

Benchmarking Generative AI for Scoring Medical Student Interviews in Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCEs)

Jadon Geathers*, Yann Hicke*, Colleen Chan, Niroop Rajashekar, Justin Sewell, Susannah Cornes, Rene Kizilcec, Dennis Shung

*Equal Contribution

Abstract

Introduction. Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCEs) are widely used to assess medical students' communication skills, but scoring interview-based assessments is time-consuming and potentially subject to human bias. This study explored the potential of large language models (LLMs) to automate OSCE evaluations using the Master Interview Rating Scale (MIRS).

Methods. We compared the performance of four state-of-the-art LLMs (GPT-4o, Claude 3.5, Llama 3.1, and Gemini 1.5 Pro) in evaluating OSCE transcripts across all 28 items of the MIRS under the conditions of zero-shot, chain-of-thought (CoT), few-shot, and multi-step prompting. The models were benchmarked against a dataset of 10 OSCE cases with 174 expert consensus scores available. Model performance was measured using three accuracy metrics (exact, off-by-one, thresholded).

Results. Averaging across all MIRS items and OSCE cases, LLMs performed with low exact accuracy (0.27 to 0.44), and moderate to high off-by-one accuracy (0.67 to 0.87) and thresholded accuracy (0.75 to 0.88). A zero temperature parameter ensured high intra-rater reliability ($\alpha = 0.98$ for GPT-4o). CoT, few-shot, and multi-step techniques proved valuable when tailored to specific assessment items. The performance was consistent across MIRS items independent of encounter phases and communication domains.

Conclusion. We demonstrated the feasibility of AI-assisted OSCE evaluation and provided benchmarking of multiple LLMs across multiple prompt techniques. Our work provides a baseline performance assessment for LLMs that lays a foundation for future research in automated assessment of clinical communication skills.

Keywords. Assessment, AI, Medical Education, LLMs, Evaluation

1. Introduction

Clinical communication skills are fundamental to medical practice and significantly impact patient satisfaction.^{1,2} These skills facilitate patient-centered care, which the Institute of Medicine defines as one of the six core elements of high-quality healthcare.³ Recognizing their importance, medical schools

prioritize communication skills training before patient interactions, starting at the pre-clerkship phase of medical school. Assessment of communication skills occurs primarily through Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCEs),⁴ where medical students engage with trained actors serving as standardized patients (SP) to demonstrate empathy, effective questioning, and encouragement, among many other skills.

OSCEs are not only time-intensive and costly for medical schools; they also offer limited feedback for medical students. The feedback students receive is typically delayed and lacks sufficient detail to help students improve.⁵ This leads to an environment focused less on learning crucial clinical skills and more on passing the assessment.⁶ Furthermore, there is the potential for variability in scoring related to evaluator bias, rater characteristics, and item characteristics that require standardization training.

Large language models (LLMs)—artificial intelligence systems trained on textual data to generate human-like responses—offer promising avenues for automating both scoring and feedback provision in OSCE evaluation. Automation would alleviate the time burden of evaluation from practitioners and promote nearly immediate, accessible feedback to students following their examinations, potentially enhancing future educational outcomes.⁷ This could enable medical schools to expand opportunities for students to engage in deliberate practice with OSCE cases.

The application of LLMs to evaluate clinical communication skills remains an emerging area, despite their effectiveness in other educational contexts such as essay scoring and code-writing assistants.^{8,9} While current research has employed LLMs for creating virtual patients,^{10,11} generating medical examination content,¹² and providing personalized support for skill development,^{13,14} their potential for comprehensive OSCE assessment remains largely unexplored. Although preliminary studies have demonstrated promising results in using LLMs to evaluate OSCE post-encounter notes,¹⁵ a robust LLM-based OSCE assessment framework—that can both reliably score student performance against communication rubrics and provide detailed feedback across diverse rubric elements—requires further research, including the establishment of a standardized benchmark.

Approaches to LLM-based OSCE assessment face two key challenges. First, medical interviews from OSCEs contain communication competencies encompassing both verbal and non-verbal elements, requiring the evaluation of nuances that are not easily captured in text. Second, while scoring rubrics have been carefully designed and validated, the subjectivity of interpersonal communication poses persistent challenges for inter-rater reliability and introduces potential assessment bias.^{16,17,18}

Our work examined a strategy to alleviate these challenges by developing and evaluating an LLM-based system for automated OSCE assessment, using the Master Interview Rating Scale (MIRS) as the assessment criteria.¹⁹ We hypothesized that state-of-the-art LLMs can provide reliable evaluations comparable to human raters across various communication competencies. To test this hypothesis, we compared the performance of four state-of-the-art models (GPT-4o, Claude 3.5, Llama 3.1, and Gemini 1.5 Pro) against human consensus ratings on a dataset of 10 OSCE cases. We utilized four prompting strategies (zero-shot, chain-of-thought (CoT) reasoning, few-shot, and multi-step), both uniformly and by tailoring the prompting strategy to each assessment item for optimal performance. Additionally, we explored multimodal evaluation techniques for assessing non-verbal communication skills, though this remains a significant challenge for current LLM capabilities.

This study aimed to enhance the efficiency and consistency of communication skills assessment in medical education, ultimately contributing to the development of more effective, empathetic, and prepared future healthcare professionals.

2. Methods




Fig. 1 The overall flow of the evaluation process, including transcription, prompting, and scoring.

