

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<u>http://bmjopen.bmj.com</u>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email <u>info.bmjopen@bmj.com</u>

BMJ Open

Experiences of using Artificial Intelligence (AI) in healthcare: a qualitative study of clinician and key stakeholder perspectives

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2023-076950
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	21-Jun-2023
Complete List of Authors:	Fazakarley, C.A.; Ultromics Ltd Breen, Maria; University of Reading, School of Psychology & Clinical Language Sciences ; Breen Clinical Research Leeson, Paul; University of Oxford, Division of Cardiovascular Medicine Thompson, Ben; Ultromics Ltd Williamson, Victoria; King's College London,
Keywords:	Clinical Decision-Making, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT





I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

terez oni

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies



Protected by copyright, including for uses related

Experiences of using Artificial Intelligence (AI) in healthcare: a qualitative study of clinician and

key stakeholder perspectives

Fazakarley, C.A.^a, Breen, M.^b, Leeson, P^d., Thompson, B.^a, Williamson, V.^{c, B^a}

^aUltromics Ltd, Cascade Way, Oxford Business Park, Oxford OX4 2SU

^b Breen Clinical Research, 70 Holland St, SE1 9NX

King's Centre for Military Health Research, King's College London, London, SE5 9RJ

^D RDM Division of Cardiovascular Medicine, University of Oxford, Oxford. OX3 9DU

^E Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust, United Kingdom

* Correspondence: Dr Victoria Williamson, King's College London, London SE5 9RJ, Victoria.williamson@kcl.ac.uk

Conflicts of interest: PL is a founder and shareholder of Ultromics Ltd and is an inventor on patents in the field of AI and healthcare.

Word count: 4928

Ethical approval: Ethical approval was received for this study from the University of Oxford Medical Sciences Interdivisional Research Ethics Committee (R77627/RE001); HRA and Health and Care Research Wales (HCRW) (21/NW/0199) and the NHS North West - Preston Research Ethics Committee (21/NW/0199).

Funding: Funding for this research was provided by National Institute for Health and Care Research (AI in Healthcare Award, Grant Number AI AWARD01833).

1	
2	
3	Data availability: Data are available from corresponding author on reasonable request
4	Dura a valuo integre Data al o a valuo to mont controspontante a autor on reasonable request.
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
10	
17	
12	
15	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
30	
40	
40	
41	
42 12	
45 AA	
44 15	
45	
40	
4/	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Abstract

Objectives: Artificial intelligence (AI) is a rapidly developing field in healthcare, with tools being developed across various specialties to support healthcare professionals and reduce workloads. It is important to understand the experience of healthcare professionals to ensure future AI tools are acceptable and effectively implemented. The aim of this study was to gain an in-depth understanding of the experience and perception of UK healthcare workers and other key stakeholders about the use of AI in the National Health Service (NHS).

Design: A qualitative study using semi-structured interviews conducted remotely via MS Teams. Thematic analysis was carried out.

Setting: NHS and UK higher education institutes.

Participants: Thirteen participants were recruited, including clinical and non-clinical participants working for the NHS and researchers working to develop AI tools for healthcare settings.

Results: Four core themes were identified: positive perceptions of AI, potential barriers to using AI in healthcare, concerns regarding AI use, and steps needed to ensure the acceptability of future AI tools. Overall, we found that those working in healthcare were generally open to the use of AI and expected it to have many benefits for patients and facilitate access to care. However, concerns were raised regarding the security of patient data, the potential for misdiagnosis and that AI could increase the burden on already strained healthcare staff.

Conclusion: This study found that healthcare staff are willing to engage with AI research and incorporate AI tools into care pathways. Going forwards, the NHS and AI developers will need to collaborate closely to ensure that future tools are suitable for their intended use and do not negatively impact workloads or patient trust. Future AI studies should continue to incorporate the views of key stakeholders to improve tool acceptability.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence, healthcare, AI, clinician, qualitative

tor beer terien only

Strengths and limitations

- Using qualitative interviews allowed for an in-depth understanding of a range of participants' experiences, perceptions, and concerns of using AI tools in healthcare settings.
- Including a range of both clinical and non-clinical participants' views yielded several transferable • learning points that may be applicable to future studies aiming to implement AI tools into patient care pathways.
- Future studies which include the views of other key stakeholders, such as information governance staff, and patients are needed to better understand perceptions of AI tool acceptability.

Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) is a rapidly evolving field within the healthcare sector. At this time, AI tools are being developed across specialities with the broad aim of assisting healthcare professionals deliver safe and effective care [1]. As healthcare workloads continue to increase, it is hoped that AI tools will be able to relieve some of the strain experienced by clinicians, nurses and other allied health professionals [1,2]. There is growing evidence to suggest that AI tools have a variety of applications, such as assisting diagnoses [3,4] and patient management [5] with many studies reporting improved outcomes for patients and improved efficiency in healthcare workflows [2].

As the amount of AI utilised in healthcare continues to increase, there is a need to understand how these tools are impacting those who interact with them both within a patient care and research setting, to improve the development and implementation of this technology. There is a developing area of research exploring the experiences of stakeholders across the healthcare sector, with some studies reporting the health professionals are open to the use of AI tools in patient care and expect that they will relieve workloads, improve efficiency and overall patient experience [6,7]. Previous studies have also documented concerns about AI implementation relating to data protection, lack of empathic care and the reducing job numbers in certain specialities such as radiology [8,9]. However, much of this research is quantitative in nature, utilising methods such as surveys with predetermined responses, which are unable to provide the in-depth understanding needed regarding participants feelings, beliefs and perceptions of AI tools in healthcare. Therefore, it is important to conduct qualitative research in this area to allow participants to express their thoughts in their own words, providing additional detail and nuance that would otherwise be missed by quantitative methods [10,11]

A study currently being conducted within the National Health Service (NHS) at this time is PROTEUS, a prospective randomised controlled trial evaluating the use of AI in stress echocardiography [12]. The aim of this research is to investigate the use of 'EchoGo Pro', an AI tool designed to assist in the diagnosis of

Page 8 of 28

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

coronary artery disease (CAD). PROTEUS involves twenty NHS sites across England, recruiting thousands of patients and involving professionals across the healthcare sector to implement this tool. As part of this trial, we aimed to qualitatively explore the experiences of the healthcare professionals and other key stakeholders to gain a detailed understanding of how trials of AI tools in the NHS are experienced, their perceptions of implementing AI tools in NHS healthcare settings, and how AI tools can impact those involved. We sought to understand the potential barriers preventing the adoption of AI tools into NHS settings, and the facilitators that make these tools attractive, well integrated and as effective as possible in these contexts.

Methods

Ethical approval

Ethical approval was received for this study from the University of Oxford Medical Sciences Interdivisional Research Ethics Committee (R77627/RE001); HRA and Health and Care Research Wales (HCRW) (21/NW/0199) and the NHS North West - Preston Research Ethics Committee (21/NW/0199).

Recruitment

This qualitative study is nested in a larger study examining the effectiveness of an AI tool – the EchoGo Pro – which is a tool used to improve the accuracy in diagnosing cardiovascular health problems [12]. The processes and procedures of this investigation are detailed in Woodward et al [12].

Between December 2021 and September 2022, 13 participants were recruited to this qualitative sub-study. This sub-study was experiential in focus, and because previous research has shown that the experiences, beliefs and perceptions of using AI tools in healthcare are under-researched (Fazakarley, et al., under review), we prioritised sample specificity when deciding the 'informational power' [13] of our sampling strategy. We aimed to include in-depth insights, rather than a broader range of views, from a

specific sample of healthcare staff and other stakeholders who had experience in their role of working with AI tools in NHS healthcare settings to address our research aim.

Participants were initially recruited from the NHS Trust sites involved in the PROTEUS study [12]. Each NHS site provided the contact details of at least one clinical and one non-clinical member of staff involved in the EchoGo Pro research, and sites were also asked to circulate study information to staff and invite any interested individuals to contact the study researcher (CAF) to participate. Due to the low response rate and limited capacity of the healthcare staff to be available for interviews during the COVID-19 Pandemic, our recruitment approach was expanded to include professionals who were not directly involved in the PROTEUS study in the NHS but had experience of using AI in a healthcare context. Participants were recruited by sharing study information via research team mailing lists, contacting leading UK researchers who published healthcare AI studies in academic journals (identified via a scoping review of the literature) (Fazakarley, et al., under review), and via a snowballing method where all participants were asked to share the study with other colleagues who may be interested in participating.

Eligible participants had to be aged 18 years or more, based in the UK, English speaking and willing to provide informed consent. Participants were eligible to participate if they had experience of using AI tools in a healthcare setting in a clinical role (e.g. doctor, nurse) or experience in evaluating, setting up or delivering an AI tool in a healthcare context (e.g. information technology (IT) expert, researcher). No limitation on eligibility was imposed according to demographic characteristics (e.g. gender, age, etc.) or professional grade, rank or qualification (e.g. PhD, consultant, etc.). The aim of this inclusive strategy was to ensure we collected rich data from a range of participants with diverse knowledge and experience of AI in NHS healthcare settings. We use the term 'professionals' throughout to refer to both clinical and non-clinical participants for clarity. Individuals were screened for eligibility in line with study inclusion/exclusion criteria by a study researcher (CAF) prior to participants. Verbal informed consent for participation in the interviews was taken from all participants and audio-recorded.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

In total, 42 individuals were invited to participate, each of which was contacted three times to arrange a time to conduct the interview. If no response was received after the third attempt, the individual was assumed to be no longer willing to participate and the research team destroyed their contact details (n=21). Eight participants declined to participate due to lack of time/capacity to be interviewed. No participants withdrew during or after providing informed consent.

Assessment

Interviews were carried out by CAF (a female researcher with training in qualitative methods), oneto-one by MS Teams. Interviews lasted on average 30 minutes (range 19-39 minutes). Prior to data collection, the interview schedule was piloted with a clinical and non-clinical professional to ensure the interview questions were sensitive and appropriate. The pilot interviews were not audio-recorded, and the data were not included in the analysis. The interview schedule (Supplementary Material 1) focused on professional's experience of using AI in the National Health Service (NHS), their perceptions of barriers and facilitators to adopting AI in NHS healthcare settings; views about barriers and facilitators to conducting AI research in NHS healthcare settings; beliefs about the potential impact of using AI tools on patient care, clinician workloads and the NHS more broadly; and perceptions about the possible benefits and risks of using AI in patient care. Interview questions were open ended and encouraged participants to describe their views and lived experiences in their own words. Interviews were transcribed verbatim by CAF with any personally identifying information removed on transcription. Audio-recordings were destroyed following transcription. Participants were also asked to provide basic demographic information.

Analysis

We used Taguette (https://www.taguette.org/) to facilitate data analysis. Data were analysed by CAF & VW using Thematic Analysis [11]. An inductive analytic approach was used, and the steps recommended by Braun & Clarke [11] were followed. Namely, the transcripts were read and re-read

BMJ Open

several times to improve familiarity with the dataset and initial codes were generated. We then searched for and generated early themes which were revisited and revised to create core themes. Data collection and analysis took place simultaneously which allowed developing topics of interest to be investigated in later interviews and to ascertain whether thematic saturation had occurred. Constant comparison was used while creating codes and themes, with each new transcript compared to the existing dataset to identify unexpected themes. Regular peer debriefing meetings were held, where early codes and themes were reviewed and discussed and further refined where needed [14]. A reflexive journal was kept by both researchers (CAF & VW) to ensure reflexivity by noting the influence of their own existing beliefs and experiences to prevent premature or biased interpretation of the data.

Patient and public involvement (PPI): Input from a dedicated PPI stakeholder group was included in this qualitative sub-study. PPI members included patients with experience of CAD, and retired researchers in the field of healthcare. The PPI group provided feedback and guidance on the development of study materials (e.g. information sheets, consent forms, interview schedules) as well as their reflections on findings from preliminary qualitative data analysis.

Results

Thirteen participants were recruited to this qualitative study. The mean age of participants was 38 years (SD = 9.09; range = 23 - 54 years). The majority of participants were male (n=8) and White British (n=9). Participants were recruited from a range of clinical and non-clinical roles (see Table 1).

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

Table 1

Participant demographic characteristics

	N(%)	
N	13	
Age, M(SD)	38 (SD 9.09)	
Male	8 (61.54%)	
Ethnicity		
White British	9 (69.23%)	
Mixed, or multiple ethnic groups	2 (15.38%)	
Asian, or Asian British	1 (7.69%)	
Other ethnic group	1 (7.69%)	
Professional role		
Doctor	3 (23.08%)	
Research nurse/practitioner	4 (30.77%)	
IT technician	2 (15.38%)	
AI developer or researcher	4 (30.77%)	

Note: AI = artificial intelligence. IT = information technology.

Qualitative findings

Four core themes were identified: positive perceptions of AI, potential barriers to using AI in healthcare, concerns regarding AI use, and steps needed to ensure the acceptability of future AI tools. Anonymised excerpts are provided.

Positive Perception of AI

AI was generally seen by professionals as having a considerably positive impact on NHS healthcare. Professionals largely viewed AI tools as equipment that would support and guide clinical decision making, particularly in situations of diagnostic uncertainty. AI tools were also expected to improve diagnostic accuracy, minimise the chance of human error, and reduce clinician workload. There was also the suggestion that AI would be able to overcome human limitations, particularly in situations where patients require round-the-clock care.

"...the people with the illness especially like long-term illness, they need like 24 hours monitoring which is you can't do that as a human ... so I think it would help..." – Participant 001, IT technician

Clinical participants highlighted that decreasing the time taken to assess and diagnose patients would be of particular importance, as it would ultimately impact the number of patients in a department at a given time, and thus reduce the burden placed on NHS staff and resources.

"...People that come in and need a CT scan for the head injury, they wait two hours for the CT scan, and then they wait another two hours for the CT report and, so potentially that could...half the time that they're in the department, which makes a huge difference to us in terms of space and resources ...that would be...quite a significant gain I think, in terms of pressure and stress in the

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de Enseignement Superieur (ABES)

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies

department because there's often more than a hundred people in our department which feels...pressurised..." – Participant 009, Doctor

When asked about the current perceptions of AI, professionals were, overall, open to its use and suggested that healthcare staff perceptions of AI would steadily improve as they gained more experience and understanding of the tools and their potential benefits. However, some professionals did highlight that younger generations may be more likely to be open to using AI, as they have been exposed to similar tools at a younger age. In contrast, older generations were expected to be more sceptical about the technology, with some never accepting its use in healthcare.

"...I think it's definitely improving ... I would make the assumption that it's individuals on the older side of life, elderly individuals are more sceptical, and we have an ageing population obviously and I think scepticism will decrease naturally because, you know, young people are growing up around Siri and Alexa, it's not foreign to them..." -Participant 008, AI developer/researcher

Regarding patient perspectives of AI use in their care, professionals reported that, in their experience, patients had few concerns regarding the AI specifically. In the context of clinical research involving AI, issues that were raised by patients were typical of those raised in studies that did not feature AI tools, suggesting that patients do not view AI as a specific risk. Patients were reportedly predominantly concerned about their data privacy, whether taking part in AI research would impact their care and were purportedly happy to participate once reassured by clinicians or medical research staff. From experience, professionals also reported that patients seemed to be generally indifferent to or unconcerned about AI use in their care, as they trust their doctor to make the best decision for them.

"...From the patients' perspective, I think, they are fine. Our experience also was that they would be concerned but, you know, they go to an x-ray machine or MRI, and they do it ... they think clinicians put them in there because they think it's safe, so they trust them. I think as long as

clinicians are reassured, they will transfer this reassurance to patients..." – Participant 012, AI developer/researcher.

"They just want to get better, I think they don't really care who does it, if it's a human or if it's a robot or, if it's anything AI..." – Participant 013, Doctor

Barriers to using AI in Healthcare

There were several barriers that were discussed by professional participants, the majority relating to the limited resources that are currently available to support the implementation of AI tools in the NHS. Those professionals involved in AI research stressed that there are currently numerous data protection hurdles in place that are often lengthy and difficult to navigate when implementing a new AI tool or research study in the NHS. While professionals acknowledged that these are necessary to keep patients and their data safe, the amount of documentation and approval that must be completed was reported to cause delays in the set-up of the AI tools, preventing patients and professionals from reaping potential benefits.

"In particular in medical or in healthcare domain...it's very difficult to access data due to regulations ... it takes time. Although the process is fairly streamlined, it takes time to access data, all consent should be sought, all documentation should be signed and all information governance should be briefed..." – Participant 007, AI developer/researcher.

