Scientific Hub of Applied Research in Emerging Medical science & technology (SHAREme)

ISSN: 2583-3162

SHARMEme |Vol.5 | Issue 1| Jan - Mar -2026
https://shareme.joinjet.org/
DOI: https://doi.org/10.61096/SHAREme.v5.iss1.2026.59-68

Research

Regulatory and Ethical Challenges of Artificial Intelligence in Clinical Research: A Global Perspective

Nandini Penchala[1], A. Dhanush Kumar[2*], Sayanolla Archana[3], Akhila Ajith[4], Thota Lakshmi[5], HB. Allankritha Sri[6]
[1,2,3,4,5,6] Doctor of Pharmacy, Department of Pharmacy Practice, Malla Reddy College of Pharmacy, Hyderabad, Telangana, India
*Correspondence: A. Dhanush Kumar
Email: dradhanushkumar@gmail.com

Published on:
14.02.2026

Published by:
Futuristic Publications

Abstract

Artificial intelligence (AI) is increasingly being integrated into clinical research across multiple stages of the trial lifecycle, including protocol development, patient recruitment and stratification, data management, statistical analysis, and safety surveillance. By enabling rapid processing of large and complex datasets, AI-driven tools offer significant advantages in improving operational efficiency, enhancing predictive accuracy, reducing trial timelines and supporting evidence-based decision-making. These capabilities position AI as a transformative technology with the potential to address long-standing challenges in clinical research, such as recruitment inefficiencies, high costs, and variability in data quality.

Despite these benefits, the implementation of AI in clinical research raises substantial regulatory and ethical challenges that must be carefully addressed. Considerable variability exists in global regulatory frameworks governing AI use, creating uncertainty for sponsors and investigators conducting multinational trials. Concerns related to data privacy, cyber security, algorithmic bias, lack of transparency, unclear accountability and limitations of traditional informed consent processes present significant barriers to the responsible adoption of AI technologies. Regulatory authorities, including the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), the European Union (EU), the World Health Organization (WHO) and various national agencies, have introduced guidance and policy frameworks aimed at mitigating AI-related risks; however, inconsistencies and limited harmonization across jurisdictions continue to impede uniform implementation.Ethical frameworks increasingly emphasize the principles of fairness, transparency, human oversight, patient autonomy, and the protection of sensitive health data to ensure trust and accountability in AI-enabled research. This review provides a comprehensive global overview of the evolving regulatory approaches governing the use of AI in clinical research and critically examines the ethical challenges associated with its application. Furthermore, practical recommendations are proposed for researchers, sponsors, ethics committees, and regulators to promote the safe, transparent, and equitable deployment of AI technologies. Addressing these regulatory and ethical challenges is essential to safeguard participant rights, uphold scientific integrity, and fully realize the potential of AI in advancing high-quality, patient-centered clinical research.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Clinical Research, Ethics, Regulation, Machine Learning, Data Privacy, Global Health.

1. Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) has emerged as one of the most influential technological advances in modern healthcare, with rapidly expanding applications in diagnostics, therapeutics, public health, and clinical research. AI refers to computer systems capable of performing tasks that typically require human intelligence, including learning, reasoning, pattern recognition, and decision-making. In clinical research, AI encompasses a range of techniques such as machine learning (ML), deep learning (DL), natural language processing (NLP), and computer vision, which collectively enable the analysis of large and complex datasets generated during clinical trials [1,2].

Clinical research is traditionally characterized by high costs, lengthy timelines, complex protocols, and challenges in patient recruitment and retention. Approximately 80% of clinical trials experience recruitment delays, and protocol amendments are common, contributing to increased costs and trial failures [3]. AI-driven solutions offer opportunities to address these limitations by improving protocol design, identifying eligible participants more efficiently, enhancing data quality, and enabling real-time safety monitoring [4]. As a result, pharmaceutical companies, contract research organizations (CROs), and academic institutions are increasingly adopting AI-based tools throughout the clinical trial lifecycle.

Despite these advantages, the rapid integration of AI into clinical research has outpaced the development of comprehensive regulatory and ethical frameworks. Traditional regulatory systems were designed for static interventions such as drugs and medical devices and may not adequately address the adaptive and continuously learning nature of AI systems [5]. Ethical concerns including algorithmic bias, lack of transparency, data privacy risks, unclear accountability, and challenges in obtaining truly informed consent have raised significant concerns among regulators, ethics committees, and patient advocacy groups [6].

