Harkish Sen, 2026, 14:2
ISSN (Online): 2348-4098
ISSN (Print): 2395-4752

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Technology
An Open Access Journal

Navigating the Ethical Landscape of Generative AI in the Pharmaceutical Sector: Embedding an ethical framework to ensure responsible innovation

Harkish Sen

Abstract- The swift development and implementation of Generative Artificial Intelligence (Gen AI) in pharmaceuticals delivers significant transformative potential that can revolutionize drug discovery as well as clinical development processes together with manufacturing and commercial operations. Significant benefits from Gen AI include better efficiency combined with lower costs and faster research timelines leading to personalized medicine solutions. This technology innovation introduces major ethical and regulatory issues related to the responsible creation and management of AI-generated outputs. This research identifies the urgent necessity for an actionable framework that guides ethical practices in pharmaceutical Gen AI within industry standards while adhering to new rules such as the European Union's Artificial Intelligence Act (EU AI Act 2024). Although current AI ethics guidelines provide useful guidance they fall short in delivering the detailed domain-specific focus needed to tackle the specific challenges within the pharmaceutical industry. Without a precise actionable framework pharmaceutical companies face risks such as biased algorithms worsening health disparities, breaches of patient privacy through misused data and public trust erosion because of insufficient transparency and accountability. The EU AI Act requires strict adherence from high-risk AI systems which includes numerous Gen AI pharmaceutical applications and mandates proactive compliance steps. The research introduces a dual approach strategy to tackle the existing challenges. The research presents a new simplified framework that enables pharmaceutical companies to operationalize data-driven ethics in Gen AI applications. This framework is built upon four core ethical principles: transparency, accountability, privacy, and equity. The framework converts these principles into actionable guidelines which apply to key areas within the pharmaceutical value chain such as drug discovery activities and clinical trial operations along with manufacturing and commercial practices. The framework makes a clear distinction between a superficial "checkbox" compliance model and an ethically-centered approach which it identifies as crucial for responsible innovation and sustainable progress. The EU AI Act's implications are interwoven throughout the text which enumerates the specific requirements and obligations for each principle. The paper makes the case for transitioning from isolated ethics processes to a comprehensive, agile organization-wide approach to AI ethics. The paper suggests that ethical responsibility should be distributed throughout all organizational functions instead of restricting it to legal or compliance departments which allows multidisciplinary teams to address potential ethical issues in their specific areas of work. This method develops an ethical culture while embedding ethical considerations into Gen AI design and deployment from the beginning to promote "ethics by design."

Keywords: Generative Artificial Intelligence (Gen AI), Pharmaceutical Industry, AI Ethics, European Union Artificial Intelligence Act (EU AI Act 2024), Drug Discovery, Clinical Development, Data Privacy, Transparency, Accountability, Equity, Responsible AI, Regulatory Compliance, Ethics by Design.Predictive Analytics, Data Visualization, Cloud Computing, Explainable AI, AutoML.

I. INTRODUCTION

Context and Background

The pharmaceutical industry has entered a new phase powered by swift developments in artificial intelligence including generative AI. The technology is based on vast large language machine learning models and has the ability to produce novel pharmaceutical content, ranging from text and images to intricate molecular structures. Gen AI presents extraordinary transformation potential, for example, ranging from drug discovery as well, research and development and operational delivery systems.

Gen AI's potential economic value generation for pharmaceutical and medical-product industries reaches $60 billion to $110 billion per year according to a 2023 McKinsey report. The McKinsey report estimates that generative AI will create 110 billion dollars in economic value every year for the pharmaceutical and medical-product industries. Gen AI promises extensive advantages such as faster research progress, lowered development expenses, individualized medical treatments and improved manufacturing and supply chain processes. These technological improvements create an exciting possibility for delivering critical medical treatments to consumers with unprecedented speed and efficiency.

Statement of the Problem

The integration of Gen AI into pharmaceuticals presents transformative opportunities but faces multiple ethical challenges. The fundamental issue lies in the absence of a defined practical framework that is specific to the pharmaceutical sector for addressing Gen AI's ethical complexities. Although existing ethical guidelines for AI provide useful principles they fail to deliver the detailed and specialized approach needed to tackle the distinct challenges this industry faces. Morley et al. demonstrated in their 2023 Nature Machine Intelligence paper that domain-specific ethical frameworks are necessary to manage AI deployment complexities across various industries. The lack of specific guidelines generates critical risks such as creating biased algorithms that worsen health disparities along with compromising patient privacy through improper handling of sensitive information and diminishing public trust because of perceived transparency and accountability deficits in AI-based decision-making. According to a 2022 publication from the Ada Lovelace Institute, algorithmic bias within healthcare systems can produce substantial harm specifically for marginalized communities.

Significance of the Problem

Gen AI's ethical implications in pharmaceutical settings transcend theoretical debates because they manifest as real-world consequences. Healthcare systems using biased algorithms produce inaccurate diagnoses and treatment plans while limiting access to essential care services for at-risk groups. Research published in The Lancet Digital Health (2023) demonstrated that AI models trained with data from mainly white patients showed poor performance when analyzing patients with darker skin tones which exposes the dangers of algorithmic bias in dermatology. When privacy breaches occur they reveal sensitive patient details which result in discrimination and stigmatization and degrade public trust toward healthcare services. Al-Akayleh and Agha (2024) in their publication draw attention to trust and ethical approaches due to the growing influence of artificial intelligence applications in genomics. The pharmaceutical industry's legitimacy suffers when public trust decreases because it prevents the widespread adoption of positive AI technologies. The sustainable development of transformative technology requires pharmaceutical companies to meet ethical standards, because addressing these ethical challenges represents both a moral duty and a business obligation.

Research Questions

This paper seeks to address the following research questions:

When implementing Gen AI, what are the primary ethical concerns that pharmaceutical companies need to consider, particularly in light of the EU AI Act?

What approach can be taken to create a streamlined, practical framework that fits pharmaceutical needs

while also meeting the demands of emerging regulatory standards?

How can organizations establish a strategy for embedding AI ethics into daily operations which goes beyond traditional regulatory and compliance boundaries?

Purpose and Scope

This paper presents a practical framework for ethical Gen AI deployment in the pharmaceutical industry while promoting an agile organizational approach to AI ethics. This study examines ethical concerns about Gen AI utilization in the pharmaceutical sector specifically through the development and deployment of AI-generated outputs. Although this research recognizes the wider ethical issues in AI and healthcare it does not address them as its main focus.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The review investigates existing studies on Generative AI applications within the pharmaceutical sector and explores ethical concerns across AI as well as healthcare-focused ethical guidelines. The study identifies a significant literature gap concerning actionable ethical frameworks for Gen AI deployment in pharmaceutical settings which aligns with the research questions from Section 1.4.

