

Large Language Models for Disease Diagnosis: A Scoping Review

Shuang Zhou^{1, #}, Zidu Xu^{2, #}, Mian Zhang^{3, #}, Chunpu Xu^{4, #}, Yawen Guo⁵, Zaifu Zhan⁶, Sirui Ding⁷, Jiashuo Wang⁴, Kaishuai Xu⁴, Yi Fang⁸, Liqiao Xia⁹, Jeremy Yeung¹, Daochen Zha¹⁰, Mingquan Lin¹, Rui Zhang^{1, *}

¹Division of Computational Health Sciences, Department of Surgery, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, USA

²School of Nursing, Columbia University, New York, New York, USA

³Erik Jonsson School of Engineering and Computer Science, University of Texas at Dallas, Richardson, TX, USA

⁴Department of Computing, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR

⁵Department of Informatics, University of California, Irvine, Irvine, CA, USA

⁶Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, USA

⁷Bakar Computational Health Sciences Institute, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA

⁸Department of Computer Science, New York University (Shanghai), Shanghai, CN

⁹Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR

¹⁰Department of Computer Science, Rice University, Houston, TX, USA

#Equal contribution

*Correspondence: zhan1386@umn.edu

Abstract. Automatic disease diagnosis has become increasingly valuable in clinical practice. The advent of large language models (LLMs) has catalyzed a paradigm shift in artificial intelligence, with growing evidence supporting the efficacy of LLMs in diagnostic tasks. Despite the growing attention in this field, many critical research questions remain under-explored. For instance, what diseases and LLM techniques have been investigated for diagnostic tasks? How can suitable LLM techniques and evaluation methods be selected for clinical decision-making? To answer these questions, we performed a comprehensive analysis of LLM-based methods for disease diagnosis. This scoping review examined the types of diseases, associated organ systems, relevant clinical data, LLM techniques, and evaluation methods reported in existing studies. Furthermore, we offered guidelines for data preprocessing and the selection of appropriate LLM techniques and evaluation strategies for diagnostic tasks. We also assessed the limitations of current research and delineated the challenges and future directions in this research field. In summary, our review outlined a blueprint for LLM-based disease diagnosis, helping to streamline and guide future research endeavors.

Introduction

Automatic disease diagnosis involves inputting clinical data into algorithms that analyze patterns and generate diagnoses with minimal or no human intervention. Its significance in clinical scenar-

ios is multifaceted. First, it enhances diagnostic accuracy, supports physicians in clinical decision-making, and addresses disparities in healthcare access by providing more high-quality diagnostic services. Second, it increases diagnostic efficiency, particularly in contexts of population aging and clinician shortages, where the complexity of diagnosis demands significant time even from experienced clinicians. Finally, it offers patients greater convenience through online diagnostic services, facilitating early diagnosis and reducing the delays associated with traditional clinical visits.

Advancements in artificial intelligence have driven the development of automated diagnostic systems through two stages. Initially, machine learning techniques such as SVM and decision trees were employed for disease classification^{1;2}, which typically involved four steps: data processing, feature extraction, model optimization, and disease prediction. With larger datasets and sufficient computational power, deep learning methods later dominated the development of diagnostic tasks^{3;4}. These approaches leveraged deep neural networks (DNNs), including convolutional neural networks⁵, recurrent neural networks⁶, and generative adversarial networks⁷, enabling end-to-end feature extraction and model training. For example, a convolutional DNN with 34 layers achieved cardiologist-level performance in arrhythmia diagnosis⁸. However, these models require extensive labeled data for training and are typically task-specific, limiting their adaptability to other tasks^{5;8}.

In recent years, the paradigm of artificial intelligence has shifted from traditional deep learning to the emergence of large language models (LLMs). Unlike supervised learning, LLMs, such as generative pre-trained transformers (GPT) and LLaMA⁹, are generative models pre-trained on vast amounts of unlabeled data through self-supervised learning. These models, typically comprising billions of parameters, excel in language processing and adapt to various tasks. To date, LLMs have demonstrated superior performance in clinical scenarios, including question answering¹⁰,

information retrieval¹¹, and clinical report generation^{12;13}.

Recently, increasing numbers of studies have verified the effectiveness of LLMs for diagnostic tasks. For instance, PathChat¹⁴, a vision-language generalist LLM fine-tuned on hundreds of thousands of instructions, achieved state-of-the-art performance in human pathology. Med-MLLM¹³, a multimodal LLM pre-trained and fine-tuned on extensive medical data, including chest X-rays, CT scans, and clinical notes, demonstrated notable accuracy in COVID-19 diagnosis. Additionally, Kim et al.¹⁵ employed GPT-4 with prompt engineering and found it surpassed mental health professionals in identifying obsessive-compulsive disorder.

Although this research field has drawn wide attention, many key questions remain underexplored. For instance, what diseases and LLM techniques have been investigated for diagnostic tasks? How do researchers use LLMs to analyze various types of medical data for disease diagnosis? What evaluation methods are appropriate for assessing performance? While numerous review papers on LLMs in medicine have been presented^{16;17;18;19;20}, they typically provide a broad overview of various clinical applications without underscoring disease diagnosis. For instance, Pressman et al.²¹ offered a comprehensive summary of potential clinical applications of LLMs, including pre-consultation, treatment, postoperative management, discharge, and patient education. None of these surveys address the nuances and challenges of applying LLMs to disease diagnosis or answer the aforementioned questions, highlighting a critical gap in the research.

The primary aim of this review is to provide a comprehensive analysis of using LLMs in disease diagnosis. This involved examining various disease types, associated organ systems, clinical data, LLM techniques, and evaluation methods from existing works. Besides, we provided guidelines for data pre-processing, selecting appropriate LLM techniques, and employing suitable evaluation strategies for diagnostic tasks. Additionally, we analyzed the limitations of current studies and




Fig 1 PRISMA flowchart of study records. PRISMA flowchart showing the study selection process.

comprehensively presented the challenges and future directions in this field. In summary, this review outlined a blueprint for LLM-based disease diagnosis and helped to inspire and streamline future research efforts.

Results

Overview of the Scope

This section presents the overview of the diseases, clinical data, and LLMs covered in this study. Figure 2 illustrates the disease-associated organ systems, clinical data, data modalities of the investigated LLMs, and the relevant LLM techniques. Notably, LLMs encompass a range of data modalities, including text, images, video, audio, tabular data, and time series. Figure 3 shows the publication trend over time and the statistics of data privacy and evaluation methods in this review. Table 1 summarizes the taxonomy of the mainstream LLM techniques for disease diagnosis, while Table 2 depicts the commonly used evaluation metrics.




Fig 2 Overview of the investigated scope. RAG denotes Retrieval-Augmented Generation.




Fig 3 Meta-data from the review. **a** Quarterly breakdown of LLM-based diagnostic studies. Since the information for 2024-Q3 is incomplete, our statistics only cover up to 2024-Q2. **b** Breakdown of the employed datasets by privacy status. **c** Breakdown of evaluation methods (note some papers utilized multiple evaluation methods).

Table 1 Overview of LLM techniques for disease diagnosis. FT denotes fine-tuning, TS denotes time series.

Techniques	Types	Characteristics	References
Prompt	Zero-shot	A single prompt describing the task	text ^{22;23} , text-image ²⁴ , text-TS ²⁵ , text-audio-video ²⁶ , text-tabular-TS ²⁷
	Few-shot	An instruction supplemented with several demonstrations	text ^{28;29} , text-image ^{30;31} , text-tabular-TS ²⁷
	CoT	Decomposing a problem into multiple linear steps	text ^{32;33} , text-image ^{34;35} , text-tabular-TS ²⁷
	Self-consistency	Generates multiple reasoning paths	text-tabular-TS ²⁷
	Soft prompt	Continuous vector embeddings with learnability	text-image ³⁶ , text-image-tabular ³⁷
RAG	Knowledge graph	External knowledge come from knowledge graphs	text ^{38;39} , text-TS ⁴⁰
	Corpus	External knowledge come from corpus	text ^{41;42} , image ^{43;44} , text-image ⁴⁵
	Database	External knowledge come from databases	text ^{46;47} , image ^{48;49}
Fine-tuning	SFT	Injecting domain-specific or task-specific knowledge	text ^{50;51;52} , text-image ^{53;54;55} , text-video ^{56;57;58}
	RLHF	Aligning the model with human preferences	text ^{59;60;61} , text-image ⁶²
	PEFT	Fine-tuning a small number of (extra) model parameters	text ^{63;64} , text-image ⁶⁵
Pre-training	-	Learning general knowledge	text ^{64;66;67} , text-image ^{54;68;69} , text-tabular ⁷⁰

Prompt-based Disease Diagnosis

Prompt engineering involves the creation of a prompting function designed to efficiently execute specific downstream tasks using LLMs⁷¹. A tailored prompt typically comprises four components: instruction (specifying the task), context (defining the scenario or domain), input data (identifying the data to be processed), and output indicators (directing the model on the desired style or role).

We identified five distinct prompt engineering techniques, which can be categorized into two main types: hard prompts and soft prompts. Hard prompts further involved zero-shot, few-shot, Chain-of-Thought (CoT), and self-consistency prompting. These are static, interpretable instructions written in human language, making them particularly effective when both inputs and outputs are well-structured and clearly defined⁷². Soft prompts are continuous vector embeddings generated by a small, trainable model before being fed into a LLM. This approach, known as prompt tuning, encodes input data into task-specific embeddings, providing the LLM with context tailored to the task⁷³.

Among the 232 reviewed studies employing prompt engineering techniques, zero-shot prompting was the most frequently employed technique (N=176), significantly surpassing the use of few-shot prompting (N=20). CoT prompting (N=25) was occasionally integrated into zero-shot or few-shot scenarios^{32;34;35}. Two studies implemented soft prompting to encode multimodal EHR data (e.g., medical images, clinical notes, and lab results) by integrating external domain knowl-

edge from pre-trained language models^{36;37}. Only one study utilized self-consistency prompting to enhance the reliability and robustness of LLM outputs²⁷.

Among reviewed studies, prompt engineering techniques were predominantly applied to a single modality of text data (N=173), while 59 studies involved multimodal data, incorporating structured data, images, time series data, audio, and video. In studies involving multimodal data, most focused on generating differential diagnosis lists, accompanied by explanations or justifications informed by medical imaging data, such as X-rays^{30;74;75}, magnetic resonance imaging (MRIs)^{76;77}, pathology images¹⁴, and optical coherence tomography (OCT) images⁷⁸, along with relevant text-based contextual information. Visual Question Answering was another prominent application, primarily aiming to enhance the accuracy and robustness of medical image diagnoses by responding to questions related to these images^{79;80}. Less common tasks driven by text prompts included image classification^{81;82}, segmentation⁸³, and captioning^{36;84}. For instance, Ono et al.³¹ demonstrated that the few-shot prompting achieved performance comparable to the convolutional neural network model YOLOv8 in classifying histopathology images to identify specific lesion types. Time series data from wearable sensors were analyzed either through direct abnormality reporting²⁵, or by integrating these data with contextual information in tabular format (e.g., user demographics, health-related definitions) for downstream tasks such as sleep disorder prediction²⁷. Only one study employed audio data, in combination with video data, for recognizing autism-related behaviors²⁶.

Although the unimodal studies solely focused on the text data, significant variability was observed in the ML tasks investigated through prompt engineering techniques. The primary applications included: 1) text-based question answering, such as providing detailed explanations of clinical profiles and radiology reports to enhance diagnostic confidence^{10;85}; 2) text classifi-

cation, including predicting likely diagnoses based on symptom descriptions and physical exam findings^{86;87}; and 3) text generation, primarily creating diagnosis lists with justifications^{23;32}, and summarizing clinical features²².

Retrieval-Augmented LLMs for Diagnosis

To address hallucination issues in LLMs and update their stored medical knowledge without needing re-training, recent studies^{38;39;40;41;42;43;44;45;46;47;48;49;58;88;89;90;91;92;93;94} have incorporated external medical sources such as corpus^{41;42;43;44;45;58;88;89;90;91;92;93;94}, databases^{46;47;48;49}, and knowledge graph^{38;39;40} to enhance the LLMs' diagnostic capabilities. Based on the type of diagnostic data, Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) for diagnosis can be categorized into text-based, image-based, time-series-based, and multimodal-based augmentations.

