International Journal of Scholarly Resources
Health Informatics & Digital Equity — A Peer-Reviewed Academic Publication

Email: editor@ijsr.org.ng
Website: www.ijsr.org.ng

Impact of Algorithmic Bias in Information Retrieval Systems on Marginalized Communities' Access to Healthcare Information and Mitigation Strategies: A Case Study of Birnin Gwari Local Government Area in Kaduna State

Ahmed Olakunle Ogungbade[1,*], Fagbemi Oluwaseyi Ajibola[2], Oluwatoyin Ishola[3]

[1]Department of Library and Information Science, Tai Solarin University of Education, Ogun State, Nigeria
[2]Department of Human Anatomy, College of Medicine and Surgery, Federal University Lokoja, Kogi State, Nigeria
[3]Department of Biochemistry, Kaduna State University, Kaduna State, Nigeria

[*]Corresponding author: olakunleogungbade@yahoo.com

Submitted: 07-23-2025 | Accepted: 10-01-2025 | Published: 10-30-2025

How to cite: Ogungbade, A. O., Fagbemi, O. A., & Ishola, O. [2025]. Algorithmic Bias in Information Retrieval Systems on Marginalized Communities' Access to Healthcare Information and Mitigation Strategies: A Case Study of Birnin Gwari Local Government Area in Kaduna State. *International Journal of Scholarly Resources*, ISSN: 1234-5678.

Abstract

INFORMATION Retrieval Systems [IRS] have become critical intermediaries in healthcare information access, yet algorithmic bias embedded within these systems disproportionately affects marginalized communities. This study examines the impact of algorithmic bias in IRS on healthcare information access among marginalized populations in Birnin Gwari Local Government Area, Kaduna State, Nigeria. Through a comprehensive analysis of existing literature and contextual examination of the study area, we identify key manifestations of algorithmic bias, document their impacts on healthcare-seeking behavior, and propose evidence-based mitigation strategies. Our findings reveal that algorithmic bias in IRS creates compounding disadvantages for already marginalized communities, limiting their access to quality healthcare information and exacerbating existing health disparities. We propose a framework of technical, policy, and community-centered interventions tailored to resource-constrained settings.

Keywords: Algorithmic bias, Information retrieval systems, Healthcare access, Digital health equity, Marginalized communities, Nigeria

Introduction

THE rapid digitalization of healthcare information has transformed how individuals seek, access, and utilize health-related knowledge. Information Retrieval Systems including search engines, recommendation algorithms, and digital health platforms have become gatekeepers to healthcare information [1]. However, mounting evidence suggests these systems perpetuate and amplify existing societal biases, creating systematic disadvantages for marginalized populations [2,3]

Algorithmic bias in healthcare manifests through multiple pathways: biased training data that underrepresents minority populations, design choices that privilege certain user groups, and evaluation metrics that fail to account for fairness across demographic categories [4]. The consequences are particularly severe in low-resource settings where digital health tools represent primary channels for health information access [5].

Nigeria, Africa's most populous nation, faces significant healthcare access challenges, with rural and conflict-affected communities bearing disproportionate burdens [6, 7]. Birnin Gwari Local Government Area in Kaduna State exemplifies these challenges, characterized by limited healthcare infras-

Email: editor@ijsr.org.ng
Website: www.ijsr.org.ng

tructure, ongoing security concerns, and significant digital divides [8]. Understanding how algorithmic bias in IRS affects healthcare information access in such contexts is critical for achieving digital health equity.

This study addresses three primary research objectives:

1. To examine the nature and manifestations of algorithmic bias in healthcare-related Information Retrieval Systems
2. To assess the impact of such biases on marginalized communities' access to healthcare information in Birnin Gwari LGA
3. To propose context-appropriate mitigation strategies aligned with international frameworks and local realities

Literature Review

Algorithmic Bias in Healthcare Systems

Algorithmic bias in healthcare has emerged as a critical concern in digital health equity. Obermeyer et al. [1] conducted a landmark study revealing that a widely-used commercial algorithm for managing patient populations exhibited significant racial bias, systematically underestimating the healthcare needs of Black patients compared to White patients with equivalent health conditions. This bias stemmed from the algorithm's reliance on healthcare costs as a proxy for health needs, failing to account for systemic inequities in healthcare access and spending.

Anderson et al. [2] conducted a scoping review examining algorithmic individual fairness in healthcare contexts, identifying multiple dimensions through which bias manifests in health algorithms. Their review highlighted that fairness in healthcare algorithms requires consideration of distributive justice, procedural fairness, and recognition of historically marginalized groups' specific needs.

The STANDING Together recommendations, presented by Alderman et al. [3], provide a comprehensive framework for tackling algorithmic bias and promoting transparency in health datasets. These recommendations emphasize the importance of diverse representation in training data, transparent documentation of algorithmic decision-making processes, and ongoing monitoring for disparate impacts across population subgroups.

Algorithmic Bias in Information Retrieval Systems

Beyond clinical algorithms, bias in Information Retrieval Systems represents a fundamental challenge to equitable information access. Lin et al. [8] investigated algorithmic bias in search engine autocomplete functions, demonstrating how stereotypical and biased suggestions can reinforce harmful narratives and limit the scope of information-seeking behavior. Their research showed that marginalized groups often encounter biased autocomplete suggestions that reflect societal prejudices.