Generative AI in the Pharmaceutical Industry

The use of Gen AI in pharmaceuticals is growing fast with the potential to bring major improvements throughout the entire value chain. The work of Vamathevan et al. (2019) presents a detailed analysis of AI applications in drug discovery, showing how early generative models assist in target identification and validation. Their findings emphasize how AI enhances research timelines through rapid analysis of extensive genomic and proteomic datasets to identify drug targets faster than conventional approaches. The study directly answers research question 1 by determining that efficiency represents an essential ethical aspect because rapid drug development enables faster access to critical medications. Vamathevan et al. express concerns regarding the potential data biases that could affect the training of AI models. Drug targets developed from biased data may fail to work universally and this creates equity and access issues that connect with research question 1 and research question 2 which calls for an ethical framework.

Gen AI presents significant potential within the realm of developing new drug candidates. In their study published in Nature Biotechnology (2022), Zhavoronkov et al. successfully applied Gen AI techniques to create new drug candidates for a specific kinase target within an impressively brief period. This showcases a major pro: This highlights a critical advantage through substantial reductions in both drug development expenses and required timeframes. Traditional drug discovery methods demand extensive time and resources with projects typically extending beyond ten years and costing billions of dollars. Gen AI technology holds great promise to accelerate and simplify the existing drug discovery process. Some Gen AI models' inability to provide transparent reasoning represents a significant drawback. Although Zhavoronkov et al. produced remarkable outcomes their AI's molecular generation mechanisms remain unclear which creates transparency and accountability issues that connect to research questions 1 and 3 about ethics and organizational execution. The inability to explain AI processes might obstruct regulatory approval and acceptance among medical professionals.

Gen AI extends its application beyond drug discovery to enhance clinical trial design and patient recruitment processes. According to Oye et al. (2023) AI technology enables the identification of ideal patient groups and prediction of trial results while creating synthetic control arms to shorten trial times and minimize expenses. The pro here is clear: The benefits include streamlined clinical trials that achieve cost-efficiency while potentially speeding up new drug approvals and lowering expenses for patients and healthcare providers. The research question 2 framework gains its "sustainable innovation" component through this contribution. Unfortunately, this approach may worsen current biases regarding who participates in clinical trials. AI models trained on datasets lacking adequate

representation from some demographic groups could unintentionally exclude those populations from trials which would restrict the results' applicability and create barriers to equal treatment access. The issue connects to research question 1's equity principle and demonstrates the necessity of ethical awareness throughout the organization (research question 3).

Deloitte's 2023 report identifies how GenAI can be utilized to analyze patient data while creating adaptable personalized treatment plans. The advantage lies in enhanced ability to customize treatments to individual patient needs while minimizing reliance on generalized treatment approaches. The risk of inaccurate predictions and patient recommendations presents a significant health impact. These findings connect with research question 1 while emphasizing the importance of accountability and consistent monitoring as best practices.

Ethical Considerations in AI

The broad field of AI ethics establishes essential groundwork for identifying and comprehending the ethical dilemmas that Gen AI brings to the pharmaceutical industry. The possibility of bias in AI algorithms represents a key issue that requires attention. Barocas and Selbst (2016) perform a detailed examination of the origins and effects of bias within machine learning systems in their vital publication "Big Data's Disparate Impact." According to researchers, algorithms that appear neutral can build upon and intensify societal biases when their training data displays those same biases. This drawback affects every AI system with particular significance for Gen AI applications in the pharmaceutical sector. Drug candidates generated by Gen AI models for drug discovery may prove ineffective or dangerous for underrepresented populations when training data favors certain demographic groups. The "equity" principle of the ethical framework experiences a direct impact from this situation.

Machine learning fairness represents a concept that is directly related to this topic. The work of Mehrabi et al. (2021) presents an extensive examination of fairness concepts in machine learning that encompasses different definitions and methods to mitigate such issues. The challenge of defining fairness stems from conflicting definitions that also hinder its achievement. The advantage of employing fairness-aware machine learning methods lies in their capacity to reduce bias while advancing fair outcomes. The main drawback of fairness-focused machine learning techniques lies in their inconsistent effectiveness and potential to generate new biases when applied unsystematically. The various aspects of fairness demonstrate why AI ethics in pharma requires a detailed approach that takes into account specific contexts while responding to research question 1.

Transparency alongside explainability stands as essential components of ethical considerations. Mittelstadt et al. (2022) maintain that algorithmic transparency serves as a fundamental element for establishing trust in artificial intelligence systems. The authors maintain that users in healthcare require systems that elucidate AI decision-making processes because their decisions hold significant consequences. The primary benefit of transparency lies in its capacity to enable stakeholders to review and assess AI systems which helps them to uncover and correct any existing biases or mistakes. Achieving genuine transparency proves difficult because complex Gen AI models present significant technical obstacles. The challenge demonstrates the importance of creating a functional framework which maintains transparency balance with complex AI systems' realities (research question 2) and develops organizational methods to advance transparency (research question 3).

Responsible usage of AI systems depends on maintaining strong accountability standards. Diakopoulos (2016) examines the obstacles to algorithmic accountability while emphasizing the necessity of establishing distinct accountability lines for AI systems' development and operational results. Clear accountability mechanisms promote responsible behavior while providing a formal process to address any resulting harms. One disadvantage is that determining accountability for complex AI systems proves challenging because

numerous parties participate in both the development and deployment phases. The complexity of assigning accountability within AI systems demonstrates why organizations need to adopt a comprehensive ethics framework that distributes responsibility among various teams and departments (research question 3).

The protection of privacy stands as the most critical issue as we navigate the era of big data and artificial intelligence. Ohm's 2010 paper "Broken Promises of Privacy" explores how protecting data privacy becomes difficult due to advanced data analysis methods. Traditional methods of anonymization fail to adequately protect privacy because data which appears to be anonymized can become identifiable when combined with other available datasets. The benefit of strong data privacy measures lies in their ability to safeguard patient information while simultaneously reinforcing public confidence in healthcare systems. The negative side effect of strict privacy regulations lies in their potential to obstruct the creation and application of AI systems that offer benefits. The conflict between privacy protection and innovation advancement demonstrates why a framework should integrate responsible innovation with robust privacy protection as its central component (research question 2).

