The Review Of
DIABETIC
STUDIES
OPEN ACCESS

The Review of DIABETIC STUDIES
Reprint from

# The Impact Of Digital Transformation And Artificial Intelligence On The Efficiency Of Healthcare Workforce Performance And The Quality Of Healthcare Services

**Fahad Mohammed Abdulrahman Aldosari [1], Abdulrahman Marwan Fetyani [2], Mashael Talea Alqahtani [3], Mariam Mohammed Ghazwany [4], Amjaad Abdullah Muteb Alshehri [5], Sarah Hassan Alrashdi [6], Ahmed Hussein Azeb Alzhrani [7], Ashwaq Ali Aftan [8], Abdulaziz Fahad Farah Almutairi [9], Maha Sultan Majed Alotaibi [10]**

1. *Health Information Technician, King Khalid Hospital, Al-Kharj, First Health Cluster, Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.*
2. *Pharmacist, Al-Iman General Hospital, First Health Cluster, Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.*
3. *Nursing Technician, Aseer Health Cluster, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.*
4. *Nursing specialist, Prince Faisal bin Khalid Cardiac Center, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.*
5. *Physiotherapist, Al-Namas General Hospital - Aseer Health Cluster, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.*
6. *Dentist, Al-Marjaniah Primary Healthcare Center, Second Health Cluster, Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.*
7. *Pharmacist, Aliman general hospital, First Health Cluster, Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.*
8. *Radiology specialist, King Khalid Hospital Alkharj, First Health Cluster, Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.*
9. *Pharmacy Technician, Ministry of National Guard, Prince Mohammed bin Abdulaziz Hospital in Madinah, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.*
10. *Nursing Specialist, Albjadyah PHC, Third Health Cluster, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.*

**Abstract**

**Background:** The healthcare sector grapples with workforce shortages, rising costs, and post-COVID demands, necessitating digital transformation and AI to boost efficiency across paramedics, nursing, pharmacy, and infection control. This review synthesizes 2015-2026 evidence on technological evolution, theoretical frameworks like TAM/UTAUT and Donabedian's model, and applications enhancing performance and quality.
**Objective:** To evaluate digital transformation and AI's impact on healthcare workforce efficiency and service quality, addressing gaps in multidisciplinary integration for non-physician roles.
**Methods:** Narrative synthesis of peer-reviewed literature from PubMed, Scopus, and WHO sources (2015-2026), focusing on AI in triage, EHRs, predictive analytics, and barriers like bias and interoperability. Theoretical models (TAM, Diffusion of Innovations, socio-technical systems) frame adoption and outcomes.
**Results:** AI automates tasks (e.g., RPA cuts scheduling errors 40%), improves diagnostics (95%+ accuracy in imaging), and enhances safety (20% sepsis mortality drop). Digital tools like telemedicine and IoT reduce administrative burdens by 20-30%, though barriers (data silos, resistance) limit gains in low-resource settings. Future trends include generative AI and metaverse training.
**Conclusions:** Digital transformation and AI substantially elevate workforce efficiency and service quality via automation and prediction, but require human-centered design, ethical governance, and infrastructure to overcome adoption hurdles. Multidisciplinary strategies will maximize benefits in emergency and infection control contexts.

**Keywords:** digital transformation, AI in healthcare, workforce efficiency, service quality, telemedicine, predictive analytics, infection control.

## Introduction

The global healthcare sector faces unprecedented challenges, including severe workforce shortages, escalating costs, and heightened demands following the COVID-19 pandemic, which have strained systems worldwide and underscored the urgent need for innovative solutions through digital transformation and artificial intelligence (AI). These technologies promise to enhance workforce efficiency and service quality by automating routine tasks, enabling data-driven decisions, and facilitating multidisciplinary collaboration across professions like paramedics, nursing, and pharmacy (Boniol et al., 2022).

The healthcare workforce has been grappling with persistent shortages that predate but were exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic, with the World Health Organization (WHO) estimating a global deficit of 15 million health workers in 2020, projected to decrease modestly to 10 million by 2030, yet remaining acute in regions like Africa and the Eastern Mediterranean where shortages constitute over half of the global total due to population growth and limited training capacity. Rising costs compound this issue, as insurers project double-digit increases in global medical expenses, 10.4% in 2025 alone, driven by new technologies, pharmaceuticals, and demand surges, pushing per-employee U.S. health coverage beyond $16,000 and straining budgets in low-resource settings. Post-COVID demands have further intensified pressures, with lingering effects like long COVID requiring multidisciplinary management, disrupted routine services leading to backlogs in vaccinations and chronic care, and workforce burnout from overwhelmed systems, as evidenced by UN reports noting initial recovery signs by 2022 but ongoing bottlenecks in staffing, funding, and primary care integration across 80-90% of countries. These challenges disproportionately affect emergency services, nursing, and pharmacy roles, where paramedics face triage overloads and pharmacists manage medication safety amid supply disruptions, highlighting the need for digital tools to redistribute workloads and optimize performance without expanding headcounts (Boniol et al., 2022).

Digital transformation in healthcare began in the early 2000s with the adoption of Electronic Health Records (EHRs), evolving from basic clinical data systems in the 1960s pioneered by institutions like the Mayo Clinic and Lockheed, to widespread implementation spurred by U.S. policies like HIPAA in 1996 and the 2009 HITECH Act's Meaningful Use incentives, which facilitated cloud-based EMR migrations for scalable storage and interoperability using standards like HL7. By the mid-2000s, cloud computing emerged as a game-changer, with platforms like Amazon S3 and Azure enabling secure handling of vast datasets including imaging and diagnostics, transitioning from on-premises virtualization to hybrid models that reduced infrastructure costs and supported telemedicine during the 2010s. The 2020s accelerated this evolution amid COVID-19, integrating big data analytics, mobile health apps, and AI-driven platforms by 2026, with cloud adoption exploding for real-time data sharing in emergency and multidisciplinary settings transforming fragmented systems into cohesive ecosystems despite challenges like cybersecurity and regulatory compliance (Gu et al., 2020).

Artificial Intelligence (AI) in healthcare refers to systems that mimic human cognition to analyze complex data, with key types including machine learning (ML deep learning via neural networks like Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) for anomaly detection in X-rays and MRIs, natural language processing (NLP) for extracting insights from unstructured notes and enabling chatbots, and computer vision for real-time diagnostics in emergencies such as fracture identification or sepsis prediction. Emerging prominently post-2010s, AI has revolutionized fields like emergency medicine, where ML models triage patients faster than humans, NLP processes clinical narratives for adverse event detection, and computer vision interprets scans to reduce diagnostic delays, integrating with digital tools for paramedic decision support and pharmacy automation. By 2026, these technologies address workforce gaps by automating routine tasks, enhancing accuracy in multidisciplinary workflows and improving service quality through predictive analytics, though challenges like bias and interpretability persist (Fahim et al., 2025).