Dai et al. [9] provided a comprehensive survey of bias and unfairness in information retrieval systems, categorizing bias sources into data bias, algorithmic bias, and presentation bias. Their taxonomy reveals that IRS bias operates at multiple levels: in the data used to train ranking algorithms, in the design of ranking functions themselves, and in how results are presented to users. The authors emphasize that addressing IRS bias requires interventions across all these levels.

Recent proceedings from the International Workshop on Algorithmic Bias in Search and Recommendation [10] highlight emerging concerns about bias in personalization algorithms, which may create filter bubbles that limit exposure to diverse health information perspectives, particularly for users from marginalized backgrounds.

Xu et al. [11] examined fairness in information retrieval from an economic perspective, demonstrating how search ranking algorithms can perpetuate economic inequalities by privileging content from well-resourced producers. In healthcare contexts, this means information from expensive private healthcare providers may dominate search results, while community health resources serving marginalized populations remain invisible.

Fang and Wang [12] conducted a systematic review of fairness in search systems, identifying key fairness metrics and evaluation approaches. Their work emphasizes the need for multi-stakeholder fairness considerations that account for content producers, platform operators, and diverse user groups simultaneously.

Digital Health Equity and Access

Digital health equity has become increasingly critical as healthcare delivery and information dissemination shift online. Koehle et al. [4] examined digital health equity through the lenses of power, usability, and inclusion, arguing that true equity requires addressing structural inequalities in technology access, digital literacy, and design inclusivity. Their framework emphasizes that technology alone cannot solve health inequities and may exacerbate them without intentional equity-focused design.

Crawford and Serhal [5] explored digital health equity during the COVID-19 pandemic, introducing the concept of the "innovation curve" to describe how rapidly deployed digital health solutions often fail to reach marginalized populations who most need them. Their research documented how emergency telehealth implementations frequently excluded individuals with limited digital access, language barriers, or disabilities.

Sun et al. [6] documented racial bias in clinical notes, revealing how biased language in medical documentation can perpetuate stereotypes and affect subsequent care decisions. Their analysis showed that Black patients were significantly more likely to have negative descriptors in their clinical notes compared to White patients with similar clinical presentations, demonstrating how bias becomes embedded in healthcare data that subsequently trains algorithms.

AI Scribes and Documentation Bias

Tierney et al. [13] examined ambient AI scribes and their implications for clinical documentation and bias. Their research revealed that AI-powered documentation tools can amplify existing biases in medical language while also introducing new forms of bias through their interpretation and summarization of clinical encounters. This is particularly concerning as these tools become more prevalent in healthcare settings.

Marko et al. [14] investigated inclusivity in AI applications across diverse health populations, finding significant gaps in how AI health technologies account for cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic diversity. Their research emphasized that AI systems trained predominantly on data from majority populations often perform poorly for minority groups, limiting their utility and potentially causing harm.

Uddin et al. [15] conducted a comprehensive review of algorithmic bias in biomedical and health research, documenting how bias permeates the entire research pipeline from study design through data collection, analysis, and dissemination. Their work highlights the need for systematic approaches to bias identification and mitigation throughout the research process.

International Frameworks for Digital Health

The World Health Organization's Global Strategy on Digital Health 2020-2025 [16] establishes principles for equitable digital health implementation, emphasizing universal health coverage, human rights-based approaches, and attention to vulnerable populations. The strategy recognizes that digital health interventions must be designed and implemented with explicit attention to equity or they risk widening existing health disparities.

WHO's broader digital health framework [17] emphasizes transformation of healthcare delivery for equity and resilience, calling for digital health systems that are accessible, affordable, and appropriate for diverse populations. The framework stresses that technology must be an enabler of equitable access rather than a barrier.

The Pan American Health Organization's eight principles for digital transformation of public health [18] provide actionable guidance for health systems implementing digital solutions. These principles include equity, interoperability, person-centeredness, and sustainability, offering a roadmap for ethical digital health implementation.

UNICEF's work on digital inclusion and equity [19] highlights the particular vulnerabilities of children and adolescents in digital health contexts, calling for special protections and design considerations for young users in marginalized communities.

Nigerian Context and Digital Health

Nigeria faces significant digital divides that affect healthcare information access. Banya Global [20] documented the gender digital divide in Nigeria, revealing that women, particularly in rural areas, have substantially lower rates of internet access and digital literacy compared to men. This gender gap has direct implications for maternal and child health information seeking.

Chika [21] examined digital healthcare tools in Nigeria, documenting both opportunities and challenges in leveraging digital solutions for public health. The research highlighted infrastructure limitations, affordability barriers, and digital literacy gaps as primary obstacles to equitable digital health implementation.

Adepoju et al. [22] investigated health-seeking behavior in urban slum communities in Lagos, Nigeria, revealing complex patterns of formal and informal healthcare utilization. Their findings demonstrated that information access significantly influences healthcare-seeking decisions, with individuals often relying on community networks and traditional media due to limited digital access.

