

Why Do Decision Makers (Not) Use AI? A Cross-Domain Analysis of Factors Impacting AI Adoption

Rebecca Yu

Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA, United States
rebyu@cs.cmu.edu

Ameet Talwalkar

Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA, United States
talwalkar@cmu.edu

Valerie Chen

Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA, United States
valeriechen@cmu.edu

Hoda Heidari

Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA, United States
hheidari@cmu.edu

ABSTRACT

Growing excitement around deploying AI across various domains calls for a careful assessment of how human decision-makers interact with AI-powered systems. In particular, it is essential to understand when decision-makers voluntarily choose to consult AI tools, which we term *decision-maker adoption*. We interviewed experts across four domains—medicine, law, journalism, and the public sector—to explore current AI use cases and perceptions of adoption. From these interviews, we identify key factors that shape decision-maker adoption of AI tools: the decision-maker’s background, perceptions of the AI, consequences for the decision-maker, and perceived implications for other stakeholders. We translate these factors into an AI adoption sheet to analyze how decision-makers approach adoption choices through comparative, cross-domain case studies, highlighting how our factors help explain inter-domain differences in adoption. Our findings offer practical guidance for supporting the responsible and context-aware deployment of AI by better accounting for the decision-maker’s perspective.

1 INTRODUCTION

Increased interest in deploying practical AI tools for decision-makers has spurred growing research into how human decision-makers interact with these tools, particularly regarding decision-maker reliance on AI [9, 19, 37]—that is, the rate at which a human decision-maker replaces their initial judgments with AI recommendations. Such studies typically involve controlled evaluations of AI prototypes in lab settings [16, 63] or pilot deployments of AI tools in real-world environments [33, 35], where decision-makers are presented with an AI tool and researchers measure the extent to which they defer to AI guidance. However, AI reliance presupposes decision-maker adoption; in practice, decision-makers may opt not to use these tools at all (e.g., a doctor may not use a model without peer endorsement [32]).

As such, we emphasize the importance of studying *decision-maker adoption* of AI—the voluntary and consistent use of an AI tool within a decision-maker’s workflow. Prior work on AI adoption has primarily focused on the perspective of *organizational adoption choices* [18, 43, 66, 73], namely, why an organization may choose to adopt an AI product or service. For example, such work may involve surveys to investigate why a hospital might choose to procure and deploy an AI tool [50], potentially irrespective of whether it is

AI Adoption Sheet

- **Decision-maker background.**
 - How does a decision-maker’s professional experience inform their adoption behaviors?
 - Does the decision-maker have any personal biases that may impact their adoption choices?
- **Perceptions of the AI model.**
 - What flaws does the decision-maker perceive the model they are deciding to consult to have?
 - Do they have any doubts about model trustworthiness or capabilities?
 - What do they believe the capabilities of the model and the benefits of AI adoption are?
- **Consequences for the decision-maker.**
 - What liabilities may the decision-maker face (e.g., legal, professional, political)?
 - Are there uncertainties regarding consequences?
 - How does the decision-maker’s workload change?
- **Perceived implications for other stakeholders.**
 - How do decision-makers believe organizations are impacted by AI adoption?
 - How do decision-makers believe decision-subjects are impacted by AI adoption?

Figure 1: We introduce an AI adoption sheet to highlight factors influencing decision-maker adoption.

used by clinicians down the line. We build on this line of research, but shift the focus to the perspective of *decision-makers* within organizations that have already made AI available to their members. While a few prior studies have taken a more decision-maker-centric approach in specific domains—primarily medicine [10, 28, 30], our goal is to identify cross-cutting factors that affect such decision-makers’ adoption of AI tools.

In this work, we conduct a cross-domain analysis to identify inter-domain trends of decision-maker AI adoption choices. We select four representative domains (journalism [71], law [22], medicine [46], and the public sector [5]) to cover a variety of predictive and generative AI applications across different sectors of the economy, with varying stakes, and include decision-makers from diverse backgrounds. In total, we conducted 16 semi-structured interviews




Figure 2: Key definitions to distinguish between organizational adoption, decision-maker adoption, and decision-maker reliance. Adoption refers to an organization or decision-maker's choice to procure or consult an AI tool. In contrast, decision-maker reliance is the rate at which decision-makers replace their initial decision with AI output, which presupposes adoption.

with decision-makers on their familiarity with AI tools and their considerations for adoption.

Through our interviews, we identify four common key factors that impact decision-maker adoption across domains: (1) the decision-maker's background, (2) their perceptions of the AI model, (3) consequences for the decision-maker, and (4) the perceived implication of AI adoption for other stakeholders. Through the lens of these four factors, we examine why decision-maker adoption choices for similar AI use cases vary across domains. In particular, we provide two case studies of AI use cases surfaced by participants. First, we discuss why AI is often adopted as an *e-discovery* tool to help gather, organize, and analyze relevant digital data in journalism, law, and the public sector, but not necessarily in medical contexts. Then, we explore why decision-makers in law choose not to use AI for *tailoring communications*, while decision-makers in other domains do. These case studies highlight inter-domain differences in adoption behavior and demonstrate how our proposed four-factor framework can explain when decision-makers will (not) adopt AI.

We envision our framework to serve as a guide to facilitate the proactive assessment of AI proposals for uptake in practice. To provide a structured guide to help researchers, model developers, and model designers think more critically about the key adoption considerations of decision-makers, we turn our factors into an *AI adoption sheet* to help facilitate the integration of decision-maker perspectives into the model development process (Figure 1). This sheet can serve as a starting point for organizations and policymakers to develop a comprehensive understanding of how decision-makers' AI adoption choices may manifest in practice. We leave the empirical assessment of the efficacy and usability of the proposed sheet as a critical direction for future work.

2 RELATED WORK

As AI-powered systems are increasingly considered for real-world workflows, research on how decision-makers interact with AI has grown rapidly. We begin by reviewing prior work on *decision-maker reliance*, as it is the most frequently studied aspect of these interactions. However, for decision-makers to rely on AI, they must first choose to consult an AI tool regularly—which we refer to as their *adoption choice*. As such, we then discuss work on AI adoption,

highlighting the difference between organizational and decision-maker adoption choices (Figure 2).

2.1 Decision-maker Reliance on AI

A key goal of AI-assisted decision-making is to foster *appropriate reliance*: ensuring that decision-makers can discern when to rely on AI recommendations and when to rely on their own expertise [56]. In practice, simply optimizing for algorithmic accuracy does not guarantee appropriate reliance choices by decision-makers [16]. Empirical studies have documented patterns of both underreliance (also termed algorithmic aversion) [16, 25, 39] and overreliance, where users accept flawed AI outputs [8, 48]. These patterns have motivated work exploring how and when AI outputs influence human decisions [54, 55, 59].

To mitigate misaligned reliance choices, researchers have proposed interventions such as providing more comprehensive information on model capabilities and limitations [16, 68, 76]. More recently, studies have moved beyond controlled settings to examine decision-maker reliance choices in real-world deployments of AI tools [33, 35]. Further, as researchers study decision-maker reliance choices in real-world settings, they have highlighted an adoption gap, where the actual adoption and use of models lag behind their development [23, 27, 60, 70]. Our work aims to uncover the underlying causes of such lags from the perspective of decision-makers.

2.2 Adoption of AI in Practice

Organizational adoption. Prior work on AI adoption has primarily focused on *organizational* adoption, examining how factors such as technology readiness and innovation culture shape adoption choices [17, 31, 70]. Through a combination of surveys, interview studies, and literature reviews on AI deployment, researchers have explored the drivers and challenges of organizational adoption in various domains—including medicine [24], business and management [23], construction [53], and public administration [40]. However, findings across these studies can be fragmented, as each study typically focuses on a single distinct domain. We include a brief survey of these factors in the Appendix.

Across ten representative papers [11, 17, 23, 31, 40, 41, 43, 49, 53, 70], recurring factors include: issues with data quality or availability

Domain	Alias	Domain Experience (Years)	AI Familiarity	AI Interaction Frequency	Primary Area of Expertise
JRN	P01	4	Expert	Daily	Research
	P02	20+	Beginner	Occasionally	Domain
	P03	20+	Intermediate	Frequently	Domain
	P04	10-19	Advanced	Occasionally	Domain
LEG	P05	20+	Intermediate	Frequently	Domain
	P06	10-19	Advanced	Daily	Research
MED	P07	20+	Intermediate	Daily	Domain
	P08	10-19	Advanced	Frequently	Domain
	P09	5-9	Advanced	Daily	Domain
	P10	10-19	Expert	Daily	Research
	P11	10-19	Intermediate	Occasionally	Domain
	P12	20+	Intermediate	Occasionally	Domain
PHW	P13	10-19	Expert	Daily	Research
	P14	10-19	Expert	Daily	Research
	P15	10-19	Beginner	Daily	Domain
	P16	20+	Intermediate	Occasionally	Domain

Table 1: Summary of interview participants along with their relevant domain experience and comfort level with AI (Beginner = Some basic understanding, but limited knowledge, Intermediate = Solid foundational knowledge, Advanced = Deep understanding of core concepts, Expert= Extensive knowledge and experience).

(10/10); lack of appropriate data governance and regulation (5/10); and organizational goals to optimize cost or time savings (4/10). While these organizational factors shape the deployment of AI tools and understanding such organizational adoption choices is important, the final choice to use AI tools rests with the individual *decision-makers* responsible for integrating these tools into daily workflows. These decision-makers may choose *not* to use AI, even in the face of organizational support or pressure [34]. We will revisit these factors in Section 6.2.