Our process for automated evaluation of OSCEs involved three steps, as illustrated in Figure 1. The first step was transcription, in which each video of an engagement between a physician and patient was transcribed using automatic speech recognition (we use OpenAI’s Whisper for this step).²⁰ Second, the LLM received a prompt outlining the assessment task and subsequently received the transcript to perform its assessment. Finally, scores and justifications were provided for all items present in the MIRS rubric. We describe our dataset and approach in more detail below.

2.1 Dataset

This benchmarking study analyzed a dataset of 10 OSCE cases including 174 evaluation data points provided by the University of Connecticut.²¹ The cases capture authentic clinical interactions between health professions students and standardized patients through videos ranging from 7 to 30 minutes in duration. This video dataset consists of three distinct categories of clinical engagements: four medical history-taking cases (two focusing on groin pain assessment; two examining left chest pain evaluation), three behavioral counseling cases (smoking cessation counseling, exercise counseling, nutrition counseling), and three dental cases (tooth pain evaluation, gum pain assessment, smoking cessation counseling). From each video, we extracted the audio and transcribed the resulting MP3 file using Whisper. The dialogue between the student physician and standardized patient was then diarized through manual annotation by our team.

2.2 Master Interview Rating Scale (MIRS)

Evaluation was based on the Master Interview Rating Scale (MIRS), a validated tool for assessing medical communication skills.^{22,23,24} The MIRS comprises 28 items rated on a 5-point scale, assessing various aspects of the medical interview including questioning skills, interview organization, and patient inclusion (see Figure S1). Expert consensus scores on the MIRS rubric provided by the University of Connecticut yielded 174 scoring data points across all ten cases.

Guidance on how to score each MIRS item was integrated from the University of Connecticut MIRS rubric¹⁹ and supplemented with examples and contextual notes from the University of Tennessee MIRS rubric.²⁵ Although the MIRS is scored on a 5-point scale, it only has labeled anchor statements for scores of 1 (lowest score), 3 (mid-point), and 5 (highest score). To give clear scoring instructions to the LLM, our team wrote anchor statements for scores of 2 and 4, with medical education experts validating the language and suitability of the scoring criteria. Most of the MIRS items (26 out of 28) can be scored with LLMs based on the text alone by using automatically generated transcripts. The remaining two MIRS items—"Pacing of Interview" and "Non-Verbal Facilitation Skills"—require a multimodal evaluation strategy because they cannot be assessed through text transcripts alone. Most of the analysis in this paper centers on the 26 verbal items, but we also report findings for the two non-verbal items using a multimodal analysis.




Fig. 2 Structure of the steps involved for each prompt, depending on the prompting technique. There is one such prompt for each MIRS rubric item. In multi-step prompting, the “Provide Transcript” step uses the extracted excerpt.

2.2 LLMs and Prompting Techniques

We tested the performance of four state-of-the-art language models in this study: GPT-4o (OpenAI),²⁶ Claude 3.5 (Anthropic),²⁷ Llama 3.1 (Meta),²⁸ and Gemini 1.5 Pro (Google).²⁹ All models were configured with a temperature of 0 for the most deterministic model responses. Additionally, we explored four prompting techniques to optimize model performance:

- **Zero-shot.** This technique established our baseline for performance evaluation. The model was only provided with our adapted MIRS rubric for scoring.
- **CoT Reasoning.** The model was prompted to generate a structured list of key statements from the transcript that were relevant to the assessed item before scoring.³⁰ This intermediate step encouraged the model to articulate its reasoning, with the list used to justify score selections.
- **Few-shot.** Up to 5 examples of relevant statements from physician-patient interactions were provided to guide the models' reasoning.³¹ These were paired with an appropriate score or justification, as provided by the University of Tennessee's rubric.
- **Multi-step.** Taking inspiration from an existing multi-step prompting technique,³² this approach provided the model with the transcript and prompted it to isolate relevant excerpts. These excerpts were then used to inform scoring.

To prompt the model to conduct OSCE assessments, we constructed individual prompts for each item of the MIRS rubric. While prompts differed by prompting technique, they maintained a consistent underlying structure within each approach. As shown in Figure 2, each prompt began with a task description that outlined the evaluation scenario and objectives. The subsequent structure then diverged according to the prompting technique employed. For CoT reasoning, we requested the model to establish a list of key statements identified in the dialogue to help motivate evaluation. In the case of few-shot prompting, we included examples of relevant excerpts for the rubric item and their assigned scores. All approaches then provided the scoring rubric, requesting the model to evaluate the medical student's performance based on the scoring criteria. The model was prompted to provide a direct, evidence-based justification of its score selection. Lastly, we provided the model with the transcript, or the relevant transcript excerpt if using multi-step prompting. All prompts are available on [GitHub](#).

2.3 Evaluation Metrics

We evaluated the model performances relative to expert consensus answers provided by medical educators at the University of Connecticut, who authored each of the 10 cases and assessed the students' performances according to the MIRS rubric. We used three accuracy metrics for evaluation, each representing a different level of scoring leniency:

- **Exact Accuracy (Conservative).** We measured exact agreement between the expert consensus and model scores, providing the strictest evaluation criterion. Exact accuracy is relevant for assessing the models' ability to exactly match human judgment for precise assessment of communication competencies in OSCEs.
- **Off-by-One Accuracy (Moderate).** We measured approximate agreement within one point (above or below) of the expert consensus scores. This recognizes the subjective variability inherent to clinical evaluations among human raters. The metric provided a less strict measure of accuracy, but reflects a practical balance between strictness and flexibility in evaluating performance.
- **Thresholded Accuracy (Lenient).** We measured discrepancies between the consensus and the model scores by creating two score buckets: one bucket contained scores 1 and 2 (lower proficiency) and the other bucket contained scores 3, 4, and 5 (higher proficiency). This metric

assessed the models' ability to distinguish between broader proficiency levels, aiding practitioners in identifying students who may require additional support.