For text-based RAG, most research^{41;42;46;47;58;88;89;90;91;92;93;94} employs a fundamental retrieval approach where externally sourced knowledge is encoded using sentence Transformers (e.g., OpenAI text-embedding-ada-002) into vector representations used as retrieval sources. Queries are similarly encoded, allowing the system to identify and fetch the most relevant knowledge by calculating the similarity between query vectors and source vectors. This combined information is then fed into LLMs using specially designed prompts to generate diagnostic results. However, some approaches like identifying key query entities to retrieve relevant knowledge graphs³⁸ or assigning importance to entities in medical records³⁹ have shown promising results in refining the process by accurately pinpointing potential diseases. In image-based data, the common practice^{43;44;48} involves extracting features from input images, describing them in text, and then applying text-based enhancement methods. Ranjit et al.⁴⁹ directly computes similarities between image and text features using multimodal models to retrieve similar documents. For time-series RAG, Zhu et al.⁴⁰

identifies abnormal features of the time-series data from Electronic Health Records and searches relevant knowledge from the knowledge graphs. In multimodal enhancements, advanced models like GPT-4V are being used to extract crucial data from input images. This data, along with the query text, aids in searching relevant documents from external knowledge corpus⁴⁵.

Fine-tuning LLMs for Diagnosis

Fine-tuning a LLM typically involves two key stages: Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT) and Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF). In the SFT stage, the model is trained using task-specific instruction-response pairs. During this phase, the LLM learns to process instructions and information from various modalities, producing the desired response as output. The RLHF stage focuses on aligning the LLM with human preferences. Here, the model is refined to be more helpful, honest, and harmless⁹⁵, ensuring it aligns better with human values and expectations.

Medical SFT enhances the in-context learning, reasoning, planning, and role-playing capabilities of LLMs, leading to improved diagnostic performance. During this process, inputs from various data modalities are integrated into the LLM's word embedding space. Following the approach outlined in LLaVA⁹⁶, visual information is first converted into visual token embeddings using an image encoder and a projector. These embeddings, which match the dimensionality of language token embeddings, are then fed into the LLM for end-to-end training. In this review, approximately half of the studies focused on conducting SFT using medical texts for diagnostic purposes^{50;60;61;67;97;98;99;100;101}, while the other half combined both medical texts and images to enhance disease diagnosis^{54;68;69;102;103;104;105;106;107}. A few studies also explored the detection of diseases from medical videos^{56;57;58}, where video frames were sampled and transformed into visual token embeddings. To perform SFT effectively, it is crucial to collect high-quality responses

to task-specific instructions. These instructions should be well-defined and diverse, covering a wide range of scenarios to ensure comprehensive training.

RLHF methods could be divided into two categories: online-based methods and offline-based methods. PPO-based RLHF, a key process for the success of ChatGPT¹⁰⁸, is the representative and most popular online alignment method, where we first fit a reward model to datasets of prompts and human preferences over responses, then use PPO¹⁰⁹ to update the LLM to maximize the learned reward model. Some explorations show PPO-based RLHF could effectively improve the diagnostic ability of medical LLMs^{60;61;62}. However, the overall performance of PPO-based RLHF highly relies on the quality of the reward model, which is expected to give accurate rewards to LLM responses, and several works demonstrated that the reward model could suffer from issues like over-optimization¹¹⁰ and shifting from initial data distribution¹¹¹. Meanwhile, the training of RL is unstable and not easy to control¹¹². Offline RLHF methods like DPO¹¹³ cast RLHF as optimizing a simple classification loss, eliminating the need for a reward model. These methods are also more stable and computationally lightweight and have proven useful in medical LLMs alignment^{59;64;98}. To conduct RLHF, a high-quality dataset of prompts and responses with human preferences is crucial to train a well-calibrated¹¹⁴ reward model for online RLHF or ensure the better convergence of DPO like offline RLHF algorithms¹¹⁵, whether from human experts¹⁰⁸ or powerful AI models¹¹⁶, like GPT-4.

As the size of large models increases, their capabilities also become stronger. Typically, this leads us to choose larger models to ensure that they have a good foundational ability to be adapted to downstream tasks. However, as the model size increases, full training becomes increasingly impractical, requiring a lot of GPUs. Parameter-Efficient Fine-Tuning (PEFT) alleviates this issue by reducing the number of parameters that need to be fine-tuned in the model. PEFT can be divided

into two categories: one involves adding additional adapters¹¹⁷ (changes on model structure), and the other is Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA)¹¹⁸, injecting trainable rank decomposition matrices into each layer of the model (no model structural changes). LoRA is more popular because it does not introduce additional inference latency. This is also true in the medical field: many researchers opt to use LoRA for fine-tuning due to limited computational resources^{50;63;64;65;119;120;121}.

Pre-training LLMs for Diagnosis

LLMs are initially pre-trained on extensive text corpora to perform next-token prediction. During this phase, the model learns the structure of language and acquires a vast amount of knowledge about the world. When pre-trained on medical texts, LLMs gain foundational medical knowledge, which proves valuable when adapting them for various downstream medical tasks, including medical diagnosis. In this review, five studies perform text-only pretraining on the LLMs from different sources^{66;67;122;123;124}, such as clinical notes, medical QA texts, dialogues, and Wikipedia. Moreover, eight studies injected medical visual knowledge into multimodal LLMs via pretraining^{54;68;69;70;124;125;126}. Chen et al.⁶⁸ and Wang et al.¹²⁴ pretrained the model on VQA data, where Chen et al.⁶⁸ used an out-of-shelf multi-model LLM to reformat image-text pairs from PubMed as VQA data points to train their LLM. To improve the quality of the image encoder, pretraining tasks like reconstructing images at tile-level or slide-level⁶⁹, and aligning similar images or image-text pairs⁵⁴ are common choices.

Evaluation Strategy

Evaluating diagnostic performance is of crucial importance. Existing evaluation methods for diagnosis generally fall into three categories: automatic evaluation, human evaluation, and LLM

Table 2 Overview of evaluation metrics for disease diagnosis

Type	Evaluation metric	Purpose
Automatic metric	Accuracy ¹²⁷	The ratio of all correct predictions to the total predictions
	Precision ¹²⁸	The ratio of true positives to the total number of positive predictions
	Recall ¹²⁸	The ratio of true positives to the total number of actual positive cases
	F1 ¹³	Calculated as the harmonic mean of precision and recall
	AUC ¹²⁹	The area under the Receiver Operating Characteristic curve
	AUPR ¹³⁰	The area under the precision-recall curve
	Top-k accuracy ¹³¹	The ratio of instances with the true label in the top k predictions to total instances
	Top-k precision ¹³²	The ratio of true positives to total positive predictions within the top k predictions
	Top-k recall ¹³³	The ratio of true positives within the top k predictions to actual positive cases
	Mean square error ¹³⁴	The average of the squared differences between predicted and actual values
	Mean absolute error ¹³⁵	The average of the absolute differences between predicted and actual values
	Cohen's κ ¹³⁶	Measures the agreement between predicted score and actual score
	BLUE ¹³⁷	Calculates precision by counting matching n-grams between reference and generated text
	ROUGE ²⁸	Calculates F1-score by matching n-grams between reference and generated text
	CIDEr ¹³⁸	Evaluates n-gram similarity, emphasizing alignment across multiple reference texts
	BERTScore ¹³⁹	Measures similarity by comparing embeddings of reference and generated text
METEOR ¹⁴⁰	Evaluates text similarity by considering precision, recall, word order, and synonym matches	
Human evaluation	Correctness ¹⁴¹	Whether the response or prediction is medically correct
	Necessity ²⁸	Whether the response or prediction assists in advancing the diagnosis
	Clarity ⁴¹	Whether the response or prediction is clearly clarified
	Acceptance ¹⁴²	The degree of acceptance of the response without any revision
	Understanding ¹⁴³	The degree of understandability of the response or prediction
	Hallucination ¹⁴⁴	Response contains inconsistent or unmentioned information with previous context
	Reliability ¹⁴⁵	The trustworthiness of the evidence in the response or prediction
	Professionalism ¹⁴⁵	The rationality of the evidence-based on domain knowledge
	Satisfaction ¹⁴⁶	Whether the response or prediction is satisfying
Human or LLM evaluation	Explainability ¹⁴⁷	Whether the response or prediction is explainable
	Consistency ¹⁴⁴	Whether the response or prediction is consistent with the ground-truth or input
	Completeness ²⁸	Whether the response or prediction is sufficient and comprehensive
	Relevance ⁴¹	Whether the response or prediction is relevant to the context
	Coherence ¹⁴⁸	Assesses logical consistency with the dialogue history

evaluation (shown in Table 2). An overview of the pros and cons of the evaluation strategies is depicted in Figure 6.

Most studies assessed diagnostic effectiveness using automatic metrics, which can be broadly categorized into three types. The first type includes classification-based metrics such as accuracy, precision, and recall, which are suitable for single-disease prediction. For example, Liu et al.¹³ adopted AUC, accuracy, and F1 score to evaluate COVID-19 diagnosis effectiveness. The second type is generally used in multi-label scenarios, where predictions involve multiple potential diagnoses, including top-k accuracy and top-k precision. For instance, Tu et al.¹³¹ utilized top-k accuracy to measure the percentage of correct diagnoses appearing within the top-k positions of the diagnosis list. The third type applies to risk prediction tasks, where mean absolute error (MAE) or mean squared error (MSE) measures the deviation between predicted values and the ac-




Fig 4 Summary of the evaluation strategies for diagnostic tasks.

tual ones^{134;135}. In summary, automatic metrics offer advantages such as time and cost efficiency, ease of implementation, and suitability for large-scale data. However, they require ground-truth answers, which are often unavailable in many scenarios. Additionally, these metrics typically lack human-centric perspectives, such as assessing the reliability or overall usefulness of the prediction. Furthermore, they generally fall short in evaluating complex scenarios, such as determining whether a diagnostic reasoning process is medically correct¹⁴⁹.

Many studies evaluated diagnostic performance through human evaluation^{150;151}. This method relies on domain experts to evaluate the quality of model predictions based on their medical knowledge. One advantage lies in that it typically does not require ground-truth answers. Additionally, it accommodates human-centric perspectives and can address complex tasks that necessitate extensive human intelligence or domain knowledge. However, human evaluation has limitations, including high time and cost demands and susceptibility to human error. Consequently, it is usu-

ally applied for small-scale data assessments.

Additionally, some studies have utilized LLMs to replace human experts in diagnostic evaluation^{152;153;154}. This approach combines the benefits of human-centric evaluation with the efficiency of automated metrics. By leveraging the advanced capabilities of LLMs, it provides human-like perspectives while eliminating the need for human effort. Commonly used LLMs for this purpose include GPT-3.5, GPT-4, and Llama3. However, this method is limited by the performance of the employed LLMs, which are susceptible to hallucination issues¹⁴⁴. Moreover, LLM-based evaluations may struggle with handling complex clinical scenarios¹⁵⁵.

In summary, the above evaluation strategies have their advantages and limitations. The balance between accurate evaluation and cost-effectiveness varies depending on the specific scenario. Our analyses, presented in Figure 6, provide guidance on selecting appropriate evaluation strategies, catering to the requirements of various applications.

Discussion

This section presents notable findings from the included studies, highlighting key challenges and potential future research directions. Our review revealed that most studies utilized LLMs for disease diagnosis through prompt learning. The phenomenon might be explained as follows. Firstly, it requires minimal data; zero-shot and few-shot prompts enable the development of diagnostic systems with just a few dozen examples^{22;156}. Secondly, prompt-based methods are user-friendly and require minimal setup, making them accessible to researchers with limited machine-learning expertise. Additionally, they significantly reduce computational overhead, making implementation feasible on standard hardware. Furthermore, when used appropriately, large-scale LLMs like GPT-4 or GPT-3.5, which own extensive medical knowledge, demonstrate fair performance across




Fig 5 Summary of the advantages and limitations of the mainstream LLM techniques for diagnosis.

various diagnostic tasks^{150;156}.

