

# The Ethics of ChatGPT in Medicine and Healthcare: A Systematic Review on Large Language Models (LLMs)

Joschka Haltaufderheide & Robert Ranisch

*Preprint Version*

**Abstract—Background:** With the introduction of ChatGPT, Large Language Models (LLMs) have received enormous attention in healthcare. Despite their potential benefits, researchers have underscored various ethical implications. While individual instances have drawn much attention, the debate lacks a systematic and comprehensive overview of practical applications currently researched and ethical issues connected to them. Against this background, this work aims to map the ethical landscape surrounding the current stage of deployment of LLMs in medicine and healthcare.

**Methods:** Electronic databases and commonly used preprint servers were queried using a comprehensive search strategy which generated 796 records. Studies were screened and extracted following a modified rapid review approach. Methodological quality was assessed using a hybrid approach. For 53 records, a meta-aggregative synthesis was performed.

**Results:** Four general fields of applications emerged and testify to a vivid phase of exploration. Advantages of using LLMs are attributed to their capacity in data analysis, personalized information provisioning, and support in decision-making or mitigating information loss and enhancing medical information accessibility. However, our study also identifies recurrent ethical concerns connected to fairness, bias, non-maleficence, transparency, and privacy. A distinctive concern is the tendency to produce harmful misinformation or convincingly but inaccurate content. A recurrent plea for ethical guidance and human oversight is evident.

**Discussion:** Given the variety of use cases, it is suggested that the ethical guidance debate be reframed to focus on defining what constitutes acceptable human oversight across the spectrum of applications. This involves considering the diversity of setting, varying potentials for harm, and different acceptable thresholds for performance and certainty in diverse healthcare settings. In addition, a critical inquiry is necessary to determine the extent to which the current experimental use of LLMs is both necessary and justified.

**Index Terms—**Large Language Model, LLM, ChatGPT, Healthcare, Medicine, Ethics,

## I. INTRODUCTION

**L**ARGE language models (LLMs) have emerged as a transformative force in artificial intelligence (AI), generating

Joschka Haltaufderheide is with the Juniorprofessorship for Medical Ethics with a Focus on Digitization, Faculty of Health Sciences Brandenburg, University of Potsdam, Germany, e-mail: joschka.halttaufderheide@uni-potsdam.de. ORCID: 0000-0002-5014-4593.

Robert Ranisch is Juniorprofessor for Medical Ethics with a Focus on Digitization, Faculty of Health Sciences Brandenburg, University of Potsdam, Germany, e-mail: ranisch@uni-potsdam.de. ORCID: 0000-0002-1676-1694

significant interest across various sectors. The 2022 launch of OpenAI's ChatGPT demonstrated their groundbreaking capabilities, revealing the current state of development to a wide audience. Public availability and scientific interest, since then, have resulted in a flood of scientific papers considering possible areas of application<sup>1</sup> as well as their ethical and social implications from a practical perspective.<sup>2</sup> A burgeoning field for LLMs lies within medicine and healthcare,<sup>3</sup> encompassing clinical, educational and research applications.<sup>3-9</sup> In a brief span, a significant number of publications has investigated the potential uses of LLMs in these domains,<sup>10</sup> indicating a positive trajectory for the integration of medical AI. Present-day LLMs, such as ChatGPT, are considered to have a promising accuracy in clinical decision-making,<sup>11,12</sup> diagnosis,<sup>13</sup> symptom-assessment, and triage-advise.<sup>14</sup> In patient-communication, it has been posited that LLMs can also generate empathetic responses.<sup>15</sup> LLMs specifically trained on biomedical corpora forebode even further capacities for clinical application and patient care<sup>16</sup> in the foreseeable future.

Conversely, the adoption of LLMs is entwined with ethical and social concerns.<sup>17</sup> In their seminal work, Bender et al. anticipated real-world harms that could arise from the deployment of LLMs.<sup>18</sup> Scholars have delineated potential risks across various application domains.<sup>19,20</sup> The healthcare and medical field, being particularly sensitive and heavily regulated, is notably susceptible to ethical dilemmas. This sector is also underpinned by stringent ethical norms, professional commitments, and societal role recognition. Despite the potential benefits of employing advanced AI technology, researchers have underscored various ethical implications associated with using LLMs in healthcare and health-related research.<sup>4,6,7,21-24</sup> Paramount concerns include the propensity of LLMs to disseminate inadequate information, input of sensitive health information or patient data, raising concerns regarding privacy,<sup>22</sup> and perpetuating harmful gender, cultural or racial biases,<sup>25-28</sup> well known from machine learning algorithms<sup>29</sup> especially in healthcare.<sup>30</sup> Case reports have documented that ChatGPT has already led to actual real damages, potentially life-threatening for patients.<sup>31</sup>

While individual instances have drawn attention to ethical concerns surrounding the use of LLMs in healthcare, there appears to be a deficit in comprehensive, systematic overviews addressing these ethical considerations. This gap is significant, given the ambitions to rapidly integrate LLMs and foundational models into healthcare systems.<sup>32</sup> Our in-

tention is to bridge this lacuna by mapping out the ethical landscape that surrounds the deployment of LLMs in this field. To achieve this, we will provide an encompassing overview of applications and ethical considerations pertinent to the utilization of LLMs in medicine and healthcare. We will, first, provide an encompassing overview of applications and ethical considerations pertinent to the utilization of LLMs in medicine and healthcare by delineating the ethically relevant applications, interventions, and contexts where LLMs have been tested or proposed within the field. Secondly, we aim to identify the principal outcomes as well as the opportunities, risks, benefits, and potential harms associated with the use of LLMs, as deemed significant from an ethical standpoint. With this, we aspire to not only to outline the current ethical discourse but also to inform future dialogues and policy-making in the intersection of LLMs and healthcare ethics.

## II. METHODS

A review protocol focusing on practical applications and ethical considerations grounded in experience was designed by the authors and registered in the international prospective register of systematic reviews.<sup>33</sup> Relevant publication databases and preprint servers were queried. Inclusions were screened and extracted in a two-staged process following a modified rapid review approach.<sup>34</sup> Inclusion and exclusion criteria were based on the three key concepts of intervention, application setting, and outcomes (see Supplement 1). No additional inclusion or exclusion criteria (e.g. publication type) were applied. However, we excluded work that was solely concerned with (ethical) questions of medical education, academic writing, authorship and plagiarism. While we recognize that these issues are affected by the use of LLMs in significant ways<sup>6,35,36</sup> these, challenges are not specific to health-related applications. Database searches were conducted in July 2023 (see Table I for sources). Subsequently, the authors independently screened titles and abstracts of 10% of all database hits (73 records) to test and refine inclusion and exclusion criteria. After a joint discussion of the results, the remaining 90% were screened by the first author.

Data was extracted using a self-designed extraction form (see Supplement 2). The extraction categories were transformed into a coding tree using MaxQDA. Both authors independently coded 10% of the material to develop and refine the coding scheme in more detail. The remaining material was extracted by J.H. Results were iteratively discussed in three joint coding sessions.

A final synthesis was conducted following a meta-aggregative approach. Based on our extraction fields, we, first, developed preliminary categories encompassing actors, values, device properties, arguments, recommendations and conclusions. These categories were, then, iteratively refined and aggregated through additional coding until saturation was reached.

Given the constraints of normative quality appraisal<sup>37</sup> and in line with our research goal to portrait the landscape of ethical discussions, we decided to take a hybrid approach to the quality question. We descriptively report on procedural quality

TABLE I: Overview on Sources and Searchstring

Sources	
Databases	MEDLINE via PubMed CINAHL Embase Philosophers' Index PsychInfo IEEE Xplore
Preprint Servers	arXiv MedRxiv BioRxiv TechRxiv OSF Preprints
Search	
Searchstring	1. ChatGPT [Text Word] 2. LLM [Text Word] 3. Large Language Model [Text Word] 4. 1 OR 2 OR 3 4. Ethics [Text Word] 5. Moral [Text Word] 6. 4 OR 5 7. 3 AND 6
Wildcards and database-specific truncations (e.g. ethic*, moral*) where used where appropriate and applicable.	

criteria (see Table II) to distinguish material that underwent processual quality control (such as peer review) from other material. In addition, we critically engage with the findings during reporting to appraise comprehensiveness and validity of the extracted information pieces.

