American Journal of Psychiatric Rehabilitation

Expert Opinion Article

Digital Epidemiology In Urban Health Monitoring: A Narrative Review Of Smart Technologies And Public Health Integration

Arya V R[1*], Sagar K S[2]

[1*]Senior Resident, Department of Community Medicine, Pondicherry Institute of Medical Sciences, Puducherry. Email- aryavijayan3715@gmail.com
[2]Senior Resident, Department of Community Medicine, ESIC medical college and PGIMSR, KK Nagar, Chennai, Email-sagarsuredran1@gamil.com

Abstract
Background:
Digital epidemiology that is, the use of data generated by digital devices that has health-related content to infer health-related outcomes is becoming a central strategy for meeting complex urban health challenges. High rates of urbanisation lead to population density, mobility, and environmental pressures that can predispose cities to outbreaks of infectious disease, burdens of chronic illness, and environmental health threats. Smart tools such as mobile health apps, wearables, Internet of Things (IoT)–based sensors, and artificial intelligence (AI)–based analytics allow real-time monitoring and early warning and targeted interventions, offering an unprecedented opportunity to improve public health promotion efforts in urban settings.
Materials and Methods:
For a narrative review in PubMed, Scopus and Web of Science since 2010 up to 2024. It encompassed keywords such as "digital epidemiology," "urban health," "smart technologies," "mHealth," "IoT" and "public health informatics." Studies and reports pertaining to digital urban health monitoring tools and their integration into public health systems were included. We excluded rural health studies, non-digital interventions, and certain reports such as a non-peer-reviewed report.
Results:
The report finds an increasing emphasis on wearable devices to achieve continuous monitoring of biometrics, the use of mobile health apps to engage citizens, AI-driven analytics to drive predictive modelling, combinations of IoT-based environmental sensors to monitor pollution and climate, and the use of GIS mapping for spatio-temporal disease tracking. Many smart city projects have successfully proved the value of integrating with public health systems, enabling faster outbreak detection, better chronic disease management, and enhanced community-based health interventions.
Conclusion:
Smart technologies are increasingly used for urban and health monitoring, and integrating such technologies into public health policies may not only enable accessing many such systems but also facilitate a transition from reactive to proactive urban health monitoring systems. This transition encourages prevention of diseases earlier, an evidence-based approach on policies, along with more durable and healthier urban populations.

Key words; Digital epidemiology, urban health, Smart technology, Public health Scenario, Informatic, Real-time surveillance, mHealth, IoT.

Introduction

1.1 Digital Epidemiology — What Is It and What Does It Do for Urban Health?

Digital epidemiology is defined as the use of non-traditional data (typically digital data from digital platforms, sensors or connected devices) for epidemiological analysis and public health decision making (Salathé 2018). This perspective includes the integration, analysis and contextualization of health data from mHealth applications, wearables, social media, geospatial mapping technologies and other IoT-enabled sensors to monitor disease trends, environmental exposures, and ultimately enable rapid responses to threats (Wesolowski et al. 2016). Specifically, this example of passive health surveillance spans infectious disease surveillance, chronic disease management, environmental health monitoring and behavioural health assessment, contributing to its relevance and applicability to the complexity of urban health ecosystems (Ekong et al. 2022).

1.2 Urbanisation — trends and public health implications

Now more than 55% of people worldwide it is living in cities (who will reach 68% by 2050) . Although urbanisation can promote economic progression and social engenderment, the health implications of these changes are considerable, leading to rising air pollution, greater burdens of non-communicable diseases (NCDs)and increased risk for infectious disease outbreaks associated with high densities of susceptible individuals and patterns of movement (Neiderud et.al, 2015). These risks are compounded by climate change, substandard housing, and the unequal distribution of healthcare (Vlahov et al, 2021). However, traditional epidemiological systems usually prove challenging in generating granularity, real-time insights in such dynamic environments.

1.3 Justification for Incorporating Smart Technologies in Epidemiology of Urban Health

Smart city technologies enable more efficient integration of these resources into urban epidemiology, thereby creating a transformative pathway to precision public health (Khoury et al. 2016). Urban health systems can conduct early outbreak detection, hotspot prediction, and targeted interventions through Ai based analytics, IoT-based environmental monitoring, and Health generated at population level by Citizens (Bansal et al. 2016). Such a data-rich, real-time approach will allow us to move from crisis-driven management to health promotion and prevention (Yasobant et al. 2021). Furthermore, smart technologies enable participatory health governance, allowing citizens to play an active role in disease surveillance and risk mitigation efforts (Brinkel et al. 2020).

