

Doctoral Dissertation

Repositioning Bioethics in Digital Health Innovation Ecosystems:
A Human-Rights Grounded Educational Architecture for Ethical Learning

Georgia E. Livieri

Limassol, June 2026

CYPRUS UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY
FACULTY OF HEALTH SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF REHABILITATION SCIENCES

Doctoral Dissertation

Repositioning Bioethics in Digital Health Innovation Ecosystems:
A Human-Rights Grounded Educational Architecture for Ethical Learning.

Georgia E. Livieri

Supervisor

Dr. Andrie Panayiotou

Associate Professor in Public Health

Limassol, June 2026

Approval Form

Doctoral Dissertation

Repositioning Bioethics in Digital Health Innovation Ecosystems:

A Human-Rights Grounded Educational Architecture for Ethical Learning.

Presented by
Georgia E. Livieri

Supervisor: Andrie Panayiotou, Associate Professor in Public Health, Department of Rehabilitation Sciences, School of Health Sciences, Cyprus University of Technology.

Member of the committee: Eleni Mangina, Professor in Computer Science, School of Computer Sciences, University College Dublin.

Member of the committee: Evangelos Protopapadakis, Professor of Applied Ethics and Bioethics, School of Philosophy, National Kapodistrian University of Athens.

Cyprus University of Technology
Limassol, June 2026

Copyrights

Copyright © Y2026 Georgia Livieri

All rights reserved.

The approval of the dissertation by the Department of Rehabilitation does not necessarily imply the approval by the Department of the views of the writer.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

«Ἐς γῆν ἑναλίαν Κύπρον, οὗ μ' ἐθέσπισεν οἰκεῖν Απόλλων...»
Ευριπίδης, «Ἠλένη», στίχοι 148-150.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Professor in Public Health, *Dr Andrie Panayiotou*, for her continuous guidance, insightful feedback, and consistent support throughout all stages of this thesis. Her supervision has been fundamental in shaping both the direction and quality of this work. I am also grateful for her trust in appointing me, as part of my doctoral responsibilities, as a link between the Bioethics Units in Greece and Cyprus, an experience that significantly strengthened my cross-institutional academic development.

I would also like to extend my special thanks to my co-supervisor, Professor in Computer Science at University College Dublin, *Dr Eleni Mangina*, for her valuable scientific input and collaboration. I am particularly grateful for her support and hospitality during the family relocation in Dublin, and my research stay at University College Dublin (September 2024 – February 2025), where I had the opportunity to contribute to the development of the tool and further advance its methodological foundations.

I am deeply grateful to my co-supervisor, Professor in Philosophy at the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, *Dr Evangelos Protopapadakis*, for his mentorship and sustained belief in my academic potential. I sincerely thank him for initiating my engagement with applied ethics through a research ethics training programme in 2017 in Hannover, Germany, under the supervision of Professor Fortwengel. This formative experience marked the beginning of my academic trajectory in the field, which subsequently led to research engagements across Europe and the United States - from Germany and Austria to New York - reflecting a sustained international engagement with bioethics.

I am also grateful to the *Department of Rehabilitation Sciences* of the *Cyprus University of Technology* for providing the academic environment and resources necessary to complete this research. Sincere gratitude to Librarian *Erasmia Kola* for her continuous support and encouragement throughout my doctoral journey.

I would also like to express my profound appreciation to the *A. G. Leventis Foundation* for its generous scholarship support, which made this research possible. Being a Leventis Foundation scholar has been a significant academic privilege, particularly given the interdisciplinary nature of this work, which integrates Public Health, Philosophy, and Computer Science across institutions in Cyprus, Greece, and Ireland. The Foundation's support has been instrumental in enabling this cross-border and cross-disciplinary research.

This doctoral research also served as the foundation for the emergence of a new professional trajectory, leading to my role as an *Ethics Manager in EU-funded projects*, where I actively support researchers in translating ethical principles into practice. In this capacity, I engage dynamically with interdisciplinary teams to operationalise and embed ethical frameworks within real-world research and innovation contexts across Europe.

I would like to thank *Dr Vasilis Prasinos* for his valuable technical assistance and overall guidance in the development of the website navigator.

Special thanks are extended to the *15 experts* who generously contributed their time and expertise, as well as to the *97 end-users* across six sectors whose insights were essential to this study. I also acknowledge the *sector-based network intermediaries* who facilitated participant recruitment.

I would also like to extend my heartfelt appreciation to *Professor Dr Georgios Georgis*, former Ambassador of Cyprus to Greece, whose encouragement and guidance played a formative role in the beginning of my academic journey. Through our collaboration at the Embassy of the Republic of Cyprus in Athens, he recognised and encouraged my inclination toward research and academic work, inspiring me to pursue postgraduate and doctoral studies. His vision and commitment to strengthening the Hellenic ties between Greece and Cyprus deeply influenced my intellectual outlook and shaped my enduring bond with Cyprus.

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to my mother, *Giannoula Livieri*, for her unwavering presence, support, and encouragement throughout this journey. Her constant presence has been an important source of strength during the course of my studies and the completion of this thesis.

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my husband, *Dr Georgios Lamos*, Fertility Specialist, for his unwavering support at every stage of this journey and for continuously encouraging me to persevere.

I dedicate this dissertation to my two sons, *Faidon (10 years old) and Evangelos (10 months old)*, with the hope that it may stand as a lighthouse, guiding and inspiring them along their own paths.

Finally, I dedicate this work to the memory of my beloved father, *Evangelos Livieris*, who passed away on February 28th, 2025. His presence, values, and strength continue to guide me throughout my personal and academic journey. Coming from a Cretan origin, he embodied resilience, perseverance, and a deep commitment to striving beyond limits. One of the phrases that he carried throughout his life, and wished to instil in my own path, was the words attributed to Nikos Kazantzakis: «*Να ζητάς το αδύνατο, και το θαύμα θα γενεί*» (“Ask for the impossible, and the miracle will happen”). This achievement is offered in his honour...

STATEMENT ON THE USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TOOLS

The author takes full responsibility for the content of this dissertation. Generative artificial intelligence tools, specifically [ChatGPT \(OpenAI\)](#), were used to support language editing, grammar correction, and brainstorming processes during the preparation of the manuscript. In addition, AI-based tools, such as [Napkin.ai](#), were used for the visualisation of concepts and the creation of illustrative figures.

AI tools were also used to assist in the organisation and formatting of tables, as well as to support aspects of data handling related to questionnaire responses from experts and end-users. All outputs were critically reviewed, validated, and interpreted by the author. No content was included without human evaluation, and all substantive ideas, analyses, interpretations, and conclusions are the sole responsibility of the author.

The use of artificial intelligence tools in this dissertation was conducted in accordance with the relevant academic integrity and artificial intelligence guidance provided by the [Cyprus University of Technology Library AI Guidelines](#).

ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ

Η παρούσα διδακτορική διατριβή εξετάζει μία κεντρική πρόκληση της ψηφιακής υγείας: τη μετάφραση αφηρημένων ηθικών αρχών σε πρακτικά και λειτουργικά εργαλεία που μπορούν να υποστηρίξουν την ηθική μάθηση και τον ηθικό αναστοχασμό σε διαφορετικά επαγγελματικά περιβάλλοντα. Σκοπός της μελέτης ήταν η ανάπτυξη ενός λειτουργικού και ανθρωποκεντρικού “Πλοηγού Ηθικής”, ικανού να ενσωματώνει την ηθική σκέψη στις πραγματικές εφαρμογές της ψηφιακής υγείας.

