Artificial Intelligence and Medical Malpractice: Legal and Ethical Implications in Modern Healthcare

Abhinav Pujari[1], Bhumika[2], Kiran H R[3], Dr. Chitra B T[4], Sharanabasayya Hiremath[5]
[1,2,3,5] *Dept. of CSE, RV College Of Engineering, Bengaluru, India*
[4]*Dept. of Industrial Engineering And Management, RV College Of Engineering, Bengaluru, India*

Abstract—A paper on new legal questions that medical AI is bringing up in terms of who can be held responsible for mistakes made by artificial intelligence systems as doctors start to use more AI in the medical field; who can be held responsible as well, as our current law doesn't always have answers in this regard. We look at real case studies of automated system errors and raise suggestions for improving the safety and fairness of existing systems (training techniques, updated consent forms etc.) to ensure they are actually workable and fair for patients today.

Keywords—artificial intelligence, medical malpractice, healthcare law, liability frameworks, medical ethics, regulatory policy

I. INTRODUCTION

Artificial Intelligence is rapidly transforming the delivery of healthcare—from enhancing radiology diagnostics to automating administrative tasks and even assisting in surgical procedures. While AI increases efficiency and precision, it simultaneously challenges long-standing legal structures surrounding medical malpractice.

Historically, medical liability has focused on the clinician's duty to act within accepted standards of care. However, when a diagnosis or treatment recommendation is shaped by machine learning algorithms—often opaque even to developers—legal responsibility becomes difficult to attribute. Who should bear the blame when an AI-assisted decision harms a patient: the doctor, the software developer, the hospital, or all of them?

This paper investigates such legal grey areas, focusing on how medical malpractice laws are adapting (or failing to adapt) to AI integration and proposes a hybrid framework to promote both innovation and accountability.

II. BACKGROUND AND RELATED WORK

A. Evolution of Medical Malpractice Law

Malpractice law typically hinges on four core principles: duty of care, breach of that duty, causation, and patient harm. These principles evolved with new technologies such as X-rays, pacemakers, and robotic surgery, often integrating innovations into legal definitions of standard practice.

However, AI introduces actors beyond the healthcare team—engineers, data scientists, and platform vendors—who are rarely held legally accountable despite playing key roles in care decisions.

B. Contemporary Applications of AI in Healthcare

Artificial Intelligence is now widely utilized across various facets of healthcare, including diagnostic support, treatment decision-making, administrative optimization, and continuous patient monitoring [7]. AI systems analyze medical imaging, laboratory results, and electronic health records (EHRs) to detect patterns that may indicate disease. Additionally, AI-driven treatment recommendation tools combine clinical guidelines, up-to-date medical research, and patient-specific information to propose therapeutic strategies. In surgical contexts, AI assists in planning procedures and supports robotic execution during operations [8].

Notable examples of such systems include:

1. IBM Watson for Oncology, which suggests treatment plans tailored to cancer patients based on global medical data,
2. DeepMind by Google Health, known for its ability to identify retinal diseases through deep learning applied to eye scan data,
3. Arterys Cardio AI, which automates the interpretation of cardiac MRI scans,
4. Viz.ai, a system that facilitates early detection of stroke symptoms using CT imaging analysis.

C. Evolving Research on AI and Medical Liability

Scholarly research has identified a growing number of legal and ethical concerns at the intersection of artificial intelligence and medical malpractice. For instance, Price [10] investigates how traditional malpractice doctrines might be applied within AI-assisted clinical environments, highlighting the difficulty in defining applicable standards of care when machine decision-making is involved. Gerke et al. [11] examine the challenges posed by opaque algorithms, emphasizing the legal uncertainty that arises when AI systems lack transparency and interpretability. Meanwhile, Froomkin et al. [12] argue that as AI technologies begin to match or exceed the diagnostic and treatment capabilities of human practitioners, conventional liability models based on physician error may no longer be sufficient.

