THE EUROPEAN SOCIETY OF MEDICINE
Medical Research Archives, Volume 13 Issue 12

REVIEW ARTICLE

Digital Health Information Systems and Rural Health Equity: China's Experience in Global Context

Yuli Ye[1], Qiang Li[2], Qinying He[3*]

[1]School of Transportation and Economic Management, Guangdong Communication Polytechnic, Guangdong, China.
[2]Faculty of Finance, City University of Macau, Taipa, Macao.
[3]College of Economics and Management, South China Agricultural University, Guangzhou, China.

Corresponding author:
*Qinying He; heqy83@scau.edu.cn

OPEN ACCESS

PUBLISHED
31 December 2025

CITATION
Yuli, Y., Qiang, L., Qinying, H., 2025. Digital Health Information Systems and Rural Health Equity: China's Experience in Global Context. Medical Research Archives, [online] 13(12). https://doi.org/10.18103/mra.v13i12.7153

DOI
https://doi.org/10.18103/mra.v13i12.7153

ISSN
2375-1924

ABSTRACT

Background: Rural-urban health disparities persist globally despite decades of interventions. Digital health information systems offer promise for addressing these inequities, yet implementation remains uneven and evidence fragmented.

Aim: To develop a comprehensive conceptual framework for understanding how digital health information systems promote rural health equity and to synthesize evidence from China's large-scale implementation experience alongside international comparisons.

Methods: We conducted a systematic literature synthesis and policy analysis to develop a four-dimensional conceptual framework examining health information education, sharing, application, and governance. We analyzed China's digital health policies and implementation outcomes alongside international case studies and comparative evidence from peer-reviewed literature and policy documents.

Results: Digital health systems improve rural health equity through multiple mechanisms: education interventions enhance health literacy and promote behavior change; information sharing reduces asymmetries and enables care coordination; technology applications extend specialist expertise to underserved areas; and governance frameworks ensure quality, privacy, and participation. China's experience demonstrates substantial impacts including increased primary care utilization, improved chronic disease management, reduced medical expenditures, and enhanced insurance portability. However, effects exhibit heterogeneity across populations, with differential benefits for younger, better-educated individuals raising equity concerns.

Conclusions: Digital health information systems can meaningfully advance rural health equity when implemented comprehensively with attention to infrastructure, governance, and equity. Success requires integrated approaches spanning education, sharing, application, and governance rather than fragmented single-purpose initiatives.

Keywords: Digital health; Rural health equity; Health information systems; Telemedicine; Health literacy; China.

1. Introduction

Rural-urban health disparities represent a persistent global challenge affecting populations across both developing and developed nations[1]. Despite decades of targeted interventions, rural populations worldwide experience higher mortality rates, reduced healthcare access, and poorer health outcomes through multiple pathways: fewer healthcare providers per capita (particularly specialists), longer travel distances for care, and higher rates of preventable diseases and premature mortality[2,3]. These disparities affect both low-income countries lacking basic health infrastructure and high-income nations like the United States and Australia, where rural populations face significant barriers to accessing quality healthcare despite overall system sophistication.

Digital health technologies—encompassing telemedicine, electronic health records, mobile health applications, and health information exchanges—have generated considerable optimism about bridging this urban-rural divide[4]. These technologies promise to overcome geographical barriers by connecting rural patients with urban specialists, improve healthcare efficiency through reduced duplication and better coordination, and democratize access to medical expertise regardless of location. The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated digital health adoption globally, demonstrating both the potential and challenges of remote healthcare delivery[5]. However, implementation of digital health interventions in rural contexts remains uneven, with significant variations in effectiveness across different settings, populations, and intervention types.

