ISSN 2689-8268 | Volume 7

American Journal of Surgery and Clinical Case Reports

Review Article Open Access

To What Extent Can Artificial Intelligence Augment Physicians Imagination?

Abdullah Ali M. AI Ghamdi*

Adjunct Assistant Professor of Family Medicine, KSAU-HS, Saudi Arabia

***Corresponding author:**

Abdullah Ali M. Al Ghamdi,
Adjunct Assistant Professor of Family Medicine,
KSAU-HS, Saudi Arabia

Received: 02 Mar 2024
Accepted: 22 Apr 2024
Published: 29 Apr 2024
J Short Name: AJSCCR

Keywords:

Artificial intelligence; Human imagination; Decision-making; Cognitive augmentation; Physician support systems

Citation:

Al Ghamdi AAM. To What Extent Can Artificial Intelligence Augment Physicians Imagination?. Ame J Surg Clin Case Rep. 2024; 7(14): 1-5

1. Abstract

The human imagination is crucial for innovation, problem-solving, and adaptation. While artificial intelligence systems can mimic certain aspects of human imagination, they lack the depth and complexity of human cognition. This article explores how artificial intelligence might augment physicians imagination, exploring core imaginative constructs: visual imagination, coherence, counterfactual thinking, mental time travel, hypothetical thinking, theory of mind, problem-solving, and planning.

This article shows that artificial intelligence excels in generating images, analyzing complex data, and simulating scenarios, offering valuable insights for physicians in areas such as improved diagnostics, treatment planning, and personalized care through their powerful natural language processing, deep neural networks, predictive modeling, and statistical algorithms.

Finally, this review shows that the current artificial intelligence systems cannot fully replicate the intuitive, creative, and emotionally driven nature of physicians imagination. It recommends that future artificial intelligence development research focus on creating meaningful physician-artificial intelligence collaboration incorporating ethical reasoning, adaptability to new contexts, and understanding patients values and narratives.

2. Introduction

Human imagination is a fascinating, complex cognitive process that allows individuals to transcend their sensory experiences and envision possibilities beyond the tangible physical world [1]. It can be defined as a cognitive ability that enables us to generate and manipulate mind-generated information to create representations that we perceive and feel with implications in our day-to-day lives [2]. It allows us to create, innovate, and dream [3,4]. Human imagination is the bedrock of arts, scientific discovery, and technological revolution [5].

The human imagination has intrigued scientists and researchers in human biology, neurology, psychology, sociology, and philosophy. It is believed that imagination is rooted in our evolutionary journey and allows us to adapt and thrive in diverse environments [6].

From a biological and neurological basis, it is believed to originate from areas responsible for memory, emotion, and executive functions. For example, Comrie et al. think it originates in the hippocampus [7]. Others specified that the anterior hippocampus is vital in perception, imagination, and episodic memory, linking high-level cognitive functions with other brain structures [8].

It is important to note that areas of the brain linked to imagination are not confined to the hippocampus. Others defined brain parietal areas as fundamental for verbal creative imagination and areas for selective suppression of visual imagination, and non-dominant brain hemispheres are linked to problem-solving abilities requiring insights [9].

Psychologists have studied imagination as a mental property linked to creativity, problem-solving, and mental simulation [10]. Meanwhile, in sociology, imagination was found to foster empathy and collaboration by allowing us to consider other perspectives. Philosophically, it raises questions about the nature of reality and our capacity for free thought.

The full extent of human imaginative capabilities and their various underpinnings remain largely unknown. However, personal factors like expertise, personality, motivation, and environment all seem to play a critical role in human imagination development [11]. This could explain the difficulty in creating artificial intelligence (AI) systems mirroring human imagination.

AI is progressively designed to mimic human cognition, including some aspects of imagination [12]. For example, machine learning and neural networks enable AI systems to generate novel content [13], simulate various scenarios [14], and engage in creative problem-solving [15]. Nonetheless, the AI imagination capabilities fall short of that of humans in critical areas, as will be discussed in the following sections of this paper.

