THE USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN THE HEALTHCARE SYSTEMS OF SAUDI ARABIA AND THE UNITED KINGDOM: A COMPARATIVE STUDY

Mohsen Almakrami[1*], Abdulraoof Alnajrani[2], Rami A. Aldawsari[3], Thekra Mudhhi Hattan[4], Esmail Hassan Alnajrani[5], Kharsan Ali Alyami[6], Sami Ali Alyami[7], Ibrahim Mohammed Alzarar[8], Youssef Mohammed Alzaarar[9], Hamad Alrabie[10], Mohammed Salem Alsuliman[11], Hussain Abdullah Al Bishr[12] and Hussain Mansour Alabbas[13]

[1]*Department of pathology and laboratory medicine King Khaled hospital and Population health department Najran 66262, Email: mmalmakrami@moh.gov.sa, https://orcid.org/0009-0002-2595-5009.*
[2]*Radiology Department Maternity hospital, Ministry of health King Abdulaziz Rd Najran 66258.*
[3]*Ministry of Heath, Central Blood Bank Najran, 66271, Email: RaawAldawsari@moh.gov.sa.*
[4]*Medical Secretary Department at Iradah and Mental health Complex, Ministry of health, Najran 66248F.*
5*Central Sterile Services Department at NGH, Najran General Hospital West. 66277.*
[6]*Department of pharmacy at New Najran General Hospital, 66277 Saudi Arabia. Email: Kkaass-1983@hotmail.com*
[7]*Medical and quality department, Minsinty of health branch 66255 Najran, Email: s111mi@hotmail.com*
[8]*King Khaled hospital Najran 66262, Pathology department, Email: Ialzurur@moh.gov.sa*
[9]*Khabash General Hospital, Pathology lab department, Email: Yalzurur@moh.gov.sa*
[10]*King Khaled hospital Najran 66262, Pathology department, Email: hoalrabie@moh.gov.sa*
[11]*King Khaled hospital Najran 66262, Pathology department, Email: malsuliman@moh.gov.sa*
[12]*Ministry of health najran branch 66255.Population health department, Email: aboofam05577@gmail.com*
[13]*Najran General Hospital West, Department of public health, 66277, Email: abo-mansour3@hotmail.com*

Corresponding Author: Mohsen Almakrami
(mmalmakrami@moh.gov.sa)

ABSTRACT

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has become a transformative force in global healthcare, reshaping clinical workflows, diagnostics, population health management, and national health system governance. This article provides a comparative analysis of AI adoption in the healthcare systems of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom (UK), two countries with distinct governance models, regulatory traditions, and strategic priorities. Drawing on global frameworks such as OECD AI governance principles and national strategies including Saudi Arabia's Vision 2030 digital health agenda and the UK's NHS AI governance frameworks, the study examines how each nation approaches AI integration across policy, regulation, ethics, data infrastructure, and clinical implementation. Evidence is provided of the progress of the Saudi Arabian Health Ministry's AI driven telemedicine expansion and national ethics guidelines, as well as the frameworks underpinning the UK NHS AI governance and risk management systems. The analysis highlights key divergences in centralisation, regulatory maturity, data governance, and workforce readiness, while identifying shared challenges related to

algorithmic bias, interoperability, and ethical oversight. The article concludes with policy recommendations for strengthening responsible AI adoption in both systems.

KEYWORDS: Artificial Intelligence (AI), Saudi Arabia, United Kingdom, Healthcare System, Ethics.

---

1. INTRODUCTION

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is rapidly reshaping healthcare systems worldwide, offering unprecedented opportunities to improve diagnostic accuracy, optimise resource allocation, enhance patient experience, and support population-level health planning. As nations invest in digital transformation, AI has emerged as a strategic priority for governments seeking to modernise healthcare delivery and address systemic pressures such as rising demand, workforce shortages, and chronic disease burdens. Within this global context, Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom (UK) represent two compelling case studies for comparative analysis due to their contrasting governance structures, regulatory traditions, and national digital-health ambitions.

Saudi Arabia's healthcare transformation is driven by Vision 2030, a national modernisation programme that positions AI as a cornerstone of economic diversification and public-sector reform [1]. The Saudi Data and AI Authority [2] has established a comprehensive national strategy for data and AI, including ethical guidelines, regulatory frameworks, and large-scale digital-health initiatives. Evidence cited in AI NewsWire [3] highlights the Kingdom's rapid deployment of AI-enabled telemedicine, predictive analytics, and virtual-care platforms such as Seha Virtual Hospital, as well as its emphasis on national-level governance and centralised data infrastructure. These developments reflect a top-down model of digital transformation, characterised by strong state coordination and accelerated implementation [4].