While these contributions have laid the groundwork for legal analysis in this domain, much of the literature lags behind the pace of technological advancement. This paper builds upon these foundational works by incorporating recent developments in AI functionality, deployment practices, and emerging regulatory responses to ensure a more current and comprehensive understanding of liability in AI-enabled healthcare.

II. METHODOLOGY

To explore the evolving relationship between AI integration and malpractice liability in healthcare, this study employs a mixed-methods research design. It incorporates doctrinal legal analysis, cross-jurisdictional regulatory comparison, and empirical case review to generate a multidimensional understanding of the issue.

A. Legal Framework Analysis

We conducted a detailed review of legal regimes governing medical malpractice, with a focus on the United States, European Union, and United Kingdom. The analysis encompassed:

1. Statutory frameworks relating to medical liability and product safety
2. Judicial opinions in cases involving AI-enabled diagnostics or treatment
3. White papers and advisory reports by regulatory agencies (e.g., FDA, EMA, MHRA)
4. Legislative proposals addressing AI governance and liability

This component of the study identified both existing points of convergence across legal systems and the areas where AI introduces new complexities unaccounted for in traditional doctrines.

B. Case Studies

To ground the theoretical and legal analysis in real-world contexts, five case studies were selected that involved adverse clinical outcomes associated with AI-assisted care. Selection criteria included:

1. Diversity in medical domains (e.g., oncology, radiology, emergency care)
2. Variation in AI roles (diagnostic support, treatment recommendation, triage)
3. Different outcomes in terms of liability, litigation, or policy revision

Each case was systematically examined using the following dimensions:

1. The technical configuration and decision-making logic of the AI involved
2. Clinical environment and the physician-AI interaction model
3. Attribution of responsibility among the stakeholders involved
4. Legal claims filed and outcomes (where publicly available)
5. Institutional changes implemented in response to the event

These case studies not only illustrate the complexity of assigning fault in AI-influenced decisions but also shed light on emerging best practices in both policy and clinical governance.

III. KEY CHALLENGES IN AI MEDICAL MALPRACTICE

A. Responsibility Assignment

With AI's role expanding, the traditional model of physician-centered liability is no longer sufficient. AI decisions often result from:

1. Developers' algorithmic design
2. Data scientists' preprocessing choices
3. Institutions' deployment strategies
4. Doctors' interpretation of AI advice

The "learned intermediary doctrine"—which shields developers if professionals make the final decision—

may be outdated, especially when doctors cannot fully understand the AI's rationale.

B. Standards of Care

What constitutes "reasonable care" in a world where AI can outperform human experts? Should doctors override AI suggestions, or defer to them?

Further questions include:

1. Must clinicians understand the model's limitations?
2. Should they use AI that's more accurate but opaque?
3. Are they liable for *not* using AI?

Courts have not settled how to judge doctors who rely on—or reject—AI input.

C. Causation and Black Box Algorithms

Causation is central in malpractice. But deep learning models often function as "black boxes," making it nearly impossible to trace errors.

Challenges include:

1. Differentiating between algorithm error and human misuse
2. Determining how a decision could've played out differently (counterfactual analysis)
3. Identifying which input caused which output in complex neural networks

This opacity can make it hard to win legitimate claims—or defend against false ones.

D. Informed Consent

Classic consent involves explaining risks, benefits, and alternatives. But AI introduces additional unknowns:

1. Algorithmic bias and limitations
2. Probabilistic reasoning
3. Lack of explainability

Very few jurisdictions require disclosure that AI is involved. Patients may be unaware that a black-box system shaped their diagnosis or treatment plan.

E. Evidentiary Challenges

Legal proceedings require verifiable data and expert testimony. AI cases face:

1. Lack of audit logs
2. Evolving algorithm versions
3. Proprietary code protected as trade secrets
4. Few qualified expert witnesses on AI behavior

This undermines due process and may favor better-resourced parties.

IV. EXISTING PARADIGMS AND THEIR LIMITATIONS

A. Regulatory Regimes

The U.S. FDA's "Pre-Cert" program approves developers, not individual AI tools. The EU's MDR regulation has more robust pre-market controls, but few post-market checks. In both cases, there's limited guidance on liability after deployment.

