









contraceptives for birth control, as mentioned in the questionnaire.

The vast part of the respondents expressed a positive view and stance towards using either implants or wearables to extend their current treatment plan. This could be an indication that the general public is ready to embrace a new form of healthcare treatment plan with more focus on enabling the patients to go about their lives in a normal fashion while still being under treatment.

### Future work

To further investigate how current patients that undergo remote care treatments would like to use IoT, we recommend further studies to include associations for these persons such as e.g. diabetic associations. Further work could also be based on investigating challenges in deployment of the presented technologies on a broader and wider scale within the healthcare system.

### Conclusion

In this pilot study chronically ill patients showed more positive attitudes towards the use of implanted sensors compared to external sensors. Respondents who had previously received remote healthcare also indicated that they could see an improvement with an implant in comparison to wearable sensors. Replies from the potential patient group demonstrated a similar tendency, although the wearable sensor also had a high number of positive replies. The same trend could be seen in the group of healthcare professionals: in general, implants had a positive response rate that was almost twice as high as the number of positive responses for wearable sensors. A majority also felt that the idea of implants was easier to understand and to use compared to the presented alternative. The analysis however showed a difference between men and women: the women indicated a 50 % larger distrust towards the external sensor.

Due to the low number of respondents (N=100) this study should be seen as a pilot study and its result should be viewed as an indication for further research. The results were however interesting and indicate that the respondents find that remote healthcare with presented technologies could be applied to improve person-centered care.

### References

- [1] SCB, Statistics Sweden, Investments, R&D and IT Unit. Private use of computers and the Internet in 2014.
- [2] Dohr A, Modre-Osprian R, Drobnics M, Hayn D, & Schreier G. The internet of things for Ambient Assisted Living. Seventh International Conference on Information Technology: New Generations, ITNG 2010, USA
- [3] IAPO. Declaration on Patient-Centred Healthcare. 2006. [http://iaapo.org.uk/sites/default/files/files/IAPO\\_declaration\\_English.pdf](http://iaapo.org.uk/sites/default/files/files/IAPO_declaration_English.pdf). Retrieved 2016-02-15.
- [4] WHO, People at the Centre of Care: What is people-centred health care? 2016. Retrieved 2016-02-15.
- [http://www.wpro.who.int/health\\_services/people\\_at\\_the\\_centre\\_of\\_care/definition/en/](http://www.wpro.who.int/health_services/people_at_the_centre_of_care/definition/en/)
- [5] Starfield B. Is Patient-Centered Care the Same As Person-Focused Care? *Perm J*. 15(2): 63–69. 2011.
- [6] Hörnsten Å, Ekman I, Vårdhandboken. Personcentrerad vård.2013..www.vardhandboken.se/ Retrieved 2016-02-16
- [7] Edberg A-K, Ehrenberg A, Friberg F, Wallin L, Wijk H, Öhlen J. Omvårdnad på avancerad nivå: Kärnkompetenser inom sjuksköterskans specialistområden. Studentlitteratur, Lund 2013; pp. 29-53.
- [8] Atzori L, Iera A, Morabito G. The Internet of Things: A survey. *Computer Networks: The International Journal of Computer and Telecommunications Networking archive* 54:15, 2010, 2787-2805 Elsevier North-Holland, Inc. NY.
- [9] Venkatesh V, Morris MG, Davis GB, Davis DF. User Acceptance of Information Technology: Toward a Unified View. *MIS Quarterly* 09/2003; 27(3):425-478.
- [10] Bui N, Zorzi M. Health care applications: a solution based on the internet of things. *ACM International Conference Proceeding Series* 01/2011; 1(5).
- [11] King WR He J. A meta analysis of the technology acceptance model. *Inform & Management* 43(6): 740–755,
- [12] Venkatesh V, Morris MG, Davis GB, Davis DF. User Acceptance of Information Technology: Toward a Unified View. *MIS Quarterly* 09/2003; 27(3):425-478.
- [13] Venkatesh, V, Davis FD. A Theoretical Extension of the Technology Acceptance Model: Four Longitudinal Field Studies. *Management Science* 46(2):186-204, 2000.
- [14] Phichitchaisopa N, Naenna T. Factors affecting the adoption of healthcare information technology. *EXCLI J*. 2013; 12: 413–436. Published online 2013 May 13
- [15] Davoody N, Hägglund M. Care professionals' perceived usefulness of a rehabilitation eHealth service in stroke care. *Stud Health Technol Inform*. 2015: 2016:992.
- [16] Gao Y, Li H, Luo Y. An empirical study of wearable technology acceptance in healthcare. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 115;9, pp.1704 - 1723 2015.
- [17] Tan P J B. Applying the UTUAT to Understand Factors Affecting The Use of English E-Learning Websites in Taiwan. Sage Open 2013.
- [18] Akbar F. What affects students' acceptance and use of technology? Thesis Information Systems, Dietrich College, Carnegie Mellon University, 4-2013.
- [19] Venkatesh V, Zhang X. Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology: U.S. Vs. China. *J of Global Inform Technology Management* 13;1: 5-27, 2010
- [20] Spil TAM, Schuring, RW. The UTAUT Questionnaire Items, Chapter V in *E-Health Systems Diffusion and Use: The Innovation, the User and the USE IT Model* Idea Group Inc. 2005.
- [21] Oates, BJ. Researching Information Systems and Computing. SAGE Publications Ltd.
- [22] Dwivedi YK, Rana NP, Hsin C, Williams MD. A Meta-analysis of the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology UTAUT. *Governance and Sustainabil-*