Dahunsi [23] analyzed determinants of healthcare-seeking behavior among Nigerian households, identifying socioeconomic status, education level, geographic location, and information access as key factors. The research emphasized that healthcare information ecosystems in Nigeria remain highly fragmented, with digital channels coexisting alongside traditional information sources.

Healthcare Infrastructure in Kaduna State

Ocheja et al. [24] conducted geospatial mapping of public primary healthcare centers in Kaduna State, revealing significant geographic inequities in healthcare facility distribution. Their analysis showed that rural and conflict-affected areas, including Birnin Gwari LGA, have substantially lower healthcare facility density compared to urban centers.

The Kaduna State Bureau of Statistics [25] maintains a health facilities dashboard documenting the distribution and characteristics of health facilities across the state. Data from this dashboard reveals that Birnin Gwari LGA has among the lowest ratios of healthcare facilities to population in the state, compounded by facility functionality challenges.

The Kaduna State Ministry of Health's facility coding system [26] provides standardized identification for health facilities, enabling tracking of service availability and quality. However, data completeness for rural facilities remains a challenge, potentially obscuring the true extent of healthcare access gaps.

Recent government initiatives documented in quarterly reports [27] show ongoing efforts to upgrade primary health centers in underserved areas. However, these infrastructure improvements are not matched by equivalent investments in digital health information systems that could enhance healthcare access.

The Family and Rural Outreach Foundation's SPHEC-MCH Project Report [28] documented maternal and child health interventions in Kaduna State, highlighting that information access remains a critical barrier to healthcare utilization, particularly for reproductive health services in rural communities.

The Federal Ministry of Health's State of Health of the Nation Report [29] contextualizes Kaduna State's health challenges within Nigeria's broader health system, noting persistent inequities in healthcare access, outcomes, and information availability between urban and rural populations.

Measuring Healthcare Access

McGrail and Humphreys [30] established methodological approaches for measuring spatial accessibility to primary health care services using GIS techniques. Their framework provides tools for quantifying healthcare access disparities, which can be integrated with assessments of information access to provide comprehensive equity analyses.

Context: Birnin Gwari Local Government Area

Demographic and Geographic Profile

Birnin Gwari Local Government Area is located in the northwestern region of Kaduna State, Nigeria. The area is predominantly rural, with scattered settlements across challenging terrain. The population is largely engaged in subsistence agriculture and faces significant development challenges including limited infrastructure, ongoing security concerns, and geographic isolation from major urban centers.

Healthcare Infrastructure

According to geospatial analyses [24] and state health data [25, 26], Birnin Gwari LGA has critically limited healthcare infrastructure. Primary Healthcare Centers are sparsely distributed, with many communities located more than 10 kilometers from the nearest functional health facility, far exceeding WHO recommendations for primary care accessibility. Recent government initiatives have begun upgrading facilities [27], but infrastructure deficits remain severe.

Table 2 summarizes the healthcare access challenges in Birnin Gwari LGA based on available data sources.

Digital Access and Connectivity

Birnin Gwari LGA experiences significant digital divides characteristic of rural Nigerian communities. Mobile phone penetration is lower than urban areas, internet connectivity is unreliable where available, and electricity access remains

Email: editor@ijsr.org.ng
Website: www.ijsr.org.ng

Table 1: Impact Pathways of Algorithmic Bias on Healthcare Access in Birnin Gwari LGA

Impact Pathway	Mechanism	Consequence for Healthcare Access	Population Affected
Direct Individual Impact	Biased search results, language barriers, cultural disconnect	Limited ability to find relevant health information online	Internet-enabled residents [~ 10-20% estimated]
Healthcare Provider Impact	Providers rely on biased IRS for clinical information	Knowledge gaps about locally-relevant health conditions, inappropriate treatment approaches	All patients receiving care from affected providers
Community Health Worker Impact	CHWs use biased systems for health education materials	Irrelevant or culturally inappropriate health education	Entire communities reached by CHW programs
Public Health Planning Impact	Program designers research using biased IRS	Interventions not optimized for local context, misallocation of resources	Entire LGA population
Policy and Resource Allocation Impact	Decision-makers rely on biased data and retrieval systems	Systematic underestimation of healthcare needs, inadequate funding	Entire LGA population
Research and Documentation Impact	Local health challenges underrepresented in searchable literature	Invisibility of community-specific health priorities, lack of evidence base for interventions	Entire LGA population, future populations

Table 2: Healthcare Access Indicators for Birnin Gwari LGA

Indicator	Status	Data Source
Healthcare facility density	Below state average, among lowest in Kaduna State	[24, 25]
Average distance to nearest PHC	>10 km for many communities	[24, 30]
Functional facility rate	Limited data, infrastructure challenges documented	[26, 27]
Healthcare workforce	Severe shortages, particularly specialists	[28, 29]
Maternal health service availability	Limited, gaps documented in SPHEC-MCH report	[28]
Emergency obstetric care	Very limited availability	[28, 29]

inconsistent [20, 21]. These infrastructure limitations fundamentally constrain the potential for digital health information access.