The importance of this article lies in the attempt to explore the intersection between human physicians imagination and AI. Enhancing medical practice through improved diagnostic accuracy, personalized treatment plans, and innovative healthcare solutions can be at least theoretically achieved by augmenting physicians imagination with AI.

The article seeks to understand the potential and limitations of AI in complementing physicians imaginative constructs. It will explore crucial human imaginative components and explore where AI converges to augment or diverge from them.

3. AI in Augmenting Physicians Imagination

3.1. Visual Imagination

Physicians often use their imagination to visualize different patient scenarios, anatomical details, and the effects of their medical interventions on their patient without actual direct visual observation. This cognitive skill is crucial for diagnosis [16], intervention planning like surgery [17], and understanding hidden patient conditions [18]. Obviously, visual imagination requires extensive clinical knowledge, experience, and comprehension of complex human biological systems.

AI can offer a computational counterpart to physicians visual imagination, leveraging technologies like Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) and Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) [19,20]. These technologies enable AI systems to excel in generating new images, recognize patterns in different medical images, and simulate surgical outcomes. However, AI in this context is limited by its training data and lacks the intuitive cross-disciplinary synthesis inherent to human physicians.

Despite the difference between physicians visual imaginations and that of the AI, the potential for the AI to enhance the visual imagination of physicians beyond their natural human limitations is massive. AI can provide advanced imaging analysis, help visualize disease outcomes through disease progression models [21], and construct virtual simulations of different interventions [22].

While it is true that AI can enhance physicians visual imagination, the physicians and AI diverge in the qualitative nature of this human cognitive trait. As part of human nature, physicians imagination is intrinsically creative and intuitive, whereas AI operates within programmed and data-driven boundaries.

Future research could bridge this gap by incorporating creativity and intuition into more sophisticated AI visual processing models. These models can be integrated with augmented and virtual reality technologies.

3.2. Coherence in Imagination

Coherence in imagination allows physicians to connect their clinical knowledge, patient histories, physical examinations, and diagnostic data, whether complete or not, to develop a unified understanding of the patient condition [23]. This crucial cognitive skill becomes even more critical during patient encounters that are complex and uncertain.

In contrast to physicians imaginative coherence, AI achieves its own through algorithms and data analysis [24]. Clearly, AI analyzes vast data sets to identify patterns and make predictions. AI systems rely on statistical correlations and logic [25]; however, that differs from physicians ability to synthesize diverse information intuitively. AI systems in this context still struggle to handle nuanced cases or sparse data [26].

In a practical sense, both physicians and AI aim for coherent interpretations of medical conditions. In this respect, AI armed with training on extensive datasets and its ability to recognize patterns and provide diagnostic suggestions could enhance physicians analytical abilities by offering powerful data-driven insights.

Like visual imagination discussed earlier, coherence has a qualitative nature that makes human physicians different from AI systems or agents. Physicians imaginative coherence incorporates emotional, psychological, and social aspects [27], which current AI systems cannot grasp. Bridging this gap may require research and enhancing AI systems natural language processing, interpretative and ethical dimensions to capture the subtleties of patient narratives and holistic care.

3.3. Counterfactual Thinking

Counterfactual thinking is imagining alternatives to past events that can affect emotions, behavior, decisions, and performance [28,29]. Physicians often contemplate alternative scenarios and outcomes even if they did not happen. Counterfactual thinking allows physicians to reflect on past decisions and different patients care approaches and learn from even hypothetical outcomes. It enhances their diagnostic, treatment, and communication strategies by exploring various possibilities and consequences.

AI algorithms employ some counterfactual thinking that simulate various scenarios based on different inputs [30]. Hence, it can augment physicians counterfactual thinking by rapidly generating and analyzing numerous scenarios, especially in complex situations. However, like the limitations discussed previously, current AI algorithms are limited by the data and lack the reflective and introspective qualities inherent in human physicians thoughts [31].