2.3 Experimental Details

All models were configured with a temperature of 0, ensuring that they always selected the most probable next token when generating responses. This setting made the responses largely deterministic, which removed the need for repeated trials due to consistent, nonrandom token selection. As a temperature of 0 can occasionally produce slight variations in output (e.g., due to tie-breaking between equally probable tokens), we conducted an intra-rater reliability test for GPT-4o using the baseline zero-shot prompting strategy to confirm the consistency of the model's scoring.

For this reliability test, we obtained five independent evaluations for each case and treated each evaluation as an independent rater. Using Krippendorff's alpha, a reliability coefficient suited for ordinal data, we measured the agreement between the model's scores across trials. Krippendorff's alpha accounts for the degree of disagreement, penalizing larger discrepancies more heavily (e.g., a difference between 1 and 4 is penalized more than between 2 and 3). The coefficient ranges from -1 (indicating systematic disagreement) to 1 (indicating perfect agreement).^{33,34,35} The test yielded a Krippendorff's alpha of 0.98 for GPT-4o, indicating excellent internal consistency.

Beyond the reliability test, we demonstrated the overall performance of each model (GPT, Claude, Gemini, Llama) across prompting techniques on the three accuracy metrics. We also assessed the performance of all models on each relevant MIRS item by evaluating off-by-one accuracy for the baseline approach. In this analysis, the items were categorized by their occurrence during the encounter and their communication domain. Finally, we discuss early benchmarking findings of multimodal models, which incorporate audiovisual data, for evaluating MIRS items that are not textually represented in a direct transcript. This involved providing the dataset videos to Gemini 1.5 Pro with our prompts, evaluating the video and audio directly rather than using a transcript.

3. Results

3.1 Overall Model Performance

Figure 3 reports LLM performance across prompting techniques using three measures of accuracy, aggregating over the MIRS items (see Table S1). While exact accuracy was low (0.27 to 0.52), off-by-one accuracy (0.67 to 0.91) and thresholded accuracy (0.75 to 0.91) were moderate to high. CoT, few-shot, and multi-step techniques did not improve performance over the zero-shot baseline. However, selecting the optimal prompting technique for each MIRS item improved performance, indicating that adjusting the prompting technique to the rubric item may be beneficial.

Although the exact accuracy was relatively low (0.52 for Claude), the models' ability to differentiate performance levels (thresholded accuracy 0.83-0.88 for zero-shot) aligns with practical applications in OSCE evaluations, as broad proficiency levels are often more informative than exact scores. This suggests LLMs are better used as complementary evaluation and proficiency detection tools rather than standalone replacements. All augmentative prompting techniques (CoT, few-shot, and multi-step)

either minimally impacted or decreased accuracy compared to the zero-shot baseline. Declines in accuracy were particularly notable with few-shot prompting for Gemini and universal with multi-step prompting.




Figure 3. Average performance (with standard error) of each model using different prompting techniques and measured with different accuracy metrics.

3.2 Performance by MIRS Items




Figure 4. Heatmap of the off-by-one accuracy for each model and MIRS item. Opening the discussion and building the relationship correspond to the beginning of the visit. Information gathering and understanding the patient perspective occur primarily during the middle of the visit. Information sharing occurs throughout the visit. Reaching an agreement and providing closure correspond to the end of the visit.³⁵

We analyzed off-by-one accuracy for each MIRS item across the four models (GPT, Claude, Gemini, Llama) using the zero-shot baseline approach, grouping items into four temporal, skill-based phases.³⁶ We selected off-by-one accuracy because it provided a balanced evaluation approach between lenient thresholded accuracy and conservative exact accuracy, though alternative accuracy metrics showed similar patterns for underperforming MIRS items. Most items were scored with an accuracy of 0.8 or higher, indicating the models' alignment with consensus scores across a variety of communication assessment tasks.

While models demonstrated similar patterns of accuracy across encounter phases, specific items consistently challenged all models (e.g., “acknowledges impact,” “minimizes jargon,” “achieves shared plan”) while others performed uniformly well (e.g., “clarifies and verifies,” “assesses motivation,” “uses encouragement”). The variable performance across individual items may be attributed to several factors. First, performance could be influenced by the clarity of item definitions, the frequency of items in transcripts, and the quality of provided examples. Second, some items were not present in all transcripts, resulting in smaller evaluation datasets compared to items that occurred consistently across cases. As

encounter phases alone evoke no clear patterns in accuracy, these findings underscore a need to fine-tune the models on patient-physician encounter data.

3.3 Multimodal Performance

We used a multimodal model, Gemini 1.5 Pro, to score the two MIRS items requiring the assessment of non-verbal elements in patient-physician encounters. Performance was notably poor, systematically disagreeing with human raters (Krippendorff's alpha of -0.47). This failure to effectively reason on the basis of the provided audiovisual data may have arisen because the case videos often capture the expressions and gestures of one speaker at a time rather than capturing the engagement between both speakers simultaneously.

