

Research Article

Challenges of Medical Ethics in the Era of Artificial Intelligence (AI)

Siti Lukmanah^{1,*}¹ University of 17 August 1945 Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia, sitilukmanah@untag-sby.ac.id***corresponding author**

Received 20 September 2026; Accepted 25 September 2026; Published 30 September 2026

Copyright © 2026 Shihhah Wal Afiah Journal. This scholarly piece is accessible under the Creative Commons Attribution Non-commercial License, permitting dissemination and modification, conditional upon non-commercial use and due citation.

Abstract:

Background: The rapid development of the digital world has penetrated various sectors of human life, including the world of health. The emergence of AI innovation has become a real form of technological innovation designed to help humans solve various problems including decision making, providing recommendations, and even providing advice based on processing available data. In the world of medical ethics, AI raises concerns about bias, injustice, data privacy, patient protection, and informed consent. This research aims to identify and analyze the challenges of medical ethics caused by the spread of AI and provide recommendations for medical ethics in the use of AI. Methods: This research uses a qualitative approach through literature analysis by collecting secondary data sourced from scientific journals, books, articles. Result: From this study it can be concluded that the use of AI provides many benefits and provides many challenges. In the world of medical ethics, AI provides its own challenges to answer ethical issues in the future, especially regarding patient data privacy and security, transparency and accountability, bias and fairness. Conclusion: Therefore, it is necessary to design a new strategy to help navigate the transition to AI-based healthcare, create regulations and create clear minimum standards or laws to report the responsibilities of all stakeholders in the event of certain errors in healthcare cases, and design specific methods to integrate ethical standards into the AI design system.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence; medical ethics; health services.**Introduction:**

The rapid development of the digital world has penetrated various sectors of human life, including healthcare. Artificial Intelligence (AI) has emerged as a major technological innovation capable of supporting complex tasks such as clinical reasoning, prediction, decision support, and personalized care. Contemporary evidence shows that AI is increasingly integrated into clinical practice to augment healthcare professionals rather than simply automate isolated tasks (1). Healthcare organizations are therefore required to consider not only technical performance but also implementation readiness, governance, and organizational strategy when deploying AI at scale (2).

AI applications in healthcare now include clinical decision support, diagnostic imaging, predictive analytics, virtual assistance, robotics, and data-driven personalization. Although these technologies may improve efficiency and diagnostic capability, their use introduces ethical concerns involving autonomy, privacy, safety, accountability, and the changing relationship between patients, clinicians, and intelligent systems (3). Recent systematic evidence further emphasizes that secure and trustworthy AI requires simultaneous attention to technical innovation, cybersecurity, privacy, and ethical safeguards (4).

The development of AI provides substantial opportunities but also creates complex ethical challenges. In medical ethics, the most prominent concerns include patient privacy and data protection, transparency, professional

responsibility and accountability, algorithmic bias and fairness, and informed consent. These issues affect patients, clinicians, healthcare organizations, developers, researchers, and regulators, making trustworthy governance a shared responsibility across the AI lifecycle (5).

Method:

This study uses a qualitative approach through literature analysis by collecting secondary data sourced from scientific journals, books, articles on Artificial Intelligence, medical ethics and legal aspects. This study uses AI as a material object and epistemology as a formal object.

Results:

This study carefully outlines that, amidst the rapid progress and multidimensional benefits contributed by Artificial Intelligence (AI) in the healthcare domain, its implementation simultaneously raises a series of significant and complex ethical challenges. These challenges require in-depth consideration and planned solutions to ensure responsible and ethical adoption of AI.

One of the core ethical dilemmas is patient data privacy and confidentiality. AI systems depend on large and often sensitive datasets, creating risks related to unauthorized access, secondary use, re-identification, and inappropriate data sharing. Responsible dataset development therefore requires explicit attention to privacy, fairness, documentation, and regulatory norms (6). Patients also need meaningful information about how their data are collected, processed, shared, and used by AI systems. Evidence from AI-based clinical screening shows that trustworthiness is closely connected to transparency, consent, and privacy protections, reinforcing the need for patient-centered governance mechanisms (7).