Decision-maker adoption. Far fewer studies directly address adoption from the perspective of the decision-maker, and those that do often focus on a single domain or use case. For example, Hameed et al. [30] determined the intentions of healthcare professionals to adopt new technologies through a cross-sectional survey. They predefined seven constructs, which they evaluated to either directly or indirectly influence behavioral intentions. These factors are: performance expectancy, effort expectancy, personal innovativeness in information technology, task complexity, technological characteristics, initial trust, and social influence. In legal use cases, Fang et al. [28] leveraged semi-structured interviews to understand the attitudes of legal professionals towards AI and identify factors that influence how they engage with AI tools. Their findings revealed that legal professionals and semi-professionals often hold contradictory attitudes towards AI tools. We build on and extend this prior work by looking at AI adoption across multiple domains from the perspective of decision-makers. By identifying cross-domain factors, we aim to draw broader conclusions that can inform future AI deployments in new domains. In Section 6.2, we contrast our

findings with factors identified in prior work to show why decision-maker perspectives and a cross-domain analysis are essential for understanding real-world AI adoption choices.

3 STUDY DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

To understand what factors influence decision-makers’ adoption choices, we conducted an interview study with 16 individuals across four professional domains. Below, we describe our participant recruitment process, study procedures, and the analysis approaches used to synthesize interview data. Participation in the study was voluntary, and the protocol was IRB-approved. We provide further details on our protocol in the Appendix.

3.1 Participants

We focus on four domains: journalism (JRN), the legal profession (LEG), medicine (MED), and the public sector (PHW)—encompassing both public health and welfare. Throughout this paper, we color-code these domains to enhance clarity and facilitate cross-domain comparisons. These domains were selected based on three criteria. First, each domain has prior research on AI applications and adoption, enabling participants to speak about concrete, real-world use (or disuse) of AI tools. Second, the domains together must represent a broad spectrum of AI applications, spanning both traditional predictive models and newer generative systems. Third, domains must include participants working in varied professional contexts to capture a breadth of decision-makers. We group “public health” and “welfare” into a composite domain (PHW), as both operate on population-level interventions and share similar methodological approaches.

From each domain, we recruited individuals in the United States who fell into one of two categories: (1) practitioners with professional experience in one of the domains and direct engagement with AI tools, and (2) researcher-insiders who have worked closely and extensively with such practitioners. Including the second category of participants helped mitigate recruitment challenges by broadening the pool of eligible participants while ensuring that all participants could speak meaningfully to the real-world use (or disuse) of AI by decision-makers.

To recruit participants, we began by compiling a list of potential candidates, identified through collaborators in each domain and by locating individuals who had published articles—whether research or opinion—about their experience with AI in their respective domains. We then applied snowball sampling [29, 47] to expand our reach and identify additional candidates. We contacted a minimum of 10 individuals within each domain. Despite our effort to diversify interviews across domains, we found that response rates varied substantially: we received 4 responses out of 13 contacts from PHW, 6 out of 24 for MED, 2 out of 11 for LEG, and 4 out of 10 from JRN.

3.2 Semi-structured interviews

We conducted 16 semi-structured interviews led either by the first and second author (n=7) or one-on-one with the first author (n=9). The interviews were scheduled via email, and participants completed a consent form before the interview. All interviews were conducted over Zoom and lasted between 45-60 minutes. Participants received a \$100 gift card as compensation.

At the start of each interview, we asked participants to describe their current role and domain experience. We also explored their level of familiarity with AI and the extent of their interaction with AI tools within their domain. Participants were then invited to discuss AI use cases they had either encountered or were otherwise familiar with. Questions were intentionally left open-ended, encouraging discussion of a range of AI use cases—simple or complex. For each use case discussed, we asked follow-up questions to better understand how AI tools were applied in practice, how decision-makers interacted with them, and what considerations influenced decision-makers to choose (not) to use AI tools. Additional details about participant backgrounds can be found in Table 1.

3.3 Analysis approach

We recorded and transcribed all interviews via Zoom in addition to taking observational notes during each session. Following each interview, we reviewed and edited audio transcriptions for accuracy. We conducted open-coding of the interview transcripts and observational notes, followed by a reflexive thematic analysis [12–14]. Through multiple iterations, we developed and refined the set of factors presented in Section 4. In parallel, we created codes to capture AI use cases mentioned by participants, detailed in the Appendix, which informed our discussion of prevalent use cases in Section 5. Quotations in this paper have been lightly edited for clarity and readability.




Figure 3: We identified four factors that influence AI adoption choices across domains. All factors are centered around the decision-maker and shape how and why decision-makers choose to adopt AI tools in practice.

4 FACTORS IMPACTING AI ADOPTION

In our cross-domain analysis, we identified four key factors that shape why decision-makers may or may not choose to adopt AI tools (Figure 3).

4.1 Decision-maker background

The first factor focuses on the decision-makers themselves. In particular, a decision-maker’s **professional experience** influences how they engage with AI support tools. Across our interviews, we found that decision-makers often prioritize their professional expertise in AI-generated recommendations, especially in contexts requiring nuanced human judgment. Several participants echoed “*the best clinicians personalize their decisions around the patient*” rather than focusing on what may objectively be the best based on various statistics (e.g., AI recommendations) (P08). One reason is that years of professional experience can provide additional context not captured by models but critical to decision or task outcomes. As P14 noted in PHW, recommendations from AI tools are “*just another piece of information for decision-makers to consider*”, whereas “*people are usually more swayed by personal stories, their own interpretations, and their past experiences*” (P14).

Beyond professional experience, decision-makers’ **personal biases** may also play a role in adoption choices. For example, some decision-makers may prefer tools that support rather than replace them. P16 mentioned that while they occasionally use AI tools for brainstorming, “*I have a little bit of bias—or perhaps it’s how I was schooled—but I do believe in authoring everything I write myself.*”

4.2 Model perception

A decision-maker’s perception of AI tools also impacts their adoption choices. Participants’ concerns clustered around three main areas: concerns about model flaws, perception of model transparency and trustworthiness, and faulty beliefs in model capabilities.

Concerns about model flaws. Many participants noted that AI tools often underperform and fall short of expectations. For example, in a PHW use case, P15 described AI-generated social media content as “comparable to an intern level and something to work with and play with”, but not mature enough that decision-makers “would feel comfortable putting out there just yet.” Concerns about “unexplained phenomena like hallucinations” or opaque black-box mechanisms were widespread amongst participants (P02). Hallucinations are particularly concerning in public health. P15 specifically mentioned “We have to be very careful about what we say and how we say it to not feed misinformation, perpetuate it, or misguide people”. Some participants described the improper use of AI as “disturbing” (P07) and alarming to decision-makers (P05), noting that decision-makers have become highly cautious to the point that “it is now a little shameful to even just use ChatGPT for legal work” (P06).

However, perceptions can change over time. Participants in all our domains have described increasingly positive perceptions of AI tools with increased exposure to models, especially if there is also organizational adoption and support:

“I think that initially, clinicians were not into AI tools, but I think with the new technologies and interfaces that now exist, I’m starting to see clinicians trying it out and being more interested. [Institution] recently launched a secure form of a language model hospital-wide for clinicians to try, and I know people are trying that out.” (P09)

Perception of model transparency and trustworthiness. Several participants mentioned that model decisions are significantly more opaque than human decisions, with the lack of explanations making mistakes harder to identify (P01, P05, P06, P08, P09, P14, P15). Improper decisions or outputs from AI tools—especially when uncaught—“can turn out to be very costly. Humans make mistakes too, but when a human makes a mistake, you have various justifications for it, such as someone didn’t do their due diligence. If the algorithm makes a mistake, it is harder to explain” (P14). In the LEG context, P05 describes challenges with AI-generated risk scores for recidivism replacing expert testimony:

“It used to be that you would work with probation officers and other experts who would say, ‘Hey! Given this person’s age, given their criminal history background, given the age at which they started being in the system, it’s more or less likely they will re-offend.’ And now, you get a score. For a defense attorney, it’s like, ‘Well, what am I supposed to do with that score?’ If this were an expert testifying, I would have the right to cross-examine them. We would have the ability to question their expertise... We are essentially allowing these AI systems to provide expert testimony without any of the protections that we normally afford to expert testimony.” (P05)

P09 clarified that decision-makers are “not new to that type of tension where you’re confused about something and asking for help” as MED decision-makers often consult their peers and are used to seeking second opinions (e.g., clinicians frequently come together

to discuss complex cases during grand rounds). Current AI tools for decision-making often only provide one-shot recommendations, which contrasts with established practices of dialogue and clarification that allow decision-makers multiple opportunities to ask questions. Comparatively, participants spoke more positively about generative chatbots, as these tools enable back-and-forth discussion (P03, P09, P11).

Faulty beliefs in model capabilities. Adoption choices are also shaped by what decision-makers believe AI tools can do—which may not always be accurate. Unclear model limitations can lead to misguided assumptions about model capabilities and adoption benefits. As one participant noted, AI is sometimes given “an unnecessary and undeserved veneer of neutrality and objectivity,” even though models and their training data are “not inherently objective or neutral, and reflect our own biases” (P05). The challenge of accurately assessing model quality is further compounded by the rapid proliferation of models across both research and commercial domains. As noted by P08, models are being “created by all of these different people,” making evaluation difficult. Moreover, limited clinical or professional engagement with modern machine learning methods (e.g., deep learning, neural networks) leaves some decision-makers struggling to “judge what’s a really good model” (P08). As a result, they may base adoption choices on faulty beliefs and overconfidence in AI capabilities.

