International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science

e-ISSN: 2544-9435

Scholarly Publisher
RS Global Sp. z O.O.
ISNI: 0000 0004 8495 2390

Dolna 17, Warsaw,
Poland 00-773
+48 226 0 227 03
editorial_office@rsglobal.pl

ARTICLE TITLE	THE ALGORITHMIC GAZE: A REVIEW OF HOW ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN OPHTHALMOLOGY IS SHAPING CLINICAL DECISION-MAKING AND THE PATIENT-DOCTOR RELATIONSHIP
DOI	https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.3(47).2025.3772
RECEIVED	28 July 2025
ACCEPTED	25 September 2025
PUBLISHED	30 September 2025
LICENSE	The article is licensed under a **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.**

THE ALGORITHMIC GAZE: A REVIEW OF HOW ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN OPHTHALMOLOGY IS SHAPING CLINICAL DECISION-MAKING AND THE PATIENT-DOCTOR RELATIONSHIP

Maja Ćwiek *(Corresponding Author, Email: maja.cwiek4@gmail.com)*
MD, Independent Public Complex of Health Care Facilities in Wyszków, Wyszków, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0009-2199-8555

ABSTRACT

The incorporation of artificial intelligence (AI) into ophthalmology represents a paradigm shift, not just technologically but socially, reshaping diagnostic processes and the core of the clinical encounter. This comprehensive review examines how AI technologies are transforming ophthalmic practice, focusing on their dual impact on clinical workflows and the fundamental nature of the patient-doctor relationship. Through analysis of current literature, we explore the applications of AI in diagnosing diabetic retinopathy, glaucoma, and age-related macular degeneration, where many systems demonstrate diagnostic accuracy rivaling experts. Crucially, we investigate the socio-technical dynamics of physician trust in AI, examining automation bias and the potential for deskilling. Patient perceptions and acceptance of AI-mediated care are analyzed, highlighting concerns about the preservation of human connection. The review concludes by discussing ethical considerations and proposing frameworks for the responsible integration of AI that leverages technological advancements to improve outcomes while preserving the core values of patient-centered care.

KEYWORDS

Artificial Intelligence, Ophthalmology, Clinical Decision-Making, Physician-Patient Relations, Algorithmic Bias, Trust, Ethics, Healthcare Technology

CITATION

Maja Ćwiek. (2025) The Algorithmic Gaze: A Review of How Artificial Intelligence in Ophthalmology Is Shaping Clinical Decision-Making and the Patient-Doctor Relationship. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science*. 3(47). doi: 10.31435/ijitss.3(47).2025.3772

1. Introduction

The emergence of artificial intelligence (AI) within medical science constitutes one of the most consequential developments in contemporary practice, with ophthalmology positioned at the forefront of its clinical application. The discipline's inherent dependence on retinal photography, optical coherence tomography (OCT), and other highly standardized imaging techniques provides an optimal substrate for AI algorithms, which excel in tasks of pattern identification and diagnostic categorization [1,2]. As these tools transition from research prototypes to components of clinical infrastructure, their implications extend beyond diagnostic precision to fundamentally alter the social dynamics that underpin patient-physician engagements.

The notion of the "algorithmic gaze" transcends the mere technological analysis of medical imagery; it embodies a shift in the production, validation, and application of clinical knowledge. This evolution prompts essential inquiries regarding authority, proficiency, and the allocation of influence within medical settings. With algorithms increasingly acting as intermediaries in clinical consultations, it is imperative to investigate their effect on the clinician-patient relationship, a bond historically founded on trust, dialogue, and collaborative decision-making [3,4].

This analysis investigates the multifaceted impact of AI on ophthalmic care, encompassing technological efficacy, clinician adoption, patient perspectives, and normative considerations. It assess whether AI integration yields superior clinical results and operational efficiency, or alternatively, introduces new complications such as automation bias (the excessive dependence on algorithmic suggestions) and the attrition of professional skills among practitioners [5]. Furthermore, it considers patient reactions to diagnoses mediated by AI and the capacity for inherently human qualities like empathy and compassion to endure amidst technological progression [3,4].

2. Methodology

This narrative review employed a systematic approach for the identification and examination of pertinent literature concerning artificial intelligence in ophthalmology, emphasizing its influence on clinical judgment and interpersonal dynamics in care. A search of PubMed/MEDLINE, Google Scholar, and other relevant databases was conducted for the period January 1, 2005, to March 31, 2025, to capture the accelerated advancement of AI in this domain [1]. The search protocol incorporated medical subject headings (MeSH terms) and keywords such as "artificial intelligence," "machine learning," "deep learning," "ophthalmology," "eye diseases," "clinical decision-making," "physician-patient relations," "trust," and "ethics."

