

How standards and user involvement can improve app quality: a lifecycle approach

Michelle Helena van Velthoven¹, Jeremy C Wyatt², Edward Meinert¹, David Brindley¹, Glenn Wells³

1 Department of Paediatrics, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

2 Wessex Institute of Health Research, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK

3 Oxford Academic Health Sciences Centre, Oxford, UK

Corresponding author: Michelle Helena van Velthoven

Postal address: Department of Paediatrics, Oxford University, Level 2, Children's Hospital, John Radcliffe, Headington, Oxford, OX3 9DU, UK

Email: Michelle.vanvelthoven@paediatrics.ox.ac.uk

Mobile: 07425167828

Keywords: health apps, Mobile Applications [MeSH], Medical Device Legislation [MeSH], standards, digital health

Word count, excluding title page, abstract, references, figures and tables: 1997

Abstract (145 words)

Health apps have great potential to improve the quality of care and reduce costs, but this has not yet been achieved. Unfortunately, there are many low-quality, unsafe health apps, resulting in different types of risks. This Perspective addresses the current failure to adopt standards for the development and implementation of health apps. For each theoretical stage of the app development lifecycle we discuss problems, examples, reasons, and solutions. We believe that adapted versions of existing professional and technical standards and tools developed for clinical information systems, medical devices and medicines could help mitigate risks throughout the health app lifecycle. Adapted standards should bring more effective user involvement and cooperation amongst stakeholders. We argue that these efforts will ultimately provide users with a wider choice of higher-quality health apps, give healthcare providers access to better quality data, and allow developers to innovate without unnecessary time-consuming restrictions.

Main text (2006 words)

'Quality is much better than quantity. One home run is much better than two doubles', said Steve Jobs, two years before introducing the iPhone in 2007.¹ Over a decade later, this statement does not yet appear to be true for health apps. There is much 'apptimism' about the potential of health apps to improve the quality of healthcare and reduce costs.² However, despite rapid growth in the health apps market, with an estimated 325,000 health apps available in 2017,³ this potential has not yet been achieved.

There are many low-quality, unsafe health apps and even apps with potentially harmful content, resulting in different types of risks for users.^{4,5} Furthermore, the quality of health apps is challenging for users to assess.⁶ The clinical risk of using a health app is influenced by the function(s) of the app, user and contextual factors.⁴ Regulatory organisations such as the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) use a risk-based approach to determine which health apps are high-risk and classified as medical devices, such as clinical-decision-support apps, and lower-risk apps that are not, such as wellness and fitness apps.⁷

All health apps should respect the privacy of sensitive user data, be based on sound evidence, be usable and behave predictably, and give accurate output or advice to mitigate the risks to users.⁸ Standards can sometimes ensure the security, quality, and consistency of products such as health apps but are by no means a panacea, especially with fast-changing technology. Standards are collaborative documents written by experts with the aim of providing *"requirements, specifications, guidelines or characteristics that can be used consistently to ensure that materials, products, processes, and services are fit for their purpose"*.⁹ Standards can be developed by professional standards organisations such as the International Standards Organisation (ISO), European Committee for Standardisation (CEN), or by expert technical groups such as the SMART Health IT Project.¹⁰ Standards often have economic benefits such as contributing to economic growth, productivity, and exports. For companies, using standards can also enhance their reputation; improve compliance with regulations; and encourage innovation through the diffusion of knowledge.¹¹ Standards do not necessarily lead to regulation, but allow for regulation to be acted upon when they are not met.

There are many standards, regulations and related guidance for medical devices, clinical software, and medicines. For example, the BSI publicly accessible standard PAS 277:2015 sets out quality criteria for health and wellness apps across the life cycle.¹² This builds on more established approaches for medical device software, health IT systems, and therapeutic active pharmaceutical ingredients. However, we still lack appropriate, trusted adapted standards and tools to guide the development of the different types of health app recognized by patients, clinical professionals, and developers.

This paper addresses our current failure to adopt standards for the development and implementation of health apps and the risk that this poses to patients and the public. We discuss problems, examples, reasons, and solutions for each stage of the health app development lifecycle¹², from design to build, test, regulatory approval, appraisal for reimbursement, and post-market surveillance.

