Critical Hermeneutics, *9*(1), 2025
Biannual International Journal of Philosophy
http://ojs.unica.it/index.php/ecch/index
ISSN 2533-1825 (on line); DOI 10.13125/CH/6701

Received: 17/07/2025
Accepted: 26/10/2025
Published: 26/10/2025

The Ethics of Tomorrow's Medical Care: Human Touch or Robotic Precision?

Denis Chiriac
Moldova State University - RO

Abstract

This article analyzes the fundamental ethical dilemma of future medicine: The choice between robotic precision and human touch. In the transhumanist era, patients face a choice between human experts and autonomous medical systems that promise statistically higher success rates. The work explores the benefits of advanced medical technologies (surgical precision, AI diagnostics, personalized medicine) and the indispensable value of the human element (empathy, clinical intuition, and compassionate communication). Key ethical dilemmas are discussed: responsibility for errors, algorithmic bias, informed consent, and the risk of de-professionalization in medicine. The conclusion supports a synergistic centaur model, where technology does not replace the doctor but complements him, allowing him to focus on ethical judgment and the therapeutic relationship. The ethical future of medicine lies not in the triumph of man over machine or vice versa, but in the creation of a reasonable and well-organized partnership.

Keywords: ethics, artificial intelligence, therapeutic relationship, robotic precision, transhumanist medicine

1. Introduction

The transhumanist era brings with it a multitude of benefits and challenges, implicitly in the sphere of health care ethics. The speed at which the new technological revolution is unfolding allows us to use our imagination to better outline the issues we are analyzing in this scientific article. In a hypothetical future, we have a patient facing the need for complex cardiac surgery. He has two possibilities. The first is that of a surgeon with a recognized reputation based on a lifetime of practical experience. The second option is the "CardioSynth 45" stand-alone surgical system, an innovative marvel of medical engineering that, according to overall statistics from millions of surgeries, promises a 0.8% higher success rate and a 1.2% lower risk of postoperative complications than the average of the best human surgeons. Which should prevail: the experienced expertise and comforting touch of a human or the cold, increasingly advanced algorithmic perfection of a machine? This issue, which until recently seemed straight out of science fiction movies, is fast becoming a reality of 21st century medicine.

A growing symbiosis between medicine, artificial intelligence (AI), robotics and Big Data analytics is taking place before our very eyes. Surgical robots (such as the Da Vinci system) are already ubiquitous in many operating rooms around the world. Thanks to these innovations, many major surgical procedures have become minimally invasive. Deep learning algorithms are capable of analyzing radiological images, CT scans and pathological samples with an accuracy that can sometimes even exceed the accuracy of human experts. If medical platforms are able to develop personalized treatments tailored to each patient's genetic profile, technology will no longer remain an ancillary tool, but an active agent in diagnosis, treatment and clinical decision-making.

This rapid technological progress brings with it fundamental ethical issues that strain the very essence of the medical act. On the one hand, there is a moral imperative to adopt the tools that offer the greatest accuracy, safety, and efficiency. Ignoring a technology that can reduce human error, save lives, and improve the quality of care can be considered, in effect, an ethical failure. On the other hand, medicine has always been more than an applied science; it has been a human art. The intrinsic value of human interaction-empathy, intuition, the ability to deliver difficult news with compassion, offer relief, and build trusting relationships-is difficult to quantify, but is universally recognized as an essential component of healing. Thus, we are faced with a seemingly irreconcilable conflict between the promise of robotic precision and the constant need for human touch.

2. The promise of robotic precision: technological frontiers and clinical benefits

The argument for deep integration of advanced technologies into medical practice is not purely theoretical, but is based on a growing body of empirical evidence that demonstrates measurable benefits in the safety, efficiency and accessibility of medical care. From the microprecision of a robotic scalpel to the superhuman ability to analyze data, technology promises to overcome the biological and cognitive limitations of the human physician. This promise generates a strong ethical imperative, based on the classic principles of beneficence (acting in the best interest of the patient) and nonmaleficence (a commitment not to harm). Failure to use a tool that has proven its superiority in minimizing risk and maximizing positive outcomes can itself be a source of harm.