Inclusion criteria covered studies of all designs (e.g., clinical trials, observational studies, validation studies, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses) focused on AI uses in ophthalmology and their consequences for diagnostic procedures, clinical operations, practitioner acceptance, patient views, or ethical issues. The review was restricted to publications in the English language. Exclusion criteria comprised studies not published in English, articles irrelevant to AI applications in vision health, and conference abstracts lacking complete text [1].

The analytical lens applied to the curated literature assessed three domains: technological attributes, human elements, and relational aspects. Technological evaluation included metrics of diagnostic power (sensitivity, specificity, AUC), designs of clinical validation studies, and models of integration. Human elements involved the calibration of physician trust, cognitive biases in AI utilization, and educational prerequisites. Relational aspects covered communication modalities, the safeguarding of empathy, and alterations in the power equilibrium within therapeutic relationships. Ethical issues were examined through the principles of autonomy, beneficence, nonmaleficence, and justice [3,8].

3. AI Algorithms in Ophthalmic Diagnosis

Ophthalmology has experienced substantial progress in the development of AI-driven systems for diagnostic purposes, especially for sight-impairing disorders like diabetic retinopathy (DR), glaucoma, age-related macular degeneration (AMD), and keratoconus. The proficiency of these systems has increased significantly, with many now showing accuracy levels that meet or surpass those of human specialists [1,2]. These advancements mark a considerable evolution in diagnostic models, from exclusive human interpretation to a synergistic human-AI partnership in evaluating ophthalmic images.

Within diabetic retinopathy screening, deep learning systems have attained notable sensitivity and specificity. For instance, the EyeArt system showed a sensitivity of 95.7% for referable DR, and the IDx-DR system attained sensitivities ranging from 87.0% to 97.5% alongside specificities of 93.9-98.5% [1]. These platforms process retinal fundus images to detect microaneurysms, hemorrhages, and other pathological indicators of DR, facilitating automated screening that could broaden care access, particularly in resource-limited areas [2]. In age-related macular degeneration, deep learning algorithms can forecast disease progression with an area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC) above 0.90, permitting earlier treatment and possibly improved visual prognosis [1].

The anterior segment has likewise seen benefits from AI, particularly in detecting keratoconus. AI algorithms processing Scheimpflug tomography and corneal biomechanical data have shown superior accuracy, with sensitivity and specificity rates above 98% and 99.6%, respectively, including the identification of subclinical forms potentially overlooked in standard examination [1]. These abilities facilitate earlier treatment and potentially improved visual results through prompt intervention. Regarding cataract surgery, machine learning-derived intraocular lens (IOL) calculation formulas, including the Kane and ZEISS AI formulas, have diminished refractive prediction errors, achieving mean absolute errors under 0.30 diopters [1].

Notwithstanding these robust technical achievements, incorporating AI into diagnostic pathways introduces notable difficulties. Dataset bias persists as a major constraint, as many algorithms are trained on data from particular demographic cohorts or imaging equipment, potentially limiting their applicability across diverse populations [1,6]. The opaque nature of complex AI models—the challenge in deciphering their decision-making processes—also creates issues of transparency and trustworthiness, especially when clinicians must justify diagnostic and therapeutic advice to patients [7]. Moreover, most current AI systems function as narrow experts concentrated on specific pathologies rather than delivering holistic ophthalmic evaluation, which could result in fragmented management if not adeptly incorporated into clinical practice [2,7].

4. Physian Trust and Interaction

The incorporation of AI into ophthalmic practice fundamentally alters clinical decision-making, establishing an intricate relationship between human acumen and algorithmic guidance. Evidence suggests that trust calibration among physicians—adjusting their reliance according to a system's demonstrated performance—is essential for productive human-AI collaboration [5]. Nevertheless, achieving this optimal calibration is challenging, encompassing tendencies for both excessive dependence and insufficient use of AI-generated advice.

Research utilizing eye-tracking technology offers revealing data on how ophthalmologists engage with AI assistance. In studies involving image interpretation, specialists employed AI support for roughly 25% of the total assessment time, typically initiating it midway through their evaluation [5]. This pattern implies that physicians utilize AI as a confirmatory mechanism rather than a primary diagnostic agent, preserving their independent clinical judgment while employing AI for verification. Analysis of gaze patterns indicated that with AI support, greater visual attention was allocated to interface components related to the AI, with increased shifting between the image and these elements [5]. This modification in attentional focus may suggest cognitive delegation, where physicians transfer some diagnostic responsibility to the algorithm, possibly impacting thorough image assessment.

