A Study Examining How AI-Driven mHealth Applications Communicate Ethical Responsibilities To Patients

By Renske Baten and Dr. Banu Buruk

Background

Mobile health (**mHealth**), when combined with AI, has the potential to greatly impact the healthcare space. However, there is a need for attention on how mHealth influences the physician-patient relationship, and how balance can be maintained between data access and the ethical issues arising from the use of mHealth. This thesis investigates how a user manual and privacy policy of an mHealth app communicate ethical responsibilities to patients, by conducting **qualitative content analysis**.

Method

The **user manual and privacy statement** of "MS Sherpa", an app tracking user data of patients with MS, is analysed in the following overarching steps:

- The texts are segmented into different categories to get an overview of the substance.

- The texts are analyzed again while taking into account the EU's **Ethical Guidelines for Trustworthy AI** (EGTAI) as a theoretical framework [1]. The original categories are matched with the corresponging themes of the ethical framework.

- These two analyses are used to form a **coding scheme** (figure 1), which is used to code all the text segments with a specific code (figure 2).

After several rounds of coding and correcting the scheme, the code frequencies and context of the codes applied are used to evaluate which **ethical issues** the user manual and privacy statement adequately address, and which they do not.

Code	Sub-category	Category	Theme
1A1	App explanation		
1A2	App goal		
1A3	Physician involvement		
1A4	Participating hospital	1B. App Introduction	Accountability
1A5	Participating clinical trial		
1A6	Contact information		
1A7	Clinical validation		
2A1	Disadvantages to regular treatment		
2A2	Advantages app use	2B. Empowered Health Perspective	
2A3	Personalized treatment		
3A1	App/phone use		
3A2	Questionnaires	3B. User Guidance	Human agency and oversight
3A3	Notes		
3A4	Recommendations/key take-aways		
4A1	Walking test		
4A2	Cognition test	4B. Test Instructions	
4A3	Results		
5A1	Withdraw/give consent	5B. Privacy	
5A2	Rights and regulations		
6A1	Use of personal data		Privacy and Data governance
6A2	Storage of personal data	6B. Data	
6A3	Data access		
6A4	Data sharing		

Figure 1. Finalized coding scheme

Figure 2. Coding snippet

Conclusion

While it is relevant to look at what the analysis finds in the text, it might be even more relevant to regard what it does not find. The analysis shows that one of the most relevant themes mentioned in EGTAI, **transparency**, is excluded from the documents. Neither document explains how the system processes data, how AI contributes to generating results, or what the system's limitations are. Further review shows any information about the apps algorithms and AI use is absent from the MS Sherpa website[2] and related articles; the app's **proprietary algorithms remain opaque** to both patients and physicians. **Digital health applications may meet legal compliance requirements while still failing to provide patients with practical clarity and empowerment.**

mHealth developers must prioritize transparency and clear communication of ethical practices, especially concerning AI usage. Incorporating these considerations early on in the development process can not only enhance user trust but also **strengthen the physician-patient relationship** by fostering a shared understanding of how patient data is managed and protected.

Specifically for MS Sherpa, the user manual and privacy document could be extended with information about error handling, how information is extracted from the data generated, and where exactly AI comes into play.

References

1. Commission, E., Directorate-General for Communications Networks, C., & Technology. (2019). Ethics guidelines for trustworthy ai. Publications Office. doi: doi/10.2759/346720
2. Sherpa B.V. (2024). *Ms sherpa website*. Retrieved 02-12-2024, from https://www.mssherpa.nl/en/

Radboud Universiteit
IN·DEI·NOMINE·FELICITER