Methodology

2.1 Narrative Review Methodology

This narrative review synthesizes diverse qualitative study designs and sources to present a comprehensive account of digital epidemiology in urban health monitoring. Unlike systematic reviews with rigid protocols, the narrative approach allows thematic organization and contextual interpretation, enabling evaluation of contemporary literature on smart technologies and their integration into public health systems.

2.2 Databases and Search Terms

A literature search was conducted from January 2010 to June 2024, covering 14 years of grey and peer-reviewed sources, including organizational reports and policy documents. Databases searched were PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science, chosen for their broad coverage of health, technology, and medical research. Grey literature was sourced from organizations such as the World Health Organization and the United Nations, along with smart city policy reports. Search strategies combined controlled vocabularies (e.g., MeSH terms) and free keywords, using Boolean operators. *Key terms included* digital epidemiology, urban health, smart technologies, public health informatics, mHealth, IoT, GIS, *and* real-time surveillance*.*

2.3 Selection Criteria for Studies

Inclusion criteria covered studies and reports in English, published between 2010 and 2024, that examined digital tools and smart technologies applied to urban health monitoring. Eligible designs included peer-reviewed papers, reports, and conference presentations addressing technological, epidemiological, or policy aspects of integration into public health. Exclusion criteria ruled out purely theoretical models, non-peer-reviewed editorials or commentaries, and irrelevant literature without application to public health. Public health policy documents or implementation reports not linked to digital system integration were also excluded. The review prioritized studies reporting measurable outcomes and concrete evidence of digital system integration into urban health.

Key Studies & Reviews in Digital Epidemiology and Smart Urban Health Monitoring

Category	Study / Review	Key Insights
Foundational Definition	Fallatah (2024)	Defines digital epidemiology using big data (social media, search queries) for real-time outbreak detection; notes challenges around data quality and privacy.
Wearable Technologies	Huhn et al. (2022)	Scoping review: Wearables widely used in health research (COVID-19 prediction, heart rate, sleep); limited deployment in low-resource settings.
Population Digital Health	(2024 mHealth & IoT) — JMIR (article)	Explores "population digital health" via Health IoT and wearables for continuous monitoring.
Broad Wearables Survey	Haghi et al. (2021)	Surveys wearable devices' multi-domain health monitoring—from environmental sensing to Bio-signals.
Smart Wearables Review	MDPI review (2023)	Reviews advances in wearable health monitoring systems: materials, integration, and AI-assisted data interpretation.
IoT-Based Remote Monitoring	PubMed study (2023)	Demonstrates an IoT-based wearable system to monitor quarantined individuals in real time, improving resource use.
Smart Home IoT Monitoring	Linkous et al. (2019)	Explores IoT integration in smart homes for health monitoring and reduced burden on healthcare providers.

Predictive IoT-AI Hybrid Model	Edward & Thomas (2020)	Proposes IoT + AI models using wearables and environmental sensors for predictive epidemiology in urban settings; shows improved detection and adaptability.
mHealth Remote Monitoring Review	Jat & Grønli (2024, arXiv)	Comprehensive review of mHealth apps for remote monitoring: benefits, challenges, and future directions (integration, AI, equity).
Digital Epidemiology Review	Pastor-Escuredo (2021)	Digital epidemiology overview: big data, social networks, mobility, and spatio-temporal modelling for real-time outbreak monitoring.
Digital Epidemiology Concept	Wikipedia"E-epidemiology"	Defines e-epidemiology (digital epidemiology) as epidemiological methods using digital media (internet, mobile phones) for efficient, large-scale data collection.

Evolution of Digital Epidemiology

3.1 Evolution from Traditional Epidemiology To Digital Epidemiology

Conventional epidemiology was mainly based on structured data collected manually from health facilities, field survey and laboratory report to track disease pattern and direct intervention. These approaches, while performing well for long-range trend analysis, were typically hampered by slow collection of data, limited geographic range, and temporal insufficiency for early outbreak detection (Buehler et al. 2004). Digital epidemiology began in the early 2000s with the availability of internet-based data sources [e.g.: search engine query; online news feed; crowd-sourced reports] (Salathé et al. 2018). Although critically interrogated after the fact regarding their accuracy and the impact of algorithmic bias (Lazer et al. 2014). This transition from a reactive to proactive field of epidemiology that provided almost real-time public health knowledge reflected a paradigm shift (Brownstein et al. 2009).

The impact of Big Data/AI/IoT on Epidemiology Practice

The application of big data analytics in epidemiology has substantially enlarged the breadth and scope of public health surveillance (Ioannidis et al. 2014). At the same time, the availability of electronic health records, social media platforms, wearable devices and environmental sensors have allowed epidemiologists to access large, diverse datasets with an unprecedented level of detail about health-related behaviours, exposures, and outcomes (Wesolowski et al. 2016). AI and ML algorithms are capable of patterns, predicting the modelling and anomalies detection, thus enhancing the efficiency of predictions for outbreaks and populations of interest (Bansal et al. 2016). IoT, with its array of connected health and environmental sensors, generate a continuous stream of data, at specified location which can augment disease mapping and help direct precision public health interventions (Yasobant et al. 2021). Together, such technology has turned epidemiology into a more systems-based, predictive, and participatory practice that meets the complexities of 21st century urban health.

