World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews
eISSN: 2581-9615 CODEN (USA): WJARAI
Cross Ref DOI: 10.30574/wjarr
Journal homepage: https://wjarr.com/

(Review Article)

Check for updates

Generative Artificial Intelligence in Medical Education: Opportunities, Challenges, Professional Implications and a Four-Pillar Readiness Framework for Responsible Integration

Mane Tavadyan *

Faculty of General Medicine, Yerevan State Medical University after Mkhitar Heratsi, Yerevan, Armenia, 0076.

World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2026, 30(03), 1535-1542

Publication history: Received on 18 April 2026; revised on 12 June 2026; accepted on 15 June 2026

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2026.30.3.1511

Abstract

Generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) is rapidly transforming medical education by introducing new opportunities for personalized learning, simulation-based training, automated feedback, and clinical decision support. Large language models and multimodal AI systems are increasingly used by both students and clinicians, with recent reports showing adoption rates of 49–89% among medical students and approximately 66–71% among physicians. These technologies may improve accessibility, learner autonomy, and educational efficiency; however, their rapid integration also raises important concerns related to reliability, hallucinations, algorithmic bias, academic integrity, privacy, and ethical accountability. Beyond these technical limitations, growing evidence suggests that excessive reliance on GenAI may promote cognitive offloading, weaken independent reasoning, and contribute to cognitive fatigue. Additional concerns include the potential for "dehumanisation drift," in which reduced human interaction may negatively influence empathy, professional identity formation, and relational competence. This review critically examines the educational opportunities, cognitive risks, ethical challenges, and professional implications of generative AI in medical education. To support responsible implementation, we propose a Four-Pillar Readiness Framework for Responsible GenAI Integration (4PRF), emphasizing student readiness, faculty readiness, institutional readiness, and professional readiness. The future of medical education should not be defined by the replacement of physicians with AI, but by responsible human–AI collaboration that preserves critical thinking, ethical judgment, and the humanistic foundations of medicine.

Keywords: AI literacy; AI-assisted learning; Medical education; Generative artificial intelligence

1. Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) has influenced healthcare and medical education for decades through clinical decision-support systems, adaptive learning platforms, simulation technologies, and automated assessment tools. However, the emergence of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) represents a fundamental shift in both AI capability and educational impact [1]. Unlike traditional predictive or discriminative AI systems, which primarily classify information or forecast outcomes, generative AI is designed to learn underlying data patterns and generate entirely new content. This includes written text, medical images, diagnostic explanations, educational cases, feedback, and interactive dialogue, transforming AI from a passive analytical tool into an active participant in learning and clinical communication [1,2].

Recent advances in deep learning, particularly transformer-based large language models (LLMs), diffusion models, and multimodal vision-language systems, have accelerated the development and adoption of generative AI technologies [3]. Large language models such as ChatGPT, Gemini, Claude, Bard, and LLaMA can interpret complex prompts, summarise

* Corresponding author: Mane Tavadan

scientific literature, simulate patient interactions, generate educational materials, and produce clinically relevant responses in real time [4]. Their performance is driven by large-scale pretraining through next-word prediction across massive text corpora, followed by fine-tuning using human feedback and instruction-based datasets to improve accuracy and contextual relevance [2]. In parallel, diffusion-based models have expanded AI applications in medical imaging by generating realistic synthetic radiological, pathological, and dermatological images, improving training datasets and potentially enhancing diagnostic model robustness in data-limited settings [2]. Multimodal systems integrating text and image understanding have further broadened these applications, supporting tasks such as radiology report generation, image interpretation, and clinical question answering. The adoption of these technologies in healthcare and medical education has been rapid. Recent evidence suggests that AI use among physicians ranges from approximately 66% to 71%, while reported use among medical students ranges from 49% to 89%. According to the American Medical Association, nearly two-thirds of physicians (66%) reported using health-related AI tools in 2024, representing a 78% increase compared with 2023 [5]. Among currently available platforms, ChatGPT remains the most frequently used system, with reported use by up to 76% of AI users [6,7]. Among medical students, these tools are primarily used to understand difficult concepts, prepare for examinations, and generate, summarise, edit, or revise academic materials. Increasingly, however, both students and clinicians are also applying these systems to clinical tasks, including differential diagnosis generation and clinical documentation support.

