EDITORIAL 10.5005/jihr-3-1-iv

# Advancing Integrative Health in the Era of Precision and Digital Care


## Abstract

Health systems worldwide face rising chronic disease burden, increasing multimorbidity, and growing expectations for care that is both effective and experience-centered. So, it is necessary to align biomedical knowledge with patient values and practical care delivery by converging evidence-focused traditional and complementary approaches, precision and multi-omics medicine, and the digital transformation of data capture and clinical decision-making. Traditional medicine and integrative care contribute therapeutic concepts, diagnostic frameworks, and whole-person outcomes orientations, yet the field must close persistent gaps in evidence generation, standardization, regulatory pathways, and equitable access. Precision medicine reframes one-size-fits-all care into risk stratification and tailored therapeutics, but its translational pipeline remains incomplete and unevenly implemented, with well-documented diversity and equity deficits. Digital innovation can unify these aims through continuous measurement, real-world evaluation, and adaptive feedback loops, while requiring careful governance to mitigate algorithmic bias, privacy risks, and digital divides.

This editorial advances a convergent research agenda centered on mechanism-informed biomarker discovery from traditional systems, multimodal phenotyping with digital biomarkers and patient-reported outcomes, and rigorous real-world evidence designs with precision-informed stratification. By integrating governance and equity criteria from the outset, future healthcare can become simultaneously scientifically rigorous, culturally responsive, and broadly accessible.


**Keywords:** Artificial intelligence, Complementary therapies, Digital health, Genomics, Integrative medicine, Pharmacogenomics, Precision medicine, Wearable electronic devices.

## Introduction

Health systems worldwide are grappling with rising chronic disease burden, increasing multimorbidity, and growing demand for care that is both effective and experience-centered. Precision medicine has begun reshaping how disease is classified and treated at the individual level, while digital health transformation is simultaneously changing how data are generated, interpreted, and applied at scale.[1,2] Multiomics technologies and statistical learning frameworks extend these capabilities further, enabling the kind of dynamic, adaptive decision support that complex chronic conditions require.[3–5] Alongside these developments, renewed scientific attention to traditional and complementary approaches reflects a re-evaluation of whole-person care models that mainstream healthcare has long underutilized.[6,7] Together, these three currents create a strategic opportunity to build research and clinical models that personalize interventions while preserving the cultural and relational dimensions that make healing meaningful.

Integrative medicine's emphasis on systemic and longitudinal outcomes research within primary care settings positions it well to complement the emerging precision and digital frameworks.[8] Precision medicine further shifts the conceptual frame from standardized treatment toward risk stratification and targeted therapeutics,[1,3] while digital infrastructure enables continuous data capture, real-world evaluation, and adaptive decision support at scale.[2,5]

## Honoring Traditional Wisdom with Rigorous Evidence

Traditional medicine and integrative health offer more than a historical record: they encode therapeutic concepts, diagnostic frameworks, and intervention traditions that are meaningful to billions of people across cultural and geographic contexts. The World Health Organization (WHO) strategy on traditional, complementary, and integrative medicine underscores this global relevance, framing integration with public health systems as promoting "safe and effective use" through "regulating, researching, and integrating trademark (TM) products, practitioners, and practice into health systems".[6] Rees and Weil similarly identified integrated medicine as an approach that "uses all appropriate therapeutic approaches" while remaining 'informed by evidence' and focused on 'the whole person'.[7] Therefore, traditional wisdom is not a substitute for scientific scrutiny, but a starting point for hypothesis-driven discovery, safety assessment, and pragmatic evaluation.

A rigorous evidence stance requires designs that address both efficacy and effectiveness. Bell et al. argued that integrative medicine and systemic outcomes research must examine results as they emerge in primary health care delivery, not only in tightly controlled experimental settings.[8] Such approaches clarify how traditional and complementary interventions affect functioning, symptoms, quality of life, and healthcare utilization across long-term trajectories. Mao et al. demonstrated that mind-body therapies, natural products, and lifestyle modifications can benefit symptom management and quality of life in cancer care, but broader integration depends on generating evidence that meets clinical governance standards in both high- and low-resource settings.[9]

