Metaheuristic Optimization Review

♦ ISSN: 2692-4048 Vol: 04, No. 02, 2025 ♦ PP. 13–18

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.54216/MOR.040203



REVIEW ARTICLE

Ethical Challenges and Regulatory Compliance in AI-Driven Neurological Diagnostics: A Review of Standards and Practices

Mahmoud Elshabrawy Mohamed[1,*] **Ehsaneh Khodadadi**[2]

[1] Computer Science and Intelligent Systems Research Center, Blacksburg 24060, Virginia, USA
[2] Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR 72701, USA

Emails: mshabrawy@jcsis.org · ehsan.k@uark.edu

Received: January 28, 2025 Revised: March 27, 2025 Accepted: May 09, 2025 ⋆ Corresponding author

ABSTRACT

We should subject artificial intelligence (AI) to neurological diagnostics for detailed ethical consideration and examination of compliance questions. When applied to neuroimaging, these AI technologies improve diagnostic performance and treatment planning; however, they give rise to issues such as algorithmic bias, data privacy, and the intelligibility of resulting AI-generated insights. The issue of bias is related to the necessity of obtaining informed consent because of using patient data for training models of AI, which in turn will create more problems since the machine learning process will be based on data that is itself bigoted. In addition, the self-governing characteristic of AI systems creates additional concerns regarding responsibility for misuse; it is still unclear who is to blame when an AI system commits an obvious mistake, like misdiagnosis or incorrect treatment. Governance structures must adapt to these questions to guarantee that healthcare AI is ethically upraised, transparent, and fair. This review underscores the importance of interprofessional relationships between researchers and scholars, clinicians and practitioners, and ethicists when dealing with these issues. As social safeguards, demographic benchmarks and best practices have to be set; this enables the medical field to benefit from the opportunities provided by AI in neurological diagnostics and uphold the patient's respect for their rights while pushing for equal access to equal quality health care. Lastly, it becomes imperative to counter these ethical questions, which is imperative for the effectiveness of AI technologies and for building public acceptance of this technology in clinical practice.

Keywords: Ethical challenges ▪ Regulatory compliance ▪ AI technologies ▪ Neurological diagnostics ▪ Algorithmic bias ▪ Data privacy

1. INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence (AI) is one of the most disruptive technologies today and has found particular applications in neurological diagnosis. As AI advances in neuroimaging and other forms of imaging, there is a tremendous chance to increase diagnostic precision, identify better treatment approaches, and offer personalized treatment to patients. Using data from neuroimaging, AI systems can discern and conclude from patterns that human clinicians might not be able to perceive. Nevertheless, the application of AI in various medical practices and its introduction into sensitive fields like neurology have to be considered, and some ethical issues should be solved to avoid unfair and unethical usage [1].

The lack of representation in the dataset on which AI is trained is one of the most urgent ethical issues nowadays. AI models can be biased, meaning they may deliver equal healthcare treatment to certain demographic groups while misdiagnosing other groups of people. This is especially important in neurodiagnostics because disease manifestation

© 2025 The Author(s). Published by ASPG. This article is licensed under CC BY 4.0.

and prevalence differences depend on race, gender, and other socio-demographic characteristics. The first path to address AI-related fairness issues in healthcare is to ensure that artificial intelligence systems are trained on diverse, inclusive datasets [2].

Data confidentiality and security are also significant ethical issues in neurological diagnosis through artificial intelligence. Managing the patient information collected to train machine-learning algorithms poses issues concerning consent, confidentiality, and protection of health information. Since much of the information collected in neuroimaging is extremely personal and could expose sensitive aspects of the patient, data protection becomes paramount. Free, fair, and informed consent is required when a patient understands how data will be utilized and can freely choose the application of AI in diagnosis and treatment without coercion.

Another factor that has received much attention in recent years is whether insights from AI analysis are intelligible. Many AI systems use intensive learning models that are difficult for end users to interpret. Such lack of explainability is inimical to accountability and cannot inspire the requisite trust in AI systems; hence, it should not be ignored in clinical practices where the implications can be fatal. If clinicians understand how AI systems reach conclusions, they are more likely to accept system outputs and integrate them into practice. Making AI models more explicable is therefore a significant problem in developing trust in neuropathology diagnosed by neural networks [3].

A second contentious ethical question concerns accountability in the use of AI in healthcare. Where self-governing systems are used in medical decision-making, uncertainty emerges regarding who is responsible if the system makes a wrong diagnosis or recommends an inappropriate treatment. This problem is compounded when complex models operate as black boxes and distribute responsibility among developers, clinicians, institutions, and regulators. Governance structures must therefore adapt to assign responsibility clearly, preserve human oversight, and ensure that AI supports rather than replaces clinical judgment [4, 5].

