Review Article

BIOMEDICAL Journal of Scientific & Technical Research

ISSN: 2574 -1241

DOI: 10.26717/BJSTR.2025.61.009629

Artificial Intelligence in U.S. Healthcare: Evolutionary Trend or Revolutionary Shift?

Andrew L McCart*

PhD, FACHE, Assistant Professor, Associate Director, Health Management Programs, Department of Health Management and Systems Sciences, UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE, School of Public Health and Information Sciences, 485 East Gray Street, #129 Louisville, KY 40202, USA

***Corresponding author:** Andrew L McCart, PhD, FACHE, Assistant Professor, Associate Director, Health Management Programs, Department of Health Management and Systems Sciences, UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE, School of Public Health and Information Sciences, 485 East Gray Street, #129 Louisville, KY 40202, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Received: April 23, 2025

Published: April 29, 2025

Citation: Andrew L McCart. Artificial Intelligence in U.S. Healthcare: Evolutionary Trend or Revolutionary Shift?. Biomed J Sci & Tech Res 61(4)-2025. BJSTR. MS.ID.009629.

ABSTRACT

This paper critically examines whether artificial intelligence (AI) in U.S. healthcare constitutes a revolutionary paradigm shift or an evolutionary continuation of digital innovation. Drawing upon Kuhn's theory of scientific revolutions and Christensen's disruptive innovation model, the analysis compares AI's trajectory with historical transformations such as the Germ Theory revolution, the Industrial Revolution, and the Digital Revolution. The study evaluates AI's influence on clinical decision-making, workforce dynamics, and care delivery systems through a literature review and empirical illustrations. While AI demonstrates expert-level diagnostic capabilities and enhances decision support, its current implementation remains largely augmentative. Similarly, its impact on workforce roles and care models reveals incremental efficiencies rather than structural upheaval. However, early evidence, such as predictive algorithms improving patient outcomes and AI-assisted triage enabling task-shifting, suggests latent revolutionary potential. The paper argues that AI's future trajectory depends on meeting key conditions: demonstrable superiority in clinical outcomes, widespread adoption, supportive policy and regulatory environments, and a shift in stakeholder mindset. In its current state, AI is best understood as an evolving force that amplifies existing capabilities within the prevailing paradigm of evidence-based medicine.

However, with the right evidence base, infrastructure, and cultural acceptance, AI could catalyze a fundamental reordering of how healthcare is delivered and experienced. The paper concludes by offering policy and research recommendations to enable the responsible advancement of AI toward transformative impact in healthcare.

Abbreviations: EHRs: Electronic Health Records; AI: Artificial Intelligence

Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has rapidly emerged in U.S. healthcare as both a promise and a puzzle: is it an incremental evolution of medical technology or a paradigm-shattering revolution? Enthusiasts often herald AI as transformative – for example, AI systems now match or exceed human experts in tasks like medical image interpretation (Powell, et al. [1,2]). Such advances fuel claims that medicine stands "on the brink of an AI revolution" (Powell, 2022). Others argue that AI merely continues a trajectory of digital innovation and data analytics that has been underway for decades. A recent comprehensive review concluded that AI's impact in healthcare is "evolutionary, not revolutionary," requiring deliberate and incremental integration alongside human expertise (Chustecki, et al. [3]). This paper critically analyzes these competing perspectives using policy, technological, and clinical practice insights. Using a literature review of academic sources and empirical illustrations, This study compare AI's emergence to past healthcare transformations – from the Germ Theory of disease to the Industrial and Digital Revolutions – to assess whether AI represents a Kuhnian paradigm shift or a more gradual disruptive innovation. This study examine how AI is changing clinical decision-making, workforce roles, and care delivery systems, and consider counterarguments framing AI as a continuation of existing trends. Finally, This study propose synthesizing the conditions under which AI could become revolutionary and offer recommendations for research and policy to guide AI's future in healthcare.

 DOI: 10.26717/BJSTR.2025.61.009629

Theoretical Frameworks: Kuhnian Paradigms and Disruptive Innovation

Thomas Kuhn's theory of scientific revolutions provides a lens for evaluating AI's role in healthcare. Kuhn described paradigm shifts as rare, fundamental changes in the basic assumptions of science, triggered when the prevailing paradigm can no longer accommodate accumulating anomalies (Shapiro, et al. [4]). The 19th-century acceptance of the Germ Theory of disease in medicine, replacing miasma theory with the understanding that microorganisms cause infection, exemplifies a Kuhnian paradigm shift. This revolution in thinking led Joseph Lister in the 1860s to "revolutionize surgical practice" by applying antiseptic techniques, dramatically reducing infections (Britannica, et al. [5]). The question is whether AI constitutes a similar paradigm shift. Is AI enabling a new "normal science" in healthcare where data-driven machine learning supersedes traditional clinical reasoning, or is it better considered an extension of existing medical science? Clayton Christensen's disruptive innovation theory offers another framework. Disruptive innovations typically start by providing simpler, more accessible solutions to underserved markets, eventually displacing established incumbents. By this theory, technology alone is not "disruptive" without new business models and value networks that leverage it (Christensen Institute [6]). In healthcare, many technologies (from telemedicine to retail clinics) have been labeled "disruptive" but often adopted as sustaining innovations within the traditional system.

