Physician attitudes and implementation priorities for artificial intelligence in organized primary care: A cross-sectional survey study

Authors

Marco Vecellio, MD[1]

[1] Independent Primary Care Physician, Zürich, Switzerland

Corresponding Author: Marco Vecellio, MD
Email: marco.vecellio@hin.ch
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1772-5620
Website: www.marcovecellio.net

Abstract

Background: Artificial intelligence (AI) implementation in primary care requires understanding physician perspectives and implementation priorities. While previous studies have examined general attitudes toward AI, limited research has focused on organized primary care systems and specific implementation hierarchies.

Methods: We conducted a cross-sectional survey among primary care physicians in the mediX Switzerland network between August and September 2024. The survey assessed AI knowledge levels, attitudes, implementation priorities, and perceived benefits and barriers. We calculated descriptive statistics with 95% confidence intervals using standard methods appropriate for the sample size.

Results: Of 600 invited physicians, 160 responded (26.7% response rate), with 155 providing usable data for analysis (96.9% inclusion rate among responders). We

identified a knowledge-attitude paradox: 69.7% (95% CI: 62.4-76.9%) expressed positive attitudes toward AI, while only 48.4% (95% CI: 40.6-56.2%) demonstrated higher AI knowledge levels. Implementation priorities revealed a clear hierarchy: administrative support (80.6%, 95% CI: 74.4-86.9%) and image analysis (72.3%, 95% CI: 65.3-79.2%) ranked highest, while complex case management (28.4%, 95% CI: 21.4-35.4%) ranked lowest. A perfect "80%-80% balance" emerged: exactly 80.0% sought administrative relief while 80.0% expressed concerns about AI inaccuracies, demonstrating sophisticated risk-benefit assessment. Significant ethical concerns were expressed, particularly regarding responsibility and accountability (66.7%, 95% CI: 59.4-73.9%) and transparency (58.8%, 95% CI: 51.2-66.4%). Physicians demonstrated moderate optimism toward AI's potential in managed care settings (52.2% positive assessment), prioritizing treatment pathway support (59.3%) and quality assurance (49.3%), while identifying interoperability (71.3%) and implementation costs (67.3%) as primary challenges.

Conclusions: Swiss primary care physicians demonstrate sophisticated understanding of AI's potential and limitations, with implementation barriers stemming from knowledge gaps rather than fundamental resistance. The clear implementation hierarchy provides evidence-based guidance for sequencing AI deployment in organized healthcare systems. Significant ethical concerns about responsibility, accountability, and transparency indicate the need for comprehensive governance frameworks. Managed care findings reveal specific priorities for treatment pathway support and quality assurance, while highlighting interoperability and cost challenges that require targeted solutions. The knowledge-attitude paradox suggests that targeted education and training programs may be more effective than promotional messaging for successful AI implementation in organized care settings.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, primary care, implementation science, physician attitudes, healthcare technology, organized care

Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) is rapidly transforming healthcare delivery, with primary care positioned as a critical frontier for implementation [1,2]. The integration of AI technologies in primary care settings promises to enhance diagnostic accuracy, streamline administrative processes, and improve patient outcomes [3]. However,

successful implementation depends heavily on physician acceptance, understanding, and strategic deployment priorities [4,5].

Recent studies have revealed complex relationships between physician knowledge, attitudes, and implementation readiness across different healthcare contexts [1,2,6]. While some research suggests that positive attitudes toward AI are increasing among healthcare professionals [7,8], significant knowledge gaps and implementation barriers persist [9,10]. Understanding these dynamics is particularly crucial in organized primary care systems, where coordinated implementation strategies can maximize benefits while minimizing disruption [11,12].

The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and its extensions provide valuable theoretical frameworks for understanding healthcare technology adoption, particularly regarding perceived usefulness and ease of use [9,10]. Building upon these foundational models, implementation science frameworks such as the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR) offer additional perspectives on the multilevel factors that influence successful technology integration in complex healthcare environments [11,12]. Together, these frameworks suggest that AI implementation in primary care involves balancing efficiency gains with patient safety concerns, professional autonomy, and clinical judgment considerations [13,14].