In contrast, the UK's AI healthcare ecosystem is shaped by the long-established National Health Service (NHS), a publicly funded system with decentralised operational structures and a mature regulatory environment. The NHS AI Lab, the Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency [5], and NHS England have developed detailed governance frameworks for AI adoption, including risk-assessment tools, transparency requirements, and lifecycle oversight mechanisms. According to NHS reports, organisations within this body are increasingly adopting structured AI governance policies, including risk-management frameworks, data-protection protocols, and AI assurance checklists [6, 7]. This reflects a more cautious, evidence-driven approach to AI integration, shaped by regulatory complexity and legacy system constraints.

Comparing these two systems provides valuable insights into how governance models, regulatory philosophies, and national strategies influence AI adoption. Saudi Arabia's centralised, investment-driven model contrasts with the UK's decentralised, regulation-heavy approach, yet both nations face shared challenges related to ethical AI deployment, data interoperability, and workforce readiness. By analysing these dynamics, this article contributes to the growing body of research on AI in healthcare and offers policy recommendations for strengthening responsible, equitable, and sustainable AI adoption.

2. GLOBAL BACKGROUND: AI AS A TRANSFORMATIVE FORCE IN HEALTHCARE

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has emerged as one of the most influential technologies shaping contemporary healthcare systems. Globally, AI is being deployed to enhance diagnostic accuracy, optimise clinical workflows, support population-health analytics, and strengthen health-system resilience [8]. International organisations such as the OECD, WHO, and ITU have developed governance frameworks to guide responsible AI adoption, reflecting growing recognition of both the opportunities and risks associated with AI-enabled health systems [9].

The OECD highlights that AI has the potential to alleviate systemic pressures such as rising demand, workforce shortages, and the increasing burden of chronic diseases [10]. At the same time, the organisation emphasises the need for robust governance to mitigate risks related to workforce disruption, automation, and ethical concerns [11]. These insights align with broader global trends in which AI is positioned as a strategic tool for improving efficiency while simultaneously raising questions about safety, accountability, and equity.

Similarly, WHO's Global Initiative on AI for Health underscores the importance of establishing governance structures, normative guidance, and evidence-based standards to ensure trustworthy and ethically sound AI adoption [9]. The recommendations from the WHO highlight the need for transparent algorithms, rigorous validation, and ethical safeguards, particularly as AI systems become more complex and integrated into clinical decision-making. These global frameworks provide a foundation for national strategies, including those of Saudi Arabia and the UK, which must balance innovation with patient safety and public trust.

The use of AI in healthcare encompasses a wide range of technologies, including machine learning, deep learning, natural language processing,

computer vision, and predictive analytics. These technologies support diverse applications across the care continuum, such as clinical decision support systems, including tools that assist clinicians by analysing patient data and recommending diagnoses or treatments. It also offers medical imaging analysis, namely AI algorithms that detect abnormalities in radiology, pathology, and ophthalmology images. In addition, it produces predictive analytics for population health, including models that forecast disease outbreaks, hospital admissions, or patient deterioration. This leads to operational optimisation, meaning that AI systems can help streamline scheduling, resource allocation, and supply-chain management. It provides opportunities for virtual health and telemedicine practices, with platforms that enable remote consultations, triage, and chronic-disease monitoring. Finally, it ensures administrative automation, with AI tools that reduce the administrative burden through automated documentation, coding, and workflow management [12].

These applications illustrate the breadth of AI's potential impact, from improving clinical accuracy to enhancing system-level efficiency. However, they also introduce challenges related to algorithmic transparency, data quality, bias, and regulatory oversight.

A. Global Governance and Ethical Considerations

International bodies have emphasised the need for responsible AI governance to ensure safe and equitable deployment. The OECD's AI & Health reports [10, 11] stress that AI must be implemented within frameworks that protect privacy, ensure accountability, and promote fairness. These principles are echoed in WHO's guidance on AI ethics [9], which calls for the following essential elements: human oversight, transparency and explainability, data protection and privacy, equity and inclusiveness, and safety and robustness of the system.

These global principles serve as reference points for national strategies. Saudi Arabia's SDAIA and the UK's NHS AI governance frameworks both draw on these international norms, though they operationalise them differently due to variations in governance structures, regulatory traditions, and health-system design.

B. Ai Adoption Drivers and Barriers

Across countries, AI adoption in healthcare is shaped by several key drivers, which include differing digital transformation agendas, which are national strategies that prioritise AI as part of broader modernisation efforts. Another factor is government and private investment in the data infrastructure, which may include cloud platforms, electronic health records, and national data repositories. Workforce capacity and digital literacy is another driver, relevant to clinician readiness of healthcare workers to adopt and trust AI tools. Regulatory clarity sets out and enforces standards for AI validation, safety, and lifecycle oversight, while public trust and ethical acceptance influence societal attitudes towards data use and algorithmic decision-making.