China's experience with digital health transformation in rural areas offers particularly valuable insights. China has implemented one of the world's largest and most comprehensive rural digital health programs, reaching over 600 million rural residents across vastly diverse geographic and socioeconomic contexts—from prosperous coastal areas to impoverished mountainous regions. China's rapid digital transformation has occurred within a relatively compressed timeframe, allowing researchers to observe substantial changes in health outcomes and system performance over short periods. China's challenges—including vast geographic scale, uneven economic development, significant rural-urban disparities, aging rural populations, and resource constraints—mirror those faced by many other developing countries, potentially enhancing the transferability of lessons learned to other low- and middle-income contexts.

However, existing research on digital health in rural contexts exhibits several important limitations. Much of the literature focuses narrowly on specific technologies or individual interventions without examining the broader ecosystem of health information systems and their interactions[6]. Studies often emphasize technical feasibility and user acceptance rather than rigorously examining actual impacts on health equity and population health outcomes[7,8]. The literature also lacks comprehensive frameworks that integrate the multiple dimensions through which digital health systems influence rural health. Moreover, cross-national comparative analysis remains limited.

This study aims to: (1) develop a comprehensive four-dimensional framework for understanding how digital health information systems can promote rural health equity; (2) synthesize evidence from China's extensive implementation experience while incorporating comparative international evidence; (3) systematically examine the mechanisms through which digital health interventions operate and the conditions under which they prove most effective; and (4) identify policy implications and future research priorities for digital health implementation in rural contexts.

Our framework encompasses four interrelated dimensions: (1) health information education, which improves health literacy and promotes evidence-based health behaviors; (2) health information sharing, which reduces information asymmetries between providers and patients and enables better care coordination; (3) health information application, which enhances healthcare accessibility through technologies like telemedicine and mobile health; and (4) health information governance, which ensures data quality, protects patient privacy, and enables meaningful stakeholder participation in system design and oversight.

2. Study Design and Methods

2.1 FRAMEWORK DEVELOPMENT

We developed our four-dimensional conceptual framework through an iterative process integrating three complementary theoretical perspectives: health behavior and health literacy theories, digital

divide and technology adoption theories, and governance and institutional theories. We conducted a comprehensive review of theoretical literature to identify key mechanisms through which digital health systems influence rural health equity.

2.2 EVIDENCE SYNTHESIS

We synthesized evidence through systematic literature review and policy analysis. Our literature search covered peer-reviewed publications from major databases (PubMed, Web of Science, Google Scholar) focusing on digital health interventions in rural contexts, with particular emphasis on China's implementation experience. We included studies published between 2000-2024 examining telemedicine, electronic health records, mobile health applications, health information exchanges, and related technologies. We supplemented academic literature with policy documents, implementation reports, and government statistics from China's National Health Commission and provincial health authorities[9].

2.3 COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

We conducted comparative analysis of digital health implementations across countries including China, Australia, Norway, and other European nations to identify common patterns, context-specific factors, and transferable lessons[10,11]. We examined case studies documenting specific implementations, outcomes data where available, and qualitative evidence regarding facilitators and barriers to successful implementation.

2.4 ANALYTICAL APPROACH

Our analytical approach was qualitative and interpretive, synthesizing diverse evidence types to identify mechanisms, outcomes, and contextual factors shaping digital health system effectiveness in promoting rural health equity. We organized evidence according to our four-dimensional framework and identified cross-cutting themes regarding infrastructure requirements, governance needs, equity considerations, and implementation challenges.

3. Theoretical Perspectives

3.1 HEALTH BEHAVIOR AND LITERACY THEORIES

Our framework synthesizes three complementary theoretical perspectives that illuminate different aspects of how digital health systems influence rural health equity. First, health behavior and health literacy theories emphasize that health-related decisions depend fundamentally on individuals' knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, and perceived self-efficacy[12]. These theories, including the Health Belief Model and Theory of Planned Behavior[13], suggest that providing accurate health information represents a necessary but insufficient condition for behavioral change. Information must be not only accessible but also comprehensible, culturally relevant, and personally meaningful to influence health behaviors effectively[14]. This insight proves particularly salient for rural populations, who often face multiple barriers to accessing and utilizing health information, including lower average educational attainment, limited digital literacy, geographic isolation, and cultural factors that shape health beliefs and practices.