Για την επίτευξη του σκοπού εφαρμόστηκε μία πολυφασική, αναπτυξιακή και μικτή μεθοδολογική προσέγγιση. Αρχικά, συλλέχθηκαν, συντέθηκαν και αναλύθηκαν συστηματικά δημοσιευμένα δεδομένα σχετικά με τα ηθικά κενά και τις προκλήσεις που βιώνουν ασθενείς και επαγγελματίες υγείας στο πλαίσιο της ψηφιακής υγείας. Τα ευρήματα αυτά μεταφράστηκαν σε δομημένες και σχεδιαστικά αξιοποιήσιμες διαστάσεις προβλημάτων. Στη συνέχεια, τα δεδομένα αυτά αξιοποιήθηκαν για την ανάπτυξη της αρχικής αρχιτεκτονικής του συστήματος (Alpha), η οποία βελτιώθηκε επαναληπτικά μέσω διαδικασίας αξιολόγησης από ειδικούς, οδηγώντας στην ανάπτυξη της αρχιτεκτονικής (BETA) και της εκπαιδευτικής της εκδοχής (BETA-EDU). Τέλος, η αξιολόγηση από τελικούς χρήστες προερχόμενους από έξι διαφορετικούς τομείς επέτρεψε την αναγνώριση αναγκών που σχετίζονται με το εκάστοτε πλαίσιο εφαρμογής και τη διαμόρφωση διατομεακών απαιτήσεων, καταλήγοντας στην τελική αρχιτεκτονική (Gamma).

Τα ευρήματα καταδεικνύουν ότι οι ηθικές προκλήσεις στην ψηφιακή υγεία είναι άμεσα εξαρτώμενες από το εκάστοτε πλαίσιο και απαιτούν προσαρμοστικές και ανθρωποκεντρικές λύσεις. Η τελική αρχιτεκτονική συνιστά ένα επεκτάσιμο, πολυεπίπεδο και αρθρωτό σύστημα, το οποίο ενσωματώνει την ηθική συλλογιστική, τη χρηστικότητα και τη διατομεακή εφαρμοσιμότητα. Η διατριβή συμβάλλει στο πεδίο της ηθικής της ψηφιακής υγείας, επαναπροσδιορίζοντας την ηθική ως διαδικασία καθοδηγούμενου αναστοχασμού και προτείνοντας έναν συγκεκριμένο, εφαρμοστικά προσανατολισμένο Πλοηγό Ηθικής για την υποστήριξη της ηθικής πρακτικής σε σύνθετα κοινωνικο-τεχνολογικά περιβάλλοντα.

Λέξεις-κλειδί: «ηθική της ψηφιακής υγείας», «ηθική εκ σχεδιασμού», «ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα στην υγεία», «ηθικός αναστοχασμός βασισμένος σε σενάρια», «μικτές μέθοδοι».

ABSTRACT

This dissertation addresses a central challenge in digital health: the translation of abstract ethical principles into practical, usable tools that can support ethical learning across diverse professional contexts. The study aimed to develop an operational, user-centred ethics navigator capable of embedding ethical reflection into real-world digital health practices.

A multi-phase, design-oriented mixed methodology was employed. First, published evidence on ethical gaps and challenges experienced by patients and healthcare professionals was systematically collected, synthesized and translated into structured, design-relevant problem dimensions. Second, these insights informed the development of an initial (Alpha) architecture, which was iteratively refined through expert validation, leading to the BETA architecture and its educational (BETA-EDU) version. Third, end-user engagement across six relevant sectors enabled the identification of context-specific needs and cross-sector requirements, culminating in the final (Gamma) architecture.

The findings demonstrate that ethical challenges in digital health are context-dependent and require adaptive, user-centred solutions. The resulting architecture provides a scalable, modular, and layered system that integrates ethical reasoning, usability, and cross-sector applicability. This work contributes to digital health ethics by reframing ethics as a process of guided reflection and by offering a concrete, implementation-oriented ethics navigator to support ethical practice in complex socio-technical environments.

Keywords: “digital health ethics”, “ethics-by-design”, “human rights in healthcare”, “scenario-based ethical reflection”, “mixed methods”.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
STATEMENT ON THE USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TOOLS	vii
ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ	viii
ABSTRACT	x
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	xi
LIST OF TABLES.....	xvi
LIST OF SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES	xvii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xix
LIST OF SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURES	xxii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xxiv
GLOSSARY	xxvi
ORIGINALITY OF THE THESIS	xxx
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 The Digital Healthcare Ecosystem as an Ethical Pressure Environment.....	1
1.1.1 The Emergence of a Digital Healthcare Ecosystem	1
1.1.2 From Risk Mitigation to Ethical Sense-Making	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.2 The functional positioning of Bioethics in healthcare and innovation	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.2.1 Traditional roles of Bioethics in healthcare	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.2.2 Bioethics in the Context of Digital Innovation Practices.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.2.3 The Structural Repositioning Problem.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.3 Ethics as Governance: Structural limits in digital health ecosystems	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.3.1 The governance turns in digital health ethics.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.3.2 Compliance, Risk and Principle's Articulation.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.3.3 The absence of an Educational Ethical Infrastructure	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.3.4 Implications: From Governance Supplement to Embedded Learning Architecture .	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.4 Ethics as Learning: Toward a Human-Rights Grounded Educational Architecture	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.5 Purpose and Aims of the Dissertation.....	16
1.6 Structure of the dissertation	17
Purpose Positioning Statement.....	19
2 Methodological Orientation and Approach.....	20

2.1.1	Iterative and Development-Oriented Research Approach	20
2.1.2	Overview of Methodological Phases	20
2.2	Methodological Considerations on Validity	23
PART A		25
Evidence Synthesis, Translation into Design Requirements and Initial Architecture Development ..		25
3	EVIDENCE SYNTHESIS METHODOLOGY: FROM EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE TO DESIGN FOUNDATIONS	26
3.1	Search Strategy	26
3.2	Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria	31
3.3	Selection Process and Data Extraction	32
3.4	Critical Appraisal	33
3.5	Quality Assessment	34
3.5.1	Quality Assessment Criteria	34
3.6	Data Synthesis	34
4	EMPIRICAL MAPPING OF ETHICAL GAPS AND CHALLENGES IN DIGITAL HEALTH: FINDINGS FROM PATIENT AND HEALTHCARE PROFESSIONAL PERSPECTIVES.....	36
4.1	Results	36
4.1.1	Search and Selection Results for Patient-focused studies	36
4.1.2	Search and selection results for healthcare professional-focused studies.....	38
4.2	Data mapping of the included papers: Patients and Healthcare Professionals	40
4.2.1	Characteristics of the included papers: patient-focused studies	40
4.2.2	Characteristics of the included healthcare professionals-focused papers	43
4.2.3	Categorization of patient-reported gaps and challenges in the included papers	47
4.2.4	Categorization of healthcare professionals' reported gaps and challenges in the included papers	49
5	BRIDGING EMPIRICAL FINDINGS AND DESIGN LOGIC: TRANSLATING EVIDENCE INTO DESIGN REQUIREMENTS	51
5.1	Patient perspective: Problem dimensions informing design requirements.....	51
5.2	Healthcare professional perspective: Problem dimensions informing design requirements	54
5.2.1	Integrative synthesis: Translating evidence-based problem dimensions to coherent design logic	57
6	FROM CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS TO OPERATIONAL DESIGN: METHODOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE ETHICS NAVIGATOR (ALPHA VERSION).....	59
6.1	Axon-Based Structure: Designing the Ethical Knowledge Spine.....	60
6.2	Technology User-Centred Pathways: Role-Sensitive Navigation Design	61
6.3	Sequential Reasoning Logic: Formalisation of Step-by-Step Ethical Deliberation into Algorithmic Flow	62
6.4	Ethical Output Logic: Scenario Grading and the Recommendation Engine	65
6.5	Interactive Ethical Navigation: Click Logic and Category-Specific Visual Tailoring.....	68
6.6	Web-Based Operationalisation and User-Centred Interface Design as Methodological Strategy	68

