

Exploring Large Language Models in Healthcare: Insights into Corpora Sources, Customization Strategies, and Evaluation Metrics

Shuqi Yang¹, Mingrui Jin¹, Shuai Wang², Jiaxin Kou¹, Manfei Shi¹,
Weijie Xing¹, Yan Hu¹, Zheng Zhu^{*1}

¹ School of Nursing, Fudan University, Shanghai, China

² School of Nursing, Dali University, Yunnan, China

* Corresponding author

Abstract

Introduction: Large Language Models (LLMs) are playing an increasingly vital role in healthcare, offering significant potential to transform various aspects of medical practice, particularly in question-answering systems. This study aims to review the corpora sources, customization techniques, and evaluation metrics of LLMs in healthcare.

Methods: A systematic search was conducted in PubMed/MEDLINE, Embase (OVID), Scopus (Elsevier), and Web of Science databases to identify studies between 2021 and 2024 that applied LLMs for delivering medical information. Data were extracted on LLMs' training corpora sources, construction methods, base models, AI customization techniques, and performance evaluation metrics.

Results: A total of 61 articles were included. The corpus sources used in the reviewed LLMs were categorized into four main types: real-world clinical resources (n=24), literature materials (n=34), open-source datasets (n=33), and web-crawled data (n=11). Notably, 44 studies employed a combination of multiple data sources to implement a more comprehensive model training approach. The primary techniques for constructing LLMs included pre-training, prompt engineering, retrieval-augmented generation, model fine-tuning, in-context learning, and offline learning. Fourteen studies used a single customization technique, while 41 studies combined these methods during model development. The evaluation metrics were classified into three main domains: 1) process metrics, 2) usability metrics, and 3) outcome metrics. The outcome metrics could also be divided into two categories: model-based outcomes and expert-assessed outcomes.

Conclusion: We identified critical gaps in corpus fairness, contributing to biases from geographic, cultural, and socio-economic factors. The reliance on unverified or unstructured data highlights the need for better integration of evidence-based clinical guidelines. Future research should focus on developing a tiered corpus architecture with vetted sources and dynamic weighting, while ensuring model transparency. Additionally, the lack of standardized evaluation frameworks for domain-specific models calls for comprehensive validation of LLMs in real-world healthcare settings.

Keywords: Large language model; Artificial intelligence; Corpora; Customization techniques; Evaluation metrics; Healthcare,

1. Background

Large Language Models (LLMs) have become increasingly important in healthcare, offering substantial promise in revolutionizing various aspects of medical practice, particularly in the context of question-answering systems. These models, powered by deep learning algorithms and large-scale corpora of textual data, are capable of understanding and generating human-like text in response to queries. In healthcare, LLMs are being applied in a wide range of domains, such as clinical decision support, medical literature review, patient communication, and personalized treatment recommendations^{1,2,3,4}. The ability of LLMs to process vast amounts of medical information and generate contextually relevant responses makes them invaluable tools for improving healthcare efficiency and patient outcomes.

However, a critical issue limiting the widespread use of LLMs in question-answering systems within clinical settings is the phenomenon of model hallucination. Hallucinations occur when the LLMs generate information that is factually incorrect, irrelevant, or fabricated, which can be particularly dangerous in the medical field⁵. For example, incorrect drug interactions or fabricated medical advice can lead to dire consequences for patients. Studies have highlighted the frequency of hallucinations in medical applications, with reports indicating that LLMs can produce erroneous responses up to 20-30% of the time in certain clinical tasks^{1,2,3,4,5,6,7}. This presents a significant challenge for integrating LLMs into clinical workflows, where accuracy and reliability are paramount.

To mitigate these risks, significant improvements have been made in both the data sources used for training and the data enhancement methods. Research suggests that the quality and diversity of the training datasets are crucial for developing more accurate and context-specific models⁸. Curated datasets, such as those derived from clinical guidelines, patient records, and peer-reviewed medical literature, have been found to significantly improve model performance⁹. Additionally, recent advancements in retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) methods—where LLMs are augmented with external data sources in real time—have shown promise in improving the factual accuracy of model outputs. Techniques such as retrieval-based fine-tuning and knowledge-based augmentation help reduce the risk of hallucinations by providing the LLMs with access to reliable, up-to-date information¹⁰. These methods aim to bridge the gap between the model's internal knowledge and real-world clinical data, thus enhancing model accuracy and clinical relevance.

In addition, the evaluation of LLMs in healthcare remains an area of significant uncertainty. Current evaluation frameworks vary widely, with some focusing primarily on task-specific metrics such as accuracy and F1 score, while others emphasize clinical outcomes or user satisfaction¹¹. There are some evaluation frameworks that heavily rely on task-specific metrics and expert assessments, while overlooking clinical relevance and ethics. Without a robust set of evaluation

criteria, it is challenging to objectively compare the performance of different models and ensure that they meet the high standards required for clinical deployment.

Despite these advancements, there is currently no comprehensive review that systematically evaluates the existing corpora, data enhancement methods, and evaluation metrics for LLM-based question-answering systems in clinical settings. This gap in the literature underscores the need for a scoping review to synthesize current approaches, identify best practices, and propose directions for future research aimed at optimizing the application of LLMs in clinical practice. By consolidating existing evidence, this review will provide a clearer understanding of how to enhance the reliability and applicability of LLMs in real-world healthcare settings.

2. Methods

2.1 Study design

This scoping review was conducted in accordance with the JBI scoping review methodology¹² and followed to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) checklist¹³ for its execution and reporting (Appendix I).

2.2 Literature search

A three-step search strategy was employed to identify relevant literature. First, a preliminary search in PubMed/MEDLINE was conducted to identify a small set of relevant studies, which informed the development of a more comprehensive search strategy. Second, a comprehensive search across multiple databases, including PubMed/MEDLINE, Embase (Ovid), Web of Science, and Scopus, focusing on publications from 2021 to 2025. The starting point of 2021 was chosen as it marks a pivotal moment in the evolution of LLMs. In 2020, OpenAI released GPT-3, a model featuring 175 billion parameters, setting a new standard in the field. Subsequently, in 2021, Google introduced the Switch Transformer, which surpassed the trillion-parameter threshold for the first time. This milestone initiated a new era of exponential growth in the scale and capabilities of language models, driving significant advancements in AI research and applications, particularly in healthcare. Publications after 2021 are expected to capture the state-of-the-art developments and applications of these advanced models. Consequently, studies published before 2021 were excluded from our search, as they predominantly focused on earlier pre-trained models with smaller parameter sizes, which are less representative of the capabilities of contemporary LLMs.

In PubMed, a combination of free words and MeSH terms was utilized. The search terms included ("large language model"[Title/Abstract] OR "LLM"[Title/Abstract] OR "generative pre -trained transformer"[Title/Abstract]) OR ("GPT"[Title/Abstract] OR "ChatGPT"[Title/Abstract] OR "GPT-3"[Title/Abstract] OR "GPT-4"[Title/Abstract] OR "LLAMA"[Title/Abstract] OR "BERT"[Title/Abstract])

OR "Claude"[Title/Abstract]) AND (("Health"[MeSH Terms]
OR "mental health"[Title/Abstract] OR "physical
health"[Title/Abstract]) OR ("medical"[Title/Abstract]
OR "medicine"[Title/Abstract] OR
"healthcare*"[Title/Abstract])). Additionally, preprint repositories such
as arXiv, SSRN, and Research Square were included in the search.
A manual search was conducted on the reference lists of all included
papers to identify any additional eligible studies. The complete search strategy
is presented in Appendix II.

2.3 Inclusion and exclusion criteria

The inclusion criteria for this review were as follows: 1) studies with significant relevance to the development or application of LLMs; 2) research specifically related to the medical or healthcare field; 3) LLMs designed to provide medical or care-related information to users via dialogue interfaces; 4) articles written in English. The exclusion criteria were: 1) studies focused on early pre-trained models, such as GPT-2, which do not reflect the current advancements in LLMs' capabilities, and 2) non-primary research, including reviews, commentaries, or editorial pieces; 3) studies that did not specify the methods used for training LLMs; 4) studies that involved tasks such as using LLMs to build prediction models, classification models, or medical named entity recognition models.

2.4 Study selection

The search results were imported into EndNote (Clarivate Analytics, Philadelphia, PA, USA), where duplicate entries were removed. The study selection process was conducted independently by two reviewers (MJ and SW). Discrepancies between the reviewers were resolved through discussion, with any unresolved conflicts were adjudicated by a third reviewer (SY). The screening process began with an initial review of titles and abstracts, followed by a full-text assessment of studies deemed potentially relevant.

2.5 Data extraction

Three reviewers (SY, MJ and SW) used a customized data extraction form to collect relevant information. The extracted data included study titles, authors, citations, year of publication, country, research field, setting, study design, target population, LLMs corpus sources, construction methods, base models, data enhancement technologies, quantitative evaluation indicators, and qualitative evaluation indicators. Data extraction was independently performed by two reviewers, with discrepancies resolved through discussion. In cases where a consensus could not be reached, a third reviewer (ZZ) was consulted to make the final decision.

3. Result

3.1 Literature search

A total of 14,744 studies were identified through the database search (Figure 1). After duplicates were removed and titles and abstracts were screened, 248 studies were selected for full-text review. Of these, 61 articles met the inclusion criteria and were

included in the analysis. The excluded studies, along with the reasons for their exclusion, are detailed in Appendix III .

3.2 Study description

Table 1 provides an overview of the general characteristics of the studies included in the final analysis. The number of studies on the application of LLMs in healthcare steadily increased showed a steady increase over the years, with one study published in 2022, 14 studies in 2023, and 46 studies in 2024. The studies were distributed across multiple countries, with the United States contributing the highest number (N=26), followed by China (N=18). Other countries included Australia (N=3), Korea (N=3), Canada (N=3), Italy (N=2), and Germany (N=2).

