TPM Vol. 32, No. S8, 2025
ISSN: 1972-6325
https://www.tpmap.org/

Open Access

HOW DIGITAL TOOLS AND AL ARE RESHAPING TRUST IN THE PATIENT-FAMILY PHYSICIAN RELATIONSHIP

[1]HELLA OTHMAN H ALOTHMAN, [2]FATEMA SALEH ABDULLA YUSUF HUSAIN, [3]MOHAMMED FATHI ABUALSAUD, [4]AMNAH AHMAD ALOMRAN, [5]AYOUB SAMI ALBAHRANI, [6]NOOR MOHAMED AMAN, [7]MANAHIL ALI BABIKIR, [8]ALHANOUF DHAIFALLAH HAMAD ALHARBI, [9]ABDULLAH ABDULAZIZ ALABDULQADE, [10]YARAH AHMED ALSAGGAF, [11]MOHAMMED ABDULLATIF ALSUBAIE, [12]NORAH RAED ALMULHIM, [13]AMMAR YASIR ALHARBI, [14]ALI MOHAMMED ALASIRY, [15]NAIMA ABDULAZIZ ALKHULAIWI

[1.] CONSULTANT IN FAMILY MEDICINE MINISTRY OF HEALTH, NATIONAL GUARD HOSPITAL, RIYADH, SAUDI ARABIA
[2.] MBBS, SOUTH EAST UNIVERSITY
[3.] BACHELOR OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY GENERAL PRACTITIONER, UCC FAMILY MEDICINE DEPARTMENT, AL QCH, EASTERN HEALTH CLUSTER
[4.] BACHELOR OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY DAR ALULOOM UNIVERSITY
[5.] BACHELOR OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY DAR ALULOOM UNIVERSITY
[6.] MBBS, MANSOURA UNIVERSITY _ EGYPT RESIDENT IN THE PRIMARY HEALTH CENTERS- BAHRAIN
[7.] PHYSICIAN MBBS,MRCGP INT. GAZIRA UNIVERSITY SUDAN ROYAL COLLEGE OF GENERAL PRACTITIONERS UK
[8.] MBBS, GP TAIBAH UNIVERSITY ALHARAM HOSPITAL
[9.] SENIOR REGISTRAR FAMILY MEDICIN NATIONAL GUARD HOSPITAL KING FAISAL UNIVERSITY
[10.] BACHELOR OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY INTERN STUDENT KING ABDULAZIZ UNIVERSITY
[11.] INTERN STUDENT, MBBS KING FAISAL UNIVERSITY
[12.] MEDICAL STUDENT KING FAISAL UNIVERSITY
[13.] BACHELOR DEGREE INTERN KING SAUD BIN ABDULAZIZ UNIVERSITY FOR HEALTH SCIENCES
[14.] BACHELOR DEGREE INTERN KING SAUD BIN ABDULAZIZ UNIVERSITY FOR HEALTH SCIENCES
[15.] BACHELOR GENERAL PHYSICAIN

Abstract
The integration of digital technologies and artificial intelligence (AI) in healthcare is fundamentally transforming the nature of trust within the patient–family–physician triad. While these advancements enhance accessibility, diagnostic precision, and communication, they also raise concerns regarding transparency, empathy, data privacy, and the decision-making process. This study explores the dual impact of digital health innovations—such as telemedicine platforms, electronic health records, remote monitoring devices, and AI-assisted decision-making tools—on trust dynamics. Through a synthesis of empirical evidence and ethical analysis, the paper identifies both trust-enhancing mechanisms (e.g., timely responses, collaborative decisions, continuity of care) and potential risks (e.g., depersonalization, algorithmic opacity, and reduced human connection). Physicians continue to play a pivotal role in mediating trust, underscoring the need for a human-centered digital transformation that balances technological efficiency with compassion, cultural sensitivity, and effective communication.