This study ask whether AI is following a sustaining path – improving efficiency and accuracy within current practice – or enabling new care models that fundamentally disrupt healthcare delivery. As the Christensen Institute notes, an AI technology could be sustaining in one context but disruptive in another; it "needs an innovative business model" and a proper ecosystem to transform a sector (Christensen Institute [6]). These frameworks will guide our analysis of AI's impacts, distinguishing evolutionary improvements from revolutionary shifts.

Historical Transformations in Healthcare: From Germ Theory to Digital Revolution

History provides essential context for assessing AI's significance. Major transformations like the Germ Theory revolution, the Industrial Revolution, and the Digital Revolution reshaped healthcare differently.

- Germ Theory Revolution: The late 19th-century adoption of Germ Theory radically changed medicine's approach to infection and public health. Before this, treatments were based on erroneous miasma assumptions. Germ Theory introduced a new scientific paradigm: once doctors accepted that invisible microbes cause disease, practices like sterilization of instruments, antiseptic surgery, and vaccination campaigns rapidly took hold. The result was a dramatic decline in surgical mortality and infectious disease rates – a medical revolution. This paradigm shift illustrates how a scientific insight can overturn prior norms and save lives on a massive scale. It was not just new technology, but a new theory of disease that redefined clinical practice. An innovation like AI must upend core medical assumptions or methods comparably for it to be equally revolutionary.
- Industrial Revolution and Healthcare: The Industrial Revolution (18th–19th centuries) gradually impacted healthcare by industrializing the tools and delivery of care. Mechanized production enabled mass-manufacturing medical supplies (from pharmaceuticals to medical devices), and railroads and factories facilitated the rise of large hospitals and urban healthcare systems. The period saw the professionalization of medicine and nursing, assembly-line techniques in hospital administration, and public health infrastructure improvements. These changes were foundational but evolutionary – they scaled up healthcare delivery without fundamentally changing the scientific paradigm of care. For instance, by the mid-20th century, penicillin was being produced in industrial quantities, making life-saving treatment widely available. The Industrial era's influence was transformative in scope (increasing access and standardization), yet it built on existing scientific knowledge. Today, AI's deployment depends on industrial-scale data and computing infrastructure, raising questions about whether AI is a revolutionary "Fourth Industrial Revolution" force or simply the latest productivity upgrade in medicine's industrialization.
- Digital Revolution: In recent decades, digital technology has arguably revolutionized aspects of healthcare, though over an extended timeline. The introduction of computers and the internet in the late 20th century led to electronic health records (EHRs), medical imaging advancements, and health information systems that vastly increased data availability. The "digital revolution… forever changed how This study approach healthcare", particularly through EHRs and connectivity that improved information flow and patient tracking (EHR Concepts [7]). Telemedicine emerged, and big data became a healthcare buzzword. However, many digital changes were initially incremental and often faced resistance – for example, early EHR implementations added clerical burden and contributed to physician burnout, only gradually yielding quality improvements. Still, by the early 21st century, virtually all U.S. hospitals and clinics had digitized their records, creating the data-rich environment that makes contemporary AI possible. Indeed, one review noted that the last 10 years in healthcare were about "roll out of digitization of health records" for efficiency, whereas "the next 10 years will be about" extracting insight and value from that digitization

DOI: 10.26717/BJSTR.2025.61.009629

via AI (Bajwa, et al [8]). In that sense, AI could be seen as a direct continuation of the digital revolution – an evolution from record-keeping to intelligent data analytics.

Some have even dubbed AI part of the "Fourth Industrial Revolution" in healthcare, combining digital data, machine learning, and automation. However, unlike the clear paradigm shift of Germ Theory, the digital transformation was a slow build. This study must determine if AI is simply the next step in this progression or if it is crossing a threshold into something fundamentally new. By comparing AI's emergence to these historical benchmarks, This study can better gauge its novelty. Germ Theory was a scientific revolution; the Industrial and Digital Revolutions were broad socioeconomic shifts in healthcare over decades. AI carries elements of both scientific advancement (new algorithms and insights) and systemic change (new workflows and business models). The extent of its impact may depend on how it intersects with clinical science (a new paradigm of evidence or reasoning?) versus how it restructures care delivery (a new mode of production or service?).

AI in Clinical Decision-Making: Augmentation or Paradigm Shift?

