

1 **Medical students' perceptions towards artificial** 2 **intelligence in education and practice: A multinational,** 3 **multicenter cross-sectional study**

4
5 Felix Busch^{1*}, Lena Hoffmann¹, Daniel Truhn², Esteban Ortiz-Prado³, Marcus R. Makowski⁴,
6 Keno K. Bresse^{1,5¶}, Lisa C. Adams^{4¶}, on behalf of the COMFORT Consortium[^]

7
8 ¹ Department of Radiology, Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Corporate Member of Freie
9 Universität Berlin and Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, Berlin, Germany

10 ² Department of Diagnostic and Interventional Radiology, University Hospital Aachen,
11 Aachen, Germany

12 ³ One Health Research Group, Universidad de Las Américas, Quito, Ecuador

13 ⁴ Department of Radiology, Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany

14 ⁵ Berlin Institute of Health at Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Berlin, Germany

15
16 * Corresponding author

17 E-mail: felix.busch@charite.de (FB)

18
19 ¶ KKB and LCA contributed equally to this work and are joint senior authors.

20
21 ^ Membership of the COMFORT Consortium is provided in the Acknowledgements.

22
NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

23 **Abstract**

24 **Background**

25 Artificial intelligence (AI) is anticipated to fundamentally change the educational and
26 professional landscape for the next generation of physicians, but its successful integration
27 depends on the global perspectives of all stakeholders. Previous medical student surveys were
28 limited by small sample sizes or geographic constraints, hindering a global comparison of
29 perceptions. This study aims to explore current medical students' attitudes towards AI in
30 medical education and the profession on a broad, international scale and to examine regional
31 differences in perspectives.

32 **Methods and Findings**


33 This international multicenter cross-sectional study developed and validated an
34 anonymous online survey of 15 multiple-choice items to assess medical, dentistry, and
35 veterinary students' AI knowledge and attitudes toward the utilization of AI in healthcare, the
36 current state of AI education, and regional differences in perspectives. Between April and
37 October 2023, 4,313 medical, 205 dentistry, and 78 veterinary students from 192 faculties in
38 48 countries responded to the survey (average response rate: 0.2%, standard deviation: 0.4%).
39 Most participants studied in European countries (N=2,350), followed by North/South
40 America (N=1,070) and Asia (N=944). Students expressed predominantly positive attitudes
41 towards the use of AI in healthcare (67.6%, N=3,091) and the desire for more AI teaching in
42 their curricula (76.1%, N=3,474). However, they reported limited general knowledge of AI
43 (75.3%, N=3,451), the absence of AI-related courses (76.3%, N=3,497), and felt inadequately
44 prepared to use AI in their future careers (57.9%, N=2,652). The subgroup analyses revealed
45 regional differences in perceptions, although predominantly with small effect sizes. The main
46 limitations include the low response rate per institution, which was calculated on total
47 enrollment across all degree programs, and the risk of selection bias.

48 Conclusions

49 This study highlights the favorable perceptions of international medical students
50 towards incorporating AI in healthcare practice while emphasizing the importance of
51 integrating AI teaching into medical education.

52

53 Graphical abstract



54

55 **Introduction**

56 The popularity of artificial intelligence (AI) in healthcare has exponentially risen in
57 recent years, attracting the attention of professionals and students alike [1, 2]. With the debut
58 of OpenAI's Chat Generative Pre-trained Transformer (ChatGPT) in November 2022, a large
59 language model (LLM)-based chatbot with human-like conversational capabilities, this
60 development has gained further momentum [3, 4]. Although not primarily trained with
61 medical data, ChatGPT-3.5 was barely able to pass the United States Medical Licensing
62 Examination (USMLE), while its successor, GPT-4, surpassed it substantially with a zero
63 short accuracy of 84.3% [5]. Specialized medical LLMs, such as Google's MedPaLM-2, have
64 advanced the field even further, achieving over 85% accuracy on the MedQA dataset of
65 USMLE-like questions and being the first model to pass the MedMCQA dataset, which
66 includes medical exam questions from the All India Institute for Medical Sciences and the
67 National Eligibility cum Entrance Test [6].

68 Similarly, specialized machine learning models have demonstrated their potential in
69 clinical applications, achieving expert-level results in areas such as breast cancer screening,
70 pathology detection on chest radiographs, or high accuracy in predicting survival and
71 treatment response [7-10].

72 Given the range and capabilities of potential applications in medicine, the integration
73 of AI into the medical curriculum holds promise, for example, by supporting the teaching of
74 medical students through explaining medical terminology, answering medical questions,
75 creating intelligent learning plans, providing real-time automated feedback, curating data, or
76 simulating patient conversations [11-14]. In addition, teaching AI in medicine may ensure
77 that medical students are familiar with the AI tools and technologies they will inevitably
78 encounter in their professional lives [15, 16].

79 On the other hand, the introduction of medical AI into clinical routine and medical
80 education poses new challenges, such as ensuring patient and user autonomy, beneficence,
81 non-maleficence, and justice according to the core biomedical ethical principles [11, 17, 18].
82 Therefore, especially in a field as critical as medicine, where vital measures can be taught and
83 sensible data is handled, it is essential to include education about both the benefits and risks
84 of AI already in the medical curriculum, preparing students for its qualified and responsible
85 use from their career's onset [19-21].

86 While previous studies have partially explored the attitudes of healthcare students
87 towards AI, reporting positive views and a desire for its inclusion in the curriculum, they have
88 been primarily limited by their small sample size, restricted scope, or geographic specificity,
89 precluding a comprehensive international comparison of perceptions [22]. To address these
90 limitations, the present study is an international, multicenter effort to conduct an online
91 survey to assess and compare the perspectives of medical, dental, and veterinary students
92 regarding: 1) their technological literacy and understanding of informatics and AI, 2) the
93 current state of AI in their respective curricula and preferences for AI education, and 3) their
94 attitudes toward the role of AI in their respective fields. In addition, the study seeks to explore
95 regional differences in perspectives.

96

97 **Methods**

98 This multicenter cross-sectional study was conducted in accordance with the STROBE
99 statement and received ethical approval from the Institutional Review Board at Charité –
100 University Medicine Berlin (EA4/213/22), serving as the principal institution, in compliance
101 with the Declaration of Helsinki and its later amendments. To ensure participant anonymity,
102 the necessity for informed consent was waived.

103

104 **Instrument development and design**

105 Following the Association for Medical Education In Europe (AMEE) Guide, this
106 study aimed to develop an anonymous online survey to assess: 1) the technological literacy
107 and knowledge of informatics and AI, 2) the current state of AI in their respective curricula
108 and preferences for AI education, and 3) the perspectives towards AI in the medical
109 profession among international medicine, dentistry, and veterinary medicine students [23]. To
110 inform instrument development, a literature review of existing publications on the attitudes of
111 medical students towards AI in medicine was independently performed by four reviewers
112 (FB, LH, KKB, LCA), leveraging MEDLINE, Scopus, and Google Scholar databases in
113 December 2022. Studies were selected for review based on the following criteria: 1) the
114 publications were original research articles, 2) the scope aligned with our research objectives
115 and targeted medical students, 3) the survey was conducted in English language, 4) the items
116 were publicly accessible, 5) the measurement of perspectives towards AI was not restricted to
117 a particular medical subfield. Following these criteria, five articles comprising a total of 96
118 items were identified as relevant to the research scope [24-28]. After a consensus-based
119 discussion, items that did not match our research objectives or overlapped in content were
120 excluded, resulting in 23 remaining items. These items were subsequently tailored to fit the
121 context of medical education and the medical profession.

122 A review cycle was undertaken with a focus group of medical AI researchers and
123 students, as well as an expert panel including physicians, medical faculty members and
124 educators, AI researchers and developers, and biomedical statisticians (FB, LH, DT, MRM,
125 KKB, LCA, AB, RC, GDV, AH, LJ, AL, PS, LX). The finalized survey consisted of 16
126 multiple-choice items, eight demographic queries, and one free-field comment section. These
127 items were further refined based on content-based domain samples, and responses were
128 standardized using a four- or five-point Likert scale where applicable.

129 The preliminary assessment was conducted through cognitive interviews with ten
130 medical students at Charité – University Medicine Berlin to evaluate the scale's
131 comprehensiveness and overall length. The feedback resulted in two rewordings and one item
132 removal, finalizing the survey with 15 multiple-choice items and eight demographic queries
133 supported by one free-field comment section.

134 Using REDCap (Research Electronic Data Capture) hosted at Charité – University
135 Medicine Berlin, the English survey was subsequently disseminated through the medical
136 student newsletter at Charité and deactivated after receiving responses from 50 medical
137 students who served as the pilot study group and were not included in the final participant
138 pool [29, 30]. After psychometric validation, participating sites distributed the REDCap
139 online survey among medical, dental, and veterinary students at their faculty. Due to the large
140 number of Spanish-speaking sites, a separate Spanish online version of the survey was
141 employed using paired forward and backward translation with reconciliation by two bilingual
142 medical professionals (LG, JSPO). Depending on their faculty location, participating sites
143 distributed either the English or Spanish online survey via their faculty newsletters and
144 courses using a QR code or the direct website link. The survey was available for participation
145 from April to October 2023.

146

147 **Inclusion and exclusion criteria**

148 Inclusion criteria consisted of students at least 18 years of age, actively enrolled in a
149 (human) medicine, dentistry, or veterinary medicine degree program, who responded to the
150 survey during its open period and were proficient in either English or Spanish, depending on
151 their faculty location. Students from unrelated degree programs, postgraduates, respondents
152 who did not indicate information about their course, and respondents who started the survey
153 but did not answer any multiple-choice items were excluded from the analysis. Partial missing
154 responses to survey items resulted in exclusion from each subanalysis.

