The American Journal of Interdisciplinary Innovations and Research
ISSN 2642-7478 Volume 08 - 2026

The Integration of Explainable Artificial Intelligence and Decentralized Frameworks in Clinical Research: A Comprehensive Analysis of Methodological Shifts and Ethical Governance

Dr. Alistair Sterling
Department of Biomedical Informatics and Health Outcomes, University of Edinburgh

Received: 22 Dec 2025 | Received Revised Version: 16 Jan 2025 | Accepted: 15 Feb 2026 | Published: 27 Feb 2026

Volume 08 Issue 02 2026 |

Abstract

The landscape of clinical trials is undergoing a fundamental paradigm shift driven by the convergence of Artificial Intelligence (AI), Machine Learning (ML), and decentralized operational models. This research article explores the transition from traditional, site-centric randomized clinical trials to digital, participant-centric models enabled by remote monitoring and predictive analytics. By synthesizing foundational work on model interpretability, such as SHAP (SHapley Additive exPlanations), with contemporary frameworks for decentralized clinical trials (DCTs), this study investigates how AI-driven strategies can enhance trial efficiency while maintaining scientific rigor. We examine the critical role of explainable AI (XAI) in gaining clinician trust and meeting regulatory requirements, particularly in the context of real-time monitoring and adaptive design. The paper further discusses the necessity of pragmatism in trial design, utilizing the PRECIS-2 tool and real-world data to bridge the gap between controlled experimental efficacy and real-world clinical effectiveness. Finally, we address the ethical imperatives of equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) within AI-enabled trials, arguing that algorithmic interventions must be intentionally designed to mitigate bias and broaden participant access.

Keywords: Decentralized Clinical Trials, Explainable Artificial Intelligence, Remote Patient Monitoring, Adaptive Design, Clinical Trial Ethics, Digital Health Technologies.

© **2026** Dr. Alistair Sterling. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). The authors retain copyright and allow others to share, adapt, or redistribute the work with proper attribution.

Cite This Article: Dr. Alistair Sterling. (2026). The Integration of Explainable Artificial Intelligence and Decentralized Frameworks in Clinical Research: A Comprehensive Analysis of Methodological Shifts and Ethical Governance. The American Journal of Interdisciplinary Innovations and Research, 8(2), 90–94. Retrieved from https://theamericanjournals.com/index.php/tajiir/article/view/7508

1. Introduction

For decades, the gold standard of medical evidence has been the centralized Randomized Clinical Trial (RCT). While these structures have provided the bedrock for evidence-based medicine, they are increasingly criticized for their high costs, slow recruitment cycles, and lack of diversity among participant populations. The traditional model requires participants to travel to academic medical centers, often creating a "zip code bias" where only those with the time, financial resources, and proximity to major urban hubs can participate. However, the emergence of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning (ML), combined with the proliferation of Digital Health Technologies (DHTs), has paved the way for a more inclusive and efficient era of clinical research (Jiang et al., 2017).

The problem at the heart of modern clinical research is two-fold: the operational inefficiency of site-based trials and the "black box" nature of the advanced algorithms proposed to fix them. As researchers integrate AI to optimize patient recruitment and monitor physiological data in real-time, they face a significant hurdle in interpretability. Clinicians and regulators are often hesitant to rely on predictions from complex models without a clear understanding of the underlying logic (Tonekaboni et al., 2019). This is where the work of Lundberg and Lee (2017) regarding unified approaches to model interpretation becomes vital. By providing a framework for understanding how individual features contribute to a model's output, researchers can bridge the gap between high-performance computing and clinical utility.

Furthermore, the shift toward Decentralized Clinical Trials (DCTs) represents a movement toward "bringing the trial to the patient." This transition is not merely a change in location but a fundamental reimagining of data acquisition. With the use of mobile health (mHealth) tools, as highlighted by Steinhubl, Topol, and Nebeker (2016), the frequency and granularity of data collection have increased exponentially. Instead of periodic "snapshots" of health during clinic visits, researchers now have access to a continuous stream of real-world data. Yet, this influx of data brings challenges regarding data integrity, participant privacy, and the need for sophisticated analytical tools to parse signal from noise (Alami et al., 2022).

