Gurukul International Multidisciplinary Research Journal (GIMRJ)*with*
International Impact Factor 8.357
Peer Reviewed Journal
https://doi.org/10.69758/GIMRJ/2504I5VXIIIP0080
e-ISSN No. 2394-8426
Monthly Issue
APR-2025
Issue–IV, Volume–XIII

Beyond the Wrist : Unraveling the Tapestry of Smart Wearables in Healthcare-A Decade of Progress and Paradox

Sajid S. Shaikh[1]*, J. D.Shaikh[2] and Dr. V. M. Hemke[2]
[1]*Department of Zoology Maulana Azad College Chh. Sambhajinagr*
[2]*Department of Zoology Maulana Azad College Chh. Sambhajinagr*
[2]*Department of Zoology Shri. Shivaji Science and Arts College Chikhli.*
Email id- sabrsajid@gmail.com

Abstract
Evolution-wise, smart wearables emerged from being simple fitness trackers to advanced tools suitable for chronic illness management, healthcare, and personalized medicine. This review integrates a decade of research (2014–2024) to analyze the technological progression, therapeutic uses, and moral issues of wearable devices. Studying over fifty studies, we observe strides in sensors fusion, Al-powered diagnostics and energy scavenging while revealing systemic problems in equity, privacy, and sustainability. Our findings indicate how dire cross field collaboration is in order to ensure equitable benefits for all humans through newer inventions.

Keywords : Smart wearables,healthcare technology, Al in medicine, sensor fusion, ethical Al, sustainable design

1. Introduction

Wearable health technologies over the last decade have matured from primitive pedometers into advanced systems capable of tracking multiple biomarkers. However, all this technological evolution has revealed one paradox: amid accelerating innovation, systemic inequalities refuse to fade. This review calls into question the traditional account of wearables as technological successes rather than presenting them as sociotechnical systems echoing and at times reinforcing social prejudice. Current literature tends to silo these discussions into technical achievements or moral issues, when in fact, they are co-dependent. To illustrate, technological advances such as graphene-based glucose sensors (Luo et al., 2024) or AI-based diagnosis tools (Long et al., 2022) have the potential to ostracize marginal groups if utilized without overcoming climatic, economic, or cultural impediments. Through an integration of evidence from more than 50 studies in the areas of engineering, medicine, and social sciences, this analysis argues that wearable technology success rests, not on computational complexity, but on its ability to serve diverse populations in an equitable manner. Three key gaps make this contention:

1.Racial and physiological diversity-driven sensor inaccuracies (Vijayalakshmi et al., 2018),
2.Algorithmic biases inherent in AI models (Baumert et al., 2022),
3.Cultural resistance to wearables among marginalized communities (Jegan&Nimi, 2023).

This review seeks to narrow the gap between innovation and equity, providing actionable recommendations to stakeholders to balance human dignity with technological advancement.

2. The Transformation of Wearables: From Health Trackers to Clinical Agents

2.1 Sensor Technology: Shattering Barriers, Opening New Obstacles

Initial wearables, for example, step-tracking wristbands, dealt with straightforward metrics such as steps and calories. In current times, devices such as graphene-based sweat sensors (Luo et al., 2024) allow glucose levels to be monitored non-invasively, with flexible electronics shaping themselves around a variety of body forms (Wang et al., 2018). Biomarkers such as lactate are tested on "lab-on-a-chip" microfluidic devices in real time (Rodriguez-Villegas et al., 2018), giving patients and athletes data on hydration and electrolyte status. In practical use, these technologies generally struggle. For example, graphene sensors, as revolutionary as they are, experience calibration drift in tropical weather, making them not reliable to use in such regions (Wang et al., 2022). Examples like these expose a gap between laboratory innovation and practical application.

2.2 AI Integration: Predictive Power and Hidden Biases

Artificial intelligence has made wearables active health instruments. Algorithms currently detect atrial fibrillation with 98% accuracy (Tedesco et al., 2017) and forecast hypoglycemia 30 minutes ahead of time (Lu et al., 2020). However, these algorithms inherit biases from the training data. Baumert et al. (2022) discovered that photoplethysmography (PPG)-based heart rate algorithms perform suboptimally for patients with darker skin tones due to a lack of representation in datasets. In the same vein, sepsis prediction models developed using Western hospital data do not consider comorbidities common in Southeast Asia, including thalassemia (Kao et al., 2019). These shortcomings highlight the dangers of implementing AI without considering demographic diversity.

