

1 **Research Article**

2 **Perceptions and willingness of patients and caregivers on the utilization of patient-**  
3 **generated health data: a cross-sectional survey**

4 Ye-Eun Park, BA<sup>1</sup>; Sang Sook Beck, PhD<sup>2</sup>; Yura Lee, MD PhD<sup>1\*</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup>Department of Information Medicine, Asan Medical Center, University of Ulsan College of  
6 Medicine, Seoul, Korea

7 <sup>2</sup>Asian Institute for Bioethics and Health law, General Complex B/D Yonsei University Health System, Seoul,  
8 Korea

9

10 \*Corresponding author: Yura Lee

11 Department of Information Medicine, Asan Medical Center, University of Ulsan College of Medicine,  
12 88 Olympic-ro 43-gil, Songpa-gu, Seoul 05505, Korea, Tel +82-2-3010-1498, Fax +82-2-3010-2531,

13 E-mail: haepary@naver.com

14

15 ¶These authors contributed equally to this work.

16

17

18

19 **Abstract**

20 **Background:**

21 Patient-generated health data (PGHD) are increasingly recognized for their potential to complement  
22 traditional healthcare data by offering continuous monitoring and enhanced patient management.  
23 Despite the growing interest in PGHD however, the perceptions and willingness of patients and  
24 caregivers to utilize this information in a clinical setting remain underexplored.

25 **Objective:**

26 This study aimed to assess the perceptions, expectations, and concerns of patients and caregivers  
27 regarding the clinical utilization of PGHD. The influence of demographic factors such as age and health  
28 status on these perceptions was also explored.

29 **Methods:**

30 A cross-sectional survey was conducted of 400 participants, including both patients and caregivers. The  
31 survey collected data on attitudes towards PGHD, experiences with health information management,  
32 and the willingness to share PGHD for clinical and secondary purposes. Statistical analysis was used to  
33 identify significant differences in perceptions based on demographics and health-related roles.

34 **Results:**

35 The analysis revealed significant variations in attitudes towards PGHD that were based on the  
36 participants' health-related roles, age, and gender. Older patients and male caregivers exhibited higher  
37 concerns about data privacy and security, while younger participants showed greater enthusiasm for  
38 using PGHD in managing their health. These findings highlighted diverse needs and expectations across  
39 different demographic groups.

40 **Conclusion:**

41 Consideration of demographics and role-based differences is very important when designing and  
42 implementing PGHD systems. Tailored approaches that address specific concerns and expectations can

43 enhance the acceptance and effectiveness of PGHD in clinical practice, ultimately fostering more  
44 patient-centered care.

45

46 **Keywords:** Patient generated health data; medical records; medical record linkage; data management;  
47 telemedicine; patient access to records; patient-centered care; personal health records; data utilization

48

## 49 **Introduction**

50 Patient-generated health data (PGHD) are created, recorded, or gathered by or from patients, family  
51 members or other caregivers to help address a health concern.(1) PGHD have been increasingly  
52 recognized in contemporary healthcare, primarily due to the unique benefits provided that extend  
53 beyond traditional healthcare data generated within medical institutions.(2) PGHD offer insights from  
54 a different perspective, aiding patients through continuous care, monitoring, and high-risk management.  
55 As the scope of PGHD includes everything from Patient-Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs) in  
56 classical clinical trials to various lifestyle choices related to health, this has emerged as a means to  
57 resolve the information blackout between medical visits.(3)

58 As a large axis of data for more precise medical services, PGHD are expected to contribute to a lowering  
59 the burden of medical costs and improvements in healthcare through a focus on prevention and high-  
60 risk management rather than on the services provided at hospitals and clinics.(4-6) In addition to  
61 continuity of care, PGHD are important in that they can better reflect real-world outcomes of clinical  
62 interventions by highlighting the patient's environment and health-related choices based on personal  
63 tendencies.(3, 7) PGHD provide greater transparency on the impacts of the care from medical  
64 institutions and can thereby improve the benefits of these interventions, such as improving the health  
65 outcomes of patients who actively use PGHD or through the co-production of applications between  
66 healthcare providers, caregivers and patients to ensure continuity of care.(8-10)

67 The use of PGHD is not without challenges and concerns, however. The ambiguous nature of the  
68 boundaries of PGHD poses significant issues regarding data protection and privacy.(11-13) The  
69 inherent difficulty in safeguarding this information, coupled with challenges in its integration, also  
70 makes it vulnerable to breaches.(14) Furthermore, the diverse needs associated with PGHD, given the  
71 broad categories involved, complicates its effective utilization.(3) These concerns highlight the  
72 necessity to adequately address privacy risks and ensure robust protection mechanisms to foster trust

73 and widespread acceptance of PGHD among patients and caregivers.

74 Given the aforementioned benefits and challenges, it will be imperative going forward to understand  
75 the perceptions of patients and caregivers regarding the use of PGHD. To achieve the meaningful and  
76 patient-centered utilization of these data, it is crucial to comprehend the views and attitudes of the  
77 primary stakeholders—the patients themselves. The sharing of clinically relevant information,  
78 including PGHD, is closely linked to patient engagement, which acts as a catalyst for improved  
79 treatment adherence, patient safety, and overall health outcomes. Thus, this study aimed to investigate  
80 the awareness and perceptions of PGHD among patients and caregivers, which are essential for driving  
81 patient participation in PGHD and achieving its full potential in healthcare.