This article seeks to fill a gap in the literature by providing a holistic synthesis of how explainable AI and decentralized methodologies intersect. We argue that the future of clinical research lies in "pragmatic" trials that acknowledge individual differences and utilize AI not just for efficiency, but for ensuring that medical interventions are effective across diverse, real-world populations (Moore et al., 2010; Ford and Norrie, 2016). Through an exhaustive review of theoretical frameworks and current technological applications, this paper outlines a roadmap for the next generation of clinical investigations.

2. Methodology

The methodology of this research involves a multi-layered theoretical analysis and a systematic synthesis of existing literature concerning AI applications in clinical settings. We categorize our approach into three distinct domains: algorithmic interpretability, decentralized operational frameworks, and regulatory-ethical compliance.

In the domain of algorithmic interpretability, we focus on the implementation of additive feature attribution methods. The methodology posits that for any AI model to be deployed in a clinical trial-whether for predicting adverse events or identifying eligible candidates-it must satisfy the property of local accuracy and consistency. We explore the theoretical underpinnings of SHAP values, which leverage game theory to assign each feature an importance value for a particular prediction. This is essential for "clinician-in-the-loop" systems, where the AI provides a recommendation, but the human investigator requires a justification to make an informed medical decision (Lundberg and Lee, 2017; Tonekaboni et al., 2019).

In the domain of decentralized frameworks, we examine the technical architecture required for remote data acquisition. This includes the deployment of wearable sensors, mobile applications, and electronic patient-reported outcomes (ePROs). Our methodological analysis focuses on the data pipeline: from the edge device (the patient's wearable) to the centralized cloud repository, and finally to the AI-driven analytical engine. We analyze the "virtual clinical trial" model, which uses AI to simulate participant behavior and optimize recruitment strategies (Gomes et al., 2020). The methodology also incorporates the PRECIS-2 tool (Pragmatic-Explanatory Continuum Indicator Summary), which allows trialists to design studies that better reflect the intended clinical practice environment rather than idealized laboratory settings (Loudon et al., 2015).

Finally, our methodology evaluates the regulatory landscape, specifically focusing on the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and European Medicines Agency (EMA) guidelines for digital health technologies. We analyze the requirements for "fit-for-purpose" digital tools, ensuring that the hardware and software used in decentralized trials are validated for the specific physiological metrics they aim to measure. This involves a deep dive into the regulatory hurdles of predictive analytics in medicine, where the balance between innovation and patient safety is paramount (Parikh et al., 2019).

3. Results

The integration of AI into decentralized clinical trials has yielded transformative results across the drug development lifecycle. One of the most significant findings is the drastic reduction in recruitment timelines. By utilizing AI-driven algorithms to screen electronic health records (EHRs) and clinicogenomic databases, researchers can identify high-probability candidates who meet complex inclusion/exclusion criteria with far greater precision than manual screening (Singal et al., 2021). This is particularly evident in oncology, where the matching of genomic markers to specific targeted therapies is a labor-intensive process.

Furthermore, the application of AI in remote monitoring has enabled the concept of "adaptive design." In traditional trials, the protocol is often fixed from start to finish. However, as noted by Wang et al. (2021), AI models can analyze incoming data in real-time to suggest modifications to the trial, such as adjusting dosage levels

or re-allocating participants between arms based on interim efficacy signals. This responsiveness not only protects participant safety but also increases the likelihood of a successful trial outcome by allowing for mid-course corrections.

In the context of participant retention, the results indicate that decentralized models significantly lower the burden of participation. By removing the need for frequent travel, trials see lower dropout rates, particularly among underserved populations and those with chronic illnesses that limit mobility (Borah et al., 2021). However, the descriptive data also suggests a "digital divide" risk. While decentralized trials increase access for some, they may exclude those without high-speed internet or digital literacy. Therefore, AI strategies for equity must include "offline" or assisted digital components to remain truly inclusive (Abbidi and Sinha, 2026).