The gender digital divide [20] is particularly pronounced in rural areas like Birnin Gwari, where women face compounding barriers of lower literacy rates, limited device ownership, and cultural constraints on technology use. This has direct implications for maternal and child health information seeking.

Healthcare-Seeking Behavior

Research on healthcare-seeking behavior in similar Nigerian contexts [22, 23] suggests that communities in Birnin Gwari likely rely on multiple information sources including: traditional healers and community health knowledge, informal networks and word-of-mouth, radio broadcasts [where electricity permits], intermittent mobile phone-based information, and occasional contact with healthcare workers during facility visits or outreach programs.

The limited penetration of formal digital health information channels means that algorithmic bias in IRS may affect this population through indirect pathways, particularly as healthcare providers, policymakers, and outreach workers themselves rely on biased IRS to obtain health information that subsequently informs community-level interventions.

Manifestations of Algorithmic Bias in Healthcare IRS

Based on the literature review, algorithmic bias in healthcare IRS manifests through multiple interconnected mechanisms. Table 4 categorizes these manifestations and their documented impacts.

Compounding Effects in Marginalized Communities

For communities like those in Birnin Gwari LGA, these biases compound existing disadvantages. When healthcare providers serving these populations rely on biased IRS for clinical information, treatment guidelines, and public health guidance, the algorithmic bias cascades into real-world healthcare delivery [1, 2]. When policymakers use biased data and information systems to allocate resources, already underserved areas receive even less support [3, 15].

Impact on Healthcare Information Access in Birnin Gwari LGA

Direct Impacts on Individual Information Seeking

For the limited proportion of Birnin Gwari residents with internet access, algorithmic bias in healthcare IRS creates specific barriers:

Language Barriers: Most healthcare IRS are optimized for English, with limited content in Hausa or other local languages. Bias toward English content means locally-relevant health information is systematically deprioritized .

Cultural Disconnect: Search algorithms trained predominantly on Western healthcare contexts may fail to surface information about traditional healing practices, culturally-appropriate care approaches, or health beliefs prevalent in the community .

Geographic Invisibility: Location-based health information searches may fail to identify local healthcare resources, instead surfacing results for distant urban facilities.

Literacy and Interface Bias: Healthcare IRS interfaces assume certain levels of health literacy and digital literacy, creating barriers for users with limited formal education

Indirect Impacts Through Healthcare Providers and Intermediaries

Perhaps more significantly, algorithmic bias affects Birnin Gwari's population indirectly through healthcare providers, community health workers, and other information intermediaries:

Provider Knowledge Gaps: Healthcare workers serving Birnin Gwari may rely on biased IRS for clinical information, treatment protocols, and continuing education. Bias in these systems can lead to knowledge gaps about health conditions disproportionately affecting the local population [2, 13].

Public Health Planning: Health officials and NGOs planning interventions for Birnin Gwari may use biased information retrieval systems to research best practices, assess community needs, and design programs. Algorithmic bias can lead to inappropriate or ineffective interventions [3, 15].

Resource Allocation: Policymakers using biased data and retrieval systems may systematically underestimate Birnin

Gwari's healthcare needs, leading to inadequate resource allocation [1, 16].

Systemic Impacts on Healthcare Equity

At a systemic level, algorithmic bias in healthcare IRS perpetuates and amplifies existing inequities:

Invisibility of Local Health Priorities: Health concerns specific to Birnin Gwari's population may be underrepresented in healthcare databases and retrieval systems, making it difficult for providers to access relevant clinical guidance.

Reinforcement of Urban Bias: Healthcare IRS that privilege urban facility information reinforce perceptions that quality care is only available in cities, potentially discouraging utilization of local healthcare resources.

Exclusion from Digital Health Innovation: As digital health tools proliferate, algorithmic bias means these innovations are designed and optimized for populations unlike Birnin Gwari residents, limiting potential benefits [4, 21].

Table 1 summarizes the pathways through which algorithmic bias in IRS impacts healthcare access in marginalized communities like Birnin Gwari.

Mitigation Strategies

Addressing algorithmic bias in healthcare IRS requires multi-level interventions spanning technical, policy, and community-centered approaches. Drawing on international frameworks [16, 17, 18] and evidence-based recommendations [3, 10, 12], we propose a comprehensive mitigation strategy tailored to resource-constrained contexts like Birnin Gwari LGA.

Technical Interventions

Data Diversity and Representation: Healthcare IRS must be trained on datasets that adequately represent marginalized populations. This requires deliberate efforts to collect, curate, and integrate data from rural Nigerian communities [3, 9]. For Birnin Gwari specifically, this means ensuring health information systems capture local disease patterns, healthcare utilization data, and health outcomes.

Bias Auditing and Testing: Regular audits of healthcare IRS should specifically test for disparate impacts on queries relevant to marginalized communities. Audit proto- cols should include testing with queries in local languages, health concerns specific to rural populations, and searches for community-level healthcare resources.

Multilingual and Culturally-Adapted Systems: Healthcare IRS should support Hausa and other Nigerian languages, with content that reflects local health beliefs and practices. This includes ensuring autocomplete suggestions, ranking algorithms, and result presentation are optimized for multilingual users.

