IAA Journal of Biological Sciences 13(1):133-139, 2025 www.iaajournals.org
©IAAJOURNALS ISSN:2636-7254
https://doi.org/10.59298/IAAJB/2025/131133139 IAAJB131

Impact of Technology on Patient Autonomy

Bwanbale Geoffrey David

Faculty of Pharmacy Kampala International University Uganda

ABSTRACT

The integration of technology into healthcare has revolutionized patient care, offering advanced tools such as remote monitoring, AI-assisted diagnostics, and smart health devices that promote efficiency, safety, and patient empowerment. While these technologies enhance patient autonomy by enabling self-monitoring and informed choices, they also present significant ethical challenges. Issues of data privacy, informed consent, therapeutic relationship erosion, and uneven access to physician oversight threaten to undermine true autonomy, particularly among vulnerable populations. This paper examines the multidimensional effects of technology on patient autonomy through historical, ethical, and socio-political lenses. Drawing on case studies and current policy debates, it analyzes how technological advancements shift agency from patient to device, creating moral hazards and inequities. The discussion highlights the urgent need for a balanced framework where technological empowerment coexists with ethical safeguards to ensure that autonomy remains a cornerstone of patient-centered care in the digital age.

Keywords: Patient autonomy, Healthcare technology, Smart health devices, Informed consent, Digital ethics, Patient empowerment, AI in medicine, Therapeutic relationships.

INTRODUCTION

Technology significantly impacts cancer patient care, enabling remote monitoring of vital signs, online treatment adjustments, and easier access to electronically prescribed medications. This can enhance patient autonomy and lower healthcare costs. However, it also brings ethical concerns that must be evaluated before regulatory approval. Existing technologies, like electronic medical records and clinical decision support systems, can lead to issues related to patient privacy and unalterable clinical decisions. This discussion will focus on technology's effects on patient autonomy, which is particularly relevant in healthcare's complex and technology-dependent environment, especially post-outbreak. Patient vulnerabilities can hinder informed decision-making about technology use. Low health literacy populations might not understand technology's monitoring abilities and may not give fully informed consent. Patients can also overestimate technology's reliability, leading to moral hazards where they blindly trust technology's results, potentially result in harm. A physician's judgment acts as a crucial safeguard against medical errors in unsupervised technology use. However, vulnerable groups often have limited access to physicians due to low appointment rates, reducing their chances of receiving tailored medication and expert advice from advanced clinical systems. Consequently, the use of technology in healthcare can exacerbate autonomy discrepancies among these at-risk patient populations, particularly those in long-term care [1, 2].

Understanding Patient Autonomy

Patient autonomy offers benefits such as improved understanding and adherence to care regimens. However, it's essential to protect patients from harm while encouraging their engagement in care decisions. The classical liberal definition of patient autonomy emphasizes the ability to act without external constraints. Biomedical ethics largely follows this classical view but questions some assumptions about patient agency, particularly in terms of "informed consent" and the creation of spaces for autonomy. Care professionals are permitted to act based on patients' desires formed through their autonomy, such as responding to diagnostic test results according to patient comprehension. Yet, biomedicine alone does not create agency. Although increasing patient autonomy is beneficial, it isn't a strict requirement arising from a crisis in medical authority. Understanding patient autonomy demands a historical perspective, highlighting influences such as the Christian origins of medical authority, biopolitics, capitalism, and how

patients are shaped as subjects within networks of power. A critical examination of these histories reveals how perceptions of agency and competence are constructed. Addressing these injustices requires more than simply restoring authority; it necessitates a thorough analysis of local and global factors to ensure individual safety and well-being within various disciplines and practices [3, 4].