6.6.1	Structural Components of the Website	70
7	OPERATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION AND INTERFACE ARCHITECTURE OF THE ETHICS NAVIGATOR: FUNCTIONAL DESIGN AND SYSTEM STRUCTURE	72
7.1	Conceptual Identity, Stakeholder-Oriented Interface Design and Implementation Impact	72
7.1.1	Logo, Name and Acronym, Classification and Purpose	72
7.1.2	Normative Foundations: Ethical Principles, the HARMONIA Concept, and Philosophical Grounding	74
7.1.3	Agents of Responsible Digital Health Innovation	76
7.1.3.1	Identification of Stakeholder Groups as Intended Users	76
7.1.3.2	Stakeholder-Beneficiary Alignment	78
7.1.4	Navigator's Impact Pathways: Primary Educational Use and Extended Applications	78
7.2	Internal structural and functional core: Operationalising the Ethics Navigator (alpha version)	80
7.2.1	Conceptual Axons and Core Challenges Shaping the Navigator's Internal Foundational Structure	80
7.2.2	Application Layer: From Case Analysis to Scenario-Based Evaluation and Structured Guidance Pathways.....	86
PART B		89
	Expert Validation, Architecture Refinement and Educational Reorientation.....	89
8	FROM ALPHA TO BETA: METHODOLOGY OF EXPERT VALIDATION, ARCHITECTURAL REFINEMENT, AND EDUCATIONAL REORIENTATION OF THE ETHICS NAVIGATOR	90
8.1	Expert-Guided Validation of the Ethics Navigator (alpha version)	90
8.1.1	Study Design	90
8.1.2	Instrument Development	91
8.1.3	Participants, Eligibility Criteria, and Recruitment	93
8.1.4	Mode of Administration	95
8.1.5	Data Collection and Confidentiality	95
8.1.6	Methodological Rationale.....	96
8.1.7	Data Analysis of Expert Input and Refinement Strategy.....	97
8.1.8	Data Synthesis Informing Multi-Layer BETA Architecture and Educational Re-Design	106
9	EXPERT VALIDATION FINDINGS: TOWARD THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE BETA ARCHITECTURE AND THE ENHANCEMENT OF ITS EDUCATIONAL DESIGN	115
9.1	Participants' Characteristics and Experts' Profiles	115
9.2	Expert-Informed Refinement of Conceptual, Technical, and Purpose-Oriented Components	119
9.2.1	Expert Validation of the Conceptual Foundations: Axons and Challenges	119
9.2.2	Expert validation of technical and design characteristics.....	122
9.2.3	Expert validation of purpose-oriented aspects	128
9.3	Design and Structure of the BETA Navigator Architecture.....	134
9.4	Designing the educational orientation of BETA Navigator Architecture	146
PART C		160
	End-User Engagement and Development of the Gamma Architecture	160
10	METHODOLOGY FOR CAPTURING END-USERS' NEEDS AND EXPECTATIONS	161
10.1	Exploring End-User Perspectives to Inform the Educational Design of the Health-Tech Ethics Navigator	162

10.1.1	Study design.....	162
10.1.2	Instrument development.....	163
10.1.3	Participants, Eligibility Criteria and Recruitment.....	165
10.1.4	Data Collection and Confidentiality.....	168
10.1.5	Methodological Rationale.....	168
10.1.6	Data analysis of end-users' insights.....	169
10.1.6.1	Preliminary Analysis of Core and Sector-specific Survey Responses	171
10.1.6.2	Synthesis of User-Survey Findings for Architectural Development	175
11	DESIGNING THE GAMMA ARCHITECTURE OF THE ETHICS NAVIGATOR BASED ON END-USER INSIGHTS.....	186
11.1	Analysis of end-users' insights and emerging patterns	187
11.1.1	Participants' profile characteristics	187
11.1.2	Perceived Relevance and Value of an Ethics Tool	191
11.1.3	Educational Design Preferences and Learning Needs	195
11.1.4	Usability and Functional Design Expectations	200
11.1.5	Cross-Sector Collaboration and Implementation Considerations	204
11.1.6	End-User Expectations and Strategic Requirements	207
11.2	Sector-Specific Perspectives' Analysis	211
11.2.1	Pharmaceutical Industry	211
11.2.2	Computer Science / Technology Development	215
11.2.3	Hospital-setting/Healthcare Provider	219
11.2.4	University/Research Institution sector	223
11.2.5	Governmental / Public Administration Sector.....	227
11.2.6	Non-Governmental Organisations/Patient Advocacy	230
11.3	Sector-Level Insights and Cross-Sector Comparative Analysis	237
11.3.1	Perceived Relevance & Practical Utility of an Ethics Tool Across Sectors	237
11.3.2	Ethical Content Priorities	240
11.3.3	Expected value of the tool.....	244
11.3.4	Learning and Interaction Preferences	248
11.3.5	Functional and Usability Needs	253
11.3.6	Patterns of Navigator Use Across Professional Sectors & Career Stages	257
11.4	From Vertical Sector Needs to Horizontal System-Level Drivers.....	262
11.5	Translating End-User Needs into Design Requirements.....	267
11.5.1	The Gamma Features Matrix	267
11.5.2	Operationalizing Horizontal Drivers in the Gamma Feature Set	270
11.6	Designing the Gamma Architecture: A scalable, layered and modular system for the Ethics Navigator	274
12	DISCUSSION	281
12.1	Ethical Challenges in Digital Health: From Empirical Evidence to an Integrated Understanding of Ethical Complexity	283
12.2	Translating Ethical Challenges into Design Requirements: The Development of a Human-Rights-Grounded Educational Ethics Architecture	286
12.3	Expert Consultation as a Mechanism for Validation, Refinement, and Educational Re-orientation of the Ethics Architecture	290
12.4	End-User Needs and Expectations: Informing the Development of an Implementation-Oriented Educational Ethics Architecture.....	294
12.5	Validity and Transferability of the Findings.....	297
12.6	Limitations	300

12.7	Future Research Directions and Recommendations	302
13	CONCLUSIONS.....	304
	REFERENCES.....	307
	APPENDIX I	315
	Supplementary Tables Supporting the Evidence-Based Conceptual Foundation of the Ethics Navigator	
	315	
	APPENDIX II	363
	Visual Representation of the Ethics Navigator (alpha version): Operational Implementation and Interface Architecture.....	363
	APPENDIX III	574
	Expert Validation Methodology and Resulting Beta and BETA-EDU Architectures of the Ethics Navigator	574
	Expert Validation Material A: Complete Questionnaire Instrument Used for Expert Evaluation.	574
	Expert Validation Material B: Participant Invitation letter for recruitment.	581
	Expert Validation Material C: Detailed Explanatory Notes.	583
	Expert Validation Material D: Study Information Sheet and Consent Form.....	585
	Expert Validation Material E: Ethical Approval Documentation issued by the Cyprus National Bioethics Committee.....	592
	Appendix IV	648
	Phase 3 Survey: Capturing end-users’ needs and expectations on digital health technology	648
	Appendix IV, End-User Engagement Material A: Survey Instrument Overview and Structure for capturing end-users’ needs and expectations.	648
	Appendix IV, End-User Engagement Material B: Intermediaries’ Invitation Text for Participant Recruitment.	662
	Appendix IV, End-User Engagement Material C: Participant Invitation Email Text for End-User Survey on Digital Health Ethics.	668
	Appendix IV, End-User Engagement Material D: Ethics amendment issued by the Cyprus National Bioethics Committee.....	670