Furthermore, clinical research is inherently global, with multinational trials conducted across diverse regulatory and ethical environments. Variations in data protection laws, regulatory expectations, and ethical standards across jurisdictions complicate the deployment of AI in global clinical research [7]. This review aims to critically analyze the regulatory and ethical challenges associated with AI in clinical research from a global perspective and to propose strategies for responsible and ethically sound implementation.

2. Applications of Artificial Intelligence in Clinical Research

AI technologies are being increasingly integrated across all phases of the clinical research continuum, from early trial planning to post-marketing surveillance.

2.1 Trial Design and Protocol Optimization

AI-driven analytics can assess historical clinical trial data, epidemiological trends, and real-world evidence to optimize protocol design. Predictive models help identify feasibility issues, estimate enrollment timelines, and reduce the likelihood of protocol amendments [8]. By simulating different trial scenarios, AI can support evidence-based decision-making during the planning stage, ultimately improving trial efficiency and success rates.

2.2 Patient Recruitment and Eligibility Screening

Patient recruitment remains one of the most significant challenges in clinical research. AI-powered systems can analyze electronic health records (EHRs), medical imaging, laboratory data, and clinical notes using NLP to identify eligible participants more efficiently than traditional manual screening methods [9]. These tools can also support diversity and inclusion efforts by identifying underrepresented populations; however, biased training datasets may inadvertently perpetuate disparities if not carefully addressed [10].

2.3 Data Management and Risk-Based Monitoring

AI-based risk-based monitoring systems can analyze trial data in real time to detect anomalies, protocol deviations, and data quality issues. These systems enable targeted site monitoring, reduce reliance on on-site visits, and support regulatory compliance [11]. Regulatory agencies increasingly recognize AI-enabled monitoring as a valuable tool, particularly in decentralized and hybrid clinical trials.

2.4 Endpoint Assessment and Medical Imaging

AI algorithms are widely used in image-based endpoint assessment, particularly in oncology, cardiology, and neurology trials. Automated image analysis improves consistency, reduces inter-observer variability, and accelerates endpoint evaluation [12].

2.5 Pharmacovigilance and Safety Surveillance

AI tools are increasingly used for adverse event detection through automated analysis of clinical trial data, spontaneous reporting systems, and real-world databases. Text-mining and signal-detection algorithms enhance early identification of safety concerns, supporting proactive risk management [13].

3. Global Regulatory Framework for AI in Clinical Research

3.1 United States

In the United States, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) adopts a risk-based and context-dependent approach to artificial intelligence in clinical research. Rather than regulating AI as a standalone category, the FDA evaluates AI systems according to their intended use and context of use (COU) within the clinical trial framework [14]. This approach assesses the system's credibility based on:

- Risk to trial participants
- Impact on clinical decision-making
- Influence on regulatory submissions

The FDA has issued guidance on Software as a Medical Device (SaMD) and AI/ML-based software, emphasizing:

- Transparent model documentation
- Analytical and clinical validation
- Real-world performance monitoring
- Lifecycle management, particularly for adaptive algorithms

A notable regulatory innovation is the FDA's proposed Predetermined Change Control Plan (PCCP) framework, which allows predefined algorithm modifications without requiring resubmission, provided changes remain within validated boundaries. This reflects recognition of the dynamic nature of AI systems.

AI tools used in recruitment analytics, risk-based monitoring, or endpoint analysis may not always qualify as regulated medical devices. However, if they materially influence trial outcomes or safety reporting, they may face scrutiny during Investigational New Drug (IND) or Biologics License Application (BLA) reviews [15]. The FDA also strongly encourages early sponsor engagement through pre-submission meetings to clarify regulatory expectations.

Overall, the U.S. model favors regulatory flexibility and innovation, but places substantial responsibility on sponsors to demonstrate validation rigor.

3.2 European Union

The European Union has established one of the most comprehensive AI governance structures through the Artificial Intelligence Act (AI Act). Under this regulation, AI systems deployed in healthcare and clinical research are generally categorized as "high-risk", triggering extensive compliance obligations [16].

Key requirements include:

- Robust data governance and quality controls
- Technical documentation and traceability
- Human oversight mechanisms
- Transparency obligations
- Post-market surveillance and risk management

The AI Act operates alongside the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the Medical Device Regulation (MDR). This layered regulatory environment increases compliance complexity for sponsors conducting multinational trials.