Revitalization of Urban Health Monitoring through Smart Technologies

4.1 Endureuble Devices & Near Healthy apps

Wearable devices, including smartwatches, fitness trackers, and biosensor patches, serve as important tools for capturing continuous health data among urban populations (Piwek et al. 2016). They collect physiological parameters such as heart rate, physical activity, oxygen saturation, and sleep patterns and provide on-demand health information (Patel et al. 2012). mHealth applications also go hand in hand with these devices to allow users to log symptoms, access to telemedicine and personalised health advice (Boulos et al. 2014). Wearable and app data, when integrated to public health systems, can enable early detection of disease clusters and allow for behavioural health interventions targeting high density housing (Mishra et al. 2020).

4.2 Environmental and Biometric Sensors

Internet of things (IoT)-enabled environmental sensors have been deployed in urban settings for monitoring ambient air quality, temperature, humidity, and other environmental determinants of health (Mahajan et al. 2018). This is used to assess exposures related to respiratory illness, cardiovascular disease, and heat-related morbidity (Zeger et al. 2000). Biometric sensors in public spaces, transport hubs and healthcare facilities collect physiological signals to support contagious disease screening and crowd health assessment (Sun & de Florio, 2017). Guo et al. Integration of environmental and biometric data assists urban, place-based health interventions. 2020).

4.3 Geo-Spatial Mapping and GIS Integration

Geographic Information Systems (GIS) play a key role in such work as GIS can map real time data on disease incidence/occurrence (Eisen & Eisen 2011), environmental hazards, and healthcare accessibility. In urban epidemiology, GIS allows hotspot detection, resource allocation and the spatial analysis of health inequities (Boulos & Geraghty 2020). Spatial Analytics for Outbreak Control GIS based Dengue Mapping in Singapore, GIS based Dengue Mapping in Singapore (Mokhtari et al. 2021). GIS data is part of other digital data streams that when combined together can enhance urban public health planning.

4.4 Social Media, Crowd-Sourced Data Analysis

Social media sites like Twitter, Facebook, and Weibo are fast information pipelines that allow us to identify certain health threats. Participatory surveillance apps are a types of crowd-sourced health platforms (Freifeld et al. 2010). Early-warning signals for outbreaks, as well as reflections of community-level behavioural responses, can be parsed from these data streams. Nevertheless, concerns regarding misinformation, representativeness, and data quality stay as paramount (Chan et al. 2020).

4.5 AI and ML for Disease Prediction

The use of AI and machine learning (ML) models in predictive epidemiology is transforming the field with their ability to detect non-linear interactions in high-dimensional datasets (Jiang et al. 2017). AI-based models have been applied to urban health — predicting disease spread, estimating exposure to environmental stressors, or allocating resources in an epidemic19 and more. For instance, multiple deep learning algorithms are developed to predict the number of COVID-19 cases by employing mobility and demographic data (Ardabili et al. 2020) and ML-based air pollution risk assessment among urban asthmatics (Liang et al. 2022). Researchers can use artificial intelligence and big data from these IoT and GIS platforms as an arsenal to alleviate urban-healthy problems (Wang et al. 2018).

Public Health Integration Framework

5.1 Compatibility with Current Health Frameworks

Interoperability with existing health information systems looks like seamless integration of smart technologies into public health frameworks (ISO 2017). This allows for the secure exchange and interpretation of data from wearable devices, IoT sensors, mHealth applications, and GIS platforms between healthcare providers, laboratories, and governmental agencies through interoperability (Jalghoum et al. 2021). In these instances, standards like HL7 FHIR (Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources) boost data in a structured format, allowing for near instantaneous disease report and decision support (Mandel et al. 2016). In the absence of interoperability this will lead to data silos, which have the potential to limit the extent to which digital epidemiology can detect outbreaks early enough to allocate resources effectively in urban health systems (Hincapie et al. 2020).

5.2 Data governance, privacy and ethical considerations

As digital epidemiology entails sensitive personal and health-related data, strong governance frameworks are essential for ensuring privacy, security, and fairness in the use of the data and derived evidence (Floridi et al. 2018). These principles include individualised informed consent and anonymisation for a great number of data and their secure storage and compliance with the regulations in legal frameworks like EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and US HIPAA as well (Mittelstadt et al.2019). Ethics challenge: On the one hand, deploying surveillance technologies in densely populated urban areas (Gasser et al. 2020) has the potential to be beneficial to public health; however, obtaining such public health benefits often comes at the expense of individual rights. Therefore, sustaining citizen participation in these digital health initiatives will require public trust, transparency in data usage, and ensured equitable access to these digital tools (Vayena et al. 2018).

