Artificial intelligence and healthcare: An ethical dilemma.

Ratan ZA et al. (zar241@uowmail.edu.au)

Reviewer 1 information			
Date review assigned	11-May-23	Date review returned	12-May-23
Reviewer name	Ateeb Ahmad Parray	Affiliation	Johns Hopkins University
Email	ahmad.ateeb101@gmail.com	ORCID	0000-0002-1653-1856
Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s?	No	Do you wish to be disclosed to the author?	Yes

Reviewer's comments (20-May-23) [Please select "Yes" or "No"]			Author's response (28-May-23) [Please write a response if the reviewer's comment is "**No**". You must change the manuscript as per your response. Mention line numbers.]
1.	Is the title appropriate?	No	Thanks for your suggestions, however, we believe the title accurately reflects the ethical complexities and dilemmas that arise at the intersection of AI and healthcare.
2.	Is the research question or study objective clearly defined in measurable terms?	No	Here, I have made significant revisions to enhance the clarity of the research question.
3.	Is the abstract accurate, balanced and complete?	NA	-
4.	Is the study design appropriate to answer the research question or achieve objective?	NA	-
5.	Are the Methods described sufficiently to allow others to repeat it?	NA	-
6.	Are the operational definitions and ascertainment of key variables given adequately?	NA	-
7.	Are the outcomes clearly defined?	NA	-
8.	Are statistics used appropriately and described fully?	NA	-
9.	Do the Results address the research question or objective clearly?	NA	-
10.	Are the tables and figures clear and appropriate to address the objective or research question?	NA	-
11.	Does the Discussion cover the main points of the paper?	NA	-
12.	Are the strengths and limitations addressed?	NA	-
13.	Are the conclusions justified by the results	NA	-
14.	Are the references up-to-date, and appropriate?	Yes	-
15.	Is the standard of written English acceptable for publication?	Yes	-
16.	**Descriptive comments** to the authors (Divide it into MAJOR and MINOR points).		Respond and reflect it in your manuscript. If you refute, justify your argument using references. Mention line numbers.
MAJOR points 1. The article mentions "healthcare" in title but focuses only on medical aspect. There is a preventive component attached to healthcare which has been completely ignored. The article also does not encompass the definition of health that includes social, political and psychosocial paradigms. The article only focuses on physical aspects of health. If you are mentioning healthcare, it cannot be seen from the narrow lens of "medicine". If you only want to focus on medical aspects of healthcare then state that accordingly.			1. Thank you for your valuable suggestions. I have made the necessary revisions in the manuscript to incorporate your feedback. Please find the updated version in the manuscript line 31-line 50 and line 67-line 92. [Track changed].
2. Line 38: This is coming off very odd. Suddenly you are switching gears from responsibilities of			2. I have made efforts to ensure a smooth transition. Please review the section between

healthcare to the role of AI in it. Please make smooth transition in the next paragraph. Please first make a case on the need to study ethical dillemas.		lines 45 and 50 in the manuscript for the revised content.[Track changed].
3.	I do not fully understand the objective of the article. The authors mention "social gaps, medical consultation, privacy and data protection, informed consent, empathy, and sympathy" in the second paragraph but do not explain these jargons. Then the authors immediately move towards the juxtaposition of who should/shouldn not make decisions? This is coming off odd. I suggest explain the ethical dillemas clearly one-by-one and then make a separate paragraph about the decision-making.	3. I have made tried to incorporate your suggestions, kindly find the updated version in the manuscript line 53- line 83.[Track changed].
4.	In the last paragraph, some sentences have mentioned which are basically broader recommendations. The authors should provide specific contextual recommendations. Please check out AI guidelines released by Indian Council of Medical research, 2023 (https://main.icmr.nic.in/content/ethical-guidelines-application-artificial-intelligence-biomedical-research-and-healthcare).	4. Thanks for your suggestions, intentionally, I have tried to present broader recommendations in context of the editorial. However, I have made few changes according to your suggestion, kindly find the updated version in the manuscript line 84-line 92. [Track changed].
5.	I would suggest to rewrite this article and define its scope and target audience. If you are focusing on medical aspects of health, then change the title accordingly. Please do not view healthcare from a narrow lens of "medicine". Discuss first the uses of AI in healthcare and then move towards discussing ethical dillemas in detail one-by-one. Please make specific and tailored recommendations for Bangladesh context instead of broader recommendations. As it stands, currently, the article is penned down with some big words with poor articulation between concepts.	5. Thank you for your suggestions. However, I would like to clarify that the content has not been exclusively prepared for Bangladeshi readers. It is intended for a broader audience.
Reviewer's Recommendation	Major revision	