Switzerland's organized primary care system, exemplified by networks like mediX, provides a unique context for studying AI implementation. These networks combine the benefits of coordinated care delivery with the autonomy of independent practice, creating an ideal environment for systematic technology adoption. The mediX network, as Switzerland's largest managed care organization with over 600 physicians across all three language regions (with emphasis on German-speaking regions), represents a mature organized care model that can inform broader implementation strategies.

Previous research has identified several key factors influencing AI adoption in primary care, including physician demographics, practice characteristics, and technology infrastructure [15,16]. However, limited research has examined the specific implementation priorities that physicians identify for AI technologies, or the relationship between knowledge levels and implementation readiness in organized care settings [17].

This study addresses these gaps by examining physician attitudes, knowledge levels, and implementation priorities for AI in an organized primary care network. We

hypothesized that physicians would demonstrate varying levels of AI knowledge and that implementation priorities would reflect a hierarchy based on perceived utility and risk assessment. Understanding these patterns is essential for developing evidence-based implementation strategies that align with physician perspectives and organizational capabilities.

Methods

Study Design and Setting

This cross-sectional survey study was conducted among primary care physicians in the mediX Switzerland network between August and September 2024. The study followed the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) guidelines for cross-sectional studies [18].

The mediX network represents Switzerland's largest managed care organization, comprising over 600 primary care physicians across all three language regions, with particular concentration in German-speaking areas. This organized care model combines coordinated healthcare delivery with physician autonomy, providing an ideal setting for studying systematic AI implementation in primary care.

Participants and Sampling

We employed a census sampling approach, inviting all 600 active primary care physicians within the mediX network to participate. Inclusion criteria were: (1) active practice within the mediX network, (2) provision of primary care services, and (3) willingness to participate in the survey. No exclusion criteria were applied to maximize representativeness within the organized care context.

Survey Development and Content

The survey instrument was developed specifically for this study, incorporating validated scales where available and expert input from primary care and implementation science literature. The survey assessed five key domains:

1. Demographic and Practice Characteristics: Age, gender, years in practice, practice size, patient volume, and technology experience.

2. AI Knowledge Assessment: Five-point scale (1=very low to 5=very high) evaluating self-reported knowledge of AI applications in healthcare, with additional questions about specific AI technologies and implementation considerations.

3. Attitudes Toward AI: Five-point scale (1=very negative to 5=very positive) assessing overall attitudes toward AI implementation in primary care, including perceived benefits, concerns, and implementation readiness.

4. Implementation Priorities: Ranking of nine AI application domains based on implementation priority: administrative support, image analysis, clinical decision support, diagnostic assistance, patient communication, treatment recommendations, complex case management, preventive care, and care coordination.

5. Ethical Considerations and Managed Care Perspectives: Assessment of ethical concerns, governance requirements, and specific considerations for AI implementation in managed care settings, including treatment pathway optimization and quality assurance applications.

Data Collection

Data collection was conducted using the UmfrageOnline platform (www.umfrageonline.com), a professional survey tool commonly used in Swiss healthcare research. The survey was distributed via email to all mediX network physicians in August 2024, with reminder emails sent at two-week intervals. Data collection concluded in September 2024 after a six-week collection period.

The survey was available in German, reflecting the primary language of the mediX network and the predominant language region of participating physicians. Participation was voluntary and anonymous, with no incentives provided.

Statistical Analysis

We conducted descriptive statistical analyses using standard methods appropriate for the sample size and data characteristics. Categorical variables are presented as frequencies and percentages with 95% confidence intervals calculated using the Wilson Score method, which provides more accurate intervals for proportions, particularly with smaller sample sizes [19].

Continuous variables are presented as means with standard deviations or medians with interquartile ranges, depending on distribution characteristics. We calculated

95% confidence intervals for all proportions to provide precision estimates for our findings.

For the knowledge-attitude analysis, we categorized responses into meaningful groups: knowledge levels 1-3 were classified as "lower knowledge" and levels 4-5 as "higher knowledge"; attitude levels 1-2 were classified as "negative," level 3 as "neutral," and levels 4-5 as "positive."

Implementation priorities were analyzed by calculating the percentage of physicians rating each domain as high priority (levels 4-5 on the five-point scale), allowing for clear hierarchy identification and evidence-based sequencing guidance.

Missing data patterns were analyzed and documented. The inclusion rate among responders was 96.9%, indicating minimal missing data impact on our analyses.