Historical Context of Patient Autonomy

Autonomy is a feature of four related but distinct notions of discourse about autonomy. These are: autonomy as the intrinsic capacity for self-governance; autonomy as a feature of empowered decision-making; autonomy as the exercised capacity for self-governance; and autonomy as a right to empowered self-governance. Each notion carries with it substantive implications regarding a normative ethic of autonomy, regarding the moral/ethical ways in which the exercise and enhancement of autonomy must be treated. The intrinsic capacity for self-governance can be exercised or not exercised, be well used or poorly used, and can be augmented or diminished. A life is considered autonomous if it is directed by a self-aware subject and is self-governed in accordance with that subject's authentic values. Empowered decision-making combines the intrinsic capacity for self-governance with related features of a context for decision-making. Empowered decision-making adds two further conditions. A nominally autonomous agent must be subjected to foreknowledge of the facts relevant to the decision, and this agent must also possess the power to assess and act on those facts, that is to say, the power necessary to in order to formulate a preference and execute that preference. The normative moral notion of autonomy as an exercise of self-governance draws attention to context-relative exercise conditions. Normative considerations arise in response to the exercise of autonomy, concerning whether that exercise meets the criteria of a well-governed autonomous decision. The possible failures of autonomous decision-making in this sense are failure to exercise self-governance or coercive interference – the deprivation of decision-making power. Normative moral notions regard the state of affairs where the autonomy of self-governance is effectively or actively denied in some way. Autonomy is the right to empowered self-governance. Capacity to self-govern is a feature of being human, but this capacity must be actively protected and underpins a moral notion of autonomy as an essential human right. Autonomy as a right involves several preconditions relating to the features of a normative, moral, and ethical conception of autonomy. No conception is self-authorized, nor unquestionable as to fundamental principle. Critically, factual considerations cannot be kept strictly separate from normative considerations. Decision-making capacity is a prerequisite for exercising autonomy within the constraints of this definition. Informed decision-making requires the receipt of relevant information, specifically that salient to the upcoming event, assessment of that information, and the ability to withhold and execute this assessment, within specific conditions. In all cases, knowledge, understanding, and interest in prescribed conditions are necessary for autonomous determination. There are restrictions on the context of empowerment; in particular, it is acknowledged that there are significant differences in decision-making capacity [5, 6].

Technological Advancements in Healthcare

The traditional patient-physician relationship is shifting slowly due to technological advancements. In some cases, physicians prioritize technology instead of the patient in evidence-based and protocol-based medicine, and in other cases, patients are prompted to go to a doctor who employs certain technologies. Nevertheless, the use of technology for diagnosis and treatment is essential to health care. Presently, technology is more than just a medical device; smart technology is now being fused with devices which then could influence human behaviours by pre-emptively delivering information to consumers before a conscious awareness of the need for information. Smart technology is now central to the vision of various healthcare systems towards a more scientifically empirical mode of care delivery. In many parts of the world, national governments are advocating the development of smart healthcare infrastructure, devices, and applications to meet the looming consequences of changing demographics: an ageing population, an increasing prevalence of chronic conditions, and the goal of keeping patients out of hospitals. Nonetheless, there are various ethical implications when health monitoring devices are directly incorporated into patients' daily lives. The ethical implications of smart healthcare are in three domains. The first is on whether devices affect therapeutic relationships. The crucial building blocks of a therapeutic relationship may be broken if patients' continued access to care directly depends on outside technology. The second ethical implication is on the safety of internet-connected devices. The inclusion of app interfaces may be information equivalent to patients' own devices, but the apps raise concerns about disclosure and unnecessary information. The lack of standardization for inputting information across devices could lead to indeterminate patient safety. The third is the difficulty in enforcing insurance compensation for devices. Patient monitoring devices designed and marketed for health care systems could be interpreted

as being at odds with conceiving patients as exclusive owners of the devices and excluded from being assets, agents, and objects of economic exploitation [7, 8].

Patient Empowerment through Technology

For decades, information technology (IT) has transformed business and consumer relationships, particularly in commerce and data collection, enhancing consumer autonomy. Similar changes are occurring in health care, where patients now have more treatment options and improved cost and outcome considerations. IT plays a crucial role in the development of e-patients and e-physicians, leading to new practices and approaches in the health care system. The evolution is driven by information technology advancements that empower individuals in health-related decision-making, increase demand for preventive care, and foster better patient engagement. Corporate health offerings reflect ongoing changes in the interplay of illness, disease, and wellness. Health significantly impacts quality of life, with advanced wellness products and communication channels promoting e-consumerism within the population. However, IT advancements have also led to challenges such as equipment failures and long wait times. This highlights the need for an in-depth discussion about the evolving patient-physician relationship in light of technological advancements and anticipated future developments [9, 10].

