Texila International Journal | Open Access | Peer Reviewed

Journal: Texila International Journal of Academic Research
https://doi.org/10.21522/TIJAR.2014.13.03.Art006

ISSN: 2520-3088
Volume 13 Issue 3, 2026

Artificial Intelligence in Regulatory Medical Writing: Opportunities, Challenges, and Implications for Clinical Trial Documentation

Padmakala Munjampally[1*], Kannan Gopal[2]

[1]*School of Clinical Research, Texila American University, Guyana, South America*

[2]*Pharmacology, PERI College of Pharmacy, Mannivakkam, Chennai, India*

***Correspondence to be addressed:** E-mail - padmakala.arepaka@gmail.com

Cite this article as: Munjampally P, Gopal K. Artificial intelligence in regulatory medical writing: opportunities, challenges, and implications for clinical trial documentation. Texila Int J Acad Res. 2026;13(3). **https://doi.org/10.21522/TIJAR.2014.13.03.Art006**

Received: 03.06.2026
Accepted: 11.07.2026
Published: 31.07.2026

Abstract *Artificial intelligence (AI) is increasingly being explored in healthcare communication and scientific documentation, including applications in regulatory medical writing. Regulatory medical writing plays a critical role in the preparation of clinical trial documentation required for regulatory submissions, including clinical study reports, study protocols, investigator brochures, and safety reports. The integration of AI technologies, particularly natural language processing and machine learning, has created opportunities to improve efficiency, consistency, and workflow management in documentation-related activities. However, concerns remain regarding accuracy, transparency, ethical considerations, and regulatory compliance associated with AI-assisted documentation. This article explores the current and potential applications of artificial intelligence in regulatory medical writing and evaluates its implications for clinical trial documentation. A qualitative narrative review approach was adopted using published literature, regulatory guidance documents, and policy papers related to AI in healthcare, scientific communication, and regulatory science. The review identifies major opportunities associated with AI-assisted documentation, including automated drafting, content summarization, workflow optimization, and consistency in document preparation. At the same time, important limitations and challenges were identified, including reliability concerns, hallucination risks, lack of transparency, ethical considerations, data privacy issues, and uncertainties regarding regulatory acceptance. The review further discusses the evolving role of medical writers in an AI-assisted environment and highlights the importance of human oversight in maintaining documentation quality, scientific accuracy, and compliance with regulatory expectations. The findings suggest that while AI has significant potential to support regulatory medical writing, responsible integration requires robust governance frameworks, ethical oversight, and clear regulatory guidance.*

Keywords *Artificial Intelligence, Clinical Study Reports, Clinical Trial Documentation, Natural Language Processing, Regulatory Medical Writing, Regulatory Science.*

This article is published under Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0)

https://doi.org/10.21522/TIJAR.2014.13.03.Art006

Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) has emerged as one of the most influential technological developments in healthcare, biomedical research, and scientific communication [1, 2]. AI-driven technologies, particularly machine learning and natural language processing (NLP), are increasingly being integrated into healthcare systems to support clinical decision-making, data analysis, workflow optimization, and scientific documentation [9, 11, 12, 19, 20]. In parallel, the healthcare and pharmaceutical industries are experiencing substantial growth in digital transformation initiatives, including automation of documentation-related processes.

Regulatory medical writing is a specialized scientific discipline that supports the preparation of regulatory and clinical trial documents required throughout the drug development lifecycle. Regulatory medical writers prepare essential documents such as clinical study reports (CSRs), clinical trial protocols, investigator brochures, informed consent forms, briefing documents, and safety reports in accordance with international regulatory guidelines including International Council for Harmonisation (ICH) E3 and ICH E6(R3) Good Clinical Practice guidelines [3, 4]. These documents require high levels of scientific accuracy, consistency, traceability, clarity, and regulatory compliance.

The increasing complexity of global clinical trials and the growing volume of clinical documentation have created significant operational challenges for pharmaceutical organizations and regulatory teams. As a result, there is growing interest in exploring AI-assisted systems that may improve efficiency, reduce repetitive manual tasks, support consistency across documents, and optimize workflow management.

Recent advancements in generative AI technologies have accelerated discussions regarding their use in healthcare communication and medical writing [22-24]. AI-assisted systems are capable of performing tasks including automated drafting, language refinement, text summarization, literature screening, data extraction, and document organization [1, 2, 22-24]. These capabilities suggest potential applications within regulatory medical writing and clinical documentation.