This rapid integration has occurred during a period of substantial strain within global medical education systems, characterized by rising student enrolment, faculty shortages, curriculum overload, administrative burden, and unequal access to educational resources. In this context, generative AI has emerged as an attractive solution because it offers scalable educational support, immediate feedback, personalized learning, and increased learner autonomy [1]. Early evidence suggests that these tools may strengthen self-directed learning, improve simulation-based education, facilitate formative assessment, and broaden access to educational content [8,9]. Despite these advantages, growing dependence on generative AI has raised important cognitive, ethical, and professional concerns. Although these systems may improve efficiency and reduce workload, increasing reliance on AI-generated outputs may encourage cognitive offloading, the delegation of memory, analytical reasoning, and decision-making tasks to external technologies rather than performing them independently [10,11].

Emerging evidence suggests that excessive dependence on AI may reduce active mental engagement, weaken critical thinking, and contribute to cognitive fatigue through the continuous burden of monitoring and verifying AI-generated information [11,12]. In medical education, where independent clinical reasoning and reflective judgment remain essential, these risks are particularly significant.

Beyond technical competence, medicine requires empathy, ethical judgment, communication skills, accountability, resilience, and the development of a strong professional identity. The growing integration of generative AI therefore raises an important question: how might technologically mediated learning influence the human and cognitive dimensions of physician development? An additional and underexplored concern is "dehumanisation drift," whereby increasing interaction with algorithmic systems may gradually reduce exposure to patients, mentors, and peers, potentially weakening empathic development and relational competence. Current literature has focused primarily on short-term outcomes such as examination performance, learner satisfaction, and diagnostic accuracy, while the long-term developmental consequences of AI use remain insufficiently understood [13,14]. A large-scale review of more than 200 studies evaluating LLM-based medical diagnosis reported an average diagnostic accuracy of approximately 52.1% across diverse specialties [15]. Still limited evidence exists regarding how prolonged exposure to AI-assisted educational systems may affect independent thinking, tolerance of uncertainty, professional identity formation, and cognitive resilience over time [10,11].

Taken together, these findings suggest that while generative AI offers meaningful educational and clinical decision-support value, substantial limitations remain that prevent safe independent clinical use. The central challenge is ,therefore, no longer whether generative AI should enter medical education—it already has—but how it can be integrated responsibly while preserving the intellectual, ethical, and human foundations of medicine. This review critically examines the opportunities, limitations, and ethical implications of generative AI in medical education and proposes a structured readiness framework to guide its sustainable, professionally responsible, and human-centered implementation.

2. Educational Opportunities of Generative AI in Medical Education

One of the most important contributions of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) to medical education is its ability to support personalized and adaptive learning [17]. Traditional medical education has largely relied on standardized teaching models that deliver identical materials to large groups of students despite differences in prior knowledge, learning pace, and educational needs.

Generative AI introduces a more individualized approach by enabling educational experiences that adapt to each learner's needs and progress [1,8]. Large language models can explain concepts at varying levels of complexity, simplify difficult topics through alternative examples, and provide immediate personalized feedback [18]. Unlike static educational resources, AI-based systems allow students to revisit challenging materials repeatedly in a nonjudgmental environment, potentially improving comprehension, confidence, and learner engagement [8]. Generative AI may also support metacognitive development and self-regulated learning [19]. Through interactive dialogue and iterative questioning, these systems can help learners identify knowledge gaps, evaluate their understanding, and refine reasoning processes. Such reflective learning may promote deeper engagement with educational materials while fostering greater learner autonomy. Another important application is simulation-based medical education. Traditional clinical simulation often requires substantial institutional resources, faculty involvement, and specialized facilities [20]. Generative AI may expand access to simulation by rapidly creating virtual patient cases and dynamic clinical scenarios. Emerging evidence also suggests that AI-supported virtual patients may enhance learner engagement, communication training, and clinical decision-making practice in scalable educational environments [1]. Unlike static textbook examples, AI-generated simulations can evolve interactively, respond to student decisions, and reproduce the uncertainty commonly encountered in real clinical practice. Generative AI may further support the development of clinical reasoning skills. These systems can propose differential diagnoses, suggest management strategies, and prompt students to justify clinical decisions [21]. When used appropriately, such tools may function as cognitive support systems that encourage analytical thinking and reflective problem-solving rather than simply providing direct answers [3]. This may allow students to practice diagnostic reasoning in low-risk educational settings before encountering real patients.

Faculty members may also benefit from the integration of generative AI into medical education. Educators can use these systems to generate examination questions, create clinical cases, summarise scientific literature, produce individualized feedback, and support curriculum planning. By reducing repetitive administrative and content-development tasks, generative AI may allow educators to devote greater attention to mentorship, interactive teaching, and other higher-order educational activities that require human expertise and professional judgment [1].