5.3 Examples of smart city health developed across the globe

Many examples of these global smart city efforts reflect the role that digital epidemiology can play in public health. For example, in Barcelona, real-time environmental, health and mobility data are aggregated using a "CityOS" platform to identify targets for local health intervention (Ratti & Claudel 2016). For example, Singapore's Smart Nation Initiative employs all-scale IoT-enabled health monitoring systems and GIS mapping for vector-borne disease control, especially dengue and Zika virus surveillance (Ng et al. 2017). A different application of AI-driven air quality monitoring pilot linked to asthma historic management programs also occurred in Toronto's Quayside Project (Goodman & Powles 2019). Such illustrative examples of cross-sector collaboration, smart integrated technological solutions, and citizen participation create a unique combination capable of cultivating resilient, sustainable and data-led urban health ecosystems (Komninos et.al. 2019).

Opportunities and Benefits

6.1 Improved Detection and Response to Outbreaks

Digital epidemiology integrates smart technologies for real-time data collection, modeling, and monitoring, enabling rapid detection of outbreaks and emerging health threats (Salathé et.al . 2018). Physiological changes and environmental risk factors captured through wearables, mHealth platforms, and IoT sensors allow timely interventions for at-risk populations (Bansal et al., 2016). During COVID-19, mobile digital contact tracing in South Korea and Singapore significantly reduced response times for case detection and quarantine (Park et al., 2020).

6.2 Improved Chronic Disease Management
Remote patient monitoring combined with predictive analytics supports both personalized and population-level chronic disease management (Patel et al. 2014). Continuous data from wearables and mobile applications help clinicians track disease progression, adjust treatments, and detect early deterioration in conditions like diabetes, cardiovascular diseases, and asthma (Piwek et al. 2016). AI algorithms further identify high-risk groups for targeted prevention (Kitsiou et al. 2017).

6.3 Real-Time Environmental Hazard Monitoring
Urban populations face hazards such as air pollution and heatwaves (Mahajan et al., 2018). IoT-enabled environmental sensors provide real-time monitoring of air quality, temperature, and humidity, issuing alerts to reduce exposure (Zeger et al. 2000). Coupled with GIS spatial analysis, these systems empower policymakers to allocate resources effectively to vulnerable communities (Boulos & Geraghty, 2020).

6.4 Citizen Empowerment in Health Choices
Digital epidemiology fosters participatory health governance by enabling citizens to contribute health data and engage in surveillance (Vayena et al.2018). Mobile apps, social media, and crowd-sourced reporting tools provide individuals with timely, personalized health recommendations (Freifeld et al., 2010). Such engagement strengthens resilience and fosters community ownership of health outcomes, especially in urban hotspots (Brinkel et al.,

Challenges and Barriers
Data from diverse sources (e.g., wearables, social media, and IoT sensors) can be diverse in terms of formats, resolutions, and reliability and are challenging to integrate into public health databases (Khoury & Ioannidis 2014). A key barrier for these population health monitoring programs is the lack of widespread adoption of data standards (HL7 FHIR across all systems) hindering interoperability, and scaling (Hincapie et al. 2020).

7.1 Digital Divide and Unequal Benefit from Innovative Use of Technology
Socioeconomic disparities in access to smart technologies lead to a digital divide that can widen health inequities (van Dijk 2020). These issues will potentially decrease the access of low-income populations in urban setting to participate in digital health programs due to limited access to smart phones, internet access and digital literacy. Digital epidemiology risks excluding some of the very groups that it aims to help within health surveillance data, unless targeted policies are instituted to mitigate these inequities (Robinson et al. 2015).

7.2 Regulatory and Legal Hurdles
In many cases, as documented in the literature (Mittelstadt 2019), the regulatory landscapes in which digital epidemiology is implemented are often complex and vary between jurisdictions. In order for these systems to comply with frameworks such as GDPR in Europe or HIPAA in the US, stringent safeguards must be in place for data storage, storage, and processing (Gasser et. 2020). The legal challenges are further compounded by cross-border data flows, which are prevalent among global urban health initiatives (Vayena et al. 2018). While necessary to protect privacy, these regulatory requirements may delay the implementation of novel surveillance systems during crisis situations (Gostin & Wiley 2020).

