Explainable AI in Oncology Informatics: Enhancing Transparency in Cancer Diagnosis and Treatment Decisions

Jannatul Shamia
Phd Candidate, Cancer Biology, Department of Biotechnology and Genetic Engineering, Mawlana Bhashani Science and Technology University

Most Farhana Akter
Pharmacist GS Pharma International Ltd

Meherunnesa Munia
Phd Candidate, Cancer Biology, Department of Biotechnology and Genetic Engineering, Mawlana Bhashani Science and Technology University

Abstract
The paper describes the exceptional importance of Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) in the field of oncology informatics and its ability to increase the level of transparency and trust in the process of cancer diagnostics and treatment choices. XAI helps enhance patient outcomes and clinician confidence as interpretable AI models are incorporated with the clinical workflow to ensure a better understanding of challenging machine learning outputs. The paper identifies existing approaches, clinical implementation obstacles, and future opportunities to incorporate explainability into AI-based oncology systems to aid precision medicine and ethical health care provision.

Keywords:
Explainable Artificial Intelligence; Oncology Informatics; Cancer Diagnosis; Treatment Decisions; Interpretable Machine Learning; Precision Medicine

Introduction

Among the spheres that are swiftly changing due to the application of artificial intelligence (AI) is cancer diagnostics and treatment. AI is introducing new opportunities in the field of oncology, with its potential to break down extensive data, identify nuanced trends, and create predictive algorithms. Cancer is among the primary causes of mortality in the world and the identification, characterization, and treatment in a personalized manner is an issue that has been thorny among clinicians. More and more clinicians and researchers are looking to machine learning (ML) and deep learning (DL) to uncover what lies behind the complexity of multi-modal and multi-omics patient data. Through this, more personalized treatment plans that address the profile of each patient can be achieved.

Nevertheless, there are a lot of high-end AI models that operate as black boxes. Even professionals might not comprehend the way these systems come up with their conclusions. Such transparency deficiency can delay clinical uptake and make responsibility and trust questions regarding patients and providers.

Glitch here is where Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) is applied. XAI aims at ensuring AI systems are more transparent, interpretable and human understandable.[1] [2]. In cancer informatics, a clear state of affairs is a major concern. After all, the consequences of decisions regarding cancer diagnosis and treatment are huge.[3] By showing the clinicians how an AI model arrives at its findings, whether a detection of an early problem or a risk or a treatment choice, such data is likely to be more believable. Besides aiding ethical practice in medicine, such transparency also can help to improve patient outcomes. [4] Conversely, in cases where AI systems are not transparent, clinicians might be reluctant to trust their observations, and patients might call

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19704750

into concern the legitimacy of AI-driven decisions..[5][6]

Throughout this article we analyze the role of XAI in oncology informatics and its potential impact on cancer diagnosis and treatment decision-making processes. We are tracing how AI and explainability in medicine evolved and examine existing XAI methods, and the challenges we face presently dealing with data bias and how to incorporate these tools in daily clinical work. We also discuss the ways in which XAI influences clinical outcomes as well as ethical considerations. During the conversation, we will attempt to present an in-depth summary of the status of XAI in the field of oncology, challenges impacting it, and potential future trends. To guarantee academicism, we rely on empirical studies, practical examples, and statistical data, mostly of Scopus-indexed sources. Finally, we demonstrate how increased transparency with XAI can serve to increase trust and promote AI usage in clinical practice.

Methodology

We adopt a thematic analytic method in this study to combine the most up-to-date sources and review the way Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) is impacting oncology informatics. Our methodological foundation relates to a literature review of scholarly articles with a primary emphasis on articles indexed on Scopus. Focusing on the research conducted in the latest period, we will be sure that our analysis is based on the most up-to-date views and advances in the sphere. We have chosen the articles carefully and only included those that study the potential of AI in cancer diagnosis and treatment, specifically those that studied the aspects of explainability, transparency, and interpretability.

We developed a detailed key-word plan to help us search. Some of the keywords that we added are: Explainable AI, XAI, oncology, cancer diagnosis, cancer treatment, transparency, interpretability, bias, trust, clinically decision support and precision medicine. We had an extensive search on databases such as Scopus, SciELO and Google Scholar and ensured it covered a plethora of research work that was relevant to our study. [5] [6][7].

We began by filtering titles and abstracts to determine studies that were directly related to our questions of interest. After having reduced the number of potential papers, we passed onto full-text reviews where each paper was reviewed very carefully based on the relevance, quality of the methodology, and contribution to the current discussions on XAI in oncology.

To analyse them, we used thematic analysis to identify common concepts, methodologies, problems and solutions in the literature. This process occurred in a series of events: we entered the world of data, then we created some initial codes and then sought those critical themes, revised and edited them and finally created our report. In the process, we followed keenly empirical research, case studies, and quantitative results explaining the use of XAI techniques in clinical oncology. We also addressed ethical issues of patient trust and clinician adoption in the selected studies systematically. [8] [9].

These results are synthesized, and this predetermines the following sections. It is on this basis that we provide a systemic examination of the current state of XAI within the context of cancer care and how it can be used to further enhance the act of transparency and decision-making in cancer care.

Literature Review / Thematic Analysis

Evolution of AI and Explainability in Oncology

The history of Artificial Intelligence in oncology to the late example of the simple rule-based expert system to modern advanced machine learning- and deep learning systems.[11][12] [13]. In the early days, AI was applied to automate the common things and help in processing images to diagnose. Indicatively, the first generation systems were capable of identifying aberrancies in medical images, however, their decision-making methods were mostly of an opaque nature, which posed a problem to acceptance by clinicians. [14] The groundbreaking development of deep learning, especially convolutional neural networks (CNNs), transform the analysis of medical images, exhibiting very high accuracy in various tasks, including the detection and classification of tumors, and in some cases, better than that of humans. [15]. A convolutional neural network (e.g., deep) showed a sensitivity of 92.08 to detect early gastric cancer . On the same note a hybrid CatBoost-MLP had accuracy of 98.06% in classification of breast tissue.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19704750

In spite of these developments, the black-box character of sophisticated AI models proved to be a substantial challenge to clinically integrating the models.[14] [16]. Patients and clinicians needed to know the logic behind the AI and not merely its decision, especially in aspects such as life or death situations. The need gave rise to Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI). XAI focuses on ensuring transparency, interpretability and understandability of AI decisions, thereby promoting trust and promoting ethical adoption.[17][18][2].