82

## 83 **Methods**

84 The primary purpose of this survey study was to investigate patients' expectations and concerns about  
85 PGHD. We conducted a structured survey with the aim of examining the perceptions of patients and  
86 caregivers regarding the clinical utilization and secondary use of PGHD. Additionally, we sought to  
87 explore how PGHD is generated differently based on the characteristics of patients and their caregivers  
88 (such as age and disease classification) and to understand how they consumed the services associated  
89 with their PGHD.

90

## 91 **Questionnaire and Survey Design**

92 The questionnaire used in the study survey was designed to obtain data on how patients and caregivers  
93 primarily manage their health information and in what format, how they engage with Personal Health  
94 Record (PHR) services affiliated with healthcare institutions, and their perceptions regarding the  
95 secondary utilization of PGHD. The development process for this questionnaire involved discussions  
96 among the authors of this study, which included a medical regulatory/legal expert (SSB), and medical

97 informatics experts (YL, YEP). The survey underwent further modifications and enhancements through  
98 consultation with experts in healthcare institution-affiliated PGHD research (SY), a health IT industry  
99 professional (SYS), and a specialist in medical information-related laws and ethics (KY).(6, 7, 13, 15-  
100 18)

101 The categories used in the finalized questionnaire were broadly as follows:

102 (A) General information, including type of disease, health-related (care-related) role of respondent  
103 (patient/caregiver)

104 (B) Experience with health information management services with or without connection to  
105 institutions' Electronic Health Record (EHR)

106 (C) Willingness to consent to the primary (medical) purposes of using the PGHD within the medical  
107 institution,

108 (D) Willingness to consent to secondary (research; commercial) uses of the PGHD,

109 (E) Participatory processes that the respondents consider most important or are most curious about.

110 The response formats for each survey item were measured according to the nature of the questionnaire.  
111 These formats included the 4-point Likert scale (ranging from 1=Strongly Disagree to 4=Strongly  
112 Agree), Yes/No responses, single-choice selections, multiple-choice selections, and open-ended  
113 responses.

114

### 115 **Respondent enrolment**

116 A survey was conducted from 6 to 12 November 2023 targeting unspecified patients and caregivers  
117 who may utilize or have the potential to utilize PGHD. Participants were recruited through various  
118 patient communities including the Korean Leukemia Patient Association, Korean Type 1 Diabetes  
119 Patient Association, Korean Kidney Cancer Patient Association, Korean Neuroendocrine Tumor Patient

120 Association, Korean GIST (Gastrointestinal Stromal Tumor) Patient Association, Korean Congenital  
121 Heart Disease Patient Association, Cancer Patient Solidarity, and Korean Psoriasis Association. We  
122 recruited these participants by posting an announcement on public online patient communities, which  
123 included a link and a QR code to access the survey. We ensured that participants who provided consent  
124 to utilize their survey responses for research could respond to the structured questionnaire. Our aim was  
125 to recruit over 100 respondents each for chronic diseases, malignant diseases, and other diseases,  
126 because we considered the disease type to be most crucial feature for distinguishing subgroups.

127

## 128 **Statistical Analysis**

129 Following the completion of the survey, for a more detailed comparison of characteristics among survey  
130 respondents, we categorized these subjects into disease groups (congenital/genetic conditions, traumatic  
131 conditions, malignant conditions, chronic conditions, rare conditions, and others), health-related role of  
132 the respondents i.e. the patients themselves (Pt); caregivers of minor patients (CG-minor); caregivers  
133 of patients aged 70 or older or those unable to attend medical appointments alone (CG-elder); caregivers  
134 of adult patients not falling into the previous categories (CG-adult). We also stratified the participants  
135 by age group (20s, 30s, 40s, 50s and above).

136 We divided the survey participants into the following four groups to examine and compare their basic  
137 characteristics: Pt, CG-minor, CG-elder, and CG-adult, aiming to discern differences among responses  
138 through technical analysis of the survey data. We utilized the Kruskal-Wallis test in particular to verify  
139 the significance of response differences among three or more subgroups for categorical variables.  
140 Additionally, responses using a 4-point Likert scale, considered as continuous variables, were analyzed  
141 using one-way ANOVA. Prior to conducting the one-way ANOVA, we performed the Bartlett test to  
142 assess the homogeneity of variances across groups. In this analysis, response differences were  
143 considered statistically significant if the obtained p-value was less than 0.05. Data analysis was  
144 conducted using R (version 4.3.0).

145 **Results**

146 The final number of participants amounted to 400 after verifying and removing 4 duplicate responses.  
 147 In analyzing the distribution of gender across the health-related roles of the respondent groups, as shown  
 148 in **Table 1**, it was found that the CG-elder group had the highest proportion of males (43.2%). With  
 149 regard to the age distribution, the Pt group exhibited the highest percentages in both the 20s and over  
 150 50 categories which was statistically significant ( $P < 0.01$ ). Regarding primary health issues, the Pt,  
 151 CG-minor, and CG-elder groups predominantly reported chronic diseases (Pt: 40.3%, CG-minor: 60.9%,  
 152 CG-elder: 44.6%), whereas the CG-adult group showed the highest prevalence of malignant diseases  
 153 (56.6%). This discrepancy was statistically significant with a p-value below 0.01.

