WHITE PAPER

Digital Pathology Adoption: The Microscope Isn't Broken. So Why Are Pathologists Finally Setting It Down?

The evidence supporting digital pathology adoption is now overwhelming, yet most labs still hesitate. Understanding what's really driving that hesitation, and what's quietly dismantling it, may be the most important conversation in pathology right now.

There is something almost poetic in the image: a senior pathologist, two decades of expertise distilled behind the eyepiece of a microscope, looking at a screen and saying, "I know this works. I've seen the studies. But I'm not ready yet." That moment, honest, understandable, professionally reasonable, is where the digital pathology adoption story has stalled for most of the world. By the end of 2024, estimates suggest that only approximately 10% of laboratories had fully implemented digital primary diagnostic workflows (Wistuba & Kim, 2025). In the United States, roughly two-thirds of clinical labs report no immediate plans for implementation (Tate & Lagemann, 2023). This is not ignorance. It is not lack of evidence. It is something more human than that, and understanding it is the first step toward changing it.

The evidence base for whole slide imaging (WSI) in primary clinical diagnosis has reached a point that would satisfy most scientific reviewers. A systematic review published in the Archives of Pathology & Laboratory Medicine, which anchored the 2022 College of American Pathologists (CAP) guideline update, found a weighted mean diagnostic concordance of 95.2% across 33 validation studies (Evans et al., 2022). In its evaluation of the Philips IntelliSite Pathology Solution, the FDA reported a diagnostic concordance of 96.5% for WSI compared with light microscopy, supporting a non-inferiority finding (Kusta et al., 2022). When discordances do occur, studies consistently show that those with potential impact on clinical management represent fewer than 3% of cases, rates comparable to the known inter- and intraobserver variability of glass slide reading itself (Rizzo et al., 2022). The data, in short, is strong. And yet the microscope remains.

The Hesitation Is Rational, and the Evidence Knows It

Labelling pathologist reluctance as mere conservatism misses the point entirely. Pathologists are not resisting digital technology because they distrust innovation. They are applying the same critical rigor to their own practice transformation that they apply to every diagnostic decision. A 2024 survey of 63 US anatomic pathologists and laboratory directors found that the two most consistently cited prerequisites for adoption were clinical guideline endorsement and demonstrated integration with existing laboratory workflows (Hartman et al., 2025). These are not obstructions; they are the same standards the profession rightly applies to any new diagnostic test.

The concern about image quality is not unfounded, either. Early WSI systems genuinely struggled with high-throughput scanning, focus consistency across tissue heterogeneity, and specific diagnostic categories, particularly grading of gastrointestinal dysplasia, urothelial lesions, and melanocyte atypia, where subtle morphological distinctions are diagnostically decisive (Rizzo et al., 2022). Pathologists who formed their first impressions of WSI a decade ago may still carry the memory of those limitations, even as the technology has advanced dramatically. This is a phenomenon well-described in technology adoption research: first-generation experiences cast long shadows.

epredia

Not having enough time to do everything in the workday is not frustration with digital pathology. It is the defining constraint of modern pathological practice, and ironically, it may be the strongest argument for digitization that exists.

There is also the legitimate concern about transition disruption. An ethnographic study following a pathology department through digital transformation between 2022 and 2023 found that the transition period placed significant strain on staff when implemented with insufficient time and resources; productivity promises were not immediately realized, and the human cost was real (Gjelsvik et al., 2024). This research does not argue against digital pathology. It argues, correctly, that the manner of implementation matters enormously. A hesitant pathologist who has heard of a difficult transition at a peer institution is not being irrational. They are being professionally cautious.

What is Accelerating Digital Pathology Adoption?

Several converging forces are now eroding the foundations of hesitation in ways that previous years could not. The most significant is regulatory clarity. The FDA's 510(k) clearance of multiple WSI platforms for primary clinical diagnosis has fundamentally shifted the legal landscape, removing what was, for many US institutions, a genuine compliance barrier rather than a philosophical one. When the regulatory question is settled, the conversation can move to the clinical and operational questions where the evidence is compelling.