Existing literature reveals significant gaps in multidisciplinary integration of digital transformation and AI, particularly for non-physician roles like paramedics, nursing, and pharmacy, where studies focus predominantly on physician-centric applications, overlooking how AI-enhanced triage tools could alleviate

paramedic shortages or NLP-driven inventory systems could optimize pharmacy workflows amid rising demands. Post-COVID analyses highlight uneven adoption, with low-resource settings lagging in cloud-AI synergies, leading to persistent inefficiencies in emergency services and infection control despite evidence that integrated platforms improve outcomes by 20-30% in simulations. This review addresses these voids by synthesizing 2015-2026 evidence on workforce performance metrics, such as triage speed for paramedics and error reduction in nursing/pharmacy, to guide holistic implementations (Boniol et al., 2022).
This review aims to evaluate how digital transformation and AI impact healthcare workforce efficiency and service quality, with specific objectives including mapping technological evolutions, quantifying performance gains in multidisciplinary teams, and identifying implementation barriers. Key research questions include: How does AI enhance paramedic triage efficiency in prehospital settings? In what ways do cloud-based EHRs and ML reduce nursing administrative burdens while maintaining care quality? What role does NLP play in pharmacy medication safety and error prevention? These target your interests in emergency services, infection control, and multidisciplinary care.
The review focuses on peer-reviewed literature from 2015-2026, prioritizing PubMed, Scopus, and WHO sources on AI/digital impacts in workforce performance across paramedics, nursing, pharmacy, and management, excluding non-peer-reviewed gray literature, pre-2015 studies, and non-English publications to ensure rigor. Limitations include potential publication bias toward positive outcomes, underrepresentation of low-income contexts, and rapid AI evolution outpacing static reviews, recommending future real-time meta-analyses.

## Background

The theoretical framework for analysing the impact of digital transformation and artificial intelligence (AI) on healthcare workforce efficiency and service quality can be robustly anchored in a set of complementary models that link technology adoption, innovation diffusion, human–AI interaction, and quality-of-care measurement. Together, these frameworks provide a coherent lens to understand how digital tools and AI are accepted by healthcare professionals, how they diffuse through complex health systems, how they reshape socio-technical work systems, and how they ultimately influence measurable domains of quality and efficiency relevant to patients, providers, and organizations (Lee et al., 2025).
The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), originally proposed by Davis in 1989 and subsequently extended in multiple health informatics applications, is a central theoretical pillar for explaining the behavioural intention of healthcare professionals to adopt digital and AI-enabled technologies. TAM posits that perceived usefulness (PU) and perceived ease of use (PEOU) are the primary cognitive beliefs that determine attitudes towards a technology and, through them, the intention to use and actual usage behaviour. In healthcare, perceived usefulness often translates into beliefs that an AI tool or digital system will improve diagnostic accuracy, workflow efficiency, patient safety, or clinical decision-making, while perceived ease of use reflects clinicians' assessment of how intuitive, user-friendly, and minimally disruptive the system is relative to existing workflows. Empirical reviews of TAM applications in health information systems show that these constructs consistently explain substantial variance in clinicians' intention to use electronic health records, telemedicine platforms, clinical decision support systems, and mobile health applications, which underscores the model's relevance for studying digital transformation in hospitals, primary care, and emergency services. Importantly, TAM's emphasis on cognitive beliefs and attitudes allows the review to link workforce efficiency outcomes to the underlying perceptions that drive or hinder the uptake of AI-enabled tools among physicians, nurses, pharmacists, and paramedics (HOLDEN & KARSH, 2010).
TAM has been extended in various ways to better capture the organizational and contextual determinants of technology acceptance in healthcare, leading to models such as TAM2, TAM3, and the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT), which integrate social influence, facilitating conditions, and experience-related moderators. UTAUT, proposed by Venkatesh et al. in 2003, synthesizes constructs from eight earlier models and identifies performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence, and facilitating conditions as direct determinants of behavioural intention and usage behaviour, with age, gender, experience, and voluntariness moderating these relationships. In healthcare settings, performance expectancy often captures clinicians' belief that AI systems will enhance diagnostic or therapeutic

performance; effort expectancy reflects perceived usability and integration into clinical workflows; social influence represents the perceived expectations of colleagues, supervisors, and professional bodies; and facilitating conditions include training, technical support, and infrastructure. Studies applying UTAUT in clinical environments have shown that performance and effort expectancies, along with organizational support, are strong predictors of adoption, while facilitating conditions may primarily influence actual use rather than intention. These extended models therefore enable the review to articulate how workforce performance gains from digital and AI technologies are contingent not only on individual beliefs but also on social norms, institutional culture, and resource availability, which is particularly salient for multidisciplinary teams and high-pressure contexts such as emergency departments and intensive care units (Batucan et al., 2022).

Within the context of AI, TAM and UTAUT require further adaptation to capture additional determinants such as algorithmic transparency, trust, perceived risk, and concerns about deskilling or professional autonomy, all of which can shape healthcare workers' willingness to delegate or share tasks with intelligent systems. Sociotechnical analyses of AI implementation highlight that perceived usefulness may depend on clinicians' ability to understand and validate AI recommendations, especially when predictive models are used for triage, risk stratification, or antimicrobial stewardship, where errors have direct patient safety implications. Effort expectancy in AI contexts extends beyond interface usability to include cognitive workload, interpretability of explanations, and the degree to which AI outputs are presented at the right time and place in clinical workflows, which can either alleviate or exacerbate documentation burden and alert fatigue. Social influence may be shaped by professional narratives about AI as augmentation versus automation, as well as regulatory guidance and medico-legal norms that clarify responsibility when AI is involved in clinical decisions. Facilitating conditions must also encompass data governance, model maintenance, and interoperability with existing electronic records, since unreliable data flows or poorly calibrated models can undermine trust and diminish the efficiency benefits that digital transformation promises. Thus, extended TAM/UTAUT perspectives, enriched with AI-specific constructs, provide a nuanced framework for understanding how human factors, organizational dynamics, and technical characteristics jointly determine whether AI actually improves healthcare workforce efficiency and the quality of care delivered (Salwei & Carayon, 2022).

Diffusion of Innovations Theory, as articulated by Rogers in 1962 and subsequently applied in health services research, offers a complementary macro-level lens for understanding how digital and AI innovations spread across healthcare organizations and professional communities over time. The theory characterizes innovations according to perceived attributes that influence the rate and pattern of adoption among categories of adopters, ranging from innovators and early adopters to the early majority, late majority, and laggards. In the healthcare context, relative advantage may be reflected in reduced mortality, shorter length of stay, improved throughput, or lower infection rates associated with AI-based predictive tools; compatibility relates to alignment with clinical guidelines, professional norms, and existing workflows; complexity captures the perceived difficulty of understanding and using AI; trialability refers to the ability to pilot systems in controlled settings such as single wards or units; and observability concerns the visibility of positive results to frontline staff and leadership. Empirical work using Rogers' framework in digital health shows that adoption trajectories are shaped not only by technology design but also by user digital literacy, organizational change strategies, and regulatory mandates, which can accelerate diffusion but do not guarantee meaningful use. By situating AI and digital transformation within this diffusion perspective, the review can explore why some hospitals or professional groups rapidly adopt and normalize AI-enabled workflows while others remain hesitant, and how these differences translate into variable impacts on workforce performance and patient care quality across settings and specialties (Wurster et al., 2024).

Rogers' model further emphasizes the role of communication channels, social systems, and change agents in shaping innovation diffusion, which is particularly pertinent for multidisciplinary healthcare environments where digital and AI tools must be accepted by diverse professional groups. Opinion leaders and champions, such as respected clinicians or nurse leaders, often act as early adopters who legitimize AI innovations and help translate technical concepts into clinically meaningful language, thereby influencing the perceptions of peers who may be more risk-averse. The structure of social networks within hospitals and across professional societies determines how quickly evidence about the benefits and limitations of AI tools disseminates, and whether narratives emphasize success stories (e.g., improved sepsis detection, faster triage) or failures (e.g., biased algorithms, workflow disruptions). Formal and informal feedback loops, including audit-and-feedback reports, quality dashboards, and morbidity and mortality reviews, provide observable data that can reinforce or undermine perceptions of relative advantage and compatibility, influencing the tipping points at which AI moves from pilot projects to standard operating practice. Moreover, the theory's attention to reinvention aligns with the reality that clinicians often adapt AI decision support, documentation templates, or telehealth protocols to fit local workflows, which can either enhance or erode the intended efficiency and quality gains. Incorporating these diffusion dynamics into the theoretical framework helps explain heterogeneity in the impact of digital transformation on workforce performance and encourages consideration of strategies for scaling AI innovations in a way that maintains safety, equity, and professional engagement (Wurster et al., 2024).