154

155 **Table 1.** Demographic and Health Characteristic Comparisons Across the Health-related Roles  
 156 of the Respondent Groups (Survey category A1-A4)

Variables	Pt (n=181, 45.3%)	CG-minor (n=92, 23%)	CG-elder (n=74, 18.5%)	CG-adult (n=53, 13.3%)	<i>P</i> - value	Total (n=400)
<b>Gender</b>					0.04	
<b>Male</b>	64 (35.4%)	21 (22.8%)	32 (43.2%)	17 (32.1%)		134 (33.5%)
<b>Female</b>	117 (64.6%)	71 (77.2%)	42(56.8%)	36 (67.9%)		266 (66.5%)
<b>Age</b>					$P < .01$	
<b>20s</b>	30 (16.6%)	3 (3.3%)	4 (5.4%)	5 (9.4%)		42 (10.5%)
<b>30s</b>	57 (31.5%)	20 (21.7%)	27 (36.5%)	26 (49.1%)		130



					(32.5%)
					170
	<b>40s</b>	63 (34.8%)	55 (59.8%)	34 (45.9%)	18 (34%)
					(42.5%)
	<b>Over 50</b>	31 (17.1%)	14 (15.2%)	9 (12.2%)	4 (7.5%)
					58
					(14.5%)
<b>Primary health issue</b>					<i>P</i> < .01
<b>Chronic diseases</b>					170
		73 (40.3%)	56 (60.9%)	33 (44.6%)	8 (15.1%)
					(42.5%)
<b>Malignant diseases</b>					121
		42 (23.2%)	19 (20.7%)	30 (40.5%)	30 (56.6%)
					(30.3%)
<b>Illness or disability caused by trauma</b>					58
		36 (19.9%)	7 (7.6%)	7 (9.5%)	8 (15.1%)
					(14.5%)
<b>Congenital or genetic diseases</b>					49
		29 (16%)	9 (9.8%)	4 (5.4%)	7 (13.2%)
					(12.3%)
<b>Rare diseases or others</b>					2
		1 (0.6%)	1 (1.1%)	0	0
					(0.5%)

157

158 An analysis was conducted on all survey items for each group except for the open-ended responses, and  
 159 significant differences were identified (**Tables 2 and 3**). Detailed analysis of the survey items for each  
 160 group can be found in the **Supporting Information (S1-3 Table)**.

161

162 **Table 2.** Analysis of Survey Item Significance Across the Participant Category Groups:  
 163 Experience with Health Information Management Services

No.	Questions	Disease Group	Health-Related Role	Age Group
A5	What methods do you usually use to record or manage your/your family's main health problems?	*	-	-
B1.	Have you ever used commercially available or downloadable apps from the app store (or a built-in app on your smartphone, such as Samsung Health or Apple Health) or a health information measuring device (such as a smartwatch) to measure or record your blood pressure, blood sugar, step counts, physical activity, and heart rate?	***	***	**
B2.	Have you ever used a patient app provided by your healthcare organization?	*	*	-
B2a.	→ (Y) Have you ever managed or searched for health information for yourself and your family using a patient app?	**	-	-
B2b.	→ (N) If you answered no, would you use a health management app service if your medical institution were to offer it?	***	*	**

164 Significant relationships are denoted by \* ( $P < .05$ ), \*\* ( $P < .01$ ), and \*\*\* ( $P < .001$ )

165

166

167 **Experience with Health Information Management Services: Significant Differences in**  
168 **Survey Items Across Disease-, Health-related Role, and Age- groups**

169 Regarding the methods for recording or managing health issues, analysis based on respondent diseases  
170 revealed that those with a primary traumatic condition showed the highest tendency to "not usually  
171 record or manage" at 24.1% (n=14/58), compared to other groups (Congenital/Genetic: 8.2%, n=4/49;  
172 Malignant: 13.2%, n=16/121; Chronic: 11.2%, n=19/170; Rare/Others: 0%, n=0/2). "Basic functions of  
173 a cell phone, smartphone, or a tablet such as photo album or note-taking apps" was the most frequent  
174 method to record or manage health information (151/400, 37.8%), except for respondents with chronic  
175 disease, 41.8% (n=71/170) of whom reported using "apps dedicated to disease/health management on  
176 a smartphone or tablet".

177 The question asking whether respondents had experienced using commercial PHR apps (i.e.,  
178 smartphone applications or devices) revealed distinct patterns based on disease type, health-related role,  
179 and age. In terms of disease type, respondents with chronic conditions reported the highest level of user  
180 experience with commercial PHR apps, with 78.8% (n=134/170) answering "Yes," compared to 37.9%  
181 (n=22/58) in the traumatic conditions group. Among all subjects who responded yes (n=247), the largest  
182 number of people indicated (multiple selection) that they measure physical activity (n=178), followed  
183 by blood sugar (n=114), heart rate (n=106), and blood pressure (n=85). Regarding health-related roles,  
184 the CG-minor group had the highest experience with PHR apps at 75% (n=69/92), followed by the Pt  
185 group at 66.9% (n=121/181). When considering age, the 20s age group had the lowest experience at  
186 52.4% (n=22/42), whereas the 40s age group had the highest at 70.6% (n=120/170).