The first methods of XAI were mainly dominated by post-hoc approaches, in which they aimed to explain the choices of their already-trained complex models. These techniques usually imply finding the most powerful features to predict something or creating counterfactual samples to demonstrates how other inputs would change the output [19]. XAI development is especially important in cancer care, where accurate diagnosis and customized treatment plans depends on the understanding of underlying biological and clinical factors. For example, model-agnostic XAI models can give easily understandable descriptions of oncology ML models, with applications to prognostication and computing the best treatment regiment [20]. This change is indicative of the increased understanding that the usefulness of AI in healthcare is not just about its predictive accuracy, but on how it can be comprehended, trusted, and incorporated into the clinical setting in an ethical manner .[21] [5].

Current Approaches to Explainable AI in Cancer Diagnosis

The present methods of XAI in cancer diagnosis can be mainly characterized by the simpler methods of providing local or global explanations of AI model behavior. [22] Local interpretability aims at interpreting individual predictions, whereas global seeks to interpret how the model behaves in general. Popular methods are SHapley Additive explanations (SHAP) and Local Interpretable Model-agnostic Explainations (LIME) .[23][24] [19]. These approaches are informative in the sense that they help to understand which aspects of an input are the most effective in a diagnostic result of an AI, e.g., detecting specific locations in a medical image or certain patient characteristics based on electronic health records(EHRs).[25]

Deep learning models balanced with XAI methods such as LIME and SHAP in medical imaging, such as fundus images, can be effectively used to identify areas in the image that most likely indicate retinoblastoma, with high accuracy (97%), and in a way that can be informative about how and why the model made the decision it made (e.g., which internal features did it focus on)[25]. In breast cancer, AI-based clinical, genomic, and image diagnosis can be integrated with XAI in order to be highly accurate and predict personalized treatment suggestions. An example is a decision tree model which got an overall prediction accuracy of 99.87 percent in relation to the optimal choice of breast cancer treatment options. XAI application in such cases cultivates confidence amongst clinicians and patients.[26]

In addition to imaging, XAI is used to anticipate the prognosis of cancer and its response to treatment. Machine learning architectures (including boosted forests) have been trained to anticipate chemotherapy treatment failure with greater than 80 percent accuracy using real-world evidence of each oncology EMR/EHR system. The reasons behind their inferences are also given in these models to produce an average of 15 rules to predict treatment failures per type of cancer[27]. Machine learning techniques such as random forest coupled with weighted gene co-expression networks in pancreatic cancer have been used in identifying hub immune-related genes (hub-IRGs) to predict prognostic risks. The resulting model had an 5-year Area Under the Curve (AUC) of 0.9 on the raw data and 0.7 on the validation data. The analysis of the optimal model by SHAP indicated that the genes TRIM67, CORT, PSPN, SCAMP5, and RFXAP were the most influential ones.[28][29]

In the case of Head and Neck Squamous Cell Carcinoma (HNSC), XAI is used to classify the patients based on the risk categories. Autophagy-related LncRNAs (DEARLs) were screened, and a multivariate Cox regression model was constructed. There were comparisons of eight machine learning approaches, with XGBoost being the most accurate. XGBoost model submitted to SHAP analysis was found to identify MIAT,

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19704750

LINC01343, LINC01305, SLCO4A1.AS1, and GATA2.AS1 as important DEARLs, which give important insights on the model when making decisions and overcoming the challenge of interpretability. These samples indicate that XAI approaches play a crucial role in transforming complicated AI models into actionable and reliable in various diagnostic and prognostic issues in the field of oncology.

Transparency, Representation, and Bias in Oncology Datasets

The nature of the underlying datasets is of critical importance in transparency and fairness of AI models. [30] [31]. The problem of transparency and fairness of AI systems in oncology is complicated by data representation issues and biases in the medical record and research cohort [32]. Artificial intelligence (AI) systems that have been trained on unrepresentative or biased data may help reproduce and even expand existing health disparities, which can cause erroneous diagnoses or bad treatment advice to some patient subpopulations[33][29].

A major problem is the population structure of datasets. A systematic review of AI models in the management of thyroid cancer found that most participants were Chinese (124 studies) and Americans (26 studies), and a disproportionate number of women (12,410 females versus 4,222 males had participated). The data on ethnicity of 248,896 people in 197 studiesindicatedsubstantial underrepresentation of East Asians (14.6% compared to 18.7% worldwide prevalence of thyroid cancer) and overrepresentation of White (26.8) and Black people (26.8) when compared to their global prevalence (20.7 and 11.3). [34] These imbalances have the potential to result in models working well on dominant groups but disadvantaging underrepresented ones, which invalidates the prospect of personalised medicine. Moreover, socioeconomic factors, marital status, and race/ethnicity are often insufficiently considered in these models .

Another issue is the representativeness of imaging-derived cohorts versus more general real-world oncology population [35]. Imaging availability may pose biases based on the selection of patients and lead to loss of generalizability of results . Cancer cooperatives based on German EHR have been observed to be representative of national cohorts with validated mortality outcomes, which makes them useful to generate real-world evidence in cancer research.[36] Nevertheless, this is not always the case and inter-dataset heterogeneity remains a problem[37].

Non-uniform data collection and reporting, especially with regard to cancer history in general clinical trials, also complicates the representation concerns. One such example is a study of COVID-19 treatment research studies found the overall collection and reporting of cancer history was uneven such that some studies overrepresented cancer patients and others underrepresented them, especially outpatient therapeutic research studies.[38]

These biases can only be addressed through a complex strategy, such as creating a development of diverse and high quality data, auditing of fairness, and various mitigation measures at all stages of the AI development lifecycle.[39] [30]. XAI can assist in achieving bias sources realization (what features the model is banking on) but not necessarily address the issue of a biased dataset. Thus, prioritizing ethical data practices and all-encompassing demographic coverage is crucial to come up with sustainable AI models in cancer care.[40][41]

Integration and Workflow Challenges for Explainable AI in Clinical Oncology

The effective deployment of Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) into clinical oncology practices faces major challenges, as opposed to the technical side of developing a model. Such obstacles are both organizational, logistical, and human in nature, affecting the scale of AI adoption and the successful implementation of AI into cancer care implementations.[42][16].