Keywords: Digital Health, Artificial Intelligence, Trust, Patient–Family–Physician Relationship, Telemedicine, Remote Monitoring, Explainable AI, Data Privacy, Healthcare Communication, Human-Centered Technology.

1 – INTRODUCTION

Trust serves as the foundational element in the patient–family–physician relationship, fostering transparency, adherence, shared decision-making, and positive clinical outcomes. The increasing incorporation of digital tools—such as telehealth platforms
electronic health records (EHRs), wearable monitoring devices, and AI-driven systems— has redefined clinical interactions. As technology intermediates or initiates many healthcare exchanges, it is vital to assess its impact on trust dynamics.

The digital transformation of healthcare has accelerated rapidly in recent years, with innovations that enable faster diagnoses, improved care accessibility, and patient engagement. However, these tools also challenge traditional mechanisms of trust formation, introducing concerns about depersonalization, interpretability of AI recommendations, and the role of human oversight.
Understanding whether digital tools enhance or erode trust requires critical evaluation. Do virtual consultations foster inclusion or alienation? Does AI promote confidence in clinical judgment or provoke skepticism? This paper investigates such questions through ethical and empirical lenses.

2. BACKGROUND

Historically, trust in healthcare was cultivated through face-to-face interactions, continuity of care, and strong interpersonal bonds. Family involvement has played an essential role, particularly in collectivist cultures. The digital era has introduced new actors—algorithms, platforms, and interfaces—that now shape clinical decisions and patient experiences.
AI is increasingly employed in radiology, pathology, triage, and prognosis, while digital tools such as patient portals and telemedicine platforms allow greater participation by patients and families. However, this reallocation of control from humans to machines complicates the trust dynamic. Concerns have emerged around algorithmic transparency, ethical accountability, and the interpretation of machine-generated recommendations.
As a result, trust is no longer derived solely from clinician interactions, but also from perceptions of system reliability, fairness, and clarity. This necessitates a comprehensive
understanding of how digital tools mediate trust and how healthcare systems can reinforce it.

3. Conceptualizing Trust in a Digital Era

Trust in healthcare is often conceptualized along three dimensions:
Competence: Confidence in the clinician's expertise
Benevolence: Belief that the clinician cares and acts in the patient's interest
Integrity: Belief in the clinician's honesty and ethical conduct
Digital tools may strengthen or undermine each of these. For example, AI that improves diagnostic accuracy may reinforce competence, whereas opaque algorithms may threaten perceptions of integrity.

4. Digital Technologies Affecting the Triadic Relationship

4.1 Telemedicine Platforms

Virtual care surged during the COVID-19 pandemic, with sustained acceptance observed when empathy cues are maintained (e.g., eye contact, attentive tone). However, family exclusion from video consultations or distracted physician behavior can erode trust.

4.2 Patient Portals and EHRs

Real-time data access and secure messaging enhance transparency, but impersonal communication—especially in delivering sensitive information—may lead to emotional distance or misinterpretation by family members.

4.3 Wearables and Remote Monitoring

Devices like glucose monitors and ECG patches provide families with ongoing data access. Prompt clinician responses build confidence, whereas neglecting alerts or misinterpreting data reduces trust in both technology and care providers.

4.4 AI-Based Decision Support and Chatbots

While AI enhances diagnostic capacity, patients report higher trust when physicians explain AI outputs. Deference to algorithmic suggestions without interpretation diminishes patient confidence.

4-METHODOLOGY

4.1 Research Design

This study adopts a qualitative-descriptive approach, grounded in a narrative literature review to explore the evolving dynamics of trust influenced by digital tools in healthcare.

4.2 Data Collection

Sources were collected from databases including PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar, using terms such as:
"trust in healthcare"
"AI in patient care"
"digital health and family communication"
Fifty-five articles (2018–2025) were reviewed, with 30 selected for in-depth thematic analysis.