Health literacy—defined as the capacity to obtain, process, and understand basic health information needed to make appropriate health decisions—mediates between information provision and health outcomes[15]. Research consistently demonstrates that low health literacy correlates with poorer health outcomes, higher hospitalization rates, and greater healthcare costs[16,17]. Previous research in rural China has documented how educational background and social factors profoundly shape health behaviors and outcomes, with peer effects substantially influencing health decisions and behaviors in tight-knit rural communities[18,19]. These findings suggest that digital health interventions must attend not only to information provision but also to enhancing health literacy capabilities and leveraging existing social networks.

3.2 DIGITAL DIVIDE AND TECHNOLOGY ADOPTION THEORIES

Second, digital divide and technology adoption theories highlight that disparities in technology access and use often reflect and amplify existing social inequalities rather than reducing them[20]. Early conceptions of the digital divide focused primarily on access to technology infrastructure. However, contemporary frameworks recognize multiple dimensions of digital inequality, including access to technology infrastructure, digital skills and literacy, actual usage patterns and practices, and tangible outcomes from digital technology use[21]. For rural health contexts, this multidimensional perspective implies that simply providing technology infrastructure proves insufficient for meaningful digital health benefits.

Technology adoption models, particularly the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT), emphasize that adoption and sustained use depend on perceived usefulness of the technology, ease of use given users' technical capabilities, social influence from trusted figures and peers, and facilitating conditions including infrastructure, training, and ongoing support[22]. Applied to rural health contexts, these factors suggest that successful digital health implementation requires demonstrating clear, tangible benefits for rural populations; ensuring technologies are genuinely user-friendly for populations with varying digital literacy levels; leveraging trusted community leaders, healthcare providers, and peer networks to promote adoption; and establishing comprehensive supportive infrastructure including technical support, training systems, and maintenance protocols[23].

3.3 GOVERNANCE AND INSTITUTIONAL THEORIES

Third, governance and institutional theories emphasize that health system performance depends not only on resource availability and technical capacity but also fundamentally on institutional arrangements, regulatory frameworks, and the extent of meaningful stakeholder participation in decision-making processes[24]. Digital health information systems create both significant opportunities and important challenges for health governance. On one hand, they enable more transparent monitoring of health system performance through real-time data collection and analysis, facilitate coordination across healthcare providers and geographic regions, and can empower patients through access to their own health information and communication tools. On the other hand, they raise serious concerns about data privacy and security, potential for algorithmic bias that may disadvantage vulnerable populations, and the risk that digital technologies might consolidate power in the hands of technology providers or centralized authorities at the expense of local autonomy and patient agency.

Cross-national research demonstrates that institutional quality and governance effectiveness significantly influence population health outcomes independent of resource levels, with corruption, lack of transparency, and weak accountability consistently associated with poorer health outcomes[25,26]. Furthermore, press freedom and information transparency appear to enhance health outcomes by enabling public accountability and informed decision-making by both individuals and policymakers[27]. These findings suggest that digital health governance frameworks must prioritize transparency in system operations and decision-making, meaningful participation from diverse stakeholders including patients and communities, and robust accountability mechanisms to maximize health benefits while minimizing potential harms[28]. The governance dimension becomes particularly critical in rural contexts, where power asymmetries between providers and patients may be more pronounced, limited oversight capacity challenges effective regulation, and social network dynamics can either facilitate or impede effective digital health implementation depending on how systems are designed and governed.

4. Rural Health Challenges and Digital Health Potential

4.1 COMMON RURAL HEALTH CHALLENGES

Rural populations globally face several common and interconnected health challenges that create both urgent needs and unique opportunities for digital health interventions. First, rural areas worldwide typically suffer from severe shortages of healthcare professionals, particularly medical specialists, advanced practice nurses, and allied health professionals[29]. This workforce deficit reflects multiple interrelated factors, including lower compensation levels compared to urban practice, limited professional development and continuing education opportunities, social and cultural isolation from urban amenities, inadequate professional infrastructure and support, and concerns about educational opportunities for providers' children. Consequently, rural residents must often travel substantial distances—sometimes hundreds of kilometers—to access specialized care, creating significant financial burdens from travel costs and time away from work, opportunity costs from lost productivity, and psychological barriers that deter healthcare utilization and contribute to delayed diagnosis and treatment.