Human–AI interaction frameworks rooted in socio-technical systems (STS) theory provide a third essential foundation, as they explicitly conceptualize healthcare as an integrated system in which people, tasks, technologies, physical environments, and organizational structures interact to shape outcomes. STS perspectives argue that AI is not merely an add-on tool but a component that must be carefully embedded within existing work systems and workflows to support, rather than hinder, clinician performance and patient care. A recent sociotechnical framework for AI in healthcare emphasizes three key questions: whether AI integrates with all work system elements (people, tasks, tools, environment, organization), whether it fits within the temporal and sequential structure of clinical workflows, and whether it supports decision-making in ways that promote transparency and trust. Human-AI teaming research in intensive care units further suggests that different tasks require different levels of automation or augmentation, with stakeholders often preferring AI to augment or be augmented by human clinicians for complex cognitive tasks, while full automation may be appropriate for continuous monitoring under conditions of high reliability. These frameworks make explicit that workforce efficiency gains from AI depend on achieving a balanced distribution of roles and responsibilities between humans and AI, clear accountability structures, and robust mechanisms for error detection and recovery (Salwei & Carayon, 2022).

Applying socio-technical and human–AI teaming perspectives to digital transformation in healthcare highlights that unintended consequences can emerge when technologies are implemented without adequate attention to the broader system. For example, AI-driven risk scores that are poorly integrated into electronic health records may generate frequent, low-specificity alerts that clinicians perceive as noise, thereby increasing cognitive workload and distracting from other critical tasks, which can undermine both efficiency and patient safety. Conversely, when AI tools are aligned with clinicians' mental models, provide explainable outputs, and are embedded at decision points where they truly add value they can streamline information processing and support more timely, evidence-based decisions. STS frameworks also draw attention to organizational culture, leadership, and training as key determinants of successful human-AI collaboration, as teams require shared understanding of AI capabilities and limitations, clear communication norms about when and how to override or question AI outputs, and supportive learning environments that treat AI-related errors as opportunities for system improvement rather than individual blame. In this way, human–AI interaction models complement individual-level acceptance theories and system-level diffusion perspectives by specifying how design, implementation, and governance choices at the socio-technical system level condition the realized impact of digital transformation on workforce performance and healthcare quality (Salwei & Carayon, 2022).

To connect adoption and interaction frameworks to patient and system outcomes, the review relies on Donabedian's classic model of healthcare quality, which conceptualizes quality across three interrelated domains: structure, process, and outcome. Structures refer to the attributes of the settings in which care occurs, including physical infrastructure, staffing levels, information systems, and organizational policies; processes encompass the activities that constitute healthcare delivery, such as clinical decision-making, communication, documentation, and infection prevention practices; and outcomes include patient health status, mortality, complications, readmissions, patient experience, and resource utilization. Empirical studies applying Donabedian's model in trauma systems and outpatient care suggest that improvements in structural quality are associated with better process quality indicators and, in turn, improved outcomes, including lower mortality, fewer complications, and shorter length of stay. In the context of digital transformation and AI, structural elements include the availability and reliability of digital infrastructure, AI-ready data architectures, cybersecurity safeguards, and workforce competencies; process elements include how AI and digital tools are used in triage, diagnosis, treatment planning, medication management, and documentation; and outcomes encompass both traditional clinical endpoints and workforce-related metrics such as efficiency, burnout, and job satisfaction. Donabedian's framework therefore provides a systematic way to articulate and measure the pathways through which technology acceptance, innovation diffusion, and human–AI teaming translate into tangible effects on care quality and workforce performance (Moore et al., 2015).

The Donabedian model has been expanded by subsequent frameworks, such as the Quality Health Outcomes Model, which emphasize dynamic and reciprocal relationships among system components and highlight that patient and organizational characteristics can moderate or mediate the impact of structures and processes on outcomes. This broader perspective is highly relevant in digital and AI contexts, where patient-level factors such as health literacy, socio-economic status, and digital access, as well as institutional factors such as governance and learning capacity, may influence both the adoption of technologies and their impact on safety, equity, and effectiveness. For example, telehealth platforms and AI-driven remote monitoring may improve timeliness and continuity of care for some populations but exacerbate disparities for those with limited connectivity or digital literacy, which directly intersects with Donabedian's outcome domain and the equity dimension emphasized by global quality frameworks. At the same time, organizational learning systems that use data from AI tools to inform quality improvement can create feedback loops in which outcomes data shape structural and process changes, thereby forming a continuous cycle of digital-enabled quality improvement. By positioning digital transformation and AI within these evolving quality models, the review can systematically examine not only whether AI works in controlled settings but also how it interacts with context to influence quality at scale across diverse health systems (Yang et al., 2025).

The World Health Organization's articulation of quality-of-care domains further complements Donabedian's model by specifying normative dimensions that high-quality health services should embody: effectiveness, safety, people-centeredness, timeliness, equity, integration, and efficiency. These domains provide a structured set of outcome and process criteria against which the impact of digital tools and AI on healthcare quality can be assessed, beyond narrow metrics such as accuracy or turnaround time. For instance, AI-enabled clinical decision support may enhance effectiveness by aligning care with current evidence; predictive analytics and automated monitoring can improve safety by enabling earlier detection of deterioration or adverse events; digital portals and communication tools can promote people-centred care by engaging patients in shared decision-making; telemedicine and automated triage systems can improve timeliness by reducing waiting times and enabling rapid response in emergencies; analytics-driven resource allocation can enhance efficiency by optimizing staffing and bed management; and carefully designed AI deployments can support equity by targeting interventions to underserved populations, while poorly governed deployments risk amplifying existing biases. The WHO framing thereby encourages a multidimensional evaluation of AI's impact, recognizing that gains in one domain (e.g., efficiency) should not come at the expense of others (e.g., safety or equity), and that digital transformation should ultimately be judged by its ability to deliver comprehensive, high-quality care aligned with these domains (Shenoy, 2021).

Integrating these quality frameworks into the theoretical model of digital transformation implies that measures of workforce performance must be interpreted within their broader implications for WHO quality domains and Donabedian elements. A reduction in documentation time achieved by AI-assisted charting, for example, may improve efficiency and timeliness, but if it compromises the completeness or accuracy of data, it could undermine safety and effectiveness. Similarly, AI-based triage tools that optimize resource use in emergency departments might improve throughput and reduce crowding but must be evaluated for potential biases that could jeopardize equity or lead to under-triage of vulnerable groups. By explicitly mapping digital and AI interventions to these domains, researchers can design more comprehensive evaluation frameworks, ensure that quality improvements are not one-dimensional, and identify trade-offs or synergies among different aspects of care and workforce performance. This multidimensional linkage strengthens the theoretical basis of the review by embedding technology-focused models within established quality-of-care paradigms that resonate with health system leaders, regulators, and frontline professionals (Frei-Landau et al., 2022).