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Structured Search Strategy and Key Terms for Patients.	27
Table 2: Structured Search Strategy and Key Terms for Healthcare Professionals. ...	28
Table 3: Database-Specific Search Algorithms for Identifying Patient-related Digital Health Studies.	29
Table 4: Database-Specific Search Algorithms for Identifying Healthcare Professional-related Digital Health Studies.	30
Table 5: Types of Technology Across Included Patient-focused Studies.	42
Table 6: Types of Technology Across Included Healthcare Professional-focused Studies.	45
Table 7: Axon-Based Challenges for Patient Technology Users.	84
Table 8: Axon-Based Challenges for Healthcare Professional Technology Users.	85
Table 9: Conceptual BETA Architecture: Axons and Challenges for Patients and Healthcare Professionals.	135
Table 10: Layer 2-Process and Navigation Logic.	141
Table 11: Layer 3 - Applied Ethical Reasoning and Scenario Engagement.	143
Table 12: Layer 4 - Ethical Output, Reflection and Continuous Learning.	145
Table 13: BETA Navigator Architecture – Educational Adaptation Triage.	147
Table 14: Educational Adaptation Matrix for the BETA navigator architecture: Technical and Purpose-driven actions.	152
Table 15: Resulting BETA-EDU Architecture of the Ethics Navigator.	157
Table 16: A comprehensive overview of sector-specific perspectives on ethics tool requirements.	235
Table 17: Perceived Relevance and Practical Utility of the ethics tool-Summary of findings per sector.	239
Table 18: Expected Value of Ethics Tool per Sector.	247
Table 19: Learning and Interaction Preferences per sector.	251
Table 20: Functional and Usability Needs per Sector.	256
Table 21: Key findings by sector and years of experience.	259
Table 22: Sector-Level Overview of End-Users’ Insights.	261
Table 23: From Vertical Needs to Horizontal Architectural Drivers: Cross-Sector Synthesis.	265
Table 24: Gamma Features Matrix: Translating Sector Needs into Design Requirements.	269
Table 25: Operationalising Horizontal Drivers: From End-User Insights to System Components in the Gamma Architecture.	272
Table 26: Five-Layer Gamma Architecture of the Ethics Navigator.	279

LIST OF SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

Appendix I, Supplementary Table 1: Quality Assessment of the included patient-focused studies.	315
Appendix I, Supplementary Table 2: Quality Assessment of the included healthcare professional-focused studies.	318
Appendix I, Supplementary Table 3: Characteristics of Included Patient-focused Papers in the Final Meta-Synthesis.	321
Appendix I, Supplementary Table 4: Characteristics of Included Healthcare Professional-focused Papers in the Final Meta-Synthesis.	330
Appendix I, Supplementary Table 5: Categorization of Patient-Reported Outcomes Based on Identified Gaps and Challenges.	334
Appendix I, Supplementary Table 6: Conceptual Categorization of Patient-Reported Findings.	336
Appendix I, Supplementary Table 7: Three Pillars Guiding the Patient-focused Meta-Synthesis and Recommendations.	340
Appendix I, Supplementary Table 8: Categorization of Healthcare Professional Reported Outcomes Based on Identified Gaps and Challenges.	344
Appendix I, Supplementary Table 9: Conceptual Categorization of Healthcare Professional-focused Studies.	348
Appendix I, Supplementary Table 10: Three Pillars Guiding the Healthcare Professional-focused Meta-Synthesis and Recommendations.	355
Appendix II, Supplementary Table 1: Case Scenarios Analysis and Evaluation for the Patient Technology Users.	374
Appendix II, Supplementary Table 2: Case Scenarios Analysis and Evaluation for the Healthcare Professional Technology Users.	425
Appendix II, Supplementary Table 3: Detailed Analysis of Challenge-Oriented General Recommendations for Patient Technology Users.	471
Appendix II, Supplementary Table 4: Detailed Analysis of Challenge-Oriented General Recommendations for Healthcare Professional Technology Users.	506
Appendix II, Supplementary Table 5: Scenario-Aligned Risk Recommendations for Patients Across Axons.	540
Appendix II, Supplementary Table 6: Scenario-Aligned Risk Recommendations for Healthcare Professionals Across Axons.	555
Appendix III, Supplementary Table 1: Distribution of Participating Experts by Professional Role and Country of Practice.	595
Appendix III, Supplementary Table 2: Evolution of Axons and Challenges for Patients: From Initial Structure to Validated Configuration.	597
Appendix III, Supplementary Table 3: Evolution of Axons and Challenges for Healthcare Professionals: From Initial Structure to Validated Configuration.	606
Appendix III, Supplementary Table 4: Usability Improvements based on experts' feedback.	614
Appendix III, Supplementary Table 5: Functionality Improvements based on experts' feedback.	619
Appendix III, Supplementary Table 6: Structure Improvements based on experts' feedback.	622

Appendix III, Supplementary Table 7: Layout Improvements based on experts' feedback.	625
Appendix III, Supplementary Table 8: Integrated Technical & Design Improvements Plan.	627
Appendix III, Supplementary Table 9: General Recommendation Revisions based on experts' feedback.	631
Appendix III, Supplementary Table 10: Risk-based Recommendations Revisions based on experts' feedback.	635
Appendix III, Supplementary Table 11: Overall Purpose Recommendation Revisions based on experts' feedback.	637
Appendix III, Supplementary Table 12: Integrated Purpose-Oriented Revision Roadmap.	640
Appendix IV, Supplementary Table 1: A Comprehensive Overview of End-Users' Insights.	670

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Overall Research Design.	22
Figure 2: PRISMA Flowchart of Search Outcome and Patient Study Selection Process.	37
Figure 3: PRISMA Flowchart of Search Outcome and Healthcare Professional Study Selection Process	39
Figure 4: Annual Trend of all Identified Papers on Digital Health and Patient Challenges (2010-2023).	40
Figure 5: Annual Distribution of Included Papers on Digital Health and Patient Challenges (2010-2023).	41
Figure 6: Comparison of Initially Identified and Included Papers for Patient-focused Studies by Year of Publication (2010-2023).	41
Figure 7: Annual Trend of all Identified Papers on Digital Health and Healthcare Professional Challenges (2020-2023).	44
Figure 8: Annual Distribution of Included Papers on Digital Health and Healthcare Professional Challenges (2010-2023).	44
Figure 9: Comparison of Initially Identified and Included Papers for Healthcare Professional-focused Studies by Year of Publication (2010-2023).	45
Figure 10: Core Methodological Components of the Ethics Navigator (alpha version).	59
Figure 11: Axon-based Structure Design Logic Pipeline.	60
Figure 12: Sequential Reasoning Logic Process.	63
Figure 13: Output Logic - Scenario Grading and the Recommendation Engine.	65
Figure 14: Logo of the BRAIN Health-tech Ethics Navigator.	73
Figure 15: Initial user Interface Displaying Guidance.	81
Figure 16: Technology User Profile Selection Interface.	81
Figure 17: Axon Selection Interface by User Profile: Patients' views.	82
Figure 18: Axon Selection Interface by User Profile: Healthcare Professionals' views.	83
Figure 19: Modified Delphi Method.	91
Figure 20: Expert Validation Timeline.	97
Figure 21: Data Analysis and Refinement Strategy.	98
Figure 22: Refinement of Axons and Challenges.	99
Figure 23: Technical Analysis and Design Refinement of the Ethics Navigator.	101
Figure 24: Purpose-oriented Analysis Process.	103
Figure 25: Data Analysis and Refinement Strategy Workflow.	106
Figure 26: Data Synthesis and Architectural Development Process.	107
Figure 27: Developing the BETA Architecture.	108
Figure 28: Educational Re-orienting of the Ethics Navigator.	110
Figure 29: Developing the BETA-EDU Architecture.	112
Figure 30: Synopsis of Data Synthesis Workflow.	114
Figure 31: Four-Layer BETA Navigator Architecture.	134
Figure 32: Five-Layer BETA-EDU Navigator Architecture.	155
Figure 33: Implementation Design for Capturing End-users' Needs and Expectations.	167
Figure 34: Phase 3 - End-users' Needs and Expectations Timeline.	169
Figure 35: Workflow of Data Analysis and Architectural Design Process.	170
Figure 36: Data Analysis and Synthesis Strategy Plan.	171
Figure 37: Quantitative Analysis of Main Questionnaire Sections/Stage 1.	172

