

Reframing Medical And Pharmaceutical Education Through Artificial Intelligence: An Integrative Pedagogical Model Linking Clinical Decision Support, Drug Discovery, Delivery Design, And Pharmacovigilance

Dr. Sofia M. Ionescu

Faculty of Health Sciences and Digital Learning, University of Bucharest, Romania

Received: 09 January 2026; **Accepted:** 07 February 2026; **Published:** 01 March 2026

Abstract: Artificial intelligence (AI) is rapidly reshaping how medicine and pharmacy are practiced and, consequently, how they must be taught. Across medical training, anatomy instruction, diagnostic reasoning, and pharmacy practice, AI tools are increasingly used to support decision-making, automate or augment learning pathways, and generate new modes of assessment and feedback (Bajwa et al., 2021; Mir et al., 2023; Joseph et al., 2025; Hooda et al., 2022). In parallel, pharmaceutical R&D is being transformed by AI-enabled workflows spanning discovery, development strategy, drug-delivery design, and post-market safety monitoring (Blanco-González et al., 2023; Sarkar et al., 2023; Vora et al., 2023; Algarvio et al., 2025). Despite this dual acceleration, educational implementation remains uneven, with persistent challenges in faculty readiness, student digital literacy, mental-health concerns, validity of assessment, and the governance of AI-supported learning environments (Delello et al., 2025; Walter, 2024; Yaseen et al., 2025; Tan et al., 2025). This article develops a publication-oriented, research-style synthesis that bridges these streams into a single curricular and governance architecture tailored to modern medical and pharmaceutical education. Using an interpretive, evidence-mapped meta-synthesis, the study identifies four integrated learning domains: (1) AI for clinical reasoning and diagnosis, (2) AI for drug discovery and pharmaceutical research, (3) AI for pharmaceutical technology and drug-delivery design, and (4) AI for pharmacovigilance, safety, and medico-legal accountability (Aamir et al., 2024; Kumar et al., 2025; Vora et al., 2023; Algarvio et al., 2025; Di Mauro et al., 2025). Results are presented as descriptive, education-focused findings that clarify how adaptive learning platforms, intelligent assistants, and assessment systems can be aligned with discipline-specific competencies and professional ethics (Chen, 2025; Sajja et al., 2024; Mahamad et al., 2025). The discussion proposes a program-level implementation pathway emphasizing AI literacy, transparent evaluation practices, and safeguards addressing bias, student wellbeing, and professional accountability (Walter, 2024; Delello et al., 2025; Vasudevan et al., 2025). The paper concludes with actionable recommendations for curriculum planners and faculty leaders to transform AI adoption from isolated tool use into coherent competency development across medicine and pharmacy (Alqahtani et al., 2025; Wang & Li, 2024).

Keywords: Artificial intelligence; medical education; pharmaceutical education; drug discovery; drug-delivery design; pharmacovigilance; adaptive learning.

Introduction: Artificial intelligence has moved from a specialized technical capability to a foundational infrastructure shaping modern healthcare practice and pharmaceutical innovation (Bajwa et al., 2021). This shift is not merely technological; it is epistemic—

altering what counts as knowledge, how clinical decisions are justified, and how professional competence is assessed. As AI becomes embedded in diagnosis, clinical documentation, and decision support, the competencies expected of clinicians and pharmacists inevitably evolve (Aamir et al., 2024; Bajwa et al., 2021). Educational institutions therefore face a dual imperative: prepare students to work effectively with AI-enhanced systems and ensure they can critically evaluate AI outputs, limitations, and risks in real-world settings (Wang & Li, 2024; Walter, 2024).

Within medical education, AI has influenced both what is taught and how it is taught. Studies describing current scenarios and future directions emphasize that AI can support personalized learning, enable simulation-driven training, and enhance performance feedback loops (Mir et al., 2023; Khakpaki, 2025). Anatomy education provides a visible example: systematic review evidence indicates AI can support teaching and learning of anatomical structures and spatial reasoning, with implications for curriculum time allocation and assessment reliability (Joseph et al., 2025). Specialized systems also demonstrate how AI can be applied in osteology and related contexts, pointing to new pedagogical modalities where learners engage with detection/classification systems and interpret outputs in academically rigorous ways (Orhan, 2025).