Professionals also highlighted considerable inconsistency in NHS IT services across Trusts as a key barrier affecting the healthcare services ability to keep up-to-date with developing technology. Professionals, especially those in IT or AI development/research, reported that sites across the NHS often use different IT systems, many of which are unable to transfer information between systems, and – as a result – were not currently meeting the demands of healthcare professionals.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

"...Another big problem is systems within the hospital not speaking to each other. So the electronic patient record, doesn't talk to the radiology system, doesn't talk to the cardiology system, doesn't talk to the lab system so there's sometimes discrepancies, we're not bad in our Trust but I know other Trusts...have real problems.." – Participant 010, Research nurse/practitioner.

As a result, professionals anticipated that most of the existing NHS computer systems would not be compatible with future AI tools and upcoming research projects would face many delays if these issues could not be resolved. Relating to this, some participants reported that many NHS IT teams are facing growing workloads, restricting the number of updates that can be made at a healthcare Trust at a given time, and adding further delays to the implementation of new technologies such as AI.

"...Some [NHS] Trusts were, well, they have more people, more capacity to do it. Some Trusts they just have a single person who's not very great...this is a big problem, it's a struggle..." – Participant 007, Research nurse/practitioner.

Concerns Regarding AI Use

Some concerns were raised in relation to the use of AI in healthcare. These concerns predominantly revolved around the possible removal of humans from patient care. Professionals described concerns that AI tools may currently lack the empathy needed to sensitively deliver health information to patients and provide the necessary reassurance and support when patients are processing diagnoses. This lack of empathy was thought to have the potential to upset patients, particularly in situations that are especially distressing (e.g. new diagnosis of a serious health condition), and as a result, professional participants emphasised that humans would need to continue to have an important role in the delivery of care.

"The number one is that people are always reassured when they have personal contact. And it has to be personalised ... if it tries to be text-base that's non-personalised, it doesn't work. So

BMJ Open

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

that's where the skill of communication is really helpful. And, yeah, you have to be empathetic..." – Participant 006, Doctor

Concerns were also raised regarding the capacity for AI tools to make errors and how suitable regulations would need to be developed to ensure these errors were managed or avoided. However, the majority of professionals described that while the accuracy of AI tools was a risk, clinicians and patients could be reassured by increasing the supporting evidence for AI tools and ensuring the tool is tested across diverse populations.

"I think for anyone participating in research and seeing that and just knowing ... how much experience there has been using that tool, I think that's going to reassure people. How much it's been tested before ... it's important for them to know just how much ... or whether [it's] already been used and their experience of it..." – Participant 003, Research nurse/practitioner,

A small number of professionals reported concerns that there was a potential for clinicians to be de-skilled by the future uptake of supporting AI tools. While some professionals did describe that there was the potential for junior doctors who utilise AI tools early in their career to be less skilled in certain areas, this was not predominantly thought to be to be a risk to patient care. Many professionals also reported that clinical training should be updated to reflect developing technology including AI, ensuring that clinicians remain highly skilled both with and without the AI tools.

"... The Royal College of Medicine and Anaesthetics ...we have this sort of, supposedly, robust and comprehensive assessment you know, ... the formal exams to workplace band etcetera so I suppose they're trying to mitigate that by making sure we do understand the fundamentals, by making us do on the job assessments and more formal or classical exams as well." - Participant 009, Doctor

There was also a specific concern raised relating to resource strain. With increased AI use, it was thought likely by professionals that more patients could be identified as having health problems and

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

would require clinical intervention. While many professionals believed that this would reduce the use of some NHS resources, it was suggested that the current strain would - in fact - move to other areas of patient care. This was of particular concern, as the NHS was considered a very delicately balanced system that could become overwhelmed easily. While it is currently unclear if this resource shift could occur, it was identified as a possible risk that should be considered and attended to as AI tools are further implemented in the NHS healthcare settings.

"It depends on the results doesn't it. So if the results are fantastic and we do find that [the AI tool is] a predictive model, I think the temptation would be to send as many patients as possible through...who could get a stress echo. [I'm] slightly... concerned ... it's going to result in this huge influx of resource use.." – Participant 005, Research nurse/practitioner.

Ensuring Acceptability of AI Tools

Transparency and communication were a central idea raised by professionals in relation to making AI tools acceptable to both clinical and non-clinical healthcare staff as well as patients. Professionals working in a research role emphasised that having technological support, including the opportunity to ask questions and raise concerns about the AI tool with developers, was particularly reassuring for healthcare staff and could help ensure a smooth set up and roll out of AI tools.

"Within that making sure it's as easy to use, and it's as quick and fast and streamlined as possible, ... having that flexibility, and whether that's having huge amount of technical support early on because that's where, as I'm sure you know, NHS IT is awful. Wherever you go it's always [bad]. Yeah so, I think...it's having support ... Having support for the technical aspect is really helpful." – Participant 005, Research nurse/practitioner.

Fostering trust in AI tools was another key issue described by professionals who stressed the importance of AI developers being open about how the tools were developed, the data that would be needed, how data would be securely stored and managed. By being transparent about these processes,

professionals described that this would create greater trust between clinicians, patients, and AI developers which could facilitate the implementation of AI tools in NHS healthcare settings. One suggestion to ensure this transparent communication was to create specific stakeholder special interest groups across the NHS to provide the opportunity to discuss AI tools and other technical implementation aspects. By developing these groups, it was thought that this could provide the opportunity for individuals – both patients and clinical/non-clinical healthcare staff - affected by or interested in AI tools to raise specific concerns or questions and allow for acceptable adjustments to implementation procedures to be made.

"Possibly connect with you and tell you what they need maybe, what they're looking for. What their concerns are and vice versa you could connect with them ... where you can say this is what we're available to sort of give you, how would this work for your needs, because people need to talk..." – Participant 010, Research nurse/practitioner.

Discussion

The aim of this qualitative study was to examine the perceptions of clinical and non-clinical professional stakeholders about their experiences and perceptions of using an AI tool in an NHS setting; their beliefs about the possible implications using AI tools may have; and views about potential facilitators/barriers to engagement to using AI tools in patient care within an NHS context. We identified four core themes: positive perceptions of AI, potential barriers to using AI in healthcare, concerns regarding AI use, and the potential steps needed to ensure the acceptability of future AI tools.

Overall, professionals reported being open to the idea of using AI in patient care and those who had previous experience utilising AI tools described how they had come away with a positive outlook on AI tools. Across the professional participants, AI was considered a supportive piece of technology that could assist healthcare professionals and benefit clinicians and patients alike. However, central to this view was that the AI tool must fit their workflow and not cause added or unnecessary strain on NHS services. There was also a central belief that clinicians would need to continue to be involved in patient

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

care to provide appropriate empathetic support. Therefore, in this study, AI was anticipated to be primarily an assistive tool, and there was little expectation that it would ever fully replace human clinicians. This is consistent with previous research involving NHS professionals, such as Morrison et al. [15] who found that AI tools were perceived to be able to provide assistance to clinical staff and had the potential to improve their working life. Similarly, Morrison et al., [15] reported that it was unlikely that human doctors would be replaced by AI technology, however this would likely remain a concern as more AI tools are used.

Participants in this study did raise concerns about AI tools relating to data protection and ensuring patient privacy. This was of particular importance to professional participants involved in research, who reported that patients required reassurance that any data that is collected would be used appropriately and kept safely. However, professionals believed that patient uncertainty would likely reduce as the amount of supporting research for AI tools increased over time. Concerns about data security are not unique to AI tools however and have been found consistently in studies investigating the acceptability of various technological advances in healthcare over the years, including the use of emails, mobile healthcare applications, and remote healthcare consultations (e.g. [16–18]). This study also identified other potential barriers to the uptake of AI tools which related to the potential consequences of AI use in healthcare, including the potential for errors and increased demand for limited healthcare resources. As using AI tools in healthcare comes with the possibility for machine error (e.g. diagnostic error), this could negatively impact not only the patient, but also the trust patients have in the healthcare professionals involved in their care [19,20]. Previous studies describe that, as the public has a relatively low tolerance for machine errors [19] ensuring future AI tools have a human override feature and that this is clearly communicated will likely be important for fostering trust.

Recommendations for future AI studies

Several structural barriers to implementing AI tools in healthcare were identified in this study, including difficulties navigating data protection policies and the limited IT infrastructure in many NHS

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

BMJ Open

services. Going forwards, for future AI development and adoption to be successful, there is a need for a robust IT governance strategy across NHS services to ensure AI tools can be smoothly and successfully integrated [19]. Given the disparity in resources and IT capacities across NHS Trusts throughout the UK[21], national efforts and investment may be needed in future to increase capacity for AI deployment to facilitate the widespread adoption of AI tools and help promote better healthcare equality.

When discussing approaches to improve the acceptability of AI tools, participating professionals highlighted the importance of transparency between AI developers and their intended users. Offering training to improve clinical care teams' understanding of AI technology, the potential risks/benefits, as well as data management may further increase clinician's receptiveness to future AI tools and increase their ability to discuss AI tools with patients [22,23]. In a similar vein, NHS sites receiving timely, practical technological support from developers when setting up a new AI tool in a healthcare context, including clear instructions and a point of contact to raise concerns with, may also be important when operationalising AI technologies into the NHS healthcare system. Developers should be mindful that a considerable proportion of NHS Trusts will have small IT teams or have less up-to-date facilities and these sites may need more time to implement new technologies and will potentially require more support than other sites.

In relation to patients' perceptions of AI tool acceptability, the results of this study highlight the perceived concerns that patients could have about AI tools being used in their care and the importance of AI tools being human-centred. It was suggested by participating professionals that patient and public involvement (PPI) groups may be especially valuable in future AI research. These groups may provide opportunities for patients and other stakeholders (e.g. caregivers, frontline clinical teams, ethicists, etc.) to raise any questions/concerns and help developers ensure adequate information is provided in future to healthcare teams, patients and their caregivers. Participants in this study also highlighted the need for future longitudinal studies of AI tools in order to provide additional evidence and reassurance to patients about a tool's safety and efficacy in a variety of populations over time.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Strengths and Limitations

This study has several strengths and limitations. A strength is that we interviewed a range of professionals (clinical and non-clinical) with a variety of lived experiences, expertise, and beliefs about AI in healthcare. This sample size allowed for a detailed analysis of the data and provided an in-depth understanding of how AI fits in the context of the NHS healthcare, the barriers/facilitators to uptake and recommendations on approaches that may improve AI acceptability and implementation. Nonetheless, a limitation of this study is the opportunity sampling strategy used and the limited demographic diversity of the sample (e.g. most participants were male and White British). It would be valuable for future studies to include the views of other key stakeholders, such as information governance staff. A number of difficulties were experienced in recruiting NHS healthcare staff, primarily as it was not possible for researchers to successfully make contact with staff, and it is possible that this reflects the fact that recruitment took place during the course of the COVID-19 Pandemic which heavily impacted NHS healthcare staff workloads. We broadened our recruitment approach in response which led to the recruitment of a more diverse professional stakeholder sample, including not only clinicians but AI developers/researchers with experience of using AI tools in NHS healthcare settings. Finally, it was beyond the scope of this study to include patient participants. The views of patients are a key component in ensuring AI tools used in healthcare settings are feasible and acceptable and future research is needed to explore patient experiences and beliefs about AI tools in their care.

Conclusion

Despite these limitations, this study adds to the limited literature about the experiences and perceptions of clinical and non-clinical professional stakeholders of using AI tools in patient care in NHS settings. We identified several practical barriers to implementation, including a disparity in NHS IT capacities across Trusts and difficult to navigate organisational permissions, as well as concerns that could act as barriers to engagement (e.g. concerns about misdiagnosis, the potential for AI tools to deskill clinicians). Nonetheless, a number of positive implications for using AI in healthcare were also

found, including the ability for AI tools to improve diagnostic accuracy and reduce clinician workload. As efforts to expand the role of AI tools in healthcare settings increase, the recommendations made by this study about the importance of ensuring transparency and trust regarding data storage/sharing and having readily available technological support from developers may ensure future AI tools are effectively implemented and benefit both patients and clinical care teams.

to peet terien only

References

- Reddy S, Fox J, Purohit MP. Artificial intelligence-enabled healthcare delivery. J R Soc Med. 2019;112. doi:10.1177/0141076818815510
- Aung YYM, Wong DCS, Ting DSW. The promise of artificial intelligence: A review of the opportunities and challenges of artificial intelligence in healthcare. Br Med Bull. 2021;139. doi:10.1093/bmb/ldab016
- Takiddin A, Schneider J, Yang Y, et al. Artificial intelligence for skin cancer detection: Scoping review. J Med Internet Res. 2021;23. doi:10.2196/22934
- Choi J, Shin K, Jung J, et al. Convolutional neural network technology in endoscopic imaging: Artificial intelligence for endoscopy. Clin Endosc. 2020;53. doi:10.5946/ce.2020.054
- Seol HY, Shrestha P, Muth JF, et al. Artificial intelligence-assisted clinical decision support for childhood asthma management: A randomized clinical trial. PLoS One 2021;16. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0255261
- Schneider-Kamp A. The Potential of AI in Care Optimization: Insights from the User-Driven Co-Development of a Care Integration System. Inquiry (United States) 2021;58. doi:10.1177/00469580211017992
- Meyer AND, Giardina TD, Spitzmueller C, et al. Patient perspectives on the usefulness of an artificial intelligence-assisted symptom checker: Cross-sectional survey study. J Med Internet Res 2020;22. doi:10.2196/14679
- Blease C, Locher C, Leon-Carlyle M, et al. Artificial intelligence and the future of psychiatry: Qualitative findings from a global physician survey. *Digit Health* 2020;6. doi:10.1177/2055207620968355
- Sit C, Srinivasan R, Amlani A, et al. Attitudes and perceptions of UK medical students towards artificial intelligence and radiology: a multicentre survey. Insights Imaging 2020;11. doi:10.1186/s13244-019-0830-7
- Sofaer S. Qualitative methods: what are they and why use them? Health Serv Res 1999;**34**:1101–18.http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10591275 (accessed 28 Jul 2016).
- Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qual Res Psychol 2006;3:77– 101.
- Woodward G, Bajre M, Bhattacharyya S, et al. PROTEUS Study: A Prospective Randomized Controlled Trial Evaluating the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Stress Echocardiography. Am Heart J 2023;263:123-32. doi:10.1016/J.AHJ.2023.05.003
- Malterud K, Siersma VD, Guassora AD. Sample Size in Qualitative Interview Studies: Guided by Information Power. Qual Health Res 2016;26:1753–60. doi:10.1177/1049732315617444
- Richards KAR, Hemphill MA. A practical guide to collaborative qualitative data analysis. Journal of Teaching in Physical Education 2018;37. doi:10.1123/jtpe.2017-0084

BMJ Open

- Morrison K. Artificial intelligence and the NHS: a qualitative exploration of the factors influencing adoption. Future Healthc J 2021;8. doi:10.7861/fhj.2020-0258
 - Baig MM, GholamHosseini H, Connolly MJ. Mobile healthcare applications: system design review, critical issues and challenges. Australas Phys Eng Sci Med. 2015;38. doi:10.1007/s13246-014-0315-4
 - Ross L, Bena J, Bermel R, et al. Implementation and Patient Experience of Outpatient Teleneurology. Telemedicine and e-Health 2021;27. doi:10.1089/tmj.2020.0032
 - Car J, Sheikh A. Email consultations in health care: 2—acceptability and safe application. BMJ 2004;329. doi:10.1136/bmj.329.7463.439
 - Matheny, M., Israni S. T., Ahmed M. WD. Artificial Intelligence in Health Care - The Hope, the Hype, the Promise, the Peril - Ehealthresearch.no (NO). Norwegian Centre for Ehealth Research. 2019;92.
 - Morley J, Floridi L. An ethically mindful approach to AI for health care. The Lancet. 2020;395. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(19)32975-7
 - INTERIM REPORT Data Driven Healthcare in 2030: Transformation Requirements of the NHS Digital Technology and Health Informatics Workforce Full Report HEE Digital Readiness Programme. 2021.
 - Paranjape K, Schinkel M, Panday RN, et al. Introducing artificial intelligence training in medical education. JMIR Med Educ. 2019;5. doi:10.2196/16048
 - Grunhut J, Wyatt AT, Margues O. Educating Future Physicians in Artificial Intelligence (AI): An Integrative Review and Proposed Changes. J Med Educ Curric Dev 2021;8. doi:10.1177/23821205211036836

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

Supplementary	Material 1
---------------	------------

Indicative guide for interviews

Introduction

a. W	/hat is	s your previous experience of AI research in healthcare?
	i.	Are there any particular barriers you've faced? Any facilitators?
	ii.	Do you know of any specific AI tools used to guide decision making in
		cardiology or healthcare more broadly?
	iii.	What impact do you think AI tools might have on patient's access to care?
		1. What factors currently impact patient's access to care? How might
		AI tools help affect these?
	iv.	If AI tools were widely accepted in the NHS, what impact could this have on
		the staff workload?
		1. Is there anything that AI developers could do to ensure the tool fits
		into the NHS workflow?
		2. Is there anything the NHS could do?
	۷.	Has your perception of using AI tools changed over time?
	vi.	Are there any factors that would help clinicians feel more comfortable when
		using AI tools?
		1. Are there any changes that would need to be made at NHS
		Trust/organisation level to facilitate the use of AI tools?
	vii.	Are there any factors that would help patients feel more comfortable with
		AI tools being used in their care?
	viii.	Is there anything we could do to encourage NHS sites to participate in AI
		research like PROTEUS?
	ix.	What impact could using AI tools have on patient care and clinical decision
		making?
		1. What are some of the benefits of using AI tools? What are some of
		the potential risks?
	х.	Do you have any thoughts or questions to add?

Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research (SRQR)*

http://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/srqr/

Page/line no(s).

Title - Concise description of the nature and topic of the study Identifying the	
study as qualitative or indicating the approach (e.g., ethnography, grounded	
theory) or data collection methods (e.g., interview, focus group) is recommended	1
Abstract - Summary of key elements of the study using the abstract format of the intended publication; typically includes background, purpose, methods, results,	
and conclusions	3

Introduction

Problem formulation - Description and significance of the problem/phenomenon	
studied; review of relevant theory and empirical work; problem statement	5-6
Purpose or research question - Purpose of the study and specific objectives or	
questions	5-6

Methods

Qualitative approach and research paradigm - Qualitative approach (e.g.	
ethnography grounded theory case study phenomenology narrative research)	
and guiding theory if appropriate: identifying the research paradigm (e.g.,	
postpositivist, constructivist/ interpretivist) is also recommended; rationale**	6
Researcher characteristics and reflexivity - Researchers' characteristics that may	
influence the research, including personal attributes, qualifications/experience.	
relationship with participants, assumptions, and/or presuppositions; potential or	
actual interaction between researchers' characteristics and the research	
questions, approach, methods, results, and/or transferability	8
Context - Setting/site and salient contextual factors; rationale**	6-8
Sampling strategy - How and why research participants, documents, or events	
were selected: criteria for deciding when no further sampling was necessary (e.g.	
sampling saturation): rationale**	6-8
Ethical issues partaining to human subjects. Desumentation of approval by an	
appropriate ethics review board and participant consent, or explanation for lack	
thereof: other confidentiality and data security issues	6
	0
Data collection methods - Types of data collected; details of data collection	
procedures including (as appropriate) start and stop dates of data collection and	
analysis, iterative process, triangulation of sources/methods, and modification of	
procedures in response to evolving study findings; rationale**	8

1 2	
2 3 4	
5 6	
7 8	
9 10	
11 12	
13 14	
15 16	
17 18	
19 20	
21 22	R
23 24	
25 26 27	
27 28 20	
29 30 31	C
32 33	
34 35	
36 37	
38 39	
40 41	c
42 43	
44 45	
46 47	
48 49	
50 51	
52 53	
54 55	
56 57	
58 59	

Data collection instruments and technologies - Description of instruments (e.g., interview guides, questionnaires) and devices (e.g., audio recorders) used for data collection; if/how the instrument(s) changed over the course of the study	7
Units of study - Number and relevant characteristics of participants, documents, or events included in the study; level of participation (could be reported in results)	9
Data processing - Methods for processing data prior to and during analysis, including transcription, data entry, data management and security, verification of data integrity, data coding, and anonymization/de-identification of excerpts	8
Data analysis - Process by which inferences, themes, etc., were identified and developed, including the researchers involved in data analysis; usually references a specific paradigm or approach; rationale**	8
Techniques to enhance trustworthiness - Techniques to enhance trustworthiness and credibility of data analysis (e.g., member checking, audit trail, triangulation); rationale**	8-9

Results/findings

Synthesis and interpretation - Main findings (e.g., interpretations, inferences, and themes); might include development of a theory or model, or integration with	
prior research or theory	9-17
Links to empirical data - Evidence (e.g., quotes, field notes, text excerpts,	
photographs) to substantiate analytic findings	9-17

Discussion

Integration with prior work, implications, transferability, and contribution(s) to	
the field - Short summary of main findings; explanation of how findings and	
conclusions connect to, support, elaborate on, or challenge conclusions of earlier	
scholarship; discussion of scope of application/generalizability; identification of	
unique contribution(s) to scholarship in a discipline or field	17-21
Limitations - Trustworthiness and limitations of findings	20

Other

	Conflicts of interest - Potential sources of influence or perceived influence on	
	study conduct and conclusions; how these were managed	1
	Funding - Sources of funding and other support; role of funders in data collection,	
	interpretation, and reporting	1

*The authors created the SRQR by searching the literature to identify guidelines, reporting standards, and critical appraisal criteria for qualitative research; reviewing the reference lists of retrieved sources; and contacting experts to gain feedback. The SRQR aims to improve the transparency of all aspects of qualitative research by providing clear standards for reporting qualitative research.

**The rationale should briefly discuss the justification for choosing that theory, approach, method, or technique rather than other options available, the assumptions and limitations implicit in those choices, and how those choices influence study conclusions and transferability. As appropriate, the rationale for several items might be discussed together.

Reference:

L L S. Cook D.A. S. Satel S O'Brien BC, Harris IB, Beckman TJ, Reed DA, Cook DA. Standards for reporting qualitative research: a synthesis of recommendations. Academic Medicine, Vol. 89, No. 9 / Sept 2014 DOI: 10.1097/ACM.00000000000388

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de Enseignement Superieur (ABES)

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies

BMJ Open

Experiences of using Artificial Intelligence (AI) in healthcare: a qualitative study of clinician and key stakeholder perspectives

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2023-076950.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	27-Sep-2023
Complete List of Authors:	Fazakarley, C.A.; Ultromics Ltd Breen, Maria; University of Reading, School of Psychology & Clinical Language Sciences ; Breen Clinical Research Leeson, Paul; University of Oxford, Division of Cardiovascular Medicine Thompson, Ben; Ultromics Ltd Williamson, Victoria; King's College London,
Primary Subject Heading :	Health informatics
Secondary Subject Heading:	Cardiovascular medicine, Qualitative research
Keywords:	Clinical Decision-Making, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT





I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

terez oni

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies



Experiences of using Artificial Intelligence (AI) in healthcare: a qualitative study of clinician and key stakeholder perspectives

Fazakarley, C.A.^a, Breen, M.^b, Leeson, P^a., Thompson, B.^a, Williamson, V.^{c, E^a}

^aUltromics Ltd, Cascade Way, Oxford Business Park, Oxford OX4 2SU

^b Breen Clinical Research, 70 Holland St, SE1 9NX

King's Centre for Military Health Research, King's College London, London, SE5 9RJ

RDM Division of Cardiovascular Medicine, University of Oxford, Oxford. OX3 9DU

^E Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust, United Kingdom

* **Correspondence**: Dr Victoria Williamson, King's College London, London SE5 9RJ, <u>Victoria.williamson@kcl.ac.uk</u>

Abstract

Objectives: Artificial intelligence (AI) is a rapidly developing field in healthcare, with tools being developed across various specialties to support healthcare professionals and reduce workloads. It is important to understand the experiences of professionals working in healthcare to ensure future AI tools are acceptable and effectively implemented. The aim of this study was to gain an in-depth understanding of the experiences and perceptions of UK healthcare workers and other key stakeholders about the use of AI in the National Health Service (NHS).

Design: A qualitative study using semi-structured interviews conducted remotely via MS Teams. Thematic analysis was carried out.

Setting: NHS and UK higher education institutes.

Participants: Thirteen participants were recruited, including clinical and non-clinical participants working for the NHS and researchers working to develop AI tools for healthcare settings.

Results: Four core themes were identified: positive perceptions of AI; potential barriers to using AI in healthcare; concerns regarding AI use; and steps needed to ensure the acceptability of future AI tools. Overall, we found that those working in healthcare were generally open to the use of AI and expected it to have many benefits for patients and facilitate access to care. However, concerns were raised regarding the security of patient data, the potential for misdiagnosis and that AI could increase the burden on already strained healthcare staff.

Conclusion: This study found that healthcare staff are willing to engage with AI research and incorporate AI tools into care pathways. Going forwards, the NHS and AI developers will need to collaborate closely to ensure that future tools are suitable for their intended use and do not negatively impact workloads or patient trust. Future AI studies should continue to incorporate the views of key stakeholders to improve tool acceptability.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence, healthcare, AI, clinician, qualitative

tor beet terien only
Strengths and limitations

- Using qualitative interviews allowed for an in-depth understanding of a range of participants' experiences, perceptions, and concerns of using AI tools in healthcare settings.
- Including a range of both clinical and non-clinical participants' views yielded several transferable learning points that may be applicable to future studies aiming to implement AI tools into patient care pathways.
- Future studies which include the views of other key stakeholders, such as information governance staff, and patients are needed to better understand perceptions of AI tool acceptability.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) is a rapidly evolving field within the healthcare sector. At this time, AI tools are being developed across specialities with the broad aim of assisting healthcare professionals deliver safe and effective care [1]. As healthcare workloads continue to increase, it is hoped that AI tools will be able to relieve some of the strain experienced by clinicians, nurses and other allied health professionals [1,2]. There is growing evidence to suggest that AI tools have a variety of applications, such as assisting diagnoses [3,4] and patient management [5] with many studies reporting improved outcomes for patients and improved efficiency in healthcare workflows [2].

As the amount of AI utilised in healthcare continues to increase, there is a need to understand how these tools are impacting those who interact with them, both within a patient care and research setting, to improve the development and implementation of this technology. There is a developing area of research exploring the experiences of stakeholders across the healthcare sector, with some studies reporting the health professionals are open to the use of AI tools in patient care and expect that they will relieve workloads, improve efficiency and overall patient experience [6,7]. Previous studies have also documented concerns about AI implementation relating to data protection, lack of empathic care and the reducing job numbers in certain specialities such as radiology [8,9]. However, much of this research is quantitative in nature, utilising methods such as surveys with predetermined responses, which are unable to provide the in-depth understanding needed regarding participants feelings, beliefs and perceptions of AI tools in healthcare. Therefore, it is important to conduct qualitative research in this area to allow participants to express their thoughts in their own words, providing additional detail and nuance that would otherwise be missed by quantitative methods [10,11]

One specific healthcare context in which to explore perceptions of AI tools further is within the National Health Service (NHS) in the UK. This is a healthcare service that is of particular interest in the context of AI, given that it is facing growing pressures such as increased workloads with reduced staffing

BMJ Open

levels [12], and recent studies have begun to explore the potential use of AI tools in the use of patient care within the NHS [13,14]. There have been some initial quantitative and qualitative research exploring the perceptions of AI by NHS staff and patients [15,16] However, there have been few studies that have comprehensively explored the perceptions of AI across multiple healthcare stakeholder groups, meaning there is limited data exploring the beliefs, expectations, and experience of these diverse groups.

A study currently being conducted within the National Health Service (NHS) at this time is PROTEUS, a prospective randomised controlled trial evaluating the use of AI in stress echocardiography [17]. The aim of this research is to investigate the use of 'EchoGo Pro', an AI tool designed to assist in the diagnosis of coronary artery disease (CAD). PROTEUS involves twenty NHS sites across England, recruiting thousands of patients and involving professionals across the healthcare sector to implement this tool. As part of this trial, we aimed to qualitatively explore the experiences of the healthcare professionals and other key stakeholders to gain a detailed understanding of how trials of AI tools in the NHS are experienced, their perceptions of implementing AI tools in NHS healthcare settings, and how AI tools could impact those involved. We sought to understand the potential barriers preventing the adoption of AI tools into NHS settings, and the facilitators that make these tools attractive, well integrated and as effective as possible in these contexts.

Methods

Ethical approval

Ethical approval was received for this study from the University of Oxford Medical Sciences Interdivisional Research Ethics Committee (R77627/RE001); HRA and Health and Care Research Wales (HCRW) (21/NW/0199) and the NHS North West - Preston Research Ethics Committee (21/NW/0199).

Recruitment

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

This qualitative study is nested in a larger study examining the effectiveness of an AI tool – the EchoGo Pro – which is a tool used to improve the accuracy in diagnosing cardiovascular health problems [17]. The processes and procedures of this investigation are detailed in Woodward et al [17].

Between December 2021 and September 2022, 13 participants were recruited to this qualitative sub-study. This sub-study was experiential in focus, and because previous research has shown that the experiences, beliefs and perceptions of using AI tools in healthcare are under-researched (Fazakarley, et al., under review), we prioritised sample specificity when deciding the 'informational power' [18] of our sampling strategy. We aimed to include in-depth insights, rather than a broader range of views, from a specific sample of healthcare staff and other key stakeholders who had experience in their role of working with AI tools in NHS healthcare settings to address our research aim.

Participants were initially recruited from the NHS Trust sites involved in the PROTEUS study [17]. Each NHS site provided the contact details of at least one clinical and one non-clinical member of staff involved in the EchoGo Pro research, and sites were also asked to circulate study information to staff and invite any interested individuals to contact the study researcher (CAF) to participate. Due to the low response rate and limited capacity of the healthcare staff to be available for interviews during the COVID-19 Pandemic, our recruitment approach was expanded to also include professionals who were not directly involved in the PROTEUS study in the NHS but had experience of using AI in a healthcare context. Participants were recruited by sharing study information via research team mailing lists, contacting leading UK researchers who published healthcare AI studies in academic journals (identified via a scoping review of the literature) (Fazakarley, et al., under review), and via a snowballing method where all participants were asked to share the study with other colleagues who may be interested in participating.

Eligible participants had to be aged 18 years or more, based in the UK, English speaking and willing to provide informed consent. Participants were eligible to participate if they had experience of using AI tools in a healthcare setting in a clinical role (e.g. doctor, nurse) or experience in evaluating,

setting up or delivering an AI tool in a healthcare context (e.g. information technology [IT] expert, researcher). No limitation on eligibility was imposed according to demographic characteristics (e.g. gender, age, etc.) or professional grade, rank or qualification (e.g. PhD, consultant, etc.). The aim of this inclusive strategy was to ensure we collected rich data from a range of participants with diverse knowledge and experience of AI in NHS healthcare settings. We use the term 'professionals' throughout to refer to both clinical and non-clinical participants for clarity. Individuals were screened for eligibility in line with study inclusion/exclusion criteria by a study researcher (CAF) prior to participation. Verbal informed consent for participation in the interviews was taken from all participants and audio-recorded.

In total, 42 individuals were invited to participate, each of which was contacted three times to arrange a time to conduct the interview. If no response was received after the third attempt, the individual was assumed to be no longer willing to participate and the research team destroyed their contact details (n=21). Eight participants declined to participate due to lack of time/capacity to be interviewed. No participants withdrew during or after providing informed consent. Recruitment was stopped after regular reviews of the collected data determined that thematic saturation had been reached [19].

Assessment

Interviews were carried out by CAF (a female researcher with training in qualitative methods), oneto-one by MS Teams. Interviews lasted on average 30 minutes (range 19-39 minutes). Prior to data collection, the interview schedule was piloted with a clinical and non-clinical professional to ensure the interview questions were sensitive and appropriate. The pilot interviews were not audio-recorded, and the data were not included in the analysis. The interview schedule (Supplementary Material 1) focused on professional's experience of using AI in the NHS, their perceptions of barriers and facilitators to adopting AI in NHS healthcare settings; views about barriers and facilitators to conducting AI research in NHS healthcare settings; beliefs about the potential impact of using AI tools on patient care, clinician workloads and the NHS more broadly; and perceptions about the possible benefits and risks of using AI in patient care. Interview questions were open ended and encouraged participants to describe their views

personally identifying information removed on transcription. Audio-recordings were destroyed following

and lived experiences in their own words. Interviews were transcribed verbatim by CAF with any

transcription. Participants were also asked to provide basic demographic information. Analysis

We used Taguette (https://www.taguette.org/) to facilitate data analysis. Data were analysed by CAF & VW using Thematic Analysis [11]. An inductive analytic approach was used, and the steps recommended by Braun & Clarke [11] were followed. Namely, the transcripts were read and re-read several times to foster familiarity with the dataset and initial codes were then generated. We subsequently searched for and generated early themes which were revisited and revised to create core themes. Data collection and analysis took place simultaneously which allowed developing topics of interest to be investigated in later interviews and to ascertain whether thematic saturation had occurred. Constant comparison was used while creating codes and themes, with each new transcript compared to the existing dataset to identify unexpected themes. Regular peer debriefing meetings were held, where early codes and themes were reviewed and discussed and further refined where needed [20]. A reflexive journal was kept by both researchers (CAF & VW) to ensure reflexivity by noting the influence of their own existing beliefs and experiences to prevent premature or biased interpretation of the data.