3.3 Application areas and target populations of LLMs in healthcare

The characteristics of the included studies are summarized in Table 1. Among the 61 studies, LLMs were developed in three primary types: single-domain applications, multi-domain applications, and unspecified domain application. Single-domain applications focused on specific medical fields. Oncology was the most frequently studied domain, represented by seven studies^{17,41,46,47,55,60}, followed by ophthalmology with six studies^{34,37,40,43,57,69}, hepatology^{24,54} and orthopedics^{16,66} were each addressed in two studies, while the following fields were each represented by a single study: neurosurgery²⁰, otolaryngology²⁸, endocrinology²⁹, nephrology³⁰, pediatrics⁴⁸, and neurology⁴⁹. Multi-domain applications included a broader range of disciplines, including diverse diseases, public health, traditional Chinese medicine (TCM), mental health, and medical education. Four studies specifically addressed mental health issues, with Kharitonova's study focusing on depression and Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD)^{25,39,50,58}. Five studies were dedicated to TCM^{22,35,53,56,64}, and three studies explored medical education, two of which specifically examined specialized training in anatomical sciences and surgical and anesthetic education^{18,21,44}. Other domains included radiology (n=3)^{15,33,62}, pharmaceutical sciences (n=2)^{31,42} and nutriology (n=2)^{14,71}. Additionally, 16 studies focus on unspecified domain applications, which are widely utilized across various medical fields to address diverse challenges and enhance clinical practices^{19,23,26,27,32,36,38,45,51,58,60,62,64,66,71,73}.

Sixty-one studies that developed LLMs primarily targeted two groups: patients and individuals seeking medical support, and healthcare providers. The majority of the LLMs (33 studies) were designed to assist healthcare providers in efficiently obtaining and analyzing medical information^{18,22,24,26,28,32,33,34,35,38,42,44,47,51,54,55,57,59,62,66,67,70,72-74}. Ten studies focused on LLMs designed to assist patients or individuals seeking medical support, enabling them to access information in a more accessible and comprehensible manner. Eighteen studies constructed LLMs that served to both groups. These LLMs typically lacked a defined target audience and instead focused on providing relevant knowledge tailored to the specific needs of their respective fields.

3.3 Corpus sources in LLMs research

Table 1 also summarized the corpus sources of the included LLMs, categorized into four primary types: real-world clinical resources, literature materials, open-source datasets, and web-crawled data.

Real-world clinical resources constituted a key category, with 24 studies^{14, 17,24,27,28,30,32,33,38,39,41,44,48,55,56,67,69,71,74} utilizing clinical data such as Electronic Health Records (EHRs), diagnostic reports, real-world case data, medical podcast, and expert-drafted clinical cases from hospitals worldwide.

Literature materials were another key sources of healthcare LLMs' training, with 34 studies^{16, 18,21,23,24,26,28-31,33,34,36,38,40,41,47-49,52-54,56-60,63,66,69,72} leveraging verified, high-level, evidence-based literature. These sources included textbooks, clinical guidelines, peer-reviewed journal articles, and other authoritative resources.

Open-source datasets were widely used in research, with 33 studies^{15, 18, 19,27,28,31,32,34,36,38-40,42,44,45,48-50,52,53,56,57,59-64,69,70} leveraging publicly available datasets. Datasets from 24 studies included validated question-answer (QA) pairs derived from established medical QA datasets, such as SQuAD-IT, MedMCQA, MedQA-USMLE, PubMedQA, emrQA, and other specialized-domain QA benchmarks^{15, 19,22,27,28,31,32,34,36,38,40,44,45,48,49,53,56,57,59,61,63,70}. Additionally, ten studies^{17,45,47,57,64,65,67,71,73,74} used virtual synthetic datasets, including virtual doctor-patient dialogue collections, virtual cases, and medical information generated and organized through simulated data. Two studies^{45,57} combined real-world and synthetic datasets to optimize training.

Web-crawled data was another important source, utilized in eleven studies^{18,20,21,25,26,27,43,51,57,61,65}. This data was scraped from publicly available medical content on the internet, including health forums, medical websites, and social media platforms. Two studies^{21,25} incorporated unverified data, while six^{37,43,46,51,57,61,65} focused on unstructured datasets, such as real-world doctor-patient dialogue datasets.

Among the studies, 44 combined multiple types of data sources to adopt a more comprehensive model training approach. Six studies relied only on academic literature sources^{23,29,54,58,66,72}, four used only open-source datasets^{22,32,62,70}, three used real-world clinical resources exclusively^{14,47,55}, three relied solely on web-crawled data^{25,43,51}, and one study utilized only virtual datasets⁷³.

3.4 Base model of LLMs

Table 2 showed the base models of the included LLMs. These models could be grouped into several key categories. The GPT series, including GPT-3, GPT-3.5, and GPT-4, accounted for 26 studies^{16-18,20,23,24,28-34,39,41,42,49,50,54,58,60,71-74}. The LLaMA series, including 15 models such as

LLaMA-2 and its variants (7B, 13B, and 70B) ^{14,27,36,44,51,55,58,61,64-68}. Additionally, some architectures were developed based on the

LLaMA framework. The Mistral series, with four models, focused on instruction tuning to enhance the models' ability to follow user commands^{19,44,47,59}. The Baichuan series, consisting of five models, emerged as a prominent Chinese domestic base model^{22,35,48,53,69}. The Vicuna^{21,70}, Ziya-LLaMA-13B^{56,63} and ChatGLM^{37,40} series were each used in two studies. Each of the following smaller models was used in a single study: IT5¹⁵, Aquila-7B⁴⁵, Alpaca-7B⁶², RoBERTa⁴³, BERT³⁸, Gemini Pro⁴⁷, WenZhong²⁵, and PanGu pre-trained models²⁵.

3.5 AI customization techniques of LLMs in healthcare

The AI customization techniques of LLMs are summarized in Table 2. The primary techniques for constructing LLMs included pre-training LLMs, prompt engineering, RAG, model fine-tuning, in-context learning, and offline learning. Fourteen studies independently used one of the AI customization techniques^{18,21,34,40-42,51,54,55,64-66,71,72}, while the other 41 studies combined these methods during the model development process^{14-17, 19,20,22-33,35-39,43-50,52,53,55-63,67-70,73,74}.

3.5.1 Pre-training LLMs

Sixteen studies focused on model pre-training^{15, 19,22,25,35,38,44-46,48,53,56,57,63,68}, which involves unsupervised pre-training on unlabeled data, enabling the models to learn general features before fine-tuning for specific tasks.

3.5.2 Prompt engineering

A total of 37 studies utilized prompt engineering, with one study⁷¹ employing this technique independently, while the others combined it with other methods^{14-20,22-33,36,39,40,43,47,49,50,52,53,58-61,63,67,68,73,74}. Zero-shot prompting was the most commonly used approach, applied in eleven studies^{14-17,19,20,63,71}. Seven studies^{17,23,24,29,59,63,73} employed few-shot prompting. Five studies used Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting to guide the model through a structured reasoning process^{22,30,47,49,71}. Eight studies^{26,28,33,59,61,67,74} used instruction-based prompting, which involved providing clear, task-specific instructions to guide the model's responses. In contrast, template-based prompting, used in five studies^{43,50,52,53,58}, relied on a predefined template to structure the prompt consistently. For soft tuning, prompt tuning was employed in four studies^{32,40,68}, enabled efficient task adaptation through gradient-based updates, optimizing memory and storage usage.

3.5.3 RAG

Twenty studies employed RAG^{14, 17,23,24,28-31,34,37,42,47,49,54,58,60,69,70,72}. Twelve studies using naive RAG adopted a basic retrieval method, where knowledge from external sources was encoded as vector representations using sentence transformers^{19,27,29,31-34,50,58,62,73,74}.

Two studies^{23,49} employed Retrieval-Augmented Generation with Knowledge Graphs (RAG-KG), which incorporated structured data and semantic relationships to establish disease-related logic and improve retrieval accuracy. One study focused on RAG combined with a multi-agent orchestration system, which allows for more sophisticated and efficient task execution⁴².

Additionally, five studies highlighted the unique capabilities of RAG when integrated with LangChain technology, which enhanced data retrieval and integration from external tools such as Application Programming Interfaces (APIs) and databases^{14,34,37,60,72}.

3.5.4 Model fine-tuning

Thirty-seven studies used model fine-tuning technique^{14, 15, 19,21,22,25,27,32,35-39,41,43-46,48,50-53,55-57,59,61-69,74}. Model fine-tuning in included studies typically involves two main types: Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT) and Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF).

SFT, used in 13 studies, adapted LLMs to healthcare-specific tasks by training them on instruction-response pairs^{15,27,45,48,50,53,56,59,63,65,69,74}. Eight studies used instruction tuning, particularly full-parameter fine-tuning, to further refine the model, enabling them to generate accurate and contextually relevant responses based on medical instructions^{14,36,46,50,53,62,64,68}.

To address the computational constraints of LLMs, 18 studies used Parameter-Efficient Fine-Tuning (PEFT) methods^{21,22,37,43,48,50-52,55-57,59,62,65,67,69}. Among them, 14 studies used Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA), reducing computational costs with low-rank matrices^{21,22,27,37,43,46,48,50,51,55,56,62,67,69}. Additionally, 5 studies used Quantized Low-Rank Adaptation (QLoRA), incorporating quantized parameters to optimize fine-tuning^{22,52,57,59,65}.

RLHF, used in 4 studies^{45,56,63,65}, refines models by aligning them with human preferences and medical standards. One study also employed Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) to further enhance performance based on human evaluations⁴⁵. Additionally, a study applied Reinforcement Learning from AI Feedback (RLAIF) after SFT, optimizing the model to generate patient-friendly and doctor-like responses with professional medical knowledge and diagnostics⁷⁴.

3.5.5 In-context learning

In-context learning in healthcare LLMs was employed in four studies to improve model performance by utilizing relevant external context in real-time inputs^{20,33,70,73}. One study combined in-context learning with RAG to incorporate contextually relevant data for accurate responses⁶⁶. Additionally, two studies integrated in-context learning with Langchain framework, enhancing data retrieval from external tools^{20,73}.