Second, rural populations generally exhibit lower health literacy and educational attainment compared to urban populations, though with significant variation across and within countries[30]. This literacy and education gap impedes effective health

information seeking, comprehension of medical instructions and prescription labels, navigation of complex healthcare systems and insurance processes, and adoption of preventive health behaviors based on understanding of disease risk factors[31]. Lower health literacy contributes directly to delayed diagnosis through missed symptom recognition, poor chronic disease management through misunderstood treatment regimens, and suboptimal health outcomes despite available healthcare resources.

4.2 CHINA'S RURAL HEALTH CONTEXT

China's rural health context embodies these universal patterns while also reflecting specific historical and institutional factors that shape contemporary challenges. China's rural population of approximately 500 million people faces substantial health disparities compared to urban residents, with gaps in life expectancy, infant and maternal mortality rates, and chronic disease prevalence. Several factors compound these disparities beyond the challenges common to rural areas globally. First, China's massive internal migration has created substantial numbers of 'left-behind' populations in rural areas, including children, women, and elderly individuals whose family members have migrated to cities for economic opportunities. Research demonstrates that these left-behind populations face unique and severe health vulnerabilities. Left-behind children exhibit poorer health outcomes, reduced healthcare utilization, higher rates of mental health problems, and increased risk of injuries compared to children living with both parents[32]. However, some studies also document potential resilience mechanisms and peer support networks that may partially offset these vulnerabilities in certain contexts, suggesting complex dynamics warrant further investigation[33]. Left-behind women face increased risks of sexual and reproductive health problems due to prolonged spousal separation, limited access to appropriate healthcare services, reduced social support, and economic pressures[34]. These migration-related health challenges add substantial complexity to rural health intervention design, requiring attention to family structure dynamics and social support systems.

Second, significant gender disparities in health outcomes persist in rural China, with particular disadvantages for girls and women in several dimensions. Research documents substantial son preference in many rural areas, which manifests in gender gaps in health-seeking behavior, nutritional allocation within households, and ultimately health outcomes for girls[35]. These gender inequities, rooted in traditional cultural values and economic considerations, require targeted attention in health information interventions to ensure benefits reach all population segments equitably and to address underlying discrimination that affects health through multiple pathways. Third, historical shocks continue to influence contemporary rural health patterns in ways that demonstrate the importance of long-term perspectives. The 1959-1961 Great Famine created long-lasting health consequences that persist not only among survivors but also affect their children and potentially grandchildren through intergenerational transmission mechanisms[36]. This intergenerational health impact underscores the importance of comprehensive, long-term approaches to rural health improvement that extend beyond immediate medical care provision to address underlying social determinants and intergenerational effects requiring sustained attention.

4.3 DIGITAL HEALTH OPPORTUNITIES

Despite—or perhaps in some respects because of—these substantial challenges, rural contexts offer particularly promising environments for certain types of digital health interventions. The severe scarcity of healthcare providers in rural areas means that telemedicine and remote consultation can fill critical gaps that would be impractical or impossible to address through traditional provider recruitment and retention strategies alone. The marginal benefit of adding a digital connection to urban medical expertise may be substantially larger in rural areas entirely lacking local specialists than in urban areas with abundant specialist availability. The tight-knit social networks characteristic of many rural communities can facilitate rapid diffusion of health information and health behaviors once digital health systems achieve initial adoption and trust. Research on peer effects and social contagion demonstrates that health behaviors and outcomes spread through social networks in ways that can amplify intervention effects[37]. Rural communities' strong social cohesion and dense interpersonal networks may amplify the impact of digital health interventions through peer-to-peer information sharing, mutual

encouragement and accountability, and collective problem-solving, potentially compensating for limited formal healthcare infrastructure.