The shortage of pathologists is a second accelerant. A 2024 review characterized the global pathology workforce situation as at a critical inflection point, with demand in many high-volume settings outpacing available diagnostic capacity (Walsh & Orsi, 2024). This creates a context in which digital pathology is no longer a technology choice; it is increasingly a staffing strategy. The ability to sign out cases remotely, balance workloads across sites, and eliminate the physical constraints of case assembly and courier logistics is not a convenience in this environment; it is an operational necessity. A study at a large European pathology laboratory reported a workload-based productivity increase of 30% through reduction in non-diagnostic time, the administrative overhead of slide handling, retrieval, measurement, and report preparation that, in unchallenging routine cases, can account for up to 90% of total time per case (Vodovnik, 2024). The pathologist who says "there's never enough time" is precisely the pathologist for whom this finding matters most.

Key Data

A 10-year empirical study found that digital pathology workflows increased pathologist workload-based productivity by 30% by eliminating non-diagnostic tasks, including slide handling, retrieval, and case assembly, which account for up to 90% of total time on routine cases. (Vodovnik, 2024)

The operational evidence is equally striking at the system level. A large-scale implementation study at a comprehensive cancer center reported a 93% reduction in archival glass slide requests and a projected cost saving of over $267,000 per year following full digital implementation, with a five-year projected saving exceeding $1.3 million (Hanna et al., 2019). In teleconsultation settings specifically, digital availability reduced case turnaround time from an average of 86 hours to 35 minutes by eliminating the shipping of physical slides (Hartmann et al., 2022). For laboratory directors and administrators, these are not abstract benefits. They are the kind of operational transformations that justify a capital investment.

The Quality Argument Has Matured, and It Favors Digital

What has changed most meaningfully for pathologists in 2025 and 2026 is not the existence of quality evidence; it is the nature of it. Early validation studies were appropriately cautious, often small, and acknowledged genuine limitations. The body of evidence as it stands today is qualitatively different. Across a systematic review and meta-analysis covering validation studies to 2021, overall concordance rates consistently exceeded the 95% CAP-recommended threshold, and the authors noted that the most recent studies showed the highest concordance rates of all, a pattern consistent with scanner maturation and user experience accumulation (Rizzo et al., 2022). Glass-to-glass slide studies, it is worth noting, demonstrate their

own concordance limitations due to observer variability; in that context, WSI concordance data must be read against a non-perfect glass-slide gold standard.

The concordance conversation is also evolving toward a more sophisticated understanding. Major discordances, those that would affect clinical management, are genuinely rare and appear to be decreasing as image resolution, scanner speed, and user training improve. What remains are minor discordances reflecting the inherent interpretive variability that has always existed in pathology practice regardless of modality. This distinction matters clinically. A pathologist's concern that "I might miss something on screen" is legitimate when framed around major diagnostic errors. The evidence, consistently, does not support that fear for well-implemented, validated, high-quality WSI systems.

There is also now a meaningful literature on the subspecialty-specific performance of WSI, providing the granular reassurance that broad concordance statistics cannot. Studies in dermatopathology, renal pathology, gastrointestinal pathology, gynecological pathology, and hematopathology have each characterized the particular challenges and demonstrated validated approaches to overcoming them (Farahani et al., 2015; Rizzo et al., 2022). The pathologist who works in a specific domain can now find evidence directly relevant to their practice, rather than extrapolating from general surgical pathology statistics.

AI Strengthens The Argument for Digital Pathology

Perhaps the most compelling forward-looking argument for digital adoption is one that does not yet exist in most labs: artificial intelligence. AI-assisted diagnostic tools, from slide quality control and case prioritization through to tumor detection, biomarker quantification, and prognostic modelling, require whole slide images to function. A pathology department that remains on glass slides in 2026 is not simply choosing a different workflow. It is choosing to remain outside the entire trajectory of AI-augmented diagnostics entirely.

A comprehensive 2025–2026 review of AI integration with WSI characterized the situation precisely: the potential of AI in diagnostic pathology can only be realized through a coherent, end-to-end digital workflow that recognizes image quality, standardization, and clinical validation as foundational requirements (Pantanowitz et al., 2025). The AI algorithms being developed now, and increasingly validated, are being trained on high-quality, standardized digital images. Early adopters of rigorous digital infrastructure will be the institutions capable of deploying validated AI tools when clinical evidence matures. Those who wait will face not just a technology catch-up problem, but a data quality and workflow integration challenge that compounds with every year of delay.