Professional responsibility and accountability constitute another major ethical dilemma. When an AI-supported decision contributes to patient harm, responsibility may be distributed across developers, manufacturers, healthcare institutions, clinicians, and other actors. This creates a responsibility gap that cannot be resolved by treating the AI system as an isolated decision-maker. Legal and ethical analyses emphasize the need to define human oversight and allocate responsibility across the development and clinical-use chain (8). Transparency also functions as a multilayered system of accountability because technical explainability, professional duties, institutional governance, and legal requirements interact in determining whether AI-supported decisions can be scrutinized (9). Healthcare professionals themselves identify accountability, transparency, and bias as central concerns in AI-assisted decision-making (10).

Algorithmic bias and fairness are serious ethical issues because AI models may reproduce or amplify inequalities present in training data, model design, deployment environments, or clinical workflows. In healthcare, biased outputs can affect diagnostic accuracy, treatment recommendations, and access to care. Fairness therefore requires more than statistical performance; it also requires attention to clinical context, affected populations, and the consequences of model use (11). Ethical analyses further argue that fairness should extend beyond narrow definitions of discrimination to include broader questions of justice and equitable healthcare (12).

Informed consent remains essential when AI systems influence medical procedures or process patient data. Patients should receive understandable information about the role of AI, the purposes for which their data are used, relevant limitations, and the extent of human oversight. Recent scholarship on medical AI highlights that conventional consent models may be insufficient when systems are complex, adaptive, or difficult to explain, requiring consent processes that better reflect AI-specific risks and uncertainties (13).

Discussion:

Privacy and Confidentiality of Patient Data

AI-driven healthcare depends heavily on large volumes of sensitive health information. The ethical challenge is not limited to confidentiality but also includes how datasets are collected, curated, reused, shared, and governed. Responsible machine-learning datasets should incorporate privacy safeguards together with fairness and regulatory requirements from the beginning of the development lifecycle (6).

The expansion of data-intensive AI increases the importance of patient trust. Privacy risks can arise through data aggregation, secondary use, model development, or insufficiently transparent processing. Studies of trustworthy AI applications show that patients' confidence is strengthened when privacy, consent, and transparency are addressed together rather than as separate compliance tasks (7).

Accordingly, healthcare AI requires governance mechanisms that specify lawful and ethical data use, access controls, security responsibilities, and mechanisms for patient information and consent. Broader ethical and regulatory reviews similarly identify data governance as a foundational requirement for safe AI integration into healthcare practice (14).

Professional Responsibility and Accountability

Accountability in medical AI is distributed across a sociotechnical chain involving developers, vendors, healthcare organizations, and clinical users. Determining responsibility after an adverse event is therefore difficult when model behavior, implementation decisions, and professional judgment interact. Contemporary analyses of AI-related medical malpractice emphasize the need to clarify responsibility while preserving meaningful human oversight (15).

The "black box" problem further complicates accountability because clinicians and patients may be unable to understand how a model produced a recommendation. Explainability is consequently not only a technical objective but also an ethical and legal requirement linked to clinical justification, contestability, informed decision-making, and professional responsibility (16).

Current evidence supports a shared-accountability approach rather than assigning responsibility exclusively to a single actor. Healthcare professionals have emphasized that accountability, transparency, and bias must be considered together when AI contributes to clinical decisions (10). This approach requires clear organizational policies defining when clinicians may rely on AI, when independent verification is necessary, and how incidents should be documented and reviewed.

Effective governance should therefore make AI systems auditable and establish responsibilities throughout design, validation, deployment, monitoring, and clinical use. Ethical and quality principles need to be translated into operational requirements so that safety and fairness are maintained throughout the technology lifecycle (17).

AI should not be treated as an autonomous bearer of moral or legal responsibility. Ethical implementation requires human and institutional accountability supported by governance structures that can respond to uncertainty, errors, and emerging risks. Recent governance scholarship emphasizes coordinated oversight involving developers, healthcare organizations, professionals, regulators, and other stakeholders (18).

Algorithmic Bias and Fairness

Algorithmic bias may originate from unrepresentative datasets, historical inequities, labeling practices, model design, or differences between development and deployment populations. In healthcare, these biases can produce unequal model performance and may worsen existing disparities. Empirical and conceptual research therefore recommends evaluating bias not only as a technical error but also in relation to its practical, epistemic, and normative consequences for patients and professionals (19).

Bias can also emerge when AI systems are transferred across populations or settings that differ from the data used for development. Public-health research demonstrates that inadequate attention to population representation and contextual factors can distort AI-supported surveillance and decision-making (20). These concerns are especially important in low- and middle-income settings, where contextual bias can undermine the potential of medical AI to democratize access to healthcare (21).