Deep reflection and consideration of emotional and ethical dimensions of alternate scenarios are the core areas where physician imagination diverges from AI imagination and counterfactual

thinking. Future AI enhancements could include more advanced simulation models integrating patients values and ethical considerations to bridge this gap.

3.4. Mental Time Travel

Mental time travel (MTT) can be defined as projecting oneself through time to revisit past experiences or anticipate future events [32]. This cognitive ability is instrumental for physicians to evaluate the evolution of diseases, foresee future health outcomes, and derive insights from prior cases. It also facilitates reflection on treatment effectiveness and future care planning considering physicians personal experiences, biases, and emotions.

Compared to physician MTT, AI systems navigate MTT differently [33]. These systems use predictive analytics and analysis of historical data to forecast health events [34]. Both physicians and AI systems aim to grasp healthcare issues from their temporal dynamics. AI could support physicians foresight by discovering trends and simulating long-term patients outcomes.

However, unlike human physicians, AI systems obviously lack personal experience of time. They also lack the human narrative, failing to embed data within patients emotional and personal stories.

To bridge this gap, AI advancement may incorporate narrative analysis and emotional contexts to allow AI systems to understand patients histories and storytelling elements, simulate potential patients journeys, and provide a comprehensive view of future scenarios.

3.5. Hypothetical Thinking

Physicians hypothetical thinking utilizes what-if scenarios to navigate uncertainties in diagnosis, therapy planning, and risk management [35,36]. Therefore, this cognitive process is crucial for balancing treatment pros and cons, foreseeing complications, and formulating backup strategies.

Similar to physicians, AI is trained to employ hypothetical thinking in decision-making [37], where AI enhances this process by efficiently generating complex scenarios aiding evidence-based medical practice through statistical outcome predictions [38]. It also supports hypothetical thinking through simulations and modeling. For example, AI can model drug effects, disease spread, and intervention outcomes [39].

Contrary to physician hypothetical thinking, AI is limited by the training data and lack of capacity to integrate intangible factors like patients preferences or ethical nuances. Moreover, physicians reasoning encompasses a broader range of unquantifiable factors compared to the confines of AI datasets.

To bridge the physicians-AI hypothetical thinking gap, training AI systems that are currently falling short of human cognitive breadth must aim to incorporate qualitative data and model ethically complex decisions, striving for a richer and more holistic approach to decision support.

3.6. Theory of Mind

In our view, nothing can help physicians empathize with patients, predict their concerns, and communicate effectively like the theory of mind (ToM). The ToM describes the cognitive ability to attribute and understand mental state, such as beliefs and desires in oneself and others, recognizing that others have different perspectives than ours [40]. Hence, this theory is crucial for delivering patient-centered care, ensuring treatment adherence, and managing patients expectations.

Given the apparent differences between physicians and AI in this context, AI could support physician ToM through data analytics, aiding in the customization of care and enhancing communication. Through these data analytics, it can simulate empathetic responses, recognize behavioral patterns, and predict certain behaviors and preferences [41]. However, no matter how AI supports physician ToM, this does not equate to a genuine understanding of others subjective experiences.

The gap between physician ToM and AI simulation is significant because it is rooted in the fundamental aspects of consciousness and emotional intelligence. To narrow this gap, natural language and emotional recognition technologies must be advanced to simulate a more human-like understanding.

3.7. Problem-Solving

Physicians encounter clinical problems with myriad variables and possible outcomes in their daily practice. These situations drive honing cognitive skills like imagination to identify, analyze, and solve problems. As stated earlier, physicians have a unique blend of knowledge, clinical experiences, creativity, and intuition that position them to skillfully navigate diagnoses, treatment options, and unforeseen complications.

While physicians switch efficiently between different imaginative constructs to solve clinical problems effectively [42], AI uses algorithms and data analysis, offering solutions grounded in pattern recognition, statistical probabilities, and established rules [43]. In this respect, AI armored with unparalleled data processing speed and volume is currently used in disease diagnosis, patients outcomes predictions, and treatment recommendations.