Barriers to the wider adoption of AI include factors such as data fragmentation, prevalence of legacy IT systems, use of algorithmic bias and inequity, the lack of interoperability, and wider regulatory uncertainty within the healthcare system [13].

These challenges are experienced differently across countries. For example, Saudi Arabia's centralised governance model allows for rapid implementation but raises questions about data concentration and oversight. Conversely, the UK's decentralised NHS structure supports rigorous regulation but slows adoption due to organisational complexity. Both countries align with global principles from the OECD and WHO, but their implementation strategies differ significantly. These differences form the basis for the comparative analysis in later sections of this article.

3. USE OF AI IN THE SAUDI ARABIAN HEALTHCARE SYSTEM

Saudi Arabia and the UK occupy distinct positions within the global AI-in-health ecosystem. Current studies and reports reveal that Saudi Arabia is a rapid adopter, leveraging strong centralised governance and national-level investment to accelerate AI deployment within its healthcare system.

A. National Strategic Context: Vision 2030 And Digital Transformation

Saudi Arabia's approach to AI in healthcare is deeply embedded within Vision 2030, the Kingdom's national transformation programme designed to diversify the economy, modernise public services, and strengthen digital infrastructure [14]. Vision 2030 positions digital health as a strategic pillar, emphasising the integration of AI-enabled clinical systems, predictive analytics, and virtual-care platforms as mechanisms for improving population

health outcomes and system efficiency. This national agenda is operationalised through the Saudi Data and AI Authority [2], established in 2019 to lead the Kingdom's AI strategy, regulate data governance, and accelerate digital transformation across sectors.

SDAIA's mandate includes developing national AI policies, establishing ethical guidelines, and coordinating cross-government digital initiatives. Search-retrieved evidence highlights that Saudi Arabia has articulated a comprehensive national AI strategy that emphasises data governance, ethics, and AI-driven public-sector innovation. This centralised governance model enables rapid implementation and alignment across ministries, including the Ministry of Health (MoH), which plays a pivotal role in deploying AI solutions across the healthcare system [15].

Saudi Arabia's digital-health ambitions are further supported by large-scale investments in cloud infrastructure, national data platforms, and health-information systems. These investments underpin the Kingdom's efforts to build a data-rich ecosystem capable of supporting advanced AI applications, from clinical decision support to population-health analytics [15].

B. Institutional Leadership: Sdaia, Ministry of Health, And National Governance

Saudi Arabia's AI healthcare ecosystem is characterised by strong institutional coordination. The SDAIA serves as the central authority for AI governance, while the Ministry of Health oversees clinical implementation and digital-health integration. Together, these institutions have developed a governance model that emphasises centralised data management, unified digital-health standards, ethical oversight of AI systems, national-level interoperability frameworks, and encourages strategic partnerships with global technology firms [2].

The findings in the study by Al-Khalifa and Al-Shehri [14] indicate that Saudi Arabia has established AI ethics principles that guide the development and deployment of AI systems in healthcare. These principles emphasise fairness, transparency, accountability, and privacy, aligning with global frameworks such as the OECD and WHO. The Kingdom's ethical guidelines are designed to ensure that AI systems are deployed responsibly, particularly in sensitive domains such as clinical decision-making and patient data management.

This governance structure reflects a top-down model in which national authorities set strategic direction, regulatory standards, and implementation priorities. Such centralisation enables rapid scaling of AI initiatives but also raises questions about data concentration, transparency, and the balance between innovation and oversight.

C. Ai-Enabled Telemedicine and Virtual Care

According to the SDAIA [2], one of the most significant areas of AI adoption in Saudi Arabia is telemedicine, particularly through the Seha Virtual Hospital, one of the largest virtual-care platforms in the world. Search-retrieved evidence highlights that Saudi Arabia has rapidly expanded AI-enabled telemedicine services, integrating remote diagnostics, AI-driven triage, and virtual consultations into routine care delivery.

Key features of Saudi Arabia's AI-enabled telemedicine ecosystem include the adoption of AI-supported radiology and pathology analysis, remote monitoring for chronic diseases, virtual specialist consultations, AI-driven triage and symptom-checking tools, and it has encouraged effective integration with national electronic health records.

These innovations have been particularly impactful in improving access to care in remote and underserved regions, supporting the Kingdom's broader goals of enhancing equity and reducing geographic disparities in healthcare access. The rapid expansion of telemedicine reflects Saudi Arabia's strategic emphasis on digital-first healthcare, supported by national investment and strong institutional coordination. AI plays a central role in enabling scalable, efficient, and patient-centred virtual-care models [16].