Figure 38: Qualitative Analysis of Sector-specific Questions/Stage 2.	174
Figure 39: System Synthesis Pathway.	176
Figure 40: Thematic Consolidation and Cross-sector Comparison/Stage 3.	177
Figure 41: Abstraction of Cross-sector Inputs into Horizontal System-level Drivers/Stage 4.....	179
Figure 42: Translation of Sector Needs into Design Requirements and Features/Stage 5a.....	181
Figure 43: Operationalisation of Horizontal Drivers into Gamma Feature Set.	183
Figure 44: Gamma Architecture Design Process.....	184
Figure 45: Participant Distribution Across Sectors.	188
Figure 46: Years of Experience in the Participants' field.	190
Figure 47: Participants' Previous Experience with an Ethics Framework or Guideline.	190
Figure 48: Participants' Engagement with Digital Health Technologies.	191
Figure 49: Relevance of an Ethics Tool for Digital Health in Participants' Professional Context.....	192
Figure 50: Perceived Support of the Ethics Tool in Daily Work.....	193
Figure 51: Relevant Ethical Areas in Participants' Work by Priority.	194
Figure 52: Priority Ranking of the Ethics Tool's Value Dimensions.....	195
Figure 53: Preferred Learning Modes.....	196
Figure 54: Preferred Engagement Methods with Educational Tools.....	198
Figure 55: Primary Contexts of Intended Use for the Ethics Navigator.....	199
Figure 56: Perceived Importance of Features Enhancing the Tool's Educational Impact.	200
Figure 57: Importance of Design Features for an Ethics Tool for Digital Health.	202
Figure 58: Most Valued Functionalities of the Ethics Tool.....	203
Figure 59: Reported Accessibility Needs and Technical Requirements.....	204
Figure 60: Key-ways the Tool can Support Cross-sector Collaboration.	206
Figure 61: Perceived Barriers to Adoption and Cross-sector Use.	207
Figure 62: Key Expectations for a Digital Ethics Education Tool.	209
Figure 63: Sustainability and Practical Integration Requirements.	210
Figure 64: Priorities for Supporting Ethical Practices in Clinical Research and Digital Trials (pharmaceutical industry representatives).	212
Figure 65: Priorities for Internal Compliance and Staff Training Functionalities (pharmaceutical industry representatives).	214
Figure 66: Priorities for Supporting Ethical Interactions with Healthcare Professionals and Patients (pharmaceutical industry representatives).	215
Figure 67: Priorities for Embedding Ethical Principles into Design and Development (computer science representatives).	216
Figure 68: Priorities for Actionable Ethical Guidance for Developers (computer science representatives).	218
Figure 69: Priorities for Addressing Challenges in Translating Ethics into Technical Design (computer science representatives).	219
Figure 70: Priorities for Supporting Ethical Decision-Making in Patient Care Using Digital Tools (hospital setting/healthcare provider representatives).	221
Figure 71: Features Supporting Practical Use in Busy Clinical Environments (hospital setting/healthcare provider representatives).	222
Figure 72: Fostering Communication Between Clinical and Technical Teams (hospital setting/healthcare providers' representatives).	223

Figure 73: Integration of an Ethics Tool into Education and Research Training (university/research institution representatives).	224
Figure 74: Learning Formats to Enhance Student Engagement (university/research institution representatives).	225
Figure 75: Supporting Interdisciplinary Teaching and Supervision (university/research institution representatives).	227
Figure 76: Supporting Policy Design and Digital Health Strategy Evaluation (governmental/public administration representatives).....	228
Figure 77: Functionalities to Support Decision-Makers (governmental/public administration representatives).	229
Figure 78: Strengthening Coordination Between Policy and Practice (governmental/public administration representatives).....	230
Figure 79: Empowering Patient Organizations and Advocacy Efforts (NGOs/patient advocacy representatives).	232
Figure 80: Enhancing Accessibility and Comprehensibility for Non-Specialists (NGOs/patient advocacy representatives).....	233
Figure 81: Building Trust and Transparency in Digital Health Adoption (NGOs/patient advocacy representatives).....	234
Figure 82: Visual Representation of Ethical Priority Distribution Across Stakeholder Sectors.....	244
Figure 83: Distribution of Implementation Priorities Across Stakeholder Sectors. ..	248
Figure 84: Designing the Gamma Architecture for Ethics Navigator.	275

LIST OF SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURES

Appendix II, Supplementary Figure 1: Acronym and Corresponding Meaning.	363
Appendix II, Supplementary Figure 2: Name and Identifying Components of the Navigator.....	363
Appendix II, Supplementary Figure 3: Name and Identifying Components of the Navigator.....	364
Appendix II, Supplementary Figure 4: Intended Function & Goals of the Navigator.	364
Appendix II, Supplementary Figure 5: Core Principles Fulfilling the Navigator’s Aims.	365
Appendix II, Supplementary Figure 6: The “HARMONIA” concept acrostic.....	365
Appendix II, Supplementary Figure 7: Aristotelian Foundations Informing the Navigator.....	366
Appendix II, Supplementary Figure 8: Stakeholders as Users of the Navigator.	366
Appendix II, Supplementary Figure 9: Overview of Primary Users.	367
Appendix II, Supplementary Figure 10: Elaboration of Primary User Profiles: Healthcare Providers.	367
Appendix II, Supplementary Figure 11: Elaboration of Primary User Profiles: Healthcare Industry & Technology Developers.	368
Appendix II, Supplementary Figure 12: Elaboration of Primary User Profiles: Policy Makers & Regulators.	368
Appendix II, Supplementary Figure 13: Secondary User Categories and Roles.	369
Appendix II, Supplementary Figure 14: Complementary Stakeholder Categories. ..	369
Appendix II, Supplementary Figure 15: Bridging Stakeholder Groups with Intended Beneficiaries.	370
Appendix II, Supplementary Figure 16: Educational Impact and User Benefits of the Navigator.....	370
Appendix II, Supplementary Figure 17: Exploring Broader Applications of the Navigator.....	371
Appendix II, Supplementary Figure 18: Human Values Axon Challenges – Patient Technology User Group.....	371
Appendix II, Supplementary Figure 19: Human Values Axon Challenges – Healthcare Professional Technology User Group.	372
Appendix II, Supplementary Figure 20: Data Management Axon Challenges – Patientnology User Group.....	372
Appendix II, Supplementary Figure 21: Data Management Axon Challenges – Healthcare Professional Technology User Group.....	373
Appendix II, Supplementary Figure 22: Digital Health Equity Axon Challenges – Patient Technology User Group.....	373
Appendix II, Supplementary Figure 23: Digital Health Equity Axon Challenges – Healthcare Professional Technology User Group.....	374

Appendix III, Supplementary Figure 1: Stakeholder roles and areas of expertise. ..	646
Appendix III, Supplementary Figure 2: Experience with healthcare technology.....	646
Appendix III, Supplementary Figure 3: Geographic distribution.	646
Appendix III, Supplementary Figure 4: Years of professional experience.	647
Appendix III, Supplementary Figure 5: Engagement with ethical considerations. ..	647
Appendix III, Supplementary Figure 6: Objectives for Providing Feedback.	647

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation Meaning

<i>AI:</i>	Artificial Intelligence
<i>API:</i>	Application Programming Interface
<i>CMS:</i>	Content Management System
<i>COVID-19:</i>	Coronavirus Disease 2019
<i>CRAs:</i>	Clinical Research Associates
<i>CUT:</i>	Cyprus University of Technology
<i>DHI:</i>	Digital Health Intervention
<i>DHIs:</i>	Digital Health Interventions
<i>DHT:</i>	Digital Health Technology
<i>DHTs:</i>	Digital Health Technologies
<i>EFPIA:</i>	European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industries and Associations
<i>EHDS:</i>	European Health Data Space
<i>HER:</i>	Electronic Health Record
<i>EHRs:</i>	Electronic Health Records
<i>EMR:</i>	Electronic Medical Record
<i>EMRs:</i>	Electronic Medical Records
<i>EPRs:</i>	Electronic Personal Records
<i>EU:</i>	European Union
<i>FAQ:</i>	Frequently Asked Questions
<i>GDPR:</i>	General Data Protection Regulation
<i>GPs:</i>	General Practitioners
<i>GPAI:</i>	General-Purpose Artificial Intelligence
<i>HCPs:</i>	Healthcare Professionals
<i>HIEs:</i>	Health Information Exchanges
<i>HTA:</i>	Health Technology Assessment
<i>ICT:</i>	Information and Communication Technology
<i>ICTs:</i>	Information and Communication Technologies
<i>IT:</i>	Information Technology
<i>KPIs:</i>	Key Performance Indicators
<i>LMS:</i>	Learning Management System
<i>LMICs:</i>	Low- and Middle-Income Countries
<i>mHealth:</i>	Mobile Health
<i>mHealth apps:</i>	Mobile Health Applications
<i>NGO:</i>	Non-Governmental Organization
<i>NGOs:</i>	Non-Governmental Organizations
<i>NIS2:</i>	Network and Information Security Directive 2 (EU)

