Physician Readiness for AI in Primary Care: A Cross-Sectional Survey on the Knowledge-Attitude Gap and Implementation Priorities in Switzerland

Author: Marco Vecellio, MD[1] e-mail: marco.vecellio@hin.ch

[1] Primary Care Physician, Hegibachstrasse 2, 8032 Zürich, Switzerland

https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1772-5620

Abstract

Primary care artificial intelligence adoption among United States (US) physicians accelerated from 38% to 66% within one year. Implementation strategies typically assume physician resistance as the primary barrier; however, emerging evidence suggests a different challenge where enthusiastic adoption precedes adequate knowledge development.

Aims: To assess physician readiness for AI implementation in organized primary care, including knowledge levels, attitudes, implementation priorities, and actual usage patterns among Swiss primary care physicians.

Methods: Multicentric cross-sectional survey involving four regional subnetworks as study centers (Zurich, Bern, Ticino, Romandie) within mediX Switzerland, conducted August-September 2024. The mediX network comprises 900+ primary care physicians across three Swiss linguistic regions operating within a hybrid managed care model. Online survey of 620 primary care physicians yielding 155 analyzable responses (25.8% response rate). Analysis employed Wilson Score confidence intervals for proportions, Cohen's h effect sizes, and sensitivity analyses addressing both non-response bias and knowledge threshold definitions.

Results: A pronounced knowledge-attitude gap emerged among respondents. While 69.0% (95% CI: 61.4%-75.8%) expressed positive attitudes toward AI and 81.9% (95% CI: 75.1%-87.2%) sought training opportunities, only 14.8% (95% CI: 10.1%-21.3%) self-assessed their knowledge as high or excellent (levels 4-5), our primary threshold for adequate knowledge. Even when including moderate self-assessed knowledge (level 3+), only 47.1% met this threshold, indicating a persistent 21.9

percentage point knowledge-attitude gap. Critically, 27.7% (95% CI: 21.3%-35.3%) already use AI tools for clinical purposes notwithstanding acknowledged competency gaps. Non-response sensitivity analyses suggest population-level training interest ranges from 20.5% to 81.3% depending on assumptions about non-responders. Physicians demonstrated clear implementation preferences: immediate priority for administrative support (80.0%) and image analysis (73.5%), medium-term priority for medication management (64.5%) and diagnostic support (61.9%), and long-term perspective for complex applications.

Conclusions: Among AI-engaged physicians, this exploratory study reveals a substantial knowledge-attitude gap and documents current AI usage patterns that may precede formal knowledge acquisition. While selection bias limits generalizability, these findings suggest that educational interventions and governance frameworks merit urgent consideration in coordinated care settings where AI adoption is accelerating.

Keywords:

Artificial Intelligence; Primary Health Care; Physician Attitudes; Technology Adoption; Implementation Science; Medical Education; Healthcare Technology; Survey Research; Managed Care

---

What is already known on this topic

- AI adoption in primary care accelerated from 38% to 66% within one year, creating urgent need for readiness assessment
- Current implementation strategies assume physician resistance, though evidence suggests knowledge deficits may be a greater barrier
- Knowledge-attitude gaps have been reported across healthcare systems, but their magnitude and implications for patient safety remain poorly understood

What this study adds

- Reveals a 54.2 percentage point knowledge-attitude gap persistent across sensitivity analyses, indicating barriers stem from education infrastructure deficits rather than fundamental resistance

- Identifies unsupervised AI usage by 27.7% of physicians despite acknowledged knowledge limitations—a patient safety concern absent from previous implementation literature

- Establishes physician-consensus implementation hierarchy enabling systematic, evidence-based AI deployment: begin with administrative applications (≥70% support), progress to clinical support (50-69%), reserve complex applications (<50%) for mature phases

---

Introduction

Artificial intelligence implementation in primary care represents a critical juncture in healthcare transformation. Recent data demonstrates remarkable acceleration in physician AI adoption, from 38% to 66% within one year among US practitioners (1), while AI technologies demonstrate expanding capabilities across medical domains (2), revolutionizing diagnostic and therapeutic practices (23), including foundation models for generalist medical applications (3) and systems exceeding human performance on medical examinations (4).

Current implementation strategies often assume physician resistance as the primary barrier (4,5); however, emerging evidence suggests a fundamentally different challenge. Physicians are increasingly implementing AI tools without adequate knowledge foundations—a phenomenon we term the 'early adopter challenge', where enthusiasm and implementation outpace formal training and governance structures. This challenge inverts traditional resistance-based barriers: rather than convincing reluctant physicians to adopt new technologies, healthcare systems must rapidly educate and govern enthusiastic but underprepared practitioners who are already experimenting with AI tools in clinical contexts, potentially creating patient safety risks despite physician goodwill.

Recent systematic reviews identify persistent knowledge-attitude gaps across healthcare systems, with positive attitudes exceeding actual competencies and generally low knowledge levels despite willingness to learn (6). The magnitude and clinical implications of these gaps remain poorly quantified; moreover, what constitutes 'adequate knowledge' for safe AI implementation requires transparent threshold definitions and empirical validation through sensitivity analyses.

Despite growing evidence of physician enthusiasm for AI technologies (7), critical gaps exist in understanding readiness within coordinated care settings, where coordinated deployment strategies increasingly shape implementation pathways (9,10). Previous studies have focused on individual attitudes (8) or isolated barrier identification (5), but none have systematically examined the relationship between knowledge, attitudes, and actual usage patterns within integrated care systems—a gap particularly problematic as healthcare organizations pursue systematic AI integration.

Primary care networks provide crucial insights for understanding systematic AI implementation dynamics. The mediX Switzerland network — encompassing over 900 physicians across three linguistic regions within a hybrid managed care model — parallels integrated care structures internationally, including Accountable Care Organizations in the United States (14) and Primary Care Networks in the United Kingdom. This organizational context, combining coordinated care delivery with physician autonomy, enables assessment of readiness patterns relevant beyond the Swiss context. Recent implementation frameworks from leading medical education institutions (12) emphasize systematic readiness assessment before AI deployment, while evidence on technology adoption factors in healthcare (13) demonstrates that organizational context significantly influences implementation success.

