Brief Report
Volume 07:02, 2025

Journal of Surgical Pathology and Diagnosis

ISSN: 2684-4575

Open Access

Digital Pathology: Augmenting Diagnosis with AI

aura Smith *

Department of Anatomic Pathology, Eastlake University Hospital, Toronto, Canada

Introduction

Transitioning to a fully digital pathology system for routine diagnostics is a massive undertaking.[1]

This is not just a matter of buying new scanners; it represents a complete overhaul of the entire laboratory workflow, demanding a phased approach, significant IT infrastructure, and robust training for both pathologists and lab staff. The key takeaway from early implementations is that success hinges on meticulous validation against the gold standard—the traditional glass slide—to ensure that the switch does not compromise diagnostic accuracy or patient safety.[1]

Before any hospital can confidently go fully digital for primary diagnosis, it must rigorously prove that the new system is at least as good as, if not better than, the conventional microscope.[4]

This validation process is absolutely non-negotiable. It involves extensive studies where pathologists diagnose the same set of cases on both glass slides and digital images, often incorporating a washout period to prevent any recall bias. The ultimate goal is to demonstrate a high level of concordance, providing concrete evidence that diagnostic accuracy is maintained on digital screens.[4]

Fortunately, the evidence supporting the use of digital pathology for primary diagnosis is now considered overwhelming.[7]

A comprehensive review of years of research confirms that for most pathology subspecialties, diagnostic performance using whole slide imaging is non-inferior to the light microscope. The technology has matured to a point where the conversation is no longer about 'if' labs should adopt digital pathology, but rather 'how' they can best implement and leverage it for better efficiency and patient care.[7]

Implementing digital pathology for everyday work is not a simple plug-and-play process.[5]

Here's the thing: it requires a detailed strategic plan that covers everything from scanner selection and IT infrastructure to workflow redesign and getting pathologists fully on board. A practical approach must address key steps like establishing clear quality control for image acquisition, managing the massive data storage requirements, and integrating the digital system with the existing Laboratory Information System (LIS) to create a smooth, efficient workflow.[5]

These challenges are magnified when implementing digital systems across a large, multi-site academic medical center.[10]

A one-size-fits-all approach does not work. The primary hurdles include standardizing workflows across different labs, building a network infrastructure capable of handling massive data flow without lag, and ensuring interoperability between various scanners, software, and electronic health records. The opportunity, however, is immense, enabling seamless case sharing for expert consultations, balancing workloads between sites, and creating a unified, rich dataset for research.[10]

Adopting this technology is not just a technical decision; it is also a financial one.[8]

The value proposition extends far beyond simple return on investment calculations. While there are significant upfront costs for scanners and storage, the long-term benefits include improved workflow efficiency, the elimination of glass slide logistics for consultations, and the ability to enable remote work. The non-economic value is also huge, encompassing better collaboration, enhanced education, and, critically, creating the foundation for AI-driven diagnostics that promise even greater future returns.[8]

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is poised to fundamentally change digital pathology, moving it beyond simple slide viewing.[2]

Let's break it down: AI algorithms can automate tedious tasks like cell counting, detect subtle disease patterns that are difficult for the human eye to see, and even predict patient outcomes directly from tissue images. The roadmap to making this a routine part of practice involves addressing challenges like data standardization, navigating regulatory approval, and integrating AI tools into the pathologist's daily workflow.[2]

Computational pathology is the engine driving this future of diagnostics.[6]

It is the practice of using computer algorithms to extract quantitative data from digital pathology images, going far beyond what a human can perceive. It is about turning images into data points that can be used for more objective grading, biomarker analysis, and ultimately, a more personalized approach to medicine.[6]

In breast pathology, for instance, digital tools and AI are already becoming indispensable.[3]

What this really means is that pathologists can now use algorithms to improve the accuracy and reproducibility of grading tumors, quantifying biomarkers like Ki-67, and identifying metastatic cancer in lymph nodes. This shift not only enhances diagnostic precision but also opens the door for new, image-based biomarkers that could predict how a patient will respond to specific treatments.[3]

As we move forward, AI is no longer a futuristic concept in pathology but an emerging reality.[9]

The real impact is seen in its ability to act as a powerful assistant, flagging areas of concern on a slide, automating measurements, and providing a second opinion. This allows pathologists to focus their expertise on the most complex diagnostic challenges. The future is not about replacing pathologists but augmenting their skills with AI to create a more efficient, accurate, and standardized diagnostic process.[9]

Description

The shift from traditional microscopy to a fully digital pathology system represents a foundational change in diagnostic practice. It's a massive undertaking that goes far beyond simply purchasing scanners, requiring a complete overhaul of established laboratory workflows [1]. The cornerstone of this transition is an uncompromising validation process. Before a digital system can be used for primary diagnosis, it must be proven to be non-inferior to the gold standard of the glass slide. This involves extensive concordance studies where pathologists compare diagnoses on both mediums, ensuring that diagnostic accuracy and patient safety are never compromised [4]. After years of research, the evidence supporting this switch is now overwhelming, with data confirming that whole slide imaging is a reliable tool for most pathology subspecialties [7].

The practical implementation of digital pathology presents significant logistical and financial hurdles. A successful rollout requires a detailed strategic plan that addresses everything from hardware selection and data storage to integrating the new system with the existing Laboratory Information System (LIS) for a smooth workflow [5]. These challenges are amplified in large, multi-site institutions, which must also contend with standardizing procedures and building a network infrastructure robust enough to handle enormous data flows without delays [10]. Financially, while the upfront investment in scanners and storage is substantial, the long-term value is clear. It includes major gains in workflow efficiency, enables remote work and consultations, and crucially, builds the necessary foundation for the integration of future Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools [8].