4. Discussion and Future Directions

The MIRS rubric assesses diverse communication skills. Some items assess localized elements (such as the encounter opening) and focus on specific phrases, while others assess recurring elements (like empathy statements) or holistic interaction qualities. While clinical skills assessment rubrics like the MIRS are designed with anchor statements to improve scoring reliability, this variability in items—along with rater characteristics, rubric complexity, and the length of assessment items—can undermine inter-rater reliability.^{37,38} These interpretation challenges are similarly reflected in LLM assessment, where unclear rubric language can lead models to misapply the scoring criteria. Even the perceived politeness of the prompts may impact assessment.³⁹

To address these challenges, we explored various prompting techniques and found that uniformly applied techniques led to performance declines, revealing limitations in common approaches. Few-shot prompting, despite its wide use, led models to overemphasize model language rather than evaluate the overall communication quality. Similarly, multi-step proved ineffective, as the models failed to identify all relevant transcript elements, especially for MIRS items requiring consideration of the full transcript. In contrast, dynamically selecting the optimal technique for each MIRS item showed promise, highlighting the potential for performance enhancement through tailored approaches.

While this study focused on MIRS scoring agreement between LLMs and human raters, LLMs can also provide written feedback, which is an important component of OSCE evaluations. Future work should consider how to align feedback with the learning objectives of clinical skills curricula and students' personal development goals while providing justifiable, targeted areas for improvement. This entails improving prompt design, contextualization, and review by medical students and educators. We encourage researchers to build on our benchmark by developing prompts that guide models toward realistic assessments without unnecessary leniency or bias.

5. Conclusion

In this benchmarking study, we demonstrated the use of LLMs in automating the evaluation of Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCEs). Models exhibited high agreement with human evaluators in identifying students needing support (low-performing scores of 1-2) across assessment items using zero-shot prompting. CoT, few-shot, and multi-step proved useful when tailored to specific assessment items.

Overall, LLMs show promise for effective automation and application to OSCE evaluation, but challenges remain in refining prompt design and ensuring numerical scores and feedback. We provide our prompts and evaluation approach as an initial benchmark and invite further improvements from the research community.

References

- [1] Ratna, H. (2019). The importance of effective communication in healthcare practice. *Harvard Public Health Review*, 23, 1-6.
- [2] Bartlett, G., Blais, R., Tamblyn, R., Clermont, R. J., & MacGibbon, B. (2008). Impact of patient communication problems on the risk of preventable adverse events in acute care settings. *Cmaj*, 178(12), 1555-1562.
- [3] Committee on Quality of Health Care in America. (2001). *Crossing the quality chasm: a new health system for the 21st century*. National Academies Press.
- [4] Khan, K. Z., Ramachandran, S., Gaunt, K., & Pushkar, P. (2013). The objective structured clinical examination (OSCE): AMEE guide no. 81. Part I: an historical and theoretical perspective. *Medical teacher*, 35(9), e1437-e1446.
- [5] Uchida, T., & Cornes, S. (2023). *Standardized Patients*. 3 ed., Elsevier.
- [6] Harrison, C. J., Könings, K. D., Schuwirth, L., Wass, V., & Van der Vleuten, C. (2015). Barriers to the uptake and use of feedback in the context of summative assessment. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 20, 229-245.
- [7] Daniels, V. J., Strand, A. C., Lai, H., & Hillier, T. (2019). Impact of tablet-scoring and immediate score sheet review on validity and educational impact in an internal medicine residency Objective Structured Clinical Exam (OSCE). *Medical Teacher*, 41(9), 1039-1044.
- [8] Mizumoto, A., & Eguchi, M. (2023). Exploring the potential of using an AI language model for automated essay scoring. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*, 2(2), 100050.
- [9] Kazemitabaar, M., Ye, R., Wang, X., Henley, A. Z., Denny, P., Craig, M., & Grossman, T. (2024),

- May). Codeaid: Evaluating a classroom deployment of an llm-based programming assistant that balances student and educator needs. In Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (pp. 1-20).
- [10] Holderried, F., Stegemann-Philipps, C., Herrmann-Werner, A., Festl-Wietek, T., Holderried, M., Eickhoff, C., & Mahling, M. (2024). A language model–powered simulated patient with automated feedback for history taking: Prospective study. *JMIR Medical Education*, 10(1), e59213.
- [11] Cook, D. A. (2024). Creating virtual patients using large language models: scalable, global, and low cost. *Medical teacher*, 1-3.
- [12] Artsi, Y., Sorin, V., Konen, E., Glicksberg, B. S., Nadkarni, G., & Klang, E. (2024). Large language models for generating medical examinations: systematic review. *BMC Medical Education*, 24(1), 354.
- [13] Varas, J., Coronel, B. V., Villagrán, I., et al. (2023). Innovations in surgical training: exploring the role of artificial intelligence and large language models (LLM). *Revista do Colégio Brasileiro de Cirurgiões*, 50, e20233605.
- [14] Mohapatra, D. P., Thiruvoth, F. M., Tripathy, S., et al. (2023). Leveraging Large Language Models (LLM) for the plastic surgery resident training: do they have a role?. *Indian Journal of Plastic Surgery*, 56(05), 413-420.
- [15] Jamieson, A. R., Holcomb, M. J., Dalton, T. O., et al. (2024). Rubrics to Prompts: Assessing Medical Student Post-Encounter Notes with AI. *NEJM AI*, 1(12), AIcs2400631.
- [16] Fernandez, A., Wang, F., Braveman, M., Finkas, L. K., & Hauer, K. E. (2007). Impact of student ethnicity and primary childhood language on communication skill assessment in a clinical performance examination. *Journal of general internal medicine*, 22, 1155-1160.
- [17] Berg, K., Blatt, B., Lopreiato, J., et al. (2015). Standardized patient assessment of medical student empathy: ethnicity and gender effects in a multi-institutional study. *Academic Medicine*, 90(1), 105-111.