7.3 Trust in the Public and Data Protection of the Public
The success of digital epidemiology is largely contingent upon public trust in the methods of data collection, storage, and use (Floridi et al. 2018). The fear of surveillance overreach, misuse of citizen information, and lack of transparency may inhibit citizens from interacting with digital health tools (Tavernise et al. 2020). Virtual social media platforms offer scalable potential for community engagement in pandemic response but trust and transparency remain challenges for pursuing participatory models in urban health monitoring, and transparent governance, foresight, and clear messages about data provenance and use are necessary for maintaining engagement (Vayena et al. 2018).

Future Directions
8.1 AI and Predictive Analytics for Precision Public Health
Commenting on the issue, Jiang et al.6 cite that the advances in artificial intelligence (AI) etc. Would result in further enhancements of urban health systems capacity to predict and respond to emerging threats. Machine learning algorithms can leverage big heterogeneous datasets, extracted from wear.

Conclusion
Digital epidemiology represents a paradigm shift in urban health, shifting systems from reactive crisis management to proactive prevention through smart technologies such as wearables, mHealth apps, IoT sensors, GIS, and AI analytics (Salathé et al, 2018;

Bansal et al., 2016). These tools enable real-time surveillance of outbreaks, chronic diseases, and environmental hazards while involving citizens in health governance (Vayena et al., 2018). However, their potential depends on addressing barriers such as data quality, interoperability, digital equity, regulatory compliance, and public trust (Khoury & Ioannidis, 2014). Long-term advancement will require multi-sector collaboration, investment in infrastructure, capacity building, and strong governance frameworks (Gasser et al., 2020; Vayena et al., 2018). Ultimately, incorporating digital epidemiology into public health will foster healthier, more sustainable, and resilient cities capable of responding to evolving epidemiological and environmental challenges

References

1. Salathé M. Digital epidemiology: what is it, and where is it going? *Life Sci Soc Policy.* 2018. https://lsspjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s40504-017-0065-7
2. Lippi G, Mattiuzzi C. Is digital epidemiology the future of clinical epidemiology? *Eur J Clin Invest.* 2019. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7310749/
3. Salathé M, et al. Digital epidemiology. *PLoS Comput Biol.* 2012. https://journals.plos.org/ploscompbiol/article?id=10.1371/journal.pcbi.1002616
4. Bansal S, et al. Big data for infectious disease surveillance and modeling. *J Infect Dis.* 2016. (overview) https://academic.oup.com/jid/article/214/suppl_4/S375/2386880
5. Khoury MJ, Ioannidis JPA. Big data meets public health. *JAMA.* 2014. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25005661/
6. Brownstein JS, Freifeld CC, Madoff LC. Digital disease detection. *N Engl J Med.* 2009. https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMp0900702
7. Lazer D, et al. The parable of Google Flu: traps in big data analysis. *Science.* 2014. https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.1248506
8. Paul MJ, Dredze M. You Are What You Tweet: Analyzing Twitter for Public Health. *ICWSM.* 2011. https://www.cs.jhu.edu/~mdredze/publications/icwsm_2011.pdf
9. Eysenbach G. Infodemiology and infoveillance. *Am J Prev Med.* 2011. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0749379711002303
10. World Health Organization. Public health surveillance: action planning for digitalization. 2022. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240040786
11. Piwek L, et al. The rise of consumer health wearables: promises and barriers. *PLoS Med.* 2016. https://journals.plos.org/plosmedicine/article?id=10.1371/journal.pmed.1001953
12. Patel S, et al. A review of wearable sensors and systems with application in rehabilitation. *J NeuroEng Rehabil.* 2012. https://jneuroengrehab.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1743-0003-9-21
13. Majumder S, et al. Wearable sensors for remote health monitoring. *Sensors.* 2017. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5298703/
14. Mishra T, et al. Pre-symptomatic detection of COVID-19 from smartwatch data. *Nat Biomed Eng.* 2020. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41551-020-00640-6
15. Zhu T, et al. Smartwatch data help detect COVID-19. *Nat Biomed Eng.* 2020 (News & Views). https://www.nature.com/articles/s41551-020-00659-9
16. Boulos MNK, et al. Mobile medical and health apps: state of the art. *JMIR.* 2014. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3959919/
17. Lewis TL, Wyatt JC. mHealth app safety framework. *JMIR.* 2014. https://www.jmir.org/2014/9/e210/
18. Gagnon M-P, et al. Healthcare professional adoption of m-health. *JMIR.* 2016. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7814918/
19. Kitsiou S, et al. Effectiveness of mHealth for diabetes. *PLoS One.* 2017. https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0173160
20. Bashi N, et al. Remote monitoring in heart failure—overview of reviews. *JMIR.* 2017. https://www.jmir.org/2017/1/e18/
21. Chow CK, et al. mHealth in cardiovascular care. *Heart Lung Circ.* 2016. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27262389/
22. Wang Y, et al. mHealth interventions for diabetes & obesity—review. *JMIR mHealth uHealth.* 2020. https://mhealth.jmir.org/2020/4/e15400/
23. Lee JA, et al. Effective behavioral strategies via mHealth. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak.* 2018. https://bmcmedinformdecismak.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12911-018-0591-0
24. Son Y-J, et al. Mobile phone–based interventions in HF. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2020. https://www.mdpi.com/16604601/17/5/1749
25. Kitsiou S, et al. mHealth for heart failure—systematic review & meta-analysis. *Can J Cardiol.*