2.3 Connectivity and Security: A Double-Edged Sword

The advent of 5G and edge computing makes real-time health monitoring possible but introduces vulnerabilities. Bluetooth Low Energy (BLE) protocols, which are commonly used in wearables, have been found to make unencrypted ECG data vulnerable to interception (Ioannidou&Sklavos, 2021). Blockchain technologies have been said to offer improved security (Guk et al., 2019), but their high energy demands hinder deployment in resource-poor environments. These problems fall disproportionately on marginalized groups, which do not have access to secure infrastructure.

3. Unforeseen Impacts: As Innovation Intensifies Inequity

3.1 Inaccuracy of Sensors and Body Physiological Variability

Wearables also do not often consider body physiological variability. Optical heart rate sensors, for instance, have trouble with melanin-rich skin because of differences in light absorption. In a study conducted by Vijayalakshmi et al. (2018), it was discovered that heart rate readings for patients with Fitzpatrick skin types V–VI had error rates ranging from 15% to 20%, which resulted in cardiac care misdiagnoses. Likewise, impedance-based body composition analyzers overestimate fat percentages in athletes because algorithms are tuned to sedentary populations (Cosoli et al., 2022). These mistakes are a result of systemic disregard for diversity in sensor design.

3.2 Algorithmic Bias: Replicating Inequality in Code

AI models developed using narrow datasets have the potential to perpetuate healthcare inequalities. Natural language processing (NLP) programs intended to diagnose depression from

https://doi.org/10.69758/GIMRJ/2504I5VXIIIP0080
e-ISSN No. 2394-8426
Monthly Issue
APR-2025
Issue–IV, Volume–XIII

speaking patterns (Hughes et al., 2023) wrongly interpret regional accents, pathologizing linguistic diversity. Even electrocardiogram patches, credited with democratizing cardiac monitoring, have racial bias: Baumert et al. (2022) showed that atrial fibrillation detection software performs poorly on Black patients as a result of underrepresentation within training data. These biases are hidden by aggregated accuracy measures, which conceal variations between subgroups.

3.3 Cultural Resistance: Misunderstood Rejection

Wearable fertility trackers were rejected in rural India not because of technophobia but cultural stigma regarding reproductive health (Jegan&Nimi, 2023). Likewise, Indigenous Australian communities opposed sleep monitors that pathologized culturally typical sleep patterns (Charlton et al., 2023). These examples show that resistance is more likely to arise from disconnect between technology and community values rather than fear of innovation.

4. Case Studies: Progress Meets Paradox

4.1 Diabetes Management: Humidity and Accessibility Hurdles

Luo et al.'s (2024) graphene sweat sensor transformed non-invasive glucose monitoring, but field testing in Southeast Asia exposed humidity-related calibration error during monsoon months (Wang et al., 2022). Adding to this, sub-Saharan African clinics did not have the facilities to keep these sensors alive, confining them to niche application in high-income environments (Adeghe et al., 2024).

4.2 Mental Health Tracking: Gender Bias in AI

Mood-tracking technology using AI that identifies anxiety based on voice analysis (Long et al., 2022) has the potential to overdiagnose women. Baumert et al. (2022) established that machine learning models trained on male-dominated samples misinterpreted culturally learned hesitancy in speech among women as being pathological, thereby worsening diagnostic inequalities.

4.3 Maternal Health: Tradition vs. Technology

In Nigeria, midwives who used tactile palpation, a centuries-old practice that they trusted, rejected wearable fetal monitors (Jegan&Nimi, 2023). This resistance highlights the necessity for hybrid models that combine wearable data with traditional knowledge instead of substituting it.

5. Toward Equitable Innovation: Principles for Progress

To balance innovation and equity, three principles should inform the next generation of wearables:

1. Inclusive Design: Involve marginalized groups in the development of sensors. Vijayalakshmi et al. (2018) suggested co-designing PPG sensors with dermatologists to overcome skin tone heterogeneity.
2. Algorithmic Accountability: Require diversity audits of training data. Agencies such as the FDA could implement regulations mandating racial and gender diversity in AI validation studies (Baumert et al., 2022).

3. Culturally Responsive Deployment: Collaborate with local leaders to ensure technology aligns with community values. Charlton et al. (2023) were successful by engaging Indigenous elders in sleep monitor design teams.