Abbreviation Meaning

<i>PGHD:</i>	Patient-Generated Health Data
<i>PICO:</i>	Population, Intervention, Comparison, and Outcome
<i>PRISMA:</i>	Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses
<i>PROs:</i>	Patient-Reported Outcomes
<i>R&D:</i>	Research and Development
<i>SSO:</i>	Single Sign-On
<i>UCD:</i>	University College Dublin
<i>UNESCO:</i>	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
<i>UX/UI:</i>	User Experience / User Interface
<i>WHO:</i>	World Health Organization

GLOSSARY

Alpha, BETA, BETA-EDU, and Gamma architectures: Successive developmental architectures of the BRAIN health-tech Ethics Navigator created through the iterative phases of this research. The terms are intentionally retained to distinguish different stages of conceptual, structural, and educational refinement throughout the dissertation. The capitalisation of BETA and BETA-EDU is purposefully maintained to denote the expanded and educationally oriented forms of the architecture.

BETA Architecture: The BETA Architecture is the refined version of the BRAIN Health-Tech Ethics Navigator, developed after expert validation and feedback analysis. It represents the consolidated structural design of the navigator, integrating its ethical foundations, procedural logic, functional components, and governance mechanisms into a coherent multi-layer architecture. The BETA version preserves the navigator's core ethical principles while incorporating improvements aimed at enhancing clarity, usability, and practical applicability. As such, it serves as the validated analytical configuration of the Ethics Navigator, providing the basis for further adaptations, including its educational extension (BETA-EDU).

BETA-EDU Architecture: The BETA-EDU Architecture refers to the educational re-architecture of the beta version of the BRAIN Health-Tech Ethics Navigator. It represents the pedagogical adaptation of the validated navigator, restructuring its analytical components into a staged learning design that supports ethical literacy, reflective reasoning, and facilitated discussion. While preserving the navigator's core ethical foundations, such as the five axons, associated challenges, and underlying principles, the BETA-EDU architecture re-frames technical and analytical elements into learning-oriented formats, including scenario-based deliberation, stakeholder perspective analysis, and reflective synthesis. This configuration positions the navigator as a structured educational

tool for teaching and training in digital health ethics rather than as a decision-support or compliance instrument.

BRAIN health-tech Ethics Navigator (alpha version): An Ethics Navigator refers to a structured tool developed in this thesis to guide users through systematic ethical deliberation, reflection, and learning in the context of digital health. It is designed to navigate individuals and stakeholders through ethically relevant questions, considerations, and prompts derived from empirically identified gaps and challenges in digital health use. Grounded in the experiences and perceptions of patients and healthcare professionals, the Ethics Navigator translates identified empirical challenges into guided reflection pathways that facilitate critical engagement, ethical awareness, and responsible practice. Rather than prescribing fixed solutions, the tool supports users in navigating complex ethical landscapes by encouraging structured inquiry, contextual sensitivity, and reflective learning.

Challenge: In this systematic review, a challenge refers to any reported barrier, concern, limitation, or contextual difficulty affecting the adoption, implementation, experience, or outcomes of digital health use, as perceived by patients and healthcare professionals. Operationally, challenges were identified through explicit references to barriers, fears, mismatches between user needs and technological solutions, perceived risks, downsides, concerns, potential pitfalls, or structural and organisational limitations.

Educational: In the context of this study, educational refers broadly to activities, structures, or resources designed to support learning, knowledge development, and ethical awareness. Educational elements aim to facilitate understanding of concepts, frameworks, and practical implications, enabling learners to engage with complex topics, such as digital health ethics, in an accessible, structured way. Within the Ethics Navigator, the educational orientation refers to adapting the navigator to support teaching, training, and capacity-building across diverse learner groups.

Gamma Architecture: Final implementation-oriented and stakeholder-informed architecture of the BRAIN health-tech Ethics Navigator developed following end-user engagement across multiple sectors. The Gamma architecture represents the most mature and scalable version of the system, integrating empirical evidence, expert refinement, usability considerations, cross-sector requirements, and educational functionality into a modular and adaptable ethical support architecture.

Gap: In the context of this systematic review, a gap refers to an identified absence, insufficiency, or unmet need in relation to the use of digital health technologies, as perceived by patients and healthcare professionals. Operationally, relevance was determined based on explicit references to a “lack of” evidence, resources, competencies, infrastructure, regulatory clarity, usability, accessibility, or structured implementation support, as well as articulated “needs for” improvement or further development.

Health Public Intelligence Recommender: A structured recommendation-generating mechanism developed in this thesis to translate empirically identified challenges in digital health use into actionable ethical guidance. The term denotes a system that synthesises collective experiential evidence (“public intelligence”) derived from patients and healthcare professionals and produces context-sensitive recommendations to support ethics deliberation, reflection, and learning. In this study, the Health Public Intelligence Recommender was conceptually grounded in the empirical mapping of gaps and challenges identified through a systematic review. These challenges served as the foundational inputs for generating structured prompts and guidance aimed at supporting ethical awareness, decision-making, and responsible digital health implementation.

Pedagogical: Pedagogical refers more specifically to the methods, strategies, and design principles used to facilitate effective learning and teaching. Pedagogical elements focus on how learning is structured, delivered, and experienced, including the use of learning stages, reflective prompts, scenario-based

exercises, and participatory discussion. In the context of the BETA-EDU architecture, pedagogical adaptation involves restructuring the Ethics Navigator's analytical components into guided learning pathways that promote ethical reasoning, critical reflection, and stakeholder perspective-taking.

ORIGINALITY OF THE THESIS

This dissertation contributes to the field of digital health ethics by moving beyond the development of abstract ethical principles toward the creation of an implementation-oriented educational ethics architecture. While existing approaches in digital health ethics predominantly focus on normative frameworks, guidelines, or principle-based recommendations, this study addresses the persistent gap between ethical theory and practical application in real-world healthcare technology environments.

The originality of the thesis lies primarily in the development of the BRAIN Health-Tech Ethics Navigator, a structured and user-oriented system designed to support ethical reflection, learning, and decision support across diverse digital health contexts. Rather than proposing an additional set of ethical principles, the study operationalises existing ethical and human rights commitments into a navigable architecture that translates ethical concerns into practical pathways, contextual challenges, graded scenarios, and structured recommendations.

The study's iterative and multi-phase methodological approach further contributes to the thesis originality in that the architecture was not developed solely through theoretical reasoning but emerged progressively through the integration of:

1. published evidence on ethical challenges in digital health,
2. expert validation and architectural refinement, and
3. end-user engagement across multiple sectors involved in healthcare technology.

This process enabled the architecture to evolve from an initial conceptual model into a more robust, scalable, and context-sensitive system grounded in empirical evidence and stakeholder perspectives.

The thesis further contributes by introducing a stakeholder-sensitive and challenge-oriented structure. Ethical issues are not treated as universal or static concerns but are organised according to distinct user perspectives, particularly those of patients and healthcare professionals, and across thematic domains such as human values, data and algorithmic transparency, governance and accountability, equity and sustainability, and

clinical integrity. This layered structure allows ethical reflection to remain adaptable to varying technological, institutional, and sociocultural contexts.

Another important contribution is the educational orientation of the navigator. The architecture conceptualises ethics not as a compliance exercise but as a process of guided ethical reasoning and ethical capacity-building. Through scenario-based learning, structured navigation, and risk-oriented recommendations, the system supports the development of ethical literacy and practical judgment among users operating in digitally mediated healthcare environments.

