ejpmr, 2024, 11(12), 618-622
SJIF Impact Factor 7.065
EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF PHARMACEUTICAL AND MEDICAL RESEARCH
www.ejpmr.com
Review Article
ISSN 2394-3211
EJPMR

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN CLINICAL DECISION-MAKING: OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES

Arpita Hazra[1]*, Pulagam Vaishnavi Reddy[2], Boga Neha[2], Savitha[2], Zeenath Begum[1], Shamna Machanchery[2] and Noorush Shifa Nizami[1]

[1]M. Sc, Student at ClinoSol Research, Hyderabad, India.
[2]Pharm. D, Student at ClinoSol Research, Hyderabad, India.
[2]M. Pharmacy (Pharmaceutical Analysis), Student at ClinoSol Research, Hyderabad, India.
B. Pharmacy, Student at ClinoSol Research, Hyderabad, India.
[2]M. Pharmacy (Pharmacy Practice), Student at ClinoSol Research, Hyderabad, India.
[1]Clinical Research Associate, ClinoSol Research, Hyderabad, India.

***Corresponding Author: Arpita Hazra**

M. Sc, Student at ClinoSol Research, Hyderabad, India.

Article Received on 21/10/2024 **Article Revised on 11/11/2024** **Article Accepted on 01/12/2024**

ABSTRACT
The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into healthcare is transforming clinical decision-making by leveraging vast datasets, including genomic, biomarker, and phenotype information, to enhance care quality and safety. However, the rapid advancement of AI technologies poses challenges for evaluating their impact on care delivery, patient outcomes, and ethical considerations. This paper explores key aspects of AI in clinical decision support, focusing on evaluation frameworks, challenges, and practical implications. Historically, AI systems have evolved from rule-based expert systems to modern machine learning models, bringing new complexities to their assessment. Challenges include ensuring algorithm generalizability, mitigating biases, and maintaining ethical standards in diverse sociotechnical settings. The need for continuous evaluation throughout the AI lifecycle—from design and development to implementation and surveillance—is emphasized, with the Learning Healthcare System paradigm providing a foundation for ongoing improvement. Practical aspects of evaluation, including the use of established guidelines like GEP-HI and STARE-HI, are examined to ensure transparent and robust assessments. Indicators such as algorithmic accuracy, user interaction, and clinical outcomes are highlighted as essential measures for monitoring AI performance. The paper concludes by addressing the need for adaptive frameworks that account for dynamic algorithms and evolving medical knowledge, ensuring AI's responsible integration into healthcare.

KEYWORD:- Artificial intelligence, clinical decision support, healthcare technology, AI evaluation, algorithm performance, machine learning, healthcare informatics, AI ethics, dynamic algorithms, Learning Healthcare System.

INTRODUCTION
Artificial intelligence (AI) holds immense potential to revolutionize clinical decision-making by leveraging vast datasets generated across the healthcare system.[1] These datasets include genomic, biomarker, and phenotype information derived from health records and delivery systems. By effectively utilizing these resources, AI can significantly enhance the safety and quality of care.

This discussion focuses on the current role of AI in supporting clinical decisions. Traditionally, the evaluation of AI-driven systems has primarily concentrated on algorithmic performance in controlled laboratory environments. However, only a limited number of observational studies have assessed these systems in real-world clinical settings, ensuring a controlled environment where patients continue to receive standard care.[2,3] Despite these efforts, there remains limited understanding of how AI impacts care delivery and patient outcomes. Such considerations are vital for ensuring that AI is implemented responsibly and effectively.[4] As with any technological advancement, the introduction of AI carries the risk of unintended consequences, including potential disruptions to care delivery and risks to patient safety.

The successful integration of AI into clinical workflows requires responsible application and mitigation of risks. While AI adoption has accelerated over the past five years, its study within the field of informatics dates back several decades. However, recent trends indicate a shift in focus from evidence-based innovation to rapid adoption driven by commercial and political pressures. This shift risks overlooking the importance of evidence, potentially jeopardizing patient safety.[5]

To ensure that AI is used effectively in clinical decision support, key considerations for evaluation must be addressed. These include the challenges of AI design, development, selection, deployment, and ongoing monitoring. A historical perspective on AI evaluation in healthcare provides valuable context, highlighting the challenges of assessing AI-enabled clinical decision-support systems.[7] Practical approaches to evaluation, such as defining clear indicators for monitoring performance and ensuring continuous surveillance, are essential. These efforts aim to enable the safe and effective integration of AI within the complex sociotechnical settings of modern healthcare.