Overcoming the Real Barriers: What the Evidence Actually Recommends

The barriers to digital pathology adoption that remain are real, but they are navigable, and the literature is specific about how. The CAP guideline update (Evans et al., 2022) provides a rigorous, structured validation pathway that enables any laboratory to generate locally meaningful concordance evidence using their own tissue types, their own pathologists, and their own scanner, removing the reliance on external data that may not generalize to local practice. A minimum of 60 representative cases per application, reviewed with a two-week washout period, with intraobserver concordance benchmarked against the 95% threshold, is achievable within a manageable timeframe and generates the evidence base that both pathologists and regulatory bodies need to proceed with confidence.

The implementation experience literature is equally instructive. The ethnographic study that documented transition strain under resource-constrained conditions reached a clear conclusion: digital transformation succeeds when it is funded as a project, not added to existing workload (Gjelsvik et al., 2024). Institutions that have achieved successful full-scale implementation consistently report the importance of dedicated project management, protected time for pathologist training, staged rollout beginning with less complex case types, and a hybrid workflow period that allows staff to build digital confidence without the anxiety of abrupt change. The Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust, which achieved a fully glassless primary diagnostic workflow, explicitly credited lean process methodology, a dedicated transformation team, and transparent staff communication as the enablers of successful adoption (Goolam-Hossen, 2023).

The financial case, which is often cited as a barrier, increasingly resolves in favor of digital when total cost of ownership is assessed over a five-year horizon. Studies examining European laboratory implementations found that despite significant upfront investment, the long-term financial analysis, accounting for personnel restructuring, elimination of off-site storage costs, reduced logistics overhead, and productivity gains, demonstrated positive net present value in most scenarios (Matias-Guiu et al., 2025). For laboratory administrators and CFOs seeking the financial justification to present to institutional leadership, the evidence is there.

Conclusion: The Hesitation Was Professional. The Evidence Is Now Clear.

The pathologist looking at the screen and saying "I'm not ready yet" was always making a professional judgement, not a personal one. They were applying the same careful weighing of evidence, risk, and disruption that makes pathological diagnosis trustworthy. That skepticism was never the enemy of digital pathology; it was its most important quality-control mechanism, driving the development of rigorous validation frameworks, honest longitudinal data, and evidence-based implementation guidance that now underpins practice at institutions around the world.

What has changed is that the evidence has caught up with the hesitation, and in many domains, surpassed it. Concordance data is robust and improving. Productivity evidence is compelling and specific. Regulatory clarity has arrived. AI integration is becoming not a future possibility but a present reality that requires digital infrastructure as its prerequisite. And the pathologists who made the transition first, some of whom were among the most resistant, are now, consistently, among the most satisfied.

The question for pathologists considering this transition is no longer whether digital pathology can be trusted. The question is whether the hesitation itself, understandable as it is, is now the greater professional risk: the risk of remaining outside an evidence base that is accelerating, an AI infrastructure that is building, and a practice environment that is increasingly designed for pathologists who work digitally.

"There's never enough time to do everything I want." is the most honest statement in pathology. The evidence suggests that for pathologists who have made the transition, it has started, finally, to become less true.

Key Takeaways for Pathologists and Laboratory Decision-Makers

1. The hesitation is rational: early WSI limitations were real, and pathologist skepticism drove the development of the rigorous validation frameworks that now make safe adoption possible. Acknowledge the evidence history, not just the current evidence state.

2. Concordance data across 33+ validation studies places mean WSI-glass diagnostic agreement at 95.2%, with clinically significant discordances below 3%, comparable to known glass-slide interobserver variability. Quality concerns at the instrument level are now largely resolved by modern high-throughput scanners.

3. Productivity gains are concrete and significant. Published data shows up to 30% gains in pathologist workload-based output through elimination of non-diagnostic time, directly addressing the most universal pathologist complaint: not enough time.

4. The CAP validation framework (Evans et al., 2022) provides a structured, laboratory-specific pathway to build local concordance evidence using your own tissue types, your own pathologists, and your own scanner. Validation is achievable within a managed timeframe and generates the professional confidence base that drives adoption.

5. AI integration is not a future consideration; it is the present strategic argument for digital adoption. AI diagnostic tools require WSI infrastructure. Labs that delay digitization are not preserving the status quo; they are creating a compounding delay relative to the AI-enabled future of the discipline.

6 Implementation quality determines the experience. Studies consistently show that pathologists who were skeptical before adoption report high satisfaction after, but only when transitions are properly resourced, staged, and supported. The evidence on how to implement well is as important as the evidence on why.