This study investigates physician readiness for AI implementation within Switzerland's largest organized primary care network, aiming to quantify the knowledge-attitude gap and early adopter challenge, establish evidence-based implementation priorities, and provide actionable insights for coordinated AI deployment in coordinated care settings.

Methods

Study Design and Setting

We conducted a multicentric cross-sectional survey across the mediX Switzerland network between August and September 2024, following STROBE guidelines for observational studies (15). The study's multicentric design encompasses four regionally independent subnetworks (Zurich, Bern, Ticino, Romandie), each constituting a separate study center with distinct geographic catchment areas, patient populations, and administrative structures across three linguistic regions (German, Italian, French). While operating under shared organizational governance, these subnetworks function as autonomous primary care delivery systems, subject to different cantonal healthcare frameworks and reimbursement models.

The mediX network comprises over 900 physicians in Switzerland's largest organized primary care system. The hybrid managed care model combines coordinated healthcare delivery with physician autonomy, where practitioners treat both managed care and fee-for-service patients. This multicentric network structure ensures representation of Switzerland's linguistic, geographic, and healthcare system diversity. The complete STROBE checklist is provided as Supplementary Material.

Participants and Sampling

We employed convenience sampling to recruit primary care physicians within the mediX network. This pragmatic approach was necessitated by several factors: (1) substantial time constraints facing practicing clinicians, (2) the voluntary nature of network participation precluding mandatory response requirements, (3) the absence of financial incentives for participation, and (4) the exploratory nature of this research, which prioritizes depth of assessment over population representativeness. All 620 primary care physicians across the four regional subnetworks received identical survey invitations via the network's communication infrastructure.

From 620 contacted physicians across all four subnetworks (zürich: 183 physicians, bern: 202 physicians, ticino: 140 physicians, romandie: 95 physicians), 160 responded (25.8% response rate), with 155 providing analyzable data after excluding 5 incomplete responses (96.9% inclusion rate among responders, detailed in

Supplementary Figure S1). This response rate aligns with international benchmarks for physician surveys, which typically range from 20-35% (24).

Inclusion criteria comprised: active primary care practice within the mediX network, provision of patient care services, and completion of ≥2 of 4 core readiness dimensions (AI knowledge, attitudes, training interest, LLM experience).

Survey Development and Measures

The online survey instrument incorporated validated scales from international AI readiness assessments (16), drawing on established technology acceptance frameworks (11) and factors known to influence healthcare technology adoption. The survey was deployed in three languages (German, French, Italian) to reflect the linguistic diversity of the Swiss primary care physician population across different national regions. The instrument underwent pilot testing with 10 physicians. Survey domains encompassed: demographic characteristics, AI knowledge self-assessment (5-point Likert scale from "very low" to "excellent"), personal attitudes toward AI (5-point scale from "very negative" to "very positive"), implementation priorities across eight application domains, perceived benefits and barriers, and ethical considerations. No financial or material incentives were provided for participation.

Survey reporting follows the CHERRIES (Checklist for Reporting Results of Internet E-Surveys) guidelines for web-based survey research. The complete CHERRIES checklist is provided as Supplementary Material.

For analytical purposes, we conservatively defined adequate knowledge as levels 4-5 ('high' or 'excellent' self-assessed competency), based on the assumption that safe AI implementation requires substantial understanding. Acknowledging that this threshold lacks empirical validation and that alternative definitions may be equally defensible, we conducted sensitivity analyses examining knowledge adequacy at both the primary threshold (levels 4-5) and a more inclusive secondary threshold (levels 3-5, including 'moderate' self-assessed knowledge). Complete scale distributions across all five levels are presented to enable independent assessment of alternative categorizations.

We acknowledge that no empirical data exist to validate which self-assessed knowledge level corresponds to 'safe' or 'adequate' AI usage in clinical practice. Our conservative threshold (levels 4-5) assumes that substantial understanding is required for independent AI implementation, but this remains a working assumption rather than an evidence-based standard. The inclusive threshold analysis (levels 3-5) examines whether our conclusions depend on this operationalization."

Statistical Analysis

We calculated 95% confidence intervals using the Wilson Score method, which provides superior coverage properties for proportions with moderate sample sizes. Effect sizes for comparing proportions were calculated using Cohen's h, with interpretation following established conventions (0.2=small, 0.5=medium, 0.8=large effect).

Given the substantial non-response rate (74.2%), we conducted sensitivity analyses to assess potential bias impacts. We modelled three scenarios: pessimistic (non-responders have zero interest in AI), moderate (non-responders have half the interest of responders), and optimistic (non-responders mirror responders). This approach provides ranges for key estimates rather than point estimates.

Additionally, we conducted sensitivity analyses for the knowledge threshold definition, examining the knowledge-attitude gap under both conservative (levels 4-5) and more inclusive (levels 3-5) criteria for adequate knowledge. This approach tests the robustness of our primary findings across alternative operationalizations of knowledge adequacy. Effect sizes (Cohen's h) were calculated for both threshold definitions to quantify the magnitude of knowledge-attitude discrepancies independent of sample size.

Ethical Considerations

Per Swiss Human Research Act Article 2, formal ethics approval was not required as this study collected only professional opinions without patient data or interventions. Participants provided informed consent by proceeding with the voluntary survey. Data were analyzed in aggregate without individual identification.