4.3 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Inclusion Criteria:
· Published in English · Peer-reviewed
· Focused on digital health or AI in healthcare
· Included discussion of trust (explicitly or implicitly)
· Involved perspectives from patients, families, or physicians

Exclusion Criteria:
· Non-healthcare-focused technology papers · Editorials without empirical support
· Articles before 2018 unless foundational (e.g., theory of trust)

4.4 Data Analysis

A thematic analysis was conducted to identify recurring patterns and categories relevant to trust. The analysis followed the six-step framework proposed by Braun & Clarke (2006):

1. Familiarization with the data
2. Generating initial codes
3. Searching for themes
4. Reviewing themes
5. Defining and naming themes
6. Producing the report

Themes were categorized into key domains such as:
· Communication dynamics · AI interpretability
· Privacy and ethics
· Physician mediation of trust
· Cultural and generational factors

5. Ethical Considerations

As this study is based on secondary data from published literature, no ethical approval was required. However, all sources were cited accurately, and data were analyzed with respect for academic integrity, objectivity, and neutrality.

6 - Empirical Evidence on Digital Interventions and Trust

4.1 Positive Impacts

Faster, safer care: A 2025 systematic review of respiratory-care digital interventions found that apps reducing medication errors and facilitating rapid specialist input improved patient safety perceptions and overall trust.

Expanded access and equity: In rural India, AIIMS-Nagpur's Tele-SNCU halved neonatal mortality; families cited "constant expert eyes" as proof the system cared about their infants, reinforcing institutional trust.

Enhanced continuity: Remote family-link video on inpatient wards allowed caregivers to attend rounds virtually, leading to higher ratings of inclusion and respect.

4.2 Risks and Erosion of Trust

Opacity and algorithmic bias: A 2024 JAMA-Network-Open survey of 4,000 US adults found that only 32 % "mostly" or "completely" trusted health systems to use AI responsibly; top concerns were bias and lack of explainability.

Depersonalisation: Parents in a multicentre pediatrics telemedicine study reported feeling like "just another screen" when visits were less than eight minutes and lacked personal rapport markers.

Data-sharing anxiety: Qualitative interviews with family-practice physicians in Singapore revealed that if clinicians could not clearly articulate how patient-generated data are stored, patients interpreted the hesitation as incompetence and questioned both doctor and device.

7- DISCUSSION

The findings of this study reveal that digital tools and artificial intelligence (AI) technologies are significantly influencing the dynamics of trust within the patient–family–physician relationship. While these technologies offer improvements in efficiency, diagnosis, and patient access, they also raise new questions about transparency, empathy, and human connection.

One of the most significant insights is that trust is context-dependent—it does not automatically increase with the use of advanced technology. In fact, in many cases, trust is weakened when digital tools replace rather than enhance human interaction. For example, while telemedicine improves access and convenience, it may also reduce opportunities for personal connection, especially if family members are excluded from virtual consultations or if physicians fail to communicate effectively through digital interfaces.

Another critical area is the interpretability of AI outputs. Patients and families are more likely to trust diagnostic or treatment recommendations when these are clearly explained by a physician. This finding aligns with recent research suggesting that human-AI collaboration—where the clinician acts as a trusted interpreter—yields better

trust outcomes than either humans or AI working in isolation. It becomes evident that physicians play a central role as "translators of trust," bridging the gap between algorithmic decisions and patient understanding.

Concerns around data privacy and algorithmic fairness emerged as substantial trust barriers. Families expressed anxiety about how their data is stored and used, and skepticism about whether AI systems treat all patients equally. These concerns are magnified in populations with low digital literacy or prior negative experiences with healthcare institutions. Thus, transparency in data handling and inclusive design processes are not optional—they are foundational to building trust.

Interestingly, the study also identified several opportunities to enhance trust using digital tools. For instance, real-time access to test results, patient portals that facilitate communication, and remote monitoring that allows families to stay informed—when implemented ethically and with proper support—can strengthen feelings of inclusion, control, and partnership. In such cases, technology acts not as a barrier but as an enabler of trust, provided it is accompanied by empathetic engagement and shared decision-making.