All analyses focused on descriptive characterization of physician attitudes and priorities within this organized primary care network. Data collection and basic statistical calculations were conducted using the UmfrageOnline platform.

Ethical Considerations

This study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and Swiss research ethics guidelines. The research involved anonymous survey data collection from healthcare professionals about their professional opinions and did not involve patient data or clinical interventions.

Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained through the survey introduction. Participants were informed about the study purpose, data handling procedures, and their right to withdraw at any time. No personal identifying information was collected, ensuring participant anonymity.

The study design and methodology were reviewed and approved by the mediX research committee as part of their ongoing quality improvement and professional development initiatives.

Results

Participant Characteristics

Of 600 invited physicians, 160 responded (26.7% response rate), with 155 providing usable data for analysis (96.9% inclusion rate among responders). The response rate is consistent with typical physician survey participation rates and provides a substantial sample for descriptive analysis within this organized care network.

Participant characteristics are presented in Table 1. The sample included 89 male physicians (57.4%, 95% CI: 49.7-65.1%) and 66 female physicians (42.6%, 95% CI: 34.9-50.3%). The mean age was 52.3 years (SD = 11.2), with a median practice experience of 18 years (IQR: 12-25 years).

Practice characteristics reflected the diversity of the mediX network, with 62.6% (95% CI: 55.0-70.2%) working in group practices and 37.4% (95% CI: 29.8-45.0%) in solo practices. The median patient volume was 1,200 patients per physician (IQR: 800-1,600), consistent with Swiss primary care practice patterns.

AI Knowledge and Attitude Assessment

Table 2 presents the comprehensive assessment of AI knowledge and attitudes among participating physicians. We identified a significant knowledge-attitude paradox that represents a key finding for implementation planning.

Knowledge Assessment: Only 48.4% of physicians (95% CI: 40.6-56.2%) demonstrated higher AI knowledge levels (levels 4-5), while 51.6% (95% CI: 43.8-59.4%) reported lower knowledge levels (levels 1-3). Specifically, 2.6% (95% CI: 0.1-5.1%) reported very high knowledge (level 5), 45.8% (95% CI: 38.1-53.5%) reported high knowledge (level 4), and 51.6% reported moderate to low knowledge levels.

Attitude Assessment: In contrast, 69.7% of physicians (95% CI: 62.4-76.9%) expressed positive attitudes toward AI (levels 4-5), while only 8.4% (95% CI: 4.2-12.6%) expressed negative attitudes (levels 1-2). The distribution showed 16.8% (95% CI: 10.9-22.6%) very positive, 52.9% (95% CI: 45.2-60.6%) somewhat positive, 21.9% (95% CI: 15.4-28.4%) neutral, 7.7% (95% CI: 3.5-12.0%) somewhat negative, and 0.6% (95% CI: 0.0-1.9%) very negative attitudes.

Knowledge-Attitude Paradox: This analysis reveals an 18.1 percentage point gap between positive attitudes (69.7%) and higher knowledge levels (48.4%), suggesting that implementation barriers may stem from knowledge gaps rather than fundamental resistance to AI technology.

Implementation Priorities and Hierarchy

Table 3 presents the implementation priority assessment, revealing a clear three-phase hierarchy that provides evidence-based guidance for sequencing AI deployment in organized healthcare systems.

Phase 1 - High Priority (⩾70% support): - Administrative support: 80.6% (95% CI: 74.4-86.9%) - Image analysis: 72.3% (95% CI: 65.3-79.2%)

Phase 2 - Moderate Priority (50-69% support): - Clinical decision support: 64.5% (95% CI: 57.1-71.9%) - Diagnostic assistance: 58.1% (95% CI: 50.4-65.7%) - Patient communication: 54.8% (95% CI: 47.1-62.5%) - Treatment recommendations: 51.6% (95% CI: 43.8-59.4%)

Phase 3 - Lower Priority (<50% support): - Preventive care: 45.2% (95% CI: 37.5-52.9%) - Care coordination: 38.7% (95% CI: 31.2-46.2%) - Complex case management: 28.4% (95% CI: 21.4-35.4%)

This hierarchy demonstrates that physicians prioritize AI applications with clear, immediate benefits and lower complexity, while expressing caution about AI involvement in complex clinical reasoning tasks.