Fairness-Aware Ranking Algorithms: Implementation of ranking algorithms that explicitly optimize for fairness across demographic groups, including geographic fairness that prevents systematic deprioritization of rural healthcare resources.

Transparent Documentation: All healthcare IRS should provide transparent documentation of data sources, algorithmic methods, and known limitations, enabling healthcare providers and policymakers to critically evaluate information quality.

Policy and Governance Interventions

Regulatory Frameworks: Nigeria should develop regulatory frameworks for healthcare algorithms and information systems that mandate bias testing, fairness requirements, and accountability mechanisms . These frameworks should be informed by international best practices while addressing Nigeria-specific contexts.

Data Governance: Establishment of ethical data governance structures ensuring that health data from marginalized communities is collected, stored, and used in ways that benefit those communities.

Procurement Standards: Government and NGO procurement of digital health systems should include explicit requirements for bias mitigation, cultural adaptation, and demonstrated effectiveness across diverse populations .

Health Information Equity Standards: Development of national standards for health information equity, specifying requirements for accessibility, cultural appropriateness, and representation of diverse health contexts.

Healthcare System Interventions

Provider Training: Healthcare workers should receive training on algorithmic bias, critical evaluation of digital health information, and strategies for compensating for bias in information systems . This training should be integrated into medical education and continuing professional development.

Community Health Worker Support: Community health workers serving Birnin Gwari should be equipped with curated, culturally-appropriate health information resources that complement rather than rely solely on biased general-purpose IRS.

Local Content Creation: Investment in creation of high-quality health information content specific to Birnin Gwari's context, in local languages, addressing local health priorities. This content should be optimized for discovery through major IRS.

Hybrid Information Systems: Recognition that digital IRS are one component of broader health information ecosystems. Healthcare delivery in Birnin Gwari should integrate digital tools with radio, community outreach, peer networks, and other information channels that reach populations with limited digital access.

Community-Centered Interventions

Community Participation in Design: Meaningfully involve Birnin Gwari community members in the design, testing, and evaluation of digital health information systems intended to serve them .

Digital Literacy Programs: Implement culturally-appropriate digital and health literacy programs that empower community members to critically evaluate health information from digital sources.

Community Health Information Networks: Strengthen community-based health information networks that can serve as trusted sources complementing formal healthcare systems.

Feedback Mechanisms: Establish accessible mechanisms for community members and healthcare workers to report problems with health information systems, including bias and cultural inappropriateness.

Research and Monitoring

Ongoing Impact Assessment: Systematic monitoring of how algorithmic bias in healthcare IRS affects health outcomes in marginalized communities.

Local Health Research: Investment in research documenting Birnin Gwari's specific health challenges, healthcare-seeking behaviors, and information needs, ensuring this knowledge enters searchable databases .

Participatory Research: Engagement of community members as co-researchers in studies examining health information access and algorithmic bias impacts .

Table 3 provides a prioritized implementation framework for mitigation strategies in resource-constrained settings.

Implementation Considerations for Birnin Gwari LGA

Contextual Adaptations

Implementing bias mitigation strategies in Birnin Gwari requires careful adaptation to local realities:

Infrastructure Constraints: Many technical interventions assume reliable electricity and internet connectivity. For Birnin Gwari, solutions must account for intermittent connectivity and limited device access.

Security Concerns: Ongoing security challenges in the area may limit researcher access, community mobility, and implementation of certain interventions. Remote and technology-mediated approaches may be necessary.

Resource Limitations: With competing priorities for limited health system resources, interventions must be cost-effective and potentially integrated with existing programs rather than creating parallel systems.

Cultural Sensitivity: All interventions must be designed with deep understanding of local cultural contexts, health beliefs, and social structures. Top-down approaches are likely to fail.

Stakeholder Engagement

Successful implementation requires engagement of multiple stakeholders:

Local Government: Birnin Gwari LGA authorities must champion interventions and integrate them into local health planning.

Traditional and Religious Leaders: These influential community figures can facilitate community acceptance and participation in digital health initiatives.

Healthcare Workers: Frontline providers must be meaningfully involved in identifying problems and co-designing solutions .

Community Members: Particularly women and youth should have central roles in shaping interventions that affect them .

State and Federal Government: Higher-level government buy-in is essential for policy changes and resource allocation.

NGOs and Development Partners: Organizations like FAROF that already work in the area can serve as implementation partners .

Technology Companies: Major IRS operators should be engaged to address bias in their systems.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Implementation should include robust monitoring and evaluation:

Process Indicators: Track implementation fidelity, stakeholder engagement, and intervention reach.

Outcome Indicators: Measure changes in health information access, healthcare-seeking behavior, and ultimately health outcomes.

Equity Metrics: Specifically assess whether interventions reduce disparities or inadvertently create new ones.

Community Feedback: Establish mechanisms for ongoing community input on intervention effectiveness and appropriateness.

Discussion

This study reveals that algorithmic bias in healthcare Information Retrieval Systems represents a significant and underrecognized barrier to health equity for marginalized communities. In contexts like Birnin Gwari LGA, where healthcare access is already severely constrained, algorithmic bias in IRS compounds existing disadvantages through multiple pathways.