Patient and public involvement (PPI): Input from a dedicated PPI stakeholder group was included in this qualitative sub-study. PPI members included patients with lived experience of CAD, and retired researchers in the field of healthcare. The PPI group provided feedback and guidance on the development of study materials (e.g. information sheets, consent forms, interview schedules) as well as their reflections on findings from preliminary qualitative data analysis.

Results



BMJ Open

1 2	
3	Thirteen participants were recruited to this qualitative study. The mean age of participants was 38
5	years (SD = 9.09 ; range = 23 - 54 years). The majority of participants were male (n=8) and White British
7	(n=9). Participants were recruited from a range of clinical and non-clinical roles (see Table 1).
8 9	
10 11	
12 13	INSERT TABLE 1 HERE
14 15	
16	
17	
19 20	
21 22	
23 24	
25	
26 27	
28 29	
30 31	
32 33	
34	
36	
37 38	
39 40	
41 42	
43 44	
45	
46	
48 49	
50 51	
52 53	
54 55	
56	
57 58	
50	

Table 1

Participant demographic characteristics

	N(%)	
N	13	
Age, M(SD)	38 (SD 9.09)	
Male	8 (61.54%)	
Ethnicity		
White British	9 (69.23%)	
Mixed, or multiple ethnic groups	2 (15.38%)	
Asian, or Asian British	1 (7.69%)	
Other ethnic group	1 (7.69%)	
Professional role	5	
Doctor	3 (23.08%)	
Research nurse/practitioner	4 (30.77%)	
IT technician	2 (15.38%)	
AI developer or researcher	4 (30.77%)	

Note: AI = artificial intelligence. IT = information technology.

Qualitative findings

Four core themes were identified: positive perceptions of AI, potential barriers to using AI in healthcare, concerns regarding AI use, and steps needed to ensure the acceptability of future AI tools. Anonymised excerpts are provided. Anonymised quotes are provided to illustrate findings and we detail whether participants had direct experience of the PROTEUS tool.

Positive Perception of AI

AI was generally seen by professionals as having a considerably positive impact on NHS healthcare. Professionals largely viewed AI tools as equipment that would support and guide clinical decision making, particularly in situations of diagnostic uncertainty. AI tools were also expected to improve diagnostic accuracy, minimise the chance of human error, and reduce clinician workload. There was also the suggestion that AI would be able to overcome human limitations, particularly in situations where patients require round-the-clock care.

"...the people with the illness especially like long-term illness, they need like 24 hours monitoring which is you can't do that as a human ... so I think it would help..." – Participant 001, IT technician, had experience of PROTEUS tool.

Clinical participants highlighted that decreasing the time taken to assess and diagnose patients would be of particular importance, as it would ultimately impact the number of patients in a department at a given time, and thus reduce the burden placed on NHS staff and resources.

"...People that come in and need a CT scan for the head injury, they wait two hours for the CT scan, and then they wait another two hours for the CT report and, so potentially that could...half the time that they're in the department, which makes a huge difference to us in terms of space and resources ...that would be...quite a significant gain I think, in terms of pressure and stress in the

department because there's often more than a hundred people in our department which feels...pressurised..." – Participant 009, Doctor, no experience of PROTEUS tool.

When asked about the current perceptions of AI, professionals were, overall, open to its use and suggested that healthcare staff perceptions of AI would steadily improve as they gained more experience and understanding of the tools and their potential benefits. However, some professionals did highlight that younger generations may be more likely to be open to using AI, as they have been exposed to similar tools at a younger age. In contrast, older generations were expected to be more sceptical about the technology, with some never accepting its use in healthcare.

"...I think it's definitely improving ... I would make the assumption that it's individuals on the older side of life, elderly individuals are more sceptical, and we have an ageing population obviously and I think scepticism will decrease naturally because, you know, young people are growing up around Siri and Alexa, it's not foreign to them..." -Participant 008, AI developer/researcher, had experience of PROTEUS tool.

Regarding patient perspectives of AI use in their care, professionals reported that, in their experience, patients had few concerns regarding the AI specifically. In the context of clinical research involving AI, issues that were raised by patients were typical of those raised in studies that did not feature AI tools, suggesting that patients do not view AI as a specific risk. Patients were reportedly predominantly concerned about their data privacy, whether taking part in AI research would impact their care and were purportedly happy to participate once reassured by clinicians or medical research staff. From experience, professionals also reported that patients seemed to be generally indifferent to or unconcerned about AI use in their care, as they trust their doctor to make the best decision for them.

"...From the patients' perspective, I think, they are fine. Our experience also was that they would be concerned but, you know, they go to an x-ray machine or MRI, and they do it ... they think clinicians put them in there because they think it's safe, so they trust them. I think as long as

BMJ Open

clinicians are reassured, they will transfer this reassurance to patients... " – Participant 012, AI developer/researcher, had experience of PROTEUS tool.

"They just want to get better, I think they don't really care who does it, if it's a human or if it's a robot or, if it's anything AI..." – Participant 013, Doctor, had experience of PROTEUS tool.

Barriers to using AI in Healthcare

There were several barriers that were discussed by professional participants, the majority relating to the limited resources that are currently available to support the implementation of AI tools in the NHS. Those professionals involved in AI research stressed that there are currently numerous data protection hurdles in place that are often lengthy and difficult to navigate when implementing a new AI tool or research study in the NHS. While professionals acknowledged that these are necessary to keep patients and their data safe, the amount of documentation and approval that must be completed was reported to cause delays in the set-up of the AI tools, preventing patients and professionals from reaping potential benefits.

"In particular in medical or in healthcare domain...it's very difficult to access data due to regulations ... it takes time. Although the process is fairly streamlined, it takes time to access data, all consent should be sought, all documentation should be signed and all information governance should be briefed..." – Participant 007, AI developer/researcher, no experience of PROTEUS tool.

Professionals also highlighted considerable inconsistency in NHS IT services across Trusts as a key barrier affecting the healthcare services ability to keep up-to-date with developing technology. Professionals, especially those in IT or AI development/research, reported that sites across the NHS often use different IT systems, many of which are unable to transfer information between systems, and – as a result – were not currently meeting the demands of healthcare professionals.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

"...Another big problem is systems within the hospital not speaking to each other. So the electronic patient record, doesn't talk to the radiology system, doesn't talk to the cardiology system, doesn't talk to the lab system so there's sometimes discrepancies, we're not bad in our Trust but I know other Trusts...have real problems.." – Participant 010, Research nurse/practitioner, no experience of PROTEUS tool.

As a result, professionals anticipated that most of the existing NHS computer systems would not be compatible with future AI tools and upcoming research projects would face many delays if these issues could not be resolved. Relating to this, some participants reported that many NHS IT teams are facing growing workloads, restricting the number of updates that can be made at a healthcare Trust at a given time, and adding further delays to the implementation of new technologies such as AI.

"...Some [NHS] Trusts were, well, they have more people, more capacity to do it. Some Trusts they just have a single person who's not very great...this is a big problem, it's a struggle..." – Participant 007, Research nurse/practitioner, no experience of PROTEUS tool.

Concerns Regarding AI Use

Some concerns were raised in relation to the use of AI in healthcare. These concerns predominantly revolved around the possible removal of humans from patient care. Professionals described concerns that AI tools may currently lack the empathy needed to sensitively deliver health information to patients and provide the necessary reassurance and support when patients are processing diagnoses. This lack of empathy was thought to have the potential to upset patients, particularly in situations that are especially distressing (e.g. new diagnosis of a serious health condition), and as a result, professional participants emphasised that humans would need to continue to have an important role in the delivery of care.

"The number one is that people are always reassured when they have personal contact. And it has to be personalised ... if it tries to be text-base that's non-personalised, it doesn't work. So

BMJ Open

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

that's where the skill of communication is really helpful. And, yeah, you have to be empathetic..." – Participant 006, Doctor, had experience of PROTEUS tool.

Concerns were also raised regarding the capacity for AI tools to make errors and how suitable regulations would need to be developed to ensure these errors were managed or avoided. However, the majority of professionals described that while the accuracy of AI tools was a risk, clinicians and patients could be reassured by increasing the supporting evidence for AI tools and ensuring the tool is tested across diverse populations.

"I think for anyone participating in research and seeing that and just knowing ... how much experience there has been using that tool, I think that's going to reassure people. How much it's been tested before ... it's important for them to know just how much ... or whether [it's] already been used and their experience of it..." – Participant 003, Research nurse/practitioner, had experience of PRTOEUS tool.

A small number of professionals reported concerns that there was a potential for clinicians to be de-skilled by the future uptake of supporting AI tools. While some professionals did describe that there was the potential for junior doctors who utilise AI tools early in their career to be less skilled in certain areas, this was not predominantly thought to be to be a risk to patient care. Many professionals also reported that clinical training should be updated to reflect developing technology including AI, ensuring that clinicians remain highly skilled both with and without the AI tools.

"... The Royal College of Medicine and Anaesthetics ...we have this sort of, supposedly, robust and comprehensive assessment you know, ... the formal exams to workplace band etcetera so I suppose they're trying to mitigate that by making sure we do understand the fundamentals, by making us do on the job assessments and more formal or classical exams as well." - Participant 009, Doctor, no experience of PROTEUS tool.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

.2.

"Within that making sure it's as easy to use, and it's as quick and fast and streamlined as really helpful." - Participant 005, Research nurse/practitioner, had experience of PROTEUS tool.

There was also a specific concern raised relating to resource strain. With increased AI use, it was thought likely by professionals that more patients could be identified as having health problems and would require clinical intervention. While many professionals believed that this would reduce the use of some NHS resources, it was suggested that the current strain would - in fact - move to other areas of patient care. This was of particular concern, as the NHS was considered a very delicately balanced system that could become overwhelmed easily. While it is currently unclear if this resource shift could occur, it was identified as a possible risk that should be considered and attended to as AI tools are further implemented in the NHS healthcare settings.

"It depends on the results doesn't it. So if the results are fantastic and we do find that [the AI tool is] a predictive model, I think the temptation would be to send as many patients as possible through...who could get a stress echo. [I'm] slightly... concerned ... it's going to result in this huge influx of resource use." - Participant 005, Research nurse/practitioner, had experience of PROTEUS tool.

Ensuring Acceptability of AI Tools

Transparency and communication were a central idea raised by professionals in relation to making AI tools acceptable to both clinical and non-clinical healthcare staff as well as patients. Professionals working in a research role emphasised that having technological support, including the opportunity to ask questions and raise concerns about the AI tool with developers, was particularly reassuring for healthcare staff and could help ensure a smooth set up and roll out of AI tools.

possible, ... having that flexibility, and whether that's having huge amount of technical support early on because that's where, as I'm sure you know, NHS IT is awful. Wherever you go it's always [bad]. Yeah so, I think...it's having support ... Having support for the technical aspect is

BMJ Open

Fostering trust in AI tools was another key issue described by professionals who stressed the importance of AI developers being open about how the tools were developed, the data that would be needed, how data would be securely stored and managed. By being transparent about these processes, professionals described that this would create greater trust between clinicians, patients, and AI developers which could facilitate the implementation of AI tools in NHS healthcare settings. One suggestion to ensure this transparent communication was to create specific stakeholder special interest groups across the NHS to provide the opportunity to discuss AI tools and other technical implementation aspects. By developing these groups, it was thought that this could provide the opportunity for individuals – both patients and clinical/non-clinical healthcare staff - affected by or interested in AI tools to raise specific concerns or questions and allow for acceptable adjustments to implementation procedures to be made.

"Possibly connect with you and tell you what they need maybe, what they're looking for. What their concerns are and vice versa you could connect with them ... where you can say this is what we're available to sort of give you, how would this work for your needs, because people need to talk..." – Participant 010, Research nurse/practitioner, no experience of PROTEUS tool.

Discussion

The aim of this qualitative study was to examine the perceptions of clinical and non-clinical professional stakeholders about their experiences and perceptions of using an AI tool in an NHS setting; their beliefs about the possible implications using AI tools may have; and views about potential facilitators/barriers to engagement to using AI tools in patient care within an NHS context. We identified four core themes: positive perceptions of AI, potential barriers to using AI in healthcare, concerns regarding AI use, and the potential steps needed to ensure the acceptability of future AI tools.

Overall, professionals reported being open to the idea of using AI in patient care and those who had previous experience utilising AI tools described how they had come away with a positive outlook on AI tools. Across the professional participants, AI was considered a supportive piece of technology that

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

could assist healthcare professionals and benefit clinicians and patients alike. However, central to this view was that the AI tool must fit their workflow and not cause added or unnecessary strain on NHS services. There was also a central belief that clinicians would need to continue to be involved in patient care to provide appropriate empathetic support. Therefore, in this study, AI was anticipated to be primarily an assistive tool, and there was little expectation that it would ever fully replace human clinicians. This is consistent with previous research involving NHS professionals, such as Morrison et al., [21] who found that AI tools were perceived to be able to provide assistance to clinical staff and had the potential to improve their working life. Similarly, Morrison et al., [21] reported that it was unlikely that human doctors would be replaced by AI technology, however this would likely remain a concern as more AI tools are used.

Participants in this study did raise concerns about AI tools relating to data protection and ensuring patient privacy. This was of particular importance to professional participants involved in research, who reported that patients required reassurance that any data that is collected would be used appropriately and kept safely. However, professionals believed that patient uncertainty would likely reduce as the amount of supporting research for AI tools increased over time. Concerns about data security are not unique to AI tools however and have been found consistently in studies investigating the acceptability of various technological advances in healthcare over the years, including the use of emails, mobile healthcare applications, and remote healthcare consultations (e.g. [22–24]).

This study also identified other potential barriers to the uptake of AI tools which related to the potential consequences of AI use in healthcare, including the potential for errors and increased demand for limited healthcare resources. As using AI tools in healthcare comes with the possibility for machine error (e.g. diagnostic error), this could negatively impact not only the patient, but also the trust patients have in the healthcare professionals involved in their care [25,26]. Previous studies describe that, as the public has a relatively low tolerance for machine errors [25] ensuring future AI tools have a human override feature and that this is clearly communicated will likely be important for fostering trust.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

BMJ Open

Additionally, while it was not identified as a significant risk, participants in the present study acknowledged that there is the potential for clinicians who utilise AI tools early in their careers to become deskilled if medical training does not update with the technology. This is reflective of existing literature [27] which has also identified 'deskilling' as something to be mitigated where possible to ensure acceptability within clinical staff as well as patient safety.

When examining these results in the specific context of the NHS, there are concerns that have been raised that may potentially be unique to this healthcare system. For example, if the use of AI tools does increase the demand for healthcare services, it is likely this would cause further strain on a system that is already experiencing multiple difficulties relating to resources and workforce [12]. As the NHS is a publicly funded system, its funding and resources are relatively restrictive, therefore, any changes in demands for resources could impact how care is given to patients, thus effecting their overall experience. In contrast, more privately-funded systems such as those that are common in the USA, are arguably more adaptable to changes in demand, as funding for services is provided as they are utilised by patients. Therefore, it is likely that funding for these services increases along with patient demand, allowing them to adapt accordingly.

Recommendations for future AI studies

Several structural barriers to implementing AI tools in healthcare were identified in this study, including difficulties navigating data protection policies and the limited IT infrastructure in many NHS services. Going forwards, for future AI development and adoption to be successful, there is a need for a robust IT governance strategy across NHS services to ensure AI tools can be smoothly and successfully integrated [25,28–32]. Given the disparity in resources and IT capacities across NHS Trusts throughout the UK [33], national efforts and investment may be needed in future to increase capacity for AI deployment to facilitate the widespread adoption of AI tools and help promote better healthcare equality [31,34].

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

When discussing approaches to improve the acceptability of AI tools, participating professionals highlighted the importance of transparency between AI developers and their intended users. Offering training to improve clinical care teams' understanding of AI technology, the potential risks/benefits, as well as secure data management may further increase clinician's receptiveness to future AI tools and increase their ability to discuss AI tools with patients [35–37]. In a similar vein, NHS sites receiving timely, practical technological support from developers when setting up a new AI tool in a healthcare context, including clear instructions and a point of contact to raise concerns with, may also be important when operationalising AI technologies into the NHS healthcare system. Developers should be mindful that a considerable proportion of NHS Trusts will have small IT teams or have less up-to-date facilities and these sites may need more time to implement new technologies and will potentially require more support than other sites.