Despite these opportunities, important concerns remain regarding the responsible use of AI in regulatory documentation. Existing literature identifies several challenges associated with AI-assisted content generation, including hallucination risks, factual inaccuracies, lack of transparency, ethical concerns, accountability issues, and uncertainties regarding regulatory acceptance [5, 6]. In clinical trial documentation, such concerns are particularly important because inaccuracies or inconsistencies may affect scientific integrity, regulatory decision-making, and patient safety.

Although AI applications in healthcare communication have been increasingly studied, limited literature specifically evaluates the role of AI in regulatory medical writing and clinical trial documentation [7, 8]. Current evidence remains fragmented, and there is limited discussion regarding how AI technologies align with regulatory expectations for scientific documentation and quality standards.

The present review article aims to explore the current and potential applications of artificial intelligence in regulatory medical writing and evaluate associated opportunities, challenges, ethical considerations, and regulatory implications for clinical trial documentation. The review further discusses the evolving role of medical writers in an AI-assisted environment and identifies areas requiring future research and governance development.

https://doi.org/10.21522/TIJAR.2014.13.03.Art006

Materials and Methods

This study employed an exploratory qualitative narrative review design based on literature review and regulatory document analysis. The methodology was selected because the objective of the study was exploratory and interpretive in nature rather than hypothesis-driven. The study focused on understanding the opportunities, challenges, and regulatory implications associated with artificial intelligence in regulatory medical writing.

Literature Search Strategy

A narrative literature review approach was adopted to identify published literature relevant to artificial intelligence, healthcare communication, scientific writing, regulatory science, and regulatory medical writing. Literature searches were conducted using electronic scientific databases including PubMed, Scopus, and Google Scholar.

Literature published between January 2015 and March 2026 was considered for inclusion in the review. Searches were conducted between February and March 2026 to identify relevant peer-reviewed publications, regulatory guidance documents, and policy papers. The final review included publications and documents considered most relevant to the study objectives following title, abstract, and full-text assessment and evaluation against the predefined inclusion and exclusion criteria.

The following keywords and combinations were used during literature searches:

1. “Artificial intelligence in healthcare”
2. “Artificial intelligence and medical writing”
3. “AI-assisted documentation”
4. “Regulatory medical writing”
5. “Clinical trial documentation”
6. “Natural language processing in healthcare”
7. “Generative AI in scientific communication”

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

The review included:

1. Peer-reviewed journal articles
2. Regulatory guidance documents
3. Policy papers
4. Published reviews related to AI in healthcare and scientific communication
5. Literature discussing ethical and regulatory considerations associated with AI.

The review excluded:

1. Non-English publications
2. Duplicate studies
3. Non-scientific opinion articles without relevant discussion
4. Publications unrelated to healthcare documentation or medical writing

Regulatory Document Review

In addition to published literature, regulatory guidance documents and policy publications from organizations including the International Council for Harmonisation (ICH), World Health Organization (WHO), and European Medicines Agency (EMA) were reviewed to evaluate regulatory perspectives regarding AI integration and documentation quality standards.

Data Collection and Thematic Analysis

Relevant literature and regulatory documents were reviewed and analyzed using qualitative thematic analysis. An inductive analytical approach was adopted to identify recurring themes, patterns, and relationships within the reviewed literature.

The thematic analysis focused on the following categories:

1. Applications of artificial intelligence in regulatory medical writing.
2. Benefits and opportunities associated with AI-assisted documentation.
3. Challenges and limitations.
4. Ethical and regulatory considerations.

5. Implications for clinical trial documentation.
6. Future role of medical writers.

Descriptive synthesis was also performed to evaluate trends within the reviewed literature. To enhance credibility and consistency of interpretation, themes identified across the reviewed literature were compared and synthesized across multiple sources, including peer-reviewed publications, regulatory guidance documents, and policy papers. Among the reviewed publications, the most frequently discussed themes included workflow efficiency, automation of repetitive documentation tasks, ethical concerns, reliability of AI-generated outputs, and the importance of human oversight.

Results

The qualitative thematic review identified multiple recurring themes regarding the applications, opportunities, challenges, and regulatory implications associated with artificial intelligence in regulatory medical writing and clinical trial documentation.