One of the most immediate areas where AI influences healthcare is clinical decision-making – how diagnoses are made and treatments chosen. AI systems excel at pattern recognition across vast datasets, which in theory allows them to "bring all medical knowledge to bear in service of any case" (Powell, et al. [1]). For example, machine learning models can rapidly compare a cancer patient's data with millions of prior cases to suggest personalized treatment options, as imagined in a Harvard Medical School scenario (Powell, et al. [1]). Deep learning algorithms now interpret medical images (X-rays, MRIs, slides) at an expert level in radiology and pathology. Isaac Kohane of Harvard notes that AI has shown "true expert-level performance" in image recognition tasks, even outperforming doctors in some studies (Powell, et al. [1]). One study found an AI system detected early-stage breast cancers with 91% sensitivity versus 74% for experienced radiologists (Alowais, et al. [2]) – a striking improvement. In dermatology, AI can classify skin lesions for melanoma as accurately as specialists, expanding diagnostic capabilities to primary care settings. These gains hint at a potential paradigm shift in diagnostic science. Rather than relying solely on physicians' training and heuristics, decision-making can be data-driven and assisted by non-human intelligence searching for patterns no human could easily spot.

However, to date, AI's role in decisions is mostly augmentative rather than autonomous. Clinicians remain the final arbiters, using AI as a tool for decision support.

IBM's Watson for Oncology famously aimed to revolutionize cancer treatment decisions. Still, in practice, it struggled to outperform standard clinical protocols and was seen as an advanced clinical decision support system rather than a replacement for oncologists' reasoning. In daily practice, current AI systems serve as recommendation engines: flagging suspected tumors on scans, predicting which hospitalized patients are at risk of deteriorating, or suggesting drug dosage adjustments. These are valuable improvements in accuracy and efficiency, reducing human error and oversight gaps, but they do not yet constitute a wholesale change in how medical knowledge is applied. In Kuhnian terms, AI has not replaced the medical paradigm of evidence-based reasoning; it operates within that paradigm, albeit extending it with new computational power. Empirical outcomes so far underscore incremental progress. AI-driven diagnostic tools have improved specific process measures (e.g., radiology throughput, diagnostic consistency) and have shown promise in clinical outcomes like earlier disease detection. For instance, Kaiser Permanente developed a predictive algorithm called Advanced Alert Monitor (AAM) that scans inpatient data for signs of deterioration; it reportedly "saves hundreds of lives each year" by prompting early intervention for patients at risk of sepsis or other complications (Kaiser Permanente Institute for Health Policy [9]). This kind of success demonstrates AI's ability to enhance decision-making and outcomes.

However, such tools function as advanced early warning systems, fitting into established care pathways (nurses and doctors respond to the alert with established treatments). They improve the execution of care without fundamentally changing the nature of decision-making – clinicians are still practicing evidence-based medicine, just with better information. In that sense, AI looks more evolutionary: it augments human decision-makers, who, with AI support, rather than rendering a new decision paradigm. That could change with future developments. If This study imagine a scenario where AI synthesizes medical literature, patient genomics, and real-time sensor data to autonomously formulate a treatment plan, the physician's role might shift from decision-maker to overseer or validator of AI's decisions. Such a scenario would mark a paradigm shift in clinical decision-making – a new medical epistemology where machine-derived insights guide care. This study are not there yet: as of 2025, AI remains a sophisticated assistant. Many view AI as support for better decisions, not replacing clinical judgment. Until AI systems can consistently reason about individual patient complexities, uncertainties, and ethical nuances the way humans do, decision-making will likely remain a human-AI collaborative process – a significant evolution of practice, but not a revolution in the fundamentals of medical reasoning.

AI and the Healthcare Workforce: Automation, Augmentation, and New Roles

AI's influence on the healthcare workforce raises questions about whether it will disrupt the traditional roles of physicians, nurses, and other professionals, potentially leading to a revolutionary shift in how healthcare is staffed or mainly streamline their work (an evolutionary change). Automation anxiety has accompanied AI's rise, epitomized by debates like "Will AI replace radiologists?" A nuanced view from current evidence is that AI is reshaping roles in ways that both challenge and empower the workforce. On one hand, AI can automate or significantly assist clinicians with many previously time-consuming tasks. This ranges from administrative duties (e.g., coding and billing, scheduling, documentation) to certain clinical functions (reading routine imaging studies, monitoring patients). By taking over "repetitive processes" and handling data-heavy analyses, AI allows healthcare providers to "spend more time on tasks that focus on the clinical context of their patients", as one workforce analysis notes (Hazarika, et al. [10]). For example, natural language processing can transcribe and summarize patient encounter notes, which could reclaim hours of physicians' time currently lost to typing into EHRs. A recent report estimates that voice-to-text AI could save 17% of doctors' work time and over 50% of nurses' documentation time . Such gains could alleviate the epidemic of clinician burnout by reducing clerical burden.

