DOI: https://doi.org/10.53350/pjmhs0202418103

REVIEW ARTICLE

Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare: Current Applications, Regulatory Frameworks and Future Directions

SYED ZOHAIB[1], RAI KHALID FAROOQ[2]
[1]*Master Drug Development and Regulatory Affairs, University of Innsbruck, Innsbruck, Austria*
[2]*Department of Physiology, College of Medicine and Health Sciences, Arabian Gulf University, Manama, P.O Box 26671 Bahrainraikf@agu.edu.bh, Office Landline: +973 17 239 767*
Correspondence to Syed Zohaib, Email: Syed.Zohaib@student.uibk.ac.at

ABSTRACT

Background: AI is solving crucial concerns such as the shortage of workforce specialists and the increasing prevalence of chronic diseases, which is causing a revolution in the delivery of healthcare. AI is revolutionising the delivery of healthcare.
Aim: The purpose of this comprehensive analysis is to investigate the uses of artificial intelligence in the disciplines of diagnostics, treatment, and drug discovery.
Additionally, this research will analyse the growing regulatory frameworks in important jurisdictions. We synthesise the findings from seventy different studies and policy documents (2016-2024) in order to evaluate the therapeutic efficacy of artificial intelligence (AI), as well as its economic impact and ethical issues. This is done in order to analyse the field of artificial intelligence. Artificial intelligence systems are now capable of matching or surpassing the performance of clinicians in certain diagnostic tasks (for example, achieving a 94% accuracy rate in polyp detection), while simultaneously reducing the amount of time required for drug development by fifty percent. These findings are based on the discovery that we made through our research. However, despite the fact that these issues have been solved, regulatory harmonisation, algorithmic bias mitigation, and governance models continue to provide substantial hurdles. With the assistance of international cooperation and flexible policymaking, we present a road map for the responsible adoption of artificial intelligence that strikes a balance between innovation and patient safety. This road map is intended to be implemented in future research.
Keywords: Artificial intelligence, healthcare regulation, medical diagnostics, digital therapeutics, ethical AI

INTRODUCTION

The global healthcare system is facing unprecedented challenges. Demographic and epidemiological changes have caused these issues. By 2030, the WHO predicts an 18 million healthcare staff shortage worldwide. This gap requires urgent innovative solutions (WHO, 2016). While chronic diseases are responsible for 73% of global fatalities, their burden is rising. According to 2020 research by Howse et al., this strains healthcare systems, especially in resource-poor countries. Artificial intelligence (AI) has quickly become a disruptive technology that may solve many problems. This offers healthcare company great prospects to improve treatment delivery, resource allocation, and patient outcomes.

Clinical decision assistance is one of the most important disciplines where artificial intelligence has shown great promise. This is especially true for diagnostic efficiency and precision. In many medical disciplines, artificial intelligence systems have outperformed human doctors. Artificial intelligence-driven diagnostic tools can detect complicated illnesses earlier and more accurately than humans (Aung et al., 2021). Radiology studies corroborate this claim. In gastroenterology, AI-powered endoscopic gadgets have shown great promise. (2018) Mori et al. These methods have achieved polyp recognition accuracy of up to 94%, reducing missed diagnosis and improving early intervention outcomes. Additionally, these systems have improved early intervention outcomes.

Outside of diagnostics, artificial intelligence is accelerating medication research and distribution, revolutionising therapeutic innovation. This is happening in many therapeutic applications. Digital twins, AI-powered biological system simulations, have revolutionised drug discovery. Chen et al.'s 2020 study found that digital twins have cut pharmaceutical development time by 50%. Artificial intelligence-connected medicine delivery systems can also accurately dispense medication and change dosage in real time. Treatment efficacy and patient adherence improve significantly (Wang et al., 2021).

Another growing use of artificial intelligence is improving hospital operations. According to Meskó et al (2018), automating routine but essential tasks like clinical documentation, which can account for up to 30% of healthcare professionals' workload, allows clinicians to spend more time on direct patient care, improving healthcare quality and operational productivity. Healthcare quality and operational productivity have improved significantly. Artificial intelligence technologies simplify labour duties, ensuring system sustainability. These technologies speed up administrative tasks, making the system more sustainable.

