

ORIGINAL RESEARCH ARTICLE

Perceived barriers to artificial intelligence integration among Moroccan public health care professionals: A cross-sectional study

Supplementary File

Table S1. Bonferroni-adjusted Dunn's post hoc pairwise comparisons of perceived artificial intelligence barrier scores

Participant characteristic	Barrier dimension	Pairwise comparison	Group with higher score	Adjusted <i>p</i> -value
Age group	Technological	21–34 years vs. ≥55 years	≥55 years	< 0.001
		35–44 years vs. ≥55 years	≥55 years	0.005
	Ethical and personal	21–34 years vs. 45–54 years	45–54 years	0.011
		21–34 years vs. ≥55 years	≥55 years	0.004
	Overall barriers	21–34 years vs. 45–54 years	45–54 years	0.019
		21–34 years vs. ≥55 years	≥55 years	<0.001
		35–44 years vs. ≥55 years	≥55 years	0.023
Years of professional experience	Technological	<1 year vs. >20 years	>20 years	0.042
		1–5 years vs. >20 years	>20 years	<0.001
		6–10 years vs. >20 years	>20 years	0.018
	Ethical and personal	1–5 years vs. >20 years	>20 years	0.003
	Overall barriers	<1 year vs. >20 years	>20 years	0.039
		1–5 years vs. >20 years	>20 years	<0.001
Professional category	Technological	Medical staff vs. nursing staff	Medical staff	0.002
		Medical staff vs. health technicians	Medical staff	<0.001
	Organizational	Medical staff vs. health technicians	Medical staff	<0.001
		Medical staff vs. administrative staff	Medical staff	0.041
		Nursing staff vs. health technicians	Nursing staff	0.044
	Ethical and personal	Medical staff vs. health technicians	Medical staff	<0.001
		Medical staff vs. educators and trainers	Medical staff	0.002
	Overall barriers	Medical staff vs. nursing staff	Medical staff	0.003
		Medical staff vs. health technicians	Medical staff	<0.001
		Medical staff vs. educators and trainers	Medical staff	0.004
		Nursing staff vs. health technicians	Nursing staff	0.009

(Cont'd...)

Table S1. (Continued)

Participant characteristic	Barrier dimension	Pairwise comparison	Group with higher score	Adjusted <i>p</i> -value
Highest educational qualification	Technological	Bachelor's degree in nursing vs. medical doctorate	Medical doctorate	<0.001
		Master's degree in health sciences vs. medical doctorate	Medical doctorate	0.035
		PhD in health sciences vs. medical doctorate	Medical doctorate	0.003
		Medical doctorate vs. other qualification	Medical doctorate	0.023
	Organizational	Bachelor's degree in nursing vs. medical doctorate	Medical doctorate	0.031
		Medical doctorate vs. other qualification	Medical doctorate	0.009
	Ethical and personal	Bachelor's degree in nursing vs. master's degree in health sciences	Bachelor's degree in nursing	0.040
		Master's degree in health sciences vs. medical doctorate	Medical doctorate	<0.001
	Interdisciplinary collaboration	Master's degree in health sciences vs. other qualification	Other qualification	0.016
	Overall barriers	Bachelor's degree in nursing vs. medical doctorate	Medical doctorate	<0.001
		Master's degree in health sciences vs. medical doctorate	Medical doctorate	<0.001
		PhD in health sciences vs. medical doctorate	Medical doctorate	0.007
		Medical doctorate vs. other qualification	Medical doctorate	0.042
Department/unit	Organizational	Medical-surgical department vs. other departments	Medical-surgical department	0.007
		Primary health care facility vs. other departments	Primary health care facility	0.001
	Ethical and personal	Emergency department vs. primary health care facility	Primary health care facility	0.030
		Primary health care facility vs. other departments	Primary health care facility	<0.001
	Overall barriers	Primary health care facility vs. other departments	Primary health care facility	0.012

Notes: Only statistically significant pairwise comparisons after Bonferroni adjustment are shown. The "Group with higher score" column indicates which group reported the higher perceived barrier score in each comparison. *p*-values are adjusted for multiple comparisons.