A review of the included literature demonstrated increasing interest in AI-assisted technologies within healthcare communication, biomedical documentation, and scientific writing over recent years [1, 2, 8]. Most publications discussed the growing role of natural language processing, machine learning systems, and generative AI tools in supporting documentation-related activities including automated drafting, summarization, literature screening, language refinement, and workflow optimization.

Thematic synthesis further demonstrated that the reviewed literature consistently emphasized both the operational opportunities and the scientific limitations associated with AI-assisted documentation. Several publications highlighted that AI technologies may improve productivity and reduce repetitive documentation activities; however, concerns regarding scientific reliability, hallucination risks, ethical considerations, transparency, and regulatory compliance were also frequently reported.

The review additionally identified limited literature specifically focused on AI applications within regulatory medical writing when compared with broader healthcare AI literature. Most available publications discussed healthcare communication or scientific writing in general rather than regulatory documentation prepared for clinical trial submissions.

Emerging Applications of Artificial Intelligence

The reviewed literature identified several potential applications of artificial intelligence in regulatory medical writing and clinical documentation.

The most frequently discussed applications included:

1. Automated drafting of narrative sections
2. Text summarization and synthesis
3. Literature screening and evidence identification
4. Grammar and language refinement
5. Consistency checking across documents
6. Workflow and document management support

The major applications identified through thematic analysis are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Potential Applications of Artificial Intelligence in Regulatory Medical Writing

AI Application	Potential Role in Regulatory Medical Writing
Natural Language Processing	Text summarization and language refinement
Generative AI	Automated drafting support
Automation Tools	Workflow management and repetitive task reduction

AI Review Systems	Consistency checking and terminology alignment
Literature Screening Tools	Evidence identification and literature review support

Generative AI technologies were particularly associated with drafting assistance and content organization [8]. Natural language processing systems were also reported to support extraction and summarization of large volumes of scientific information [1, 2].

Within regulatory medical writing, AI-assisted applications may potentially support preparation of:

1. Clinical study reports
2. Clinical trial protocols
3. Safety narratives
4. Investigator brochures
5. Submission summaries
6. Regulatory briefing documents

Recent advancements in artificial intelligence have also resulted in the development of multiple AI-assisted technologies relevant to healthcare documentation and scientific communication. The reviewed literature identified several categories of AI tools that may support regulatory medical writing activities.

Natural language processing systems are increasingly used for language refinement, terminology standardization, text summarization, and extraction of scientific information from large datasets [1, 2]. Generative AI systems such as ChatGPT and other large language model-based tools are capable of supporting automated drafting, content organization, and generation of narrative summaries [8, 22].

Machine learning-based systems are also increasingly explored for healthcare data analysis, predictive modeling, and workflow automation [9-11, 15]. In addition, AI-assisted literature review and document management platforms are being evaluated for evidence identification, data organization, and document workflow support.

Examples of AI-assisted technologies currently discussed or explored within healthcare and pharmaceutical industries include:

1. ChatGPT and large language model-based tools for drafting and summarization
2. Natural language processing platforms for language refinement and text extraction
3. AI-assisted literature screening tools for evidence review
4. Automation systems for workflow management and document tracking
5. AI-supported quality review systems for terminology consistency and formatting verification

Examples of AI-assisted technologies relevant to regulatory medical writing are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Examples of AI Tools Relevant to Regulatory Medical Writing

AI Tool	**Primary Function**	**Potential Regulatory Writing Application**
ChatGPT	Generative AI	Drafting support and summarization
Claude	Large Language Model	Document review and content refinement
Gemini	Multimodal AI	Information synthesis and drafting support
Microsoft Copilot	Productivity AI	Workflow support and content generation
Elicit	Literature Review AI	Evidence identification and

		literature screening
Consensus	Research Search AI	Scientific evidence retrieval
Covidence	Review Platform	Literature screening and review management
DistillerSR	Systematic Review Platform	Evidence management and document review

The reviewed literature also identified growing interest in AI-assisted quality review tools that may support:

1. Consistency checking
2. Grammar review
3. Template standardization
4. Terminology alignment
5. Cross-document verification

However, the reviewed literature consistently emphasized that these technologies should function as supportive tools under human oversight rather than independent systems for regulatory decision-making or scientific interpretation.

The findings suggest that AI-assisted technologies may be most beneficial in repetitive and process-oriented documentation tasks, while higher-level scientific interpretation and regulatory judgment continue to require human expertise. The reviewed literature consistently identified repetitive documentation activities, workflow management, language refinement, and content summarization as the most frequently reported areas of potential AI application within regulatory medical writing.