Challenges to Patient Autonomy

Sophisticated technologies are increasingly used to enhance patient care and outcomes, including health-tracking apps, wearable devices, remote monitoring, and AI-driven tools. While hailed for empowering patient autonomy, these technologies could undermine therapeutic relationships, patient safety, and fair resource allocation. The movement against medical paternalism may deter clinicians from guiding patients away from inappropriate use of health-tracking devices, leading to a practice of "defensive medicine." Digital manufacturers market their products in ways that promote a tech-centric view of health, pressuring patients to engage with technology in their care, potentially infringing on true autonomy. This expectation can result in patients being labeled as "noncooperative" if they reject these new technologies. Such reliance on devices can produce distrust; patients may feel their subjective experiences are invalid unless backed by “objective” data. Even without monitoring devices, they might fear their self-reports will be dismissed. Digital tools complicate the interpretation of symptoms and health experiences, and if patients receive diagnoses differing from device readings, it can erode trust in their providers. This distrust fosters harmful perceptions of healthcare professionals, damaging therapeutic relationships. Consequently, under-treatment and the dismissal of patient input due to distrust could jeopardize patient safety [11, 12].

Ethical Considerations

With the rapid growth of smart technologies, some believe these advances create unique ethical challenges for therapeutic relationships and patient safety. New technologies enable patients to monitor their health without professional help through self-monitoring devices and health apps. This empowerment can increase patient involvement in their care. Devices measuring health indicators like heart rate and blood pressure are approaching the accuracy of professional equipment. Smartphone apps provide information on test results, medication schedules, and interactions with care providers. As this technology becomes part of expected self-care, ethical issues arise. While it can enhance patient safety by involving patients in monitoring and improving communication, there are concerns about regulatory issues. Current consumer safety regulations are insufficient given the pace of technological change, and unregulated use may threaten patient safety. Sharing self-measurements could overwhelm care providers, potentially worsening safety. Ethical questions surround the development, marketing, and safe use of these technologies. Physician emotional involvement is viewed as essential for effective therapeutic relationships. Transitioning patients from professional care to self-monitoring risks reliance on technology, as health devices are poor substitutes for human contact, especially in direct monitoring and feedback. Power imbalances complicate respecting patient vulnerability and making self-care recommendations in the big data age. It is unclear when to alert patients to concerning health signs influenced by these applications [13, 14].

Case Studies

Patients with chronic conditions often seek health care for assistance in managing alarming health-related symptoms, which can range from the trivial to life-threatening. Doctors' responses to those requests can vary from reassurance, exploration of new problems, notes on the back of the envelope, prescriptions, to dismissal and perhaps recommendations of self-management regimes. The disaster of incongruent responses to chronic illness and the inadequacy of self-management methods are legion. Newly licensed blood glucose meters and inhalers now allow patients to test blood glucose, use single-agent hydration-

fluoride drops, and monitor the use of antimony. After decades of improving accuracy and routine at auto-analysis labs, the capillary whole blood determinator is now available, exceeding numbers that exceed the manufacturer's acceptable limits. This study traced the approval process for the over-the-counter availability of blood pathogen self-tests. The Australian case study indicates that the modalities shaping homogenously the outcome for the medical profession were forged by keeping patient expectations invisible. Media attention in the United States, while less intense, similarly feared the unexplained consequences of self-testing health behaviours. The issue is of great practical significance in health policy and planning, because what holds reasonably true for one disease health behaviour could apply more widely as tests become available for non-focally limiting functional integrity, and such expectations seem datable to the citizenship effect of the public's health. Empirically, health behaviours shaped by new technology allow a close reading of functional pitfalls. These health behaviours are for testing either outside the medical centre or over a wider area of the body than before, representing a changed negotiation between the patient, professionally filtered by the different transformation spaces, and the test. The modalities surrounding them offer resources for understanding the processes by which one possibility becomes reality, and another is repressed from view [15, 16].