The GDPR introduces additional considerations for AI-based research, including:

- Lawful basis for data processing
- Restrictions on automated decision-making
- Data minimization and purpose limitation
- Cross-border data transfer safeguards

Compared to the U.S., the EU framework adopts a precautionary, rights-centered model emphasizing participant protection and algorithmic accountability. While this strengthens ethical safeguards, it may also slow AI deployment due to regulatory burden.

3.3 United Kingdom

Following its departure from the EU, the United Kingdom has adopted a principles-based regulatory model for AI governance. Oversight involves multiple regulators, including the Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) and the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO).

Rather than implementing a single AI statute, the UK framework is built on five cross-sectoral principles:

- Safety
- Transparency
- Fairness
- Accountability
- Contestability

The MHRA regulates AI-enabled medical devices under the UK Medical Devices Regulations, while AI tools used in clinical trials must comply with Good Clinical Practice (GCP) standards and data protection laws (UK GDPR).

This decentralized approach offers flexibility and adaptability but relies heavily on sponsor self-governance and regulatory interpretation. For multinational trials, divergence from the EU AI Act may create parallel compliance obligations.

3.4 India

India's regulatory landscape for AI in clinical research remains developmental. The Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR) has issued ethical guidelines emphasizing:

- Patient safety
- Equity and inclusivity
- Transparency in algorithmic design
- Accountability mechanisms

Clinical trials are regulated by the Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) under the New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules, 2019. However, no AI-specific regulatory pathway currently exists.

India has also introduced the Digital Personal Data Protection Act (DPDP Act), which influences data governance in AI-driven research. However, operational guidance for AI validation, bias auditing, and lifecycle monitoring remains limited.

While this evolving framework offers flexibility and innovation potential, regulatory ambiguity may create uncertainty for sponsors deploying AI-based systems in Indian clinical trials.

3.5 Australia

Australia's regulatory oversight of AI-enabled technologies is led by the Therapeutic Goods Administration (TGA). The TGA applies a risk-proportionate framework consistent with international standards, particularly those developed by the IMDRF [19].

AI systems classified as medical devices are regulated under the Therapeutic Goods Act and must demonstrate:

- Clinical safety and performance
- Quality management systems
- Ongoing post-market surveillance

Australia has increasingly emphasized real-world evidence integration and digital health innovation. Regulatory guidance also addresses adaptive AI systems and continuous learning models.

Compared to the EU, Australia's framework is less prescriptive but maintains alignment with global best practices. This alignment facilitates multinational trial collaboration, particularly with the U.S. and Canada.

3.6 Canada

Canada has adopted a risk-based, sector-integrated approach to artificial intelligence governance in healthcare and clinical research. Regulatory oversight involves multiple agencies, including Health Canada**,** the Office of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada (OPC), and provincial research ethics boards [35].

Regulatory Oversight

Health Canada regulates AI-enabled medical devices under the Medical Devices Regulations (SOR/98-282), which apply when AI systems are used for diagnostic or decision-support purposes that influence clinical care or regulatory submissions. AI-based software may be classified as Software as a Medical Device (SaMD) and is regulated based on risk classification (Class I–IV) [36].

Health Canada aligns closely with international guidance from the International Medical Device Regulators Forum (IMDRF), particularly regarding lifecycle management, real-world performance monitoring, and algorithm transparency [37].

For AI used in clinical trials (e.g., recruitment algorithms, risk-based monitoring tools), regulatory scrutiny depends on whether the AI influences safety endpoints or regulatory decision-making. Sponsors may need to justify validation methods and data governance practices during Clinical Trial Applications (CTAs) [38].

Artificial Intelligence and Data Act (AIDA)

Canada introduced the proposed Artificial Intelligence and Data Act (AIDA) under Bill C-27. Although not yet fully enacted, AIDA represents a significant development in federal AI governance [39].

Key features:

- Classifies "high-impact AI systems"
- Requires risk mitigation, impact assessments, and documentation
- Mandates transparency and accountability mechanisms
- Establishes penalties for non-compliance

AI systems used in healthcare and clinical research would likely qualify as high-impact under this framework.

Data Protection and Privacy

Canada's federal privacy law, the Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act (PIPEDA), governs private-sector data processing, including health data in some contexts. Additionally, provinces such as Ontario, Alberta, and British

Columbia have their own health information privacy statutes [40].

Important considerations for AI-based clinical research:

- Cross-border data transfer requirements
- Consent for secondary data use
- Data de-identification standards
- Safeguards against re-identification

Unlike the European Union's GDPR, Canada's framework is considered more flexible but still emphasizes accountability and transparency.