4.3 Consequences for the decision-maker

When choosing whether to adopt AI tools, decision-makers also weigh potential consequences—including additional **legal, professional, and reputational liabilities**—against their current workflows. In particular, decision-makers may consider the risk of potential lawsuits, loss of professional licences, or damaging credibility, citing concerns such as “the reputational risk of being wrong” (P12). Legal liability remains a complex consideration as “laws have still not evolved” to address decisions involving AI models (P09). In MED, P10 emphasizes that “regulating AI models is hard and it all moves at a pace that the FDA does not”. Similarly, in LEG contexts, although judges and court systems have begun to issue guidance rules on the use of AI (e.g., the guidance for the use of generative AI from the state bar of California mentioned by P06), regulation is still largely “catching up” to actual AI use in practice (P05).

In addition, **uncertainties about how these consequences apply** may also discourage adoption. For instance, clinicians in MED ask:

“Who is liable? Is it the AI? Is it the company or the programmer that made it? That then a health system purchased? Was [the model] written in-house? Is it the doctor who, at the end of the whole process, is ultimately responsible?” (P14)

Beyond legal liability, there are also concerns about political and professional risks, among other liabilities. P05 described how judges may be hesitant to rely on AI tools for fear that incorrect decisions could become a “political liability” if they later run for office (P05). While some AI vendors have attempted to mitigate these concerns by offering indemnification clauses—e.g., compensating law firms for losses caused by chatbot errors—the individual professional

often remains ultimately accountable: “to the client, the lawyer is [still] the sole responsible party for any mistakes” (P06). As P05 summarized, adopting AI tools is often seen as being “at your own peril”.

Beyond legal and reputational consequences, decision-makers also consider practical implications for their daily work, such as **workload changes**. Many participants mentioned poor integration with existing workflows as a significant barrier to adoption (P10, P13, P14). Especially in high-stress fields where burnout is prevalent, any additional effort required to incorporate AI tools can be prohibitive (P09). In contrast, participants expressed more optimism toward AI adoption in “low-stakes” scenarios (i.e., contexts where there are fewer potential negative consequences and the impact on workload is more clearly beneficial). For example, P11 noted that “administrative simplification and cutting out processes that are low-stakes and do not have risk for bias are a lot easier to contemplate using AI for than having an agent-based model make decisions that impact patients.” Similarly, P08 described how most AI models currently used in practice address “low-hanging fruit and low-stakes problems such as resource utilization or administrative work.” In these cases, decision-makers can leverage the processing capability of AI tools “to streamline their processes to make their work a little bit more efficient” (P15).

4.4 Perceived implications for other stakeholders

When considering AI adoption, decision-makers also weigh the broader impact of AI and the implications for other stakeholders involved in how AI systems are deployed and used. These stakeholders’ goals may diverge from those of the decision-maker. One key stakeholder is the **organization** to which the decision-maker belongs. For instance, in JRN, news agencies “obviously have different agendas” from journalists and typically prioritize profits P02, whereas many journalists value producing high-quality content over maximizing output. Nonetheless, organizational objectives such as cost reduction and efficiency gains can significantly influence decision-makers’ adoption choices.

Decision-subjects (e.g., patients in MED settings or clients in LEG contexts) are another crucial stakeholder group considered by decision-makers. While AI tools can offer benefits to decision-makers and their organizations, participants noted potential harms to decision-subjects. For example, AI systems may fail to identify contextually relevant factors that a human might catch (P05), or introduce biases and stereotyping in decision-making (P04, P06, P09, P10, P12, P15). These risks may make decision-makers hesitant to adopt AI tools, especially when decision-makers perceive risks to vulnerable populations.

5 COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF AI ADOPTION

We use the factors outlined in Section 4 to develop an AI adoption sheet (Figure 1) that helps analyze decision-makers’ adoption choices around adopting AI for specific use cases. We define these use cases as unique contexts where AI supports decision-making or task completion. Importantly, decision-maker adoption is often context-dependent, varying not only across different use cases, but also for similar use cases in different domains.

To identify use cases of interest, we first coded 34 distinct use cases mentioned by our participants (detailed in the Appendix). Most use cases are domain-specific, targeting specific tasks or objectives (e.g., recidivism prediction in LEG or MED diagnostics through radiology reads). However, two use cases appeared in three domains each: **e-discovery** (mentioned by nine participants in JRN, LEG, PHW) and **tailoring communications** (mentioned by four participants in JRN, MED, PHW). We now examine both case studies through a cross-domain lens to illustrate how our AI adoption sheet helps systematically elucidate differences in decision-maker adoption.

5.1 E-Discovery for Research and Analysis

Decision-makers increasingly use AI tools for *e-discovery*, which refers to gathering, organizing, and analyzing relevant digital data for downstream goals. For example, journalists investigating a story often need to draw on various sources of data (e.g., interviews, public records) [15, 52, 65]. All of our JRN participants described AI tools for e-discovery to be extremely helpful in streamlining the reporting process (P01, P02, P03, P04). In LEG contexts, discovery is a long-standing procedure that comprises the initial phase of litigation, requiring attorneys and paralegals to sift through case materials to identify pertinent documents and evidence. Recently, AI tools have allowed attorneys to more efficiently identify relevant documents in the increasingly digitalized landscape through e-discovery (P05, P06) [42, 45, 74]. PHW decision-makers similarly draw on community-level data to help shape effective policies, and participants described the use of AI tools for the analysis of these data (P13, P15, P16) [61, 75]. In MED settings, a key part of clinicians’ workflow involves reviewing patient histories to tailor treatment plans and provide the highest quality of care for each patient. AI for e-discovery could substantially reduce their workload; however, our MED participants noted that these types of tools are seldom adopted in practice (P08, P12).¹ We summarize our analysis in Figure 4a, where we illustrate why e-discovery AI tools are more widely adopted by decision-makers in some domains (e.g., in JRN, LEG, PHW) compared to others (i.e., in MED).

Factor 1: Decision-maker background. In fields requiring high specialization, such as LEG, MED, and PHW, decision-makers often have a greater sense of confidence in their own judgment. Such confidence may make them less inclined to rely on support from AI tools, especially if the tools might lack relevant context (P05, P09). For example, an attorney may believe “AI tools have a hard time understanding the nuance and complex context involved” in case documents and thus prefer to go through discovery on their own (P06). P05 notes that although AI tools for e-discovery can be extremely beneficial, “there’s a trade-off. Being the associate who knew the entire case and read every document was really valuable and obviously, there are times when a machine learning algorithm is not able to correctly predict what would have been relevant whereas a lawyer would have noticed something and pulled that document.” We also observe this in MED, where clinicians may prioritize their professional experience over insights provided by AI (P08, P12).

¹A large-scale survey by PWC studying AI and robotics in healthcare has also not identified the use of AI tools for e-discovery in MED [51].




Figure 4: An overview of two cross-domain case studies analyzed through our AI adoption sheet. For each domain, a green plus sign (+) indicates that a factor is likely to influence decision-makers to adopt AI tools, a red minus sign (-) indicates that a factor is likely to sway decision-makers NOT to adopt AI tools, and a tilde (~) indicates that the factor likely does not strongly affect a decision-maker’s adoption choice.

Even in PHW, case workers often have extensive professional experience with the communities they serve, allowing them to process more nuanced context than AI tools can provide (P14). In contrast, decision-makers in JRN may tackle a wide range of topics, including those outside their immediate expertise, which may make them more likely to embrace AI tools for e-discovery (P02, P03).

Factor 2: Model perception. E-discovery tools in JRN and LEG settings are typically used for researching information as decision-makers believe they can simplify and streamline research processes effectively (P03, P05, P06, [72]). Similarly, decision-makers believe e-discovery tools in PHW can be used to support existing data analysis frameworks (e.g., generating spreadsheet formulas). As P15 explained: “If I ask an AI tool for a formula to do something in sheets and it gives me an answer that’s not true, it’s easy for me to know that it’s not true because when I just go in, I type in the formula and it doesn’t work”. In these settings, decision-makers may perceive models to be more trustworthy as it is easier to identify when AI outputs are incorrect. In contrast, participants in MED domains

tend to express significant skepticism towards the use of AI tools and algorithms in clinical practice (P10) as it remains “unclear what their added value is and whether there is really consensus that these models are safe to use”(P08). P09 admits it feels “a bit off when you have the human depending on the accuracy of the model and not on the expertise of humans.” Especially as there are a multitude of established and validated resources in MED (e.g., classical risk scores), clinicians may be unlikely to adopt AI tools for e-discovery.

Factor 3: Consequences for the decision-maker. The stakes of using e-discovery tools vary across domains. For example, attorneys may face serious legal repercussions if e-discovery tools cause pertinent information to be missed or lead the attorney to form biased opinions, negatively impacting trial outcomes. Improper handling of sensitive data may also have legal ramifications for the attorney considering “chats with AI systems are not confidential” (P06) and would “be a breach of duties as a lawyer to protect client confidential information,” violating attorney-client privilege without informed consent (P05). In MED, similar concerns have

arisen regarding incorporating e-discovery tools, though the full extent of potential consequences remains unclear. As noted by P10, malpractice liability is a key consideration among clinicians:

“All the clinicians have malpractice insurance. Do the algorithms? Do they need to? I think all of these are hard questions. If I was liable for what happened to my patient and I have very expensive insurance because of that, I don’t want to be told what to do unless they’re going to take the liability away.” (P10)

In high-stakes domains such as LEG and MED—where risks are more pronounced—decision-makers may be more hesitant to adopt tools that could expose them to additional liability. In comparison, mistakes as a result of using AI tools during the research step in both JRN and PHW may only result in a mild reprimand.