Future Trends in Healthcare Technology

Technology advances daily, enhancing healthcare systems globally for improved patient safety, efficiency, and convenience. Rapid technological growth has revolutionized communication and high-accuracy computing in healthcare. Care networks connect through the internet, creating a borderless information world. Electronic records increase accessibility to patients' healthcare data, enabling disease prediction and prevention before symptoms appear, thanks to global healthcare databases. However, sharing patient data raises privacy concerns. Digital healthcare, sensors, and data management are key technologies enhancing health services, security, and equality for citizens in various time frames. The healthcare system is shifting towards digital platforms and connected health networks, necessitating nationwide implementation of wearable and mobile devices that monitor vital signs continuously for personalized health assessments. This will lead to tailored care plans by health coaches, helping to preemptively avert diseases and making health-improving lifestyle factors more visible. Future trends will cluster around five advanced technology groups impacting healthcare delivery processes. AI systems are anticipated to be critical for enhancing healthcare delivery within the next 5–10 years, assisting physicians with diagnostics, disease prediction, and prevention strategies. AI will guide individuals as health style coaches, advising on actions for better health maintenance. When combined with health wearables, AI offers continuous remote health monitoring, a key technology for the next 10-20 years. Telehealth's wide adoption will further decentralize care, ensuring access to current protocols. These trends aim to transform traditional hospital-centric models into community and home-based care approaches. However, while advanced technologies promise significant healthcare delivery transformations, growth must be balanced with privacy concerns. Current technologies are evolving to utilize citizens' health data on a national scale. Accessing and analyzing global health records using ultra-high accuracy algorithms will facilitate the prediction of healthcare needs based on population profiles, potentially minimizing in-hospital checkups through probabilistic screening models derived from this analysis [17, 18].

Policy Implications

The world of health technologies and their application is expanding rapidly, so too is the breadth of ethical issues that arise as it is integrated into patients' lives. Smart devices that automate aspects of patient care are key technologies currently growing in demand; however, there is ongoing concern about how patient autonomy will be supported in these scenarios. Patient safety, human agency, and physician-patient relationships are likely to be impacted by smart devices that impact healthcare decisions. Policymakers should be aware that the context and implementation of the technology will greatly influence its downstream effects on healthcare relationships that support autonomy. Smart devices should be tested thoroughly in practice before being justified and implemented widely. Increasingly, patients will have devices that monitor their health readily at their disposal. The growing availability of off-the-shelf devices that track health-seeking behaviour has already increased understanding about health in the general population. Enabling better self-care has been posited as the promised model of modern development. Devices that automate care decisions will likely allow chronic diseases to be monitored safely and treatment to be escalated more efficiently. However, as the technology continues to improve, and more patients are monitored by accurate smart technology and automated algorithms, the capacities of patients to make their own health decisions will be obfuscated. Who is to blame when a negative

outcome occurs? If a care decision is exercised off-line, who will the doctor punish? The emergence of this technology will likely be primarily beneficial; however, just as with any tool, there are risks at scale that must be understood. This is a consequential technology that should be explored deeply. The regulatory framework surrounding smart technology in the context of healthcare should be centralized, unified, and drivers of uncertainty explicitly stated. Additionally, data collection and sharing permission protocols should be clear and widely understood. Widespread education must be undertaken to ensure that both patients and physicians understand how to best leverage smart technology and appreciate the potential pitfalls [19, 20].

Global Perspectives on Technology and Autonomy

Technology and autonomy, however defined, should not be taken to include the idea of development or social progress… the deeper understanding of what technologies are being and the consequences of their application, and of the moral imperatives that are inherent in any application of technology, may lower the expectations that accompany the popular rhetoric of "empowerment". Technology and autonomy as understood in the capability approach… moral universities are rooted in human associations. Culture cannot be reduced to the mere functioning of a fixed assemblage of capabilities. Capabilities are social constructions. Cultures can be incommensurable yet equally moral and right. In societies susceptible to the technology-convergence process, where biomedical personalization is widespread and widely accepted, there is a danger of new social categories emerging as new generations cannot compare their experience vis-à-vis lived possibilities of being and doing or capabilities. Children born after genome editing technologies are widely considered normative and cannot develop concepts or expectations of future lives that include being otherwise or the absence of biotechnology, while generations of parents will have lived the experience of not accepting genetic programming or not having compliant sisters or brothers free from diseases. Popular discourses about technology and patient autonomy may obscure strong, conflicting moral hypotheses. In contemporary debates about the globalisation of technology and the future of the human condition, the following seemingly simple questions: Are humans good to their social environment? Are humans co-existing within a social framework to the benefit of themselves and to other species? Are humans free actors? Are choices made by humans well-informed? These questions bracket very different moral universes involving very different qualities of change and design. The convergence of biotechnology and information technology opens new pathways of development that will put into perspective the rationality of the substantive agency and the choices made by the actors in decision systems in which humans are embraced with a universe of sentient beings and agency [21-28].