In pharmaceutical education, AI's influence is similarly multifaceted. Clinical pharmacy is witnessing growing use of AI for medication therapy management, risk stratification, and operational decision-making, creating new requirements for training in AI-supported professional judgment (Alqahtani et al., 2025). Pharmaceutical research and development increasingly rely on AI to accelerate compound screening, optimize design cycles, and interpret complex biological data, which must be reflected in course content, laboratory experiences, and capstone work (Blanco-González et al., 2023; Sarkar et al., 2023; Kumar et al., 2025). Pharmaceutical technology and drug-delivery design are also explicitly impacted, with AI methods contributing to design logic, formulation decision workflows, and iterative optimization practices (Vora et al., 2023). Post-market safety, too, is shifting through AI-enabled pharmacovigilance systems, including expert-defined Bayesian approaches used in practical contexts; this reframes how students should be taught signal detection, causality reasoning, and safety governance (Algarvio et al., 2025). Additionally, medico-legal environments are beginning to involve AI-assisted analysis of disputes and record management, indicating that professional education must address documentation, accountability, and legal reasoning in

AI-mediated ecosystems (Di Mauro et al., 2025).

However, educational implementation is not frictionless. Evidence from educators highlights concerns around usage barriers, professional workload, and mental-health implications within AI-rich classrooms (Delello et al., 2025). At the same time, studies underscore the importance of digital literacy as a moderating factor for student engagement with adaptive tools, implying that unequal readiness can widen educational inequities if not actively managed (Yaseen et al., 2025). Broader syntheses emphasize AI literacy, critical thinking, and prompt-oriented interaction skills as increasingly essential, not as optional “tech skills” but as core learning outcomes tied to professional performance (Walter, 2024). Research on teacher professional development in AI-enhanced environments further shows that educator roles evolve, requiring capability-building in instructional design, assessment validity, and learning analytics interpretation (Tan et al., 2025; Umar et al., 2025).

A key gap is that the literature often treats “AI in education” and “AI in healthcare/pharma practice” as parallel conversations rather than an integrated curricular problem. Medical education papers may focus on personalized learning and classroom practice (Mir et al., 2023; Chen, 2025), while pharmaceutical research papers focus on discovery, development, and delivery innovation (Blanco-González et al., 2023; Vora et al., 2023). Yet students do not experience these topics as separate realities: a future clinician will encounter AI-enabled diagnostic tools and AI-generated documentation; a future pharmacist will work with AI-influenced prescribing ecosystems, safety systems, and drug-development narratives (Aamir et al., 2024; Alqahtani et al., 2025; Di Mauro et al., 2025). This mismatch creates curricular fragmentation: isolated modules on “AI basics” without strong alignment to professional competencies and real workflows (Wang & Li, 2024; Khakpaki, 2025).

Accordingly, this article aims to bridge these domains by developing a coherent educational framework that connects AI-enabled medical learning modalities with AI-driven pharmaceutical innovation pipelines. The study addresses four guiding questions grounded in the provided literature:

- (1) Which AI-enabled practice domains most strongly shape competency requirements in medicine and pharmacy? (Bajwa et al., 2021; Alqahtani et al., 2025)
- (2) Which educational technologies and models are most consistently linked to improved learner engagement or performance, and under what conditions? (Chen, 2025; Yaseen et al., 2025; Sajja et al., 2024)

(3) How can assessment, feedback, and digital transformation measurement be aligned with professional outcomes rather than tool adoption alone? (Hooda et al., 2022; González-Pérez et al., 2025; Mahamad et al., 2025)

(4) What governance and responsibility considerations must be embedded to address safety, trust, and wellbeing? (Algarvio et al., 2025; Di Mauro et al., 2025; Delello et al., 2025; Walter, 2024)

METHODOLOGY

This study uses a qualitative, interpretive meta-synthesis designed to produce a publication-ready integrative model for curriculum and educational governance. The approach is appropriate where the objective is not to compute pooled effect sizes but to develop a coherent conceptual architecture from diverse peer-reviewed evidence across education, clinical practice, pharmaceutical R&D, and professional development (Mir et al., 2023; Khakpaki, 2025; Blanco-González et al., 2023).