Table S2. Model diagnostics, robust and bootstrap estimates for the five general linear models ($N = 480$)

Model	Shapiro–Wilk $W(p)$	Skewness/kurtosis	Breusch– Pagan p	Max Cook's D	HC3 F for prior artificial intelligence training (p)	B for prior artificial intelligence training (bootstrap 95% confidence interval)
Technological	0.995 (0.152)	0.09/–0.36	0.090	0.032	19.31 (< 0.001)	–0.37 (–0.53, –0.20)
Organizational	0.994 (0.058)	–0.01/–0.12	0.018	0.041	187.98 (< 0.001)	–1.22 (–1.39, –1.04)
Ethical and personal	0.989 (0.002)	0.31/–0.18	<0.001	0.068	11.74 (0.001)	–0.40 (–0.63, –0.17)
Interdisciplinary collaboration	0.972 (<0.001)	0.62/0.67	0.008	0.080	21.45 (< 0.001)	–0.43 (–0.61, –0.26)
Overall barriers	0.994 (0.052)	0.22/0.31	0.001	0.094	89.92 (< 0.001)	–0.62 (–0.74, –0.50)

Notes: All models comprised 25 numerator and 454 denominator degrees of freedom. Bootstrap estimates are based on 1,000 resamples using the percentile method. Generalized variance inflation factors ($GVIF^{1/(2df)}$) ranged from 1.07 to 1.68 across all predictors and models. The maximum leverage value was 0.50, attributable to the two participants in the other professionals category. HC3 = Heteroscedasticity-consistent covariance estimator; B = Unstandardized regression coefficient.

Table S3. Unstandardized parameter estimates (B) with 95% confidence intervals from the five multivariable general linear models ($N = 480$)

Predictor (reference category)	Technological	Organizational	Ethical and personal	Interdisciplinary collaboration	Overall
Gender (ref. Male)					
Female	+0.03 (–0.13, +0.19)	–0.00 (–0.15, +0.15)	+0.00 (–0.21, +0.22)	–0.09 (–0.29, +0.11)	–0.01 (–0.13, +0.12)
Age group (ref. 21–34 years)					
35–44 years	+0.23 (–0.05, +0.50)	+0.05 (–0.20, +0.31)	+0.30 (–0.06, +0.66)	+0.18 (–0.15, +0.52)	+0.18 (–0.03, +0.40)
45–54 years	+0.23 (–0.14, +0.60)	+0.08 (–0.27, +0.42)	+0.32 (–0.17, +0.80)	–0.10 (–0.55, +0.35)	+0.14 (–0.15, +0.43)
≥ 55 years	+0.77 (+0.23, +1.31) *	–0.18 (–0.68, +0.32)	+0.76 (+0.05, +1.47) *	+0.39 (–0.27, +1.05)	+0.44 (+0.02, +0.86) *
Professional experience (ref. < 1 year)					
1–5 years	–0.11 (–0.29, +0.08)	–0.04 (–0.22, +0.13)	–0.19 (–0.43, +0.05)	–0.20 (–0.42, +0.03)	–0.12 (–0.27, +0.02)
6–10 years	–0.15 (–0.41, +0.11)	–0.07 (–0.31, +0.17)	+0.10 (–0.24, +0.43)	+0.01 (–0.31, +0.32)	–0.05 (–0.26, +0.15)
11–20 years	–0.19 (–0.52, +0.14)	–0.13 (–0.44, +0.17)	–0.15 (–0.58, +0.29)	–0.19 (–0.59, +0.22)	–0.17 (–0.42, +0.09)
> 20 years	–0.02 (–0.42, +0.39)	+0.27 (–0.11, +0.65)	+0.07 (–0.47, +0.60)	–0.14 (–0.63, +0.36)	+0.05 (–0.26, +0.37)
Professional category (ref. Medical staff)					
Nursing staff	+0.89 (+0.00, +1.79) *	+0.39 (–0.44, +1.22)	+0.05 (–1.12, +1.21)	–0.24 (–1.33, +0.84)	+0.40 (–0.31, +1.10)
Health technicians	+0.55 (–0.39, +1.49)	–0.00 (–0.88, +0.88)	–0.09 (–1.32, +1.14)	–0.77 (–1.92, +0.37)	+0.04 (–0.69, +0.78)
Administrative staff	+0.38 (–0.61, +1.37)	–0.02 (–0.94, +0.91)	+0.35 (–0.94, +1.65)	–0.32 (–1.53, +0.89)	+0.14 (–0.64, +0.92)
Educators and trainers	+0.62 (–0.28, +1.52)	+0.42 (–0.42, +1.26)	–0.39 (–1.57, +0.78)	–0.73 (–1.82, +0.37)	+0.14 (–0.57, +0.84)