AI has already been integrated into decision-support systems in data-intensive fields such as radiology, pathology, and ophthalmology, where it aids diagnostic processes. Future systems are expected to become increasingly autonomous, taking on roles such as triaging patients and screening referrals. The ongoing evaluation and careful monitoring of these advancements will ensure that AI can maximize its benefits while minimizing risks.

Evaluation of AI in Healthcare: A Historical Perspective

The application of artificial intelligence (AI) in healthcare has a long history, accompanied by an equally rich tradition of evaluating its effectiveness. Although the term "artificial intelligence" has gained widespread recognition in recent years, its foundational concepts in medicine date back decades. The journal *Artificial Intelligence in Medicine*, first published in the early 1990s, stands as a testament to the enduring interest in exploring AI's potential to enhance healthcare delivery.[8] Early AI efforts were frequently referred to as decision-support technologies, knowledge-based systems, or expert systems. These systems sought to improve clinical decision-making by leveraging structured rules and domain knowledge.

In its initial phases, AI in healthcare focused on tasks like diagnosis and therapy recommendations. These early applications primarily relied on symbolic approaches, which were rule-based systems that encoded expert knowledge to simulate clinical reasoning. For example, systems such as MYCIN, developed in the 1970s, provided recommendations for treating bacterial infections by applying predefined rules. Symbolic AI approaches aimed to replicate human logic and reasoning, often through frameworks that processed data using "if-then" rules or decision trees.[6]

The late 1950s marked a key technological milestone with the development of LISP by John McCarthy and colleagues. LISP, a programming language particularly suited for symbolic reasoning, enabled the creation of systems that could manipulate symbols to represent knowledge. Around the same time, the PROLOG language emerged, emphasizing logic programming and enabling further advancements in rule-based systems. These innovations laid the groundwork for early AI systems in medicine, which, while promising, faced challenges such as limited computational power, difficulty scaling, and a lack of sufficient data for robust training.[5]

Over time, the evolution of AI led to a paradigm shift. Modern AI leverages statistical and machine learning techniques, often combined with symbolic approaches, to represent diseases and infer patterns from data. Unlike earlier systems that depended heavily on predefined rules, contemporary AI models can learn from vast datasets, uncovering patterns and relationships that would be difficult or impossible to encode manually. Techniques like neural networks, natural language processing, and deep learning have significantly broadened AI's applicability in healthcare. These methods have enabled advancements in predictive analytics, personalized medicine, and image-based diagnostics.

Evaluation of AI systems has also evolved alongside technological advancements. Initial evaluations of AI in healthcare focused on the performance of algorithms in controlled settings. These assessments often tested systems' ability to simulate clinical decision-making based on historical data.[9] While such evaluations provided valuable insights, they fell short in addressing real-world complexities. Modern evaluations emphasize not only algorithmic accuracy but also the integration of AI systems within clinical workflows. Factors such as usability, ethical considerations, and patient outcomes are now central to the assessment of AI systems.

The trajectory of AI in healthcare illustrates both the progress made and the challenges that remain. From early rule-based systems to advanced machine learning algorithms, AI has shown its potential to transform care delivery. However, ongoing evaluation is crucial to ensure that AI systems are safe, effective, and equitable. By learning from the past and addressing current challenges, healthcare can harness AI's full potential to improve patient outcomes and operational efficiency.[4-7]

Challenges in Evaluating AI for Clinical Decision Support

Evaluating the effects of artificial intelligence (AI) on care delivery and patient outcomes is critical to ensuring its safe and effective implementation in clinical settings. This evaluation must span every phase of the AI lifecycle, including design, development, selection, implementation, and ongoing monitoring.

Design and Development Challenges

Traditionally, the evaluation of AI systems has focused heavily on the design and development stages. At this phase, the primary goal is to assess algorithm performance in terms of metrics such as discrimination, accuracy, and precision. These metrics are prioritized based on the specific use case. For instance, algorithms used for triage require high discrimination to correctly identify critical cases, whereas predictive models for risks like mortality or complications demand high accuracy and precision across diverse patient populations.