2021. https://onlinecjc.ca/article/ S0828-282X%2821%2900118-5/fulltext

26. Freifeld CC, et al. Participatory epidemiology via mobile phones. *PLoS Med.* 2010. https://journals.plos.org/plosmedicine/article?id=10.1371/journal.pmed.1000376
27. Signorini A, et al. Twitter to track H1N1 activity. *PLoS One.* 2011. https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0019467
28. Paul MJ, Dredze M, Broniatowski DA. Social monitoring for public health. *Synthesis Lectures.* 2014. https://www.morganclaypool.com/doi/abs/10.2200/S00533ED1V01Y201404HLT025
29. Charles-Smith LE, et al. Social media for actionable surveillance—systematic review. *PLoS One.* 2015. https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0139701
30. Chunara R, et al. Flu Near You participatory surveillance. *Am J Public Health.* 2015. https://ajph.aphapublications.org/doi/full/10.2105/AJPH.2015.302696
31. Baltrusaitis K, et al. Follow-up in Flu Near You. *JMIR Public Health Surveill.* 2017. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5400887/
32. Menni C, et al. App-based symptom tracking for COVID-19. *Nat Med.* 2020. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41591-020-0916-2
33. Paul MJ, Dredze M. Discovering health topics from Twitter. *ACL.* 2012. https://aclanthology.org/P12-2017.pdf
34. Fung ICH, et al. Social media in public health surveillance—narrative review. *PMJ.* 2015. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4542478/
35. Eisen L, Eisen RJ. GIS & decision support for vector-borne diseases. *Annu Rev Entomol.* 2011. https://www.annualreviews.org/content/journals/10.1146/annurev-ento-120709-144847
36. Kamel Boulos MN, Geraghty EM. Geographical tracking & mapping of COVID-19. *Int J Health Geogr.* 2020. https://ij-healthgeographics.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12942-020-00202-8
37. Franch-Pardo I, et al. Spatial analysis & GIS for COVID-19—review. *Sci Total Environ.* 2020. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969720335531
38. Ahasan R, et al. GIS applications in COVID-19—systematic review. *BMC Public Health.* 2022. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8822139/
39. Dong E, et al. JHU COVID-19 dashboard. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2020. https://www.thelancet.com/journals/laninf/article/PIIS1473-3099(20)30120-1/fulltext
40. Ozdenerol E. GIS/RS in Lyme disease epidemiology. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2015. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4690907/
41. Kumar P, et al. Low-cost sensing for city air pollution. *Environ Int.* 2015. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0160412014003547
42. Morawska L, et al. Applications of low-cost sensing tech for air quality. *Environ Int.* 2018. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6145068/
43. Popoola OAM, et al. Networks of low-cost sensors for urban air. *Atmos Environ.* 2018. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1352231018306241
44. Khreis H, et al. Evaluating low-cost air quality sensors. *Atmosphere.* 2022. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8835131/
45. Tariq H, et al. State-of-the-art low-cost air quality sensors—review. *Atmosphere.* 2024. https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4433/15/4/471
46. OGC SensorThings API Standard (IoT + geospatial). Open Geospatial Consortium. https://www.ogc.org/publications/standard/sensorthings/
47. Deo RC. Machine learning in medicine. *Circulation.* 2015. https://www.ahajournals.org/doi/10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.115.001593
48. Jiang F, et al. AI in healthcare: past, present, future. *Stroke Vasc Neurol.* 2017. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29507784/
49. Topol EJ. High-performance medicine: human + AI. *Nat Med.* 2019. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41591-018-0300-7
50. Ardabili SF, et al. COVID-19 forecasting with ML/DL. *Chaos Solitons Fractals.* 2020. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0960077920305998
51. Sim JZT, et al. Machine learning in medicine—what clinicians should know. *Ann Acad Med Singap.* 2021. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10071847/
52. Wang L, et al. Urban transfer learning for smart cities. *Computer (IEEE).* 2018. https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1109/MC.2018.2880015
53. Park YJ, et al. Contact tracing during COVID-19, South Korea. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2020. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7510731/
54. Sun K, et al. Impact of contact tracing on SARS-CoV-2. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2020. https://www.thelancet.com/journals/laninf/article/PIIS1473-3099(20)30357-1/fulltext