Taken together, these applications suggest that generative AI has substantial potential to improve accessibility, personalization, and educational efficiency in medical training. However, its effectiveness ultimately depends on how it is integrated. When used as a supportive educational tool rather than a replacement for independent thinking, generative AI may strengthen learning while preserving the cognitive and professional foundations essential to medical education.

3. Risks and Limitations

Despite the considerable potential of generative artificial intelligence (AI) in medical education, its integration introduces important educational, ethical, cognitive, and professional challenges that prevent uncritical adoption.

One of the most recognized concerns is AI hallucination, in which generative systems produce inaccurate, fabricated, or misleading information that may nevertheless appear highly convincing [3]. In medical education, this is particularly problematic because students and novice learners may lack the expertise needed to distinguish reliable information from erroneous outputs. As a result, inaccurate AI-generated explanations or recommendations may reinforce misconceptions and contribute to unsafe clinical reasoning if accepted without verification.

Algorithmic bias remains another major limitation. Because these models are trained on large human-generated datasets, they may inherit and reproduce existing social, cultural, racial, and clinical biases [22]. In healthcare, such bias may reinforce disparities in diagnosis, treatment recommendations, and educational representation, raising concerns regarding fairness and equity.

Academic integrity and authenticity of learning also present significant challenges. Generative AI tools are increasingly used to draft assignments, summarise literature, answer questions, and generate educational content. Although these applications may improve efficiency, excessive reliance may reduce active engagement with learning materials and weaken opportunities for independent analysis and knowledge construction [1]. If students become passive recipients of AI-generated information, educational depth and intellectual development may be compromised. Privacy and confidentiality represent additional concerns, particularly in healthcare-related educational environments. Entering patient-related or other sensitive clinical information into publicly accessible AI platforms may lead to confidentiality breaches, unauthorized data exposure, and erosion of professional trust. These risks highlight the need for clear institutional policies, secure technological infrastructure, and improved digital literacy [23].

Ethical concerns extend beyond privacy. Questions involving explainability, transparency, accountability, and responsibility have become increasingly important as AI systems enter healthcare and educational decision-making. A particularly underexplored issue is the “responsibility gap,” in which accountability for harmful recommendations or inaccurate outputs becomes difficult to assign among developers, institutions, educators, and end users [23].

Perhaps the most concerning and least understood limitation involves the long-term cognitive consequences of excessive AI dependence. Emerging evidence suggests that frequent reliance on AI may encourage cognitive offloading, whereby users progressively delegate memory, analytical reasoning, and problem-solving tasks to external systems rather than performing them independently [11]. Over time, this may weaken critical thinking, reduce intellectual engagement, and increase dependence on algorithmic support—an especially important concern in medicine, where clinical decision-making requires nuanced judgment and tolerance of uncertainty.

A related concern is “dehumanisation drift,” whereby increasing interaction with algorithmic systems may reduce opportunities for meaningful engagement with patients, mentors, and peers. Over time, this may weaken empathic development, interpersonal sensitivity, and relational competence—core dimensions of medical professionalism.

Although generative AI is often promoted as a tool for reducing workload, it may also increase cognitive burden. Users must continuously evaluate, verify, and filter AI-generated information, and this ongoing monitoring may itself consume substantial cognitive resources and reduce higher-order analytical performance [10]. Finally, much of the current literature remains limited by cross-sectional study designs and short-term observations.

Although existing evidence provides valuable preliminary insights, it does not yet establish causal relationships between AI use and long-term cognitive or educational outcomes [10]. Longitudinal, experimental, and interdisciplinary research is therefore essential to determine how sustained AI exposure influences learning behavior, clinical reasoning, professional identity formation, and intellectual development over time.

4. Professional Identity and the AI-Augmented Physician

The growing integration of generative artificial intelligence into healthcare and medical education has prompted renewed discussion about what it means to train and practice as a physician in the digital era. Although medicine increasingly depends on technological innovation, effective medical practice requires more than scientific knowledge and technical proficiency; it also depends on clinical judgment, ethical responsibility, empathy, communication skills, and the ability to provide human-centered care.

The expansion of AI-assisted learning and clinical decision-support systems may influence how these professional competencies develop. As learners become increasingly accustomed to algorithmic recommendations, concerns have emerged that opportunities to cultivate independent judgment, intellectual confidence, and professional accountability may diminish [13]. Students may become highly proficient in using AI systems while developing reduced tolerance for uncertainty and less confidence in their own reasoning. This is particularly important in medicine, where physicians must routinely make decisions in complex situations requiring contextual interpretation, ethical reasoning, and nuanced judgment beyond algorithmic capability.

