.

Panel Description

Those of us who have chosen to conduct research in health informatics have typically done so hoping to make a difference in healthcare. We hold aspirations of improve well-being, of improving health care better, and of reducing human suffering due to disease. Many of us also care specifically about reducing health disparities, or well-documented differences the incidence and prevalence of disease, as well as disease-related morbidity, mortality and survival rates in one group when compared to the general population. Because we have such good intentions, we often think the worst thing that could happen is that our efforts would have no effect. However, there is a more pernicious possibility: that our technological interventions do work, but they work better for those who are already better off. When this happens, our work actually increases inequality. This phenomenon, well established in public health, is known as “intervention-generated inequality” (IGI). Unfortunately, health informatics interventions pose a particular risk for producing IGIs by disproportionately benefiting more advantaged people.

This panel aims to build awareness of the potential for IGIs, and to explore potential strategies for mitigating them. A health informatics intervention can produce inequality if it is (1) more effective among socioeconomically advantaged groups, (2) more accessible to advantaged groups, (3) adopted more frequently by advantaged groups, or (4) adhered to more closely by advantaged groups. Each of these four options represents a stage of the “intervention cycle,” times at which time there is a need to guard against the possibility of IGIs. Accordingly, we will organize our panel around each of these phases, as well as reporting.

Overview of Intervention-Generated Inequalities (IGI) (Tiffany Veinot)

Beginning with the motivating example of smoking cessation efforts, the concept of IGIs will be defined. Next, the factors that place HI intervention strategies at risk of producing IGI will be introduced, and their potential emergence at each stage of the intervention cycle illustrated. Differences between population-based and disparity population-focused intervention strategies will also be emphasized.

IGI stemming from differential efficacy (Andrea G. Parker)

The first stage of intervention cycle at which inequalities might emerge is efficacy, where an intervention works better for one group than another. For example, people with lower socioeconomic status (SES) are less likely to have a healthy diet (1), and more likely to be obese (2, 3); yet, technology-based interventions targeting these outcomes are more effective in those with higher SES (4-7). An explanation for this is that traditional obesity interventions that are equity-negative in low-SES populations focus on “downstream” strategies like the provision of information and nutrition counseling to individuals to facilitate their behavior change (8, 9). In contrast, interventions that are equity-positive in low-SES populations focused on “upstream” factors at the structural and environmental level, like making
environmental changes that make healthy eating and exercise easier — such as food pricing policies and transportation to exercise facilities (8, 9). Thus, IGI may be mitigated by emphasizing “upstream” informatics intervention strategies such as: (1) supporting environmental changes via ambient technologies (10); (2) catalyzing community activism concerning health (11, 12); (3) providing health equity-focused, social computing-based surveillance and decision support for elected and administrative decision makers such as urban planners and public health officials (e.g., (13)); (4) expansion of access to resources through coordination and process simplification (e.g., (14)); and (5) developing targeted informatics interventions focused on health disparity populations.

**IGI stemming from differential access (Tiffany Veinot)**

When interventions are available through the consumer market, healthcare organizations and employers, this will create inequitable access. For instance, commercial health tracking devices are used more by people with higher than lower education levels and incomes (15). Technologies made available through healthcare will also reliably reach more well-off people; even in countries with universal healthcare access such as the UK, low-SES people are less likely to go to the doctor for preventative care (16). Corporate wellness programs may also give away or stimulate use of tracking technologies, which advantaged employed people. The information technology platforms through which we deliver interventions also tend to be more accessible to educated, well-off, young, and urban people (17-20). Healthcare provider bias can also emerge when a technology must be offered to a patient, or it use encouraged (21). Consequently, we advocate partnerships with nonprofit organizations and public libraries to provide intervention access, continued design for older technological infrastructures such as SMS, and making linkage to informatics interventions routine, rather than requiring opt-in from providers.

**IGI stemming from differential uptake/adoption (Courtney Lyles)**

Health interventions for the public are marked by an “inverse equity law,” whereby population-focused interventions initially widen social inequalities due to “preferential uptake” by more advantaged groups (22). A key example of this law is patient portals: while patient portals are being widely implemented and may contribute to improved health outcomes, there is evidence that racial/ethnic minorities and patients with limited health literacy, income, and education are less likely to use portals (23-26), despite uniformly high interest in online access to personal health records (27). The differences in portal use cannot be attributed to computer/Internet access alone (25). Potential reasons for nonuse include lack of awareness (27), lack of sufficient computer skills (25), reduced ability to understand medical content or limited health literacy, differential perceptions of the value of portal features (28), poor usability of portal websites/interfaces (29), need for provider or system support (30), and concerns about online security (25). These findings suggest issues to address in patient portal implementation, which can be addressed in part through targeted approaches such as trust-centered design (31) and tailored training programs.

**IGI stemming from differential usage/adherence (Katie Siek)**

Inequalities might also emerge in how intervention is used, and whether it is used as advised. Numerous studies have shown that people with less formal education are less likely to adhere to informatics interventions; this was present in interventions for mental health (32, 33), smoking (34-36), alcohol consumption (37, 38), healthy eating and physical activity (39-41). Because an inability to use technologies is often a reason given for abandoning technologies (42, 43), we discuss designing usable systems for people with low literacy, who are more likely to have less formal education. We will contrast personal health usage with how people with disabilities abandon technologies designed for their abilities to re-appropriate commodity technologies and modify them for their own purposes. We encourage researchers to use a mix of user centered and participatory design techniques to better design systems for all abilities (44).

**Evaluation and Reporting (Jessica Ancker)**

When we study informatics interventions, we need to show not only whether the intervention is effective but also whether it improves or worsens equity. We need to design studies that include diverse participant samples, and power them to provide robust estimates of the effect overall and within subgroups of interest. Hence, if we want to show that our intervention is just as effective in low-literacy patients as high-literacy patients, we need to make sure we have included enough low-literacy patients to draw firm conclusions in subgroup analysis. We also advocate enforced reporting regarding the equity impact of interventions by the journals and conferences in which we publish. The first reporting guideline, CONSORT, was developed in the 1990s by a consortium of medical journals to standardize published descriptions of randomized trials; the goal was to ensure that reviewers and readers could assess the validity of the trial. Almost immediately, journals that enforced CONSORT documented an improvement in the quality of randomized trials. If the publication venues we respect required us to report the effect of our interventions on equity, the result would be more transparency about this topic which would lead, in the long run, to beneficial effects.
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