155

156 **Statistical analysis**

157 Statistical analyses were performed with SPSS Statistics 25 (version 28.0.1.0) and R
158 (version 4.2.1), using the "tidyverse", "rnatualearth", and "sf" packages [31-34]. The
159 Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to test for normal distribution. Categorical and ordinal
160 data were reported as frequencies with percentages. Medians and interquartile ranges (IQR)
161 were reported for non-parametric continuous data. Variances were reported for items in Likert
162 scale format. The response rate was derived from the overall student enrollment numbers at
163 each faculty according to the faculty websites or the Times Higher Education World
164 University Rankings 2024 due to the unavailability of official data on enrolled medical,
165 dentistry, or veterinary students. In the pilot study group, item reliability was measured using
166 Cronbach's alpha, with values above 0.7 interpreted as acceptable internal consistency.
167 Explanatory factor analysis was used to examine the structure and subscales of the instrument,
168 using an eigenvalue cutoff of 1 for item extraction. Items with factor loadings of 0.4 or higher
169 were retained. Data suitability for structural evaluation was assessed using the Kaiser-Meyer-
170 Olkin measure and Bartlett's test of sphericity. For geographical subgroup analysis,
171 respondents were categorized based on their faculty location (Global North versus Global
172 South) according to the United Nations' Finance Center for South-South Cooperation [35].
173 Additionally, participants were grouped into continents based on the United Nations
174 geoscheme [36]. Due to the substantial number of European participants, students in
175 North/West and South/East Europe were analyzed separately. Further subgroup analyses
176 based on gender, age, academic year, technological literacy, self-reported AI knowledge, and
177 previous curricular AI events can be found in the supporting information. The Mann-Whitney
178 U-test was employed for subgroup analyses of two independent non-parametric samples. For
179 continental comparison, the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance and Dunn-
180 Bonferroni post hoc test were performed. To estimate effect size, we calculated r , with 0.5

181 indicating a large effect, 0.3 a medium effect, and 0.1 a small effect [37]. An asymptotic two-
182 sided p-value below 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

183

184 **Results**

185 **Pilot study**


186 The median age of the pilot study group was 24 years (IQR: 21-26 years). 58% of
187 participants identified as female (N=29), 38% as male (N=19), and 4% (N=2) did not report
188 their gender. The median current academic year was 2 (IQR: 2-4 years) out of 6 total
189 academic years. Internal consistency for our scale's dimensions ranged from acceptable to
190 good, as indicated by Cronbach's alpha. The section on "Technological literacy and
191 knowledge of informatics and AI" registered an alpha of 0.718, while the section "Current
192 state of AI in the curriculum and preferences for AI education" scored an alpha of 0.726, both
193 displaying acceptable internal consistency. A Cronbach's alpha value of 0.825 for the
194 "Perspectives towards AI in the medical profession" section denoted good internal
195 consistency. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure for sampling adequacy was 0.801, confirming
196 the sample's representational validity. Bartlett's test of sphericity returned a p-value of less
197 than 0.001, validating the chosen method for factor analysis. Factor analysis yielded a
198 structure comprising 15 items across three dimensions, collectively explaining 54% of the
199 total variance. Factor loadings for individual items ranged from 0.495 for "Which of these
200 technical devices do you use at least once a week?" to 0.888 for "What is your general attitude
201 toward the application of artificial intelligence (AI) in medicine?".

202

203 **Study cohort**

204 Between the first of April and the first of October 2023, 4,900 responses were
205 recorded, of which 4,345 (88.7%) were collected via the English survey and 555 (11.3%) via

206 the Spanish survey version. Of these, 283 (5.8%) respondents reported degrees other than
207 medicine, dentistry, or veterinary medicine or indicated that they had completed their studies,
208 while 21 (0.4%) did not respond to any multiple-choice item or did not indicate their degree.
209 The final study cohort comprised 4,596 participants from 192 faculty and 48 countries, of
210 whom 4,313 (93.8%) were medical, 205 (4.5%) dentistry, and 78 (1.7%) veterinary medicine
211 students. Of 5,575,307 enrolled students from all degrees at the 183 (95.3%) participating
212 faculties in which the total enrollment number was publicly available, the survey achieved an
213 average response rate of 0.2% (standard deviation: 0.4%). Most respondents studied in
214 Southern/Eastern European (N=1,240, 27.0%) countries, followed by Northern/Western
215 Europe (N=1,110, 24.2%), Asia (N=944, 20.5%), South America (N=555, 12.1%), North
216 America (N=515, 11.2%), Africa (N=125, 2.7%), and Australia (N=104, 2.3%). Please refer
217 to Fig 1 to view the distribution of participating institutions in relation to the number of
218 participants on a world map. A detailed list of survey participants divided by country, faculty,
219 city, degree, number of enrolled students, and response rate is provided in the supplemental
220 material (S1 Table). The median age of the study population was 22 years (IQR: 20-24 years).
221 56.6% of the participants were female (N=2,600) and 42.4% male (N=1,946), with a median
222 academic year of 3 (IQR: 2-5 years). Full descriptive data, including items on technological
223 literacy and preferences for AI teaching in the medical curriculum, are displayed in Table 1.
224 Any free field comments of the survey participants are listed in the supplements (S2 Table),
225 with selected comments highlighted in Fig 2.



226

227 **Fig 1. The world map displays the geographical distribution of participating institutions**

228 **(blue dots) in relation to the number of respondents per institution.**

229 **Table 1. Descriptive data of the study population and results of the questions about tech-**
230 **savviness and topic preferences for AI teaching in the medical curriculum.**

Item	Value
Gender (N=4,594)	N (%)
Female	2,600 (56.6)
Male	1,946 (42.4)
Diverse	25 (0.5)
Prefer not to disclose	23 (0.5)
Age (N=4,571)	Years, median (IQR)
	22 (20-24)
Current academic year (N=4,473)	Years, median (IQR)
	3 (2-5)
Total academic years (N=4,315)	Years, median (IQR)
	6 (6-6)
Which of these technical devices do you use at least once a week? (N=4,596)	N (%)
Smartphone	4,406 (95.9)
PC/laptop	4,020 (87.5)
Game console (e.g., PlayStation, Switch)	511 (11.1)
Tablet (e.g., iPad)	2,172 (47.3)
E-reader	325 (7.1)
Smartwatch	1,033 (22.5)
None	9 (0.0)
Have you already programmed code? (N=4,585 ^a)	N (%)
Yes	912 (19.9)
C	85 (1.9)
C++	155 (3.4)
C#	37 (0.8)
CSS	32 (0.7)
HTML	107 (2.3)
Java	166 (3.6)
JavaScript	91 (2.0)
MATLAB	35 (0.8)
Pascal	17 (0.4)
PHP	24 (0.5)
Python	382 (8.3)
R	284 (6.2)
SQL	11 (0.2)
Visual Basic	14 (0.3)
No	3,673 (80.1)
What would you like to learn about artificial intelligence (AI) as part of your medical curriculum? (N=4,596)	N (%)
Theory and background (e.g., mathematical basics)	1,549 (33.7)
Practical skills (e.g., learning programming languages; solving medical problems with AI)	3,515 (76.5)
History and development	827 (18.0)
Legal and ethical aspects	2,518 (54.8)
Future perspectives of AI in medicine	3,278 (71.3)
No preference	162 (3.5)
None	12 (0.3)

231 ^a To enhance data presentation, programming languages with a sample size of fewer than 10

232 respondents were omitted.

233 IQR, interquartile range.



AI is on the rise, without a doubt. What worries me is that our empathy and focus on the patient is currently getting worse - we are understaffed and are so busy with other things that patient care is often secondary. I am worried that with AI doing a certain part of our job, such as triage, we will lose even more patient contact and that everything will be dehumanized - like a factory! [...]

A medical student from Switzerland.

My problem with quality healthcare in Africa, particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa, is that it's too expensive, and it's only affordable by the elites, leaving the poor masses almost completely out. Won't AI be for just the rich?

A medical student from Nigeria.



[...] Would our 10-year training have that much value, or would it be easy to replace a doctor with some two-month trained personnel as the accuracy of the programs increases? I feel we, as students, are confused about our future role when AI is introduced.

A medical student from India.

Even though AI seems scary in some ways, we cannot withdraw developments that have already happened. Thus, we must know about its drawbacks as much as about its benefits. [...]

A medical student from Germany.



AI should be a tool as much as a stethoscope is a tool in medicine. It should guide diagnosis and management without ever making the final call. A stethoscope never makes the diagnosis of a heart murmur; neither should AI. It is important that a human remains the final decision maker, as it is impossible to hold a machine accountable.

A medical student from Canada.

AI should be seen as a tool and not a substitute for physicians. In the end, it will be a human doctor to make a decision. You can never remove the human aspect of medicine.

A medical student from Portugal.



234

235 **Fig 2. Diverse perspectives from medical students on the integration of artificial**
236 **intelligence (AI) in healthcare education and practice.** The selected quotes reflect a range
237 of sentiments, from concerns about dehumanization and potential challenges in low-resource
238 settings to viewing AI as a beneficial tool that complements rather than replaces the human
239 touch in medicine.

240 **Collective perceptions towards artificial intelligence**

241 Table 2 displays the survey results for Likert scale items. Students generally reported a
242 rather or extremely positive attitude towards the application of AI in medicine (3,091, 67.6%).
243 The highest positive attitude towards AI in the medical profession was recorded for the item
244 "How do you estimate the effect of artificial intelligence (AI) on the efficiency of healthcare
245 processes in the next 10 years?" with 4,042 respondents (88.4%) estimating a moderate or
246 great improvement. Contrarily, 3,171 students (69.4%) rather or completely agreed with the
247 item "The use of artificial intelligence (AI) in medicine will increasingly lead to legal and
248 ethical conflicts.". Regarding AI education and knowledge, 3,451 students (75.3%) reported
249 no or little knowledge of AI, and 3,474 (76.1%) rather or completely agreed that they would
250 like to have more teaching on AI in medicine as part of their curricula. On the other hand,
251 3,497 (76.3%) students responded that they did not have any curricular events on AI as part of
252 their degree, as illustrated on the country level in Fig 3. Variability in responses was
253 observed, ranging from 0.279 for the item "How would you rate your general knowledge of
254 artificial intelligence (AI)?" —measured on a four-point Likert scale— to 1.372 for "With my
255 current knowledge, I feel sufficiently prepared to work with artificial intelligence (AI) in my
256 future profession as a physician.". Notably, the items capturing the trade-offs in medical AI
257 diagnostics revealed that most students preferred AI explainability (N=3,659, 80.2%) over a
258 higher accuracy (N=902, 19.8%) and higher sensitivity (N=2,906, 63.9%) over higher
259 specificity (N=1,118, 24.6%) or equal sensitivity/specificity (N=524, 11.5%), as visualized in
260 Fig 4.