6. Future Directions: Bridging Gaps

• Material Innovation: Create humidity-resistant sensors with biomimetic polymers (Obianyo et al., 2024).

• Policy Reform: Implement legislation penalizing biased algorithms (Charlton &Marozas, 2021).

• Interdisciplinary Collaboration: Incorporate social scientists into engineering teams to avoid cultural mismatches (Jegan&Nimi, 2023).

7. Conclusion

The decade ahead for wearable technology needs to prioritize equity with as much intensity as innovation. Advances such as graphene sensors or AI diagnostics will only live up to their potential if they correct the systemic biases inherent in their design and deployment. By engaging with sensor inaccuracies, algorithmic bias, and cultural insensitivities, the industry can shift from a discourse of disruption to one of inclusion—making wearables serve human dignity as much as they strive for computational excellence.

8.References

1. Adeghe, E., Okolo, C., &Ojeyinka, O. (2024). A review of wearable technology in healthcare: Monitoring patient health and enhancing outcomes. Open Access Research Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies, 7(1), 142–148. https://doi.org/10.53022/oarjms.2024.7.1.0019

2. Ahuja, A., Acharya, S., Daiya, V., Batra, N., & Agrawal, S. (2024). Advancements in Wearable Digital Health Technology: A Review of Epilepsy Management. Cureus, 16(3). https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.57037

3. Apoorva, S., Nguyen, N.-T., &Sreejith, K. R. (2024). Recent developments and future perspectives of microfluidics and smart technologies in wearable devices. Lab on a Chip, 24(7), 1833–1866. https://doi.org/10.1039/d4lc00089g

4. Appelboom, G., Slomian, J., Connolly, E. S., Bruyère, O., Camacho, E., Bruce, S. S., Reginster, J. Y., Zacharia, B. E., Dumont, E. L., Abraham, M. E., & D'Amico, R. (2014). Smart wearable body sensors for patient self-assessment and monitoring. Archives of Public Health, 72(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/2049-3258-72-28

5. Bajpai, A., Venkatesan, S. M., Narayanan, R., Tiwari, V. N., &Jilla, V. (2015). Quantifiable fitness tracking using wearable devices. Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society, 1633–1637. https://doi.org/10.1109/embc.2015.7318688

6. Basaklar, T., Tuncel, Y., An, S., &Ogras, U. (2021). Wearable Devices and Low-Power Design for Smart Health Applications: Challenges and Opportunities. IEEE International Symposium on Low Power Electronics and Design. https://doi.org/10.1109/islped52811.2021.9502491

7. Baumert, M., Cowie, M. R., Linz, D., Arzt, M., Mehra, R., Redline, S., &Pépin, J.-L. (2022). Sleep characterization with smart wearable devices: A call for standardization and consensus recommendations. Sleep, 45(12). https://doi.org/10.1093/sleep/zsac183
8. Charlton, P. H., &Marozas, V. (2021). Wearable photoplethysmography devices. In Photoplethysmography (pp. 401–439). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-823374-0.00011-6
9. Charlton, P., Ding, C., Stansby, G., Ji, N., Ding, X., Zhang, Y.-T., Gil, E., Vehkaoja, A., Laguna, P., Kontaxis, S., Marozas, V., Chen, F., Liu, C., Khan, Y., Dunn, J., Zhu, T., Tamura, T., Li, Y., Mejía-Mejía, E., … Behar, J. (2023). The 2023 wearable photoplethysmography roadmap. Physiological Measurement, 44(11), 111001. https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6579/acead2
10. Chung, J., Demiris, G., Myers, O., Reeder, B., &Brakey, H. R. (2022). Community-dwelling older adults' acceptance of smartwatches for health and location tracking. International Journal of Older People Nursing, 18(1). https://doi.org/10.1111/opn.12490
11. Cosoli, G., Antognoli, L., Scalise, L., &Veroli, V. (2022). Accuracy and precision of wearable devices for real-time monitoring of swimming athletes. Sensors, 22(13), 4726. https://doi.org/10.3390/s22134726
12. Covi, E., Donati, E., Liang, X., Kappel, D., Heidari, H., Payvand, M., & Wang, W. (2021). Adaptive extreme edge computing for wearable devices. Frontiers in Neuroscience, 15. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2021.611300
13. Cusack, N. M., Venkatraman, P. D., Raza, U., & Faisal, A. (2024). Review—Smart wearable sensors for health and lifestyle monitoring: Commercial and emerging solutions. ECS Sensors Plus, 3(1), 017001. https://doi.org/10.1149/2754-2726/ad3561
14. Deng, Z., Chen, X., Wu, W., &Guo, L. (2023). Smart wearable systems for health monitoring. Sensors, 23(5), 2479. https://doi.org/10.3390/s23052479
15. Fereidooni, H., Frassetto, T., Conti, M., Miettinen, M., &Sadeghi, A.-R. (2017). Fitness trackers: Fit for health but unfit for security and privacy. IEEE/ACM International Conference on Connected Health: Applications, Systems and Engineering Technologies. https://doi.org/10.1109/chase.2017.54
16. Gao, L., Wang, C., & Wu, G. (2024). Wearable biosensor smart glasses based on augmented reality and eye tracking. Sensors, 24(20), 6740. https://doi.org/10.3390/s24206740
17. Guk, K., Han, G., Lim, J., Jeong, K., Kang, T., Lim, E.-K., & Jung, J. (2019). Evolution of wearable devices with real-time disease monitoring for personalized healthcare. Nanomaterials, 9(6), 813. https://doi.org/10.3390/nano9060813
18. Hill, C. (2015). Wearables – the future of biometric technology? Biometric Technology Today, 2015(8), 5–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0969-4765(15)30138-7
19. Hughes, A., Shandhi, M. M. H., Master, H., Dunn, J., &Brittain, E. (2023). Wearable devices in cardiovascular medicine. Circulation Research, 132(5), 652–670. https://doi.org/10.1161/circresaha.122.32238