In relation to patients' perceptions of AI tool acceptability, the results of this study highlight the perceived concerns that patients could have about AI tools being used in their care and the importance of AI tools being human-centred. It was suggested by participating professionals that patient and public involvement (PPI) groups may be especially valuable in future AI research. These groups may provide opportunities for patients and other stakeholders (e.g. caregivers, frontline clinical teams, ethicists, etc.) to raise any questions/concerns and help developers ensure adequate information is provided in future to healthcare teams, patients and their caregivers. Participants in this study also highlighted the need for future longitudinal studies of AI tools in order to provide additional evidence and reassurance to patients about a tool's safety and efficacy in a variety of populations over time.

Strengths and Limitations

This study has several strengths and limitations. A strength is that we interviewed a range of professionals (clinical and non-clinical) with a variety of lived experiences, expertise, and beliefs about

Page 23 of 31

BMJ Open

AI in healthcare. This sample size allowed for a detailed analysis of the data and provided an in-depth understanding of how AI fits in the context of the NHS healthcare, the barriers/facilitators to uptake and recommendations on approaches that may improve AI acceptability and implementation. Nonetheless, a limitation of this study is the opportunity sampling strategy used and the limited demographic diversity of the sample (e.g. most participants were male and White British). It would be valuable for future studies to include the views of other key stakeholders, such as information governance staff. A number of difficulties were experienced in recruiting NHS healthcare staff, primarily as it was not possible for researchers to successfully make contact with staff, and it is possible that this reflects the fact that recruitment took place during the course of the COVID-19 Pandemic which heavily impacted NHS healthcare staff workloads. We broadened our recruitment approach in response which led to the recruitment of a more diverse professional stakeholder sample, including not only clinicians but AI developers/researchers with experience of using AI tools in NHS healthcare settings. Finally, it was beyond the scope of this study to include patient participants. The views of patients are a key component in ensuring AI tools used in healthcare settings are feasible and acceptable and, while speculation was made by participants about potential patient views, these opinions have been made from a very different position than actual patients going through treatment, and therefore future research is needed to explore patient experiences and beliefs about AI tools in their care.

Conclusion

Despite these limitations, this study adds to the limited literature about the experiences and perceptions of clinical and non-clinical professional stakeholders of using AI tools in patient care in NHS settings. We identified several practical barriers to implementation, including a disparity in NHS IT capacities across Trusts and difficult to navigate organisational permissions, as well as concerns that could act as barriers to engagement (e.g. concerns about misdiagnosis, the potential for AI tools to deskill clinicians). Nonetheless, a number of positive implications for using AI in healthcare were also found, including the ability for AI tools to improve diagnostic accuracy and reduce clinician workload. As

efforts to expand the role of AI tools in healthcare settings increase, the recommendations made by this study about the importance of ensuring transparency and trust regarding data storage/sharing and having readily available technological support from developers may ensure future AI tools are effectively implemented and benefit both patients and clinical care teams.

to beer terien only

BMJ Open

Conflicts of interest: PL is a founder and shareholder of Ultromics Ltd and is an inventor on patents in the field of AI and healthcare.

Word count: 4928

Ethical approval: Ethical approval was received for this study from the University of Oxford Medical Sciences Interdivisional Research Ethics Committee (R77627/RE001); HRA and Health and Care Research Wales (HCRW) (21/NW/0199) and the NHS North West - Preston Research Ethics Committee (21/NW/0199).

Funding: Funding for this research was provided by National Institute for Health and Care Research (AI in Healthcare Award, Grant Number AI AWARD01833).

Data availability: Data are available from corresponding author on reasonable request.

Contributor statement: All authors contributed to the conception, planning and design of the study. CAF & VW collected, interpreted and analysed the data. CAF & VW drafted the manuscript for publication. All authors reviewed and approved the manuscript.

References

- 1 Reddy S, Fox J, Purohit MP. Artificial intelligence-enabled healthcare delivery. J R Soc Med. 2019;**112**. doi:10.1177/0141076818815510
- 2 Aung YYM, Wong DCS, Ting DSW. The promise of artificial intelligence: A review of the opportunities and challenges of artificial intelligence in healthcare. Br Med Bull. 2021;**139**. doi:10.1093/bmb/ldab016
- 3 Takiddin A, Schneider J, Yang Y, *et al.* Artificial intelligence for skin cancer detection: Scoping review. J Med Internet Res. 2021;**23**. doi:10.2196/22934
- Choi J, Shin K, Jung J, *et al.* Convolutional neural network technology in endoscopic imaging: Artificial intelligence for endoscopy. Clin Endosc. 2020;53.
 doi:10.5946/ce.2020.054
- 5 Seol HY, Shrestha P, Muth JF, *et al.* Artificial intelligence-assisted clinical decision support for childhood asthma management: A randomized clinical trial. *PLoS One* 2021;**16**. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0255261

2		
3	6	Schneider-Kamp A. The Potential of AI in Care Optimization: Insights from the User-
4		Driven Co-Development of a Care Integration System Inquiry (United States) 2021:58
5		doi:10 1177/00/69580211017992
6 7	7	Mover AND Ciardina TD Spitzmueller C et al Datient perspectives on the usefulness of
7 8	/	wieyer AND, Glaruma TD, Spitzmuener C, et al. Patient perspectives on the userumess of
9		an artificial intelligence-assisted symptom checker: Cross-sectional survey study. J Nied
10		Internet Res 2020; 22 . doi:10.2196/14679
11	8	Blease C, Locher C, Leon-Carlyle M, et al. Artificial intelligence and the future of
12		psychiatry: Qualitative findings from a global physician survey. Digit Health 2020;6.
13		doi:10.1177/2055207620968355
14	9	Sit C Srinivasan R Amlani A <i>et al</i> Attitudes and nercentions of LIK medical students
15	5	towards artificial intelligence and radiology: a multicentre survey. Insights Imaging
16		
17	_	2020;11. doi:10.1186/s13244-019-0830-7
18	10	Sofaer S. Qualitative methods: what are they and why use them? <i>Health Serv Res</i>
19		1999; 34 :1101–18.http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10591275 (accessed 28 Jul
20		2016).
21	11	Braun V. Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. <i>Qual Res Psychol</i> 2006: 3 :77–
22		101
23	17	Cookslow T. Clarke S. Dean L at al. NHS cricic: rebuilding the NHS people urgent action
25	12	COOKSIEV T, Clarke S, Deari J, et al. NHS CHSIS. TEbuliung the NHS needs digent action.
26	_	BMJ 2023; 380 . doi:10.1136/BMJ.P1
27	13	Soltan AAS, Yang J, Pattanshetty R, et al. Real-world evaluation of rapid and laboratory-
28		free COVID-19 triage for emergency care: external validation and pilot deployment of
29		artificial intelligence driven screening. Lancet Digit Health 2022;4:e266–78.
30		doi:10.1016/S2589-7500(21)00272-7
31	14	Ahmad A Wilson A Haycock A <i>et al.</i> Evaluation of a real-time computer-aided polyn
32	7	detection system during screening colonoscopy: ALDETECT study. Endescopy
33		2022 EF 212 O dei: 10 10EF (A 10CC 0CC1 (ID (ID 22004 7 /DID
34		2022; 55 :313–9. doi:10.1055/A-1966-0661/ID/JR22094-7/BIB
35	15	Ganapathi S, Duggal S. Exploring the experiences and views of doctors working with
30 27		Artificial Intelligence in English healthcare; a qualitative study. PLoS One
20		2023; 18 :e0282415. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0282415
30	16	Aggarwal R, Farag S, Martin G, et al. Patient Perceptions on Data Sharing and Applying
40		Artificial Intelligence to Health Care Data: Cross-sectional Survey, 1 Med Internet Res
41		2021:23(8):e26162 https://www.imir.org/2021/8/e26162 2021: 23 :e26162
42		doi:10.2106/26162
43	47	
44	1/	Woodward G, Bajre M, Bhattacharyya S, et al. PROTEUS Study: A Prospective
45		Randomized Controlled Trial Evaluating the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Stress
46		Echocardiography. <i>Am Heart J</i> 2023; 263 :123–32. doi:10.1016/J.AHJ.2023.05.003
47	18	Malterud K, Siersma VD, Guassora AD. Sample Size in Qualitative Interview Studies:
48		Guided by Information Power. <i>Qual Health Res</i> 2016: 26 :1753–60.
49		doi:10.1177/1049732315617444
50	10	Morro IM Critical Analysis of Stratogics for Determining Digor in Qualitative Inquiry
51	19	
52 53		<i>Quai Health Kes</i> 2015; 25 :1212–22. doi:10.11///1049/32315588501
55	20	Richards KAR, Hemphill MA. A practical guide to collaborative qualitative data analysis.
55		Journal of Teaching in Physical Education 2018; 37 . doi:10.1123/jtpe.2017-0084
56		
57		
58		

Page 27 of 31

BMJ Open

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.	MJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique c
	ue de l

Π

21	Morrison K. Artificial intelligence and the NHS: a qualitative exploration of the factors influencing adoption. <i>Future Healthc J</i> 2021; 8 . doi:10.7861/fhj.2020-0258
22	Baig MM, GholamHosseini H, Connolly MJ. Mobile healthcare applications: system design review, critical issues and challenges. Australas Phys Eng Sci Med. 2015; 38 . doi:10.1007/s13246-014-0315-4
23	Ross L, Bena J, Bermel R, <i>et al.</i> Implementation and Patient Experience of Outpatient Teleneurology. <i>Telemedicine and e-Health</i> 2021; 27 . doi:10.1089/tmj.2020.0032
24	Car J, Sheikh A. Email consultations in health care: 2—acceptability and safe application. BMJ 2004: 329 . doi:10.1136/bmi.329.7463.439
25	Matheny, M., Israni S. T., Ahmed M. WD. Artificial Intelligence in Health Care - The Hope, the Hype, the Promise, the Peril - Ehealthresearch.no (NO). Norwegian Centre for E-health Research. 2019; 92 .
26	Morley J, Floridi L. An ethically mindful approach to Al for health care. The Lancet. 2020; 395 . doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(19)32975-7
27	Aquino YSJ, Rogers WA, Braunack-Mayer A, <i>et al.</i> Utopia versus dystopia: Professional perspectives on the impact of healthcare artificial intelligence on clinical roles and skills. <i>Int J Med Inform</i> 2023; 169 :104903. doi:10.1016/J.IJMEDINF.2022.104903
28	Widner K, Virmani S, Krause J, <i>et al.</i> Lessons learned from translating AI from development to deployment in healthcare. <i>Nature Medicine 2023 29:6</i> 2023; 29 :1304–6. doi:10.1038/s41591-023-02293-9
29	Gray K, Slavotinek J, Dimaguila GL, <i>et al.</i> Artificial Intelligence Education for the Health Workforce: Expert Survey of Approaches and Needs. <i>JMIR Med Educ</i> 2022; 8 . doi:10.2196/35223
30	Neher M, Petersson L, Nygren JM, <i>et al.</i> Innovation in healthcare: leadership perceptions about the innovation characteristics of artificial intelligence—a qualitative interview study with healthcare leaders in Sweden. <i>Implement Sci Commun</i> 2023; 4 :1–13. doi:10.1186/S43058-023-00458-8/TABLES/2
31	Novak LL, Russell RG, Garvey K, <i>et al.</i> Clinical use of artificial intelligence requires Al- capable organizations. <i>JAMIA Open</i> 2023; 6 . doi:10.1093/JAMIAOPEN/OOAD028
32	Petersson L, Larsson I, Nygren JM, <i>et al.</i> Challenges to implementing artificial intelligence in healthcare: a qualitative interview study with healthcare leaders in Sweden. <i>BMC</i> <i>Health Serv Res</i> 2022; 22 :1–16. doi:10.1186/S12913-022-08215-8/FIGURES/1
33	INTERIM REPORT Data Driven Healthcare in 2030: Transformation Requirements of the NHS Digital Technology and Health Informatics Workforce Full Report HEE Digital Readiness Programme. 2021.
34	Apell P, Eriksson H. Artificial intelligence (AI) healthcare technology innovations: the current state and challenges from a life science industry perspective. <i>Technol Anal Strateg Manag</i> 2023; 35 :179–93. doi:10.1080/09537325.2021.1971188
35	Paranjape K, Schinkel M, Panday RN, <i>et al.</i> Introducing artificial intelligence training in medical education. JMIR Med Educ. 2019; 5 . doi:10.2196/16048
36	Grunhut J, Wyatt AT, Marques O. Educating Future Physicians in Artificial Intelligence (AI): An Integrative Review and Proposed Changes. <i>J Med Educ Curric Dev</i> 2021; 8 . doi:10.1177/23821205211036836
36	Grunhut J, Wyatt AT, Marques O. Educating Future Physicians in Artificial Intelligence (AI): An Integrative Review and Proposed Changes. <i>J Med Educ Curric Dev</i> 2021; 8 . doi:10.1177/23821205211036836

Russell RG, Lovett Novak L, Patel M, et al. Competencies for the Use of Artificial Intelligence–Based Tools by Health Care Professionals. Academic Medicine 2023;98:348-56. doi:10.1097/ACM.000000000004963

s by F. , ACM.OO.

1	
2 3	Supplementary Material 1
4	Indicative guide for interviews
5	
7	
8	Introduction
9	Introduction
10	
11	a. What is your previous experience of AI research in healthcare?
13 14	i. Are there any particular barriers you've faced? Any facilitators?
15	ii. Do you know of any specific AI tools used to guide decision making in
16 17	cardiology or healthcare more broadly?
18	iii. What impact do you think AI tools might have on patient's access to care?
19 20	What factors currently impact nationt's access to care? How might
20	1. What factors currently impact patient s access to care i now might
22	Al tools help affect these?
23	iv. If AI tools were widely accepted in the NHS, what impact could this have on
24 25	the staff workload?
26	
27	1. Is there anything that AI developers could do to ensure the tool fits
28	into the NHS workflow?
29 30	2. Is there anything the NHS could do?
31	y Has your perception of using AI tools changed over time?
32 33	v. This your perception of using vit tools changed over time.
34	vi. Are there any factors that would help clinicians feel more comfortable when
35	using AI tools?
36	1. Are there any changes that would need to be made at NHS
37 38	In the there any energies that need to be made at the
39	Trust/organisation level to facilitate the use of AI tools?
40	
41 42	vii. Are there any factors that would help patients feel more comfortable with
42	At to als having used in their arm?
44	Ai tools being used in their care?
45	viji. Is there anything we could do to encourage NHS sites to participate in Al
46 47	
48	research like PROTEUS?
49	
50	ix. What impact could using AI tools have on patient care and clinical decision
51 52	making?
52	
54	1. What are some of the benefits of using AI tools? What are some of
55	the potential risks?
50 57	x. Do you have any thoughts or questions to add?
58	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
59	
60	

Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research (SRQR)*

http://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/srqr/

Page/line no(s).

Title - Concise description of the nature and topic of the study Identifying the	
study as qualitative or indicating the approach (e.g., ethnography, grounded	
theory) or data collection methods (e.g., interview, focus group) is recommended	1
Abstract - Summary of key elements of the study using the abstract format of the intended publication; typically includes background, purpose, methods, results,	
and conclusions	3

Introduction L

Problem formulation - Description and significance of the problem/phenomenon studied; review of relevant theory and empirical work; problem statement	5-6
Purpose or research question - Purpose of the study and specific objectives or questions	5-6

Methods

Qualitative approach and research paradigm - Qualitative approach (e.g., ethnography, grounded theory, case study, phenomenology, narrative research) and guiding theory if appropriate: identifying the research paradigm (e.g.,	
postpositivist, constructivist/ interpretivist) is also recommended; rationale**	6
Researcher characteristics and reflexivity - Researchers' characteristics that may	
influence the research, including personal attributes, qualifications/experience,	
relationship with participants, assumptions, and/or presuppositions; potential or	
actual interaction between researchers' characteristics and the research	
questions, approach, methods, results, and/or transferability	8
Context - Setting/site and salient contextual factors; rationale**	6-8
Sampling strategy - How and why research participants, documents, or events were selected; criteria for deciding when no further sampling was necessary (e.g.,	
sampling saturation); rationale**	6-8
Ethical issues pertaining to human subjects - Documentation of approval by an appropriate ethics review board and participant consent, or explanation for lack	
thereof; other confidentiality and data security issues	6
Data collection methods - Types of data collected; details of data collection	
procedures including (as appropriate) start and stop dates of data collection and	
analysis, iterative process, triangulation of sources/methods, and modification of	
procedures in response to evolving study findings; rationale**	8

interview guides, questionnaires) and devices (e.g., audio recorders) used for data	
collection; if/how the instrument(s) changed over the course of the study	7
Units of study - Number and relevant characteristics of participants, documents,	
or events included in the study; level of participation (could be reported in results)	9
Data processing - Methods for processing data prior to and during analysis, including transcription, data entry, data management and security, verification of	
data integrity, data coding, and anonymization/de-identification of excerpts	8
Data analysis - Process by which inferences, themes, etc., were identified and developed, including the researchers involved in data analysis; usually references a	
specific paradigm or approach; rationale**	8
Techniques to enhance trustworthiness - Techniques to enhance trustworthiness	
and credibility of data analysis (e.g., member checking, audit trail, triangulation);	
rationale**	8-9

Results/findings

Synthesis and interpretation - Main findings (e.g., interpretations, inferences, and themes); might include development of a theory or model, or integration with	
prior research or theory	9-17
Links to empirical data - Evidence (e.g., quotes, field notes, text excerpts,	
photographs) to substantiate analytic findings	9-17

Discussion

Integration with prior work, implications, transferability, and con the field - Short summary of main findings; explanation of how find conclusions connect to, support, elaborate on, or challenge conclus scholarship; discussion of scope of application/generalizability; ide	tribu lings sions ntifica	tion(s) to and of earlier ation of	
unique contribution(s) to scholarship in a discipline or field			17-21
Limitations - Trustworthiness and limitations of findings		~	20
er		2	

Other

Conflicts of interest - Potential sources of influence or perceived influence on	
study conduct and conclusions; how these were managed	1
Funding - Sources of funding and other support; role of funders in data collection,	1
Interpretation, and reporting	

*The authors created the SRQR by searching the literature to identify guidelines, reporting standards, and critical appraisal criteria for qualitative research; reviewing the reference lists of retrieved sources; and contacting experts to gain feedback. The SRQR aims to improve the transparency of all aspects of qualitative research by providing clear standards for reporting qualitative research.