Finally, the study contributes to the broader field of digital health implementation research by demonstrating how ethical reflection can be embedded into system design through an interdisciplinary, human rights-informed, and implementation-oriented process. The resulting Gamma architecture represents a modular and adaptable ethics support system that may inform future educational tools, governance initiatives, and responsible digital health innovation practices.

Collectively, this dissertation advances the discussion from “*what ethical principles should guide digital health*” toward “*how ethical reflection can be operationalised, taught, navigated, and applied in practice.*”

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Digital Healthcare Ecosystem as an Ethical Pressure Environment

1.1.1 The Emergence of a Digital Healthcare Ecosystem

In the rapidly evolving landscape of digital technologies, the concept of *digital ecosystems* has emerged as a foundational field of exploration(1). Originally developed to describe interconnected digital environments in which technologies, actors, and institutions co-evolve, the “*ecosystem*” way of thinking has been applied across several domains of innovation, including industry, public services, and complex socio-technical systems(2,3). During recent years, this conceptual lens has been extended to the healthcare sector at an increasing pace, recognising that modern healthcare can no longer be adequately understood through isolated technologies or single institutional actors(1,3).

Digital health represents a central manifestation of this ecosystemic shift within the field of healthcare. Instead of referring to discrete digital tools or applications, digital health functions as a platform through which digital technologies act as intermediaries among patients, healthcare professionals, institutions and data infrastructures(4). Through mechanisms such as remote monitoring, decision-support systems, and patient-facing digital services, digital health technologies reshape how care is coordinated across settings and organisational boundaries(3,4).

The rapid evolution and diffusion of health technologies has, in turn, transformed the way in which healthcare services are delivered, regulated and perceived by stakeholders across the healthcare system(5). Developments such as semantic interoperability in electronic health records, cloud-based infrastructure, artificial intelligence-enabled decision-support systems, and data-driven approaches to precision medicine illustrate a broader shift toward integrated, data-intensive healthcare infrastructure(5). All these

developments operate not as standalone technological interventions, but as interconnected components of wider systems that depend on continuous data flows, shared standards and cross-organisational coordination(1,3).

Within this context, the notion of a digital healthcare ecosystem provides a useful conceptual lens for capturing the complexity and interdependence of the contemporary digital health innovation ecosystem. Iyawa et al. define a digital health innovation ecosystem as “*a network of digital health communities consisting of interconnected, interrelated and interdependent digital health species, including healthcare stakeholders, healthcare institutions and digital healthcare devices situated in a digital health environment*”(3). This definition highlights that digital health ecosystems are not defined solely by technological connectivity, but by the coordinated interaction of actors, practices and infrastructures aimed at improving health outcomes and empowering patients.

An ecosystem perspective also highlights the increasing convergence of domains that were previously more clearly delineated. In digital healthcare ecosystems, the boundaries between research and care, industry and clinical practice, and governance and innovation are becoming progressively blurred(1,6,7). Digital tools developed within research settings may rapidly enter clinical practice; commercial infrastructures may mediate public care functions; and governance logics may be embedded directly within technical architectures. As a consequence, responsibility, accountability, and decision-making authority may be distributed across several actors operating at different levels of the healthcare system(1,3).

Therefore, understanding digital health as an ecosystem shifts analytical attention away from individual technologies toward the interactions, dependencies, and relationships that shape innovation at a system level(3,8). From this perspective, many challenges associated with digital health do not arise solely from the technical properties of individual tools, but from how technologies are designed, integrated, governed, and used within complex socio-technical environments(1,6,7). Consequently, ethical analysis confined to individual technologies or isolated decision points risks overlooking the systemic dynamics through which ethical tensions are generated, distributed, and amplified across the ecosystem.

The digital healthcare ecosystem thus operates as an ethical pressure environment: a structurally dynamic context in which rapid innovation, distributed responsibility, commercial incentives, regulatory uncertainty and evolving professional roles interact to generate continuous normative demands. Within such an environment, ethics cannot remain external or episodic but must be understood as a structural component of how innovation is interpreted, negotiated and integrated into practice.

1.1.2 From Risk Mitigation to Ethical Sense-Making

Within the field of digital health, ethics has been framed as a matter of risk identification, harm prevention and regulatory compliance, mainly concerning bias, privacy, safety and accountability(9). Moreover, this framing is reflected in the proliferation of ethical principles, governance mechanisms and guidelines designed to mitigate potential harms relevant to digital health technologies(10). Doubtlessly, these approaches have played a significant role in raising ethical risk awareness; on the other hand, they treat ethics as a checklist activity aimed at achieving procedural compliance instead of being an ongoing interpretive practice(11).

However, in complex digital health ecosystems, ethical challenges are rarely static or fully predictable, emerging instead through evolving interactions among technologies, users, institutions and contexts of use(12). Risk-based approaches tend to fragment ethical issues into discrete categories, obscuring how ethical tensions accumulate, transform or reappear across the lifecycle of innovation and deployment(13). As digital systems evolve through iterative updates, machine learning adaptation and infrastructural integration, ethical implications become temporally extended and relational rather than discrete and event-based.

From this perspective, the core ethical challenge in digital health is not solely what risks exist, but how professionals understand, interpret and respond to ethical complexity within situated decision-making contexts(14). The central question shifts from “*Which*

risks must be mitigated?” to “How are ethical meanings constructed, negotiated and justified within evolving socio-technical environments?” Under these conditions, addressing ethics as ethical sense-making foregrounds the development of reflective capacities, contextual judgement and shared interpretive frameworks that enable stakeholders to reason ethically across diverse scenarios and stages of innovation(15). Ethical sense-making emphasises the cultivation of ethical learning, that is, the development of interpretive competence, deliberative capacity and human-rights-grounded judgement that can be exercised across roles and institutional settings.

This shift reframes ethics from a peripheral mechanism of control toward a constitutive element of professional learning and practice within the digital healthcare ecosystem(10). Accordingly, the challenge is not merely to strengthen governance instruments, but to reconsider how bioethics itself is positioned within digital innovation processes, whether as an external evaluative authority or as an embedded educational architecture that supports ongoing ethical learning across the ecosystem.

1.2 The functional positioning of Bioethics in healthcare and innovation

1.2.1 Traditional roles of Bioethics in healthcare

Bioethics has played a significant role in shaping the moral foundations of healthcare by systematically addressing ethical dilemmas arising in medical practice and biomedical research(16). Although often perceived as a contemporary discipline, its intellectual roots extend deep into the history of moral philosophy and medical ethics(17). The term “*bioethics*” itself derives from the Greek words *bios* (life) and *ethos* (character), reflecting its concern with the moral dimensions of life sciences and healthcare(18). From its inception, philosophical reflection has enriched medicine by foregrounding ethical reasoning as central to clinical judgment and professional integrity(17).

While the formal field of bioethics emerged in the twentieth century, its historical foundations are intertwined with the evolution of medical ethics(16). Ethical guidance for medical practice predates the Hippocratic tradition, as many early societies articulated professional obligations through oaths and moral codes(19). The Hippocratic Oath, commonly dated to the fifth century BC, became the most influential ethical reference point in Western medicine and established enduring principles concerning professional conduct and patient welfare(20). Traditional medical ethics primarily focused on the doctor-patient relationship and emphasised the virtues and character of the physician as the cornerstone of good medical practice(21).

Bioethics, however, developed as a broader and more critical enterprise that extended beyond professional virtue and bedside decision-making(16). In the 1960s and 1970s, the term was popularised by Van Rensselaer Potter, who envisioned bioethics as a “*science of survival*” linking biological knowledge with human values in response to technological and ecological challenges(22). During this period, rapid advances in biomedical science and clinical innovation, including organ transplantation, life-sustaining technologies, reproductive medicine, and genetic engineering, generated ethical questions that exceeded the traditional boundaries of medical ethics(23). At the same time, public revelations of egregious research abuses, including the experiments conducted during the Second World War and the Tuskegee syphilis study, exposed profound failures in the protection of human subjects and catalysed the institutionalisation of research ethics(24,25).