DESIGN

The design of many apps is inadequate, with common issues including a failure of developers to adequately understand the problem to be solved, user-friendliness and engagement.¹³ For example, there are a large number of pink floral design apps for fertility tracking based on stereotypical assumptions, without options for women who prefer a different design.¹⁴ While a considerable proportion of people download health apps, many stop using them because of data entry burden, loss of interest, and hidden costs.¹⁵

Technology use is a social practice that requires consideration of the complex social system and the needs of users.¹⁶ However, for many apps there is often strong technology push with very little consideration of the clinical or self-care pathway and users.¹⁷ Providing one generic technology solution is problematic due to the wide variation in the needs of

different users, e.g. patients vs. clinicians, and within user groups, e.g. different age groups.¹⁸

Effective user involvement in app design can help understand the problem and context of use as perceived by users and overcome usability issues. There are well established usability evaluation methods such as scripted user-centered design workshops, user testing in the wild, and interviews that can improve the safety of health apps.¹⁹ A basic set of standards for the design of health apps can then be adapted to different user segments.²⁰ This requires multidisciplinary work between the different stakeholders, building on initiatives such as the Oxford Digital Health Roadmap that outlines the questions developers should ask at each stage of developing a health app, starting with the design.²¹

BUILD AND TEST

Unfortunately, many apps are poorly built and tested.²² Patient harm can potentially result when a user acts on incorrect information provided by the app, which may result in poor choices, incorrect medication, and deterioration in health. Previous research showed a lack of attention to quality in, for example, breast cancer²³ and insulin dose calculators for diabetes²⁴. Recent clinical software incidents (eg. Qrisk 2 – see BBC news article 2016²⁵), have sparked renewed interest in the value of clinical risk and accuracy assessment and highlight the need to update current standards.²⁶

Apps can be developed quickly, at any place and time by anyone interested, including people with non-medical backgrounds. This, together with the innovators' mantra of starting with the minimum viable product, can create conflicting views on rapid technology development versus thorough evidence-based evaluation.²⁷ Apps are often developed by start-ups with limited research resources, which results in short duration

pilots with small participant numbers. Traditional healthcare companies with larger financial resources, such as pharma, have realized that they need to engage with digital health, but are struggling given the differences between the development methods for drugs and digital tools. Developers are often concerned that adhering to standards will be time-consuming.

For technical standards, developers could work with validated standards-compliant platforms to share code, either by building a new platform or by contributing to current initiatives.²⁸ For professional standards, developers could make use of adapted versions of existing standards for health apps, such as the BSI PAS 277 standard mentioned in our introduction.¹² However, more work is needed to make these standards appropriate for the different types of health apps. For example, health apps are increasingly used in combination with medication, so high-risk health app development would benefit from guidance for therapeutic active pharmaceutical ingredients, such as Good Automated Manufacturing Practice.²⁹

There is the concern that standards will inhibit innovation, so there needs to be a balance between efficiency and basic principles for safe development of clinical software that allows products to be built correctly. Standards can also encourage innovation. For example, WhatsApp is widely used by clinicians across the UK NHS without meeting relevant privacy and other standards.³⁰ As a result, there are efforts to produce innovations that meet standards for messaging in clinical settings. To reduce the time it takes to develop and disseminate standards for a health app, we need to build on efforts to develop more proportionate and adaptive governance for innovative technologies.³¹

REGULATORY APPROVAL, APPRAISAL FOR REIMBURSEMENT, AND POST-MARKET SURVEILLANCE

Regulated health apps (medical devices)

Apps that fall under the definition of medical devices are regulated by organizations such as the FDA in the US³¹. In the European Economic Area, developers of those health apps classified as medical devices are required to obtain a CE-mark to show that they have been assessed as meeting safety, health, and environmental protection requirements. However, a CE-mark or FDA approval does not guarantee that a health app is without issues. For example, the CE-marked 'Sepsis 6' app that provides tools for the diagnosis and management of sepsis was found to be faulty (see acknowledgments). An error in the app prevented the user from scrolling down and seeing the full list of actions to carry out when a patient is severely septic. This unusable but approved app could result in a delay in administering urgent effective treatment when a user is reliant on it.

We have the technical tools available to assess health apps at scale, but regulatory organizations have been slow to adapt their processes. At the time of regulatory approval, the data collected about an app is often sparse, and long-term outcomes and sustainability of treatment effects are lacking. In the medical devices industry, we have historically seen a similar shortage of evidence because regulators are evaluating medical devices at an early stage of their development life cycle. This even more likely for health apps, given their rapid development process.