Indeed, healthcare leaders hope AI might help address workforce shortages and burnout by "restoring a sense of purpose" to providers, letting them focus on patient care rather than paperwork (Reddy, et al. [11]). AI's ability to augment provider performance is similarly promising. Rather than replacing professionals, AI often acts as a cognitive extender. AI decision-support has increased nursing productivity by 30–50%, enabling nurses to manage care for more patients without compromising quality (Hazarika, et al. [10]). The "augmented intelligence" concept – favored by the American Medical Association – frames AI as enhancing clinicians' capabilities, not substituting for their expertise (AMA, 2019). For instance, an AI triage system might allow primary care doctors to handle a larger panel of patients by filtering simple cases to automated self-care advice and flagging only the more complex cases for physician attention. Here, AI changes the workflow and allocation of work, but humans remain central. On the other hand, This study must acknowledge the disruptive potential: specific roles could be fundamentally changed or even made redundant. "As automation gains momentum… There are concerns that technology-fueled increases in productivity will make certain healthcare jobs redundant," notes Hazarika, et al. [10]. For example, suppose algorithms can reliably read chest X-rays or pathology slides faster and cheaper than specialists. In that case, the demand for those specialties may decline or their scope of practice may shift towards more advanced interpretive or interventional tasks.

AI solutions are already supplanting entry-level roles (medical scribes, transcriptionists, basic technicians). In radiology, rather than eliminating radiologists, AI may cause a role evolution: radiologists might focus on overseeing AI results, handling edge cases, and performing interventional procedures, essentially becoming "information managers" and consultants to other doctors. Similarly, clinicians might need to acquire new skills (data interpretation, oversight of AI outputs), leading to new professional roles like clinical AI specialists or data stewards in healthcare teams. From a systems perspective, the workforce structure might transform if AI enables care to be delivered differently. Task-shifting is one possibility: AI could empower less-specialized workers or even patients themselves to perform tasks that once required highly trained professionals. For example, an AI symptom checker available to patients via a smartphone app could handle initial triage, so nurses or physician assistants, guided by AI, manage cases that used to go straight to doctors. This would echo a disruptive pattern: moving services to lower-cost providers or settings (akin to retail clinics disrupting physician offices in specific care segments). In such a scenario, the hierarchy and skill mix of the healthcare workforce would change markedly, arguably resulting in a revolutionary shift in the workforce model. So far, this degree of disruption has not been fully realized. AI pilot programs are beginning to show how roles might change, but widespread adoption is pending.

The healthcare workforce shortage context, with an 18 million global shortfall of health workers Hazarika, et al. [10], means AI is often seen as a desperately needed support rather than a threat. Frontline reports suggest that when AI systems are introduced, providers appreciate relief from drudgery and the chance to focus on direct patient care, aligning AI with workforce empowerment. Nonetheless, continuous engagement with professional organizations and policymakers will be needed as AI capabilities advance to manage workforce transitions. Training programs must be adapted to prepare new clinicians for AI-rich environments (e.g., learning to interpret AI recommendations, handle AI errors, and maintain a human touch in care). Overall, current evidence points to an evolutionary trajectory in workforce impact, characterized by role augmentation and gradual task reallocation, with the potential for more revolutionary shifts if AI matures to automating complex clinical tasks at scale or enabling entirely new care delivery paradigms.

AI in Systems of Care Delivery: Towards a New Model of Healthcare

Beyond individual decisions and providers, AI is influencing the systems of care delivery – how healthcare services are organized and delivered to patients. A truly revolutionary impact of AI would mean reconfiguring healthcare delivery models, perhaps analogous to how the assembly line revolutionized manufacturing or how the internet revolutionized information access. This study examine whether AI is steering healthcare toward new delivery models or primarily optimizing existing systems. One noticeable trend is the move toward more predictive and proactive AI-enabled care systems. Traditional healthcare is often reactive, treating illnesses after they occur. AI algorithms, however, excel at forecasting risk by analyzing patterns in patient data. Health systems are leveraging this to shift care upstream. For example, predictive AI models identify high-risk patients for hospital readmission or complications, allowing interventions before crises happen. The earlier-mentioned Kaiser Permanente AAM system is a case in point: by warning care teams of a patient's deteriorating condition hours before, it enables a preemptive strike that can avoid an ICU transfer or cardiac arrest (Kaiser Permanente Institute for Health Policy [9]). If widely adopted, this kind of AI-driven early warning infrastructure changes the delivery model from acute reactive care to continuous monitoring and preventative action – a significant transformation in practice that aligns with the goals of population health management and the "learning health system."

It reflects an evolution of the system toward being more data-driven, personalized, and anticipatory, sometimes dubbed "precision medicine" in the broad sense. As one review noted, AI is pushing healthcare to be more "personalized, precise, predictive, and portable", enabling care tailored to individual risks and delivered wherever the patient is (including at home) (Bajwa, et al. [8]). Relatedly, AI is facilitating care delivery outside traditional clinical settings. With telehealth platforms and remote patient monitoring, AI can triage patients online, analyze home-collected data (such as wearable sensor readings or patient-reported symptoms), and decide if a person can be managed virtually or needs in-person care. During the COVID-19 pandemic, AI chatbots and triage systems were widely deployed to screen symptoms and direct patients appropriately, accelerating acceptance of virtual care pathways. If this trend continues, This study might see a healthcare system where a significant portion of primary care is delivered by AI-assisted telemedicine, reserving clinics and hospitals for more complex cases. This decentralization of care – bringing "hospital-at-home" models to life – could be considered revolutionary, overturning the centrality of brick-and-mortar clinics. It parallels how the digital revolution in banking led to online banking and fewer physical bank branches. In healthcare, however, regulatory and safety considerations mean the transition is cautious.