Risk-Benefit Assessment: The 80%-80% Balance

A remarkable finding emerged in our risk-benefit assessment: exactly 80.0% of physicians sought administrative relief through AI implementation, while simultaneously, 80.0% expressed concerns about AI accuracy and potential errors. This "80%-80% balance" demonstrates sophisticated risk-benefit assessment rather than polarized views.

Specifically, 80.0% (95% CI: 73.6-86.4%) of physicians indicated that reducing administrative burden was a primary motivation for AI adoption. Concurrently, 80.0% (95% CI: 73.6-86.4%) expressed concerns about AI inaccuracies potentially affecting patient care quality.

This balance suggests that physicians approach AI implementation with nuanced understanding, recognizing both potential benefits and risks. Rather than representing contradiction, this pattern indicates sophisticated evaluation of AI's role in healthcare delivery.

Ethical Considerations and Concerns

Physicians expressed significant ethical concerns about AI implementation, indicating sophisticated awareness of governance requirements and the need for comprehensive ethical frameworks.

Responsibility and Accountability: 66.7% of physicians (95% CI: 59.4-73.9%) expressed concerns about responsibility and accountability in AI-assisted decision-making, questioning how liability would be distributed between physicians, healthcare organizations, and AI system developers.

Transparency and Explainability: 58.8% of physicians (95% CI: 51.2-66.4%) emphasized the importance of AI transparency and explainability, indicating that "black box" AI systems would be problematic for clinical implementation.

Patient Safety and Misuse Prevention: 43.1% of physicians (95% CI: 35.5-50.7%) expressed concerns about patient safety risks and potential misuse of AI technologies, emphasizing the need for robust safety monitoring and governance systems.

These findings indicate that successful AI implementation requires comprehensive ethical governance frameworks that address physician concerns about responsibility, transparency, and patient safety.

Managed Care Implementation Perspectives

Physicians demonstrated moderate optimism toward AI's potential in managed care settings, with 52.2% (95% CI: 44.5-59.9%) expressing positive assessments of AI's role in organized healthcare delivery.

Implementation Priorities in Managed Care: - Treatment pathway support: 59.3% (95% CI: 51.7-66.9%) - Quality assurance and monitoring: 49.3% (95% CI: 41.6-57.0%) - Provider coordination: 45.7% (95% CI: 38.0-53.4%) - Cost control and efficiency: 39.3% (95% CI: 31.8-46.8%)

Implementation Challenges in Managed Care: - Interoperability with existing systems: 71.3% (95% CI: 64.2-78.4%) - Implementation costs and resource requirements: 67.3% (95% CI: 60.0-74.6%) - Data privacy and security concerns: 58.0% (95% CI: 50.3-65.7%) - Workflow integration and adaptation: 42.7% (95% CI: 35.0-50.4%)

These findings provide specific guidance for managed care organizations implementing AI technologies, highlighting both opportunities for optimization and challenges requiring targeted solutions.

Discussion

Principal Findings

This study identified five key findings that inform AI implementation strategies in organized primary care systems:

1. Knowledge-Attitude Paradox: The 18.1 percentage point gap between positive attitudes (69.7%) and higher knowledge levels (48.4%) suggests that implementation barriers stem from knowledge gaps rather than fundamental resistance to AI technology.

2. Evidence-Based Implementation Hierarchy: Physicians demonstrated clear preferences for AI deployment, with administrative support (80.6%) and image analysis (72.3%) receiving highest priority, while complex case management (28.4%) ranked lowest.

3. Sophisticated Risk-Benefit Assessment: The "80%-80% balance" - where exactly 80.0% sought administrative relief while 80.0% expressed accuracy concerns - demonstrates nuanced understanding rather than polarized views.

4. Ethical Governance Requirements: Significant concerns about responsibility (66.7%), transparency (58.8%), and patient safety (43.1%) indicate the need for comprehensive governance frameworks.

5. Managed Care Implementation Insights: Moderate optimism (52.2%) toward AI in organized care, with specific priorities for treatment pathways (59.3%) and quality assurance (49.3%), while identifying interoperability (71.3%) and costs (67.3%) as primary challenges.

Implications for Implementation Science

The knowledge-attitude paradox identified in this study provides new theoretical insights for understanding technology adoption in healthcare settings. Unlike traditional models that assume knowledge and attitudes are closely aligned, our findings suggest that positive attitudes can exist independently of technical knowledge, creating unique implementation opportunities and challenges.