261 **Table 2. Survey results of Likert scale format items on attitudes towards the medical degree, AI in the medical profession, AI education and**
 262 **knowledge, and results of the regional comparisons.**

Item	Total responses					Variance	Regional comparison Global North/Global South			
	Completely disagree/ Extremely negative/ Great deterioration N (%)	Rather disagree/ Rather negative/ Moderate deterioration N (%)	Neutral/No effect N (%)	Rather agree/ Rather positive/ Moderate improvement N (%)	Completely agree/ Extremely positive/ Great improvement N (%)		Global North Median (IQR)	Global South Median (IQR)	P-value ^a	r
Attitude towards medical studies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
What is your current general attitude toward your medical studies?	48 (1.0)	216 (4.7)	899 (19.6)	2,597 (56.7)	819 (17.9)	0.638	N=3,162 4 (4-4)	N=1,417 4 (3-4)	<.001	.095
Perspectives towards AI in the medical profession	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
What is your general attitude toward the application of artificial intelligence (AI) in medicine?	60 (1.3)	307 (6.7)	1,118 (24.4)	2,286 (50.0)	805 (17.6)	0.748	N=3,164 4 (3-4)	N=1,412 4 (3-4)	.707	.006
How do you estimate the effect of artificial intelligence (AI) on the efficiency of healthcare processes in the next 10 years?	48 (1.1)	194 (4.2)	286 (6.3)	2,687 (58.8)	1,355 (29.6)	0.610	N=3,155 4 (4-5)	N=1,415 4 (4-5)	<.001	.061
The use of artificial intelligence (AI) in medicine will increasingly lead to legal and ethical conflicts.	73 (1.6)	370 (8.1)	961 (21.0)	1,869 (40.9)	1,302 (28.5)	0.944	N=3,159 4 (3-5)	N=1,416 4 (3-4)	<.001	.185
What is your view on the influence of artificial intelligence (AI) on the profession of physicians? AI will affect the everyday life of physicians in a way that is...	50 (1.1)	323 (7.1)	1,027 (22.5)	2,676 (58.5)	495 (10.8)	0.630	N=3,157 4 (3-4)	N=1,414 4 (3-4)	.002	.046
How would you rate artificial intelligence (AI) software being available to physicians as a second opinion on medical issues?	89 (1.9)	428 (9.4)	1,026 (22.5)	2,281 (50.0)	741 (16.2)	0.842	N=3,155 4 (3-4)	N=1,410 4 (3-4)	.019	.035
I think working with artificial intelligence (AI) as a physician is necessary to stay competitive.	135 (3.0)	523 (11.4)	1,115 (24.4)	1,988 (43.4)	815 (17.8)	0.998	N=3,160 4 (3-4)	N=1,416 4 (3-4)	<.001	.049
With my current knowledge, I feel sufficiently prepared to work with artificial intelligence (AI) in my future profession as a physician.	1,003 (21.9)	1,649 (36.0)	910 (19.9)	740 (16.2)	275 (6.0)	1.372	N=3,161 2 (1-3)	N=1,416 3 (2-4)	<.001	.162
AI education and knowledge level	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
I would like to have more teaching on artificial intelligence (AI) in medicine as part of my studies. (N=4,565)	86 (1.9)	191 (4.2)	814 (17.8)	2,033 (44.5)	1,441 (31.6)	0.831	N=3,155 4 (4-5)	N=1,410 4 (3-5)	.107	.024
As part of my studies, there are curricular events on artificial intelligence (AI) in medicine. (N=4,581)	No N (%)	Yes; 1-5 hours in total N (%)	Yes; >5-10 hours in total N (%)	Yes; >10-20 hours in total N (%)	Yes; >20 hours in total N (%)	-	-	-	-	-
	3,497 (76.3)	820 (17.9)	178 (3.9)	48 (1.0)	38 (0.8)	0.458	N=3,165 1 (1-1)	N=1,416 1 (1-2)	<.001	.090
How would you rate your general knowledge of artificial intelligence (AI)? (N=4,585)	No knowledge (never heard of AI) N (%)	Little knowledge (e.g., documentary seen on TV) N (%)	Good knowledge (e.g., read several journal articles on AI) N (%)	Expert (e.g., involved in AI research/development) N (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	170 (3.7)	3,281 (71.6)	1,064 (23.2)	70 (1.5)	-	0.279	N=3,167 2 (2-3)	N=1,418 2 (2-2)	<.001	.025

263


264 **Table 2. (Continued)**

Item	Regional comparison continental							P-value ^b	Significant differences in Dunn-Bonferroni post hoc analysis 1, North/Western Europe; 2, South/Eastern Europe; 3, Asia; 4, North America; 5, South America; 6, Africa; 7, Australia
	North/Western Europe Median (IQR)	South/Eastern Europe Median (IQR)	Asia Median (IQR)	North America Median (IQR)	South America Median (IQR)	Africa Median (IQR)	Australia Median (IQR)		
Attitude towards medical studies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
What is your current general attitude toward your medical studies?	N=1,108 4 (4-4)	N=1,230 4 (4-4)	N=941 4 (3-4)	N=514 4 (4-4)	N=555 4 (3-4)	N=124 4 (4-5)	N=104 4 (4-4)	<.001	1-4 (p=.034; r=.078); 2-3 (p=.021; r=.071); 3-4 (p<.001; r=.132); 3-6 (p=.014; r=.104); 4-5 (p=.002; r=.121)
Perspectives towards AI in the medical profession	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
What is your general attitude toward the application of artificial intelligence (AI) in medicine?	N=1,109 4 (3-4)	N=1,231 4 (3-4)	N=937 4 (3-4)	N=514 4 (3-4)	N=554 4 (4-4)	N=124 4 (3-4)	N=104 4 (3-4)	<.001	1-5 (p=.004; r=.091); 1-7 (p=.038; r=.090); 2-5 (p<.001; r=.104); 3-5 (p<.001; r=.124); 4-7 (p=.026; r=.130); 5-7 (p<.001; r=.187)
How do you estimate the effect of artificial intelligence (AI) on the efficiency of healthcare processes in the next 10 years?	N=1,107 4 (4-5)	N=1,223 4 (4-5)	N=939 4 (4-5)	N=515 4 (4-5)	N=555 4 (4-5)	N=124 4 (4-5)	N=104 4 (4-4)	.001	1-3 (p=.071); 1-4 (p=.012; r=.085)
The use of artificial intelligence (AI) in medicine will increasingly lead to legal and ethical conflicts.	N=1,108 4 (4-5)	N=1,227 4 (4-5)	N=941 4 (3-4)	N=515 4 (3-4)	N=554 4 (3-4)	N=124 4 (3-5)	N=103 4 (4-5)	<.001	1-3 (p<.001; r=.216); 1-4 (p<.001; r=.202); 1-5 (p<.001; r=.301); 2-3 (p<.001; r=.175); 2-4 (p<.001; r=.161); 2-5 (p<.001; r=.258); 3-5 (p=.003; r=.099); 3-7 (p<.001; r=.194); 4-5 (p=.018; r=.102); 4-7 (p<.001; r=.243); 5-6 (p<.001; r=.174); 5-7 (p<.001; r=.311); 6-7 (p=.048; r=.203)
What is your view on the influence of artificial intelligence (AI) on the profession of physicians? AI will affect the everyday life of physicians in a way that is...	N=1,109 4 (3-4)	N=1,225 4 (3-4)	N=940 4 (3-4)	N=515 4 (3-4)	N=553 4 (4-4)	N=124 4 (3-4)	N=104 4 (3-4)	<.001	1-3 (p<.001; r=.106); 2-5 (p<.001; r=.128); 3-4 (p<.001; r=.127); 3-5 (p<.001; r=.164); 5-7 (p=.012; r=.135)
How would you rate artificial intelligence (AI) software being available to physicians as a second opinion on medical issues?	N=1,108 4 (3-4)	N=1,226 4 (3-4)	N=936 4 (3-4)	N=513 4 (3-4)	N=553 4 (4-4)	N=124 4 (3-4)	N=103 4 (3-4)	<.001	1-2 (p=.008; r=.073); 1-3 (p<.001; r=.125); 1-6 (p=.020; r=.094); 1-7 (p=.017; r=.096); 2-5 (p<.001; r=.128); 3-4 (p=.034; r=.083); 3-5 (p<.001; r=.185); 4-5 (p=.014; r=.104); 5-6 (p<.001; r=.172); 5-7 (p<.001; r=.173)
I think working with artificial intelligence (AI) as a physician is necessary to stay competitive.	N=1,108 4 (3-4)	N=1,228 4 (3-4)	N=940 4 (3-4)	N=514 4 (3-4)	N=555 4 (4-4)	N=124 4 (3-4)	N=104 4 (3-4)	<.001	1-5 (p<.001; r=.124); 2-5 (p<.001; r=.172); 3-5 (p<.001; r=.124); 4-5 (p<.001; r=.146); 5-7 (p=.027; r=.126)
With my current knowledge, I feel sufficiently prepared to work with artificial intelligence (AI) in my future profession as a physician.	N=1,108 2 (1-2)	N=1,228 2 (2-3)	N=940 3 (2-4)	N=515 2 (2-4)	N=555 2 (2-3)	N=124 3 (2-4)	N=104 2 (2-3)	<.001	1-2 (p<.001; r=.187); 1-3 (p<.001; r=.531); 1-4 (p<.001; r=.259); 1-5 (p<.001; r=.114); 1-6 (p<.001; r=.197); 2-3 (p<.001; r=.342); 2-4 (p=.011; r=.083); 3-4 (p<.001; r=.243); 3-5 (p<.001; r=.398); 3-6 (p<.001; r=.132); 3-7 (p<.001; r=.248); 4-5 (p<.001; r=.158); 5-6 (p=.001; r=.159); 6-7 (p=.037; r=.208)
AI education and knowledge level	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
I would like to have more teaching on artificial intelligence (AI) in medicine as part of my studies.	N=1,106 4 (4-5)	N=1,226 4 (3-5)	N=933 4 (3-4)	N=514 4 (4-5)	N=555 4 (4-5)	N=124 4 (3-5)	N=104 4 (3-5)	<.001	1-2 (p=.003; r=.078); 1-3 (p<.001; r=.144); 2-3 (p=.049; r=.066); 2-4 (p<.001; r=.091); 2-5 (p<.001; r=.122); 3-4 (p<.001; r=.174); 3-5 (p<.001; r=.210)
As part of my studies, there are curricular events on artificial intelligence (AI) in medicine.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	N=1,109 1 (1-1)	N=1,233 1 (1-1)	N=941 1 (1-2)	N=513 1 (1-1)	N=554 1 (1-1)	N=124 1 (1-1)	N=104 1 (1-1)	<.001	1-3 (p<.001; r=.172); 2-3 (p<.001; r=.202); 3-4 (p<.001; r=.141); 3-5 (p<.001; r=.225); 3-6 (p<.001; r=.154); 3-7 (p=.017; r=.103)
How would you rate your general knowledge of artificial intelligence (AI)?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	N=1,109 2 (2-2)	N=1,233 2 (2-3)	N=942 2 (2-3)	N=515 2 (2-3)	N=555 2 (2-2)	N=124 2 (2-3)	N=104 2 (2-3)	<.001	1-4 (p=.015; r=.089)

265 ^a Compares student responses in Global North and South using the Mann-Whitney U-test.