Results

Participant Characteristics

The sample of 155 physicians demonstrated balanced gender distribution (54.8% male, 45.2% female) with substantial clinical experience (38.1% >20 years, 33.5% 10-20 years, 17.4% 5-10 years, 11.0% <5 years). Participants represented predominantly German-speaking regions (88.4%), with representation from Italian-speaking (10.3%) and French-speaking (1.3%) areas, reflecting the network's geographic distribution. Practice settings varied from solo practice (12.9%) to large groups of ≥10 physicians (16.1%), with most working in small (37.4%) or medium (33.5%) group practices (Table 1). Detailed distributions of AI knowledge and attitude assessments are provided in Supplementary Table S1, showing that the majority of physicians (85.2%) self-assessed their knowledge as insufficient (levels 1-3).

The Knowledge-Attitude Gap: Critical Finding

Responding physicians demonstrated remarkably positive attitudes toward AI implementation, with 69.0% (95% CI: 61.4%-75.8%) expressing positive attitudes, only 10.9% expressing negative attitudes, and 20.0% remaining neutral. This positivity persists even under conservative assumptions about non-responders.

Despite this enthusiasm, a substantial knowledge-attitude gap emerged (Figure 1). While 69.0% of responders held positive attitudes, only 14.8% (95% CI: 10.1%-21.3%) self-assessed their AI knowledge as high or excellent (levels 4-5). The majority—85.2%—assessed their knowledge as insufficient, with 17.4% reporting very low, 35.5% low, and 32.3% moderate levels.

This 54.2 percentage point knowledge-attitude gap represents a very large effect size (Cohen's h=1.17). To test robustness, we examined an alternative, more inclusive threshold including moderate self-assessed knowledge (levels 3-5): 47.1% met this criterion, yielding a persistent 21.9 percentage point gap (Cohen's h=0.45, medium effect). This medium effect size indicates that even under more inclusive knowledge criteria, the discrepancy between attitudes and competencies remains clinically meaningful.

Non-response sensitivity analyses suggest the gap persists across scenarios: under the conservative threshold (levels 4-5), it ranges from 13.6 percentage points (pessimistic) to 53.8 percentage points (optimistic scenario), with a moderate estimate of 33.9 percentage points. Even under the inclusive threshold (levels 3-5) and pessimistic non-response assumptions, a meaningful gap persists (complete sensitivity analyses presented in Supplementary Table S3).

The Early Adopter Pattern: Critical Safety Finding

Most concerning, 27.7% (95% CI: 21.3%-35.3%) of responding physicians already utilize AI tools including Large Language Models for medical purposes, in the absence of formal training infrastructure, despite evidence that current models can encode substantial clinical knowledge (10). Usage patterns include research (71.7%), documentation (22.6%), and clinical decision support (20.8%).

Early adopters demonstrated significantly higher AI knowledge (mean 3.02 vs 2.26, Mann-Whitney $U=3395$, $p<0.001$) and more positive attitudes (mean 4.21 vs 3.57, $U=3359$, $p<0.001$) than non-adopters. However, their mean knowledge level of 3.02 still falls below our predefined adequacy threshold (levels 4-5), suggesting that even among early adopters, self-assessed AI competency remains moderate. The cross-sectional design precludes determination of whether AI usage preceded or followed knowledge acquisition.

This pattern of unsupervised adoption among more than one-quarter of engaged physicians, occurring in the absence of formal training infrastructure, represents what we term the 'early adopter challenge'—creating potential patient safety implications that warrant immediate attention.

High Training Demand and Universal Readiness

The documented knowledge-attitude gap and existing usage patterns are accompanied by substantial demand for formal education. Among responding physicians, 81.9% (95% CI: 75.1%-87.2%) expressed interest in AI training opportunities, with 48.4% showing definite interest and 33.5% probable interest. This training demand markedly exceeds international benchmarks, where approximately 60% of physicians express AI education interest (5).

However, sensitivity analyses reveal considerable uncertainty about population-level estimates. Training interest could range from 20.5% (pessimistic scenario assuming non-responders have no interest) to 81.3% (optimistic scenario assuming non-responders mirror responders), with a moderate estimate of 50.8% (assuming non-responders have half the interest).

Notably, correlation analysis revealed no significant relationship between professional experience and AI attitudes (Spearman's $\rho=-0.023$, $p=0.779$). Training interest remained consistent across all experience levels, from recent graduates to physicians with >20 years practice. This universality suggests AI readiness represents a profession-wide phenomenon rather than generational divide, supporting comprehensive rather than age-targeted training approaches.

Strategic Implementation Preferences: A Three-Phase Hierarchy

Physicians demonstrated remarkable consensus on implementation sequencing despite acknowledged knowledge limitations (Figure 2). Analysis revealed a clear three-phase hierarchy based on support levels:

Phase 1 - Immediate Implementation (≥70% support): Administrative support garnered 80.0% endorsement (95% CI: 73.0%-85.5%), followed by image analysis at 73.5% (95% CI: 66.1%-79.9%). This consensus reflects pragmatic recognition of AI's immediate potential for workflow optimization and represents applications with strong physician readiness for deployment.

Phase 2 - Medium-term Implementation (50-69% support): Clinical support applications received moderate endorsement: medication management (64.5%, 95% CI: 56.7%-71.6%), diagnostic support (61.9%, 95% CI: 54.1%-69.2%), and therapy recommendations (56.1%, 95% CI: 48.3%-63.7%). These applications show majority support but suggest physicians recognize the need for additional preparation and evidence development before widespread implementation.

Phase 3 - Long-term Implementation (<50% support): Complex applications showed lower support: prevention and risk assessment (38.1%), complex case treatment (27.7%), research applications (20.0%), and patient communication (16.8%). The comparison between administrative support (highest priority) and patient

communication (lowest priority) revealed a very large effect size (Cohen's h=1.35), indicating substantial differences in perceived readiness across domains and reflecting appropriate risk assessment rather than technology aversion. Detailed implementation priorities across all eight application domains are provided in Supplementary Table S2.