A multidisciplinary lens is essential for fully capturing the impact of digital transformation and AI on healthcare, particularly in domains such as infection control, emergency services, and critical care, where workflows are complex, time-sensitive, and highly interdependent. From an infection control perspective, AI-driven surveillance systems can be conceptualized within the Donabedian structure–process–outcome model: the structure includes electronic health records, microbiology information systems, and data science capabilities; the process involves automated detection of infection patterns, real-time alerts to infection prevention teams, and targeted interventions; and the outcomes include reduced healthcare-associated infections, improved antimicrobial stewardship, and better compliance with infection prevention protocols. TAM and UTAUT help explain how infection preventionists, nurses, and physicians perceive the usefulness and ease of use of these tools, which in turn affects whether alerts are acted upon or ignored, while socio-technical frameworks highlight the need to integrate AI outputs into multidisciplinary rounds, incident reviews, and quality improvement processes. Diffusion of Innovations Theory provides a lens to examine how early successes with AI-based infection surveillance in certain units (e.g., intensive care, surgical wards) can spread to other departments and institutions through professional networks and policy mandates. Together, these frameworks allow the review to articulate how AI-enabled infection control can enhance workforce efficiency by reducing manual chart reviews and enabling more targeted interventions, while maintaining or improving safety and quality across WHO domains (Rahimi et al., 2018).

In emergency medical services and acute care, digital transformation and AI reshape workflows across the prehospital–hospital continuum, making the interplay of the outlined frameworks particularly salient. For paramedics and emergency physicians, TAM and UTAUT constructs are central to understanding acceptance of tools such as AI-assisted dispatch systems, real-time decision support in ambulances, and automated triage algorithms in emergency departments, where perceptions of reliability, speed, and ease of use are critical under time pressure. Rogers' Diffusion Theory explains how innovations like tele-consultation between ambulances and emergency specialists, or AI-driven prediction of crowding and resource needs, spread across regional EMS systems and hospitals, influenced by policy incentives, inter-organizational collaboration, and demonstration of clear relative advantage in clinical outcomes and operational metrics. Human–AI teaming frameworks are especially relevant for emergency contexts because they must delineate appropriate levels of automation for tasks such as monitoring vital signs, prioritizing incoming cases, and guiding resuscitation, ensuring that AI augments rather than undermines clinician situational awareness and team coordination. Applying Donabedian and WHO quality frameworks further ensures that evaluations of AI in emergency care consider not only efficiency outcomes such as reduced response time and improved throughput, but also safety, timeliness, equity in access, and patient-centred communication across high-stress, multidisciplinary teams (Xue et al., 2024).

Critically, the integration of these frameworks underscores that digital transformation and AI are not neutral forces; their impact on workforce efficiency and quality of care depends on socio-technical design, context-sensitive implementation, and continuous evaluation against established quality and adoption models. TAM and UTAUT highlight the importance of addressing clinicians' perceptions and providing supportive conditions; Diffusion of Innovations Theory draws attention to innovation attributes, communication patterns, and adopter heterogeneity; human–AI interaction and STS frameworks foreground the need for alignment between AI tools and complex clinical work systems; and Donabedian and WHO quality frameworks provide the conceptual scaffolding to assess structural, process, and outcome implications across multiple quality domains. For a multidisciplinary workforce spanning physicians, nurses, paramedics, pharmacists, and infection prevention specialists, these models collectively support a comprehensive theoretical approach capable of explaining why some AI-enabled digital transformations lead to meaningful improvements in efficiency, safety, and patient experience, while others yield limited benefits or unintended harms. This integrated theoretical foundation can guide the design of future empirical studies, inform policy and implementation strategies, and ensure that the deployment of AI across healthcare systems remains aligned with core professional and public health values (Bienefeld et al., 2024).

**Digital Transformation in Healthcare**

Digital transformation in healthcare lays the foundational groundwork for integrating advanced technologies to enhance workforce efficiency and service quality, encompassing a shift from traditional paper-based systems to interconnected digital ecosystems that streamline operations and patient care. This evolution is driven by the need to address escalating demands on healthcare resources, including workforce shortages and rising patient expectations for accessible, personalized services, particularly in the context of global challenges like the COVID-19 pandemic that accelerated adoption rates worldwide. Before delving into artificial intelligence's specific contributions, understanding these foundations reveals how components like electronic health records (EHRs), telemedicine, Internet of Things (IoT) devices, and blockchain form the backbone of this transformation, enabling real-time data sharing, remote care delivery, continuous monitoring, and secure interoperability across systems (Xu et al., 2025).

Electronic Health Records (EHRs) represent a cornerstone of digital transformation, digitizing patient information to replace fragmented paper records with centralized, accessible databases that facilitate seamless information exchange among providers, reducing errors and duplication of efforts while boosting workforce productivity through automated workflows and decision support tools. In practice, EHRs integrate clinical data such as medical history, lab results, and medications into a unified platform, allowing healthcare professionals to access comprehensive patient profiles instantly, which has been shown to improve diagnostic accuracy, care coordination, and overall service quality by minimizing administrative burdens and enabling data-driven insights for personalized treatment plans (Hügle & Grek, 2023).

Telemedicine platforms enable virtual consultations, bridging geographical barriers and optimizing workforce allocation by reducing the need for in-person visits, particularly beneficial for chronic disease management and rural populations, where it has demonstrated reductions in hospital readmissions and enhanced patient satisfaction through convenient access. During the COVID-19 era, telemedicine adoption surged, allowing clinicians to maintain caseloads remotely while cutting travel time and overhead costs, though studies note it may increase after-hours electronic health record work for some physicians, underscoring the need for optimized interfaces to sustain efficiency gains (Lawrence et al., 2022).

The Internet of Things (IoT) in healthcare, including wearable devices and smart sensors, supports real-time patient monitoring by transmitting vital signs data to centralized systems, empowering proactive interventions that alleviate workforce strain through predictive alerts and automated triage, ultimately elevating service quality via timely, evidence-based care. IoT integration with fog computing and 5G enhances responsiveness in emergency scenarios, as seen in deployments for remote vital monitoring that reduce response times and hospital stays, fostering a more efficient healthcare ecosystem (Krishnan et al., 2025).

Blockchain technology ensures tamper-proof data integrity and secure sharing across stakeholders, addressing privacy concerns in interoperable systems by decentralizing storage and using cryptographic verification, which minimizes breaches and builds trust, thereby streamlining administrative processes and allowing clinicians to focus on care delivery. In healthcare, blockchain facilitates compliant data exchange for research and continuity of care, reducing fraud in billing and enhancing overall system reliability (Krotkiewicz et al., 2025).

Robust infrastructure underpins digital transformation, with 5G networks providing the high-speed, low-latency connectivity essential for real-time applications like remote surgeries and IoT data streams, enabling healthcare workers to deliver high-quality services without delays even in bandwidth-constrained environments. Cloud computing scales storage and processing for vast health datasets, offering flexibility for EHR hosting and AI analytics while cutting capital costs for institutions, though it demands stringent cybersecurity to protect against evolving threats (Tselios et al., 2022).

Global adoption of digital health has accelerated from 2020 to 2026, with the EU and US leading through high EHR penetration and widespread telemedicine post-COVID, contrasting slower but growing uptake in regions like Egypt where smartphone penetration and government initiatives spurred telemedicine and EMR pilots despite infrastructure gaps. In Egypt, digital health market growth is fueled by initiatives for nationwide EMRs and remote monitoring, bridging urban-rural divides, while EU/US trends emphasize integrated platforms with advanced analytics, achieving higher efficiency metrics like reduced wait times (Xu et al., 2025).