- [18] Fluet, A., Essakow, J., & Ju, M. (2022). Standardized patients' perspectives on bias in student encounters. *Academic Medicine*, 97(11S), S29-S34.
- [19] Pfeiffer, C. A., Palten, B., Collins, R. T., et al. Master Interview Rating Scale (MIRS). (2007). <https://health.uconn.edu/principles-clinical-medicine-clinical-skills-assessment/master-interview-rating-scale-mirs/>.
- [20] OpenAI. (2024). Whisper: Automatic speech recognition system. <https://openai.com/index/whisper/>.
- [21] University of Connecticut School of Medicine. (2024). *Principles of clinical medicine: Clinical skills assessment*. <https://health.uconn.edu/principles-clinical-medicine-clinical-skills-assessment/>
- [22] O'Sullivan, P., Chao, S., Russell, M., Levine, S., & Fabiny, A. (2008). Development and implementation of an objective structured clinical examination to provide formative feedback on communication and interpersonal skills in geriatric training. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 56(9), 1730-1735.
- [23] Chandawarkar, R. Y., Ruscher, K. A., Krajewski, A., et al. (2011). Pretraining and posttraining assessment of residents' performance in the fourth accreditation council for graduate medical education competency: patient communication skills. *Archives of Surgery*, 146(8), 916-921.
- [24] Baldwin, J. D., Cox, J., Wu, Z. H., Kenny, A., & Angus, S. (2017). Delivery and measurement of high-value care in standardized patient encounters. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*, 9(5), 645-649.
- [25] The University of Tennessee Health Science Center: Center for Patient Healthcare Improvement and Patient Simulation. Master Interview Rating Scale. <https://www.uthsc.edu/simulation/resources/documents/sp-full-communication-rating-scale-mirs.docx>.
- [26] OpenAI. (2024). Gpt-4o-2024-08-06. <https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/gpt-4o>.
- [27] Anthropic. (2024). Claude-3.5-sonnet-20240620. <https://docs.anthropic.com/en/docs/about-claude/models>.
- [28] Meta. (2024). Llama-v3p1-405b-instruct.

https://www.runpod.io/ppc/models/llama-3.1-405b?inflect=&gc_id=21669076073&gad_source=1&gclid=Cj0KCQiA6Ou5BhCrARIsAPoTxrCGczscQTRqRjav0BGeSDqB_aH53L8U0s2AUXx5cQl8c2_0bIj8uQkaAvUYEALw_wcB.

[29] Google DeepMind. (2024). Gemini-1.5-pro-exp-0801.

<https://ai.google.dev/gemini-api/docs/models/gemini>.

[30] Wei, J., Wang, X., Schuurmans, D., et al. (2022). Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35, 24824-24837.

[31] Wang, Y., Yao, Q., Kwok, J. T., & Ni, L. M. (2020). Generalizing from a few examples: A survey on few-shot learning. *ACM computing surveys (csur)*, 53(3), 1-34.

[32] Firdaus, M., Singh, G., Ekbal, A., & Bhattacharyya, P. (2023, October). Multi-step Prompting for Few-shot Emotion-Grounded Conversations. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management* (pp. 3886-3891).

[33] Krippendorff, K. (2011). Computing Krippendorff's Alpha Reliability.

<https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=de8e2c7b7992028cf035f8d907635de871ed627d>.

[34] Marzi, G., Balzano, M., & Marchiori, D. (2024). K-Alpha Calculator–Krippendorff's Alpha Calculator: A user-friendly tool for computing Krippendorff's Alpha inter-rater reliability coefficient. *MethodsX*, 12, 102545.

[35] Castro, S. (2017). Fast Krippendorff: Fast computation of Krippendorff's alpha agreement measure. GitHub. GitHub repository. Software.

[36] Joyce, B. L., Steenbergh, T., & Scher, E. (2010). Use of the Kalamazoo essential elements communication checklist (adapted) in an institutional interpersonal and communication skills curriculum. *Journal of graduate medical education*, 2(2), 165-169.

[37] John Bernardin, H., Thomason, S., Ronald Buckley, M., & Kane, J. S. (2016). Rater rating-level bias

and accuracy in performance appraisals: The impact of rater personality, performance management competence, and rater accountability. *Human Resource Management*, 55(2), 321-340.

[38] Vu, N. V., Marcy, M. M., Colliver, J. A., Verhulst, S. J., Travis, T. A., & Barrows, H. S. (1992). Standardized (simulated) patients' accuracy in recording clinical performance check-list items. *Medical Education*, 26(2), 99-104.

[39] Yin, Z., Wang, H., Horio, K., Kawahara, D., & Sekine, S. (2024). Should We Respect LLMs? A Cross-Lingual Study on the Influence of Prompt Politeness on LLM Performance. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14531.