Corpus definition and eligibility logic. The evidence base is strictly limited to the provided reference list. Sources were treated as eligible if they addressed at least one of the following: (a) AI applications relevant to medical practice or diagnosis (Bajwa et al., 2021; Aamir et al., 2024), (b) AI applications relevant to pharmacy practice, pharmacovigilance, or pharmaceutical research and drug delivery design (Alqahtani et al., 2025; Algarvio et al., 2025; Kumar et al., 2025; Vora et al., 2023), or (c) AI-enabled educational models such as adaptive learning, personalized platforms, digital transformation measurement, assessment/feedback systems, or educator development (Chen, 2025; Gligorea et al., 2023; González-Pérez et al., 2025; Tan et al., 2025).

Analytic procedure and coding. The synthesis proceeded in four interpretive stages:

1. Extraction of claims and educational implications. Each source was read for primary assertions about AI's role, documented challenges, and implications for training design (Mir et al., 2023; Delello et al., 2025).

2. Thematic clustering into practice-to-competency pathways. Findings were coded into (i) clinical reasoning/diagnosis, (ii) anatomy and foundational medical learning, (iii) clinical pharmacy and therapeutics, (iv) drug discovery/development, (v) drug-delivery design and pharmaceutical technology, (vi) pharmacovigilance and safety governance, and (vii) learning systems and institutional capability-building (Joseph et al., 2025; Alqahtani et al., 2025; Vora et al., 2023; Algarvio et al., 2025; Tan et al., 2025).

3. Cross-domain mapping. Codes were mapped to show how a competency introduced in education connects to a practice domain and where gaps occur—for example, how diagnostic AI understanding must connect to documentation accountability and medico-legal consequences (Aamir et al., 2024; Di Mauro et al., 2025).

4. Model construction and validation through convergence. Only model components supported by multiple sources, or strongly supported by one domain-defining source, were retained. Convergence between educational and practice sources was treated as higher-confidence justification for curricular inclusion (Bajwa et al., 2021; Alqahtani et al., 2025; Khakpaki, 2025).

Operational definition of “bridging.” In this article, bridging refers to designing educational structures where: (a) AI concepts are taught through authentic clinical/pharmaceutical tasks; (b) learning technologies align with professional competency outcomes; and (c) governance and wellbeing protections are integrated into course delivery and assessment (Walter, 2024; Mahamad et al., 2025; Delello et al., 2025). This definition is anchored in the literature emphasizing AI literacy, adaptive learning architectures, and educator role transformation (Walter, 2024; Sajja et al., 2024; Umar et al., 2025).

Results

Results are presented as descriptive findings from the synthesis. Because the corpus contains mixed article types (systematic reviews, narrative reviews, empirical evaluations, and conceptual analyses), “results” here represent structured integrative conclusions rather than new experimental data (Mir et al., 2023; Blanco-González et al., 2023).

Finding 1: AI literacy must be framed as professional reasoning competence, not software familiarity.

Evidence across education-oriented work indicates that AI literacy in the classroom must extend beyond exposure to tools; it should cultivate critical thinking and responsible interaction skills that remain stable even as platforms change (Walter, 2024). This aligns with broader accounts of AI's expanding role in healthcare practice, which require professionals to interpret AI outputs, understand limitations, and integrate them into decisions while maintaining responsibility (Bajwa et al., 2021). When medical education focuses on AI as a “technology trend” rather than as a reasoning partner and risk domain, students may over-trust outputs or fail to recognize contexts where human judgment must dominate (Mir et al., 2023; Khakpaki, 2025). Pharmacy education faces parallel risks: learners may adopt AI clinical supports without fully understanding how algorithmic inference

interacts with medication safety, patient-specific variability, and reporting obligations (Alqahtani et al., 2025; Algarvio et al., 2025).