Balanced Risk-Benefit Assessment

Physicians demonstrated sophisticated risk-benefit evaluation rather than naive enthusiasm (Figure 3). They identified administrative relief as the primary benefit (78.1%, 95% CI: 70.9%-83.9%), followed by efficient workflows (58.1%), continuous monitoring (54.8%), and enhanced competence (46.5%). Recent evidence of GPT-4's impact on physician performance (20) supports these perceived benefits.

Simultaneously, they articulated specific concerns with nearly equivalent emphasis: AI inaccuracy (77.4%, 95% CI: 70.2%-83.3%) emerged as the primary concern, followed by technology dependence (64.5%), lack of transparency (56.1%), data protection (49.7%), and threats to physician-patient relationships (41.9%). The near-equivalence between top benefit (78.1%) and top concern (77.4%) with negligible effect size (Cohen's h=0.02) demonstrates balanced assessment.

This balanced perspective indicates that responding physicians recognize both opportunities and limitations of AI implementation, suggesting they are prepared for honest dialogue about AI trade-offs rather than oversimplified promotional messaging.

Framework Conditions and Implementation Challenges

Analysis of framework conditions revealed specific requirements physicians consider essential for successful AI implementation (Figure 4). Easy integration into existing workflows emerged as the top priority (81.3%, 95% CI: 74.4%-86.6%), followed by sufficient evidence for safety and efficacy (76.1%, 95% CI: 68.8%-82.2%).

Regarding implementation challenges, interoperability between systems dominated concerns (69.0%, 95% CI: 61.4%-75.8%), followed by implementation costs (65.2%, 95% CI: 57.4%-72.2%). The paradox between high demand for easy integration (81.3%) and significant interoperability concerns (69.0%) highlights the complexity of

AI implementation, suggesting that implementation strategies must address both aspirational goals (workflow integration) and pragmatic obstacles (system compatibility) simultaneously.

Discussion

Summary and International Context

This study reveals a striking “readiness paradox” in organized primary care, manifesting in three dimensions: (1) high enthusiasm without corresponding knowledge, (2) implementation without formal training infrastructure, and (3) safety concerns coexisting with actual unsupervised usage. Rather than the anticipated barrier of physician resistance, we encounter the unexpected challenge of managing premature adoption—a fundamentally different implementation problem requiring education-focused rather than motivation-focused interventions.

While the vast majority of engaged physicians demand AI training and express positive attitudes, few report adequate knowledge, and many already implement AI without proper foundation. The 81.9% training demand among responders substantially exceeds international benchmarks (5), though selection bias and threshold definition necessitates cautious interpretation.

The documented 54.2 percentage point knowledge-attitude gap among responders **(Figure 1)** exceeds findings from other healthcare systems (7), despite those systems having more established AI training programs. This gap's persistence across sensitivity analyses indicates a genuine phenomenon requiring immediate attention. Rather than confirming assumptions about physician resistance (4), our findings suggest implementation challenges stem primarily from inadequate knowledge infrastructure to support willing practitioners.

This knowledge-attitude gap appears consistent across international contexts: recent studies from the United Kingdom, United States, and other European healthcare systems report similar knowledge-attitude discrepancies, suggesting that the challenges identified in our Swiss multicentric sample reflect universal implementation barriers rather than context-specific phenomena.

International Applicability and Transferability

This Swiss network study addresses challenges transcending national healthcare boundaries. Conducted within the mediX managed care network, our results illuminate universal AI implementation dynamics in networked primary care, where technological innovation and clinical preparedness tensions manifest independently of financing models or regulatory frameworks.

Transferability rests on three structural similarities in integrated care systems internationally. First, coordinated delivery within defined physician networks creates centralized technology adoption points. Second, inherent tension between organizational coordination and physician autonomy enables independent tool adoption despite readiness gaps. Third, shared information technology infrastructure enables centralized AI deployment.

The mediX hybrid model parallels Accountable Care Organizations (US), Clinical Commissioning Groups (UK), Integrated Care Systems (Europe), and Primary Care Networks (Australia, Canada).

International evidence corroborates our core findings. A systematic review encompassing 24 studies documented remarkably low knowledge levels (pooled proportion 0.33) despite positive attitudes (6), mirroring our knowledge-attitude gap; UK general practitioners demonstrated high training demand (79%) yet minimal employer support (7); US physicians exhibited adoption acceleration from 38% to 66% within one year without corresponding knowledge infrastructure (1), substantiating our early adopter challenge. Our three-phase implementation hierarchy aligns with international patterns, with UK GPs showing strongest agreement for administrative applications (69%) (7), confirming cross-cultural validity for evidence-based sequencing. Contextual factors including healthcare financing, regulatory frameworks, and cultural attitudes may moderate effect magnitude; however, fundamental patterns—substantial knowledge-attitude gaps, unsupervised early adoption, and preference hierarchies favoring administrative applications—appear to reflect universal physician responses rather than Swiss-specific phenomena. The framework developed here provides replicable methodology for coordinated care systems internationally confronting similar AI integration challenges.

The Knowledge Gap as Implementation Opportunity

The substantial knowledge-attitude gap, while concerning, represents opportunity rather than obstacle. The combination of positive attitudes with knowledge deficits creates ideal conditions for educational intervention—physicians want to learn but lack structured pathways, fundamentally differing from resistance-based barriers that require motivational rather than educational solutions.

This interpretation warrants methodological caution, as alternative explanations merit consideration. Self-assessment biases may operate differentially: physicians with greater AI expertise may underestimate their competence (reverse Dunning-Kruger effect or impostor phenomenon), while those with limited knowledge overestimate it. Positive attitudes may partially reflect social desirability bias, where physicians express enthusiasm toward technological innovation regardless of true sentiments. Moreover, knowledge and attitudes may represent fundamentally different constructs—attitudes reflecting aspirational values and openness to change, knowledge assessments tapping current technical competency—that need not correlate strongly. However, the combination of high training demand (81.9%) with acknowledged knowledge deficits suggests physicians themselves recognize the gap and actively seek to address it, lending credibility to the educational infrastructure interpretation rather than supporting alternative explanations based on assessment biases or social desirability.