However, even optimal algorithms may present ethical dilemmas. AI systems built on machine learning often struggle to generalize beyond their training data. Variations in real-world populations, workflows, and even data capture methods can lead to erroneous outputs. For example, image interpretation algorithms may fail to recognize certain patterns due to differences in the populations or imaging workflows upon which they were trained. Moreover, the dynamic nature of medical knowledge requires algorithms to be regularly updated to reflect new evidence, which raises questions about how knowledge is integrated and maintained in these systems.[8]

Another significant challenge is ensuring that computational outputs are ethically actionable. For instance, algorithms designed to prioritize organ transplant recipients might use expected longevity as a predictor, inadvertently disadvantaging certain socio-demographic groups. Similarly, the inferential logic behind an algorithm should be evaluated to ensure its findings are contextually meaningful rather than statistical artifacts. For example, the "weekend effect," suggesting higher hospital mortality on weekends, may stem from inadequate adjustment for patient mix differences, leading to inconsistent conclusions.

Additionally, many modern AI systems, particularly those utilizing neural networks, function as "black boxes" where the underlying reasoning is opaque to users. While auditing outcomes has been suggested as a pragmatic approach to evaluate such systems, this may not be sufficient in healthcare, where transparency is essential. Developers must work towards creating more interpretable models, allowing clinicians to assess the rationale behind computational outputs effectively.

Selection and Implementation Challenges

The growing availability of clinical data and accessible AI development platforms has led to a proliferation of algorithms, making selection a complex task. When choosing among multiple algorithms, it is essential to assess their compatibility with the intended use case. For example, an algorithm developed for ICU patients with continuous blood pressure monitoring may not be suitable for general hospital wards where blood pressure is measured sporadically.

Generalizability is another concern. The foundational data used to train an algorithm may not align with the demographics or morbidity patterns of the target population. Moreover, data quality issues can compromise performance, as data often originates from workflows prone to human error or unreliable processes.

Finally, the interaction between AI systems and human decision-makers must be evaluated. AI tools should enhance clinical decision-making without undermining human expertise or causing conflicts between clinicians and algorithm developers. Transparent and collaborative frameworks are essential to align AI systems with clinical goals and ethical principles.

By addressing these challenges at every stage of the AI lifecycle, healthcare systems can ensure the responsible integration of AI into clinical decision support, ultimately improving patient care and outcomes.

Practical Aspects of Evaluating AI-Enabled Clinical Decision Support

Evaluating AI-enabled clinical decision support systems (CDSS) requires a comprehensive and ongoing approach that considers the unique challenges and dynamic nature of these technologies. This process involves applying established evaluation frameworks, adapting existing guidelines, and identifying suitable indicators to monitor the effectiveness, safety, and ethical implications of AI systems.

Approaching AI Evaluation

Evaluating AI systems as a one-time activity is insufficient due to their inherent complexity and the unpredictable nature of their interactions with sociotechnical environments. Continuous evaluation and surveillance are essential to monitor the evolving behavior of these systems and their impact on users and broader clinical settings. This ongoing assessment may become an ethical necessity as the interplay between AI interventions and healthcare systems grows increasingly intricate.[10]

One promising paradigm for AI evaluation is the concept of the Learning Healthcare System. This approach emphasizes continuous improvement, using locally generated evidence to adapt practices over time. It supports learning at multiple levels:

- **Institutional level:** Focuses on monitoring algorithm performance and operational integration within a single organization.
- **National level:** Addresses safety governance, regulatory oversight, and compliance with standards.
- **International level:** Examines ethical implications, equity, and global harmonization of AI applications in healthcare.

By applying the Learning Healthcare System paradigm, healthcare organizations can ensure that AI technologies are constantly optimized for safety, efficiency, and ethical appropriateness.

Evaluation Guidelines and Models

Existing guidelines for health informatics evaluations provide a robust starting point for AI-specific assessments. Frameworks such as the Good Evaluation Practice in Health Informatics (GEP-HI) guide the planning and execution of evaluation projects, offering a structured approach to assess the design, implementation, and outcomes of AI systems. These guidelines encourage evaluators to consider various dimensions, such as usability, interoperability, and performance.

Similarly, the Statement on Reporting of Evaluation Studies in Health Informatics (STARE-HI) offers principles for designing and reporting evaluation studies. These frameworks help ensure consistency, transparency, and rigor in the evaluation process, making findings reliable and actionable. They also provide flexibility to tailor methods to specific AI systems, considering the purpose of the study and the evaluation questions posed.[9]

Key Indicators for Monitoring AI

Practical evaluation of AI systems must involve measurable indicators that assess their functionality, impact, and safety. These indicators might include:

- **Algorithmic performance:** Metrics such as accuracy, precision, and recall to evaluate decision-making capabilities.
- **User interaction:** Measures of clinician satisfaction, system usability, and integration into workflows.
- **Clinical outcomes:** Indicators such as reduced diagnostic errors, improved patient outcomes, and timeliness of care.
- **Ethical considerations:** Monitoring bias in decision-making and evaluating the equitable distribution of AI benefits across different populations.
- **System adaptability:** Ability to update algorithms in response to emerging evidence or changes in medical knowledge.