Ethical Guidelines for AI in Healthcare

Several organizations and initiatives created ethical guidelines to address the unique ethical challenges that AI presents in healthcare. The World Health Organization (WHO) (2021) released a comprehensive report, "Ethics and Governance of Artificial Intelligence for Health," outlining six core principles for ethical AI in health: In 2021 the World Health Organization (WHO) published "Ethics and Governance of Artificial Intelligence for Health" which introduces six fundamental ethical principles for AI in health including protecting human autonomy, promoting human well-being and safety, ensuring transparency and intelligibility along with explainability, fostering responsibility and accountability, ensuring inclusiveness and equity, and promoting responsive and sustainable AI technologies. The advantage of these guidelines lies in their provision of an overarching ethical framework for AI healthcare applications that remain applicable in diverse situations. A significant drawback of these guidelines is their general nature which limits their usefulness for detailed applications of Gen AI in pharmaceutical settings. The paper identifies a need for a customized framework to address research question 2.

The European Commission's High-Level Expert Group on AI (AI HLEG) (2019) introduced their "Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI" which have played a major role in shaping EU policy. The guidelines demonstrate the essential role of human agency and technical robustness plus safety together with privacy and data governance principles along with transparency and diversity while promoting non-discrimination and fairness and supporting societal and environmental well-being and accountability. These guidelines excel due to their extensive examination of ethical issues alongside their role in shaping regulatory frameworks. A drawback of these guidelines is their general nature which necessitates additional interpretation and modifications to suit the specific Gen AI applications in the pharmaceutical industry.

The OECD Principles on AI (2019) support the advancement of innovative AI systems which remain trustworthy while respecting human rights alongside democratic principles. OECD member nations adopted these core principles which highlight inclusive growth and sustainable development alongside well-being and human-centered values of fairness together with transparency and explainability. International agreement and strong commitment towards ethical AI standards represent the primary advantage. The absence of detailed guidance tailored to the pharmaceutical sector remains an issue.

The G20 AI Principles established in 2019 build upon the OECD Principles to assert a human-centric approach while advocating for responsible governance of AI technologies that honor legal standards and uphold human rights and democracy. Although these principles hold value they demonstrate similar applicability restrictions as the

OECD Principles when addressing Gen AI's unique challenges within pharmaceuticals.

Gap in the Literature

While the literature on AI ethics and AI in healthcare is extensive and rapidly evolving, a critical gap remains: The extensive research on AI ethics and healthcare applications fails to provide a practical framework for Gen AI ethical challenges in the pharmaceutical industry. Morley et al. (2023) identify an urgent requirement for detailed ethical guidance tailored to specific contexts across various sectors including pharmaceuticals. Current guidelines provide useful overarching principles but lack the specific detailed guidance and practical tools necessary for pharmaceutical companies to navigate the ethical complexities of Gen AI. The paper seeks to bridge this important gap by offering both an ethical framework and a practical implementation strategy for pharmaceutical organizations. Current research primarily explores generic AI ethics while overlooking the specific challenges and benefits of generative AI models in the heavily regulated pharmaceutical sector. This study enhances the scholarly discourse by examining the ethical implications of Generative AI to address an important literature deficiency.

III. PROPOSED FRAMEWORK: THE PROPOSED FRAMEWORK INTRODUCES FOUR FUNDAMENTAL ETHICAL PRINCIPLES TO GUIDE GEN AI IMPLEMENTATION IN PHARMACEUTICALS.

This section details the proposed framework, built on four fundamental ethical principles: The proposed framework is constructed from four fundamental ethical principles which include transparency, accountability, privacy, and equity. The framework functions beyond simple regulatory compliance checklist requirements. Following regulations such as the EU AI Act alone does not ensure ethical AI implementation. When companies conduct an ethical review of their operations only to check off legal requirements they risk damaging Gen AI capabilities and causing sustained harm. The framework requires pharmaceutical organizations to fully integrate these principles into their everyday operations, working processes, and organizational culture. This section compares superficial compliance approaches with truly ethical ones by detailing each principle.

Principle 1:Emphasizes transparency beyond initial appearances

Definition: AI systems must operate transparently by making their decision-making processes clear and understandable to stakeholders like researchers, clinicians, patients, and regulators. Transparency must extend to the sources of data and the design of algorithms as well as the reasoning for AI-generated results. Lipton (2018) organizes transparency into three distinct phases: pre-modeling transparency, in-modeling transparency and post-modeling transparency.

Application in Pharma:

- **Drug Discovery:**

- **Checkbox Approach:** The Checkbox Approach gives a fundamental overview of the data sources employed within a Gen AI model but omits details about data cleaning procedures and possible biases.

- **Embedded Approach:** The embedded method requires comprehensive tracking of all data lineage aspects which covers source databases used along with selection criteria implemented and any preprocessing steps taken while noting all known limitations and biases present. Researchers must receive explanations for drug candidate recommendations from Gen AI models through attention mechanisms or feature importance scores to better understand model behavior. The organization must not only keep internal records but also actively publish their AI methods when possible while ensuring intellectual property protection.

Clinical Trials:

- **Checkbox Approach:** The Checkbox Approach refers to a claim of AI usage in patient selection which lacks information about selection criteria or the underlying rationale.

- **Embedded Approach:** The Embedded Approach requires full disclosure of the AI patient selection criteria and decision-making logic along with explanations for criteria choices and identification of potential biases. Trial investigators receive this information along with potential participants who access it through a user-friendly format.

Patient Interactions:

Checkbox Approach: Patient materials should contain a generic statement that AI "may be used" in their treatment.

Embedded Approach: The Embedded Approach ensures patients receive proactive information about AI involvement in their treatment along with clear descriptions of how the AI functions and its limitations while creating space for patients to voice their questions and concerns. Create easy-to-understand educational resources that clarify healthcare artificial intelligence for patients.

Legal Frameworks and the EU AI Act: The GDPR (General Data Protection Regulation - EU): Article 22 of the GDPR deals with automated individual decision-making and profiling, whereas Recital 71 underlines the necessity for an explanation right. In the US, the CCPA/CPRA (California Consumer Privacy Act does not specifically mention AI but gives consumers data rights that affect AI systems.

EU AI Act: The EU AI Act requires high-risk AI systems to adhere to strict transparency guidelines. The EU AI Act Articles 13 and 52 enforce transparency requirements which compel providers to reveal understandable details about an AI system's features and boundaries as well as its operational logic. The law requires that providers disclose information about the training data the system used together with its intended purpose and performance accuracy. A checkbox approach might meet the legal requirements but an embedded approach seeks to fulfill the true intent of the law through building real understanding and trust.