266 ^b Compares student responses across all regions using the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance.

267 IQR, interquartile range.



268

269

270

271

272

273

274


275

276

277

Fig 3. Pie charts illustrating student responses at the country level for the item "As part of my studies, there are curricular events on artificial intelligence (AI) in medicine.". A more filled, darker red chart indicates a higher proportion of students reporting no AI events, while a less filled, greener chart indicates fewer students reporting the absence of AI events. The missing portion of each chart displays the proportion of students who reported AI events, regardless of the duration. An all-white pie chart indicates that all students reported AI events in the medical curriculum. The absolute number of responses per country is shown above each chart. Analysis of the pie charts from countries with a representative sample of at least 50 respondents reveals that, among 28 nations, only four (Indonesia, Switzerland, Vietnam,

278 and China) exhibited over 50% of students reporting the inclusion of AI events within their
279 medical curriculum. Data from the USA displayed an equal proportion of students reporting
280 the presence or absence of AI events in their curriculum (50% each). The residual 23
281 countries, encompassing Germany, Portugal, Mexico, Brazil, Poland, UAE, Austria, Italy,
282 India, Argentina, Macedonia, Canada, Slovenia, Ecuador, Australia, Azerbaijan, Japan, Spain,
283 Chile, Moldova, South Africa, Nepal, and Nigeria, had a lower proportion of students
284 reporting the integration of AI in the medical curriculum.
285 UAE, United Arab Emirates; USA, United States of America.



286

287 **Fig 4. Gantt diagrams depicting medical students' preferences in AI diagnostics. a) AI**

288 explainability (N=3,659, 80.2%) versus higher accuracy (N=902, 19.8%) and b) higher

289 sensitivity (N=2,906, 63.9%) versus higher specificity (N=1,118, 24.6%) or equal sensitivity

290 and specificity (N=524, 11.5%).

291 **Regional comparisons**

292 Please refer to Table 2 to view the results of the comparison between responses from
293 the Global North and South and at the continental level. Perceptions between the Global
294 North and South differed significantly for nine Likert scale format items. The highest effect
295 size was observed for the item on AI increasing ethical and legal conflicts, with respondents
296 from the Global North indicating a higher agreement (median: 4, IQR: 3-5) compared to those
297 from the Global South (median: 4, IQR: 3-4; $r=0.185$). Notably, Global South students felt
298 more prepared to use AI in their future practice (median: 3, IQR: 2-4) compared to their
299 Global North counterparts (median: 2, IQR: 1-3; $r=0.162$) and reported longer AI-related
300 curricular events (median: 1, IQR: 1-2; Global North: median: 1, IQR: 1-1; $r=0.090$).
301 Conversely, Global North students rated their AI knowledge higher (median: 2, IQR: 2-3;
302 Global South: median: 2, IQR: 2-2; $r=0.025$).

303 For continental comparison, the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance revealed
304 significantly different Likert scale responses across all survey items. Subsequent Dunn-
305 Bonferroni post hoc analysis displayed various significant differences in Likert scale
306 responses for pairwise regional comparisons, while median and IQR remained largely
307 consistent. Considering only medium to large effect sizes, the item "The use of artificial
308 intelligence (AI) in medicine will increasingly lead to legal and ethical conflicts." yielded an r
309 of 0.301 when comparing Northern/Western European (median: 4, IQR: 4-5) and South
310 American participants (median: 4, IQR: 3-4), and an r of 0.311 between South American and
311 Australian participants (median: 4, IQR: 4-5). Similarly, the statement "With my current
312 knowledge, I feel sufficiently prepared to work with artificial intelligence (AI) in my future
313 profession as a physician." displayed strong effect sizes in comparisons between North/West
314 Europe (median: 2, IQR: 1-2) and Asia (median: 3, IQR: 2-4; $r=0.531$), South/East Europe
315 (median: 2, IQR: 2-3) and Asia ($r=0.342$), and South America (median: 2, IQR: 2-3) and Asia
316 ($r=0.398$).

317

318 **Discussion**

319 This multicenter survey of 4,596 medical, dental, and veterinary students from 192
320 faculties in 48 countries reveals an optimistic outlook of medical students about the future
321 role of AI in healthcare practice. However, this optimism is mixed with concerns, with a
322 majority foreseeing increasing ethical and legal challenges as AI technologies become more
323 integrated into medical practice and feeling inadequately prepared to use AI in their later
324 careers. In terms of AI knowledge and education, our results demonstrate that most students
325 report no or little AI knowledge and favor the inclusion of AI teaching in their curriculum,
326 while over three-quarters did not have any events on AI as part of their studies. The subgroup
327 analyses revealed regional differences in perceptions, although predominantly with small
328 effect sizes.

329 To date, multiple studies have examined healthcare students' attitudes towards AI in
330 medicine [22]. Focusing on studies with large sample sizes of at least 500 medical or dental
331 students, predominantly positive attitudes toward the application of AI in medicine were
332 reported [24, 38-42]. For instance, a 2021 study by Bisdas et al., spanning 2,495 medical and
333 638 dental students in 63 countries, most of whom studying in Libya (N=790), Jordan
334 (N=450), and the United Kingdom (N=331), found that 88.2% (N=2,766) of respondents
335 either strongly or somewhat agree that AI will generally enhance medical practice, while
336 about half (N=1,655, 52.8%) indicated that they would usually or always incorporate AI in
337 their future practice [24]. Similarly, a 2022 survey of 2,981 medical students in Turkey by
338 Civaner et al. demonstrated that 85.8% (N=2,558) of participants acknowledge AI's role in
339 facilitating physicians' access to information, while 74.4% (N=2,218) of students affirm that
340 widespread AI usage would make them better physicians and 70.5% (N=2,102) believe that
341 AI application would lead to reduced errors [38]. Another large-scale survey conducted in

342 2020 among 1,103 dental students in Turkey by Yüzbaşıoğlu et al. demonstrated a significant
343 agreement (N=945, 85.7%) on the prospective major advancements in dentistry and medicine
344 through AI, which was similar to a 2022 study by Swed et al., comprising a cohort of 1,251
345 medical students and 243 physicians in Syria, with 1,317 respondents (87.4%) either strongly
346 agreeing or agreeing on the crucial role of AI in the medical field [39, 40]. These findings are
347 consistent with those of our study, in which most participants generally expressed positive
348 attitudes toward the use of AI in medicine, the increase in efficiency of healthcare processes
349 through AI, the positive impact of AI on the medical profession, and the availability of AI as
350 a second opinion on medical issues.

351 Despite these positive attitudes, our study revealed a pronounced deficit in both self-
352 reported AI knowledge and the integration of AI education into the medical curriculum, with
353 about three-quarters of participants reporting little or no AI knowledge, no curricular events
354 on AI, and the desire for AI teaching, respectively. However, the lack of AI knowledge and
355 education among medical and dentistry students is not a novel phenomenon. Depending on
356 the study and item design, self-reported AI knowledge in the literature ranges from 2.8% of
357 2,981 medical students in Turkey in 2022 who reported feeling informed about the use of AI
358 in medicine to 51.8% of 900 medical students in Jordan in 2021 who indicated having read
359 articles about AI or machine learning in the past two years [24, 38-42]. On the other hand, the
360 reported prevalence of AI training in the medical curriculum ranges, for instance, from 9.2%
361 in a 2020 survey of 484 medical students in the United Kingdom up to 24.4% in a 2022 study
362 among 2,981 medical students in Turkey, although variations in item designs and
363 demographic contexts hinder a comprehensive longitudinal analysis [25, 38, 40, 41, 43]. In
364 our study, less than 18% (N=5) of countries with a sample size of 50 or more participants had
365 a higher or equal proportion of students reporting any duration of AI teaching, pointing to a
366 persistent deficit in medical AI education across various demographic landscapes.
367 Consequently, the incorporation of AI into medical education on a broader national or

368 international scale is limited, and the adoption of frameworks, certification programs,
369 interdisciplinary collaborations, modules, and formal lectures seems still to be at an early
370 stage [18, 44-46].

371 In terms of educational preferences, most of the participants in our study indicated
372 their interest in learning practical skills, followed by future perspectives and legal and ethical
373 aspects of medical AI. On the other hand, the majority rather or completely agreed with the
374 item that AI will increasingly lead to legal and ethical conflicts in the medical profession.
375 Similarly, a 2021 survey by Mehta et al. of 321 medical students at four medical schools in
376 Canada found that 95% of medical students surveyed believe AI would introduce new ethical
377 and social challenges, whereas Civaner et al. reported in 2022 that 93.8% of 2,981 medical
378 students in Turkey consider AI training to address the ethical dilemmas raised by AI a
379 necessary component of their education [38, 47]. This underscores the great potential of AI
380 education to not only improve medical students' oversight, knowledge, and practical skills in
381 using AI but also to educate about ethical, legal, and societal implications — topics that are
382 also addressed in other AI education frameworks, such as the United Nations Educational,
383 Scientific and Cultural Organization K-12 AI curricula report [48].