This evidence suggests healthcare systems should pivot from convincing reluctant physicians to rapidly educating enthusiastic but underprepared practitioners—a paradigm shift requiring immediate educational infrastructure development. Previous implementation frameworks have focused on overcoming skepticism (5) without recognizing that physicians may have already mentally committed to AI adoption; our findings indicate the barrier lies not in motivation but in accessible, structured learning pathways that match physician readiness to engage with AI technologies.

Evidence-Based Implementation Hierarchy

The three-phase implementation hierarchy **(Figure 2)** provides actionable guidance beyond theoretical frameworks. The 80.0% consensus on administrative applications as starting points aligns with successful international deployments, where

administrative AI achieved high satisfaction before clinical expansion (17). This evidence-based approach moves beyond simple 'implementation' toward comprehensive service design (18), recognizing that systematic progression builds physician confidence.

Healthcare systems internationally should leverage this natural progression rather than pushing premature clinical implementation, aligning with strategic implementation frameworks proposed by leading medical education centers and the structured curriculum development for AI in primary care (12). The strong preference gradient (Cohen's h=1.35) between administrative and patient-facing applications reflects appropriate risk assessment rather than technology aversion and provides actionable guidance for other coordinated care systems pursuing phased AI deployment strategies.

The Safety Imperative: Addressing Unsupervised Adoption

The discovery that 27.7% of physicians already use AI tools without adequate knowledge represents an urgent safety concern absent from previous literature. While studies have extensively documented barriers to adoption (5, 9), none have identified the opposite problem: premature, unsupervised adoption creating potential patient safety risks, despite evidence that current large language models can encode substantial clinical knowledge (19).

These early adopters, though more knowledgeable than non-users, still fall below adequacy thresholds while using AI for clinical decisions (20.8%). This pattern among engaged physicians suggests the urgent need for interventions to support safe adoption in settings where early AI experimentation is occurring, rather than planning for future controlled deployment. Regulatory frameworks assuming gradual, supervised implementation (20) (21) may be inadequate for current reality where physicians access consumer AI tools.

It should be noted that our cross-sectional design cannot establish the temporal sequence: whether physicians adopted AI tools before acquiring knowledge (creating safety risks) or whether AI usage itself facilitated learning (a more benign explanation). Longitudinal research is essential to clarify this causal pathway and inform appropriate intervention strategies.

Balanced Risk-Benefit Understanding

The near-equivalence between perceived benefits and barriers **(Figure 3)** indicates sophisticated evaluation rather than naive enthusiasm. Physicians recognize both administrative relief potential (78.1%) and AI inaccuracy risks (77.4%), suggesting preparation for honest dialogue about trade-offs. This balanced perspective, combined with clear framework requirements **(Figure 4)**, indicates that physicians understand implementation complexity beyond simple technology adoption.

Universal Readiness and Implementation Implications

The universal readiness across experience levels **(Table 1)** supports comprehensive rather than targeted training approaches, consistent with systematic reviews identifying organizational and individual factors influencing technology adoption by healthcare professionals (13). This universality aligns with emerging educational frameworks that advocate for profession-wide AI competency development rather than selective training programs (22). All physicians, regardless of seniority, require AI education, challenging assumptions about generational divides in technology adoption.

Methodological Considerations and Limitations

This study faces several important limitations requiring transparent acknowledgment. First, the 25.8% response rate, while typical for physician surveys (7), creates substantial selection bias. Responding physicians likely represent the 'AI-engaged segment' rather than the general physician population. Our sensitivity analyses attempt to quantify this uncertainty, but cannot eliminate it.

Second, the study was conducted within a single coordinated care network that may attract technology-oriented physicians. However, the network's size (900+ physicians) and hybrid payment model provide substantial heterogeneity relevant to international integrated care systems. The geographic and linguistic diversity within our sample enhances transferability to other multilingual healthcare systems and federally organized countries.

Third, knowledge assessment relied on self-reported measures without objective validation. While self-assessment remains standard in physician attitude research

due to practical constraints, it may not accurately reflect true competency levels. The conservative threshold for 'adequate knowledge' (levels 4-5) may underestimate or overestimate true preparedness. However, our sensitivity analyses demonstrate that the knowledge-attitude gap persists across alternative threshold definitions (levels 3-5), with effect sizes ranging from medium (h=0.46) to very large (h=1.17), indicating that our conclusions are robust to this operationalization choice.

Fourth, the cross-sectional design prevents causal inference about relationships between knowledge, attitudes, and usage patterns. Longitudinal research is needed to understand how these factors evolve during AI implementation.

Fifth, convenience sampling, while necessary given physician time constraints, limits generalizability. The exploratory nature of this research provides initial insights requiring validation through more comprehensive studies.

Sixth, the survey was conducted primarily in German-speaking regions (88.4%), with limited representation from French-speaking (1.3%) and Italian-speaking (10.3%) areas. This linguistic imbalance may not fully capture cultural differences in AI attitudes across Switzerland's linguistic regions, potentially limiting generalizability to the entire Swiss primary care population.

Finally, this survey was conducted in August-September 2024, a period of rapid AI evolution. Physician knowledge and attitudes may shift substantially as AI tools become more prevalent, training programs expand, and regulatory frameworks mature. Our findings represent a snapshot of a dynamic transition period and may require periodic reassessment to maintain relevance.

Implications for Practice and Policy

Among AI-engaged physicians in coordinated care settings, our findings suggest urgent need for coordinated action across multiple domains. While selection bias limits generalizability to all primary care practitioners, the documented patterns—substantial knowledge-attitude gaps, unsupervised early adoption, and clear implementation preferences—provide actionable insights for healthcare systems where AI interest is emerging.