Key Findings

Our analysis demonstrates that algorithmic bias in healthcare IRS manifests through data representation gaps, biased query processing, unfair ranking, harmful personalization, and cultural-linguistic bias [1, 8, 9]. These biases affect marginalized communities both directly, through individual information seeking, and indirectly, through impacts on healthcare providers, public health planners, and policymakers who rely on biased systems.

The literature consistently shows that current healthcare algorithms and IRS are optimized for majority populations in high-resource settings, performing poorly for populations like those in Birnin Gwari [2, 14, 15]. This optimization mismatch means that even well-intentioned digital health interventions may fail to reach or benefit marginalized communities.

Theoretical Implications

This research contributes to digital health equity theory by demonstrating how algorithmic bias operates as a structural determinant of health. Like other social determinants, algorithmic bias shapes health through pathways that are often invisible to affected communities [4, 5]. Addressing algorithmic bias requires not just technical fixes, but transformation of power relations in technology design and deployment [3, 18].

The findings support conceptualizations of health equity that center justice and recognize historical marginalization [16, 17]. Digital health interventions cannot be equity-neutral, they either actively work to reduce disparities or risk amplifying them.

Practical Implications

For practitioners and policymakers, this research highlights the need for critical evaluation of digital health tools. Healthcare providers serving marginalized communities should be trained to recognize and compensate for algorithmic bias in their information sources . Procurement decisions should explicitly consider bias and fairness characteristics of health information systems.

Table 3: Prioritized Mitigation Strategy Implementation Framework

Priority Level	Intervention Category	Specific Actions	Implementation Timeframe	Key Stakeholders	Resource Requirements
High Priority [0-12 months]	Provider Training	Integrate algorithmic bias awareness into CHW and healthcare worker training	Immediate	MOH Kaduna, FAROF, training institutions	Low-Medium
	Local Content Creation	Develop Hausa-language health information resources for priority conditions	3-6 months	MOH, local health organizations, community leaders	Medium
	Community Participation	Establish community advisory boards for digital health initiatives	3-6 months	LGA authorities, community representatives	Low
	Hybrid Information Systems	Integrate radio, community outreach with digital channels	Immediate	Public health programs, media partners	Medium
Medium Priority [1-2 years]	Bias Auditing	Conduct audits of commonly-used healthcare IRS for rural Nigeria bias	6-12 months	Academic institutions, MOH Federal	Medium
	Digital Literacy	Implement community digital and health literacy programs	6-18 months	Education sector, NGOs, community organizations	Medium-High
	Data Diversity	Ensure Birnin Gwari health data enters national health information systems	12-24 months	MOH State/Federal, health facilities	Medium
	Multilingual Systems	Advocate for/develop Hausa language support in major health IRS	12-24 months	Technology companies, MOH Federal, academic institutions	High
Long-term Priority [2-5 years]	Regulatory Frameworks	Develop national regulations for healthcare algorithm fairness	24-48 months	Federal government, regulatory bodies	Medium
	Fairness-Aware Algorithms	Implement or procure IRS with geographic and demographic fairness optimization	24-60 months	Technology sector, MOH, research institutions	High
	Research Infrastructure	Establish systematic monitoring of algorithmic bias health impacts	24-60 months	Research institutions, MOH, international partners	Medium-High
	Data Governance	Create ethical governance structures for health data from marginalized communities	24-48 months	Government, civil society, community representatives	Medium

Table 4: Manifestations of Algorithmic Bias in Healthcare Information Retrieval Systems

Bias Type	Mechanism	Documented Impact	Key References
Data Representation Bias	Training data underrepresents marginalized populations	Algorithms perform poorly for underrepresented groups, relevant health information for minorities is de-prioritized	[1, 2, 9]
Query Understanding Bias	Autocomplete and query interpretation reflect stereotypes	Biased suggestions reinforce harmful narratives, limit information-seeking scope	[8, 10]
Ranking Bias	Algorithms privilege content from well-resourced sources	Community health resources remain invisible, expensive private provider content dominates	[9, 11]
Personalization Bias	Filter bubbles limit exposure to diverse health perspectives	Users from marginalized backgrounds receive narrower information, limited exposure to preventive care information	[10, 12]
Language and Cultural Bias	Systems optimized for dominant languages and cultural contexts	Non-English content de-prioritized, culturally-specific health practices underrepresented	[14, 19]
Geographic Bias	Location-based results favor urban areas	Rural health resources underrepresented, local healthcare options invisible in search results	[4, 24]
Socioeconomic Bias	Cost-based proxies fail to account for systemic inequities	Healthcare needs of low-income populations systematically underestimated	[1, 5]
Documentation Bias	Clinical notes contain biased language	Biased medical documentation trains subsequent algorithms, perpetuates stereotypes	[6, 13]

The proposed mitigation framework provides actionable guidance, prioritizing interventions that are feasible in resource-constrained settings. High-priority actions like provider training, local content creation, and hybrid information systems can be implemented relatively quickly with moderate resources .

Limitations

This study has several limitations. First, direct empirical data on how algorithmic bias in healthcare IRS specifically affects Birnin Gwari residents is limited.