Opportunities Associated with AI-Assisted Documentation

The reviewed literature consistently identified operational efficiency as one of the major opportunities associated with AI integration in healthcare documentation [1, 2]. AI-assisted systems were reported to support faster drafting, improved workflow management, and reduction of repetitive manual activities.

Several publications suggested that AI technologies may contribute to:

1. Improved documentation efficiency
2. Faster turnaround timelines
3. Enhanced consistency across documents
4. Better organization of large datasets
5. Standardization of terminology and formatting
6. Support for literature review activities

The key opportunities and challenges identified from the reviewed literature are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Opportunities and Challenges Associated with AI-Assisted Documentation

Opportunities	**Challenges**
Improved efficiency	Hallucination risks
Faster document drafting	Factual inaccuracies
Workflow optimization	Ethical concerns
Consistency support	Regulatory uncertainty
Reduction in repetitive tasks	Data privacy concerns

Thematic analysis also indicated that AI-assisted systems may become increasingly valuable because of the growing complexity and volume of clinical trial documentation generated during modern drug development programs.

Another recurring theme involved workflow optimization. Automation technologies were associated with potential improvements in project management, document tracking, version control, and cross-functional collaboration.

The literature additionally suggested that AI may support medical writers by reducing administrative burden and allowing greater focus on scientific interpretation, strategic communication, and quality review.

Regulatory and Ethical Concerns

Regulatory and ethical considerations emerged as major themes throughout the reviewed literature and regulatory guidance documents [5, 6, 14]. Several publications emphasized that clinical trial documentation requires high standards of scientific accuracy, data integrity, traceability, and regulatory compliance.

The review identified multiple concerns regarding the use of AI-assisted systems in regulatory medical writing, including [13]:

1. Hallucination risks and fabricated information
2. Lack of transparency in AI-generated outputs
3. Potential bias in generated content
4. Data privacy and confidentiality concerns have been widely discussed in healthcare AI literature
5. Inaccurate interpretation of scientific information
6. Uncertainty regarding accountability and authorship

Several studies evaluating generative AI systems have emphasized the importance of human validation because AI-generated outputs may contain inaccuracies, fabricated content, and context-dependent errors [23].

Regulatory guidance documents including ICH E3 and ICH E6(R3) emphasize the importance of accurate, traceable, and quality-controlled clinical documentation [3, 4]. These principles are highly relevant to AI-assisted documentation because inaccuracies or inconsistencies may affect regulatory decision-making and patient safety.

The World Health Organization guidance on ethics and governance of artificial intelligence for health further highlights the importance of transparency, accountability, human oversight, and ethical governance in healthcare AI applications [5, 21]. Similarly, the European Medicines Agency reflection paper discusses the need for governance frameworks, validation procedures, and regulatory oversight for AI integration within the medicinal product lifecycle [6].

The thematic review demonstrated that current regulatory frameworks remain limited regarding the acceptable use of generative AI in regulatory medical writing and clinical documentation. Existing literature therefore emphasizes the need for development of:

1. AI governance frameworks
2. Validation procedures
3. Quality control standards
4. Human review requirements
5. Documentation auditability standards
6. Regulatory guidance specific to AI-assisted documentation

Future Role of Medical Writers

The reviewed literature consistently suggested that artificial intelligence is unlikely to replace regulatory medical writers entirely but may augment documentation workflows and scientific communication processes [24]. Instead, AI technologies are more likely to function as supportive tools that assist with repetitive and administrative documentation tasks.

The findings indicate that medical writers will continue to play critical roles in:

1. Scientific interpretation
2. Clinical and regulatory judgment
3. Quality assurance
4. Contextual understanding
5. Strategic communication
6. Regulatory compliance review

Several publications emphasized that AI-generated outputs require careful review and validation by qualified subject matter experts because AI systems currently lack contextual reasoning and independent scientific judgment [1, 2].

The literature also suggests that future medical writers may require additional competencies related to AI-assisted workflows, prompt engineering, validation of AI-generated content, and digital literacy [22-24].

Overall, the findings indicate that future regulatory medical writing environments are likely to involve increasing collaboration between human expertise and AI-assisted technologies rather than complete automation.