2.1 The technological revolution in surgery and diagnostics

Perhaps the most notable indicator of this revolution is robot-assisted surgery. Systems such as the da Vinci platform have changed standards in many specialties, from urology and gynecology to thoracic and general surgery. These systems are not autonomous robots, but rather complex telemanipulators that convert the surgeon's hand movements into extremely precise movements of surgical instruments. The benefits are widely documented: improved three-dimensional visualization of the surgical field, elimination of the physiological tremor of the human hand, and a range of motion for the device that far exceeds the capabilities of the human wrist. These technical advantages translate directly into clinical benefits for patients, such as smaller incisions, less blood loss, less postoperative pain, shorter hospital stays and faster recovery (Gharagosulu et al. 2021). Thus, the robot does not replace the surgeon, but on the contrary, it enhances the surgeon's skills, allowing him or her to perform complex procedures with greater precision and safety.

At the same time, a similar revolution, albeit less visible to the general public, is taking place in the field of diagnostics. Artificial intelligence algorithms, in particular convolutional neural networks trained on millions of medical images, are producing outstanding results. In radiology, artificial intelligence systems can detect lung nodules, brain lesions or early signs of breast cancer on mammograms with equal or even greater accuracy than experienced radiologists. A comprehensive meta-analysis published in The Lancet Digital Health found that the diagnostic effectiveness of deep learning systems is comparable to that of medical professionals (Liu et al.2019: e271). In pathology, AI can analyze digital drugs to detect cancer cells at a speed and accuracy beyond human reach, eliminating inter-individual variation and reducing the risk of diagnostic errors. The ethical order is clear: if an algorithm can detect cancer at an early stage that the human eye may not notice, the duty to use it as an auxiliary tool becomes urgent.

2.2 Personalized medicine and Big Data

Beyond mechanical and visual precision, AI's real strength lies in its ability to detect complex patterns in large datasets (Big data), which far exceeds human cognitive capacities. This is the basis for precise, personalized medicine. Rather than using standard protocols based on population averages, Precision Medicine seeks to tailor treatment and prevention to the individual characteristics of each patient: his or her genetic profile, clinical data, family history and environmental and lifestyle factors. A doctor, no matter how experienced, cannot process and link thousands of genomic and clinical variables of a patient. However, the algorithm can analyze the tumor genome and, based on comparisons with global databases, can recommend the most effective chemotherapeutic drug while simultaneously predicting the probability of response and the risk of side effects (Topol 2019: 44). This approach transforms treatment from a trial-and-error process into a targeted intervention, maximizing the chances of success and minimizing unnecessary toxicity.

2.3 Efficiency and democratization of access

An often-underestimated advantage of technology in medicine is its potential to improve systemic efficiency and democratize access to quality healthcare. Most of the time, medical staff are busy with administrative tasks: making appointments, filling out paperwork and billing. Automating these processes with artificial intelligence can save valuable time by allowing doctors and nurses to focus on direct patient interaction, reducing burnout and increasing job satisfaction. What's more, technology can act as an experience multiplier, enabling the transfer of specialist expertise from large university centers to remote or abandoned areas. A family doctor living in a rural area can use a diagnostic tool based on artificial intelligence to obtain an expert-level second opinion. Thanks to telemedicine and telerobotics, a surgeon in Rome can theoretically manage a patient's operation hundreds of kilometers away, and even conduct it. Technology not only improves the quality of healthcare; it also has the potential to reduce the profound inequalities that characterize healthcare systems around the world (Khan 2023-2024).

3. The eternal value of the human touch: empathy, intuition and holistic care

Although we have already presented promising horizons for technological precision, a holistic and ethical vision of the future of Medicine must also take into account its inevitable limits. Focusing solely on data, algorithms and mechanical features risks ignoring the fundamental dimension of health and disease: the human experience. Illness is not just a biological defect that needs to be corrected; it is a biographical event that affects a person's personality, relationships and emotional state. In this context, the human qualities of a physician – empathy, intuition and the ability to provide holistic care – are not just lightweight additions, but powerful therapeutic tools whose value remains irreplaceable. Neglecting these aspects in favor of a purely technocratic approach would mean treating the disease without caring for the patient.