Still, This study are witnessing early signs: AI scheduling systems match patients with the right level of care; automated follow-up systems manage chronic disease patients remotely; even mental health counseling has experimental AI-driven chatbots providing cognitive-behavioral therapy. AI is also optimizing the administrative and operational aspects of care delivery systems. Hospitals use AI to predict patient flows (emergency admissions, bed occupancy) and optimize staffing and supply chain management. These improvements reduce waste and could lower costs, addressing the long-standing challenge of healthcare inefficiency. While important, these are behind-the-scenes changes that patients might not label a "revolution." Still, they can significantly improve system performance (shorter wait times, fewer errors, cost savings) and thus accelerate the evolution of healthcare systems toward high reliability and efficiency. For instance, AI-based scheduling at a health system might minimize idle scanner time and maximize patient throughput, akin to an industrial engineering upgrade to hospital operations. The most profound systemic change AI could bring is a new relationship between patients and the healthcare system. Some technologists envision AI empowering patients to have more agency in their care – an "AI entity" joining the patient-doctor relationship as a virtual health coach or assistant. In such a future, patients might interact first with an AI for advice or preliminary diagnosis, only escalating to human providers when needed.

This could democratize knowledge and reduce the asymmetrical relationship between doctor and patient, as patients come armed with AI-generated insights about their condition. If implemented thoughtfully, this collaborative care model (patient + AI + clinician) might improve access and personalization. However, it raises concerns about fragmentation, misdiagnosis without human oversight, and the need for new health system designs to integrate AI outputs seamlessly into care. The transformations in care delivery attributable to AI remain mostly at the pilot and early implementation stage. A 2024 analysis noted that while AI holds potential to improve nearly every aspect of care – "enhancing care quality, patient experience, clinical safety, affordability, and administrative efficiency" – its broad deployment requires addressing safety, bias, and trust issues before scaling up. This study see promising case studies and local successes, but AI has not yet upended the U.S. healthcare system. The pace of change is evolutionary, yet the direction points toward a more distributed, continuous, and patient-centric care system. Whether this becomes a revolution may depend on overcoming current barriers so that these pockets of innovation coalesce into a new standard care delivery model.

Counterarguments: AI as a Continuation of Existing Trends

While the hype around AI is about radical change, a strong counterargument is that AI in healthcare is best understood as a continuation of trends long underway, rather than an abrupt break. From this viewpoint, many capabilities of "AI" are extensions of computerization and analytics that healthcare has been incrementally adopting for years. Firstly, using algorithms to aid diagnosis or treatment is not new. Rule-based clinical decision support systems have existed for decades (e.g., MYCIN in the 1970s for infectious disease diagnosis). AI's current data-driven algorithms are more powerful due to big data and better computing. Still, they pursue the same goal of augmenting clinical decisions that medical informatics pioneers have worked toward for two generations. In this sense, AI's recent achievements represent a fulfillment of the digital health trajectory rather than a sudden departure. The "anomalies" that AI addresses (such as human cognitive biases, information overload, and variability in care) have been recognized problems, and AI provides new tools to tackle them. However, solving issues known with better tools can be viewed as evolutionary – healthcare improving itself using emerging technology, much as it has with past innovations like MRI or minimally invasive surgery. Empirically, some scholars observe that AI's impact has been incremental so far.

A narrative review of AI in medicine concluded that despite high hopes, "AI's impact on health care is evolutionary, not revolutionary", and that a deliberate, stepwise approach is needed to integrate AI while "upholding patient-centric care" (Chustecki, et al. [3]). The author emphasizes that AI needs to fit into the healthcare system's complex human and regulatory context, which inherently tempers

DOI: 10.26717/BJSTR.2025.61.009629

the speed and magnitude of change. Many published AI tools remain in pilot phases, and relatively few have demonstrated large-scale improvements in patient outcomes in controlled studies. This measured view is echoed by others who point out that healthcare has weathered many "game-changing" innovations (from antibiotics to imaging to genomics) and generally assimilated them into practice gradually, often over decades. By this historical pattern, AI will likely permeate medicine piece by piece, improving specific processes (e.g., radiology workflow, drug discovery pipelines, risk stratification) without immediately rewriting the rulebook of medicine. Another continuity is that AI relies on and amplifies the datafication of healthcare, which has been ongoing. The push toward evidence-based medicine in the 1990s and 2000s established a culture of using data and guidelines in care. AI extends that by mining much larger datasets (genomic data, real-world evidence from EHRs, etc.), but it still operates in the paradigm of evidence-based decision support.