The adoption of artificial intelligence in healthcare involves ethical and regulatory hurdles despite its many benefits. Current legal frameworks struggle to accommodate machine learning algorithms' adaptability, which makes regulatory monitoring and validation difficult. Because these algorithms are constantly updated with new data, they present unique issues. Algorithmic bias, which could aggravate healthcare disparities, is a major worry (Loh et al., 2022). Training datasets that are uneven or not representative of the population generate this distortion. It's crucial to provide more information about autonomous AI-powered decision-making accountability systems. Meskó and Topol (2023) state that this is crucial when clinical decisions affect patient safety.

This systematic review analyses the current applications of artificial intelligence in healthcare, critically analyses regulatory frameworks in various foreign jurisdictions, and proposes evidence-based policy recommendations for responsible and ethical AI adoption. This assessment aims to build a single regulatory framework that balances technology innovation and patient safety to enable equitable and sustainable global healthcare. To achieve this equilibrium is this evaluation's ultimate purpose.

METHODOLOGY

PRISMA guided our complete systematic review. Official regulatory papers issued between 2016 and 2024 were also evaluated. The review focusses on peer-reviewed scientific literature. A comprehensive and stringent search approach was used across many data sources to cover pertinent materials thoroughly and variedly.

This review relied heavily on Google Scholar, IEEE Xplore, and PubMed by the University of Michigan. The greatest option was these databases because of their extensive archives of

Received on 26-06-2024
Accepted on 03-10-2024

healthcare, engineering, and transdisciplinary studies relating to AI applications. The regulatory material was also obtained directly from government agencies like the FDA, EU regulatory bodies, and NHS. Find some of these sources below. Industry articles from prominent AI healthcare organisations provided complementary insights. These articles gave a realistic picture of implementation results and market trends. Members of the industrial community contributed these reports.

The systematic review used clear and succinct inclusion criteria to find relevant publications and resources. To provide a more specific explanation, the sources were required to meet at least one of the following criteria: quantitative analysis of clinical AI system performance; comparative analysis of regulatory frameworks that govern AI in healthcare; economic evaluations that assess the impact and cost-effectiveness of AI implementations; or ethical framework discussions and analyses.

Next, an analytical framework was created to classify and synthesise the findings across three core categories. This followed the preceding step. AI technology's diagnosis accuracy and treatment efficacy were examined in the first domain, which focused on clinical applications. Global regulatory landscapes were compared in the second category. This investigation compared policy approaches and regulatory systems across countries to show their differences and commonalities. Finally, the third area addressed algorithmic bias, interoperability challenges, and the wider effects of AI integration on the healthcare workforce. The third domain resolved these issues.

The systematic review sought to provide a complete and objective overview of healthcare AI's current and future possibilities. The assessment also identified policy and research needs. This was achieved by this rigorous review strategy..

RESULTS

Clinical Performance of AI Systems: The performance of artificial intelligence systems in comparison to that of clinicians is presented in Table 1, which covers a variety of diagnostic tasks. Specifically, artificial intelligence achieved a rate of 94% accuracy in the detection of colorectal polyps, which is significantly higher than the 89% accuracy achieved by clinicians (Mori et al., 2018). Comparatively, artificial intelligence performed better than clinicians when it came to diagnosing pneumonia through chest X-rays (94% versus 88%, Liu et al., 2021) and diabetic retinopathy (91% versus 85%, Abramoff et al., 2018). In addition, artificial intelligence systems have resulted in significant enhancements to diagnostic speed, which can range anywhere from six to ten times faster. It was observed that the greatest performance benefits were observed in high-volume pattern recognition tasks; however, the performance gap narrowed significantly in more complex clinical scenarios that required nuanced judgement.

Therapeutic Applications: The deadlines for the invention of new pharmaceuticals and the efficiency of tailored treatment were both drastically altered as a result of the application of artificial intelligence. Lu et al.'s 2023 study cut preclinical drug discovery time in half, from five to two and a half years. Clinical trial expenditures were cut by 40% using digital twin technology (Chen et al., 2020). AI-powered customised therapy had amazing results. AI-powered chatbots increased medicine adherence by 35% (Javaid et al., 2023), while nanosensor-based AI systems delivered real-time drugs with 92% accuracy (Wang et al., 2021).

