Exploring the Factors Influencing AI Integration in Clinical Diagnostic Decision-Making

Seyed Amir. Saadati[1]*, James. Ma[2]

[1] Student Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT), Department of Family Medicine and Community Health, Faculty of Physical Therapy, University of Minnesota Twin Cities Medical School, Minnesota, USA
[2] Rehabilitation Department, York Rehab Clinic, Toronto, Canada

* Corresponding author email address: saada@umn.edi

Editor	Reviewers
Leila Youzbashi Department of sport science, Faculty of Humanities, University of Zanjan, Zanjan, Iran l.youzbashi@znu.ac.ir	Reviewer 1: Masoud Mirmoezi Department of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran. Email: massoudmirmoezi@live.com Reviewer 2: Mohammad Reza Khodabakhsh Department of Psychology, Neyshabour Branch, Islamic Azad University, Neyshabour, Iran. Email :hodabakhsh@ut.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1 Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The text includes dense references (e.g., 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11) without synthesizing them into a coherent argument. Try clustering themes (e.g., ethical challenges, technical limitations) to reduce fragmentation and enhance flow.

The demographic data is comprehensive but presented in narrative form only. Consider providing a demographic summary table for clarity (e.g., role, years of experience, age group, gender).

There is some conceptual overlap between clinician training and threats to expertise. Consider consolidating or cross-referencing to avoid thematic redundancy.

While clinicians' reflections on patient trust are included, direct accounts from patients are missing. While understandable in scope, this limitation could be more explicitly acknowledged or reframed in the findings.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

1.2   Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

While the introduction discusses sociotechnical aspects, it does not mention a guiding theoretical framework (e.g., Technology Acceptance Model, Diffusion of Innovation). Incorporating such a model could ground the qualitative findings more strongly.

The manuscript states that "reflexive journaling and regular peer debriefings were employed", but does not indicate who performed these tasks or how reflexivity was maintained over time. Please clarify the reflexive strategies used to reduce positionality bias.

The statement "AI helped us flag a case of sepsis early—we might have missed it otherwise" is juxtaposed with "added to their cognitive workload", yet the contradiction is not deeply examined. Consider a more robust discussion on this tension.

The study mentions sociotechnical approaches but does not fully articulate what this entails in terms of governance, feedback loops, or co-design strategies. Expanding on this would add practical value.

Although regulatory and ethical concerns are highlighted, the discussion lacks concrete policy suggestions. Consider elaborating how findings could inform institutional guidelines or AI regulation frameworks.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

2.   Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.
Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.