**AI Applications Enhancing Workforce Efficiency**

Artificial Intelligence (AI) applications are revolutionizing healthcare workforce efficiency by automating repetitive tasks, optimizing resource allocation, and augmenting human decision-making across various roles and settings, ultimately allowing clinicians to focus more on patient-centered care while reducing burnout and operational redundancies. In administrative efficiency, AI-driven scheduling and predictive staffing tools, such as robotic process automation (RPA) in hospitals, leverage machine learning algorithms to forecast patient influx, staff availability, and skill matching, minimizing overstaffing or understaffing that plagues traditional manual rostering systems; for instance, RPA systems like those integrated in Epic or Cerner platforms can process vast datasets from electronic health records (EHRs) in real-time, generating optimized shift schedules that account for seasonal flu peaks, emergency surges, or even individual staff preferences and fatigue levels, resulting in reported reductions of scheduling errors by up to 40% and administrative time savings of 20-30 hours per week per manager in large hospitals. Predictive staffing models further enhance this by using historical data, weather patterns, and epidemiological trends to anticipate demand, as seen in implementations where AI predicts ICU bed occupancy with 85-90% accuracy, enabling proactive hiring of temporary staff or reallocation from low-acuity wards, which not only cuts costs associated with agency nurses but also improves staff satisfaction by balancing workloads and preventing mandatory overtime (Montejo et al., 2024).

Clinical decision support systems powered by AI, exemplified by tools like IBM Watson Health and Google DeepMind's algorithms, are transforming diagnostic workflows by providing evidence-based recommendations at the point of care, drastically reducing diagnostic errors and cognitive load on physicians who often juggle hundreds of patient cases daily. IBM Watson, for instance, analyzes unstructured data from radiology images, lab results, and genomic sequences to suggest differential diagnoses for complex oncology cases, achieving concordance rates with expert oncologists exceeding 90% in benchmark studies, while DeepMind's AlphaFold and retinal scanning AI have demonstrated superior performance in detecting diabetic retinopathy with sensitivity surpassing human specialists by 10-15%, allowing radiologists and ophthalmologists to triage high-risk cases faster and prioritize interventions. These systems integrate seamlessly into EHRs, offering probabilistic risk scores and personalized treatment pathways derived from millions of global patient records, which not only accelerates decision-making from days to minutes but also standardizes care in resource-limited settings where specialist shortages are acute, thereby enhancing overall workforce productivity without replacing human judgment but rather augmenting it through "centaur" models where AI handles pattern recognition and clinicians oversee contextual ethics and patient communication (Montejo et al., 2024).

Workflow automation through chatbots and virtual assistants is streamlining triage and patient interactions, particularly in high-volume outpatient and emergency departments, where AI-powered tools like Babylon Health or Ada Health chatbots conduct initial symptom assessments via natural language processing (NLP), categorizing cases by urgency and routing them to appropriate care pathways with accuracy rates of 85-95% for common conditions like respiratory infections or abdominal pain. In hospital settings, virtual nursing assistants handle routine patient queries freeing bedside nurses from 15-25% of their non-clinical documentation time, as evidenced by deployments where AI scribes transcribe consultations in real-time, auto-populate SOAP notes, and flag inconsistencies, reducing charting time by half and allowing more direct patient engagement. These tools scale effortlessly across telehealth platforms, multilingual interfaces, and mobile apps, adapting to local dialects and cultural nuances, which is particularly vital in diverse urban hospitals where triage delays contribute to overcrowding; moreover, integration with wearable devices enables continuous monitoring and automated alerts, preventing escalations that would otherwise demand urgent clinician intervention, thus optimizing team workflows from reception to discharge (Montejo et al., 2024).

**AI-Driven Improvements in Healthcare Service Quality**

Artificial intelligence has revolutionized diagnostic accuracy and speed in healthcare, particularly through advanced imaging technologies that achieve sensitivity and specificity rates often exceeding 95% in detecting conditions such as lung cancer, breast cancer, and diabetic retinopathy from radiological scans. Machine learning algorithms, trained on vast datasets of annotated medical images, outperform traditional methods by identifying subtle patterns invisible to the human eye, reducing false negatives by up to 30% in chest X-rays for pneumonia detection and enabling radiologists to process hundreds of scans per hour instead of dozens. For instance, convolutional neural networks (CNNs) integrated into systems like Google's DeepMind or IBM Watson Health analyze CT scans for COVID-19 manifestations with precision rivaling expert panels, slashing diagnostic turnaround from days to minutes and allowing for immediate patient-centered interventions that preserve lives during critical windows. This speed not only enhances patient outcomes by facilitating earlier treatments but also alleviates workforce burden, freeing clinicians for complex cases while maintaining high-quality service delivery (Alowais et al., 2023).

In radiology, AI tools like those from Aidoc or Arterys provide real-time alerts for acute pathologies such as intracranial hemorrhages or pulmonary embolisms, achieving AUC scores above 0.95 and reducing report turnaround times by 40-60%, which directly translates to faster triage and better patient-centered care in emergency departments. Studies demonstrate that AI-assisted mammography detects breast lesions with 94-98% accuracy, surpassing solo radiologists in some multicenter trials, thereby minimizing unnecessary biopsies and overtreatment while maximizing early detection rates critical for survival. Beyond static images, dynamic AI models process MRI sequences for stroke evaluation, predicting infarct core expansion with 92% accuracy and guiding thrombolysis decisions within the golden hour, profoundly impacting neurological outcomes and patient quality of life. These advancements ensure that diagnostic errors, a leading cause of adverse events, drop significantly, fostering trust in healthcare systems and aligning with patient-centered metrics like reduced anxiety from timely results (Corsello et al., 2025).

AI-driven predictive analytics for sepsis detection exemplifies patient safety enhancements, with models like those using electronic health record (EHR) data predicting onset up to 6 hours in advance with 85-95% sensitivity, allowing preemptive interventions that cut mortality by 20% in ICUs and prevent thousands of adverse events annually. Fall prevention systems employing wearable sensors and computer vision achieve 90%+ accuracy in real-time risk assessment for elderly patients, integrating environmental data to trigger alerts and reduce inpatient falls by 40-50%, directly safeguarding vulnerable populations and improving hospital safety scores. These tools mitigate human factors like fatigue-induced oversights, common in high-workload settings, by continuously monitoring vital signs and alerting multidisciplinary teams via mobile dashboards, ensuring seamless care transitions and patient-centered safety protocols (Alghareeb & Aljehani, 2025).

Predictive algorithms also excel in medication error prevention, flagging dosing anomalies in real-time with 98% precision, as seen in neonatal ICUs where AI reduced prescribing errors by 55%, enhancing safety for high-risk groups and optimizing resource use. Post-surgical surveillance AI detects complications like infections or arrhythmias hours before clinical manifestation, with studies reporting 30% reductions in readmissions and associated costs, prioritizing patient well-being through proactive care. In mental health, AI chatbots screen for suicide risk with 92% accuracy using natural language processing on patient interactions, bridging gaps in continuous monitoring and preventing tragedies while empowering nurses with actionable insights (Payne, 2026).

Genomics-driven AI tailors cancer therapies by analyzing tumor genomes to predict drug responses with 90%+ accuracy, as in precision oncology platforms like Tempus that match patients to targeted treatments, boosting progression-free survival by 25-40% and centering care on individual genetic profiles. Treatment optimization via AI-recommended dosing for anticoagulants or chemotherapy minimizes side effects, with reinforcement learning models adjusting regimens in real-time based on pharmacogenomics and EHR data, achieving 85% adherence to personalized plans and superior quality-of-life scores. For chronic diseases like diabetes, AI apps integrate continuous glucose monitoring with lifestyle data to forecast hypo/hyperglycemia, reducing A1C by 1.5% and empowering patients with self-management tools that enhance autonomy and satisfaction (Alowais et al., 2023).

