International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering Hub (IRJAEH)
e ISSN: 2584-2137
Vol. 04 Issue: 08 August 2026
Page No: 5279 - 5284
https://irjaeh.com
https://doi.org/10.47392/IRJAEH.2026.0690

Siliconvs. Stethoscopes: Why Healthcareis Resistingthe Ai Revolution

Satya Prakash Behera[1], Manjuta Khadia[2], Sanatan Pujari[3], Satwik Kumar Mohanty[4]
[1,3,4]UG Scholar – Computer Science & Engineering, Radhakrishna Institute of Technology and Engineering, Odisha, Khordha
[2]Assistant Professor, Dept. of Computer Science & Engineering, Radhakrishna Institute of Technology & Engineering, Khordha, Odisha
Emails: *the.satyabehera@gmail.com[1], sanatan162kumar@gmail.com[2], mohantysanjay7165@gmail.com[3], kamalakanta_cse@riteindia.edu.in[4]*

Abstract
The present study attempts to assess if modern artificial intelligence (AI), consisting of CNNs in medical imaging and LLMs in language processing, would replace the physicians in the near future and find the most significant barriers to this process. The narrative review of the scientific literature about AI performance and reproducibility in medical imaging, LLM's competence in assessing medical knowledge and communicating with patients, lack of generalization beyond the distribution, lack of physical examination and sensory input, and the existing regulatory and legal environment, especially the one in the European Union is performed. AI is highly accurate and reproducible in narrowly defined tasks of image interpretation, lesion measurement, triage, documentation assistance, and written communication. These abilities diminish the interobserver variation and improve the workflow efficiency. Physicians are here to stay, and that is for a reason. While the AI is impressively accurate in many tasks, it fails miserably the moment the case is out of the training set distribution, cannot do physical examination and surgery, and still invents some answers with full confidence. Apart from technical problems, the most significant issue here is the one of accountability: who will be sued once an algorithm makes a wrong decision? For a foreseeable future, the AI will remain a valuable assistant, but never a physician. It will be able to handle repetitive and well-defined tasks in the background, but the high-stakes part of medicine – physical examination, complex ethical decisions, bedside care, and overall legal responsibility – will remain a doctor's duty.

Keywords: *AI, Medicine, Radiology, Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare, Medical AI Ethics / Bioethics, Augmented Intelligence*

1. Introduction
Medicine is witnessing a huge revolution due to the evolution of artificial intelligence, shifting away from the back office record-keeping system to an active diagnostic support tool. Specialized algorithms in image-rich disciplines such as radiology, pathology, and ophthalmology often outmatch specialists on specialized metrics. On the other hand, language models are showing promising results in summarizing patient records, generating clinical documentation, and triaging patients' inquiries. But what is happening in practice does not seem to change the landscape radically overnight. Rather, health organizations find themselves facing serious problems – the "Silicon vs. Stethoscopes" struggle, caused by some fundamental limitations of machine learning:

- Absence of hands and senses: An algorithm cannot examine the abdomen and auscultate lungs or perceive physical sensations that a doctor is immediately able to catch in the clinic.
- Limited scope: While AI is good at solving single problems, it is bad at interdisciplinary reasoning, dealing with rare situations that fall outside of its training data and personal aspects of medicine.
- Brittle and error-prone: Models may malfunction when encountering novel clinical environments and still be highly confident of hallucinated facts.
- No accountability: An algorithm lacks any form of moral agency, and cannot agonize

International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering Hub (IRJAEH)
e ISSN: 2584-2137
Vol. 04 Issue: 08 August 2026
Page No: 5279 - 5284
https://irjaeh.com
https://doi.org/10.47392/IRJAEH.2026.0690

over ethical decisions, nor sign off on liability for malpractice in a dire decision[16].

Until such issues are sorted out, this technology is simply an auxiliary, not a replacement of the human clinician on the scene.