The phenomenon of automation bias constitutes a substantial risk in AI-assisted ophthalmology, where clinicians might disproportionately value algorithmic suggestions despite conflicting clinical evidence or their own intuition [5]. This bias can result in diagnostic oversights when algorithms fail, as physicians may not exercise suitable skepticism. Conversely, algorithmic skepticism—the inclination to dismiss AI recommendations following encountered errors—can lead to the underuse of beneficial decision support [6]. Both patterns represent flawed trust calibration that may endanger diagnostic accuracy and patient safety.

The specialized nature of AI systems adds further complexity to physician trust. Ophthalmologists may display different trust levels based on the particular condition diagnosed and their own proficiency in that area [2]. For disorders where AI performance is exceptional (e.g., diabetic retinopathy screening), clinicians might develop greater trust compared to areas with moderate AI performance or greater clinical variability [1,2]. This differentiated trust calibration is actually appropriate but demands that clinicians maintain awareness of AI capacities and constraints across various clinical scenarios.

The interpretability of AI recommendations arises as a key factor affecting physician trust. Systems that offer not just conclusions but also supporting evidence and confidence measures promote appropriate trust and enable better-informed clinical choices [6,7]. Progress in explainable AI (XAI) methods that emphasize relevant image attributes or supply conceptual rationales for decisions helps connect algorithmic logic with clinical comprehension, potentially strengthening trust and enabling more effective collaboration between humans and AI [7].

5. Patient Perceptions and Acceptance

Patient receptiveness to AI in eye care is a decisive element for the successful adoption of these technologies. Investigations reveal a complex spectrum of perspectives characterized by guarded optimism alongside significant reservations about maintaining the human aspect of medical treatment. Studies show that while patients generally regard AI adoption in medicine favorably (53.18% rating it as positive or very positive), a mere 4.77% express negative views [3]. However, this general approval is subject to important qualifications that reflect nuanced perspectives on algorithmic healthcare.

A consistent result across studies is that patients exhibit a strong preference for AI systems to operate under physician oversight rather than autonomously. In one study, respondents strongly agreed that "AI must be controlled by a physician" and that final accountability for diagnosis and treatment should rest with human

doctors [3]. This preference for supervised AI reflects demands for accountability and the acknowledgment that medical decision-making encompasses more than data pattern recognition—it requires contextual interpretation, compassion, and holistic integration of patient values and situations [3,4].

The potential for AI to diminish personalized care surfaces as a major concern among patients. Qualitative studies identify apprehension about losing the 'human touch' associated with physicians as a recurring theme. Patients prize the empathetic and relational components of healthcare that existing AI systems cannot replicate, indicating that the most acceptable implementation would supplement rather than substitute human clinicians [3,4]. This viewpoint aligns with conceptualizing AI as an instrument that augments physician abilities, thereby maintaining the therapeutic alliance that patients value.

Demographic variables considerably affect attitudes toward AI in eye care. Older patients, women, individuals with less formal education, and those with lower technological comfort typically exhibit more cautious attitudes toward healthcare AI [3]. These findings indicate potential differences in acceptance and access that need addressing to guarantee equitable deployment of AI technologies. Additionally, patients with more complex or severe conditions often express a stronger preference for human expertise, while those undergoing routine screening or monitoring may be more receptive to AI-mediated services [4].

Trust in AI recommendations seems to be context-specific. Patients show greater acceptance of AI for administrative functions (84.2% comfortable with scheduling applications) than for diagnostic or therapeutic choices [4]. This acceptance gradient indicates that patients make refined judgments about suitable roles for AI in healthcare, with comfort levels diminishing as tasks grow more complex and personally consequential [3,4]. Notably, decision self-efficacy—an individual's belief in their capability to make informed health choices—correlates with increased comfort with AI, suggesting that empowered patients may be more amenable to AI integration [4].

Transparency and explainability are critical factors for patient acceptance. Patients desire comprehension of how AI systems formulate recommendations and what data they utilize [4,7]. Concerns about data security and potential algorithmic biases significantly affect trust levels, with patients expressing anxiety about commercial interests behind AI development and potential mishandling of health information [3,4]. These results emphasize the importance of clear policies regarding data usage, algorithm training, and accountability structures to foster patient trust in AI-assisted eye care.

6. Communication and Ethical Models

The integration of AI into ophthalmology requires the adaptation of clinical communication models and ethical structures that respond to the distinctive challenges presented by algorithmic medicine. Conventional patient-doctor interactions must evolve to facilitate discussions about AI-generated results, algorithmic uncertainty, and the distinct roles of humans and machines in diagnostic and treatment processes [3,8]. This evolution demands new communicative skills and ethical reflections particular to AI-mediated care.