Our empirical findings support a dual-framework implementation approach addressing both application prioritization and implementation process. The three-phase implementation hierarchy derived from physician consensus (Figure 2) provides evidence-based sequencing guidance: begin with administrative applications (≥70% support: administrative support 80.0%, image analysis 73.5%) to build confidence, progress to clinical support applications (50-69% support: medication management 64.5%, diagnostic support 61.9%, therapy recommendations 56.1%) with appropriate governance, and reserve complex applications (<50% support) for mature implementation phases when robust evidence frameworks exist.

Complementing this application sequencing, we propose a four-step implementation process (detailed in Supplementary Framework 1) that addresses the specific readiness profile documented here: (1) leverage early adopters (27.7%) as mentors and champions, (2) deploy comprehensive, career-stage-agnostic training programs addressing universal demand (81.9%), (3) systematically close the knowledge-attitude gap (54.2 percentage points) through competency-based education, and (4) sequence deployment according to physician consensus while monitoring outcomes.

Regulatory bodies must recognize and address unsupervised AI adoption already occurring among engaged physicians. Current frameworks assuming controlled future deployment may be inadequate for contexts where sizable proportions already experiment with tools. Governance structures, safety guidelines, and usage monitoring systems warrant immediate consideration, particularly in coordinated care networks where coordination infrastructure exists, aligning with WHO guidance (21) and emerging regulatory frameworks.

The combination of high enthusiasm, substantial knowledge gaps, and existing unsupervised usage creates a unique implementation window: physicians want education and are receptive to governance, but spontaneous adoption is outpacing formal structures.

Healthcare systems that act decisively to provide training, evidence-based guidance, and appropriate oversight can channel this enthusiasm toward safe AI integration. Delayed action risks entrenching unregulated usage patterns that may be difficult to modify retrospectively.

Conclusion

This exploratory study reveals high AI readiness among engaged physicians in organized primary care, characterized by substantial training demand, positive attitudes, but critical knowledge deficits. The discovery that 27.7% already use AI notwithstanding inadequate knowledge—the 'early adopter challenge'—transforms implementation from future planning to immediate intervention. While selection bias limits generalizability to all primary care physicians, the findings provide crucial insights for coordinated care networks pursuing AI implementation.

Success depends not on overcoming resistance but on channeling existing enthusiasm through structured education and governance frameworks. The evidence-based implementation hierarchy offers practical guidance for systematic AI integration that builds from administrative applications toward clinical deployment, ensuring both innovation and safety in primary care transformation.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to all the primary care physicians from mediX zürich, bern, ticino, and romandie 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.

I acknowledge the use of artificial intelligence tools for literature review assistance, data visualization optimization, and manuscript formatting. All data analysis,

interpretation, and scientific conclusions remain under my full oversight and responsibility.

Author Contributions

MV conceived and designed the study, collected and analysed the data, interpreted the results, and wrote the manuscript. Prof. Oliver Senn contributed to the initial study design and Prof. Corinne Chmiel (Head of mediX Switzerland Science Suport) supported online deployment within the network and gave additional advice.

Funding: No specific grants from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors were received for this research.

Competing Interests: The author declares no competing interests.

Data Availability: The datasets supporting the conclusions of this article are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Supplementary Materials:

Supplementary File 1: STROBE Checklist

Completed STROBE (Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology) checklist demonstrating adherence to reporting guidelines for cross-sectional studies.

Supplementary File 2: CHERRIES Checklist

Completed CHERRIES (Checklist for Reporting Results of Internet E-Surveys) checklist for reporting results of internet-based surveys.

Supplementary File 3: Additional Materials

Including: Supplementary Table S1 (Complete AI Knowledge and Attitude Assessment), Supplementary Table S2 (Detailed Implementation Priorities), Supplementary Table S3 (Combined Sensitivity Analyses), Supplementary Framework 1 (Four-Phase Implementation Strategy), Supplementary Figure S1 (Study Flow Diagram), and Methodological Notes.

REFERENCES

1. American Medical Association. Physicians' use of AI in practice doubles in one year [Internet]. Chicago: American Medical Association; 2023 [cited 2024 Oct 14]. Available from: https://www.ama-assn.org/practice-management/digital-health/physicians-use-ai-practice-doubles-one-year

2. Topol EJ. High-performance medicine: the convergence of human and artificial intelligence. Nat Med. 2019 Jan;25(1):44-56. doi: 10.1038/s41591-018-0300-7. PMID: 30617339.

3. Moor M, Banerjee O, Abad ZSH, Krumholz HM, Leskovec J, Topol EJ, et al. Foundation models for generalist medical artificial intelligence. Nature. 2023 Apr;616(7956):259-265. doi: 10.1038/s41586-023-05881-4. PMID: 37045921.

4. Nori H, King N, McKinney SM, Carignan D, Horvitz E. Capabilities of GPT-4 on Medical Challenge Problems. arXiv. 2023. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2303.13375.

5. Hassan M, Kushniruk A, Borycki E. Barriers to and Facilitators of Artificial Intelligence Adoption in Health Care: Scoping Review. JMIR Hum Factors. 2024;11:e48633. doi: 10.2196/48633. PMID: 39207831.

6. Abdulazeem HM, Meckawy R, Schwarz S, Novillo-Ortiz D, Klug SJ. Knowledge, attitude, and practice of primary care physicians toward clinical AI-assisted digital health technologies: Systematic review and meta-analysis. Int J Med Inform. 2025;201:105945. doi: 10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2025.105945.

7. Kharko A, Garcia Sanchez C, Hagström J, Gaab J, Locher C, McMillan B, et al. General practitioners' opinions of generative artificial intelligence in the UK: An online survey. Digit Health. 2025;11:20552076251360863. doi: 10.1177/20552076251360863.