Factor 4: Perceived implications for other stakeholders.

Since e-discovery tools can make decision-makers more efficient, other stakeholders may prefer decision-makers to adopt these tools. For example, P05 and P06 noted that e-discovery tools powered by generative AI, when used appropriately, can help not only lawyers, but also “clients because it can make what lawyers do cheaper” as clients are billed based on the hours spent on their case (P05). Some law firms may also encourage the usage of these tools so that lawyers can take on more clients. Similarly, news companies that journalists work for may also urge the use of e-discovery tools to help maximize content output, and thus business profits as well (P02, P03). However, in MED, while some hospitals may promote the adoption of AI for e-discovery to increase the number of patients that a clinician sees each day, clinicians tend to feel that they must take the patient into account above everything else. To this end, P08 emphasized that AI outputs, which oftentimes “objectively seem to be the best, may subjectively be worse for the patient” and may cause more harm than good if adopted. Analogously in PHW, case workers often work for non-profits or government agencies that have “limited capacity to maintain and use more complex models” (P14), which may result in a limited number of tools available to decision-makers.

5.2 Tailoring Communication to Audiences of Differing Backgrounds

Effective communication is crucial for successful interactions across numerous domains and is often necessary to communicate between individuals from different backgrounds (e.g., educational, cultural, linguistic). Tailoring communication to audiences of differing backgrounds is a complex task that has seen an increase in the use of AI tools [1, 4, 7, 26, 38]. Our participants also noted the use of AI tools for relevant applications, including language translation (P01, P03), simplifying jargon (P09, P12), and even adjusting the tone and style of writing to better align with specific cultural contexts (P15, P16). Despite their potential, these AI tools are not always adopted by decision-makers. While this use case emerged in interviews across JRN, MED, and PHW, it was absent in LEG.² Using our factors, we investigate how AI tools are used to tailor communications across domains (summarized in Figure 4b). We

focus our discussion on Factors 1, 2, and 4 as they have the greatest inter-domain differences. For conciseness, we omit discussion of Factor 3 as inter-domain differences are less distinct.

Factor 1: Decision-maker background. Emphasis in some domains prioritizing human-to-human interactions may discourage the adoption of AI for tailoring communications (P05, P06, P08, P09). Especially in LEG where “lawyers are the world’s most highly paid rhetoricians” (P05), direct communications with the decision-maker may be highly valued. Similarly, AI tools can help streamline communications in MED, but “shared decision-making between a doctor and their patient—which has to be customized to what the patient feels is important at that time”—can never be replaced by AI due to the subjective nature of MED (P08). Alternatively, fields such as PHW may be “chronically underfunded, underresourced, understaffed, and overworked”, so a desire to “be more efficient and do more with less” may encourage decision-makers to adopt AI tools to avoid burnout (P15).

Factor 2: Model perception. Depending on the specific needs of a decision-maker, they may perceive model performance and reliability differently. Although some decision-makers may be inclined to use AI tools for translation as many languages are available, others may be reluctant to adopt such tools because they feel “some languages are not yet working well” (P16) or believe that AI generates low-quality outputs (P04, [69]). Participants echo the sentiment found in Clio [21], which highlights that LEG professionals are interested yet cautious of AI due to the risk of hallucinations (P05, P06). Similarly, in MED, both our participants (P09, P11) and the surveys by Association [6] show that physician sentiment toward enthusiasm for AI translation services trends positive, with a 3% increase from 2023 to 2024 [6]. P15 explains this with a concrete example: When prompting an AI model for a vaccine analogy, model outputs “tailoring for the Latino and Hispanic communities gave an example of a soccer game” but when prompting for anecdotes “tailored to the Black and African American communities, the model gave me a bulletproof vest analogy which, of course, is hugely problematic.” However, in a recent repeat of this experiment, P15 found the model had improved and no longer performed in this problematic way.

Factor 4: Perceived implications for other stakeholders. AI tools can enable decision-makers to tailor communications to a variety of backgrounds. In MED, while “the best clinicians are the ones who personalize their decisions around the patient,” patients must be able to fully understand any health considerations to properly “come up with a shared decision” with their clinician (P08). As such, our participants spoke positively about AI tools that can translate medical text into “a reading format that fits the patient and their education level” (P09) to “help patients or caregivers when they have to make personal, value-based decisions by turning something of high complexity into something understandable for them” (P12). Patients have even been found to prefer AI responses to clinician-to-patient messages [36, 67]. However, when decision-makers believe that AI tools fail to account for varying cultural backgrounds and the impact of harmful speech, they may be less inclined to adopt AI tools. This is because the outputs of AI models “become representative of a country and representative of a culture”, and models trained

²It similarly did not appear across surveys in LEG conducted by Warren et al. [72].

on low-quality data can perpetuate harmful stereotypes (P04). Additionally, P15 notes that AI use can have a “broader impact. If we continue to use language that is harmful to communities, if we use language that is inaccurate, if we use tools that provide information that is misleading, or that turns people off to the information because it is not presented in a compassionate way. I think all of that will have a negative impact down the line” such as “contribute to inequities and contribute to widening disparities” (P15).

6 DISCUSSION

6.1 Recommendation for better AI adoption

While decision-makers ultimately choose whether to adopt AI tools, their choices are shaped by many other actors—including model developers, policymakers, and researchers. Building on our findings, we offer four recommendations to support responsible AI adoption in practice.

(1) Integrate Decision-Maker Perspectives in AI Development. We recommend starting with the decision-maker and considering whether they are likely to adopt an AI tool before developing and deploying AI tools for specific use cases. We present our AI adoption sheet in Figure 1, summarizing the four high-level factors that we identified. We also provide examples of how this AI adoption sheet can be applied to the aforementioned case studies in the Appendix. Prior to deploying new AI tools, we encourage model developers, policymakers, and researchers to utilize this AI adoption sheet to proactively assess how AI tools may be adopted by decision-makers in practice.

(2) Bolster Decision-maker Education on AI. Increasing AI literacy can mitigate the influence of decision-maker background and model misperception on adoption choices (P07, P08, P16). We encourage decision-makers to engage with emerging resources on AI literacy [20, 44]. We also recommend that organizations developing AI tools concurrently invest in literacy initiatives in collaboration with AI researchers and model designers. In particular, we encourage future literacy work to focus not only on decision-maker adoption choices, but also on the relationship between adoption and reliance to promote responsible use of AI tools by decision-makers.

(3) Develop Infrastructure to Integrate AI into Existing Workflows. Often, the additional workload required to use AI tools not integrated into decision-maker workflows may be prohibitive to adoption. Moreover, AI systems often demand substantial resources—such as data storage—that many organizations, particularly those lacking a clear AI adoption strategy, struggle to accommodate (P01, P06, P10, P13, P14). These challenges typically place an additional burden on the decision-maker, further deterring adoption. We recommend that organizations adopt a more deliberate approach to AI procurement, ensuring they have the necessary infrastructure in place. To support decision-maker adoption, deployed tools should align with existing workflows rather than requiring substantial procedural changes [62].

(4) Provide Resources to Decision-makers for Navigating Applicable Policies. The consequences decision-makers must weigh when adopting AI tools remain poorly defined (P10, P11). Our

interviews suggest that the current regulatory landscape is inadequate, with one participant noting a “lack [of] the right regulatory framework” to ensure responsible AI use (P05). The reactive nature of AI policy has left decision-makers struggling to “navigate the patchwork regulatory approach that currently exists” (P05). Policymakers should interface with existing research on AI governance [57, 58, 64] and collaborate with researchers, model designers, and decision-makers to craft more coherent and proactive AI policies. However, until such policies are implemented, it is essential that organizations offer practical resources to their members to support navigation of the existing regulatory environment.

6.2 Comparison of findings to prior work

Comparison to organizational factors. As highlighted in Section 2.2, researchers have extensively studied AI adoption at the organizational level, identifying factors such as issues with data quality and availability, lack of data governance or regulation, and goals related to cost or time efficiency. These organizational-level factors parallel some of our decision-maker-centric factors—for instance, organizational concerns about data quality or availability mirror decision-maker concerns about model performance (*Model perception*). However, prior work studying organizational adoption tends to overlook the nuanced and multifaceted consequences considered by decision-makers, which include time trade-offs, various types of liabilities, and implications for other stakeholders that may not align with organizational priorities. Although organizational factors touch on some of these issues, they typically focus narrowly on organizational goals. Examining adoption at both the decision-maker and organizational levels highlights overlapping factors that are important to consider when evaluating AI tools. However, considering AI adoption from the perspective of decision-makers may offer a more comprehensive understanding of the factors shaping real-world adoption.