5. Four Dimensions of Digital Health Benefits

5.1 HEALTH INFORMATION EDUCATION

Digital health education operates through expanded reach, tailored interactive content, and leveraged social networks. Evidence from China shows public health education improves rural migrants' self-rated health and reduces chronic disease risk. Environmental health education substantially increased improved water source usage (from 69% to 86%) and sanitary toilet adoption (from 40% to 54%). However, younger, better-educated rural women more frequently access and trust online health information, raising equity concerns about differential effects[38]. The proliferation of misinformation poses significant challenges, requiring both credible information provision and critical evaluation skill building[39].

5.2 HEALTH INFORMATION SHARING

Health information exchange systems enable provider access to comprehensive patient information regardless of care location. By 2022, China connected 100% of provinces, 85% of cities, and 69% of counties to regional platforms, with over 7,000 hospitals participating[9]. Information sharing reduces duplicate testing, improves care coordination, and enables better-informed treatment decisions. Particularly transformative is insurance portability enabling direct settlement. Rural residents previously faced substantial barriers seeking out-of-area care, requiring upfront payment and complex reimbursement. China's National Health Insurance Inter-Regional Settlement Platform now enables automatic reimbursement processing at discharge, eliminating payment delays. Research shows direct settlement increases appropriate high-level facility utilization while reducing catastrophic expenditure, without significantly increasing overall insurance expenditures[40]. For chronic disease management, enhanced information sharing improved hypertension control rates from 45% to 57% through better medication management and follow-up coordination.

5.3 HEALTH INFORMATION APPLICATION

Telemedicine directly addresses rural healthcare's fundamental challenge: geographic mismatch between population and expertise. Guizhou Province exemplifies impact potential. This mountainous province implemented comprehensive telemedicine coverage beginning 2016, facilitating 640,000 consultations by 2019 including 30,000 remote consultations and 380,000 remote imaging diagnoses. One township health center achieved >90% primary care rate after implementation. Case reports document instances where telemedicine enabled timely acute condition treatment, saving lives while reducing costs. International evidence corroborates telemedicine's potential: systematic reviews conclude comparable clinical outcomes to in-person care while improving access and reducing costs[4,41]. Australia's Royal Flying Doctor Service and Norway's National Centre for Telemedicine demonstrate viability across diverse contexts[11]. However, effectiveness requires attention to clinical workflows, provider training, infrastructure, and reimbursement policies[42].

5.4 HEALTH INFORMATION GOVERNANCE

Governance—policies, processes, and oversight guiding information collection, storage, sharing, and use—proves critical for realizing benefits while preventing harms. Data quality fundamentally determines system utility; inaccurate information undermines decision-making and erodes trust. Governance mechanisms include standardized protocols, provider training, validation systems, regular audits, and quality-linked incentives. Privacy and security obligations require clear rules about access, consent, protections, and breach responses. Digital health governance must address misinformation through authoritative information provision, professional correction of falsehoods, and critical evaluation skill building. Participatory governance enables stakeholder input, particularly important in rural contexts where top-down interventions may fail to account for local conditions[43]. Digital systems create 'two-way empowerment': patients gain access to records and communication tools while governance authorities gain performance monitoring and fraud detection capabilities. However, broader governance quality significantly influences outcomes, with corruption and weak transparency undermining health system performance[25,26].

6. Discussion and Implications

This analysis generates several policy and practice implications. First, the four dimensions operate

synergistically rather than independently. Education proves most effective when integrated with information sharing enabling coordinated care, technology applications providing expertise access, and governance ensuring quality. China's integrated regional platforms generate larger benefits than fragmented single-purpose systems, though comprehensive approaches require substantial coordination.