384 In our subgroup analysis of respondents across continents, two items displayed
385 moderate to large effect sizes. First, participants from South America were less likely to agree
386 that the use of medical AI will increase ethical and legal conflicts compared to participants
387 from Northern/Western Europe and Australia. Yet, students' median responses in these
388 regions were identical. Thus, the level of effect size primarily reflects outliers rather than a
389 uniform regional disparity in opinion. Second, Asian students reported being better prepared
390 to work with AI in their future careers. Although these differences in perceived preparedness
391 could be driven by different national AI policies and educational strategies as well as
392 macroeconomic factors, our study design and varying sample sizes across regions complicate
393 a causal analysis [49, 50]. However, it is noteworthy that three of four countries in which

394 more than 50% of medical students reported receiving AI training were located on the Asian
395 continent, which may have contributed to Asian students indicating a higher preparedness
396 towards applying AI in their future profession.

397 Finally, we observed a strong preference among medical students for AI systems that
398 are explainable rather than highly accurate. This mirrors the growing emphasis on
399 'Explainable AI' in the medical field and underscores the urgent need for developing AI
400 algorithms that transparently disclose their decisions and limitations, especially when applied
401 to the medical domain, to promote trust and acceptance among healthcare students,
402 professionals, and patients [51-54].

403 This study has limitations. First, the uneven regional distribution of participants
404 potentially biased results in favor of overrepresented regions. Additionally, the online design
405 and language availability in either English or Spanish may have introduced selection bias,
406 precluding students without internet access, as well as students who are not proficient in
407 either language. Another potential source of selection bias could be that respondents with a
408 specific interest in or experience with AI were more likely to participate in the survey.
409 Furthermore, the calculated response rate appeared to be rather low due to the lack of data on
410 the number of students enrolled in each medical discipline for most participating institutions.
411 Consequently, we derived the response rate using the total student enrollment numbers, which
412 significantly underestimated the true rate of participation among medical students as it
413 assumes that all students within each institute received an invitation to participate. Moreover,
414 the presence of 20 institutions with fewer than 50 student respondents has skewed the
415 response rate further downward.

416 In conclusion, our study—the currently largest survey of medical students'
417 perceptions towards AI in healthcare education and practice—reveals a broadly optimistic
418 view of AI's role in healthcare. It draws on insights from students with diverse geographical,
419 sociodemographic, and cultural backgrounds, underlining the critical need for AI education in

- 420 medical curricula around the world and identifying a universal challenge and opportunity: to
- 421 adeptly prepare healthcare students for a future that integrates AI into healthcare practice.

422 Acknowledgments

423 Members of the COMFORT consortium (alphabetically listed by surname):

Full name	Affiliation	ORCID
Nitamar Abdala	Department of Radiology, Federal University of São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil	0000-0002-0421-0959
Álvaro Aceña Navarro	Department of Cardiology, Hospital Universitario Fundación Jiménez Díaz, Madrid, Spain; Department of Medicine, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain	0000-0002-5975-5761
Hugo J. W. L. Aerts	Artificial Intelligence in Medicine (AIM) Program, Mass General Brigham, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA; Department of Radiation Oncology and Radiology, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute and Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA, USA; Radiology and Nuclear Medicine, CARIM & GROW, Maastricht University, Maastricht, The Netherlands	0000-0002-2122-2003
Catarina Águas	Radiology Department, University of Algarve, Faro, Portugal	0000-0002-1575-6367
Martina Aineseder	Radiology Department, Hospital Italiano de Buenos Aires, Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires, Argentina	0000-0002-8733-856
Muaed Alomar	Department of Clinical Sciences, College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences, Ajman University, Ajman, UAE	0000-0001-6526-2253
Salita Angkurawaranon	Department of Radiology, Faculty of Medicine, Chiang Mai University, Chiang Mai, Thailand	0000-0001-6211-5717
Zachary G. Angus	Centre for Eye Research Australia, Royal Victorian Eye and Ear Hospital, Melbourne, Australia, Faculty of Medicine, Nursing and Health Sciences, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia	0000-0003-3117-6116
Eirini Asouchidou	Anatomy Laboratory, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece	-
Sameer Bakhshi	Department of Medical Oncology, Dr. B.R.A. Institute Rotary Cancer Hospital, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi, India	0000-0001-9367-4407
Panagiotis D. Bamidis	Lab of Medical Physics & Digital Innovation, School of Medicine, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, Greece	0000-0002-9936-5805
Paula N. V. P. Barbosa	Department of Imaging A.C.Camargo Cancer Center, São Paulo, Brazil	0000-0002-3231-5328

Nuru Y. Bayramov	Department of I Surgical Diseases, Azerbaijan Medical University, Baku, Azerbaijan	0000-0001-6958-5412
Antonios Billis	Lab of Medical Physics & Digital Innovation, School of Medicine, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, Greece	0000-0002-1854-7560
Almir G. V. Bitencourt	Department of Imaging, A.C.Camargo Cancer Center, São Paulo, Brazil	0000-0003-0192-9885
Antonio José Bollas Becerra	Department of Cardiology, Hospital Universitario Fundación Jiménez Díaz, Madrid, Spain	0000-0003-4612-3949
Fabrice Busomoke	Ministry of Health - Byumba Hospital, Byumba, Rwanda	0009-0002-2520-2488
Andreia Capela	Medical Oncology Department, Centro Hospitalar Vila Nova de Gaia-Espinho, Vila Nova de Gaia, Portugal; Associação de Investigação de Cuidados de Suporte em Oncologia (AICSO), Vila Nova de Gaia, Portugal	0000-0002-7576-6938
Riccardo Cau	Department of Radiology, Azienda Ospedaliero Universitaria (A.O.U.), di Cagliari - Polo di Monserrato s.s. 554 Monserrato, Cagliari, Italy	0000-0002-7910-1087
Warren Clements	Department of Radiology, Alfred Health, Melbourne, Australia; Department of Surgery, Monash University Central Clinical School, Melbourne, Australia; National Trauma Research Institute, Melbourne, Australia	0000-0003-1859-5850
Alexandru Corlateanu	Department of Respiratory Medicine and Allergology, Nicolae Testemițanu State University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Chișinău, Republic of Moldova	0000-0002-3278-436X
Renato Cuocolo	Department of Medicine, Surgery and Dentistry, University of Salerno, Baronissi, Italy	0000-0002-1452-1574
Nguyễn N. Cường	Radiology Center Hanoi, Medical University Hospital Hanoi, Hanoi, Vietnam	0000 0001 8809 9583
Zenewton Gama	Department of Collective Health, Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte, Natal, Brazil	0000-0003-0818-9680
Paulo J. de Medeiros	Department of Integrated Medicine, Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte, Natal-RN, Brazil	0000-0002-2409-9944
Guillermo de Velasco	Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, School of Biology, Complutense University, Madrid, Spain; Instituto de Investigaciones Sanitarias San Carlos (IdISSC), Madrid, Spain	0000-0002-1994-2386

Vijay B. Desai	Department of Clinical Sciences, College of Dentistry, Ajman University, Ajman, UAE	0000-0003-3256-4778
Ajaya Kumar Dhakal	Department of Pediatrics, KIST Medical College and Teaching Hospital, Kathmandu, Nepal	0000-0002-2881-655X
Virginia Dignum	Department of Computing Science, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden	0000-0001-7409-5813
Izabela Domitrz	Department of Neurology, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry, Medical University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland; Bielanski Hospital, Warsaw, Poland	0000-0003-3130-1036
Carlos Ferrarotti	Department of Diagnostic Imaging, Centro de Educación Médica e Investigaciones Clínicas "Norberto Quirno" (CEMIC), Autonomous City of Buenos Aires, Argentina	-
Katarzyna Fułek	Department of Otolaryngology, Head and Neck Surgery, Wrocław Medical University, Wrocław Poland	0000-0002-1147-774X
Shuvadeep Ganguly	Department of Medical Oncology, Dr. B.R.A. Institute Rotary Cancer Hospital, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi, India	0000-0002-7296-6088
Ignacio García-Juárez	Department of Gastroenterology and Unit of Liver Transplantation, Instituto Nacional de Ciencias Médicas y Nutrición Salvador Zubirán, Mexico City, Mexico	0000-0003-2400-1887
Cvetanka Gjerakaroska Savevska	University Clinic for Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Ss Cyril and Methodius University, Skopje, Republic of North Macedonia	0000-0002-2328-4873
Marija Gjerakaroska Radovikj	University Clinic for State Cardiac Surgery, Ss Cyril and Methodius University, Skopje, Republic of North Macedonia	0000-0003-4916-6178
Natalia Gorelik	Department of Radiology, McGill University Health Center, Montreal, Canada	0000-0001-9672-6807
Valérie Gorelik	Dawson College, Montreal, Canada	0009-0004-0184-2231
Luis Gorospe	Department of Radiology, Ramón y Cajal University Hospital, Madrid, Spain	0000-0002-2305-7064
Ian Griffin	Department of Radiology, University of Florida, Florida, USA	0009-0006-6565-4971
Andrzej Grzybowski	Institute for Research in Ophthalmology, Foundation for Ophthalmology Development, Poznań, Poland	0000-0002-3724-2391
Alessa Hering	Department of Radiology and Nuclear Medicine, Radboud University Medical Center, Nijmegen, The Netherlands;	0000-0002-7602-803X