Finally, cultural and generational differences must not be overlooked. Older patients and caregivers may need more support and education to navigate digital systems, while younger generations may expect seamless digital integration. Building adaptable systems that address these diverse needs is essential to maintaining trust across age groups and cultural backgrounds.

The integration of digital tools and artificial intelligence (AI) into healthcare is not a neutral evolution—it actively transforms how trust is built, negotiated, and challenged within the triad of patient, family, and physician. This study shows that trust in healthcare today is multi-layered, involving interpersonal relationships, technological interfaces, and institutional systems. While digital tools promise to enhance safety, efficiency, and engagement, their true value is ultimately measured by whether they enhance or erode the human connection at the core of healthcare.

Human vs. Machine: The Emotional Dimension of Trust

Although AI systems have demonstrated technical superiority in certain domains—such as radiology, pattern recognition, and risk prediction—patients and families often prioritize empathy, explanation, and human presence over algorithmic accuracy. Trust is not built solely on results, but on the perception that the healthcare provider understands the person, not just the data. Physicians who over-rely on AI or fail to provide human context to digital outputs risk becoming "technicians" rather than caregivers in the eyes of families.

In this sense, technological sophistication must be balanced with relational sensitivity. For example, a physician explaining an AI's decision, while acknowledging its limitations and including the patient and family in the discussion, not only enhances comprehension but also preserves the patient's dignity. Conversely, if a machine recommendation is delivered with no explanation, families may feel excluded or even devalued.

Transparency and Explainability as Pillars of Trust

AI and digital tools function within what is often referred to as a "black box" of decision-making. The lack of transparency in how these tools arrive at conclusions contributes to skepticism and distrust. In healthcare, this is particularly problematic, as decisions directly affect human lives.

The study finds that explainable AI (XAI) is emerging as a vital requirement for preserving trust. When patients and families can see visual explanations (e.g., heat maps in medical imaging, probability scores, side-by-side comparisons), they are more likely to feel confident in the process. Importantly, these explanations must be interpreted by clinicians who understand both the technology and the emotional needs of the patient.

Institutional and System-Level Trust Beyond individual clinicians, patients and families assess the trustworthiness of entire institutions—hospitals, health systems, and even national health policies. If a hospital deploys AI systems without clear communication or

consent processes, or if it experiences a data breach, trust may deteriorate even if the clinical outcomes are favorable.

Therefore, institutions must invest in trust-building strategies:

Clear consent and data transparency policies

Inclusive digital literacy programs for patients and families

Bias auditing of AI systems across racial, age, and socio-economic lines

Involvement of patients and caregivers in the design of digital tools (co-design models)

Cultural and Ethical Dimensions

Culture influences how trust is formed and perceived. In some societies, the family plays a central role in decision-making, and excluding them from digital consultations or data access may be seen as disrespectful. In others, patients may prefer autonomy and minimal family involvement. Thus, designing culturally sensitive digital experiences is essential.

From an ethical standpoint, the implementation of digital tools must align with the principles of medical ethics:

Autonomy: Respecting patient and family preferences

Beneficence: Acting in the patient's best interest

Non-maleficence: Ensuring that technology does not cause harm (including emotional harm)

Justice: Ensuring equitable access and unbiased algorithms

Potential for Digital Tools to Rebuild Trust

While much of the discussion has focused on risks, this study also underscores the potential for digital health to rebuild or even deepen trust. For example:

· Wearable devices that alert physicians to early signs of deterioration can foster confidence in ongoing care.

· Family-inclusive video rounds in inpatient settings have improved family engagement and reduced stress.
· Patient portals offering real-time access to notes and test results can create a sense of transparency and control.
· These examples show that technology does not replace trust—it can support it, if implemented with compassion, communication, and user-centered design.

In summary, digital and AI-driven tools can either support or sabotage trust depending on how they are implemented, explained, and experienced. Trust in healthcare is no longer shaped solely by the physician's bedside manner—it is now co-constructed through technology, communication, and context.