3.1 Empathy as a therapeutic tool

Clinical empathy, defined as the ability to understand a patient's internal experiences and to convey this understanding in a supportive manner, means more than just being polite at the bedside. Numerous scientific studies prove that the empathic relationship between patient and doctor has tangible clinical effects. Patients who find the doctor empathetic experience greater satisfaction, but more importantly, they are more likely to follow a treatment plan, whether this involves taking medication, changing lifestyle or participating in rehabilitation (Hojat et al.2011: 564). The trust generated by empathic interaction encourages patients to disclose essential and often confidential clinical information they might otherwise miss, leading to a more accurate diagnosis and a more appropriate treatment plan.

What's more, empathy can directly affect symptom perception and physiological outcomes. The placebo phenomenon, understood not as a ploy but as the body's neurobiological response to positive expectations, is greatly enhanced by a warm and trusting therapeutic relationship. A doctor who communicates with hope and confidence can activate the internal mechanisms of pain relief and healing. On the other hand, cold, impersonal and technical interactions can trigger a nocebo effect, where the patient's negative expectations can aggravate symptoms or create new problems (Colloca and Miller: 2011). Of course, the algorithm can be programmed to mimic sensitive speech and utter phrases such as: I understand you're going through a difficult time. However, both doctor and patient know that this is a simulation, an imitation devoid of authentic emotional experience. The ethical and therapeutic value of empathy lies not only in the words spoken, but also in genuine human presence, eye contact, non-verbal language and the sincere feeling that the other person sees, hears and understands us.

3.2. Clinical intuition and the management of uncertainty

Medicine rarely relies on the application of clear formulas to well-defined problems. It often operates under conditions of uncertainty, with incomplete information and obscure symptoms. In this field, one of the most valuable tools of an experienced physician is clinical intuition, also known as "medical feeling" or clinical Gestalt. This is not some kind of mystical power, but a complex form of pattern recognition developed over many years under the influence of thousands of cases. It includes the ability to rapidly synthesize a great deal of subtle data-the patient's tone of voice, body language, social context, minor inaccuracies in his or her account-and combine it with formal medical knowledge to create a hypothesis (Groopman 2007: 85).

The artificial intelligence algorithm is very effective at recognizing patterns in the structured data it has been trained on (for example, pixels in an X-ray image). However, clinical intuition works very well for interpreting unstructured, contextual and often non-verbal data. The doctor may get the impression that "something's not right" in a patient whose results are almost normal, based on a soft complexion, an unusual state of arousal or the way he or she describes a seemingly trivial pain. This sensation could lead to further research that could eventually reveal a rare or atypical pathology that a system based solely on statistical probability might ignore. In the increasingly complex world of Medicine, the ability to navigate the "gray zone" and tolerate ambiguity is an important function that algorithms, due to their logical and probabilistic nature, may encounter difficulties with.

3.3 Transmission of bad news and end-of-life decisions

There are certain tasks in medicine that by their very nature transcend technical competence and fall into a deep realm of humanity. The most prominent example is probably the announcement of a serious diagnosis such as advanced cancer or neurodegenerative disease. It is not just about conveying information, but also a gentle act of guidance and support at one of the most difficult moments in a person's life. Protocols such as Pikes (scenery, perception, invitation, knowledge, emotion, strategy/summary) form the basis, but their effective application depends on the emotional intelligence of the clinician: the ability to regulate the pace of the conversation, to recognize and acknowledge the patient's emotions (shock, denial, anger), to answer unspoken questions, and to offer realistic hope without creating false illusions (Baile et al.2000) Delegating this task to a machine, however complex, would be an act of profound cruelty and unethical inadequacy that deprives this critical moment of the dignity and compassion it requires.