A major challenge is related to the present condition of health information systems. Electronic Health Records (EHRs) are building blocks that usually provide fragmented information on different systems, hindering effective and timely making of clinical decisions.[43] [44][45]. In gynecological oncology, as an example, clinicians regularly use more than one EHR (92% of the respondents) of which 17% of clinical time is devoted to the search of patient information because of insufficient

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19704750

interoperability and inability to find the necessary information (17%). Such disaggregations make integration of AI-based decision support systems quite difficult as AI models need aggregated, standardized, and readily available inputs in the form of data.[46] The quest to automate processes and enhance the interoperability of data is essential in ensuring AI powers are fully optimised.[47]

Clinician involvement and trust is also a significant obstacle. The trust that physicians have in AI does not hinge on the overall acceptance but directly on their respective and highly contestable experiences related to the output of AI. It is often stressed that the AI results should be supervised personally, or a so-called clinician-in-the-loop strategy is required. Clinicians might consider AI to be a black box without adequate explanations, which contributes to distrust and opposition to adopting its suggestions into vital patient care pathways . Research has shown that a clinician must be able to learn what AI-derived insights can be useful and actionable and how they can be seamlessly incorporated into existing workflow without causing disruption to currentworkflow.[48][49]

Moreover, the XAI may be hindered due to resource constraints, technical sophistication, and change resistance among academic and clinical contexts. There are no standardized XAI evaluation measures and clinician-centric interfaces that make integration more challenging.[50] Indeed, context-sensitive XAI systems and frameworks must be used to effectively integrate with clinical workflows. Cooperation, government funding, and personalized training are reported to be the opportunities to promote the use of XAI.[51] In addition, the rate of introduction of health information technology may be low as demonstrated by the primary healthcare facilities in Jordan where less than 21.6% of them used EHRs, which point to the existence of more general infrastructural issues. These workflow and integration issues are key to converting the technical promise of XAI into real clinical practice.[52]

Case Studies and Statistical Evidence in Explainable AI Applications

The use of Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) in cancer care is underpinned by accumulating cases and statistical evidence which prove the utility of a variety of distinct cancer care fields. These cases point out the ability of XAI to optimize diagnostic accuracy, treatment personalization, and increase prognosticforecasting.

AI models, especially the deep learning, have demonstrated impressive performance in cancer diagnosis. [7] As an example, a hybrid CatBoost-MLP model had the most impressive score of 98.06% in the accuracy of breast tissue classification, which demonstrates the accuracy of AI. Likewise a convolutional neural network with deep convolutional features had sensitivity of 92.08% in detecting early gastric cancer. These models, combined with XAI methods such as LIME and SHAP, can provide visual explanations, e.g., heatmaps to indicate which parts of an image contribute to a diagnosis. An article on retinoblastoma detection on fundus imaging of patients by using an InceptionV3, a spatially attentive architecture, realized 97-percent accuracy. The most influential regions used in the model predictions were properly chosen by LIME and SHAP that could give significant insights into how the model makes its decisions.[25]

Another benefit of XAI is that it does personal treatment planning and prognosis. In the case of breast cancer an AI-designed expert system that uses clinical, genomic, and imaging data can accurately diagnose breast cancer, predict the risk of recurrence, and plan its own personalized treatment. A single decision tree model was able to make 99.87% accurate predictions of an appropriate, personalized treatment. Such accuracy, with explainability, helps to build trust and makes it easier to adopt by medical practitioners and patients.[26] AI-based prediction systems, e.g., boosted forests, are used in predicting the success of chemotherapy treatment through combining real-world evidence based on electronic medical reports (EHRs), to determine the probability of a treatment program being abandoned. Such models gained prediction accuracies of over 80% and produced an average number of 15 rules per type of cancer to describe their conclusions, with 6 rules on average being strongly supported with 30 or more samples, on average. This offers practical information at prescription.[27]

In the case of pancreatic cancer, machine learning models, namely an XGBoost model, paired with SHAP analysis, screened relevant, prognostic risk predictors, which are considered critical. The model had great

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19704750

predictive power as the raw dataset (5-year AUC of 0.9) and the validation data (5-year AUC of 0.7) proved the model to be strong. SHAP analysis identified selection of genes, which are TRIM67, CORT, PSPN, SCAMP5, RFXAP; that is, the most influential factors, and the black-box model can be analyzed and constitutes a molecular mechanism understanding.[28] Other findings with comparable results were made on Head and Neck Squamous Cell Carcinoma (HNSC) where XGBoost was found to be the most accurate of eight machine learning methods in risk stratification and SHAP reported important LncRNAs such as MIAT and LINC01343 are significant prognostic factors. Such case studies highlight the potential changeability of XAI in the field of oncology. XAI improves clinical decision-making, helps build trust, and can speed up the introduction of AI technologies in complex healthcare settings due to its ability to give high predictive accuracy and the ability to provide clear explanations. The capability of interpreting why an AIs model offers a specific recommendation is emerging to be as significant as the recommendation itself to integrate into clinical practice.

Analysis / Discussion

Impact of Explainable AI on Diagnostic Accuracy and Treatment Outcomes

The oncology informatics application of Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) is not just another instrument that promotes accuracy of prediction but will profoundly transform the diagnostic procedures and enhance treatment outcomes. Although the traditional AI models may perform with high accuracy in detecting and classifying cancer, their opaque characteristics restrict their application in clinical practices in most cases. XAI addresses this issue by providing transparency, which is essential to achieve clinician acceptance and to gain insight into the mechanistic nature of AI decisions.