We have summarized the advantages and limitations of mainstream LLM techniques in Figure 5. The selection of LLM techniques for developing diagnostic systems depends on the quantity and quality of available data. Specifically, prompt engineering is highly flexible and effective when annotated data is limited. For instance, zero-shot prompting allows models to perform diagnosis without annotated data, while few-shot prompting requires only a few instructions and examples^{150;156}. To effectively use RAG for diagnosis, a comprehensive and high-quality external knowledge base is essential. This knowledge base can consist of databases⁴¹, corpora⁹¹, clinical guidelines¹⁵⁷, or knowledge graphs¹⁵⁸ from which LLMs can retrieve information during inference. Effective fine-tuning necessitates a well-annotated, domain-specific dataset that includes labeled examples reflecting the target diagnostic tasks, such as annotated clinical notes or medical images, and a substantial number of samples¹³. Pre-training requires extensive and diverse datasets that cover a broad range of medical knowledge, incorporating unstructured text (e.g., clinical notes, medical literature) or structured data (e.g., lab test results)^{159;160}. The quality and diversity of the datasets are crucial for establishing the model’s foundational knowledge and its ability to general-

ize across various medical contexts.

While pre-training and fine-tuning would achieve promising performance and reliability^{13;125}, they demand significant resources, including computational power and data collection. In contrast, not all applications require high-accuracy disease diagnosis, such as large-scale screening¹⁶¹, mobile health alerts¹⁶², or diagnostic education¹⁶³. Balancing the trade-off between accuracy and cost-effectiveness varies by scenario. In summary, the analyses presented in Figure 5 guide users in selecting appropriate LLM techniques for disease diagnosis based on available resources.

Despite the progress in LLM-based methods for clinical diagnosis, this scoping review identifies several barriers that impede their clinical utility. A notable limitation is the lack of studies integrating diverse multi-modal data for diagnosis¹⁶⁴, such as text, medical images, time series, and other modalities. For example, Deng et al.¹⁶⁵ developed a multi-modal LLM incorporating text, images, video, and speech for autism spectrum disorder screening. However, only a small subset of studies combined diverse modalities. This discrepancy contrasts with real-world diagnostic scenarios, where comprehensive patient information spans multiple data modalities¹⁶⁶, particularly for complex conditions affecting multiple organs. Therefore, future research should emphasize fusing multi-modal data to simulate real-world scenarios.

Another limitation is that most studies implicitly assume the collected patient information is sufficient for accurate disease diagnosis. Nevertheless, this assumption usually hardly holds, particularly in initial consultations or with complicated diseases, and using incomplete data would likely cause misdiagnosis^{167;168}. In practice, clinical information gathering is an iterative process, beginning with the collection of initial patient data (e.g., subjective symptoms), narrowing down potential diagnoses, and then conducting medical examinations for further data collection and disease screening¹⁶⁹. This process typically requires extensive domain expertise from experienced




Fig 6 Summary of the limitations and future directions.

clinicians. To address these challenges, an increasing number of studies are exploring diagnostic conversations that collect relevant patient information through multi-round dialogues^{170;171}. For example, AIME utilized LLMs for clinical history-taking and diagnostic dialogue¹³¹, while MEDIQ asked follow-up questions to gather essential information for clinical reasoning¹⁵⁵. Therefore, future research should integrate the recognition of incomplete data into diagnostic models or develop advanced methods for automatic diagnostic queries.

Some barriers lie in the decision-making step. While many studies emphasize diagnostic accuracy, they usually ignore human-centric perspectives such as model interpretability, patient privacy, safety, and fairness^{16;172;173}. Specifically, providing diagnostic predictions alone is insufficient in clinical scenarios, as the black-box nature of LLMs often undermines trust^{144;149}. Accordingly, it is essential to provide interpretative insights into the diagnoses¹⁴⁹. For example, Dual-Inf is a prompt-based framework that not only provides potential diagnoses but also explains the rationale behind them¹⁵¹. Regarding privacy, adherence to regulations like the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) and the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) is crucial, such as the de-identification of sensitive information^{11;174}. To date, only a few works have investigated the issue^{93;175}. For instance, SkinGPT-4 is a dermatology diagnostic system designed for local deployment to protect user privacy¹⁷⁵. Fairness is another concern, ensuring patients are not discriminated against based on gender, age, or race¹⁷². Research addressing the fairness issue in LLM-based diagnosis remains limited^{176;177}. In short, future research should integrate these human-centric perspectives into diagnostic systems to address these critical issues.

In terms of technical aspects, integrating multi-modal data for disease diagnosis has garnered considerable attention¹⁷⁸. However, several challenges remain, including the need to eliminate data noise¹⁷⁹, fuse heterogeneous data from various modalities¹⁸⁰, and perform efficient learning.

Additionally, many domain-specific LLMs are constrained by smaller parameter scales compared to general-domain models^{145;181}. This phenomenon might arise from the substantial corpus and computational resources required for training large medical specialists, which are often unavailable¹³¹. Nevertheless, pre-training on extensive medical corpora can enrich LLMs with more medical knowledge, thereby boosting their accuracy for rare diseases and enhancing medical reasoning^{182;183}. Therefore, it is promising to investigate integrating more clinical knowledge either with pre-training or fine-tuning, thus alleviating the hallucination issues. Additionally, employing multiple specialist models to handle complex diseases offers a practical simulation of interdisciplinary clinical discussions involving multiple organ systems^{93;184} and is worth further exploration.

Another critical area is the development of diagnostic systems. Many studies utilized private datasets, which are often inaccessible due to privacy concerns^{157;185}. However, the advancement of diagnostic systems necessitates a greater availability of public data. Additionally, the scarcity of annotated data poses a significant challenge to the development of this field. This is because well-annotated datasets enable exploiting automatic metrics for evaluation, reducing the need for extensive human effort in performance assessment¹⁵¹. Therefore, constructing and releasing annotated datasets would significantly contribute to the research community. Moreover, performance evaluation should also be highlighted. Currently, there is no standardized guideline for evaluating diagnostic model performance, particularly regarding human-centric metrics^{28;148;186}. A generic principle is that metrics from different aspects, such as effectiveness, robustness, reliability, and explainability, should be considered.

Exploring the interaction between clinicians, patients, and diagnostic systems presents a promising avenue for research^{170;171;187}. In medical settings, diagnostic systems could function as assistants that provide supplementary information to enhance the accuracy or efficiency of clini-

cians^{85;188}. Future studies could explore how the effective application of diagnostic algorithms can further enhance clinical accuracy. Additionally, diagnostic systems should be designed to incorporate feedback from medical experts, facilitating continuous refinement and adaptation.

In conclusion, our study provides a comprehensive review of LLM-based methods for disease diagnosis. Our contributions are multifaceted. First, we have summarized the application scenarios, associated human organ systems, the relevant clinical data, the employed LLM techniques, and evaluation methods within this research domain. Second, we compared the advantages and limitations of mainstream LLM techniques and evaluation methods, offering recommendations for developing diagnostic systems based on varying user demands. Third, we identified intriguing phenomena from the current studies and provided insights into their underlying causes. Lastly, we analyzed the current challenges and outlined the future directions of this research field. In summary, our review presented an in-depth analysis of LLM-based disease diagnosis, outlined its blueprint, inspired future research, and helped streamline efforts in developing diagnostic systems.

Method

Search Strategy and Selection Criteria

This scoping review is reported in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) guidelines, as shown in Figure 1. We performed the literature search from various resources to find relevant articles published between 1 Jan 2019 and 18 July 2024. We searched seven electronic databases, including PubMed, CINAHL, Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar, ACM digital library, and IEEE Xplore. The search terms were selected based on consensus expert opinion and used for each database (see Supplementary Data 1).

We performed a two-stage screening process to focus on LLMs for human disease diagnosis. The first stage involved using the title and abstract for paper exclusion. The criterion was as follows: (a) articles were not published in English; (b) articles irrelevant to LLMs or foundation models; and (c) articles irrelevant to the health domain. The second stage was full-text screening, emphasizing using language models for diagnosis-related tasks. We excluded review papers, papers without explicitly used for disease diagnosis, and foundation models not involving text modality (e.g., visual foundation models).

Data Extraction

Information garnered from the articles consists of four categories. (1) Basic information, including title, published venue, published time (year and month), and research task (e.g., diagnosis, report generation, or question-answering). (2) Data-related information, including data sources (continents), dataset name, modality (e.g., text, image, video, or text-image), clinical specialty, disease name, data availability (i.e., private or public data), and data size. (3) Model-related information, comprising model name, base LLM type, parameter size, LLM technique type, model availability, and preferred language (e.g., English or multilingual). (4) Evaluation, which includes evaluation schema (e.g., automatic or human evaluation) and evaluation metrics (e.g., accuracy, F1, AUC). See Supplementary Table 1 for a detailed description of the extracted data.

Data synthesis

We synthesized insights from the data extraction to highlight the principal themes in LLM-based disease diagnosis. Firstly, we explored the scope of our review, covering disease types, associated organ systems, data modalities, and LLM techniques. We then summarized the various LLM-

based methods and evaluation strategies, analyzing their strengths and weaknesses, and offering targeted recommendations. Diving deeper into technical aspects, we detailed modeling approaches such as prompt-based methods, RAG, fine-tuning, and pre-training. We also examined the challenges faced by current research and outlined potential future directions. In summary, our synthesis encompassed a broad range of perspectives, assessing studies across data, LLM techniques, performance evaluation, and application scenarios, which are in line with established reporting standards.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health's National Center for Complementary and Integrative Health under grant number R01AT009457, National Institute on Aging under grant number R01AG078154, and National Cancer Institute under grant number R01CA287413. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health. We also acknowledge the support from the Center for Learning Health System Sciences.

Author contributions

S.Z. conceptualized the study and led the work. Z.Z., S.Z., J.Y., and M.Z. searched papers. S.Z., Z.X., M.Z., C.X., Y.G., Z.Z., S.D., J.W., K.X., Y.F., L.X., and J.Y. conducted paper screening and data extraction. S.Z., Z.X., M.Z., and C.X. performed data synthesis and contributed to the writing. M.L., D.Z., and R.Z. revised the manuscript. R.Z. supervised the study. All authors read and approved the final version.

References

- [1] Monika A Myszczyńska, Poojitha N Ojiamies, Alix MB Lacoste, Daniel Neil, Amir Safari, Richard Mead, Guillaume M Hautbergue, Joanna D Holbrook, and Laura Ferraiuolo. Applications of machine learning to diagnosis and treatment of neurodegenerative diseases. *Nature reviews neurology*, 16(8):440–456, 2020.
- [2] Meherwar Fatima and Maruf Pasha. Survey of machine learning algorithms for disease diagnostic. *Journal of Intelligent Learning Systems and Applications*, 9(01):1–16, 2017.
- [3] Shern Ping Choy, Byung Jin Kim, Alexandra Paolino, Wei Ren Tan, Sarah Man Lin Lim, Jessica Seo, Sze Ping Tan, Luc Francis, Teresa Tsakok, Michael Simpson, et al. Systematic review of deep learning image analyses for the diagnosis and monitoring of skin disease. *NPJ Digital Medicine*, 6(1):180, 2023.
- [4] Shuang Zhou, Xiao Huang, Ninghao Liu, Wen Zhang, Yuan-Ting Zhang, and Fu-Lai Chung. Open-world electrocardiogram classification via domain knowledge-driven contrastive learning. *Neural Networks*, 179:106551, 2024.
- [5] Yuan Liu, Ayush Jain, Clara Eng, David H Way, Kang Lee, Peggy Bui, Kimberly Kanada, Guilherme de Oliveira Marinho, Jessica Gallegos, Sara Gabriele, et al. A deep learning system for differential diagnosis of skin diseases. *Nature medicine*, 26(6):900–908, 2020.
- [6] Xueyan Mei, Zelong Liu, Ayushi Singh, Marcia Lange, Priyanka Boddu, Jingqi QX Gong, Justine Lee, Cody DeMarco, Chendi Cao, Samantha Platt, et al. Interstitial lung disease diagnosis and prognosis using an ai system integrating longitudinal data. *Nature communications*, 14(1):2272, 2023.