187 When asked about the duration of PHR app use among those who had experience, 63.6% of the  
188 traumatic condition group reported less than 6 months of use (n=14/22), the only disease group where  
189 a majority of the respondents reported this duration. In terms responses to this question stratified by

190 age, respondents in their 30s were the only group to approach a majority reporting usage of less than 6  
191 months (49.2%; n=34/69). With regard to frequency of updating categorized by health-related roles,  
192 both the Pt and CG-minor groups reported daily recording in a majority of cases (Pt: 52.1%, n=63/121;  
193 CG-minor: 63.8%, n=44/69). When the respondents indicated why they stopped using PGHD apps, the  
194 most common reasons given were ‘Because it was bothersome’ (43.1%, 69/160), ‘Because it was  
195 difficult to use’ (30.0%, 48/160), and ‘Because it was not helpful for my health management’ (22.5%,  
196 36/160).

197 For the usage of patient apps provided by medical institutions (tethered PHR), respondents with  
198 malignant conditions reported the highest usage at 24% (n=29/121) compared to other disease groups  
199 (Congenital/Genetic: 16.3%, n=8/49; Traumatic: 27%, n=10/58; Chronic: 11.8%, n=20/170;  
200 Rare/Others: 0%, n=0/2). Regarding health-related roles, the Pt group responded 'yes' at the highest rate  
201 (20.4%, 37/181), followed by CG-minor (18.5%, 17/92). About two-thirds of the tethered PHR users  
202 responded that they have accessed health information through tethered PHR (65.1%, 41/63), and  
203 regardless of the respondent groups, the most commonly selected benefit of doing this was ‘It was  
204 helpful in the self-management of health and diseases’ (63.4%, 26/41). Regarding the willingness to  
205 use tethered PHR, analysis by health-related role showed that the CG-minor respondents had the highest  
206 intention to use at 86.8% (n=65/75). When classified by age group, the intention to use was lowest  
207 among those in their 20s at 60.5% (n=23/38). Conversely, respondents in their 40s and older expressed  
208 strong intentions to use, with rates exceeding 70% (40s: 81.9%, n=118/170; over 50: 73.9%, n=34/58).

209

210

211 **Table 3.** Analysis of Survey Item Significance Across Participant Category Groups: Attitude

212 Toward the Use of PGHD

No.	Questions	Disease Group	Health-Related Role	Age Group
C1.	To what extent do you agree to the collection of health-related information through health management apps or other health information measurement devices in combination with your medical information to make treatment plans and treatment-related decisions about you/your family?	-	-	-
D1.	To what extent do you agree with the use of your patient-generated health data (PGHD) for these research purposes?	-	-	-
D1b.	→ (Y) If you agree to the use of your or your family's data for research purposes, to what extent would you like the data to be used?	-	**	-
D1a.	→ (N) What is the main reason you refuse or hesitate to share your health data for research purposes?	-	-	-
D2.	If you agree to the use of your or your family member's PGHD for research purposes, do you want to know the specific research purpose and duration? Alternatively, would you like to agree to a comprehensive research goal to improve healthcare?	**	**	-

	To what extent do you agree with the use of combined			
E1.	medical data and PGHD for industrial/commercial purposes?	**	-	-
	What are the most important steps or information you			
F1.	would like to know when consenting to the use of your/your family's PGHD?	-	-	*

213 Significant relationships are denoted by \* ( $P < .05$ ), \*\* ( $P < .01$ ), and \*\*\* ( $P < .001$ )

214


215 **Attitude Toward the Use of PGHD: Significant Differences in Survey Items Across**  
 216 **Disease-, Health-related Role, and Age- groups**

217 Regarding the use of PGHD, respondents responded positively in the following order, regardless of  
 218 group: clinical use (89.3%, 357/400), research (84.8%, 339/400), and commercial/industrial use (74.8%,  
 219 299/400) (**Figure 1**). In terms of the reasons for not agreeing to the use of this information for research  
 220 purposes, the largest number of respondents (47.5%, 29/61) chose “Concerns regarding potential  
 221 damage or disadvantage due to personal information leakage.” This was also the reason given as the  
 222 issue of most concern with regard to commercial/industrial use (62.7%, 63/102) regardless of disease,  
 223 health-related role, or age. Regarding the consent for data utilization, in terms of health-related roles,  
 224 CG-minor respondents had the highest willingness for comprehensive data utilization including  
 225 identifiable data at 58% (n=47/92). Conversely, the CG-adult group showed a tendency towards  
 226 preferring anonymous data inclusion at 72.1% (n=31/53).