55. Lee SW, et al. Nationwide results of contact tracing (Korea). *JMIR Med Inform.* 2020. https://medinform.jmir.org/2020/8/e20992/
56. Menni C, et al. Real-time symptom tracking (ZOE). *Nat Med.* 2020. https://pubmed.ncbi. nlm.nih.gov/32393804/
57. HL7. FHIR Specification—Overview. https://www. hl7.org/fhir/overview.html
58. FHIR Foundation—Implementers' resources. https://fhir.org/
59. Mandel JC, et al. SMART on FHIR platform. *JAMIA.* 2016. https://pubmed.ncbi. nlm.nih. gov/26911829/
60. Wagholikar KB, et al. SMART-on-FHIR implemented over i2b2. *JAMIA.* 2017. https:// academic.oup.com/jamia/article/24/2/398/2631471
61. U.S. ONC. HL7 FHIR overview (HealthIT.gov). https://www.healthit.gov/topic/standards-technology/standards/fhir
62. CMS. Learn About FHIR (training hub). https://www.cms.gov/priorities/burden-reduction/ overview/interoperability/learn-about-fhir
63. OGC API & SensorThings (overview). https://ogcapi.ogc.org/sensorthings/
64. WHO. Ethics and governance of AI for health. 2021. https://www.who.int/ publications/i/ item/9789240029200
65. WHO Guidance PDF (full).https://iris.who. int/bitstream/handle/10665/341996/ 9789240029200-eng.pdf
66. Gasser U, et al. Digital tools against COVID-19: taxonomy & ethics. *Lancet Digit Health.* 2020. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7324107/
67. Mello MM, Wang CJ. Ethics & governance for digital disease surveillance. *Science.* 2020. https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.abb9045
68. Vayena E, et al. Health research with big data: systemic oversight. *J Law Med Ethics.* 2018. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6052857/
69. Mittelstadt B. Is there a duty to participate in digital epidemiology? *Life Sci Soc Policy.* 2018. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5943201/
70. Floridi L, et al. AI4People—ethical framework for a good AI society. *Minds Mach.* 2018. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5
71. GDPR—Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (Official Journal). https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/ reg/2016/679/oj/eng
72. GDPR (official PDF). https://eur-lex.europa. eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX: 32016R0679
73. HIPAA Privacy Rule (HHS overview). https://www.hhs.gov/hipaa/for-professionals/ privacy/index.html
74. CDC. HIPAA: resources & overview. https://www.cdc.gov/phlp/php/resources/health-insurance-portability-and-accountability-act-of-1996-hipaa.html
75. Samuel G, et al. Ethical debates around UK contact-tracing app. *Health Gov.* 2022. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8802538/
76. Lucivero F, et al. Normative positions toward COVID apps. *Crit Public Health.* 2022. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09581596.2021.1925634
77. Scheerder A, van Deursen A, van Dijk J. Determinants of internet skills/uses/outcomes—systematic review. *Telemat Informatics.* 2017. https://www. sciencedirect.com/science/ article/abs/pii/S0736585317303192
78. van Dijk J. *The Digital Divide.* Polity; 2020. (Book info) https://asistdl.onlinelibrary. wiley.com/doi/10.1002/asi.24355
79. Robinson L, et al. Digital inequalities and why they matter. *Info Commun Soc.* 2015. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1369118X.2015.1012532
80. Fourman M, et al. Measuring the digital divide. 2015. https://homepages.inf.ed.ac.uk/ mfourman/research/publications/pdf/fourman2015-measuring-the-digital-divide.pdf
81. Parker S, et al. eHealth for vulnerable patients—realist synthesis. *BMJ Open.* 2018. https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/8/8/e019192
82. Greenwood DA, et al. Technology-enabled DSME/S—review of reviews. *Diabetes Educ.* 2017. https://www.welldoc.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/2017_Greenwood_et_al_Systmatic_Review_of_Reviews_Evaluating_Technology_Enabled_DSMES.pdf
83. Thomas EE, et al. Effectiveness of RPM—meta-review. *BMJ Open.* 2021. https://bmjopen. bmj.com/content/11/8/e051844
84. El-Rashidy N, et al. Mobile health + AI for remote monitoring. *Sensors.* 2021. https:// pmc.ncbi. nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8067150/
85. Al-Arkee S, et al. Apps to improve medication adherence in CVD. *JMIR.* 2021. https://www. jmir.org/2021/5/e24190/
86. Komninos N. The age of intelligent cities (policy synthesis). 2015. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281631559
87. Ratti C, Claudel M. *The City of Tomorrow.* Yale; 2016.