Ethical Governance

Canadian research ethics oversight operates through institutional Research Ethics Boards (REBs), guided by the Tri-Council Policy Statement (TCPS 2). TCPS 2 emphasizes:

- Respect for persons
- Concern for welfare
- Justice

AI-based clinical research must demonstrate:

- Transparency in algorithm use
- Fair participant selection
- Risk minimization
- Clear consent processes for data reuse

Practical Implications for Multinational Trials

For multinational clinical trials incorporating AI:

- Canada is generally aligned with US regulatory philosophy but places stronger emphasis on privacy governance.
- Regulatory expectations may differ from the EU AI Act's prescriptive requirements.
- Sponsors must address provincial variations in health data governance.
- Real-world data use requires robust de-identification and justification [41].

4. Ethical Challenges of AI in Clinical Research

4.1 Algorithmic Bias and Fairness

Algorithmic bias is one of the most significant ethical concerns associated with AI in clinical research. Bias can arise from unrepresentative datasets, flawed assumptions, or systemic inequalities embedded in healthcare data. In clinical trials, biased algorithms may influence patient selection, stratification, or outcome prediction, potentially exacerbating health disparities [20].

4.2 Transparency and Explain ability

Many AI systems, particularly deep learning models, lack interpretability, functioning as "black boxes." This lack of transparency challenges ethical review, regulatory assessment, and clinical trust. Ethics committees increasingly demand explain ability to justify AI-assisted decisions affecting trial participants [21].

4.3 Informed Consent and Autonomy

AI-driven research raises concerns regarding informed consent, as participants may not fully understand how their data are processed, reused, or analyzed by complex algorithms. Traditional consent models may be insufficient, necessitating enhanced consent processes that explicitly address AI use and data governance [22].

4.4 Data Privacy and Confidentiality

AI systems rely on large, often sensitive datasets, increasing risks of data breaches and re-identification. Ensuring compliance with data protection laws such as GDPR and maintaining robust cybersecurity measures are essential, particularly in multinational trials [23].

4.5 Accountability and Liability

Determining responsibility when AI systems contribute to errors or adverse outcomes remains challenging. Ethical concerns arise regarding the distribution of accountability among sponsors, investigators, software developers, and data providers [24].

Table 1. Global Regulatory Approaches to AI in Clinical Research

Region	Regulatory Authority	Regulatory Approach	Key Features
United States	FDA	Risk-based, context of use	Model validation, lifecycle monitoring, human oversight
European Union	European Commission	AI Act (high-risk classification)	Transparency, data governance, post-market surveillance
United Kingdom	MHRA	Principles-based	Safety, accountability, flexibility
India	ICMR / CDSCO	Ethics-focused, evolving	Equity, transparency, patient protection
Australia	TGA	Risk-proportionate	Safety, quality assurance, international alignment
Canada	Health Canada / OPC	Hybrid, risk-based with emerging AI legislation	SaMD classification, privacy governance (PIPEDA), proposed high-impact AI oversight (AIDA), research ethics board supervision (TCPS 2)

Table 2. Ethical Challenges of AI in Clinical Research and Mitigation Strategies

Ethical Challenge	Description	Mitigation Strategy
Algorithmic bias	Non-representative training data	Fairness audits, diverse datasets
Lack of transparency	Black-box models	Explainable AI, documentation
Informed consent	Limited participant understanding	AI-specific consent language
Data privacy	Re-identification risks	Strong data governance, encryption
Accountability	Unclear responsibility	Human oversight, defined liability

5. Ethical and Regulatory Challenges in Multinational Clinical Trials

Multinational clinical trials using AI face compounded challenges due to heterogeneity in regulatory requirements, ethical review processes, and data protection laws across jurisdictions. Cross-border data sharing, differing consent requirements, and inconsistent definitions of AI-related risks complicate trial conduct [25]. These challenges increase operational burden and may delay approvals, highlighting the need for international harmonization.

6. Recommendations for Responsible Integration of AI in Clinical Research

To address regulatory and ethical challenges, the following strategies are recommended:

1. **Early Definition of Context of Use:** Clearly define the intended purpose, scope, and limitations of AI systems within clinical protocols [14].
2. **Robust Validation and Performance Monitoring:** Conduct rigorous validation studies and continuous performance monitoring to detect model drift [26].
3. **Bias Assessment and Mitigation:** Implement fairness audits and ensure diverse training datasets to minimize bias [20].
4. **Human Oversight:** Maintain human-in-the-loop decision-making for critical trial processes [21].