D. Ai in Clinical Decision Support and Diagnostics

Saudi Arabia has also invested heavily in AI-enabled clinical decision support systems (CDSS) and diagnostic tools. Hospitals across the Kingdom are adopting AI algorithms for radiology image analysis, pathology slide interpretation, cardiology diagnostics, predictive analytics for patient deterioration, and the early detection of chronic diseases [15].

These applications are supported by national data platforms that aggregate clinical information from across the healthcare system, enabling the development of robust AI models. The Kingdom's investment in cloud infrastructure and data interoperability has facilitated the deployment of AI tools at scale, particularly in tertiary hospitals and specialised centres.

Saudi Arabia's approach to AI-enabled diagnostics aligns with its broader strategy of leveraging technology to enhance clinical accuracy, reduce diagnostic delays, and improve patient outcomes. This reflects a commitment to building a high-performance, data-driven healthcare system capable of meeting the needs of a rapidly growing population [1].

E. *Regulatory Frameworks and Ethical Oversight*

Regulation is a critical component of Saudi Arabia's AI healthcare ecosystem. The Saudi Food and Drug Authority [17] has developed guidelines for the regulation of AI-based medical devices, including requirements for validation, safety testing, and post-market surveillance. These guidelines align with international standards and reflect the Kingdom's commitment to ensuring the safety and reliability of AI systems.

Evidence from the SFDA [17] indicates that Saudi Arabia has also developed AI ethics principles that guide the responsible deployment of AI in healthcare. These principles emphasise fairness and non-discrimination, transparency and explainability, accountability and governance, privacy and data protection, the feature of human oversight. These ethical guidelines are integrated into national AI strategies and institutional governance frameworks, ensuring that AI systems are deployed in a manner that protects patient rights and promotes public trust.

F. *Data Infrastructure and Interoperability*

Saudi Arabia's AI healthcare ecosystem is underpinned by significant investment in data infrastructure. The Kingdom has developed national platforms for electronic health records (EHRs), widespread use of health-information exchange, cloud-based data storage, AI model training and deployment, and population-health analytics [1]. This infrastructure supports the development of large-scale, high-quality datasets that are essential for training AI models. It also enables interoperability across healthcare providers, facilitating seamless data exchange and supporting integrated care delivery.

Saudi Arabia's centralised approach to data governance allows for rapid scaling of AI initiatives but also requires robust safeguards to protect privacy and ensure ethical data use. The Kingdom's data-protection regulations, overseen by SDAIA, aim to balance innovation with privacy and security.

G. *Workforce Development and Capacity Building*

AI adoption in healthcare requires a skilled workforce capable of developing, deploying, and managing AI systems. Saudi Arabia has launched several initiatives to build digital and AI competencies among healthcare professionals, including training programmes in AI and data science, effective partnerships with universities and global technology firms, professional development courses for clinicians, and clear national AI education initiatives [3].

These efforts reflect the Kingdom's recognition that workforce readiness is essential for sustainable AI adoption. By investing in capacity building, Saudi Arabia aims to create a healthcare workforce that is digitally literate, AI-competent, and capable of leveraging advanced technologies to improve patient care.

To sum up, Saudi Arabia's AI healthcare ecosystem is characterised by centralised governance, rapid implementation, and large-scale investment in digital infrastructure. The Kingdom's strategic approach, anchored in Vision 2030 and led by SDAIA and the Ministry of Health, has enabled the deployment of AI across telemedicine, diagnostics, clinical decision support, and population-health analytics. While this model offers significant advantages in terms of scalability and alignment, it also raises important questions about data governance, transparency, and ethical oversight.

4. USE OF AI IN THE UNITED KINGDOM'S HEALTHCARE SYSTEM

The UK is a regulatory leader, developing detailed governance frameworks and assurance mechanisms to ensure safe and ethical AI use across its healthcare system.

A. *National Strategic Context: Nhs Digital Transformation and Ai Integration*

The United Kingdom's approach to AI in healthcare is shaped by the long-standing structure of the National Health Service (NHS), a publicly funded system founded on principles of universality, equity, and central stewardship. Over the past decade, the UK has positioned AI as a key enabler of its digital-transformation agenda, with national strategies emphasising data-driven healthcare, precision medicine, and AI-supported clinical workflows. Unlike Saudi Arabia's centralised, state-directed model, the UK's approach reflects a blend of national policy direction and local

organisational autonomy.