The influence of generative AI also extends to the interpersonal dimensions of medical practice. Although modern AI systems can generate language that appears empathetic, such responses remain simulated because AI lacks emotional consciousness, lived experience, and moral intentionality [24]. While AI-mediated communication may improve efficiency in some settings, excessive dependence on it may reduce opportunities for learners to practice active listening, empathy, and patient-centered communication.

This concern is important because many core elements of medical professionalism are developed through repeated human interaction rather than theoretical instruction alone. Empathy, ethical sensitivity, and professional maturity are cultivated through patient encounters, mentorship, and reflective clinical experience. Reduced exposure to these experiences may contribute to “dehumanisation drift,” in which relational competence and empathic development gradually weaken over time [24].

Current generative AI systems also remain limited in their ability to interpret emotional complexity, contextual nuance, and crises. In vulnerable clinical settings, AI-generated reassurance may appear convincing while lacking genuine situational understanding, creating risks related to emotional misinterpretation, inappropriate guidance, or patient harm [24]. These limitations reinforce the need for continued human oversight and preservation of physician responsibility in all clinically significant decisions.

Accordingly, the future of medicine should not be viewed as a replacement of physicians by artificial intelligence, but as the development of an AI-augmented physician model. In this framework, AI serves as a collaborative tool that improves efficiency, information access, and decision support, while physicians retain responsibility for interpretation, ethical judgment, empathy, and compassionate care. Future physicians will therefore require not only technological literacy, but also strong critical thinking, emotional intelligence, and professional identity to use AI responsibly without compromising the human foundations of medicine.

5. A Four-Pillar Readiness Framework for Responsible Integration

Although much of the current literature focuses on the opportunities and risks of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI), relatively few studies provide practical models for responsible long-term implementation. To address this gap, this review proposes the 4-Pillar Readiness Framework for Responsible GenAI Integration (4PRF), consisting of four interconnected domains: student readiness, faculty readiness, institutional readiness, and professional readiness.

The first pillar is student readiness. Effective preparation extends beyond basic technical familiarity and requires development of critical AI literacy. Learners must understand how to formulate effective prompts, evaluate the reliability of AI-generated information, recognize model limitations, and apply ethical judgment when using these systems. Equally important is maintaining active intellectual engagement. Emerging evidence suggests that excessive dependence on AI may contribute to cognitive offloading and weakened critical thinking, particularly when learners accept outputs passively without sufficient verification or reflection [10,11]. Educational preparation should therefore incorporate reflective learning strategies, metacognitive training, and awareness of cognitive fatigue to promote responsible and sustainable AI use.

The second pillar is faculty readiness. Integrating generative AI into medical education requires structured professional development rather than informal exposure to emerging technologies. Educators must develop both technical understanding and pedagogical competence in AI-assisted teaching and assessment. Recent faculty development initiatives suggest that targeted institutional training can support redesign of learning activities, assessments, and feedback systems for AI-mediated environments [2]. Faculty preparation should therefore include curriculum redesign, development of assessment methods that preserve authentic reasoning, and strategies for supervising responsible human–AI collaboration.

The third pillar is institutional readiness. Universities and medical schools must establish clear governance structures to guide AI integration in a consistent, ethical, and transparent manner. This includes acceptable-use policies, disclosure requirements for AI-assisted work, redesigned assessment frameworks, secure technological infrastructure, and equitable access to AI resources. Without clear institutional guidance, implementation may become inconsistent, ethically vulnerable, and difficult to regulate. Institutions also play a critical role in ensuring that AI adoption aligns with educational standards, professional expectations, and patient confidentiality requirements.

The fourth pillar is professional readiness. As AI becomes increasingly embedded in healthcare and medical education, preserving the humanistic foundations of medicine becomes essential. Medical training must continue to prioritize empathy, professionalism, ethical responsibility, communication skills, accountability, and patient-centered care within technologically mediated environments. Although AI may support information access and decision-making, it cannot replace human moral judgment, emotional understanding, or compassionate clinical interaction. Future physicians must therefore learn not only how to use AI effectively, but also how to preserve professional identity and human-centered care while working alongside intelligent technologies.