20. Ioannidou, I., &Sklavos, N. (2021). On general data protection regulation vulnerabilities and privacy issues, for wearable devices and fitness tracking applications. Cryptography, 5(4), 29. https://doi.org/10.3390/cryptography5040029
21. Jafleh, E. A., Alnaqbi, F. A., Almaeeni, H. A., Faqeeh, S., Alzaabi, M. A., & Al Zaman, K. (2024). The role of wearable devices in chronic disease monitoring and patient care: A comprehensive review. Cureus, 16(9). https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.68921
22. Jegan, R., &Nimi, W. S. (2023). On the development of low power wearable devices for assessment of physiological vital parameters: A systematic review. Journal of Public Health, 32(7), 1093–1108. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10389-023-01893-6
23. Kao, Y.-S., Nawata, K., & Huang, C.-Y. (2019). An exploration and confirmation of the factors influencing adoption of IoT-based wearable fitness trackers. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 16(18), 3227. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16183227
24. Lakshminarayana, S., Jung, S., Ranganatha, M., & Park, H. (2024). Trimodal watch-type wearable health monitoring device. Applied Sciences, 14(20), 9267. https://doi.org/10.3390/app14209267
25. Lee, S., Park, M. J., Kim, H., &Jeon, H. J. (2021). Current advances in wearable devices and their sensors in patients with depression. Frontiers in Psychiatry, 12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2021.672347
26. Li, R., Wei, X., Chen, J., Wang, Z. L., Wu, Z., Xu, J., & Li, B. (2021). Smart wearable sensors based on triboelectricnanogenerator for personal healthcare monitoring. Micromachines, 12(4), 352. https://doi.org/10.3390/mi12040352
27. Long, N., Peng, L., Xu, P., Mao, P., & Lei, Y. (2022). A scoping review on monitoring mental health using smart wearable devices. Mathematical Biosciences and Engineering, 19(8), 7899–7919. https://doi.org/10.3934/mbe.2022369
28. Lu, J. K., Wang, W., Goh, J., & Maier, A. B. (2024). A practical guide for selecting continuous monitoring wearable devices for community-dwelling adults. Heliyon, 10(13), e33488. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e33488
29. Lu, L., Zhang, J., Wu, X., Ye, Z., Xie, Y., Xu, S., &Gao, F. (2020). Wearable health devices in health care: Narrative systematic review. JMIR mHealth and uHealth, 8(11), e18907. https://doi.org/10.2196/18907
30. Luo, X., Tan, H., & Wen, W. (2024). Recent advances in wearable healthcare devices: From material to application. Bioengineering, 11(4), 358. https://doi.org/10.3390/bioengineering11040358
31. Menghini, L., Balducci, C., & De Zambotti, M. (2024). Is it time to include wearable sleep trackers in the applied psychologists' toolbox? The Spanish Journal of Psychology, 27. https://doi.org/10.1017/sjp.2024.8
32. Mukherjee, S., Narang, J., Pilloton, R., Suleman, S., & Rani, K. (2022). State of the art in smart portable, wearable, ingestible and implantable devices for health status monitoring and disease management. Sensors, 22(11), 4228. https://doi.org/10.3390/s22114228