1. Minimal post-market performance monitoring
2. Unclear requirements to update as systems change
3. Inadequate regulation on responsibility
4. Disintegrated standards between jurisdictions

B. Professional Guidelines

Professional bodies such as the AMA and the Royal College of Physicians have published AI-related guidelines focusing on transparency, usability, and limitation recognition. Although beneficial, these guidelines are not legally binding and differ in comprehensiveness and relevance across environments.

C. Institutional Policies

Health care organizations are adopting their own controls, such as:

1. Credentialing for users of AI tools
2. Modified decision support algorithms
3. AI-specific consent forms
4. Specific incident reporting
5. AI oversight committees

These initiatives, while proactive, tend to be inconsistent and disconnected from wider legal frameworks [26].

D. Liability Insurance

Insurers are beginning to insure AI-specific risks. Some policies cover algorithmic mistakes, while others do not cover high-risk AI uses [27]. These changing policies affect provider behavior but can fall behind fast-paced AI developments.

IV. PROPOSED FRAMEWORK FOR AI MEDICAL MALPRACTICE

A. Altered Liability Standards

1. *Graduated Responsibility*: Liability based on AI autonomy, transparency, and human oversight.
2. *Contextual Standard of Care*: Standards considering clinical context, AI capabilities, and provider training.
3. *Comparative Negligence*: Shared liability among multiple parties based on their roles and knowledge.
4. *Safe Harbor Provisions*: Limited liability for providers following set AI protocols.

B. AI-Specific Informed Consent

1. *Tiered Disclosure*: Disclosure based on AI's role in clinical decisions.
2. *Comprehensible Explanations*: Simple, non-technical explanations tailored to patient understanding.
3. *Ongoing Consent:* Renewal of consent as AI evolves.
4. *Decision Support Tools*: Patient-friendly tools explaining AI's role in treatment.

C. Technical Standards and Certification

1. *Explainability*: Standards for clarity in high-risk AI use.
2. *Audit Trails:* Logging AI inputs, outputs, and human interactions.
3. *Bias Detection:* Tools for identifying and removing bias.
4. *Performance Benchmarking:* Ongoing evaluations against clinical standards.
5. *Simulation Testing:* Testing AI against edge cases.

D. Educational Initiatives

1. *Provider Education:* Integrating AI literacy into medical training.
2. *Legal Education:* Training for legal professionals on AI technologies.
3. *Patient Education:* Tools for patient understanding of AI involvement.
4. *Cross-Disciplinary Training:* Bridging knowledge between medical, technical, and legal fields.

E. Regulatory Coordination

1. *Joint Oversight:* Coordinated oversight between healthcare, tech, and standards bodies.
2. *Harmonization:* Aligning regulations across jurisdictions.
3. *Adaptive Regulation:* Updating regulations as technology advances.
4. *Incident Reporting:* Mandatory reporting of AI-related adverse events.

V. CASE ANALYSIS

To demonstrate the use of our suggested framework, we examine three sample cases depicting various AI deployment scenarios**.**

A. Case 1: Provider Override Diagnostic AI

Scenario:

A radiologist employs an AI system to interpret mammograms. The system identifies an area of concern, but the radiologist decides it's a false alarm and overrides the suggestion. The patient is subsequently diagnosed with breast cancer that might have been detected earlier.

1. *Analysis under Existing Framework:*

This case would most likely proceed as a standard malpractice action against the radiologist, with expert opinion on whether the override was a deviation from the standard of care.

The AI developer would most likely have limited liability under the "learned intermediary" doctrine.

2. *Analysis under New Framework:*

Our framework would take into account:

a. The AI system's recorded performance statistics and known limitations
b. The training of the radiologist on the particular AI system
c. Whether established override procedures were adhered to
d. Whether the AI's flagged issue can be explained
e. Institutional rules that govern AI-human disagreement

3. This method would provide more nuanced guidance in deciding suitable liability allocation while keeping the focus on compensating the patient.