Undoubtedly, AI systems supplement physicians with insights and evidence-based recommendations invaluable in intricate scenarios that may otherwise overwhelm human problem-solving capabilities [44]. Nonetheless, the difference between them is fundamental.

Physicians and AI problem-solving diverge in their essence and breadth. Physicians incorporate empathy, ethical judgment, and management of uncertainties, aspects AI systems current state does not fully embrace. Two issues need to be considered to narrow the chasm between physicians-centric problem-solving cognitive skills and AI analytical power.

First, AI systems must be advanced to complement rather than replace the intricate decision-making processes of physicians. Second, and as might have been stated elsewhere, future AI systems must be enhanced to integrate ethical reasoning, adaptability to new situations, and context-sensitive learning to narrow the gap.

3.8. Planning

In patient care, planning encompasses forecasting, strategizing, and preparing for future actions. Therefore, in this regard, physicians consider immediate and long-term care aspects, such as treatment plans, follow-up appointments, and patient condition trajectories.

Like other imaginative skills, the physicians planning process demands a comprehensive blend of clinical expertise and foresight to predict and adapt to potential future changes and complications to ensure successful patients outcomes and overall care delivery.

AI systems powered with planning tools grounded in analyzing historical data and trends could enhance physicians planning through predictive modeling [45], resource optimization, and scheduling algorithms [46]. This capability could facilitate efficient treatment schedules, healthcare resources management, and the forecasting of patients admissions and discharges.

Physicians planning excels in flexibility and individualized patient considerations, traits that AI system efficiency-centric planning currently lacks. Efforts to bridge this gap must focus on advancing AI systems to supplement the physicians intricate patient-centered planning processes.

Bridging this might be achieved by creating AI systems with adaptable planning features capable of real-time adjustments to patients conditions and incorporating patients preferences into care plans to achieve a personalized patient-centered approach.

4. Discussion

While AI systems can use existing data to extrapolate and replicate patterns to help physicians provide thoughtful patient care, they obviously lack the consciousness and intrinsic depth of emotions that characterize human imaginative capacity.

Even if AI-generated content can be indistinguishable from that of humans in certain areas [47], it typically lacks the human-set parameters, spontaneity, and intentionality of human thought [48].

AI systems have unparalleled potential capabilities to augment the various imaginative constructs of physicians. These capabilities are rooted in handling complex data and generating insights that would otherwise overwhelm the already busy and overwhelmed physicians.

However, human imagination is driven by existential motivations that AI systems do not possess. These motivations include fear, curiosity, and the search for meaning. Understanding these fundamental differences between human imagination and that of AI helps highlight the practical limitations of AI in replicating the full spectrum of human imaginative processes.

5. Conclusion

The potential of AI systems to augment physicians imaginative capabilities is promising but will continue to be challenging, at least in the foreseeable future. They excel in data analysis and pattern recognition but lack nuanced human cognition.

The physician-AI partnership in this respect could revolutionize diagnostics, personalized patient care, and innovative patient care solutions, but this necessitates a collaborative approach and further research to close the current gap. However, the focus must be on augmentation rather than replacing or replicating physicians cognition and imagination.