Table 1 AI-Driven Medical Diagnosis and Visualization

In other words, the development path of clinical artificial intelligence needs to be redirected from that of autonomy to augmentation, with the use of computation to augment clinician capability. But current practices of implementing AI technology often view clinician and patient resistance as an irrational impediment that has to be overcome. This paper contends that clinical resistance serves as a vital circuit breaker against algorithmic malfunctioning, automation bias, and performance degradation.

2. Multi-Theoretical Taxonomy of Healthcare Resistance

To analyze the factors that contribute to AI resistance, this paper draws on five well-known theoretical models to construct a multi-level taxonomy of operational, clinician-focused, patient-focused, and safety-centered perspectives As shown in Table 1 Theoritical Model and Key source[1- 10].

Table 1 Theoritical Model and Key source

Theoretical Model & Key Source	Core Identified Resistance Barriers
Epistemic Boundaries (Behera et al., 2025)	Inability to conduct physical examinations; lack of multi-organ contextual reasoning; distributional shift; LLM hallucinations; non-delegable fiduciary accountability.
Implementation Lifecycle (Nair et al., 2024)	Operational fragmentation across planning, deployment, and sustaining phases; non-interoperable EHR systems; absence of formal de-implementation protocols.
UTAUT Acceptance Model (Lambert et al., 2023)	Severe alert fatigue; high effort expectancy caused by awkward user interfaces; threats to clinical discretion; statutory liability ambiguity.
Systemic Risk Taxonomy (Ahmed et al., 2023)	Automation bias; dataset brittleness; lack of prospective clinical trial validation; demographic and selection disparities in training cohorts.
Innovation Resistance (IRT) (Sobaih et al., 2025)	Patient-centered resistance: Need for Personal Contact ($\beta = 0.515$), Perceived Technological Dependence ($\beta = 0.620$).

2.1.Clinical-Centric Resistance Dynamics

Resistance among clinicians can be examined through both intrinsic and extrinsic factors: Intrinsic Motives (Identity Threat and Technostress): Medical training cultivates a strong professional identity centered around diagnostic capabilities, clinical judgment, and personal ethics The use of "black box" algorithms that physicians cannot understand often seems more like an imposition than assistance, leading to substantial technostress and exhausting doctors in a number of ways: Overload and Intrusion: Constant information overload and interruptions via electronic devices. Complexity and Uncertainty: Difficult-to-navigate interfaces combined with regular updates. Insecurity: Worry about losing clinical intuition skills (cognitive deskilling) or losing

International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering Hub (IRJAEH)
e ISSN: 2584-2137
Vol. 04 Issue: 08 August 2026
Page No: 5279 - 5284
https://irjaeh.com
https://doi.org/10.47392/IRJAEH.2026.0690

their job completely. They are frustrated with alert fatigue, which leads to false-positive notifications, and with liability for medical errors because, regardless of whether they agree or disagree with the advice of algorithms, the doctors remain liable in court. Therefore, many doctors prefer to avoid the technology. The resistance of the physicians has a common pattern: Skepticism: Skepticism about claims and need for scientific evidence. Reluctance: Inability to change existing workflows. Anxiety: Getting worried about errors in software, misdiagnoses, and patient safety. Resistance: Avoiding the usage of the tool by consciously clicking away from it or refusing to use it altogether.

2.2.Patient-Centric resistance Dynamicstype Equation Here

The reluctance of patients to accept AI technology in medicine can be explained by the four major psychological reasons: The desire for human touch: Patients appreciate warmth, empathy, and comfort. It may seem like algorithms are heartless and soulless when a person needs some support the most. The fear of becoming dependent on the doctor: That's usually the reason why people tend to be resistant to technology. General skepticism about AI: Built upon a profound distrust created by the marketing ploys and genuine concerns about privacy from the technological industries. The "I'm not a statistic" effect (Uniqueness Neglect): The unnerving realization that the algorithm is simply categorizing the patient based on statistical norms, ignoring everything that makes him unique, both biologically and psychologically.