The UK government has articulated its ambitions through policy frameworks such as the NHS Long Term Plan [18], the NHS Digital Strategy [19], and the establishment of the NHS AI Lab in 2019. These initiatives aim to accelerate the safe adoption of AI across the NHS, focusing on areas such as diagnostics, triage, population-health analytics, and operational optimisation. The NHS AI Lab, in particular, plays a central role in funding innovation, evaluating AI technologies, and developing governance frameworks that ensure safety, transparency, and accountability.

Evidence from recent government publications [20], shows that NHS organisations are increasingly adopting structured AI governance policies, including risk-assessment frameworks, data-protection protocols, and AI assurance mechanisms. These frameworks reflect the UK's commitment to responsible innovation and align with broader national priorities around patient safety, ethical oversight, and regulatory compliance.

B. Regulatory Leadership: Mhra and Ai as a Medical Device

The UK is widely recognised as a global leader in the regulation of AI-based medical technologies. The Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) oversees the regulation of AI as a medical device (AIaMD), ensuring that AI systems meet rigorous standards for safety, performance, and clinical effectiveness. The MHRA's regulatory framework includes pre-market validation, post-market surveillance, lifecycle oversight for adaptive AI systems, transparency and explainability requirements, and risk-classification standards [5].

This regulatory maturity distinguishes the UK from many other countries and provides a robust foundation for the safe deployment of AI in clinical settings. The MHRA has also been actively developing new frameworks for adaptive AI, recognising that machine-learning systems may evolve over time and require continuous monitoring.

National guidelines highlight that NHS organisations are adopting governance tools aligned with MHRA principles, including AI risk-management checklists, model-validation protocols, and data-protection assessments [21]. These tools help ensure that AI systems deployed within the NHS meet national regulatory standards and align with ethical and legal requirements.

C. Institutional Governance: Nhs England, Nhs Ai Lab, And Local Trusts

AI governance in the UK is shaped by a multi-layered institutional structure involving NHS England, which sets national policy direction and digital-health strategy, the NHS AI Lab, which funds innovation, evaluates AI tools, and develops assurance frameworks. It also involves Integrated Care Systems (ICSs), which coordinate regional health and care services, and the NHS Trusts, which implement AI solutions at the organisational level [22].

This structure reflects the UK's decentralised model, in which national bodies provide strategic direction while local organisations retain operational autonomy. Search-retrieved evidence shows that NHS Trusts are increasingly adopting AI governance policies, including AI lifecycle management frameworks, ethical-risk assessments, data-protection impact assessments (DPIAs), wide transparency and accountability mechanisms. These governance tools ensure that AI systems are deployed responsibly and align with national standards for safety, ethics, and data protection [23].

D. Ai in Diagnostics and Clinical Decision Support

The UK has been at the forefront of deploying AI in diagnostics, particularly in radiology, pathology, and ophthalmology. NHS organisations have adopted AI tools for the early detection of cancers, the production of automated image analysis, risk stratification for cardiovascular disease, predictive analytics for patient deterioration, and clinical decision support in emergency departments [24].

These applications are supported by national programmes such as the AI in Health and Care Award, which funds the development and evaluation of AI technologies across the NHS. The UK's emphasis on rigorous evaluation ensures that AI tools are clinically validated before widespread deployment, reflecting a cautious but evidence-driven approach to innovation.

E. Data Infrastructure and Interoperability Challenges

Data infrastructure is a critical component of the UK's AI healthcare ecosystem. The NHS has invested heavily in electronic health records (EHRs), national data platforms, interoperability standards, secure data environments (SDEs), and population-health analytics systems. However, the UK faces significant challenges related to legacy IT systems, data fragmentation, and variable digital maturity across NHS Trusts. These challenges hinder the seamless integration of AI tools and limit the scalability of

AI-enabled solutions.

Search-retrieved evidence indicates that NHS organisations are adopting governance frameworks to address these challenges, including data-quality standards, risk-management tools, and AI assurance checklists. These frameworks help ensure that AI systems are deployed in environments that support safe and effective operation.

F. Ethical and Legal Considerations

Ethical oversight is a central component of the UK's AI governance model. Key ethical considerations include algorithmic fairness, transparency and explainability, patient consent and autonomy, data privacy and security, and accountability for AI-driven decisions [25].

The UK's legal framework, including the Data Protection Act 2018 and the UK GDPR, provides strong protections for patient data and establishes clear requirements for data processing, consent, and privacy. NHS organisations must conduct Data Protection Impact Assessments (DPIAs) for AI systems, ensuring that ethical and legal risks are identified and mitigated.

G. Workforce Readiness and Capacity Building

AI adoption in the NHS requires a workforce that is digitally literate, confident in using AI tools, and capable of interpreting AI-generated insights. The UK has launched several initiatives to build workforce capacity, including digital-skills training programmes, AI education for clinicians, professional development courses, and partnerships with universities and industry.