5. **Enhanced Informed Consent:** Update consent documents to transparently describe AI use, data sharing, and potential risks [22].
6. **Strengthened Data Governance:** Implement strong cybersecurity, data minimization, and access-control measures [23].
7. **Global Regulatory Collaboration:** Encourage harmonization through international bodies such as WHO and ICH [27].

7. Future Directions and Research Priorities

The future integration of artificial intelligence in clinical research depends on the development of adaptive, transparent, and ethically grounded governance models. As AI systems increasingly evolve through continuous learning and real-world data integration, regulators and ethics committees must shift from static approval models toward dynamic oversight mechanisms [28].

One key research priority is the establishment of standardized validation frameworks for AI systems used in clinical trials. Current validation approaches often vary across institutions and sponsors, limiting comparability and reproducibility of findings. International standards for AI performance metrics, explain ability thresholds, and bias assessment are urgently needed [29]. Reporting guidelines such as CONSORT-AI and SPIRIT-AI represent important steps toward transparency, but broader adoption remains limited [30].

Another critical area is regulatory harmonization. Differences between regulatory approaches in the United States, European Union, and emerging economies create barriers to multinational clinical trials. Collaborative initiatives through organizations such as the World Health Organization (WHO) and the International Council for Harmonization (ICH) could facilitate convergence of AI governance principles [31].

From an ethical perspective, future research should explore novel informed consent models, including dynamic and tiered consent, to better accommodate AI-driven data reuse and secondary analyses [32]. Additionally, ongoing evaluation of AI’s impact on health equity is essential to ensure that technological advancements do not exacerbate existing disparities [33].

Finally, capacity-building initiatives are needed to improve AI literacy among investigators, ethics committee members, and regulators. Enhanced understanding of AI technologies will support more informed ethical review and regulatory decision-making [34].

8. Conclusion

Artificial intelligence represents a paradigm shift in the conduct of clinical research, offering unprecedented opportunities to enhance trial efficiency, data quality, and patient safety. AI-driven tools have demonstrated potential across the clinical trial lifecycle, from protocol design and patient recruitment to safety monitoring and post-marketing surveillance. However, these benefits are accompanied by complex regulatory and ethical challenges that cannot be overlooked.

The dynamic and adaptive nature of AI systems challenges traditional regulatory models, while ethical concerns related to bias, transparency, informed consent, data privacy, and accountability demand careful consideration. The lack of global regulatory harmonization further complicates AI deployment in multinational clinical trials.

Addressing these challenges requires a coordinated, multidisciplinary approach involving regulators, researchers, sponsors, technology developers, and ethics committees. Risk-based regulatory frameworks, robust validation standards, enhanced transparency, and strong ethical oversight are essential to ensure responsible AI integration. By adopting globally aligned and ethically grounded governance strategies, the clinical research community can harness the transformative potential of AI while safeguarding participant rights and maintaining scientific integrity.

References

1. Toprol EJ. High-performance medicine: the convergence of human and artificial intelligence. *Nat Med*. 2019; 25(1):44–56.
2. Rajkomar A, Dean J, Kohane I. Machine learning in medicine. *N Engl J Med*. 2019; 380(14):1347–1358.
3. Carlisle B, Immelmann J, Ramsay T, MacKinnon N. Unsuccessful trial accrual

and human subjects protections: an empirical analysis of recently closed trials. *Clin Trials*. 2015; 12(1):77–83.