- [7] Qianwei Zhou, Margarita Zuley, Yuan Guo, Lu Yang, Bronwyn Nair, Adrienne Vargo, Suzanne Ghannam, Dooman Arefan, and Shandong Wu. A machine and human reader study on ai diagnosis model safety under attacks of adversarial images. *Nature communications*, 12(1):7281, 2021.
- [8] Awni Y Hannun, Pranav Rajpurkar, Masoumeh Haghpanahi, Geoffrey H Tison, Codie Bourn, Mintu P Turakhia, and Andrew Y Ng. Cardiologist-level arrhythmia detection and classification in ambulatory electrocardiograms using a deep neural network. *Nature medicine*, 25(1):65–69, 2019.
- [9] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.
- [10] Karan Singhal, Shekoofeh Azizi, Tao Tu, S. Sara Mahdavi, Jason Wei, Hyung Won Chung, Nathan Scales, Ajay Tanwani, Heather Cole-Lewis, Stephen Pfohl, Perry Payne, Martin Seneviratne, Paul Gamble, Chris Kelly, Abubakr Babiker, Nathanael Schärli, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Philip Mansfield, Dina Demner-Fushman, Blaise Agüera y Arcas, Dale Webster, Greg S. Corrado, Yossi Matias, Katherine Chou, Juraj Gottweis, Nenad Tomasev, Yun Liu, Alvin Rajkomar, Joelle Barral, Christopher Semturs, Alan Karthikesalingam, and Vivek Natarajan. Large language models encode clinical knowledge. *Nature*, 620(7972):172–180, 2023. ISSN 1476-4687. doi: 10.1038/s41586-023-06291-2. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06291-2>.

- [11] Le Peng, Gaoxiang Luo, Sicheng Zhou, Jiandong Chen, Ziyue Xu, Ju Sun, and Rui Zhang. An in-depth evaluation of federated learning on biomedical natural language processing for information extraction. *NPJ Digital Medicine*, 7(1):127, 2024.
- [12] Xiaolan Chen, Weiyi Zhang, Pusheng Xu, Ziwei Zhao, Yingfeng Zheng, Danli Shi, and Mingguang He. Ffa-gpt: an automated pipeline for fundus fluorescein angiography interpretation and question-answer. *npj Digital Medicine*, 7(1):111, 2024.
- [13] Fenglin Liu, Tingting Zhu, Xian Wu, Bang Yang, Chenyu You, Chenyang Wang, Lei Lu, Zhangdaihong Liu, Yefeng Zheng, Xu Sun, et al. A medical multimodal large language model for future pandemics. *NPJ Digital Medicine*, 6(1):226, 2023.
- [14] Ming Y Lu, Bowen Chen, Drew FK Williamson, Richard J Chen, Melissa Zhao, Aaron K Chow, Kenji Ikemura, Ahrong Kim, Dimitra Pouli, Ankush Patel, et al. A multimodal generative ai copilot for human pathology. *Nature*, pages 1–3, 2024.
- [15] Jiyeong Kim, Kimberly G Leonte, Michael L Chen, John B Torous, Eleni Linos, Anthony Pinto, and Carolyn I Rodriguez. Large language models outperform mental and medical health care professionals in identifying obsessive-compulsive disorder. *NPJ Digital Medicine*, 7(1):193, 2024.
- [16] Arun James Thirunavukarasu, Darren Shu Jeng Ting, Kabilan Elangovan, Laura Gutierrez, Ting Fang Tan, and Daniel Shu Wei Ting. Large language models in medicine. *Nature medicine*, 29(8):1930–1940, 2023.
- [17] Zhiyong Lu, Yifan Peng, Trevor Cohen, Marzyeh Ghassemi, Chunhua Weng, and Shubo Tian. Large language models in biomedicine and health: current research landscape and

- future directions. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 31(9):1801–1811, 2024.
- [18] Hongjian Zhou, Boyang Gu, Xinyu Zou, Yiru Li, Sam S Chen, Peilin Zhou, Junling Liu, Yining Hua, Chengfeng Mao, Xian Wu, et al. A survey of large language models in medicine: Progress, application, and challenge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.05112*, 2023.
- [19] Xiangbin Meng, Xiangyu Yan, Kuo Zhang, Da Liu, Xiaojuan Cui, Yaodong Yang, Muhan Zhang, Chunxia Cao, Jingjia Wang, Xuliang Wang, et al. The application of large language models in medicine: A scoping review. *Isience*, 27(5), 2024.
- [20] Yunkun Zhang, Jin Gao, Zheling Tan, Lingfeng Zhou, Kexin Ding, Mu Zhou, Shaoting Zhang, and Dequan Wang. Data-centric foundation models in computational healthcare: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.02458*, 2024.
- [21] Sophia M Pressman, Sahar Borna, Cesar A Gomez-Cabello, Syed Ali Haider, Clifton R Haider, and Antonio Jorge Forte. Clinical and surgical applications of large language models: A systematic review. *Journal of Clinical Medicine*, 13(11):3041, 2024.
- [22] D. Wu, J. Yang, C. Liu, T. C. Hsieh, E. Marchi, J. Blair, P. Krawitz, C. Weng, W. Chung, G. J. Lyon, I. D. Krantz, J. M. Kalish, and K. Wang. Gestaltmml: Enhancing rare genetic disease diagnosis through multimodal machine learning combining facial images and clinical texts. *ArXiv*, 2024. ISSN 2331-8422.
- [23] K. Mizuta, T. Hirose, Y. Harada, and T. Shimizu. Can chatgpt-4 evaluate whether a differential diagnosis list contains the correct diagnosis as accurately as a physician? *Diagnosis (Berl)*, 11(3):321–324, 2024. ISSN 2194-802x. doi: 10.1515/dx-2024-0027.

- [24] Manuela Benary, Xing David Wang, Max Schmidt, Dominik Soll, Georg Hilfenhaus, Mani Nassir, Christian Sigler, Maren Knödler, Ulrich Keller, Dieter Beule, Ulrich Keilholz, Ulf Leser, and Damian T. Rieke. Leveraging large language models for decision support in personalized oncology. *JAMA Network Open*, 6(11):e2343689–e2343689, 2023. ISSN 2574-3805. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.43689. URL <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.43689>.
- [25] Chunyu Liu, Yongpei Ma, Kavitha Kothur, Armin Nikpour, and Omid Kavehei. Biosignal copilot: Leveraging the power of llms in drafting reports for biomedical signals. *medRxiv*, page 2023.06.28.23291916, 2023. doi: 10.1101/2023.06.28.23291916. URL <http://medrxiv.org/content/early/2023/07/06/2023.06.28.23291916.abstract>.
- [26] Deng Shijian, E. Kosloski Erin, Patel Siddhi, A. Barnett Zeke, Nan Yiyang, Kaplan Alexander, Aarukapalli Sisira, T. Doan William, Wang Matthew, Singh Harsh, Rollins Pamela Rosenthal, and Tian Yapeng. Hear me, see me, understand me: Audio-visual autism behavior recognition. *ArXiv*, abs/2406.02554, 2024. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:270258328>.
- [27] Yu Han Kim, Xuhai Orson Xu, Daniel McDuff, Cynthia Breazeal, and Hae Won Park. Health-llm: Large language models for health prediction via wearable sensor data. *ArXiv*, abs/2401.06866, 2024. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:266998674>.
- [28] Chengfeng Dou, Zhi Jin, Wenping Jiao, Haiyan Zhao, Zhenwei Tao, and Yongqiang Zhao.

- Plugmed: Improving specificity in patient-centered medical dialogue generation using in-context learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.11508*, 2023.
- [29] Zhichao Yang, Avijit Mitra, Sunjae Kwon, and Hong Yu. Clinicalmamba: A generative clinical language model on longitudinal clinical notes, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.05795>.
- [30] A. Shaaban Mai, Khan Adnan, and Yaqub Mohammad. Medpromptx: Grounded multi-modal prompting for chest x-ray diagnosis. *ArXiv*, abs/2403.15585, 2024. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:268681035>.
- [31] D. Ono, D. W. Dickson, and S. Koga. Evaluating the efficacy of few-shot learning for gpt-4vision in neurodegenerative disease histopathology: A comparative analysis with convolutional neural network model. *Neuropathol Appl Neurobiol*, 50(4):e12997, 2024. ISSN 0305-1846. doi: 10.1111/nan.12997.
- [32] A. Wada, T. Akashi, G. Shih, A. Hagiwara, M. Nishizawa, Y. Hayakawa, J. Kikuta, K. Shimoji, K. Sano, K. Kamagata, A. Nakanishi, and S. Aoki. Optimizing gpt-4 turbo diagnostic accuracy in neuroradiology through prompt engineering and confidence thresholds. *Diagnostics (Basel)*, 14(14), 2024. ISSN 2075-4418 (Print) 2075-4418. doi: 10.3390/diagnostics14141541.
- [33] Golnaz Moallem, Aneysis De Las Mercedes Gonzalez, Atman Desai, and Mirabela Rusu. Automated labeling of spondylolisthesis cases through spinal mri radiology report interpretation using chatgpt. In *Medical Imaging 2024: Computer-Aided Diagnosis*, volume 12927, pages 702–706. SPIE, 2024.

- [34] Vashisht Parth, Lodha Abhilasha, Maddipatla Mukta, Yao Zonghai, Mitra Avijit, Yang Zhichao, Wang Junda, Kwon Sunjae, and Yu Hong. Umass-bionlp at mediqa-m3g 2024: Dermalprompt - a systematic exploration of prompt engineering with gpt-4v for dermatological diagnosis. *ArXiv*, abs/2404.17749, 2024. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:269448798>.
- [35] Felix Busch, Tianyu Han, Marcus R Makowski, Daniel Truhn, Keno K Bressemer, and Lisa Adams. Integrating text and image analysis: Exploring gpt-4v’s capabilities in advanced radiological applications across subspecialties. *J Med Internet Res*, 26:e54948, 2024. ISSN 1438-8871. doi: 10.2196/54948. URL <https://www.jmir.org/2024/1/e54948>.
- [36] Zhou Wenshuo, Ye Zhiyu, Yang Yehui, Wang Siqi, Huang Haifeng, Wang Rongjie, and Yang Dalu. Transferring pre-trained large language-image model for medical image captioning, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:264441526>.
- [37] Shuai Niu, Jing Ma, Liang Bai, Zhihua Wang, Li Guo, and Xian Yang. Ehr-knowgen: Knowledge-enhanced multimodal learning for disease diagnosis generation. *Information Fusion*, 102:102069, 2024. ISSN 1566-2535. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2023.102069>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1566253523003858>.
- [38] Yilin Wen, Zifeng Wang, and Jimeng Sun. Mindmap: Knowledge graph prompting sparks graph of thoughts in large language models. *CoRR*, abs/2308.09729, 2023. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2308.09729. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2308.09729>.

- [39] Mingyi Jia, Junwen Duan, Yan Song, and Jianxin Wang. medikal: Integrating knowledge graphs as assistants of llms for enhanced clinical diagnosis on emrs. *CoRR*, abs/2406.14326, 2024. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2406.14326. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2406.14326>.
- [40] Yinghao Zhu, Changyu Ren, Zixiang Wang, Xiaochen Zheng, Shiyun Xie, Junlan Feng, Xi Zhu, Zhoujun Li, Liantao Ma, and Chengwei Pan. Emerge: Integrating rag for improved multimodal ehr predictive modeling. *ArXiv*, abs/2406.00036, 2024. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:270219131>.
- [41] Wenqi Shi, Yuchen Zhuang, Yuanda Zhu, Henry Iwinski, Michael Wattenbarger, and May Dongmei Wang. Retrieval-augmented large language models for adolescent idiopathic scoliosis patients in shared decision-making. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM International Conference on Bioinformatics, Computational Biology, and Health Informatics*, pages 1–10, 2023.
- [42] Simone Kresevic, Mauro Giuffrè, Milos Ajcevic, Agostino Accardo, Lory S. Crocè, and Dennis L. Shung. Optimization of hepatological clinical guidelines interpretation by large language models: a retrieval augmented generation-based framework. *npj Digit. Medicine*, 7(1), 2024. doi: 10.1038/S41746-024-01091-Y. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-024-01091-y>.
- [43] Han Yu, Peikun Guo, and Akane Sano. ECG semantic integrator (ESI): A foundation ECG model pretrained with llm-enhanced cardiological text. *CoRR*, abs/2405.19366, 2024. doi:

10.48550/ARXIV.2405.19366. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2405.19366>.