3.5.6 Offline learning

One study applied offline knowledge distillation to enhance user intent extraction by transferring knowledge from a teacher model, improving accuracy without real-time updates, and supporting tasks like PRO data collection within computational limits¹⁷.

3.6 Evaluation approaches of LLMs in healthcare

The evaluation approaches of LLMs in healthcare included three approaches. Human-based evaluation focusing on task examinations was used in 36 studies^{14-20,22,24-29,31-34,36,37,39-41,45,48,50,53,59,62,63,64,67-69,73,74}, while 15 studies used human-based evaluation for case analysis^{19,22,25,30,35,36,42,46,50,53,54,66,69-71}. In addition, 43 studies employed model-based evaluation for the same purpose^{15, 16, 18-22,24,25,27,29,32,35,38,39,41-45,48-53,55-58,60,61,63,65,67-72,74}. Eleven studies combined multiple evaluation methods to assess model performance^{19,22,25,35,36,42,50,53,69-71}.

The expert-assessed outcome metrics evaluated using five primary measurement methods. Likert scales or binary/multiple-choice evaluation scales were employed in 18 studies^{15, 17, 19,20,25,26,27,31,32,37,42,50,59,62,63,64,69,73}. Unstructured feedback was collected

in 16 studies, offering more detailed and subjective insights into model performance^{19,22,25,30,35,36,39,42,47,53,54,66,70,71}. The comparison of model responses with human expert-provided answers served as the gold standard in 15 studies, offering a direct benchmark for model performance^{14-17,21,22,24,25,28,29,33,34,36,67,68}. Performance rankings based on comparisons between different models were used in two studies^{36,48}. The comparison of predicted versus actual responses in two studies aimed to evaluate the models' accuracy and reliability in forecasting outcomes^{25,45}. Additionally, the presence or absence of specific categories within model responses was assessed in four studies^{14, 16, 18, 47}.

3.7 Evaluation metrics of LLMs in healthcare

The reviewed studies predominantly employed systematic evaluation approaches, with only one study excluding model performance assessment²³. Based on our analysis, the evaluation metrics utilized across these studies can be categorized into three primary domains: 1) process metrics, 2) usability metrics, and 3) usability metrics.

3.7.1 Process metrics

As systematically categorized in Table 3, the process evaluation metrics for LLMs in healthcare applications included ten distinct dimensions. The most frequently used process evaluation metrics were repetition testing turns^{33,34,45,53,56,63,74} and model size^{32,38,44,46,53,68,69}, each being evaluated in seven independent studies (n=7). Repetition testing turns were primarily employed to assess the model's consistency maintenance during iterative clinical interactions, while model size evaluations focused on computational capacity analysis and resource allocation requirements. Secondary process metrics included training parameters^{38,46,56,57,58}, which were examined in five studies (n=5) to investigate the correlation between specific configurations and model performance. Response time metrics^{17,20,21,33,46}, evaluated in four studies (n=4), provided critical insights into the models' operational efficiency in time-sensitive clinical scenarios. Additionally, output length analysis^{21,39,65}, conducted in three studies (n=3), served as a quantitative measure for evaluating response conciseness and clinical relevance.

3.7.2 Usability evaluation metrics

The usability evaluation metrics of LLMs in healthcare are summarized in Table 3. The most commonly used metric was user helpfulness, assessed in nine studies^{16,25,27,39,48,50,62,64,73}. Other metrics, such as user intent fulfillment¹⁶, response costs³³, personalization⁷¹, and interactivity⁷¹, were each evaluated in one study.

3.7.3 Outcome metrics

Outcome metrics were categorized into two main types: model-based outcomes and expert-assessed outcomes. As shown in Table 4, the model-based outcome metrics for LLMs in healthcare were further classified into two groups: (1) general domain standard metrics and (2) automated metrics evaluation using structured prompts in LLMs.

We identified 17 model-based outcomes across the included studies. Accuracy emerged as the most prevalent metric (n=20)^{15, 16, 18, 19,20,21,29,32,38,44,49,50,52,57,58,63,68,70,71,74}. Precision (n= 13)^{17,22,27,29,32,38,43,46,51,57,61,67,72}, recall (n= 13)^{17,22,27,29,32,38,43,46,51,57,61,67,72}, and F1 score (n=15)^{15, 17,22,27,29,32,38,42,43,46,51,57,61,67,72} were typically used together as components of the Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers (BERT) score evaluation system. Ten studies employed Bilingual Evaluation Understudy (BLEU)^{24,35,39,43,46,48,50,63,69,74}, and eleven studies employed Recall-Oriented Understudy for Gisting Evaluation (ROUGE)^{24,25,35,43,46,48,55,63,69,72,74}. Additionally, four studies employed distinct^{25,43,48,74} and three studies used Metric for Evaluation of Translation with Explicit Ordering (METEOR) score^{24,50,72} as supplementary metrics to assess diversity and semantic accuracy. Additionally, three studies used cosine similarity to evaluate semantic alignment between model-generated responses and reference answers in healthcare-specific tasks^{47,50,65}.

The automated evaluation approach utilizing structured prompts involved employing LLMs to assess model-generated responses. A notable application of this method was the comparative evaluation of PediatricsGPT-13B against baseline models through GPT-4-based assessment of dialogue responses⁴⁸. The analysis revealed the following distribution of evaluation metrics: Fluency/smoothness (n=5)^{45,48,53,56,72}, relevance (n=3)^{45,53,72} and accuracy (n=2)^{48,53}, completeness (n=2)^{45,53}, consistency (n=2)^{48,72} and proficiency (n=2)^{45,53}. Safety⁵⁶, professionalism⁵⁶, and coherence⁷² were each used in a single study.

Table 5 presents the expert-assessed outcome metrics for LLMs in healthcare, categorized into five domains. The Information quality domain included five sub-metrics: accuracy (34 studies)^{13-17, 19-22,24-29,31,33-37,40-42,48,53-54,59,63,66-69,73,74}, completeness (n=7)^{15, 17,20,26,37,41,63}, relevance (n=12)^{16,20,25,26,31,32,37,41,50,62,69,70}, comprehension (n=9)^{16, 17,29,36,59,62,66,69,71}, and consistency (n=8)^{17, 19,25,28,32-34,47}. These metrics evaluated the model's capacity to deliver accurate, comprehensive, and contextually appropriate information within healthcare settings. Safety and risk domain focused on four critical aspects: safety (n=4)^{17,28,48,64}, risk (n=7)^{16,19,29,31,35,39,69},

bias (n=6)^{16, 19, 29, 50, 63, 69}, and hallucination (n=5)^{14, 16, 24, 31, 47}. This domain evaluated potential hazards, including output inaccuracies, inherent biases, and other risks associated with LLM. The reasoning and justification domain comprised two key components: reasoning (n=6)^{16, 25, 29, 35, 42, 69} and provision of rationales with citations (n=6)^{18, 26, 31, 36, 47, 69}. These metrics examined the model's ability to provide logically sound explanations supported by credible references for its outputs. Communication quality included five sub-metrics: quality (n=9)^{22, 25, 28, 30, 35, 39, 45, 48, 53}, empathy (n=4)^{19, 27, 35, 50}, readability (n=14)^{20, 22, 25, 31, 32, 36, 37, 41, 50, 59, 62, 63, 64, 73}, responsiveness (n=4)^{25, 27, 35, 37}, and creativity (n=1)²². These metrics evaluated the model's effectiveness in delivering information, considering aspects such as response tone, clarity, and adaptability to user needs. Lastly, the cultural fidelity (n=1)²² assessed the LLM's capability to generate culturally appropriate and sensitive responses within healthcare contexts.

4. Discussion

This is the first scoping review to explore the corpus sources, AI customization techniques, and evaluation metrics of healthcare LLMs. We identified four main types of corpus sources: real-world clinical resources, literature materials, open-source datasets, and web-crawled data. Regarding AI customization techniques, the studies highlighted several methods used in constructing these models, including pre-training, prompt engineering, RAG, fine-tuning, in-context learning, and offline learning. In terms of performance evaluation, the evaluation metrics applied were grouped into three main categories: process metrics, outcome metrics, and usability metrics.

We found that 72% of the reviewed LLMs relied on multiple data sources, with literature materials and open-source datasets being the most frequently utilized. While integrating diverse data sources can enhance model performance and applicability, it also raises significant equity concerns, as it inherently embeds biases related to geographic, cultural, and socio-economic factors. Despite incorporating various types of data, the majority of these sources are concentrated in high-income countries or specific regions, leading to potential biases. For instance, previous analyses of the PubMed dataset have highlighted substantial gaps in socio-demographic representation, including nationality, gender, and geographic region, within these datasets⁷⁵. Such biases⁷⁶ disproportionately affect underrepresented populations, particularly those in low- and middle-income countries, where clinical features and healthcare challenges may be systematically overlooked. The prerequisite for data openness is the establishment of digital infrastructure. Zharima et al.'s study⁷⁷ showed that even in South Africa, where policies to promote healthcare digitization were widely formulated, the adoption rate of Electronic Health Record (HER) systems remained low, and progress in building a digital ecosystem was slow. This lack of representation perpetuates healthcare inequities, as LLMs trained on narrow datasets are ill-equipped to address the unique needs of diverse patient groups. Consequently, reliance on data from certain regions or specific sources exacerbates disparities in

healthcare resource allocation, reinforcing systemic biases and limiting the potential of AI-driven solutions to achieve equitable outcomes. This narrow focus perpetuates healthcare inequities by failing to address the distinct challenges faced by underrepresented patient groups, thereby hindering the broader applicability of AI-driven healthcare solutions. To address these challenges, it is imperative to integrate a more comprehensive array of data sources from varied geographic regions and socio-economic backgrounds. Only by prioritizing diversity and inclusivity in dataset construction can we ensure that LLMs are capable of serving global populations equitably and mitigating the entrenched biases that currently hinder their broader applicability.