Another key result is the increased granularity of safety data. In a centralized trial, an adverse event might only be captured during a weekly or monthly visit. In an AI-enabled decentralized trial, wearable sensors can detect subtle physiological changes-such as a slight increase in resting heart rate or a decrease in sleep quality-that precede a clinical event. AI models, specifically those using deep learning on time-series data, have shown high sensitivity in detecting these "pre-symptomatic" signals, allowing for earlier intervention (Alami et al., 2022).

4. Discussion

The implications of these findings are profound, suggesting a future where clinical trials are more integrated into the daily lives of patients. However, this transition is not without its complexities. The discussion must be framed around four pillars: interpretability, pragmatism, regulation, and equity.

The Necessity of Explainable AI (XAI) The "black box" nature of advanced ML models remains a primary barrier to adoption. If an AI system flags a patient in a decentralized trial as being at high risk for a stroke, the principal investigator cannot simply take that at face value. They need to know why. Was it a change in blood pressure, a medication adherence issue, or a combination of genomic factors? The unified approach to interpretation suggested by Lundberg and Lee (2017) provides a mathematical foundation for this transparency. By decomposing a prediction into the contributions of its individual input features, XAI allows clinicians to validate the model's logic against their own medical expertise. This "sanity check" is crucial for maintaining the ethical integrity of the trial.

Pragmatism and Real-World Evidence Traditional trials often suffer from a lack of generalizability. A drug that works in a highly controlled environment with a homogeneous population may fail when released into the "wild" of general clinical practice. The move toward pragmatic trials, as advocated by Ford and Norrie (2016) and Usman et al. (2022), addresses this by embracing the complexity of real-world patients. AI plays a vital role here by helping researchers manage the inherent noise of real-world data. Rather than trying to eliminate every confounding variable, AI can be used to model and adjust for these variables, providing a clearer picture of how a treatment performs across different demographics and comorbidities.

Regulatory Hurdles and Data Governance As trials become more digital and decentralized, the regulatory burden shifts. The FDA's draft guidance on digital health technologies emphasizes the need for data security and the "validation" of tools (FDA, 2021). Regulators are concerned with "data provenance"-the ability to track a piece of data from the moment it is captured by a wearable device to its inclusion in the final analysis. AI systems used in this pipeline must be "locked" or follow a pre-specified "change protocol" to ensure that the algorithm's behavior doesn't shift in an unvalidated way during the trial. Parikh et al. (2019) highlight the need for a new regulatory framework that can keep pace with the iterative nature of machine learning while ensuring that predictive analytics do not introduce new forms of harm.

Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) Perhaps the most significant discussion point is the role of AI in fostering equity. Historically, clinical trials have been disproportionately white and male. AI-ML based strategies, as discussed by Abbidi and Sinha (2026), offer a way to intentionally over-sample underrepresented groups or to identify "hidden" populations who might benefit from a trial but are currently invisible to traditional recruitment networks. However, the risk of "algorithmic bias" is ever-present. If the historical data used to train an AI is biased, the AI will likely perpetuate that bias. Continuous auditing of recruitment algorithms is necessary to ensure they are not inadvertently excluding marginalized groups.

Limitations and Future Scope While the benefits are clear, we must acknowledge limitations. The technical infrastructure for DCTs is expensive to implement and

requires significant upfront investment. Furthermore, the reliance on high-quality data means that any sensor failure or data loss can jeopardize the entire trial. Future research should focus on "federated learning"-a technique where AI models are trained across multiple decentralized servers without the need to exchange the raw data itself. This could enhance privacy while still allowing for large-scale, multi-center insights. Additionally, long-term studies are needed to determine if the efficacy results from decentralized trials truly match those of traditional RCTs over the lifespan of a drug.

5. Conclusion

The evolution of clinical trials from centralized, manual processes to decentralized, AI-driven ecosystems represents a turning point in medical science. By leveraging explainable machine learning, researchers can now handle the vast amounts of data generated by mobile health technologies without sacrificing the transparency required for clinical and regulatory trust. This shift toward pragmatism, supported by real-world data and adaptive designs, ensures that new therapies are not only scientifically sound but also relevant to the diverse populations they are intended to serve.

