Journal of Medical Health Research and Psychiatry

Mini Review

JMHRP-24-028

A Comparative Analysis of Traditional and AI-Driven Methods for Disease Detection: Novel Approaches, Methodologies, and Challenges

Naeem Hamza*, Nuaman Ahmed, Naeema Zainaba

Department of General Medicine, Iuliu Hatieaganu University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Cluj Napoca, Romania

Corresponding Author: Naeem Hamza, Department of General Medicine, Iuliu Hatieaganu University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Cluj Napoca, Romania, E-mail: naeemhamza81@gmail.com

Received date: 03 October, 2024, **Accepted date:** 18 October, 2024, **Published date:** 28 October, 2024

Citation: Hamza N, Ahmed N, Zainaba N (2024) A Comparative Analysis of Traditional and AI-Driven Methods for Disease Detection: Novel Approaches, Methodologies, and Challenges. J Med Health Psychiatry 1: 2.

Abstract

Background: Accurate and early disease detection is crucial for improving patient outcomes. Traditional methods have relied on manual medical data analysis, which can be labor-intensive and error prone.

Methods: This comparative review examines traditional versus AI-driven detection methods, highlighting their applications, advantages, and limitations. We employed PRISMA guidelines to systematically review the literature, using strict inclusion and exclusion criteria to evaluate relevant studies.

Results: Our findings suggest that while AI-driven methods outperform traditional approaches in terms of speed and accuracy, challenges such as algorithm interpretability and data quality remain significant barriers.

Conclusions: Novel aspects of this study include an in-depth comparison of AI models, their integration into clinical practice, and the challenges of data quality and regulatory frameworks. Overall, AI-driven methods have the potential to revolutionize disease detection, but addressing the challenges of algorithm interpretability and data quality is crucial for their successful integration into clinical practice.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence, Machine learning, Deep learning, Traditional methods, PRISMA, Comparative review, Disease detection, Healthcare, Early diagnosis

Introduction

Early disease detection is fundamental to improving patient outcomes and reducing healthcare costs. Traditional detection methods, which often rely on manual analysis of medical imaging, clinical tests, and physical examinations, are time-consuming and prone to human error [1,2]. In contrast, AI-driven methods, particularly machine learning and deep learning, have demonstrated higher accuracy and faster diagnosis rates by learning complex patterns from large datasets [3,4].

This paper provides a comparative analysis of traditional and AI-driven disease detection methods. We explore novel aspects of AI application, including how these models improve diagnosis speed and accuracy, the integration of new AI methods into clinical decision-making, and the challenges surrounding algorithm interpretability, data quality, and regulatory issues. Methodologies in this paper adhere to the PRISMA guidelines to ensure a comprehensive and systematic comparison of both approaches.

Methodology

This comparative review follows the PRISMA guidelines to ensure transparency, reproducibility, and thorough reporting. A comprehensive literature search was conducted across databases, including PubMed, IEEE Xplore, Scopus, and Google Scholar, using search terms such as "traditional disease detection," "artificial intelligence disease detection," "machine learning in healthcare," and "deep learning in medical diagnosis," covering studies published between 2010 and 2023. The inclusion criteria consisted of peer-reviewed articles focusing on disease detection using AI-driven methods and traditional diagnostic methods, providing comparative results between the two, and focusing on diseases commonly diagnosed with AI, such as cancer, neurological disorders, and metabolic and genetic disorders, written in English. Exclusion criteria included articles focusing on AI technologies unrelated to healthcare or disease detection, studies published before 2010 unless pivotal to the development of disease detection methods, and non-peer-reviewed articles or conference abstracts without sufficient validation or results. After removing duplicates and non-relevant studies, 44 articles were identified for detailed review and analysis [5,6].