Comparison to previously identified decision-maker factors. While prior work has rarely studied adoption at the level of the individual decision-maker, our findings align with and extend insights from two prior works [28, 30]. Fang et al. [28] emphasizes that distinctions based on professional roles—analogue to *Decision-maker background*—are important to understanding decision-maker adoption in LEG. However, their findings focus solely on how occupational roles shape adoption attitudes and do not cover any other factors. Hameed et al. [30] validates seven predefined constructs to influence adoption behaviors (performance expectancy, effort expectancy, personal innovativeness in information technology, task complexity, technological characteristics, initial trust, and social influence) that also align with our identified factors. However, while these studies find factors to always be significant, our case studies in Section 5 show that these factors vary in importance across domains and use cases. By offering broader categories with more granular prompts, our AI adoption sheet helps organize and simplify these constructs, encouraging more systematic future research into what shapes AI adoption choices. Together, these contributions provide a structured, practical tool for future research and practice.

6.3 Limitations and Future Work

Our study has several limitations, which motivate directions for future work. We acknowledge that our participant sample size and the set of domains are limited and do not capture the full spectrum of real-world applications. Additionally, our participants were all based in the United States, which may limit the generalizability of our findings to other domains and contexts. As such, the four key factors we identified in Section 4 may not be exhaustive. We encourage future work to build on our methods and evaluate a larger sample of decision-makers in more domains. Additionally, as our recruitment protocol required that study participants have prior experience with AI tools in their domain, our interviewees may be biased towards the adoption of AI tools in practice. Participants may have also had varying degrees of comfort when discussing some use cases and factors over others, which may have shaped the responses we received. As our interviews were open-ended, discussions primarily focused on an *individual* decision-maker, which is consistent with most prior work. However, we encourage future work to also consider factors influencing adoption by groups of decision-makers. Further, we acknowledge that decision-makers' perceptions and the capabilities of AI models are rapidly evolving. Our interviews, conducted between October 2023 and October 2024, reflect perceptions and model capabilities relevant during this time frame. Finally, we focused on *inter-domain* differences; further study is needed to explore *intra-domain* differences between decision-makers and how they influence AI adoption.

7 CONCLUSION

AI adoption depends on the decision-maker actively incorporating AI tools into their workflows. To identify common factors across domains that influence decision-makers' use of AI, we conducted 16 semi-structured interviews with decision-makers across four domains. Through our cross-domain analysis, we identify four key factors that impact decision-maker adoption. We apply this sheet to two case studies of real-world use cases, illustrating why AI-powered tools are more widely adopted by decision-makers in some domains and not others. We believe that the AI adoption sheet has many uses; it can support researchers considering the adoption of AI in new domains, model developers creating new AI tools with the end user in mind, and organizations identifying appropriate AI tools suited for decision-maker adoption. In closing, we hope that this work not only encourages further analyses focused on the decision-maker but also inspires future research to look beyond a single use case or domain.

REFERENCES

- [1] ZAID Abdelali, Hanane Bennoudi, et al. 2023. AI vs. Human Translators: Navigating the Complex World of Religious Texts and Cultural Sensitivity. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation* 6, 11 (2023), 173–182.
- [2] William C Adams. 2015. Conducting semi-structured interviews. *Handbook of practical program evaluation* (2015), 492–505.
- [3] Omolola A Adeoye-Olatunde and Nicole L Olenik. 2021. Research and scholarly methods: Semi-structured interviews. *Journal of the american college of clinical pharmacy* 4, 10 (2021), 1358–1367.
- [4] Sami Algouzi and Ali Abbas Falah Alzubi. 2023. The study of AI-mediated communication and socio-cultural language-related variables: Gmail reply suggestions. *Applied Artificial Intelligence* 37, 1 (2023), 2175114.
- [5] Parham Amiri and Elena Karahanna. 2022. Chatbot use cases in the Covid-19 public health response. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 29, 5 (2022), 1000–1010.
- [6] American Medical Association. 2025. *AMA Augmented Intelligence Research: Physician sentiments around the use of AI in healthcare*. Technical Report. American Medical Association.
- [7] Nune Ayyvazyan, Yu Hao, and Anthony Pym. 2024. Things to Do in the Translation Class When Technologies Change: The Case of Generative AI. In *New Advances in Translation Technology: Applications and Pedagogy*. Springer, 219–238.
- [8] Gagan Bansal, Besmira Nushi, Ece Kamar, Walter S Lasecki, Daniel S Weld, and Eric Horvitz. 2019. Beyond accuracy: The role of mental models in human-AI team performance. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on human computation and crowdsourcing*, Vol. 7. 2–11.
- [9] Gagan Bansal, Tongshuang Wu, Joyce Zhou, Raymond Fok, Besmira Nushi, Ece Kamar, Marco Tulio Ribeiro, and Daniel Weld. 2021. Does the Whole Exceed its Parts? The Effect of AI Explanations on Complementary Team Performance. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*. 1–16.
- [10] Enes Emre Başar and Aysu Kes Erkul. 2024. Factors Affecting the Attitude of Medical Doctors in Türkiye towards Using Artificial Intelligence Applications in Healthcare Services. (2024).
- [11] Patrick Bedué and Albrecht Fritzsche. 2022. Can we trust AI? An empirical investigation of trust requirements and guide to successful AI adoption. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management* 35, 2 (2022), 530–549.
- [12] Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke. 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology* 3, 2 (2006), 77–101.
- [13] Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke. 2019. Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative research in sport, exercise and health* 11, 4 (2019), 589–597.
- [14] Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke. 2021. Can I use TA? Should I use TA? Should I not use TA? Comparing reflexive thematic analysis and other pattern-based qualitative analytic approaches. *Counselling and psychotherapy research* 21, 1 (2021), 37–47.
- [15] Meredith Broussard, Nicholas Diakopoulos, Andrea L Guzman, Rediet Abebe, Michel Dupagne, and Ching-Hua Chuan. 2019. Artificial intelligence and journalism. *Journalism & mass communication quarterly* 96, 3 (2019), 673–695.
- [16] Carrie J. Cai, Samantha Winter, David Steiner, Lauren Wilcox, and Michael Terry. 2019. "Hello AI": Uncovering the Onboarding Needs of Medical Practitioners for Human-AI Collaborative Decision-Making. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 3, CSCW, Article 104 (Nov. 2019), 24 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3359206>
- [17] Averill Campion, Mila Gasco-Hernandez, Slava Jankin Mikhaylov, and Marc Esteve. 2022. Overcoming the challenges of collaboratively adopting artificial intelligence in the public sector. *Social Science Computer Review* 40, 2 (2022), 462–477.
- [18] Sheshadri Chatterjee, Nripendra P Rana, Yogesh K Dwivedi, and Abdullah M Baabdullah. 2021. Understanding AI adoption in manufacturing and production firms using an integrated TAM-TOE model. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* 170 (2021), 120880.
- [19] Valerie Chen, Q Vera Liao, Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, and Gagan Bansal. 2023. Understanding the role of human intuition on reliance in human-AI decision-making with explanations. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-computer Interaction* 7, CSCW2 (2023), 1–32.
- [20] Thomas KF Chiu, Zubair Ahmad, Murod Ismailov, and Ismaila Temitayo Sanusi. 2024. What are artificial intelligence literacy and competency? A comprehensive framework to support them. *Computers and Education Open* 6 (2024), 100171.
- [21] Clio. 2023. *Legal Trends Report*. Technical Report. Clio.
- [22] Francesco Contini. 2024. Unboxing Generative AI for the Legal Professions: Functions, Impacts and Governance. In *IJCA*, Vol. 15. HeinOnline, 1.
- [23] Marija Cubric. 2020. Drivers, barriers and social considerations for AI adoption in business and management: A tertiary study. *Technology in Society* 62 (2020), 101257.
- [24] Thomas H Davenport and John P Glaser. 2022. Factors governing the adoption of artificial intelligence in healthcare providers. *Discover Health Systems* 1, 1 (2022), 4.
- [25] Berkeley J Dietvorst, Joseph P Simmons, and Cade Massey. 2015. Algorithm aversion: people erroneously avoid algorithms after seeing them err. *Journal of experimental psychology: General* 144, 1 (2015), 114.
- [26] Aditya Dwivedi, Siddhinath Sahu, Anubhava Srivastava, et al. 2024. AI-Powered Real-Time Text Editor with Multilingual Translation and Speech Recognition. In *2024 IEEE 16th International Conference on Computational Intelligence and Communication Networks (CICN)*. IEEE, 1335–1340.
- [27] Yogesh K Dwivedi, Laurie Hughes, Elvira Ismagilova, Gert Aarts, Crispin Coombs, Tom Crick, Yanqing Duan, Rohita Dwivedi, John Edwards, Aled Eirug, et al. 2021. Artificial Intelligence (AI): Multidisciplinary perspectives on emerging challenges, opportunities, and agenda for research, practice and policy. *International journal of information management* 57 (2021), 101994.
- [28] Chengyu Fang, J Nan Wilkenfeld, Nitzan Navick, and Jennifer L Gibbs. 2023. "AI Am Here to Represent You": Understanding How Institutional Logics Shape Attitudes Toward Intelligent Technologies in Legal Work. *Management Communication Quarterly* 37, 4 (2023), 941–970.
- [29] Leo A Goodman. 1961. Snowball sampling. *The annals of mathematical statistics* (1961), 148–170.