Fortunately, apps can easily capture large amounts of a wide range of real-world data (e.g. geographical, movement or behavioral data) over extended periods of time that would be hard to obtain from other sources. App developers could provide regulators with such real-world data to augment the evidence required for approval, appraisal and post-

marketing processes.³² Currently more efforts are needed to define outcomes against intended use and metrics for the monitoring of 'in use' data.

Non-regulated apps

Health apps for which the developers have not sought regulatory approval are freely available on the app stores without a standardized appraisal process in place. While the risks posed by these apps are usually smaller, using a suboptimal app (eg. Instant Blood Pressure, discussed below) can result in significant opportunity loss when an effective health intervention would have been used instead. This requires careful balancing of the time to market, (cost-)effectiveness and access to different interventions. There is considerable patient pull and clinical push for health app approval, but introducing an over complex evaluation process could reduce innovation.³³

An example of a low-quality but transiently successful health app is 'Instant Blood Pressure' that claimed to take an accurate blood pressure measurement without the use of cuffs. While this app might meet the definition of a medical device, its developers added a disclaimer that it was "for entertainment purposes only". It was one of the top 50 best-selling iPhone apps (at \$4.99) for 156 days between its release in June 2014 and removal in July 2015. In September 2015, researchers showed that its blood pressure measurements were highly inaccurate, with approximately four-fifths (78%) of people with hypertension falsely reassured that their blood pressure was within the normal range.³⁴

Previous efforts to assess health apps and provide guidance about them to the public have proven challenging. The European Commission mobile health working group aimed to develop guidelines in 2016 for assessing the validity and reliability of health apps, but a lack

of consensus resulted in no published guidelines.³⁵ However, there are several commercial initiatives to appraise the quality of health apps with increasing market share.^{36,37}

The European Commission is preparing regulation that will ask app stores to better filter out low-quality apps building on, for example, the Apple store that is currently providing a pre-review check-list that states an app may be rejected if it behaves in a way that risks physical harm.³⁸ Developers could work more closely together with app stores, consumers, physicians, regulators and policy makers on a standardized automatic identification system in app stores that would identify and appraise higher- and lower-quality health apps.³⁹

CONCLUSION

The current lack of usable, effective standards for the development of health apps has resulted in different types of risks for users such as stress, dissatisfaction, delay in effective treatment, loss of privacy, poor lifestyle choices and deterioration in health. Also, app developers and health care providers can be negatively impacted by reputation loss, poor quality of care, increase in undue demand on services, and opportunity losses. Adapted versions of existing professional and technical standards designed for software for clinical systems, medical devices and medicines could help mitigate these risks at critical stages throughout the health apps lifecycle (Table 1). A key component of the adapted standards we advocate is more effective app user involvement and cooperation amongst stakeholders throughout the app design, development and implementation phases. We argue that these efforts will ultimately help users to choose and use higher-quality health apps, let health care providers get access to good quality data, and support developers to innovate without unnecessary time-consuming restrictions.

Table 1 Summary of the approaches suggested to improve health app quality by app life cycle phase

App life cycle phase	Suggested quality improvement approaches	Examples
Design	Use well-established methods to identify the needs and preferences of users	User centred design; Oxford Digital Health Roadmap ²¹
Build and test	Adopt more appropriate adapted technical and professional standards based on established principles	Proportionate and adaptive governance of innovative technologies ³¹
Regulatory approval, appraisal for reimbursement and post-market surveillance	Provide standards-based real-world data from health apps to facilitate streamlining of regulatory and appraisal processes	Food and Drug Administration real-world evidence guidance ⁴⁰
	Work more closely together with app stores, consumer and physician organisations, regulators and policy makers on a standardized automatic identification system in app stores that would identify and appraise higher- and lower-quality health apps	Apple App Store Review Guidelines ³⁸

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank Harold Thimbleby of Swansea University for providing the example of the faulty CE marked Sepsis 6 app. Also, would like to thank Mark Thomas and Stuart Harrison of NHS Digital for their insightful feedback on this editorial.

COMPETING INTERESTS

This article represents the authors' individual opinions and may not necessarily represent the viewpoints of their employers. Dr Michelle van Velthoven is the director of Dutches Consulting Ltd., which provides digital health-related advice to clients in the life sciences. Dr David Brindley is a stockholder in Translation Ventures Ltd. (Charlbury, Oxfordshire, UK) and IP Asset Ventures Ltd. (Oxford, Oxfordshire, UK), companies that, among other services, provide cell therapy biomanufacturing, regulatory, and financial advice to pharmaceutical clients. David Brindley is also subject to the CFA Institute's codes, standards, and guidelines, so he must stress that this piece is provided for academic interest only and must not be construed in any way as an investment recommendation. Additionally, at the time of publication, David Brindley and the organizations with which he is affiliated may or may not have agreed and/or have pending funding commitments from the organizations named here.