	Fraunhofer MEVIS, Institute for Digital Medicine, Bremen, Germany	
Michihiro Hide	Department of Dermatology, Hiroshima City Hiroshima Citizens Hospital, Hiroshima, Japan	0000-0002-1569-6034
Bruno Hochegger	Department of Radiology, University of Florida, Florida, USA	0000-0003-1984-4636
Jochen G. Hofstaetter	Michael Ogon Laboratory for Orthopaedic Research, Orthopaedic Hospital Vienna-Speising, Vienna, Austria; 2nd Department, Orthopaedic Hospital Vienna-Speising, Vienna, Austria	0000-0001-7741-7187
Mehriban R. Huseynova	Department of I Surgical Diseases, Azerbaijan Medical University, Baku, Azerbaijan	0000-0002-4040-5868
Oana-Simina Iaconi	Research Cooperation Unit within the Research Department, National Institute of Research in Medicine and Health, Nicolae Testemițanu State University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Chișinău, Republic of Moldova	0009-0003-3139-7004
Pedro Iturralde Torres	Subdirección de Diagnóstico y Tratamiento, Instituto Nacional de Cardiología - Ignacio Chávez, Mexico City, Mexico	-
Nevena G. Ivanova	Department of Urology and General Medicine, Medical University of Plovdiv, Plovdiv, Bulgaria; Department of Cardiology, Karidad Medical Health Center, Plovdiv, Bulgaria	0000-0002-4213-8142
Juan S. Izquierdo-Condoy	One Health Research Group, Universidad de Las Américas, Quito, Ecuador	0000-0002-1178-0546
Aidan B. Jackson	Centre for Eye Research Australia, Royal Victorian Eye and Ear Hospital, Melbourne, Australia, St Vincent's Hospital Melbourne, Fitzroy 3065, Fitzroy, Australia	0000-0002-3809-8301
Ashish K. Jha	Department of Nuclear Medicine, Tata Memorial Hospital, Mumbai, India, Homi Bhabha National Institute - Deemed University, Anushaktinagar, Mumbai, India	0000-0001-5998-3206
Nisha Jha	Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics, KIST Medical College and Teaching Hospital, Kathmandu, Nepal	0000-0003-1089-6042
Lili Jiang	Department of Computing Science, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden	0000-0002-7788-3986
Rawen Kader	Division of Surgery and Interventional Sciences, University College London, London, United Kingdom	0000-0001-9133-0838
Padma Kaul	Department of Medicine, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada,	0000-0003-2239-3944

	Canadian VIGOUR Centre, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada	
Gürsan Kaya	Department of Nuclear Medicine, Hacettepe University, Faculty of Medicine, Ankara, Turkey	0000-0003-3157-5782
Katarzyna Kępczyńska	Department of Neurology, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry, Medical University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland	-
Israel K. Kolawole	Department of Anaesthesia, University of Ilorin/Teaching Hospital, Ilorin, Nigeria	0000-0001-5823-8685
George Kolostoumpis	European Cancer Patient Coalition (ECPC), Brussels, Belgium	0000-0001-9768-9526
Abraham Koshy	Department of Gastroenterology, Lakeshore Hospital, Kochi, India	0000-0002-9997-6569
Nicholas A. Kruger	Orthopaedic Department, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa	0000-0002-8543-5745
Alexander Loeser	Berlin University of Applied Sciences and Technology (BHT), Berlin, Germany	0000-0002-4440-3261
Marko Lucijanic	Department of Hematology, Clinical Hospital Dubrava, Zagreb, Croatia, Department of Internal Medicine, School of Medicine University of Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia	0000-0002-1372-2040
Stefani Maihoub	Department of Otorhinolaryngology, Head and Neck Surgery, Semmelweis University, Budapest, Hungary	0000-0002-3024-6197
Sonya McFadden	School of Health Sciences, Londonderry, Northern Ireland	0000-0002-4001-7769
Maria C. Mendez Avila	Department of Imaging, University of Costa Rica, San Jose, Costa Rica	0009-0000-7124-2662
Matúš Mihalčín	Department of Infectious Diseases, Faculty of Medicine, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic; Department of Infectious Diseases, University Hospital Brno, Brno, Czech Republic	0000-0002-2946-658X
Masahiro Miyake	Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences, Kyoto University Graduate School of Medicine, Kyoto, Japan	0000-0001-7410-3764
Roberto Mogami	Departamento de Medicina Interna, Faculdade de Ciências Médicas da Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil	0000-0002-7610-2404
András Molnár	Department of Otorhinolaryngology, Head and Neck Surgery, Semmelweis University, Budapest, Hungary	0000-0002-4417-5166
Wipawee Morakote	Department of Radiology, Faculty of Medicine, Chiang Mai University, Chiang Mai, Thailand	0000-0002-8670-7386
Issa Ngabonziza	Ministry of Health - Byumba Hospital, Byumba, Rwanda	0000-0001-6092-166X

Trung Q. Ngo	Department of Urology and Renal Transplantation, People's Hospital 115, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam	0000-0001-8044-6376
Thanh T. Nguyen	Department of Radiology, University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Hue University, Hue, Vietnam	0000-0001-9379-6359
Marc Nortje	Orthopaedic Department, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa	0000-0002-7737-409X
Subish Palaian	Department of Clinical Sciences, College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences, Ajman University, Ajman, UAE	0000-0002-9323-3940
Rui P. Pereira de Almeida	Radiology Department, University of Algarve, Faro, Portugal; Comprehensive Health Research Center, University of Évora, Évora, Portugal	0000-0001-7524-9669
Barbara Perić	Department of Surgical Oncology, Institute of Oncology Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia; Faculty of Medicine, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia	0000-0001-7228-8267
Gašper Pilko	Department of Surgical Oncology, Institute of Oncology Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia; Faculty of Medicine, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia	0009-0003-0470-2034
Monserrat L. Puntunet Bates	Unidad de Calidad, Instituto Nacional de Cardiología - Ignacio Chávez, Mexico City, Mexico	-
Mitayani Purwoko	Medical Biology, Faculty of Medicine Universitas Muhammadiyah Palembang, Palembang, Indonesia	0000-0002-3936-3883
Clare Rainey	School of Health Sciences, Londonderry, Northern Ireland	0000-0003-0449-8646
João Carlos Ribeiro	Coimbra University and Medical School, Coimbra, Portugal	0000-0002-1039-6358
Gaston A. Rodriguez-Granillo	Centro de Educación Médica e Investigaciones Clínicas "Norberto Quirno" (CEMIC), Autonomous City of Buenos Aires, Argentina	0000-0003-0820-2611
Nicolás Rozo Agudelo	Instituto Global de Excelencia Clínica, Bogotá D.C, Colombia	0000-0003-0409-2515
Luca Saba	Department of Radiology, Azienda Ospedaliero Universitaria (A.O.U.), di Cagliari - Polo di Monserrato s.s. 554 Monserrato, Cagliari, Italy	0000-0003-2870-3771
Shine Sadasivan	Department of Gastroenterology, Amrita Institute of Medical Sciences & Research Centre, Kochi, India	0000-0001-5676-5000
Keina Sado	Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences, Kyoto University Graduate School of Medicine, Kyoto, Japan	0009-0002-7596-4325

Julia M. Saidman	Radiology Department, Hospital Italiano de Buenos Aires, Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires, Argentina	0000-0002-7626-7356
Pedro J. Saturno-Hernandez	AXA Chair in Healthcare Quality, CIEE, National Institute of Public Health, Cuernavaca, Mexico	0000-0002-4991-5805
Gilbert M. Schwarz	Department of Orthopedics and Trauma Surgery, Medical University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria	0000-0001-6434-0520
Sergio M. Solis-Barquero	Department of Imaging, University of Costa Rica, San Jose, Costa Rica	0000-0002-2513-0747
Javier Soto Pérez-Olivares	Department of Radiology, Ramón y Cajal University Hospital, Madrid, Spain	0000-0002-0858-1394
Petros Sountoulides	Urology Department, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, Greece	0000-0003-2671-571X
Arnaldo Stanzione	Department of Advanced Biomedical Sciences, University of Naples "Federico II", Naples, Italy	0000-0002-7905-5789
Nikoleta G. Tabakova	Medical University of Varna, Varna, Bulgaria	0000-0003-4177-3897
Konagi Takeda	Department of Radiology, Hiroshima City Hiroshima Citizens Hospital, Hiroshima, Japan	0009-0004-3763-5701
Satoru Tanioka	Department of Neurosurgery, Mie University Graduate School of Medicine, Tsu, Japan; Charité Lab for Artificial Intelligence in Medicine, Corporate Member of Freie Universität Berlin, Charité - University Medicine Berlin, Berlin, Germany	0000-0002-4678-6163
Hans O. Thulesius	Research and Development Department Region Kronoberg, Växjö, Sweden; Department of Medicine and Optometry, Linnaeus University, Kalmar, Sweden	0000-0002-3785-5630
Liz N. Toapanta-Yanchapaxi	Department of Neurology, Instituto Nacional de Ciencias Médicas y Nutrición Salvador Zubirán, Mexico City, Mexico	0000-0002-1218-1721
Minh H. Truong	Department of Urology and Renal Transplantation, People's Hospital 115, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam; Department of Nephro-Urology and Andrology, Pham Ngoc Thach University of Medicine, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam	-
Murat Tuncel	Department of Nuclear Medicine, Hacettepe University, Faculty of Medicine, Ankara, Turkey	0000-0003-2352-3587
Elon H. C. van Dijk	Department of Ophthalmology, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands; Department of Ophthalmology, Alrijne Hospital, Leiderdorp, The Netherlands	0000-0002-6351-7942

Peter van Wijngaarden	Centre for Eye Research Australia, Royal Victorian Eye and Ear Hospital, Melbourne, Australia; Ophthalmology, Department of Surgery, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia	0000-0002-8800-7834
Lina Xu	Department of Radiology, Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Corporate Member of Freie Universität Berlin and Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, Berlin, Germany	0009-0007-4119-1033
Tomasz Zatoński	Department of Otolaryngology, Head and Neck Surgery, Wrocław Medical University, Wrocław, Poland	0000-0003-3043-4806
Longjiang Zhang	Department of Radiology, Jinling Hospital, Medical School of Nanjing University, Nanjing, China	0000-0002-6664-7224

424

425 In addition, the authors want to thank Jaime Moujir-López, Javier Blázquez-Sánchez
426 (Department of Radiology, Ramón y Cajal University Hospital, Madrid, Spain), Rubens
427 Chojniak (Department of Imaging, A.C.Camargo Cancer Center, São Paulo, Brazil), and
428 Dania Saad Rammal, Aya Mutasem Baradie, and Farrah Emad Elsubeihi (College of
429 Pharmacy and Health Sciences, Ajman University, Ajman, United Arab Emirates) for
430 supporting the data collection at their institutions. Keno K. Bressem is grateful for his
431 participation in the Berlin Institute of Health (BIH) Charité Digital Clinician Scientist
432 Program, funded by the Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin and the BIH.