- [30] BM Zeeshan Hameed, Nithesh Naik, Sufyan Ibrahim, Nisha S Tatkar, Milap J Shah, Dharini Prasad, Prithvi Hegde, Piotr Chlost, Bhavan Prasad Rai, and Bhaskar K Somani. 2023. Breaking barriers: Unveiling factors influencing the adoption of artificial intelligence by healthcare providers. *Big Data and Cognitive Computing* 7, 2 (2023), 105.
- [31] Harlan Benjamin Harvey and Vrushab Gowda. 2021. Regulatory issues and challenges to artificial intelligence adoption. *Radiologic Clinics* 59, 6 (2021), 1075–1083.
- [32] Katharine E Henry, Rachel Kornfield, Anirudh Sridharan, Robert C Linton, Catherine Groh, Tony Wang, Albert Wu, Bilge Mutlu, and Suchi Saria. 2022. Human-machine teaming is key to AI adoption: clinicians' experiences with a deployed machine learning system. *NPJ digital medicine* 5, 1 (2022), 97.
- [33] Eunkyoung Jo, Daniel A. Epstein, Hyunhoon Jung, and Young-Ho Kim. 2023. Understanding the Benefits and Challenges of Deploying Conversational AI Leveraging Large Language Models for Public Health Intervention. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Hamburg, Germany) (CHI '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 18, 16 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3544548.3581503>
- [34] Anna Kawakami, Amanda Coston, Hoda Heidari, Kenneth Holstein, and Haiyi Zhu. 2024. Studying Up Public Sector AI: How Networks of Power Relations Shape Agency Decisions Around AI Design and Use. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 8, CSCW2 (2024), 1–24.
- [35] Anna Kawakami, Venkatesh Sivaraman, Hao-Fei Cheng, Logan Stapleton, Yanghui Cheng, Diana Qing, Adam Perer, Zhiwei Steven Wu, Haiyi Zhu, and Kenneth Holstein. 2022. Improving human-AI partnerships in child welfare: understanding worker practices, challenges, and desires for algorithmic decision support. In *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–18.
- [36] Jiyeon Kim, Michael L Chen, Shawheen J Rezaei, April S Liang, Susan M Seav, Sonia Onyeka, Julie J Lee, Shivam C Vedak, David Mui, Rayhan A Lal, et al. 2024. Perspectives on Artificial Intelligence-Generated Responses to Patient Messages. *JAMA Network Open* 7, 10 (2024), e2438535–e2438535.
- [37] Min Kyung Lee, Nina Grgić-Hlača, Michael Carl Tschantz, Reuben Binns, Adrian Weller, Michelle Carney, and Kori Inkpen. 2020. Human-Centered Approaches to Fair and Responsible AI. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Honolulu, HI, USA) (CHI EA '20). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3334480.3375158>
- [38] Tong King Lee. 2024. Artificial intelligence and posthumanist translation: ChatGPT versus the translator. *Applied Linguistics Review* 15, 6 (2024), 2351–2372.
- [39] Jennifer M Logg, Julia A Minson, and Don A Moore. 2019. Algorithm appreciation: People prefer algorithmic to human judgment. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 151 (2019), 90–103.
- [40] Rohit Madan and Mona Ashok. 2023. AI adoption and diffusion in public administration: A systematic literature review and future research agenda. *Government Information Quarterly* 40, 1 (2023), 101774.
- [41] Mohammad I Merhi. 2023. An evaluation of the critical success factors impacting artificial intelligence implementation. *International Journal of Information Management* 69 (2023), 102545.
- [42] Padmapriya Nagineni. 2024. The Rise of AI in eDiscovery: How Machine Learning is Revolutionizing Legal Data Processing. *International Journal of Computer Engineering and Tehnology (IJ CET)* 15, 5 (2024), 329–341.
- [43] Oliver Neumann, Katharina Guirguis, and Reto Steiner. 2024. Exploring artificial intelligence adoption in public organizations: a comparative case study. *Public Management Review* 26, 1 (2024), 114–141.
- [44] Davy Tsz Kit Ng, Jac Ka Lok Leung, Samuel Kai Wah Chu, and Maggie Shen Qiao. 2021. Conceptualizing AI literacy: An exploratory review. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence* 2 (2021), 100041.
- [45] Sumit Pai, Sounak Lahiri, Ujjwal Kumar, Krishanu Bakshi, Elijah Soba, Michael Suesserman, Nirmala Pudota, Jon Foster, Edward Bowen, and Sanmitra Bhat-tacharya. 2023. Exploration of Open Large Language Models for eDiscovery. In *Proceedings of the Natural Legal Language Processing Workshop 2023*. 166–177.
- [46] Sun Young Park, Pei-Yi Kuo, Andrea Barbarin, Elizabeth Kaziunas, Astrid Chow, Karandeep Singh, Lauren Wilcox, and Walter S Lasecki. 2019. Identifying challenges and opportunities in human-AI collaboration in healthcare. In *Companion Publication of the 2019 Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing*. 506–510.
- [47] Charlie Parker, Sam Scott, and Alistair Geddes. 2019. Snowball sampling. *SAGE research methods foundations* (2019).
- [48] Samir Passi and Mihaela Vorvoreanu. 2022. Overreliance on AI literature review. *Microsoft Research* 339 (2022), 340.
- [49] Aruna Polisetty, Debarun Chakraborty, Arpan Kumar Kar, and Subhajit Pahari. 2024. What determines AI adoption in companies? Mixed-method evidence. *Journal of Computer Information Systems* 64, 3 (2024), 370–387.
- [50] Eric G Poon, Christy Harris Lemak, Juan C Rojas, Janet Guptill, and David Classen. 2025. Adoption of artificial intelligence in healthcare: survey of health system priorities, successes, and challenges. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* (2025), ocaf065.
- [51] PWC. 2017. *Why AI and Robotics will define New Health*. Technical Report. PWC.
- [52] Claudia Quinonez and Edgar Meij. 2024. A new era of AI-assisted journalism at Bloomberg. *AI Magazine* (2024).
- [53] Massimo Regona, Tan Yigitcanlar, Bo Xia, and Rita Yi Man Li. 2022. Opportunities and adoption challenges of AI in the construction industry: A PRISMA review. *Journal of open innovation: technology, market, and complexity* 8, 1 (2022), 14952.
- [54] Carlo Reverberi, Tommaso Rigon, Aldo Solari, Cesare Hassan, Paolo Cherubini, and Andrea Cherubini. 2022. Experimental evidence of effective human-AI collaboration in medical decision-making. *Scientific reports* 12, 1 (2022), 14952.
- [55] Beau G Schelble, Jeremy Lopez, Claire Textor, Rui Zhang, Nathan J McNeese, Richard Pak, and Guo Freeman. 2024. Towards ethical AI: Empirically investigating dimensions of AI ethics, trust repair, and performance in human-AI teaming. *Human Factors* 66, 4 (2024), 1037–1055.
- [56] Max Schemmer, Niklas Kuehl, Carina Benz, Andrea Bartos, and Gerhard Satzger. 2023. Appropriate reliance on AI advice: Conceptualization and the effect of explanations. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces*. 410–422.
- [57] Daniel Schiff. 2022. Education for AI, not AI for education: The role of education and ethics in national AI policy strategies. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education* 32, 3 (2022), 527–563.
- [58] Daniel Schiff, Justin Biddle, Jason Borenstein, and Kelly Laas. 2020. What's next for ai ethics, policy, and governance? a global overview. In *Proceedings of the AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*. 153–158.
- [59] Jakob Schoeffler, Maria De-Arteaga, and Niklas Kuehl. 2024. Explanations, fairness, and appropriate reliance in human-AI decision-making. In *Proceedings of the 2024 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–18.
- [60] Tavprites Sethi, Anushtha Kalia, Arjun Sharma, and Aditya Nagori. 2020. Interpretable artificial intelligence: Closing the adoption gap in healthcare. In *Artificial Intelligence in Precision Health*. Elsevier, 3–29.
- [61] Tianqi Shang, Shu Yang, Weiqing He, Tianhua Zhai, Dawei Li, Bojian Hou, Tianlong Chen, Jason H Moore, Marylyn D Ritchie, and Li Shen. 2024. Leveraging Social Determinants of Health in Alzheimer's Research Using LLM-Augmented Literature Mining and Knowledge Graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.09080* (2024).
- [62] Elise Silva, Nari Johnson, Ravit Dotan, Motahare Eslami, Hoda Heidari, and Beth Schwanke. 2025. Procuring Public-Sector AI: Guidance for Local Governments. Available at SSRN 5227802 (2025).
- [63] Ítalo Silva, Leandro Marinho, Alan Said, and Martijn C Willemsen. 2024. Leveraging ChatGPT for Automated Human-centered Explanations in Recommender Systems. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces*. 597–608.
- [64] Charlotte Stix. 2021. Actionable principles for artificial intelligence policy: three pathways. *Science and engineering ethics* 27, 1 (2021), 15.
- [65] Jonathan Stray. 2021. Making artificial intelligence work for investigative journalism. *Algorithms, Automation, and News* (2021), 97–118.
- [66] Tara Qian Sun and Rony Medaglia. 2019. Mapping the challenges of Artificial Intelligence in the public sector: Evidence from public healthcare. *Government information quarterly* 36, 2 (2019), 368–383.
- [67] Ming Tai-Seale, Sally L Baxter, Florin Vaida, Amanda Walker, Amy M Sitapati, Chad Osborne, Joseph Diaz, Nimit Desai, Sophie Webb, Gregory Polston, et al. 2024. AI-generated draft replies integrated into health records and physicians' electronic communication. *JAMA Network Open* 7, 4 (2024), e246565–e246565.
- [68] Anja Thieme, Maryann Hanratty, Maria Lyons, Jorge Palacios, Rita Faia Marques, Cecily Morrison, and Gavin Doherty. 2023. Designing Human-centered AI for Mental Health: Developing Clinically Relevant Applications for Online CBT Treatment. *ACM Trans. Comput.-Hum. Interact.* 30, 2, Article 27 (March 2023), 50 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3564752>
- [69] Brian Thompson, Mehak Dhaliwal, Peter Frisch, Tobias Domhan, and Marcello Federico. 2024. A shocking amount of the web is machine translated: Insights from multi-way parallelism. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024*. 1763–1775.
- [70] Victoria Uren and John S Edwards. 2023. Technology readiness and the organizational journey towards AI adoption: An empirical study. *International Journal of Information Management* 68 (2023), 102588.
- [71] Deepika Verma. 2024. Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Journalism: A Comprehensive Review of AI in Journalism. *Journal of Communication and Management* 3, 02 (2024), 150–156.
- [72] Zach Warren, Mike Abbott, Lucy Leach, Christine Post, Steve Seemer, Anastasia Strunsky, and Gregg Wirth. 2024. *2024 Generative AI in Professional Services: Perceptions, Usage and Impact on the Future of Work*. Technical Report. Thomson Reuters Institute.
- [73] Kevin Wu, Eric Wu, Brandon Theodorou, Weixin Liang, Christina Mack, Lucas Glass, Jimeng Sun, and James Zou. 2024. Characterizing the clinical adoption of medical AI devices through US insurance claims. *NEJM AI* 1, 1 (2024), AIoa2300030.
- [74] Eugene Yang, Roshanak Omrani, Evan Curtin, Tara Emory, Lenora Gray, Jeremy Pickens, Nathan Reff, Cristin Traylor, Sean Underwood, David D Lewis, et al. 2024. Beyond the Bar: Generative AI as a Transformative Component in Legal