The rapidly evolving nature of digital health tech- nologies means that specific technical interventions may quickly become outdated. The proposed strategies should be viewed as a starting framework requiring ongoing adaptation.

Future Research Directions

Several important research directions emerge from this work:

Empirical Impact Studies: Direct measurement of how algorithmic bias in healthcare IRS affects health information access and outcomes in specific marginalized communities.

Intervention Evaluation: Rigorous evaluation of bias mitigation strategies in resource-constrained settings, using experimental or quasi-experimental designs where feasible.

Participatory Action Research: Community-based participatory research engaging marginalized populations in identifying, documenting, and addressing algorithmic bias.

Technical Innovation: Development of novel approaches to bias detection and mitigation specifically adapted for low- resource, multilingual, culturally-diverse contexts.

Policy Analysis: Examination of policy and regulatory ap- proaches to algorithmic fairness in healthcare across differ- ent national contexts.

Intersectional Approaches: Research explicitly examining how algorithmic bias intersects with multiple marginalized identities [gender, rurality, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, disability].

Conclusion

Algorithmic bias in healthcare Information Retrieval Systems represents a critical barrier to digital health equity for marginalized communities. This case study of Birnin Gwari Local Government Area in Kaduna State, Nigeria, demonstrates how algorithmic bias compounds existing healthcare access challenges through multiple pathways, affecting not only individual information seekers but also healthcare providers, public health planners, and policymakers who rely on biased systems.

The literature review reveals consistent evidence that healthcare algorithms and IRS are optimized for majority populations in high-resource settings, systematically disadvantaging marginalized communities. These biases manifest through underrepresentation in training data, cul- turally inappropriate query processing, unfair ranking that privileges well-resourced content producers, harmful personalization creating filter bubbles, and geographic bias that renders rural healthcare resources invisible.

For communities like Birnin Gwari, where healthcare infrastructure is already severely limited , algorithmic bias in IRS creates compounding disadvantages. The indirect impacts—through healthcare providers accessing biased clin- ical information, public health officials using biased systems for program planning, and policymakers relying on biased data for resource allocation—may be even more consequen- tial than direct impacts on individual information seeking.

The proposed mitigation framework integrates technical interventions [data diversity, bias auditing, multilingual systems, fairness-aware algorithms], policy interventions [regulatory frameworks, data governance, procurement standards], healthcare system interventions [provider training,community health worker support, local content creation], and community-centered approaches [participatory design, digital literacy, feedback mechanisms. Critically, the framework prioritizes interventions that are feasible in resource-constrained settings, recognizing that perfect tech- nical solutions are less valuable than practical approaches that can be implemented with available resources.Implementation in contexts like Birnin Gwari requires care- ful attention to local realities including infrastructure con- straints, security concerns, cultural contexts, and resource limitations.

Success depends on meaningful engagement of multiple stakeholders including local govern- ment, traditional and religious leaders, healthcare workers, community members, and development partners.

This research contributes to growing recognition that achieving digital health equity requires explicit attention to algorithmic fairness. Digital health technologies are not neutral tools, they embody the values, biases, and priorities of their designers and the data used to train them. For marginalized communities to benefit from digital health innovations, algorithmic bias must be recognized as a structural determinant of health and addressed through systematic, multi-level interventions.

The path forward requires commitment from multiple actors. Technology companies developing healthcare IRS must prioritize fairness, diversity, and inclusion in their design processes. Healthcare providers must develop criti- cal digital health literacy to recognize and compensate for algorithmic bias. Policymakers must establish regu- latory frameworks ensuring that healthcare algorithms serve all populations equitably. Researchers must center marginalized communities in digital health research, employing participatory approaches that recognize community members as co-creators of knowledge.

Most fundamentally, addressing algorithmic bias in healthcare IRS requires recognizing that technology alone cannot solve health inequities. Digital health tools must be integrated within broader strategies addressing social determinants of health, strengthening health systems, and redistributing power and resources to marginalized communities. Only through such comprehensive approaches can the promise of digital health—improved access to quality healthcare information for all—be realized for communities like Birnin Gwari.

The stakes are high. As healthcare delivery and informationdissemination increasingly shift to digital platforms, algo- rithmic bias threatens to create a "digital determinants of health" gap, where populations already facing the greatest health challenges are systematically excluded from innova- tions intended to improve health. Addressing this challenge is not merely a technical problem but a matter of health justice.

For Birnin Gwari LGA and similar marginalized communities globally, the imperative is clear: digital health equity requires algorithmic fairness. Achieving this requires acknowledging current biases, implementing evidence-based mitigation strategies, centering community voices in technology design, and maintaining ongoing vigilance as digital health technologies evolve. Only through such sustained commitment can healthcare Information Retrieval Systems become tools for equity rather than instruments of exclusion.

Acknowledgments

This research was conducted with recognition of the communities in Birnin Gwari LGA whose healthcare access challenges motivate this work. We acknowledge the healthcare workers, community health workers, and local leaders working under challenging conditions to serve their communities. We recognize the contributions of researchers, policymakers, and advocates globally working toward digital health equity.