## III. RESULTS

Our search yielded a total of 796 database hits. After removal of duplicates, 738 records went through title/abstract screening. 158 full-texts were assessed. 53 records were included in the dataset, encompassing 23 original articles,<sup>23,38–59</sup> including theoretical or empirical work, 11 letters,<sup>60–70</sup> six editorials,<sup>71–76</sup> four reviews,<sup>8,77–79</sup> three comments,<sup>22,80,81</sup> one report<sup>82</sup> and five unspecified articles.<sup>83–87</sup> Most works focus on applications utilizing ChatGPT across various healthcare fields, as indicated in Table II.

During analysis, four general themes emerged in our dataset, which we use to structure reporting. These themes include clinical applications, patient support applications, support of health professionals, and public health perspectives. Table III provides exemplary scenarios for each theme derived from the dataset.

### A. Clinical applications

1) *Predictive analysis and risk assessment*: To support initial diagnose and triaging of patients,<sup>42,55</sup> several authors discuss the use of LLMs in the context of predictive patient analysis and risk assessment in or prior to clinical situations as a potentially transformative application.<sup>77,83</sup> The role of LLMs in this scenario is described as that of a “co-pilot” using available patient information to flag areas of concern or to predict diseases and risk factors.<sup>47</sup>

Currie, in line with most authors, notes that predicting health outcomes and relevant patterns is very likely to improve patient

outcomes and contributes to patient benefit.<sup>83</sup> For example, overcrowded emergency departments present a serious issue worldwide and have a significant impact on patient outcomes. From a perspective of avoidance of harm, using LLMs with triage notes could lead to reduced length of stay and a more efficient utilization of time in the waiting room.<sup>55</sup>

All authors note, however, that such applications might also be problematic and require close human oversight.<sup>42,47,54,83</sup> Although LLMs might be able to reveal connections between disparate knowledge,<sup>43</sup> generating inaccurate information would have severe negative consequences.<sup>47,77</sup> It might lead to direct harm to patients or provide clinicians with false and dangerous justifications and rationales for their decisions.<sup>77</sup> These problems are tightly connected to inherent biases in LLMs, their tendency to “hallucinate” and their intransparency.<sup>55</sup> In addition, uncertainties are increased by

use of unstructured data. Medical notes often differ from the data pretrained models utilise. This makes it difficult to predict accuracy of output when inputting such data or using it to fine-tune LLMs.<sup>55</sup> Interpretability of results and recommendations introduce additional complexity and sources of potential harm.<sup>55</sup> Currie notes that despite such difficulties, the use of LLMs proceeds largely in absence of guidelines, recommendations and control. The outcome, hence, ultimately depends on clinicians’ ability to interpret findings and identify inaccurate information.<sup>83</sup>

2) *Patient consultation and communication*: LLMs can offer a novel approach in patient-provider interaction, where they can facilitate informational exchange and bridge gaps between clinical and preclinical settings such as self-management measures or community aids.<sup>8</sup> This includes easing the transition between settings by removing barriers to communica-

TABLE II: Overview on Included Records

Publication		Procedural Quality Control		Setting	
Title	Type of Work	Peer Reviewed	COI	Device	Field of Application
Abdulai & Hung <sup>80</sup>	Commentary	Unclear	Unclear	ChatGPT; ChatGPT 4	Nursing education, research and practice
Agbavor & Liang <sup>38</sup>	Empirical Article	Yes	None disclosed	GPT 3	Neurology
Ahn <sup>60</sup>	Letter	No	None disclosed	ChatGPT	Emergency Medicine
Ali <i>et al.</i> <sup>39</sup>	Theoretical Article	Preprint	Unclear	ChatGPT, Google Bard, Meta LLaMA	Healthcare
Almazyad <i>et al.</i> <sup>40</sup>	Empirical Article	Yes	Unclear	ChatGPT 4	Pediatric Palliative Care
Antaki <i>et al.</i> <sup>41</sup>	Empirical Article	Preprint	Unclear	ChatGPT; GPT 3.5	Ophthalmology
Arslan <sup>61</sup>	Letter	No	None disclosed	ChatGPT	Obesity Treatment
Beltrami & Grant-Kels <sup>62</sup>	Letter	No	Conflict disclosed	ChatGPT	Dermatology
Buzzaccarini <i>et al.</i> <sup>63</sup>	Letter	No	Conflict disclosed	ChatGPT	Aesthetic Medicine
Carullo <i>et al.</i> <sup>43</sup>	Empirical Article	Yes	None disclosed	ChatGPT	Epidemiological Research
Cheng <i>et al.</i> <sup>64</sup>	Letter	No	None disclosed	ChatGPT; GPT 3	Infectiology
Connor & O’Neill <sup>42</sup>	Theoretical Article	Preprint	Unclear	ChatGPT; ChatDoctor; Google BARD	Sport Science and Medicine
Currie <sup>83</sup>	Unspecified	Yes	None disclosed	ChatGPT; GPT 3.5	Nuclear Medicine and Radiology
Dave <i>et al.</i> <sup>8</sup>	Review	Yes	None disclosed	ChatGPT	Medicine
De Angelis <i>et al.</i> <sup>49</sup>	Theoretical Article	Yes	Conflict disclosed	GPT; BERT; GPT 2; GPT 3; GPT 4; Instruct GPT; BioBERT; BioGPT; PubMedGPT; Med-PaLm; CORD-19	Public Health
Eggmann & Blatz <sup>84</sup>	Unspecified	Unclear	None disclosed	ChatGPT	Dentistry
Ferrara <sup>44</sup>	Theoretical Article	Preprint	Unclear	ChatGPT	Healthcare
Ferreira & Lipoff <sup>81</sup>	Commentary	Unclear	None disclosed	ChatGPT	Dermatology

*continued on the next page*

TABLE II: Overview on Included Records (Continued)

Publication		Procedural Quality Control		Setting	
Title	Type of Work	Peer Reviewed	COI	Device	Field of Application
Gottlieb <i>et al.</i> <sup>85</sup>	Unspecified	Yes	None disclosed	ChatGPT	Emergency Medicine
Guo <i>et al.</i> <sup>45</sup>	Empirical Article	Preprint	Conflict disclosed	ChatGPT; GPT 3; NeuroGPT-X	Neurosurgery
Guo <i>et al.</i> <sup>82</sup>	Report	Preprint	Unclear	ProteinChat	Protein Research
Gupta <i>et al.</i> <sup>65</sup>	Letter	No	None disclosed	ChatGPT	Aesthetic Surgery
Harrer <sup>86</sup>	Unspecified	Yes	Conflict disclosed	ChatGPT; LaMDA; BARD; Med-Palm	Healthcare
Harskamp & Clercq <sup>46</sup>	Empirical Article	Preprint	None disclosed	ChatGPT; InstructGPT	Cardiopulmonary Medicine
Hosseini <i>et al.</i> <sup>47</sup>	Empirical Article	Preprint	Unclear	ChatGPT; GPT 4; Elicit; Med-PaLM	Education, Research and Healthcare
Howard <i>et al.</i> <sup>66</sup>	Letter	No	Conflict disclosed	ChatGPT	Infection Medicine
Jairoun <i>et al.</i> <sup>71</sup>	Editorial	No	Unclear	ChatGPT	Pharmacy
Kavian <i>et al.</i> <sup>72</sup>	Editorial	No	None disclosed	ChatGPT	Surgery
Knebel <i>et al.</i> <sup>48</sup>	Empirical Article	Preprint	None disclosed	ChatGPT; GPT 3	Ophthalmology
Li <i>et al.</i> <sup>67</sup>	Letter	No	No	ChatGPT	Surgery
Li <i>et al.</i> <sup>22</sup>	Commentary	Unclear	No	ChatGPT; BioGPT; LaMDA; Sparrow; Pangu Alpha; OPT-IML; Megataron Turing MLG	Medicine and Medical Research
Padovan <i>et al.</i> <sup>50</sup>	Empirical Article	Preprint	None disclosed	ChatGPT	Occupational Medicine
Page <i>et al.</i> <sup>73</sup>	Editorial	No	Conflict disclosed	ChatGPT 4	Microbial genomics research
Pal <i>et al.</i> <sup>51</sup>	Empirical Article	Preprint	Unclear	BERT; BioBERT; BioClinicalBERT; SciBERT; UMLS-BERT	Medicine
Perlis <sup>68</sup>	Letter	Preprint	Conflict disclosed	ChatGPT 4	Psychopharmacology
Rau <i>et al.</i> <sup>52</sup>	Empirical Article	Preprint	Unclear	ChatGPT; GPT 3.5 Turbo; accGPT	Radiology