These four domains are interdependent rather than isolated. Together, they provide a practical framework for responsible integration of generative AI into medical education. Achieving balanced implementation will require continuous evaluation, interdisciplinary collaboration, and adaptive governance to ensure that AI strengthens medical education without compromising its cognitive, ethical, and human foundations.

Future Directions

Future research on GenAI in medical education should move beyond descriptive reports of user satisfaction, perceived usefulness, and short-term performance outcomes toward deeper investigation of long-term educational and cognitive effects [1]. Although current evidence demonstrates substantial educational potential, many of the most important consequences of continuous AI exposure are likely to emerge gradually through changes in reasoning habits, learning behavior, and professional development rather than immediate measurable outcomes [25].

One major research priority is the long-term cognitive impact of sustained AI-assisted learning. Existing evidence suggests that excessive reliance on generative AI may contribute to cognitive offloading, reduced independent reasoning, and mental fatigue; however, most available studies remain cross-sectional and therefore cannot determine causal or developmental effects [10,11]. Future research should prioritize longitudinal and experimental designs capable of evaluating how repeated AI use influences critical thinking, metacognition, memory retention, problem-solving ability, and intellectual resilience over time. Studies should also incorporate objective cognitive and behavioral measures rather than relying primarily on self-reported perceptions.

Another important direction involves professional identity formation within increasingly AI-mediated educational environments. Because medical education traditionally depends on mentorship, reflective practice, clinical immersion, and interpersonal interaction to cultivate empathy, accountability, and professional judgment, future studies should examine how prolonged AI exposure influences clinical autonomy, tolerance of uncertainty, and confidence in independent decision-making, particularly among early-stage learners.

Assessment science also requires substantial innovation. As generative AI increasingly challenges traditional written assignments and knowledge-based examinations, future educational models must place greater emphasis on reasoning processes, reflective judgment, creativity, and responsible human–AI collaboration rather than simple information reproduction. New assessment approaches may therefore be needed to evaluate how learners interpret, critique, and appropriately integrate AI-generated information into clinical reasoning.

Equity and accessibility should remain central considerations in future implementation research. Current adoption of generative AI remains concentrated primarily within high-resource institutions, raising concern that AI integration may unintentionally widen existing disparities in global medical education [25].

Future studies should therefore explore strategies for developing inclusive, accessible, and culturally appropriate AI-supported educational models across diverse healthcare and educational settings. Future research should also examine the ethical and psychological implications of prolonged AI-mediated learning. Questions related to learner autonomy, dependency, trust in AI-generated information, and the balance between efficiency and independent thinking remain insufficiently understood. Understanding how students adapt psychologically to continuous interaction with generative AI will become increasingly important as these systems become more deeply integrated into healthcare and education.

Ultimately, progress in this field will require sustained interdisciplinary collaboration among clinicians, educators, psychologists, ethicists, policymakers, and computer scientists. Responsible integration will depend not only on technological advancement, but also on careful consideration of how AI influences cognition, professional identity, ethical responsibility, and the humanistic foundations of medicine.

6. Conclusion

Generative artificial intelligence offers major opportunities to improve medical education through personalized learning, simulation-based training, and increased access to educational resources. However, it also raises concerns regarding reliability, bias, academic integrity, privacy, and the preservation of independent reasoning and humanistic patient care. The key challenge is not whether AI should be used, but how it can be integrated responsibly. Successful implementation will require strong governance, digital literacy, critical evaluation skills, and continued human oversight to ensure that AI supports rather than undermines the ethical, cognitive, and relational foundations of medicine.

References

[1] Jung E, Samuel A. The new wave of generative artificial intelligence in medical education. Korean J Med Educ. 2026;38(1):1-4. doi:10.3946/kjme.2025.139

[2] Shanmugam D, Agrawal M, Movva R, Chen IY, Ghassemi M, Jacobs M, et al. Generative AI in medicine [preprint]. arXiv. 2024. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2412.10337

[3] Jayasrilakshmi S, Mahapatra A. Generative AI in medicine: A thorough examination of applications, challenges, and future perspectives. Comput Biol Med. 2026;203:111469.

[4] Yu H, Fan L, Li L, Zhou J, Ma Z, Xian L, et al. Large language models in biomedical and health informatics: A review with bibliometric analysis. J Healthc Inform Res. 2024;8(4):658-711. doi:10.1007/s41666-024-00171-8

[5] American Medical Association. More than 80% of physicians use AI professionally: AMA survey [Internet]. Chicago (IL): American Medical Association; 2026 Mar 12 [cited 2026 May 24]. Available from: American Medical Association

[6] Zhang JS, Yoon C, Williams DKA, Pinkas A. Exploring the usage of ChatGPT among medical students in the United States. J Med Educ Curric Dev. 2024;11:23821205241264695. doi:10.1177/23821205241264695

[7] Xu AY, Speakman S, Piranio VS, Medina R, Liu M, Lamprecht C, et al. Medical student experiences with ChatGPT: National cross-sectional study. JMIR Form Res. 2026;10:e76838. doi:10.2196/76838

[8] Burbage A, Styron JL. Crossing the theory threshold: The pedagogical potential of generative artificial intelligence in educational research. Korean J Med Educ. 2026;38(1):5-9. doi:10.3946/kjme.2025.098

[9] Bhuyan SS, Sateesh V, Mukul N, Galvankar A, Mahmood A, Nauman M, et al. Generative artificial intelligence use in healthcare: Opportunities for clinical excellence and administrative efficiency. J Med Syst. 2025;49(1):10. doi:10.1007/s10916-024-02136-1

[10] Khan SMFA, Suhluli S. Generative AI and cognitive challenges in research: Balancing cognitive load, fatigue, and human resilience. Technologies. 2025;13(11):486. doi:10.3390/technologies13110486

[11] Tian J, Zhang R. Learners' AI dependence and critical thinking: The psychological mechanism of fatigue and the social buffering role of AI literacy. Published online 2025 Oct 11.

[12] Gerlich M. AI tools in society: Impacts on cognitive offloading and the future of critical thinking. Societies. 2025;15(1):6. doi:10.3390/soc15010006

[13] Komasawa N, Yokohira M. Generative artificial intelligence (AI) in medical education: A narrative review of the challenges and possibilities for future professionalism. Cureus. 2025;17(6):e86316. doi:10.7759/cureus.86316

[14] Lu Q. Development of generative artificial intelligence in medical education: A bibliometric profiling. Front Educ. 2025;10:1613067. doi:10.3389/feduc.2025.1613067

[15] Mierzynska A, Tlegenova Z, Pidvalna U, Abibillaev D, Scianna S, Kudaiberdieva G. Effect of artificial intelligence on publication performance of physicians involved in medical research. Eur Heart J Digit Health. 2026;7(Suppl 1):ztaf143.020. doi:10.1093/ehjdh/ztaf143.020

[16] Khakpaki A. Advancements in artificial intelligence transforming medical education: A comprehensive overview. Med Educ Online. 2025;30(1):2542807. doi:10.1080/10872981.2025.2542807

[17] Maity S, Saikia MJ. Large language models in healthcare and medical applications: A review. Bioengineering. 2025;12(6):631. doi:10.3390/bioengineering12060631

[18] Chavan M, Patole R. Generative AI as a catalyst for metacognitive growth and academic performance: A quantitative study in secondary education. Int J Adv Trends Eng Manag. 2025;4(08). doi:10.59544/CBKU8444/IJATEMV04I08P3

[19] Elendu C, Amaechi DC, Okatta AU, Amaechi EC, Elendu TC, Ezeh CP, et al. The impact of simulation-based training in medical education: A review. Medicine (Baltimore). 2024;103(27):e38813. doi:10.1097/MD.0000000000038813

[20] Izquierdo-Condoy JS, Arias-Intriago M, Tello-De-la-Torre A, Busch F, Ortiz-Prado E. Generative artificial intelligence in medical education: Enhancing critical thinking or undermining cognitive autonomy? J Med Internet Res. 2025;27:e76340. doi:10.2196/76340

[21] Chustecki M. Benefits and risks of AI in health care: Narrative review. Interact J Med Res. 2024;13:e53616. doi:10.2196/53616

[22] Jangid P, Meena A, Prerna R, Hashmi ZH, Kumar V, Bhagtani H. The role of artificial intelligence in safeguarding patient privacy in healthcare systems. J Pharm Bioallied Sci. 2025;17(Suppl 2):S1083-S1085. doi:10.4103/jpbs.jpbs_381_25

[23] Muthukumar K. Empathy AI in healthcare. Front Psychol. 2025;16:1680552. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1680552

[24] Vieriu AM, Petrea G. The impact of artificial intelligence (AI) on students' academic development. Educ Sci. 2025;15(3):343. doi:10.3390/educsci15030343

[25] Lu Q. Development of generative artificial intelligence in medical education: A bibliometric profiling. Front Educ. 2025;10:1613067. doi:10.3389/feduc.2025.1613067