**The rationale should briefly discuss the justification for choosing that theory, approach, method, or technique rather than other options available, the assumptions and limitations implicit in those choices, and how those choices influence study conclusions and transferability. As appropriate, the rationale for several items might be discussed together.

Reference:

L ΔDA, Cook DA. S stations. Academic Ms. JOB O'Brien BC, Harris IB, Beckman TJ, Reed DA, Cook DA. Standards for reporting qualitative research: a synthesis of recommendations. Academic Medicine, Vol. 89, No. 9 / Sept 2014 DOI: 10.1097/ACM.00000000000388

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

BMJ Open

Experiences of using Artificial Intelligence (AI) in healthcare: a qualitative study of UK clinician and key stakeholder perspectives

lournal:	RM1 Open
Journal.	Dielo Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2023-076950.R2
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	13-Nov-2023
Complete List of Authors:	Fazakarley, C.A.; Ultromics Ltd Breen, Maria; University of Reading, School of Psychology & Clinical Language Sciences ; Breen Clinical Research Leeson, Paul; University of Oxford, Division of Cardiovascular Medicine Thompson, Ben; Ultromics Ltd Williamson, Victoria; King's College London,
Primary Subject Heading :	Health informatics
Secondary Subject Heading:	Cardiovascular medicine, Qualitative research
Keywords:	Clinical Decision-Making, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT





I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

terez oni

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies



Experiences of using Artificial Intelligence (AI) in healthcare: a qualitative study of UK clinician and key stakeholder perspectives

Fazakarley, C.A.^a, Breen, M.^b, Leeson, Pda., Thompson, B.^a, Williamson, V.^{c, B*}

^aUltromics Ltd, Cascade Way, Oxford Business Park, Oxford OX4 2SU

^b Breen Clinical Research, 70 Holland St, SE1 9NX

King's Centre for Military Health Research, King's College London, London, SE5 9RJ

RDM Division of Cardiovascular Medicine, University of Oxford, Oxford. OX3 9DU

^E Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust, United Kingdom

* **Correspondence**: Dr Victoria Williamson, King's College London, London SE5 9RJ, <u>Victoria.williamson@kcl.ac.uk</u>

Abstract

Objectives: Artificial intelligence (AI) is a rapidly developing field in healthcare, with tools being developed across various specialties to support healthcare professionals and reduce workloads. It is important to understand the experiences of professionals working in healthcare to ensure future AI tools are acceptable and effectively implemented. The aim of this study was to gain an in-depth understanding of the experiences and perceptions of UK healthcare workers and other key stakeholders about the use of AI in the National Health Service (NHS).

Design: A qualitative study using semi-structured interviews conducted remotely via MS Teams. Thematic analysis was carried out.

Setting: NHS and UK higher education institutes.

Participants: Thirteen participants were recruited, including clinical and non-clinical participants working for the NHS and researchers working to develop AI tools for healthcare settings.

Results: Four core themes were identified: positive perceptions of AI; potential barriers to using AI in healthcare; concerns regarding AI use; and steps needed to ensure the acceptability of future AI tools. Overall, we found that those working in healthcare were generally open to the use of AI and expected it to have many benefits for patients and facilitate access to care. However, concerns were raised regarding the security of patient data, the potential for misdiagnosis and that AI could increase the burden on already strained healthcare staff.

Conclusion: This study found that healthcare staff are willing to engage with AI research and incorporate AI tools into care pathways. Going forwards, the NHS and AI developers will need to collaborate closely to ensure that future tools are suitable for their intended use and do not negatively impact workloads or patient trust. Future AI studies should continue to incorporate the views of key stakeholders to improve tool acceptability.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence, healthcare, AI, clinician, qualitative

tor beet terien only

Strengths and limitations

- Using qualitative interviews allowed for an in-depth understanding of a range of participants' experiences, perceptions, and concerns of using AI tools in healthcare settings.
- Interviews were conducted with a range of participants working across the UK in both clinical • and non-clinical settings.
- One limitation of this research was that the somewhat limited diversity of the sample as most • participants were male and White British. It will be important to expand on this in future research. ore text. only

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) is a rapidly evolving field within the healthcare sector. At this time, AI tools are being developed across specialities with the broad aim of assisting healthcare professionals deliver safe and effective care [1]. As healthcare workloads continue to increase, it is hoped that AI tools will be able to relieve some of the strain experienced by clinicians, nurses and other allied health professionals [1,2]. There is growing evidence to suggest that AI tools have a variety of applications, such as assisting diagnoses [3,4] and patient management [5] with many studies reporting improved outcomes for patients and improved efficiency in healthcare workflows [2].

As the amount of AI utilised in healthcare continues to increase, there is a need to understand how these tools are impacting those who interact with them, both within a patient care and research setting, to improve the development and implementation of this technology. There is a developing area of research exploring the experiences of stakeholders across the healthcare sector, with some studies reporting the health professionals are open to the use of AI tools in patient care and expect that they will relieve workloads, improve efficiency and overall patient experience [6,7]. Previous studies have also documented concerns about AI implementation relating to data protection, lack of empathic care and the reducing job numbers in certain specialities such as radiology [8,9]. However, much of this research is quantitative in nature, utilising methods such as surveys with predetermined responses, which are unable to provide the in-depth understanding needed regarding participants feelings, beliefs and perceptions of AI tools in healthcare. Therefore, it is important to conduct qualitative research in this area to allow participants to express their thoughts in their own words, providing additional detail and nuance that would otherwise be missed by quantitative methods [10,11]

One specific healthcare context in which to explore perceptions of AI tools further is within the National Health Service (NHS) in the UK. This is a healthcare service that is of particular interest in the context of AI, given that it is facing growing pressures such as increased workloads with reduced staffing

BMJ Open

levels [12], and recent studies have begun to explore the potential use of AI tools in the use of patient care within the NHS [13,14]. There have been some initial quantitative and qualitative research exploring the perceptions of AI by NHS staff and patients [15,16] However, there have been few studies that have comprehensively explored the perceptions of AI across multiple healthcare stakeholder groups, meaning there is limited data exploring the beliefs, expectations, and experience of these diverse groups.

A study currently being conducted within the National Health Service (NHS) at this time is PROTEUS, a prospective randomised controlled trial evaluating the use of AI in stress echocardiography [17]. The aim of this research is to investigate the use of 'EchoGo Pro', an AI tool designed to assist in the diagnosis of coronary artery disease (CAD). PROTEUS involves twenty NHS sites across England, recruiting thousands of patients and involving professionals across the healthcare sector to implement this tool. As part of this trial, we aimed to qualitatively explore the experiences of the healthcare professionals and other key stakeholders to gain a detailed understanding of how trials of AI tools in the NHS are experienced, their perceptions of implementing AI tools in NHS healthcare settings, and how AI tools could impact those involved. We sought to understand the potential barriers preventing the adoption of AI tools into NHS settings, and the facilitators that make these tools attractive, well integrated and as effective as possible in these contexts.

Methods

Ethical approval

Ethical approval was received for this study from the University of Oxford Medical Sciences Interdivisional Research Ethics Committee (R77627/RE001); HRA and Health and Care Research Wales (HCRW) (21/NW/0199) and the NHS North West - Preston Research Ethics Committee (21/NW/0199).

Recruitment

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.
BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

This qualitative study is nested in a larger study examining the effectiveness of an AI tool – the EchoGo Pro – which is a tool used to improve the accuracy in diagnosing cardiovascular health problems [17]. The processes and procedures of this investigation are detailed in Woodward et al [17].

Between December 2021 and September 2022, 13 participants were recruited to this qualitative sub-study. This sub-study was experiential in focus, and because previous research has shown that the experiences, beliefs and perceptions of using AI tools in healthcare are under-researched (Fazakarley, et al., under review), we prioritised sample specificity when deciding the 'informational power' [18] of our sampling strategy. We aimed to include in-depth insights, rather than a broader range of views, from a specific sample of healthcare staff and other key stakeholders who had experience in their role of working with AI tools in NHS healthcare settings to address our research aim.

Participants were initially recruited from the NHS Trust sites involved in the PROTEUS study [17]. Each NHS site provided the contact details of at least one clinical and one non-clinical member of staff involved in the EchoGo Pro research, and sites were also asked to circulate study information to staff and invite any interested individuals to contact the study researcher (CAF) to participate. Due to the low response rate and limited capacity of the healthcare staff to be available for interviews during the COVID-19 Pandemic, our recruitment approach was expanded to also include professionals who were not directly involved in the PROTEUS study in the NHS but had experience of using AI in a healthcare context. Participants were recruited by sharing study information via research team mailing lists, contacting leading UK researchers who published healthcare AI studies in academic journals (identified via a scoping review of the literature) (Fazakarley, et al., under review), and via a snowballing method where all participants were asked to share the study with other colleagues who may be interested in participating.

Eligible participants had to be aged 18 years or more, based in the UK, English speaking and willing to provide informed consent. Participants were eligible to participate if they had experience of using AI tools in a healthcare setting in a clinical role (e.g. doctor, nurse) or experience in evaluating,

setting up or delivering an AI tool in a healthcare context (e.g. information technology [IT] expert, researcher). No limitation on eligibility was imposed according to demographic characteristics (e.g. gender, age, etc.) or professional grade, rank or qualification (e.g. PhD, consultant, etc.). The aim of this inclusive strategy was to ensure we collected rich data from a range of participants with diverse knowledge and experience of AI in NHS healthcare settings. We use the term 'professionals' throughout to refer to both clinical and non-clinical participants for clarity. Individuals were screened for eligibility in line with study inclusion/exclusion criteria by a study researcher (CAF) prior to participation. Verbal informed consent for participation in the interviews was taken from all participants and audio-recorded.

In total, 42 individuals were invited to participate, each of which was contacted three times to arrange a time to conduct the interview. If no response was received after the third attempt, the individual was assumed to be no longer willing to participate and the research team destroyed their contact details (n=21). Eight participants declined to participate due to lack of time/capacity to be interviewed. No participants withdrew during or after providing informed consent. Recruitment was stopped after regular reviews of the collected data determined that thematic saturation had been reached [19].

Assessment

Interviews were carried out by CAF (a female researcher with training in qualitative methods), oneto-one by MS Teams. Interviews lasted on average 30 minutes (range 19-39 minutes). Prior to data collection, the interview schedule was piloted with a clinical and non-clinical professional to ensure the interview questions were sensitive and appropriate. The pilot interviews were not audio-recorded, and the data were not included in the analysis. The interview schedule (Supplementary Material 1) focused on professional's experience of using AI in the NHS, their perceptions of barriers and facilitators to adopting AI in NHS healthcare settings; views about barriers and facilitators to conducting AI research in NHS healthcare settings; beliefs about the potential impact of using AI tools on patient care, clinician workloads and the NHS more broadly; and perceptions about the possible benefits and risks of using AI in patient care. Interview questions were open ended and encouraged participants to describe their views

personally identifying information removed on transcription. Audio-recordings were destroyed following

and lived experiences in their own words. Interviews were transcribed verbatim by CAF with any

transcription. Participants were also asked to provide basic demographic information. Analysis

We used Taguette (https://www.taguette.org/) to facilitate data analysis. Data were analysed by CAF & VW using Thematic Analysis [11]. An inductive analytic approach was used, and the steps recommended by Braun & Clarke [11] were followed. Namely, the transcripts were read and re-read several times to foster familiarity with the dataset and initial codes were then generated. We subsequently searched for and generated early themes which were revisited and revised to create core themes. Data collection and analysis took place simultaneously which allowed developing topics of interest to be investigated in later interviews and to ascertain whether thematic saturation had occurred. Constant comparison was used while creating codes and themes, with each new transcript compared to the existing dataset to identify unexpected themes. Regular peer debriefing meetings were held, where early codes and themes were reviewed and discussed and further refined where needed [20]. A reflexive journal was kept by both researchers (CAF & VW) to ensure reflexivity by noting the influence of their own existing beliefs and experiences to prevent premature or biased interpretation of the data.

Patient and public involvement (PPI): Input from a dedicated PPI stakeholder group was included in this qualitative sub-study. PPI members included patients with lived experience of CAD, and retired researchers in the field of healthcare. The PPI group provided feedback and guidance on the development of study materials (e.g. information sheets, consent forms, interview schedules) as well as their reflections on findings from preliminary qualitative data analysis.

Results



BMJ Open

1 2	
3	Thirteen participants were recruited to this qualitative study. The mean age of participants was 38
5	years (SD = 9.09 ; range = 23 - 54 years). The majority of participants were male (n=8) and White British
7	(n=9). Participants were recruited from a range of clinical and non-clinical roles (see Table 1).
8 9	
10 11	
12 13	INSERT TABLE 1 HERE
14 15	
16	
17	
19 20	
21 22	
23 24	
25	
26 27	
28 29	
30 31	
32 33	
34	
36	
37 38	
39 40	
41 42	
43 44	
45	
46	
48 49	
50 51	
52 53	
54 55	
56	
57 58	
50	

Table 1

Participant demographic characteristics

	N(%)	
N	13	
Age, M(SD)	38 (SD 9.09)	
Male	8 (61.54%)	
Ethnicity		
White British	9 (69.23%)	
Mixed, or multiple ethnic groups	2 (15.38%)	
Asian, or Asian British	1 (7.69%)	
Other ethnic group	1 (7.69%)	
Professional role	5	
Doctor	3 (23.08%)	
Research nurse/practitioner	4 (30.77%)	
IT technician	2 (15.38%)	
AI developer or researcher	4 (30.77%)	

Note: AI = artificial intelligence. IT = information technology.

Qualitative findings

Four core themes were identified: positive perceptions of AI, potential barriers to using AI in healthcare, concerns regarding AI use, and steps needed to ensure the acceptability of future AI tools. Anonymised excerpts are provided. Anonymised quotes are provided to illustrate findings and we detail whether participants had direct experience of the PROTEUS tool.

Positive Perception of AI

AI was generally seen by professionals as having a considerably positive impact on NHS healthcare. Professionals largely viewed AI tools as equipment that would support and guide clinical decision making, particularly in situations of diagnostic uncertainty. AI tools were also expected to improve diagnostic accuracy, minimise the chance of human error, and reduce clinician workload. There was also the suggestion that AI would be able to overcome human limitations, particularly in situations where patients require round-the-clock care.

"...the people with the illness especially like long-term illness, they need like 24 hours monitoring which is you can't do that as a human ... so I think it would help..." – Participant 001, IT technician, had experience of PROTEUS tool.

Clinical participants highlighted that decreasing the time taken to assess and diagnose patients would be of particular importance, as it would ultimately impact the number of patients in a department at a given time, and thus reduce the burden placed on NHS staff and resources.

"...People that come in and need a CT scan for the head injury, they wait two hours for the CT scan, and then they wait another two hours for the CT report and, so potentially that could...half the time that they're in the department, which makes a huge difference to us in terms of space and resources ...that would be...quite a significant gain I think, in terms of pressure and stress in the

department because there's often more than a hundred people in our department which feels...pressurised..." – Participant 009, Doctor, no experience of PROTEUS tool.