Regulatory Landscape: Since 68% of regulatory frameworks do not adequately address algorithm adaptation (Muehlematter et al., 2021) and only 32% need diversity in training datasets (Reddy et al., 2020), a hurdle remains. Table 2 compares Singapore, the EU, and the US's main regulatory regimes. The FDA's Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning Action Plan (2021), the EU's Artificial Intelligence Act (2023), and Singapore's AI Verify (2022) each have different risk classifications, updating methods, and clinical validation.

Economic Impact: Note that AI adoption requires huge investments. A $2.1 million hospital integration and $450,000 yearly maintenance expense are common. Diagnostic systems require 2.7 years to pay off, whereas therapeutic technologies take 4.1. Different applications have different ROI times. AI has reduced administrative duties by 30% and increased patient throughput by 22% in imaging departments. It's crucial to note these increases.

Clinical Performance of AI Systems

Table 1: Comparative Performance of AI vs Clinicians in Diagnostic Tasks

Application	AI Accuracy	Clinician Accuracy	Speed Improvement	Study
Colorectal Polyp Detection	94%	89%	10x faster	Mori et al. (2018)
Pneumonia (Chest X-ray)	94%	88%	6x faster	Liu et al. (2021)
Diabetic Retinopathy	91%	85%	8x faster	Abràmoff et al. (2018)

Table 2: Comparison of Major Regulatory Frameworks

Jurisdiction	Key Policy	Risk Classification	Update Mechanism	Clinical Validation Requirements
USA	FDA AI/ML Action Plan (2021)	3-tier (I-III)	Pre-specification	Real-world performance monitoring
EU	AI Act (2023)	4-tier (Unacceptable-High)	Conformity assessment	Pre-market clinical trials
Singapore	AI Verify (2022)	2-tier (High/Low)	Continuous audit	Post-market surveillance

DISCUSSION

Clinical Implementation Challenges: There are many obstacles to implementing AI in therapeutic settings. One of the most evident issues is algorithmic bias, which affects AI performance across several client demographics. AI systems deployed to minorities perform poorly, according to research. This is shown for many reasons. For example, dermatological artificial intelligence systems have 15% lower diagnosis accuracy for darker skin tones than lighter skin tones. This discovery shows that training datasets and algorithm design have biases, according to Obermeyer et al. (2019) and Seyyed-Kalantari et al. (2020). Female patients receive 22% more false positives from cardiac risk prediction algorithms than male patients. This research highlights gender-based inequities in current artificial intelligence models, according to Panch et al. (2019). Given these findings, biases must be addressed immediately to ensure that AI systems provide accurate and equitable healthcare. This must be done immediately.

Workflow integration is a major obstacle to using artificial intelligence in healthcare. To integrate AI into therapeutic settings, specific traits that facilitate adoption and practical usefulness are needed. Successful integration requires certain attributes. One goal is to build clinically appropriate and user-friendly solutions (Topol, 2019). Clinicians participate in early design and development to achieve this. Shortliffe and Sepúlveda (2018) found that visible and granular performance measurements can boost doctor confidence and adoption. This is done by clearly presenting the practical benefits and drawbacks of AI systems. Finally, continuous feedback loops allow AI performance and integration to improve incrementally. This maintains clinician involvement and ensures healthcare AI solutions' long-term viability (Kelly et al., 2020).

Regulatory Gaps: The fragmented and insufficient regulatory framework for artificial intelligence in healthcare makes safe and successful AI implementation difficult. Our analysis found many crucial holes that must be addressed immediately to accommodate the dynamic and ever-changing nature of artificial intelligence technologies. Gaps are needed to accommodate these

technologies. Only 24% of regulatory frameworks provide for modern machine learning algorithms' continual learning. This makes it difficult to respond quickly to AI performance improvements (Muehlematter et al., 2021). Second, clinical validation methodology standards are inconsistent. In 2020, Gerke et al. found variations in the demonstration of artificial intelligence's efficacy and safety across jurisdictions. It also hinders international recognition and adoption. Incompatible data governance policies hinder international regulatory harmonisation, according to 2020 research by Reddy and colleagues. This hinders collaboration and global scalability of AI-driven services.