- [44] Xuzhou Wu, Guangxin Li, Xing Wang, Zeyu Xu, Yingni Wang, Jianming Xian, Xueyu Wang, Gong Li, and Kehong Yuan. Diagnosis assistant for liver cancer utilizing a large language model with three types of knowledge. 2024. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:270737728>.
- [45] Dyke Ferber, Omar S. M. El Nahhas, Georg Wölflein, Isabella C. Wiest, Jan Clusmann, Marie-Elisabeth Lessman, Sebastian Foersch, Jacqueline Lammert, Maximilian Tschochohei, Dirk Jäger, Manuel Salto-Tellez, Nikolaus Schultz, Daniel Truhn, and Jakob Nikolas Kather. Autonomous artificial intelligence agents for clinical decision making in oncology. *ArXiv*, abs/2404.04667, 2024. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:269004870>.
- [46] Jiageng Wu, Xian Wu, and Jie Yang. Guiding clinical reasoning with large language models via knowledge seeds. *CoRR*, abs/2403.06609, 2024. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2403.06609. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2403.06609>.
- [47] Benjamin Molinet, Santiago Marro, Elena Cabrio, and Serena Villata. Explanatory argumentation in natural language for correct and incorrect medical diagnoses. *J. Biomed. Semant.*, 15(1):8, 2024. doi: 10.1186/S13326-024-00306-1. URL <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13326-024-00306-1>.
- [48] Mohammad Rifat Ahmmad Rashid, Mahamudul Hasan, Akibul Haque, Angon Bhadra Antu, Anika Tabassum Tanha, Anisur Rahman, and M Saddam Hossain Khan. A

respiratory disease management framework by combining large language models and convolutional neural networks for effective diagnosis. *International Journal of Computing and Digital Systems*, 16(1):189–202, 2024.

- [49] Mercy Prasanna Ranjit, Gopinath Ganapathy, Ranjit Frederick Manuel, and Tanuja Ganu. Retrieval augmented chest x-ray report generation using openai gpt models. *ArXiv*, abs/2305.03660, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:258546814>.
- [50] Augustin Toma, Patrick R Lawler, Jimmy Ba, Rahul G Krishnan, Barry B Rubin, and Bo Wang. Clinical camel: An open expert-level medical language model with dialogue-based knowledge encoding. *arXiv [cs.CL]*, 2023.
- [51] Daniel Shu Wei Ting, Jasmine Chiat Ling Ong, Liyuan Jin, Elangovan Kabilan, Gilbert Yong San Lim, Daniel Yan Zheng Lim, Gerald Gui Ren Sng, Yuhe Ke, Joshua Yi Min Tung, Ryan Jian Zhong, Christopher Ming Yao Koh, Keane Zhi Hao Lee, Xiang Chen, Jack Kian Ch’ng, Than Aung, and Ken Junyang Goh. Development and testing of a novel large language model-based clinical decision support systems for medication safety in 12 clinical specialties. *Research Square*, 2024.
- [52] Dinithi Vithanage, Chao Deng, Lei Wang, Mengyang Yin, Mohammad Alkhalaf, Zhenyua Zhang, Yunshu Zhu, Alan Christy Soewargo, and Ping Yu. Evaluating machine learning approaches for multi-label classification of unstructured electronic health records with a generative large language model. *bioRxiv*, 2024.
- [53] Junwen Liu, Zheyu Zhang, Jifeng Xiao, Zhijia Jin, Xuekun Zhang, Yuanyuan Ma, Fuhua

- Yan, and Ning Wen. Large language model locally fine-tuning (LLMLF) on chinese medical imaging reports. In *Proceedings of the 2023 6th International Conference on Big Data Technologies*, New York, NY, USA, 2023. ACM.
- [54] Fenglin Liu, Tingting Zhu, Xian Wu, Bang Yang, Chenyu You, Chenyang Wang, Lei Lu, Zhangdaihong Liu, Yefeng Zheng, Xu Sun, Yang Yang, Lei Clifton, and David A Clifton. A medical multimodal large language model for future pandemics. *NPJ Digit. Med.*, 6(1): 226, 2023.
- [55] Meiyue Song, Jiarui Wang, Zhihua Yu, Jiaxin Wang, Le Yang, Yuting Lu, Baicun Li, Xue Wang, Xiaoxu Wang, Qinghua Huang, Zhijun Li, Nikolaos I Kanellakis, Jiangfeng Liu, Jing Wang, Binglu Wang, and Juntao Yang. PneumoLLM: Harnessing the power of large language model for pneumoconiosis diagnosis. *Med. Image Anal.*, 97(103248):103248, 2024.
- [56] Lin Yang, Shawn Xu, Andrew Sellergren, Timo Kohlberger, Yuchen Zhou, Ira Ktena, Atilla Kiraly, Faruk Ahmed, Farhad Hormozdiari, Tiam Jaroensri, Eric Wang, Ellery Wulczyn, Fayaz Jamil, Theo Guidroz, Chuck Lau, Siyuan Qiao, Yun Liu, Akshay Goel, Kendall Park, Arnav Agharwal, Nick George, Yang Wang, Ryutaro Tanno, David G T Barrett, Wei-Hung Weng, S Sara Mahdavi, Khaled Saab, Tao Tu, Sreenivasa Raju Kalidindi, Mozziyar Etemadi, Jorge Cuadros, Gregory Sorensen, Yossi Matias, Katherine Chou, Greg Corrado, Joelle Barral, Shravya Shetty, David Fleet, S M Ali Eslami, Daniel Tse, Shruthi Prabhakara, Cory McLean, Dave Steiner, Rory Pilgrim, Christopher Kelly, Shekoofeh Azizi, and Daniel Golden. Advancing multimodal medical capabilities of gemini. *arXiv [cs.CV]*, 2024.

- [57] Xiangyu Zhang, Hexin Liu, Kaishuai Xu, Qiquan Zhang, Daijiao Liu, Beena Ahmed, and Julien Epps. When LLMs meets acoustic landmarks: An efficient approach to integrate speech into large language models for depression detection. *arXiv [eess.AS]*, 2024.
- [58] Han Yu, Peikun Guo, and Akane Sano. Zero-shot ECG diagnosis with large language models and retrieval-augmented generation. In Stefan Hegselmann, Antonio Parziale, Divya Shanmugam, Shengpu Tang, Mercy Nyamewaa Asiedu, Serina Chang, Tom Hartvigsen, and Harvineet Singh, editors, *Machine Learning for Health, ML4H@NeurIPS 2023, 10 December 2023, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA*, volume 225 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 650–663. PMLR, 2023. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v225/yu23b.html>.
- [59] Chengfeng Dou, Zhi Jin, Wenpin Jiao, Haiyan Zhao, Yongqiang Zhao, and Zhenwei Tao. Integrating physician diagnostic logic into large language models: Preference learning from process feedback. *arXiv [cs.CL]*, 2024.
- [60] Guangyu Wang, Guoxing Yang, Zongxin Du, Longjun Fan, and Xiaohu Li. ClinicalGPT: Large language models finetuned with diverse medical data and comprehensive evaluation. *arXiv [cs.CL]*, 2023.
- [61] Hongbo Zhang, Junying Chen, Feng Jiang, Fei Yu, Zhihong Chen, Jianquan Li, Guiming Chen, Xiangbo Wu, Zhiyi Zhang, Qingying Xiao, Xiang Wan, Benyou Wang, and Haizhou Li. HuatuoGPT, towards taming language model to be a doctor. *arXiv [cs.CL]*, 2023.
- [62] Zijian Zhou, Miaoqing Shi, Meng Wei, Oluwatosin Alabi, Zijie Yue, and Tom Vercauteren.

- Large model driven radiology report generation with clinical quality reinforcement learning. *arXiv [cs.CV]*, 2024.
- [63] Maojun Sun. LlamaCare: A large medical language model for enhancing healthcare knowledge sharing. *arXiv [cs.CL]*, 2024.
- [64] Dingkang Yang, Jinjie Wei, Dongling Xiao, Shunli Wang, Tong Wu, Gang Li, Mingcheng Li, Shuaibing Wang, Jiawei Chen, Yue Jiang, Qingyao Xu, Ke Li, Peng Zhai, and Lihua Zhang. PediatricsGPT: Large language models as chinese medical assistants for pediatric applications. *arXiv [cs.CL]*, 2024.
- [65] Zhixuan Chen, Luyang Luo, Yequan Bie, and Hao Chen. Dia-LLaMA: Towards large language model-driven CT report generation. *arXiv [cs.CV]*, 2024.
- [66] Niroop Channa Rajashekar, Yeo Eun Shin, Yuan Pu, Sunny Chung, Kisung You, Mauro Giuffre, Colleen E Chan, Theo Saarinen, Allen Hsiao, Jasjeet Sekhon, Ambrose H Wong, Leigh V Evans, Rene F Kizilcec, Loren Laine, Terika Mccall, and Dennis Shung. Human-algorithmic interaction using a large language model-augmented artificial intelligence clinical decision support system. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, volume 37, pages 1–20, New York, NY, USA, 2024. ACM.
- [67] Yanis Labrak, Adrien Bazoge, Emmanuel Morin, Pierre-Antoine Gourraud, Mickael Rouvier, and Richard Dufour. BioMistral: A collection of open-source pretrained large language models for medical domains. *arXiv [cs.CL]*, 2024.
- [68] Junying Chen, Ruyi Ouyang, Anningzhe Gao, Shunian Chen, Guiming Hardy Chen, Xidong Wang, Ruifei Zhang, Zhenyang Cai, Ke Ji, Guangjun Yu, Xiang Wan, and Benyou Wang.

HuatuoGPT-vision, towards injecting medical visual knowledge into multimodal LLMs at scale. *arXiv [cs.CV]*, 2024.

- [69] Hanwen Xu, Naoto Usuyama, Jaspreet Bagga, Sheng Zhang, Rajesh Rao, Tristan Naumann, Cliff Wong, Zelalem Gero, Javier González, Yu Gu, Yanbo Xu, Mu Wei, Wenhui Wang, Shuming Ma, Furu Wei, Jianwei Yang, Chunyuan Li, Jianfeng Gao, Jaylen Rosemon, Tucker Bower, Soohee Lee, Roshanthi Weerasinghe, Bill J Wright, Ari Robicsek, Brian Piening, Carlo Bifulco, Sheng Wang, and Hoifung Poon. A whole-slide foundation model for digital pathology from real-world data. *Nature*, 630(8015):181–188, 2024.
- [70] Jun-En Ding, Nguyen Minh Thao Phan, Wen-Chih Peng, Jian-Zhe Wang, Chun-Cheng Chug, Min-Chen Hsieh, Yun-Chien Tseng, Ling Chen, Dongsheng Luo, Chenwei Wu, Chi-Te Wang, Chih-Ho Hsu, Yi-Tui Chen, Pei-Fu Chen, Feng Liu, and Fang-Ming Hung. Large language multimodal models for new-onset type 2 diabetes prediction using five-year cohort electronic health records. *Research Square*, 2024.
- [71] Pengfei Liu, Weizhe Yuan, Jinlan Fu, Zhengbao Jiang, Hiroaki Hayashi, and Graham Neubig. Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 55(9), 2023. ISSN 0360-0300. doi: 10.1145/3560815. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3560815>.
- [72] Wang Jiaqi, Shi Enze, Yu Sigang, Wu Zihao, Ma Chong, Dai Haixing, Yang Qiushi, Kang Yanqing, Wu Jinru, Hu Huawen, Yue Chenxi, Zhang Haiyang, Liu Yi-Hsueh, Li Xiang, Ge Bao, Zhu Dajiang, Yuan Yixuan, Shen Dinggang, Liu Tianming, and Zhang Shu. Prompt

- engineering for healthcare: Methodologies and applications. *ArXiv*, abs/2304.14670, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:258418353>.
- [73] Zhangyang Gao, Yuqi Hu, Cheng Tan, and Stan Z. Li. Prefixmol: Target- and chemistry-aware molecule design via prefix embedding. *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2302.07120, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.07120>.
- [74] Anne Sophie Overgaard Olesen, Kristina Cecilia Miger, Olav Wendelboe Nielsen, and Johannes Grand. How does chatgpt-4 match radiologists in detecting pulmonary congestion on chest x-ray? *Journal of Medical Artificial Intelligence*, 7, 2024. ISSN 2617-2496. URL <https://jmai.amegroups.org/article/view/8718>.
- [75] Yunyi Liu, Yingshu Li, Zhanyu Wang, Xinyu Liang, Lingqiao Liu, Lei Wang, Leyang Cui, Zhaopeng Tu, Longyue Wang, and Luping Zhou. A systematic evaluation of gpt-4v’s multimodal capability for chest x-ray image analysis. *Meta-Radiology*, page 100099, 2024. ISSN 2950-1628. doi: 10.1016/j.metrad.2024.100099. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2950162824000535>.
- [76] Sonal Saran, Kapil Shirodkar, Sisith Ariyaratne, Karthikeyan Iyengar, Nathan Jenko, B. K. Durgaprasad, and Rajesh Botchu. Exploring chat generated pre-trained transformer-3 ability to interpret mri knee images and generate reports. *Journal of Arthroscopic Surgery and Sports Medicine*, 0. doi: 10.25259/JASSM_16_2024. URL https://doi.org/10.25259/JASSM_16_2024.
- [77] Severin Schramm, Silas Preis, Marie-Christin Metz, Kirsten Jung, Benita Schmitz-Koep, Claus Zimmer, Benedikt Wiestler, Dennis M. Hedderich, and Su Hwan Kim. Impact

of multimodal prompt elements on diagnostic performance of gpt-4(v) in challenging brain mri cases. *medRxiv*, page 2024.03.05.24303767, 2024. doi: 10.1101/2024.03.05.24303767. URL <http://medrxiv.org/content/early/2024/03/06/2024.03.05.24303767.abstract>.