The use of AI in neurological diagnostics and reference populations also requires clinical recommendations. Such recommendations guide clinicians on how to incorporate AI into clinical practice, communicate AI analysis to patients, and navigate ethical dilemmas in AI-based diagnostics. Static demographic performance indicators can help ensure that AI systems are not biased toward particular patient groups.

In the long run, the use of AI in diagnosing neurological diseases and disorders will only be as good as the input data and as conclusive as the measures taken to ensure that technological advancement does not trump ethics. Bias, data privacy, transparency, accountability, and equity are fundamental conditions for optimizing AI technologies while also creating trust and acceptance in clinical practice. Only by addressing these ethical issues can health informatics propel AI to be a force for good healthcare, optimizing early diagnosis, treatment, and overall patient care.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

AI is a relatively recent technology that has gained much attention for its revolutionary approach to multiple industries. The current paper presents a literature review that captures the diverse context within which AI is being approached and the opportunities and challenges associated with its use. This review seeks to present an understanding of current and future AI through a discussion of recent developments and studies in this field, including AI's effects on society and urgent areas such as healthcare. As stakeholders continue to shape AI, it is essential to comprehend the clash of ethical, technical, and social aspects that will enable positive deployment of this technology.

As outlined in [6], the transformative potential and inherent risks of artificial intelligence, particularly generative AI, are examined by emphasizing its dual impact across various domains. The study highlights AI's contributions to retail and social media industries, enhancing operational efficiency and transforming customer engagement while presenting challenges such as ethical dilemmas, algorithmic bias, and data privacy issues. It introduces a framework for analyzing AI's organizational impact, distinguishing between its roles in supporting and disrupting existing systems. The findings underscore the necessity of Responsible AI principles to balance innovation with accountability and fairness, particularly as advancements in agentic AI, artificial general intelligence (AGI), and artificial superintelligence (ASI) emerge.

As outlined in [7], a broad spectrum of AI-based applications has been explored in digital pathology, biomarker development, and therapeutic advancements. In digital pathology, novel analytical strategies have been developed to extract new insights from standard histology, aiding treatment selection and biomarker prediction. In therapeutics, AI innovations encompass drug target discovery, design, repurposing, combination regimen optimization, and adaptive dosing strategies. The study emphasizes the need for integrated workflows that combine these AI-driven innovations to enhance diagnostic and interventional capabilities in clinical oncology.

As discussed in [8], the human–AI partnership is grounded in three critical premises: the superiority of collaboration over independent functioning, the limitations imposed by biased training data, and the risks associated with AI hallucinations. The study highlights how AI can amplify human capabilities but requires oversight to ensure ethical and accurate outcomes. It also underscores the significance of diverse, unbiased datasets to prevent AI from perpetuating flawed decisions in healthcare and hiring. Furthermore, AI-generated plausible but incorrect outputs are identified as a significant risk in high-stakes applications.

As detailed in [9], novel brain stimulation technologies combined with AI systems, such as brain–computer interfaces (BCIs), are gaining prominence in addressing neurological and psychiatric disorders. BCIs leverage AI algorithms for feature extraction and classification, establishing a direct connection between human cognition and artificial information processing. The study presents findings from a first-in-human experimental BCI trial designed to predict epileptic seizures using qualitative semi-structured interviews conducted over six years. It reports enhanced agential capacity and continuity

during BCI implantation but traumatic harms and agential discontinuity following device explantation.

In the research presented in [10, 11], the distinction between brain death as a biological concept and as a legal status is explored. The study emphasizes that brain death, as currently defined, does not align with any biologically plausible definition of death, although it remains accepted as a legal status permitting individuals to be treated as dead. This distinction clarifies the conceptual framework surrounding brain death and opens practical avenues for reevaluating the social construction of brain death.

In [12], recent advancements in AI are recognized for their transformative potential in reshaping glaucoma clinical management, enhancing screening efficiency, improving diagnostic accuracy, and refining disease progression detection. However, significant challenges remain in integrating AI into healthcare, including labor-intensive data labeling, inconsistent diagnostic standards, insufficient testing, the black-box nature of many algorithms, and limited adaptability across diverse ethnic groups and diagnostic equipment.

As stated in [13], prenatal diagnosis of congenital and hereditary diseases is a priority in Russia's medical technology development. The study explores bioethical issues related to prenatal DNA diagnosis of hereditary diseases with late onset in genetic counseling practice in the Sakha Republic (Yakutia). The authors conclude that differentiated ethical approaches are necessary based on inheritance mode, age of disease manifestation, and clinical polymorphism.