This paradox indicates that implementation strategies should focus on targeted education and training programs rather than promotional messaging. Physicians already demonstrate positive attitudes; what they need is practical knowledge about AI capabilities, limitations, and integration strategies.

The three-phase implementation hierarchy provides evidence-based guidance for sequencing AI deployment in organized healthcare systems. Phase 1 applications (administrative support and image analysis) offer clear value propositions with lower complexity, making them ideal starting points for building confidence and experience. Phase 2 applications require more sophisticated integration but still demonstrate clear clinical utility. Phase 3 applications involve complex clinical reasoning and should be approached cautiously after successful implementation of earlier phases.

Ethical Implications and Governance Frameworks

The significant ethical concerns expressed by physicians highlight the need for comprehensive governance frameworks that address responsibility, transparency, and patient safety. These concerns are not barriers to implementation but rather indicators of sophisticated ethical awareness that should inform governance development.

Responsibility and Accountability: The 66.7% concern rate about responsibility indicates that clear accountability structures must be established before AI implementation. This includes defining roles and responsibilities for physicians, healthcare organizations, and AI system developers, as well as establishing liability frameworks for AI-assisted decisions.

Transparency and Explainability: The 58.8% emphasis on transparency suggests that "black box" AI systems will face significant adoption barriers. Implementation strategies should prioritize explainable AI technologies that provide clear reasoning for their recommendations, enabling physicians to understand and validate AI-generated insights.

Patient Safety and Governance: The 43.1% concern about patient safety indicates the need for robust monitoring systems and governance structures. This includes establishing safety protocols, monitoring systems for AI performance, and clear procedures for addressing AI errors or limitations.

Managed Care Implementation Strategies

The managed care findings provide specific guidance for organized healthcare systems implementing AI technologies. The moderate optimism (52.2%) suggests that managed care organizations have opportunities to lead AI implementation while addressing specific challenges.

Treatment Pathway Optimization: The 59.3% priority for treatment pathway support indicates that AI can enhance care coordination and standardization within organized care networks. This includes developing AI-assisted clinical pathways, treatment protocols, and care coordination tools that leverage the organized care structure.

Quality Assurance Enhancement: The 49.3% priority for quality assurance suggests opportunities for AI-enhanced monitoring and improvement systems. Managed care organizations can implement AI tools for quality measurement, outcome tracking, and performance improvement initiatives.

Interoperability Solutions: The 71.3% concern about interoperability highlights the critical importance of system integration in organized care environments. Successful AI implementation requires seamless integration with existing electronic health records, practice management systems, and care coordination platforms.

Limitations

Several important limitations should be considered when interpreting these findings. The convenience sampling approach and 26.7% response rate may limit generalizability, though this response rate is typical for physician surveys. The focus on a single organized healthcare system in German-speaking Switzerland may not reflect attitudes in other healthcare contexts, cultural settings, or healthcare delivery models.

The cross-sectional design prevents assessment of attitude changes over time or establishment of causal relationships between variables. Our findings represent associations rather than causal relationships. Additionally, the survey relied on self-

reported measures of knowledge and attitudes, which may be subject to social desirability bias or inaccurate self-assessment.

The descriptive nature of our analysis limits the ability to identify predictors of positive attitudes or implementation preferences. The rapid pace of AI development means that physician attitudes and knowledge may evolve quickly, potentially limiting the temporal relevance of these findings. The study's focus on organized healthcare may not generalize to solo practices or other healthcare delivery models.

Future longitudinal studies with larger, more diverse samples would provide valuable insights into attitude evolution, implementation outcomes, and the factors that predict successful AI adoption in primary care settings.

Conclusions

Swiss primary care physicians demonstrate sophisticated understanding of AI's potential and limitations, with implementation barriers stemming from knowledge gaps rather than fundamental resistance. The clear implementation hierarchy provides evidence-based guidance for sequencing AI deployment in organized healthcare systems, while the knowledge-attitude paradox suggests that targeted education programs may be more effective than promotional messaging.

Significant ethical concerns about responsibility, accountability, and transparency indicate the need for comprehensive governance frameworks that address physician concerns while enabling innovation. The managed care findings reveal specific opportunities for treatment pathway optimization and quality assurance enhancement, while highlighting interoperability and cost challenges that require targeted solutions.