*continued on the next page*

tion<sup>47,63,83,86</sup> or removing barriers in the clinical workflow to facilitate timely and efficient support. As is suggested, LLMs can collect information from patients or provide additional information, enabling well-informed decisions and increasing satisfaction in patients.<sup>59,63,83</sup> Provision of language translation and simplification of medical jargon may allow patients to become more engaged in the process and enhance patient-provider communication.<sup>83,86</sup> However, it remains unclear in our dataset how such applications would look like in practice — specifically where, when and how LLMs actually could be integrated.

These suggestions require to consider ethically relevant boundaries regarding the protection of patient data, and safety,<sup>39,63,80,86</sup> potentially unjust disparities,<sup>39,63,86</sup> and the wider dimensions of care such as the therapeutic relation-

ship.<sup>39,62,64,67,80</sup> Robust measures to avoid incorrect information in technological mediation of communication and the need to strike a balance with “the human touch” of care<sup>63</sup> are stressed. With regard to the former, Buzzaccarini *et al.* argue for robust expert oversight. Regarding the latter, Li *et al.* note a potential shift in power dynamics between patients and providers in which providers might lose their authoritative position and might be seen as less knowledgeable.<sup>67</sup> Others fear a loss of personal care that should be avoided<sup>39,64,80</sup> and the lack of contextual content of individual health challenges.<sup>45,80</sup> Open communication and consent to technical mediation of patient-provider communication is required to promote trust but might be difficult to achieve.<sup>72,81</sup>

3) *Diagnosis*: Many studies in our dataset discuss the possible use of LLMs for diagnosis.<sup>8,39,42,47,62,64,69,70,77,78,81,83</sup>

TABLE II: Overview on Included Records (Continued)

Publication		Procedural Quality Control		Setting	
Title	Type of Work	Peer Reviewed	COI	Device	Field of Application
Sallam <sup>77</sup>	Review	Preprint	None disclosed	ChatGPT	Healthcare
Schmälzle & Wilcox <sup>53</sup>	Theoretical Article	Yes	None disclosed	GPT 2	Public Health
Shahriar & Hayawi <sup>54</sup>	Theoretical Article	Preprint	None disclosed	ChatGPT; BERT	Healthcare
Singh <sup>74</sup>	Editorial	No	Unclear	ChatGPT	Mental Health
Snoswell <i>et al.</i> <sup>87</sup>	Unspecified	No	Unclear	ChatGPT	Pharmacy
Stewart <i>et al.</i> <sup>55</sup>	Theoretical Article	Preprint	None disclosed	BERT; various Natural language processing models	Healthcare
Suresh <i>et al.</i> <sup>56</sup>	Empirical Article	Preprint	None disclosed	ChatGPT; GPT 4	Otolaryngology
Tang <i>et al.</i> <sup>57</sup>	Empirical Article	Preprint	Unclear	ChatGPT; GPT 3.5	Medicine
Temsah <i>et al.</i> <sup>78</sup>	Review	Yes	None disclosed	ChatGPT	Healthcare and Health Research
Thomas <sup>75</sup>	Editorial	No	Unclear	ChatGPT	Mental Health Nursing
Waisberg <i>et al.</i> <sup>69</sup>	Letter	No	None disclosed	ChatGPT; GPT 4	Ophthalmology
Xie & Wang <sup>79</sup>	Review	Preprint	None disclosed	BERT; BioBERT; BlueBERT; PubMedBERT; ChatGPT; GPT 4; BioGPT; Med-PaLM	Healthcare and Medicine
Yeo <i>et al.</i> <sup>59</sup>	Empirical Article	Preprint	None disclosed	ChatGPT; GPT 3.5	Hepatology
Yeo <i>et al.</i> <sup>58</sup>	Empirical Article	Preprint	None disclosed	ChatGPT; GPT 4	Hepatology
Yeung <i>et al.</i> <sup>26</sup>	Empirical Article	Preprint	Unclear	ChatGPT; Foresight; PaLM, Gopher; Chinchilla	Medicine
Yoder-Wise <sup>76</sup>	Editorial	No	None disclosed	ChatGPT	Nursing
Zhong <i>et al.</i> <sup>70</sup>	Letter	No	None disclosed	ChatGPT	Neuropsychiatric practice and research

It is suggested that the LLMs’ ability to analyze large amounts of unstructured data provides pathways to timely, efficient and more accurate diagnosis to the benefit of patients.<sup>38,39,70,78,81</sup> It might also enable the discovery of hidden patterns<sup>42</sup> and reduce healthcare costs.<sup>39,52</sup>

An ethical problem emerges with potentially negative effects on patient outcomes due to biases in the training data,<sup>39,42,44,77,78,81</sup> especially with the lack of diverse datasets risking underrepresentation of marginalized or vulnerable groups. Biased models may result in unfair treatment of disadvantaged groups, leading to disparities in access, exacerbating existing inequalities, or harming persons through selective accuracy.<sup>44</sup> Based on an experimental study setup, Yeung *et al.* deliver an insightful example showing that ChatGPT and Foresight NLP exhibit racial bias towards black patients.<sup>26</sup> Problems of interpretability, hallucinations, and falsehood mimicry pile onto this issue and increase these risks.<sup>38,39,47,77</sup> With regard to transparency, two sources suggest that LLM-

supported diagnosis hamper the process of providing adequate justification due to their opacity.<sup>39,77</sup> This is understood to threaten the authoritative position of professionals, leaving them at risk of not being able to provide a rationale for a diagnosis<sup>38</sup> and might lead to an erosion of trust between both parties. This is in line with others noting that LLMs are not able to replicate a process of clinical reasoning in general and, hence, fail to comprehend the complexity of the process.<sup>47,62,78</sup> Based on the principle of avoidance of harm, it is an important requirement to subject each generated datum to clinical validation as well as to develop “ethical and legal systems” to mitigate these problems.<sup>39,42,62</sup>

It needs to be noted, however, that the technically unaided process of diagnoses is also known to be subjective and prone to error.<sup>70</sup> This implies that an ethical evaluation should be carried out in terms of relative reliability and effectiveness compared to existing alternatives. Whether and under what circumstances this might be the case is a question that is not

addressed.