References

1. Evans, A. J., Brown, R. W., Bui, M. M., Chlipala, E. A., Lacchetti, C., Milner, D. A., Pantanowitz, L., Parwani, A. V., Reid, K., Riben, M. W., Reuter, V. E., Stephens, L., Stewart, R. L., & Thomas, N. E. (2022). Validating whole slide imaging systems for diagnostic purposes in pathology: Guideline update from the College of American Pathologists in collaboration with the American Society for Clinical Pathology and the Association for Pathology Informatics. Archives of Pathology & Laboratory Medicine, 146(4), 440–450. https://doi.org/10.5858/arpa.2020-0723-CP
2. Rizzo, P. C., Girolami, I., Marletta, S., Pantanowitz, L., Antonini, P., Brunelli, M., Santonicco, N., Vacca, G., Tumino, R., Moretta, L., Parwani, A. V., Satturwar, S., Eccher, A., & Munari, E. (2022). Technical and diagnostic issues in whole slide imaging published validation studies. Frontiers in Oncology, 12, 918580. https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2022.918580
3. Hanna, M. G., Reuter, V. E., Samboy, J., England, C., Corsale, L., Fine, S. W., Klimstra, D. S., & Travis, W. D. (2020). Implementation of digital pathology offers clinical and operational increase in efficiency and cost savings. Archives of Pathology & Laboratory Medicine, 143(12), 1545–1555. https://doi.org/10.5858/arpa.2018-0514-OA
4. Kusta, O., Rift, C. V., Risor, T., Santoni-Rugiu, E., & Brodersen, J. B. (2022). Lost in digitization: A systematic review about the diagnostic test accuracy of digital pathology solutions. Journal of Pathology Informatics, 13, 100136. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpi.2022.100136
5. Vodovnik, A. (2024). Non-diagnostic time in digital pathology: An empirical study over 10 years. Journal of Pathology Informatics, 15, 100393. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpi.2024.100393
6. Hartmann, A., Djudjaj, S., Boor, P., Amann, K., & Linz, P. (2022). Digitization of pathology labs: A review of lessons learned. Laboratory Investigation, 102(11), 1134–1150. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.labinv.2023.100244
7. Gjelsvik, B. L., Pujol-Papell, S., & Røsand, E. (2024). Streamlining a patchwork: Exploring the challenges of digital transformation in pathology: Ethnographic study. JMIR Formative Research, 8, e56022. https://doi.org/10.2196/56022
8. Walsh, E., & Orsi, N. (2024). The current troubled state of the global pathology workforce: A concise review. Diagnostic Pathology, 19, 63. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13000-024-01590-2
9. Tate, S., & Lagemann, E. (2023). US digital pathology 2023: A deep dive into early clinical adopters' successes and lessons learned. KLAS Research. https://klasresearch.com/report/us-digital-pathology-2023
10. Hartman, D., Parwani, A., Roehmholdt, B., Van Meter, B., Ardon, O., Hanna, M. G., Kelly, D., & Sowards, C. (2025). Perspectives on reducing barriers to the adoption of digital and computational pathology technology by clinical labs. Diagnostics, 15(8), 1011. https://doi.org/10.3390/diagnostics15081011
11. Farahani, N., Parwani, A. V., & Pantanowitz, L. (2015). Whole slide imaging in pathology: Advantages, limitations, and emerging perspectives. Pathology and Laboratory Medicine International, 7, 23–33. https://doi.org/10.2147/PLMI.S59826
12. Matias-Guiu, X., Temprana-Salvador, J., Garcia Lopez, P., Velasquez, M., Chorro, J. L., Artigas, A., Ejarque, M., Garcia, V., Gutierrez, B., & Bernet, L. (2025). Implementing digital pathology: Qualitative and financial insights from eight leading European laboratories. Virchows Archiv. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00428-025-04064-y
13. Caputo, A., Gibilisco, F., Belmonte, B., Mondello, A., L'Imperio, V., & Fraggetta, F. (2023). Real-world digital pathology: Considerations and ruminations of four young pathologists. Journal of Clinical Pathology, 76, 68–70. https://doi.org/10.1136/jclinpath-2022-208218
14. Dawson, H. (2022). Digital pathology: Rising to the challenge. Frontiers in Medicine, 9, 928219. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmed.2022.888896

©2026 Epredia. All rights reserved. All trademarks are the property of Epredia unless otherwise specified. **M2600098 R092026**

epredia
A Member of PHC Group