The same logic applies to end-of-life decisions. Discussing palliative care, withholding treatment, or planning long-term care is not algorithmic optimization. These are difficult conversations about values, fears, hopes, and what "a good life" and "a dignified death" mean to each individual. Here, the physician does not play the role of a technician, but rather that of a trusted ethical advisor, helping the patient and their family choose difficult medical options in light of their beliefs and desires. This ethical discussion, which takes place at the intersection of medical facts and personal values, is a purely human issue that requires wisdom, compassion, and an understanding of human nature that no line of code can capture.

4. Key ethical dilemmas at the intersection of man and machine

The integration of artificial intelligence and robotics into medicine is not a smooth and seamless process. Beyond the enthusiasm generated by technological advances, there are a number of complex ethical dilemmas that challenge our traditional notions of responsibility, justice and autonomy. These issues are not just technical obstacles that can be overcome with better algorithms, but they are deeply human issues that require careful discussion and careful regulation. The lack of an active approach to these ethical dilemmas threatens to cause harm, injustice, and inhumane treatment of the tools intended for healing. This section examines four of the most pressing areas of ethical conflict: liability for error, algorithmic bias, the fragility of informed consent, and the risk of losing the professionalism of doctors.

4.1 Liability and legal responsibility: the "black box" problem

Consider one likely scenario: a diagnostic algorithm with a proven 99.5% success rate fails to identify the early stage of a patient's malignant tumor, leading to late diagnosis and dismal prognosis. Who is to blame? The doctor who trusted the system's recommendations and didn't ask for a second human opinion? The hospital that introduced the technology, perhaps to reduce costs? Or the company that developed and marketed the algorithm? Current legal systems, based on concepts of negligence and intent, are ill-equipped to deal with this problem.

The difficulty is compounded by the nature of many modern artificial intelligence systems, especially those based on deep learning. These often operate like a black box. We can see the input data (medical images) and the output (diagnosis), but the internal decision-making process of the algorithm – a complex network of millions of interconnected parameters – is opaque and often incomprehensible even to its creators. It is impossible to ask the algorithm why it has come to a particular conclusion. This lack of interpretability creates an accountability gap. If we cannot identify the exact cause of the error, it becomes almost impossible to fairly assign blame (Price 2017: 440–441). This ambiguity is not only a legal problem, but also an ethical one, as it undermines public trust in medical technology and leaves injured patients without a clear avenue of redress.

4.2 Algorithmic bias and social justice

One of the greatest promises of AI is objectivity: the removal of bias and human subjectivity from medical decisions. Paradoxically, one of the greatest threats is the exact opposite: the encoding and amplification of human bias on an unprecedented scale. Algorithms learn from the data they are trained on, and if that data reflects existing structural inequalities in society and the healthcare system, the result will be biased medicine "washed" by an aura of technological neutrality.

Examples are already numerous and alarming. A benchmark study published in the journal Science analyzed an algorithm widely used in the US to identify high-risk patients who would benefit from complementary care programs. The algorithm used previous health care costs as an indicator of health needs. Because patients of color generated lower costs on average (due to limited access to care, distrust of the system, etc.) at the same disease level, the algorithm mistakenly concluded that they were healthier and systematically allocated fewer resources to them. The result was a massive racial bias that affected millions of patients (Obermeyer et al. 2019). Similarly, dermatology algorithms trained predominantly on light-skinned images have demonstrated significantly worse performance in diagnosing skin cancer in dark-skinned people (Adamson & Smith 2018). Instead of eliminating disparities, uncritically implemented AI can exacerbate and perpetuate them, creating a health system that works best for those who are already privileged.

4.3 Patient autonomy and informed consent

The principle of informed consent is a pillar of modern medical ethics. This law states that the patient has the right to make decisions about his or her own body based on a clear understanding of the nature, benefits and risks of the proposed intervention. The development of “black box” artificial intelligence puts tremendous pressure on this principle. If a doctor recommends surgery based primarily on an algorithm's suggestion, but cannot explain the reasons behind the suggestion, can the patient really give “informed” consent?