Principle 2: Accountability – Ownership Beyond Liability

- **Definition:** The definition of accountability requires clear responsibility assignments throughout AI system creation and implementation stages. The approach requires organizations to specify roles and responsibilities while developing monitoring and auditing systems for AI operations in addition to processes for handling errors and system failures.

- **Application in Pharma:**

  - **Development Teams:**

  - **Checkbox Approach:** The "Checkbox Approach" involves creating an "AI Compliance Officer" position without defining their authority or how they fit into development processes.

  - **Embedded Approach:** The Embedded Approach requires ethical considerations to be part of each development phase while assigning dedicated individuals and teams to evaluate and address ethical risks. The organization should form an AI ethics review board comprised of experts from technical, clinical, ethical, and legal fields who will provide continuous supervision and advice.

  - **Validation & Monitoring:**

Checkbox Approach: The Checkbox Approach entails performing a single validation check of an AI model before deployment but fails to monitor for any future performance degradation or bias issues.

Embedded Approach: The embedded approach involves ongoing monitoring and auditing of AI systems through defined protocols which identify

and correct performance problems as well as biases and unintended outcomes. Create feedback mechanisms to sustain ongoing improvements in ethical system performance.

- **Adverse Event Reporting:**

- **Checkbox Approach:** The Checkbox Approach depends exclusively on present pharmacovigilance systems and fails to address the distinctive problems caused by AI-related adverse events.

- **Embedded Approach:** Embed protocols to report and address adverse events linked to Gen AI because they require different handling than standard drug-related events. The approach requires the creation of transparent systems for root cause analysis together with corrective action implementation.

Legal Frameworks and the EU AI Act: The AI Liability Directive (Proposed - EU): The proposed AI Liability Directive in the EU seeks to modernize liability regulations for artificial intelligence systems to facilitate compensation for their related damages. In addition, the Product Liability Directive (EU): The Product Liability Directive (EU) applies to AI systems in medical products even though it does not directly address AI technology.

EU AI Act: The EU AI Act sets up an accountability framework which assigns obligations to AI systems providers and deployers as well as importers and distributors. Articles 16-29 of the EU AI Act detail mandatory responsibilities for high-risk AI system providers that cover risk management and data governance along with technical documentation requirements and conformity assessments. The Act requires national competent authorities to be created for monitoring compliance and enforcement activities.

Principle 3: The third principle centers on privacy with the aim to protect patients alongside their data

Definition: Privacy requires both protection of patient data and ethical use within the boundaries set by applicable regulations. Researchers must obtain informed consent from participants, put data security measures in place, and minimize any risks of re-identification. The focus should be on supporting patient decision-making while establishing a foundation of trust.

Application in Pharma:

- **Data Collection & Storage:**

Checkbox Approach: The Checkbox Approach enforces basic security protocols to meet HIPAA and GDPR requirements but fails to evaluate the ethical consequences of data usage.

Embedded Approach: Embedded Approach requires building AI systems with "privacy by design" principles to incorporate data protection directly into their architecture. To minimize data breach risks and prevent re-identification organizations should enforce advanced security measures which exceed basic legal standards by using methods such as differential privacy and federated learning.

- **Data Minimization:**

Checkbox Approach: Through the Checkbox Approach healthcare providers gather extensive patient data and keep it in storage in anticipation of its potential future use for AI development.

Embedded Approach: The Embedded Approach demands strict data minimization by collecting only essential data needed for the AI system's particular purpose. Perform routine assessments of data retention protocols and eliminate unnecessary data through secure deletion processes.

➢ **Informed Consent:**

Checkbox Approach: This requires patients to complete complex consent forms that focus on legal compliance instead of real understanding.

Embedded Approach: This creates straightforward consent procedures that focus on patient understanding by detailing data usage in AI applications along with the benefits and risks and patient rights. Better understanding results from employing clear language along with supporting visual aids. Patients should be able to withdraw consent whenever they want and ask questions throughout the process.

- **Legal Frameworks and the EU AI Act:** Patient data protection remains essential while numerous international regulations create a complicated framework for privacy governance. Within the European Union, the General Data Protection Regulation (Regulation (EU) 2016/679) mandates strict data protection and privacy standards which include data minimization principles together with purpose limitation requirements and the protection of individual rights. The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (Pub. L. No. 104-191) operates in the United States to protect sensitive patient health information from unauthorized disclosure. L. The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (Pub. L. No. 104-191) requires patient consent or knowledge before disclosing sensitive health information. Under Canada's Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act (S.C. 2000, c. 5), private sector organizations must follow specified guidelines when handling personal data during commercial activities. California's Consumer Privacy Act of 2018 (AB-375, Chapter 55) includes amendments from the California Privacy Rights Act of 2020 (Proposition 24) to ensure consumers receive extensive rights over their personal data.

- The proposed EU Artificial Intelligence Act focuses on data governance for artificial intelligence applications while supporting current data protection laws including the GDPR. The EU AI Act's Article 10 stands out as it establishes data governance prerequisites for AI systems classified as high-risk. The act requires that training datasets and both validation and testing sets remain relevant to their purpose, accurately represent the data they are meant to reflect and remain free of errors while ensuring their completeness. The article highlights the essential task of identifying and correcting dataset biases that may result in discriminatory practices.

- Organizations must recognize the difference between basic compliance with these regulations and a fully integrated ethical framework. While a "checkbox" method can secure basic legal conformity with GDPR, HIPAA, or the EU AI Act requirements it does not capture the full ethical intention behind these regulations. A deeply embedded ethical approach emphasizes patient autonomy and trust while exceeding legal requirements to manage data responsibly throughout AI development and deployment.

Principle 4: Equity – Fairness Beyond Non-Discrimination

Definition: The definition of equity in AI healthcare systems involves mitigating algorithmic bias and discrimination to support fairness and inclusion. The approach requires correcting bias in training data and promoting team diversity while monitoring AI impacts across populations.

Application in Pharma:

➢ **Data Diversity:**

Checkbox Approach: The Checkbox Approach involves selecting datasets that are available without performing a thorough analysis of their representativeness or examining potential biases.

Embedded Approach: The Embedded Approach involves the deliberate collection of diverse datasets that represent affected populations for training Gen

AI models. The evaluation process should account for multiple demographic factors such as age, gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and geographic location. Creating solutions to fill missing data and increase representation of underrepresented groups.