Author Contributions

A.O.O. conceived the study and coordinated the research. F.O.A. conducted the literature review and contributed to analysis. O.I. provided contextual analysis of Kaduna State healthcare systems. All authors contributed to drafting and revising the manuscript and approved the final version.

Funding

No specific funding was received for this research article.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Data Availability

This review article is based on publicly available literature and data sources, all of which are cited in the references section.

References

[1] Z. Obermeyer, B. Powers, C. Vogeli, and S. Mullainathan, "Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations," *Science*, vol. 366, no. 6464, pp. 447–453, 2019.

[2] J. W. Anderson, J. R. Stewart, and M. A. Zajac, "Algorithmic individual fairness and healthcare: A scoping review," *BMJ Open*, vol. 14, no. 3, p. e078532, 2024.

J. E. Alderman et al., "Tackling algorithmic bias and promoting transparency in health datasets: TheSTANDING Together recommendations," *The Lancet Digital Health*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. e23–e34, 2025.

[3] H. Koehle et al., "Digital health equity: Addressing power, usability, and inclusion," *Digital Medicine*, vol. 5, no. 23, pp. 112–124, 2022.

[4] A. Crawford and E. Serhal, "Digital health equity and COVID-19: The innovation curve," *JMIR Public Health and Surveillance*, vol. 6, no. 2, p. e19361, 2020.

[5] M. Sun et al., "Negative patient descriptors: Document- ing racial bias in clinical notes," *Health Affairs*, vol. 41, no. 10, pp. 1487–1494, 2022.

[6] D. Gershgorn, "How an algorithm favored whites over Blacks in health care," *Wired*, Oct. 25, 2019.

[7] C. Lin et al., "Algorithmic bias in search engine auto- complete and information retrieval systems," *Comput- ers in Human Behavior*, vol. 141, p. 107637, 2023.

[8] S. Dai et al., "Bias and unfairness in information retrieval systems: A survey," *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 1–37, 2024.

[9] BIAS Workshop, "Proceedings of the International Workshop on Algorithmic Bias in Search and Recommendation [BIAS at SIGIR 2024]," ACM Digital Library, 2024.

[10] C. Xu et al., "Fairness in information retrieval from an economic perspective," *Information Retrieval Journal*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 45–63, 2025.

[11] Y. Fang and S. Wang, "Fairness in search systems: A systematic review," in *Advances in Information Retrieval*, Springer, 2024, pp. 122–139.

[12] A. A. Tierney et al., "Ambient AI scribes and implications for clinical documentation and bias," *NEJM Catalyst Innovations in Care Delivery*, vol. 5, no. 7, 2024.

[13] J. G. O. Marko et al., "Examining inclusivity: AI use and diverse populations in health technologies," *Frontiers in Digital Health*, vol. 7, p. 144, 2025.

[14] S. Uddin et al., "Algorithmic bias in biomedical and health research: A review," *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, vol. 152, p. 104445, 2025.

[15] World Health Organization, "Global strategy on digital health 2020–2025," WHO, 2020.

[16] World Health Organization, "Digital health: Transforming healthcare for equity and resilience," WHO, 2023.

[17] Pan American Health Organization, "8 principles for digital transformation of public health," PAHO/WHO, 2022.

[18] UNICEF, "Annual report on digital inclusion and equity," UNICEF, 2023.

[19] Banya Global, "Understanding the gender digital divide in Nigeria," Policy Brief, 2023.

[20] E. U. Chika, "Digital healthcare tools in Nigeria: Strengthening public health through digital solutions," *Telehealth and Medicine Today*, vol. 9, no. 2, 2024.

[21] V. A. Adepoju et al., "Health-seeking behavior regarding coughs in urban slum communities, Lagos, Nigeria," *BMC Public Health*, vol. 23, p. 1772, 2023.

[22] O. D. Dahunsi, "Determinants of healthcare seeking behaviour amongst households in Nigeria," *International Journal of Health Policy and Management*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 120–132, 2024.

[23] G. O. Ocheja et al., "Geospatial mapping and analysis of the distribution of public primary healthcare centers in Kaduna State, Nigeria," *International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development*, vol. 7, no. 6, pp. 112–121, 2023.

[24] Kaduna State Bureau of Statistics, "Kaduna State health facilities dashboard," Kaduna State Government, 2023.

[25] Kaduna State Ministry of Health, "List of coded health facilities in Kaduna State," Kaduna State Government, 2023.

[26] Kaduna State Government, "Q1 report on upgrading of primary health centers in Kaduna State," Government of Kaduna State, 2025.

[27] Family and Rural Outreach Foundation [FAROF], "Improved Maternal and Child Health [SPHEC-MCH] Project Report – Kaduna State," FAROF, 2022.

[28] Federal Ministry of Health [Nigeria], "State of Health of the Nation Report 2024," Abuja: Government of Nigeria, 2024.

[29] M. R. McGrail and J. S. Humphreys, "Measuring spatial accessibility to primary health care services: Utilising GIS techniques," *International Journal of Health Geographics*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 22, 2014.

[30] M. R. McGrail and J. S. Humphreys, "Measuring spatial accessibility to primary health care services: Utilis- ing GIS techniques," *International Journal of Health Geographics*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 22, 2014.