8. Blease C, Kaptchuk TJ, Bernstein MH, Mandl KD, Halamka JD, DesRoches CM. Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Primary Care: Exploratory Qualitat

ve Study of UK General Practitioners' Views. J Med Internet Res. 2019;21(3):e12802. doi: 10.2196/12802. PMID: 30892270.

9. Nair M, Svedberg P, Larsson I, Nygren JM. A comprehensive overview of barriers and strategies for AI implementation in healthcare: Mixed-method design. PLoS One. 2024 Aug 9;19(8):e0305949. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0305949. PMID: 39121051.

10. Kelly CJ, Karthikesalingam A, Suleyman M, Corrado G, King D. Key challenges for delivering clinical impact with artificial intelligence. BMC Med. 2019;17:195. doi: 10.1186/s12916-019-1426-2. PMID: 31665002.

11. Kueper JK, Emu M, Banbury M, Bjerre LM, Choudhury S, Green M, et al. Artificial intelligence for family medicine research in Canada: current state and future directions: Report of the CFPC AI Working Group. Can Fam Physician. 2024;70(3):161-168. doi: 10.46747/cfp.7003161. PMID: 38499374.

12. College of Family Physicians of Canada. Artificial Intelligence in Graduate Medical Education. Ann Fam Med. 2025;23(5):480-481. doi: 10.1370/afm.250512. PMID: 40983546.

13. Gagnon M-P, Desmartis M, Labrecque M, Car J, Pagliari C, Pluye P, et al. Systematic review of factors influencing the adoption of information and communication technologies by healthcare professionals. J Med Syst. 2012;36:241-277. doi: 10.1007/s10916-010-9473-4. PMID: 20703721.

14. Amon C, King J, Colclasure J, Hodge K, DuBard CA. Leveraging Accountable Care Organization infrastructure for rapid pandemic response in independent primary care practices. Healthc (Amst). 2022;10(2):100623. doi: 10.1016/j.hjdsi.2022.100623. PMID: 35276633.

15. 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):1453-7. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(07)61602-X. PMID: 18064739.

16. Venkatesh V, Morris MG, Davis GB, Davis FD. User Acceptance of Information Technology: Toward a Unified View. MIS Q. 2003;27(3):425-78. doi: 10.2307/30036540. PMID: 38408043.

17. Ta AWA, Goh HL, Ang C, Koh LY, Poon K, Miller SM. Two Singapore public healthcare AI applications for national screening programs and other examples. Health Care Sci. 2022;1(2):41-57. doi: 10.1002/hcs2.10. PMID: 38938890.

18. Shaw J, Agarwal P, Desveaux L, Palma DC, Stamenova V, Jamieson T, et al. Beyond "implementation": digital health innovation and service design. npj Digit Med. 2018;1:48. doi: 10.1038/s41746-018-0059-8. PMID: 31304327.

19. Singhal K, Azizi S, Tu T, Mahdavi SS, Wei J, Chung HW, et al. Large language models encode clinical knowledge. Nature. 2023 Aug;620(7972):172-180. doi: 10.1038/s41586-023-06291-2. PMID: 37438534.

20. Busch F, Kather JN, Johner C, Moser M, Truhn D, Adams LC, et al. Navigating the European Union Artificial Intelligence Act for Healthcare. npj Digit Med. 2024;7:210. doi: 10.1038/s41746-024-01213-6. PMID: 39134637.

21. World Health Organization. Ethics and governance of artificial intelligence for health: Guidance on large multi-modal models. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2025. 98 p.

22. Hoffman et al. , Competency-based and less time-bound: a new approach to the macro-structure of a medical school curriculum. Med Educ Online. 2024;29(1):2343205. doi: 10.1080/10872981.2024.2343205. PMID: 38626425.

23. Iqbal J, Cortés Jaimes D, Makineni P, Subramani S, Hemaida S, Thugu TR, et al. Reimagining Healthcare: Unleashing the Power of Artificial Intelligence in Medicine. Cureus. 2023 Sep 04;15(9):e44658. doi: 10.7759/cureus.44658.

24. VanGeest JB, Johnson TP, Welch VL. Methodologies for improving response rates in surveys of physicians: a systematic review. Eval Health Prof. 2007;30(4):303-21. doi: 10.1177/0163278707307899. PMID: 17986667.

TABLE 1: PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS (N=155)

Characteristic	Category	n	%	95% CI
Gender	Male	85	54.8%	47.0%-62.5%
	Female	70	45.2%	37.5%-53.0%
Language Region	German-speaking	137	88.4%	82.4%-92.5%
	Italian-speaking (Ticino)	16	10.3%	6.5%-16.1%
	French-speaking	2	1.3%	0.4%-4.6%
Years of Experience	>20 years	59	38.1%	30.8%-45.9%
	10-20 years	52	33.5%	26.6%-41.3%
	5-10 years	27	17.4%	12.3%-24.2%
	<5 years	17	11.0%	7.0%-16.9%
Practice Size	Small group (2-3 physicians)	58	37.4%	30.2%-45.3%
	Medium group (4-9 physicians)	52	33.5%	26.6%-41.3%
	Large group (≥10 physicians)	25	16.1%	11.2%-22.7%
	Solo practice	20	12.9%	8.5%-19.1%

Legend Table 1:

Sample: 155 primary care physicians from mediX Switzerland network who completed the survey (96.9% inclusion rate among 160 responders, 25.8% response rate from 620 contacted physicians). Demographics: Balanced gender distribution with substantial clinical experience (71.6% >10 years practice). Geographic representation across all Swiss linguistic regions with predominant German-speaking participation reflecting national physician distribution.

Practice Settings: Diverse practice sizes from solo practitioners to large group practices (≥10 physicians), representing typical Swiss primary care organizational structures within the mediX managed care network. Statistical Methods: Percentages calculated with 95% confidence intervals using Wilson Score method for optimal coverage properties. All confidence intervals provide conservative estimates appropriate for the sample size and observed proportions.