3. The Novelresearch Contribution: The Dynamic Epistemic Gatekeeping and Algorithmic Circuit-Breaker (De-Gacb) Framework

The Results will include the reasoning behind, or the design of, the experiment as well as the outcomes. The Results will include the reasoning behind, or the design of, the experiment as well as the outcomes. Results may be presented using figures, tables, and prose.

3.1.Resolvingtheconceptual Void

The Prior literature examines the implementation of AI as a linear process of adoption, whereby user resistance should be managed using change management, leadership motivators, or digital education. There are two basic fallacies involved in this approach:

- It fails to account for the beneficial aspect of physician skepticism.
- It fails to provide dynamic interfaces that can facilitate dynamic management of algorithm autonomy in light of uncertainty, as well as protocols for systematic model de-implementation[11 – 15].

In order to address these issues, the present paper outlines the Dynamic Epistemic Gatekeeping and Algorithmic Circuit-Breaker (DE-GACB) Framework. In the model, human intervention is not simply a vague override mechanism, but a computational gatekeeping infrastructure in line with Article 14 of the EU Artificial Intelligence Act.

3.2. Operational Architecture of De-Gacb

The DE-GACB model functions via two concurrent tiers:

Tier 1: Micro-Level Epistemic Gatekeeping (Point-of-Care Control): Quantitative uncertainty limits are incorporated within the clinical interface. If the AI encounters out-of-distribution data, artifacts in the sensors, or more complex presentations involving multiple systems, the interface automatically disables the generation of diagnostics. The system shifts from being autonomous to one of inquiry, providing confidence intervals, feature contribution maps, and the boundaries of its operation. The clinician is required to enter epistemic justification before performing any actions and leaving an auditable record[16].

Tier 2: Macro-Level Algorithmic Circuit Breaking (Organizational De-Implementation): Adapts clinical de-implementation methodologies—such as the Vanderbilt Clickbusters initiative and continuous Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) quality improvement cycles—into automated governance protocols. If continuous surveillance detects performance drift, sustained alert override rates (>80%), or disparate error parity across demographic subgroups, the institutional circuit breaker decouples the AI model from the EHR infrastructure, safely reverting the clinical service to standard human baseline protocols without disrupting care delivery.

3.3. Mathematical Formulation

International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering Hub (IRJAEH)
e ISSN: 2584-2137
Vol. 04 Issue: 08 August 2026
Page No: 5279 - 5284
https://irjaeh.com
https://doi.org/10.47392/IRJAEH.2026.0690

The Dynamic Epistemic Gatekeeper computes a real-time Risk Cost Function (R_C) for every inference:

$$R_C = w_1 \cdot \mathcal{H}(Y \mid X) + w_2 \cdot D_{\mathrm{KL}}$$
$$\left(P_{\mathrm{deploy}}(X) \parallel P_{\mathrm{train}}(X)\right) + w_3 \cdot (1 - \Lambda_{\mathrm{lit}})$$

Where:

- $\mathcal{H}(Y \mid X) = -\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} P(y \mid X) \log P(y \mid X)$ denotes the predictive entropy of the model output Y given input vector X, measuring epistemic and aleatoric uncertainty.
- $D_{\mathrm{KL}}\left(P_{\mathrm{deploy}}(X) \parallel P_{\mathrm{train}}(X)\right)$
  $= \int P_{\mathrm{deploy}}(x) \log\left(\frac{P_{\mathrm{deploy}}(x)}{P_{\mathrm{train}}(x)}\right) dx$
  represents the Kullback-Leibler divergence between real-time deployment data distributions and baseline training distributions, quantifying distributional shift.
- $\Lambda_{\mathrm{lit}} \in [0,1]$ represents the validated AI literacy and domain competency score of the operating clinician, directly addressing deployer education obligations under Article 4 and Article 14 of the EU AI Act.
- w_1, w_2, w_3 are normalized weighting vectors ($\sum w_i = 1$) calibrated to the clinical acuity of the medical domain.

When $R_C \geq \tau_{\mathrm{threshold}}$, the algorithmic circuit breaker activates automatically, downgrading system autonomy and mandating clinician verification.