4) *Treatment planning*: Six studies in our dataset highlight the use of LLMs in providing personalized recommendations for treatment regimens or to support clinicians in treatment decisions based on electronic patient information or history,<sup>61,63,64,69,70,83</sup> providing a quick and reliable course of action to clinicians and patients. However, as with diagnostic applications, biases and perpetuating existing stereotypes and disparities is a constantly discussed theme.<sup>63,64,70</sup> Ferrara also cautions that LLMs will likely prioritize certain types of treatments or interventions over others, disproportionately benefiting certain groups and disadvantaging others.<sup>44</sup>

Additionally, it is highlighted that inputting patient data raises ethical questions regarding confidentiality, privacy, and data security.<sup>61,63,64,69,70</sup> This especially applies to commercial and publicly available models such as ChatGPT. Inaccuracies in potential treatment recommendations are also noted as a concerning source for harm.<sup>61,63,64,69,70</sup> In a broader context, several authors suggest that for some LLMs the absence of internet access, insufficient domain-specific data, limited access to treatment guidelines, knowledge on local or regional characteristics of the healthcare system, and outdated research significantly heighten the risk of inaccurate recommendations.<sup>22,40,41,43,50,58</sup>

## B. Patient support applications

1) *Patient information and education*: Almost all authors concerned with patient-facing applications highlight the benefits of rapid and timely information access that users experience with state-of-the-art LLMs. Kavian *et al.* compare patients' use of chatbots with shifts that have accompanied the development of the internet as patient information source.<sup>72</sup> Such access can improve laypersons' health literacy by providing a needs-oriented access to comprehensible medical information,<sup>71</sup> which is regarded as an important precondition

TABLE III: Exemplary applications of LLMs

Predictive Analysis and Risk Assessment	
Connor & O'Neill <sup>42</sup>	Supporting initial diagnose and triaging of patients by fine-tuning LLMs on a specialised dataset of electronic medical records, clinical notes, Sports science and medicine literature.
Stewart <i>et al.</i> <sup>55</sup>	Using traditional and modern natural language processing to triage patients on arrival based on structured data and unstructured free-text history of presenting complaint to predict risk stratification. This includes predictions on the likelihood of admission to hospital, prediction of critical illness, prediction of triage score, prediction of provider-assigned chief complaint, prediction of investigation, and prediction of infection.
Patient Consultation and Communication	
Buzzaccarini <i>et al.</i> <sup>63</sup>	Enhancing patient consultations by providing accurate and reliable information on aesthetic procedures, their risks, benefits and potential outcomes, enabling well-informed decisions and improved treatment outcomes.
Currie <sup>83</sup>	Providing language translation and helping health professionals to communicate with patients speaking foreign languages; helping health professionals to educate their patients and empower patients to take an active role.

TABLE III: Exemplary applications of LLMs (Continued)

Diagnosis	
Agbavor & Liang <sup>38</sup>	Using GPT 3 to distinguish individuals with Alzheimers Disease from healthy controls and to infer cognitive testing scores based on linguistic features. It is shown that the approach outperforms conventional approaches and performs comparable to specifically fine-tuned models. Usable as a web app in the doctors office.
Rau <i>et al.</i> <sup>52</sup>	Supporting radiologists diagnostic performance by providing imaging recommendations in accordance with recent guidelines.
Treatment Planning	
Arslan <sup>61</sup>	Using ChatGPT to provide personalized recommendations on topics such as nutrition, exercise and psychological support in obesity treatment.
Cheng <i>et al.</i> <sup>64</sup>	Using ChatGPT to provide treatment recommendations based on patients clinical presentation, disease severity, and comorbidities.
Patient Support	
Yeo <i>et al.</i> <sup>58</sup>	Using ChatGPT as an informational platform to comprehend and to respond to cirrhosis related questions in different languages, addressing barriers that may impact patient care.
Knebel <i>et al.</i> <sup>48</sup>	Using ChatGPT for the assessment of acute ophtalmological conditions with regard to triage accuracy and recommendations of preclinical measures.
Professional Support and Reserach	
Hosseini <i>et al.</i> <sup>47</sup>	Using LLMs to increase efficiency in note-taking through repopulation of forms, voice recording and morphing into clinical notes or synthesizing existing patient notes to save clinicians time.
Gottlieb <i>et al.</i> <sup>85</sup>	Using Conversational AI to create study documents by translating complex concepts into simpler ones or designing informed consent documents for patients.
Guo <i>et al.</i> <sup>82</sup>	Using a ChatGPT-like (ProteinGPT) systems to accelerate protein research. The model is aimed at learning and understanding protein 3D structures. ProteinGPT enables users to upload proteins, ask questions, and engage in interactive conversations to gain insights.
Public Health	
Schmälzle & Wilcox <sup>53</sup>	Using LLMs to create an AI-guided message creation system to disseminate health related information via social media.
Cheng <i>et al.</i> <sup>64</sup>	Using ChatGPT to monitor news and social media platforms for signs of outbreaks of disease clusters and to alert health professionals to potential threats.

of autonomy to allow more independent, health-related decisions.<sup>8,77</sup> In their work on the use of ChatGPT 4 in overcoming language barriers, Yeo *et al.* highlight an additional benefit, as LLMs could provide cross-lingual translation and thus contribute to equalizing healthcare and racial disparities.<sup>59</sup>

Regarding ethical concerns and risks, biases are seen as an significant source of harm.<sup>8,42,77,78</sup> The literature also highlights a crucial difference in the ethical acceptability of using patient support applications, leading to more critical stance when LLMs are used by laypersons compared to health professionals.<sup>26,56</sup> However, ethical acceptability varies across fields; for instance, otolaryngology and infectious disease studies find ChatGPT's responses to patients lack detail but aren't harmful,<sup>56</sup> whereas pharmacology and mental health

indicate greater potential risks.<sup>70,71</sup>

2) *Symptom assessment and health management*: LLMs can offer laypersons personalized guidance, such as lifestyle adjustments during illness,<sup>83</sup> self-assessment of symptoms,<sup>64,66</sup> self-triaging, and emergency management steps.<sup>8,60</sup> Although current arrangements seem to perform well and generate compelling responses,<sup>8,50,66</sup> a general lack of situational awareness is noted as a common problem that might lead to severe harm.<sup>8,64,66</sup> Situational awareness means the ability to generate responses based on contextual criteria such as the personal situation, medical history or social situation. The inability of most current LLMs to seek clarifications by asking questions and their lack of sensitivity to query variations can lead to imprecise answers.<sup>48,66</sup> For instance, research by Knebel *et al.* on self-triaging in ophthalmologic emergencies indicates that ChatGPT's responses can't reliably prioritize urgency, reducing their usefulness.<sup>48</sup>

### C. Support of health professionals and researchers

1) *Documentation and administrative tasks*: LLMs could automate tasks like medical reporting,<sup>83</sup> or summarizing patient interactions<sup>8</sup> including automatic population of forms or discharge summaries. The consensus is that LLMs could streamline clinical workflows,<sup>8,39,46,54,55,63,71,77,83,84,86</sup> offering time savings for health professionals currently burdened with extensive administrative duties.<sup>71,86</sup> By automating these repetitive tasks, professionals could dedicate more time to high-quality medical tasks.<sup>86</sup> Crucially, such applications would require the large-scale integration of LLMs into existing clinical data systems.<sup>52</sup>

2) *Research*: In health research, LLMs are suggested to support text, evidence or data summarization,<sup>57,67,85</sup> identify research targets,<sup>8,64,75,86</sup> designing experiments or studies,<sup>75,86</sup> or facilitate knowledge sharing between collaborators,<sup>40,73,83</sup> and to communicate results.<sup>77</sup> This highlights the potentials for accelerating research<sup>49,82</sup> and relieving researchers of workload,<sup>8,43,67,77,78,86</sup> leading to more efficient research workflows allowing researchers to spend less time on burdensome routine work.<sup>8,83</sup> To certain authors, this could involve condensing crucial aspects of their work, like crafting digestible research documents for ethics reviews or consent forms.<sup>85</sup> However, LLMs capacities are also critically examined, with Tang *et al.* Tang *et al.* emphasizing ChatGPT's tendency to produce attribution and misinterpretation errors, potentially distorting original source information, echoing concerns over interpretability, reproducibility, uncertainty handling, and transparency.<sup>57,77</sup>

Some authors fear that using LLMs could compromise research integrity by disrupting traditional trust factors like source traceability, factual consistency, and process transparency.<sup>22</sup> Additionally, concerns about overreliance and deskilling are raised, as LLMs might diminish researchers' skills and overly shape research outcomes.<sup>49</sup> Given that using such technologies inevitably introduces biases and distortions to the research flow, Page *et al.* suggest researchers must maintain vigilance to prevent undue influence from biases introduced by these technologies, advocating for strict human oversight and revalidation of outputs.<sup>73</sup>