Finding 2: Personalized and adaptive learning can improve performance, but digital literacy and instructional design moderate outcomes.

Empirical evaluation of AI-driven personalized learning platforms demonstrates measurable improvements in learning performance among medical students, supporting the value of adaptive pathways when properly implemented (Chen, 2025). Complementing this, literature reviews in e-learning identify adaptive learning as a recurring theme in AI-enabled education, emphasizing personalization logic and learner modeling as central mechanisms (Gligorea et al., 2023). However, engagement is not guaranteed: evidence indicates that digital literacy moderates the impact of adaptive technologies and interactive AI tools on student engagement (Yaseen et al., 2025). Therefore, results suggest that institutions must treat digital literacy as a prerequisite capability and not assume uniform readiness across cohorts (Walter, 2024; Yaseen et al., 2025).

Finding 3: Assessment and feedback systems are becoming AI-mediated, requiring new validity and transparency practices.

AI-based assessment and feedback mechanisms are associated with enhanced student success in higher education when designed to provide timely, structured guidance (Hooda et al., 2022). Architectures for AI-driven decision support in online learning and assessment suggest that system design choices—data capture, evaluation logic, and feedback interfaces—shape educational fairness and reliability (Mahamad et al., 2025). These findings imply that in medical and pharmaceutical education, assessment must be explicitly linked to professional competencies (clinical reasoning, safety practices, documentation), not only course-level outcomes (Mir et al., 2023; Alqahtani et al., 2025). Without transparent evaluation criteria, AI-mediated assessment risks being perceived as opaque or punitive, undermining learning motivation and trust (Walter, 2024; Delello et al., 2025).

Finding 4: The drug discovery and development pipeline is a central “bridge” domain linking medicine and pharmacy curricula.

The pharmaceutical literature emphasizes AI’s accelerating role in modern drug discovery and development, including the management of complex datasets, candidate selection, and strategy optimization (Blanco-González et al., 2023; Sarkar et al., 2023). Advanced AI technologies are also described as transforming contemporary pharmaceutical

research more broadly, indicating a shift in what graduates must understand about how therapeutics are created and evaluated (Kumar et al., 2025). This has direct relevance to medical education: clinicians increasingly encounter therapies whose development and evidence narratives are AI-influenced, and they must interpret such narratives responsibly in patient care contexts (Bajwa et al., 2021; Aamir et al., 2024). Thus, the results support positioning AI-driven discovery as a shared curriculum component that connects medical and pharmacy training rather than a specialized elective (Kumar et al., 2025; Sriram et al., 2025).

Finding 5: Pharmaceutical technology and drug-delivery design represent a second bridge domain, but teaching must focus on design reasoning rather than tool demonstrations.

AI in pharmaceutical technology and drug-delivery design indicates a strong need for educational translation: students must learn how AI informs formulation choices, delivery constraints, and design objectives in practical product development contexts (Vora et al., 2023). If taught as isolated “AI for formulation” software workshops, these topics risk becoming quickly outdated. Instead, synthesis suggests teaching should focus on stable design reasoning: defining objectives, evaluating constraints, iterating designs, and interpreting AI-supported recommendations critically (Vora et al., 2023; Taye, 2023). Here, foundational understanding of machine learning workflows and architectures supports deeper comprehension of where AI can assist and where it can mislead (Taye, 2023).

Finding 6: Pharmacovigilance, accountability, and medico-legal reasoning must be explicit learning outcomes in AI-rich curricula.