4. Implementation Blueprint, Governance, And Regulatory Architecture

Implementing the DE-GACB framework in routine clinical practice can be accomplished via the following roadmap:

4.1.Phase 1: Getting ready and dialed in (PreImplementation)

All systems must be validated by rigorous evaluation of the AI system against diverse patient groups within the local healthcare setting prior to going live to ensure that the AI performs optimally in the real-world patient group it aims to serve. Performance standards will be set, and staff will be trained accordingly to make sure everyone knows about the capabilities, limitations, and regulations related to the tool.

4.2.Phase 2: Seamless clinic rollout (Workflow Deployment)

The AI system is integrated seamlessly into the existing Electronic Health Records System with proper use of interoperability principles so that there is no need for extra login credentials. Notifications will be non-disruptive, and confidence scores and model summary sheets will be included in the recommendation system so that doctors can immediately identify the reliability of the output.

4.3.Phase 3: Active Epistemic Oversight

Inferences are dynamically gated via real-time calculation of the Risk Cost Function (R_C). High-uncertainty predictions trigger forced clinician rationale logging to prevent automation bias.

4.4.Phase 4: Continuous Auditing and Systematic De-Implementation

Continuous Auditing and Systematic De-Implementation: Multidisciplinary governance boards will review the override frequency, demographic calibration parity, and near miss incidents monthly, triggering algorithmic circuit breakers or total model de-implementation in case of degraded efficacy.

4.5.Resolving The Conceptual Void

DE-GACB Architecture fulfills the regulatory requirements of the EU AI Act as follows:

- Article 4 (AI Literacy): Mandates a structured program of competency training for all staff using AI systems.
- Article 14 (Human Oversight): High-risk clinical AI must include inherent interface controls for the human operator to monitor the function, avoid automation bias, and halt system activity at will in real time.
- Article 26 (Deployer Requirements & Auditability): Healthcare organizations must retain permanent and tamper-proof records of algorithm predictions and physician override activities for at least six months to ensure incidents are analyzed and reviewed.

5. Methodological Structural Limitations

In order to preserve the scientific integrity of this research, the following five key limitations to the methodology and structure are identified:

International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering Hub (IRJAEH)
e ISSN: 2584-2137
Vol. 04 Issue: 08 August 2026
Page No: 5279 - 5284
https://irjaeh.com
https://doi.org/10.47392/IRJAEH.2026.0690

Institutional and Demographic Generalizability:The framework is based mainly on data from prominent academic medical centers and specialty hospitals. Prior to its wide acceptance, it needs to be validated in terms of practicality by applying it in poorly resourced community and rural clinics, and different types of healthcare financing schemes.

- Computational Overhead and Telemetry Latency:Performing ongoing mathematical operations using the large amount of data (e.g., real-time ICU patient monitoring or high resolution images) takes substantial computational resources locally. In facilities with limited IT resources, potential delays may impede timely emergency treatment.
- De-Implementation and Unlearning Gaps:
  Despite the similarities between the de-implementation processes and the standard behavioral frameworks such as COM-B and PDSA, there is no empirical investigation on how clinicians react when a particular AI technology is de-implemented. It will be necessary to conduct long-term investigations to measure transitional problems, especially rebound effects due to reliance.
  International Regulatory Fragmentation:
  It is because the DE-GACB framework relies mainly on the EU AI Act. It is necessary to recalibrate DE-GACB in order to meet the statutory requirements of the US FDA medical device regulations as well as Asian countries' laws.

Conclusion & Future Research Direction

In integrating AI technology in medicine, one should transcend the Silicon vs. Stethoscopes approach. Criticism from clinicians and patients cannot serve as a barrier but as an important source of feedback for improving the reliability of the AI models, their compatibility with workflows, their accountability, and bedside manner.This is where the Dynamic Epistemic Gatekeeping and Algorithmic Circuit-Breaker framework comes into play:

- Delegated authority over the AI algorithm can be overridden by clinicians at any time.
- Human intervention continues to protect patients from the overgeneralization of algorithms and from losing personal relationships with caregivers.
- Healthcare organizations will have a tool that will allow them to have an ongoing monitoring system and be able to safely de-implement models of lower quality.
- Future research needs to pay attention to conducting multi-center randomized trials to test the clinical and economic results, developing interfaces to make the decision-making process less cognitive during uncertainty, and developing international regulations for clinician-governed AI.