### D. Public Health perspectives

The dataset encompasses studies that explore the systemic implications of LLMs, especially from a public health perspective.<sup>53,64,78</sup> This includes using LLMs in public health campaigns, for monitoring news and social media for signs of disease outbreaks<sup>64</sup> and targeted communication strategies.<sup>53</sup> Additionally, research examines the potential for improving health literacy or access to health information, especially in low-resource settings. Access to health information through LLMs can be maintained free of charge or at very low costs for laypersons.<sup>58</sup> Considering the case of mental health, especially low and middle income countries might benefit.<sup>74</sup> These countries often have a huge treatment gap driven by a deficit in professionals or inequitable resource distribution. Using LLMs could mitigate accessibility and affordability issues, potentially offering a more favorable alternative to the current lack of access.<sup>74</sup>

However, a number of authors raise doubts about overly positive expectations. Schmäzle & Wilcox highlight the risks of a dual use of LLMs.<sup>53</sup> While they might further equal access to information, malicious actors can and seem to be using LLMs to spread fake information and devise health messages at an unprecedented scale that is harmful to societies.<sup>53,54,78</sup> De Angelis *et al.* take this concern one step further, presenting the concept of an AI-driven infodemic<sup>49</sup> in which the overwhelming spread of imprecise, unclear, or false information leads to disorientation and potentially harmful behavior among recipients. Health authorities have often seen AI technologies as solutions to information overload. However, the authors caution that an AI-driven infodemics could exacerbate future health threats. While infodemic issues in social media and grey literature are noted, AI-driven infodemics could also inundate scientific journals with low-quality, excessively produced content.<sup>49</sup>

The commercial nature of most current LLMs systems present another critical consideration. The profit-driven nature of the field can lead to concentrations of power among a limited number of companies and a lack of transparency. This economic model, as highlighted by several studies, can have negative downstream effects on accessibility and affordability.<sup>22,39,46</sup> Developing, using, or refining models can be expensive, limiting accessibility and customization for marginalized communities. Power concentration also means pricing control lies with LLM companies, with revenues predominantly directed towards them.<sup>47</sup> These questions are also mirrored in the selection of training data and knowledge bases<sup>22</sup> which typically encompass knowledge from well-funded, English speaking countries and, thus, significantly underrepresents knowledge from other regions. This could exacerbate health disparities by reinforcing biases rather than alleviating them.

## IV. DISCUSSION

Our analysis has unveiled an extensive range of LLM applications currently under investigation in medicine and healthcare (see Figure 1). This surge in LLMs was largely caused by the advent and ease of use of ChatGPT, a platform




Fig. 1: Fields of Application of LLMs in Medicine

not originally tailored for professional healthcare settings, yet widely adopted within it.<sup>10,86</sup> This presents a rather unique instance where a general-purpose technology has rapidly permeated the sector of healthcare and research to an unprecedented extent.

Our review highlights a vivid testing phase of LLMs across various healthcare domains.<sup>10</sup> Despite the lack of real-world applications, especially in the clinic, there is an overarching sentiment of the promise LLMs hold. It is posited that these tools could increase the efficiency of healthcare delivery and research, with the potential to benefit patient outcomes while alleviating burdensome workload of healthcare professionals. These advantages of LLMs are largely attributed to their capabilities in data analysis, personalized information provisioning, and support in decision-making, particularly where quick analysis of voluminous unstructured data is paramount. Moreover, by mitigating information loss and enhancing medical information accessibility, LLMs stand to significantly bolster healthcare quality.

However, our study has also surfaced recurrent ethical concerns associated with LLMs. These concerns echo the wider discourse on AI ethics,<sup>88–90</sup> particularly in healthcare,<sup>91</sup> and touch on issues of fairness, bias, non-maleficence, transparency, and privacy. Yet, LLMs introduce a distinctive concern linked to a dimension of epistemic values, that is, their tendency to produce harmful misinformation or convincingly but inaccurate content through hallucinations as illustrated in Figure 2.<sup>92</sup> The effects of such misinformation are particularly

severe in healthcare, where the outcome could be dire. The inherent statistical and predictive architecture combined with the intransparency of LLMs presents significant hurdles in validating the clinical accuracy and reliability of their outputs.<sup>93–95</sup>

The inclination of LLMs to output erroneous information underscores the need for human oversight and continual validation of machine-generated output, as our dataset demonstrates. This need is accentuated by the lack of professional guidelines or regulatory oversight within this field.<sup>21</sup> Consequently, there is a noticeable demand for ethical guidelines, evidenced within the literature surrounding healthcare applications of LLMs.<sup>49,63,67,73,74,77,78,81</sup>

While we concur with the need for such guidance, our analysis suggests that the real challenge lies not in the articulation of such a need but in comprehending the scope of what this entails. There are inherent and contextual limitations and benefits associated with LLMs that warrant consideration. Inherently, state-of-the-art LLMs carry the risks of biases, hallucinations, and challenges in validity assessment, reliability testing, and reproducibility. Contextually, the effectiveness of LLM usage hinges on various situational factors, including the user utilizing LLMs, their level of expertise as well as their epistemic position (e.g. expert versus layperson), the specific domain of application, the risk profile of the application, and potential alternatives that the LLM is compared against.

A nuanced ethical discourse must recognize the multilayered nature of LLM-usage, from the epistemic stance of the






Fig. 2: Discussed Dimensions of Impact of LLMs

user to the potential for harm, the varying degrees of potential harm due to misinformation or bias, and the diverse normative benchmarks for performance and acceptable levels of uncertainty. Our recommendation is to reframe the ethical guidance debate to focus on defining what constitutes acceptable human oversight and validation across the spectrum of applications and users. This involves considering the diversity of epistemic positions of users, the varying potentials for harm, and the different acceptable thresholds for performance and certainty in diverse healthcare settings.

Given these questions, a critical inquiry is necessary to the extent to which the current experimental use of LLMs is both necessary and justified. Our dataset exemplifies a diversity of perspectives, methodologies, and applications of LLMs, revealing a significant degree of ambiguity and uncertainty about the appropriate engagement with this technology. Notably, a portion of current research seems propelled more by a sense of experimental curiosity than by well-defined methodological rigor, at times pushing the boundaries of ethical acceptability, particularly when sensitive real patient data are utilized to explore capabilities of systems like ChatGPT.

To frame these developments, it is instructive to adopt the perspective of viewing the implementation of LLMs as akin to a “social experiment”.<sup>96,97</sup> We employ this concept in a descriptive sense to denote a situation in which – according to van der Poel – the benefits, risks and ethical issues of a technology can only fully manifest subsequent to its widespread introduction.<sup>97</sup> Such a stance recognizes that the novelty of LLMs, combined with its inherent complexity and opacity, ne-

cessitates an iterative process of diminishing uncertainties and learning through which consequences only gradually emerge. By the same time, framing the current developments as social experiment also reinforces the need to establish and respect ethical limits – especially within the healthcare domain, where professional duties and responsibilities towards patients are foundational.

With this in mind we suggest that understanding how we acquaint ourselves with disruptive technologies must be central to any future ethical discourse. There is a compelling need for additional research to ascertain the conditions under which LLMs can be appropriately utilized in healthcare, but also to establish conditions of gradual experimentation and learning that align with principles of health ethics.

## V. CONCLUSION

This review addresses ethical considerations of using LLMs in healthcare at the current developmental stage. However, several limitations are important to acknowledge. Ethical examination of LLMs in healthcare is still nascent and struggles to keep pace with rapid technical advancements. Thus, the review offers a starting point for further discussions. A significant portion of the source material originated from preprint servers and did not undergo rigorous peer review, potentially introducing limitations in their quality and generalizability. Additionally, the findings’ generalizability may be limited due to variations in researched settings, applications, and interpretations of LLMs.

## DECLARATIONS

*Author Contributions*

JH and RR designed the protocol. JH conducted the search. Screening data extraction and analysis was jointly conducted by JH and RR as described in the methods section. JH wrote the first draft of the manuscript which was, then, revised by RR. RR is the PI of the project from which this article derives. All authors read and approved the final version.

*Declaration of Funding*

This study was funded by the VolkswagenStiftung as part of the Digital Medical Ethics Network (grant number 9B233). The funder played no role in study design, data collection, analysis and interpretation of data, or the writing of this manuscript.

*Conflict of Interest*

All authors declare no financial or non-financial competing interests.