(Cont'd...)

Table S3. (Continued)

Predictor (reference category)	Technological	Organizational	Ethical and personal	Interdisciplinary collaboration	Overall
Other professionals	+1.08 (−0.27, +2.42)	+1.03 (−0.22, +2.29)	−0.82 (−2.58, +0.94)	−1.05 (−2.69, +0.58)	+0.33 (−0.72, +1.39)
Educational qualification (ref. Bachelor's degree in nursing)					
Master's degree in health sciences	+0.14 (−0.08, +0.35)	+0.10 (−0.10, +0.30)	−0.39 (−0.67, −0.12) *	−0.14 (−0.40, +0.12)	−0.02 (−0.19, +0.15)
PhD in health sciences	−0.03 (−0.45, +0.38)	−0.11 (−0.50, +0.27)	−0.05 (−0.60, +0.49)	+0.23 (−0.28, +0.74)	−0.01 (−0.34, +0.32)
Medical doctorate	+1.14 (+0.24, +2.05) *	+0.54 (−0.30, +1.39)	+0.13 (−1.05, +1.32)	−0.15 (−1.26, +0.95)	+0.56 (−0.15, +1.27)
Other qualification	+0.13 (−0.31, +0.58)	+0.20 (−0.21, +0.62)	−0.36 (−0.94, +0.23)	+0.80 (+0.25, +1.34) *	+0.18 (−0.17, +0.53)
Department/unit (ref. Medical-surgical)					
Intensive care unit	+0.20 (−0.21, +0.61)	−0.17 (−0.54, +0.21)	−0.42 (−0.95, +0.11)	−0.47 (−0.97, +0.02)	−0.14 (−0.45, +0.18)
Emergency department	+0.11 (−0.18, +0.40)	−0.40 (−0.66, −0.13) *	−0.30 (−0.67, +0.08)	−0.08 (−0.43, +0.27)	−0.14 (−0.36, +0.09)
Mother and child health department	+0.01 (−0.28, +0.29)	−0.28 (−0.55, −0.01) *	+0.09 (−0.28, +0.47)	−0.08 (−0.42, +0.27)	−0.07 (−0.30, +0.15)
Medical technology department	+0.05 (−0.36, +0.45)	−0.34 (−0.72, +0.04)	−0.37 (−0.90, +0.16)	−0.14 (−0.63, +0.35)	−0.17 (−0.49, +0.15)
Rehabilitation	+0.07 (−0.52, +0.66)	−0.46 (−1.01, +0.09)	−0.12 (−0.90, +0.65)	+0.47 (−0.25, +1.19)	−0.04 (−0.50, +0.43)
Primary health care facility	+0.25 (+0.01, +0.49) *	−0.10 (−0.33, +0.12)	+0.24 (−0.08, +0.55)	+0.07 (−0.23, +0.36)	+0.12 (−0.07, +0.31)
Other department	+0.22 (−0.04, +0.47)	−0.30 (−0.53, −0.06) *	+0.03 (−0.30, +0.36)	+0.18 (−0.12, +0.49)	+0.04 (−0.16, +0.23)
Prior formal AI training (ref. No training)					
Prior formal AI training	−0.37 (−0.54, −0.19) *	−1.22 (−1.38, −1.06) *	−0.40 (−0.62, −0.17) *	−0.43 (−0.64, −0.21) *	−0.62 (−0.75, −0.48) *

