Establishing Ethical Standards a Comprehensive Guide for Artificial Intelligence Research in Neurology

Gill Succi*

Abstract

V@^ â}c^*¦æcâ[} [~A¦câ,&âæ|I}c^||â*^}&^ (AI) â}c[}^˘¦[|[*ˆ @æ• c@^][c^}cïæ| c[¦^ç[|˘câ[}â:^ ââæ*}[•câ&•, c¦^æc{^}c]|æ}}â}*, æ}å ¦^•^æ¦&@. H[¸^ç^¦, c@^ ˘•^ [~AI æ|•[ ]¦^•^}c• •â*}â,&æ}c ^c@â&æ| &@æ||^}*^•, â}&|˘âå}*]æcâ^}c]|âçæ&ˆ,

V@â•]æ]^¦]¦[çïâ^• æ &[{]¦^@^}•âç^ *˘ïâ^ c[^c@â&æ| •cæ}åæ¦å• ~[¦&[}å˘&câ}* AI ¦^•^æ¦&@ â} }^˘¦[|[*^ˆ, æâ{â}* c[@^|] &|â}â&âæ• æ}å ¦^•^æ¦&@^¦• }æçâ*æc^ c@^ ^c@â&æ| &[{]|^¢âcâ^• [~AI å^ç^|[]{^}c æ}å â{]|^{^}câ[}. A •ˆ•c^{ æcâ& ¦^çâ^¸ [~^¢â•câ}* ^c@â&æ| *˘ïâ^ › ¦^•][}•âà|ˆ å^ç^|[]{} æ}å å^]||ˆ AI c^&@}[[|[*â^•.

Keywords: Arti cial intelligence (AI); Ethical guidelines; Data privacy; Algorithm bias; Patient autonomy; AI accountability; Clinical research

Introduction

e application of Arti cial Intelligence (AI) in neurology has transformed how clinicians approach diagnostics, treatment planning, and patient care. AI-powered tools can process vast datasets, identify subtle patterns, and predict outcomes with precision, o ering new possibilities for personalized medicine [1]. However, with these advancements come signi cant ethical concerns. AI algorithms, o en trained on large-scale patient data, raise questions around privacy, bias, and the transparency of AI-driven clinical decisions. Addressing these

*Corresponding author:
G˘*|â^|{[åæ Ùæ|â&^c[H[•]âcæ|, Icæ|ˆ, E-{æâ|: •˘&&â*â||@*{æâ|.&[{

may lead to less accurate AI predictions for these populations [8]. Researchers must ensure that training datasets are diverse and that algorithms are regularly audited for fairness.

Accountability and transparency: AI-driven clinical decisions must be explainable to both clinicians and patients. Lack of transparency in AI algorithms, often referred to as the "black box" problem, can undermine trust. Ethical AI research in neurology requires models that can provide clear explanations for their outputs, allowing clinicians to validate AI-assisted decisions.

Equitable access to ai technologies: Ethical considerations also extend to the accessibility of AI technologies in neurology. Efforts should be made to ensure that AI advancements are available across different socioeconomic groups to avoid exacerbating healthcare disparities.

Discussion

The integration of AI into neurology poses numerous ethical challenges that require careful consideration. The results demonstrate the need for comprehensive ethical guidelines that not only address the technical aspects of AI development but also prioritize patient rights, equity, and fairness [9, 10]. AI tools must be developed and implemented in ways that enhance clinical decision-making while maintaining transparency, accountability, and inclusivity.

Conclusion

Artificial Intelligence has the potential to significantly enhance neurology by improving diagnostic accuracy, treatment personalization, and research capabilities. However, the ethical challenges it presents cannot be overlooked. This paper provides a comprehensive guide to conducting ethical AI research in neurology, focusing on informed consent, data privacy, bias mitigation, and accountability. By adhering to these ethical principles, clinicians and researchers can ensure that AI-driven advancements contribute positively to patient care while minimizing risks. The recommendations set forth in this guide can serve as a framework for responsible AI development and implementation in neurology and other medical elds.