Addressing gaps in evaluation

While existing frameworks provide a strong foundation, AI-specific considerations highlight areas requiring further development. For instance, governance models must address the unique challenges of continuous learning algorithms that evolve over time. Additionally, strategies for mitigating risks associated with biased data and opaque decision-making processes must be integrated into the evaluation process.[11]

Practical evaluation of AI-enabled clinical decision support systems requires a combination of established health informatics guidelines, ongoing surveillance, and the identification of specific indicators to monitor their performance and impact. Continuous evaluation ensures that these technologies not only enhance clinical decision-making but also uphold safety, equity, and ethical standards in healthcare.

CONCLUSION

The rapid pace of technological advancements in artificial intelligence (AI) is outstripping our ability to fully anticipate its effects on medical practice, patient care, and overall outcomes. In the near term, AI is expected to play a supportive role in clinical decision-making, where human clinicians remain central to the decision process. This integration will require balancing AI-generated insights with other evidence and the preferences of individual patients, fundamentally altering traditional decision-making dynamics in healthcare.

Ensuring the safe and effective incorporation of AI into care delivery demands a strong and sustained focus on evaluation. Robust evaluation frameworks are essential to guide the design, development, selection, implementation, and continuous monitoring of AI systems in clinical settings. Lessons from past experiences in health informatics and current best practices should be leveraged to develop evidence-based approaches for assessing AI technologies.

An essential element of these evaluations will be clear labeling and documentation of the source and training data used by AI systems. This information is critical for understanding the applicability and transferability of AI models to different clinical contexts. Additionally, the evaluation of dynamic algorithms capable of processing large-scale genomic, biomarker, and phenotype data will evolve through practical implementation and ongoing refinement. By prioritizing thorough evaluation and applying lessons from existing methodologies, healthcare systems can maximize the benefits of AI while minimizing potential risks. This approach will ensure that AI systems are responsibly and effectively integrated into clinical workflows, improving outcomes for both patients and providers.

REFERENCES

1. Burnett S, Franklin BD, Moorthy K, Cooke MW, Vincent C. How reliable are clinical systems in the UK NHS? A study of seven NHS organisations. BMJ Qual Saf, 2012; 21(6): 466-72.
2. Lehmann HP, Downs SM. Desiderata for sharable computable biomedical knowledge for learning health systems. Learn Health Syst, 2018; e10065.
3. Lyell D, Magrabi F, Coiera E. Reduced verification of medication alerts increases prescribing errors. Appl Clin Inform, 2019; 10(1): 66-76.
4. Bhattacharya S, Czejdo B, Agrawal R, Erdemir E, Gokaraju B, editors. Open Source Platforms and Frameworks for Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning. Southeast Con, 2018; 2018: 19-22.
5. Treleaven P, Galas M, Lalchand V. Algorithmic trading review. Commun ACM, 2013; 56(11): 76-85.
6. Minne L, Eslami S, de Keizer N, de Jonge E, de Rooij SE, Abu-Hanna A. Effect of changes over time

in the performance of a customized SAPS-II model on the quality of care assessment. Intensive Care Med, 2012; 38(1): 40-6.
7. Osoba OA, Welser IV W. An intelligence in our image: The risks of bias and errors in artificial intelligence. Rand Corporation, 2017.
8. Lyell D, Magrabi F, Raban MZ, Pont LG, Baysari MT, Day RO, et al. Automation bias in electronic prescribing. BMC Med Inform Decis Mak, 2017; 17(1): 28.
9. Ser G, Robertson A, Sheikh A. A qualitative exploration of workarounds related to the implementation of national electronic health records in early adopter mental health hospitals. PLoS One, 2014; 9(1): e77669.
10. NHS code of conduct for data-driven health and care technology, 2019; 19. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/code-of-conduct-for-data-driven-health-and-care-technology/initial-code-of-conduct-for-data-driven-health-and-care-technology
11. Crouch H. East and North Herts could face £7m bill to fix Lorenzo issue. Digital Health; 2018. Available from: https://www.digitalhealth.net/2018/10/east-and-north-herts-lorenzo-it-issue/