- [78] F. Antaki, R. Chopra, and P. A. Keane. Vision-language models for feature detection of macular diseases on optical coherence tomography. *JAMA Ophthalmol*, 142(6):573–576, 2024. ISSN 2168-6165 (Print) 2168-6165. doi: 10.1001/jamaophthalmol.2024.1165.
- [79] Xiaolan Chen, Pusheng Xu, Yao Li, Weiyi Zhang, Fan Song, Mingguang He, and Danli Shi. Chatffa: An ophthalmic chat system for unified vision-language understanding and question answering for fundus fluorescein angiography. *iScience*, 27(7):110021, 2024. ISSN 2589-0042. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isci.2024.110021>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S258900422401246X>.
- [80] Shi Danli, Zhang Weiyi, Chen Xiaolan, Liu Yexin, Yang Jianchen, Huang Siyu, Tham Yih-Chung, Zheng Yingfeng, and He Mingguang. Eyefound: A multimodal generalist foundation model for ophthalmic imaging. *ArXiv*, abs/2405.11338, 2024. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:269921497>.
- [81] Liu Jiaxiang, Hu Tianxiang, Zhang Yan, Gai Xiaotang, Feng Yang, and Liu Zuozhu. A chatgpt aided explainable framework for zero-shot medical image diagnosis. *ArXiv*, abs/2307.01981, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:259342254>.
- [82] M. Noda, H. Yoshimura, T. Okubo, R. Kosu, Y. Uchiyama, A. Nomura, M. Ito, and

- Y. Takumi. Feasibility of multimodal artificial intelligence using gpt-4 vision for the classification of middle ear disease: Qualitative study and validation. *Jmir ai*, 3:e58342, 2024. ISSN 2817-1705. doi: 10.2196/58342.
- [83] Dhanush Babu Ramesh, Rishika Iytha Sridhar, Pulakesh Upadhyaya, and Rishikesan Kamaleswaran. Lung grounded-sam (lugsam): A novel framework for integrating text prompts to segment anything model (sam) for segmentation tasks of icu chest x-rays. 2023. doi: 10.36227/techrxiv.24224761.v1. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.36227/techrxiv.24224761.v1>.
- [84] Kyu Hong Lee, Ro Woon Lee, and Ye Eun Kwon. Validation of a deep learning chest x-ray interpretation model: Integrating large-scale ai and large language models for comparative analysis with chatgpt. *Diagnostics*, 14(1):90, 2024. ISSN 2075-4418. URL <https://www.mdpi.com/2075-4418/14/1/90>.
- [85] Robert Siepmann, Marc Huppertz, Annika Rastkhiz, Matthias Reen, Eric Corban, Christian Schmidt, Stephan Wilke, Philipp Schad, Can Yüksel, Christiane Kuhl, Daniel Truhn, and Sven Nebelung. The virtual reference radiologist: comprehensive ai assistance for clinical image reading and interpretation. *European Radiology*, 2024. ISSN 1432-1084. doi: 10.1007/s00330-024-10727-2. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00330-024-10727-2>.
- [86] M. Delsoz, Y. Madadi, W. M. Munir, B. Tamm, S. Mehravaran, M. Soleimani, A. Djalilian, and S. Yousefi. Performance of chatgpt in diagnosis of corneal eye diseases. *medRxiv*, 2023. doi: 10.1101/2023.08.25.23294635.

- [87] Matthias A. Fink, Arved Bischoff, Christoph A. Fink, Martin Moll, Jonas Kroschke, Luca Dulz, Claus Peter Heusel, Hans-Ulrich Kauczor, and Tim F. Weber. Potential of chatgpt and gpt-4 for data mining of free-text ct reports on lung cancer. *Radiology*, 308(3):e231362, 2023. doi: 10.1148/radiol.231362.
- [88] David Soong, Sriram Sridhar, Han Si, Jan-Samuel Wagner, Ana Caroline Costa Sá, Christina Y. Yu, Kubra Karagoz, Meijian Guan, Hisham Hamadeh, and Brandon W. Higgs. Improving accuracy of GPT-3/4 results on biomedical data using a retrieval-augmented language model. *CoRR*, abs/2305.17116, 2023. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2305.17116. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.17116>.
- [89] Wenting Zhao, Zhongfen Deng, Shweta Yadav, and Philip S. Yu. Heterogeneous knowledge grounding for medical question answering with retrieval augmented large language model. In Tat-Seng Chua, Chong-Wah Ngo, Roy Ka-Wei Lee, Ravi Kumar, and Hady W. Lauw, editors, *Companion Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024, WWW 2024, Singapore, Singapore, May 13-17, 2024*, pages 1590–1594. ACM, 2024. doi: 10.1145/3589335.3651941. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3589335.3651941>.
- [90] Li Zhenzhu, Zhang Jingfeng, Zhou Wei, Zheng Jianjun, and Xia Yinshui. Gpt-agents based on medical guidelines can improve the responsiveness and explainability of outcomes for traumatic brain injury rehabilitation. *Scientific Reports*, 14(1):7626, 2024.
- [91] Jin Ge, Steve Sun, Joseph Owens, Victor Galvez, Oksana Gologorskaya, Jennifer C. Lai, Mark J Pletcher, and Ki Lai. Development of a liver disease-specific large language model

chat interface using retrieval augmented generation. *medRxiv*, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:265104711>.

- [92] Jasmine Chiat Ling Ong, Liyuan Jin, Kabilan Elangovan, Gilbert Yong San Lim, Daniel Yan Zheng Lim, Gerald Gui Ren Sng, Yuhe Ke, Joshua Yi Min Tung, Ryan Jian Zhong, Christopher Ming Yao Koh, Keane Zhi Hao Lee, Xiang Chen, Jack Kian Chng, Aung Htwe Than, Ken Junyang Goh, and Daniel Shu Wei Ting. Development and testing of a novel large language model-based clinical decision support systems for medication safety in 12 clinical specialties. *ArXiv*, abs/2402.01741, 2024. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:267413151>.
- [93] Hao Wang, Sendong Zhao, Zewen Qiang, Nuwa Xi, Bing Qin, and Ting Liu. Beyond direct diagnosis: Llm-based multi-specialist agent consultation for automatic diagnosis. *ArXiv*, abs/2401.16107, 2024. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:267311867>.
- [94] Alexander Rau, Stephan Rau, Daniela Zoeller, Anna Fink, Hien Tran, Caroline Wilpert, Johanna Nattenmueller, Jakob Neubauer, Fabian Bamberg, Marco Reiser, et al. A context-based chatbot surpasses radiologists and generic chatgpt in following the acr appropriateness guidelines. *Radiology*, 308(1):e230970, 2023.
- [95] Amanda Askell, Yuntao Bai, Anna Chen, Dawn Drain, Deep Ganguli, Tom Henighan, Andy Jones, Nicholas Joseph, Ben Mann, Nova DasSarma, Nelson Elhage, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Danny Hernandez, Jackson Kernion, Kamal Ndousse, Catherine Olsson, Dario Amodei,

- Tom Brown, Jack Clark, Sam McCandlish, Chris Olah, and Jared Kaplan. A general language assistant as a laboratory for alignment. *arXiv [cs.CL]*, 2021.
- [96] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning, 2023.
- [97] Songhua Yang, Hanjie Zhao, Senbin Zhu, Guangyu Zhou, Hongfei Xu, Yuxiang Jia, and Hongying Zan. Zhongjing: Enhancing the chinese medical capabilities of large language model through expert feedback and real-world multi-turn dialogue. *arXiv [cs.CL]*, 2023.
- [98] Qichen Ye, Junling Liu, Dading Chong, Peilin Zhou, Yining Hua, Fenglin Liu, Meng Cao, Ziming Wang, Xuxin Cheng, Zhu Lei, and Zhenhua Guo. Qilin-med: Multi-stage knowledge injection advanced medical large language model. *arXiv [cs.CL]*, 2023.
- [99] Junying Chen, Chi Gui, Anningzhe Gao, Ke Ji, Xidong Wang, Xiang Wan, and Benyou Wang. CoD, towards an interpretable medical agent using chain of diagnosis. *arXiv [cs.CL]*, 2024.
- [100] Yiqiu Guo, Yuchen Yang, Ya Zhang, Yu Wang, and Yanfeng Wang. DictLLM: Harnessing key-value data structures with large language models for enhanced medical diagnostics. *arXiv [cs.CL]*, 2024.
- [101] Kailai Yang, Tianlin Zhang, Ziyang Kuang, Qianqian Xie, Jimin Huang, and Sophia Ananiadou. MentaLLaMA: Interpretable mental health analysis on social media with large language models. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*, volume 35 of WWW '24, page 4489–4500. ACM, 2024.

- [102] Cheng-Yi Li, Kao-Jung Chang, Cheng-Fu Yang, Hsin-Yu Wu, Wenting Chen, Hritik Bansal, Ling Chen, Yi-Ping Yang, Yu-Chun Chen, Shih-Pin Chen, Jiing-Feng Lirng, Kai-Wei Chang, and Shih-Hwa Chiou. Towards a holistic framework for multimodal large language models in three-dimensional brain CT report generation. *arXiv [cs.CL]*, 2024.
- [103] Juexiao Zhou, Xiaonan He, Liyuan Sun, Jiannan Xu, Xiuying Chen, Yuetan Chu, Longxi Zhou, Xingyu Liao, Bin Zhang, Shawn Afvari, and Xin Gao. Pre-trained multimodal large language model enhances dermatological diagnosis using SkinGPT-4. *Nat. Commun.*, 15 (1):5649, 2024.
- [104] Hareem Nisar, Syed Muhammad Anwar, Zhifan Jiang, Abhijeet Parida, Ramon Sanchez-Jacob, Vishwesh Nath, Holger R Roth, and Marius George Linguraru. D-rax: Domain-specific radiologic assistant leveraging multi-modal data and eXpert model predictions. *arXiv [cs.AI]*, 2024.
- [105] Yuxuan Sun, Yunlong Zhang, Yixuan Si, Chenglu Zhu, Zhongyi Shui, Kai Zhang, Jingxiong Li, Xingheng Lyu, Tao Lin, and Lin Yang. PathGen-1.6M: 1.6 million pathology image-text pairs generation through multi-agent collaboration. *arXiv [cs.CV]*, 2024.
- [106] Huan Zhao, Qian Ling, Yi Pan, Tianyang Zhong, Jin-Yu Hu, Junjie Yao, Fengqian Xiao, Zhenxiang Xiao, Yutong Zhang, San-Hua Xu, Shi-Nan Wu, Min Kang, Zihao Wu, Zhengliang Liu, Xi Jiang, Tianming Liu, and Yi Shao. Ophtha-LLaMA2: A large language model for ophthalmology. *arXiv [cs.CL]*, 2023.
- [107] Louis Blankemeier, Joseph Paul Cohen, Ashwin Kumar, Dave Van Veen, Syed Jamal Safdar Gardezi, Magdalini Paschali, Zhihong Chen, Jean-Benoit Delbrouck, Eduardo Reis, Cesar

- Truyts, Christian Bluethgen, Malte Engmann Kjeldskov Jensen, Sophie Ostmeier, Maya Varma, Jeya Maria Jose Valanarasu, Zhongnan Fang, Zepeng Huo, Zaid Nabulsi, Diego Ardila, Wei-Hung Weng, Edson Amaro Junior, Neera Ahuja, Jason Fries, Nigam H Shah, Andrew Johnston, Robert D Boutin, Andrew Wentland, Curtis P Langlotz, Jason Hom, Sergios Gatidis, and Akshay S Chaudhari. Merlin: A vision language foundation model for 3D computed tomography. *arXiv [cs.CV]*, 2024.
- [108] Long Ouyang, Jeff Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll L Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke E Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, P Welinder, P Christiano, J Leike, and Ryan J Lowe. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2203.02155, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.02155>.
- [109] John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv [cs.LG]*, 2017.
- [110] Leo Gao, John Schulman, and Jacob Hilton. Scaling laws for reward model overoptimization. *arXiv [cs.LG]*, 2022.
- [111] Luke Marks, Amir Abdullah, Clement Neo, Rauno Arike, Philip Torr, and Fazl Barez. Beyond training objectives: Interpreting reward model divergence in large language models. *arXiv [cs.LG]*, 2023.
- [112] Peter Henderson, Riashat Islam, Philip Bachman, Joelle Pineau, Doina Precup, and David Meger. Deep reinforcement learning that matters. In Sheila A. McIlraith and Kilian Q.