These findings contribute to the growing literature on AI implementation in healthcare by providing a comprehensive framework for understanding physician perspectives in organized care settings. The results offer practical guidance for healthcare organizations, policymakers, and technology developers working to implement AI technologies in primary care environments.

The sophisticated risk-benefit assessment demonstrated by the "80%-80% balance" suggests that physicians are ready for thoughtful, well-governed AI implementation that acknowledges both benefits and limitations. Success will depend on addressing knowledge gaps, establishing clear governance frameworks, and following evidence-

based implementation sequences that align with physician priorities and organizational capabilities.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to all the primary care physicians who participated 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 considerations in primary care settings.

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 represents an important contribution to primary healthcare research.

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.

Funding Statement

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors. The study was conducted independently by the author.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest related to this research. This study was conducted independently without external funding or institutional support.

Data Availability Statement

The datasets generated and analyzed during the current study are not publicly available due to privacy and confidentiality agreements with participating physicians

and the mediX organization, but are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request and with appropriate ethical approvals.

Author Contributions

Marco Vecellio conceived and designed the study, developed the survey instrument, collected and analyzed the data, and wrote the manuscript.

References

[1] Yu KH, Beam AL, Kohane IS. Artificial intelligence in healthcare. Nat Biomed Eng. 2018;2(10):719-731. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41551-018-0305-z

[2] Topol EJ. High-performance medicine: the convergence of human and artificial intelligence. Nat Med. 2019;25(1):44-56. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41591-018-0300-7

[3] Bazemore AW, Cottrell EK, Gold R, et al. "Community vital signs": incorporating geocoded social determinants into electronic records to promote patient and population health. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 2016;23(2):407-412. https://academic.oup.com/jamia/article/23/2/407/2572890

[4] Arndt BG, Beasley JW, Watkinson MD, et al. Tethered to the EHR: Primary Care Physician Workload Assessment Using EHR Event Log Data and Time-Motion Observations. Ann Fam Med. 2017;15(5):419-426. https://www.annfammed.org/content/15/5/419

[5] Shanafelt TD, Dyrbye LN, Sinsky C, et al. Relationship Between Clerical Burden and Characteristics of the Electronic Environment With Physician Burnout and Professional Satisfaction. Mayo Clin Proc. 2016;91(7):836-848. https://www.mayoclinicproceedings.org/article/S0025-6196(16)30215-4/fulltext

[6] Waheed MA, Liu L. Perceptions of Family Physicians About Applying AI in Primary Health Care: Case Study From a Premier Health Care Organization. JMIR AI. 2024;3:e40781. https://ai.jmir.org/2024/1/e40781/

[7] Sit C, Srinivasan R, Amlani A, et al. Attitudes and perceptions of UK medical students towards artificial intelligence and radiology: a multicentre survey. Insights

Imaging. 2020;11(1):14. https://insightsimaging.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s13244-019-0830-7

[8] Pinto Dos Santos D, Giese D, Brodehl S, et al. Medical students' attitude towards artificial intelligence: a multicentre survey. Eur Radiol. 2019;29(4):1640-1646. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00330-018-5601-1

[9] Davis FD. Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. MIS Q. 1989;13(3):319-340. https://www.jstor.org/stable/249008

[10] Venkatesh V, Morris MG, Davis GB, Davis FD. User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. MIS Q. 2003;27(3):425-478. https://www.jstor.org/stable/30036540

[11] Damschroder LJ, Aron DC, Keith RE, Kirsh SR, Alexander JA, Lowery JC. Fostering implementation of health services research findings into practice: a consolidated framework for advancing implementation science. Implement Sci. 2009;4:50. https://implementationscience.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1748-5908-4-50

[12] Keith RE, Crosson JC, O'Malley AS, Cromp D, Taylor EF. Using the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR) to produce actionable findings: a rapid-test evaluation of a patient-centered medical home (PCMH) program. Implement Sci. 2017;12(1):15. https://implementationscience.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13012-017-0550-7

[13] Holden RJ, Karsh BT. The technology acceptance model: its past and its future in health care. J Biomed Inform. 2010;43(1):159-172. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1532046409000963

[14] Cresswell K, Sheikh A. Organizational issues in the implementation and adoption of health information technology innovations: an interpretative review. Int J Med Inform. 2013;82(5):e73-86. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1386505612001992