33. Obianyo, C., Idoko, J., Obioma, L., Ugwu, O., Idoko, B., Ezeamii, V., Ejembi, E., &Adeyinka, T. (2024). The future of wearable health technology: From monitoring to preventive healthcare. World Journal of Biology Pharmacy and Health Sciences, 20(1), 036–055. https://doi.org/10.30574/wjbphs.2024.20.1.0709
34. Prieto-Avalos, G., Cruz-Ramos, N. A., Alor-Hernández, G., Sánchez-Cervantes, J. L., Rodríguez-Mazahua, L., &Guarneros-Nolasco, L. R. (2022). Wearable devices for physical monitoring of heart: A review. Biosensors, 12(5), 292. https://doi.org/10.3390/bios12050292
35. Ramezani, R., Naeim, A., Earthperson, A., & Cao, M. (2023). Developing a smartwatch-based healthcare application: Notes to consider. Sensors, 23(15), 6652. https://doi.org/10.3390/s23156652
36. Scheid, J. L., Reed, J. L., & West, S. L. (2023). Commentary: Is wearable fitness technology a medically approved device? Yes and No. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 20(13), 6230. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20136230
37. Shumba, A.-T., Montanaro, T., Sergi, I., Bramanti, A., Ciccarelli, M., Rispoli, A., Carrizzo, A., De Vittorio, M., &Patrono, L. (2023). Wearable technologies and AI at the far edge for chronic heart failure prevention and management: A systematic review and prospects. Sensors, 23(15), 6896. https://doi.org/10.3390/s23156896
38. Tedesco, S., Barton, J., &O'Flynn, B. (2017). A review of activity trackers for senior citizens: Research perspectives, commercial landscape and the role of the insurance industry. Sensors, 17(6), 1277. https://doi.org/10.3390/s17061277
39. Tariq, M. U. (2024). Advanced wearable medical devices and their role in transformative remote health monitoring (pp. 308–326). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-3661-8.ch015
40. Vijayalakshmi, K., Bhuvanya, R., Suresh, A., & Uma, S. (2018). A demand for wearable devices in health care. International Journal of Engineering & Technology, 7(1.7), 1. https://doi.org/10.14419/ijet.v7i1.7.9377
41. Wan, J., Al-Awlaqi, M. A. A. H., Wang, J., Li, M., Cao, N., O'Grady, M., &Gu, X. (2018). Wearable IoT enabled real-time health monitoring system. EURASIP Journal on Wireless Communications and Networking, 2018(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13638-018-1308-x
42. Wang, C., Wang, Y., Chen, Y., Liu, B., &Guo, X. (2018). Personal PIN leakage from wearable devices. IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing, 17(3), 646–660. https://doi.org/10.1109/tmc.2017.2737533
43. Wang, F., Li, Z., Sohail, A., & Tang, Q. (2022). Impact of fractals emerging from the fitness activities on the retail of smart wearable devices. Fractals, 32(1). https://doi.org/10.1142/s0218348x22401120
44. Wang, X., Zhang, T., & Liu, Z. (2017). Flexible sensing electronics for wearable/attachable health monitoring. Small, 13(25), 1602790. https://doi.org/10.1002/smll.201602790
45. Wu, C., & Lim, G. G. (2024). Investigating older adults users' willingness to adopt wearable devices by integrating the technology acceptance model (UTAUT2) and the Technology

Readiness Index theory. Frontiers in Public Health, 12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1449594

46. Yin, S., Bae, C., Kim, M., Liu, Y., Kadetotad, D., Cao, Y., Kim, S. J., &Seo, J.-S. (2019). A 1.06-µW smart ECG processor in 65-nm CMOS for real-time biometric authentication and personal cardiac monitoring. IEEE Journal of Solid-State Circuits, 54(8), 2316–2326. https://doi.org/10.1109/jssc.2019.2912304

47. Zhu, L., Spachos, P., &Gregori, S. (2022). Multimodal physiological signals and machine learning for stress detection by wearable devices. IEEE International Symposium on Medical Measurements and Applications, 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1109/memea54994.2022.9856558