Fair AI in healthcare therefore requires representative data, context-sensitive validation, transparent evaluation, and continuous monitoring across demographic and clinical groups. Algorithmic fairness should be assessed in relation to the intended clinical purpose and the distribution of benefits and harms, rather than being reduced to a single mathematical metric (11).

Informed Consent for Medical Procedures

Informed consent is central to respecting patient autonomy when AI systems process personal health information or influence clinical decisions. Patients should be informed about the role of AI, relevant risks and limitations, the

intended use of their data, and the degree of clinician oversight. Recent legal and ethical analysis shows that AI challenges conventional consent because complex or adaptive systems may make it difficult to explain future data uses and decision processes in advance (13).

Transparency is closely connected to meaningful consent. Patients need information that is understandable enough to support genuine decision-making, while clinicians need sufficient knowledge of AI limitations to communicate uncertainty responsibly. Explainability can therefore support informed consent, clinical justification, and the ability to question or contest AI-supported recommendations (16).

Regulatory approaches to healthcare AI increasingly emphasize privacy, patient autonomy, safety, accountability, and human oversight. Rather than relying only on general technology rules, healthcare-specific governance should align legal obligations with clinical ethics and quality requirements (14). Translating these principles into operational standards across development, deployment, and monitoring is essential for safe and fair use (17).

Conclusion:

Cumulatively, the findings underscore that while AI integration into healthcare offers substantial transformative benefits, it also raises multidimensional ethical challenges. The most important concerns include privacy and security of sensitive patient data, transparency and accountability in AI-assisted decisions, and the mitigation of algorithmic bias and unfairness. Recent ethical and legal scholarship similarly emphasizes that innovation must be accompanied by policies that protect safety, fairness, autonomy, and public trust (22).

Based on this evidence, proactive initiatives are required to support responsible AI integration into healthcare. Organizations should establish adaptive governance, explicit minimum standards, clearly allocated responsibilities, and mechanisms for continuous evaluation of AI systems. Trustworthy implementation also requires ethical principles to be embedded throughout design, validation, deployment, and post-deployment monitoring (23). Because AI can generate both high rewards and high risks, robust ethical and legal oversight is necessary to ensure that innovation remains aligned with patient welfare and the integrity of healthcare systems (24).

References:

1. Alowais SA. Revolutionizing healthcare: the role of artificial intelligence in clinical practice [Internet]. Vol. 23, BMC Medical Education. 2023. Available from: <https://api.elsevier.com/content/article/eid/1-s2.0-S1472692023004303>
2. Esmaeilzadeh P. Challenges and strategies for wide-scale artificial intelligence (AI) deployment in healthcare practices: A perspective for healthcare organizations. *Artif Intell Med* [Internet]. 2024;151. Available from: <https://api.elsevier.com/content/article/eid/1-s2.0-S0933365724001039>
3. Elendu C. Ethical implications of AI and robotics in healthcare: A review [Internet]. Vol. 102, *Medicine United States*. 2023. Available from: <https://api.elsevier.com/content/article/eid/1-s2.0-S0025797421005285>
4. Khan MM. Towards secure and trusted AI in healthcare: A systematic review of emerging innovations and ethical challenges [Internet]. Vol. 195, *International Journal of Medical Informatics*. 2025. Available from: <https://api.elsevier.com/content/article/eid/1-s2.0-S138650562400443X>
5. Zhang J. Ethics and governance of trustworthy medical artificial intelligence. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak* [Internet]. 2023;23(1). Available from: <https://api.elsevier.com/content/article/eid/1-s2.0-S1472694723001747>
6. Mittal S. On responsible machine learning datasets emphasizing fairness, privacy and regulatory norms with examples in biometrics and healthcare. *Nat Mach Intell* [Internet]. 2024;6(8):936–49. Available from: <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?partnerID=HzOxMe3b&scp=85201289171&origin=inward>
7. Chauhan A. Evaluating trustworthiness in AI-Based diabetic retinopathy screening: addressing transparency, consent, and privacy challenges. *BMC Med Ethics* [Internet]. 2025;26(1). Available from: <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?partnerID=HzOxMe3b&scp=105019113702&origin=inward>