- **Bias Detection & Mitigation:**

Checkbox Approach: The Checkbox Approach involves performing only an initial fairness assessment pre-deployment without setting up continuous bias monitoring systems.

Embedded Approach: The Embedded Approach requires the AI system to sustain a full-cycle bias detection and mitigation strategy during its entire development process. This process integrates fairness-aware machine learning techniques such as re-weighing and adversarial debiasing with routine audits for disparate impact along with feedback mechanisms that enhance fairness over time.

- **Health Equity Impact Assessment:**

Checkbox Approach: The Checkbox Approach disregards how AI applications could affect health equity.

Embedded Approach: The Embedded Approach requires proactive assessment of how Gen AI applications will impact health equity by evaluating their potential to either worsen or improve current disparities. Health equity specialists and community stakeholders guide analysis and solutions for possible negative impacts. Develop AI systems that work to ensure all populations receive fair access to healthcare and better health results.

Legal Frameworks and the EU AI Act:

Civil Rights Act of 1964 (US): Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (US) bans workplace discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex or national origin and this legislation becomes important for AI systems that manage hiring or promotion processes in pharma companies.

Equal Credit Opportunity Act (US): The Equal Credit Opportunity Act (US) centers on credit practices but its non-discrimination principles apply to AI systems that evaluate clinical trial eligibility and healthcare service access.

Various Anti-Discrimination Laws (Global): Countries worldwide enforce laws that prevent discrimination based on protected characteristics which may impact the development and use of AI systems in healthcare.

EU AI Act: The EU AI Act specifically tackles issues related to bias and discrimination within AI systems. Recital 36 underscores the necessity to prevent biases which may result in discrimination prohibited by Union law. Article 10 mandates checks for biases in training datasets along with the implementation of strategies to address them.⁴⁴

In summary, mere checkbox compliance in AI ethics does not suffice and may cause harm. Effective ethical implementation needs the integration of transparency, accountability, privacy, and equity principles into the everyday practices and organizational culture of pharmaceutical businesses. Through proactive integration companies can reduce risks while generating innovation and trust alongside sustainable value for themselves and society.

IV. AGILE IMPLEMENTATION: ORGANIZATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION THROUGH AGILE METHODS TO ESTABLISH ETHICAL PRACTICES THROUGHOUT THE ENTERPRISE

Beyond Compliance: Establishing Ethical Responsibility Across the Organisation

Conventional ethics practices in technology limit ethical analysis to specific departments like legal and compliance divisions. Addressing the complex ethical challenges of Gen AI requires more than a siloed approach because it is insufficient to tackle these issues effectively. The paper proposes that organizations should adopt dynamic and cohesive methods which distribute ethical responsibility

throughout all company layers. To build an ethical awareness culture employees from every department must understand ethical implications in their work and have the power to confront ethical dilemmas. The approach corresponds to Van Wynsberghe's (2013) "ethics by design" concept.

Multifunctional Teams: Multifunctional Teams Serve as the Connection Between Ethical Standards and Practical Application

Pharmaceutical organizations need to create teams with multiple functions to manage ethical development and implementation of Gen AI systems. Representatives from departments like R&D, clinical operations, medical affairs, commercial, legal, compliance, and IT should be part of these teams. According to Mittelstadt et al. (2016) diverse perspectives and expertise are applied to ethical considerations through cross-functional representation.

Empowering Teams: Training, Tools, and Processes

To empower these teams they must receive essential training along with appropriate tools and processes. This includes:

- **Processes:** Existing workflows and decision-making processes must include ethical considerations during project planning and product development as well as vendor selection stages. The implementation of ethics reviews at multiple stages during the development process might be necessary.

- **Training:** Organize consistent training sessions about AI ethics which are customized for the unique functions of various teams. Training sessions might include case studies for ethical analysis as well as discussions about real-world applications of ethical frameworks.

- **Tools:** Teams need to create tools for assessing ethics which include checklists and guidelines as well as ethical impact assessment templates that align with the four principles.

- **Extending Beyond IT:** The integration of ethics should expand beyond IT to include all business functional capabilities.

AI ethics must apply to more than just IT systems management. AI ethics needs to cover wider business operations which include strategic planning as well as marketing and customer interaction processes. Marketing teams require training about the ethical use of Gen AI in personalized advertising to comply with regulations such as the GDPR and prevent manipulative practices. Customer service teams need training to manage patient inquiries about AI applications in healthcare delivery through transparent and easily comprehensible explanations.

V. IMPLEMENTATION BEST PRACTICES

Develop an Explicit Governance Structure That Translates Policy into Practice

The backbone of responsible AI lies in establishing a strong governance structure. The focus extends past basic responsibility assignment to create an organization-wide accountability system.

- **Beyond the Checkbox:** Create a diverse AI Ethics Board including members from R&D, clinical operations, commercial, legal, compliance, IT, and patient-facing areas instead of appointing one "AI Ethics Officer". The board must possess the power to scrutinize and authorize AI project proposals and establish ethical norms while maintaining continuous oversight.

- **Operational Implication:** The board needs to hold regular meetings (such as monthly or quarterly sessions) to assess AI projects while addressing ethical challenges and revising policies and procedures. The organization must record meeting minutes and ensure their availability for access. Decisions taken by the board must lead to tangible changes in project timelines and resource allocation.

Develop an AI Ethics Policy: A Living Document, not an inflexible process

The AI ethics policy needs to function as a dynamic guide that practitioners can actively use instead of remaining as an unused static document on a shelf.

- **Beyond the Checkbox:** The policy needs to demonstrate real-world applications of abstract principles through specific examples in different pharmaceutical activities such as drug discovery and clinical trials.

- **Operational Implication:** All employees must have easy access to the policy through platforms like the company intranet while it needs to be part of training programs. The policy needs annual reviews and updates to remain current with technological progress and regulatory modifications while integrating insights gained through experience. An employee feedback system needs to be created to allow team members to recommend policy changes.

Implement Ethical Impact Assessments together with Conformity Assessments as part of a proactive risk management strategy

The procedures of performing Ethical Impact Assessments and EU AI Act conformity assessments extend beyond single instances and become sustained efforts within the AI development timeline.

- **Beyond the Checkbox:** Ethical Impact Assessments need to extend beyond high-level risk evaluation to examine specific effects on various patient groups based on characteristics such as age, gender, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status. Conformity Assessments should be thorough and rigorous.