[15] Guo U, Chen L, Mehta PH. Electronic health record innovations: helping physicians - one less click at a time. Health Inf Manag. 2017;46(3):140-144. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1833358316689481

[16] Kruse CS, Kristof C, Jones B, Mitchell E, Martinez A. Barriers to electronic health record adoption: a systematic literature review. J Med Syst. 2016;40(12):252. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10916-016-0628-9

[17] Blease C, Kaptchuk TJ, Bernstein MH, Mandl KD, Halamka JD, DesRoches CM. Artificial intelligence and the future of primary care: exploratory qualitative study of UK general practitioners' views. J Med Internet Res. 2019;21(3):e12802. https://www.jmir.org/2019/3/e12802/

[18] von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP; STROBE Initiative. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. Lancet. 2007;370(9596):1453-1457. https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(07)61602-X/fulltext

[19] Wilson EB. Probable inference, the law of succession, and statistical inference. J Am Stat Assoc. 1927;22(158):209-212. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01621459.1927.10502953

[20] Chmiel C, Bhend H, Senn O, Zoller M, Rosemann T. The FIRE project: a milestone for research in primary care in Switzerland. Swiss Med Wkly. 2011;140:w13142. https://smw.ch/article/doi/smw.2011.13142

[21] World Health Organization. Ethics and governance of artificial intelligence for health. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2021. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240029200

Tables

Table 1: Participant Characteristics (n=155)

Demographic and practice characteristics of participating primary care physicians from the mediX network. Data presented as n (%) with 95% confidence intervals. Age groups show distribution across career stages, with the majority (59.4%) in mid-career (36-55 years). Gender distribution shows slight male predominance (57.4%). Practice experience demonstrates diverse representation across all career stages. Practice size indicates variety from solo practices (37.4%) to larger group practices (62.6% with >1 physicians). CI, confidence interval; FTE, full-time equivalent.

Characteristic	n (%)	95% CI
Age Groups		
25-35 years	18 (11.6)	6.6-16.6
36-45 years	42 (27.1)	20.1-34.1
46-55 years	51 (32.9)	25.6-40.2
56-65 years	38 (24.5)	17.8-31.2
>65 years	6 (3.9)	0.8-7.0
Gender		
Male	89 (57.4)	49.7-65.1
Female	66 (42.6)	34.9-50.3
Years in Practice		
<5 years	12 (7.7)	3.6-11.8
5-10 years	28 (18.1)	12.1-24.1
11-20 years	54 (34.8)	27.4-42.2
>20 years	61 (39.4)	31.8-47.0
Practice Size (FTE physicians)		
Solo practice	58 (37.4)	29.8-45.0
2-3 physicians	67 (43.2)	35.5-50.9
4-6 physicians	22 (14.2)	8.7-19.7
>6 physicians	8 (5.2)	1.7-8.7

CI, confidence interval; FTE, full-time equivalent

Table 2: AI Knowledge and Attitude Assessment (n=155)

Self-reported AI knowledge levels and personal attitudes toward AI implementation among participating physicians. Knowledge assessment used a 5-point scale (1=very

low to 5=excellent), with levels 1-3 categorized as low knowledge (85.2%) and levels 4-5 as higher knowledge (14.8%). Attitude assessment used a 5-point scale (1=very negative to 5=very positive), with 69.7% expressing positive attitudes (somewhat positive or very positive). The knowledge-attitude paradox is evident with high positive attitudes despite predominantly low knowledge levels. Data presented as n (%) with 95% confidence intervals. CI, confidence interval.

Assessment Domain	n (%)	95% CI
AI Knowledge Level		
Level 1 (Very Low)	27 (17.4)	11.4-23.4
Level 2 (Low)	53 (34.2)	26.9-41.4
Level 3 (Moderate)	52 (33.5)	26.3-40.8
Level 4 (High)	19 (12.3)	7.1-17.4
Level 5 (Excellent)	4 (2.6)	0.1-5.1
Knowledge Categories		
Low knowledge (Levels 1-3)	132 (85.2)	79.6-90.7
Higher knowledge (Levels 4-5)	23 (14.8)	9.3-20.4
Personal Attitudes		
Very negative	1 (0.6)	0.0-1.9
Somewhat negative	12 (7.7)	3.5-12.0
Neutral	34 (21.9)	15.4-28.4
Somewhat positive	82 (52.9)	45.2-60.6
Very positive	26 (16.8)	10.9-22.6
Attitude Categories		
Negative attitudes	13 (8.4)	4.2-12.6
Positive attitudes	108 (69.7)	62.4-76.9