B. Case 2: Treatment Recommendation System

Scenario:

An oncologist employs an AI system that prescribes a new treatment regimen for an uncommon cancer. The patient undergoes an undiscovered adverse reaction, leading to irreversible injury.

1. *Analysis under Current Framework*:

Conventional analysis would focus on whether the oncologist's decision to act on the AI suggestion was reasonable care. The sophistication involved in the AI recommendation process and the rarity of the condition would make this challenging.

2. *Analysis under Proposed Framework:*
Our process would consider:

a. Disclosure of the role of the AI in treatment planning as part of informed consent
b. Whether the clinical evidence underlying the treatment recommendation was sufficient
c. Whether the AI system could provide an explanation of the rationale behind the recommendation
d. Post-approval monitoring systems for identifying new adverse effects
e. Shared responsibility among the provider, institution, and AI developer according to their respective roles

VI. IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES AND STRATEGIES

Implementing the proposed framework for AI medical malpractice presents various challenges, requiring coordinated efforts from multiple stakeholders.

A. Legal System Adaptation

To address AI malpractice, the legal system must adapt in the following ways:

1. *Judicial Education*: Training programs for judges to understand AI's capabilities and limitations.
2. *Specialized Court Resources*: Inclusion of technical consultants and special masters for complex AI cases.
3. *Evidentiary Rules*: Modification of discovery and expert evidence approaches for AI systems.
4. *Case Law Evolution*: Strategic litigation to establish precedents for new issues related to AI.

B. Healthcare System Implementation

Healthcare organizations will encounter several obstacles, including:

1. *Resource Limitations:* Different levels of ability to implement robust AI governance.
2. *Legacy System Integration:* Challenges in incorporating AI oversight into existing risk management structures.
3. *Culture Shift:* Moving from hierarchical decision-making to collaborative human-AI processes.
4. *Rural and Underserved Settings:* Ensuring that the framework is applicable across diverse healthcare settings.

C. Technology Developer Compliance

AI developers need to address the following:

1. *Clear Documentation:* Creating proper documentation without compromising intellectual property.
2. *Validity Across Populations*: Ensuring AI systems perform effectively across diverse patient populations.
3. *Ongoing Monitoring:* Establishing systems for continuous performance evaluation.
4. *Cross-Disciplinary Communication:* Translating technical principles for healthcare and legal stakeholders.

D. Patient Engagement

Effective patient engagement requires the following:

1. *Information Availability:* Providing accessible materials that explain AI's role in care, tailored to different education levels.
2. *Representative Input:* Ensuring that diverse patient perspectives are considered during framework development.
3. *Navigation Support:* Offering resources to help patients understand their rights regarding AI-enabled care.
4. *Trust Building:* Transparent communication about the benefits and limitations of AI systems.

VII. CONCLUSION

AI in healthcare is not just a technical evolution—it’s a legal revolution. The current malpractice model, centered on physician intent and ability, is insufficient in the era of opaque, semi-autonomous tools. Without urgent reform, patients may be left unprotected, and providers may be unfairly exposed.

By reimagining liability, informed consent, and professional standards, we can create a legal ecosystem that balances innovation with justice. A fair, AI-ready malpractice system will empower doctors, protect patients, and ensure accountability from every stakeholder involved in digital healthcare.

REFERENCES

[1] T. Davenport and R. Kalakota, "The potential for artificial intelligence in healthcare," Future Healthcare Journal, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 94-98, 2019.

[2] W. N. Price II, "Medical Malpractice and Black-Box Medicine," in Big Data, Health Law, and Bioethics, I.G. Cohen, H. F. Lynch, E. Vayena, and U. Gasser, Eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018, pp. 295-306

[3] M. A. Hall, M. F. Hall, and G. Orentlicher, Health Care Law and Ethics, 9th ed. New York: Wolters Kluwer, 2018.

[4] A. Esteva et al., "A guide to deep learning in healthcare," Nature Medicine, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 24-29-2019

[5] P. D. Jacobson, "Medical liability and the culture of technology," in Health and Health Care 2010: The Forecast, The Challenge, 2nd ed., C. Evashwick, Ed. Chicago: Health Administration Press, 2005, pp. 111-150.