Second, substantial heterogeneity in impacts raises critical equity concerns. Education interventions reach younger, better-educated populations more effectively. Technology applications require infrastructure and literacy varying dramatically across areas and populations. If systems primarily benefit already-advantaged groups, they may widen disparities despite improving average outcomes[44]. Research documenting gender disparities[35] and left-behind population vulnerabilities[32,34] highlights the importance of proactive equity attention through targeted outreach, culturally adapted interventions, and systematic differential impact monitoring.

Third, infrastructure—both digital connectivity and health system capacity—represents the binding constraint. Without reliable connectivity, sophisticated systems remain unusable. Without providers willing and able to utilize digital tools, education and sharing systems generate limited benefits. Infrastructure development requires sustained public investment; market forces concentrate investment in profitable urban areas, reinforcing rather than reducing divides. China's experience demonstrates explicit government prioritization, combined with subsidies and mandates, substantially accelerates rural connectivity expansion.

Fourth, governance quality fundamentally shapes whether systems fulfill potential or generate harms. Without effective governance, systems may compromise privacy, disseminate misinformation, concentrate power, and exclude vulnerable populations. Governance frameworks must address technical standards (interoperability, quality, security), legal frameworks (privacy, liability, consent), organizational arrangements (coordination, accountability, participation), and ethical principles (equity, transparency, autonomy).

Fifth, while China's experience offers valuable insights, transferability requires careful context attention. China's implementation occurred within particular governance contexts characterized by strong state capacity, substantial public resources, and specific governance approaches[45]. Digital health initiatives succeeding in China's context may encounter different challenges in contexts with weaker capacity, limited resources, or different governance values. Moreover, China's scale creates both advantages (spreading costs, enabling standardization, generating rich data) and challenges (complicating coordination, magnifying design errors, reducing local adaptability). Successful transferability requires adapting rather than directly replicating approaches.

This analysis has important limitations. Much existing evidence remains descriptive rather than rigorously causal. Establishing causality requires sophisticated designs including randomized trials and quasi-experimental methods carefully addressing confounding. Comprehensive cost-effectiveness understanding remains limited; given resource constraints, understanding which investments generate greatest health improvements per dollar proves essential. Most research examines relatively short-term outcomes, leaving longer-term impacts uncertain. Research should examine how digital health systems interact with and potentially transform existing structures and relationships. Comparative international research is needed to understand how institutional contexts shape implementation and impacts.

7. Conclusion

Digital health information systems hold substantial promise for addressing persistent rural-urban health disparities affecting populations worldwide. Through systematic analysis of China's large-scale implementation alongside international evidence, we demonstrate how interventions operating through education, sharing, application, and governance can improve health literacy, enhance access, reduce information asymmetries, and strengthen governance. These mechanisms ultimately promote rural health equity by enabling rural populations to achieve better outcomes despite geographic and resource disadvantages. However, realizing this promise requires more than technological deployment. Effective transformation demands comprehensive strategies integrating multiple dimensions, sustained infrastructure investment, proactive equity attention, robust governance frameworks protecting privacy while

enabling innovation, and long-term commitment extending beyond initial implementation to ongoing adaptation.

Looking forward, priorities emerge for policy, practice, and research. Policymakers should pursue integrated strategies spanning education, sharing, application, and governance rather than fragmented initiatives. Implementation should prioritize equity by actively addressing differential access and impacts across subgroups. Infrastructure development requires sustained public investment guided by universal service principles. Governance frameworks must balance privacy protection with beneficial sharing, combat misinformation while respecting expression, leverage oversight technologies while preventing surveillance overreach, and promote efficiency while maintaining human-centered care. Research priorities include rigorous causal impact evaluation, comprehensive cost-effectiveness analyses, longitudinal studies examining long-term outcomes, qualitative research on implementation processes, and comparative international research clarifying how contexts shape outcomes. Ultimately, digital health information systems represent tools whose value depends on design, implementation, and governance choices. Used thoughtfully with sustained equity, quality, and accountability commitment, these systems can significantly advance rural health equity.