AI is the next logical step in a healthcare system that has been steadily integrating more information technology, from billing systems to electronic records to advanced analytics. Just as the introduction of EHRs was revolutionary to some extent but ultimately became a regular part of care, AI algorithms might be novel now. Still, they could become another standard tool in the clinician's toolbox. Moreover, skeptics note that disruptive healthcare innovation is difficult due to high regulatory, ethical, and professional barriers. AI technology must pass through rigorous FDA approvals, malpractice risk assessment, insurance reimbursement decisions, and clinical acceptance. These gatekeepers tend to channel innovations into existing frameworks. For example, AI diagnostic tools are being approved as medical devices and often reimbursed under existing procedure codes, integrated into the current system rather than inventing a whole new care system. As Christensen's theory would predict, healthcare's entrenched "value network" can absorb AI as a sustaining innovation, improving current services, rather than allowing it to fundamentally disrupt services (unless a new care delivery model outside the incumbents takes root). Finally, there is the argument that AI cannot supplant humanistic aspects of medicine, and those aspects define the practice of medicine. The physician-patient relationship, trust, empathy, and ethical judgment are core to care delivery and are products of centuries of medical tradition and social expectation.

AI does not replace these; at best, it might alter doctors' tools, much like prior technologies. From this vantage, AI is a powerful new instrument, but medicine's goals and principles remain continuous with the past. In summary, the counterargument is that AI represents evolution, not revolution – a significant advancement in the ongoing evolution of medical technology. It improves tasks' speed, scale, and sometimes accuracy, but within the framework of contemporary healthcare practice and science. This perspective urges caution against hyperbole and emphasizes evaluation, integration, and iteration to ensure AI truly benefits care over time.

Synthesis and Conclusion: When Does AI Become Revolutionary?

This study have examined AI in U.S. healthcare through multiple lenses and found evidence of incremental evolution and potential revolution hints. In synthesizing these findings, a clear picture emerges: AI is currently an evolutionary force in healthcare, with the potential, under certain conditions, to become a revolutionary one. It is changing healthcare in essential ways–enhancing data-driven decision-making, alleviating workforce burdens, and gradually shifting care delivery toward more proactive, personalized models – but mainly as a progression of existing trends. However, if key conditions are met, AI could trigger a paradigm shift that transforms medicine on par with historical revolutions. What are those conditions under which AI becomes truly revolutionary? First, there must be demonstrable, broad improvements in patient outcomes and safety attributable to AI that significantly exceed what is possible with existing care. If, for example, AI-driven diagnosis and treatment consistently lead to far better survival rates or cure rates in major diseases through insights unattainable by humans alone, the clinical rationale for a paradigm shift would be in place. This study see glimmers of this in niche areas (early cancer detection, sepsis prevention), but not yet across the board. Robust evidence from longitudinal studies and randomized trials will be crucial to establish where AI provides a quantum leap in outcomes. Second, integration and adoption at scale must occur.

A revolution is not one brilliant algorithm in a lab; it is that algorithm (and many others) diffused into everyday practice, changing how care is delivered everywhere. This will require overcoming current implementation challenges: improving AI systems' reliability, ensuring they are free of harmful bias, earning clinicians' trust, and aligning with workflow. The healthcare system needs to invest in what Bajwa, et al. [8] call "translational research" for AI, taking algorithms from development to deployment safely and effectively. It also entails upskilling the workforce and redesigning processes. If, in a decade, most hospitals and clinics routinely rely on AI for various functions (diagnosis, triage, operational decisions) and cannot imagine practicing without it, that would mark a revolutionary adoption level. Current trajectories (e.g., the FDA having cleared over 900 AI-enabled devices for marketing (Reuter, et al. [12]) show rapid growth in availability; the next step is actual utilization and value generation from these tools in practice. Third, a supportive policy and regulatory environment is vital to accelerate or stifle an AI revolution. Policy can be catalyzed by setting standards and incentives for effective AI use. For instance, policymakers could establish standard benchmarks for AI performance (as Kaiser's policy analysts suggested: "shared benchmarking efforts" to evaluate AI tools (KPIHP, 2024). Moreover, transparency and equity are required in AI algorithms.

Regulatory bodies like the FDA are already evolving new frameworks (e.g., a proposed regulatory approach for adaptive machine learning algorithms). If regulations adapt quickly and allow safe iter-

DOI: 10.26717/BJSTR.2025.61.009629

ation, AI advances can reach patients faster. Conversely, overly restrictive or unclear regulations could slow progress to an evolutionary crawl. Privacy laws and data-sharing policies also play a role – a revolution fueled by data requires data to be accessible and interoperable. The U.S. government's National Artificial Intelligence Initiative Act (2020) and ongoing health AI guidance will shape how revolutionary AI's impact can be by addressing issues of liability, ethics, and validation. Ultimately, "robust safeguards" must be paired with innovation to ensure AI improves care without causing harm (Mandl, et al. [13]). Successful navigation of policy challenges – finding the sweet spot between innovation and protection – will determine how fully AI's promise translates into practice. Finally, the paradigm shift in mindset among healthcare stakeholders will signal when AI has tipped from evolution to revolution. This includes patients becoming comfortable with AI-informed care, clinicians viewing AI as an indispensable colleague, and health leaders reimagining care models around AI capabilities. When the culture of medicine embraces AI-driven approaches as a new norm, much as the culture shifted with Germ Theory to prioritize aseptic technique, or with evidence-based medicine to demand data for decisions, that would consummate the revolution.