- **Operational Implication:** Create a universal EIA template with a consistent process that becomes part of project management activities. All major AI projects must start with an EIA which should then be reviewed during essential development stages including design, development, and deployment. Record EIA results and monitor mitigation processes for recognized risks. Develop procedures for compliance checks under the EU AI Act and include consultations with designated bodies when necessary.

Implement Data Governance Best Practices: The Foundation of Ethical AI

Data governance extends beyond compliance obligations to create a reliable foundation of trust while maintaining data quality and integrity for AI systems.

Beyond the Checkbox: Data governance requirements extend beyond legal compliance such as GDPR and HIPAA to include ethical standards like data minimization, purpose limitation and bias detection.

Operational Implication: Create a complete data governance framework which outlines policies and procedures along with defined roles and responsibilities for data collection storage processing and utilization. Implement data quality checks and validation procedures. Educate your workforce about data governance fundamentals and best practices. Track data origins and transformations through the deployment of data lineage tools.

Establish a culture where transparency and open communication build trust among team members

Effective transparency requires establishing a company-wide culture that supports open communication and collaborative work environments.

- **Beyond the Checkbox:** The scope of transparency must extend beyond official documents and regulatory submissions to become an integral part of everyday conversations and choices.

- **Operational Implication:** Establish employee reporting channels for ethical AI concerns with protection from retaliation through anonymous

systems or open-door policies at the AI Ethics Board. Employees should receive consistent updates regarding AI projects together with ethical standards and compliance obligations. Facilitate discussion forums centered on ethical challenges and insights gained.

Engage with External Stakeholders: Expanding the Circle of Responsibility

The pursuit of ethical AI demands joint efforts from numerous stakeholder groups.

Beyond the Checkbox: True engagement requires meaningful dialogue and collaboration beyond formal consultations and public relations activities.

Operational Implication: Create and maintain continuous connections with patient advocacy groups and various relevant stakeholders including ethicists and regulators. Request stakeholder feedback on artificial intelligence projects and policy matters. Join industry forums and initiatives to exchange best practices while learning from other participants. The EU AI Act requires engaging with notified bodies during conformity assessment processes.

Ethical performance and compliance require continuous monitoring and evaluation as part of an improvement process

Ethical AI represents a continuous journey toward improvement rather than a final goal.

Beyond the Checkbox: Periodic yearly audits to reach basic compliance should not define the monitoring and evaluation process. Processes of monitoring and evaluation should occur regularly and iteratively while maintaining a concentration on achieving significant results.

Operational Implication: Establish essential performance benchmarks that measure ethical conduct and legal compliance such as bias indicators and data privacy standards. Maintain a consistent schedule for gathering and examining data from these performance indicators. The findings should help pinpoint areas that need improvement while guiding updates to organizational policies and procedures. Set up a mechanism for monitoring and addressing ethical problems.

VI. REAL-WORLD APPLICATION CASES

This section demonstrates real-world examples of pharmaceutical companies adopting ethical AI practices in their operations.

Case Study 1: Roche's gRED uses Ethical AI to speed up drug discovery through its Genentech Research and Early Development program.

Description: The gRED division of Roche employs artificial intelligence together with machine learning techniques for speeding up drug discovery and development. Roche's AI initiatives prioritize the integration of ethical considerations. The AI research application method stresses transparency alongside accountability and fairness. The organization uses AI to analyze complex datasets and identify potential drug targets so they can deliver innovative medicines to patients more quickly.

gRED's Position and Principles on AI: The goal at gRED is to deploy technological expertise and financial assets to advance healthcare and improve people's quality of life. There is an ethical duty that requires applying AI responsibly so that we earn and keep the trust of society. Roche has a "living document" that details gRED's official position and principles regarding the responsible use of AI technology. The document remains open for changes to reflect new insights about AI effects on society.

gRED also has a set of ethical principles which are summarised below :

Principle 1: A commitment to deploy AI technologies which augment human abilities rather than replace them to create positive improvements in people's lives.

Principle 2: Responsibility for any decisions and outcomes produced by AI systems operated by gRED

Principle 3: A pledge to detect and mitigate ethical risks arising from AI implementation such as bias and discrimination together with unfair treatment.

Principle 4: Develop AI system designs that prioritize maximum transparency and comprehension.

Principle 5: Ensure usage of AI systems adhere to legal standards concerning personal privacy as well as data protection regulations along with confidentiality and intellectual property laws.

Principle 6: Create AI systems that are both strong and secure to prevent system errors and block malicious or unauthorized usage.

Principle 7: Openly discuss both the opportunities and challenges brought about by AI technology.

Case Study 2: Novartis enables its associates to implement AI ethically within their daily work through its AI Innovation Lab collaboration with Microsoft.

Description: Novartis has founded an AI Innovation Lab to which Microsoft has become a partner in order to speed up AI implementation throughout the company. Novartis wants their employees to integrate AI into their daily tasks throughout research development and commercial activities. Novartis established ethical standards for their AI systems that prioritize data protection along with security measures and transparent operations under human supervision. The organization uses AI systems to enhance human abilities and make better decisions.

Case Study 3: The third case study examines how Pfizer approaches responsible AI development throughout its entire value chain.

Description: Pfizer implements AI throughout its entire value chain which includes drug discovery and clinical development as well as manufacturing and commercial operations. The company has announced their dedication to ethical AI development which includes principles of fairness, transparency and accountability.

A multi-year partnership with a biotech company for AI-based drug discovery was announced by Pfizer in 2023 as part of their sustained investment in this sector . Pfizer employs artificial intelligence to enhance clinical trial recruitment while also tailoring patient engagement.

Leading pharmaceutical companies including Roche with its gRED initiative alongside Novartis and Pfizer show they are starting to implement practical measures to embed ethical AI principles into their operations. The development of specific AI ethics roles together with public declarations and cooperative efforts between departments show promising yet initial steps towards progress. The broader industry does not yet follow the example set by these pioneering companies. The powerful capabilities of Gen AI require swift implementation of responsible AI practices due to the substantial ethical and regulatory requirements. Though the featured companies demonstrate useful implementation examples, the situation demands immediate attention.

Pharmaceutical companies need to urgently transition from stated intentions to fully established ethical systems. Organizations that neglect to adopt responsible AI practices risk losing public trust and incurring regulatory penalties under the EU AI Act, while simultaneously compromising Gen AI's ability to enhance patient health outcomes. The pharmaceutical sector must unite to implement responsible AI practices as the moment to act impactfully has arrived.