8. Naik N. Legal and Ethical Consideration in Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare: Who Takes Responsibility? *Front Surg* [Internet]. 2022;9. Available from: <https://api.elsevier.com/content/article/eid/1-s2.0-S2296875X22001765>
9. Kiseleva A. Transparency of AI in Healthcare as a Multilayered System of Accountabilities: Between Legal Requirements and Technical Limitations [Internet]. Vol. 5, *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*. 2022. Available from: <https://api.elsevier.com/content/article/eid/1-s2.0-S2624821222001016>
10. Nouis SCE. Evaluating accountability, transparency, and bias in AI-assisted healthcare decision- making: a qualitative study of healthcare professionals' perspectives in the UK. *BMC Med Ethics* [Internet]. 2025;26(1). Available from: <https://api.elsevier.com/content/article/eid/1-s2.0-S1472693925000014>
11. Chen RJ. Algorithmic fairness in artificial intelligence for medicine and healthcare. *Nat Biomed Eng* [Internet]. 2023;7(6):719–42. Available from: <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?partnerID=HzOxMe3b&scp=85163638540&origin=inward>
12. Giovanola B. Beyond bias and discrimination: redefining the AI ethics principle of fairness in healthcare machine-learning algorithms. *AI Soc* [Internet]. 2023;38(2):549–63. Available from: <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?partnerID=HzOxMe3b&scp=85130223028&origin=inward>
13. Wang Y. Ethical and legal challenges of medical AI on informed consent: China as an example. *Dev World Bioeth* [Internet]. 2025;25(1):46–54. Available from: <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?partnerID=HzOxMe3b&scp=85190860549&origin=inward>
14. Chau M. Ethical, legal, and regulatory landscape of artificial intelligence in Australian healthcare and ethical integration in radiography: A narrative review [Internet]. Vol. 55, *Journal of Medical Imaging and Radiation Sciences*. 2024. Available from: <https://api.elsevier.com/content/article/eid/1-s2.0-S1939865424004648>
15. Micco F De. Robotics and AI into healthcare from the perspective of European regulation: who is responsible for medical malpractice? *Front Med* [Internet]. 2024;11. Available from: <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?partnerID=HzOxMe3b&scp=85204704632&origin=inward>
16. Blackman J. On the practical, ethical, and legal necessity of clinical Artificial Intelligence explainability: an examination of key arguments. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak* [Internet]. 2025;25(1). Available from: <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?partnerID=HzOxMe3b&scp=86000107227&origin=inward>
17. Economou-Zavlanos NJ. Translating ethical and quality principles for the effective, safe and fair development, deployment and use of artificial intelligence technologies in healthcare. *J Am Med Informatics Assoc* [Internet]. 2024;31(3):705–13. Available from: <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?partnerID=HzOxMe3b&scp=85185342697&origin=inward>
18. Boudierhem R. Shaping the future of AI in healthcare through ethics and governance. *Humanit Soc Sci Commun* [Internet]. 2024;11(1). Available from: <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?partnerID=HzOxMe3b&scp=85187899065&origin=inward>
19. Aquino YSJ. Practical, epistemic and normative implications of algorithmic bias in healthcare artificial intelligence: A qualitative study of multidisciplinary expert perspectives. *J Med Ethics* [Internet]. 2025;51(6):420–8. Available from: <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?partnerID=HzOxMe3b&scp=85152709771&origin=inward>
20. Flores L. Addressing bias in artificial intelligence for public health surveillance. *J Med Ethics* [Internet]. 2023;50(3):190–4. Available from: <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?partnerID=HzOxMe3b&scp=85159161897&origin=inward>
21. Weissglass DE. Contextual bias, the democratization of healthcare, and medical artificial intelligence in low- and middle-income countries. *Bioethics* [Internet]. 2022;36(2):201–9. Available from: <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?partnerID=HzOxMe3b&scp=85113823239&origin=inward>
22. Pham T. Ethical and legal considerations in healthcare AI: Innovation and policy for safe and fair use [Internet]. Vol. 12, *Royal Society Open Science*. 2025. Available from: <https://api.elsevier.com/content/article/eid/1-s2.0-S2054570324002728>
23. Goktas P. Shaping the Future of Healthcare: Ethical Clinical Challenges and Pathways to Trustworthy AI. *J Clin Med* [Internet]. 2025;14(5). Available from: <https://api.elsevier.com/content/article/eid/1-s2.0-S2077038325011488>
24. Corfmatt M. High-reward, high-risk technologies? An ethical and legal account of AI development in healthcare [Internet]. Vol. 26, *BMC Medical Ethics*. 2025. Available from:

<https://api.elsevier.com/content/article/eid/1-s2.0-S1472693924001414>