433

434 **Financial disclosure statement**

435 This research is funded by the European Union (COMFORT (Computational Models
436 FOR patient stratification in urologic cancers – Creating robust and trustworthy multimodal
437 AI for health care), project number: 101079894, authors involved: FB, MRM, LCA, PDB, AB,
438 RC, GDV, VD, AH, LJ, GK, AL, PS, principal investigator: KKB, sponsors' website:
439 <https://www.comfort-ai.eu>). Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the authors
440 only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union. The European Union cannot

441 be held responsible for them. The funding had no role in the study design, data collection and
442 analysis, manuscript preparation, or decision to publish.

443

444 **Competing interests**

445 KKB reports grants from the Wilhelm Sander Foundation and receives speaker fees
446 from Canon Medical Systems Corporation. KKB is a member of the advisory board of the EU
447 Horizon 2020 LifeChamps project (875329) and the EU IHI project IMAGIO (101112053).
448 MA reports consultant fees from Segmed, Inc. The competing interests had no role in the study
449 design, data collection and analysis, manuscript preparation, or decision to publish. All other
450 authors declare no financial or non-financial competing interests.

451

452 **ICJME authorship contributions**

453 **Conceptualization:** Felix Busch, Lena Hoffmann, Daniel Truhn, Marcus R.
454 Makowski, Keno K. Bressem, Lisa C. Adams, Antonios Billis, Renato Cuocolo, Guillermo de
455 Velasco, Luis Gorospe, Alessa Hering, Lili Jiang, Alexander Loeser, Javier Soto-Pérez-
456 Olivares, Petros Sountoulides, Lina Xu; **Project administration:** Felix Busch, Lena
457 Hoffmann, Keno K. Bressem, Lisa C. Adams; **Resources:** Felix Busch, Keno K. Bressem,
458 Lisa C. Adams, COMFORT consortium; **Software:** Felix Busch, Lena Hoffmann, Keno K.
459 Bressem, Lisa C. Adams; **Data curation:** Felix Busch, Lena Hoffmann, Keno K. Bressem,
460 Lisa C. Adams; **Formal analysis:** Felix Busch, Lena Hoffmann, Keno K. Bressem, Lisa C.
461 Adams, COMFORT consortium; **Funding acquisition:** Felix Busch, Marcus R. Makowski,
462 Keno K. Bressem, Lisa C. Adams, Panagiotis D. Bamidis, Antonios Billis, Renato Cuocolo,
463 Guillermo de Velasco, Virginia Dignum, Alessa Hering, Lili Jiang, George Kolostoumpis,
464 Alexander Loeser, Petros Sountoulides; **Investigation:** Felix Busch, Lena Hoffmann, Keno
465 K. Bressem, Lisa C. Adams; **Methodology:** Felix Busch, Lena Hoffmann, Daniel Truhn,

466 Keno K. Bresse, Lisa C. Adams; **Supervision:** Felix Busch, Keno K. Bresse; **Validation:**
467 Felix Busch, Lena Hoffmann, Daniel Truhn, Esteban Ortiz-Prado, Marcus R. Makowski,
468 Keno K. Bresse, Lisa C. Adams, COMFORT consortium; **Visualization:** Felix Busch,
469 Esteban Ortiz-Prado, Keno K. Bresse; **Writing – original draft preparation:** Felix Busch,
470 Keno K. Bresse, Lisa C. Adams; **Writing – review & editing:** Felix Busch, Lena
471 Hoffmann, Daniel Truhn, Esteban Ortiz-Prado, Marcus R. Makowski, Keno K. Bresse, Lisa
472 C. Adams, COMFORT consortium.

473 All COMFORT consortia authors equally contributed to the data collection at their
474 institutions, critically revised the final version of the manuscript for intellectual content, gave
475 their final approval of the version to be published, and agreed to be accountable for all aspects
476 of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work
477 are appropriately investigated and resolved.

478

479 **Data availability statement**

480 Upon acceptance of the peer-reviewed article, the collected and analyzed dataset will
481 be publicly available under CC-BY 4.0 license: Busch F, Hoffmann L, Truhn D, Ortiz-Prado
482 E, Makowski MR, Bresse KK, et al. Dataset: Medical students' perceptions towards
483 artificial intelligence in education and practice: A multinational, multicenter cross-sectional
484 study. Database: figshare [Internet]. doi:10.6084/m9.figshare.24422422 [Reserved]. For peer
485 review, a private anonymized link is provided.

486

487 **References**

- 488 1. Davenport T, Kalakota R. The potential for artificial intelligence in healthcare. *Future*
489 *Healthc J.* 2019;6(2):94-8. doi:10.7861/futurehosp.6-2-94
- 490 2. Chen M, Zhang B, Cai Z, Seery S, Gonzalez MJ, Ali NM, et al. Acceptance of clinical
491 artificial intelligence among physicians and medical students: A systematic review with cross-
492 sectional survey. *Front Med.* 2022;9. doi:10.3389/fmed.2022.990604
- 493 3. Milmo D. ChatGPT reaches 100 million users two months after launch. 2023 Feb 2
494 [cited 2023 Oct 17]. In: *The Guardian* [Internet]. Kings Place, London. [about 1 screen].
495 Available from: [https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2023/feb/02/chatgpt-100-million-](https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2023/feb/02/chatgpt-100-million-users-open-ai-fastest-growing-app)
496 [users-open-ai-fastest-growing-app](https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2023/feb/02/chatgpt-100-million-users-open-ai-fastest-growing-app)
- 497 4. OpenAI. GPT-4 Technical Report. arXiv [Preprint]. 2023 arXiv:2303.08774 [posted
498 2023 Mar 15; revised 2023 Mar 16; revised 2023 Mar 27; cited 2023 Oct 31]: [100 pp.].
499 doi:10.48550/arXiv.2303.08774
- 500 5. Nori H, King N, McKinney SM, Carignan D, Horvitz E. Capabilities of gpt-4 on
501 medical challenge problems. arXiv [Preprint]. 2023 arXiv:230313375 [posted 2023 Mar 20;
502 revised 2023 Apr 12; cited 2023 Oct 31]: [35 pp.] doi:10.48550/arXiv.2303.13375
- 503 6. Singhal K, Tu T, Gottweis J, Sayres R, Wulczyn E, Hou L, et al. Towards expert-level
504 medical question answering with large language models. arXiv [Preprint]. 2023
505 arXiv:230509617 [posted 2023 Mar 16; cited 2023 Oct 17]: [30 pp.].
506 doi:10.48550/arXiv.2305.09617
- 507 7. Qu J, Zhao X, Chen P, Wang Z, Liu Z, Yang B, et al. Deep learning on digital
508 mammography for expert-level diagnosis accuracy in breast cancer detection. *Multimed Syst.*
509 2022;28(4):1263-74. doi:10.1007/s00530-021-00823-4

- 510 8. Tiu E, Talius E, Patel P, Langlotz CP, Ng AY, Rajpurkar P. Expert-level detection of
511 pathologies from unannotated chest X-ray images via self-supervised learning. *Nat Biomed*
512 *Eng.* 2022;6(12):1399-406. doi:10.1038/s41551-022-00936-9
- 513 9. Cygu S, Seow H, Dushoff J, Bolker BM. Comparing machine learning approaches to
514 incorporate time-varying covariates in predicting cancer survival time. *Sci Rep.*
515 2023;13(1):1370. doi:10.1038/s41598-023-28393-7
- 516 10. Huang C, Clayton EA, Matyunina LV, McDonald LD, Benigno BB, Vannberg F, et al.
517 Machine learning predicts individual cancer patient responses to therapeutic drugs with high
518 accuracy. *Sci Rep.* 2018;8(1):16444. doi:10.1038/s41598-018-34753-5
- 519 11. Chan KS, Zary N. Applications and Challenges of Implementing Artificial
520 Intelligence in Medical Education: Integrative Review. *JMIR Med Educ.* 2019;5(1):e13930.
521 doi:10.2196/13930
- 522 12. Li YS, Lam CSN, See C. Using a Machine Learning Architecture to Create an AI-
523 Powered Chatbot for Anatomy Education. *Med Sci Educ.* 2021;31(6):1729-30.
524 doi:10.1007/s40670-021-01405-9
- 525 13. Nagy M, Radakovich N, Nazha A. Why Machine Learning Should Be Taught in
526 Medical Schools. *Med Sci Educ.* 2022;32(2):529-32. doi:10.1007/s40670-022-01502-3
- 527 14. Fernández-Alemán JL, López-González L, González-Sequeros O, Jayne C, López-
528 Jiménez JJ, Toval A. The evaluation of i-SIDRA – a tool for intelligent feedback – in a course
529 on the anatomy of the locomotor system. *Int J Med Inform.* 2016;94:172-81.
530 doi:10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2016.07.008
- 531 15. Jiang F, Jiang Y, Zhi H, Dong Y, Li H, Ma S, et al. Artificial intelligence in
532 healthcare: past, present and future. *Stroke Vasc Neurol.* 2017;2(4):230-43. doi:10.1136/svn-
533 2017-000101