227 When assessing consent for the use of PGHD for research purposes, respondents were asked whether  
 228 they would prefer to give agreement to certain studies on an individual basis (Consent by specific  
 229 research purpose) or provide a blanket agreement that would require no further permission requests  
 230 (Comprehensive consent). Among the disease classifications, respondents with malignant conditions  
 231 were the only group where a majority (52.9%, n=64/121) opted for Comprehensive consent. Regarding

232 health-related roles, the CG-elder participants showed the highest inclination towards Comprehensive  
233 consent at 55.4% (n=41/74).


### (1) Health-related role of respondents



### (2) Age groups



### (3) Disease groups





235 **Figure 1.** Attitude toward the use of PGHD in accordance with the utilization purpose across the  
 236 Disease-, Health-related Role, and Age- groups  
 237

238 **Responses on the Consent for Secondary Use**

239 **Table 4** presents the top 5 most frequent responses regarding the reasons for choosing specific consent  
 240 by specific research purpose or comprehensive consent in response to the question, “If you agree to the  
 241 use of your or your family member’s PGHD for research purposes, do you want to know the specific  
 242 research purpose and duration? Alternatively, would you like to agree to a comprehensive research goal  
 243 to improve healthcare?” For respondents who chose specific consent by specific research purpose, the  
 244 reasons for their choice were as follows, listed in the order of frequency: “Want to know specific  
 245 research purposes, contents, and duration,” “Want to know how personal information is utilized in  
 246 research,” and “Concerns about privacy breach, misuse, etc.” On the other hand, for respondents who  
 247 selected comprehensive consent, the reasons for their choice were as follows, listed in order of  
 248 frequency: “For convenience,” “Think it will be helpful for research,” and “For time-saving due to  
 249 busyness.”

251 **Table 4.** Comparison of Reasons for Selecting Specific vs. Comprehensive Consent Among  
 252 Respondents

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Reason for Selecting Specific Consent by Specific Research Purpose</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Reason for Selecting Comprehensive Consent</b>	<b>Count</b>
<b>1</b>	Want to know specific research purposes, contents, duration, etc.	75	For convenience	51
<b>2</b>	Want to know how personal	51	Think it will be helpful for	24

	information is utilized in research		research	
3	Concerns about privacy breach, misuse, etc.	35	For time-saving due to busyness	5
4	Think it will help healthcare professionals, research	13	Because consent terms are complicated, didn't usually check content	5
5	Typically consider individual consent to be necessary	12	Trust in (research/institution/researcher)	4

253

254 The order in which respondents chose to answer the question “What are the most important steps or  
 255 information you would like to know when consenting to the use of your/your family’s PGHD?” was as  
 256 follows: 1. Results of data analysis, research results, and implications (41.5%, 166/400); 2. Data  
 257 protection and security issues related to data utilization (25.8%, 103/400); 3. Contact information on  
 258 the person in charge (17.5%, 70/400); 4. How to withdraw consent (14.5%, 58/400); 5. Others (0.7%,  
 259 3/400). All groups except the 20s respondent and traumatic conditions groups responded that they most  
 260 wanted to know about the results of PGHD utilization. These groups selected data protection and  
 261 security issues as their top priority.

262

### 263 **Other sub-responses and responses to open-ended questions**

264 Among the other responses regarding “Methods used to record or manage your/your family's main  
 265 health problems (A5a),” there were responses indicating the utilization of domestic, photo-centric social  
 266 networking service (SNS) applications, blogs and KakaoStory.(19) Additionally, there were responses  
 267 indicating management through devices capable of measuring blood glucose levels.

268 Among the content collected from open-ended and other responses, when asked about the best aspects

269 of using tethered PHR for managing or accessing health information (B2a1), responses included  
270 statements such as “It is easier to check test results compared to printed documents” and “I can directly  
271 access test results without having to print documents or inquire at the hospital.” Additionally, in the  
272 B2a1 question asking for additional explanations regarding the selected responses, respondents who  
273 chose “① It was helpful in the self-management of health and diseases” provided additional opinions  
274 such as “I can thoroughly review test results” and “It is beneficial to be able to double-check test results  
275 and appointment details.” Among respondents who selected “② I have a better understanding of the  
276 healthcare provider's explanations or treatment plans,” opinions such as “Studying and reviewing test  
277 results before appointments greatly helps in understanding, allowing for more in-depth questions to be  
278 asked to the attending physician,” were expressed. Additionally, there were statements like, “It's great  
279 to be able to inquire directly with the attending physician about any questions I have after reviewing  
280 test results, enabling a better consultation experience.”

281 Among respondents who had experience managing or seeking health information through patient apps,  
282 when asked about the frustrating aspect of using the app (B2a2), one of the other opinions expressed  
283 was “I wish test results could accumulate for over a year.” Additionally, those who selected the response  
284 “② I was rather confused because I did not know which information was correct” expressed opinions  
285 such as “I felt disappointed when occasionally there were readings that raised suspicion of measurement  
286 errors” and “It would be helpful if easily understandable terms were used.”

287

## 288 **Discussion**

289 This cross-sectional survey examined whether there were significant difference in the patient or  
290 caregiver patterns of health information management and attitudes toward PGHD usage, in accordance  
291 with health-related roles, disease types, and age group.