Reviewer (2) information			
Date review assigned	11-May-23	Date review returned	13-May-23
Reviewer name	Md. Sahidul Islam	Affiliation	National Consultant-WHO, Bangladesh
Email	ripon.ru.statistics@gmail.com	ORCID	
Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s?	No	Do you wish to be disclosed to the author?	Yes

Reviewer's comments (20-May-23) [Please select "Yes" or "No"]		**Author's response (28-May-23)** [Please write a response if the reviewer's comment is "**No**". You must change the manuscript as per your response. Mention line numbers.]
1. Is the title appropriate?	Yes	-
2. Is the research question or study objective clearly defined in measurable terms?	Yes	-
3. Is the abstract accurate, balanced and complete?	NA	-
4. Is the study design appropriate to answer the research question or achieve objective?	NA	-
5. Are the Methods described sufficiently to allow others to repeat it?	NA	-
6. Are the operational definitions and ascertainment of key variables given adequately?	NA	-
7. Are the outcomes clearly defined?	NA	-

8.	Are statistics used appropriately and described fully?	NA	-
9.	Do the Results address the research question or objective clearly?	NA	-
10.	Are the tables and figures clear and appropriate to address the objective or research question?	NA	-
11.	Does the Discussion cover the main points of the paper?	NA	-
12.	Are the strengths and limitations addressed?	NA	-
13.	Are the conclusions justified by the results	Yes	-
14.	Are the references up-to-date, and appropriate?	Yes	-
15.	Is the standard of written English acceptable for publication?	Yes	-
16.	**Descriptive comments** to the authors (Divide it into MAJOR and MINOR points).		Respond and reflect it in your manuscript. If you refute, justify your argument using references. Mention line numbers.

MINOR points

Overall, this editorial provides a comprehensive overview of the potential benefits of AI in healthcare and the ethical challenges that need to be addressed to ensure its responsible use. The article is well-structured and provides clear examples of how AI can improve healthcare, such as in the case of skin cancer diagnosis. However, there are a few areas where the article could be improved.

1.	Firstly, while the editorial does touch on some of the ethical concerns, such as social gaps and medical consultation, it could have gone into more depth on these issues and provided more concrete examples. Additionally, the article could have explored some of the potential solutions to these ethical challenges, such as the use of transparent and explainable AI algorithms or the involvement of ethicists in the development and deployment of AI in healthcare. Recent comments of Geoffrey Hinton and OPEN AI can improve the visibility of the paper.	1.	Thanks a lot for your valuable suggestions.I have made necessary changes incorporating your suggestions, kindly find the updated manuscript line 31-line 50 and line 67-line 92. [Track changed].
2.	The article could have addressed some of the limitations of AI in healthcare, such as the potential for biased algorithms or the difficulty in replicating the complexity of human decision-making. Additionally, the article could have discussed some of the challenges in implementing AI in healthcare, such as the need for large amounts of high-quality data and the difficulty in integrating AI into existing healthcare systems.	2.	Thanks again for your suggestions, here I have made necessary changes according to your suggestions,kindly find the updated manuscript line 62, line 75-line 83. [Track changed]

Reviewer's Recommendation	Minor revision	

Executive editor's comments (20-May-23) [Please select "Yes" or "No"]	**Author's response (28-May-23)** [Please write a response if the reviewer's comment is "**No**". You must change the manuscript as per your response. Mention line numbers.]
1. This manuscript can be accepted as an editorial for the issue 16.2 subject to satisfactory revisions to address the BSMMUJ reviewers comments.	Thank you so much. We are agreeing with that.
2. Please provide justification if you refuse the reviewers comments.	NA
Editor's Decision	Minor revision	