- 534 16. Paranjape K, Schinkel M, Nannan Panday R, Car J, Nanayakkara P. Introducing
535 Artificial Intelligence Training in Medical Education. *JMIR Med Educ.* 2019;5(2):e16048.
536 doi:10.2196/16048
- 537 17. Beauchamp TL, Childress JF. *Principles of Biomedical Ethics.* 8th ed. Oxford: Oxford
538 Publishing Press; 2019.
- 539 18. Busch F, Adams LC, Bressemer KK. Biomedical Ethical Aspects Towards the
540 Implementation of Artificial Intelligence in Medical Education. *Med Sci Educ.*
541 2023;33(4):1007-12. doi:10.1007/s40670-023-01815-x
- 542 19. Kumar P, Chauhan S, Awasthi LK. Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare: Review,
543 Ethics, Trust Challenges & Future Research Directions. *Eng Appl Artif Intell.*
544 2023;120:105894. doi:10.1016/j.engappai.2023.105894
- 545 20. Grunhut J, Wyatt AT, Marques O. Educating Future Physicians in Artificial
546 Intelligence (AI): An Integrative Review and Proposed Changes. *J Med Educ Curric Dev.*
547 2021;8:23821205211036836. doi:10.1177/23821205211036836
- 548 21. Lee J, Wu AS, Li D, Kulasegaram K. Artificial Intelligence in Undergraduate Medical
549 Education: A Scoping Review. *Acad Med.* 2021;96(11S):S62-S70.
550 doi:10.1097/acm.0000000000004291
- 551 22. Mousavi Baigi SF, Sarbaz M, Ghaddaripouri K, Ghaddaripouri M, Mousavi AS,
552 Kimiafar K. Attitudes, knowledge, and skills towards artificial intelligence among healthcare
553 students: A systematic review. *Health Sci Rep.* 2023;6(3):e1138. doi:10.1002/hsr2.1138
- 554 23. Artino AR, La Rochelle JS, Dezee KJ, Gehlbach H. Developing questionnaires for
555 educational research: AMEE Guide No. 87. *Med Teacher.* 2014;36(6):463-74.
556 doi:10.3109/0142159X.2014.889814
- 557 24. Bisdas S, Topriceanu C-C, Zakrzewska Z, Irimia A-V, Shakallis L, Subhash J, et al.
558 Artificial Intelligence in Medicine: A Multinational Multi-Center Survey on the Medical and
559 Dental Students' Perception. *Front Public Health.* 2021;9. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2021.795284

- 560 25. Sit C, Srinivasan R, Amlani A, Muthuswamy K, Azam A, Monzon L, et al. Attitudes
561 and perceptions of UK medical students towards artificial intelligence and radiology: a
562 multicentre survey. *Insights Imaging*. 2020;11(1):14. doi:10.1186/s13244-019-0830-7
- 563 26. Park CJ, Yi PH, Siegel EL. Medical Student Perspectives on the Impact of Artificial
564 Intelligence on the Practice of Medicine. *Curr Probl Diagn Radiol*. 2021;50(5):614-9.
565 doi:10.1067/j.cpradiol.2020.06.011
- 566 27. Ejaz H, McGrath H, Wong BL, Guise A, Vercauteren T, Shapey J. Artificial
567 intelligence and medical education: A global mixed-methods study of medical students'
568 perspectives. *Digit Health*. 2022;8:20552076221089099. doi:10.1177/20552076221089099
- 569 28. Blease C, Kharko A, Bernstein M, Bradley C, Houston M, Walsh I, et al. Machine
570 learning in medical education: a survey of the experiences and opinions of medical students in
571 Ireland. *BMJ Health Care Inform*. 2022;29(1). doi:10.1136/bmjhci-2021-100480
- 572 29. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic
573 data capture (REDCap)--a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing
574 translational research informatics support. *J Biomed Inform*. 2009;42(2):377-81.
575 doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2008.08.010
- 576 30. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, Elliott V, Fernandez M, O'Neal L, et al. The REDCap
577 consortium: Building an international community of software platform partners. *J Biomed*
578 *Inform*. 2019;95:103208. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2019.103208
- 579 31. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. 2023 [cited
580 2023 Oct 17]. In: R Foundation for Statistical Computing [Internet]. Vienna [about 1 screen].
581 Available from: <https://www.R-project.org/>
- 582 32. Wickham H, Averick M, Bryan J, Chang W, McGowan L, François R, et al. Welcome
583 to the Tidyverse. *J Open Source Softw*. 2019;4:1686. doi:10.21105/joss.01686
- 584 33. Pebesma E. Simple Features for R: Standardized Support for Spatial Vector Data. *R*
585 *Journal*. 2018;10:439-46. doi:10.32614/RJ-2018-009

- 586 34. Pebesma E, Bivand R. Spatial Data Science: With Applications in R. 1st ed. New
587 York: Chapman and Hall/CRC; 2023. doi:10.1201/9780429459016
- 588 35. The Finance Center for South-South Cooperation. Global South Countries (Group of
589 77 and China). 2015 [cited 2023 Oct 18]. In: United Nations [Internet]. Connaught Place,
590 Central, Hong Kong. Available from: [http://www.fc-](http://www.fc-ssc.org/en/partnership_program/south_south_countries)
591 [ssc.org/en/partnership_program/south_south_countries](http://www.fc-ssc.org/en/partnership_program/south_south_countries)
- 592 36. United Nations, Statistics Division. Methodology Standard country or area codes for
593 statistical use (M49). 1999 [cited 2023 Oct 18]. In: United Nations [Internet]. New York, NY
594 [about 2 screens]. Available from: <https://unstats.un.org/unsd/methodology/m49/>
- 595 37. Cohen J. Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences. 2nd ed. Hillsdale, NJ:
596 Erlbaum; 1988.
- 597 38. Civaner MM, Uncu Y, Bulut F, Chalil EG, Tatli A. Artificial intelligence in medical
598 education: a cross-sectional needs assessment. BMC Med Educ. 2022;22(1):772.
599 doi:10.1186/s12909-022-03852-3
- 600 39. Yüzbaşıoğlu E. Attitudes and perceptions of dental students towards artificial
601 intelligence. J Dent Educ. 2021;85(1):60-8. doi:10.1002/jdd.12385
- 602 40. Swed S, Alibrahim H, Elkalagi NKH, Nasif MN, Rais MA, Nashwan AJ, et al.
603 Knowledge, attitude, and practice of artificial intelligence among doctors and medical
604 students in Syria: A cross-sectional online survey. Front Artif Intell. 2022;5:1011524.
605 doi:10.3389/frai.2022.1011524
- 606 41. Al Saad MM, Shehadeh A, Alanazi S, Alenezi M, Eid H, Alfaouri MS, et al. Medical
607 students' knowledge and attitude towards artificial intelligence: An online survey. Open
608 Public Health J. 2022;15(1). doi:10.2174/18749445-v15-e2203290
- 609 42. Teng M, Singla R, Yau O, Lamoureux D, Gupta A, Hu Z, et al. Health Care Students'
610 Perspectives on Artificial Intelligence: Countrywide Survey in Canada. JMIR Med Educ.
611 2022;8(1):e33390. doi:10.2196/33390

- 612 43. Stewart J, Lu J, Gahungu N, Goudie A, Fegan PG, Bennamoun M, et al. Western
613 Australian medical students' attitudes towards artificial intelligence in healthcare. PLoS One.
614 2023;18(8):e0290642. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0290642
- 615 44. Thongprasit J, Wannapiroon P. Framework of Artificial Intelligence Learning
616 Platform for Education. Int Educ Stud. 2022;15:76. doi:10.5539/ies.v15n1p76
- 617 45. McCoy LG, Nagaraj S, Morgado F, Harish V, Das S, Celi LA. What do medical
618 students actually need to know about artificial intelligence? NPJ digital medicine.
619 2020;3(1):86.
- 620 46. Ngo B, Nguyen D, van Sonnenberg E. The Cases for and against Artificial
621 Intelligence in the Medical School Curriculum. Radiol Artif Intell. 2022;4(5):e220074.
622 doi:10.1148/ryai.220074
- 623 47. Mehta N, Harish V, Bilimoria K, Morgado F, Ginsburg S, Law M, et al. Knowledge
624 and Attitudes on Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare: A Provincial Survey Study of Medical
625 Students [version 1]. MedEdPublish [Preprint]. 2021 [posted 2021 Mar 15; cited 2023 Oct
626 30]: [14 pp.]. doi:10.15694/mep.2021.000075.1
- 627 48. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. K-12 AI curricula: a
628 mapping of government-endorsed AI curricula. 2022 [cited 2023 Oct 19]. In: UNESCO
629 [Internet]. Paris, France [63 pp.]. Available from:
630 <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000380602>
- 631 49. Groth OJ, Nitzberg M, Zehr D. Comparison of National Strategies to Promote
632 Artificial Intelligence. 1st ed. Sankt Augustin; Berlin: Konrad-Adenauer Foundation e.V.;
633 2019.
- 634 50. Zhang W, Cai M, Lee HJ, Evans R, Zhu C, Ming C. AI in Medical Education: Global
635 situation, effects and challenges. Educ Inf Technol. 2023. doi:10.1007/s10639-023-12009-8
- 636 51. Kundu S. AI in medicine must be explainable. Nat Med. 2021;27(8):1328.
637 doi:10.1038/s41591-021-01461-z

- 638 52. Bienefeld N, Boss JM, Lüthy R, Brodbeck D, Azzati J, Blaser M, et al. Solving the
639 explainable AI conundrum by bridging clinicians' needs and developers' goals. *NPJ Digit.*
640 *Med.* 2023;6(1):94. doi:10.1038/s41746-023-00837-4
- 641 53. Ribeiro MT, Singh S, Guestrin C. "Why Should I Trust You?" Explaining the
642 Predictions of Any Classifier. Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American
643 Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Demonstrations. 2016; 97-101.
644 doi:10.18653/v1/N16-3020
- 645 54. Lundberg SM, Lee S-I. A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. *Adv*
646 *Neural Inf Process Syst* 2017;30:4768-77. Available from:
647 [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2017/file/8a20a8621978632d76c43dfd28b67](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2017/file/8a20a8621978632d76c43dfd28b67767-Paper.pdf)
648 [767-Paper.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2017/file/8a20a8621978632d76c43dfd28b67767-Paper.pdf)

649 **Supporting information captions**

650 S1 Table. Overview of survey participants divided by country, faculty, city, degree, number
651 of enrolled students, and response rate.

652 S2 Table. Free-field comments by survey participants

653 S3 Table. Subgroup analysis by gender.

654 S4 Table. Subgroup analysis by age.

655 S5 Table. Subgroup analysis by study year.

656 S6 Table. Subgroup analysis by weekly use of technical devices.

657 S7 Table. Subgroup analysis by previous coding experience.

658 S8 Table. Subgroup analysis by AI knowledge.

659 S9 Table. Subgroup analysis by students who reported curricular events on AI in medicine of
660 any duration versus those who indicated no curricular events

661 S10 Table. STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of
662 cross-sectional studies