Translation remains challenging. Traditional remedies vary across regions, preparations, and practitioners, complicating standardization and reproducibility; regulatory pathways for complex interventions are uneven; and the evidence base is often fragmented by language, jurisdiction, and study design.[6,8] Pharmacovigilance, standardized reporting frameworks, and context-sensitive evaluation designs are therefore as central to this research agenda as the interventions themselves. Evidence generation must also address access, ensuring that integrative approaches reach populations for whom cultural relevance and proximity to care are already barriers.[7,10]

## Promise and Unfinished Work of Precision Medicine

Precision medicine is grounded in the premise that individual variability in genes, environment, and lifestyle should shape clinical decisions, improving outcomes from prevention to treatment.[1,3] Genomics has enabled refined disease classification, targeted therapies, and pharmacogenomic approaches that optimize drug selection, dosing, and adverse-event profiles.[3] Multiomics technologies integrating genomics, transcriptomics, proteomics, and metabolomics extend this capability further, shifting medicine from symptom-oriented

diagnosis toward prevention and early detection.[4] Large-scale cohort programs and national biobank initiatives are assembling the data infrastructure needed for discovery and real-world translation.[2,11] Yet the translational gap is substantial. As Jameson and Longo observed, 'precision medicine is personalized, problematic, and promising', acknowledging in a single phrase that the challenges are inseparable from the potential.[1] Real-world implementation faces barriers including the absence of genomics-enabled electronic health records, the complexity of genetic recommendations within clinical workflows, and patchy reimbursement frameworks.[3] Less than 3% of participants in published genome-wide association studies are of African or Hispanic/Latin American ancestry, and this lack of diversity risks both exacerbating health disparities and impoverishing biological discovery.[2,11] Genomic data are uniquely sensitive, demanding robust privacy protections designed into study architectures from the outset rather than retrofitted after publication.[3,12] For integrative health research, precision medicine contributes not a mandate for reductionism but a toolkit for stratification. Identifying which patients respond to which integrative interventions and through which mechanisms is precisely the question that multiomics characterization and machine-learning-assisted phenotyping can address, provided that study populations reflect the diversity of people who actually use these therapies.[4,5]

## Digital Innovation as Connective Tissue

Digital health and artificial intelligence function as connective tissue across integrative and precision paradigms by enabling continuous measurement, longitudinal feedback, and learning that extends beyond the clinic visit. Wearables and remote monitoring shift care from reactive to proactive, converting streams of physiological data into early warnings, decision support, and personalized recommendations in real time.[2,5] For integrative health specifically, digital biomarkers offer a path toward objective evaluation of interventions that are difficult to measure by conventional means, allowing researchers to capture the downstream effects of mind–body practices, lifestyle modification, and herbal interventions across days and weeks.[5,8]

Evidence for outcome impact is growing. Systematic review data covering 14 randomized controlled trials and 4,264 patients reported that telemonitoring systems reduced hospital readmission rates by 21% and all-cause mortality by 20%,[2] endpoints directly relevant to integrative care models targeting chronic disease burden. Many integrative interventions are expected to work gradually and through multiple mechanisms, making trajectory measurement over time far more informative than single time-point assessments.[8,10]

The same digital systems enable the introduction of distinct ethical and methodological risks. Algorithms trained on nonrepresentative data can amplify existing health inequities, and AI systems operating as 'black boxes' undermine clinical trust and accountability.[2,5] Personal data collected by wearables and mobile health platforms may include sensitive information about lifestyle, mental health, and social circumstances, raising the stakes of privacy governance and consent frameworks.[12] Digital divides persist across demographic groups and regions, and if not actively addressed, digital innovation risks becoming another axis of health inequality rather than a tool for reducing it.[2,5]

## Bridging the Three: A Research Agenda

Bridging traditional wisdom, precision medicine, and digital innovation requires research designs that are simultaneously multimodal, governance-aware, and person-centered. The integrated medicine field has articulated the foundational aspiration: care that is 'informed by evidence' while making 'uses of all appropriate therapeutic approaches' and focusing on 'the whole person'.[7,10] Precision medicine contributes the tools to characterize biological variability, stratify patients, and translate molecular findings into clinical decisions.[1,3,4] Digital innovation provides the infrastructure to operationalize this vision in real-world care, enabling continuous evaluation and adaptive refinement.[2,5]

So, four research priorities should be followed. First, integrative interventions need mechanism-informed evaluation: studies should systematically characterize biological effects using validated biomarker panels and, where appropriate, multiomics strategies, enabling hypothesis testing and subgroup identification alongside clinical outcomes.[4,9] Rather than treating traditional therapies as opaque, multiomics characterization can reveal how herbal preparations, acupuncture, or mind–body practices act on identifiable pathways, providing the mechanistic evidence that responsible integration requires.