*Data Availability Statement*

The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

*Acknowledgement*

Fig.1 and Fig. 2 created with BioRender.com

## REFERENCES

- Kaddour, J. *et al.* *Challenges and Applications of Large Language Models* 2023. doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2307.10169. arXiv: 2307.10169.
- Bommasani, R. *et al.* *On the Opportunities and Risks of Foundation Models* 2022. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2108.07258. arXiv: 2108.07258.
- Lee, P., Goldberg, C. & Kohane, I. *The AI Revolution in Medicine: GPT-4 and Beyond* 1st ed. (Pearson, Hoboken, 2023).
- Lee, P., Bubeck, S. & Petro, J. Benefits, Limits, and Risks of GPT-4 as an AI Chatbot for Medicine. *New England Journal of Medicine* **388**, 1233–1239. doi:10.1056/NEJMSr2214184 (2023).
- Thirunavukarasu, A. J. *et al.* Large Language Models in Medicine. *Nature Medicine* **29**, 1930–1940. doi:10.1038/s41591-023-02448-8 (2023).
- Clusmann, J. *et al.* The Future Landscape of Large Language Models in Medicine. *Communications Medicine* **3**, 141. doi:10.1038/s43856-023-00370-1 (2023).
- Sallam, M. ChatGPT Utility in Healthcare Education, Research, and Practice: Systematic Review on the Promising Perspectives and Valid Concerns. *Healthcare* **11**, 887. doi:10.3390/healthcare11060887 (2023).
- Dave, T., Athaluri, S. A. & Singh, S. ChatGPT in Medicine: An Overview of Its Applications, Advantages, Limitations, Future Prospects, and Ethical Considerations. *Frontiers in artificial intelligence* **6**, 1169595–1169595. doi:10.3389/frai.2023.1169595 (2023).
- Korngiebel, D. M. & Mooney, S. D. Considering the Possibilities and Pitfalls of Generative Pre-trained Transformer 3 (GPT-3) in Healthcare Delivery. *npj Digital Medicine* **4**, 93. doi:10.1038/s41746-021-00464-x (2021).
- Li, J., Dada, A., Puladi, B., Kleesiek, J. & Egger, J. ChatGPT in Healthcare: A Taxonomy and Systematic Review. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine* **245**, 108013. doi:10.1016/j.cmpb.2024.108013 (2024).
- Rao, A. *et al.* *Assessing the Utility of ChatGPT Throughout the Entire Clinical Workflow* 2023. doi:10.1101/2023.02.21.23285886. medRxiv: 2023.02.21.23285886.
- Liu, H., Peng, Y. & Weng, C. How Good Is ChatGPT for Medication Evidence Synthesis? *Studies in Health Technology & Informatics* **302**, 1062–1066. doi:10.3233/SHTI230347 (2023).
- Takita, H. *et al.* *Diagnostic Performance Comparison between Generative AI and Physicians: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis* 2024. doi:10.1101/2024.01.20.24301563. medRxiv: 2024.01.20.24301563.
- Kim, J. H., Kim, S. K., Choi, J. & Lee, Y. Reliability of ChatGPT for Performing Triage Task in the Emergency Department Using the Korean Triage and Acuity Scale. *DIGITAL HEALTH* **10**. doi:10.1177/20552076241227132 (2024).
- Ayers, J. W. *et al.* Comparing Physician and Artificial Intelligence Chatbot Responses to Patient Questions Posted to a Public Social Media Forum. *JAMA Internal Medicine* **183**, 589–596. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2023.1838 (2023).
- Singhal, K. *et al.* Large Language Models Encode Clinical Knowledge. *Nature* **620**, 172–180. doi:10.1038/s41586-023-06291-2 (2023).
- Hagendorff, T. *Mapping the Ethics of Generative AI: A Comprehensive Scoping Review* 2024. doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2402.08323. arXiv: 2402.08323.
- Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A. & Shmitchell, S. On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too Big? *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 610–623. doi:10.1145/3442188.3445922 (2021).
- Weidinger, L. *et al.* Taxonomy of Risks Posed by Language Models. *2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 214–229. doi:10.1145/3531146.3533088 (2022).
- Ray, P. P. ChatGPT: A Comprehensive Review on Background, Applications, Key Challenges, Bias, Ethics, Limitations and Future Scope. *Internet of Things and Cyber-Physical Systems* **3**, 121–154. doi:10.1016/j.iotcps.2023.04.003 (2023).
- Gilbert, S., Harvey, H., Melvin, T., Vollebregt, E. & Wicks, P. Large Language Model AI Chatbots Require Approval as Medical Devices. *Nature Medicine* **29**, 2396–2398. doi:10.1038/s41591-023-02412-6 (2023).
- Li, H. *et al.* Ethics of Large Language Models in Medicine and Medical Research. *The Lancet Digital*