4. Harrer S, Shah P, Antony B, Hu J. Artificial intelligence for clinical trial design. *Trends Pharmacol Sci*. 2019; 40(8):577–591.
5. Benjamin's S, Dhunnoo P, Meskó B. The state of artificial intelligence-based FDA-approved medical devices and algorithms: an online database. *NPJ Digit Med*. 2020; 3:118.
6. Mittelstadt B, Allo P, Taddeo M, Wachter S, Floridi L. The ethics of algorithms: mapping the debate. *Big Data Soc*. 2016; 3(2):1–21.
7. Price WN, Cohen IG. Privacy in the age of medical big data. *Nat Med*. 2019; 25(1):37–43.
8. Chen JH, Asch SM. Machine learning and prediction in medicine—beyond the peak of inflated expectations. *N Engl J Med*. 2017; 376(26):2507–2509.
9. Weng C, et al. A real-time screening alert improves patient recruitment efficiency. *J Am Med Inform Assoc*. 2019; 26(12):164–174.
10. Obermeyer Z, Powers B, Vogeli C, Mullainathan S. Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations. *Science*. 2019; 366(6464):447–453.
11. US Food and Drug Administration. Use of risk-based monitoring approaches in clinical trials. Guidance for industry. FDA; 2013.
12. Esteva A, et al. A guide to deep learning in healthcare. *Nat Med*. 2019; 25(1):24–29.
13. Harpaz R, DuMouchel W, Shah NH, Madigan D, Ryan P, Friedman C. Novel data-mining methodologies for adverse drug event discovery. *Clin Pharmacol Ther*. 2019; 106(3):485–493.
14. US Food and Drug Administration. Considerations for the use of artificial intelligence to support regulatory decision-making for drug and biological products. FDA; 2023.
15. US Food and Drug Administration. Clinical decision support software: guidance for industry and FDA staff. FDA; 2022.
16. European Commission. Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 laying down harmonized rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act). Official Journal of the European Union; 2024.
17. Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA). Software and AI as a medical device change programmer. MHRA; 2023.
18. Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR). Ethical guidelines for application of artificial intelligence in biomedical research and healthcare. New Delhi: ICMR; 2023.
19. Therapeutic Goods Administration (TGA). Regulation of software-based medical devices including AI. Canberra: TGA; 2022.
20. Chen IY, Johansson FD, Sontag D. Why is my classifier discriminatory? *BMJ*. 2021; 372:n79.
21. Rudin C. Stop explaining black box machine learning models for high stakes decisions and use interpretable models instead. *Nat Mach Intell*. 2019; 1(5):206–215.
22. McGuire AL, Beskow LM. Informed consent in genomics and health data research. *Annu Rev Genomics Hum Genet*. 2010; 11:361–381.
23. Voigt P, von dem Bussche A. *The EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR): A Practical Guide*. Cham: Springer; 2017.
24. London AJ. Artificial intelligence and responsibility in clinical research. *Hastings Cent Rep*. 2019; 49(1):8–10.
25. International Council for Harmonization (ICH). Integrated addendum to ICH E6 (R2): guideline for good clinical practice. ICH; 2016.
26. Kelly CJ, Karthikesalingam A, Suleyman M, Corrado G, King D. Key challenges for delivering clinical impact with artificial intelligence. *BMC Med*. 2019; 17:195.
27. World Health Organization. Ethics and governance of artificial intelligence for health. Geneva: WHO; 2021.

28. Liu X, et al. Reporting guidelines for clinical trial reports for interventions involving artificial intelligence: the CONSORT-AI extension. *Nat Med*. 2020; 26(9):1364–1371.
29. SPIRIT-AI Working Group. Guidelines for clinical trial protocols involving artificial intelligence. *BMJ*. 2020; 370:m3210.
30. EMA. Artificial intelligence in medicines regulation. European Medicines Agency; 2023.
31. Vayena E, Blasimme A, Cohen IG. Machine learning in medicine: addressing ethical challenges. *PLoS Med*. 2018; 15(11):e1002689.
32. Steinsbekk KS, et al. Broad consent versus dynamic consent in biobank research. *BMJ*. 2013; 346:f286.
33. Panch T, Mattie H, Celi LA. The "inconvenient truth" about AI in healthcare. *NPJ Digit Med*. 2019; 2:77.
34. World Health Organization. Governance of artificial intelligence for health: WHO guidance on large multi-modal models. Geneva: WHO; 2023.
35. Government of Canada. *Food and Drugs Act, Medical Devices Regulations (SOR/98-282)*. Ottawa: Government of Canada; 2023.
36. Health Canada. *Software as a Medical Device (SaMD): Definition and Classification Guidance*. Ottawa: Health Canada; 2022.
37. International Medical Device Regulators Forum (IMDRF). *Software as a Medical Device (SaMD): Clinical Evaluation Guidance*. IMDRF; 2017.
38. Government of Canada. *Bill C-27: Digital Charter Implementation Act, 2022 (Artificial Intelligence and Data Act – AIDA)*. Ottawa: Parliament of Canada; 2022.
39. Government of Canada. *Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act (PIPEDA)*. Ottawa: Government of Canada; 2023.
40. Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (TCPS 2)*. Ottawa; 2022.
41. Office of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada. *Guidance on De-identification of Personal Information*. Ottawa; 2020