Beyond Algorithms: Protecting the Reasoning Skills of Future Clinicians in an AI-driven Era

It's no longer a fantasy to have an AI-empowered junior doctor who can use algorithms to diagnose clinical conditions. The influence on clinicians' thinking as AI enters clinical routines, from radiology to emergency triage, is profound. AI can bring precision and efficiency, but misapplication of the technology could degrade the fundamental cognitive skills that make up clinical expertise. Today the question is not whether to use AI in clinical practice, but how to use it effectively, preserving the instinctive experience-based judgement of clinicians, while benefiting from the technological support. As we become more reliant on artificial intelligence it is important to consider how this may influence clinicians' thinking in years to come. Will they carefully consider each case or will AI be their sole diagnostic tool?

AI is good at pattern recognition, data synthesis and probabilistic reasoning. Technologies like IBM Watson, DeepMind's AlphaFold and clinical decision support systems have demonstrated impressive results in diagnosing complex diseases and predicting outcomes.[1] In high-stakes settings, AI can help reduce diagnostic errors, streamline processes and identify subtle differences that may be missed by humans. Yet, this capability comes with a cognitive cost. Frequent dependence on artificial intelligence may result in cognitive offloading the practice of delegating mental tasks to external systems, thereby diminishing internal reasoning capabilities.[2] Healthcare professionals might start to place greater trust in algorithms than in their own judgment, particularly when faced with time constraints or uncertainty. They may have opportunities to get involved in problem-solving, which may further reduce their reasoning abilities.[3]

Clinical reasoning is far more than a repetitive logical exercise; it encompasses a variety of educational, reflective, and team-based practices.[4] There exists a dynamic interplay of experience, pattern recognition, and contextual judgment for each patient. Experienced clinicians frequently rely on "gut feelings" informed by years of exposure to subtle clinical cues. Although difficult to quantify, this intuitive reasoning becomes especially vital in ambiguous or atypical cases.[5] As artificial intelligence approaches widespread clinical integration, it will be essential for clinicians to accurately evaluate diagnostic tools' performance using realistic and clinically pertinent metrics, ensuring human reasoning remains central for decision-making.[4]

While the adaptability of machine learning algorithms has opened new avenues, abrupt over-reliance on artificial intelligence (AI) may diminish innate skills. Regular use of AI can shrink the "analytical mental pathways," thereby decreasing the brain's engagement in critical thinking. Long-term dependence on AI may impair neuroplasticity, the brain's capacity to reconfigure its neural networks—and consequently, making it difficult for clinicians to maintain their reasoning and problem-solving skills. Therefore, technology influences neural restructuring, leading to cognitive deskilling. As AI has already entered our doors, we must consciously monitor its influence in the medical field as we transition from human-driven problem identification to AI-driven pattern recognition for diagnosis.[3]

There is a plausible concern that technology use can either enhance or impair brain function depending on how it's integrated into practice. This means AI should be used to stimulate the reasoning rather than to replace it in the clinical settings.[6] In medicine intuition is not merely guesswork but is a skill learnt through gradual exposure, reflection followed by sequential pattern recognition. It allows clinicians to identify presented subtle signs and make decisions after interpreting the patient narratives in the face of uncertainty. In comparison, despite its computational strength, AI still lacks this depth of human nuance.[7] Therefore, as the machines are becoming smarter day by day, the art of listening, interpreting still remains relevant.[8]

Clinicians must actively engage with AI outputs to keep this art alive. Instead of blindly accepting algorithmic recommendations at face value, they should interrogate the logic, compare it with their own reasoning, and reflect on differences. This dual-processing approach augments both machine and human cognition.[9] To benefit from AI without compromising clinical judgment, deliberate strategies are necessary, such as using AI as a second opinion, promoting reflective practice, and employing AI to reduce administrative burden to reserve mental bandwidth for complex reasoning. Lastly, medical education must evolve; future doctors need to learn when and how to trust AI. We stand at the crossroads of innovation and intuition, the path forward is clear:

train minds that think with machines, not through them. Only then can we ensure that the art of medicine survives the age of algorithms.

REFERENCES

1. Topol EJ. High-performance medicine: the convergence of human and artificial intelligence. Nat Med 2019; 25(1): 44-56. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-018-0300-7
2. Celi LA, Cellini J, Charpignon ML, Dee EC, Dernoncourt F, Eber R, et al; for MIT Critical Data. Sources of bias in artificial intelligence that perpetuate healthcare disparities-A global review. PLOS Digit Health 2022 ; 1(3): e0000022. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pdig.0000022
3. Scibelli D, Stevens B. Is AI flattening the curve of critical thinkers leaving behind a cognitive cap for learners? Iss Inform Syst 2024; 25(3): 133–147. https://doi.org/10.48009/3_iis_2024_111
4. Goh E, Gallo R, Hom J, Strong E, Weng Y, Kerman H, et al. Large Language Model Influence on Diagnostic Reasoning: A Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA Netw Open 2024; 7(10): e2440969. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.40969
5. Norman GR, Monteiro SD, Sherbino J, Ilgen JS, Schmidt HG, Mamede S. The Causes of Errors in Clinical Reasoning: Cognitive Biases, Knowledge Deficits, and Dual Process Thinking. Acad Med ; 92(1): 23-30. https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000001421
6. Shaffer J. Neuroplasticity and Clinical Practice: Building Brain Power for Health. Front Psychol 2016; 7: 1118. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01118
7. Dreyfus SE. The five-stage model of adult skill acquisition. Bull Sci Technol Soc. 2004; 24(3): 177–81.
8. Reddy H, Joshi S, Joshi A, Wagh V. A Critical Review of Global Digital Divide and the Role of Technology in Healthcare. Cureus 2022; 14(9): e29739. https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.29739
9. Croskerry P. A universal model of diagnostic reasoning. Acad Med 2009; 84(8): 1022-1028. https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0b013e3181ace703

Dr. Shabana Ali
Professor of Anatomy
Assistant Dean Medical Education
Riphah International University, Pakistan