Discussion

The present narrative review identified growing interest in the application of artificial intelligence within healthcare communication and scientific documentation. Existing literature demonstrates that AI-assisted technologies have potential applications across multiple aspects of regulatory medical writing, particularly in repetitive and process-oriented documentation tasks.

The findings suggest that AI-assisted systems may improve operational efficiency and workflow management by supporting automated drafting, text summarization, consistency checking, and content organization [1, 2]. The thematic review further indicated that AI-assisted technologies may be most beneficial in repetitive and process-oriented documentation activities, including drafting support, content summarization, workflow management, and document standardization. These findings support the view that AI is currently best positioned as a supportive technology rather than a replacement for scientific expertise and regulatory judgment.

One of the most significant findings from the review was the potential role of AI in reducing repetitive manual activities associated with documentation preparation. Clinical trial documentation often involves large volumes of standardized content and repetitive formatting processes. AI-assisted technologies may support faster document preparation and improved productivity while enabling medical writers to focus on higher-level scientific interpretation and quality review.

The review also identified important concerns regarding the use of AI-assisted systems in regulatory documentation. Hallucination risks, factual inaccuracies, lack of transparency, and potential bias in generated outputs were among the most frequently discussed limitations [5, 6]. These concerns are particularly important in regulatory medical writing because clinical trial documentation directly supports regulatory decision-making and patient safety.

Another major theme identified in the literature was the importance of human oversight. The reviewed publications consistently emphasized that AI-generated outputs require scientific review and validation by qualified professionals. AI technologies currently lack contextual understanding, scientific judgment, and regulatory interpretation capabilities required for independent preparation of high-quality regulatory documentation [16-19].

The findings further indicate that regulatory frameworks governing AI-assisted documentation remain underdeveloped. Current regulatory guidance documents do not yet provide comprehensive direction regarding the acceptable use of generative AI tools such as ChatGPT or other large language model-based systems within clinical trial documentation workflows. Although organizations such as WHO and EMA have published broader guidance related to AI governance and healthcare applications, limited guidance specifically addresses AI-assisted regulatory medical writing and clinical trial documentation [21]. This creates uncertainty regarding acceptable practices, validation standards, auditability requirements, and accountability for AI-generated content.

The evolving role of medical writers also emerged as an important discussion point.

Rather than replacing medical writers, AI is more likely to function as a supportive technology that enhances productivity while human experts continue to provide scientific interpretation, regulatory oversight, quality assurance, and strategic communication.

The review identified several areas requiring future research, including evaluation of AI-assisted drafting systems, assessment of quality review platforms, validation of AI-generated outputs, comparison between AI-assisted and traditionally authored documentation, assessment of documentation quality outcomes, and development of governance frameworks for responsible AI integration within regulated documentation environments.

Study Limitations

The present review was based on narrative literature review and qualitative thematic analysis rather than systematic review methodology. Therefore, findings should be interpreted within the context of exploratory qualitative research. In addition, literature specifically focused on AI in regulatory medical writing remains limited because this is an emerging area of research.

Conclusion

Artificial intelligence represents an important technological advancement with increasing applications in healthcare communication and scientific documentation. The findings from this review suggest that AI-assisted technologies may support regulatory medical writing through automated drafting, text summarization, workflow optimization, and consistency support.

The review identified several potential benefits associated with AI-assisted documentation, including improved operational efficiency, reduction of repetitive manual tasks, enhanced workflow management, and support for large-scale documentation processes. These opportunities may become increasingly relevant as clinical trials continue to generate substantial volumes of complex scientific information.

However, the review also identified significant concerns associated with AI integration in regulatory documentation, including hallucination risks, factual inaccuracies, lack of transparency, ethical considerations, data privacy concerns, and uncertainties regarding regulatory acceptance. Because clinical trial documentation directly influences regulatory decision-making and patient safety, maintaining scientific integrity and documentation quality remains critically important.

The findings further demonstrate that human oversight remains essential in AI-assisted regulatory medical writing. Medical writers continue to play a central role in scientific interpretation, quality assurance, contextual understanding, and regulatory compliance.

Overall, the study highlights the need for responsible integration of artificial intelligence into regulatory medical writing practices through governance frameworks, validation procedures, ethical oversight, and clear regulatory guidance. Future empirical research is required to evaluate the practical implementation and long-term impact of AI-assisted technologies within clinical trial documentation environments.