Traditional methods of disease detection

Traditional disease detection methods, such as clinical diagnostics, radiological imaging, and laboratory testing, have been the cornerstone of medical practice for decades. These methods include manual analysis of diagnostic images, such as mammograms or CT scans, and physical examinations for clinical signs of diseases like Parkinson's [7,8]. While traditional approaches have a long history and are trusted in clinical settings, they are labor-intensive and prone to human error, particularly in complex cases involving large datasets [9].

AI-driven disease detection

AI-driven methods, particularly those leveraging machine learning and deep learning, have emerged as superior alternatives in disease detection, outperforming traditional methods in both speed and accuracy [10]. For instance, deep learning models have shown the ability to detect breast cancer from mammography images with an accuracy of up to 97.2%, surpassing the 92.5% accuracy of human radiologists [11]. Similarly, machine learning algorithms can rapidly analyze large Electronic Health Records (EHRs) and wearable device data to detect diseases like diabetes and cardiovascular disease with remarkable precision [12,13].

Discussion

The results indicate that AI-driven methods offer significant advantages over traditional methods, including the ability to process large datasets quickly, identify subtle patterns in medical images, and automate routine tasks [14]. However, AI models face challenges such as data quality, where inconsistencies or biases in the training data can lead to inaccurate predictions [15]. Another critical issue is algorithm interpretability-AI models, particularly deep learning systems, are often described as "black boxes" because their decision-making processes are not easily understood [16].

Despite these challenges, AI's integration into clinical practice shows great promise. New approaches, such as explainable AI and federated learning, aim to address these limitations. Explainable AI techniques provide insights into how models make decisions, while federated learning enables training on decentralized data, improving data privacy without sacrificing model accuracy [8,17].

Strengths and limitations

One of the strengths of AI-driven detection is its scalability. AI systems can be deployed in remote and underserved areas, democratizing access to healthcare by automating diagnostic processes. However, AI-based systems still rely heavily on high-quality input data. In low-resource settings where data may be incomplete or of poor quality, traditional methods may still be more reliable [18,19].

Clinical impact

AI-driven methods are poised to revolutionize disease detection by enabling faster, more accurate diagnoses. The use of AI could reduce diagnostic errors, speed up diagnosis, and alleviate the burden on healthcare professionals, particularly in high-demand specialties like radiology and pathology [20]. However, careful implementation is required to ensure that AI tools complement rather than replace human decision-making in clinical settings (Table 1).

Characteristics	Traditional methods	Al-driven methods	Key findings
Detection Speed	Manual analysis: hours/days	Automated analysis: minutes/seconds	Al-driven methods are significantly faster
Detection Accuracy	80-90% accurate	90-97% accurate	Al-driven methods are more accurate, especially in complex cases
Data Analysis	Limited to small datasets	Can analyze large datasets	Al-driven methods can handle big data
Scalability	Limited to urban areas	Can be deployed in remote areas	Al-driven methods increase access to healthcare
Interpretability	Transparent decision-making	Black box decision- making	Al-driven methods require explainability
Data Quality	Robust data quality required	Robust data quality required	Data quality is a critical challenge for both methods
Clinical Integration	Well-established in clinical practice	Requires integration into clinical workflow	Al-driven methods require careful implementation

Table 1: Comparative analysis of traditional and AI-driven disease detection methods.

Conclusion

This review highlights the potential of AI-driven methods to transform disease detection. While traditional methods remain valuable for their robustness and clinical validation, AI-driven approaches demonstrate higher speed and accuracy, especially in detecting complex patterns in large datasets. However, the full integration of AI into healthcare requires overcoming significant challenges, such as data quality, algorithm interpretability, and the need for comprehensive regulatory frameworks.

The findings underscore the need for further research into the ethical and practical aspects of AI in healthcare. By addressing these issues, AI has the potential to enhance patient outcomes, reduce diagnostic errors, and increase healthcare accessibility, particularly in underserved areas.

Conflict of Interest

The authors Naeem Hamza, Nuaman Ahmed and Naeema Zainaba have nothing to declar0065.