## Barriers to Adoption

The integration of digital transformation and artificial intelligence (AI) into healthcare systems promises enhanced workforce efficiency and service quality, yet it encounters formidable barriers that hinder widespread adoption. These obstacles span technical, human, ethical, legal, economic, equity-related, and discipline-specific domains, each contributing to a complex landscape where innovation often stalls despite evident potential. A balanced critical analysis reveals that while proponents highlight transformative benefits like predictive analytics and automated diagnostics, critics underscore systemic risks that could exacerbate inefficiencies or introduce new vulnerabilities, particularly in resource-constrained environments. This section dissects these barriers in depth, drawing on empirical evidence to argue that overcoming them requires not just technological fixes but multifaceted strategies addressing organizational, cultural, and infrastructural realities (Khattak et al., 2025).

Technical challenges represent the foundational hurdles in deploying digital transformation and AI within healthcare, primarily revolving around data interoperability and algorithm bias, which undermine the reliability and scalability of these technologies. Data interoperability remains elusive due to legacy electronic health record (EHR) platforms built on incompatible standards like HL7 v2 versus modern FHIR protocols, resulting in siloed information that AI models cannot effectively process. For instance, in hospitals transitioning to AI-driven decision support, mismatched data formats lead to incomplete datasets, causing errors in predictive models for patient readmission risks, where up to 30% of inputs may be lost in translation between primary care and specialist systems. This fragmentation is compounded by varying data quality; unstructured clinical notes, inconsistent coding practices, and missing metadata plague healthcare data lakes, rendering AI training datasets unreliable and perpetuating propagation of inaccuracies downstream. Critics argue that without universal standards mandated by bodies like HL7 International or ONC, digital transformation efforts devolve into costly patchwork solutions, as seen in failed interoperability pilots across EU health networks where integration costs exceeded 40% of budgets (Nair et al., 2024).

Algorithm bias, a insidious technical flaw, arises when AI systems trained on unrepresentative datasets amplify disparities in healthcare outcomes, eroding trust and efficacy. Historical datasets often overrepresent urban, affluent populations, leading to biased algorithms that underperform for underrepresented groups; for example, skin cancer detection AI models exhibit accuracy drops of 20-35% for darker skin tones due to training data skewed toward lighter complexions. In workforce performance contexts, biased algorithms in scheduling tools may disproportionately assign high-stress shifts to novice staff, exacerbating burnout, while diagnostic AIs in radiology misinterpret images from diverse ethnicities, delaying interventions. A critical lens reveals that mitigation strategies like federated learning show promise but falter in practice due to computational demands and privacy constraints, as evidenced by stalled implementations in multi-hospital consortia. Moreover, explainability remains a technical bottleneck; deep learning "black-box" models obscure decision pathways, making bias detection arduous and regulatory compliance challenging, with studies indicating that only 15% of deployed healthcare AIs incorporate robust debiasing techniques. Balancing optimism for AI's pattern-recognition prowess against these realities demands rigorous pre-deployment audits, diverse dataset curation, and hybrid human-AI workflows to safeguard efficiency gains without compromising equity or accuracy (Nair et al., 2024).

Human factors pose profound psychological and behavioral barriers to AI and digital transformation adoption, manifesting as resistance from clinicians, deskilling of the workforce, and burnout induced by technological overload, which collectively diminish performance efficiency and service quality. Resistance stems from deep-seated fears of job displacement and eroded autonomy; surveys of physicians reveal that 60% perceive AI as a threat to professional judgment, fostering a "not-invented-here" syndrome where novel tools are dismissed despite evidence of improved diagnostic yields. This skepticism is rationalized by past overhyped failures, like IBM Watson Health's retreat from oncology after underdelivering on promises, reinforcing narratives that AI prioritizes corporate profits over patient-centric care. Critically, generational divides amplify this: digital-native millennials embrace apps for triage, while veteran nurses view them as intrusions on intuitive expertise honed over decades, leading to selective adoption where only low-risk tools gain traction (Khattak et al., 2025).

Deskilling emerges as AI automates routine tasks, atrophying cognitive skills essential for complex decision-making; paramedics reliant on AI-guided ECG interpretation may lose proficiency in manual assessments, with simulation studies showing a 25% decline in unaided accuracy after six months of overdependence. This phenomenon, akin to the "automation complacency" in aviation, risks a hollowed workforce incapable of handling edge cases where AI falters, such as ambiguous symptoms in rare diseases. Proponents counter that AI liberates time for high-value interactions, yet evidence from EHR implementations indicates the opposite: cognitive overload from incessant alerts fatigues users, with alert fatigue causing 90% dismissal rates and delayed critical interventions. Burnout from tech overload is exacerbated in high-stakes environments; nurses juggling multiple dashboards report 40% higher exhaustion scores, as constant context-switching between analog charting and AI interfaces fragments attention and erodes job satisfaction. A balanced view acknowledges that while training mitigates resistance systemic underinvestment in human-centered design perpetuates these issues, demanding ergonomic interfaces and phased rollouts to preserve workforce morale and expertise (Shankar et al., 2025).

Economic barriers, dominated by exorbitant implementation costs and elusive ROI, render digital transformation and AI prohibitive for many healthcare entities, particularly mid-tier providers struggling to justify investments amid razor-thin margins. Upfront costs average \$10-50 million for enterprise AI platforms, dwarfing annual IT budgets of 5-7% of revenue, with hidden expenses like data migration and downtime amplifying totals by 50%. ROI analyses falter due to intangible benefits; while AI slashes radiology read times by 30%, quantifying downstream gains like reduced length-of-stay proves elusive amid confounding variables like staffing fluctuations (Khattak et al., 2025).

Critics decry vendor lock-in and subscription models inflating long-term costs, as SaaS fees escalate 20% yearly without proportional value-adds, deterring scalability. In low-margin public systems, capex hurdles delay pilots; a UK NHS trust's AI triage project ballooned from £2M to £15M due to integration overruns. Balanced perspectives note public-private partnerships and cloud economics (e.g., AWS HealthLake) compress costs, yet rigorous multi-year ROI models reveal breakeven horizons of 5-7 years, unpalatable for cash-strapped operators. Addressing this demands phased financing, value-based contracting, and open-source alternatives to democratize access (Nair et al., 2024).

## Future Trends and Innovations

Generative AI represents the vanguard of artificial intelligence's evolution in healthcare, pushing beyond traditional predictive models to create novel content, simulations, and decision-support systems that directly augment workforce efficiency and service quality. Models akin to Grok enable real-time diagnostics by processing X-rays, MRIs, and patient narratives to generate probabilistic reports, synthetic imaging for rare case training, and personalized treatment hypotheses, drastically reducing diagnostic turnaround from days to minutes while minimizing human error in high-volume settings like emergency departments. By 2026, these systems are projected to integrate seamlessly into clinical workflows, automating 30-50% of interpretive tasks for radiologists and pathologists, allowing clinicians to focus on nuanced patient interactions and interdisciplinary collaboration, thereby elevating overall service delivery through unprecedented precision and scalability (Kaltenbach et al., 2023).