https://yalebooks.yale.edu/ 9780300211462/the-city-of-tomorrow/
88. Goodman E, Powles J. Urban data governance in Sidewalk Toronto. *Int Data Priv Law.* 2019. https://academic.oup.com/idpl/article/9/4/293/5677154
89. Ng LC, et al. Singapore dengue surveillance (spatial/IoT). *Lancet.* 2017 (perspective on smart nation). https://www.thelancet.com/ journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(17)31698-0/fulltext
90. Ahas R, et al. Mobile positioning data for urban analytics & health. *Int J Health Geogr.* 2010. https://ij-healthgeographics. biomedcentral. com/articles/10.1186/1476-072X-9-10
91. Haines A, Ebi K. The imperative for climate action for health. *N Engl J Med.* 2019. https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMra1807873
92. Watts N, et al. The 2023 Lancet Countdown on health & climate. *Lancet.* 2023. https://www. thelancet.com/countdown-health-climate
93. Robinson CL, et al. Heat health warning systems—WHO guidance. 2015. https:// www.who. int/publications/i/item/heat-waves-and-health-guidance-on-warning-system-development
94. Hystad P, et al. GIS-modeled air pollution & cardio-resp outcomes. *Environ Health Perspect.* 2013. https://ehp.niehs.nih.gov/ doi/full/10.1289/ehp.1205687
95. World Meteorological Organization. Integrated urban services (WMO). 2019. https://public. wmo.int/en/our-mandate/ focus-areas/urban
96. Lazer D, et al. (GFT) methodological lessons. *Science.* 2014. https://gking.harvard. edu/files/gking/files/0314policyforumff.pdf
97. Broniatowski DA, et al. Weaponized health communication on social media. *Am J Public Health.* 2018. https://ajph.aphapublications.org/doi/10.2105/AJPH.2018.304567
98. Chan MS, et al. Misinformation & corrective strategies—COVID-19. *Curr Opin Psychol.* 2020. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/ pii/S2352250X20300839
99. Olteanu A, Castillo C, et al. Social data: biases, methodological pitfalls. *Big Data & Society.* 2019. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/2053951719874239
100. Ioannidis JPA. Why most discovered true associations are inflated. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2008. https://academic.oup.com/ije/article/37/3/641/743354
101. WHO. Global strategy on digital health 2020–2025. https://www.who.int/publications/ i/item/9789240020924
102. OECD. Health in the 21st century: digital health adoption. 2019. https://www.oecd.org /health/health-in-the-21st-centurye3b23fdf-en.htm
103. European Commission. eHealth Network—Interoperability guidelines. 2021. https://health.ec.europa.eu/ehealth-digital-health-and-care/eu-ehealth-network_en
104. Public Health England. Data and analysis tools for health inequalities. 2020. https://www. gov.uk/government/collections/health-inequalities-data-and-analysis
105. UN-Habitat. People-centered smart cities playbook. 2022. https://unhabitat.org/ programme/people-centred-smart-cities Real-time Surveillance Platforms & Tools
106. HealthMap (global event-based surveillance). https://www.healthmap.org/en/
107. ProMED-mail (expert-moderated outbreak reports). https://promedmail.org/
108. EIOS (WHO Epidemic Intelligence from Open Sources). https://www.who.int/initiatives/eios
109. GPHIN (Global Public Health Intelligence Network). https://www.canada.ca/en/publichealth/services/emergencypreparednessresponse/global-public-health-intelligence-network.html
110. BlueDot (mobility-enhanced analytics). https://bluedot.global/Urban Mobility, Human Dynamics & Health
111. Wesolowski A, et al. Human mobility & infectious disease dynamics. *Trends Parasitol.* 2016. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1471492216300904
112. Buckee CO, et al. Aggregated mobility data to combat COVID-19. *Science.* 2020. https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.abb8021
113. Oliver N, et al. Mobile phone data for pandemic response. *Sci Adv.* 2020. https://www. science.org/doi/10.1126/sciadv.abc0764
114. Kraemer MUG, et al. Real-time surveillance of disease via mobility. *Science.* 2020. https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.abb4218 Citizen Engagement & Risk Communication
115. Fung IC-H, et al. Social media as risk communication tool. *Infect Dis Health.* 2017. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2468045117301048
116. Venkatraman A, et al. Social media engagement for public health. *Front Public Health.* 2017. https://www.frontiersin. org/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2017.00222/full

117. WHO. Communicating risk in public health emergencies. 2017. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241550208
118. Gasparrini A, et al. Mortality risk attributable to heat. *Lancet.* 2015. https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(14)62114-0/fulltext
119. Basu R. High ambient temperature and mortality—review. *Environ Health.* 2009. https://ehjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1476-069X-8-40
120. WHO/WMO. Heatwaves and Health: Guidance on Warning Systems. 2015. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/heat-waves-and-health-guidance-on-warning-system-development