Document Review. In *2024 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (BigData)*. IEEE, 4779–4788.

- [75] Jingmei Yang, Kenji C Walker, Ayse A Bekar-Cesaretli, Boran Hao, Nahid Bhadelia, Diane Joseph-McCarthy, and Ioannis Ch Paschalidis. 2024. Automating biomedical literature review for rapid drug discovery: Leveraging GPT-4 to expedite pandemic response. *International Journal of Medical Informatics* (2024), 105500.
- [76] Qian Yang, Aaron Steinfeld, and John Zimmerman. 2019. Unremarkable AI: Fitting Intelligent Decision Support into Critical, Clinical Decision-Making Processes. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Glasgow, Scotland Uk) (CHI '19). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3290605.3300468>

A IRB-APPROVED PROTOCOL

A.1 Email Solicitation

Dear [...],

We hope our email finds you well. We are a group of researchers from Carnegie Mellon University, conducting a research study on Human-AI (H-AI) partnerships in practice. Based on the publicly available information, we have identified you as an individual with relevant domain expertise with experience working with AI in our application domains of interest (journalism, social computing, medicine, justice, welfare). We are writing to invite you to participate in a virtual interview.

Study purpose: We have observed that H-AI partnerships look different in various domains and as such are interested in studying how different factors may affect these partnerships and the outcomes of these partnerships. As such, the purpose of the study is to obtain the opinions of domain experts across several important domains (e.g., medicine, justice, etc.) on applications of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and existing H-AI partnerships in their field in order to explore how various aspects of these partnerships may augment or diminish their use in practice. We consider H-AI interactions, collaboration between humans and AI models, and AI-assisted decision-making as forms of H-AI partnership.

Participation qualifications: In order to participate, you must be 18 years or older. Since this study seeks to better understand H-AI partnerships in practice, we are looking to interview individuals who are either:

- (1) domain experts with experience around human-AI partnerships in real-world applications of AI
- (2) researchers who have worked closely with domain experts.

Interview questions will cover your level of familiarity with applications of AI in your domain—how your field benefits from AI models, what potential harms AI models present, what ideal H-AI partnerships look like to you, etc.—as well as your perceptions of existing research on H-AI partnerships within your domain. If you feel as if your expertise does not enable you to answer these questions comfortably, we thank you for your time and consideration. If you can think of other prominent individuals in the field who you believe would be a good fit for our study, we would appreciate it if you could forward this email to them or share their contact information with us.

Study details: We expect the full study to take less than 60 minutes to provide detailed responses, but all questions are optional to respond to. Participation is voluntary and you will be compensated \$100 for your participation in a one-on-one interview. Please see the consent form attached. If you wish to proceed after reading

the consent form, please schedule an interview here: [link to scheduling form]

If you have any questions or concerns at any point, please don't hesitate to reply to this email to get in touch with the principal investigator (rebeccay@andrew.cmu.edu).

Thank you for your consideration! Again, if you can think of other prominent individuals in the field who you believe would be a good fit for our study, we would greatly appreciate it if you could forward this email to them or share their contact information with us.

Best regards,
Rebecca Yu (on behalf of the research team)
Valerie Chen
Hoda Heidari
Ameet Talwalkar

A.2 Interview Protocol

Interviews were semi-structured, meaning that we started with a set of predetermined interview questions, but also asked additional questions to follow up on participants' responses and explore emerging themes [2, 3]. Our interview protocol, including predetermined interview questions, is as follows:

- Interviewer instructions
- Consent
 - (Before recording) Can you confirm that you have received and read through the consent document?
 - (On recording) Can you confirm that the consent information has been provided to you, that you agree to participate, and that you agree to have the session recorded?
 - Please remember not to reveal any information you don't want us to include in our study. If you do say anything you would like us to exclude, please let us know.
- Background information
 - What is your area of expertise?
 - * What is your current role?
 - * How many years of domain experience do you have?
 - What is your level of familiarity with Artificial Intelligence (AI) or Machine Learning (ML)?
 - * How many years of experience with AI do you have?
 - Within your domain, how much interaction do you have with AI/ML models?
- Applications of AI
 - Based on your prior experiences and use cases you are familiar with, what is the use of AI in your domain?
 - Do humans interact with these AI systems? We're particularly interested in use cases where humans work closely with AI models in order to make decisions.
 - Can you elaborate on some of the interactions between humans and AI systems?
 - Why do you think current interactions are designed as such? What were the main considerations?

- What should be the main considerations for setting up H-AI interactions for [insert example they talked about]?
- Conclusion
 - Do you have any questions for us?
 - If there's anything from this interview you would like us to not include, please let us know.
 - We'll be reaching out to you again via email after all of our interviews have concluded with regard to reimbursement. Thank you so much for your time!

B FACTORS FOR ORGANIZATIONAL ADOPTION IDENTIFIED IN PRIOR WORK

Below, we provide a brief survey on the factors identified for organizational adoption:

- Cubric [23] — job security; reusability of model; increased dependence on non-humans; lack of knowledge; trust; safety; availability of data; and multiple stakeholders' perspectives.
- Harvey and Gowda [31] — data quality; regulatory paradigm and existing pathways; workflow patterns.
- Regona et al. [53] — reduction of time spent on repetitive tasks; accuracy of events, risks, and cost forecasting; issues with data acquisition and retention.
- Bedué and Fritzsche [11] — “ability”: system and service quality, access to knowledge (including employee training), transparency, explainability, and reliability, data quality; “integrity”: standards, guidelines, and government regulation; “benevolence”: social responsibility, ethical guidelines, data bias, cultural guidelines, sustainability.
- Campion et al. [17] — resistance to sharing data (privacy and security concerns); insufficient understanding of required data available; lack of alignment between project interests and expectations; engagement across organizational hierarchy.
- Madan and Ashok [40] — cost; alternative novel solutions available; expected benefits; organizational risk taking culture; AI literacy; data-oriented culture; company leadership; data governance maturity; ecosystem of partners and experts; bureaucracy and centralized decision-making; data quality; data availability; digital infrastructure.
- Merhi [41] — high cost of AI; lack of technical expertise; AI integration complexity; IT infrastructure; accessibility of a scalable and flexible system; management support; resistance to changing from the status quo; organizational culture; selection of vendors; lack of visibility on benefits of AI; availability of a project champion; ambiguous strategic vision; security and confidentiality; ethics issues; responsibility and accountability; data governance issues; low data quality; insufficient quantity of data.
- Uren and Edwards [70] — cost optimization; technology readiness and AI maturity; disruption of AI adoption; data governance processes; data readiness.
- Neumann et al. [43] — impact on business practices; AI maturity level; alternative solutions available; understandability and explainability of AI solution; fit into existing workflow; organizational innovation culture; intrinsic motivation of project members; data infrastructure and strategy.
- Polisetty et al. [49] — cost savings; AI compatibility; improvements to accuracy, speed, and consistency with better business outcomes; perceived trust by employees; data governance; data quality.

C AI ADOPTION SHEET: E-DISCOVERY

We provide an example of how the AI adoption sheet can be utilized to evaluate the use case of e-discovery across four domains in Figure 5.

D TAXONOMIZING USE CASES

We coded our interviews for use cases mentioned by participants. These use cases were then categorized as utilizing predictive or generative AI models. Predictive AI use cases mentioned by participants are described in Tables 2 and 3. Generative AI use cases mentioned by participants are described in Tables 4 and 5.