Informed consent procedures must broaden to include AI disclosure, clarifying how algorithms contribute to care decisions and what limitations they possess. Patients possess a right to know about AI involvement in their diagnosis and treatment, including potential risks related to algorithmic inaccuracies or data privacy issues [3]. This transparency extends to elucidating the evidence foundation for AI recommendations, the training data for algorithms, and the confidence levels associated with specific findings [8,7]. Effective communication about AI necessitates balancing technical precision with comprehensibility, ensuring patients grasp enough to make informed choices without being inundated with computational specifics.

The accountability structure becomes more complicated with AI integration, raising liability questions when algorithms make mistakes. Current ethical frameworks stress that physicians maintain ultimate responsibility for diagnostic and therapeutic decisions, framing AI as a clinical instrument rather than an autonomous agent [3,8]. This responsibility assignment creates an obligation for clinicians to sustain suitable oversight and comprehension of AI recommendations, avoiding uncritical acceptance of algorithmic outputs without clinical correlation [6,8]. Establishing precise guidelines for when and how to challenge AI recommendations is a vital element of ethical AI implementation.

The potential for algorithmic bias presents significant ethical challenges that must be confronted through technical and regulatory strategies. If AI systems are trained on non-representative data, they may underperform for demographic minorities or patients with uncommon conditions, worsening existing health inequities [6,8]. Reducing this risk necessitates diverse training datasets, rigorous testing across population

segments, and continuous surveillance for biased outcomes [8,7]. Ethical AI implementation must prioritize equity as a core value, ensuring these technologies lessen rather than intensify health disparities.

The preservation of humanistic principles in AI-mediated eye care represents a crucial ethical consideration. Medicine has historically valued empathy, compassion, and the therapeutic relationship as indispensable components of healing [3,4]. As algorithms assume more diagnostic functions, clinicians must deliberately maintain and highlight these human elements, ensuring that efficiency improvements from AI do not occur at the cost of patient-centered care [4,8]. This may necessitate reengineering clinical workflows to reclaim physician time for communication and emotional support while AI manages more technical duties.

Novel ethical frameworks specifically addressing AI in healthcare are emerging to guide implementation. Principles such as justice, transparency, accountability, and inclusivity constitute the foundation of these frameworks [8,7]. Institutions have developed ethical AI guidelines that advocate for suitable professional oversight, bias reduction tactics, and ongoing monitoring to ensure systems continue to be fair and effective [8]. These frameworks emphasize that AI should enhance rather than supplant human expertise, maintaining the "human in the loop" to provide supervision and contextual understanding [8].

7. Future Directions and Recommendations

The rapid evolution of AI in ophthalmology demands proactive approaches to maximize benefits while addressing ethical, relational, and practical challenges. Based on current evidence and trends, we identify several key directions for future development and implementation of AI technologies in eye care.

First, the development of more explainable AI systems represents a priority for enhancing trust and usability. Black-box algorithms that provide recommendations without transparent reasoning create barriers to appropriate trust calibration and clinical integration [6,7]. Innovations in explainable AI methods that highlight pertinent image features, supply confidence metrics, and furnish conceptual rationales for decisions will enable more productive human-AI partnership [5,7]. These developments should engage clinicians in the design process to ensure explanations match clinical reasoning patterns and information requirements.

Second, adaptive trust calibration mechanisms should be embedded into AI systems to reduce both overreliance and underutilization. These mechanisms could include confidence indicators, uncertainty measures, and just-in-time education about system capabilities and limitations [5,6]. Systems might also integrate continuous feedback loops where clinician corrections enhance algorithm performance progressively, establishing a cooperative learning dynamic between humans and algorithms [7].

Third, medical education must advance to prepare ophthalmologists for practice within an AI-influenced environment. Training should incorporate critical appraisal of AI recommendations, understanding of algorithmic constraints, and skills for discussing AI-assisted care with patients [6,8]. Ophthalmology trainees require exposure to AI systems during their education to cultivate appropriate usage patterns and trust calibration [5]. Continuing education for practicing clinicians should address evolving AI capabilities and integration methods.

Fourth, regulatory structures must equilibrium innovation with safety, ensuring rigorous validation while accommodating the iterative improvement inherent to AI systems [6,7]. Regulatory approaches should mandate diverse validation datasets representative of the populations who will use the systems clinically [8,7]. Post-market surveillance systems should track real-world performance and identify performance decay or emerging biases over time [7].