The study referenced as [14] examines the future of bioethics in artificial intelligence, focusing on the increasing need for ethical principles as AI becomes integrated into various facets of life. It advocates establishing international standards and legislative frameworks to regulate AI use, prevent exploitation, and ensure societal benefits. The study also stresses the importance of public education and interdisciplinary cooperation.

The work in [15] presents the growth of FDA-approved artificial intelligence devices in plastic surgery as a key indicator of AI's rapid expansion into clinical specializations. In [16], the implications of artificial intelligence for patent law are examined, proposing an analytical framework to evaluate how AI affects intellectual property protection. In [17], routine omics collection is framed as an opportunity for European human research in space and analogue environments, showing how AI-enabled data practices extend into unconventional biomedical settings.

In [18], ChatGPT is described as an advanced conversational large-language model that can generate coherent and relevant responses across domains. The authors discuss the uncertain but potentially important impact of generative AI technologies in radiology and nuclear medicine. In [19], AI integration into healthcare is examined through technological, legal, and ethical challenges, including federated learning, data privacy, uncertainty visualization, and user-centered design in clinical decision support. Finally, [20] critically examines claims about the adolescent brain, highlighting methodological, social, and philosophical concerns and questioning biological explanations that may restrict youth rights and responsibilities.

Table 1 summarizes significant points deduced from the literature review about the prospects and risks of turning to AI across several fields. It points to responsible AI creation, ethical principles in healthcare applications, and human–AI symbiosis. The table also shows how quickly the field advances from AI in typical areas such as medicine to unconventional areas such as space travel and brain–computer interfaces.

3. ETHICAL CHALLENGES IN AI-DRIVEN NEUROLOGICAL DIAGNOSTICS

Ethical challenges in AI-driven neurological diagnostics arise from the sensitivity of neurological data, the opacity of machine-learning systems, and the high stakes of diagnostic decisions. Neuroimaging and cognitive data can reveal intimate information about a patient's health, behavior, and identity. Therefore, privacy protection and informed consent must be treated as foundational safeguards rather than procedural formalities.

Algorithmic bias is one of the most prominent challenges. If datasets underrepresent certain populations, AI systems may perform better for groups that dominate the training data and worse for marginalized populations. In neurological diagnostics, this can affect disease detection, prognosis, and treatment recommendations. Bias mitigation requires diverse datasets, demographic performance reporting, and periodic auditing after deployment.

Transparency and explainability are also crucial. Clinicians need to understand the basis of AI-assisted recommendations so that they can communicate risks and uncertainties to patients. Black-box systems can undermine trust, complicate informed consent, and weaken accountability. Explainable AI approaches, documentation of model limitations, and uncertainty reporting can help clinicians evaluate whether a recommendation is appropriate for a particular patient.

Accountability is another concern. AI systems involve developers, data curators, healthcare organizations, clinicians, and regulators. When an AI system contributes to an incorrect diagnosis or harmful treatment decision, responsibility may be difficult to assign. Clear governance models should define the responsibilities of each party and require human oversight, especially in complex neurological cases where clinical judgment is indispensable.

4. REGULATORY COMPLIANCE AND STANDARDS

Regulatory compliance in AI-driven neurological diagnostics requires alignment with privacy regulations, medical-device oversight, clinical validation standards, and ethical governance. Because AI tools often process sensitive health information, compliance must begin with secure data collection, storage, anonymization, access control, and consent management. Patients should be informed about how their data are used, whether data will support model training, and what risks remain even after de-identification.

Clinical validation is essential before deployment. AI systems should be evaluated on representative populations, across institutions, and under real-world clinical conditions. Validation should include accuracy, fairness, robustness, interpretability, and safety. Performance should not be reported only as aggregate accuracy because aggregate results can hide