The dialogue can turn from a collective discussion into an act of faith in the opaque power of a machine. The doctor may say, I can't explain exactly how this works, but the system has a 99% success rate and recommend this approach. This shifts the basis of trust from the doctor's judgment and experience to the statistical power of the algorithm. The patient is put in the position of having to accept or reject a recommendation that no one in the room fully understands. Not only does this undermine patient autonomy, but it can also jeopardize the therapeutic relationship, turning the doctor from a trusted advisor into a simple technical intermediary between the patient and the algorithm (Bjerring and Busch 2021: 5).

4.4. Deprofessionalization and erosion of medical skills

Over-reliance on technology also raises long-term concerns about the future of the medical profession. The phenomenon of “deskilling,” or the erosion of skills due to automation, is well documented in other fields, such as aviation. There is a real risk that future generations of doctors, raised in an environment where initial diagnoses and treatment plans are determined by artificial intelligence, will no longer develop the same basic skills of clinical reasoning, physical examination and diagnostic intuition. They may become excellent users of the technology, but less competent practitioners when the technology fails, produces inconclusive results, or they must confront an unusual case that is not present in the training data.

Such erosion of skills could lead to gradual deprofessionalization, with the physician's role reduced from that of autonomous expert and decision-maker to that of supervisor of automated systems. This would not only reduce professional satisfaction, but could also prove dangerous for patients, as it would deprive them of the vital safety net of experienced human judgment. Instead of creating “augmented physicians," the ill-considered implementation of technology could lead to the education of "impaired physicians," relying on tools they have not mastered and do not fully understand (Verghese et al. 2018: 1120).

5. Synergistic future: models of ethical integration

Confronting the promise of robotic precision with the value of the human touch, and the ethical dilemmas that ensue, can evoke a sense of paralysis or pessimism. However, such a perspective is based on a false dichotomy, forcing us to choose between man and machine. The most promising and ethical future of medicine lies not in the victory of either side, but in the creation of an intelligent and well-regulated partnership. That is why we propose a vision of synergy in which technology does not replace the doctor, but enriches him, freeing him from computational tasks so that he can devote more time to aspects that require exceptional judgment, empathy and human wisdom. To make this vision a reality, coordinated action is needed in four main areas: adopting new models of collaboration, developing a robust regulatory framework, reforming medical education and implementing human-centered technology design.

5.1 The Centaur Model: human collaboration with artificial intelligence

The most appropriate metaphor for this synergistic future is not the future of the autonomous robot, but the centaur. This term, popularized in the world of chess by world champion Garry Kasparov, describes a model in which an average player, cooperating with a computer, is able to consistently beat even the most powerful supercomputer or the best grandmaster playing alone. The success of the centaur is not based on the brute superiority of the computer, but on the combination of the machine's tactical and mathematical skills with the strategic intuition, creativity and general knowledge of humans. Humans do not blindly follow the computer's suggestions, but use them as powerful analytical tools and integrate them into their own strategic vision (Topol 2019: 52).

Applied to medicine, the centaur model places the doctor in the role of chief strategist. Artificial intelligence is becoming an extremely powerful tool: it analyzes huge data sets, identifies subtle patterns in medical imaging, calculates risks and suggests treatment options based on the latest evidence. However, the doctor makes the final decision. He critically evaluates the algorithm's recommendations, taking into account the patient's individual context: his values, social situation, comorbidities and preferences. The doctor is the one who handles the uncertainty, communicates with the patient and his family, and makes the final decision, taking responsibility for it. In this model, artificial intelligence focuses on the “what” (data analysis), while the doctor focuses on the ‘why’ and “how” (the ethical and human context of the decision). This approach not only preserves the doctor's central role, but also elevates his or her stature, transforming him or her from a collection of memorized information into an expert knowledge manager and ethical advisor (Verghese et al. 2018).

5.2 Need for a regulatory and validation framework

For the centaur model to work safely, trust in the technology equipment is essential. This trust cannot be left to the marketing of technology companies, but must be built on a solid foundation of independent regulation and validation. It is essential that government agencies, such as the European Medicines Agency (EMA) and the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA), develop and implement a detailed regulatory framework for AI-based medical devices. Such frameworks need to go beyond the traditional model of one-time pre-market approval. Because artificial intelligence algorithms can continue to “learn” and change after deployment, a system of continuous postlaunch monitoring and auditing is needed to detect performance degradation or the emergence of new bugs (Cohen and Mello 2019: 1345).