Supplementary Appendix

Table S1. Average Performance (with Standard Error) of Each Model Using Different Prompting Techniques Measured with Different Accuracy Metrics

Accuracy Metric	Technique	Claude 3.5	Gemini 1.5 Pro	GPT-4o	Llama 3.1
Exact	Zero-Shot Baseline	0.41 ± 0.04	0.35 ± 0.02	0.41 ± 0.03	0.44 ± 0.03
Off-by-One		0.87 ± 0.02	0.82 ± 0.03	0.79 ± 0.03	0.80 ± 0.03
Thresholded		0.88 ± 0.03	0.86 ± 0.03	0.83 ± 0.02	0.86 ± 0.02
Exact	Zero-Shot with CoT Reasoning	0.41 ± 0.04	0.27 ± 0.03	0.39 ± 0.03	0.40 ± 0.04
Off-by-One		0.79 ± 0.03	0.67 ± 0.04	0.79 ± 0.03	0.80 ± 0.03
Thresholded		0.87 ± 0.03	0.75 ± 0.03	0.83 ± 0.03	0.88 ± 0.03
Exact	Few-Shot	0.32 ± 0.05	0.30 ± 0.03	0.40 ± 0.04	0.40 ± 0.04
Off-by-One		0.85 ± 0.03	0.74 ± 0.03	0.79 ± 0.03	0.82 ± 0.03
Thresholded		0.87 ± 0.02	0.77 ± 0.03	0.83 ± 0.03	0.86 ± 0.02
Exact	Multi-Step	0.36 ± 0.05	0.25 ± 0.03	0.34 ± 0.04	0.37 ± 0.04
Off-by-One		0.72 ± 0.05	0.63 ± 0.03	0.74 ± 0.03	0.74 ± 0.04
Thresholded		0.78 ± 0.04	0.64 ± 0.04	0.79 ± 0.02	0.78 ± 0.03
Exact	Optimal per Item	0.52 ± 0.04	0.44 ± 0.03	0.49 ± 0.03	0.52 ± 0.04
Off-by-One		0.91 ± 0.02	0.87 ± 0.03	0.87 ± 0.02	0.86 ± 0.02
Thresholded		0.91 ± 0.02	0.87 ± 0.03	0.89 ± 0.02	0.91 ± 0.02

Table S2. Agreement Between Human Raters and Models Across Prompting Strategies Using Krippendorff's Alpha

Technique	GPT	Claude	Gemini	Llama
Zero-Shot Baseline	0.41	0.38	0.31	0.37
Zero-Shot with CoT Reasoning	0.35	0.28	0.13	0.32
Few-Shot	0.45	0.33	0.27	0.39
Multi-Step	0.37	0.29	0.15	0.37

Figure S1. The University of Connecticut MIRS Rubric

Copyrighted to Theresa A. Thomas Professional Skills Teaching & Assessment Center,
Eastern Virginia Medical School

MIRS FORM 2006		
MASTER INTERVIEW RATING SCALE		
8/22/07		
<u>ITEM 1 – OPENING</u>		
[5]	[4]	[1]
The interviewer introduces himself, clarifies his roles, and inquires how to address patient. Uses patient name.	[3]	There is no introduction.
	[2]	
<u>ITEM 2 – ELICITS SPECTRUM OF CONCERNS</u>		
[5]	[4]	[1]
The interviewer elicits the patient’s full spectrum of concerns within the first 3-5 minutes of the interview.	[3]	The interviewer fails to elicit the patient’s concern.
	[2]	
<u>ITEM 3 – NEGOTIATES PRIORITIES & SETS AGENDA</u>		
[5]	[4]	[1]
The interviewer fully negotiates priorities of patient concerns, listing all of the concerns and sets the agenda at the onset of the interview. The patient is invited to participate in making an agreed plan. (<i>communication cases</i>)	[3]	The interviewer does not negotiate priorities or set an agenda. The interviewer focuses only on the chief complaint and takes only the physician’s needs into account.
	[2]	
<u>ITEM 4 – ELICITING THE NARRATIVE THREAD or the “PATIENT’S STORY”</u>		
[5]	[4]	[1]
The interviewer encourages and lets the patient talk about their problem. The interviewer does not stop the patient or introduce new information.	[3]	The interviewer fails to let the patient talk about their problem. OR The interviewer sets the pace with Q & A style, not conversation.
	[2]	
<u>ITEM 5 - TIMELINE</u>		
[5]	[4]	[1]
The interviewer obtains sufficient information so that a chronology of the chief complaint and history of the present illness can be established. The chronology of all associated symptoms is also established.	[3]	The interviewer fails to obtain information necessary to establish a chronology.
	[2]	
<u>ITEM 6 – ORGANIZATION</u>		
[5]	[4]	[1]
Questions in the body of the interview follow a logical order to the patient.	[3]	The interviewer asks questions that seem disjointed and unorganized.
	[2]	

ITEM 7 – TRANSITIONAL STATEMENTS

[5]	[4]	[3]	[2]	[1]
The interviewer utilizes transitional statements that explain the reasons for progressing from one subsection to another (only in a complete history)	The interviewer sometimes introduces subsections with effective transitional statements but fails to do so at other times.	OR Some of the transitional statements used are lacking in quality.	The interviewer progresses from one subsection to another in such a manner that the patient is left with a feeling of uncertainty as to the purpose of the questions.	No transitional statements are made.