Notes: *B* = Unstandardized regression coefficient from the general linear model, mutually adjusted for all seven predictors; values in parentheses are 95% confidence intervals. An asterisk indicates $p < 0.05$. Positive values indicate higher perceived barriers relative to the reference category. Each model comprised 25 numerator and 454 denominator degrees of freedom. Reference categories are given in parentheses in the first column.

Table S4. Sensitivity analyses of the association between prior formal artificial intelligence training and perceived barriers ($N = 480$)

Analysis	Outcome	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η_p^2	Adjusted R^2
Primary model	Organizational barriers (3 items)	219.15	<0.001	0.326	0.382
Primary model	Overall barriers (11 items)	79.03	<0.001	0.148	0.240
Sparse categories pooled	Organizational barriers (3 items)	225.02	<0.001	0.330	0.380
Sparse categories pooled	Overall barriers (11 items)	79.12	<0.001	0.148	0.243
Overlapping training item removed	Organizational barriers (2 items)	43.92	<0.001	0.088	0.156
Overlapping training item removed	Overall barriers (10 items)	38.14	<0.001	0.078	0.176

Notes: All models were mutually adjusted for gender, age group, years of professional experience, professional category, highest educational qualification, department/unit, and prior formal AI training. In the pooling analysis, other professionals ($n = 2$) were merged with administrative staff ($n = 13$), the intensive care unit ($n = 16$) with the medical-surgical department ($n = 48$), and rehabilitation ($n = 7$) with the medico-technical department ($n = 21$); these models comprised 22 numerator and 457 denominator degrees of freedom. In the item-removal analysis, the item “No formal training received on AI technologies” was excluded from the organizational and overall scores. Adjusted regression coefficients for prior formal AI training in the item-removal models were $B = -0.77$ (95% CI −1.00 to −0.54) for organizational barriers and $B = -0.47$ (95% CI −0.61 to −0.32) for overall barriers. η_p^2 = partial eta squared.

Table S5. Exploratory factor analysis of the 11 retained items: Principal axis factoring with Promax rotation, four-factor solution (N = 480)

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
Lack of familiarity with the concept of AI in health care	−0.12	−0.02	0.81 ^a	−0.10
Limited ease of use of digital technologies in daily practice	0.09	−0.11	0.72 ^a	0.13
Insufficient access to the digital tools required at the workplace	0.05	0.18	−0.04	0.64 ^a
Current infrastructure does not support AI integration	−0.19	0.56 ^a	0.05	0.19
Lack of managerial support for adopting new technologies	0.01	0.91 ^a	−0.20	−0.04
No formal training received on AI technologies	0.05	0.35 ^a	0.04	−0.03
Lack of clarity of institutional policies and procedures on AI	0.09	0.56 ^a	0.04	0.11
Discomfort with AI taking over certain aspects of care	0.63 ^a	0.14	0.07	−0.03
Lack of confidence in AI for making clinical decisions	0.37 ^a	0.16	0.21	−0.10
Ineffective interdisciplinary collaboration during AI integration	0.94 ^a	−0.04	−0.15	−0.08
Insufficient interprofessional communication for AI implementation	0.55 ^a	−0.13	−0.02	0.19
Explained variance (%)	16.4	15.3	11.8	4.9

Notes: Cumulative explained variance: 48.4%. Eigenvalues of the unrotated solution: 3.58, 1.64, 1.09, 0.91, 0.82, 0.69, 0.56, 0.49, 0.45, 0.40, 0.36. Parallel analysis based on 500 simulated datasets supported the retention of two factors, whereas the Kaiser criterion supported three. Inter-factor correlations ranged from 0.20 to 0.58. ^aLoadings of 0.35 or above. Items are presented reverse-scored, so that higher values indicate greater perceived barriers.