Acknowledgement

None

Conflict of Interest

None

References

1. Fˇtá•æ¸æC, W{^*æ\àH, Næ\æ•@á{æH, Kˇ:ˇˆæM, V[àæK, ^cæ|. (2019) C[{]|æá}c

   A|:@^á{^¦q• âá•^æ•^]æcá^}c•. G^¦æc¦ G^¦[}c[|I}c 19: 171-172.

2. Bæ|| V, G[}:ı|^:-Mæ¦cð}^: J, Z^{{æ¦ A, Ù¸^áâ A, C@æ}â¦æ Ù, ^c æ|. (2021) Ü[à[cá&A]]|á&æcá[}•á} C¦æ}áæ| N^ˇ¦[•ˇ¦*^¦ˆ: Cˇ¦¦^}cæ}â Fˇcˇ¦^. O]^¦ N^ˇ¦[•ˇ¦* 21: 371-379.

   K@æ}}æ O, B^æ•|^ˆ Ü, F¦æ}&[D, DâMæá[Ù (2021) V@^ Pæc@ c[Ùˇ¦*á&æ| Ü[à[cá&•á} N^ˇ¦[•ˇ¦*^¦ˆ. O]^¦ N^ˇ¦[•ˇ¦* 20: 514-520.

4. Z@æ}* Q, Hæ} ÝG, Ýˇ ÝF, Fæ} MÝ, Z@æ[JY, ^c æ|. (2020) Ü[à[cá& }æçá*æcá[} . E¢]^¦c Üˇç M^å D^çá&^• 17: 27-32.

5. F[{^}\[A, Ù^¦|^cá• D (2018) Ü[à[cá& Ùc^¦^[cæ¢ˆá} C¦æ}áæ| N^ˇ¦[•ˇ¦*^¦ˆ: A Qˇæ|ácæcáç^ Ùˆ•c^{æcá& Ü^çáˆ¸. N^ˇ¦[•ˇ¦*^¦ˆ 83: 642-650.

6. Mæå@æçæ} K, K[|&ˇ} JPG, C@á^}* LO, Yæ}* MÝ (2017)Aˇˇ*{^}c^å-¦^æ|áˆ á}c^*¦æc^å ¦[à[cá&•á} }^ˇ¦[•ˇ¦*^¦ˆ: æ¦^ ¸^ c@^¦^ ^^c?. N^ˇ¦[•ˇ¦* F[&ˇ• 42: E3-E6.

7. Ùˇ*á{[c[K, Ýæ•ˇtá{æ M, Ýæ*á@æ•@á Ù (2008) Ü[|^ [- æåçæ}&^å *|ˆ&æcá[} ^}å . Cˇ¦¦ P@æ¦{ D^•14: 953-961.

8. Ùá}*@ XP, Bæ|á A, Ùá}*@ N, Jæ**á AÙ (2014) Aåçæ}&^å *|ˆ&æcá[} ^}å ¦¦[åˇ&• . K[¦^æ} J P@ˆ•á[| 18: 1-14.

9. C¦áæå[PÜ, Mæ¦ˇˇ^• GF, M[¦ácæ VC, å^-Cæ¦çæ|@[JF (2016) &¦á}â&æ| æ}å |æà[¦æc[¦ˆ]¦[,|^• [- &ˇcæ}^[ˇ•][|ˆæ¦c^¦ácá• }[â[•æ]æcá^}c•: Ü^][¦c [- 22 &æ•^•æ}å |ác^¦æcˇ¦^ ¦^çá^¸. Aˇc[á{{ˇ}^ Üˇç 15: 558-563.

10. L^}*|^c V, Hæ¦[&@^ J, Ù&@}ˇ¦â*^¦ A, Mæá•[}[à^ V, Xáæ|æ K, ^c æ| (2011) M[}[}^ˇ¦[]æc@ˆ {ˇ|cá]|^¢ æ•[&áæc^å ¸á&@ æ&ˇc^]æ¦ç[çᦡˇ• B19 á}-^&cá[}: &@æ|æ&c^¦á•cá&•, c¦^æc{^}c æ}å [ˇc[{{^. J N^ˇ¦[|[| 258: 1321-1326.