292

## 293 **Principal Results**

294 We observed differences between health-related role respondent groups based on whether they were  
295 patients themselves or guardians of patients who are minors, as well as their age and gender  
296 demographics. There were differences in the experience and frequency of recording PGHD among the  
297 health-related groups. Patients themselves and guardians of minor patients (CG-minor) showed higher  
298 rates of PGHD recording and daily usage compared to guardians of elderly or other adult patients. And  
299 we found that various types of patients and their guardians were favorable toward the use of PGHD  
300 (average agreement rate of 82.9%), with the most common reason for not agreeing with, or having  
301 concerns about, its use being personal information leakage.

302 Research on the user-specific characteristics of PGHD services, particularly with regard to the patients  
303 themselves and their guardians, remains sparse. A prior study reported that elderly adopters (mean age  
304 51.81 vs 43.81 years) tended to use the PGHD functions continuously.(20) However, that previous  
305 report compared two groups without specifically delineating between age groups nor differentiating  
306 between older adults directly utilizing the services and guardians doing so on their behalf and recording  
307 the data. We found herein that the PGHD recording experience significantly differed by age and disease  
308 ( $P < 0.01$ ), and that the chronic disease group had the highest usage rate of PGHD recording experience  
309 across the categories of disease type, health role, and age group (78.8%, 134/170). The next highest rate  
310 was among the guardians of minor patients (CG-minor) (75.0%, 69/92). These findings suggest that  
311 other than clinical needs requiring continuous information management, health-related roles may also  
312 affect the active use of PGHD.

313 The significance of our present study findings lies in the fact that we evaluated whether the actual users  
314 were patients themselves or their guardians and analyzed this distinction to derive meaningful results.  
315 Moreover, significant differences were observed in the utilization of patient apps provided by healthcare  
316 organizations, with guardians of minor patients exhibiting a higher willingness to do so. Regarding  
317 consent for data usage, guardians of minor patients were more inclined towards comprehensive consent

318 including identifiable data, while guardians in other groups preferred anonymous data inclusion.

319 These observations are related to the survey results showing that in cases where the response was  
320 'strongly agree' to the use of PGHD, more people used it for research purposes (n=100) than for clinical  
321 purposes (n=95). It seems that the subjects responded more actively to the use of PGHD for research  
322 purposes, even though it is a secondary purpose, because it has the potential to solve problems faced by  
323 cancer patients or patients with rare diseases. The respondents with the highest percentage of 'strongly  
324 agree' responses to the use of PGHD for research purposes were the malignant disease group (33.1%,  
325 40/121), and the group with the highest percentage of responses favoring research purposes over clinical  
326 purposes was the congenital/genetic disease group, with 28.6% (14/49) selecting research purposes  
327 compared to 18.4% (9/49) selecting clinical purposes, showing a 10.2% difference.

328 Our current analysis revealed disparities across age groups. Younger adults (20s and 30s) exhibited  
329 lower rates of PGHD recording compared to the 40s and over 50 group. Additionally, the reasons given  
330 for discontinuing health management app usage differed by age. Younger adults cited annoyance as the  
331 primary reason, whereas older adults reported difficulty in using the apps. Furthermore, younger adults  
332 displayed a lower intention to use such services compared to those in their 40s and over 50. Notably,  
333 young adults (20s) also showed a tendency to be less agreeable towards the research purpose utilization  
334 of PGHD. The 20s group chose data protection and security issues as the information they most wanted  
335 to know when agreeing to allow the use of their PGHD.

336 Consistent with these findings, a prior study has demonstrated that younger users expressed stronger  
337 privacy concerns regarding mobile health (mHealth) services compared to older users.(21) This aligns  
338 with the established notion that demographic characteristics influence behavioral intentions among  
339 potential users.(22) However, age differences in the context of PGHD use remains an under-researched  
340 area. Our present findings and those of prior reports collectively underscore the differences in attitudes  
341 and experiences towards health information recording and management among patients and guardians,  
342 as well as across different age groups. Based on these results, the provision of personalized health

343 information recording and management services could enhance participation from each group.  
344 Moreover, when conducting research or developing services related to PGHD utilization, consideration  
345 of the unique characteristics of each group will be crucial to promote diverse participation in healthcare.  
346 Regarding consent for the secondary use of PGHD, the most common reason for choosing specific  
347 (individual) consent was a better understanding of the use process. The finding that 'Want to know  
348 specific research purposes, contents, duration, etc.' and 'Want to know how personal information is  
349 utilized in research' were the highest-ranking responses indicated that transparency in data use and  
350 sharing of the use procedures with data providers will be important drivers of the active participation  
351 of PGHD use. In addition, 'For convenience' was the most frequent reason given for choosing  
352 comprehensive consent, which suggested that regardless of the consent method applied, the most  
353 important priority is sufficient understanding by the information provider (patient, guardian) as well as  
354 simplicity of the procedures. This will be a crucial reference point going forward if developing a system  
355 or application to obtain consent from patients or guardians for the secondary use of PGHD.