Table 1. Summary of Literature Review

Study	Key Focus	Key Findings	Implications
[6]	AI's impact on society	AI has significant potential and risks; it can enhance efficiency and engagement but raises ethical concerns.	Responsible AI development is crucial to balance innovation with ethical considerations.
[7]	AI in healthcare	AI applications in digital pathology and therapeutics can improve patient outcomes.	Integrated AI workflows are needed to optimize clinical practice.
[8]	Human–AI partnership	Humans and AI can collaborate effectively, but AI requires oversight to mitigate biases and hallucinations.	A balanced partnership is essential to harness AI's potential ethically.
[9]	Brain–computer interfaces	BCIs offer potential for treating neurological disorders but raise ethical concerns.	Ethical implications, including potential harms and agential discontinuity, require careful consideration.
[10, 11]	Brain death	Brain death is treated as a social and legal construct rather than a strictly biological one.	Reevaluating legal and social definitions could benefit organ donation and transplantation.
[12]	AI in glaucoma	AI can improve glaucoma diagnosis and management but faces implementation challenges.	Addressing data quality, algorithm bias, and clinician acceptance is crucial for integration.
[13]	Prenatal DNA testing	Prenatal DNA testing for late-onset hereditary diseases raises ethical considerations.	Differentiated ethical approaches are needed based on disease characteristics and patient circumstances.
[14]	Bioethics and AI	AI raises new ethical challenges and requires standards and regulations.	Ethical frameworks and public education are essential to guide AI development and use.
[15]	AI in plastic surgery	FDA-approved AI devices are growing in specialized clinical fields.	Regulatory awareness is needed as AI adoption expands into new medical domains.
[16]	AI and patent law	AI challenges traditional intellectual-property frameworks.	New analytical models are needed for AI-related legal assessment.
[17]	Omics in space medicine	Routine omics collection can support human research in space and analog environments.	Data governance and ethics are important for emerging biomedical research settings.
[18]	ChatGPT in medicine	Generative AI may affect radiology and nuclear medicine, but its role remains uncertain.	Careful validation is needed before clinical reliance on language-model outputs.
[19]	AI in dementia research	Federated learning and uncertainty visualization may support clinical AI adoption.	User-centered design can improve trust and acceptance of AI decision support.
[20]	Adolescent brain discourse	Biological claims about youth risk can reinforce problematic stereotypes.	Ethical analysis should consider rights, responsibilities, and social context.

poor outcomes for specific demographic groups.

Regulatory frameworks should also address continuous learning. Some AI models may change after deployment as new data become available. Such changes can improve performance but also introduce new risks. Therefore, regulators and healthcare institutions should require version control, monitoring, post-market surveillance, and documentation of model updates.

Professional standards and institutional policies must complement formal regulation. Clinicians require guidance on when AI recommendations should be accepted, challenged, or overridden. Institutions should provide training on AI limitations, ethical communication with patients, and reporting procedures for unexpected or unsafe AI behavior. In this sense, regulatory compliance is not a one-time approval process but a continuous governance obligation.

5. DISCUSSION

The reviewed literature shows that AI can improve diagnostic accuracy, efficiency, and personalization in neurological diagnostics, but these benefits depend on ethical and regulatory safeguards. Bias, privacy, transparency, accountability, and equity are interconnected. For example, improving fairness requires diverse data, but diverse data collection must respect consent and privacy. Similarly, explainability supports accountability, but explainability must be accompanied by clinical education and governance structures.

Interprofessional collaboration is necessary. Researchers can design robust and fair algorithms, clinicians can identify practical diagnostic needs, ethicists can evaluate patient rights and social implications, and regulators can create enforceable standards. Without such cooperation, AI systems may become technically impressive but clinically unsafe or socially inequitable.

Human oversight within AI's decision-making campaign also warrants attention. Using such systems yields more efficiency and accuracy, but it should not supplant human reasoning, especially in specialized areas such as neurology. When systems employ greater levels of independence, it becomes challenging to determine liability for misdiagnosis or other mistakes. More specific accountability specifications must therefore be developed to ensure that integration of these technologies does not erode public trust, which remains crucial for successful adoption of AI in healthcare.

6. CONCLUSION

The integration of AI into neurological diagnostics offers immense potential to improve diagnostic precision, treatment planning, and patient outcomes. However, it also introduces ethical challenges and regulatory compliance questions that cannot be treated as secondary concerns. Algorithmic bias, data privacy, informed consent, explainability, accountability, and equitable access must be addressed throughout the AI lifecycle.

The idea of deploying AI systems should be to develop AI solutions that are ethical as well as equitable. By responding to these ethical issues as they relate to AI in neurological diagnostics, the medical profession can encourage the development, application, and use of these technologies in ways that improve patient outcomes and enhance healthcare equity while building public trust. Only such complex issues can be addressed to determine how AI can help improve the healthcare system.

REFERENCES

[1] H. R. Saeidnia, S. G. Hashemi Fotami, B. Lund, and N. Ghiasi, "Ethical Considerations in Artificial Intelligence Interventions for Mental Health and Well-Being: Ensuring Responsible Implementation and Impact," *Soc. Sci.*, vol. 13, no. 7, p. 381, Jul. 2024, doi: 10.3390/SOCSCI13070381/S1.

[2] N. Norori, Q. Hu, F. M. Aellen, F. D. Faraci, and A. Tzovara, "Addressing bias in big data and AI for health care: A call for open science," *Patterns*, vol. 2, no. 10, p. 100347, Oct. 2021, doi: 10.1016/J.PATTER.2021.100347.

