pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:13, Issue 02, February -2026 eISSN:2349-5715

Reimagining Randomized Clinical Trials in the Era of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Health: Regulatory Governance, Virtualization, and Equity-Centered Innovation

Dr. Matthias Laurent
Institute for Health Policy and Digital Medicine University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

ABSTRACT

The rapid integration of artificial intelligence (AI), digital health technologies, and Internet of Things (IoT)-enabled wearable systems into clinical research has catalyzed the emergence of virtual and hybrid clinical trial models. These developments promise enhanced efficiency, real-time monitoring, and broader geographic reach. Simultaneously, regulatory agencies face unprecedented challenges in overseeing AI-based medical devices and adaptive algorithms. Persistent concerns regarding trial eligibility criteria, participant diversity, data integrity, and digital equity underscore the need for a comprehensive governance framework.

This study develops an integrative theoretical framework examining how AI-driven medical devices, digital health infrastructures, and virtual trial methodologies can be harmonized with regulatory oversight mechanisms and equity-centered recruitment strategies to modernize randomized clinical trials (RCTs) while safeguarding public trust and scientific validity.

A qualitative integrative analysis synthesizing regulatory scholarship, virtual clinical trial literature, digital health research, IoT-enabled wearable frameworks, patient-reported outcome augmentation studies, diversity and eligibility reform recommendations, and national-scale research programs was conducted. Conceptual mapping was employed to identify structural interdependencies among technological innovation, regulatory governance, participant diversity, and digital inclusion.

Findings reveal five transformative domains shaping modern RCTs: regulatory adaptation to AI-based medical devices; virtualization of clinical trial operations; IoT-enabled real-time health monitoring; augmentation of patient-reported outcomes through machine learning; and equity-driven recruitment and eligibility modernization. National initiatives such as the All of Us Research Program and Project Baseline demonstrate scalable models for inclusive data ecosystems. However, regulatory ambiguity, digital access disparities, and algorithmic governance gaps persist.

The modernization of RCTs through AI and digital technologies requires synchronized regulatory reform, robust interpretability standards, inclusive recruitment infrastructures, and proactive equity strategies. Without integrated governance mechanisms, digital transformation risks amplifying disparities rather than democratizing clinical research. Sustainable innovation depends upon aligning technological capability with ethical responsibility and regulatory clarity.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence regulation, Virtual clinical trials, Digital health technologies, Clinical trial diversity, IoT health monitoring, Regulatory governance, Equity in research

INTRODUCTION

The Randomized clinical trials (RCTs) have long constituted the methodological backbone of evidence-based medicine. Through controlled randomization and standardized endpoints, RCTs establish causal relationships between interventions and outcomes. However, the traditional RCT paradigm-characterized by centralized research sites, rigid eligibility criteria, periodic in-person assessments, and geographically constrained enrollment-faces growing scrutiny. Increasing complexity of therapeutic innovation, expanding global populations, and rapid digital transformation are reshaping expectations regarding how clinical evidence

should be generated.

Artificial intelligence (AI), digital health platforms, wearable sensors, and virtual research infrastructures now offer tools capable of fundamentally altering trial design and implementation. Digital health technologies enable continuous remote monitoring, while machine learning systems analyze high-dimensional biomedical data streams in real time (Sharma et al., 2020). IoT-enabled wearable sensors and edge AI architectures promise decentralized, real-time physiological surveillance (Sathiya et al., 2025). Patient-reported outcomes, historically limited to episodic self-report instruments, can now be augmented by machine learning models analyzing behavioral and biometric data (Creagh et al., 2022). Meanwhile, virtual clinical trials-conducted partially or entirely through digital platforms-are emerging as viable alternatives to traditional site-based models (Iqbal et al., 2018).

Yet technological innovation unfolds within a complex regulatory landscape. AI-based medical devices challenge conventional regulatory paradigms, as adaptive algorithms may evolve post-deployment (Moore & Brook, 2020). Regulatory agencies must reconcile innovation with safety, effectiveness, and accountability (Shen et al., 2021). The governance of AI in health care requires not only device-level evaluation but lifecycle oversight capable of addressing continuous learning systems.

Parallel to technological transformation, longstanding inequities in clinical research participation demand attention. Historically restrictive eligibility criteria have limited representation of older adults, individuals with comorbidities, and underrepresented racial and ethnic populations (Spira et al., 2021). Diversity in clinical trials remains essential for generalizable evidence and equitable healthcare outcomes (Johnson-Williams et al., 2022). National research initiatives such as the All of Us Research Program seek to construct inclusive, diverse biomedical datasets (National Institutes of Health, 2022; Ramirez et al., 2022). Project Baseline and the HERO program further demonstrate large-scale digital recruitment and monitoring strategies (Arges et al., 2020; HERO Program, 2021).

The intersection of AI-enabled virtual trials and equity-centered research presents both promise and peril. Digital recruitment through social media may enhance outreach to marginalized populations, yet digital divides risk excluding those lacking technological access (Parker et al., 2021). AI-driven eligibility screening may increase efficiency but inadvertently reinforce structural biases if training data reflect historical inequities.

