

# The Algorithmic Accountability Gap: How AI is Reshaping Medical Liability Law

Rasit Dinc

*Rasit Dinc Digital Health & AI Research*

Published: June 10, 2022 | Medical Imaging AI

DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.17997893](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17997893)

## Abstract

The integration of Artificial Intelligence AI into clinical practice—from diagnostic imaging to personalized treatment recommendations—promises a revolution ...

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into clinical practice—from diagnostic imaging to personalized treatment recommendations—promises a revolution in healthcare. Yet, as AI systems become indispensable tools for physicians, they introduce a profound and complex challenge to the established framework of **medical liability law**. The traditional malpractice model, centered on the actions and judgment of a human physician, is struggling to accommodate the algorithmic errors and opaque decision-making processes of advanced AI. This shift necessitates a critical re-evaluation of accountability, standard of care, and the very definition of negligence in the digital age.

## The Erosion of the "Reasonable Physician" Standard

Medical malpractice hinges on the "standard of care," which asks whether a physician acted with the same skill and care that another reasonably prudent physician would have exercised under similar circumstances. AI complicates this standard in two primary ways [1]:

1. **AI as the New Standard:** If an AI system consistently outperforms human physicians, does the standard of care evolve to require a physician to use that AI, or at least to follow its recommendations? Failure to use a superior AI tool could potentially become a new basis for negligence. 2. **AI as the Fallible Tool:** Conversely, if a physician relies on a faulty AI recommendation that leads to patient harm, is the physician protected because they followed a tool widely used in the field, or are they liable for failing to exercise independent judgment? Current legal thinking suggests that the physician, as the final human gatekeeper, still bears the ultimate responsibility [2].

## The Shifting Sands of Liability: Who is to Blame?

The core legal question is one of attribution: when an AI system makes an error, who is the responsible party? Legal scholars and practitioners are

exploring several potential avenues for liability, moving beyond the sole focus on the clinician [3]:

| Responsible Party | Traditional Legal Theory | AI-Specific Challenge | | :--- | :-- | :--- | | **The Clinician** | Medical Malpractice (Negligence) | Did the clinician fail to override a clearly erroneous AI output, or fail to use the AI correctly? | | **The Developer/Manufacturer** | Product Liability (Defect) | Was the AI system defectively designed, manufactured, or did it lack adequate warnings? This is difficult due to AI's continuous learning and "black box" nature. | | **The Hospital/Health System** | Corporate Negligence / Vicarious Liability | Did the hospital fail to properly vet, train staff on, or maintain the AI system? This is a growing area of direct liability [4]. |

The application of **product liability** to AI is particularly challenging. Unlike a faulty surgical instrument, an AI's error may stem not from a manufacturing defect but from flawed training data, which can introduce bias or lead to unpredictable outcomes. Establishing causation—proving that the AI's error, and not a human factor, was the direct cause of injury—is a significant hurdle [5].

## **The Regulatory Imperative**

---

The current legal landscape is a patchwork, ill-equipped to handle the rapid evolution of AI. Many experts argue that a new regulatory framework is necessary to ensure patient safety and clear lines of accountability. This framework must address issues of algorithmic transparency, data governance, and mandatory testing protocols for AI systems before they are deployed in high-stakes clinical settings [6].

The application of **product liability** to AI is particularly challenging. Unlike a faulty surgical instrument, an AI's error may stem not from a manufacturing defect but from flawed training data, which can introduce bias or lead to unpredictable outcomes. Establishing causation—proving that the AI's error, and not a human factor, was the direct cause of injury—is a significant hurdle [5].

### ***The Challenge of Causation and the "Black Box"***

In a traditional medical malpractice case, the plaintiff must prove that the physician's negligent act or omission directly caused the patient's injury. When an AI system is involved, the chain of causation becomes murky. If a diagnostic AI provides an incorrect reading, and the physician, relying on that reading, fails to order a necessary test, is the cause the AI's error, the physician's reliance, or a combination of both? The "black box" nature of many deep learning algorithms—where the exact process leading to a decision is opaque even to its developers—further complicates this. Without transparency, it is nearly impossible for a court to determine if the AI met a reasonable standard of performance or if the error was foreseeable and preventable [7].

### ***The Regulatory Imperative and Future Models***

The current legal landscape is a patchwork, ill-equipped to handle the rapid

evolution of AI. Many experts argue that a new regulatory framework is necessary to ensure patient safety and clear lines of accountability. This framework must address issues of algorithmic transparency, data governance, and mandatory testing protocols for AI systems before they are deployed in high-stakes clinical settings [6].

One proposed solution is a **no-fault compensation scheme** for AI-related medical injuries, which would compensate patients without the need to prove negligence, thereby encouraging innovation. Another is the creation of a specialized regulatory body, similar to the FDA's role in drug approval, that would certify AI systems for safety and efficacy, and potentially share liability with developers [8]. The transformation of **medical liability law** by AI is not a future concern; it is a present reality. Stakeholders across the healthcare and legal sectors must collaborate to define a robust, equitable system of accountability that fosters innovation while rigorously protecting patient well-being.

For more in-depth analysis on this topic, the resources at [www.rasitdinc.com] (https://www.rasitdinc.com) provide expert commentary.

\*\*

## References

- [1] Cestonaro, C. (2023). *Defining medical liability when artificial intelligence is used in clinical practice: A systematic literature review*. BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making, 23(1), 314. [https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10711067/] (https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10711067/)
- [2] Jones, C. (2023). *Artificial intelligence and clinical decision support: clinicians' concerns about legal liability*. Medical Law Review, 31(4), 501-526. [https://academic.oup.com/medlaw/article/31/4/501/7176027] (https://academic.oup.com/medlaw/article/31/4/501/7176027)
- [3] Price II, N. W. (2024). *Liability for Use of Artificial Intelligence in Medicine*. In Research Handbook on the Law and Economics of Digital Health. Edward Elgar Publishing. [https://repository.law.umich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1569&context=book\_chapters] (https://repository.law.umich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1569&context=book\_chapters)
- [4] Price, W. N. (2022). *Liability for Use of Artificial Intelligence in Medicine*. Law & Economics Working Papers. [https://repository.law.umich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1352&context=law\_econ\_current] (https://repository.law.umich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1352&context=law\_econ\_current)
- [5] Terranova, C., et al. (2024). *AI and professional liability assessment in healthcare. A narrative review*. Frontiers in Medicine, 11. [https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/medicine/articles/10.3389/fmed.2023.1337335/full] (https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/medicine/articles/10.3389/fmed.2023.1337335/full)
- [6] Pham, T., et al. (2025). *Ethical and legal considerations in healthcare AI*. Journal of Medical Ethics\*. [https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12076083/] (https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12076083/)
- [7] Milbank Quarterly.

(2021). Artificial Intelligence and Liability in Medicine: Balancing Safety and Innovation. [<https://www.milbank.org/quarterly/articles/artificial-intelligence-and-liability-in-medicine-balancing-safety-and-innovation/>]  
(<https://www.milbank.org/quarterly/articles/artificial-intelligence-and-liability-in-medicine-balancing-safety-and-innovation/>) [8] Stanford HAI. (2024). Understanding Liability Risk from Healthcare AI. [<https://hai.stanford.edu/policy-brief-understanding-liability-risk-healthcare-ai>]  
(<https://hai.stanford.edu/policy-brief-understanding-liability-risk-healthcare-ai>)

---

**Rasit Dinc Digital Health & AI Research**

<https://rasitdinc.com>

© 2022 Rasit Dinc