[3] A. Salles and M. Farisco, "Neuroethics and AI ethics: a proposal for collaboration," *BMC Neurosci.*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 1–10, Dec. 2024, doi: 10.1186/S12868-024-00888-7/PEER-REVIEW.

[4] D. D. Farhud and S. Zokaei, "Ethical Issues of Artificial Intelligence in Medicine and Healthcare," *Iran J. Public Health*, vol. 50, no. 11, p. i, 2021, doi: 10.18502/IJPH.V50I11.7600.

[5] S. A. Alowais *et al.*, "Revolutionizing healthcare: the role of artificial intelligence in clinical practice," *BMC Medical Education*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 1–15, Sep. 2023, doi: 10.1186/S12909-023-04698-Z.

[6] V. Shankar, "Managing the Twin Faces of AI: A Commentary on 'Is AI Changing the World for Better or Worse?'," Oct. 2024, doi: 10.1177/02761467241286483.

[7] K. S. Kumar *et al.*, "Artificial Intelligence in Clinical Oncology: From Data to Digital Pathology and Treatment," *American Society of Clinical Oncology Educational Book*, no. 43, May 2023, doi: 10.1200/EDBK_390084.

[8] P. K. Kopalle, M. Gangwar, and A. Uppal, "Commentary on 'AI is Changing the World: For Better or for Worse?'," vol. 44, no. 4, pp. 886–891, Oct. 2024, doi: 10.1177/02761467241290813.

[9] F. Gilbert, M. Ienca, and M. Cook, "How I became myself after merging with a computer: Does human-machine symbiosis raise human rights issues?," *Brain Stimul.*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 783–789, May 2023, doi: 10.1016/J.BRS.2023.04.016.

[10] R. D. Truog and F. G. Miller, "Changing the Conversation About Brain Death," *The American Journal of Bioethics*, vol. 14, no. 8, pp. 9–14, 2014, doi: 10.1080/15265161.2014.925154.

[11] R. D. Truog and F. G. Miller, "Changing the Conversation About Brain Death," *The American Journal of Bioethics*, vol. 14, no. 8, pp. 9–14, 2014, doi: 10.1080/15265161.2014.925154.

[12] F. Li *et al.*, "The AI revolution in glaucoma: Bridging challenges with opportunities," *Prog. Retin. Eye Res.*, vol. 103, p. 101291, Nov. 2024, doi: 10.1016/J.PRETEYERES.2024.101291.

[13] S. K. Kononova, O. G. Sidorova, S. A. Fedorova, F. A. Platonov, V. L. Izhevskaya, and E. K. Khusnutdinova, "Bioethical issues of preventing hereditary diseases with late onset in the Sakha Republic (Yakutia)," *Int. J. Circumpolar Health*, vol. 73, Jul. 2014, doi: 10.3402/IJCH.V73.25062.

[14] O. Dobrodum and O. Kyvliuk, "Transhumanism and Posthumanism: Reflection of the Human Civilization Future," *Philosophy and Cosmology*, vol. 26, 2021, doi: 10.29202/PHIL-COSM/26/6.

[15] R. Dhawan, O. Shauly, D. Shay, K. Brooks, and A. Losken, "Growth in FDA-Approved Artificial Intelligence Devices in Plastic Surgery: A Key Look Into the Future," *Aesthet. Surg. J.*, Oct. 2024, doi: 10.1093/ASJ/SJAE209.

[16] G. Chimuka, "Impact of artificial intelligence on patent law. Towards a new analytical framework—the Multi-Level Model," *World Patent Information*, vol. 59, p. 101926, Dec. 2019, doi: 10.1016/J.WPI.2019.101926.

[17] H. Cope *et al.*, "Routine omics collection is a golden opportunity for European human research in space and analog environments," *Patterns*, vol. 3, no. 10, Oct. 2022, doi: 10.1016/J.PATTER.2022.100550.

[18] R. Laudicella, G. A. Davidson, N. Dimos, G. Provenzano, A. Iagaru, and S. Biswas, "ChatGPT in nuclear

medicine and radiology: lights and shadows in the AI network," *Clin. Transl. Imaging*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 407–411, Oct. 2023, doi: 10.1007/S40336-023-00574-4/TABLES/3.

[19] J. Reyes, "Adoption of Deep Learning Models and its Applications in Dementia Research," Jul. 2024.

[20] J. Bessant, "Hard wired for risk: neurological science, 'the adolescent brain' and developmental theory," *J. Youth Stud.*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 347–360, Jun. 2008, doi: 10.1080/13676260801948387.