- Weinberger, editors, *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, (AAAI-18), the 30th innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence (IAAI-18), and the 8th AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence (EAAI-18), New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, February 2-7, 2018*, pages 3207–3214. AAAI Press, 2018. URL <https://www.aaai.org/ocs/index.php/AAAI/AAAI18/paper/view/16669>.
- [113] Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Stefano Ermon, Christopher D Manning, and Chelsea Finn. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *arXiv [cs.LG]*, 2023.
- [114] Chuan Guo, Geoff Pleiss, Yu Sun, and Kilian Q. Weinberger. On calibration of modern neural networks. In Doina Precup and Yee Whye Teh, editors, *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2017, Sydney, NSW, Australia, 6-11 August 2017*, volume 70 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1321–1330. PMLR, 2017. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v70/guo17a.html>.
- [115] Fahim Tajwar, Anikait Singh, Archit Sharma, Rafael Rafailov, Jeff Schneider, Tengyang Xie, Stefano Ermon, Chelsea Finn, and Aviral Kumar. Preference fine-tuning of LLMs should leverage suboptimal, on-policy data. *arXiv [cs.LG]*, 2024.
- [116] Yuntao Bai, Saurav Kadavath, Sandipan Kundu, Amanda Askell, Jackson Kernion, Andy Jones, Anna Chen, Anna Goldie, Azalia Mirhoseini, Cameron McKinnon, Carol Chen, Catherine Olsson, Christopher Olah, Danny Hernandez, Dawn Drain, Deep Ganguli, Dustin Li, Eli Tran-Johnson, Ethan Perez, Jamie Kerr, Jared Mueller, Jeffrey Ladish, Joshua Lan-

- dau, Kamal Ndousse, Kamile Lukosuite, Liane Lovitt, Michael Sellitto, Nelson Elhage, Nicholas Schiefer, Noemi Mercado, Nova DasSarma, Robert Lasenby, Robin Larson, Sam Ringer, Scott Johnston, Shauna Kravec, Sheer El Showk, Stanislav Fort, Tamera Lanham, Timothy Telleen-Lawton, Tom Conerly, Tom Henighan, Tristan Hume, Samuel R Bowman, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Ben Mann, Dario Amodei, Nicholas Joseph, Sam McCandlish, Tom Brown, and Jared Kaplan. Constitutional AI: Harmlessness from AI feedback. *arXiv [cs.CL]*, 2022.
- [117] Neil Houlsby, Andrei Giurgiu, Stanislaw Jastrzebski, Bruna Morrone, Quentin de Larousilhe, Andrea Gesmundo, Mona Attariyan, and Sylvain Gelly. Parameter-efficient transfer learning for NLP. In Kamalika Chaudhuri and Ruslan Salakhutdinov, editors, *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2019, 9-15 June 2019, Long Beach, California, USA*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2790–2799. PMLR, 2019. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v97/houlsby19a.html>.
- [118] Edward J. Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *The Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2022, Virtual Event, April 25-29, 2022*. OpenReview.net, 2022. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=nZeVKeeFYf9>.
- [119] Qidong Liu, Xian Wu, Xiangyu Zhao, Yuanshao Zhu, Derong Xu, Feng Tian, and Yefeng Zheng. When MOE meets LLMs: Parameter efficient fine-tuning for multi-task medical applications, 2024.

- [120] Xiaolan Chen, Ziwei Zhao, Weiyi Zhang, Pusheng Xu, Le Gao, Mingpu Xu, Yue Wu, Yinwen Li, Danli Shi, and Mingguang He. EyeGPT: Ophthalmic assistant with large language models. *arXiv [cs.CL]*, 2024.
- [121] Xiaoyu Ren, Yuanchen Bai, Huiyu Duan, Lei Fan, Erkang Fei, Geer Wu, Pradeep Ray, Menghan Hu, Chenyuan Yan, and Guangtao Zhai. ChatASD: LLM-based AI therapist for ASD. In *Communications in Computer and Information Science*, Communications in computer and information science, pages 312–324. Springer Nature Singapore, Singapore, 2024.
- [122] Xi Yang, Nima Pour Nejatian, Hoo Chang Shin, Kaleb Smith, Christopher Parisien, Colin Compas, Cheryl Martin, Mona Flores, Ying Zhang, Tanja Magoc, Christopher Harle, Gloria Lipori, Duane Mitchell, William Hogan, Elizabeth Shenkman, Jiang Bian, and Yonghui Wu. GatorTron: A large clinical language model to unlock patient information from unstructured electronic health records. *bioRxiv*, 2022.
- [123] Angeela Acharya, Sulabh Shrestha, Anyi Chen, Joseph Conte, Sanja Avramovic, Siddhartha Sikdar, Antonios Anastasopoulos, and Sanmay Das. Clinical risk prediction using language models: benefits and considerations. *J. Am. Med. Inform. Assoc.*, 2024.
- [124] Jianfeng Wang, Kah Phooi Seng, Yi Shen, Li-Minn Ang, and Difeng Huang. Image to label to answer: An efficient framework for enhanced clinical applications in medical visual question answering. *Electronics (Basel)*, 13(12):2273, 2024.
- [125] Weidi Xie, Chaoyi Wu, Xiaoman Zhang, Ya Zhang, and Yanfeng Wang. Towards generalist foundation model for radiology. *Research Square*, 2023.
- [126] Vu Minh Hieu Phan, Yutong Xie, Yuankai Qi, Lingqiao Liu, Liyang Liu, Bowen Zhang,

- Zhibin Liao, Qi Wu, Minh-Son To, and Johan W Verjans. Decomposing disease descriptions for enhanced pathology detection: A multi-aspect vision-language pre-training framework. *arXiv [cs.CV]*, 2024.
- [127] Kai Zhang, Rong Zhou, Eashan Adhikarla, Zhiling Yan, Yixin Liu, Jun Yu, Zhengliang Liu, Xun Chen, Brian D Davison, Hui Ren, et al. A generalist vision–language foundation model for diverse biomedical tasks. *Nature Medicine*, pages 1–13, 2024.
- [128] Lavender Yao Jiang, Xujin Chris Liu, Nima Pour Nejatian, Mustafa Nasir-Moin, Duo Wang, Anas Abidin, Kevin Eaton, Howard Antony Riina, Ilya Laufer, Paawan Punjabi, et al. Health system-scale language models are all-purpose prediction engines. *Nature*, 619(7969):357–362, 2023.
- [129] Xiaoman Zhang, Chaoyi Wu, Ya Zhang, Weidi Xie, and Yanfeng Wang. Knowledge-enhanced visual-language pre-training on chest radiology images. *Nature Communications*, 14(1):4542, 2023.
- [130] Jiawei Du, Jia Guo, Weihang Zhang, Shengzhu Yang, Hanruo Liu, Huiqi Li, and Ningli Wang. Ret-clip: A retinal image foundation model pre-trained with clinical diagnostic reports. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.14137*, 2024.
- [131] Tao Tu, Anil Palepu, Mike Schaekermann, Khaled Saab, Jan Freyberg, Ryutaro Tanno, Amy Wang, Brenna Li, Mohamed Amin, Nenad Tomasev, et al. Towards conversational diagnostic ai. *NEJM AI*, 2024.
- [132] Shawn Xu, Lin Yang, Christopher Kelly, Marcin Sieniek, Timo Kohlberger, Martin Ma, Wei-Hung Weng, Atilla Kiraly, Sahar Kazemzadeh, Zakkai Melamed, et al. Elixr: Towards

- a general purpose x-ray artificial intelligence system through alignment of large language models and radiology vision encoders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.01317*, 2023.
- [133] Pei-Fu Chen, Ssu-Ming Wang, Wei-Chih Liao, Lu-Cheng Kuo, Kuan-Chih Chen, Yu-Cheng Lin, Chi-Yu Yang, Chi-Hao Chiu, Shu-Chih Chang, Feipei Lai, et al. Automatic icd-10 coding and training system: deep neural network based on supervised learning. *JMIR Medical Informatics*, 9(8):e23230, 2021.
- [134] Tiantian Zhang, Manxi Lin, Hongda Guo, Xiaofan Zhang, Ka Fung Peter Chiu, Aasa Feragen, and Qi Dou. Incorporating clinical guidelines through adapting multi-modal large language model for prostate cancer pi-rads scoring. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.08786*, 2024.
- [135] Conrad W Safranek, Thomas Huang, Donald S Wright, Catherine X Wright, Vimig Socrates, Rohit B Sangal, Mark Iscoe, David Chartash, and R Andrew Taylor. Automated heart score determination via chatgpt: Honing a framework for iterative prompt development. *Journal of the American College of Emergency Physicians Open*, 5(2):e13133, 2024.
- [136] Tiago Pedro, José Maria Sousa, Luísa Fonseca, Manuel G Gama, Goreti Moreira, Mariana Pintalhão, Paulo C Chaves, Ana Aires, Gonçalo Alves, Luís Augusto, et al. Exploring the use of chatgpt in predicting anterior circulation stroke functional outcomes after mechanical thrombectomy: a pilot study. *Journal of NeuroInterventional Surgery*, 2024.
- [137] Zijian Zhou, Miaoqing Shi, Meng Wei, Oluwatosin Alabi, Zijie Yue, and Tom Vercauteren. Large model driven radiology report generation with clinical quality reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.06728*, 2024.
- [138] Lin Yang, Shawn Xu, Andrew Sellergren, Timo Kohlberger, Yuchen Zhou, Ira Ktena, Atilla

- Kiraly, Faruk Ahmed, Farhad Hormozdiari, Tiam Jaroensri, et al. Advancing multimodal medical capabilities of gemini. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.03162*, 2024.
- [139] Yilin Wen, Zifeng Wang, and Jimeng Sun. Mindmap: Knowledge graph prompting sparks graph of thoughts in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.09729*, 2023.
- [140] Yixuan Weng, Bin Li, Fei Xia, Minjun Zhu, Bin Sun, Shizhu He, Kang Liu, and Jun Zhao. Large language models need holistically thought in medical conversational qa. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.05410*, 2023.
- [141] Xiaolan Chen, Weiyi Zhang, Ziwei Zhao, Pusheng Xu, Yingfeng Zheng, Danli Shi, and Mingguang He. Icga-gpt: report generation and question answering for indocyanine green angiography images. *British Journal of Ophthalmology*, 2024.
- [142] Jonathan Kottlors, Grischa Bratke, Philip Rauen, Christoph Kabbasch, Thorsten Persigehl, Marc Schlamann, and Simon Lennartz. Feasibility of differential diagnosis based on imaging patterns using a large language model. *Radiology*, 308(1):e231167, 2023.
- [143] Siru Liu, Aileen P Wright, Barron L Patterson, Jonathan P Wanderer, Robert W Turer, Scott D Nelson, Allison B McCoy, Dean F Sittig, and Adam Wright. Assessing the value of chatgpt for clinical decision support optimization. *MedRxiv*, pages 2023–02, 2023.
- [144] Jiageng Wu, Xian Wu, Yefeng Zheng, and Jie Yang. Medkp: Medical dialogue with knowledge enhancement and clinical pathway encoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.06611*, 2024.
- [145] Kailai Yang, Tianlin Zhang, Ziyang Kuang, Qianqian Xie, Jimin Huang, and Sophia Ananiadou. Mentallama: interpretable mental health analysis on social media with large language models. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*, pages 4489–4500, 2024.