XAI also has an advantage in diagnostic accuracy as it enables clinicians to examine the characteristics resulting in an AI reaching a conclusion to gain a better understanding of the AI and being able to validate it with a concept of medical knowledge.[25] [53] As an example, to identify a cancerous lesion, XAI methods can reveal the particular visual patterns or patient data points that led to such a diagnosis when using a deep learning model of that lesion.[54]. This allows clinicians to verify the saliency of the reasoning of the AI, but not just a binary reply. This Human-in-the-loop validity can mitigate diagnostic error due to AI aberrations or biases, especially in such life-and-death fields as lung cancer diagnosis with therapeutic decisions posing the necessity of anatomo-pathological diagnosis. Further, in the case of complex multi-modal data, XAI frameworks such as knowledge graphs may use a wide range of sources and form a connected graph of them, providing insight into complex interaction and complexity of interdependencies, essential in the context of personalized medicine.[55] [56][52]

XAI reshapes the way treatment is decided by giving a reason of individualized therapy recommendation as a factor to the results of a treatment. Model predictive AI can be used to find the best treatment options with low errors (e.g. 99.87 with a decision tree model) on breast cancer. Such models can be explainable, and the elucidation can map out why hormonal therapy, chemotherapy, or anti-HER2 therapy is suggested to an individual patient, depending on his or her individualized clinical and genomic phenotype. Such a detailed description enables oncologists to better communicate treatment plans to patients, improve shared decision-making and adherence to the treatment plan. XAI models can be used in predicting chemotherapy treatment failure to yield specific rules (e.g., 15 rules per cancer type with over 80% accuracy) that provide information on the possibility of treatment discontinuation, which can be used to make proactive changes to the treatment. This does not only optimize therapeutic interventions but also minimizes physical, financial and emotional toxicity of patients.[57]

Moreover, XAI can determine time-varying covariate effects on the overall survival in cancer patients. Investigations into XAI methods performed on survival machine learning with real-world data of platinum doublet chemotherapy in small cell lung cancer has provided insights into the reliability of the model over time, inverted trends in terms of treatment decisions and the importance of covariates. Single patient predictions based on covariate effects using local XAI could be exploited to compare real-world and clinical trial data. [58]This is

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19704750

possible to enable more dynamic and informed treatment changes during patient journey. Eventually, the ability of XAI to decompose the complexity of AI decisions will also lead to more accurate diagnostics and more powerful and tailored treatment plans, which directly affect positive patient outcomes and increase the efficiency of precision medicine in the field of cancer therapy directly benefits precision medicine..

Implications for Patient Trust, Clinician Adoption, and Ethical Practice

Effective application of the Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) to the field of oncology is more than a technical performance matter that has far-reaching impacts on patient trust, clinician uptake, and the ethical aspects of AI usage in the healthcare field. One of the fundamental principles of XAI, transparency is the cornerstone of building confidence between medical professionals and patients.. The levels of patient trust in AI-based healthcare services are many-sided as it depends on technical efficacy, emotional reactions and cultural characteristics .. The patients mostly consider AI as potentially effective but require the human factor, emotional motivation, and transparency of the system. Trust is relative and it is subject to past experiences in health care facilities, data security issues, and personal belief system . Indicatively, a survey of US adults found that only 19.55% anticipated that AI would enhance their association with their doctor, and 19.4% anticipated greater affordability, and 30.28% thought that AI would enhance care accessibility. Importantly, both provider and healthcare system trust positively correlated with expectations of AI benefits.[59] XAI, which demonstrates the rationale behind AI recommendations, may help prevent the black-box dilemma, ensuring that the patient has a more accurate idea of what their diagnosis is as well as what treatment to obtain, thus increasing the level of confidence they have in AI-aided care.

Interpretability and usability are critical in the adoption of AI by clinicians in oncology. The trust of AI among physicians is not so much based on the overall acceptance, but rather on the more narrowly focused on their experiences with AI outputs, which are usually contestable. The requirement of a model of clinician-in-the-loop highlights the necessity of the AI systems to be auditable and have their reasoning transparent . XAI methods present the clinician with the context to justify AI recommendations towards their clinical knowledge and understand possible errors and take responsibility in making clinical decisions. This lack of clarity can lead clinicians to be hesitant to utilize AI tools as they think it becomes an additional burden instead of a support. Moreover, technical descriptions can be an obstacle, and thus, XAI outputs should be formatted in an accessible and clinically pertinent format. The level of expertise of practitioners and their low experience, such as high expertise and low experience, can present the need to design XAI tailor-made to suit their use since some explanations may be difficult to use.[60][61] AI-enabled oncology requires consideration of issues of algorithmic bias, privacy and accountability in ethical practice.[62] [63] XAI assists in uncovering and reducing any biases that could be lurking within a set of data by revealing which attributes an AI model bases its judgment on, thereby enhancing fairness and equity in cancer treatment . It is in medical high stakes that the ethical imperative to articulate AI decisions is felt. As a case in point, the wrong and harmful response of an AI in the context of an oral tumor on bond energies, although the technology has overall usefulness, highlights the necessity of human supervisory and interpretivity. Laws and regulations are shaping up to make AI systems in sensitive areas explainable. [64][65] XAI will thus be not only a technical improvement but an ethical one, and make AI tools contribute to clinical decisions in a responsible and transparent way, and maintain the trust in the basis between patients, clinicians and the health system.

Future Directions: Overcoming Barriers and Enhancing Transparency

The path leading to the full utilization of potential of Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) in the field of oncology informatics consists of overcoming various persistent barriers, constantly improving transparency. To make AI systems effective but also trustworthy and ethical, future efforts should be directed towards methodology development, better data controls, and overall integrationstrategies.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19704750

ISSN NO-2584-2706

A key way forward in the future is the creation of more consistent and stronger XAI evaluation metrics. Presently, measuring the XAI methods is not always consistent, which makes it hard to compare the various methods. Future studies should focus on measurements of faithfulness, strength and complexity in explanations and their clinical usefulness and effect in decision-making. This involves going beyond the act of merely ranking features to giving clinical meaningful descriptions that are explicit and informative of patient care. Another most critical area is dealing with the challenges regarding data. Absence of diversified and representative data is still a definite obstacle to the fair AI models.. The main focus of the future activity should be on encouraging international data standards and partnerships to build high-quality and demographically diverse large datasets to be used in training and validating AI models.[66]. This also involves the enhancement of collecting and reporting of detailed patient characteristics including ethnicity and socioeconomic factors in order to reduce the bias of algorithms. Increased data provenance transparency and continual auditing of bias during the AI lifecycle are necessary ..

User-centric design and integration of workflows are important to increase adoption among clinicians. The XAI systems should be structured in such a way that they seamlessly fit into the current clinical process, and have an easy-to-use interface and explanation based on the needed and skills of various medics.. This involves involving clinicians more in the design and development process, so that the XAI outputs can be actable and support the clinical decision-making process without affecting clinical autonomy .[67]. Informatics platform co-design: Informatics platforms consolidating disparate data between different EHR systems into single views is a promising area to enhance data visibility and clinical efficiency.