References

1. Pearson J. The human imagination: the cognitive neuroscience of visual mental imagery. Nat Rev Neurosci. 2019; 20(10): 624-34.
2. Drubach D, Benarroch EE, Mateen FJ. Imagination: its definition, purposes and neurobiology]. Rev Neurol. 2007; 45(6): 353-8.
3. Barrett D. Dreams and creative problem-solving. Ann N Y Acad Sci. 2017; 1406(1): 64-7.
4. Finke RA. Imagery, creativity, and emergent structure. Conscious Cogn. 1996; 5(3): 381-93.
5. Trevors JT, Saier MH. Exercises in human imagination. Water Air Soil Pollut. 2010; 205(S1): 9-10.
6. Fuentes A. Human evolution, niche complexity, and the emergence of a distinctively human imagination. Time Mind. 2014; 7(3): 241-57.
7. Comrie AE, Frank LM, Kay K. Imagination as a fundamental function of the hippocampus. Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci. 2022; 377(1866): 20210336.
8. Zeidman P, Maguire EA. Anterior hippocampus: the anatomy of perception, imagination and episodic memory | Nature Reviews Neuroscience [Internet].
9. Duch W. Creativity and the Brain. Creat Brain. 2007; 507-30.
10. Kris E. Psychoanalysis and the study of creative imagination. 1953; 29(4): 334-54.
11. Gotlieb RJM, Hyde E, Immordino-Yang MH, Kaufman SB. Imagination is the seed of creativity. In: Kaufman JC, Sternberg RJ, editors. The Cambridge Handbook of Creativity [Internet]. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2019; 709-31.
12. Fei N, Lu Z, Gao Y, Yang G, Huo Y, Wen J, et al. Towards artificial general intelligence via a multimodal foundation model. Nat Commun. 2022; 13(1): 3094.
13. Pokhrel S, Banjade SR. AI content generation technology based on open AI language Model. J Artif Intell Capsule Netw. 2023; 5(4): 534-48.
14. Hamdan BA. Neural network principles and its application. Webology. 2022; 19(1): 3955-070.
15. Drori I, Zhang S, Shuttleworth R, Tang L, Lu A, Ke E, et al. A neural

network solves, explains, and generates university math problems by program synthesis and few-shot learning at human level. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2022; 119(32): e2123433119.