These historical developments led to the formalization of bioethics as a normative discipline concerned with the protection of human dignity and rights in medicine and research(16). The Belmont Report articulated foundational ethical principles, respect for persons, beneficence, and justice, that became cornerstones of research oversight and regulatory frameworks(26). Building on this foundation, principlism, most prominently formulated by Beauchamp and Childress, provided a systematic framework for analyzing clinical and research dilemmas through the principles of autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice(27). Through these developments, bioethics established itself as an interdisciplinary field spanning medicine, philosophy, law, public policy, and the social sciences(18).

Traditionally, bioethics has operated across three central domains within healthcare. First, in clinical ethics, it has guided decision-making in cases involving end-of-life care, informed consent, capacity, and treatment refusal, offering structured approaches to resolving moral conflict at the bedside(21,27). Second, in research ethics, it has institutionalized oversight mechanisms such as Institutional Review Boards and articulated normative standards for ethical experimentation and the protection of vulnerable populations(26,28). Third, at the level of policy and governance, bioethics has informed legislative deliberations and public debates concerning emerging technologies, healthcare allocation, and questions of distributive justice(16,29).

Across these domains, bioethics has primarily functioned as a reflective and evaluative discipline: clarifying principles, adjudicating dilemmas, and guiding decision-making within relatively bounded institutional settings. This functional positioning presupposes identifiable decision points, stable professional roles and clearly demarcated institutional boundaries. It assumes that ethical analysis can be applied at discrete moments of deliberation or review. These conditions, however, are increasingly destabilised within digital health innovation ecosystems.

1.2.2 Bioethics in the Context of Digital Innovation Practices

Digital health innovation is characterised by rapid development cycles, large-scale data integration, and interdisciplinary collaboration across clinical, technical, commercial, and regulatory domains(6,7). Such innovation ecosystems operate through iterative design, agile development, and continuous deployment, conditions that differ substantially from the slower, episodic structures within which traditional bioethical oversight evolved(12). As a result, the speed and scale of digital innovation often outpace conventional ethical review mechanisms designed for discrete clinical interventions or research protocols(30).

Traditional bioethical governance has relied heavily on episodic ethics review, particularly through institutional review boards and regulatory approval processes structured

around clearly bounded projects(26,28). However, digital health technologies frequently evolve after deployment through software updates, machine learning adaptation, and integration with new datasets, rendering one-time ethical assessments insufficient(13).

In such environments, ethical implications are not confined to the moment of approval but unfold dynamically across design iterations, data flows, user interactions, and infrastructural integrations. Ethical questions become continuous rather than episodic, distributed rather than centralized, and embedded within technical decision-making processes. Moreover, expert-driven oversight models position ethics as an external evaluative function rather than as an integral component of design and implementation practices(14). Consequently, value-laden decisions may be negotiated implicitly within engineering, procurement, and deployment processes, even when formal ethical authority remains institutionally separate(30).

This structural separation creates a functional gap: ethics retains formal authority at the level of review and governance. At the same time, practical normative decisions are made within innovation teams that may lack structured support for ethical reasoning.

1.2.3 The Structural Repositioning Problem

In light of this misalignment, the issue is not merely procedural but structural. Bioethics remains institutionally positioned as an evaluative checkpoint, whereas digital innovation processes distribute ethical decision-making across technical and organisational actors. Embedding ethics within design and development processes aligns with approaches such as Value Sensitive Design, which emphasize the integration of normative reflection into technical development(31). However, embedding ethics cannot be reduced to inserting additional checkpoints into development cycles. It requires rethinking the functional role of bioethics within the ecosystem itself, from an external arbiter of compliance to an internal infrastructure that supports ethical learning and deliberation across roles and stages of innovation.

Repositioning bioethics, therefore, entails a shift from external oversight to internal capacity-building. Complex digital ecosystems demand participatory and distributed forms of ethical engagement, as responsibility is dispersed among developers, clinicians, data scientists, managers, and policymakers(32).

In this context, the central challenge becomes educational rather than exclusively regulatory: *how can stakeholders cultivate the interpretive capacities required to recognize, articulate and negotiate ethical tensions as they arise within innovation practice?* Supporting ethical sense-making across these roles transforms bioethics into an enabling infrastructure for reflective practice rather than a compliance-oriented checkpoint, thereby situating it as an active and strategic component of digital health innovation(10).

Accordingly, the repositioning required is architectural. Bioethics should function as a human-rights grounded educational architecture capable of scaffolding ethical learning, sustaining deliberative capacity and embedding normative reflection into the evolving fabric of digital healthcare systems. This structural misalignment thus raises a broader question: *how has digital health ethics been operationalized in practice, and what conceptual limitations follow from its prevailing governance orientation?*

1.3 Ethics as Governance: Structural limits in digital health ecosystems

1.3.1 The governance turns in digital health ethics

Over the past decade, digital health and artificial intelligence have been accompanied by a rapid proliferation of ethical principles, guidelines, and governance toolkits developed by academic institutions, professional bodies, governments, and international organizations(10,33). Comparative analyses have identified dozens of AI ethics frameworks globally, many converging on shared principles such as transparency, accountability, fairness, privacy, and human oversight(33). In parallel, health-specific guidance documents have emerged that address clinical AI, digital platforms, and data-driven medicine, reflecting efforts to adapt traditional bioethical principles to digitally mediated healthcare contexts(6,34). These frameworks have contributed significantly to raising awareness of ethical risks and to embedding normative language within digital health governance discussions(10).

This proliferation reflects what may be described as a governance turn in digital health ethics: a collective attempt to stabilise rapidly evolving technological environments through the articulation of principles, standards, and oversight mechanisms(35). The development of such frameworks represents an important maturation of ethical reflection in response to technological transformation and regulatory uncertainty(30). By articulating shared values and high-level principles, they provide common reference points for policymakers, developers, and healthcare organizations navigating emerging digital infrastructures(34). Furthermore, governance-oriented ethics guidance has supported the integration of accountability mechanisms, impact assessments, and risk-management strategies into innovation processes(13).

In this sense, governance-oriented ethics has performed a crucial system-stabilizing function: it renders technological development normatively visible and institutionally accountable. Seen in this light, contemporary digital health ethics has largely evolved as a governance response to uncertainty, seeking to render emerging technologies ethically legible through codification, standard-setting, and compliance instruments. Nonetheless, the existence of numerous frameworks has also produced fragmentation and overlap, raising questions about their practical coherence and operational effectiveness(33). The issue is therefore not the absence of ethical articulation, but the structural form through which ethics has been operationalized.

1.3.2 Compliance, Risk and Principle's Articulation

Despite their normative contributions, many existing ethics frameworks remain principle-heavy and abstract, offering high-level values without clear pathways for contextual interpretation and implementation(30). Scholars have noted that principles alone are insufficient to resolve concrete ethical tensions, particularly in complex socio-technical systems where values conflict, and trade-offs are unavoidable(10). Moreover, numerous frameworks are prescriptive or compliance-oriented, positioning ethics primarily as a matter of risk mitigation and regulatory conformity rather than as a practice of ongoing moral reasoning(11). This orientation may limit their capacity to guide reflective engagement during iterative design and deployment processes(12).

Within such approaches, ethics is frequently operationalized as procedural compliance: adherence to checklists, completion of impact assessments, and satisfaction of predefined safeguards. Ethical robustness becomes equated with documentation, reporting, and risk containment, rather than with the cultivation of interpretive judgement and deliberative competence.

In addition, many ethics frameworks are designed primarily for policy-level governance or institutional oversight, rendering them difficult to translate into everyday professional practice across interdisciplinary teams(34). Their structure often assumes centralized authority or expert-led evaluation, which may not align with distributed innovation environments in digital health ecosystems(14). As a result, such frameworks can be unevenly applicable across sectors, particularly where technological development occurs in commercial or hybrid public–private contexts(6). The structural limitation, therefore, lies not in the normative content of these frameworks, but in their predominant logic of application: they regulate outcomes but rarely scaffold ethical reasoning processes within innovation workflows.

These dynamics reveal a deeper orientation: ethics is positioned primarily as supervisory governance rather than as embedded professional practice. While governance