

## **Bias in Large Language Models Across Clinical Applications: A Systematic Review**

Thanathip Suenghataiphorn<sup>1</sup>, Narisara Tribuddharat<sup>2</sup>, Pojsakorn Danpanichkul<sup>3</sup>, Narathorn Kulthamrongsri<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Internal Medicine, Griffin Hospital, Derby, CT, United States, <sup>2</sup>St. Elizabeth Medical, Boston, MA, United States, <sup>3</sup>Department of Internal Medicine, Texas Tech University Health Science Center, Lubbock, TX, United States and <sup>4</sup>University of Hawaii, Honolulu, HI, United States

Corresponding Author: Thanathip Suenghataiphorn, Department of Internal Medicine, Griffin Hospital, Derby, CT; 130 Division St, Derby, CT, United States 06418; [Thanathip.sue@gmail.com](mailto:Thanathip.sue@gmail.com); 443-484-8464

**Abstract Word Count:** 244 words

**Word count:** 2,786 words

**Tables:** 2; **Figures:** 2

**Keywords:** Generative AI; Large-language Model; Systematic review; Bias; Safety

**Conflict of Interest:** We declared no conflict of interest

**Fundings:** No funding was sought for this study

**Acknowledgments/Disclosure:** During the preparation of this work the authors used Gemini in order to summarize each original article. After using this tool/service, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and takes full responsibility for the content of the publication.

**Ethics Statement:** This study does not involve human participants and this study does not involve animal subjects

### **Author contributions**

Conceptualization – TSu, NT

Data curation – TSu, NK

Formal analysis – TSu, PD

Investigation (Search) – TSu, PD, NT

Methodology – Tsu; Validation – Tsu

Writing, original draft – TSu, NK

Finalized the manuscript – TSu, PD

**All authors have read and approved the final version of the manuscript for submission.**

## **ABSTRACT**

**Background:** Large language models (LLMs) are rapidly being integrated into healthcare, promising to enhance various clinical tasks. However, concerns exist regarding their potential for bias, which could compromise patient care and exacerbate health inequities. This systematic review investigates the prevalence, sources, manifestations, and clinical implications of bias in LLMs.

**Methods:** We conducted a systematic search of PubMed, OVID, and EMBASE from database inception through 2025, for studies evaluating bias in LLMs applied to clinical tasks. We extracted data on LLM type, bias source (data-related or model-related), bias manifestation (allocative harm, representational harm, or performance disparities), affected attributes, clinical task, evaluation methods, and outcomes. Risk of bias was assessed using a modified ROBINS-I tool.

**Results:** Thirty-eight studies met inclusion criteria, revealing pervasive bias across various LLMs and clinical applications. Both data-related bias (from biased training data) and model-related bias (from model training) were significant contributors. Biases manifested as: allocative harm (e.g., differential treatment recommendations); representational harm (e.g., stereotypical associations, biased image generation); and performance disparities (e.g., variable output quality). These biases affected multiple attributes, most frequently race/ethnicity and gender, but also age, disability, and language.

**Conclusions:** Bias in clinical LLMs is a pervasive and systemic issue, with a potential to lead to misdiagnosis and inappropriate treatment, particularly for marginalized patient populations. Rigorous evaluation of the model is crucial. Furthermore, the development and implementation of effective mitigation strategies, coupled with continuous monitoring in real-world clinical settings, are essential to ensure the safe, equitable, and trustworthy deployment of LLMs in healthcare.

**Keywords:** Generative AI; Large-language Model; Systematic review; Bias; Safety

## STUDY HIGHLIGHTS

### WHAT IS KNOWN

- Large Language Models (LLMs) are increasingly being integrated into healthcare, offering potential benefits across a spectrum of applications, from streamlining administrative workflows to assisting in complex clinical decision-making.
- Bias in artificial intelligence, particularly in machine learning models, is a well-documented issue, with prior research demonstrating its presence in various domains, including some initial investigations in non-clinical LLM applications. Previous clinical studies are limited in scope and sample size.