Second, multimodal phenotyping should incorporate patient-reported outcomes, digital biomarkers, and social determinants of health.[5,8,12] Personalization that ignores context, values, and adherence will underperform in real-world populations; precision approaches must therefore extend beyond molecular data to encompass behavioral, environmental, and psychosocial dimensions.

Third, governance must be integral to study design from the beginning.[3,6,11] Data-sharing architectures, privacy frameworks, and equitable participation models are not compliance tasks; they are scientific prerequisites for credible, generalizable results. Given the sensitivity of genomic and wearable-derived data and the existing underrepresentation of diverse populations in both genomic and integrative medicine research, purposeful inclusion is simultaneously a methodological imperative and an ethical obligation.

Fourth, equity must function as a design criterion throughout, not an afterthought.[6,9,10] Evidence generation should not remain concentrated in well-resourced academic centers, and the benefits of integrative and precision research must reach the populations who bear the greatest chronic disease burden and who, in many cases, rely most heavily on traditional medicine.

A future in which traditional wisdom, precision medicine, and digital innovation genuinely reinforce one another is already becoming visible in AI-assisted analysis of traditional herbal compound libraries, wearable monitoring of physiological responses to mind–body practices, and multiomics characterization of acupuncture and dietary interventions. Consolidating this work into a rigorous, equitable, and person-centered research program is the defining scientific opportunity of integrative health in the decade ahead.

## ORCID

Vivekanand Kattimani https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9812-7207

## References


1. Jameson JL, Longo DL. Precision medicine: personalized, problematic, and promising. N Engl J Med 2015;372(23):2229–2234. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMsb1503104
2. Denny JC, Collins FS. Precision medicine in 2030: seven ways to transform healthcare. Cell 2021;184(6):1415–1419. DOI: 10.1016/j.cell.2021.01.015
3. Chan IS, Ginsburg GS. Personalized medicine: progress and promise. Annu Rev Genomics Hum Genet 2011;12(1):217–244. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-genom-082410-101446
4. Chen R, Snyder M. Promise of personalized omics to precision medicine. Wiley Interdiscip Rev Syst Biol Med 2013;5(1):73–82. DOI: 10.1002/wsbm.1198
5. Kosorok MR, Laber EB. Precision medicine. Annu Rev Stat Appl 2019;6(1):263–286. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-statistics-030718-105251
6. Hoenders R, Ghelman R, Portella C, et al. A review of the WHO strategy on traditional, complementary, and integrative medicine from the perspective of academic consortia for integrative medicine and health. Front Med 2024;11:1395698. DOI: 10.3389/fmed.2024.1395698
7. Rees L, Weil A. Integrated medicine. BMJ 2001;322(7279):119–120. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.322.7279.119
8. Bell IR, Caspi O, Schwartz GE, et al. Integrative medicine and systemic outcomes research: issues in the emergence of a new model for primary health care. Arch Intern Med 2002;162(2):133–140. DOI: 10.1001/archinte.162.2.133
9. Mao JJ, Pillai GG, de Andrade CJ, et al. Integrative oncology: addressing the global challenges of cancer prevention and treatment. CA Cancer J Clin 2022;72(2):144–164. DOI: 10.3322/caac.21706
10. Horrigan B, Lewis S, Abrams DI, et al. Integrative medicine in America: how integrative medicine is being practiced in clinical centers across the United States. Glob Adv Health Med 2012;1(3):18–94. DOI: 10.7453/gahmj.2012.1.3.006
11. Burke W, Psaty BM. Personalized medicine in the era of genomics. JAMA 2007;298(14):1682–1684. DOI: 10.1001/jama.298.14.1682
12. Mathur S, Sutton J. Personalized medicine could transform healthcare. Biomed Rep 2017;7(1):3–5. DOI: 10.3892/br.2017.922



**Vivekanand Kattimani**
Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery,
Narsinhbhai Patel Dental College and Hospital,
Sankalchand Patel University,
Visnagar, Gujarat, Ind