When asked about the current perceptions of AI, professionals were, overall, open to its use and suggested that healthcare staff perceptions of AI would steadily improve as they gained more experience and understanding of the tools and their potential benefits. However, some professionals did highlight that younger generations may be more likely to be open to using AI, as they have been exposed to similar tools at a younger age. In contrast, older generations were expected to be more sceptical about the technology, with some never accepting its use in healthcare.

"...I think it's definitely improving ... I would make the assumption that it's individuals on the older side of life, elderly individuals are more sceptical, and we have an ageing population obviously and I think scepticism will decrease naturally because, you know, young people are growing up around Siri and Alexa, it's not foreign to them..." -Participant 008, AI developer/researcher, had experience of PROTEUS tool.

Regarding patient perspectives of AI use in their care, professionals reported that, in their experience, patients had few concerns regarding the AI specifically. In the context of clinical research involving AI, issues that were raised by patients were typical of those raised in studies that did not feature AI tools, suggesting that patients do not view AI as a specific risk. Patients were reportedly predominantly concerned about their data privacy, whether taking part in AI research would impact their care and were purportedly happy to participate once reassured by clinicians or medical research staff. From experience, professionals also reported that patients seemed to be generally indifferent to or unconcerned about AI use in their care, as they trust their doctor to make the best decision for them.

"...From the patients' perspective, I think, they are fine. Our experience also was that they would be concerned but, you know, they go to an x-ray machine or MRI, and they do it ... they think clinicians put them in there because they think it's safe, so they trust them. I think as long as

BMJ Open

clinicians are reassured, they will transfer this reassurance to patients... " – Participant 012, AI developer/researcher, had experience of PROTEUS tool.

"They just want to get better, I think they don't really care who does it, if it's a human or if it's a robot or, if it's anything AI..." – Participant 013, Doctor, had experience of PROTEUS tool.

Barriers to using AI in Healthcare

There were several barriers that were discussed by professional participants, the majority relating to the limited resources that are currently available to support the implementation of AI tools in the NHS. Those professionals involved in AI research stressed that there are currently numerous data protection hurdles in place that are often lengthy and difficult to navigate when implementing a new AI tool or research study in the NHS. While professionals acknowledged that these are necessary to keep patients and their data safe, the amount of documentation and approval that must be completed was reported to cause delays in the set-up of the AI tools, preventing patients and professionals from reaping potential benefits.

"In particular in medical or in healthcare domain...it's very difficult to access data due to regulations ... it takes time. Although the process is fairly streamlined, it takes time to access data, all consent should be sought, all documentation should be signed and all information governance should be briefed..." – Participant 007, AI developer/researcher, no experience of PROTEUS tool.

Professionals also highlighted considerable inconsistency in NHS IT services across Trusts as a key barrier affecting the healthcare services ability to keep up-to-date with developing technology. Professionals, especially those in IT or AI development/research, reported that sites across the NHS often use different IT systems, many of which are unable to transfer information between systems, and – as a result – were not currently meeting the demands of healthcare professionals.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

"...Another big problem is systems within the hospital not speaking to each other. So the electronic patient record, doesn't talk to the radiology system, doesn't talk to the cardiology system, doesn't talk to the lab system so there's sometimes discrepancies, we're not bad in our Trust but I know other Trusts...have real problems.." – Participant 010, Research nurse/practitioner, no experience of PROTEUS tool.

As a result, professionals anticipated that most of the existing NHS computer systems would not be compatible with future AI tools and upcoming research projects would face many delays if these issues could not be resolved. Relating to this, some participants reported that many NHS IT teams are facing growing workloads, restricting the number of updates that can be made at a healthcare Trust at a given time, and adding further delays to the implementation of new technologies such as AI.

"...Some [NHS] Trusts were, well, they have more people, more capacity to do it. Some Trusts they just have a single person who's not very great...this is a big problem, it's a struggle..." – Participant 007, Research nurse/practitioner, no experience of PROTEUS tool.

Concerns Regarding AI Use

Some concerns were raised in relation to the use of AI in healthcare. These concerns predominantly revolved around the possible removal of humans from patient care. Professionals described concerns that AI tools may currently lack the empathy needed to sensitively deliver health information to patients and provide the necessary reassurance and support when patients are processing diagnoses. This lack of empathy was thought to have the potential to upset patients, particularly in situations that are especially distressing (e.g. new diagnosis of a serious health condition), and as a result, professional participants emphasised that humans would need to continue to have an important role in the delivery of care.

"The number one is that people are always reassured when they have personal contact. And it has to be personalised ... if it tries to be text-base that's non-personalised, it doesn't work. So

BMJ Open

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

that's where the skill of communication is really helpful. And, yeah, you have to be empathetic..." – Participant 006, Doctor, had experience of PROTEUS tool.

Concerns were also raised regarding the capacity for AI tools to make errors and how suitable regulations would need to be developed to ensure these errors were managed or avoided. However, the majority of professionals described that while the accuracy of AI tools was a risk, clinicians and patients could be reassured by increasing the supporting evidence for AI tools and ensuring the tool is tested across diverse populations.

"I think for anyone participating in research and seeing that and just knowing ... how much experience there has been using that tool, I think that's going to reassure people. How much it's been tested before ... it's important for them to know just how much ... or whether [it's] already been used and their experience of it..." – Participant 003, Research nurse/practitioner, had experience of PRTOEUS tool.

A small number of professionals reported concerns that there was a potential for clinicians to be de-skilled by the future uptake of supporting AI tools. While some professionals did describe that there was the potential for junior doctors who utilise AI tools early in their career to be less skilled in certain areas, this was not predominantly thought to be to be a risk to patient care. Many professionals also reported that clinical training should be updated to reflect developing technology including AI, ensuring that clinicians remain highly skilled both with and without the AI tools.

"... The Royal College of Medicine and Anaesthetics ...we have this sort of, supposedly, robust and comprehensive assessment you know, ... the formal exams to workplace band etcetera so I suppose they're trying to mitigate that by making sure we do understand the fundamentals, by making us do on the job assessments and more formal or classical exams as well." - Participant 009, Doctor, no experience of PROTEUS tool.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

.2.

"Within that making sure it's as easy to use, and it's as quick and fast and streamlined as really helpful." - Participant 005, Research nurse/practitioner, had experience of PROTEUS tool.

There was also a specific concern raised relating to resource strain. With increased AI use, it was thought likely by professionals that more patients could be identified as having health problems and would require clinical intervention. While many professionals believed that this would reduce the use of some NHS resources, it was suggested that the current strain would - in fact - move to other areas of patient care. This was of particular concern, as the NHS was considered a very delicately balanced system that could become overwhelmed easily. While it is currently unclear if this resource shift could occur, it was identified as a possible risk that should be considered and attended to as AI tools are further implemented in the NHS healthcare settings.

"It depends on the results doesn't it. So if the results are fantastic and we do find that [the AI tool is] a predictive model, I think the temptation would be to send as many patients as possible through...who could get a stress echo. [I'm] slightly... concerned ... it's going to result in this huge influx of resource use." - Participant 005, Research nurse/practitioner, had experience of PROTEUS tool.

Ensuring Acceptability of AI Tools

Transparency and communication were a central idea raised by professionals in relation to making AI tools acceptable to both clinical and non-clinical healthcare staff as well as patients. Professionals working in a research role emphasised that having technological support, including the opportunity to ask questions and raise concerns about the AI tool with developers, was particularly reassuring for healthcare staff and could help ensure a smooth set up and roll out of AI tools.

possible, ... having that flexibility, and whether that's having huge amount of technical support early on because that's where, as I'm sure you know, NHS IT is awful. Wherever you go it's always [bad]. Yeah so, I think...it's having support ... Having support for the technical aspect is

BMJ Open

Fostering trust in AI tools was another key issue described by professionals who stressed the importance of AI developers being open about how the tools were developed, the data that would be needed, how data would be securely stored and managed. By being transparent about these processes, professionals described that this would create greater trust between clinicians, patients, and AI developers which could facilitate the implementation of AI tools in NHS healthcare settings. One suggestion to ensure this transparent communication was to create specific stakeholder special interest groups across the NHS to provide the opportunity to discuss AI tools and other technical implementation aspects. By developing these groups, it was thought that this could provide the opportunity for individuals – both patients and clinical/non-clinical healthcare staff - affected by or interested in AI tools to raise specific concerns or questions and allow for acceptable adjustments to implementation procedures to be made.

"Possibly connect with you and tell you what they need maybe, what they're looking for. What their concerns are and vice versa you could connect with them ... where you can say this is what we're available to sort of give you, how would this work for your needs, because people need to talk..." – Participant 010, Research nurse/practitioner, no experience of PROTEUS tool.

Discussion

The aim of this qualitative study was to examine the perceptions of clinical and non-clinical professional stakeholders about their experiences and perceptions of using an AI tool in an NHS setting; their beliefs about the possible implications using AI tools may have; and views about potential facilitators/barriers to engagement to using AI tools in patient care within an NHS context. We identified four core themes: positive perceptions of AI, potential barriers to using AI in healthcare, concerns regarding AI use, and the potential steps needed to ensure the acceptability of future AI tools.

Overall, professionals reported being open to the idea of using AI in patient care and those who had previous experience utilising AI tools described how they had come away with a positive outlook on AI tools. Across the professional participants, AI was considered a supportive piece of technology that

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

could assist healthcare professionals and benefit clinicians and patients alike. However, central to this view was that the AI tool must fit their workflow and not cause added or unnecessary strain on NHS services. There was also a central belief that clinicians would need to continue to be involved in patient care to provide appropriate empathetic support. Therefore, in this study, AI was anticipated to be primarily an assistive tool, and there was little expectation that it would ever fully replace human clinicians. This is consistent with previous research involving NHS professionals, such as Morrison et al., [21] who found that AI tools were perceived to be able to provide assistance to clinical staff and had the potential to improve their working life. Similarly, Morrison et al., [21] reported that it was unlikely that human doctors would be replaced by AI technology, however this would likely remain a concern as more AI tools are used.

Participants in this study did raise concerns about AI tools relating to data protection and ensuring patient privacy. This was of particular importance to professional participants involved in research, who reported that patients required reassurance that any data that is collected would be used appropriately and kept safely. However, professionals believed that patient uncertainty would likely reduce as the amount of supporting research for AI tools increased over time. Concerns about data security are not unique to AI tools however and have been found consistently in studies investigating the acceptability of various technological advances in healthcare over the years, including the use of emails, mobile healthcare applications, and remote healthcare consultations (e.g. [22–24]).

This study also identified other potential barriers to the uptake of AI tools which related to the potential consequences of AI use in healthcare, including the potential for errors and increased demand for limited healthcare resources. As using AI tools in healthcare comes with the possibility for machine error (e.g. diagnostic error), this could negatively impact not only the patient, but also the trust patients have in the healthcare professionals involved in their care [25,26]. Previous studies describe that, as the public has a relatively low tolerance for machine errors [25] ensuring future AI tools have a human override feature and that this is clearly communicated will likely be important for fostering trust.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

BMJ Open

Additionally, while it was not identified as a significant risk, participants in the present study acknowledged that there is the potential for clinicians who utilise AI tools early in their careers to become deskilled if medical training does not update with the technology. This is reflective of existing literature [27] which has also identified 'deskilling' as something to be mitigated where possible to ensure acceptability within clinical staff as well as patient safety.

When examining these results in the specific context of the NHS, there are concerns that have been raised that may potentially be unique to this healthcare system. For example, if the use of AI tools does increase the demand for healthcare services, it is likely this would cause further strain on a system that is already experiencing multiple difficulties relating to resources and workforce [12]. As the NHS is a publicly funded system, its funding and resources are relatively restrictive, therefore, any changes in demands for resources could impact how care is given to patients, thus effecting their overall experience. In contrast, more privately-funded systems such as those that are common in the USA, are arguably more adaptable to changes in demand, as funding for services is provided as they are utilised by patients. Therefore, it is likely that funding for these services increases along with patient demand, allowing them to adapt accordingly.

Recommendations for future AI studies

Several structural barriers to implementing AI tools in healthcare were identified in this study, including difficulties navigating data protection policies and the limited IT infrastructure in many NHS services. Going forwards, for future AI development and adoption to be successful, there is a need for a robust IT governance strategy across NHS services to ensure AI tools can be smoothly and successfully integrated [25,28–32]. Given the disparity in resources and IT capacities across NHS Trusts throughout the UK [33], national efforts and investment may be needed in future to increase capacity for AI deployment to facilitate the widespread adoption of AI tools and help promote better healthcare equality [31,34].

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

When discussing approaches to improve the acceptability of AI tools, participating professionals highlighted the importance of transparency between AI developers and their intended users. Offering training to improve clinical care teams' understanding of AI technology, the potential risks/benefits, as well as secure data management may further increase clinician's receptiveness to future AI tools and increase their ability to discuss AI tools with patients [35–37]. In a similar vein, NHS sites receiving timely, practical technological support from developers when setting up a new AI tool in a healthcare context, including clear instructions and a point of contact to raise concerns with, may also be important when operationalising AI technologies into the NHS healthcare system. Developers should be mindful that a considerable proportion of NHS Trusts will have small IT teams or have less up-to-date facilities and these sites may need more time to implement new technologies and will potentially require more support than other sites.

In relation to patients' perceptions of AI tool acceptability, the results of this study highlight the perceived concerns that patients could have about AI tools being used in their care and the importance of AI tools being human-centred. It was suggested by participating professionals that patient and public involvement (PPI) groups may be especially valuable in future AI research. These groups may provide opportunities for patients and other stakeholders (e.g. caregivers, frontline clinical teams, ethicists, etc.) to raise any questions/concerns and help developers ensure adequate information is provided in future to healthcare teams, patients and their caregivers. Participants in this study also highlighted the need for future longitudinal studies of AI tools in order to provide additional evidence and reassurance to patients about a tool's safety and efficacy in a variety of populations over time.

Strengths and Limitations

This study has several strengths and limitations. A strength is that we interviewed a range of professionals (clinical and non-clinical) with a variety of lived experiences, expertise, and beliefs about

Page 23 of 31

BMJ Open

AI in healthcare. This sample size allowed for a detailed analysis of the data and provided an in-depth understanding of how AI fits in the context of the NHS healthcare, the barriers/facilitators to uptake and recommendations on approaches that may improve AI acceptability and implementation. Nonetheless, a limitation of this study is the opportunity sampling strategy used and the limited demographic diversity of the sample (e.g. most participants were male and White British). It would be valuable for future studies to include the views of other key stakeholders, such as information governance staff. A number of difficulties were experienced in recruiting NHS healthcare staff, primarily as it was not possible for researchers to successfully make contact with staff, and it is possible that this reflects the fact that recruitment took place during the course of the COVID-19 Pandemic which heavily impacted NHS healthcare staff workloads. We broadened our recruitment approach in response which led to the recruitment of a more diverse professional stakeholder sample, including not only clinicians but AI developers/researchers with experience of using AI tools in NHS healthcare settings. Finally, it was beyond the scope of this study to include patient participants. The views of patients are a key component in ensuring AI tools used in healthcare settings are feasible and acceptable and, while speculation was made by participants about potential patient views, these opinions have been made from a very different position than actual patients going through treatment, and therefore future research is needed to explore patient experiences and beliefs about AI tools in their care.

Conclusion

Despite these limitations, this study adds to the limited literature about the experiences and perceptions of clinical and non-clinical professional stakeholders of using AI tools in patient care in NHS settings. We identified several practical barriers to implementation, including a disparity in NHS IT capacities across Trusts and difficult to navigate organisational permissions, as well as concerns that could act as barriers to engagement (e.g. concerns about misdiagnosis, the potential for AI tools to deskill clinicians). Nonetheless, a number of positive implications for using AI in healthcare were also found, including the ability for AI tools to improve diagnostic accuracy and reduce clinician workload. As

efforts to expand the role of AI tools in healthcare settings increase, the recommendations made by this study about the importance of ensuring transparency and trust regarding data storage/sharing and having readily available technological support from developers may ensure future AI tools are effectively implemented and benefit both patients and clinical care teams.

to beer terien only

BMJ Open

Conflicts of interest: PL is a founder and shareholder of Ultromics Ltd and is an inventor on patents in the field of AI and healthcare. Ultromics Ltd uses Artificial Intelligence to build solutions that help meet the unmet needs of cardiovascular medicine, including EchoGo Pro, the Medical Device used in PROTEUS, the clinical trial associated with this qualitative research project.

Word count: 4928

Ethical approval: Ethical approval was received for this study from the University of Oxford Medical Sciences Interdivisional Research Ethics Committee (R77627/RE001); HRA and Health and Care Research Wales (HCRW) (21/NW/0199) and the NHS North West - Preston Research Ethics Committee

(21/NW/0199).

Funding: Funding for this research was provided by National Institute for Health and Care Research (AI

in Healthcare Award, Grant Number AI_AWARD01833).