In addition, we found that, aside from the six studies relying solely on academic literature sources^{23,29,54,58,66,72}, the remaining 90% of studies incorporated at least one type of unverified or unstructured data. The quality and accuracy of LLMs are inherently tied to the quality of their training data. Unverified or unstructured data can significantly compromise model performance, leading to unreliable or even harmful outputs. Brown et al.'s⁷⁸ study showed the importance of filtering out low-quality information to enhance model performance. However, many corpus sources currently used to train healthcare-specific LLMs lack professional medical review. For instance, web-crawled content, such as medical forums or doctor-patient dialogues, often includes clinically unvalidated recommendations⁷⁹. Furthermore, unstructured data, which lacks a standardized format, forces the model to rely heavily on contextual interpretation during processing, increasing the risk of ambiguity and misinterpretation. For example, the abbreviation "CP" in clinical notes could represent either "chest pain" or "cerebral palsy", while non-standardized entries like "BID" for "twice daily" could lead to dosage errors. Without sufficient context, LLMs may fail to accurately interpret such terms, potentially resulting in clinically significant errors. these correctly. While frameworks like Wiest et al.'s have improved the accessibility and utility of unstructured medical text data through LLMs, their effectiveness still depends on high-quality input data. Similarly, synthetic datasets, such as virtual doctor-patient dialogues, often oversimplify the complexity of real-world medical conditions, further limiting their utility. Alber's⁸⁰ recent study found that introducing even a minimal amount of medical misinformation—as little as 0.001% of training tokens—can result in models that propagate harmful errors. When LLMs are trained on erroneous or unverified data, they struggle to differentiate between evidence-based facts and unsubstantiated anecdotes, often presenting inaccurate recommendations with unwarranted confidence.

To mitigate these risks, it is important to integrate evidence-based principles into the development of healthcare-specific LLMs. Incorporating clinical practice guidelines ensures that model outputs align with the latest clinical standards while also addressing the nuanced interplay between patient preferences, values, and evidence-based care²⁰. Future research should prioritize the implementation of a tiered corpus architecture, where core training data is derived from rigorously vetted sources

and supplemented by carefully curated unstructured data. This approach would strike a balance between model adaptability and safety. For instance, training data could be organized into tiers based on reliability (e.g., Level I: evidence-based guidelines and expert consensus; Level II: electronic health records; Level III: curated forum data), with dynamic weighting applied to each tier. Additionally, tracking the provenance of information throughout model development and transparently presenting the reasoning chain behind outputs would ensure that conclusions are grounded in robust, evidence-based sources.

Our study highlights that most LLMs evaluation metrics focus on a single dimension, such as repetition testing turn, accuracy or helpfulness, which is insufficient given the complexity of healthcare. A multidimensional approach is necessary to meet the rigorous demands of clinical practice. We identified three critical metric categories in current evaluation frameworks for healthcare LLMs. For process metrics, common indicators like model size measure efficiency and stability but do not assess real-world clinical effectiveness^{32,38,69,74}. For outcome metrics, model-based metrics predominantly rely on general domain standards, such as accuracy and F1-score, as well as automated evaluations via structured prompts like BLEU and ROUGE^{15,24,48,74}. However, these metrics fail to address clinical semantic accuracy, as evidenced by the absence of healthcare-specific measures, such as clinical guideline compliance and differential diagnosis validity. Expert assessments of LLMs, covering information quality, safety, reasoning, communication, and cultural fidelity, are crucial but can be subjective and biased. Mitigating subjectivity is essential for ensuring reliable model performance.

Moreover, hallucinations, a major issue in LLMs, are inadequately addressed by current metrics. While traditional metrics measure content correctness, they miss hallucinations that could endanger patient safety¹⁴. Future research must develop methods for detecting and mitigating hallucinations, integrating these into training and evaluation stages. Improving transparency and interpretability is key to reducing hallucinations, ensuring reliable, safe clinical decision-making, and supporting reasoning with high-quality evidence^{18,25,31,35,47}. Finally, usability metrics focus on user experience but often overlook critical aspects like supporting clinical decisions and adapting to diverse healthcare environments. This narrow metrics needs expansion to capture full clinical applicability.

Previous research has proposed frameworks for evaluating LLM construction. For instance, Choi et al.⁸¹utilized the SERVQUAL (Service Quality) framework to assess ChatGPT's service quality, while Long et al. applied the CVSC (Concordance, Validity, Safety, and Concordance) framework to evaluate their models²⁸. Tam et al.⁸²developed the QUEST (Quality Evaluation for Service Training) framework for human evaluation of LLMs. However, no universally applicable framework exists for the systematic evaluation of LLMs. Furthermore, current evaluation methods are inefficient, relying heavily on static datasets, supervision signals, or manual expert

assessments. Some studies have used LLMs to evaluate responses from constructed models, performing deep interactions between domain-specific models and LLMs through single or multiple instructions, followed by performance evaluation^{83,84}. A previous review noted that LLMs tend to rate chatbot responses higher than human gold standards, suggesting the need for further scrutiny of LLMs as an evaluation tool. Future evaluation frameworks should integrate multidimensional metrics that assess both technical performance and clinical applicability. Additionally, a hybrid evaluation approach combining automation and expert input could reduce manual workload while ensuring professionalism. Finally, ethical considerations and fairness must be incorporated to account for diverse populations and contexts.

Limitations

This scoping review is the first comprehensive exploration of corpus sources, customization techniques, and evaluation metrics for healthcare LLMs. However, our review has several limitations. First, we did not explore the evaluation requirements for specific healthcare tasks, such as clinical decision support and medical record summarization. Different tasks may require distinct evaluation criteria to ensure accuracy, reliability, and clinical applicability. Future research should refine evaluation frameworks to incorporate both overarching principles and task-specific metrics, thereby enhancing their relevance to real-world healthcare applications. Additionally, given the rapid evolution of LLMs' architectures, our analysis, based on methodologies up to 2024, may not fully capture the latest developments. This may lead to an incomplete understanding of the healthcare LLMs' landscape. Future research should adapt to emerging frameworks and techniques to ensure accurate evaluation and clinical applicability.

Conclusion

This scoping review analyzed 61 studies on corpus sources, customization techniques, and evaluation metrics for LLMs in healthcare. A significant gap was found in the fairness of corpus usage, leading to biases tied to geographic, cultural, and socio-economic factors. Moreover, most studies incorporated unverified or unstructured data, highlighting the need for stronger integration of evidence-based sources, especially high-level clinical guidelines. Future research should focus on developing a tiered corpus architecture with rigorously vetted sources and dynamic weighting, ensuring transparency in model reasoning and information provenance. Additionally, the lack of standardized evaluation systems for vertical-specific models underscores the need for comprehensive frameworks and real-world validation of healthcare LLMs.

References

1. Zhou, Z. Evaluation of ChatGPT's Capabilities in Medical Report Generation. *Cureus* 15, e37589 (2023).
2. Zhang, K., et al. UltraMedical: Building Specialized Generalists in Biomedicine. *ArXiv abs/2406.03949*(2024).
3. Johnson, A.E.W., et al. MIMIC-CXR, a de-identified publicly available database of chest radiographs with free-text reports. *Sci Data* 6, 317 (2019).
4. Blease, C. & Torous, J. ChatGPT and mental healthcare: balancing benefits with risks of harms. *BMJ Ment Health* 26(2023).
5. Jiang, C., et al. On Large Language Models' Hallucination with Regard to Known Facts. *ArXiv abs/2403.20009*(2024).
6. Falke, T., Ribeiro, L.F.R., Utama, P.A., Dagan, I. & Gurevych, I. Ranking Generated Summaries by Correctness: An Interesting but Challenging Application for Natural Language Inference. in *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics* (2019).
7. Cao, Z., Yang, Y. & Zhao, H. AutoHall: Automated Hallucination Dataset Generation for Large Language Models. *ArXiv abs/2310.00259*(2023).
8. Longpre, S., et al. A Pretrainer's Guide to Training Data: Measuring the Effects of Data Age, Domain Coverage, Quality, & Toxicity. *ArXiv abs/2305.13169*(2023).
9. Kresevic, S., et al. Optimization of hepatological clinical guidelines interpretation by large language models: a retrieval augmented generation-based framework. *NPJ Digit Med* 7, 102 (2024).
10. Kirchenbauer, J. & Barns, C. Hallucination reduction in large language models with retrieval-augmented generation using wikipedia knowledge. (2024).
11. Hu, T. & Zhou, X.-H. Unveiling LLM Evaluation Focused on Metrics: Challenges and Solutions. *ArXiv abs/2404.09135*(2024).
12. Peters, M.D.J., et al. Updated methodological guidance for the conduct of scoping reviews. *JBIM Evid Synth* 18, 2119-2126 (2020).
13. Tricco, A.C., et al. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Ann Intern Med* 169, 467-473 (2018).
14. Alkhalaf, M., Yu, P., Yin, M. & Deng, C. Applying generative AI with retrieval augmented generation to summarize and extract key clinical information from electronic health records. *J Biomed Inform* 156, 104662 (2024).
15. Bergomi, L., et al. Reshaping free-text radiology notes into structured reports with generative question answering transformers. *ArtifIntell Med* 154, 102924 (2024).
16. Chen, X., et al. Evaluating and Enhancing Large Language Models' Performance in Domain-Specific Medicine: Development and Usability Study With DocOA. *J Med Internet Res* 26, e58158 (2024).
17. Chen, Z., Wang, Q., Sun, Y., Cai, H. & Lu, X. Chat-ePRO: Development and pilot study of an electronic patient-reported outcomes system based on ChatGPT. *J Biomed Inform* 154, 104651 (2024).
18. Collins, B.R., Black, E.W. & Rarey, K.E. Introducing AnatomyGPT: A customized artificial intelligence application for anatomical sciences education.

Clin Anat 37, 661-669 (2024).

19. Griot, M., Hemptinne, C., Vanderdonckt, J. & Yuksel, D. Impact of high-quality, mixed-domain data on the performance of medical language models. *JAm Med Inform Assoc* 31, 1875-1883 (2024).
20. Guo, E., et al. neuroGPT-X: toward a clinic-ready large language model. *J Neurosurg* 140, 1041-1053 (2024).
21. Guthrie, E., Levy, D. & Del Carmen, G. The Operating and Anesthetic Reference Assistant (OARA): A fine-tuned large language model for resident teaching. *Am J Surg* 234, 28-34 (2024).
22. Hua, R., et al. Lingdan: enhancing encoding of traditional Chinese medicine knowledge for clinical reasoning tasks with large language models. *JAm Med Inform Assoc* 31, 2019-2029 (2024).
23. Kakalou, C., Karamanidou, C., Dalamagas, T. & Koubarakis, M. Enhancing Patient Empowerment and Health Literacy: Integrating Knowledge Graphs with Language Models for Personalized Health Content Delivery. *Stud Health Technol Inform* 316, 1018-1022 (2024).
24. Kresevic, S., et al. Optimization of hepatological clinical guidelines interpretation by large language models: a retrieval augmented generation-based framework. *NPJ Digit Med* 7, 102 (2024).
25. Lai, T., et al. Supporting the Demand on Mental Health Services with AI-Based Conversational Large Language Models (LLMs). *BioMedInformatics* 4, 8-33 (2024).
26. Li, Y., et al. RefAI: a GPT-powered retrieval-augmented generative tool for biomedical literature recommendation and summarization. *JAm Med Inform Assoc* 31, 2030-2039 (2024).
27. Liu, S., et al. Leveraging large language models for generating responses to patient messages-a subjective analysis. *JAm Med Inform Assoc* 31, 1367-1379 (2024).
28. Long, C., et al. ChatENT: Augmented Large Language Model for Expert Knowledge Retrieval in Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 171, 1042-1051 (2024).
29. Mashatian, S., et al. Building Trustworthy Generative Artificial Intelligence for Diabetes Care and Limb Preservation: A Medical Knowledge Extraction Case. *J Diabetes Sci Technol*, 19322968241253568 (2024).
30. Miao, J., Thongprayoon, C., Craici, I.M. & Cheungpasitporn, W. How to improve ChatGPT performance for nephrologists: a technique guide. *J Nephrol* 37, 1397-1403 (2024).
31. Murugan, M., et al. Empowering personalized pharmacogenomics with generative AI solutions. *JAm Med Inform Assoc* 31, 1356-1366 (2024).
32. Peng, C., et al. A study of generative large language model for medical research and healthcare. *NPJ Digit Med* 6, 210 (2023).
33. Rau, A., et al. A Context-based Chatbot Surpasses Trained Radiologists and Generic ChatGPT in Following the ACR Appropriateness Guidelines. *Radiology* 308, e230970 (2023).

34. Singer, M.B., Fu, J.J., Chow, J. & Teng, C.C. Development and Evaluation of Aeyeconsult: A Novel Ophthalmology Chatbot Leveraging Verified Textbook Knowledge and GPT-4. *J Surg Educ* 81, 438-443 (2024).
35. Tan, Y., et al. MedChatZH: A tuning LLM for traditional Chinese medicine consultations. *Comput Biol Med* 172, 108290 (2024).
36. Wu, C., et al. PMC-LLaMA: toward building open-source language models for medicine. *JAm Med Inform Assoc* 31, 1833-1843 (2024).
37. Xue, X., et al. Xiaoqing: AQ&A model for glaucoma based on LLMs. *Comput Biol Med* 174, 108399 (2024).
38. Yang, X., et al. A large language model for electronic health records. *NPJ Digit Med* 5, 194 (2022).
39. Yu, H.Q. & McGuinness, S. An experimental study of integrating fine-tuned large language models and prompts for enhancing mental health support chatbot system. *Journal of Medical Artificial Intelligence* 7(2024).
40. Zheng, C., et al. Development and evaluation of a large language model of ophthalmology in Chinese. *Br J Ophthalmol* 108, 1390-1397 (2024).
41. Zhu, L., Rong, Y., McGee, L.A., Rwigema, J.M. & Patel, S.H. Testing and Validation of a Custom Retrained Large Language Model for the Supportive Care of HN Patients with External Knowledge Base. *Cancers (Basel)* 16(2024).
42. Choi, J., et al. MALADE: Orchestration of LLM-powered Agents with Retrieval Augmented Generation for Pharmacovigilance. *ArXiv abs/2408.01869(2024)*.
43. Fu, L., et al. A Role-specific Guided Large Language Model for Ophthalmic Consultation Based on Stylistic Differentiation. *ArXiv abs/2407.18483(2024)*.
44. Jia, S., et al. PodGPT: An audio-augmented large language model for research and education. *medRxiv* (2024).
45. Zhao, L., et al. Aquilia-Med LLM: Pioneering Full-Process Open-Source Medical Language Models. *ArXiv abs/2406.12182(2024)*.
46. Li, M., et al. CancerLLM: A Large Language Model in Cancer Domain. *ArXiv abs/2406.10459(2024)*.
47. Lammert, J., et al. Expert-Guided Large Language Models for Clinical Decision Support in Precision Oncology. *JCO Precis Oncol* 8, e2400478 (2024).
48. Yang, D., et al. PediatricsGPT: Large Language Models as Chinese Medical Assistants for Pediatric Applications. *ArXiv abs/2405.19266(2024)*.
49. Li, D., et al. DALK: Dynamic Co-Augmentation of LLMs and KG to answer Alzheimer's Disease Questions with Scientific Literature. in *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing* (2024).
50. Na, H. CBT-LLM: A Chinese Large Language Model for Cognitive Behavioral Therapy-based Mental Health Question Answering. in *International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation* (2024).
51. Jia, F., et al. OncoGPT: A Medical Conversational Model Tailored with Oncology Domain Expertise on a Large Language Model Meta-AI (LLaMA). *ArXiv abs/2402.16810(2024)*.
52. Bhatti, A., Parmar, S. & Lee, S. SM70: A Large Language Model for Medical Devices. *ArXiv abs/2312.06974(2023)*.

53. Chen, J., et al. HuatuoGPT-II, One-stage Training for Medical Adaption of LLMs. ArXiv abs/2311.09774(2023).
54. Ge, J., et al. Development of a liver disease-specific large language model chat interface using retrieval-augmented generation. *Hepatology* 80, 1158-1168 (2024).
55. Liu, Z., et al. RadOnc-GPT: A Large Language Model for Radiation Oncology. ArXiv abs/2309.10160(2023).
56. Yang, S., et al. Zhongjing: Enhancing the Chinese Medical Capabilities of Large Language Model through Expert Feedback and Real-world Multi-turn Dialogue. in *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* (2023).
57. Haghighi, T., et al. EYE-Llama, an in-domain large language model for ophthalmology. *bioRxiv* (2024).
58. Kharitonova, K., et al. Incorporating evidence into mental health Q&A: a novel method to use generative language models for validated clinical content extraction. *Behaviour & Information Technology* (2024).
59. Labrak, Y., et al. BioMistral: A Collection of Open-Source Pretrained Large Language Models for Medical Domains. in *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics* (2024).
60. Lee, J.W., et al. Development of AI-generated medical responses using the ChatGPT for cancer patients. *Comput Methods Programs Biomed* 254, 108302 (2024).
61. Li, Y., et al. ChatDoctor: A Medical Chat Model Fine-Tuned on a Large Language Model Meta-AI (LLaMA) Using Medical Domain Knowledge. *Cureus* 15, e40895 (2023).
62. Liu, Z., et al. Radiology-GPT: A Large Language Model for Radiology. ArXiv abs/2306.08666(2023).
63. Tian, Y., Gan, R., Song, Y., Zhang, J. & Zhang, Y. ChiMed-GPT: A Chinese Medical Large Language Model with Full Training Regime and Better Alignment to Human Preferences. in *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics* (2023).
64. Wang, H., et al. HuaTuo: Tuning LLaMA Model with Chinese Medical Knowledge. ArXiv abs/2304.06975(2023).
65. Wang, R., et al. IvyGPT: InteractiVe Chinese pathwaY language model in medical domain. in *CAAI International Conference on Artificial Intelligence* (2023).
66. Kim, J.-h. Fine-Tuning the Llama2 Large Language Model Using Books on the Diagnosis and Treatment of Musculoskeletal System in Physical Therapy. *medRxiv* (2023).
67. Kumichev, G., et al. MedSyn: LLM-Based Synthetic Medical Text Generation Framework. in *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases. Applied Data Science Track* (eds. Bifet, A., Krilavičius, T., Miliou, I. & Nowaczyk, S.) 215-230 (Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham, 2024).
68. Kweon, S., et al. Publicly Shareable Clinical Large Language Model Built on Synthetic Clinical Notes. ArXiv abs/2309.00237(2023).
69. Luo, M.J., et al. Development and Evaluation of a Retrieval-Augmented Large

- Language Model Framework for Ophthalmology. *JAMA Ophthalmol* 142, 798-805 (2024).
70. Shi, Y., et al. MKRAG: Medical Knowledge Retrieval Augmented Generation for Medical Question Answering. (2023).
 71. Yang, Z., et al. ChatDiet: Empowering Personalized Nutrition-Oriented Food Recommender Chatbots through an LLM-Augmented Framework. *ArXiv* abs/2403.00781(2024).
 72. Lozano, A., Fleming, S.L., Chiang, C.C. & Shah, N. Clinfo.ai: An Open-Source Retrieval-Augmented Large Language Model System for Answering Medical Questions using Scientific Literature. *Pac Symp Biocomput* 29, 8-23 (2024).
 73. Yu, Y., Shi, Y., Feng, Y. & Gong, Y. Developing a Generative AI-Powered Chatbot for Analyzing MAUDE Database. *Stud Health Technol Inform* 316, 1255-1259 (2024).
 74. Zhang, H., et al. HuatuoGPT, towards Taming Language Model to Be a Doctor. in *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing* (2023).
 75. Celi, L.A., et al. Sources of bias in artificial intelligence that perpetuate healthcare disparities-A global review. *PLOS Digit Health* 1, e0000022 (2022).
 76. Wu, B. & Zhu, Z. Multiple approaches to advance health equity in nursing science: Recruitment, data, and dissemination. *Nurs Outlook* 73, 102343 (2024).
 77. Zharima, C., Griffiths, F. & Goudge, J. Exploring the barriers and facilitators to implementing electronic health records in a middle-income country: a qualitative study from South Africa. *Front Digit Health* 5, 1207602 (2023).
 78. Brown, T.B., et al. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. *ArXiv* abs/2005.14165(2020).
 79. Perelkiewicz, M. & Poswiata, R. A Review of the Challenges with Massive Web-mined Corpora Used in Large Language Models Pre-Training. *ArXiv* abs/2407.07630(2024).
 80. Alber, D.A., et al. Medical large language models are vulnerable to data-poisoning attacks. *Nat Med* (2025).
 81. Choi, J., et al. Availability of ChatGPT to provide medical information for patients with kidney cancer. *Sci Rep* 14, 1542 (2024).
 82. Tam, T.Y.C., et al. A framework for human evaluation of large language models in healthcare derived from literature review. *NPJ Digit Med* 7, 258 (2024).
 83. Li, J., Li, R. & Liu, Q. Beyond Static Datasets: A Deep Interaction Approach to LLM Evaluation. *ArXiv* abs/2309.04369(2023).
 84. Mizrahi, M., et al. State of What Art? A Call for Multi-Prompt LLM Evaluation. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 12, 933-949 (2023).

Table 1 Overview of characteristics of the included LLMs

Author	Application areas	Target population	LLMs corpus sources				
			Real-world clinical resources	Literature sources	Virtual datasets	Open-source datasets	Web crawled data
Alkhalaf, et al (2024, Australia) ¹⁴	Nutriology	①	✓	N/P	N/P	N/P	N/P
Bergomi, et al (2024, Italy) ¹⁵	Radiology	①	✓	N/P	N/P	✓	N/P
Chen, et al (2024, China) ¹⁶	Sports medicine and orthopedics	①	✓	✓	N/P	N/P	N/P
Chen, et al (2024, China) ¹⁷	Oncology	①	✓	N/P	✓	N/P	N/P
Collins, et al (2024, USA) ¹⁸	Anatomical sciences education	②	N/P	✓	N/P	✓	✓ (unverified data)
Griot, et al (2024, Belgium) ¹⁹	Unspecified domain	②	N/P	✓	N/P	✓	N/P
Guo, et al (2023, Canada) ²⁰	Neurosurgery	②	N/P	✓	N/P	N/P	✓
Guthrie, et al (2024, USA) ²¹	Surgical and anesthetic education	②	N/P	✓	N/P	N/P	✓
Hua, et al (2024, China) ²²	TCM	②	N/P	N/P	✓	N/P	N/P

Kakalou,et al (2024, Greece) ²³	Unspecified domain	①	N/P	✓	N/P	N/P	N/P
Krešević,et al (2024, Italy, USA) ²⁴	Hepatology	②	✓	✓	N/P	N/P	N/P
Lai, et al (2024, Australia) ²⁵	Mental health	①②	N/P	N/P	N/P	N/P	✓ (unverified data)
Li, et al (2024, USA) ²⁶	Unspecified domain	②	N/P	✓	N/P	N/P	✓
Liu, et al (2024, USA) ²⁷	Unspecified domain	①②	✓	N/P	N/P	✓	N/P
Long, et al (2024, Canada, USA) ²⁸	Otolaryngology	②	✓	✓	N/P	✓	N/P
Mashatian,et al (2024, USA) ²⁹	Endocrinology	①	N/P	✓	N/P	N/P	N/P
Miao,et al (2024, USA) ³⁰	Nephrology	②	✓	✓	N/P	N/P	N/P
Murugan,et al (2024, USA) ³¹	Pharmaceutical sciences	①②	N/P	✓	N/P	✓	N/P

Peng, et al (2023, USA) ³²	Unspecified domain	②	✓	N/P	N/P	✓	N/P
Rau, et al (2023, Germany) ³³	Radiology	②	✓	✓	N/P	N/P	N/P
Singer, et al (2023, USA) ³⁴	Ophthalmology	①②	N/P	✓	N/P	✓	N/P
Tan, et al (2024, China) ³⁵	TCM	②	N/P	N/P	N/P	✓	N/P
Wu, et al (2024, China) ³⁶	Unspecified domain	②	N/P	✓	N/P	✓	N/P
Xu, et al (2024, China) ³⁷	Ophthalmology	①	N/P	✓	N/P	N/P	✓ (doctor-patient dialogue datasets)
Yang, et al (2022, USA) ³⁸	Unspecified domain	②	✓	✓	N/P	✓	N/P
Yu, et al (2024, UK) ³⁹	Mental health	①②	✓	N/P	N/P	✓	N/P
Zheng, et al (2024, China) ⁴⁰	Ophthalmology	①②	N/P	✓	N/P	✓	N/P
Zhu, et al (2024, USA) ⁴¹	Oncology	①②	✓	✓	N/P	N/P	N/P

Choi, et al (2024, USA) ⁴²	Pharmaceutical sciences	②	N/P	N/P	N/P	✓	N/P
Fu, et al (2024, China) ⁴³	Ophthalmology	①②	N/P	N/P	N/P	N/P	✓ (doctor-patient dialogue datasets)
Jia, et al (2024, USA) ⁴⁴	Medical education	②	✓	N/P	N/P	✓	N/P
Zhao, et al (2024, China) ⁴⁵	Unspecified domain	②	✓	N/P	✓	✓	N/P
Li, et al (2024, USA) ⁴⁶	Oncology	①②	✓	N/P	N/P	N/P	N/P
Lammert, et al (2024, Germany) ⁴⁷	Oncology	②	✓	✓	N/P	✓	N/P
Yang, et al (2024, China) ⁴⁸	Pediatrics	①②	✓	✓	✓	N/P	N/P
Li, et al (2024, USA) ⁴⁹	Neurology	①②	N/P	✓	N/P	✓	N/P
Na, et al (2024, Australia) ⁵⁰	Mental health	①	N/P	N/P	N/P	✓	N/P

Jia, et al (2024, China) ⁵¹	Oncology	②	N/P	N/P	N/P	N/P	√ (doctor-patient dialogue datasets)
Bhatti, et al (2023, Canada) ⁵²	Unspecified domain	①②	N/P	√	N/P	√	N/P
Chen, et al (2023, China) ⁵³	TCM	①②	N/P	√	N/P	√	N/P
Ge, et al (2023, USA) ⁵⁴	Hepatology	②	N/P	√	N/P	N/P	N/P
Liu, et al (2023, USA) ⁵⁵	Oncology	②	√	N/P	N/P	N/P	N/P
Yang, et al (2023, China) ⁵⁶	TCM	①②	√	√	N/P	√	√ (doctor-patient dialogue datasets)
Haghighi, et al (2024, USA) ⁵⁷	Ophthalmology	②	N/P	√	√	√	N/P
Kharitonova, et al (2024, Spain) ⁵⁸	Mental health (depression and ADHD)	②	N/P	√	N/P	N/P	N/P

Labrak, et al (2024, France) ⁵⁹	Unspecified domain	②	N/P	✓	N/P	✓	N/P
Lee, et al (2024, Korea) ⁶⁰	Oncology	①	N/P	✓	N/P	✓	N/P
Li, et al (2023, USA) ⁶¹	Unspecified domain	①②	N/P	N/P	N/P	✓	✓ (doctor-patient dialogue datasets)
Liu, et al (2024, USA) ⁶²	Radiology	②	N/P	N/P	N/P	✓	N/P
Tian, et al (2024, China) ⁶³	Unspecified domain	①②	N/P	✓	N/P	✓	N/P
Wang, et al (2023, China) ⁶⁴	TCM	①②	N/P	N/P	✓	✓	N/P
Wang, et al (2023, China) ⁶⁵	Unspecified domain	①②	N/P	N/P	✓	N/P	✓ (doctor-patient dialogue datasets)
Kim (2023, Korea) ⁶⁶	Orthopedics	②	N/P	✓	N/P	N/P	N/P

Kumichev, et al (2024, Russia) ⁶⁷	Unspecified domain	②	✓	N/P	✓	N/P	N/P
Kweon, et al (2024, Korea) ⁶⁸	Healthcare informatics	②	N/P	N/P	✓	✓	N/P
Luo, et al (2024, China) ⁶⁹	Ophthalmology	②	✓	✓	N/P	✓	N/P
Shi, et al (2024, USA) ⁷⁰	Clinical healthcare	②	N/P	N/P	N/P	✓	N/P
Yang, et al (2024, USA) ⁷¹	Nutriology	①	✓	N/P	✓	N/P	N/P
Lozano, et al (2023, USA) ⁷²	Unspecified domain	②	N/P	✓	N/P	N/P	N/P
Yu, et al (2024, USA) ⁷³	Clinical risk management	②	N/P	N/P	✓	N/P	N/P
Zhang, et al (2023, China) ⁷⁴	Unspecified domain	②	✓	N/P	✓	N/P	N/P

① Patients and individuals seeking medical support; ② Healthcare providers Information not provided is marked by N/P.

TCM: Traditional Chinese Medicine; LLMs: Large Language Models; CKD: Chronic Kidney Disease

Table 2 Overview of Included LLMs: base model and AI customization techniques

Author	Base model	AI customization techniques					
		Pre-training LLM	Prompt engineering	RAG	Model fine-tuning	In-context learning	Offline learning
Alkhalaf, et al (2024, Australia) ¹⁴	Llama 2 model	N/P	√ (zero-shot)	√ (LangChain technology)	√ (instruction tuning)	N/P	N/P
Bergomi, et al (2024, Italy) ¹⁵	IT5 Base version model (220 M of parameters)	√	√ (zero-shot)	N/P	√ (SFT)	N/P	N/P
Chen, et al (2024, China) ¹⁶	GPT-4-1106-preview model	N/P	√ (zero-shot)	√	N/P	N/P	N/P
Chen, et al (2024, China) ¹⁷	ChatGPT	N/P	√ (zero-shot, few-shot)	N/P	N/P	N/P	√ (offline knowledge distillation)
Collins, et al (2024, USA) ¹⁸	GPT-4	N/P	√ (prompt tuning)	N/P	N/P	N/P	N/P
Griot, et al (2024, Belgium) ¹⁹	Mistral LLaMA 7b	√	√ (zero-shot)	N/P	√	N/P	N/P
Guo, et al (2023, Canada) ²⁰	GPT-3	N/P	√ (zero-shot)	N/P	N/P	√ (LangChain technology)	N/P

Guthrie, et al (2024, USA) ²¹	Vicuna v1.5 which is based on the LLaMA architecture	N/P	N/P	N/P	✓ (LoRA)	N/P	N/P
Hua, et al (2024, China) ²²	Baichuan2-13B-Base	✓	✓ (CoT technique)	N/P	✓ (QLoRA)	N/P	N/P
Kakalou,et al (2024, Greece) ²³	GPT-4	N/P	✓ (few-shot)	✓ (KG)	N/P	N/P	N/P
Krešević,et al (2024, Italy, USA) ²⁴	GPT-4 Turbo	N/P	✓ (few-shot)	✓	N/P	N/P	N/P
Lai, et al (2024, Australia) ²⁵	WenZhong and PanGu pre-trained models	✓	N/P	N/P	✓	N/P	N/P
Li, et al (2024, USA) ²⁶	GPT-4 Turbo	N/P	✓ (instruction-base d prompting)	✓	N/P	N/P	N/P
Liu, et al (2024, USA) ²⁷	LLaMA-65B	N/P	✓ (zero-shot)	N/P	✓ (LoRA-SFT)	N/P	N/P
Long, et al (2024, Canada, USA) ²⁸	GPT-4	N/P	✓ (instruction-base d prompting)	✓	N/P	N/P	N/P

Mashatian,et al (2024, USA) ²⁹	GPT-4	N/P	√ (zero-shot, few-shot)	√	N/P	N/P	N/P
Miao,et al (2024, USA) ³⁰	GPT-4	N/P	√ (CoT technique)	√	N/P	N/P	N/P
Murugan,et al (2024, USA) ³¹	GPT-4	N/P	√	√	N/P	N/P	N/P
Peng, et al (2023, USA) ³²	GPT-3	N/P	√ (prompt tuning, zero-shot)	N/P	√	N/P	N/P
Rau, et al (2023, Germany) ³³	GPT-3.5-turbo	N/P	√ (instruction-base d prompting)	N/P	N/P	√	N/P
Singer, et al (2023, USA) ³⁴	GPT-4	N/P	N/P	√ (LangChain technology)	N/P	N/P	N/P
Tan, et al (2024, China) ³⁵	Baichuan-7B	√	N/P	N/P	√ (instruction fine-tuning: full-parameter fine-tuning)	N/P	N/P
Wu,et al (2024, China) ³⁶	LLaMA	N/P	√ (prompt tuning)	N/P	√ (instruction tuning)	N/P	N/P

Xu, et al (2024, China) ³⁷	ChatGLM-6B	N/P	N/P	√ (LangChain technology)	√ (LoRA & Freeze)	N/P	N/P
Yang, et al (2022, USA) ³⁸	BERT	√	N/P	N/P	√(SFT)	N/P	N/P
Yu, et al (2024, UK) ³⁹	DialoGPT, ChatGPT-3.5	N/P	√	N/P	√	N/P	N/P
Zheng, et al (2024, China) ⁴⁰	ChatGLM2-6B	N/P	√ (N/P, prompt tuning)	N/P	N/P	N/P	N/P
Zhu, et al (2024, USA) ⁴¹	ChatGPT-4	N/P	N/P	N/P	√	N/P	N/P
Choi, et al (2024, USA) ⁴²	GPT-4	N/P	N/P	√ (with multi-agent orchestration system)	N/P	N/P	N/P
Fu, et al (2024, China) ⁴³	RoBERT a	N/P	√ (template-based prompting, prompt tuning)	N/P	√(LoRA)	N/P	N/P
Jia, et al (2024, USA) ⁴⁴	The Gemma series, LLaMA collections, and the Mistral series	√	N/P	N/P	√ (instruction fine-tuning)	N/P	N/P

Zhao, et al (2024, China) ⁴⁵	Aquila-7B	✓	N/P	N/P	✓ (SFT, DPO-RLHF)	N/P	N/P
Li, et al (2024, USA) ⁴⁶	Mistral 7B	✓	N/P	N/P	✓ (instruction tuning, LoRA)	N/P	N/P
Lammert, et al (2024, Germany) ⁴⁷	Gemini Pro	N/P	✓ (CoT technology)	✓	N/P	N/P	N/P
Yang, et al (2024, China) ⁴⁸	Baichuan2-Base	✓	N/P	N/P	✓ (Full-parameter SFT, LoRA-SFT)	N/P	N/P
Li, et al (2024, USA) ⁴⁹	GPT-3.5-turbo	N/P	✓ (CoT technology)	✓ (KG)	N/P	N/P	N/P
Na, et al (2024, Australia) ⁵⁰	GPT-3.5-turbo-16k	N/P	✓ (template-based prompting)	N/P	✓ (LoRA-SFT, instruction tuning)	N/P	N/P
Jia, et al (2024, China) ⁵¹	LLaMA-7B	N/P	N/P	N/P	✓ (LoRA)	N/P	N/P
Bhatti, et al (2023, Canada) ⁵²	Llama 2 70B	N/P	✓ (template-based prompting)	N/P	✓ (QLoRA-PEFT)	N/P	N/P
Chen, et al (2023, China) ⁵³	Baichuan2-7B-Base and Baichuan2-13B-Base models	✓	✓ (template-based prompting)	N/P	✓ (SFT, instruction tuning)	N/P	N/P
Ge, et al (2023, USA) ⁵⁴	Versa (GPT series)	N/P	N/P	✓	N/P	N/P	N/P

Liu, et al (2023, USA) ⁵⁵	LLaMA2	N/P	N/P	N/P		√ (LoRA, instruction tuning)	N/P	N/P
Yang, et al (2023, China) ⁵⁶	Ziya-LLaMA-13B-v1	√	N/P	N/P		√ (SFT, RLHF, LoRA)	N/P	N/P
Haghighi, et al (2024, USA) ⁵⁷	LLaMA 2-7b-chat	√	N/P	N/P		√ (QLoRA)	N/P	N/P
Kharitonova, et al (2024, Spain) ⁵⁸	GPT-3, LLaMA-1, LLaMA-2	N/P	√ (template-based prompting)	√		N/P	N/P	N/P
Labrak, et al (2024, France) ⁵⁹	Mistral 7B Instruct v0.1	√	√ (instruction-base dprompting, few-shot)	N/P		√ (QLoRA-SFT)	N/P	N/P
Lee, et al (2024, Korea) ⁶⁰	GPT 3.5	N/P	√ (instruction-base d prompting)	√ (LangChain technology)		N/P	N/P	N/P
Li, et al (2023, USA) ⁶¹	LLaMA-7B	N/P	√ (instruction-base d prompting)	N/P		√	N/P	N/P
Liu, et al (2024, USA) ⁶²	Alpaca-7B	N/P	N/P	N/P		√ (instruction tuning, LoRA)	N/P	N/P

Tian, et al (2024, China) ⁶³	Ziya-13B-v2	✓	✓ (zero-shot, few-shot)	N/P	✓ (SFT, RLHF)	N/P	N/P
Wang, et al (2023, China) ⁶⁴	LLaMa-7B	N/P	N/P	N/P	✓ (instruction tuning)	N/P	N/P
Wang, et al (2023, China) ⁶⁵	LLaMA-33B	N/P	N/P	N/P	✓ (QLoRA-SFT, RLHF)	N/P	N/P
Kim (2023, Korea) ⁶⁶	Llama-2-13B	N/P	N/P	N/P	✓	N/P	N/P
Kumichev, et al (2024, Russia) ⁶⁷	LLaMA-7b	N/P	✓ (instruction-base d prompting)	N/P	✓ (LoRA)	N/P	N/P
Kweon, et al (2024, Korea) ⁶⁸	LLaMA	✓	✓ (prompt tuning)	N/P	✓ (instruction tuning)	N/P	N/P
Luo, et al (2024, China) ⁶⁹	Baichuan-13B	N/P	N/P	✓	✓ (LoRA-SFT)	N/P	N/P
Shi, et al (2024, USA) ⁷⁰	Vicuna-7B	N/P	N/P	✓	N/P	✓	N/P
Yang, et al (2024, USA) ⁷¹	GPT-3.5-turbo	N/P	✓ (zero-shot, CoT technology)	N/P	N/P	N/P	N/P

Lozano, et al (2023, USA) ⁷²	GPT-3.5 and GPT-4	N/P	N/P	✓ (Langchain technology)	N/P	N/P	N/P
Yu, et al (2024, USA) ⁷³	GPT-4	N/P	✓ (few-shot)	N/P	N/P	✓ (Langchain technology)	N/P
Zhang, et al (2023, China) ⁷⁴	ChatGPT	N/P	✓ (instruction-base d prompting)	N/P	✓ (SFT, RLAIIF)	N/P	N/P

Information not provided is marked by N/P.