Artificial Intelligence is the next evolutionary step, poised to transform digital pathology from a viewing platform into a powerful analytical tool. The goal of AI is to automate tedious tasks, such as cell counting, and to detect subtle patterns of disease that may be imperceptible to the human eye [2]. The engine behind this is computational pathology, a field dedicated to using algorithms to extract vast amounts of quantitative data from digital images [6]. This turns a subjective visual assessment into a set of objective data points. The focus is not on replacing human expertise but on augmenting it. AI acts as an invaluable assistant, flagging regions of interest or providing a rapid second opinion, which allows pathologists to concentrate their skills on the most complex and nuanced aspects of diagnosis [9].

This technology is already making a tangible impact in specific areas like breast pathology. Here, algorithms are used to improve the accuracy and reproducibility of tumor grading and to quantify key biomarkers, leading to enhanced diagnostic precision [3]. This application highlights the potential for developing novel, image-based biomarkers capable of predicting patient response to therapy. The roadmap to making AI a routine part of diagnostics involves overcoming challenges related to data standardization, regulatory approval, and seamless integration into the daily work of pathologists [2]. By transforming images into actionable data, computational pathology is paving the way for a more objective, standardized, and personalized era of medicine [6, 3].

Conclusion

Transitioning to digital pathology is a complex overhaul of laboratory workflow, not just a technology upgrade. Success is entirely dependent on meticulous validation against the traditional glass slide to ensure diagnostic accuracy and patient safety remain paramount. This shift requires significant investment in IT infrastructure, strategic planning for workflow integration, and comprehensive training for staff. The long-term value, however, extends beyond simple efficiency gains, enabling remote collaboration and creating the foundation for the next major leap: Artificial Intelligence (AI). AI is fundamentally changing the field by moving beyond simple image viewing to provide powerful analytical capabilities. Algorithms can automate tedious tasks like cell counting, detect subtle disease patterns, and extract quantitative data that is imperceptible to the human eye. What this really means is that AI is emerging as a powerful assistant for pathologists. The future isn't about replacing these experts but augmenting their skills with computational tools. This synergy promises to create a more efficient, accurate, and standardized diagnostic process, ultimately leading to more objective and personalized patient care. The conversation has decisively shifted from whether to adopt digital pathology to how to best implement it and leverage the AI tools it enables.

Acknowledgement

None.

Conflict of Interest

None.

References

1. David R. Snead, David Treanor, Gareth Williams, Darren Trezise, Bethany Williams, Paul Verrill, Clare Verrill. "The implementation of a digital pathology system for routine histopathology diagnosis: a workflow and validation study." *J Pathol Inform* 11 (2020):37.

2. Jeroen van der Laak, Francesco Ciompi, Geert Litjens. "Artificial intelligence in digital pathology: a roadmap to routine practice." *Am J Pathol* 191 (2021):1402-1413.

3. Catarina Eloy, Paula Ferreira, Luís F. Costa, Joana Santos, André M. Ribeiro, Fernando Schmitt. "Digital pathology and artificial intelligence in breast pathology." *Breast* 57 (2021):1-9.

4. Jon H. L. T. van der Veen, Rob van der Laak, Annemarie van der Loo, Wouter Bulten, Jeroen A. W. M. van der Laak, Geert J. A. Litjens, Iris D. Nagtegaal. "Validation of digital pathology for primary histopathological diagnosis." *Histopathology* 77 (2020):303-314.

5. Liron Pantanowitz, Anil V. Parwani, W. Dean Wallace, John H. Sinard, Douglas J. Hartman, Jason L. Hornick, Michael D. Feldman. "A practical guide for the implementation of digital pathology for routine diagnostic use." *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 146 (2022):1264-1277.

6. Matthew G. Hanna, Germán Corredor, Andrew J. Evans, Faisal Mahmood, Liron Pantanowitz, Brandon D. Gallas, Rajendra Singh. "Computational pathology: a guide for the practicing pathologist." *Mod Pathol* 35 (2022):1239-1253.

7. Anil V. Parwani, Laura J. Tafe, Jeffrey L. Fine. "Digital pathology for primary diagnosis: a comprehensive review of the literature." *J Pathol Inform* 14 (2023):100344.

8. Estée C. M. van der Zwan, Iris D. Nagtegaal, Merel M. van der Strate, Alexi A. Wright, Jeroen A. W. M. van der Laak, Koen van de Velde, Lotte M. G. Steuten. "The economic and noneconomic value of digital pathology." *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 146 (2022):1228-1237.

9. Rish Pai, Matthew G. Hanna, Liron Pantanowitz. "Impact of artificial intelligence on the practice of pathology: a 2023 perspective." *Mod Pathol* 37 (2024):100418.

10. Joseph R Sanfrancesco, Jennifer A Brainard, Michael D Feldman, Jonhan Ho, Liron Pantanowitz, Laura J Tafe, Isam-Eldin A Eltoum. "Challenges and opportunities in implementing digital pathology in a multi-site academic medical center." *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 27 (2020):920-925.

How to cite this article: , aura Smith. "Digital Pathology: Augmenting Diagnosis with AI." *J Surg Path Diag* 07 (2025):11.

Address for Correspondence: aura, Smith , Department of Anatomic Pathology, Eastlake University Hospital, Toronto, Canada , E-mail: l.smith@eastlakeuh.ca

Received: 01-May-2025, Manuscript No. jspd-25-172587; **Editor assigned:** 05-May-2025, PreQC No. P-172587; **Reviewed:** 19-May-2025, QC No. Q-172587; **Revised:** 22-May-2025, Manuscript No. R-172587; **Published:** 29-May-2025, DOI: 10.37421/2684-4575.2025.7.011