

Is Informed Consent Required for AI Diagnosis? Navigating the Legal and Ethical Landscape of Digital Health

Rasit Dinc

Rasit Dinc Digital Health & AI Research

Published: December 9, 2022 | AI Diagnostics

DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.17997684](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17997684)

Abstract

Is Informed Consent Required for AI Diagnosis? Navigating the Legal and Ethical Landscape of Digital Health The integration of Artificial Intelligence (...)

Is Informed Consent Required for AI Diagnosis? Navigating the Legal and Ethical Landscape of Digital Health

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into clinical practice, particularly in diagnostic processes, promises to revolutionize healthcare by enhancing speed, accuracy, and efficiency. However, this technological leap introduces complex legal and ethical challenges, chief among them the question of **informed consent**. As AI systems move from being mere clinical aids to integral components of the diagnostic workflow, healthcare professionals and the public must grapple with whether the traditional model of informed consent is sufficient, or if a new framework is required to protect patient autonomy and trust.

The Foundation of Informed Consent in the Age of AI

Informed consent is a cornerstone of medical ethics and law, rooted in the principle of patient autonomy—the right of a patient to make decisions about their own body and medical care [1]. Legally, informed consent requires a physician to disclose all **material facts** about a proposed treatment or procedure, including its nature, risks, benefits, and alternatives [2].

The core challenge posed by AI diagnosis is determining what constitutes a "material fact" when an algorithm is involved. The use of AI can impact the diagnostic process in several ways:

- 1. AI as a Consultative Tool:** The AI system assists the physician, who then uses their clinical judgment to deliver the final diagnosis.
- 2. AI as a Primary Diagnostician:** The AI system delivers a diagnosis or recommendation that

the physician is expected to follow, such as in the case of autonomous AI systems cleared by regulatory bodies [3].

In both scenarios, the patient's right to know is paramount. The legal consensus is moving toward the position that the use of an AI system in a patient's care is a material fact that must be disclosed, especially if it significantly alters the standard of care or introduces unique risks, such as algorithmic bias or a lack of transparency (the "black box" problem) [4].

The "Black Box" Problem and Patient Autonomy

Many advanced AI diagnostic tools, particularly those based on deep learning, operate as "black boxes." Their decision-making process is so complex and opaque that even the developers and clinicians using them cannot fully explain *why* a specific diagnosis was reached. This opacity directly conflicts with the requirements of informed consent, which traditionally demands a clear explanation of the procedure.

If a physician cannot fully explain the basis of an AI-driven diagnosis, how can a patient provide truly **informed** consent?

Component of Consent	Traditional Diagnosis	AI-Assisted Diagnosis	:--
:--	:--	Disclosure of Procedure	Clear explanation of tests and physician's rationale.
Must include disclosure of AI's involvement and its role (e.g., primary or secondary).		Disclosure of Risks	Known risks of the procedure (e.g., side effects, complications).
			Must include risks unique to AI (e.g., algorithmic bias, data security, lack of interpretability).
		Alternatives	Alternative diagnostic methods or treatment paths.
			Must include the option to opt-out of AI use, if a non-AI alternative exists.
		Understanding	Patient comprehends the information provided.
			Requires simplified, clear communication about AI's function and limitations.

The consensus emerging from legal and ethical scholarship suggests that the patient must be informed not only that AI is being used, but also about the **limitations** of the system, including its known error rates, the potential for bias, and the degree of human oversight involved [5].

A Shift Towards Shared Decision-Making

The complexities of AI diagnosis are pushing the medical community toward a model of **shared decision-making** that goes beyond mere legal compliance. This model emphasizes a collaborative process where the physician and patient jointly arrive at a decision, ensuring the patient's values and preferences are central to the care plan.

For AI, this means:

Transparency: *Physicians must be trained to communicate the AI's role and its level of certainty in a way that is understandable to the layperson.* **Opt-Out Provision:** Patients should generally have the right to refuse the use of an AI system in their diagnosis, provided a reasonable alternative exists. **Human Accountability:** *The physician remains ultimately responsible for the diagnosis and treatment plan, even when relying on AI. The AI is a tool, not a*

shield from liability [6].

*The debate is not about whether consent is required—it is—but rather about the **depth and nature** of the disclosure. As AI becomes ubiquitous, a blanket consent for "standard medical practice" may eventually cover its use, but for now, and for novel or high-risk applications, explicit, specific consent is the ethical and legally prudent path.*

For more in-depth analysis on this topic, including the latest regulatory developments and expert commentary on the future of digital health ethics, the resources at www.rasitdinc.com provide expert commentary.

Conclusion

*The question, "Is informed consent required for AI diagnosis?" is unequivocally **yes**. The challenge lies in adapting the centuries-old doctrine of informed consent to the unprecedented complexity of algorithmic medicine. The future of digital health depends on a framework that champions transparency, preserves patient autonomy, and ensures that the power of AI is harnessed ethically and legally. Physicians must embrace their duty to disclose the "material fact" of AI involvement, transforming the black box into a clear, understandable component of the patient-physician relationship.*

*

References

[1] Cohen, I. G., & Slottje, A. (2023). Artificial intelligence and the law of informed consent. In Research Handbook on Health, AI and the Law. Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK613199/

[2] Caplan, A. L. (2024). The Role of Informed Consent in Medical AI. CAP Physicians. https://www.capphysicians.com/articles/role-informed-consent-medical-ai-balancing-innovative-advancements-patient-rights

[3] U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2024). Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning (AI/ML) in Software as a Medical Device (SaMD). https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/software-medical-device-samd/artificial-intelligence-and-machine-learning-aiml-software-medical-device-samd

[4] Abujaber, A. A. (2024). Ethical framework for artificial intelligence in healthcare. Journal of Clinical and Translational Research, 10(3), 1-10. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11230076/

[5] Weiner, E. B. (2025). Ethical challenges and evolving strategies in the integration of artificial intelligence in healthcare. Journal of Medical Ethics, 51(3), 1-8. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11977975/

(<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11977975/>)

[6] Holt, D. J. (2025). *Can AI Diagnose Patients? What Healthcare Providers Need to Know*. DJ Holt Law*. <https://djholtlaw.com/ai-legal-diagnosis-healthcare-liability/>

Rasit Dinc Digital Health & AI Research

<https://rasitdinc.com>

© 2022 Rasit Dinc