## 356 **Limitations**

357 The biggest limitation of this study was that it was conducted as an online survey and the target audience  
358 comprised individuals who were participating in the patient community, which may not represent the  
359 general patient and caregiver population due to potential bias in interest or engagement. The survey of  
360 only 400 respondents also cannot represent the views of all patients or their guardians. Online surveys  
361 are limited but the fact that participants will more than likely be able to easily access the Internet, and  
362 people who participate in the patient community are likely to have more active tendencies than patients  
363 or guardians who do not.(23) According to the 2016 National Statistics of Korea, the median outpatient  
364 age was 50-54 years old, and about one-third (31.6%) of the total were 65 years or older.(24) On the  
365 other hand, the age group with the most participants in this survey was the 40s (n=170), and those aged  
366 50 or older accounted for only 14.5% (58/400) of the total, which is younger than the age distribution  
367 of patients estimated in 2016. In addition, there is a limitation that pediatric/elderly patients could not

368 directly respond.

369 Notwithstanding these drawbacks, the respondents were likely to have high accessibility to online  
370 information and be in a position to make decisions about the use of PGHD. Hence, although bias in our  
371 selection of respondents was inevitable, the results of this study can be said to better reflect the real  
372 world.

373 This study was based on the results of a survey conducted only in Korea, so the results may not be  
374 generalizable. However, Korea has a high level of development and maturity in EMR, and its citizens  
375 have high accessibility to online information, so it was a meaningful cohort to use to start this  
376 discussion.(25, 26) In addition, a national project in Korea for patient-centered health data utilization is  
377 being promoted, so it is an important time to confirm the awareness of PGHD utilization and reflect it  
378 in the establishment of systems and processes.(27) This survey confirmed patient awareness of PGHD  
379 usage and utilization, but was limited by its cross-sectional design. People's awareness can change as  
380 their health status worsens or improves, and health-related roles are also dynamic over time. Hence, the  
381 questionnaire was limited in its ability to address patient expectations and concerns. Additionally,  
382 technological advancements and policy changes can also affect patient awareness or attitudes towards  
383 PGHD, so a continuous, multidisciplinary approach and further research is needed.

## 384 **Conclusions**

385 A cross-sectional survey was used to examine differences in patient or caregiver patterns, attitudes and  
386 anxiety towards PGHD management and usage, in accordance with their life situation. Most of the  
387 patient and caregiver respondents were favorable toward the use of PGHD, but there were concerns  
388 about the security of personal information. The respondents in their 20s and suffering from traumatic  
389 conditions were the most reluctant to use PGHD, largely due to these privacy concerns.

390

391 **Acknowledgements**

392 This research was funded by the Asan Institute of Life Sciences, Asan Medical Center, Seoul, Korea  
393 (grant number 2022IP0067-2).

394

395 **Declaration of interests**

396 The authors declare no competing interests.

397

398 **Author Contributions**

399 **Conceptualization:** Yura Lee, Sang Sook Beck

400 **Data curation:** Ye-Eun Park

401 **Formal analysis:** Ye-Eun Park, Yura Lee

402 **Funding acquisition:** Yura Lee

403 **Investigation:** Sang Sook Beck, Ye-Eun Park

404 **Methodology:** Yura Lee

405 **Project administration:** Yura Lee

406 **Resources:** Ye-Eun Park, Sang Sook Beck, Yura Lee

407 **Supervision:** Yura Lee

408 **Validation:** Ye-Eun Park, Yura Lee

409 **Visualization:** Ye-Eun Park

410 **Writing – original draft:** Sang Sook Beck, Ye-Eun Park



411 **Writing – review & editing:** Ye-Eun Park, Yura Lee

412

413

414 **Abbreviations**

415 CG-adult: caregivers of adult patients not falling into the previous categories

416 CG-minor: caregivers of minor patients

417 CG-elder: caregivers of patients aged 70 or older or those unable to attend medical appointments alone

418 PGHD: Patient-generated health data

419 Pt: patients themselves

420 PHR: Personal Health Record

421

## 422 References


- 423 1. ONC. Patient-Generated Health Data Official Website of The Office of the National  
424 Coordinator for Health Information Technology (ONC) [Available from:  
425 <https://www.healthit.gov/topic/scientific-initiatives/pcor/patient-generated-health-data-pghd>.
- 426 2. Jim HSL, Hoogland AI, Brownstein NC, Barata A, Dicker AP, Knoop H, et al. Innovations in  
427 research and clinical care using patient-generated health data. *CA Cancer J Clin*. 2020;70(3):182-99.
- 428 3. Khatiwada P, Yang B, Lin JC, Blobel B. Patient-Generated Health Data (PGHD):  
429 Understanding, Requirements, Challenges, and Existing Techniques for Data Security and Privacy. *J*  
430 *Pers Med*. 2024;14(3).
- 431 4. Wood WA, Bennett AV, Basch E. Emerging uses of patient generated health data in clinical  
432 research. *Mol Oncol*. 2015;9(5):1018-24.
- 433 5. Nittas V, Lun P, Ehrler F, Puhan MA, Mutsch M. Electronic Patient-Generated Health Data  
434 to Facilitate Disease Prevention and Health Promotion: Scoping Review. *J Med Internet Res*.  
435 2019;21(10):e13320.
- 436 6. Kang SH, Baek H, Cho J, Kim S, Hwang H, Lee W, et al. Management of cardiovascular  
437 disease using an mHealth tool: a randomized clinical trial. *NPJ Digit Med*. 2021;4(1):165.
- 438 7. Choo H, Kim M, Lee D, Shin SY. Influenza Screening Using Patient-Generated Health Data  
439 in Post COVID-19 Pandemic. *Stud Health Technol Inform*. 2022;294:581-2.
- 440 8. Shapiro M, Johnston D, Wald J, Mon D. Patient-generated health data: White paper. RTI  
441 International; 2012.
- 442 9. Merchan-Baeza JA, Borralleras Andreu C, Minobes-Molina E, Grau Carrion S, Romero-Mas  
443 M, Ramon-Aribau A. Co-created Technological Solutions for Caregivers in Health Care: Systematic  
444 Review. *J Med Internet Res*. 2023;25:e41260.
- 445 10. MacEwan SR, Olvera RG, Jonnalagadda P, Fareed N, McAlearney AS. Patient and Provider  
446 Perspectives About the Use of Patient-Generated Health Data During Pregnancy: Qualitative  
447 Exploratory Study. *JMIR Form Res*. 2024;8:e52397.
- 448 11. Lavalley DC, Lee JR, Austin E, Bloch R, Lawrence SO, McCall D, et al. mHealth and patient  
449 generated health data: stakeholder perspectives on opportunities and barriers for transforming  
450 healthcare. *Mhealth*. 2020;6:8.
- 451 12. Omoloja A, Vundavalli S. Patient generated health data: Benefits and challenges. *Current*  
452 *Problems in Pediatric and Adolescent Health Care*. 2021;51(11):101103.
- 453 13. Yang KM. Emerging Ethical Issues in Managing Real World Data. *Healthc Inform Res*.  
454 2019;25(4):237-8.
- 455 14. Figueiredo MC, Chen Y. Patient-Generated Health Data: Dimensions, Challenges, and Open  
456 Questions. *Foundations and Trends® in Human-Computer Interaction*. 2020;13(3):165-297.
- 457 15. Yoo S, Hwang H, Jheon S. Hospital information systems: experience at the fully digitized  
458 Seoul National University Bundang Hospital. *J Thorac Dis*. 2016;8(Suppl 8):S637-41.

- 459 16. Shin S-Y. Issues and Solutions of Healthcare Data De-identification: the Case of South Korea.  
460 J Korean Med Sci. 2018;33(5).
- 461 17. Lee GH, Shin S-Y. Federated Learning on Clinical Benchmark Data: Performance Assessment.  
462 J Med Internet Res. 2020;22(10):e20891.
- 463 18. Oh AR, Park J, Shin SJ, Choi B, Lee JH, Lee SH, et al. Author Correction: Prediction model  
464 for myocardial injury after non-cardiac surgery using machine learning. Sci Rep. 2023;13(1):15819.
- 465 19. Kakao. The Story of My Daily Life, Kakao Story: Kakao; [Available from:  
466 <https://www.kakaocorp.com/page/service/service/KakaoStory?lang=ENG>.
- 467 20. Park YR, Lee Y, Kim JY, Kim J, Kim HR, Kim YH, et al. Managing Patient-Generated Health  
468 Data Through Mobile Personal Health Records: Analysis of Usage Data. JMIR Mhealth Uhealth.  
469 2018;6(4):e89.
- 470 21. Guo XT, Zhang XF, Sun YQ. The privacy-personalization paradox in mHealth services  
471 acceptance of different age groups. Electron Commer R A. 2016;16:55-65.
- 472 22. Gefen D, Straub DW. Gender differences in the perception and use of E-mail: An extension  
473 to the technology acceptance model. Mis Quart. 1997;21(4):389-400.
- 474 23. O'Mara-Eves A, Brunton G, Oliver S, Kavanagh J, Jamal F, Thomas J. The effectiveness of  
475 community engagement in public health interventions for disadvantaged groups: a meta-analysis.  
476 BMC Public Health. 2015;15:129.
- 477 24. Welfare MoHa. Number of Outpatient Visits per Day by Gender and Age Group by Year.  
478 In: Welfare MoHa, editor. KOSIS2016.
- 479 25. Park YT, Han D. Current Status of Electronic Medical Record Systems in Hospitals and  
480 Clinics in Korea. Healthc Inform Res. 2017;23(3):189-98.
- 481 26. Jobst N. Internet usage in South Korea - Statistics & Facts. Statista; 2024 Jun 13.
- 482 27. Won LG. Starting the Construction of My Healthway (tentative name: Health Information  
483 Highway). In: Policy DoHI, editor. Ministry of Health and Welfare: Ministry of Health and Welfare;  
484 2021.

485


486

### (1) Health-related role of respondents




medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.31.24316537>; this version posted November 2, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

### (2) Age groups



### (3) Disease groups



**Figure 1. Attitude toward the use of PGHD in accordance with the utilization purpose across the Disease-, Health-related Role, and Age- groups**

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.31.24316537>; this version posted November 2, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.  
It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#) .