Acknowledgment

The author would like to express sincere gratitude to Dr. G. Kannan, Research Supervisor, School of Clinical Research, Texila American University, for his valuable guidance, encouragement, and academic support throughout the development of this work. The author also acknowledges Texila American University for providing academic resources and support during the conduct of this research.

Funding

The author received no specific financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Data Availability Statement

No primary datasets were generated or analyzed during the current study. All information used in this review was obtained from publicly available published literature, regulatory guidance documents, and policy papers cited within the manuscript.

Author Contributions

The Corresponding author was solely responsible for the conceptualization, literature review, data collection, thematic analysis, interpretation of findings, manuscript preparation, and final approval of the submitted article.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

Ethical Approval

Ethical approval was not required for this study because it was based exclusively on published literature, regulatory guidance documents, and publicly available sources. No human participants, patient data, or animal subjects were involved in the conduct of this research.

References

[1]. Davenport T, Kalakota R. The potential for artificial intelligence in healthcare. Future Healthc J. 2019;6(2):94-8.

[2]. Topol EJ. High-performance medicine: the convergence of human and artificial intelligence. Nat Med. 2019;25(1):44-56.

[3]. International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH). ICH harmonised guideline E3: Structure and content of clinical study reports. 1995.

[4]. International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH). ICH harmonised guideline E6(R3): Good Clinical Practice. 2025.

[5]. World Health Organization. Ethics and governance of artificial intelligence for health. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2021.

[6]. European Medicines Agency. Reflection paper on the use of artificial intelligence in the medicinal product lifecycle. Amsterdam: European Medicines Agency; 2024.

[7]. Gattrell WT, Hopewell S, Young K, et al. Professional medical writing support and the quality of randomised controlled trial reporting: a cross-sectional study. BMJ Open. 2016;6(2):e010329.

[8]. Biswas S. ChatGPT and the future of medical writing. Radiology. 2023;307(2):e223312.

[9]. Jiang F, Jiang Y, Zhi H, et al. Artificial intelligence in healthcare: past, present and future. Stroke Vasc Neurol. 2017;2(4):230-43.

[10]. Kelly CJ, Karthikesalingam A, Suleyman M, Corrado G, King D. Key challenges for delivering clinical impact with artificial intelligence. BMC Med. 2019;17(1):195.

[11]. Yu KH, Beam AL, Kohane IS. Artificial intelligence in healthcare. Nat Biomed Eng. 2018;2(10):719-31.

[12]. Esteva A, Robicquet A, Ramsundar B, et al. A guide to deep learning in healthcare. Nat Med. 2019;25(1):24-9.

[13]. Price WN, Cohen IG. Privacy in the age of medical big data. Nat Med. 2019;25(1):37-43.

[14]. Goodman KW. Ethics, medicine, and information technology: intelligent machines and the transformation of healthcare. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2020.

[15]. Shah P, Kendall F, Khozin S, et al. Artificial intelligence and machine learning in clinical development: a translational perspective. NPJ Digit Med. 2019;2(1):69.

[16]. Wang F, Casalino LP, Khullar D. Deep learning in medicine—promise, progress, and challenges. JAMA Intern Med. 2019;179(3):293-4.

[17]. Luxton DD. Artificial intelligence in psychological practice: current and future applications and implications. Prof Psychol. 2016;47(3):147-53.
[18]. Sendak MP, D'Arcy J, Kashyap S, et al. A path for translation of machine learning products into healthcare delivery. EMJ Innov. 2020;4(1):25-32.
[19]. Shortliffe EH, Sepúlveda MJ. Clinical decision support in the era of artificial intelligence. JAMA. 2018;320(21):2199-200.
[20]. Mesko B. The role of artificial intelligence in precision medicine. Expert Rev Precis Med Drug Dev. 2017;2(5):239-41.
[21]. World Health Organization. Ethics and governance of artificial intelligence for health: guidance on generative artificial intelligence. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2024.
[22]. Sallam M. ChatGPT utility in healthcare education, research, and practice: systematic review on the promising perspectives and valid concerns. Healthcare. 2023;11(6):887.
[23]. Cascella M, Montomoli J, Bellini V, Bignami E. Evaluating the feasibility of ChatGPT in healthcare: an analysis of multiple clinical and research scenarios. J Med Syst. 2023;47(1):33.
[24]. Biswas S. Role of generative artificial intelligence in medical writing and scientific communication. Med Writ. 2024;33(1):15-22.