CONCLUSION

The growing incorporation of advanced technologies into healthcare systems undeniably alters the dynamics of patient autonomy. While tools such as wearable monitors, AI-driven diagnostics, and telehealth platforms offer promising improvements in health outcomes and self-management, they simultaneously pose challenges in preserving ethical care practices and authentic patient agency. Autonomy risks being diluted when decision-making is displaced from patients to automated systems, especially in contexts where health literacy is low or access to professional oversight is limited. In response, a recalibration of ethical and policy frameworks is essential one that foregrounds transparency, equitable access, informed consent, and a clear delineation of responsibility in technology-driven care. By anchoring innovation in compassion, education, and accountability, the healthcare community can ensure that technology supports, rather than supplants, the autonomous voice of the patient.

REFERENCES

1. Ho A. Live like nobody is watching: Relational autonomy in the age of artificial intelligence health monitoring. 2023. Available from: [https://example.com]
2. Dinsmore B, Pugh AJ. The paradox of constrained well-being: Childhood autonomy, surveillance and inequality. *Sociol Forum.* 2021;36(2):450–72.
3. Nyamboga TO, Ugwu OP, Ugwu JN, Alum EU, Eze VH, Ugwu CN, Ogenyi FC, Okon MB, Ejemot-Nwadiaro RI. Biotechnological innovations in soil health management: a systematic review of integrating microbiome engineering, bioinformatics, and sustainable practices. Cogent Food & Agriculture. 2025 Dec 31;11(1):2519811.
4. Rajiah K, Sivarasa S, Maharajan MK. Impact of pharmacists' interventions and patients' decision on health outcomes in terms of medication adherence and quality use of medicines among patients attending community pharmacies: A systematic review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2021 Apr 21;18(9):4392.