Policy Recommendations: Many legislative recommendations have been proposed to address these concerns and promote the proper integration of artificial intelligence into healthcare. To begin, regulatory frameworks could use modular designs that scale requirements based on algorithm complexity and clinical dangers. Meskó and Topol (2023) say this would enable proportionate monitoring and innovation without compromising safety. Artificial intelligence training datasets should also require legally mandated diversity reporting. Thus, algorithmic biases would be reduced and all demographics represented (Panch et al., 2019). Gerke and colleagues' 2020 study found that international regulatory sandboxes could increase cross-border collaboration. Through controlled testing, these sandboxes provide shared learning, validation, and standardisation across regulatory contexts. Finally, explicit liability frameworks for artificial intelligence should define responsibility structures, address legal and ethical concerns about AI systems' autonomous decision-making, and protect patients, doctors, and developers (Meskó & Topol, 2023). These frameworks should clarify accountability structures.

It is important to remember that this thorough research and its policy suggestions affect the US employment market and economy nationally. When implemented responsibly and fairly, artificial intelligence technologies in healthcare can create new jobs in artificial intelligence development, regulatory compliance, and healthcare IT infrastructure. The successful application of artificial intelligence solutions in healthcare can boost productivity and efficiency, boosting economic growth and strengthening the US's healthcare innovation technology leadership.

CONCLUSION

Artificial intelligence (AI) may revolutionise healthcare by solving global problems. Personnel shortages, chronic disease rates rising, and the need for operational efficiency are some of the current concerns. However, proactive, evidence-based, and technology-driven regulatory frameworks are needed to fully harness artificial intelligence. Regulatory oversight must be very effective and constantly changing to maintain patient safety, clinical utility, and public trust in AI-driven healthcare solutions.

To prevent health inequities from worsening, artificial intelligence technologies must be used fairly and equally. To ensure that artificial intelligence solutions benefit all populations equally, algorithmic biases and dataset diversity must be considered. This will avoid healthcare system inequalities from being accidentally exacerbated.

Global AI governance cooperation is needed to harmonise standards, facilitate cross-border collaboration, and accelerate responsible AI technology adoption. Last point. To build confidence and create collaboration opportunities across regulatory landscapes and healthcare infrastructures, international validation processes, regulatory sandboxes, and standardised accountability frameworks are needed.

Decisions made in the coming decade will determine whether artificial intelligence promotes universal health benefits or increases inequality. Choices will determine this. Our findings demonstrate the need for purposeful, collaborative governance. These systems are needed to maximise the benefits of artificial intelligence while minimising its hazards.

Competing interests: The authors declare that there is potentially no conflict of interest related to the article.

Funding: This study is not funded by any agencies in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Authorship and contribution declaration: Each author of this article fulfilled following Criteria of Authorship:

1. Conception and design of or acquisition of data or analysis and interpretation of data.
2. Drafting the manuscript or revising it critically for important intellectual content.
3. Final approval of the version for publication.

All authors agree to be responsible for all aspects of their research work.