AI-enabled pharmacovigilance—supported by narrative review evidence and practical experience with expert-defined Bayesian network tools—highlights that safety monitoring is increasingly computational and requires specialized interpretive competence (Algarvio et al., 2025). This connects naturally with the role of pharmacy teachers in promoting pharmacovigilance awareness among healthcare students, implying that curriculum and teaching roles must evolve to address AI-mediated safety workflows (Pankaj, 2025). Additionally, research on AI in clinical malpractice disputes through medical record management suggests medico-legal dimensions are becoming entangled with AI-supported documentation and analysis practices (Di Mauro et al., 2025). Therefore, results support integrating accountability and documentation literacy into both

medical and pharmaceutical education as a shared competency area (Di Mauro et al., 2025; Walter, 2024).

Finding 7: Implementation success depends on educator capability-building and attention to wellbeing.

Educator-focused research describes usage challenges and mental-health considerations associated with AI in classroom environments, indicating that implementation strategies must include workload and wellbeing safeguards (Delello et al., 2025). Systematic review evidence emphasizes the evolving role of educators in AI-enhanced learning environments, including the need for professional development to support instructional design and reflective practice (Tan et al., 2025; Umar et al., 2025). This is reinforced by studies measuring digital transformation in Education 4.0 with validated models, suggesting institutions need structured methods to assess readiness and progress rather than relying on informal adoption indicators (González-Pérez et al., 2025). The results thus point to implementation as an organizational transformation issue—not merely a curriculum update (González-Pérez et al., 2025; Tan et al., 2025).

DISCUSSION

The synthesis indicates that bridging AI across medical and pharmaceutical education requires a shift from tool-centered integration to competency-centered design. This section interprets the results with attention to theoretical implications, counter-arguments, and constraints implied by the evidence base.

Integrating clinical AI and educational AI: avoiding the “two AI problem.”

A common institutional pattern is to adopt AI for teaching (adaptive platforms, assessment tools) while separately teaching AI as a topic within health curricula. The literature suggests this creates a “two AI problem,” where students experience AI as a set of classroom utilities rather than as a professional practice domain with accountability and risk. When students encounter AI-driven personalized learning platforms that optimize quizzes or study plans, they may develop a tacit assumption that AI is “helpful and correct,” which can become hazardous when transferred uncritically to clinical decision-making contexts (Chen, 2025; Bajwa et al., 2021). Educational designs must therefore explicitly connect classroom AI experiences to professional reasoning norms: verifying outputs, recognizing uncertainty, and maintaining responsibility (Walter, 2024; Bajwa et al., 2021).

Counter-argument: AI literacy is too broad to teach

consistently.

One might argue that “AI literacy” is a moving target and therefore cannot be reliably incorporated into already dense curricula. The evidence, however, supports reframing AI literacy as durable cognitive and ethical competencies: critical thinking, prompt interaction skills, domain-specific verification strategies, and awareness of limitations (Walter, 2024). These competencies do not require teaching every new model or platform; they require teaching how professionals interrogate AI outputs and integrate them within established standards of care and safety monitoring (Bajwa et al., 2021; Algarvio et al., 2025). Thus, the literature supports feasible, stable learning outcomes that can be updated incrementally rather than redesigned annually (Khakpaki, 2025; Tan et al., 2025).

Bridging through the pharmaceutical pipeline: from discovery to safety as a single educational storyline.

The provided references collectively outline an end-to-end AI influence pathway: discovery and development (Blanco-González et al., 2023; Sarkar et al., 2023; Kumar et al., 2025), pharmaceutical technology and delivery design (Vora et al., 2023), clinical pharmacy application (Alqahtani et al., 2025), and post-market pharmacovigilance (Algarvio et al., 2025). Treating these as separate topics misses the central educational opportunity: a coherent storyline that teaches how AI-mediated decisions at one stage influence safety and efficacy expectations downstream. For instance, if AI accelerates candidate selection, future clinicians and pharmacists must understand the implications for evidence interpretation and clinical adoption patterns (Bajwa et al., 2021; Aamir et al., 2024). If AI influences delivery design, students should learn how design constraints affect therapeutic outcomes and adherence, and how to evaluate AI-supported design logic critically (Vora et al., 2023; Taye, 2023). If AI is used in pharmacovigilance, students must interpret signals, understand inference logic, and responsibly communicate risk (Algarvio et al., 2025; Pankaj, 2025).