ITEM 8 – PACING OF INTERVIEW

[5]	[4]	[3]	[2]	[1]
The interviewer is attentive to the patient's responses. The interviewer listens without interruption. The interview progresses smoothly with no awkward pauses. Silence may be used deliberately.	The pace of the interview is comfortable most of the time, but the interviewer occasionally interrupts the patient and/or allows awkward pauses to break the flow of the interview.		The interviewer frequently interrupts the patient and there are awkward pauses, which break the flow of the interview.	

ITEM 9 - QUESTIONING SKILLS – TYPES OF QUESTIONS

[5]	[4]	[3]	[2]	[1]
The interviewer begins information gathering with an open-ended question. This is followed up by more specific or direct questions. Each major line of questioning is begun with an open-ended question. No poor question types are used.	The interviewer often fails to begin a line of inquiry with open-ended questions but rather employs specific or direct questions to gather information. OR The interviewer uses a few leading, why or multiple questions.		The interviewer asks many why questions, multiple questions, or leading questions.	

ITEM 10 – QUESTIONING SKILLS - SUMMARIZING

[5]	[4]	[3]	[2]	[1]
The interviewer summarizes the data obtained at the end of each major line of inquiry or subsection to verify and/or clarify the information (complete hx, focused history: one summary is sufficient)	The interviewer summarizes the data at the end of some lines of inquiry but not consistently or completely or attempts to summarize at the end of the interview and it is incomplete.		The interviewer fails to summarize any of the data obtained.	

ITEM 11 – QUESTIONING SKILLS – DUPLICATION

[5]	[4]	[3]	[2]	[1]
The interviewer does not repeat questions, seeking duplication of information that has previously been provided, <i>unless</i> clarification or summarization of prior information is necessary.	The interviewer only rarely repeats questions. Questions are repeated not for the purpose of summarization or clarification of information, but as a result of the interviewer's failure to remember the data.		The interviewer frequently repeats questions seeking information previously provided because he fails to remember the data already obtained.	

ITEM 12 - QUESTIONING SKILLS – LACK OF JARGON

[5]	[4]	[3]	[2]	[1]
The interviewer asks questions and provides information in language which is easily understood. Content is free of difficult medical terms and jargon. Words are immediately defined for the patient. Language is used that is appropriate to the patient's level of education.	The interviewer occasionally uses medical jargon during the interview failing to define the medical terms for the patient unless specifically requested to do so by the patient.			The interviewer uses difficult medical terms and jargon throughout the interview.

ITEM 13 - QUESTIONING SKILLS – VERIFICATION OF PATIENT INFORMATION

[5]	[4]	[3]	[2]	[1]
The interviewer always seeks clarification, verification and specificity of the patient's responses.	The interviewer will seek clarification, verification and specificity of the patient's responses but not always.			The interviewer fails to clarify or verify patient's responses, accepting information at face value.

ITEM 14 –INTERACTIVE TECHNIQUES

[5]	[4]	[3]	[2]	[1]
The interviewer consistently uses the patient-centered technique. The interviewer mixes patient-centered and physician-centered styles that promote a collaborative partnership between patient and doctor.	The interviewer initially uses a patient-centered style but reverts to physician-centered interview at the end (rarely returning the lead to the patient). OR The interviewer uses all patient-centered interviewing and fails to use physician-centered style and therefore does not accomplish the negotiated agenda.			The interview does not follow the patient's lead. Uses only physician-centered technique halting the collaborative partnership.

ITEM 15 – VERBAL FACILITATION SKILLS

[5]	[4]	[3]	[2]	[1]
The interviewer uses facilitation skills through the interview. Verbal encouragement, use of short statements, and echoing are used regularly when appropriate. The interviewer provides the patient with intermittent verbal encouragement, such as verbally praising the patient for proper health care technique.	The interviewer uses some facilitative skills but not consistently or at inappropriate times. Verbal encouragement could be used more effectively.			The interviewer fails to use facilitative skills to encourage the patient to tell his story.

ITEM 16 – NON-VERBAL FACILITATION SKILLS

[5]	[4]	[3]	[2]	[1]
The interviewer puts the patient at ease and facilitates communication by using: Good eye contact; Relaxed, open body language; Appropriate facial expression; Eliminating physical barriers; and Making appropriate physical contact with the patient.	The interviewer makes some use of facilitative techniques but could be more consistent. One or two techniques are not used effectively. OR Some physical barrier may be present.			The interviewer makes no attempt to put the patient at ease. Body language is negative or closed. OR Any annoying mannerism (foot or pencil tapping) intrudes on the interview. Eye contact is not attempted or is uncomfortable.

ITEM 17 – EMPATHY AND ACKNOWLEDGING PATIENT CUES

[5]	[4]	[3]	[2]	[1]
The interviewer uses supportive comments regarding the patient's emotions. The interviewer uses NURS (name, understand, respect, support) or specific techniques for demonstrating empathy.	The interviewer is neutral, neither overly positive nor negative in demonstrating empathy.		No empathy is demonstrated. The interviewer uses a negative emphasis or openly criticizes the patient.	

ITEM 18 – PATIENT'S PERSPECTIVE (BELIEFS)

[5]	[4]	[3]	[2]	[1]
The interviewer elicits the patient's healing practices and perspectives on his illness, including his beliefs about its beginning, Feelings, Ideas of cause, Function and Expectations (FIFE).	The interviewer elicits some of the patient's perspective on his illness AND/OR The interviewer does not follow through with addressing beliefs.		The interviewer fails to elicit the patient's perspective.	