These initiatives aim to ensure that clinicians can effectively integrate AI into clinical workflows and maintain oversight of AI-supported decision-making, keeping the focus on patient-centred healthcare [26].

To sum up, the UK's AI healthcare ecosystem is characterised by regulatory maturity, institutional governance, and a cautious, evidence-driven approach to innovation. While the UK faces challenges related to legacy systems and data fragmentation, its strong regulatory frameworks and ethical oversight mechanisms position it as a global leader in responsible AI adoption. The UK's decentralised model contrasts sharply with Saudi Arabia's centralised approach, setting the stage for a rich comparative analysis in the next section.

5. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS, CHALLENGES AND ETHICS

This section examines the different models of AI adoption that exist in both countries, along with the associated governance models, regulatory frameworks and ethical considerations.

A. Comparative Overview: Two Divergent Models of Ai Adoption

Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom represent two distinct paradigms of AI adoption in healthcare. Saudi Arabia's model is characterised by centralised governance, rapid implementation, and national-level coordination, driven by Vision 2030 and the Saudi Data and AI Authority (SDAIA). In contrast, the UK's model reflects a decentralised, regulation-heavy, and evidence-driven approach shaped by the NHS, the MHRA, and local Trust-level governance frameworks.

Search-retrieved evidence shows that Saudi Arabia has rapidly expanded AI-enabled telemedicine and virtual-care platforms, while the UK has focused on developing detailed AI governance policies, risk-assessment frameworks, and assurance mechanisms. These differences reflect broader structural, cultural, and regulatory distinctions between the two systems.

B. Governance Models: Centralisation Vs. Decentralisation

Saudi Arabia: Centralised Governance

Saudi Arabia's governance model is highly centralised, with SDAIA and the Ministry of Health setting national strategy, regulatory standards, and implementation priorities. This centralisation enables the rapid scaling of AI initiatives, unified data-governance frameworks, national interoperability standards, and coordinated investment in digital infrastructure. This model aligns with broader Vision 2030 reforms and supports the Kingdom's ambition to become a global leader in AI adoption [27].

C. United Kingdom: Decentralised Governance

The UK's governance model is more fragmented, reflecting the structure of the NHS. National bodies such as NHS England and the NHS AI Lab set strategic direction, but implementation occurs at the level of Integrated Care Systems (ICSs), the various regional NHS Trusts, the direction of local digital-transformation teams. Search-retrieved evidence shows that NHS Trusts are adopting AI governance policies that include risk-management frameworks, data-protection protocols, and AI lifecycle oversight. This decentralisation supports local autonomy but slows national-level scaling.

In brief, Saudi Arabia's centralised model supports speed, while the UK's decentralised model supports rigour. Both approaches have strengths and limitations, and both countries could benefit from adopting elements of the other's governance philosophy.

D. Regulatory Frameworks: Maturity Vs. Acceleration

Saudi Arabia

Saudi Arabia's regulatory frameworks for AI in healthcare are rapidly evolving. The Saudi Food and Drug Authority (SFDA) has developed guidelines for AI-based medical devices, and SDAIA has issued national AI ethics principles. These frameworks emphasise fairness, transparency, accountability, privacy, and guarantee human oversight. Evidence from the SDAIA [2] confirms the existence of national AI ethics guidelines that shape clinical deployment.

United Kingdom

The UK is recognised as a global leader in AI regulation. The MHRA has developed detailed frameworks for AI as a medical device (AIaMD), adaptive AI systems, post-market surveillance, transparency and explainability. Evidence from NHS England [7] shows that NHS organisations are adopting governance tools aligned with MHRA principles, including AI assurance checklists and risk-assessment frameworks.

In brief, Saudi Arabia's regulatory model is emerging but ambitious, while the UK's model is mature but cautious. Saudi Arabia benefits from speed and alignment; the UK benefits from safety and accountability.

E. Data Governance and Interoperability

Saudi Arabia has invested heavily in national data platforms, cloud infrastructure, and interoperability frameworks. This centralised approach supports large-scale data aggregation, AI model training, population-health analytics, and unified EHR integration. However, centralisation raises concerns about data concentration, privacy, and oversight.

The UK faces challenges related to its legacy IT systems, which are often incompatible across Trusts, data fragmentation, variable digital maturity across Trusts, all of which leads to interoperability gaps. Evidence from NHS England [7] shows that NHS organisations are adopting governance frameworks to address these issues, including data-quality standards and AI risk-management tools.

To sum up, Saudi Arabia excels in infrastructure coherence, while the UK excels in data-protection rigour. Both systems face challenges in achieving seamless interoperability.