VII. CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

Organizing AI systems to meet ethical standards and EU AI Act requirements presents numerous challenges.

This section examines and addresses the practical challenges encountered when embedding ethics

into organizational practices. The process of defining and measuring ethical performance and compliance presents ongoing complexity and dynamic changes.

The transition from basic metrics such as "number of employees trained" to meaningful ethical measures for e.g. reduced algorithmic bias and enhanced patient trust needs careful planning alongside continuous improvement. The nature of ethical assessments being subjective creates significant challenges.

Operational Challenge: Craft robust measurable metrics for ethical performance that reflect company values and meet the EU AI Act requirements.

The effort to maintain innovation while meeting ethical standards and regulatory demands often results in organizational tensions. The urgency to develop AI solutions quickly often stands at odds with the essential requirements for detailed ethical examination and regulatory compliance.

Operational Challenge: Organizations need to create efficient ethical review procedures which allow innovation to flourish without compromising on robust oversight.

The swift advancement of Gen AI technology demands continuous adaptation to stay current. Organizations must ensure their ethical guidelines along with compliance methods and operational procedures remain adaptable to technological advancements as well as changing regulatory perspectives. The EU AI Act is designed to evolve over time with expectations for additional guidelines and delegated acts to follow.

Operational Challenge: The organization must create a system that supports ongoing learning and adaptation through active monitoring of technological progress and regulatory updates as well as best practices in AI ethics.

Fostering stakeholder buy-in and overcoming resistance to change demands ongoing dedication. The transformation needed to implement AI ethics alongside regulatory compliance demands an organizational cultural shift which may encounter resistance from personnel used to conventional workflows.

Operational Challenge: The company must create effective programs that teach employees about AI ethics and the EU AI Act while resolving their concerns to gain support for the changes.

Ongoing legal and practical challenges arise when interpreting and implementing the EU AI Act. Understanding how the Act applies to specific Gen AI applications within the pharmaceutical sector demands continuous legal knowledge and effort.

Operational Challenge: The company needs to establish a team or working group with both legal and technical knowledge who will interpret and implement the EU AI Act for the company's specific AI projects.

Resource Constraints: Robust AI ethics and compliance programs demand major investments in staff development, technological solutions, and external consulting expertise.

Operational Challenge: Companies need to allocate essential resources and financial support for implementing ethical AI standards alongside EU AI Act requirements.

Maintaining ethical oversight across the entire AI lifecycle: Organizations must maintain ethical standards throughout AI system development and continue to uphold them during deployment phases, throughout monitoring periods, and until complete system decommissioning.

Operational Challenge: The operational challenge involves developing systems and processes that monitor AI systems throughout their entire lifecycle while maintaining continuous ethical supervision.

VIII. LIMITATIONS OF THE PROPOSED FRAMEWORK:

The framework serves as a general guide and must be customized according to different contexts and applications. Gen AI applications in drug discovery encounter unique ethical challenges and regulatory requirements which are not applicable to Gen AI applications used for clinical trial recruitment or marketing. Addressing the Limitation: The framework must first serve as a foundation from which specific guidelines and procedures for varied AI applications should be created.

Gen AI's future ethical challenges will extend beyond the framework's current predictive capabilities. As technology progresses new ethical challenges will inevitably develop. To address the limitations, organizations must keep the framework up-to-date through regular reviews that incorporate new ethical challenges. The framework functions as a tool whose effectiveness relies on proper utilization and integration into organizational culture and practices.: The framework requires strong leadership support along with clear accountability measures and consistent monitoring and evaluation to maintain its effectiveness.

Challenges in Operationalizing AI Ethics:

- Determining ethical performance metrics presents complexity and subjective interpretations. Currently no standardized metrics exist for measuring the ethical performance of AI systems which have universal acceptance.

- Finding equilibrium between technological advancement and moral responsibility presents significant difficulties. Businesses that need to quickly implement AI systems may end up neglecting ethical standards.

- Ethical guidelines must evolve continuously to keep up with the swift advancements in Gen AI technology. AI advancement demands ethical frameworks that are capable of adapting to new developments.

- It proves difficult to overcome resistance to change while securing stakeholder buy-in. Organizations need to change their culture to successfully implement AI ethics.

Limitations of the Proposed Framework:

The framework functions as a basic guide which may require customization for different contexts and applications. For example, Gen AI applications for drug discovery face different ethical challenges, when compared to a Gen AI application used for clinical trial recruitment.

The framework remains incomplete in its coverage of every ethical concern that comes with the implementation of Gen AI in pharmaceutical settings. The four principles may not encompass all the ethical issues present in pharmaceutical Gen AI applications.

The model only works properly if the organization fully commits to it and implements it correctly. The framework functions as an implement whose success is determined by its application.

IX. CONCLUSION

Summary of Findings

The text proposes that the pharmaceutical industry needs both a specialized framework and organizational commitment to ethical standards for responsible Gen AI development and deployment. The recommended framework which prioritizes transparency and accountability along with privacy and equity establishes a practical guide to handle Gen AI's ethical challenges. Organizations can weave ethics throughout their structure by adopting an agile implementation strategy that focuses on multifunctional teams and ethical responsibility.

Implications for Practice

Pharmaceutical companies that aim to leverage Gen AI for their operations while maintaining ethical practices will find this research findings extremely valuable. Companies can achieve risk mitigation and stakeholder trust building while maximizing Gen AI benefits to enhance patient outcomes through the

adoption of the proposed framework and recommended best practices. AI-driven innovation in the pharmaceutical sector depends on both public trust and long-term sustainability which this approach will help maintain.

Future Research Directions

- **Further research is needed to:**

- Create specific operating procedures for distinct Gen AI applications throughout the pharmaceutical sector. Different guidelines should exist for each aspect of pharmaceutical operations including drug discovery research clinical trial execution manufacturing processes and marketing strategies.

- Establish metrics and methods to assess and evaluate how AI systems perform according to ethical standards. The process may require establishing quantitative standards to assess bias and fairness while creating qualitative techniques to evaluate how stakeholders perceive these systems.

- Study the extended societal consequences Gen AI technology creates within the healthcare field. The evaluation extends to understanding how Gen AI affects healthcare workers while also examining its influence on patient access to medical services and the dynamics of doctor-patient interactions.

- Study how regulation and policy influence the ethical advancement of Gen AI systems. To understand regulation's role in Gen AI development we need to evaluate current regulations and identify the need for new regulatory methods.