Data availability: Data are available from corresponding author on reasonable request.

Contributor statement: All authors (CAF, VW, MB, BT, PL) contributed to the conception, planning and design of the study. All authors (CAF, VW, MB, BT, PL) contributed towards participant recruitment. CAF & VW collected, interpreted and analysed the data. CAF & VW drafted the manuscript for publication. All authors (CAF, VW, MB, BT, PL) reviewed and approved the manuscript.

References

- 1 Reddy S, Fox J, Purohit MP. Artificial intelligence-enabled healthcare delivery. J R Soc Med. 2019;**112**. doi:10.1177/0141076818815510
- Aung YYM, Wong DCS, Ting DSW. The promise of artificial intelligence: A review of the opportunities and challenges of artificial intelligence in healthcare. Br Med Bull.
 2021;139. doi:10.1093/bmb/ldab016
- 3 Takiddin A, Schneider J, Yang Y, *et al.* Artificial intelligence for skin cancer detection: Scoping review. J Med Internet Res. 2021;**23**. doi:10.2196/22934
- Choi J, Shin K, Jung J, *et al.* Convolutional neural network technology in endoscopic imaging: Artificial intelligence for endoscopy. Clin Endosc. 2020;53. doi:10.5946/ce.2020.054

3	-	Cool LIV Charatha D. Math. I.
4	5	Seoi HY, Shrestha P, Muth JF, et
5		for childhood asthma managem
6		doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0255
7	6	Schneider-Kamp A. The Potentia
8		Driven Co-Development of a Ca
9		
10	_	001:10.11/7/004695802110179
11	7	Meyer AND, Giardina TD, Spitzn
12		an artificial intelligence-assisted
13		Internet Res 2020; 22 . doi:10.21
14	8	Blease C. Locher C. Leon-Carlyle
15	C	nsychiatry: Qualitative findings
16		
17	-	001:10.11/7/205520762096835
18	9	Sit C, Srinivasan R, Amlani A, et
19		towards artificial intelligence ar
20		2020;11. doi:10.1186/s13244-0
21	10	Sofaer S. Qualitative methods: v
22	10	1000- 24 -1101 18 http://www.
23		1999, 54 .1101–18.11(p.//www.1
24		2016).
25	11	Braun V, Clarke V. Using themat
20		101.
27	12	Cooksley T. Clarke S. Dean J. et (
20		BMI 2023:380 doi:10 1136/BM
30	12	Soltan AAS Vang Dattanshott
31	15	Soliali AAS, Falig J, Pattalishetty
32		free COVID-19 triage for emerge
33		artificial intelligence driven scre
34		doi:10.1016/S2589-7500(21)002
35	14	Ahmad A, Wilson A, Haycock A,
36		detection system during screen
37		2022.55.213_9 doi:10.1055/A_
38	4 5	2022, 33 :515-9: 001:10:1055/A-
39	15	Ganapathi S, Duggai S. Exploring
40		Artificial Intelligence in English I
41		2023; 18 :e0282415. doi:10.1371
42	16	Aggarwal R, Farag S, Martin G, e
43		Artificial Intelligence to Health (
44 45		2021.23/8).e26162 https://www
45 46		doi:10.2106/20102 https://www
40 47	. –	001:10.2196/26162
47	17	Woodward G, Bajre M, Bhattacl
49		Randomized Controlled Trial Eva
50		Echocardiography. Am Heart J 2
51	18	Malterud K. Siersma VD. Guasso
52		Guided by Information Power (
53		doi:10.1177/104072221F61744
54		001.10.11///1049/3231561/44
55	19	Morse JM. Critical Analysis of St
56		Qual Health Res 2015; 25 :1212-
57		
58		
59		

1 2

- 5 Seol HY, Shrestha P, Muth JF, *et al.* Artificial intelligence-assisted clinical decision support for childhood asthma management: A randomized clinical trial. *PLoS One* 2021;**16**. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0255261
- 6 Schneider-Kamp A. The Potential of AI in Care Optimization: Insights from the User-Driven Co-Development of a Care Integration System. *Inquiry (United States)* 2021;**58**. doi:10.1177/00469580211017992
- 7 Meyer AND, Giardina TD, Spitzmueller C, *et al.* Patient perspectives on the usefulness of an artificial intelligence-assisted symptom checker: Cross-sectional survey study. *J Med Internet Res* 2020;**22**. doi:10.2196/14679
- 8 Blease C, Locher C, Leon-Carlyle M, *et al.* Artificial intelligence and the future of psychiatry: Qualitative findings from a global physician survey. *Digit Health* 2020;**6**. doi:10.1177/2055207620968355
- 9 Sit C, Srinivasan R, Amlani A, *et al.* Attitudes and perceptions of UK medical students towards artificial intelligence and radiology: a multicentre survey. *Insights Imaging* 2020;**11**. doi:10.1186/s13244-019-0830-7
- 10 Sofaer S. Qualitative methods: what are they and why use them? *Health Serv Res* 1999;**34**:1101–18.http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10591275 (accessed 28 Jul 2016).
- Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qual Res Psychol* 2006;3:77–101.
- 12 Cooksley T, Clarke S, Dean J, *et al.* NHS crisis: rebuilding the NHS needs urgent action. *BMJ* 2023;**380**. doi:10.1136/BMJ.P1
- 13 Soltan AAS, Yang J, Pattanshetty R, *et al.* Real-world evaluation of rapid and laboratoryfree COVID-19 triage for emergency care: external validation and pilot deployment of artificial intelligence driven screening. *Lancet Digit Health* 2022;**4**:e266–78. doi:10.1016/S2589-7500(21)00272-7
- Ahmad A, Wilson A, Haycock A, *et al.* Evaluation of a real-time computer-aided polyp detection system during screening colonoscopy: AI-DETECT study. *Endoscopy* 2022;55:313–9. doi:10.1055/A-1966-0661/ID/JR22094-7/BIB
- 15 Ganapathi S, Duggal S. Exploring the experiences and views of doctors working with Artificial Intelligence in English healthcare; a qualitative study. *PLoS One* 2023;**18**:e0282415. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0282415
- 16 Aggarwal R, Farag S, Martin G, *et al.* Patient Perceptions on Data Sharing and Applying Artificial Intelligence to Health Care Data: Cross-sectional Survey. *J Med Internet Res* 2021;23(8):e26162 https://www.jmir.org/2021/8/e26162 2021;**23**:e26162. doi:10.2196/26162
- 17 Woodward G, Bajre M, Bhattacharyya S, *et al.* PROTEUS Study: A Prospective Randomized Controlled Trial Evaluating the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Stress Echocardiography. *Am Heart J* 2023;**263**:123–32. doi:10.1016/J.AHJ.2023.05.003
- Malterud K, Siersma VD, Guassora AD. Sample Size in Qualitative Interview Studies:
 Guided by Information Power. *Qual Health Res* 2016;**26**:1753–60.
 doi:10.1177/1049732315617444
- 19 Morse JM. Critical Analysis of Strategies for Determining Rigor in Qualitative Inquiry. *Qual Health Res* 2015;**25**:1212–22. doi:10.1177/1049732315588501

Page 27 of 31

BMJ Open

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar tec	Dpen: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from h
---	---

ω

20	Richards KAR, Hemphill MA. A practical guide to collaborative qualitative data analysis.
21	Morrison K. Artificial intelligence and the NHS: a qualitative exploration of the factors
	influencing adoption. <i>Future Healthc J</i> 2021; 8 . doi:10.7861/fhj.2020-0258
22	review, critical issues and challenges. Australas Phys Eng Sci Med. 2015; 38 .
	doi:10.1007/s13246-014-0315-4
23	Ross L, Bena J, Bermel R, <i>et al.</i> Implementation and Patient Experience of Outpatient Teleneurology. <i>Telemedicine and e-Health</i> 2021; 27 . doi:10.1089/tmj.2020.0032
24	Car J, Sheikh A. Email consultations in health care: 2—acceptability and safe application. <i>BMJ</i> 2004; 329 . doi:10.1136/bmj.329.7463.439
25	Matheny, M., Israni S. T., Ahmed M. WD. Artificial Intelligence in Health Care - The Hope,
	the Hype, the Promise, the Peril - Ehealthresearch.no (NO). Norwegian Centre for E-
26	Morley I Floridi I. An ethically mindful approach to AI for health care. The Lancet
20	2020: 395 . doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(19)32975-7
27	Aquino YSJ, Rogers WA, Braunack-Mayer A, et al. Utopia versus dystopia: Professional
	perspectives on the impact of healthcare artificial intelligence on clinical roles and skills.
	Int J Med Inform 2023;169:104903. doi:10.1016/J.IJMEDINF.2022.104903
28	Widner K, Virmani S, Krause J, et al. Lessons learned from translating AI from
	development to deployment in healthcare. <i>Nature Medicine 2023 29:6</i> 2023; 29 :1304–6.
	doi:10.1038/s41591-023-02293-9
29	Gray K, Slavotinek J, Dimaguila GL, et al. Artificial Intelligence Education for the Health
	Workforce: Expert Survey of Approaches and Needs. JMIR Med Educ 2022;8.
30	about the innevation characteristics of artificial intelligence. a gualitative interview
	study with healthcare leaders in Sweden, Implement Sci Commun 2023:4:1–13
	doi·10 1186/S43058-023-00458-8/TABLES/2
31	Novak LL, Russell RG, Garvey K, <i>et al.</i> Clinical use of artificial intelligence requires Al-
-	capable organizations. JAMIA Open 2023:6. doi:10.1093/JAMIAOPEN/OOAD028
32	Petersson L, Larsson I, Nygren JM, et al. Challenges to implementing artificial intelligence
	in healthcare: a qualitative interview study with healthcare leaders in Sweden. BMC
	Health Serv Res 2022; 22 :1–16. doi:10.1186/S12913-022-08215-8/FIGURES/1
33	INTERIM REPORT Data Driven Healthcare in 2030: Transformation Requirements of the
	NHS Digital Technology and Health Informatics Workforce Full Report HEE Digital
	Readiness Programme. 2021.
34	Apell P, Eriksson H. Artificial intelligence (AI) healthcare technology innovations: the
	current state and challenges from a life science industry perspective. <i>Technol Anal</i>
25	Strateg Manag 2023; 35 :179–93. doi:10.1080/09537325.2021.1971188
35	Paranjape K, Schinkel M, Panday KN, <i>et al.</i> Introducing artificial intelligence training in

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de Enseignement Superieur (ABES) .

data mining, Al training, and similar technologies

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text

- Grunhut J, Wyatt AT, Marques O. Educating Future Physicians in Artificial Intelligence (AI): An Integrative Review and Proposed Changes. J Med Educ Curric Dev 2021;8. doi:10.1177/23821205211036836
- . Prc. .6836 . Patel M, et .d Tools by Heak .u.1097/ACM.000000

1	
2 3	Supplementary Material 1
4	Indicative guide for interviews
5	
7	
8	Introduction
9	Introduction
10	
11	a. What is your previous experience of AI research in healthcare?
13 14	i. Are there any particular barriers you've faced? Any facilitators?
15	ii. Do you know of any specific AI tools used to guide decision making in
16 17	cardiology or healthcare more broadly?
18	iii. What impact do you think AI tools might have on patient's access to care?
19 20	What factors currently impact nationt's access to care? How might
20	1. What factors currently impact patient s access to care i now might
22	Al tools help affect these?
23	iv. If AI tools were widely accepted in the NHS, what impact could this have on
24 25	the staff workload?
26	
27	1. Is there anything that AI developers could do to ensure the tool fits
28	into the NHS workflow?
29 30	2. Is there anything the NHS could do?
31	y Has your perception of using AI tools changed over time?
32 33	v. This your perception of using vit tools changed over time.
34	vi. Are there any factors that would help clinicians feel more comfortable when
35	using AI tools?
36 27	1. Are there any changes that would need to be made at NHS
37 38	In the there any energies that need to be made at the
39	Trust/organisation level to facilitate the use of AI tools?
40	
41 42	vii. Are there any factors that would help patients feel more comfortable with
42	At to als having used in their arm?
44	Ai tools being used in their care?
45	viji. Is there anything we could do to encourage NHS sites to participate in Al
46 47	
48	research like PROTEUS?
49	
50	ix. What impact could using AI tools have on patient care and clinical decision
51 52	making?
52	
54	1. What are some of the benefits of using AI tools? What are some of
55	the potential risks?
50 57	x. Do you have any thoughts or questions to add?
58	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
59	
60	

Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research (SRQR)*

http://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/srqr/

Page/line no(s).

Title - Concise description of the nature and topic of the study Identifying the	
study as qualitative or indicating the approach (e.g., ethnography, grounded	
theory) or data collection methods (e.g., interview, focus group) is recommended	1
Abstract - Summary of key elements of the study using the abstract format of the intended publication; typically includes background, purpose, methods, results,	
and conclusions	3

Introduction L

Problem formulation - Description and significance of the problem/phenomenon studied; review of relevant theory and empirical work; problem statement	5-6
Purpose or research question - Purpose of the study and specific objectives or questions	5-6

Methods

Qualitative approach and research paradigm - Qualitative approach (e.g., ethnography, grounded theory, case study, phenomenology, narrative research) and guiding theory if appropriate: identifying the research paradigm (e.g.,	
postpositivist, constructivist/ interpretivist) is also recommended; rationale**	6
Researcher characteristics and reflexivity - Researchers' characteristics that may	
influence the research, including personal attributes, qualifications/experience,	
relationship with participants, assumptions, and/or presuppositions; potential or	
actual interaction between researchers' characteristics and the research	
questions, approach, methods, results, and/or transferability	8
Context - Setting/site and salient contextual factors; rationale**	6-8
Sampling strategy - How and why research participants, documents, or events were selected; criteria for deciding when no further sampling was necessary (e.g.,	
sampling saturation); rationale**	6-8
Ethical issues pertaining to human subjects - Documentation of approval by an appropriate ethics review board and participant consent, or explanation for lack	
thereof; other confidentiality and data security issues	6
Data collection methods - Types of data collected; details of data collection	
procedures including (as appropriate) start and stop dates of data collection and	
analysis, iterative process, triangulation of sources/methods, and modification of	
procedures in response to evolving study findings; rationale**	8

interview guides, questionnaires) and devices (e.g., audio recorders) used for data	
collection; if/how the instrument(s) changed over the course of the study	7
Units of study - Number and relevant characteristics of participants, documents,	
or events included in the study; level of participation (could be reported in results)	9
Data processing - Methods for processing data prior to and during analysis, including transcription, data entry, data management and security, verification of	
data integrity, data coding, and anonymization/de-identification of excerpts	8
Data analysis - Process by which inferences, themes, etc., were identified and developed, including the researchers involved in data analysis; usually references a	
specific paradigm or approach; rationale**	8
Techniques to enhance trustworthiness - Techniques to enhance trustworthiness	
and credibility of data analysis (e.g., member checking, audit trail, triangulation);	
rationale**	8-9

Results/findings

Synthesis and interpretation - Main findings (e.g., interpretations, inferences, and themes); might include development of a theory or model, or integration with	
prior research or theory	9-17
Links to empirical data - Evidence (e.g., quotes, field notes, text excerpts,	
photographs) to substantiate analytic findings	9-17

Discussion

Integration with prior work, implications, transferability, and con the field - Short summary of main findings; explanation of how find conclusions connect to, support, elaborate on, or challenge conclus scholarship; discussion of scope of application/generalizability; ide	tribu lings sions ntifica	tion(s) to and of earlier ation of	
unique contribution(s) to scholarship in a discipline or field			17-21
Limitations - Trustworthiness and limitations of findings		~	20
er		2	

Other

Conflicts of interest - Potential sources of influence or perceived influence on	
study conduct and conclusions; how these were managed	1
Funding - Sources of funding and other support; role of funders in data collection,	1
Interpretation, and reporting	

*The authors created the SRQR by searching the literature to identify guidelines, reporting standards, and critical appraisal criteria for qualitative research; reviewing the reference lists of retrieved sources; and contacting experts to gain feedback. The SRQR aims to improve the transparency of all aspects of qualitative research by providing clear standards for reporting qualitative research.

**The rationale should briefly discuss the justification for choosing that theory, approach, method, or technique rather than other options available, the assumptions and limitations implicit in those choices, and how those choices influence study conclusions and transferability. As appropriate, the rationale for several items might be discussed together.

Reference:

O'Brien BC, Harris IB, Beckman TJ, Reed DA, Cook DA. Standards for reporting qualitative research: a synthesis of recommendations. Academic Medicine, Vol. 89, No. 9 / Sept 2014 DOI: 10.1097/ACM.00000000000388

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-076950 on 11 December 2023. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de Enseignement Superieur (ABES)

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies