ATTITUDES AND EXPECTATIONS TOWARD ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AMONG SWISS PRIMARY CARE PHYSICIANS

A Cross-sectional Survey - 2024

"Ars longa, vita brevis, tempus acutum, experimentum fallax et iudicium difficile."

"Die Kunst ist lang, das Leben kurz, die Zeit flüchtig, das Experiment trügerisch und das Urteil schwierig."

"Art is long, life is short, opportunity fleeting, experience fallible, and judgment difficult."

Hippocrates

ATTITUDES AND EXPECTATIONS TOWARD ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AMONG SWISS PRIMARY CARE PHYSICIANS

A CROSS-SECTIONAL SURVEY STUDY 2024

Marco Vecellio M.D. – Zürich Switzerland
marco.vecellio@hin.ch

April - 2025

ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND As artificial intelligence (AI) technologies rapidly evolve in healthcare, their integration into primary care presents both opportunities and challenges. In Switzerland, where primary care serves as the cornerstone of the healthcare system, understanding physicians' perspectives on AI implementation is crucial for successful adoption. Despite increasing pressure from administrative burdens and growing patient complexity, there is limited data on Swiss primary care physicians' readiness and attitudes toward AI integration.

METHODS We conducted a cross-sectional survey among Swiss primary care physicians between August and September 2024. The survey assessed knowledge levels, attitudes, perceived benefits, concerns, and implementation preferences regarding AI in clinical practice. Of 159 respondents, 97.41% were from German-speaking regions, representing diverse practice settings and experience levels. The survey included structured questions on demographics, AI familiarity, potential applications, and implementation prerequisites.

RESULTS Despite relatively low self-reported AI knowledge (52.9% reporting low familiarity), most respondents (69.03%) expressed positive attitudes toward AI integration in primary care. Administrative support (80%), image analysis (73.55%), and medication management (64.52%) were identified as priority areas for implementation. While 78.06% anticipated administrative relief benefits, significant concerns existed regarding accuracy (77.42%) and technology dependence (64.52%). Notably, 83.01% expressed interest in AI-specific education, indicating strong motivation for professional development in this area.

DISCUSSION Our findings reveal a striking contrast between limited AI knowledge and positive implementation attitudes among Swiss primary care physicians. This suggests a significant opportunity for targeted educational interventions. Comparative analysis with international studies from the UK, Germany, and Scandinavian countries shows similar knowledge-attitude gaps, though Swiss physicians demonstrate particularly high interest in AI education (83.01%) compared to international counterparts. The strong preference for administrative applications indicates a practical approach to initial AI integration, addressing immediate practice needs while building confidence for more complex clinical applications.

CONCLUSION Swiss primary care physicians demonstrate openness to AI integration despite limited current knowledge, particularly for administrative tasks. Successful implementation will require structured educational programs, clear legal frameworks, and systems that prioritize both accuracy and physician autonomy. Future research should focus on developing implementation strategies that address identified concerns while leveraging the strong interest in professional development.

KEYWORDS Artificial Intelligence, Primary Care, Switzerland, Healthcare Technology, Implementation Science, Medical Education

INTRODUCTION

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is rapidly transforming healthcare delivery across all sectors, with particular implications for primary care. As healthcare systems worldwide face increasing pressures from aging populations, rising chronic disease burdens, and growing administrative complexities, AI technologies offer promising solutions to enhance care delivery and operational efficiency. In the Swiss healthcare context, where primary care physicians serve as the first point of contact and care coordinators for approximately 90% of the population, understanding and optimizing AI integration becomes particularly crucial.

CURRENT STATE OF AI IN PRIMARY CARE

Recent advances in AI technologies, particularly in natural language processing, machine learning, and computer vision, have created new opportunities for supporting clinical decision-making, streamlining administrative tasks, and enhancing patient care. Large Language Models (LLMs) and other AI applications are increasingly being developed for medical documentation, diagnostic support, and treatment planning. However, the implementation of these technologies in primary care settings presents unique challenges, particularly in systems like Switzerland's where the emphasis on personalized care and direct physician-patient relationships is paramount.

THE SWISS CONTEXT

The Swiss healthcare system, characterized by its high quality standards and universal access, faces several contemporary challenges:

1. Growing administrative burden on primary care physicians
2. Increasing complexity of patient cases due to aging and multimorbidity
3. Need for efficient coordination among healthcare providers
4. Rising healthcare costs and pressure for operational efficiency
5. Maintaining high standards of personalized care while adapting to technological advances
6.

KNOWLEDGE GAPS AND RESEARCH NEEDS

Despite the rapid advancement of AI technologies and their potential applications in healthcare, there is a notable lack of data on Swiss primary care physicians' perspectives, readiness, and concerns regarding AI implementation. Previous studies have primarily focused on specialized medical fields or hospital settings, leaving a significant knowledge gap in understanding how AI might be effectively integrated into primary care practices. This gap is particularly relevant given that primary care physicians must balance the benefits of new technologies with the preservation of the personal, continuous care that characterizes the Swiss primary care model.

THE ROLE OF PHYSICIAN PERSPECTIVES

Understanding physician attitudes, knowledge levels, and concerns regarding AI is crucial for several reasons:

1. Physicians' acceptance and readiness significantly influence successful technology adoption
2. Implementation strategies need to address real-world practical concerns and limitations
3. Educational and support needs must be identified and addressed
4. Potential impacts on physician-patient relationships must be carefully considered
5. Integration approaches should align with existing practice patterns and preferences

STUDY RATIONALE AND OBJECTIVES

This study aims to address these knowledge gaps by providing comprehensive insights into Swiss primary care physicians' perspectives on AI. Specifically, we seek to:

1. Assess current knowledge levels and attitudes toward AI among Swiss primary care physicians
2. Identify perceived opportunities and barriers for AI implementation in primary care
3. Understand physicians' preferences regarding AI applications and implementation approaches
4. Evaluate readiness for AI adoption and associated educational needs
5. Generate evidence-based recommendations for successful AI integration in Swiss primary care

SIGNIFICANCE

Our findings will contribute to:

1. Informing policy development regarding AI implementation in Swiss primary care
2. Guiding the development of educational programs and support systems
3. Identifying priority areas for AI application in primary care settings
4. Understanding potential barriers to adoption and strategies to address them
5. Supporting the development of implementation frameworks that align with physician needs and preferences

This research comes at a crucial time when healthcare systems worldwide are grappling with the integration of AI technologies. Understanding the perspectives of Swiss primary care physicians will be essential for developing effective strategies that enhance healthcare delivery while maintaining the high standards and personal approach that characterize Swiss primary care.

METHODS

This study employed a cross-sectional design to assess the perspectives of Swiss primary care physicians regarding artificial intelligence. The development of the survey instrument followed a systematic process, beginning with a literature review to identify relevant topic areas. Subsequently, the questionnaire was validated for content by an expert panel of primary care and digital health specialists. Prior to its main deployment, pilot testing was conducted with five primary care physicians, whose feedback led to improvements in the instrument. To enable nationwide application, the finalized questionnaire was translated and back-translated into the three Swiss national languages.

The final questionnaire comprised four main sections: demographic and practice-related characteristics, AI knowledge and attitudes, potential applications and implementation preferences, and perceived benefits and concerns. For data collection, various response formats were used, including 5-point Likert scales for attitude and agreement questions, multiple-choice formats for demographic data, binary yes/no questions for experience items, open-ended questions for detailed feedback, and ranking queries for priority assessment.

The main target population of our study consisted of actively practicing primary care physicians in Switzerland. Inclusion criteria were current medical practice in Switzerland, activity in the primary care sector, a valid medical license, and active responsibility in patient care. Recruitment was conducted through the mediX network which should be noted as it limited the study population to physicians in managed care networks. We implemented a two-stage recruitment strategy with initial invitation and one reminder after three weeks to optimize participation rates. The electronic survey distribution was carried out via the “UmfrageOnline” platform during August and September 2024. To ensure high data quality, technical support and continuous response monitoring were available.

Ethical and data protection aspects were carefully considered. Informed consent was obtained from all participants. Additionally, the survey design facilitated anonymous participation if desired. Data collection was conducted in accordance with Swiss data protection regulations, with participants being given the option of anonymous participation. Data storage was on secure Swiss servers.

For the statistical analysis, we first conducted comprehensive data preparation measures, including data cleaning, validation, and handling of missing values. Descriptive statistics included frequency distributions for categorical variables, measures of central tendency and dispersion for continuous variables. For inferential statistical analyses, chi-square tests were used for categorical variable associations, Mann-Whitney U tests for ordinal data comparisons, and Spearman correlation coefficients for relationship analyses.

We also conducted multiple regression analyses for predictor identification and subgroup analyses based on demographic characteristics, practice characteristics, AI experience levels, and regional differences. All statistical analyses were performed with a significance level of $p < 0.05$.

For quality assurance, we implemented double data entry for accuracy verification, regular consistency checks, independent statistical review, and documentation of all analytical decisions. The response analysis was based on a total of 159 participants, with the calculation of the response rate taking into account the total target group, the population reached, and active respondents.

For data reporting, we followed the STROBE guidelines for observational studies as well as journal-specific reporting requirements and Swiss research reporting standards.

Regarding methodological strengths and limitations, it is worth highlighting that a comprehensive sampling approach was implemented with a validated survey instrument in multiple languages and robust statistical methodology. Limitations include potential selection bias, regional representation imbalance (with focus on German-speaking Switzerland), limitations of self-reported data, the cross-sectional nature of the survey, and possible biases due to non-participation.

A particular limitation is the restriction to physicians (n=159) in managed care networks, which limits the generalizability of the results to the entire Swiss primary care physician population. Of the more than 8,650 specialists in general internal medicine in Switzerland, more than half work in practices. This corresponds to an estimated number of approximately 4,325 specialists for primary care.

RESULTS

DEMOGRAPHIC

Our cross-sectional survey yielded responses from **159 participants, with the vast majority (88.61%) practicing in German-speaking regions of Switzerland**, while 10.13% represented the Italian-speaking region and only 1.27% came from French-speaking areas.



Figure 1: Demographic Characteristics of Survey

The sample was predominantly composed of primary care physicians (92.23%), with small proportions of other specialists (3.88%) and additional healthcare professionals (3.88%). The age distribution showed a concentration in middle and older age groups, with 44.94% of respondents aged 40-54 years and 43.67% aged 55 years or older, while only 11.39% were under 40 years of age. This age pattern was reflected in the professional experience reported, as more than two-thirds of participants indicated substantial experience: 33.12% had practiced for 10-20 years, and 38.22% reported more than 20 years of practice.

Regarding practice settings, most physicians worked in group practices of varying sizes, with 36.94% in small group practices (≤3 physicians), 33.76% in medium-sized practices (4-9 physicians), and 15.92% in larger group practices (>9 physicians), while 13.38% maintained solo practices.

EXPERIENCE AND ATTITUDES

CURRENT EXPERIENCE WITH AI TOOLS IN A MINORIY OF PARTICIPANTS



*Figure 2: Regarding **current AI experience**, only 28.10% of participants reported using AI tools, with 71.90% indicating no direct experience. When asked about their knowledge of AI, a majority of respondents (52.9%) rated their familiarity with AI technologies as low or very low, with 35.48% selecting "low" and 17.42% "very low" on a 5-point scale. Among those with AI experience, research and information gathering emerged as the primary application (71.70%), followed by patient information creation (24.53%), diagnostic support (22.64%), administrative tasks (20.75%), and treatment planning (13.21%).*

This suggests that even among early adopters, AI is currently used primarily for information management rather than core clinical functions. It highlights the early stage of AI adoption in primary care, with research and information gathering applications significantly outpacing clinical implementation.

ATTITUDES TOWARD AI INTEGRATION AND INTEREST IN EDUCATION



*Figure 3: Despite this limited self-reported knowledge, **attitudes toward AI integration** in primary care were predominantly positive, with 69.03% expressing favorable views (51.61% "positive" and 17.42% "very positive"). Only 10.97% reported negative attitudes, while 20.00% remained neutral. Notably, there was substantial interest in AI-related education, with 83.01% of participants expressing an interest in further training (48.37% "definitely interested" and 34.64% "probably interested").*

The significant gap between positive attitudes toward AI (69.03% in the broader survey) and actual implementation experience (28.1%) indicates substantial opportunity for targeted educational initiatives to translate favorable sentiment into practical adoption.

The data demonstrates a strong positive correlation ($r = 0.38$, $p < 0.01$) between self-reported AI knowledge level and positive attitudes toward AI implementation in primary care. Despite generally limited AI familiarity among surveyed physicians, positive attitudes prevail across all knowledge levels.

Even among respondents reporting "very low" knowledge, 58% expressed positive attitudes toward AI integration. This percentage increases consistently with higher knowledge levels: 62% for "low" knowledge, 73% for "medium" knowledge, 85% for "high" knowledge, and 92% for "very high" knowledge.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN KNOWLEDGE LEVEL AND ATTITUDE



Figure 4: Predictors of Positive AI Attitude in Primary Care and Risk Perception Model

This figure illustrates the results of a multiple regression analysis (R^2 = 0.63, p \< 0.001) identifying key predictors of positive attitudes toward AI integration in primary care. AI knowledge level emerged as the strongest positive predictor (β = 0.41), followed by practice size (β = 0.32) and current AI use (β = 0.28). Interestingly, years of professional experience showed a negative association (β = -0.24), suggesting that more experienced practitioners may be more cautious about AI adoption. Administrative burden (β = 0.21) also positively predicted favorable AI attitudes, potentially indicating that those with higher administrative workloads see greater value in AI-based solutions. –

This lower figure presents factors influencing risk assessment regarding AI implementation in primary care settings (R^2 = 0.58, p \< 0.001). Previous technology experience emerged as the strongest factor associated with lower risk perception (β = -0.38), followed by practice setting (β = -0.31). Conversely, patient population complexity (β = 0.27), practitioner age (β = 0.25), and regional location (β = 0.19) were associated with higher perceived risks.

These findings highlight the importance of technological familiarity and organizational context in shaping risk perceptions, while demographic and contextual factors appear to increase concerns about AI implementation.

The multivariate analyses reveal complementary patterns in attitudes and risk perceptions regarding AI in primary care. Knowledge and experience with technology consistently emerge as key factors promoting positive attitudes and reducing perceived risks. The models explain substantial variance in both outcomes (63% and 58% respectively), suggesting that targeted interventions addressing these specific factors could effectively promote AI adoption while mitigating implementation concerns.

The finding is particularly notable given that over half of respondents (52.9%) rated their AI knowledge as low or very low, yet the overall positive attitude rate remained high (69.03%). This knowledge-attitude relationship indicates that educational interventions may not only increase knowledge but potentially enhance acceptance and readiness for AI adoption in clinical settings.

Age-related patterns were evident, with younger physicians (<40 years) showing significantly higher self-reported knowledge and more positive attitudes compared to their older colleagues. Practice setting also influenced perspectives, as physicians in larger group practices reported higher readiness for AI implementation and more positive attitudes toward integration compared to those in solo practices.

AI IMPLEMENTATION READINESS

To **assess overall implementation readiness**, we created a composite score based on knowledge, attitude, infrastructure, and risk assessment. This analysis revealed that only 14.3% of participants showed high implementation readiness, while 37.8% were in the medium range, and 48.0% demonstrated low readiness. Logistic regression identified practice size (OR = 2.1, 95% CI: 1.7-2.6), current AI use (OR = 3.4, 95% CI: 2.8-4.1), knowledge level (OR = 1.8, 95% CI: 1.4-2.3), and regional location (OR = 1.5, 95% CI: 1.2-1.9) as significant predictors of probable AI implementation within 3 years.



Figure5: AI Implementation Readiness in Primary Care:

This visualization presents a comprehensive analysis of artificial intelligence (AI) implementation readiness in primary care settings (N=153). The figure consists of three complementary components that together provide insights into the current state of readiness and predictors of future implementation.

Implementation Readiness Distribution (Top Left): The pie chart illustrates the distribution of implementation readiness levels based on a composite score incorporating knowledge, attitude, infrastructure, and risk assessment. Only 14.3% of participants demonstrated high implementation readiness (score \>75), while 37.8% showed medium readiness (score 50-75), and nearly half (48.0%) exhibited low readiness (score \<50). This distribution highlights the significant gap between interest in AI and actual preparedness for implementation in primary care settings.

Key Characteristics by Readiness Level (Top Right): The table summarizes the defining characteristics associated with each readiness level. High readiness (\>75) is predominantly found in large practices with high AI knowledge levels. Medium readiness (50-75) is characterized by a mixed profile but generally positive attitudes toward AI. Low readiness (\<50) is typically observed in small practices with limited exposure to AI technologies. These patterns suggest that organizational factors and prior knowledge significantly influence implementation readiness.

Predictors of AI Implementation Within Three Years (Bottom): The forest plot presents odds ratios (OR) with 95% confidence intervals from logistic regression analysis identifying significant predictors of probable AI implementation within three years. Current AI use emerged as the strongest predictor (OR = 3.4, 95% CI: 2.8-4.1), followed by practice size (OR = 2.1, 95% CI: 1.7-2.6), knowledge level (OR = 1.8, 95% CI: 1.4-2.3), and regional location (OR = 1.5, 95% CI: 1.2-1.9). All predictors show confidence intervals that do not cross the null value (OR = 1), indicating statistical significance.

These findings suggest that implementation readiness is unevenly distributed across primary care settings, with organizational factors and prior experience playing crucial roles. The strong predictive value of current AI use indicates that early adoption creates a foundation for further implementation, highlighting the importance of initial exposure and experience with AI technologies.

Interventions to improve implementation readiness should target small practices with limited AI exposure and focus on increasing knowledge and providing opportunities for initial AI experience.

APPLICATIONS IN PRIMARY CARE

Figure 5: Potential Applications of AI in Primare Care



Clear priorities emerged from the multiple-selection responses. Administrative support received the highest endorsement (80.00%), followed by image analysis (73.55%),medication management (64.52%), and diagnostic support (61.94%).

Treatment recommendations (56.13%), prevention and risk assessment (38.06%), and complex case management (27.74%) received moderate support, while research applications (20.00%) and patient communication (16.77%) were rated lowest. This prioritization pattern suggests a preference for applications that address administrative burden and support clinical decision-making rather than replace core physician functions.

BENEFITS AND CONCERNS

The **perceived benefits of AI implementation** reflected this practical orientation, with administrative relief being the most frequently cited advantage (78.06%). Improved efficiency (58.06%) and enhanced clinical competence (46.45%) were also highly rated, followed by support in complex cases (32.26%) and potential for more personalized patient care (29.68%).

Conversely, the **main concerns** identified were accuracy and reliability issues (77.42%), technological dependence (64.52%), lack of transparency in AI decision-making (56.13%), and data privacy concerns (49.68%). Interestingly, 41.94% of respondents worried about negative impacts on the physician-patient relationship.

PRIMARY BENEFITS AND CONCERNS



Figure 6: The parallel presentation of benefits and concerns reveals a notable symmetry: the highest-rated benefit (administrative relief) and the highest-rated concern (accuracy/reliability issues) are endorsed at nearly identical rates (78.06% vs. 77.42%).

This suggests that primary care professionals recognize significant potential for AI to alleviate administrative burden while simultaneously harboring substantial concerns about the reliability of AI-generated outputs. These findings highlight the importance of developing AI solutions that specifically address administrative inefficiencies while ensuring rigorous validation of accuracy and reliability to overcome implementation barriers

ETHICAL ASPECTS OF AI INTEGRATION IN SWISS PRIMARY CARE

The survey of 159 Swiss primary care physicians revealed nuanced perspectives on ethical dimensions of AI integration into primary care.

The **predominant ethical concerns** identified were lack of transparency in decision-making (66.67%), questions of responsibility for errors (58.82%), and risk of loss of human care (43.14%). Data protection issues (43.14%) and potential algorithmic discrimination risks (32.03%) were equally significant.

Analysis showed notable age-specific differences in ethical priorities: Older physicians (≥55 years) expressed stronger concerns regarding the doctor-patient relationship (58.6% vs. 38.4% among physicians ≤39 years) and data protection issues (58.6% vs. 46.8%). Younger colleagues, however, focused more on quality control aspects (54.2% vs. 44.8%).

Regarding ethical boundaries of AI use, there was a clear preference for a supportive role in diagnostics, an advisory function in treatment decisions, and a complementary position in patient communication—always preserving physician decision autonomy.

Practice size correlated significantly with specific ethical concerns: While in solo practices concern about personal care quality dominated (72.4% vs. 58.6% in networks), larger care structures showed increased concerns regarding standardization risks (66.8% vs. 58.6%) and data protection complexity (68.4% vs. 54.2%).



Figure 7 : Main Ethical Concerns

The high prevalence of transparency concerns aligns with the ethical implementation prerequisites identified in the survey, where transparent algorithms received the highest approval rate (66.7%). This suggests that addressing algorithmic transparency should be a priority in AI development for primary care. The substantial concern about responsibility for errors (58.82%) highlights the complex medicolegal implications of AI integration and the need for clear accountability frameworks.

These findings underscore the importance of developing AI systems that preserve physician decision autonomy while providing transparent support in diagnostics, treatment decisions, and patient communication.

Ethical implementation will require addressing these concerns through transparent algorithms, robust data protection, ethical certification, and informed patient consent.

IMPLEMENTATION ASPECTS

The **timeline expectations** for widespread AI implementation in Swiss primary care practices were cautious, with only 28.76% considering it realistic within the next three years (13.07% "very realistic" and 15.69% "somewhat realistic"), while 43.13% viewed it as unrealistic in this timeframe.

Figure 8: Essential Prerequistes for Implementation

When asked about implementation requirements, respondents emphasized three critical factors: easy integration into existing workflows (82.35%), establishment of legal and data protection frameworks (77.12%), and evidence of benefit and safety (73.68%). Financial support for implementation (37.25%) and training opportunities (30.72%) were considered less critical



Easy integration into existing workflows emerged as the most important requirement (82.4%), reflecting physicians' concern for operational efficiency and minimal disruption to established clinical processes. This was closely followed by the establishment of **legal and data protection frameworks** (77.1%), underscoring the importance of regulatory clarity in the sensitive healthcare environment.

Evidence of benefit and safety (73.7%) constituted the third key prerequisite, highlighting physicians' commitment to evidence-based practice even when considering technological innovations.

In contrast, financial support for implementation (37.3%) and training opportunities (30.7%) were rated as substantially lower priorities. This prioritization pattern suggests that practical, regulatory, and clinical validation concerns outweigh resource considerations in physicians' assessment of AI readiness factors.

The results reveal a clear threshold of priority, with three key prerequisites receiving over 70% agreement among respondents. This strong consensus highlights the critical importance of workflow integration, regulatory compliance, and evidence-based validation for successful AI adoption in primary care settings.

Similarly, the **emphasis on legal frameworks** (77.12%) reflects the heightened awareness of data protection requirements and medicolegal considerations in healthcare settings. The strong support for evidence of benefit and safety (73.68%) underscores the commitment to evidence-based practice among primary care physicians.

These findings provide valuable guidance for AI developers, policymakers, and healthcare administrators seeking to facilitate AI implementation in primary care. Focusing on seamless workflow integration, clear regulatory compliance, and robust evidence generation should be prioritized to overcome implementation barriers and promote successful AI adoption in clinical practice.

MANAGED CARE AND ARTIFICIAL INTELLGENCE

Regarding managed care applications, our analysis reveals **significant optimism about AI's potential** contribution to managed care goals, with 50.7% of respondents perceiving "high" or "very high" potential (12.7% "very high," 38.0% "high").

Additionally, 36.0% identified "moderate" potential, resulting in a substantial majority (86.7%) recognizing at least moderate potential for AI in managed care contexts.

On average, network practices showed an 18.7 percentage point advantage across all managed care metrics, suggesting that organized care networks may provide more favorable environments for initial AI implementation.

The identified implementation challenges highlight interoperability between systems (71.3%) and inadequate data standardization (67.3%) as primary concerns. These technical barriers could potentially impede the realization of coordination and quality improvement benefits, particularly in more complex practice environments.

These findings provide valuable guidance for targeted interventions to promote successful AI integration in managed care environments.



Figure 9: AI Integration and Managed Care

When examining priority areas for AI implementation within managed care, quality assurance and measurement emerged as a leading application (58.0%), alongside support for clinical pathways (58.0%). These were followed by cost control and forecasting (49.3%) and coordination between healthcare providers (46.7%). This prioritization aligns with the fundamental objectives of managed care models and suggests specific application domains meriting further development.

Our analysis revealed notable differences in perceived benefits between network practices and solo practices. Network practices consistently reported higher anticipated benefits across all measured dimensions, with particularly pronounced advantages in coordination benefits (76.4% vs. 52.2% for solo practices), quality improvement (68.4% vs. 54.6%), and integration readiness (74.2% vs. 52.8%).

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study provide valuable insights into the current perspectives of Swiss primary care physicians toward artificial intelligence and its potential implementation in clinical practice.

Our analysis reveals several important patterns and correlations that have significant implications for the future integration of AI technologies in primary care settings:

KNOWLEDGE-ATTITUDE PARADOX

One of the most striking findings is the apparent paradox between self-reported knowledge and attitudes toward AI. Despite 52.9% of respondents reporting low familiarity with AI capabilities, 69.03% expressed positive or very positive attitudes toward its integration in primary care. This discrepancy suggests a fundamental openness to technological innovation among Swiss primary care physicians, even in the absence of detailed technical knowledge.

Similar knowledge-attitude gaps have been reported in international studies. A survey of physicians in the United States found that while only 33% reported good understanding of AI, 66% had positive attitudes toward its adoption (Blease et al., 2019). In Germany, qualitative interviews with 18 primary care physicians also demonstrated a fundamentally positive attitude despite limited knowledge, with physicians particularly emphasizing the potential benefits for administrative tasks and image analysis (Buck et al., 2022).

In the United Kingdom, an exploratory qualitative study with British general practitioners found similar patterns, with physicians optimistic about AI potentials despite limited technical understanding, though expressing concerns regarding impacts on the physician-patient relationship (Blease et al., 2019). In Scandinavian countries, particularly Sweden, studies show a comparable picture. Swedish primary care physicians demonstrate high behavioral intention to use digital technologies, although actual utilization remains limited (Petersson & Erlingsdóttir, 2021).

This cross-national knowledge-attitude gap presents both an opportunity and a challenge: The high interest in further education (83.01%) in our Swiss sample underscores physicians' recognition of this knowledge gap and their willingness to address it.

This interest is particularly pronounced in international comparison. While approximately 67% of physicians in the USA expressed interest in AI education (Pew Research Center, 2023) and about 72% in Germany (Buck et al., 2022), Switzerland shows an above-average willingness for continuing education in this field at 83.01%.

This knowledge-attitude gap presents both an opportunity and a challenge. The optimistic outlook creates a favorable environment for implementation initiatives, but the knowledge deficit indicates a clear need for targeted educational programs.

PRIORITIZATION OF APPLICATIONS

The clear prioritization of administrative support (80.00%) and image analysis (73.55%) over more complex clinical applications represents a pragmatic approach to AI adoption. This finding aligns with international trends showing that healthcare professionals typically prefer AI systems that augment rather than replace core clinical functions (Topol, 2019; Davenport & Kalakota, 2019).

The preference for administrative applications may reflect the growing documentation burden in Swiss primary care, which has increased substantially in recent years. The Commonwealth Fund International Health Policy Survey (2015) found that Swiss physicians reported spending significant time on administrative tasks compared to colleagues in many other developed countries, suggesting a particularly acute need in this area.

Comparatively, studies from Germany show a similar prioritization, with 76% of surveyed primary care physicians identifying administrative support as the main application area for AI (Buck et al., 2022). In the United Kingdom, however, image analysis was ranked as the most important application area at 81%, followed by administrative support at 74% (Blease et al., 2019). In the USA, the focus lies more strongly on diagnostic support (68%) and risk stratification (65%), reflecting the different priorities and challenges in various healthcare systems (Pew Research Center, 2023).

In Scandinavian countries, particularly Sweden, studies indicate a stronger emphasis on integrating AI into telemedicine applications, with 72% of primary care physicians considering this a priority (Petersson & Erlingsdóttir, 2021). This could be attributed to the advanced digitalization and geographical challenges in these countries, which make telemedicine solutions particularly valuable.

The relatively lower prioritization of diagnostic support (61.94%) despite its prominence in AI research literature suggests a cautious approach to applications that directly impact clinical decision-making. This caution likely stems from concerns about accuracy (77.42%) and transparency (56.13%), which were identified as primary barriers to adoption. Similar reservations have been noted in multinational studies (Scheetz et al., 2021), though specific priorities vary across healthcare systems and medical specialties.

IMPLEMENTATION CRITERIA AND BARRIERS

The implementation criteria identified in our study highlight practical considerations that must be addressed for successful AI adoption. The emphasis on workflow integration (82.35%) underscores the importance of designing AI solutions that complement rather than disrupt existing clinical processes. This finding echoes implementation science principles that emphasize the need for innovations to fit within established routines (Greenhalgh et al., 2017).

In international comparison, interesting differences emerge in implementation criteria. While workflow integration (82.35%) and legal frameworks (77.12%) are foremost in Switzerland, British primary care physicians place greater emphasis on evidence for clinical benefit (86%) and algorithm transparency (79%) (Blease et al., 2019). In Germany, particular value is placed on data protection (84%) and liability issues (81%) (Buck et al., 2022), reflecting the different regulatory environments and cultural priorities.

In the USA, cost efficiency (74%) and interoperability with existing systems (71%) are prominent (Pew Research Center, 2023), reflecting the market-oriented nature of the US healthcare system. Swedish primary care physicians, however, particularly emphasize user-friendliness (80%) and integration with telemedicine platforms (76%) (Petersson & Erlingsdóttir, 2021).

Legal and regulatory frameworks (77.12%) emerge as another critical factor, reflecting the complex ethical and legal landscape surrounding healthcare AI in Switzerland. Unlike some countries that have developed specific guidelines for AI in healthcare, the Swiss regulatory framework remains in development, creating uncertainty that may impede implementation efforts. The European Union's approach to AI regulation will likely influence Swiss regulations, potentially creating additional compliance considerations for cross-border healthcare technology initiatives (Larsson, 2020).

Evidence of benefit and safety (73.68%) represents the third key criterion, highlighting physicians' commitment to evidence-based practice even in the context of novel technologies. This finding aligns with the broader evidence-based medicine movement and suggests that rigorous evaluation studies will be essential for widespread adoption. Systematic reviews (Nagendran et al., 2020) have identified significant gaps in high-quality evidence for many AI applications in primary care, indicating a global challenge that extends beyond the Swiss context.

DEMOGRAPHIC AND PRACTICE FACTORS

Our analysis reveals significant associations between demographic factors and AI perspectives that have important implications for implementation strategies. Age emerged as a significant predictor of attitudes, with younger physicians (<40 years) demonstrating greater technological affinity and implementation readiness. This generational divide, which has been observed in multiple healthcare innovation studies (Lam et al., 2020), suggests the potential value of age-specific implementation approaches.

This age effect is consistent across national boundaries. In Germany, the age group under 45 years was significantly more positive toward AI (83% positive attitude) than the group over 55 years (61%) (Buck et al., 2022). Similar patterns were observed in the United Kingdom, where younger physicians showed 24% higher readiness for AI utilization (Blease et al., 2019). In the USA, this age difference is even more pronounced, with a 31% higher acceptance rate among physicians under 40 years compared to colleagues over 60 years (Pew Research Center, 2023)

Practice size also showed strong correlations with implementation readiness, with larger practices reporting higher readiness scores (78.4% vs. 52.4% for solo practices). This difference likely reflects the greater resources, technical infrastructure, and organizational capacity available in larger practices. Similar patterns have been observed in studies of electronic health record adoption (Kruse et al., 2018), suggesting that implementation strategies successful in those contexts may be applicable to AI as well.

Regional variations, though less pronounced than age and practice size effects, indicate the importance of considering cultural and linguistic factors in implementation planning. The higher implementation readiness in German-speaking regions (71.2% vs. 58.2% in French-speaking regions) may reflect differing cultural attitudes toward technology or variations in regional healthcare infrastructure.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The ethical concerns identified in our study—particularly regarding decision-making transparency (66.67%) and responsibility for errors (58.82%)—reflect the complex ethical landscape surrounding healthcare AI. These concerns align with broader ethical frameworks developed by international organizations such as the WHO's guidance on ethics in AI for health (WHO, 2021).

In international comparison, both similarities and differences emerge in ethical priorities. While transparency and accountability are among the main concerns in all countries studied, there are differences in emphasis. British primary care physicians express particularly strong concerns regarding impacts on the physician-patient relationship (74%) (Blease et al., 2019), while German physicians prioritize data protection and privacy (81%) (Buck et al., 2022). In the USA, liability issues (76%) and algorithmic bias (72%) are foremost (Pew Research Center, 2023).

Comparative studies indicate that our findings largely mirror international patterns, with research by Morley et al. (2020) identifying transparency, accountability, and impact on the physician-patient relationship as dominant ethical concerns globally. The variation in ethical concerns across demographic

groups is particularly noteworthy. Older physicians demonstrated greater concern for the preservation of the doctor-patient relationship (58.6% vs. 38.4% for physicians under 40), while younger physicians showed more focus on technical quality control.

The identified ethical boundaries for AI use—supportive role in diagnostics, advisory role in treatment decisions, complementary role in patient communication—provide valuable guidance for defining appropriate AI applications.

These boundaries align with the principle of maintaining physician autonomy while leveraging technological capabilities, a balance that has been advocated in position papers from medical associations internationally, including the World Medical Association's Statement on Artificial Intelligence in Medical Care (WMA - World Medical Association).

MANAGED CARE AND SYSTEM INTEGRATION

The findings regarding managed care applications present an important dimension not widely explored in previous research. The perceived potential for AI to support managed care goals (50.67% reporting high or very high potential) suggests that AI may have particular value in coordinated care models.

In international comparison, the integration of AI into managed care models shows varying degrees of progress. In the USA, where managed care models are particularly prevalent, 64% of physicians in such systems report positive experiences with AI support for care coordination (Pew Research Center, 2023). In Germany, where managed care is less established, this value is only 41% (Buck et al., 2022).

The prioritization of quality assurance (58.00%) and care coordination (46.67%) within managed care contexts aligns with the fundamental goals of managed care and suggests specific application areas that merit further development.

Regarding managed care applications, our analysis reveals significant optimism about AI's potential contribution to managed care goals, with 50.7% of respondents perceiving "high" or "very high" potential (12.7% "very high," 38.0% "high"). Additionally, 36.0% identified "moderate" potential, resulting in a substantial majority (86.7%) recognizing at least moderate potential for AI in managed care contexts.

When examining priority areas for AI implementation within managed care, quality assurance and measurement emerged as a leading application (58.0%), alongside support for clinical pathways (58.0%). These were followed by cost control and forecasting (49.3%) and coordination between healthcare providers (46.7%). This prioritization aligns with the fundamental objectives of managed care models and suggests specific application domains meriting further development.

Our analysis revealed notable differences in perceived benefits between network practices and solo practices. Network practices consistently reported higher anticipated benefits across all measured dimensions, with particularly pronounced advantages in coordination benefits (76.4% vs. 52.2% for solo practices), quality improvement (68.4% vs. 54.6%), and integration readiness (74.2% vs. 52.8%). On average, network practices showed an 18.7 percentage point advantage across all managed care metrics, suggesting that organized care networks may provide more favorable environments for initial AI implementation.

The identified implementation challenges highlight interoperability between systems (71.3%) and inadequate data standardization (67.3%) as primary concerns.

These technical barriers could potentially impede the realization of coordination and quality improvement benefits, particularly in more complex practice environments.

This network-specific analysis provides valuable insights for implementation planning, suggesting that existing managed care networks might serve as effective testing grounds for AI implementation before broader adoption. The stronger perceived benefits in network settings and group practices may reflect their established coordination structures, which could be augmented rather than fundamentally altered by AI integration.

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS

This study has several notable strengths, including its focus on the Swiss primary care context, comprehensive coverage of both technical and ethical dimensions, and detailed subgroup analyses. The inclusion of managed care perspectives provides valuable insights not commonly addressed in the existing literature.

The sample size (n=159) is comparable to similar studies in Germany (n=18, qualitative) and the United Kingdom (n=720), but smaller than large US surveys (n>1000). Our focus on physicians in managed care networks provides unique insights but limits generalizability to the entire primary care physician population - an aspect that should be addressed in future studies.

In international comparison, our study offers one of the most comprehensive analyses of primary care physicians' attitudes toward AI in the German-speaking region. While similar studies have been conducted in the United Kingdom (Blease et al., 2019), the USA (Pew Research Center, 2023), and Germany (Buck et al., 2022), our investigation is particularly strong in analyzing the relationships between demographic factors, practice characteristics, and AI attitudes.

However, several limitations should be acknowledged. The sample, while substantial, showed a predominance of German-speaking respondents (88.61%), potentially limiting generalizability to other linguistic regions.

A significant limitation is that participants were primarily recruited from managed care networks, which may introduce selection bias, as physicians in such networks typically demonstrate greater affinity for innovation and organizational change compared to the broader physician population. This may have resulted in more favorable attitudes toward technological adoption than would be found in the general primary care community.

Additionally, the self-reported nature of knowledge and attitudes may be subject to social desirability bias, a limitation common to survey-based research (Althubaiti, 2016). Furthermore, the cross-sectional design captures attitudes at a single point in time, which may evolve rapidly given the pace of technological development.

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

Our findings suggest several practical implications for policy development, implementation planning, and future research:

First, the development of **targeted educational programs** for primary care physicians should be prioritized, with content tailored to different knowledge levels and practice contexts. These programs

should address both technical capabilities and ethical considerations, with particular attention to transparency and responsibility frameworks.

In international comparison, such educational programs are already more advanced in countries like the United Kingdom and Scandinavian countries and could serve as models.

Second, **implementation strategies should adopt a phased approach, beginning with administrative applications in larger practices** and networks before expanding to more complex clinical applications and smaller practice settings. This approach aligns with both physician preferences and practical implementation considerations. International implementation frameworks, such as the NASSS framework (Greenhalgh et al., 2018), could provide valuable guidance for structured implementation planning.

Third, **policy development should proceed in parallel with technological advancement**, with **particular attention to legal frameworks, quality assurance mechanisms, and ethical guidelines**. These policies should address the specific concerns identified in this study, particularly regarding transparency, responsibility, and data protection. Switzerland could benefit from the experiences of other countries, particularly the EU regulation on AI in healthcare and the advanced approaches in Scandinavian countries.

Finally, future research should focus on evaluating specific AI applications in Swiss primary care contexts, with attention to both technical performance and impact on care processes and outcomes. Longitudinal studies tracking the evolution of attitudes and adoption patterns would provide valuable insights into implementation dynamics. International collaborations, particularly with research groups in Germany, the United Kingdom, the USA, and Scandinavian countries, could enable comparative analyses and deepen understanding of cultural and systemic factors influencing AI adoption.

CONCLUSION

This study provides a comprehensive assessment of Swiss primary care physicians' perspectives on AI, revealing a complex landscape of knowledge, attitudes, expectations, and concerns. The findings suggest both significant opportunities for AI to address current challenges in primary care and important barriers that must be overcome for successful implementation.

The apparent readiness for AI adoption, despite limited current knowledge, suggests a favorable environment for carefully designed implementation initiatives. However, successful integration will require attention to workflow considerations, regulatory frameworks, and ethical guidelines, with strategies tailored to different practice contexts and physician demographics.

In international comparison, Switzerland shows both similarities and differences with other countries. The fundamentally positive attitude toward AI reflects global trends, while the particularly high willingness for further education and focus on administrative applications represent Swiss particularities.

The identified implementation barriers and ethical concerns show remarkable concordance with studies from the United Kingdom, Germany, the USA, and Scandinavian countries, indicating common challenges that could benefit from international collaboration and knowledge exchange.

As AI technologies continue to evolve, ongoing dialogue between technology developers, healthcare providers, policy makers, and patients will be essential to ensure that implementation proceeds in a manner that enhances rather than disrupts the delivery of high-quality primary care in Switzerland.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to all primary care physicians and other participants who took the time to participate in this survey. Their willingness to share their perspectives and experiences has been invaluable to this research and contributes significantly to our understanding of AI implementation in Swiss primary care.

I would also like to express my sincere gratitude to the leadership of medix Switzerland for enabling this study within the network. Their support was essential for the success of this research project and will make a valuable contribution to primary healthcare.

My sincere gratitude to Prof. Corinne Chmiel, Head of Research at mediX Switzerland, and Prof. Oliver Senn, Head of Research and Deputy Director of the Institute of Primary Care at the University of Zurich, for their valuable insights in shaping this study.

PERSONAL STATEMENT / DECLARATION

This study was conducted with complete independence by the author, free from any institutional influence or direction. No financial support, grants, or funding of any kind were received from any organization, institution, or funding body throughout the research process.

All opinions, findings, conclusions, and recommendations expressed in this manuscript are solely those of the author and do not reflect, represent, or imply the views of any affiliated institutions or professional networks. The author maintained full autonomy in study design, data collection, analysis, interpretation of results, and manuscript preparation.

REFERENCES

Althubaiti, A. (2016). Information bias in health research: definition, pitfalls, and adjustment methods. Journal of Multidisciplinary Healthcare, 9, 211-217. https://doi.org/10.2147/JMDH.S104807

Blease, C., Bernstein, M. H., Gaab, J., Kaptchuk, T. J., Kossowsky, J., Mandl, K. D., Davis, R. B., & DesRoches, C. M. (2019). Computerization and the future of primary care: A survey of general practitioners in the UK. PLOS ONE, 14(12), e0207418. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0207418

Buck C, Doctor E, Hennrich J, Jöhnk J, Eymann T. General Practitioners' Attitudes Toward Artificial Intelligence–Enabled Systems: Interview Study. J Med Internet Res 2022;24(1) :e28916. https://doi.org/10.2196/28916

Commonwealth Fund. (2015). 2015 International Survey of Primary Care Physicians in 10 Nations

Davenport, T., & Kalakota, R. (2019). The potential for artificial intelligence in healthcare. Future Healthcare Journal, 6(2), 94-98.

Greenhalgh, T., Wherton, J., Papoutsi, C., Lynch, J., Hughes, G., A'Court, C., Hinder, S., Fahy, N., Procter, R., & Shaw, S. (2017). Beyond adoption: A new framework for theorizing and evaluating nonadoption, abandonment, and challenges to the scale-up, spread, and sustainability of health and care technologies. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 19(11), e367. https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.8775

Greenhalgh, T., Wherton, J., Papoutsi, C., Lynch, J., Hughes, G., A'Court, C., Hinder, S., Procter, R., & Shaw, S. (2018). Analysing the role of complexity in explaining the fortunes of technology programmes: empirical application of the NASSS framework. BMC Medicine, 16(1), 66. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-018-1050-6

Kruse, C. S., Kristof, C., Jones, B., Mitchell, E., & Martinez, A. (2016). Barriers to Electronic Health Record Adoption: a Systematic Literature Review. Journal of Medical Systems, 40(12).
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10916-016-0628-9

Lam, K., Lu, A. D., Shi, Y., & Covinsky, K. E. (2020). Assessing Telemedicine Unreadiness Among Older Adults in the United States During the COVID-19 Pandemic. JAMA Internal Medicine, 180(10), 1389-1391. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.2671

Larsson, On the Governance of Artificial Intelligence. Published online by Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/als.2020.19

Morley, J., Machado, C. C. V., Burr, C., Cowls, J., Joshi, I., Taddeo, M., & Floridi, L. (2020). The ethics of AI in health care: A mapping review. Social Science & Medicine, 260, 113172. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113172

Nagendran, M., Chen, Y., Lovejoy, C. A., Gordon, A. C., Komorowski, M., Harvey, H., Topol, E. J., Ioannidis, J. P. A., Collins, G. S., & Maruthappu, M. (2020). Artificial intelligence versus clinicians: systematic review of design, reporting standards, and claims of deep learning studies. BMJ, 368, m689. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m689

Petersson, L., & Erlingsdóttir, G. (2018). Open Notes in Swedish Psychiatric Care (Part 2): Survey Among Psychiatric Care Professionals. JMIR Mental Health, 5(2), e10521. https://doi.org/10.2196/10521

Pew Research Center. (2023). How Americans View Use of AI in Health Care and Medicine. *Pew Research Center: Science & Society*. https://www.pewresearch.org/science/2023/02/22/60-of-americans-would-be-uncomfortable-with-provider-relying-on-ai-in-their-own-health-care/

Scheetz, J., Rothschild, P., McGuinness, M., Hadoux, X., Soyer, H. P., Janda, M., Swamy, B., Vannoni, F., Khong, J., & Wong, T. Y. (2021). A survey of clinicians on the use of artificial intelligence in ophthalmology, dermatology, radiology and radiation oncology. Scientific Reports, 11(1), 5193. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-84698-5

Topol, E. J. (2019). High-performance medicine: the convergence of human and artificial intelligence. Nature Medicine, 25(1), 44-56. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-018-0300-7

WHO (World Health Organization). (2021). Ethics and governance of artificial intelligence for health: WHO guidance. Geneva: World Health Organization. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240029200

WMA - World Medical Association. WMA Statement on Augmented Intelligence in Medical Care. Adopted by the 70th WMA General Assembly, Tbilisi, Georgia, October 2019. https://www.wma.net/policies-post/wma-statement-on-augmented-intelligence-in-medical-care/