16. Eddy David M, Clanton Charles H. The art of diagnosis. N Engl J Med. 1982; 306(21): 1263-8.
17. Gauderer MWL. Creativity and the surgeon. J Pediatr Surg. 2009; 44(1): 13-20.
18. Barsky AJ. Hidden reasons some patients visit doctors. Ann Intern Med. 1981; 94(4_Part_1): 492.
19. Wang Z, Healy G, Smeaton AF, Ward TE. Use of neural signals to evaluate the quality of generative adversarial network performance in facial image generation. Cogn Comput. 2020; 12(1): 13-24.
20. Gui J, Sun Z, Wen Y, Tao D, Ye J. A review on generative adversarial networks: algorithms, theory, and applications. IEEE Trans Knowl Data Eng. 2023; 35(4): 3313-32.
21. Wang S, Yang DM, Rong R, Zhan X, Fujimoto J, Liu H, et al. Artificial intelligence in lung cancer pathology image analysis. Cancers. 2019; 11(11): 1673.
22. Sherouse W, Mcmurry HL. Virtual simulation in the clinic setting: some practical considerations. Int J Radiation Oncology Biol Phys. 1990; 19: 1059-65.
23. Moskowitz AJ. Dealing with uncertainty, risks, and tradeoffs in clinical decisions: a cognitive science approach. Ann Intern Med. 1988; 108(3): 435.
24. Maimon A, Tsarfaty R. A novel computational and modeling foundation for automatic coherence assessment [Internet]. arXiv. 2023.
25. Yu B, Kumbier K. Artificial intelligence and statistics. Front Inf Technol Electron Eng. 2018; 19(1): 6-9.
26. Kepner J, Alford S, Gadepally V, Jones M, Milechin L, Reuther A, et al. GraphChallenge.org Sparse deep neural network performance. In: 2020 IEEE High Performance Extreme Computing Conference (HPEC) [Internet]. 2020; 1-7.
27. Zabelina DL, Condon DM. The four-factor imagination scale (FFIS): a measure for assessing frequency, complexity, emotional valence, and directedness of imagination. Psychol Res. 2020; 84(8): 2287-99.
28. Roese NJ. Counterfactual thinking. Psychol Bull. 1997; 121(1): 133-48.
29. Epstude K, Roese NJ. The functional theory of counterfactual thinking. Personal Soc Psychol Rev. 2008; 12(2): 168-92.
30. De Schutter L, De Cremer D. How counterfactual fairness modelling in algorithms can promote ethical decision-making. Int J Human–Computer Interact. 2024; 40(1): 33-44.
31. Fokas AS. Can artificial intelligence reach human thought? Kavraki L, editor. PNAS Nexus. 2023; 2(12): pgad409.
32. Berntsen D, Jacobsen AS. Involuntary (spontaneous) mental time travel into the past and future. Conscious Cogn. 2008; 17(4): 1093-104.
33. Hung CC, Lillicrap T, Abramson J, Wu Y, Mirza M, Carnevale F, et al. Optimizing agent behavior over long time scales by transporting value. Nat Commun. 2019; 10(1): 5223.
34. Cohen IG, Amarasingham R, Shah A, Xie B, Lo B. The legal and ethical concerns that arise from using complex predictive analytics in health care. Health Aff (Millwood). 2014; 33(7): 1139-47.
35. Han PKJ, Strout TD, Gutheil C, Germann C, King B, Ofstad E, et al. How physicians manage medical uncertainty: a qualitative study and conceptual taxonomy. Med Decis Making. 2021; 41(3): 275-91.
36. Lichtstein DM. Strategies to deal with uncertainty in medicine. Am J Med. 2023; 136(4): 339-40.
37. Kolker S, Dennis L, Pereira RF, Xu M. Uncertain machine ethical decisions using hypothetical retrospection [Internet]. arXiv; 2023.
38. Ambags EL, Capitoli G, Imperio VL, Provenzano M, Nobile MS, Liò P. Assisting clinical practice with fuzzy probabilistic decision trees [Internet]. arXiv; 2023.
39. Vora LK, Gholap AD, Jetha K, Thakur RRS, Solanki HK, Chavda VP. Artificial intelligence in pharmaceutical technology and drug delivery design. Pharmaceutics. 2023; 15(7): 1916.
40. Iglesias L, Pellicena MÀ, Valero-Garcia J, Ivern I, Vila-Rovira JM. Evolution of ToM abilities among older adults and the elder. [Internet]. 2023.
41. Alanazi SA, Shabbir M, Alshammari N, Alruwaili M, Hussain I, Ahmad F. Prediction of emotional empathy in intelligent agents to facilitate precise social interaction. Appl Sci. 2023; 13(2): 1163.
42. Style A. Intuition and problem solving. J R Coll Gen Pract. 1979; 29(199): 71-4.
43. Biswas AK. Autonomous intelligence in problem-solving by searching in the field of artificial intelligence. Int J Sci Res Sci Eng Technol. 2022; 53-62.
44. Samhammer D, Roller R, Hummel P, Osmanodja B, Burchardt A, Mayrdorfer M, et al. Nothing works without the doctor: Physicians' perception of clinical decision-making and artificial intelligence. Front Med [Internet]. 2022; 9.
45. Ed-Driouch C, Gourraud PA, Dumas C, dric, Mars F. The Integration of human intelligence into artificial intelligence to provide medical practice-based predictions. In: HHAI2022: Augmenting human intellect [Internet]. IOS Press. 2022; 293–4.
46. Eichhorn S, Rolle J, Kaiyas Y, Georgiou P, Park JHJ. Application of an AI-supported diagnostic planning tool in ENT patients. In: Laryngo-Rhino-Otologie [Internet]. Georg Thieme Verlag. 2023.
47. Denny P, Khosravi H, Hellas A, Leinonen J, Sarsa S. Can we trust AI-generated educational content? comparative analysis of human and AI-generated learning resources [Internet]. arXiv. 2023.
48. Liu T, Lyu E, Wang J, Meng MQH. Unified intention inference and learning for human–robot cooperative assembly. IEEE Trans Autom Sci Eng. 2022; 19(3): 2256-66.