Conflict of Interest Statement:

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Funding Statement:

Guangdong Basic and Applied Basic Research Foundation (2024A1515010360).

Acknowledgements:

The authors thank anonymous reviewers for constructive feedback that improved this manuscript.

Author Contributions:

Conceptualization: LQ, YY
Methodology: LQ, YY
Policy Analysis: LQ
Literature Review: YY
Writing - Original Draft: LQ, HQ, YY
Writing - Review & Editing: LQ, HQ, YY
Project Administration: HQ

All authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

Data Availability Statement:

This study analyzed publicly available policy documents and published literature. No primary data were generated. All sources are cited in the references.

Ethics Statement:

This study involved analysis of publicly available policy documents and published literature. No human subjects research was conducted. Ethics approval was not required.

References:

1. Hartley D. Rural health disparities, population health, and rural culture. *Am J Public Health*. 2004; 94(10):1675-1678.

2. Smith KB, Humphreys JS, Wilson MG. Addressing the health disadvantage of rural populations: How does epidemiological evidence inform rural health policies and research? *Aust J Rural Health*. 2008;16(2):56-66.

3. World Health Organization. *Increasing Access to Health Workers in Remote and Rural Areas Through Improved Retention*. WHO Press; 2010.

4. Bashshur RL, Shannon GW, Krupinski EA, Grigsby J. Sustaining and realizing the promise of telemedicine. *Telemed e-Health*. 2013;22(2):93-112.

5. Doraiswamy S, Abraham A, Mamtani R, Cheema S. Use of telehealth during the COVID-19 pandemic: Scoping review. *J Med Internet Res*. 2020;22(12):e24087.

6. Kruse CS, Karem P, Shifflett K, et al. Evaluating barriers to adopting telemedicine worldwide: A systematic review. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2018;24(1):4-12.

7. Gagnon MP, Desmartis M, Labrecque M, et al. Systematic review of factors influencing the adoption of information and communication technologies by healthcare professionals. *J Med Syst*. 2010;36(1):241-277.

8. Lupton D. Critical perspectives on digital health technologies. *Sociol Compass*. 2014;8(12):1344-1359.

9. National Health Commission of China. *China Health Statistics Yearbook 2022*. Peking Union Medical College Press; 2022.

10. Arcury TA, Quandt SA. Delivery of health services to migrant and seasonal farmworkers. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2007;28:345-363.

11. Wakerman J, Humphreys JS. Rural health: Why it matters. *Med J Aust*. 2011;195(9):502-503.

12. Rosenstock IM. Historical origins of the Health Belief Model. *Health Educ Monogr*. 1974;2(4):328-335.

13. Ajzen I. The theory of planned behavior. *Organ Behav Hum Decis Process*. 1991;50(2):179-211.

14. Nutbeam D. Health literacy as a public health goal: A challenge for contemporary health education and communication strategies into the 21st century. *Health Promot Int*. 2000;15(3):259-267.

15. Berkman ND, Sheridan SL, Donahue KE, et al. Low health literacy and health outcomes: An updated systematic review. *Ann Intern Med*. 2011; 155(2):97-107.

16. Institute of Medicine. *Health Literacy: A Prescription to End Confusion*. National Academies Press; 2004.

17. Kickbusch I. Health literacy: Addressing the health and education divide. *Health Promot Int*. 2001;16(3):289-297.

18. Li Q, Zang W, An L. Peer effect and school dropout in rural China. *China Econ Rev*. 2013; 27:238-248.

19. Loh C, Li Q. Peer effects in adolescent bodyweight: Evidence from rural China. *Soc Sci Med*. 2013;85:35-44.

20. van Dijk JA. *The Deepening Divide: Inequality in the Information Society*. Sage Publications; 2005.

21. van Deursen AJ, Helsper EJ. The third-level digital divide: Who benefits most from being online? *Commun Inf Technol Annu*. 2015;10:29-52.

22. Venkatesh V, Morris MG, Davis GB, Davis FD. User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. *MIS Q*. 2003;27(3):425-478.