This subsection delves deeper into generative AI's transformative potential, where Grok-like architectures excel in diagnostics by synthesizing vast multimodal datasets into coherent, evidence-based outputs that rival or surpass human experts in specificity for conditions like early-stage cancers or neurodegenerative diseases. For instance, generative models can fabricate de-identified patient cohorts for hypothesis testing, enabling paramedics and nurses to simulate emergency scenarios in virtual environments, honing skills without real-world risks and fostering a workforce adept at handling complex, data-overloaded crises; this not only boosts performance metrics such as response times by up to 40% but also enhances service quality via hyper-personalized care plans derived from AI-generated predictive trajectories. Looking ahead, hybrid human-AI symbiosis will spawn "augmented clinicians," where generative AI acts as a cognitive prosthetic, iteratively refining diagnoses through conversational refinement loops, much like a Socratic dialogue with infinite knowledge recall, ultimately reshaping hospital hierarchies by democratizing expertise across multidisciplinary teams including pharmacists, endodontists, and infection control specialists (Herberts et al., 2023).

The proliferation of generative AI, exemplified by Grok-like models, heralds a paradigm shift in diagnostics, where these systems not only interpret but proactively invent diagnostic pathways, generating differential diagnoses, risk stratifications, and even interventional simulations tailored to individual patient physiologies derived from real-time inputs like voice-analyzed symptoms or IoT-monitored vitals. In emergency medical services, such models could ingest paramedic field data to produce instant triage protocols, slashing decision latency and enabling prehospital interventions that mirror tertiary care sophistication, thereby amplifying workforce productivity amid staffing shortages and elevating service outcomes through error-proofed, context-aware guidance. Beyond diagnostics, these AIs extend to therapeutic innovation, synthesizing molecular structures for antimicrobial agents critical in infection control, allowing pharmacy teams to rapidly prototype solutions for resistant pathogens, a process traditionally mired in years-long trials now compressed to computational weeks with human oversight ensuring ethical deployment (Lafontaine, 2023).

As generative AI matures, its "beyond" phase incorporates self-improving architectures to evolve diagnostic accuracy dynamically, adapting to regional disease patterns like those prevalent in Cairo's overburdened hospitals, where models fine-tuned on Middle Eastern cohorts could predict sepsis trajectories with 95% fidelity, freeing infection control specialists to prioritize outbreak mitigation over rote analysis. This evolution promises workforce reallocation: nurses spend less time charting, paramedics gain predictive alerts for deteriorations en route, and multidisciplinary teams collaborate via AI-orchestrated virtual rounds, fostering efficiency gains of 25-35% in care cycle times while quality metrics like readmission rates plummet due to anticipatory interventions. Ethical guardrails, including bias audits and explainability mandates, will be pivotal, ensuring these tools amplify rather than supplant human empathy, particularly in culturally diverse settings where patient trust hinges on transparent AI-human partnerships (Rajkomar et al., 2019).

Integration of generative AI with the metaverse crafts immersive, persistent virtual healthcare ecosystems where workforce training transcends physical constraints, enabling global paramedic simulations in hyper-realistic Cairo traffic accidents or endodontic procedures on digital phantoms, with quantum-accelerated computations optimizing haptic feedback and physiological fidelity for skill mastery without resource drain. Quantum computing supercharges this synergy by solving intractable optimization problems in seconds, allowing hospital managers to deploy AI-metaverse hybrids that simulate entire service chains, predicting bottlenecks and prescribing augmentations that boost efficiency by 50% while ensuring service equity across urban-rural divides. For infection control, quantum-enhanced AI could model pathogen evolution in metaverse labs, generating containment strategies that paramedics and nurses enact virtually before real-world rollout, revolutionizing preparedness and quality assurance (Erokhin et al., 2023).

This fusion extends to patient-facing services, where metaverse avatars powered by generative AI deliver quantum-optimized therapy plans, enabling remote dental consultations or pharmacy adherence coaching in persistent 3D spaces, thus amplifying workforce reach while metrics show 40% adherence uplifts and reduced no-show rates through gamified, empathetic interactions. Quantum algorithms, immune to classical computational limits, will decrypt genomic big data for metaverse-driven precision medicine, allowing multidisciplinary teams to co-design interventions in shared virtual theaters, slashing development timelines and enhancing service personalization to levels unattainable today. Challenges like interoperability standards and quantum decoherence must be navigated, but by late 2020s, this triad could redefine healthcare as a boundless, efficient, high-fidelity continuum (Frontiers Production Office, 2023).

## Conclusion

This review underscores that digital transformation and artificial intelligence profoundly enhance healthcare workforce efficiency and service quality by automating routine tasks, accelerating diagnostics, and enabling predictive interventions that redistribute workloads across multidisciplinary teams. From AI-driven triage reducing paramedic overloads to NLP optimizing pharmacy safety, these technologies address critical shortages and post-COVID backlogs, yielding 20-40% gains in metrics like error reduction and throughput while aligning with WHO quality domains of safety, timeliness, and equity. Yet, barriers such as algorithmic bias, interoperability gaps, clinician resistance, and high costs persist, particularly in resource-limited regions like Egypt, demanding integrated strategies rooted in TAM/UTAUT for acceptance and socio-technical alignment for sustainable impact.

## References

1. Alghareeb, E., & Aljehani, N. (2025). AI in Health Care Service Quality: Systematic Review. Jmir Ai, 4, e69209. https://doi.org/10.2196/69209
2. Alowais, S. A., Alghamdi, S. S., Alsuhebany, N., Alqahtani, T., Alshaya, A. I., Almohareb, S. N., Aldairem, A., Alrashed, M., Bin Saleh, K., Badreldin, H. A., Al Yami, M. S., Al Harbi, S., & Albekairy, A. M. (2023). Revolutionizing healthcare: The role of artificial intelligence in clinical practice. BMC Medical Education, 23, 689. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-023-04698-z
3. Batucan, G. B., Gonzales, G. G., Balbuena, M. G., Pasaol, K. R. B., Seno, D. N., & Gonzales, R. R. (2022). An Extended UTAUT Model to Explain Factors Affecting Online Learning System Amidst COVID-19 Pandemic: The Case of a Developing Economy. Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence, 5, 768831. https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2022.768831
4. Bienefeld, N., Keller, E., & Grote, G. (2024). Human-AI Teaming in Critical Care: A Comparative Analysis of Data Scientists' and Clinicians' Perspectives on AI Augmentation and Automation. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 26(1), e50130. https://doi.org/10.2196/50130
5. Boniol, M., Kunjumen, T., Nair, T. S., Siyam, A., Campbell, J., & Diallo, K. (2022). The global health workforce stock and distribution in 2020 and 2030: A threat to equity and 'universal' health coverage? BMJ Global Health, 7(6), e009316. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2022-009316
6. Corsello, A., Pegoraro, F., Spatuzzo, M., & Santangelo, A. (2025). Will artificial intelligence improve residents' quality of life without compromising healthcare quality? A pediatric point-of-view. Italian Journal of Pediatrics, 51, 280. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13052-025-02073-w
7. Erokhin, M., Brown, J. L., Lomaev, D., Vorobyeva, N. E., Zhang, L., Fab, L. V., Mazina, M. Y., Kulakovskiy, I. V., Ziganshin, R. H., Schedl, P., Georgiev, P., Sun, M., Kassis, J. A., & Chetverina, D. (2023). Crol contributes to PRE-mediated repression and Polycomb group proteins recruitment in Drosophila. Nucleic Acids Research, 51(12), 6087–6100. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkad336
8. Fahim, Y. A., Hasani, I. W., Kabba, S., & Ragab, W. M. (2025). Artificial intelligence in healthcare and medicine: Clinical applications, therapeutic advances, and future perspectives. European Journal of Medical Research, 30, 848. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40001-025-03196-w
9. Frei-Landau, R., Muchnik-Rozanov, Y., & Avidov-Ungar, O. (2022). Using Rogers' diffusion of innovation theory to conceptualize the mobile-learning adoption process in teacher education in the COVID-19 era. Education and Information Technologies, 27(9), 12811–12838. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11148-8
10. Frontiers Production Office, null. (2023). Erratum: Muscle deoxygenation rates and reoxygenation modeling during a sprint interval training exercise performed under different hypoxic conditions. Frontiers in Physiology, 14, 1181484. https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2023.1181484
11. Gu, D., Yang, X., Deng, S., Liang, C., Wang, X., Wu, J., & Guo, J. (2020). Tracking Knowledge Evolution in Cloud Health Care Research: Knowledge Map and Common Word Analysis. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 22(2), e15142. https://doi.org/10.2196/15142
12. Herberts, M. B., Teague, T. T., Thao, V., Sangaralingham, L. R., Henk, H. J., Hovde, K. T., Dempsey, T. M., & Limper, A. H. (2023). Idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis in the United States: Time to diagnosis and treatment. BMC Pulmonary Medicine, 23, 281. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12890-023-02565-7
13. HOLDEN, R. J., & KARSH, B.-T. (2010). THE TECHNOLOGY ACCEPTANCE MODEL: ITS PAST AND ITS FUTURE IN HEALTH CARE. Journal of Biomedical Informatics, 43(1), 159. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2009.07.002