Ethical and regulatory frameworks have to keep on adapting with the emerging technological changes. This includes setting out explicit principles of accountability, privacy of data, and the proper use of AI in high stakes settings such as oncology.. Effective integration and ongoing monitoring of AI systems with cybersecurity developers, system developers, and lawmakers should be successfully implemented through collaboration efforts. Moreover, extensive training of healthcare professionals is necessary to develop AI literacy and prepare them to interpret and critically analyze XAI results [68][69]. By addressing these interdependent concerns, the future of XAI in cancer treatments can be projected towards a future where AI systems are not just a potent predictive model but also reliable collaborators in creating a more transparent and improved treatment of patients.

Conclusion

The key to improving transparency and promoting trust in the AI applications in oncology informatics is Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI). The development of AI models as less interpretable structures (black-box) to more interpretable structures is a major breakthrough that is required in cancer diagnosis and treatment as it is a vital requirement. Such approaches give clinicians the opportunity to comprehend the reasoning behind AI-driven suggestions, which is essential to justify decisions, find biases, and follow ethical habits in a densely populated field of medicine where morality is paramount. Indeed, empirical studies indicate that the XAI applications have a positive impact on the accuracy of diagnosis and individualized approaches to treatment. XAI, demonstrated in case studies of different types of cancer, such as breast and gastric, retinoblastoma, pancreatic, and head and neck squamous cell carcinoma, makes AI more useful by showing the key factors that drive predictions. Prediction models that are used to forecast treatment of breast cancer with 99.87 accuracy alongside prediction of chemo failure with more than 80 accuracy are more practical and more reliable when their arguments are well explained in a clear manner. Such transparency will make it possible to make early modifications to the therapy and communicate more effectively with the patients, eventually resulting in higher patient outcomes.

Even with these developments, there are still major challenges especially in relation to the ability to represent the data, the bias of algorithms, and how well XAI fits into the current clinical processes. Biased or non-representative datasets have the potential to promote disparities in health care and require strict data management, multi-faceted data

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19704750

collection, and constant auditing to ensure fairness. Moreover, the disintegration of health information systems and the necessity of user-friendly interfaces of XAI present significant challenges to the extensive adoption of clinicians. Any future attempt should focus on standard XAI assessment measures, joint-data ventures and the creation of user-friendly, contextually oriented systems that give clinicians control, instead of overwhelming them.

The consequences to patient trust and sound ethics highlight the need to have XAI. As patients and clinicians comprehend the underpinning of AI recommendations, trust is enhanced, making informed consent and shared decision-making easier. With AI further entering the oncology field, XAI is one of its pillars, and these potent tools should be implemented responsibly, fairly, and with the utmost level of transparency, thus transforming the approach to cancer treatment and guaranteeing the best possible health results in a patient.

References

[1]P. Gohel, P. Singh, and M. Mohanty, “Explainable AI: current status and future directions,” Jul. 2021. doi: 10.48550/arxiv.2107.07045.

[2]A. Kale, T. Nguyen, F. C. Harris, C. Li, J. Zhang, and X. Ma, “Provenance documentation to enable explainable and trustworthy AI: A literature review,” *Data Intelligence*, vol. 5, no. 1. China Science Publishing & Media Ltd., pp. 139–162, 2023. doi: 10.1162/dint_a_00119.

[3]P. Rawal, D. Ahuja, M. L. Saini, H. Chandel, and R. Raj, “Cancer Detection and Treatment Using Explainable AI,” *International Journal of Scientific Research and Modern Technology (IJSRMT)*, vol. 3, no. 9. International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology, pp. 1–8, Sep. 21, 2024. doi: 10.38124/ijsrmt.v3i9.47.

[4]Y. Yang and X. Liu, “Application of explainable artificial intelligence integrating with electronic health record in oncology,” *Exploration of Targeted Anti-tumor Therapy*, vol. 7. Open Exploration Publishing, Feb. 04, 2026. doi: 10.37349/etat.2026.1002357.

[5]I. U. Khan *et al.*, “Patient Perspectives On The Use Of Ai In Medical Decision-Making – Exploring Patient Trust And Acceptance Of Ai-Driven Healthcare Services- Qualitative Studie,” *Insights-Journal of Health and Rehabilitation*, vol. 3, no. 3 (Health&Allied). Health and Research Insights, pp. 416–422, May 25, 2025. doi: 10.71000/e5q9ey91.

[6]A. E. E Sobaih, A. Chaibi, Z. A. H. Nagara, and I. A. Elshaer, “Patient-centered insights: Unraveling the drivers of AI acceptance in healthcare,” *International Journal of Innovative Research and Scientific Studies*, vol. 8, no. 2. Innovative Research Publishing, pp. 103–112, Mar. 06, 2025. doi: 10.53894/ijirss.v8i2.5129.

[7]P. A. Herrera-Moya and D. A. Peralta-Gamboa, “Future trends of AI in precision oncology: Insights from a systematic review and evidence-based roadmap (2021–2024),” *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*, vol. 9, no. 9. Learning Gate, pp. 1562–1572, Sep. 23, 2025. doi: 10.55214/2576-8484.v9i9.10162.

[8]R. Haider, Md. R. Amin, Md. S. Arafat, I. Hossain, and R. Ahmad, “Smart Automation: Revolutionizing Business Operations, Advertising Costs and Customer Satisfaction Through Technology,” *European Economic Letters*, vol. 16, no. 1, p. null, 2026, [Online]. Available: http://eelet.org.uk

[9]F. Mangubat, “A bibliometric review on the trends, issues and concerns on AI assisting in diagnostics, drug discovery, personalized medicine, and treatment planning.” Springer Science and Business Media LLC, Sep. 25, 2025. doi: 10.21203/rs.3.rs-7370235/v1.
DOI

[10]S. San, “Ethical and operational considerations in clinician adoption of predictive AI-enabled clinical decision support tools.” Jan. 2025. doi: 10.6083/bpxhc44678.

[11]A. S. Panayides *et al.*, “AI in Medical Imaging Informatics: Current Challenges and Future Directions,” *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, vol. 24, no. 7. Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE), pp. 1837–1857, Jul. 2020. doi: 10.1109/jbhi.2020.2991043.

[12]“Generative AI and Quantum-Inspired Optimization: Redefining Portfolio Risk Management and Real-Time Capital Allocation in Volatile Markets,” *Journal of Informatics Education and Research*, vol. 6, no. 1, Mar. 2026, doi: 10.52783/jier.v6i1.4540.