Abbreviations: CI = Confidence Interval; n = number of participants.

FIGURE 1



Figure 1: Substantial Knowledge-Attitude Gap in AI Readiness Among Primary Care Physicians

Figure 1 demonstrates a substantial 54.2 percentage point gap between positive attitudes toward AI (69.0%, 95% CI: 61.4%-75.8%) and adequate knowledge levels (14.8%, 95% CI: 9.9%-21.4%), representing a very large effect size (Cohen's h = 1.17). Panel A shows AI knowledge self-assessment distribution across five levels (1=very low
to 5=excellent), with 85.2% reporting insufficient knowledge levels (1-3) and only 14.8% reporting adequate knowledge (4-5). Panel B displays personal attitudes toward AI implementation across five levels (1=very negative to 5=very positive), with 69.0% expressing positive attitudes (4-5), 20.0% neutral (3), and 10.9% negative (1-2).

This substantial knowledge-attitude gap indicates that implementation barriers stem primarily from knowledge deficits rather than fundamental resistance to AI adoption.

Despite insufficient AI knowledge, the majority of physicians maintain positive attitudes toward AI implementation, suggesting significant readiness for education-focused interventions. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals calculated using Wilson Score method for optimal coverage properties with moderate sample sizes.

FIGURE 2



Figure 2: AI Implementation Priorities in Swiss Primary Care

Figure 2 illustrates physician preferences for AI implementation sequencing, revealing a clear three-phase hierarchy based on support levels (n=155). Phase 1applications (≥70% support, blue bars) include administrative support (80.0%, 95% CI: 73.0%-85.5%) and image analysis (73.5%, 95% CI: 66.1%-79.9%), representing immediate implementation priorities with strong physician consensus. Phase 2 applications (50-69% support, yellow bars) encompass medication management (64.5%, 95% CI: 56.7%-71.6%) and diagnostic support (61.9%, 95% CI: 54.1%-69.2%), suitable for medium-term implementation following successful Phase 1 deployment. Phase 3 applications (<50% support, red gradient bars) involve prevention & risk assessment (38.1%, 95% CI: 30.8%-45.9%), complex case treatment (27.7%, 95% CI: 21.3%-35.3%), research applications (20.0%, 95% CI: 14.5%-27.0%), and patient communication (16.8%, 95% CI: 11.7%-23.4%), representing long-term implementation goals requiring substantial preparation and evidence development. The comparison between administrative support and patient communication reveals a very large effect size (Cohen's h = 1.35), indicating substantial differences inimplementation readiness with practical implications for deployment sequencing. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals (Wilson Score method). This evidence-based hierarchy provides practical guidance for AI deployment sequencing in primary care settings, supporting systematic implementation approaches that build physician confidence progressively.

FIGURE 3



Figure 3: Perceived Benefits vs. Barriers of AI in Primary Care

Figure 3 demonstrates physician perceptions of AI benefits (Panel A) and barriers (Panel B), revealing balanced risk-benefit assessment rather than polarized views (n=155). Near-equivalent recognition of top benefit (78.1%) and top barrier (77.4%) demonstrates nuanced understanding of AI's potential and limitations (Cohen's h=0.02, negligible difference).

Panel A shows the top five perceived benefits: administrative relief (78.1%, 95% CI: 70.9%-83.9%) as the primary benefit, followed by efficient workflows (58.1%, 95% CI: 50.2%-65.5%), continuous monitoring capabilities (54.8%, 95% CI: 47.0%-62.5%), enhanced competence (46.5%, 95% CI: 38.8%-54.3%), and faster diagnosis (38.1%, 95% CI: 30.8%-45.9%).

Panel B illustrates the top five perceived barriers: AI inaccuracy concerns (77.4%, 95% CI: 70.2%-83.3%) as the primary concern, followed by technology dependence (64.5%, 95% CI: 56.7%-71.6%), lack of transparency (56.1%, 95% CI: 48.3%-63.7%), data protection issues (49.7%, 95% CI: 41.9%-57.5%), and threats to physician-patient relationships (41.9%, 95% CI: 34.5%-49.8%). The near-equivalent levels of administrative relief benefits (78.1%) and AI inaccuracy concerns (77.4%)

indicate nuanced understanding of AI's potential and limitations, suggesting physicians are ready for honest discussions about AI trade-offs rather than oversimplified promotional messaging. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals (Wilson Score method). This balanced assessment provides evidence for implementation strategies that address both opportunities and concerns simultaneously.

FIGURE 4



Figure 4: Framework Conditions and Implementation Challenges

Figure 4 presents physician perspectives on AI implementation requirements across two critical dimensions (n=155). Panel A displays framework conditions considered essential for AI adoption: easy integration into existing workflows (81.3%, 95% CI: 74.4%-86.6%) and sufficient evidence for safety and efficacy (76.1%, 95% CI:68.8%-82.2%) emerge as top priorities, while financing by insurance (36.8%, 95% CI: 29.6%-44.6%), tool certification (36.1%, 95% CI: 29.0%-43.9%), and training opportunities (30.3%, 95% CI: 23.6%-38.0%) receive moderate support. Panel B illustrates anticipated implementation challenges: interoperability between systems (69.0%, 95% CI: 61.4%-75.8%) and implementation costs (65.2%, 95% CI: 57.4%-72.2%) represent primary concerns, followed by data protection and security(56.1%, 95% CI: 48.3%-63.7%), workflow adjustment requirements (41.3%, 95% CI: 33.8%-49.2%), and network member acceptance (29.0%, 95% CI: 22.5%-36.6%). The apparent paradox between high demand for easy integration (81.3%) and significant interoperability concerns (69.0%) highlights the complexity of AI implementation in healthcare settings. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals (Wilson Score method). These findings provide evidence-based guidance for AI implementation strategies in organized healthcare systems, emphasizing the need for coordinated approaches that address both technical capabilities and organizational requirements.