This article addresses a central research question: How can AI-driven digital health technologies and virtual clinical trial infrastructures be harmonized with regulatory governance and equity-centered recruitment strategies to modernize RCTs without compromising scientific integrity or social justice?

The literature reveals significant gaps. Regulatory discussions often focus on device approval without fully addressing virtual trial ecosystems. Virtual trial scholarship emphasizes feasibility but insufficiently engages with diversity mandates. Digital health research highlights technical capabilities yet rarely integrates comprehensive regulatory and ethical frameworks. This study synthesizes these domains to construct a holistic modernization framework.

METHODOLOGY

This research employs a qualitative integrative methodology, synthesizing regulatory analysis, digital health scholarship, and diversity-focused research initiatives. The methodological process unfolds through thematic synthesis and conceptual modeling.

First, regulatory literature addressing AI-based medical devices was examined (Moore & Brook, 2020; Shen et al., 2021). These sources were analyzed for themes including adaptive algorithm oversight, lifecycle

regulation, transparency requirements, and post-market monitoring.

Second, literature on virtual and digital clinical trials was reviewed (Iqbal et al., 2018; Sharma et al., 2020). Emphasis was placed on operational models, decentralized trial components, and regulatory compliance considerations.

Third, IoT-enabled healthcare frameworks and wearable sensor technologies were evaluated (Sathiya et al., 2025; Creagh et al., 2022). Particular attention was given to real-time monitoring, data integrity, and patient-reported outcome augmentation.

Fourth, diversity and eligibility reform literature was analyzed (Spira et al., 2021; Johnson-Williams et al., 2022). National-scale inclusive research programs were examined as case studies (National Institutes of Health, 2022; Ramirez et al., 2022; Arges et al., 2020; HERO Program, 2021). Recruitment modality comparisons, including social media strategies, were assessed (Parker et al., 2021).

Fifth, the AI/ML equity framework proposed by Abbidi and Sinha (2026) was incorporated to align technological innovation with inclusion objectives.

The synthesis process involved identifying structural interdependencies across five domains: regulatory governance, virtualization infrastructure, IoT-enabled monitoring, patient-reported outcome augmentation, and diversity-centered recruitment. Analytical triangulation ensured coherence between technological, regulatory, and ethical dimensions.

RESULTS

The integrative analysis identifies five transformative domains shaping the modernization of RCTs.

The first domain concerns regulatory governance of AI-based medical devices. Moore and Brook (2020) emphasize that AI-driven devices challenge static regulatory models because adaptive algorithms may change performance over time. Shen et al. (2021) argue for dynamic regulatory strategies that accommodate continuous learning while preserving patient safety. In virtual trials, AI systems may influence eligibility screening, endpoint adjudication, and safety monitoring, necessitating lifecycle oversight rather than one-time approval.

The second domain involves virtualization of clinical trial operations. Iqbal et al. (2018) describe virtual clinical trials as decentralized models leveraging telemedicine, digital data capture, and remote monitoring. Sharma et al. (2020) highlight the integration of AI in digital health ecosystems to enhance data quality and operational efficiency. Virtualization reduces geographic barriers but introduces challenges related to digital literacy, cybersecurity, and regulatory harmonization across jurisdictions.

The third domain centers on IoT-enabled real-time health monitoring. Sathiya et al. (2025) propose edge AI architectures enabling real-time physiological analysis through wearable sensors. Creagh et al. (2022) demonstrate how digital health technologies can augment patient-reported outcomes in rheumatoid arthritis by integrating sensor data with machine learning models. Such augmentation enhances granularity and ecological validity of endpoints but requires rigorous validation.

The fourth domain addresses modernization of eligibility criteria and inclusion strategies. Spira et al. (2021) recommend updating laboratory reference ranges and testing intervals to reduce unnecessary exclusions. Johnson-Williams et al. (2022) underscore the importance of diversity for therapeutic generalizability. Abbidi and Sinha (2026) propose AI-driven strategies to optimize inclusive recruitment.

The fifth domain encompasses large-scale inclusive research ecosystems. The All of Us Research Program aims to recruit diverse participants across the United States (National Institutes of Health, 2022). Ramirez et al. (2022) report on data quality and diversity within this initiative. Project Baseline seeks to map human health longitudinally (Arges et al., 2020). The HERO program demonstrates rapid digital mobilization of healthcare workers (HERO Program, 2021). Parker et al. (2021) reveal lessons from social media recruitment among marginalized youth populations.

Collectively, these domains illustrate that modernization requires synchronized innovation across technology, regulation, and equity infrastructures.

DISCUSSION

The modernization of RCTs through AI and digital health technologies represents a paradigmatic shift in biomedical research. Historically, clinical trials operated as episodic, site-based investigations with narrowly defined participant cohorts. Today, decentralized architectures enable continuous, distributed, and data-intensive research.