[6] B. Furrow, T. Greaney, S. Johnson, T. Jost, and R. Schwartz, Health Law: Cases, Materials and Problems, 8th ed. St. Paul, MN: West Academic Publishing, 2018.

[7] E. J. Topol, "High-performance medicine: the convergence of human and artificial intelligence," Nature Medicine, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 44-56, 2019.

[8] S. M. McKinney et al., "International evaluation of an AI system for breast cancer screening," Nature, vol. 577, no. 7788, pp. 89-94, 2020.

[9] J. J. Berman, Principles of Big Data: Preparing, Sharing, and Analyzing Complex Information. Waltham, MA: Morgan Kaufmann, 2013

[10] W. N. Price II, "Artificial Intelligence in HealthCare: Applications and Legal Implications," The SciTech Lawyer, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 10-13, 2017

[11] S. Gerke, T. Minssen, and G. Cohen, "Ethical and legal challenges of artificial intelligence-driven healthcare," in Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare, A. Bohr and K. Memarzadeh, Eds. London: AcademicPress, 2020, pp. 295-336.

[12] A. M. Froomkin, I. Kerr, and J. Pineau, "When AIs outperform doctors: confronting the challenges of a tort-induced over-reliance on machine learning," Arizona Law Review, vol. 61, pp. 33-101, 2019

[13] A. D. Selbst, "Negligence and AI's Human Users," Boston University Law Review, vol. 100, pp. 1315-1376, 2020.

[14] S. P. Sanbar, Legal Medicine, 7th ed. Philadelphia: Mosby, 2007

[15] P. Moffett and G. Moore, "The standard of care: legal history and definitions: the bad and good news," Western Journal of Emergency Medicine, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 109-112, 2011.

[16] D. B. Fogel and E. C. Fogel, "Artificial Intelligence and Medical Malpractice," IEEE Pulse, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. 16-19, 2019

[17] J. Allison Stanton, "Transparency and Accountability in AI Decision-making," Michigan Journal of Law Reform, vol. 54, pp. 15-42, 2020.

[18] A. Holzinger, C. Biemann, C. S. Pattichis, and D. B. Kell, "What do we need to build explainable AI systems for the medical domain?," arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.09923, 2017

[19] R. R. Faden and T. L. Beauchamp, A History and Theory of Informed Consent. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

[20] I. G. Cohen, "Informed Consent and Medical Artificial Intelligence: What to Tell the Patient?," Georgetown Law Journal, vol. 108, pp. 1425-1469, 2020

[21] N. P. Terry, "Medical Malpractice: External Influences and Controls," SIU Legal Studies Research Paper No. 2011-23, 2011

[22] U.S. Food and Drug Administration, "Digital Health Software Precertification (Pre-Cert) Program," 2019. [Online]. Available: https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/digital-health/digital-health-software- precertification-pre-cert-program. [Accessed Feb. 10, 2023].

[23] European Parliament and Council, "Regulation (EU) 2017/745 on medical devices," Official Journal of the European Union, L 117/1, 2017

[24] American Medical Association, "Augmented intelligence in health care," 2018. [Online]. Available:https://www.ama-assn.org/system/files/2019-01/augmented-intelligence-policy-report.pdf . [AccessedFeb. 10, 2023].

[25] Royal College of Physicians, "Artificial intelligence in healthcare," 2018. [Online]. Available: https://www.rcplondon.ac.uk/projects/outputs/art

ificial-intelligence-ai-health . [Accessed Feb. 15, 2023].

[26] T. Minssen, S. Gerke, M. Aboy, N. Price, and G. Cohen, "Regulatory responses to medical machine learning," Journal of Law and the Biosciences, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 1-18, 2020.

[27] M. Guihot, A. F. Christie, and D. Walters, "Nudging Robots: Innovative Solutions to Regulate ArtificialIntelligence," Vanderbilt Journal of Entertainment & Technology Law, vol. 20, pp. 385-456, 2017.