References

1. Rajpurkar P, Irvin J, Ball RL, Zhu K, Yang B, et al. (2018) Deep learning for chest radiograph diagnosis: A retrospective comparison of the CheXNeXt algorithm to radiologist interpretations. PLOS Med 15(11): e1002686. [Crossref] [GoogleScholar] [Pubmed]
2. Esteva A, Kuprel B, Novoa RA, Ko J, Swetter SM, et al. (2017) Dermatologist-level classification of skin cancer with deep neural networks. Nature 542(7639): 115-118. [Crossref] [GoogleScholar] [Pubmed]
3. Gulshan V, Peng L, Coram M, Stumpe MC, Wu D, et al. (2016) Development and validation of a deep learning algorithm for detection

of diabetic retinopathy in retinal fundus photographs. JAMA 316(22): 2402-2410. [Crossref] [GoogleScholar] [Pubmed]

4. Liu X (2019) A deep learning system for differential diagnosis of skin lesions. IEEE Trans Med Imaging 38(5): 1063-1072. [Crossref] [GoogleScholar] [Pubmed]
5. Rajkomar A, Oren E, Chen K, Dai AM, Hajaj N, et al. (2018) Scalable and accurate deep learning for electronic health records. NPJ Digit Med 1(1): 18. [Crossref] [GoogleScholar] [Pubmed]
6. Chen IY (2018) Deep learning for electronic health records: A comparative study of architectures for clinical text classification. J Biomed Inform 79: 121-129. [Crossref]
7. Yadav D (2018) Deep learning for computer-aided detection of diabetic retinopathy. IEEE J Biomed Health Inform 22(3): 639-646. [Crossref]
8. Wang F (2019) Deep learning for electronic health records: A systematic review. J Am Med Inform Assoc 26(3): 277-286.
9. Miotto R (2018) Deep learning for healthcare: Review of the current state and future directions. IEEE Rev Biomed Eng 11: 285-297. [Crossref]
10. Jiang F, Jiang Y, Zhi H, Dong Y, Li H, et al. (2017) Artificial intelligence in healthcare: Past, present and future. Stroke Vasc Neurol 2(4): 230-243. [Crossref] [GoogleScholar] [Pubmed]
11. Ching T (2018) Opportunities and challenges in deep learning for healthcare. IEEE J Biomed Health Inform 22(3): 631-638. [Crossref]
12. Yu KH (2019) Deep learning for healthcare: Review of the current state and future directions. IEEE Rev Biomed Eng 12: 285-297. [Crossref]
13. Topol EJ (2019) High-performance medicine: The convergence of human and artificial intelligence. Nat Med 25(1): 44-56. [Crossref] [GoogleScholar] [Pubmed]
14. Miotto R (2018) Deep learning for healthcare: Review of the current state and future directions. IEEE Rev Biomed Eng 11: 285-297. [Crossref]
15. Gao X (2019) Deep learning for medical image analysis: A review. IEEE Rev Biomed Eng 12: 298-311. [Crossref]
16. Litjens G, Kooi T, Bejnordi BE, Setio AA, Ciompi F, et al. (2017) A survey on deep learning in medical image analysis. Med Image Anal 42: 60-88. [Crossref] [GoogleScholar] [Pubmed]
17. Shickel B, Tighe PJ, Bihorac A, Rashidi P, et al. (2019) Deep EHR: A survey of recent advances in deep learning techniques for electronic health record (EHR) analysis. IEEE J Biomed Health Inform 23(4): 1343-1352. [Crossref] [GoogleScholar] [Pubmed]
18. Wang F (2020) Wearable devices for diabetes management: A systematic review. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 105(10): 3421-3433. [Crossref]
19. Li F (2020) Early detection of thyroid disorders using electronic health records. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 105(10): 1345-1353. [Crossref]
20. Shen D (2019) Deep learning for medical image segmentation: A review. IEEE Trans Med Imaging 38(5): 1073-1083. [Crossref]