Regulatory governance must evolve accordingly. Moore and Brook (2020) warn that adaptive AI systems complicate traditional approval processes predicated on static device characteristics. Shen et al. (2021) propose adaptive regulatory frameworks incorporating post-market surveillance and algorithmic transparency. In virtual trials, oversight must extend beyond discrete devices to integrated digital ecosystems.

Virtualization offers profound inclusivity potential. By removing geographic constraints, decentralized trials can reach rural or mobility-limited populations (Iqbal et al., 2018). However, digital inequities persist. Access to high-speed internet, digital literacy, and wearable technology varies across socioeconomic strata. Without deliberate equity strategies, virtual trials risk privileging technologically advantaged populations.

IoT-enabled monitoring enhances endpoint sensitivity and ecological validity. Sathiya et al. (2025) demonstrate how edge AI processes data locally, reducing latency and preserving privacy. Creagh et al. (2022) show that machine learning augmentation of patient-reported outcomes enables nuanced disease characterization. Yet regulatory validation of digital endpoints remains evolving.

Eligibility reform constitutes a critical equity lever. Spira et al. (2021) argue that overly conservative laboratory thresholds exclude patients unnecessarily. Modernization requires evidence-based calibration balancing safety with inclusivity. AI can simulate demographic impacts of eligibility adjustments, as suggested by Abbidi and Sinha (2026).

National-scale programs illustrate inclusive data ecosystems. The All of Us Research Program prioritizes diversity as a foundational principle (National Institutes of Health, 2022). Ramirez et al. (2022) highlight its data quality infrastructure. Such models demonstrate that inclusivity and scientific rigor are not mutually exclusive.

Limitations of this study include its conceptual orientation and reliance on published literature. Empirical trials implementing fully integrated AI-regulated virtual frameworks remain limited.

Future research should evaluate real-world outcomes of AI-driven virtual RCTs, develop standardized digital endpoint validation protocols, and examine long-term equity impacts.

CONCLUSION

The convergence of AI, digital health technologies, IoT-enabled monitoring, and virtual trial methodologies signals a transformative era for clinical research. Regulatory frameworks must adapt to oversee adaptive algorithms and decentralized infrastructures. Simultaneously, modernization must prioritize diversity, inclusion, and equitable access.

By aligning regulatory governance, technological innovation, eligibility reform, and inclusive recruitment ecosystems, RCTs can evolve into more representative, efficient, and patient-centered enterprises. The challenge lies not in technological capability but in coordinated governance and ethical commitment.

Modernized RCTs must embody scientific rigor and social responsibility. Only through integrated frameworks can digital transformation advance both innovation and justice in clinical research.

REFERENCES

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

2. Arges, K., et al. (2020). The project baseline health study: a step towards a broader mission to map human health. NPJ Digital Medicine, 3, 84.

3. Creagh, A., Hamy, V., Yuan, H., Mertes, G., Tomlinson, R., Chen, W., et al. (2022). Digital health technologies and machine learning augment patient reported outcomes to remotely characterise rheumatoid arthritis. NPJ Digital Medicine, 7.

4. HERO Program. (2021). The Healthcare Worker Exposure Response & Outcomes program.

5. Iqbal, A., Joseph, A., & Hull, L. (2018). Virtual clinical trials: the future of clinical research? International Journal of Clinical Trials, 5, 94–102.

6. Johnson-Williams, B., Jean, D., Liu, Q., & Ramamoorthy, A. (2022). The importance of diversity in clinical trials. Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics.

7. Moore, T.J., & Brook, R.H. (2020). Challenges and opportunities in the regulation of artificial intelligence–based medical devices. Journal of the American Medical Association, 324, 513–514.

8. National Institutes of Health. (2022). All of Us Research Program.

9. Parker, J.N., et al. (2021). Comparing social media and in-person recruitment: lessons learned from recruiting substance-using, sexual and gender minority adolescents and young adults for a randomized control trial. JMIR Public Health and Surveillance, 7, e31657.

10. Ramirez, A.H., et al. (2022). The all of us research program: data quality, utility, and diversity. Patterns, 3, 100570.

11. Sathiya, A., Angel, D., Iswarya, M., Poonkodi, R., Angelo, K., & Priyadharshini, P.N. (2025). IoT enabled healthcare framework using edge AI and advanced wearable sensors for real time health monitoring. Proceedings of the International Conference on Multi–agent Systems for Collaborative Intelligence.

12. Sharma, A., Kowalski, T., & Lopez, A. (2020). Digital health and artificial intelligence in clinical trials: current state and prospects. Therapeutic Innovation & Regulatory Science, 54, 835–841.

13. Shen, Y., Wang, Y., & Yang, J. (2021). Regulatory strategies for artificial intelligence in health care: challenges and opportunities. Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics, 110, 1019–1025.

14. Spira, A.I., et al. (2021). Modernizing clinical trial eligibility criteria: recommendations of the ASCO-friends of cancer research laboratory reference ranges and testing intervals work group. Clinical Cancer Research, 27, 2416–2423.