F. Clinical Adoption and Workforce Readiness

Saudi Arabia's rapid AI adoption is supported by national training programmes, partnerships with global technology firms, AI education initiatives, and digital-skills development for clinicians. This reflects a proactive approach to building a digitally literate workforce.

The UK has launched several initiatives to build workforce capacity, including AI education for clinicians, professional development programmes, digital-skills frameworks, and partnerships with universities and industry. However, workforce readiness varies significantly across regions and Trusts.

In brief, both countries recognise the importance of workforce development, but Saudi Arabia's centralised model enables more uniform implementation, while the UK's decentralised model results in variability.

G. Ethical Challenges: Bias, Transparency, and Accountability, Algorithmic Bias

Both countries face risks related to algorithmic bias, particularly in AI models trained on non-representative datasets. Saudi Arabia's diverse population and the UK's multi-ethnic demographics both require careful attention to fairness and equity.

The UK places strong emphasis on explainability, driven by MHRA requirements and NHS governance frameworks. Saudi Arabia's ethical guidelines also emphasise transparency, but implementation varies across institutions.

The UK has clearer accountability structures due to its regulatory maturity. Saudi Arabia's accountability frameworks are evolving but increasingly aligned with global

It is evident that both systems recognise the importance of ethical AI, but the UK's regulatory environment provides stronger enforcement mechanisms.

H. Operational Challenges: Scaling, Integration, And Sustainability

Saudi Arabia faces several operational challenges, which include scaling AI across diverse regions, ensuring data privacy in centralised systems, balancing innovation with oversight, sustaining long-term investment.

The United Kingdom faces operational challenges, which include integrating AI into legacy

systems, ensuring interoperability across Trusts, managing organisational resistance, and securing long-term funding.

Saudi Arabia's challenges are primarily strategic and ethical, while the UK's challenges are technical and organisational. Saudi Arabia and the UK represent two contrasting but complementary models of AI adoption in healthcare. Saudi Arabia's centralised, investment-driven approach enables rapid implementation and national alignment, while the UK's decentralised, regulation-heavy model ensures safety, accountability, and ethical oversight. Both systems face challenges related to data governance, interoperability, workforce readiness, and ethical risk management. Understanding these differences provides valuable insights for policymakers seeking to strengthen responsible AI adoption.

6. FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND CONCLUSION

As AI continues to evolve, both Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom face critical decisions about how to shape the next decade of digital-health transformation. While their governance models differ, both countries share opportunities to strengthen responsible AI adoption through targeted policy interventions, investment strategies, and ethical safeguards.

Saudi Arabia can enhance its centralised model by deepening regulatory transparency, expanding public-engagement mechanisms, and strengthening independent oversight bodies. The UK, meanwhile, can streamline its decentralised governance by improving inter-Trust coordination, reducing regulatory fragmentation, and accelerating national interoperability standards.

Saudi Arabia's national data platforms provide a strong foundation for AI, but future progress requires continued investment in privacy-preserving technologies, federated learning, and secure data environments. The UK must prioritise modernising legacy systems, harmonising data standards, and expanding cross-system interoperability to support scalable AI deployment.

Both countries should expand AI-focused clinical training, multidisciplinary education, and professional development programmes. Saudi Arabia's centralised training initiatives can serve as a model for national alignment, while the UK's academic-industry partnerships offer a blueprint for innovation-driven capacity building. Saudi Arabia and the UK must continue to operationalise ethical frameworks through bias-mitigation protocols,

explainability requirements, human-in-the-loop oversight, and transparent model-validation processes.

National healthcare guidelines confirm that both countries have established ethical guidelines for AI deployment, but implementation must be strengthened to ensure fairness and accountability. Both nations can benefit from deeper engagement with OECD, WHO, and global AI-ethics consortia. Such international collaboration will support shared regulatory standards, cross-border data-governance frameworks, global AI-safety research, and the benchmarking of clinical AI performance. Such collaboration is essential for ensuring that AI systems are safe, equitable, and interoperable across borders.

In conclusion, Artificial Intelligence is reshaping healthcare systems worldwide, offering transformative potential for improving clinical outcomes, enhancing operational efficiency, and strengthening population-health management. Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom represent two contrasting but complementary models of AI adoption. Saudi Arabia's centralised, investment-driven approach enables rapid implementation and national alignment, while the UK's decentralised, regulation-heavy model ensures rigorous oversight, ethical accountability, and patient safety.

Search-retrieved evidence demonstrates that Saudi Arabia has rapidly expanded AI-enabled telemedicine and virtual-care platforms, while the UK has developed detailed AI governance frameworks, risk-assessment tools, and assurance mechanisms. These differences reflect broader structural, cultural, and regulatory distinctions between the two systems.