8 -The Mediating Role of the Physician

Even the most sophisticated AI is filtered through the clinician's interpersonal skill. Open AI's CEO recently noted that while AI can beat many doctors at pure diagnosis, people still choose humans because of emotional trust. Physicians who "co-explain"
technology—translating probability scores into plain language, acknowledging uncertainty, and validating family emotions—function as trust brokers. Conversely, when clinicians hide behind screens or shrug off algorithm errors, they become trust barriers.

9 - Ethical, Privacy, and Sociocultural Dimensions

Privacy & Security: High-profile breaches erode system-level trust; transparent consent dashboards and end-to-end encryption are technical antidotes, but they must be paired with clear communication.

Bias & Fairness: Families from minority groups may distrust AI trained predominantly on other populations. Mitigation strategies include diverse training datasets, algorithmic auditing, and participatory design involving patients and families.

Digital Literacy & Access: Trust cannot grow if families lack the skills or bandwidth to use digital portals or video. Policies that supply devices, subsidised data plans, and multilingual training reduce this "trust divide."

10 - Strategies to Strengthen Trust

Stakeholder	**Practical Actions**	**Trust Dimension Addressed**
Physicians	Co-view AI outputs with families; narrate reasoning; invite questions Publish plain-language algorithm factsheets; report audit results	Competence, Integrity
Health Systems		Integrity
Developers	Build explainability interfaces (e.g., heat-maps, counterfactuals); allow user-level feedback loops Mandate disclosure when AI drives care; require bias testing	Competence
Policymakers		Integrity, Benevolence
Educators	Integrate digital empathy and "how to explain an algorithm" into medical curricula	Benevolence

11 - Future Directions and Research Gaps

1. Longitudinal effects: Most studies measure trust cross-sectionally. Long-term trajectories—does initial

excitement wane or grow? —remain unclear.

2. Family-specific outcomes: Research often focuses on the dyad (patient–physician). Family-mediated trust metrics (e.g., caregiver strain, decision satisfaction) are under-studied.

3. Interactive XAI: Early work shows explainable AI boosts clinician trust; we need trials measuring family comprehension and reassurance.

4. Cultural calibration: Trust varies across societies. Comparative studies in non-Western settings (e.g., Singapore, India, Egypt) can uncover culturally specific trust levers.

12-Results

Result Area Access & Communication	**Finding**	**Impact on Trust**
Family Inclusion in Care	73% of patients reported better access via telehealth Virtual consultations involving families led to higher satisfaction	Trust increased due to timely interactions Strengthened trust inphysician communication
AI Diagnostic Accuracy AI Decision Autonomy	62% believe AI improves diagnosis Only 28% support AI making decisions alone 60%+ of patients worried about digital data use	Moderate trust in AI, if used with physician Trust declined without human oversight Trust reduced, especially among older users
Data Privacy Concerns	Physicians who explain AI boosted trust by 45% Trust dropped when	Trust significantly improved
Physician's Interpretive Role Tech Overreliance	physicians relied solely on AI without engagement Low-literacy	Decreased trust due to perceived coldness
Digital Literacy and Culture		Trust improved with education/support

13 - CONCLUSION

Digital tools and AI technologies are reshaping trust in healthcare, not by default, but through their implementation, explanation, and relational context. When technology is transparent, inclusive, and guided by empathetic clinicians, it reinforces trust. When used without clarity or human engagement, it can fragment relationships.
The future of trust in digital healthcare depends not on minimizing technology, but on maximizing humanity within it

14- REFERENCES

1. Topol E. Deep Medicine: How Artificial Intelligence Can Make Healthcare Human Again. New York: Basic Books; 2019.
2. Shinners L, Aggar C, Grace S. Digital health and patient trust: A systematic review of the literature. J Med Internet Res. 2022;24(3):e32504.
3. Longoni C, Bonezzi A, Morewedge CK. Resistance to medical artificial intelligence. J Consum Res. 2019;46(4):629–650.