Decision-maker adoption for E-Discovery

<p>Journalism (JRN)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision-maker background. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Professional experience. Decision-makers are comfortable using AI tools for e-discovery to augment journalism. • Perceptions of the AI model. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Model transparency and trustworthiness. Outputs can be easily verified/validated. – Belief in model capabilities and adoption benefits. Adopting AI tools be helpful in streamlining the journalism process. • Consequences for the decision-maker. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Liabilities. With due diligence, there should be few legal, professional, or social liabilities. – Uncertainty regarding consequences. Potential consequences are uncertain due to a lack of regulation. • Implications for other stakeholders. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Organizations. JRN organizations will prioritize a high quantity of articles, which adopting an AI e-discovery tool will help with. 	<p>Public Sector (PHW)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision-maker background. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Professional experience. PHW caseworkers are likely to prioritize their expertise over AI outputs. • Perceptions of the AI model. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Model flaws. Some concerns about hallucinations and misinformation. – Model transparency and trustworthiness. Outputs are easy to fact check. – Belief in model capabilities and adoption benefits. Added value when used for data processing tasks—including time optimization. • Consequences for the decision-maker. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Uncertainty regarding consequences. Unclear liabilities for the decision-maker. • Implications for other stakeholders. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Organizations. PHW organizations may lack the infrastructure to support AI adoption. – Decision-subjects. Biased, discriminatory, or stereotyping outputs may significantly harm decision-subjects.
<p>Law (LEG)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision-maker background. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Professional experience. Lawyers and other decision-makers in LEG are likely to prioritize their expertise over AI outputs. • Perceptions of the AI model. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Belief in model capabilities and adoption benefits. Models are trained specifically on LEG data. • Consequences for the decision-maker. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Liabilities. Likely significant legal and professional liabilities. – Uncertainty regarding consequences. Potential indemnification clauses, though these do not absolve the decision-maker of liability. – Workload changes. Potential time optimization from AI adoption may be offset by the time required to fact-check. • Implications for other stakeholders. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Organizations. LEG firms may advocate for AI adoption for time efficiency. – Decision-subjects. Some clients may want AI tools for time efficiency and consequently reduced cost, while others prefer no use of AI. 	<p>Medicine (MED)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision-maker background. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Professional experience. Clinicians are likely to prioritize their expertise over AI outputs. Healthcare treatment requires subjective treatment plan (human interaction), not objective (model output). • Perceptions of the AI model. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Model transparency and trustworthiness. Models are not transparent or as well-validated when compared to existing models. – Belief in model capabilities and adoption benefits. Time optimization, though the benefits are uncertain given the time necessary to fact-check. • Consequences for the decision-maker. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Liabilities. Decision-maker is at risk for significant legal and professional liabilities if adverse outcome. – Uncertainty regarding consequences. No clear guidelines regarding who is liable. • Implications for other stakeholders. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Organizations. MED hospitals may advocate for AI adoption for time efficiency. – Decision-subjects. Biased, discriminatory, or stereotyping outputs may significantly harm decision-subjects.

Figure 5: For each domain, we show how one could proactively work through the AI adoption sheet for the e-discovery case study to understand decision-maker adoption. For brevity, we only include key subfactors for each domain.

Use Case	Description	Mentions
UC01 Medical risk stratification	Derive risk scores from logistic regression models for patients across various applications (e.g., Wells' Criteria for pulmonary embolisms, qSOFA score for sepsis) to identify high-risk individuals for triaging or diagnosis.	P08, P10
UC02 Recidivism prediction	Generate risk scores that are provided to judges attempting to identify ideal sentencing terms to result in just <i>"enough time in prison that is necessary to serve deterrent purposes and rehabilitative purposes"</i> (P05).	P05
UC03 Risk stratification to identify at-risk individuals	Identify children at a high-risk of harm or at risk of returning to the foster care system	P14
UC04 Targeting of welfare services	Determine risk scores for individuals and/or communities to identify high risk for optimized allocation of welfare services	P13, P14
UC05 Assisting medical imaging reads by experts	Provide imaging diagnosis to an expert decision-maker to aid their diagnosis process. Decision-makers may review the model's read prior and simply review results or they may review the model's read after they make their own initial diagnosis prior to their final diagnosis.	P07, P08, P09
UC06 Initial radiology reads for non-experts	Provide radiology read given medical imaging directly to non-expert decision makers (e.g., clinicians that are not trained in radiology). Reads are reviewed by expert radiologists within 48 hours (or 2 hours in urgent cases) who may issue addendums as needed.	P07
UC07 "Gut-check" medical diagnoses	AI identification of easy diagnoses (e.g., obvious cases of pneumoonia) as a "just in case you missed it" backup	P08, P10
UC08 Hospital case scheduling	Generate heuristic-based risk scores for each case in order to optimize scheduling of elective and emergency medical cases for effective time and resource allocation	P10
UC09 Visualizing risk for informed resource-allocation	Generate risk scores to identify high risk areas that are presented to decision-makers to help with informed resource-allocation decisions	P13
UC10 Prioritizing public health check-in calls	Generate heuristic-based risk scores for each case in order to optimize calling schedule for medical and/or public health experts to identify at-risk individuals or otherwise urgent scenarios where experts should focus initial calling efforts to optimize outcomes given limited resources	P13
UC11 Fraud detection in medical insurance claims	Parse insurance claims and records to identify suspicious claims and flag providers who may be overbilling patients for further review by an expert decision-maker.	P11
UC12 Medical image flagging for prioritized clinical review	Identify and flag medical imaging with life threatening findings for immediate review by a clinician, specifically screening out low-risk images to help decision-makers focus their efforts more effectively.	P11

Table 2: Summary of predictive AI use cases.

Use Case	Description	Mentions
UC13 Descriptive analysis of medical images	Automating tasks such as counting mitotic figures or calculating the amount of calcium in an image	P11
UC14 Automatic hours tracking and billing	Automatically track decision-maker (typically an attorney) time allocation when they are working on a client's case. This time allocation is then reviewed and finalized by the decision-maker.	P07
UC15 Predictive analytics for data-informed policymaking	Generate rule-based risk scores that are then benchmarked to consistently apply policy (i.e., automatically determine insurance costs for policyholders) across all scenarios with varying case-by-case decision-maker involvement.	P11
UC16 Feedback to capture better quality medical images	Imaging technicians are provided feedback from the model to attain better imaging quality	P07, P09
UC17 Improved training in pathology	Identify the human learning process to improve teaching (and the learning experience of) new decision-makers	P07, P09, P11

Table 3: Summary of predictive AI use cases (cont.).

Use Case	Description	Mentions
UC18 Medical chart summarization	Summarize a patient's medical history to provide the clinician a concise update on information relevant to the patient's visit	P08
UC19 General information summarization	Decision-makers use the AI model to obtain summarized information about a new, unfamiliar topic to get a general understanding of the topic.	P02, P11
UC20 Judicial behavior predictive analytics	Identify trends for a particular judge based on previous decisions to help lawyers identify the most effective way to build into their legal case.	P05
UC21 E-discovery, data management, and data analysis	Quickly gather, organize, and summarize content about a specific topic to streamline processes (e.g., news production, finding legal precedent, analyzing survey data) for decision-makers.	P01, P02, P03, P04, P05, P06, P13, P15, P16
UC22 Idea generation for writing	Given a topic by the decision-maker, identify possible ideas to discuss (e.g., interesting sub-topics, potential issues and implications). The model is used by the decision-maker as a brainstorming tool.	P02
UC23 Outline generation for writing	Outline a potential news article structure for a journalist to iterate off of based on a given topic and relevant sources	P02
UC24 Content generation	Draft content (e.g., news article, social media post) a decision-maker to review based on a given topic and relevant sources	P03
UC25 Legal case drafting	Given a legal case, create an initial draft of legal correspondences, etc. when provided relevant evidence, precedents, judicial opinions. Drafts are reviewed and information is verified by the decision-maker.	P05, P06
UC26 Medical visit note drafting	Draft medical visit notes (e.g., medical history, symptoms, diagnosis, discharge summaries for continuation of care) from ambient listening during clinical interactions that are then reviewed by a clinician.	P08, P09
UC27 Insurance authorization drafting	Draft insurance authorization documentation based on patient information for clinicians to review	P09
UC28 Radiology assessment drafting	Draft an initial radiology report given medical imaging and a radiologist's diagnosis that is then reviewed and verified by the radiologist. Some reports may focus on drafting patient-friendly reports while others focus on recommendation or simple result reporting	P07
UC29 Healthcare document coding for insurance	Identify codes and draft coding documents from a clinician's medical notes needed to facilitate communication with insurance companies	P08, P11
UC30 Improving data visualization	Suggest appropriate visualizations for quantitative data, provide code or formulas to generate visualizations, or design assets to improve presentations	P15

Table 4: Summary of generative AI use cases.

Use Case	Description	Mentions
UC31 Tailoring communication to specific backgrounds	Provide alternate communications with reduced jargon and/or complexity to accommodate and facilitate conversations with individuals from different backgrounds. For example, AI tools can summarize patient-physician interactions with reduced jargon in a “ <i>reading format that fits the patient</i> ” P09.	P03, P09, P12, P15
UC32 Meeting notes summarization	Identify key points in meeting notes (e.g., corporate meetings) for concise summarization of meeting notes	P11
UC33 Copyediting decision-maker text	Review and edit decision-maker writing (e.g., grammar, structure)	P03, P04, P05
UC34 Content moderation facilitation	Flag content on social media or other sources for potential misinformation or disinformation requiring further moderation by a decision-maker. For example, some models may be used to used to “ <i>flag egregious tweets, [including] potentially misleading claims that might go viral</i> ” and every piece of content that is flagged is consequently looked at by a human (P01).	P01, P02, P04, P15

Table 5: Summary of generative AI use cases (cont.).