

Digital health literacy for older adults

Population	Older adults
Intervention/Exposure	Digital health literacy; digital health education
Comparator	No digital health literacy; no digital health education
Outcomes	QoL; knowledge levels; healthcare utilization

Interview Details:

Why did you choose this topic and why is it important to you?

- Professional background in digital health research, in which the following observations have been made:
 - A large population (e.g., older adults) lacks access to health technology due to lack of digital literacy, geographic restrictions, and other factors.
 - Older adults tend to be the heaviest users of the healthcare system, requiring the most resources.
- Use of digital resources can help to reduce the load on hospitals and primary care.

- How to increase digital literacy knowledge levels for patients.

- Determine educational component (e.g., community programs, training, etc.) to be integrated for healthcare providers and patients.

Who needs to know about the findings?

- Regulatory colleges (e.g., College of Family Physicians of Canada, Royal College of Surgeons and Physicians of Canada)
- Digital Health Canada
- Telus Health

What do you hope to learn from researching this topic?

- Seeking information on access to digital health (and increasing digital health literacy) that can help to identify:
 - Where the load to healthcare providers can be reduced;
 - How to improve healthcare outcomes;
 - How to improve healthcare by integrating technology at the home-level; and

Feasibility Assessment Results

Summary:

Three systematic reviews and one scoping review were identified during the scoping literature search. The following four reviews by Huang et al (2023), Kim et al (2023), Verma et al (2022) and Xie et al (2022) were assessed using AMSTAR-2. A summary of the AMSTAR-2 assessments is provided in the table below.

Review #1: Huang et al, 2023	Review #2: Kim et al, 2023
LOW quality rating ●●○○	CRITICALLY LOW quality rating ●○○○
Critical flaw: Missing 1 checklist item Study design: Systematic review	Critical flaw: Missing 2 checklist items Study design: Systematic review
Review #3: Verma et al, 2022	Review #4: Xie et al, 2022
CRITICALLY LOW quality rating ●○○○	CRITICALLY LOW quality rating ●○○○
Critical flaw: Missing several checklist items Study design: Scoping review	Critical flaw: Missing 2 checklist items Study design: Systematic review

Conclusion:

This topic has a critically low quality systematic review and critically low to low quality scoping reviews, which suggests that there is scope to conduct further research in this area.