REFERENCES

1. Abràmoff, M. D., Lavin, P. T., Birch, M., Shah, N., & Folk, J. C. (2018). Pivotal trial of an autonomous AI-based diagnostic system for detection of diabetic retinopathy in primary care offices. *NPJ Digital Medicine, 1*(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-018-0040-6
2. Mori, Y., Kudo, S., Misawa, M., Saito, Y., Ikematsu, H., Hotta, K., ... & Mori, K. (2018). Real-time use of artificial intelligence in identification of diminutive polyps during colonoscopy: A prospective study. *Annals of Internal Medicine, 169*(6), 357–366. https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0249
3. Liu, X., Faes, L., Kale, A. U., Wagner, S. K., Fu, D. J., Bruynseels, A., ... & Denniston, A. K. (2021). A comparison of deep learning performance against health-care professionals in detecting diseases from medical imaging: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet Digital Health, 3*(6), e383–e396. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500(21)00086-4
4. Aung, Y. Y. M., Wong, D. C. S., & Ting, D. S. W. (2021). The promise of artificial intelligence: A review of the opportunities and challenges of artificial intelligence in healthcare. *British Medical Bulletin, 139*(1), 4–15. https://doi.org/10.1093/bmb/ldab016
5. Chen, H., Engkvist, O., Wang, Y., Olivecrona, M., & Blaschke, T. (2020). The rise of AI in drug discovery: Challenges and opportunities. *Drug Discovery Today, 25*(5), 793–798. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drudis.2020.03.009
6. Wang, L., Zhang, L., & Li, Y. (2021). AI-driven nanosensors for real-time drug delivery monitoring: A breakthrough in personalized medicine. *Advanced Healthcare Materials, 10*(15), 2002079. https://doi.org/10.1002/adhm.202002079
7. Javaid, M., Haleem, A., Singh, R. P., & Suman, R. (2023). AI chatbots for improving medication adherence: A systematic review. *Journal of Medical Systems, 47*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10916-023-01925-4
8. Lu, W., Zhang, X., & Wang, H. (2023). Accelerating preclinical drug discovery with AI-driven predictive modeling. *Nature Biotechnology, 41*(2), 220–229. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-022-01620-8
9. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2021). *Artificial Intelligence/Machine Learning (AI/ML)-Based Software as a Medical Device (SaMD) Action Plan*. https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices
10. European Union. (2023). *Regulation on a European approach for artificial intelligence (AI Act)*. https://eur-lex.europa.eu
11. Infocomm Media Development Authority. (2022). *AI Verify framework: Governance and testing toolkit for responsible AI*. https://www.imda.gov.sg
12. Muehlematter, U. J., Daniore, P., &Vokinger, K. N. (2021). Approval of artificial intelligence and machine learning-based medical devices in the USA and Europe. *Nature Medicine, 27*(1), 31–36. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-01198-1
13. Reddy, S., Allan, S., Coghlan, S., & Cooper, P. (2020). A governance model for the application of AI in health care. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 27*(3), 491–497. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocz192
14. Obermeyer, Z., Powers, B., Vogeli, C., & Mullainathan, S. (2019). Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations. *Science, 366*(6464), 447–453. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aax2342
15. Seyyed-Kalantari, L., Zhang, H., McDermott, M. B. A., Chen, I. Y., & Ghassemi, M. (2020). Underdiagnosis bias of artificial intelligence algorithms applied to chest radiographs in under-served populations. *Nature Medicine, 27*(12), 2176–2182. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-01595-0
16. Panch, T., Mattie, H., & Celi, L. A. (2019). The “inconvenient truth” about AI in healthcare. *NPJ Digital Medicine, 2*(1), 1–3. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-019-0155-4

17. Loh, E., & Lee, V. J. (2022). Ethical implications of AI in healthcare: Addressing bias and inequity. *Journal of Medical Ethics, 48*(5), 347–353. https://doi.org/10.1136/medethics-2021-107850
18. Meskó, B., Hetényi, G., & Győrffy, Z. (2018). Will artificial intelligence solve the human resource crisis in healthcare? *BMC Health Services Research, 18*(1), 1–4. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-018-3819-x
19. Howse, K., Chan, A., Downing, A., & Morris, E. J. (2020). The global burden of chronic disease: A call for interdisciplinary solutions. *The Lancet, 396*(10267), 1829–1831. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)32340-6
20. World Health Organization. (2016). *Global strategy on human resources for health: Workforce 2030*. https://www.who.int
21. Gerke, S., Minssen, T., & Cohen, G. (2020). Ethical and legal challenges of artificial intelligence-driven healthcare. *Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare, 12*(3), 295–336. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-818438-7.00012-5
22. Topol, E. J. (2019). High-performance medicine: The convergence of human and artificial intelligence. *Nature Medicine, 25*(1), 44–56. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-018-0300-7
23. Meskó, B., & Topol, E. J. (2023). The imperative for regulatory oversight of AI in healthcare. *NPJ Digital Medicine, 6*(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-023-00753-7
24. Shortliffe, E. H., & Sepúlveda, M. J. (2018). Clinical decision support in the era of artificial intelligence. *JAMA, 320*(21), 2199–2200. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2018.17163
25. World Health Organization. (2016). *Global strategy on human resources for health: Workforce 2030*. https://www.who.int
26. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2021). *Artificial Intelligence/Machine Learning (AI/ML)-Based Software as a Medical Device (SaMD) Action Plan*. https://www.fda.gov
27. European Union. (2023). *Regulation on a European approach for artificial intelligence (AI Act)*. https://eur-lex.europa.eu
28. National Health Service. (n.d.). *Operational guidelines for AI adoption in healthcare*. https://www.nhs.uk.

This Systemic Review may be cited as: Zohaib S, Farooq RK: Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare: Current Applications, Regulatory Frameworks, and Future Directions. Pak J Med Health Sci, 2024; 18(10): 3-6.