Special Focus Session 4: AI and Radiomics for Breast Ultrasound · May 7, 2026 · 14:25–14:40 · GBR 101

Ethics and Challenges of Artificial Intelligence Development for Breast Ultrasound

Won Hwa Kim,Kyungpook Natioanl University Chilgok Hospital

Artificial intelligence (AI) has rapidly transitioned from experimental research into clinical tools now being evaluated and deployed at scale across breast imaging practices worldwide. In breast ultrasound specifically, AI-assisted detection and classification systems demonstrate promising performance in controlled settings, with some deep learning models achieving area under the receiver operating characteristic curve values exceeding 0.90 for malignancy classification. Yet the translation of these results into equitable, trustworthy clinical tools requires confronting a set of ethical and practical challenges that the field has not yet resolved.

The first and most consequential challenge is data bias and health equity. Many large training datasets have been assembled from academic medical centers in high-income countries, reflecting a narrow demographic profile. When these models are deployed across diverse patient populations and heterogeneous imaging environments, performance can degrade in ways that disproportionately affect already-marginalized groups. Training data must be deliberately curated for diversity, and subgroup performance analyses must be pre-specified and transparently reported.

A second challenge is transparency and explainability. Most high-performing AI systems rely on deep learning architectures that function as black boxes, producing diagnostic outputs without providing clinicians with traceable reasoning. This opacity undermines trust and accountability. Demanding explainability — through saliency maps, confidence intervals, and feature-level attribution — as a criterion for clinical deployment is both an ethical and a practical imperative.

Third, the embedding of AI into diagnostic workflows raises unresolved questions about informed consent and patient autonomy. Patients are frequently unaware that an algorithm has contributed to their care. Rights to know, to opt out, and to control how imaging data are used for model training or commercial development are inadequately protected under most current regulatory frameworks. Fourth, responsibility and accountability remain undefined: when a radiologist defers to an AI recommendation that proves incorrect, the locus of liability is unclear. Workflow defaults and productivity incentives create implicit pressure to follow AI outputs blur the boundary between augmentation and delegation, requiring explicit governance frameworks to preserve meaningful human oversight.

Beyond these ethical dimensions, practical development challenges are substantial. Data standardization across scanner manufacturers and acquisition protocols is a persistent bottleneck. Annotation quality is constrained by significant inter-observer variability in lesion classification. Most published studies are retrospective and curated, systematically overestimating real-world utility; prospective, multi-site validation measuring clinical outcomes — biopsy rates, cancer detection rates, interval cancers — is the appropriate but underused standard. Regulatory pathways differ by jurisdiction (FDA, MFDS, CE MDR), necessitating early regulatory engagement, and clinical workflow integration remains a barrier when tools disrupt established practice patterns or produce outputs that are difficult to interpret and act upon.

Responsible AI development for breast ultrasound requires five operational commitments: diversity-first data curation from the outset; prospective, multi-site validation against clinical outcome measures; continuous post-market surveillance with mechanisms for model updating; transparent reporting using established standards such as the Checklist for Artificial Intelligence in Medical Imaging (CLAIM); and institutional governance inclusive of clinical, technical, ethical, legal, and patient representation. Potential is not performance, and performance in a research setting is not performance in clinical practice across diverse populations. The patients who will benefit — or be harmed — by these technologies deserve our full accountability.