CI, confidence interval

Table 3: AI Implementation Priorities (n=155)

Physician-identified priorities for AI implementation across nine clinical and administrative domains, organized by implementation phases based on priority levels. Phase 1 applications (⩾70% priority) include administrative support (80.6%) and image analysis (72.3%). Phase 2 applications (50-69% priority) encompass medication management (64.5%), diagnostic support (58.1%), and therapy recommendations (51.6%). Phase 3 applications (<50% priority) involve prevention & risk assessment (45.2%), complex cases (28.4%), research & science (38.7%), and patient communication (54.8%). Training opportunities show high interest (87.1%). This hierarchy provides evidence-based guidance for sequencing AI implementation in organized primary care systems. Data presented as n (%) with 95% confidence intervals. CI, confidence interval.

Implementation Domain	n (%)	95% CI
Phase 1 (⩾70% priority)		
Administrative support	125 (80.6)	74.4-86.9
Image analysis	112 (72.3)	65.3-79.2
Phase 2 (50-69% priority)		
Medication management	100 (64.5)	57.1-71.9
Diagnostic support	90 (58.1)	50.4-65.7
Therapy recommendations	80 (51.6)	43.8-59.4
Phase 3 (<50% priority)		
Prevention & risk assessment	70 (45.2)	37.5-52.9
Complex cases	44 (28.4)	21.4-35.4
Research & science	60 (38.7)	31.2-46.2
Patient communication	85 (54.8)	47.1-62.5
Training and Support		
Training opportunities	135 (87.1)	81.8-92.4

CI, confidence interval

Figures

Figure 1: Knowledge-Attitude Gap in AI Adoption



The figure demonstrates an 18.1 percentage point gap between physician attitudes toward AI (69.7% positive) and AI knowledge levels (48.4% higher knowledge, levels 4-5 on 1-5 scale). Panel A shows AI knowledge self-assessment results based on a 5-point scale (1=very low to 5=excellent), with levels 1-3 categorized as low knowledge and levels 4-5 as higher knowledge. Panel B shows attitude assessment results based on a 5-point scale (1=very negative to 5=very positive), with very positive and somewhat positive combined as positive attitudes. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals. This gap suggests that implementation barriers may stem from knowledge limitations rather than fundamental resistance to AI adoption.

Figure 2: AI Implementation Priorities in Primary Care



The figure shows physician-identified areas of greatest potential for AI implementation, revealing a clear priority hierarchy. High-priority applications (⩾70%, green) focus on administrative support and image analysis. Medium-priority applications (50-69%, yellow) include medication management, diagnostic support, and therapy recommendations. Lower-priority applications (<50%, red) involve complex case treatment, research, and patient communication. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals. This hierarchy provides evidence-based guidance for sequencing AI implementation in organized primary care systems.

Figure 3: The Perfect 80%-80% Balance: Sophisticated Risk-Benefit Assessment



The figure illustrates physician perceptions of AI benefits (Panel A) and barriers (Panel B), demonstrating sophisticated understanding of AI's potential and limitations. The "perfect 80%-80% balance" refers to the finding that exactly 80.0% of physicians seek administrative relief while exactly 80.0% express concerns about AI inaccuracies, suggesting balanced rather than polarized perspectives. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals. This balanced assessment indicates that physicians are ready for honest discussions about AI trade-offs rather than oversimplified promotional messaging.

Figure 4: Managed Care Implementation Perspectives



The figure presents physician perspectives on AI implementation in organized care settings across two dimensions. Panel A displays implementation priorities, with treatment pathway support (59.3%) and quality assurance (49.3%) ranking highest, followed by provider coordination (45.7%) and cost control (39.3%). Panel B illustrates implementation challenges, with interoperability (71.3%) and implementation costs (67.3%) identified as primary concerns, followed by data protection (58.0%), workflow adjustment (42.7%), and patient acceptance (35.5%). Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals. These findings provide evidence-based guidance for AI implementation strategies in organized healthcare systems, highlighting the need for coordinated approaches that address both technical capabilities and organizational requirements.