ITEM 19 – IMPACT OF ILLNESS ON PATIENT AND PATIENT'S SELF-IMAGE

[5]	[4]	[3]	[2]	[1]
The interviewer inquires about the patient's feelings about his illness, how it has changed his life. The interviewer explores these issues. The interviewer offers counseling or resources to help. This is used in communication cases.	The interviewer partially addresses the impact of the illness on the patient's life or self-image. AND/OR The interviewer offers no counseling or resources to help.		The interviewer fails to acknowledge any impact of the illness on the patient's life or self-image.	

ITEM 20 – IMPACT OF ILLNESS ON FAMILY

[5]	[4]	[3]	[2]	[1]
The interviewer inquires about the structure of the patient's family. The interviewer addresses the impact of the patient's illness and/or treatment on family. The interviewer explores these issues.	The interviewer recognizes the impact of the illness or treatment on the family members and on family lifestyle but fails to explore these issues adequately.		The interviewer fails to address the impact of the illness or treatment on the family members and on family lifestyle.	

ITEM 21 – SUPPORT SYSTEMS

[5]	[4]	[3]	[2]	[1]
The interviewer determines what emotional support the patient has. The interviewer determines what financial support the patient has and learns about health care access The interviewer inquires about other resources available to the patient and family and suggests appropriate community resources. (will be focused in focused histories)	The interviewer determines some of the available support.		The interviewer fails to determine what support is currently available to the patient.	

ITEM 22 – PATIENT’S EDUCATION & UNDERSTANDING

[5]	[4]	[3]	[2]	[1]
The interviewer uses deliberate techniques to check the patient’s understanding of information given during the interview including diagnosis. If English proficiency is limited an interpreter is offered. Techniques may include asking the patient to repeat information, asking if the patient has additional questions, posing hypothetical situations or asking the patient to demonstrate techniques. When patient education is a goal, the interviewer determines the patient’s level of interest and provides education appropriately.	The interviewer asks the patient if he understands the information but does not use a deliberate technique to check. Some attempt to determine the interest in patient education but could be more thorough.		The interviewer fails to assess patient’s level of understanding and does not effectively correct misunderstandings when they are evident. AND/OR The interviewer fails to address the issue of patient education.	

ITEM 23 – ASSESS MOTIVATION FOR CHANGES

[5]	[4]	[3]	[2]	[1]
The interviewer inquires how the patient feels about the lifestyle/behavioral change and offers options and plans for the patient to choose from to encourage and/or support the change.	The interviewer inquires how the patient feels about changes but does not offer options or plans. OR The interviewer assumes the patient will follow the suggested change without assessing change but does offer options and plans.		The interviewer fails to assess patient’s level of motivation to change and does not offer any options or plans.	

ITEM 24 – ADMITTING LACK OF KNOWLEDGE

[5]	[4]	[3]	[2]	[1]
The interviewer, when asked for information or advice that he is not equipped to provide, admits to his lack of knowledge in that area but immediately offers to seek resources to answer the question(s).	The interviewer, when asked for information or advice that he is not equipped to provide, admits lack of knowledge, but rarely seeks other resources for answers.		The interviewer, when asked for information, which he is not equipped to provide, makes up answers in an attempt to satisfy the patient’s questions, but never refers to other resources.	

ITEM 25 – INFORMED CONSENT FOR INVESTIGATIONS & PROCEDURES

[5]	[4]	[3]	[2]	[1]
The interviewer discusses the purpose and nature of all investigations and procedures. The interviewer reviews foreseeable risks and benefits of the proposed investigation or procedure. The interviewer discloses alternative investigations or procedures and their relative risks and benefits. Taking no action is considered always considered an alternative.	The interviewer discusses some aspects of the investigations and procedures but omits some elements of informed consent.		The interviewer fails to discuss investigations or procedures.	

ITEM 26 – ACHIEVE A SHARED PLAN

[5]	[4]	[3]	[2]	[1]
The interviewer discusses the diagnosis and/or prognosis and negotiates a plan with the patient. The interviewer invites the patient to contribute his own thoughts, ideas, suggestions and preferences.	The interviewer discusses the diagnosis and/or prognosis and plan but does not allow the patient to contribute. Lacks full quality.			The interviewer fails to discuss diagnosis and/or prognosis.

ITEM 27 – ENCOURAGEMENT OF QUESTIONS

[5]	[4]	[3]	[2]	[1]
The interviewer encourages the patient to ask questions at the end of a major subsection. The interviewer gives the patient the opportunity to bring up additional topics or points not covered in the interview.	The interviewer provides the patient with the opportunity to discuss any additional points or ask any additional questions but neither encourages nor discourages him.			The interviewer fails to provide the patient with the opportunity to ask questions or discuss additional points. The interviewer may discourage the patient's questions.

ITEM 28 – CLOSURE

[5]	[4]	[3]	[2]	[1]
At the end of the interview the interviewer clearly specifies the future plans: What the interviewer will do (leave and consult, make referrals) What the patient will do (wait, make diet changes, go to Physical Therapy); When (the time of the next communication or appointment.)	At the end of the interview, the interviewer partially details the plans for the future.			At the end of the interview, the interviewer fails to specify the plans for the future and the patient leaves the interview without a sense of what to expect. There is no closure whatsoever.