In addition, regulations must set minimum standards for transparency and interpretability. While complete “black box” transparency may be technically impossible, developers can and should explain the overall logic of the algorithm, the data on which it was trained, and the limitations of its performance. This is key to addressing accountability and enabling doctors and patients to make truly informed decisions. Creating “nutritional labels” for algorithms that clearly describe their performance, training data, and the populations on which they have been tested may prove to be an important step in this direction (Rajkomar et al. 2019).

5.3 Medical education reform

The current system of medical education, which largely focuses on memorizing vast amounts of factual information, is becoming increasingly anachronistic in a world where access to any information is just a click away. The future requires a new type of doctor, the augmented doctor, and medical schools must adapt to this. Curricula should include the basic concepts of statistics, data science and artificial intelligence ethics. Future doctors don't need to become programmers, but they do need to understand the basic principles of these systems, their limitations and potential risks of errors.

Education should emphasize not only the acquisition of knowledge, but also the development of higher-order skills: critical thinking, evaluation of evidence (including that generated by artificial intelligence), dealing with uncertainty and, above all, ethical, communication and empathetic skills. As artificial intelligence takes over some of the diagnostic and analytical tasks, the time saved should be invested in improving interpersonal skills. Simulations with standardized patients, workshops on delivering bad news, and courses on ethics and the humanities should become central rather than peripheral components of medical education (Wartman & Combs 2018: 891). The goal is to educate doctors who can interpret the results of algorithms as well as they can interpret the nonverbal language expressed by concerned patients.

5.4 Human-centered design

Ultimately, the responsibility for ethical integration lies not only with physicians and regulators, but also with engineers and technology designers. Too often, medical technology is developed in a vacuum, with a focus solely on technical optimization, and then "thrown into a complex clinical environment," and doctors are expected to adapt to it. A far more productive approach is human-centered design, a process in which end users – doctors, nurses, patients – and ethical experts are actively involved in all stages of technology development.

The collaborative process ensures that the tools being developed are truly useful, that they integrate seamlessly into clinical processes and, most importantly, that they are designed to support rather than undermine the therapeutic relationship. For example, an AI-based diagnostic system could be designed so that it does not give a binary answer ("cancer"/"not cancer"), but instead distinguishes areas of interest in the image, while providing a level of reliability and linkage to similar cases, leaving the final interpretation to the physician. An electronic documentation system could be designed to reduce the number of clicks and maximize eye contact with the patient. By giving priority to human needs and values in the design process, we can shape technologies that will seem less like intruders and more like trusted partners in healthcare.

6. Conclusions

The journey through the landscape of medicine of the future, which begins with the dilemma of a patient forced to choose between the knowledge and experience of a surgeon and the statistical precision of a machine, does not lead us to a simple verdict, but to a more complex and nuanced understanding. The discussion cannot end with the victory of robotic precision over the ethics of human touch and vice versa. Such a binary vision would betray both the enormous potential of new technologies and the timeless nature of the medical profession. On the one hand, we have been exploring the promising possibilities of technology: its ability to make surgeries safer, personalize treatments at the molecular level and democratize access to expertise. This is not just about optimization, but about progress that carries with it the ethical imperative to minimize errors and maximize patient welfare. On the other hand, we have affirmed the irreplaceable value of the human component: empathy as an ethical and therapeutic tool, intuition as a compass in the face of uncertainty and compassion as the only appropriate response to suffering and existential decisions.

The collision of these two perspectives revealed profound ethical dilemmas, from the vacuum of accountability created by opaque algorithms and the risk of perpetuating social inequality through biased data, to the weakening of patient autonomy and the potential erosion of medical skills. These challenges make clear that uncritical and unregulated adoption of technology can paradoxically do more harm than good, creating a medical system that may be more technically efficient but colder, less fair, and less humane. The integration of artificial intelligence into medical care has sparked considerable debate regarding its potential impact on the fundamental aspects of healthcare, specifically whether it will enhance or detract from the human connection that is essential to patient care (Akingbola, Adeleke, Idris, Adewole, & Adegbesan, 2024).