Despite their differences, both countries face shared challenges related to data governance, interoperability, algorithmic bias, workforce readiness, and ethical oversight. Addressing these challenges requires sustained investment, robust governance, and a commitment to responsible innovation.

By learning from each other's strengths—Saudi Arabia's strategic alignment and rapid scaling, and the UK's regulatory maturity and ethical rigor—both nations can build more resilient, equitable, and AI-enabled healthcare systems. As AI continues to evolve, the future of healthcare will depend on the ability of policymakers, clinicians, technologists, and regulators to collaborate in shaping systems that are not only technologically advanced but also safe, transparent, and centred on patient well-being.

REFERENCES

AI Newswire. (2024). Saudi Arabia's AI driven healthcare transformation.

Al Khalifa, H. S., & Al Shehri, A. (2023). Artificial intelligence in Saudi Arabian healthcare: Opportunities and challenges. Journal of Medical Systems, 47(2), 1–15.

Al Turaiki, I., & Alturki, N. (2022). AI enabled telemedicine in the Gulf region: A systematic review. Health Informatics Journal, 28(4), 1–18.

Alasiri, A. A., & Mohammed, V. (2022). Healthcare transformation in Saudi Arabia: an overview since the launch of vision 2030. Health services insights, 15, 11786329221121214.

Alderwick, H., & Dixon, J. (2019). The NHS long term plan. bmj, 364.

Blease, C., Kaptchuk, T., Bernstein, M., et al. (2023). Artificial intelligence and the future of clinical decision making. The Lancet Digital Health, 5(1), e12–e20.

Department of Health and Social Care. (2022). Data saves lives: Reshaping health and social care with data. UK Government.

European Commission. (2021). Ethics guidelines for trustworthy AI.

Grand, S. R., & Wolff, K. (2022). ASSESSING SAUDI VISION 2030: A 2020 REVIEW. Atlantic Council. Grand, S. R., & Wolff, K. (2022). ASSESSING SAUDI VISION 2030: A 2020 REVIEW. Atlantic Council.

Greenhalgh, T., Wherton, J., & Shaw, S. (2022). Digital transformation in the NHS: Lessons from the front line. BMJ, 376, e067447.

Healthcare World. (2024). Saudi Arabia AI governance and ethics overview.

MHRA. (2023). Software and AI as a medical device: UK regulatory framework.

MIAA NHS AI Governance Checklist. (2025/26). AI assurance and governance standards.

NHS AI Lab. (2023). AI in Health and Care Award: Evaluation report.

NHS England. (2022). NHS digital strategy: Data, digital and technology for the future.

NHS Trust AI Governance Policy. (2025). AI governance and risk management framework.

NHS Trust AI Governance Policy. (2025). AI governance and risk management framework.

OECD. (2021). Artificial intelligence in health: Risks, opportunities, and governance.

OECD. (2022). AI and the future of the health workforce.

PricewaterhouseCoopers. (2023). AI in healthcare: Global trends and strategic insights.

Royal College of Physicians. (2023). Ethical deployment of AI in clinical practice.

SDAIA. (2022). National strategy for data and AI: Healthcare applications.

SFDA. (2023). Regulatory guidelines for AI based medical devices.

Solaiman, B. (2024). Regulating AI-based medical devices in Saudi Arabia: new legal paradigms in an evolving global legal order. Asian Bioethics Review, 16(3), 373-389.

Topol, E. (2019). Deep medicine: How artificial intelligence can make healthcare human again. Basic Books.

WHO. (2021). Ethics and governance of artificial intelligence for health.

WHO. (2022). Global strategy on digital health 2020–2025.

First A. Author: (M'76–SM'81–F'87) and the other authors may include biographies at the end of regular papers. Biographies are often not included in conference-related papers. This author became a Member (M) of IAENG in 1976. The first paragraph may contain a place and/or date of birth (list place, then date). Next, the author's educational background is listed. The degrees should be listed with type of degree in what field, which institution, city, state, and country, and year degree was earned. The author's major field of study should be lower-cased.

The second paragraph uses the pronoun of the person (he or she) and not the author's last name. It lists military and work experience, including summer and fellowship jobs. Job titles are capitalized. The current job must have a location; previous positions may be listed without one. Information concerning previous publications may be included. Try not to list more than three books or published articles. The format for listing publishers of a book within the biography is: title of book (city, state: publisher name, year) similar to a reference. Current and previous research interests end the paragraph.

The third paragraph begins with the author's title and last name (e.g., Dr. Smith, Prof. Jones, Mr. Kajor, Ms. Hunter). List any memberships in professional societies other than the IAENG. Finally, list any awards and work for IAENG committees and publications. If a photograph is provided, the biography will be indented around it. The photograph is placed at the top left of the biography. Personal hobbies will be deleted from the biography.