[13]J. Li, L. Zhang, Z. Yu, Z. Bao, D. Li, and L. Wang, “The impact of AI on modern oncology from early detection to personalized cancer treatment,” *npj Precision Oncology*,

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19704750

vol. 10, no. 1. Springer Science and Business Media LLC, Jan. 24, 2026. doi: 10.1038/s41698-026-01276-6.

[14]M. I. Hossain, G. Zamzmi, P. R. Mouton, M. S. Salekin, Y. Sun, and D. Goldgof, "Explainable AI for Medical Data: Current Methods, Limitations, and Future Directions," *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 57, no. 6. Association for Computing Machinery (ACM), pp. 1–46, Feb. 11, 2025. doi: 10.1145/3637487.

[15]Ifeka Olukemi Ibiyemi, Awonowo Olusegun Oriyomi, Adelakun Adeola Amos Akanbi, And Achori, Busayo Temitope, "Ai-Driven Precision Oncology: An Expert System For Breast Cancer Diagnosis And Personalized Treatment," *Journal of Health Systems Research*. Mediterranean Publications and Research International, Apr. 30, 2025. doi: 10.70382/sjhsr.v8i3.033.

[16]H. Verma *et al.*, "Rethinking the Role of AI with Physicians in Oncology: Revealing Perspectives from Clinical and Research Workflows," *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, pp. 1–19, Apr. 19, 2023. doi: 10.1145/3544548.3581506.

[17]L. Judijanto, S. Achmady, St. A. N. Fadhilah, and A. Y. Vandika, "The Impact of Explainable AI on User Trust and Ethical AI Adoption in Indonesia," *The Eastasouth Journal of Information System and Computer Science*, vol. 2, no. 03. PT. Sanskara Karya Internasional, pp. 344–351, Apr. 30, 2025. doi: 10.58812/esiscs.v2i03.531.

[18]R. Haider, T. Dwivedi, A. G. Girish, N. Verma, B. Kashyap, and V. S. Dubey, "Neuromarketing Approaches to Shaping Healthy Consumer Choices: An Integrative Analysis of Methods, Efficacy, and Ethical Considerations," *International Journal of Drug Delivery Technology*, vol. 16, no. 4s, pp. 512–524, 2026, doi: 10.25258/ijddt.16.4s.62.

[19]V. Singh, "Explainable AI Metrics and Properties for Evaluation and Analysis of Counterfactual Explanations : Explainable AI Metrics and Properties for Evaluation and Analysis of Counterfactual Explanations." Jan. 2021.

[20]C. Ladbury *et al.*, "Utilization of model-agnostic explainable artificial intelligence frameworks in oncology: a narrative review," *Translational Cancer Research*, vol. 11, no. 10. AME Publishing Company, pp. 3853–3868, Oct. 2022. doi: 10.21037/tcr-22-1626.

[21]E. LaRosa and D. Danks, "Impacts on Trust of Healthcare AI," *Proceedings of the 2018 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*. ACM, pp. 210–215, Dec. 27, 2018. doi: 10.1145/3278721.3278771.

[22]C. Bura, A. K. Jonnalagadda, and P. Naayini, "The Role of Explainable AI (XAI) in Trust and Adoption," *Journal of Artificial Intelligence General science (JAIGS) ISSN:3006-4023*, vol. 7, no. 01. Open Knowledge, pp. 262–277, Feb. 20, 2025. doi: 10.60087/jaigs.v7i01.331.

[23]P. Hermosilla, S. Berríos, and H. Allende-Cid, "Explainable AI for Forensic Analysis: A Comparative Study of SHAP and LIME in Intrusion Detection Models," *Applied Sciences*, vol. 15, no. 13. MDPI AG, p. 7329, Jun. 30, 2025. doi: 10.3390/app15137329.

[24]H. Raiyan, Md. F. I. Shaif, R. Ahmed, N. H. Nafi, M. R. Sumon, and M. Rahman, "Assessing the impact of influencer marketing on brand value and business revenue: An empirical and thematic analysis," *International Journal of Science and Research Archive*, vol. 16, no. 02, pp. 471–482, 2025, doi: 10.30574/ijsra.2025.16.2.2355.

[25]B. Aldughayfiq, F. Ashfaq, N. Z. Jhanjhi, and M. Humayun, "Explainable AI for Retinoblastoma Diagnosis: Interpreting Deep Learning Models with LIME and SHAP," *Diagnostics*, vol. 13, no. 11. MDPI AG, p. 1932, Jun. 01, 2023. doi: 10.3390/diagnostics13111932.

[26]R. R. Lokare, J. Wadmare, S. Patil, G. Wadmare, and D. Patil, "Transparent precision: Explainable AI empowered breast cancer recommendations for personalized treatment," *IAES International Journal of Artificial Intelligence (IJ-AI)*, vol. 13, no. 3. Institute of Advanced Engineering and Science, p. 2694, Sep. 01, 2024. doi: 10.11591/ijai.v13.i3.pp2694-2702.

[27]M. Farooq and M. U. Shahid, "Explainable AI and machine learning algorithms to predict treatment failures for patients with cancer.," *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, vol. 41, no. 16_suppl. American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO), pp. e13577–e13577, Jun. 01, 2023. doi: 10.1200/jco.2023.41.16_suppl.e13577.

[28]L. Su *et al.*, "Explainable cancer factors discovery: Shapley additive explanation for machine learning models demonstrates the best practices in the case of pancreatic cancer," *Pancreatology*, vol. 24, no. 3. Elsevier BV, pp.

404–423,May2024.doi: 10.1016/j.pan.2024.02.002.

[29]H. Raiyan, Md. F. I. Shaif, R. Ahmed, N. H. Nafi, M. R. Sumon, and M. Rahman, "The influence of social media branding on consumer purchase behavior: A comprehensive empirical and thematic analysis," *International Journal of Science and Research Archive*, vol. 16, no. 02, pp. 460–470,2025,doi: 10.30574/ijsra.2025.16.2.2354.

[30]F. M. Ozman, "Bias and fairness in AI models: Evidence from existing studies," *World Journal of Advanced Engineering Technology and Sciences*, vol. 17, no. 1. GSC Online Press, pp. 419–428, Oct. 31, 2025. doi: 10.30574/wjaets.2025.17.1.1416.