The main thesis of this work, which emerged from the analysis, is that the only ethical path is the path of synergy. The goal should not be to automate care, but to empower the person providing it. The future belongs not to the robot doctor, but to the doctor-centaur – the professional who uses artificial intelligence as an extremely powerful consultant, but at the same time retains the supreme role of strategist, decision-maker and ethical leader. Making this shared future a reality depends on our collective wisdom in creating a robust ecosystem of support: a regulatory framework that ensures transparency and security, medical education reform that develops both digital skills and human capacity, and the technology industry's commitment to developing tools that serve the therapeutic relationship rather than work against it.

Ultimately, the fundamental question is not: man or machine? The right question is: how can a machine help humans become better physicians? The answer to this question will shape the face of medicine for future generations. The greatest challenge of our time is not only to develop smarter tools, but also to ensure that as these tools become more powerful, our medical practice becomes more human.

References

Adamson, A. S., & Smith, A. (2018). Machine learning and health care disparities in dermatology. *JAMA Dermatology*, *154*(11): 1247–1248.

Akingbola, A., Adeleke, O., Idris, A., Adewole, O., & Adegbesan, A. (2024). Artificial Intelligence and the Dehumanization of Patient Care. *Journal of Medicine Surgery and Public Health*, *3*, 100138.

Baile, W. F., Buckman, R., Lenzi, R., Glober, G., Beale, E. A., & Kudelka, A. P. (2000). SPIKES—A six-step protocol for delivering bad news: application to the patient with cancer. *The Oncologist, 5*(4): 302–311.

Bjerring, J. C., & Busch, J. (2021). Artificial intelligence and patient-centered decision-making. *Philosophy & Technology, 34*(1): 1–22.
Cohen, I. G., & Mello, M. M. (2019). Big data, big tech, and protecting patient privacy. *JAMA, 322*(14): 1345–1346.
Colloca, L., & Miller, F. G. (2011). The nocebo effect and its relevance for clinical practice. *Psychosomatic Medicine, 73*(7): 598–603.
Groopman, J. (2007). How doctors think. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
Hojat, M., Louis, D. Z., Markham, F. W., Wender, R., Rabinowitz, C., & Gonnella, J. S. (2011). Physicians' empathy and clinical outcomes for diabetic patients. *Academic Medicine, 86(3)*: 359–364.
Liu, X., Faes, L., Kale, A. U., Wagner, S. K., Fu, D. J., Bruynseels, A., ... & Keane, P. A. (2019). A comparison of deep learning performance against health-care professionals in detecting diseases from medical imaging: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet Digital Health, 1*(6): e271–e297.
Obermeyer, Z., Powers, B., Vogeli, C., & Mullainathan, S. (2019). Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations. *Science, 366*(6464): 447–453.
Khan, F. (2023–2024). From Pixels to Prescriptions: The Case for National Telehealth Licensing & AI-Enhanced Care. *Indiana Law Review, 57*(3): 58.
Price, W. N. (2017). Black-box medicine. *Harvard Journal of Law & Technology, 28*(2): 419–469.
Rajkomar, A., Dean, J., & Kohane, I. (2019). Machine learning in medicine. *New England Journal of Medicine, 380*(14): 1347–1358.
Gharagozloo, F., Patel, V. R., Giulianotti, P. C., Poston, R., Gruessner, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2021). Robotic surgery (2nd ed.). Springer.
Topol, E. J. (2019). High-performance medicine: the convergence of human and artificial intelligence. *Nature Medicine, 25*(1): 44–56.
Verghese, A., Shah, N. H., & Harrington, R. A. (2018). What this computer needs is a physician: humanism and artificial intelligence.

Journal of the American Medical Association, 319(1): 19–20.
Wartman, S. A., & Combs, C. D. (2018). Medical education must move from the information age to the age of artificial intelligence. *Academic Medicine, 93*(8): 1107–1109.