Educational technology as governance: why assessment design becomes an ethics issue.

Assessment and feedback systems are not neutral; they shape learner behavior and professional identity formation. AI for assessment and feedback can enhance student success, but design choices can also distort learning priorities if feedback optimizes for superficial performance rather than competence development (Hooda et al., 2022). Architectures for AI-driven decision support in learning highlight that data pipelines, model logic, and interface design embed value choices—what gets measured, what gets

rewarded, and what gets ignored (Mahamad et al., 2025). In medicine and pharmacy, where professional accountability is critical, the opacity of AI-mediated assessment could undermine trust and intensify stress, reinforcing the need to address mental health impacts documented in educator experiences (Delello et al., 2025). Therefore, governance must be part of pedagogy: students should understand not only how AI helps learning but also how AI-mediated evaluation can be biased, incomplete, or misaligned with professional standards (Walter, 2024; Tan et al., 2025).

Institutional capability and digital transformation: measuring progress beyond adoption.

Validated models for measuring digital transformation in Education 4.0 suggest that institutions need systematic instruments to evaluate readiness, progress, and reliability rather than celebrating isolated innovations (González-Pérez et al., 2025). This matters because AI adoption can be performative—implemented as a marketing signal rather than a competency improvement initiative. Evidence on educator role evolution emphasizes that teacher professional development is required for sustainable change (Umar et al., 2025; Tan et al., 2025). Without capacity-building, AI may increase workload (creating new tasks: monitoring platforms, interpreting analytics, managing integrity concerns) and produce mental-health strain, consistent with classroom insights (Delello et al., 2025). Consequently, the most robust educational strategy is not simply to “add AI tools” but to build institutional literacy and evaluation culture (Walter, 2024; González-Pérez et al., 2025).

Limitations and boundaries of this study.

This article is deliberately limited to the provided references and therefore does not incorporate external phytosomal-specific drug delivery literature. The bridge proposed here is anchored in the drug-delivery design and pharmaceutical technology domain as represented in the cited corpus (Vora et al., 2023). Additionally, because the study is a meta-synthesis, results are descriptive and integrative rather than statistically aggregated; the article’s contribution is a coherent model and an implementation logic supported by the convergent evidence base (Mir et al., 2023; Khakpaki, 2025). Future empirical work could test the proposed competency mappings using controlled educational evaluations similar to those reported for personalized learning platforms (Chen, 2025) and could assess institutional transformation with validated measurement approaches (González-Pérez et al., 2025).

CONCLUSION

AI’s integration into healthcare and pharmaceutical

systems is reshaping the competencies required of future professionals, making AI-aware education a necessity rather than an elective (Bajwa et al., 2021; Wang & Li, 2024). This article synthesized the provided literature to develop an integrated educational architecture that bridges: AI-supported clinical reasoning and diagnosis (Aamir et al., 2024), AI-enhanced learning environments and assessment systems (Chen, 2025; Hooda et al., 2022), AI-driven drug discovery and development (Blanco-González et al., 2023; Sarkar et al., 2023; Kumar et al., 2025), AI-informed drug-delivery design (Vora et al., 2023), and AI-enabled pharmacovigilance and accountability infrastructures (Algarvio et al., 2025; Di Mauro et al., 2025). The synthesis indicates that sustainable implementation requires competency-centered design, digital literacy support, transparent assessment governance, educator professional development, and wellbeing safeguards (Yaseen et al., 2025; Tan et al., 2025; Delello et al., 2025; Walter, 2024). Ultimately, bridging AI across medicine and pharmacy is best achieved by teaching stable reasoning practices—critical interrogation of outputs, responsibility for decisions, and understanding of end-to-end therapeutic lifecycles—rather than focusing narrowly on any single tool or platform (Walter, 2024; Bajwa et al., 2021).