### WHAT IS NEW HERE

- This systematic review provides the first comprehensive evidence that bias, particularly stemming from data-related and model-related sources, is a pervasive and systemic issue in LLMs applied to a broad range of clinically relevant tasks. This bias has the potential to amplify them, leading to misdiagnosis, delayed treatment, undertreatment of pain, and ultimately, poorer health outcomes for marginalized patient populations.
- The identified biases manifest as allocative harm, representational harm, and performance disparities, affecting critical clinical processes such as diagnostic reasoning, treatment recommendations, and the generation of clinical documentation. These biases are observed across a range of attributes including, but not limited to race, ethnicity, gender, age, and socioeconomic status.
- Mitigation strategies, while nascent, must address bias at multiple levels, including data curation, model development, and clinical deployment, with continuous monitoring and evaluation being essential. Continuous, rigorous evaluation of LLMs in real-world clinical settings is essential to ensure their safe, equitable, and trustworthy deployment. Future research needs to go beyond identifying bias and develop, test and validate tools for mitigation and reduction of bias across the different categories of bias.

## INTRODUCTION

Large language models (LLMs) are rapidly transforming the landscape of artificial intelligence, demonstrating remarkable capabilities in natural language processing, generation, and understanding. These powerful models, trained on vast corpora of text and code, are increasingly being deployed across diverse sectors, with healthcare emerging as a particularly promising, yet challenging, frontier<sup>1</sup>. From automating administrative tasks and summarizing patient records to assisting with clinical decision-making and generating personalized treatment plans<sup>2</sup>, LLMs hold the potential to revolutionize healthcare delivery, improve efficiency, and enhance patient outcomes.

However, LLMs usage also raises critical concerns, particularly regarding the potential for bias<sup>3</sup>. LLMs learn from the data they are trained on, and this data often reflects existing societal biases, including those

related to race, ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, age, sexual orientation, and disability<sup>4</sup>. When these biases are encoded within LLMs, they can be amplified and perpetuated, leading to potentially harmful consequences, especially in the sensitive and high-stakes domain of healthcare<sup>5</sup>. For instance, a biased LLM might misdiagnose patients from underrepresented groups, recommend inappropriate treatments, or exacerbate existing health disparities.

This systematic review addresses this critical gap by comprehensively examining the existing literature on bias in LLMs, with a specific focus on clinical applications. We aim to synthesize the evidence on: (1) the types and sources of bias identified in clinically-relevant LLMs; (2) the methods used to detect and measure these biases; (3) the potential clinical consequences of biased LLM outputs; and (4) the proposed strategies for mitigating bias in LLMs for healthcare. By providing a systematic overview of the current state of knowledge, this review aims to inform the responsible development, deployment, and regulation of LLMs in healthcare, ensuring that these powerful technologies are used to promote equity, fairness, and improved patient care for all.

## **METHODS**

### *Search strategy & Eligibility*

Two investigators (TS and NT) independently conducted searches in PUBMED, OVID, and EMBASE databases from inception through 27<sup>th</sup> January 2025 using the search strategy as specified in **Supplementary Table 1**. The investigators (TS and NT) independently assessed the eligibility of the retrieved records. Any conflicts were resolved through further discussions involving a third investigator (PD). The protocol was designed based on the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA) checklist as seen in **Supplementary Table/Material 2**<sup>6</sup>. The protocol was preregistered (PROSPERO: 649773). Studies were included if they satisfied the following criteria:(1) any type of studies that investigated the potential bias role of LLMs in the medical, medicine or physician related (eg. studies that investigated bias generated from the LLM model, that was analyzed by comparing

between ground truth and LLM result or between LLM models, are acceptable) (2) studies published in English, and (3) studies in full-text format. The exclusion criteria were: (1) studies that did not report on the direct application or potential role of LLMs in clinical medicine/physician (e.g., studies focusing solely on technical development without clinical application); (2) case reports, review papers; (3) studies involving non-human subjects (e.g., animal or basic research); (4) studies that focus solely on accuracy of the response; and (5) studies with insufficient data regarding the evaluation of bias in LLMs. Only publications conducted on human participants were included. The bibliographies of relevant papers were also reviewed to identify additional studies. No restrictions were applied regarding age, sex, or country of origin.

#### *Data extraction*

To ensure consistency and rigor, we implemented a standardized data collection protocol across all included studies. This protocol facilitated the systematic extraction of key variables pertinent to our research objectives. Extracted data included demographic information (first author's surname, country of study, year of publication), the primary AI/LLM model used, the study's topic and aims, evaluation criteria, the population or data source, the method of applying the LLM, the ground truth used for comparison, any other LLM models used in the study, and the main outcomes reported.

#### *Data synthesis*

Due to the heterogeneity in the specified aims and methodologies of the included studies, a narrative synthesis approach was employed. This involved a qualitative synthesis of the findings, categorized by the types of bias, impact, implications, and future considerations.