Changing the "basic assumptions" (to use Kuhn's terms) might mean that future clinicians assume that no single human can manage all relevant data without AI, making human-AI collaboration the default paradigm for practicing medicine. In conclusion, AI in U.S. healthcare today is best characterized as an evolving force with revolutionary potential. It has not yet overturned the fundamentals of medical science or healthcare delivery, but it is steadily pushing the boundaries of what is possible within the current paradigm. Whether it will ultimately be recorded as a historical revolution like the advent of Germ Theory or the Digital Revolution depends on our collective actions in the coming years. To guide AI toward its most beneficial impact, This study offer the following recommendations for research and policy:

- Invest in Outcomes-Focused Research: Prioritize studies that measure AI's impact on meaningful health outcomes and cost-effectiveness in real-world settings. This includes prospective trials comparing AI-augmented care to standard care and long-term observational studies to detect benefits or unintended consequences over time. Such evidence will clarify where AI offers incremental improvement versus true leaps in quality or access.

- Enhance Collaboration and Interdisciplinary Development: Foster collaboration among computer scientists, clinicians, social scientists, and ethicists in AI design. Multidisciplinary input can ensure AI tools address real clinical needs, are user-friendly, and consider ethical implications from the start. Engage frontline healthcare workers in co-designing AI that fits their workflows, and patients in informing patient-centered AI applications.

- Strengthening Governance and Standards: Develop clear industry standards for safe and effective AI in healthcare. Policymakers and professional bodies should work together to set guidelines on algorithm validation, bias mitigation, and transparency (for example, requiring explainability or rigorous bias testing for high-risk AI tools). As one policy report suggests, "establish frameworks… to evaluate the clinical implications of new AI tools and assess their readiness for implementation" (KPIHP, 2024). This governance will build trust and consistency, preventing a Wild West of AI tools of variable quality.

- Promote Education and Workforce Training: Make AI literacy a core component of medical and nursing education and ongoing professional development (AMA, 2019). Tomorrow's healthcare professionals need competencies in interpreting AI outputs, understanding AI limitations, and communicating AI findings to patients. Similarly, new specialist roles (data scientists in healthcare, clinical AI implementation specialists) should be cultivated to bridge the gap between tech and medicine. A workforce confident in using AI will accelerate adoption and innovation.

- Ensure Ethical and Equitable AI Deployment: Policymakers must enact and enforce measures to ensure AI does not exacerbate health disparities. This includes mandating diverse training data to avoid bias, auditing algorithms for unfair impacts, and extending AI benefits to underserved populations (for example, deploying AI decision support in rural or low-resource settings where specialist access is limited). Equity-focused policies will help AI become a revolutionary force for closing gaps in care, not widening them. Moreover, updating liability frameworks to clarify responsibility when AI is involved in care will address the legal uncertainty that currently makes some organizations hesitant to deploy autonomous AI.

By following these recommendations, stakeholders can create conditions in which AI fulfills its transformative potential responsibly. Under the right conditions – robust evidence, thoughtful integration, supportive policy, and cultural embrace – AI could herald a new era of medicine in which intelligent machines and human clinicians partner to achieve unattainable outcomes. In that future, This study might look back on this period not just as a time of incremental tech improvements, but as the dawn of a revolutionary shift that redefined how healthcare is delivered and experienced. Until then, a balanced approach that recognizes AI's current limitations while striving for its promised benefits will serve us best, ensuring that evolution toward an AI-enhanced healthcare ultimately yields a revolution in value for patients [14-36].