REFERENCES

1. Aamir, A., Iqbal, A., Jawed, F., Ashfaque, F., Hafsa, H., Anas, Z., et al. (2024). Exploring the current and prospective role of artificial intelligence in disease diagnosis. *Annals of Medicine and Surgery* (London), 86(2), 943–949. <https://doi.org/10.1097/MS9.0000000000001700>
2. Algarvio, R. C., Conceição, J., Rodrigues, P. P., Ribeiro, I., & Ferreira-da-Silva, R. (2025). Artificial intelligence in pharmacovigilance: A narrative review and practical experience with an expert-defined Bayesian network tool. *International Journal of Clinical Pharmacy*, 47(4), 932–944. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11096-025-01975-3>
3. Alqahtani, S. S., Menachery, S. J., Alshahrani, A., Albalkhi, B., Alshayban, D., & Iqbal, M. Z. (2025). Artificial intelligence in clinical pharmacy: A systematic review of current scenario and future perspectives. *Digital Health*, 11, 20552076251388145. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20552076251388145>
4. Bajwa, J., Munir, U., Nori, A., & Williams, B. (2021). Artificial intelligence in healthcare: Transforming the practice of medicine. *Future Healthcare Journal*, 8(2), e188–e194. <https://doi.org/10.7861/fhj.2021-0095>

5. Blanco-González, A., Cabezon, A., Seco-González, A., Conde-Torres, D., Antelo-Riveiro, P., Piñeiro, Á., et al. (2023). The role of AI in drug discovery: Challenges, opportunities, and strategies. *Pharmaceuticals (Basel)*, 16(6), 891. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ph16060891>
6. Chen, Y. (2025). Evaluation of the impact of AI-driven personalized learning platform on medical students' learning performance. *Frontiers in Medicine (Lausanne)*, 12, 1610012. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmed.2025.1610012>
7. Delello, J. A., Sung, W., Mokhtari, K., Hebert, J., Bronson, A., & De Giuseppe, T. (2025). AI in the classroom: Insights from educators on usage, challenges, and mental health. *Education Sciences*, 15(2), 113. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15020113>
8. Di Mauro, L., Capasso, E., Tettamanti, C., Casella, C., Francaviglia, M., Volonnino, G., et al. (2025). The role of artificial intelligence in analyzing clinical malpractice disputes through medical record management. *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine*, 115, 102941. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jflm.2025.102941>
9. Gligorea, I., Cioca, M., Oancea, R., Gorski, A.-T., Gorski, H., & Tudorache, P. (2023). Adaptive learning using artificial intelligence in e-learning: A literature review. *Education Sciences*, 13(12), 1216. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13121216>
10. González-Pérez, L. I., Enciso-González, J. A., Vicario-Solorzano, C. M., et al. (2025). Measuring digital transformation in education 4.0 with DT-Smarty: Valid and reliable model. *Technology, Knowledge and Learning*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-025-09844-8>
11. Hooda, M., Rana, C., Dahiya, O., Rizwan, A., & Hossain, M. S. (2022). Artificial intelligence for assessment and feedback to enhance student success in higher education. *Mathematical Problems in Engineering*, 2022, 5215722. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/5215722>
12. Joseph, T. S., Gowrie, S., Montalbano, M. J., Bandelow, S., Clunes, M., Dumont, A. S., et al. (2025). The roles of artificial intelligence in teaching anatomy: A systematic review. *Clinical Anatomy*, 38(5), 552–567. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ca.24272>
13. Khakpaki, A. (2025). Advancements in artificial intelligence transforming medical education: A comprehensive overview. *Medical Education Online*, 30(1), 2542807. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10872981.2025.2542807>
14. Kumar, P., Chaudhary, B., Arya, P., Chauhan, R., Devi, S., Parejiya, P. B., et al. (2025). Advanced artificial intelligence technologies transforming contemporary pharmaceutical research. *Bioengineering (Basel)*, 12(4), 363. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bioengineering12040363>
15. Mahamad, S., Chin, Y. H., Zulmuksah, N. I. N., Haque, M. M., Shaheen, M., & Nisar, K. (2025). Architecting an AI-driven decision support system for enhanced online learning and assessment. *Future Internet*, 17(9), 383. <https://doi.org/10.3390/fi17090383>
16. Mir, M. M., Mir, G. M., Raina, N. T., Mir, S. M., Mir, S. M., & Miskeen, E., et al. (2023). Application of artificial intelligence in medical education: Current scenario and future perspectives. *Journal of Advances in Medical Education and Professionalism*, 11(3), 133–140. <https://doi.org/10.30476/JAMP.2023.98655.1803>
17. Orhan, İ. (2025). Smart osteology: An AI-powered two-stage system for multi-species long bone detection and classification using YOLOv5 and CNN architectures for veterinary anatomy education and forensic applications. *Veterinary Sciences*, 12(8), 765. <https://doi.org/10.3390/vetsci12080765>
18. Pankaj, K. (2025). Role of pharmacy teachers in promoting pharmacovigilance awareness among healthcare students. *Journal of Community Health Management*, 11, 216–218. <https://doi.org/10.18231/j.jchm.2024.037>
19. Peng, J., & Li, Y. (2025). Frontiers of artificial intelligence for personalized learning in higher education: A systematic review of leading articles. *Applied Sciences*, 15(18), 10096. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app151810096>
20. Sajja, R., Sermet, Y., Cikmaz, M., Cwiertny, D., & Demir, I. (2024). Artificial intelligence-enabled intelligent assistant for personalized and adaptive learning in higher education. *Information*, 15(10), 596. <https://doi.org/10.3390/info15100596>
21. Sarkar, C., Das, B., Rawat, V. S., Wahlang, J. B., Nongpiur, A., Tiewsoh, I., et al. (2023). Artificial intelligence and machine learning technology driven modern drug discovery and development. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, 24(3), 2026. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms24032026>
22. Sriram, A., Ramachandran, K., & Krishnamoorthy, S. (2025). Artificial intelligence in medical education: Transforming learning and practice. *Cureus*, 17(3), e80852. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.80852>
23. Tan, X., Cheng, G., & Ling, M. H. (2025). Artificial intelligence in teaching and teacher professional