Due to the limited information in the types of bias exist from the large language model, we utilized a three-view of bias of evaluation, namely source of bias, manifestation of bias and attributes of bias. First, we categorize the source of bias studied into three types: Data-related bias, Model-related Bias and

Deployment Bias. These three bias corresponding to the three key stages of constructing a large language model<sup>7</sup>: data collection and preparation, model training and testing, and post-deployment of the model. Second, we examined the manifestation or the harm of the bias. We assigned three types of harms as follows: allocative harm<sup>8</sup>, representational harm<sup>9</sup> and performance disparities. Allocative harm occurs when the model systematically allocates resources or opportunities unfairly across different groups. Representational harm is assigned when the model reinforces negative stereotypes or diminishes the status of certain groups. We then allocated all other kinds of manifestation into performance disparities, as models can exhibit differences, but does not fall into the above categories. Lastly, the attributes of bias are documented, in which we focus on *which groups* are affected by the bias, such as race and ethnicity, gender or socioeconomic status.

### *Methodological Quality Assessment*

The quality of the included studies was assessed using the ROBINS-I tool<sup>10</sup>, which is designed for evaluating the risk of bias in non-randomized studies. This tool examines seven domains where bias can occur: confounding, participant selection, intervention classification, deviations from intended interventions, missing data, outcome measurement, and selective reporting of results. Each domain is rated as having a "low," "moderate," "serious," or "critical" risk of bias. The overall risk of bias for each study was determined by considering the highest risk rating across all domains. For instance, if a study had a "serious" risk in one domain and "moderate" or "low" in others, the overall risk was considered "serious." Two reviewers (TS and NT) independently assessed each study, and any disagreements were resolved through discussion or with the assistance of a third reviewer (PD).

## **RESULTS**

Our search strategy identified 1065 records. After removing 286 duplicates, we reviewed those studies by title and abstract, excluding 735 studies that did not meet the eligibility criteria related to study

design or participants. Subsequently, we thoroughly reviewed 45 articles and excluded 7 for reporting different topic/domain. Ultimately, 38 studies met the eligibility criteria for our systematic review<sup>11-48</sup>. **Figure 1** illustrates our search methodology and selection process, and **Table 1** details each recorded selected papers. **Table 2** shows the methodological quality of each study as assessed by ROBIN-I tool. **Figure 2** shows the heatmap of the amount of research studies, with source of bias and manifestation of bias.

### *Source of Bias*

Data-related bias, originating from the datasets used to train the LLMs, emerged as a significant and recurring issue. This type of bias arises when the training data does not accurately reflect the real-world diversity of patient populations, clinical presentations, or relevant contextual factors. Several studies highlighted the detrimental effects of skewed datasets. For example, imbalances in the representation of skin tones in dermatological image datasets<sup>48</sup>. Studies analyzing the readability and content of LLM-generated text found that outputs varied significantly based on patient race<sup>12</sup> and socioeconomic status<sup>29</sup>. Furthermore, the utilization of historical data that reflects past societal biases, even if technically "accurate," can lead LLMs to reproduce and amplify those biases in their outputs<sup>19,31,34,46</sup>. This was evident in studies where models associated specific diagnoses with particular demographic groups, potentially influencing clinical decision-making and reinforcing harmful stereotypes<sup>14,47</sup>. None of the included studies directly assessed deployment bias, indicating a significant gap in the current literature.

Beyond the data itself, the design, training, and evaluation of LLMs introduce another significant source of bias: model-related bias. A striking example of model-related bias is the consistent tendency of image generation models to depict healthcare professionals, such as physicians and surgeons, as predominantly White and male<sup>13,20,21,26,27</sup>. This could be likely stemming from a combination of biased training data and the model's inherent tendencies. Furthermore, even when presented with identical inputs,



different LLMs can exhibit varying degrees of bias, highlighting the influence of model-specific design choices. For instance, one study<sup>45</sup> demonstrated that Gemini was more likely than GPT-4 to recommend strong opioids, showcasing how algorithmic differences can lead to harm.

### *Manifestation of Bias*

The biases stemming from both data and model sources are consistently observed across the reviewed studies. *Allocative Harm* was frequently seen in studies examining diagnostic pathways and treatment recommendations, where model outputs varied based on patient demographics<sup>14,31,34,46</sup>. *Representational Harm* manifested as the reinforcement of harmful stereotypes or the under-representation of certain groups<sup>13,18,24,25,33,35,43</sup>. Finally, *Performance Disparities* were identified in some studies<sup>15,42</sup>. We noted that some studies reporting no significant bias<sup>32,37,41,44</sup>.