The integration of AI into decentralized trials is not merely a technological upgrade; it is a moral imperative to make clinical research more accessible, equitable, and efficient. As we move forward, the focus must remain on the human element: ensuring that these digital tools empower patients and provide clinicians with the actionable insights they need to improve health outcomes. The roadmap is clear, but the path requires rigorous adherence to ethical standards, transparent modeling, and a commitment to including all segments of society in the quest for medical innovation.

References

1. Alami, H., Boursier, V., Crissey, R., & Hervé, C. (2022). AI-driven remote monitoring in decentralized clinical trials: Benefits, challenges, and perspectives. Journal of Clinical Monitoring and Computing, 36(2), 345-357.
2. Borah, B. J., David, J., & Chary, S. R. (2021). Decentralized clinical trials: Opportunities and challenges with digital tools. Therapeutic Innovation & Regulatory Science, 55(5), 958-965.
3. Ford, I., & Norrie, J. (2016). Pragmatic trials. New England Journal of Medicine, 375, 454-463.
4. Gomes, H. F., Silva, T., & Souza, L. (2020). Virtual clinical trials and AI: Revolutionizing patient recruitment and monitoring. Computers in Biology and Medicine, 123, Article 103898.
5. Jiang, F., Jiang, Y., Zhi, H., Dong, Y., Li, H., Ma, S., et al. (2017). Artificial intelligence in healthcare: past, present and future. Stroke and Vascular Neurology, 2(4), 230-243.
6. Loudon, K., Treweek, S., Sullivan, F., Donnan, P., Thorpe, K. E., & Zwarenstein, M. (2015). The PRECIS-2 tool: designing trials that are fit for purpose. BMJ, 350, h2147.
7. Lundberg, S. M., & Lee, S.-I. (2017). A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 30, 4765-4777.
8. Mofid, S., Bolislis, W. R., & Kühler, T. C. (2022). Real-world data in the postapproval setting as applied by the EMA and the US FDA. Clinical Therapeutics, 44, 306-322.
9. Moore, R. A., et al. (2010). Clinical effectiveness: an approach to clinical trial design more relevant to clinical practice, acknowledging the importance of individual differences. Pain, 149, 173-176.
10. Parikh, R. B., Obermeyer, Z., & Navathe, A. S. (2019). Regulation of predictive analytics in medicine. Science, 363(6429), 810-812.
11. Singal, G., et al. (2019). Association of patient characteristics and tumor genomics with clinical outcomes among patients with non-small cell lung cancer using a clinicogenomic database. JAMA, 321, 1391-1399.
12. Steinhubl, S. R., Topol, E. J., & Nebeker, J. R. (2016). The emerging field of mobile health clinical trials. Clinical Trials, 13(1), 1-5.
13. Tonekaboni, S., Joshi, S., McCradden, M. D., & Goldenberg, A. (2019). What clinicians want: Contextualizing explainable machine learning for clinical end use. arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.05134.
14. Tuerk, M. J., Litz, B. T., Resick, P. A., & Foa, E. B. (2023). Innovative clinical trial designs in the digital era: the rise of decentralized and adaptive studies. Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 92, Article 102659.
15. US Food and Drug Administration. (2021). Draft guidance for industry, investigators, and other stakeholders: digital health technologies for remote data acquisition in clinical investigations.
16. Usman, M. S., et al. (2022). The need for increased pragmatism in cardiovascular clinical trials. Nature Reviews Cardiology, 19, 737-750.

17. Wang, S., Cai, X., Chen, L., & Xu, J. (2021). AI in decentralized clinical trials: Real-time monitoring and adaptive design. IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics, 25(8), 2942-2951.

18. Abbidi, S.R., Sinha, D. AI/ML-based strategies for enhancing equity, diversity, and inclusion in randomized clinical trials. Trials (2026). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13063-026-09537-2