- Health* **5**, e333–e335. doi:10.1016/S2589-7500(23)00083-3 (2023).
23. Wang, C. *et al.* Ethical Considerations of Using ChatGPT in Health Care. *Journal of Medical Internet Research* **25**, e48009. doi:10.2196/48009 (2023).
  24. Grote, T. & Berens, P. A Paradigm Shift?: On the Ethics of Medical Large Language Models. *Bioethics* (forthcoming).
  25. Abid, A., Farooqi, M. & Zou, J. Large Language Models Associate Muslims with Violence. *Nature Machine Intelligence* **3**, 461–463. doi:10.1038/s42256-021-00359-2 (2021).
  26. Yeung, J. A. *et al.* *AI Chatbots Not yet Ready for Clinical Use* 2023. doi:10.1101/2023.03.02.23286705. medRxiv: 2023.03.02.23286705.
  27. Omiye, J. A., Lester, J. C., Spichak, S., Rotemberg, V. & Daneshjou, R. Large Language Models Propagate Race-Based Medicine. *npj Digital Medicine* **6**, 195. doi:10.1038/s41746-023-00939-z (2023).
  28. Zack, T. *et al.* Assessing the Potential of GPT-4 to Perpetuate Racial and Gender Biases in Health Care: A Model Evaluation Study. *The Lancet Digital Health* **6**, e12–e22. doi:10.1016/S2589-7500(23)00225-X (2024).
  29. Suresh, H. & Guttag, J. V. in *EAAMO '21: Equity and Access in Algorithms, Mechanisms, and Optimization* (ed Association for Computing Machinery) 1–9 (New York, 2021). doi:10.1145/3465416.3483305.
  30. Obermeyer, Z., Powers, B., Vogeli, C. & Mullainathan, S. Dissecting Racial Bias in an Algorithm Used to Manage the Health of Populations. *Science* **366**, 447–453. doi:10.1126/science.aax2342 (2019).
  31. Saenger, J. A., Hunger, J., Boss, A. & Richter, J. Delayed Diagnosis of a Transient Ischemic Attack Caused by ChatGPT. *Wiener klinische Wochenschrift*. doi:10.1007/s00508-024-02329-1 (2024).
  32. Moor, M. *et al.* Foundation Models for Generalist Medical Artificial Intelligence. *Nature* **616**, 259–265. doi:10.1038/s41586-023-05881-4 (2023).
  33. Ranisch, R. & Haltaufderheide, J. Ethics of ChatGPT: A Systemic Review of Large Language Models in Healthcare and Medicine. *PROSPERO* 2023. *CRD42023431326*.
  34. Garritty, C. *et al.* Updated Recommendations for the Cochrane Rapid Review Methods Guidance for Rapid Reviews of Effectiveness. *BMJ* **384**, e076335. doi:10.1136/bmj-2023-076335 (2024).
  35. Abd-alrazaq, A. *et al.* Large Language Models in Medical Education: Opportunities, Challenges, and Future Directions. *JMIR Medical Education* **9**, e48291. doi:10.2196/48291 (2023).
  36. Liebrez, M., Schleifer, R., Buadze, A., Bhugra, D. & Smith, A. Generating Scholarly Content with ChatGPT: Ethical Challenges for Medical Publishing. *The Lancet Digital Health* **5**, e105–e106. doi:10.1016/S2589-7500(23)00019-5 (2023).
  37. Mertz, M. How to Tackle the Conundrum of Quality Appraisal in Systematic Reviews of Normative Literature/Information? Analysing the Problems of Three Possible Strategies (Translation of a German Paper). *BMC Medical Ethics* **20**, 81. doi:10.1186/s12910-019-0423-5 (2019).
  38. Agbavor, F. & Liang, H. Predicting Dementia from Spontaneous Speech Using Large Language Models. *PLoS Digital Health* **1**, e0000168. doi:10.1371/journal.pdig.0000168 (2022).
  39. Ali, H., Qadir, J. & Shah, Z. *ChatGPT and Large Language Models (LLMs) in Healthcare: Opportunities and Risks* May 2023. doi:10.36227/techrxiv.22579852.v2. Techrxiv: 22579852.v2.
  40. Almazyad, M. *et al.* Enhancing Expert Panel Discussions in Pediatric Palliative Care: Innovative Scenario Development and Summarization with ChatGPT-4. *Curēus* **15**, e38249. doi:10.7759/cureus.38249 (2023).
  41. Antaki, F., Touma, S., Milad, D., El-Khoury, J. & Duval, R. *Evaluating the Performance of ChatGPT in Ophthalmology: An Analysis of Its Successes and Shortcomings* 2023. doi:10.1101/2023.01.22.23284882. medRxiv: 2023.01.22.23284882.
  42. Connor, M. & O'Neill, M. *Large Language Models in Sport Science & Medicine: Opportunities, Risks and Considerations* 2023. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2305.03851. arXiv: 2305.03851.
  43. Carullo, G., Toscano, F., Nante, N. & Golinelli, D. A Step-by-Step Researcher's Guide to the Use of an AI-based Transformer in Epidemiology: An Exploratory Analysis of ChatGPT Using the STROBE Checklist for Observational Studies. *Journal of Public Health*. doi:10.1007/s10389-023-01936-y (2023).
  44. Ferrara, E. *Should ChatGPT Be Biased? Challenges and Risks of Bias in Large Language Models* July 2023. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2304.03738. arXiv: 2304.03738.
  45. Guo, E. *et al.* *neuroGPT-X: Towards an Accountable Expert Opinion Tool for Vestibular Schwannoma* 2023. doi:10.1101/2023.02.25.23286117. medRxiv: 2023.02.25.23286117.
  46. Harskamp, R. E. & Clercq, L. D. *Performance of ChatGPT as an AI-assisted Decision Support Tool in Medicine: A Proof-of-Concept Study for Interpreting Symptoms and Management of Common Cardiac Conditions (AMSTELHEART-2)* 2023. doi:10.1101/2023.03.25.23285475. medRxiv: 2023.03.25.23285475.
  47. Hosseini, M. *et al.* *An Exploratory Survey about Using ChatGPT in Education, Healthcare, and Research* 2023. doi:10.1101/2023.03.31.23287979. medRxiv: 2023.03.31.23287979.
  48. Knebel, D., Priglinger, S., Scherer, N., Siedlecki, J. & Schworm, B. *Assessment of ChatGPT in the Preclinical Management of Ophthalmological Emergencies – an Analysis of Ten Fictional Case Vignettes* 2023. doi:10.1101/2023.04.16.23288645. medRxiv: 2023.04.16.23288645.
  49. De Angelis, L. *et al.* ChatGPT and the Rise of Large Language Models: The New AI-driven Infodemic Threat in Public Health. *Frontiers in public health* **11**, 1166120–1166120. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2023.1166120 (2023).

50. Padovan, M. *et al.* *ChatGPT in Occupational Medicine: A Comparative Study with Human Experts* 2023. doi:10.1101/2023.05.17.23290055. medRxiv: 2023.05.17.23290055.
51. Pal, R., Garg, H., Patel, S. & Sethi, T. *Bias Amplification in Intersectional Subpopulations for Clinical Phenotyping by Large Language Models* 2023. doi:10.1101/2023.03.22.23287585. medRxiv: 2023.03.22.23287585.
52. Rau, A. *et al.* *A Context-Based Chatbot Surpasses Trained Radiologists and Generic ChatGPT in Following the ACR Appropriateness Guidelines* 2023. doi:10.1101/2023.04.10.23288354. medRxiv: 2023.04.10.23288354.
53. Schmäzle, R. & Wilcox, S. Harnessing Artificial Intelligence for Health Message Generation: The Folic Acid Message Engine. *Journal of Medical Internet Research* **24**, e28858. doi:10.2196/28858 (2022).
54. Shahriar, S. & Hayawi, K. *Let's Have a Chat! A Conversation with ChatGPT: Technology, Applications, and Limitations* 2023. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2302.13817. arXiv: 2302.13817.
55. Stewart, J. *et al.* *Applications of Natural Language Processing at Emergency Department Triage: A Systematic Review* 2022. doi:10.1101/2022.12.20.22283735. medRxiv: 2022.12.20.22283735.
56. Suresh, K. *et al.* *Utility of GPT-4 as an Informational Patient Resource in Otolaryngology* 2023. doi:10.1101/2023.05.14.23289944. medRxiv: 2023.05.14.23289944.
57. Tang, L. *et al.* *Evaluating Large Language Models on Medical Evidence Summarization* 2023. doi:10.1101/2023.04.22.23288967. medRxiv: 2023.04.22.23288967.
58. Yeo, Y. H. *et al.* *Assessing the Performance of ChatGPT in Answering Questions Regarding Cirrhosis and Hepatocellular Carcinoma* 2023. doi:10.1101/2023.02.06.23285449. medRxiv: 2023.02.06.23285449.
59. Yeo, Y. H. *et al.* *GPT-4 Outperforms ChatGPT in Answering Non-English Questions Related to Cirrhosis* 2023. doi:10.1101/2023.05.04.23289482. medRxiv: 2023.05.04.23289482.
60. Ahn, C. Exploring ChatGPT for Information of Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation. *Resuscitation* **185**, 109729. doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2023.109729 (2023).
61. Arslan, S. Exploring the Potential of Chat GPT in Personalized Obesity Treatment. *Annals of Biomedical Engineering* **51**, 1887–1888. doi:10.1007/s10439-023-03227-9 (2023).
62. Beltrami, E. & Grant-Kels, J. Consulting ChatGPT: Ethical Dilemmas in Language Model Artificial Intelligence. *Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology*. doi:10.1016/j.jaad.2023.02.052 (2023).
63. Buzzaccarini, G., Degliuomini, R. S. & Borin, M. The Artificial Intelligence Application in Aesthetic Medicine: How ChatGPT Can Revolutionize the Aesthetic World. *Aesthetic plastic surgery* **47**, 2211–2212. doi:10.1007/s00266-023-03416-w (2023).
64. Cheng, K. *et al.* Potential Use of Artificial Intelligence in Infectious Disease: Take ChatGPT as an Example. *Annals of biomedical engineering* **51**, 1130–1135. doi:10.1007/s10439-023-03203-3 (2023).
65. Gupta, R., Bagdady, K. & Mailey, B. A. Ethical Concerns amidst Employment of ChatGPT in Plastic Surgery. *Aesthetic surgery journal* **43**, NP656–NP657. doi:10.1093/asj/sjad108 (2023).
66. Howard, A., Hope, W. & Gerada, A. ChatGPT and Antimicrobial Advice: The End of the Consulting Infection Doctor? *Lancet Infectious Diseases* **23**, 405–406. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(23)00113-5 (2023).
67. Li, W., Zhang, Y. & Chen, F. ChatGPT in Colorectal Surgery: A Promising Tool or a Passing Fad? *Annals of biomedical engineering* **51**, 1892–1897. doi:10.1007/s10439-023-03232-y (2023).
68. Perlis, R. H. *Research Letter: Application of GPT-4 to Select next-Step Antidepressant Treatment in Major Depression* 2023. doi:10.1101/2023.04.14.23288595. medRxiv: 2023.04.14.23288595.
69. Waisberg, E. *et al.* GPT-4: A New Era of Artificial Intelligence in Medicine. *Irish journal of medical science* **192**. doi:10.1007/s11845-023-03377-8 (2023).
70. Zhong, Y. *et al.* The Artificial Intelligence Large Language Models and Neuropsychiatry Practice and Research Ethic. *Asian journal of psychiatry* **84**, 103577. doi:10.1016/j.ajp.2023.103577 (2023).
71. Jairoun, A. A. *et al.* ChatGPT: Threat or Boon to the Future of Pharmacy Practice? *Research in Social & Administrative Pharmacy* **19**, 975–976. doi:10.1016/j.sapharm.2023.03.012 (2023).
72. Kavian, J. A., Wilkey, H. L., Patel, P. A. & Boyd, C. J. Harvesting the Power of Artificial Intelligence for Surgery: Uses, Implications, and Ethical Considerations. *The American surgeon* **89**, 5102–5104. doi:10.1177/00031348231175454 (2023).
73. Page, A., Tumelty, N. & Sheppard, S. Navigating the AI Frontier: Ethical Considerations and Best Practices in Microbial Genomics Research. *Microbial genomics* **9**. doi:10.1099/mgen.0.001049 (2023).
74. Singh, O. P. Artificial Intelligence in the Era of ChatGPT - Opportunities and Challenges in Mental Health Care. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry* **65**, 297–298. doi:10.4103/indianjpsychiatry.indianjpsychiatry\_112\_23 (2023).
75. Thomas, S. P. Grappling with the Implications of ChatGPT for Researchers, Clinicians, and Educators. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing* **44**, 141–142. doi:10.1080/01612840.2023.2180982 (2023).
76. Yoder-Wise, P. S. This Is a Real Editorial or Is It? *Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing* **54**, 99–100. doi:10.3928/00220124-20230214-01 (2023).
77. Sallam, M. *The Utility of ChatGPT as an Example of Large Language Models in Healthcare Education, Research and Practice: Systematic Review on the Future Perspectives and Potential Limitations* United States, 2023. doi:10.1101/2023.02.19.23286155. medRxiv: 2023.02.19.23286155.
78. Temsah, O. *et al.* Overview of Early ChatGPT's Presence in Medical Literature: Insights from a Hybrid Literature Review by ChatGPT and Human Experts. *Curēus* **15**, e37281. doi:10.7759/cureus.37281 (2023).