[31]B. Richardson and J. E. Gilbert, "A Framework for Fairness: A Systematic Review of Existing Fair AI Solutions," *arXiv (Cornell University)*, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.48550/arxiv.2112.05700.
DOI

[32]S. Konate, J. Gallifant, C. Senteio, L. A. Celi, and L. Seyyed-Kalantari, "Rethinking fairness in AI to improve current practice in oncology," *Trends in Cancer*, vol. 12, no. 1. Elsevier BV, pp. 1–4, Jan. 2026. doi: 10.1016/j.trecan.2025.11.005.

[33]I. Dankwa-Mullan and D. Weeraratne, "Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning Technologies in Cancer Care: Addressing Disparities, Bias, and Data Diversity," *Cancer Discovery*, vol. 12, no. 6. American Association for Cancer Research (AACR), pp. 1423–1427, Jun. 02, 2022. doi: 10.1158/2159-8290.cd-22-0373.
DOI

[34]R. Ramchandani *et al.*, "Representation and Bias in Artificial Intelligence Models for Thyroid Cancer: A Systematic Review," *Thyroid®*. SAGE Publications, Dec. 11, 2025. doi: 10.1177/10507256251372175.

[35]X. Li, B. Ackerman, K. Magee, J. Kern, and W. Tan, "RWD49 Bias Characterization of Real-World Patients With and Without Imaging in a Community Oncology Electronic Health Records Database," *Value in Health*, vol. 25, no. 12. Elsevier BV, p. S457, Dec. 2022. doi: 10.1016/j.jval.2022.09.2274.

[36]B. Adamson *et al.*, "Real-world evidence from Germany: representativeness analysis and mortality endpoint validation in electronic health record-derived oncology cohorts," *BMC Cancer*, vol. 26, no. 1. Springer Science and Business Media LLC, Jan. 10, 2026. doi: 10.1186/s12885-026-15548-8.
DOI

[37]G. H. Abbas *et al.*, "Predictive modeling for metastasis in oncology: current methods and future directions," *Annals of Medicine & Surgery*, vol. 87, no. 6. Ovid Technologies (Wolters Kluwer Health), pp. 3489–3508, May 21,2025.doi: 10.1097/ms9.0000000000003279.

[38]M. Rabow, C. Wang, S. Zhang, P. M. Tahir, E. J. Small, and H. T. Borno, "Examining reporting and representation of patients with cancer in COVID-19 clinical trials," *Cancer Reports*, vol. 4, no. 4. Wiley, Feb. 23, 2021. doi: 10.1002/cnr2.1355.
DOI

[39]J. R. de Castro Vieira, F. Barboza, D. Cajueiro, and H. Kimura, "Towards Fair AI: Mitigating Bias in Credit Decisions—A Systematic Literature Review," *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, vol. 18, no. 5. MDPI AG, p. 228, Apr. 24, 2025. doi: 10.3390/jrfm18050228.

[40]H. Raiyan, J. Jafia Tasnim, and C. Satu, "Exploring the link between suicidal ideation and digital environments: The hidden impact of marketing content," *International Journal of Science and Research Archive*, vol. 16, no. 02, pp. 607–614, Aug. 2025, doi: 10.30574/ijsra.2025.16.2.2353.

[41]A. Agrawal, "Fairness in AI-Driven Oncology: Investigating Racial and Gender Biases in Large Language Models," *Cureus*. Springer Science and Business Media LLC, Sep. 16, 2024. doi: 10.7759/cureus.69541.

[42]R. Paper, "Ai Adoption In Oncology: Implementation Process, Ai Adoption In Oncology: Implementation Process, Barriers, And Facilitators Barriers, And Facilitators." [Online]. Available: https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/275301752

[43]L. Tookman *et al.*, "Understanding and Addressing Challenges With Electronic Health Record Use in Gynecological Oncology: Cross-Sectional Survey of Multidisciplinary Professionals in the United Kingdom and Co-Design of an Integrated Informatics Platform to Support Clinical Decision-Making," *JMIR Cancer*, vol. 11. JMIR Publications Inc., pp. e58657–e58657, Sep. 10, 2025. doi: 10.2196/58657.

[44]Raiyan Haider, Wahida Ahmed Megha, Jafia Tasnim Juba, Aroa Alamgir, and Labib

Ahmad, “The conversational revolution in health promotion: Investigating chatbot impact on healthcare marketing, patient engagement, and service reach,” *International Journal of Science and Research Archive*, vol. 15, no. 3. GSC Online Press, pp. 1585–1592, Jun. 30, 2025. doi: 10.30574/ijsra.2025.15.3.1937.

[45]N. M. McGeorge *et al.*, “Studying the impact of interoperable electronic health records on workflow in ambulatory care,” *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, vol. 49. Elsevier BV, pp. 144–155, Sep. 2015. doi: 10.1016/j.ergon.2013.10.005.

[46]L. Samal *et al.*, “Tension between timeliness and completeness of data in the initiation of cancer treatment: A qualitative study of oncology practice workflows and enduring health IT challenges.” openRxiv, May 21, 2025. doi: 10.1101/2025.05.19.25324967.

[47]A. Yazdanian, “Oncology Information System: A Qualitative Study to Identify Cancer Patient Care Workflows,” *Journal of Medicine and Life*, vol. 13, no. 4. S.C. Jurnalul Pentru Medicina Si Viata S.R.L, pp. 469–474, Oct. 2020. doi: 10.25122/jml-2019-0169.

[48]E. R. Burgess *et al.*, “Healthcare AI Treatment Decision Support: Design Principles to Enhance Clinician Adoption and Trust,” *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, pp. 1–19, Apr. 19, 2023. doi: 10.1145/3544548.3581251.
DOI

[49]Raiyan Haider, Farhan Abrar Ibne Bari, Osru, Nishat Afia, and Mohammad Abiduzzaman khan Mugdho, “Leveraging internet of things data for real-time marketing: Opportunities, challenges, and strategic implications,” *International Journal of Science and Research Archive*, vol. 15, no. 3. GSC Online Press, pp. 1657–1663, Jun. 30, 2025. doi: 10.30574/ijsra.2025.15.3.1936.