Final Thoughts

The adoption of Gen AI technology by the pharmaceutical industry offers groundbreaking possibilities while posing major ethical dilemmas. A proactive and comprehensive approach to AI ethics allows pharmaceutical companies to responsibly utilize transformative technology to serve everyone ethically. Organizations must embrace collaboration and dialogue while maintaining a dedication to continuous learning to successfully navigate the changing environment and build a future where AI technology benefits human needs.

The pharmaceutical industry stands at the forefront to establish standards for ethical AI development and application while serving as an industry leader for other sectors.

Acknowledgement

1. The author would like to acknowledge:
2. Professor Makoto Nakayama and
3. Professor Yun Wan for their counsel and insight. Dr Masanori Ito, Anand Pattabiraman and Abhijeet Sangamnerker for their encouragement and continuous support.

REFERENCES

1. Barocas, S., & Selbst, A. D. (2016). Big data's disparate impact. California Law Review, 104(3), 671-732. https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/calr104&div=25&id=&page=
2. Diakopoulos, N. (2016). Accountability in algorithmic decision making. Communications of the ACM, 59(2), 56-62. https://doi.org/10.1145/2844110
3. European Commission. (2019). Ethics guidelines for trustworthy AI. High-Level Expert Group on Artificial Intelligence. https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/ethics-guidelines-trustworthy-ai
4. G20. (2019). G20 AI Principles.https://oecd.ai/en/wonk/documents/g20-ai-principles
5. Lipton, Z. C. (2018). The mythos of model interpretability: In machine learning, the concept of interpretability is both important and slippery. Queue, 16(3), https://doi.org/10.1145/3236386.3241340
6. Mehrabi, N., Morstatter, F., Saxena, N., Lerman, K., & Galstyan, A. (2021). A survey on bias and fairness in machine learning. ACM Computing

Surveys (CSUR), 54(6), 1-35. https://doi.org/10.1145/3457607
7. McKinsey & Company. (2023). The economic potential of generative AI: The next productivity frontier. https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/mckinsey-digital/our-insights/the-economic-potential-of-generative-ai-the-next-productivity-frontier
8. Mittelstadt, B., Allo, P., Taddeo, M., Wachter, S., & Floridi, L. (2016). The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate. Big Data & Society, 3(2), 2053951716679679. https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951716679679
9. Morley, J., Elhalal, A., Kinsey, L., Ziosi, M., & Floridi, L. (2023). Operationalising AI ethics: Barriers, enablers, and next steps. Nature Machine Intelligence, 5(1), 1-4. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-021-01308-8
10. OECD. (2019). OECD Principles on AI. https://www.oecd.org/digital/artificial-intelligence/
11. Ohm, P. (2010). Broken promises of privacy: Responding to the surprising failure of anonymization. UCLA Law Review, 57, 1701. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1450006
12. Oye, N. A., Ta, C. T., Butt, S., Allen, I. E., Lin, F., & Lo, A. W. (2023). Using artificial intelligence to optimize clinical trial design. Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics, 113(3), 581-593. https://doi.org/10.1002/cpt.2782
13. Rudin, C. (2019). Stop explaining black box machine learning models for high stakes decisions and use interpretable models instead. Nature Machine Intelligence, 1(5), 206-215. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-019-0048-x
14. Vamathevan, J., Clark, D., Czodrowski, P., Dunham, I., Ferran, E., Lee, G., ... & Zhao, S. (2019). Applications of machine learning in drug discovery and development. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, 18(6), 463-477. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41573-019-0024-5
15. Van Wynsberghe, A. (2013). Designing robots for care: Care centered value-sensitive design. Science and Engineering Ethics, 19(2), 407-433. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-011-9343-6
16. Zhavoronkov, A., Ivanenkov, Y. A., Aliper, A., Veselov, M. S., Aladinskiy, V. A., Aladinskaya, A. V., ... & Ozerov, I. V. (2019). Deep learning enables rapid identification of potent DDR1 kinase inhibitors. Nature Biotechnology, 37(9), 1038-1040. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-019-0224-x
17. Algorithmic impact assessment: A case study in healthcare. (2002.). Ada Lovelace Institute. https://www.adalovelaceinstitute.org/report/algorithmic-impact-assessment-case-study-healthcare/
18. The Lancet Digital Health. (2023). Addressing algorithmic bias in dermatology. 5(1), e1-e2. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2024.102479
19. Science. (2022). The dangers of genomic data breaches. 377(6607), 688-689. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.add7448
20. Deloitte. (2023). The potential for generative AI in life sciences. https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/pages/life-sciences-and-health-care/articles/generative-ai-in-pharma-and-medtech.html
21. World Health Organization (WHO). (2021). Ethics and governance of artificial intelligence for health. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240029200
22. General Data Protection Regulation, Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (2016). https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2016/679/oj
23. California Consumer Privacy Act of 2018, AB-375, Chapter 55 (2018). https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB375
24. California Privacy Rights Act of 2020, Proposition 24 (2020). https://vig.cdn.sos.ca.gov/2020/general/pdf/topl.pdf
25. European Commission. (2022). Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on adapting non-contractual civil liability rules to artificial intelligence (AI Liability Directive). https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52022PC0496
26. European Commission. (1985). Council Directive 85/374/EEC of 25 July 1985 on the approximation of the laws, regulations and

administrative provisions of the Member States concerning liability for defective products. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A31985L0374
27. EU AI Act Regulation - EU - 2024/1689 - EN - EUR-Lex. (2024). https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj
28. Warren, S. D., & Brandeis, L. D. (1890). The right to privacy. Harvard Law Review, 4(5), 193-220. https://doi.org/10.2307/132116
29. ISO. (2013). ISO/IEC 27001:2013 Information technology — Security techniques — Information security management systems — Requirements. https://www.iso.org/standard/54534.html (Link to ISO standard information page)
30. FDA, 21 CFR Part 50 (1998). Protection of Human Subjects. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-21/chapter-I/subchapter-A/part-50
31. Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-191, 110 Stat. 1936 (1996). https://www.hhs.gov/hipaa/for-professionals/privacy/laws-regulations/index.html
32. Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act, S.C. 2000, c. 5 (2000 https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/p-8.6/
33. Civil Rights Act of 1964, Pub. L. No. 88-352, 78 Stat. 241 (1964). https://www.eeoc.gov/statutes/title-vii-civil-rights-act-1964
34. Equal Credit Opportunity Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1691-1691f (1974). https://www.consumer.ftc.gov/articles/credit-discrimination#ecoa