LoRA: Low-Rank Adaptation; RAG: Retrieval-augmented generation; KG: Knowledge Graph; SFT: Supervised Fine-tuning; RLHF: Reinforcement learning from human feedback; COT: Chain-of-Thought; QLoRA: Quantized Low-Rank Adaptation; RLAIIF: reinforced learning from AI feedback; PEFT: Parameter-Efficient Fine-Tuning; DPO: Direct Preference Optimization; IT5: Text-to-Text Transfer Transformer for Italian; GPT: Generative Pretrained Transformer; LLaMA: Long-Language Model Anthropic; GLM: General Language Model; BERT: Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers; RoBERT: Robustly Optimized BERT Pretraining Approach

Table 3 Evaluation metrics for process and usability assessment of LLMs in healthcare

Evaluation metrics domain	Evaluation metric	Associated study	Number
Process evaluation metrics	Repetition testing turn	33,34,45,53,56,63,74	7
	Model size	32,38,44,46,53,68,69	7
	Used training parameters	38,46,56,57,58	5
	Response time	17,20,21,33,46	5
	Output length	21,39,65	3
	Response rate	16,17	2
	Likelihood of generating harmful content	16	1
	Average number of dialogues turns per item	17	1
	Percentage of free-text interaction usage	17	1
	Average number of tokens per second	21	1
Usability evaluation metrics	User helpfulness	16,25,27,39,48,50,62,64,73	9
	User intent	16	1
	Response costs fulfillment	33	1
	Personalization	71	1
	Interactivity	71	1

Table 4 Evaluation metrics for model-based outcome of LLMs in healthcare

Metrics Types	Evaluation metric	Associated study	Number
General domain standard metrics	Accuracy/correctness	15,16,18,19,20,21,29,32,38,44,49,50,52,57,58,63,68,70,71,74	20
	F1 score	15,17,22,27,29,32,38,42,43,46,51,57,61,67,72	15
	Precision	17,22,27,29,32,38,43,46,51,57,61,67,72	13
	Recall	17,22,27,29,32,38,43,46,51,57,61,67,72	13
	ROUGE	24,25,35,43,46,48,55,63,69,72,74	11
	BLEU	24,35,39,43,46,48,50,63,69,74	10
	Distinct	25,43,48,74	4
	METEOR score	24,50,72	3
	GLEU	35,48,74	3
	Cosine similarity	47,50,65	3
	Perplexity	25,39	2
	CHRF	50,72	2
	Exact Match score	38,46	2
	Specificity	29	1
	AUC with confidence	42	1
	Automated metrics evaluation via structured prompts in LLMs	Sentence-BERT embeddings	69
Expected Calibration Error		58	1
Fluency/smoothness		45,48,53,56,72	5
Relevance		45,53,72	3
Accuracy		48,53	2
Completeness	45,53	2	

Proficiency	45.53	2
Consistency	48.72	2
Safety	56	1
Professionalism	56	1
Coherence	72	1

BERT: Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers; BLEU: Bilingual Evaluation Understudy; ROUGE: Recall-Oriented Understudy for Gisting Evaluation; METEOR: Metric for Evaluation of Translation with Explicit Ordering; GLEU: Generalized Language Evaluation Understudy; AUC: Area Under the Curve; CHRF: Character F-score

Table 5 The expert-assessed outcomes and strategies for the outcome evaluation metrics of LLMs in healthcare

Type	Evaluation metric	Definition	Related concepts	Evaluation strategies
Information Quality	Accuracy	The degree to which human evaluators correctly assess the model's responses in line with the intended task or knowledge.	Accuracy ^{14,17,20,21,22,24,26,27,31,33,35,36,37,40,41,53,54,59,68,74} Correctness ^{15,33,34,42,67,73} Inaccuracy ^{16,21} Missing content ^{16,68,69} Error ^{17,19} Validity ²⁸ Factuality ^{29,48} Precision ⁶³	(1) Comparison with human expert-provided answers used as the gold standard 14,15,16,17,21,22,24,25,28,29,33,34,36,67,68; (2) Likert scale/Binary or Multiple-Choice evaluation scale 17,19,20,26,27,31,37,40,41,59,63,69,73; (3) Unstructured feedback 34,35,42,53,54,66; (4) Comparison of performance rankings with different models 48,74
	Completeness	The extent to which the model provides all necessary and relevant information for a given task.	Completeness ^{15,17,37,41,63} Thoroughness ²⁰ Comprehensiveness ²⁶	Likert scale ^{15,17,20,26,37,41,63}

Relevance	How well the model's output aligns with the user's query or task requirements.	Relevance ^{16,20,25,26,31,37,42,50,62,70} Clinical relevance ³² Scientific consensus ⁶⁹	(1) Comparison with human expert-provided answers used as the gold standard ¹⁶ ; (2) Likert scale/Binary or Multiple-Choice evaluation scale ^{20,25,26,31,32,37,42,50,62,69} ; (3) Comparison with a set of predicted and actual responses ²⁵ ; (4) Unstructured feedback ⁷⁰
Comprehension	The model's ability to understand and interpret the meaning and context of the input correctly.	Comprehension ^{16,17,29} Contextual Understanding ³⁶ Comprehensibility ⁵⁹ Understandability ^{62,66,69} Explainability ⁷¹	(1) Comparison with human expert-provided answers used as the gold standard ^{16,29} ; (2) Likert scale/Binary or Multiple-Choice evaluation scale ^{17,59,62,69} ; (3) Comparison of performance rankings with different models ³⁶ (4) Unstructured feedback ^{66,71}
Consistency	The model's ability to provide reliable, predictable, and consistent responses over time, maintaining performance across different interactions.	Stability ¹⁷ Reliability ¹⁹ Concordance ^{28,47} Consistency ³²⁻³⁴	(1) Likert scale ^{17,25,32} ; (2) Unstructured feedback ^{19,47} ; (3) Comparison with human expert-provided answers used as the gold standard ^{28,33,34}

Safety and Risk	Safety	The model's ability to prevent misuse or exploitation, ensuring safe interactions and protecting against malicious inputs.	Security ¹⁷ Safety ^{28,48,64}	(1) Likert scale ^{17,64} ; (2) Comparison with human expert-provided answers used as the gold standard ²⁸ (3) Comparison of performance rankings with different models ⁴⁸
	Risk	The potential negative outcomes or harm that could arise from a model's response or action.	Risk of causing severe harm ¹⁶ Harm likelihood and harm extent ¹⁹ Possible harm ^{29,69} Risk ^{31,35,39} ,	(1) Categories (Presence or absence) ¹⁶ ; (2) Likert scale/Binary or Multiple-Choice evaluation scale ^{19,29,69} ; (3) Comparison with human expert-provided answers used as the gold standard ²⁹ ; (4) Unstructured feedback ^{35,39} ;
	Bias	The likelihood that the model's output reflects unfair, prejudiced, or skewed perspectives.	Bias ^{16,19,29,50,63,69}	(1) Categories (Presence or absence) ¹⁹ ; (2) Likert scale/Binary or Multiple-Choice evaluation scale ^{16,63,69} ; (3) Comparison with human expert-provided answers used as the gold standard ²⁹ ; (4) Unstructured feedback ⁵⁰

	Hallucination	The generation of false, inaccurate, or fabricated information by a model.	Hallucination ^{14,16,24,31,47}	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Categories (Presence or absence)^{14,16,24}; (2) Comparison with human expert-provided answers used as the gold standard⁴⁷; (3) Likert scale³¹
Reasoning and Justification	Provision of rationales with citations	The inclusion of logical explanations and references to credible sources in the model's output to support its answers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationales and citations^{18,31,47} Reference integration²⁶ Knowledge Correlation³⁶ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (2) Categories (Presence or absence)^{18,47}; (3) Likert scale/Binary or Multiple-Choice evaluation scale^{26,31,69}; (4) Performance ranking rates across models³⁶
	Reasoning	The model's ability to logically analyze, infer, and derive conclusions or decisions based on available data or input.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Logic^{25,35} Reasoning^{29,42} Correct reasoning^{16,69} 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Comparison with a set of predicted and actual responses²⁵; (2) Comparison with human expert-provided answers used as the gold standard^{16,29} (3) Likert scale/Binary or Multiple-Choice evaluation scale⁶⁹; (3) Unstructured feedback^{35,42}

Communication Quality	Quality	A measure of how effectively the model addresses the user's query with expertise.	Capability ²² Quality ^{25,30,35,39,45,53} Competency ²⁸ Professionalism ⁴⁸ Proficiency ⁵³	(1) Unstructured feedback ^{22,30,35,39} ; (2) Likert scale ²⁵ ; (3) Comparison with human expert-provided answers used as the gold standard ²⁸ (4) Comparison with a set of predicted and actual responses ⁴⁵ ; (5) Comparison of performance rankings with different models ^{48,53}
	Empathy	The evaluation of a response's suitability in a clinical context, assessing its professionalism, appropriateness, and sensitivity to patients.	Inappropriateness ¹⁹ Empathy ^{27,50} Sensitivity ³⁵	(1) Likert scale ^{19,27} ; (2) Unstructured feedback ^{35,50}
	Readability	How easily the model's generated responses can be understood, focusing on vocabulary, sentence structure, clarity, and fluency	Coherence ^{20,62,73} Fluency ^{22,25,36,63} Language ³¹ Readability ^{32,36,59,73} Clarity ³¹ Structure ⁵⁰ Conciseness ⁶² Smoothness ⁶⁴	(1) Likert scale ^{20,25,31,32,37,41,50,59,62,63,64,73} ; (2) Comparison with the gold standard provided by human experts ²² ; (3) Comparison with a set of predicted and actual responses ²⁵ ; (4) Comparison of performance rankings with different models ³⁶

	Responsiveness	The ability to quickly and effectively react to changes, needs, or feedback.	Responsiveness ^{25,27,35} Timeliness ³⁷	(1) Unstructured feedback ^{25,35} ; (2) Likert scale ^{27,37}
	Creativity	The ability of the model to generate novel and original content.	Creativity ²²	(1) Comparison with human expert-provided answers used as the gold standard ²²
Cultural fidelity	Cultural fidelity	The faithful transmission and preservation of cultural traditions, values, and practices, ensuring their authenticity and completeness across generations.	Fidelity to cultural heritage ²²	(1) Comparison with human expert-provided answers used as the gold standard ²²

PRISMA 2020 flow diagram for new systematic reviews which included searches of databases and registers only