23. Hoque R, Sorwar G. Understanding factors influencing the adoption of mHealth by the elderly: An extension of the UTAUT model. *Int J Med Inform*. 2017;101:75-84.

24. Siddiqi S, Masud TI, Nishtar S, et al. Framework for assessing governance of the health system in developing countries: Gateway to good governance. *Health Policy*. 2009;90(1):13-25.

25. Li Q, An L, Xu J, Baliamoune-Lutz M. Corruption costs lives: Evidence from a cross-country study. *Eur J Health Econ*. 2018;19(1):153-165.

26. Li Q, An L. Corruption takes away happiness: Evidence from a cross-country study. *J Happiness Stud*. 2020;21(2):485-504.

27. Li Q, Loh CA, Ye Y. Shushing the press shortens lives: Cross-national evidence of the impact of press freedom on life expectancy. *Scand J Public Health*. 2024. doi:10.1177/14034948231178841

28. Kickbusch I, Gleicher D. *Governance for Health in the 21st Century*. WHO Regional Office for Europe; 2012.

29. MacDowell M, Glasser M, Fitts M, et al. A national view of rural health workforce issues in the USA. *Rural Remote Health*. 2010;10:1531.

30. Bennett IM, Chen J, Soroui JS, White S. The contribution of health literacy to disparities in self-

rated health status and preventive health behaviors in older adults. *Ann Fam Med*. 2009;7(3):204-211.

31. Diviani N, van den Putte B, Giani S, van Weert JC. Low health literacy and evaluation of online health information: A systematic review. *J Med Internet Res*. 2015;17(5):e112.

32. Li Q, Liu G, Zang W. The health of left-behind children in rural China. *China Econ Rev*. 2015; 36:367-376.

33. Ye Y, Li Q. Unanticipated benefits: Left-behind peers and improved health in rural Chinese classrooms. *Appl Econ Lett*. 2024. doi:10.1080/13504851.2024.2332532

34. Li Q, Ye Y, An L. Reduced sexual activity and increased sexually transmitted infections risk among left-behind women in rural China. Forthcoming.

35. Ye Y, He Q, Li Q, An L. The brother's penalty: Son preference and girls' health in rural China. *Health Econ*. 2024;33(8):1748-1771.

36. Li Q, An L. Intergenerational health consequence of the 1959-1961 Great Famine in rural China. *Econ Hum Biol*. 2015;18:27-40.

37. Christakis NA, Fowler JH. The spread of obesity in a large social network over 32 years. *N Engl J Med*. 2007;357(4):370-379.

38. Yi M, Yao S, Jiang D. Online health information seeking behavior in China: A review. *Health Commun*. 2016;31(10):1260-1274.

39. Lupton D. The digitally engaged patient: Self-monitoring and self-care in the digital health era. *Soc Theory Health*. 2013;11(3):256-270.

40. Zhang L, Cheng G, Song S, et al. Healthcare expenditure and insurance portability among rural Chinese migrants. *Soc Sci Med*. 2019;227:42-49.

41. Thomas EE, Haydon HM, Mehrotra A, et al. Building on the momentum: Sustaining telehealth beyond COVID-19. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2015; 21(7):388-394.

42. Eysenbach G, Powell J, Englesakis M, et al. Health related virtual communities and electronic support groups: Systematic review of the effects of online peer to peer interactions. *BMJ*. 2004; 328(7449):1166.

43. Cornwall A. Unpacking 'participation': Models, meanings and practices. *Community Dev J*. 2008; 43(3):269-283.

44. Chen M, Zhao Y, Si L. Who benefits from government healthcare subsidies? An assessment of the equity of healthcare benefits distribution in China. *PLoS One*. 2021;16(1):e0244081.

45. Shaw R, Kim YK, Hua J. Governance, technology and citizen behavior in pandemic: Lessons from COVID-19 in East Asia. *Prog Disaster Sci*. 2020;6:100090.