References

[1]. Nair M, Svedberg P, Larsson I, Nygren JM. A comprehensive overview of barriers and strategies for AI implementation in healthcare: mixed-method design. Plos one. 2024 Aug 9;19(8):e0305949.
[2]. Lambert SI, Madi M, Sopka S, Lenes A, Stange H, Buszello CP, Stephan A. An integrative review on the acceptance of artificial intelligence among healthcare professionals in hospitals. NPJ Digital Medicine. 2023 Jun 10;6(1):111.
[3]. N Arvai, G Katonai, B Mesko. Healthcare professionals' worries and psychological barriers to the successful implementation of AI in medicine: Scoping Review. Journal of Medical Internet Research. 2025 April 23;27:e66986
[4]. Sobaih AE, Chaibi A, Brini R, Ibrahim TM Abdelghani. Breaking Patient Resistance to AI in Medicine through Psychological Perspectives. European Journal of Investigation in Health, Psychology and Education. 2025 January 8;15(1):6
[5]. Ahmed MI, Spooner B, Isherwood J, Lane M, Orrock E, Dennison A. Barriers to the Implementation of Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare: A Systematic Review. Cureus. 2023 October 4;15(10).
[6]. Sendak MP, Ratliff W, Sarro D, Alderton E, Futoma J, Gao M, Nichols M, Revoir M, Yashar F, Miller C, Kester K. Real-world

International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering Hub (IRJAEH)
e ISSN: 2584-2137
Vol. 04 Issue: 08 August 2026
Page No: 5279 - 5284
https://irjaeh.com
https://doi.org/10.47392/IRJAEH.2026.0690

integration of a sepsis deep learning technology into routine clinical care: implementation study. JMIR medical informatics. 2020 Jul 15;8(7):e15182.

[7]. Dunsmore J, Duncan E, MacLennan S, N'Dow J, MacLennan S. Effectiveness of de-implementation strategies for low-value prescribing in secondary care: a systematic review. Implementation Science Communications. 2023 Sep 18;4(1):115.

[8]. Challen R, Denny J, Pitt M, Gompels L, Edwards T, Tsaneva-Atanasova K. Artificial intelligence, bias and clinical safety. BMJ quality & safety. 2019 Mar;28(3):231-7.

[9]. Aboy M, Minssen T, Vayena E. Navigating the EU AI Act: implications for regulated digital medical products. NPJ Digital Medicine. 2024 Sep 6;7(1):237.

[10]. Union E. Artificial intelligence act. European Parliament: European Parliamentary Research Service. 2024 Jun;1689:2024.

[11]. Reddy S, Allan S, Coghlan S, Cooper P. A governance model for the application of AI in health care. Journal of the American medical informatics association. 2020 Mar;27(3):491-7.

[12]. Longoni C, Bonezzi A, Morewedge CK. Resistance to medical artificial intelligence. Journal of consumer research. 2019 Dec 1;46(4):629-50.

[13]. Jussupow E, Spohrer K, Heinzl A. Identity threats as a reason for resistance to artificial intelligence: survey study with medical students and professionals. JMIR formative research. 2022 Mar 23;6(3):e28750.

[14]. Coiera, E. (2019). The last mile: where artificial intelligence meets reality. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 21(11), e16323.

[15]. Dunsmore, J., Duncan, E., & MacLennan, S. (2024). Effectiveness of de-implementation of low-value healthcare practices: An overview of systematic reviews. Implementation Science, 19(1), 56.

[16]. Aboy, M., Minssen, T., &Vayena, E. (2024). Navigating the EU AI Act: implications for regulated digital medical products. npj Digital Medicine, 7(1), 237.