- development: A systematic review. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 8, 100355. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100355>
24. Taye, M. M. (2023). Understanding machine learning with deep learning: Architectures, workflow, applications and future directions. *Computers*, 12(5), 91. <https://doi.org/10.3390/computers12050091>
25. Umar, M., Shaheen, S., Shehzad, T., ul Muntaha, S. S., & Khan, S. (2025). Teachers and technology: The evolving role of educators in AI-enhanced learning environments. *Indus Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(2), 600–616. <https://doi.org/10.59075/ijss.v3i2.1431>
26. Vasudevan, R., Alqahtani, T., Alqahtani, S., Devanandan, P., Kandasamy, G., Saad, R., et al. (2025). Integrating AI in healthcare education: Attitudes of pharmacy students at King Khalid University towards using ChatGPT in clinical decision-making. *Healthcare (Basel)*, 13(11), 1265. <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare13111265>
27. Vora, L. K., Gholap, A. D., Jetha, K., Thakur, R. R. S., Solanki, H. K., & Chavda, V. P. (2023). Artificial intelligence in pharmaceutical technology and drug delivery design. *Pharmaceutics*, 15(7), 1916. <https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmaceutics15071916>
28. Walter, Y. (2024). Embracing the future of artificial intelligence in the classroom: The relevance of AI literacy, prompt engineering, and critical thinking in modern education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 21, 15. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00448-3>
29. Wang, J., & Li, J. (2024). Artificial intelligence empowering public health education: Prospects and challenges. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 12, 1389026. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1389026>
30. Yaseen, H., Mohammad, A. S., Ashal, N., Abusaimh, H., Ali, A., & Sharabati, A. A. (2025). The impact of adaptive learning technologies, personalized feedback, and interactive AI tools on student engagement: The moderating role of digital literacy. *Sustainability*, 17(3), 1133. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17031133>