5. Mohammed SA, Osman YM, Ibrahim AM, Shaban M. Ethical and regulatory considerations in the use of AI and machine learning in nursing: A systematic review. *Int Nurs Rev.* 2025 Mar;72(1):e70010.
6. Castillo BD. Neggsed (Autonomy): Progress and challenges in the self-government of the Gunadule people of Panama. *Autonomy and.* 2023. Available from: [https://oapen.org]
7. Ugwu CN, Ugwu OP, Alum EU, Eze VH, Basajja M, Ugwu JN, Ogenyi FC, Ejemot-Nwadiaro RI, Okon MB, Egba SI, Uti DE. Medical preparedness for bioterrorism and chemical warfare: A public health integration review. Medicine. 2025 May 2;104(18):e42289.
8. Stanka H. Autonomy reconsidered: Conceptualising a phenomenon on the verges of self-government and self-governance. 2023. Available from: [https://researchgate.net]
9. Riotta S, Bruccoleri M. Revisiting the patient–physician relationship under the lens of value co-creation and defensive medicine. *J Serv Theory Pract.* 2021;31(1):31–54.
10. Basil C. Treat the patient not the disease: Evolving physician approaches to cancer care through communication, collaboration, and experience. 2025. Available from: [https://utexas.edu]
11. Ugwu CN, Ugwu OP, Alum EU, Eze VH, Basajja M, Ugwu JN, Ogenyi FC, Ejemot-Nwadiaro RI, Okon MB, Egba SI, Uti DE. Sustainable development goals (SDGs) and resilient healthcare systems: Addressing medicine and public health challenges in conflict zones. Medicine. 2025 Feb 14;104(7):e41535.
12. Smith HA, Besunder JB, Betters KA, Johnson PN, Srinivasan V, Stormorken A, et al. 2022 Society of Critical Care Medicine clinical practice guidelines on prevention and management of pain, agitation, neuromuscular blockade, and delirium in critically ill pediatric patients with consideration of the ICU environment and early mobility. *Pediatr Crit Care Med.* 2022 Feb 1;23(2):e74–110.
13. Yau K, Dharia A, Alrowiyti I, Cherney DZI. Prescribing SGLT2 inhibitors in patients with CKD: Expanding indications and practical considerations. *Kidney Int Rep.* 2022;7(7):1740–50.
14. Mennella C, Maniscalco U, De Pietro G, Esposito M. Ethical and regulatory challenges of AI technologies in healthcare: A narrative review. *Heliyon.* 2024;10:e16723.
15. Fracica PJ, Fracica EA. Patient safety. In: *Medical Quality Management: Theory and Practice.* 2021. p. 53–90.
16. Ho A, Quick O. Leaving patients to their own devices? Smart technology, safety and therapeutic relationships. *BMJ Health Care Inform.* 2018;25(3):78–84.
17. Boers SN, Jongsma KR, Lucivero F, Aardoom J, et al. SERIES: eHealth in primary care. Part 2: Exploring the ethical implications of its application in primary care practice. *Eur J Gen Pract.* 2019;25(2):75–82.
18. Edyedu I, Ugwu OP, Ugwu CN, Alum EU, Eze VH, Basajja M, Ugwu JN, Ogenyi FC, Ejemot-Nwadiaro RI, Okon MB, Egba SI. The role of pharmacological interventions in managing urological complications during pregnancy and childbirth: A review. Medicine. 2025 Feb 14;104(7):e41381.
19. Duan J, Chen X, Fan D, Jiang H, Zhang X, Zhang W, et al. Experience of using electronic inhaler monitoring devices for patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease or asthma: Systematic review of qualitative studies. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth.* 2025 May 16;13:e57645.
20. Dhole MR, Mankhair VB, Marathe PS. A brief review on various devices used in treatment of diabetes mellitus. *J Survey Fish Sci.* 2023;10(1):3201–10.
21. Ullah M, Hamayun S, Wahab A, Khan SU, Rehman MU, Haq ZU, et al. Smart technologies used as smart tools in the management of cardiovascular disease and their future perspective. *Curr Probl Cardiol.* 2023 Nov 1;48(11):101922.
22. Tayefi M, Ngo P, Chomutare T, Dalianis H, Salvi E, Budrionis A, et al. Challenges and opportunities beyond structured data in analysis of electronic health records. *Wiley Interdiscip Rev Comput Stat.* 2021 Nov;13(6):e1549.
23. Ongesa TN, Ugwu OP, Ugwu CN, Alum EU, Eze VH, Basajja M, Ugwu JN, Ogenyi FC, Okon MB, Ejemot-Nwadiaro RI. Optimizing emergency response systems in urban health crises: A project management approach to public health preparedness and response. Medicine. 2025 Jan 17;104(3):e41279.
24. Shafik W. Ethical considerations in automated healthcare. In: *Next-Generation Therapeutics Using Internet of Things and Machine Learning.* IGI Global; 2025. p. 315–38.

25. Johnson J. Automating the OODA loop in the age of intelligent machines: Reaffirming the role of humans in command-and-control decision-making in the digital age. *Def Stud.* 2023;23(4):561–79.
26. Ugwu OP, Alum EU, Ugwu JN, Eze VH, Ugwu CN, Ogenyi FC, Okon MB. Harnessing technology for infectious disease response in conflict zones: Challenges, innovations, and policy implications. Medicine. 2024 Jul 12;103(28):e38834.
27. Richter MA, Hagenmaier M, Bandte O, Parida V, Wincent J. Smart cities, urban mobility and autonomous vehicles: How different cities need different sustainable investment strategies. *Technol Forecast Soc Change*. 2022 Nov 1;184:121857.
28. Søraa RA, Nyvoll P, Tøndel G, Fosch-Villaronga E, Serrano JA. The social dimension of domesticating technology: Interactions between older adults, caregivers, and robots in the home. *Technol Forecast Soc Change*. 2021 Jun 1;167:120678.

CITE AS: Bwanbale Geoffrey David (2025). Impact of Technology on Patient Autonomy. IAA Journal of Biological Sciences 13(1):133-139. https://doi.org/10.59298/IAAJB/2025/131133139