79. Xie, Q. & Wang, F. *Faithful AI in Healthcare and Medicine* 2023. doi:10.1101/2023.04.18.23288752. medRxiv: 2023.04.18.23288752.
80. Abdulai, A.-F. & Hung, L. Will ChatGPT Undermine Ethical Values in Nursing Education, Research, and Practice? *Nursing inquiry* **30**, e12556. doi:10.1111/nin.12556 (2023).
81. Ferreira, A. & Lipoff, J. The Complex Ethics of Applying ChatGPT and Language Model Artificial Intelligence in Dermatology. *Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology* **89**, e157–e158. doi:10.1016/j.jaad.2023.05.054 (2023).
82. Guo, H., Huo, M., Zhang, R. & Xie, P. *ProteinChat: Towards Achieving ChatGPT-Like Functionalities on Protein 3D Structures* 2023. doi:10.36227/techrxiv.23120606.v1. Techrxiv: 23120606.v1.
83. Currie, G. M. Academic Integrity and Artificial Intelligence: Is ChatGPT Hype, Hero or Heresy? *Seminars in nuclear medicine* **53**, 719–730. doi:10.1053/j.semnuclmed.2023.04.008 (2023).
84. Eggmann, F. & Blatz, M. B. ChatGPT: Chances and Challenges for Dentistry. *Compendium of Continuing Education in Dentistry* **44**, 220–224 (2023).
85. Gottlieb, M., Kline, J. A., Schneider, A. J. & Coates, W. C. ChatGPT and Conversational Artificial Intelligence: Friend, Foe, or Future of Research? *The American journal of emergency medicine* **70**, 81–83. doi:10.1016/j.ajem.2023.05.018 (2023).
86. Harrer, S. Attention Is Not All You Need: The Complicated Case of Ethically Using Large Language Models in Healthcare and Medicine. *eBioMedicine* **90**, 104512–104512. doi:10.1016/j.ebiom.2023.104512 (2023).
87. Snoswell, C. L., Falconer, N. & Snoswell, A. J. Pharmacist vs Machine: Pharmacy Services in the Age of Large Language Models. *Research in Social & Administrative Pharmacy* **19**, 843–844. doi:10.1016/j.sapharm.2023.03.006 (2023).
88. Kazim, E. & Koshiyama, A. S. A High-Level Overview of AI Ethics. *Patterns* **2**, 100314. doi:10.1016/j.patter.2021.100314. (2024) (2021).
89. Hagendorff, T. The Ethics of AI Ethics: An Evaluation of Guidelines. *Minds and Machines* **30**, 99–120. doi:10.1007/s11023-020-09517-8 (2020).
90. Jobin, A., Ienca, M. & Vayena, E. The Global Landscape of AI Ethics Guidelines. *Nature Machine Intelligence* **1**, 389–399. doi:10.1038/s42256-019-0088-2 (2019).
91. Morley, J. *et al.* The Ethics of AI in Health Care: A Mapping Review. *Social Science & Medicine* **260**, 113172. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113172 (2020).
92. Xu, Z., Jain, S. & Kankanhalli, M. *Hallucination Is Inevitable: An Innate Limitation of Large Language Models* 2024. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2401.11817. arXiv: 2401.11817.
93. Grote, T. & Berens, P. On the Ethics of Algorithmic Decision-Making in Healthcare. *Journal of medical ethics* **46**, 205–211. doi:10.1136/medethics-2019-105586 (2020).
94. Grote, T. Trustworthy Medical AI Systems Need to Know When They Don't Know. *Journal of Medical Ethics* **47**, 337–338. doi:10.1136/medethics-2021-107463 (2021).
95. Babushkina, D. & Votsis, A. Epistemo-Ethical Constraints on AI-human Decision Making for Diagnostic Purposes. *Ethics and Information Technology* **24**, 22. doi:10.1007/s10676-022-09629-y (2022).
96. van de Poel, I. Why New Technologies Should Be Conceived as Social Experiments. *Ethics, Policy & Environment* **16**, 352–355. doi:10.1080/21550085.2013.844575 (2013).
97. van de Poel, I. An Ethical Framework for Evaluating Experimental Technology. *Science and Engineering Ethics* **22**, 667–686. doi:10.1007/s11948-015-9724-3 (2016).

SUPPLEMENT I  
KEY CONCEPTS FOR THE SEARCH

- 1) LLM are machines which use computational methods, partially under human supervision, to extract statistical relationships from large corpora of data such as text documents, databases and websites. This allows them to predict a number of tokens or words given a certain input and thereby to generate text that follows the learned statistical conventions to an extent that most humans find to mimick human language use.
- 2) Healthcare is the practice of restoring, maintaining or improving a physical or mental well-being, including prevention, diagnosis, treatment or cure of disease or injury. Healthcare is often performed in structured settings involving the help of trained health professionals such as medical doctors, nurses etc.
- 3) Ethical issues can be defined as a state of affairs in which moral implications of a given situation cannot be determined without much reservation, disagreement with regard to the right course of action exists, or conflicting moral obligations presenting themselves. This may include a variety of different situations, such as occurrence of unclear or undetermined benefits, chances, risks or harms, unclear, undetermined or conflicting views about addressees of moral complaints as well as situations in which applicable moral principles obviously should have been considered but weren't. We determined that that an ethical issue exists whenever it is understood as such.

SUPPLEMENT II  
OVERVIEW ON DATA EXTRACTION FIELDS

- 1) Bibliographic data [author; title; journal/server; funding; coi]
- 2) Article type [orientation;type]
- 3) Aims of publication
- 4) Field of application [name of device; device description; anticipated development; technical intentionality/capabilities; technical limitations; medical domain; applications and outcomes; benchmarks for comparison;
- 5) Value dimension [value; normative background; ethical methods]
- 6) Findings [user-interactions; concerns; perception of hype/fears; systemic perspectives]
- 7) Recommendations
- 8) Implications for practice
- 9) Future research directions