FUNDING

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: no specific funding was obtained to write this paper. Dr Michelle Helena van Velthoven and Edward Meinert are funded by Sir David Cooksey Fellowships in Healthcare Translation. Jeremy Wyatt is funded by Southampton University and the NIHR Research on Research programme.

REFERENCES

1. Steve Jobs's 13 Most Inspiring Quotes. <https://www.inc.com/dylan-love/steve-jobs-most-inspiring-quotes.html>. Accessed February 1, 2018.
2. Ventola CL. Mobile Devices and Apps for Health Care Professionals: Uses and Benefits. *Pharmacy and Therapeutics*. 2014;39(5):356-364. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4029126/>.
3. Research2Guidance. 325,000 mobile health apps available in 2017 – Android now the leading mHealth platform. <https://research2guidance.com/325000-mobile-health-apps-available-in-2017/>. Published 2017. Accessed February 9, 2018.
4. Lewis TL, Wyatt JC. mHealth and Mobile Medical Apps: A Framework to Assess Risk and Promote Safer Use. *J Med Internet Res*. 2014;16(9):e210. doi:10.2196/jmir.3133
5. Huckvale K, Prieto JT, Tilney M, Benghozi P-J, Car J. Unaddressed privacy risks in accredited health and wellness apps: a cross-sectional systematic assessment. *BMC Medicine*. 2015;13(1):214. doi:10.1186/s12916-015-0444-y
6. Sunyaev A, Dehling T, Taylor PL, Mandl KD. Availability and quality of mobile health app privacy policies. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*. 2015;22(e1):e28-e33. doi:10.1136/amiajnl-2013-002605
7. FDA. Mobile Medical Applications. <https://www.fda.gov/MedicalDevices/DigitalHealth/MobileMedicalApplications/default.htm#a>. Accessed January 23, 2018.
8. Wyatt JC, Thimbleby H, Rastall P, Hoogewerf J, Wooldridge D, Williams J. What makes a good clinical app? Introducing the RCP Health Informatics Unit checklist. *Clinical Medicine*. 2015;15(6):519-521. doi:10.7861/clinmedicine.15-6-519
9. ISO website. <https://www.iso.org/standards.html>. Accessed February 16, 2018.
10. Mandel JC, Kreda DA, Mandl KD, Kohane IS, Ramoni RB. SMART on FHIR: a standards-based, interoperable apps platform for electronic health records. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*. 2016;23(5):899-908. doi:10.1093/jamia/ocv189
11. BSI. How standards benefit businesses and the UK economy. <https://www.bsigroup.com/LocalFiles/en-GB/standards/BSI-standards-brochure-how-standards-benefit-businesses-and-the-UK-economy-UK-EN.pdf>. Accessed January 23, 2018.
12. BSI. PAS 277:2015 Health and wellness apps. Quality criteria across the life cycle. Code of practice. <https://shop.bsigroup.com/forms/PASs/PAS-2772015/>. Accessed January 23, 2018.
13. Murray E, Hekler EB, Andersson G, et al. Evaluating Digital Health Interventions: Key Questions and Approaches. *Am J Prev Med*. 2016;51(5):843-851. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2016.06.008
14. Lupton D. Quantified sex: a critical analysis of sexual and reproductive self-tracking using apps. *Cult Health Sex*. 2015;17(4):440-453. doi:10.1080/13691058.2014.920528