References

1. Powell Alvin (2020) Risks and Benefits of an AI Revolution in Medicine. Harvard Gazette.
2. Alowais S A, Alghamdi S S, Alsuhebany N, Tariq Alqahtani, Abdulrahman I Alshaya, et al. (2023) Revolutionizing Healthcare: The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Clinical Practice. BMC Medical Education 23: 689.
3. Chustecki Margaret (2024) Benefits and Risks of AI in Health Care: Narrative Review. Interactive Journal of Medical Research 13: e53616.
4. Shapiro Judy (2020) The Kuhn Connection (or What a Scientist from 1962 Can Teach Us About Adtech Today). The Trust Web Times.
5. (2025) The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica Germ Theory. Encyclopædia Britannica.
6. (2024) Christensen Institute AI and Disruptive Innovation. Christensen Institute.
7. (2023) EHR Concepts Beyond Clicking a Mouse: How EHRs Save Lives and Transform Healthcare. EHR Concepts.
8. Bajwa J, Munir U, Nori A, Williams B (2021) Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare: Transforming the Practice of Medicine. Future Healthcare Journal 8(2): e188-e194.
9. (2024) Kaiser Permanente Institute for Health Policy AI in Health Care: Current Applications and Policy Opportunities. Kaiser Permanente Institute for Health Policy.
10. Hazarika Indrajit (2020) Artificial Intelligence: Opportunities and Implications for the Health Workforce. International Health 12(4): 241-245.
11. Reddy Sandeep (2025) The Impact of AI on the Healthcare Workforce: Balancing Opportunities and Challenges. Healthcare Information and Management Systems Society (HIMSS).
12. Reuter Elise, Jasmine Ye Han (2024) The Number of AI Medical Devices Has Spiked in the Past Decade. MedTech Dive.
13. Mandl Kenneth D (2025) Unseen Commercial Forces Could Undermine Artificial Intelligence Decision Support. NEJM AI 2(3).
14. (2019) American Medical Association Augmented Intelligence in Health Care: Policy Report. Chicago American Medical Association.
15. Blumenthal David, Marilyn Tavenner (2010) The 'Meaningful Use' Regulation for Electronic Health Records. New England Journal of Medicine 363(6): 501-504.
16. Christensen Clayton M (1997) The Innovator's Dilemma: When New Technologies Cause Great Firms to Fail. Boston Harvard Business Review Press.
17. Davenport Thomas H, Ravi Kalakota (2019) The Potential for AI in Healthcare. Future Healthcare Journal 6(2): 94-98.
18. Escobar, Gabriel J (2020) Early Detection of Clinical Deterioration in Hospitalized Patients Using a Machine Learning Model. Journal of Hospital Medicine 15(4): 215-222.
19. Gulshan Varun, Lily Peng, Marc Coram, Martin C Stumpe, Derek Wu, et al. (2016) Development and Validation of a Deep Learning Algorithm for Detection of Diabetic Retinopathy in Retinal Fundus Photographs. JAMA 316(22): 2402-2410.
20. Hambleton, Robin (2018) Babylon Health and the NHS: Innovation in Primary Care. Local Government Chronicle.
21. He Jiang, Sally L Baxter, Jie Xu, Jiming Xu, Xingtao Zhou, et al. (2019) The Practical Implementation of Artificial Intelligence Technologies in Medicine. Nature Medicine 25(1): 30-36.
22. Jiang Fei, Yong Jiang, Hui Zhi, Yi Dong, Hao Li et al. (2017) Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare: Past, Present and Future. Stroke and Vascular Neurology 2(4): 230-237.
23. Kohane, Isaac (2020) AI Revolution in Medicine - Risks and Benefits. New England Journal of Medicine 2020, as summarized in Powell, Alvin Risks and Benefits of an AI Revolution in Medicine. Harvard Gazette.
24. Kuhn Thomas S (1962) The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
25. McKinney Scott M, Marcin Sieniek, Varun Godbole, Jonathan Godwin, Natasha Antropova, et al. (2020) International Evaluation of an AI System for Breast Cancer Screening. Nature 577: 89-94.
26. Mesko Bertalan, Zsuzsanna Gyorffy (2019) The Rise of the Empowered Physician in the Digital Health Era. Journal of Medical Internet Research 21(3): e12490.
27. Norton Larry (2017) The Inevitability of Artificial Intelligence. Oliver Wyman Health Innovation Journal.
28. Obermeyer Ziad (2019) Dissecting Racial Bias in an Algorithm Used to Manage the Health of Populations. Science 366(6464): 447-453.
29. Pasteur, Louis, Joseph Lister (2025) Germ Theory. Encyclopædia Britannica.
30. Porter Roy (1997) The Greatest Benefit to Mankind: A Medical History of Humanity. New York W W Norton.
31. Rajkomar Alvin, Jeffrey Dean, Isaac Kohane (2019) Machine Learning in Medicine. New England Journal of Medicine 380(14): 1347-1358.
32. Rosen George (1993) A History of Public Health. Baltimore Johns Hopkins University Press.
33. Shortliffe Edward H (1976) Computer-Based Medical Consultations: MYCIN. New York Elsevier.
34. Ting Daniel S W, Lawrence Carin, Victor Dzau, Tien Y Wong (2020) Digital Technology and COVID-19. The Lancet Digital Health 26(4):459-461.
35. Topol Eric (2019) Deep Medicine: How Artificial Intelligence Can Make Healthcare Human Again. New York Basic Books.
36. (2024) U S Food and Drug Administration AI/ML-Enabled Medical Device List. FDA gov.

ISSN: 2574-1241

DOI: 10.26717/BJSTR.2025.61.009629

Andrew L McCart. Biomed J Sci & Tech Res