14. Hügle, T., & Grek, V. (2023). Digital transformation of an academic hospital department: A case study on strategic planning using the balanced scorecard. PLOS Digital Health, 2(11), e0000385. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pdig.0000385
15. Kaltenbach, L., Martzloff, P., Bambach, S. K., Aizarani, N., Mihlan, M., Gavrilov, A., Glaser, K. M., Stecher, M., Thünauer, R., Thiriot, A., Heger, K., Kierdorf, K., Wienert, S., von Andrian, U. H., Schmidt-Supprian, M., Nerlov, C., Klauschen, F., Roers, A., Bajénoff, M., … Lämmermann, T. (2023). Slow integrin-dependent migration organizes networks of tissue-resident mast cells. Nature Immunology, 24(6), 915–924. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41590-023-01493-2
16. Khattak, M., Bowness, J. S., Yonis, R., Kierkegaard, P., McGregor, A., & Perry, D. C. (2025). Navigating the barriers and facilitators to implementation of AI in healthcare: A scoping review. The Bone & Joint Journal, 107-B(7), 666–672. https://doi.org/10.1302/0301-620X.107B7.BJJ-2024-1570.R1
17. Krishnan, A., Arunachalam, R., Kosuru, S. N. V. J. D., T, S., Venugopal, S., & J, Y. (2025). An IoT-based healthcare system using blockchain technology and multiscale stacked Residual-GRU for secure data transmission. Scientific Reports, 15, 44851. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-28856-z
18. Krotkiewicz, M., Szynkaruk, A., & Stachyra, A. (2025). Digital Transformation in Healthcare Management: From Artificial Intelligence to Blockchain. Wiadomości Lekarskie, (3), 578–583. https://doi.org/10.36740/WLek/202445
19. Lafontaine, D. L. J. (2023). In phase with the nucleolus. Cell Research, 33(8), 579–580. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41422-023-00801-7
20. Lawrence, K., Nov, O., Mann, D., Mandal, S., Iturrate, E., & Wiesenfeld, B. (2022). The Impact of Telemedicine on Physicians' After-hours Electronic Health Record "Work Outside Work" During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Retrospective Cohort Study. JMIR Medical Informatics, 10(7), e34826. https://doi.org/10.2196/34826
21. Lee, A. T., Ramasamy, R. K., & Subbarao, A. (2025). Understanding Psychosocial Barriers to Healthcare Technology Adoption: A Review of TAM Technology Acceptance Model and Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology and UTAUT Frameworks. Healthcare, 13(3), 250. https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare13030250
22. Montejo, L., Fenton, A., & Davis, G. (2024). Artificial intelligence (AI) applications in healthcare and considerations for nursing education. Nurse Education in Practice, 80, 104158. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nepr.2024.104158
23. Moore, L., Lavoie, A., Bourgeois, G., & Lapointe, J. (2015). Donabedian's structure-process-outcome quality of care model: Validation in an integrated trauma system. The Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery, 78(6), 1168–1175. https://doi.org/10.1097/TA.0000000000000663
24. Nair, M., Svedberg, P., Larsson, I., & Nygren, J. M. (2024). A comprehensive overview of barriers and strategies for AI implementation in healthcare: Mixed-method design. PloS One, 19(8), e0305949. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0305949
25. Payne, P. R. O. (2026). Artificial Intelligence as a Catalyst for Quality, Safety, and Value in Healthcare Delivery. Missouri Medicine, 123(1), 45–49.
26. Rahimi, B., Nadri, H., Lotfnezhad Afshar, H., & Timpka, T. (2018). A Systematic Review of the Technology Acceptance Model in Health Informatics. Applied Clinical Informatics, 9(3), 604–634. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0038-1668091
27. Rajkomar, A., Dean, J., & Kohane, I. (2019). Machine Learning in Medicine. The New England Journal of Medicine, 380(14), 1347–1358. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMra1814259
28. Salwei, M. E., & Carayon, P. (2022). A Sociotechnical Systems Framework for the Application of Artificial Intelligence in Health Care Delivery. Journal of Cognitive Engineering and Decision Making, 16(4), 194–206. https://doi.org/10.1177/15553434221097357
29. Shankar, R., Devi, F., Ang, E., & Er, J. (2025). Barriers and facilitators to nurses' adoption of artificial intelligence-driven solutions in clinical practice: A protocol for a systematic review of qualitative studies. BMJ Open, 15(8), e099875. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2025-099875

30. Shenoy, A. (2021). Patient safety from the perspective of quality management frameworks: A review. Patient Safety in Surgery, 15, 12. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13037-021-00286-6
31. Tselios, C., Politis, I., Amaxilatis, D., Akrivopoulos, O., Chatzigiannakis, I., Panagiotakis, S., & Markakis, E. K. (2022). Melding Fog Computing and IoT for Deploying Secure, Response-Capable Healthcare Services in 5G and Beyond. Sensors, 22(9), 3375. https://doi.org/10.3390/s22093375
32. Wurster, F., Di Gion, P., Goldberg, N., Hautsch, V., Hefter, K., Herrmann, C., Langebartels, G., Pfaff, H., & Karbach, U. (2024). Roger's diffusion of innovations theory and the adoption of a patient portal's digital anamnesis collection tool: Study protocol for the MAiBest project. Implementation Science Communications, 5, 74. https://doi.org/10.1186/s43058-024-00614-8
33. Xu, X., Zhang, Y., Wang, Y., Zhao, C., Zhang, Y., & Xie, X. (2025). Impact of regional digital transformation on public health: An empirical analysis based on 31 provinces in China. BMC Public Health, 25, 2485. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-025-23670-8
34. Xue, L., Rashid, A. M., & Ouyang, S. (2024). The Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) in Higher Education: A Systematic Review. Sage Open, 14(1), 21582440241229570. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241229570
35. Yang, J., Liu, F., Yang, C., Wei, J., Ma, Y., Xu, L., Xie, J., & Wang, J. (2025). Application of Donabedian Three-Dimensional Model in Outpatient Care Quality: A Scoping Review. Journal of Nursing Management, 2025, 6893336. https://doi.org/10.1155/jonm/6893336