15. Krebs P, Duncan DT. Health App Use Among US Mobile Phone Owners: A National Survey. Eysenbach G, ed. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*. 2015;3(4):e101. doi:10.2196/mhealth.4924
16. Fraccaro P, Vigo M, Balatsoukas P, Buchan IE, Peek N, van der Veer SN. The influence of patient portals on users' decision making is insufficiently investigated: A systematic methodological review. *International Journal of Medical Informatics*. 2018;111:100-111. doi:10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2017.12.028
17. Greenhalgh T, Swinglehurst D. Studying technology use as social practice: the untapped potential of ethnography. *BMC Medicine*. 2011;9(1):45. doi:10.1186/1741-7015-9-45
18. Gao C, Zhou L, Liu Z, Wang H, Bowers B. Mobile application for diabetes self-management in China: Do they fit for older adults? *International Journal of Medical Informatics*. 2017;101:68-74. doi:10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2017.02.005
19. Schnall R, Rojas M, Bakken S, et al. A user-centered model for designing consumer mobile health (mHealth) applications (apps). *J Biomed Inform*. 2016;60:243-251. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2016.02.002
20. Gordon M, Henderson R, Holmes JH, Wolters MK, Bennett IM. Participatory design of ehealth solutions for women from vulnerable populations with perinatal depression. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*. 2016;23(1):105-109. doi:10.1093/jamia/ocv109
21. Oxford Academic Health Science Network (Oxford AHSN) Digital Health Roadmap. <https://www.healthandwealthoxford.org/digital-health-roadmap/>. Accessed February 1, 2018.
22. Boulos MNK, Brewer AC, Karimkhani C, Buller DB, Dellavalle RP. Mobile medical and health apps: state of the art, concerns, regulatory control and certification. *Online Journal of Public Health Informatics*. 2014;5(3):229-229. doi:10.5210/ojphi.v5i3.4814
23. Giunti G, Giunta DH, Guisado-Fernandez E, Bender JL, Fernandez-Luque L. A biopsy of Breast Cancer mobile applications: state of the practice review. *International Journal of Medical Informatics*. 2018;110:1-9. doi:10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2017.10.022
24. Huckvale K, Adomaviciute S, Prieto JT, Leow MK-S, Car J. Smartphone apps for calculating insulin dose: a systematic assessment. *BMC Medicine*. 2015;13(1):106. doi:10.1186/s12916-015-0314-7
25. BBC. Statins alert over IT glitch in heart risk tool. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/health-36274791>.
26. Shneiderman B. Opinion: The dangers of faulty, biased, or malicious algorithms requires independent oversight. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 2016;113(48):13538-13540. doi:10.1073/pnas.1618211113
27. Nilsen W, Kumar S, Shar A, et al. Advancing the science of mHealth. *J Health Commun*. 2012;17 Suppl 1:5-10. doi:10.1080/10810730.2012.677394
28. LifeGuide Online. <https://www.lifeguideonline.org/>. Accessed February 1, 2018.
29. International Society for Pharmaceutical Engineering ISPE's Good Automated Manufacturing Practice (GAMP) V-model. <https://www.ispe.org/publications/guidance-documents/gamp-5>. Accessed January 23, 2018.

30. Thomas K. Wanted: a WhatsApp alternative for clinicians. *BMJ*. 2018;360. doi:10.1136/bmj.k622
31. Tait J, Banda G. Proportionate and adaptive governance of innovative technologies - The role of regulations, guidelines and standards. <https://www.bsigroup.com/LocalFiles/en-GB/BIS/Innovate%20UK%20and%20emerging%20technologies/Summary%20Report%20-%20Adaptive%20governance%20-%20WEB.pdf>. Accessed February 16, 2018.
32. Resnic FS, Matheny ME. Medical Devices in the Real World. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;378(7):595-597. doi:10.1056/NEJMp1712001
33. van Velthoven MH, Powell J. Do health apps need endorsement? Challenges for giving advice about which health apps are safe and effective to use. *DIGITAL HEALTH*. 2017;3:2055207617701342. doi:10.1177/2055207617701342
34. Plante TB, Urrea B, MacFarlane ZT, et al. Validation of the instant blood pressure smartphone app. *JAMA Internal Medicine*. 2016;176(5):700-702. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2016.0157
35. EC. New EU working group aims to draft guidelines to improve mHealth apps data quality. <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/en/news/new-eu-working-group-aims-draft-guidelines-improve-mhealth-apps-data-quality>. Accessed February 1, 2018.
36. Our Mobile Health website. <https://www.ourmobilehealth.com/>. Published February 18, 2018.
37. ORCHA website. <https://www.orchac.co.uk/>. Published February 18, 2018.
38. Apple. App Store Review Guidelines. <https://developer.apple.com/app-store/review/guidelines/>. Accessed February 1, 2018.
39. Ahmed OH, Lee H, Marchant H, Jones R, Hall EE. Navigating the new landscape of apps: Overcoming the challenge of poor quality apps in sport and exercise medicine. *Br J Sports Med*. November 2017. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2017-097911
40. FDA. Use of Real-World Evidence to Support Regulatory Decision-Making for Medical Devices. <https://www.fda.gov/downloads/medicaldevices/deviceregulationandguidance/guidancedocuments/ucm513027.pdf>. Accessed February 19, 2018.