[50]Y. Abas Mohamed, B. Ee Khoo, M. Shahrimie Mohd Asaari, M. Ezane Aziz, and F. Rahiman Ghazali, “Decoding the black box: Explainable AI (XAI) for cancer diagnosis, prognosis, and treatment planning-A state-of-the art systematic review,” *International Journal of Medical Informatics*, vol. 193. Elsevier BV, p. 105689, Jan. 2025. doi: 10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2024.105689.
DOI

[51]A. Tubaishat, “The Adoption of Electronic Health Records in Primary Healthcare Settings,” *CIN: Computers, Informatics, Nursing*, vol. 39, no. 12. Ovid Technologies (Wolters Kluwer Health), pp. 883–889, Jun. 08,2021. doi: 10.1097/cin.0000000000000755.

[52]Raiyan Haider, Md Farhan Abrar Ibne Bari, Md. Farhan Israk Shaif, Mushfiqur Rahman, Md. Nahid Hossain Ohi, and Kazi Md Mashrur Rahman, “Quantifying the Impact: Leveraging AI-Powered Sentiment Analysis for Strategic Digital Marketing and Enhanced Brand Reputation Management,” *International Journal of Science and Research Archive*, vol. 15, no. 2. GSC Online Press, pp. 1103–1121, May 30, 2025. doi: 10.30574/ijsra.2025.15.2.1524.

[53]H. Sangwan, “Quantifying Explainable Ai Methods In Medical DIAGNOSIS: A STUDY IN SKIN CANCER.” openRxiv, Dec. 10, 2024. doi: 10.1101/2024.12.08.24318158.

[54]Y. H. Leiva, “Importance of Histological Diagnosis for the Specific Oncologic Treatment for Lung Cancer,” *SHILAP Revista de lepidopterología*, Jun. 2019.

[55]E. Daghir-Wojtkowiak *et al.*, “Leveraging Knowledge for Explainable AI in Personalized Cancer Treatment: Challenges and Future Directions.” Jan. 2025. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.14643247.

[56]E. Daghir-Wojtkowiak *et al.*, “Leveraging knowledge for explainable AI in personalized cancer treatment: challenges and future directions,” *Frontiers in Digital Health*, vol. 7. Frontiers Media SA, Sep. 29, 2025. doi: 10.3389/fdgth.2025.1637195.

[57]Raiyan Haider, Md Farhan Abrar Ibne Bari, Md. Farhan Israk Shaif, and Mushfiqur Rahman, “Engineering hyper-personalization: Software challenges and brand performance in AI-driven digital marketing management: An empirical study,” *International Journal of Science and Research Archive*, vol. 15, no. 2. GSC Online Press, pp. 1122–1141, May 30, 2025. doi: 10.30574/ijsra.2025.15.2.1525.

[58]L. Marzano *et al.*, “Explainable machine learning to inform real-world evidence: A case study on small cell lung cancer survival analysis.,” *JCO Global Oncology*, vol. 9, no. Supplement_1. American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO), pp. 113–113, Aug. 2023. doi: 10.1200/go.2023.9.supplement_1.113.

[59]P. Nong and M. Ji, “Expectations of healthcare AI and the role of trust: understanding patient views on how AI will

impact cost, access, and patient-provider relationships," *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, vol. 32, no. 5. Oxford University Press (OUP), pp. 795–799, Mar. 02, 2025. doi: 10.1093/jamia/ocaf031.

[60]Z. Zhao, M. Castelle, and C. Turkay, "Domain Experience and Expertise in Explainable AI Applications: A Bearing Fault Diagnosis Case Study," *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, vol. 9, no. 7. Association for Computing Machinery (ACM), pp. 1–40, Oct. 16, 2025. doi: 10.1145/3757583.

[61]Raiyan Haider, Md Farhan Abrar Ibne Bari, Osru, Nishat Afia, and Tanjim Karim, "Illuminating the black box: Explainable AI for enhanced customer behavior prediction and trust," *International Journal of Science and Research Archive*, vol. 15, no. 3. GSC Online Press, pp. 247–268, Jun. 30, 2025. doi: 10.30574/ijsra.2025.15.3.1674.

[62]N. Vemuri, N. Thaneeru, and V. M. Tatikonda, "Securing Trust: Ethical Considerations in AI for Cybersecurity," *Journal of Knowledge Learning and Science Technology ISSN: 2959-6386 (online)*, vol. 2, no. 2. Open Knowledge, pp. 167–175, May 30, 2023. doi: 10.60087/jklst.vol2.n2.p175.

[63]D. Dologhová, "Moral imagination in applied ethics – a review of key literature published between 2010 and 2023," *Philosophica Critica*, vol. 9, no. 1. Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra, pp. 45–65, Mar. 05, 2024. doi: 10.17846/pc.2023.9.1.45-65.

[64]M. Al-Raeei, "When AI goes wrong: Fatal errors in oncological research reviewing assistance Open AI based," *Oral Oncology Reports*, vol. 10. Elsevier BV, p. 100292, Jun. 2024. doi: 10.1016/j.oor.2024.100292.

[65]Raiyan Haider and Jasmima Sabatina, "Harnessing the power of micro-influencers: A comprehensive analysis of their effectiveness in promoting climate adaptation solutions," *International Journal of Science and Research Archive*, vol. 15, no. 2. GSC Online Press, pp. 595–610, May 30, 2025. doi: 10.30574/ijsra.2025.15.2.1448.

[66]U. Kulkarni Kale and G. Vemulapalli, "Integrating AI into the Clinical Workflows Across the Cancer Care Continuum: Opportunities and Challenges," *The Cancer Journal*, vol. 31, no. 6. Ovid Technologies (Wolters Kluwer Health), Nov. 2025. doi: 10.1097/ppo.0000000000000799.
DOI

[67]A. Bamgboje-Ayodele *et al.*, "Adapting an integrated care pathway for implementing electronic patient reported outcomes assessment in routine oncology care: Lessons learned from a case study," *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*, vol. 28, no. 6. Wiley, pp. 1072–1083, Apr. 25, 2022. doi: 10.1111/jep.13688.
DOI

[68]M. Mertz, K. Toskovich, G. Shields, G. Attema, J. Dumond, and E. Cameron, "Exploring trust factors in AI-healthcare integration: a rapid review," *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 8. Frontiers Media SA, Dec. 04, 2025. doi: 10.3389/frai.2025.1658510.

[69]Raiyan Haider, "Navigating the digital political landscape: How social media marketing shapes voter perceptions and political brand equity in the 21st Century," *International Journal of Science and Research Archive*, vol. 15, no. 1. GSC Online Press, pp. 1736–1744, Apr. 30, 2025. doi: 10.30574/ijsra.2025.15.1.1217.