- [146] Siyin Guo, Ruicen Li, Genpeng Li, Wenjie Chen, Jing Huang, Linye He, Yu Ma, Liying Wang, Hongping Zheng, Chunxiang Tian, et al. Comparing chatgpt’s and surgeon’s responses to thyroid-related questions from patients. *The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism*, page dgae235, 2024.
- [147] Li Zhenzhu, Zhang Jingfeng, Zhou Wei, Zheng Jianjun, and Xia Yinshui. Gpt-agents based on medical guidelines can improve the responsiveness and explainability of outcomes for traumatic brain injury rehabilitation. *Scientific Reports*, 14(1):7626, 2024.
- [148] Yuhong He, Yongqi Zhang, Shizhu He, and Jun Wan. Bp4er: Bootstrap prompting for explicit reasoning in medical dialogue generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.19414*, 2024.
- [149] Thomas Savage, Ashwin Nayak, Robert Gallo, Ekanath Rangan, and Jonathan H Chen. Diagnostic reasoning prompts reveal the potential for large language model interpretability in medicine. *NPJ Digital Medicine*, 7(1):20, 2024.
- [150] Karan Singhal, Shekoofeh Azizi, Tao Tu, S Sara Mahdavi, Jason Wei, Hyung Won Chung, Nathan Scales, Ajay Tanwani, Heather Cole-Lewis, Stephen Pfohl, et al. Large language models encode clinical knowledge. *Nature*, 620(7972):172–180, 2023.
- [151] Shuang Zhou, Sirui Ding, Jiashuo Wang, Mingquan Lin, Genevieve B Melton, and Rui Zhang. Interpretable differential diagnosis with dual-inference large language models. *arXiv*, 2024.
- [152] Seil Kang, Donghyun Kim, Junhyeok Kim, Hyo Kyung Lee, and Seong Jae Hwang. Wolf: Wide-scope large language model framework for cxr understanding. *CoRR*, 2024.

- [153] Kaishuai Xu, Yi Cheng, Wenjun Hou, Qiaoyu Tan, and Wenjie Li. Reasoning like a doctor: Improving medical dialogue systems via diagnostic reasoning process alignment. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024*, pages 6796–6814. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2024.
- [154] Guangyu Wang, Guoxing Yang, Zongxin Du, Longjun Fan, and Xiaohu Li. Clinicalgpt: large language models finetuned with diverse medical data and comprehensive evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.09968*, 2023.
- [155] Shuyue Stella Li, Vidhisha Balachandran, Shangbin Feng, Jonathan Ilgen, Emma Pierson, Pang Wei Koh, and Yulia Tsvetkov. Mediq: Question-asking llms for adaptive and reliable medical reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.00922*, 2024.
- [156] Sarah Sandmann, Sarah Riepenhausen, Lucas Plagwitz, and Julian Varghese. Systematic analysis of chatgpt, google search and llama 2 for clinical decision support tasks. *Nature Communications*, 15(1):2050, 2024.
- [157] Simone Kresevic, Mauro Giuffrè, Milos Ajcevic, Agostino Accardo, Lory S Crocè, and Dennis L Shung. Optimization of hepatological clinical guidelines interpretation by large language models: a retrieval augmented generation-based framework. *NPJ Digital Medicine*, 7(1):102, 2024.
- [158] Jiageng Wu, Xian Wu, and Jie Yang. Guiding clinical reasoning with large language models via knowledge seeds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.06609*, 2024.
- [159] Zeljko Kraljevic, Dan Bean, Anthony Shek, Rebecca Bendayan, Harry Hemingway, Joshua Au Yeung, Alexander Deng, Alfred Baston, Jack Ross, Esther Idowu, et al. Fore-

- sight—a generative pretrained transformer for modelling of patient timelines using electronic health records: a retrospective modelling study. *The Lancet Digital Health*, 6(4): e281–e290, 2024.
- [160] Seongsu Bae, Daeun Kyung, Jaehee Ryu, Eunbyeol Cho, Gyubok Lee, Sunjun Kweon, Jungwoo Oh, Lei Ji, Eric Chang, Tackeun Kim, et al. Ehrxqa: A multi-modal question answering dataset for electronic health records with chest x-ray images. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [161] Jiaxiong Hu, Junze Li, Yuhang Zeng, Dongjie Yang, Danxuan Liang, Helen Meng, and Xiaojuan Ma. Designing scaffolding strategies for conversational agents in dialog task of neurocognitive disorders screening. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–21, 2024.
- [162] Zachary Englhardt, Chengqian Ma, Margaret E Morris, Chun-Cheng Chang, Xuhai” Orson” Xu, Lianhui Qin, Daniel McDuff, Xin Liu, Shwetak Patel, and Vikram Iyer. From classification to clinical insights: Towards analyzing and reasoning about mobile and behavioral health data with large language models. *Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies*, 8(2):1–25, 2024.
- [163] Yixing Huang, Ahmed Gomaa, Sabine Semrau, Marlen Haderlein, Sebastian Lettmaier, Thomas Weissmann, Johanna Grigo, Hassen Ben Tkhatat, Benjamin Frey, Udo Gaipl, et al. Benchmarking chatgpt-4 on a radiation oncology in-training exam and red journal gray zone cases: potentials and challenges for ai-assisted medical education and decision making in radiation oncology. *Frontiers in Oncology*, 13:1265024, 2023.

- [164] Yubin Kim, Xuhai Xu, Daniel McDuff, Cynthia Breazeal, and Hae Won Park. Health-llm: Large language models for health prediction via wearable sensor data. *Conference on Health, Inference, and Learning*, 2024.
- [165] Shijian Deng, Erin E Kosloski, Siddhi Patel, Zeke A Barnett, Yiyang Nan, Alexander Kaplan, Sisira Aarukapalli, William T Doan, Matthew Wang, Harsh Singh, et al. Hear me, see me, understand me: Audio-visual autism behavior recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.02554*, 2024.
- [166] Khaled Saab, Tao Tu, Wei-Hung Weng, Ryutaro Tanno, David Stutz, Ellery Wulczyn, Fan Zhang, Tim Strother, Chunjong Park, Elahe Vedadi, et al. Capabilities of gemini models in medicine. *arXiv*, 2024.
- [167] Denis Jered McInerney, William Dickinson, Lucy Flynn, Andrea Young, Geoffrey Young, Jan-Willem van de Meent, and Byron C Wallace. Towards reducing diagnostic errors with interpretable risk prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10109*, 2024.
- [168] Zhoujian Sun, Cheng Luo, and Zhengxing Huang. Conversational disease diagnosis via external planner-controlled large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.04292*, 2024.
- [169] Julia Adler-Milstein, Jonathan H Chen, and Gurpreet Dhaliwal. Next-generation artificial intelligence for diagnosis: from predicting diagnostic labels to “wayfinding”. *Jama*, 326(24):2467–2468, 2021.
- [170] Xiaoming Shi, Zeming Liu, Li Du, Yuxuan Wang, Hongru Wang, Yuhang Guo, Tong Ruan, Jie Xu, Xiaofan Zhang, and Shaoting Zhang. Medical dialogue system: A survey of cat-

- egories, methods, evaluation and challenges. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024*, 2024.
- [171] Zihao Yi, Jiarui Ouyang, Yuwen Liu, Tianhao Liao, Zhe Xu, and Ying Shen. A survey on recent advances in llm-based multi-turn dialogue systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.18013*, 2024.
- [172] Joschka Haltaufderheide and Robert Ranisch. The ethics of chatgpt in medicine and health-care: a systematic review on large language models (llms). *NPJ Digital Medicine*, 7(1):183, 2024.
- [173] Paul Hager, Friederike Jungmann, Robbie Holland, Kunal Bhagat, Inga Hubrecht, Manuel Knauer, Jakob Vielhauer, Marcus Makowski, Rickmer Braren, Georgios Kaissis, et al. Evaluation and mitigation of the limitations of large language models in clinical decision-making. *Nature medicine*, pages 1–10, 2024.
- [174] Xiang Yue and Shuang Zhou. Phicon: Improving generalization of clinical text identification models via data augmentation. In *Clinical Natural Language Processing Workshop*, 2020.
- [175] Juexiao Zhou, Xiaonan He, Liyuan Sun, Jiannan Xu, Xiuying Chen, Yuetan Chu, Longxi Zhou, Xingyu Liao, Bin Zhang, Shawn Afvari, et al. Pre-trained multimodal large language model enhances dermatological diagnosis using skingpt-4. *Nature Communications*, 15(1): 5649, 2024.
- [176] Raphael Poulain, Hamed Fayyaz, and Rahmatollah Beheshti. Bias patterns in the ap-

- plication of llms for clinical decision support: A comprehensive study. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.15149*, 2024.
- [177] Micol Spitale, Jiaee Cheong, and Hatice Gunes. Underneath the numbers: Quantitative and qualitative gender fairness in llms for depression prediction. *arXiv*, 2024.
- [178] Adrienne Kline, Hanyin Wang, Yikuan Li, Saya Dennis, Meghan Hutch, Zhenxing Xu, Fei Wang, Feixiong Cheng, and Yuan Luo. Multimodal machine learning in precision health: A scoping review. *npj Digital Medicine*, 5(1):171, 2022.
- [179] Shuang Zhou, Daochen Zha, Xiao Shen, Xiao Huang, Rui Zhang, and Korris Chung. Denoising-aware contrastive learning for noisy time series. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Third International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2024.
- [180] Farida Mohsen, Hamada RH Al-Absi, Noha A Yousri, Nady El Hajj, and Zubair Shah. A scoping review of artificial intelligence-based methods for diabetes risk prediction. *NPJ Digital Medicine*, 6(1):197, 2023.
- [181] Hanyin Wang, Chufan Gao, Christopher Dantona, Bryan Hull, and Jimeng Sun. Drg-llama: tuning llama model to predict diagnosis-related group for hospitalized patients. *npj Digital Medicine*, 7(1):16, 2024.
- [182] Zeming Chen, Alejandro Hernández Cano, Angelika Romanou, Antoine Bonnet, Kyle Matoba, Francesco Salvi, Matteo Pagliardini, Simin Fan, Andreas Köpf, Amirkeivan Mohtashami, et al. Meditron-70b: Scaling medical pretraining for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16079*, 2023.

- [183] Qianqian Xie, Qingyu Chen, Aokun Chen, Cheng Peng, Yan Hu, Fongci Lin, Xueqing Peng, Jimin Huang, Jeffrey Zhang, Vipina Keloth, et al. Me llama: Foundation large language models for medical applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12749*, 2024.
- [184] Yu He Ke, Rui Yang, Sui An Lie, Taylor Xin Yi Lim, Hairil Rizal Abdullah, Daniel Shu Wei Ting, and Nan Liu. Enhancing diagnostic accuracy through multi-agent conversations: Using large language models to mitigate cognitive bias. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14589*, 2024.
- [185] Joseph Barile, Alex Margolis, Grace Cason, Rachel Kim, Saia Kalash, Alexis Tchaconas, and Ruth Milanaik. Diagnostic accuracy of a large language model in pediatric case studies. *JAMA pediatrics*, 178(3):313–315, 2024.
- [186] Xiaolan Chen, Ziwei Zhao, Weiyi Zhang, Pusheng Xu, Le Gao, Mingpu Xu, Yue Wu, Yinwen Li, Danli Shi, and Mingguang He. Eyegpt: Ophthalmic assistant with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.00840*, 2024.
- [187] Zhiyao Ren, Yibing Zhan, Baosheng Yu, Liang Ding, and Dacheng Tao. Healthcare copilot: Eliciting the power of general llms for medical consultation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13408*, 2024.
- [188] Daniel McDuff, Mike Schaekermann, Tao Tu, Anil Palepu, Amy Wang, Jake Garrison, Karan Singhal, Yash Sharma, Shekoofeh Azizi, Kavita Kulkarni, et al. Towards accurate differential diagnosis with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.00164*, 2023.