Fifth, implementation plans should emphasize equitable availability of AI-enhanced eye care. This requires addressing both technical barriers (like dataset diversity) and structural barriers (such as resource constraints in underserved regions) [1,8]. Mobile AI applications and telehealth integration represent promising approaches for expanding access to specialty eye care in remote or resource-limited settings [1,2].

Finally, patient involvement in AI development and implementation ensures these technologies align with patient priorities and concerns. Participatory design approaches that include patients as partners in creating AI systems can help synchronize technological capabilities with patient values and preferences [4,7]. Clear communication strategies regarding AI's role in care and its limitations will help manage patient expectations and cultivate appropriate trust [4].

8. Conclusions

The incorporation of artificial intelligence into ophthalmology marks a transformative change in how eye care is delivered, diagnosed, and managed. The "algorithmic gaze" introduces unprecedented capacities for pattern recognition and diagnostic precision, with AI systems now achieving parity with or exceeding human performance for specific ophthalmic conditions. However, this technological progression also fundamentally reshapes clinical decision-making processes and the clinician-patient relationship, generating both opportunities and challenges that require thoughtful management.

The effective implementation of AI in ophthalmology depends on appropriate trust calibration by clinicians, who must navigate between the risks of overreliance and algorithmic skepticism. This balance requires new competencies in critical assessment of AI recommendations and comprehension of algorithmic limitations. Concurrently, patients generally accept AI as an instrument to augment rather than replace physician expertise, strongly preferring that humans retain authority over medical decisions. Safeguarding the human connection in medicine emerges as a vital value that must be protected as algorithms undertake more technical functions.

Ethical implementation of AI demands attention to transparency, accountability, and equity. Patients deserve clarity on how AI contributes to their care, where responsibility lies for decisions, and how potential biases are addressed. The advancement of explainable AI systems and comprehensive regulatory frameworks will help meet these ethical requirements while encouraging innovation.

Looking ahead, the most promising approach involves human-AI collaboration that utilizes the complementary strengths of human and artificial intelligence. Algorithms excel at processing vast data volumes and detecting subtle patterns, while humans provide contextual understanding, empathy, and complex judgment. By designing systems that intelligently integrate these capabilities, we can improve both the technical standard and human experience of eye care, potentially widening access to specialty expertise while preserving the therapeutic relationship that remains central to healing.

The algorithmic gaze in ophthalmology constitutes more than a novel diagnostic tool; it reflects a broader shift in medical epistemology and practice. By approaching this transformation with careful consideration of technological capabilities, human factors, and ethical values, we can utilize AI's potential to advance eye care while conserving what patients value most in the healing relationship.

REFERENCES

1. Grzybowski A, et al. (2025) Artificial intelligence in ophthalmology. Ophthalmology Review. 14(1):255–272. doi: 10.51329/mehdiophthal1517. PMID: 38805604, PMCID: PMC12121673
2. Gunasekeran DV, et al. (2023) Artificial intelligence in ophthalmology: The path to the real-world clinic. *Cell Reports Medicine*. PMID: 37563226, PMCID: PMC10394169
3. Karaca O, et al. (2022) Attitudes and perception of artificial intelligence in healthcare: A cross-sectional survey among patients. Digital Health. PMID: 35982856, PMCID: PMC9380417
4. Bohr A, Memarzadeh K. (2022) Ethical Issues of Artificial Intelligence in Medicine and Healthcare. Insights into Imaging. PMID: 35140613, PMCID: PMC8826344.
5. Ting DSW, et al. (2024) The present and future of AI in ophthalmology. Ophthalmology. PMID: 38677446, PMCID: PMC11109690.
6. Zhao AY, et al. (2024) Expert gaze as a usability indicator of medical AI decision support systems. NPJ Digit Med*. 7:199. PMID: 39105921.
7. Li JO, et al. (2023) AI in ophthalmology: a guide for clinicians. Eye (Lond). PMID: 37349560, PMCID: PMC10354260.
8. Bjerring JC, Busch J. (2024) Public perceptions of artificial intelligence in healthcare: ethical concerns and opportunities for patient-centered care. BMC Medical Ethics. 25:74. PMID: 38909180, PMCID: PMC11193174.
9. Stai B, et al. (2023) Ethical challenges of artificial intelligence in health care: a narrative review. Chin Med J (Engl). PMID: 37972956, PMCID: PMC10678031.
10. Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health. (2025) 2025 Watch List: Artificial Intelligence in Health Care: Health Technologies [Internet]. Ottawa (ON): CADTH; 2025 Mar. Report No.: ER0015. PMID: 40294189, Bookshelf ID: NBK613808.