### *Attributes of Bias*

Race/ethnicity and gender were the most frequently investigated attributes, with numerous studies documenting biases related to these characteristics<sup>11,12,18,19,21,24,25,31,33,35,36,39,40,46,48</sup>. However, the scope of the reviewed studies extended to other crucial attributes, including age<sup>14,18,21,27</sup>, socioeconomic status<sup>29,34</sup>, disability status<sup>43</sup>, language<sup>42</sup>, and specific health conditions (smoking status)<sup>15</sup>.

### *Methodological Quality and Risk of Bias*

The overall methodological quality of the included studies was variable. Based on the ROBINS-I assessment, the majority of studies had a low risk of bias across most domains (**Table 2**). However, several studies exhibited a moderate risk of bias in the domains of outcome measurement and selective reporting of results. This was often due to the subjective nature of evaluating LLM-generated responses and the potential for selective reporting of positive findings.

## **DISCUSSION**

This systematic review, encompassing 38 studies of large language models (LLMs) applied to a range of clinical tasks, provides the first comprehensive overview of the complexity nature of bias within clinical application. The findings of this systematic review unequivocally demonstrate that bias in clinical LLMs is not a theoretical concern but a pervasive and systemic problem with the potential to significantly compromise patient care and exacerbate health inequities.

### *Bias in Large Language Model*

The earliest studies of generative AI in Bias focuses on retrieving information, from typical large language models<sup>20</sup>, to more specific fine-tuned models<sup>44</sup>. Data-related bias, the first major source, stems from the vast datasets that form the foundation of LLM training<sup>49</sup>. These datasets, often scraped from the internet or compiled from existing medical records<sup>50</sup>, are rarely perfectly representative of the real-world diversity of patient populations and clinical scenarios<sup>4</sup>, as seen in racial, disability and some individuals. Historical bias may explain this phenomenon. Medical data, by its very nature, reflects the history of medical practice, which has often been marked by disparities and inequities<sup>51</sup>. Past biases in diagnosis, treatment, and access to care are embedded within historical medical records, and if these records are used to train LLMs without careful consideration, the models will inevitably learn and perpetuate these historical injustices.

Model-related bias, the second primary source, highlights the fact that even with perfectly unbiased data (a theoretical ideal rarely achievable in practice), LLMs can still exhibit bias due to their inherent design and training processes, as seen in one of the studies regarding opioid recommendation<sup>45</sup>, in which Gemini recommended a stronger opioid than GPT-4. This exposes the crucial point that LLMs are not monolithic entities; each model has its own unique bias profile<sup>52</sup>, shaped by its specific architecture, training data, and training process. Addressing model-related bias requires a deep dive into the technical intricacies of LLM design and training, demanding expertise in both machine learning and fairness principles.

These source of bias leads to various manifestation. Allocative harm generates biased diagnostic reasoning to differential treatment recommendations. The downstream consequences of allocative harm can be significant, leading to disparities in access to care, delays in diagnosis, undertreatment of pain, or the unnecessary use of invasive procedures<sup>53</sup>. Representational harm, while perhaps less immediately tangible than allocative harm, occurs when the LLM reinforces harmful stereotypes, contributes to the under-representation of certain groups, or otherwise distorts the perception of specific populations<sup>54</sup>, such as the overrepresentation of whites in the physician field compared to the true proportions<sup>36</sup>.

### *Clinical and ethical impacts*

Beyond direct impacts on clinical decision-making, biased LLMs can also subtly influence clinician perceptions and behaviors<sup>55</sup>. The constant exposure to biased outputs, even if clinicians are aware of the potential for bias, could unconsciously reinforce existing stereotypes and prejudices. This "automation bias," where clinicians over-rely on AI-generated information<sup>56</sup>, can be particularly insidious, especially when dealing with complex or ambiguous cases. Furthermore, the use of biased LLMs could erode trust in AI systems among both clinicians and patients<sup>5</sup>. If patients from marginalized groups perceive that the AI tools used in their care are biased against them, they may be less likely to seek care, to adhere to treatment recommendations, or to trust their healthcare providers.

### *Mitigation strategies of Bias*

We propose bias mitigation strategies as similar to how LLMs were constructed. To address data-related bias, rigorous curation and auditing of training datasets are essential, including techniques like data augmentation<sup>57</sup>, re-weighting, and the incorporation of diverse data sources<sup>58</sup>. To mitigate model-related bias, researchers should explore fairness-aware training algorithms<sup>59</sup>, adversarial debiasing techniques, and alternative model architectures less susceptible to bias amplification<sup>60</sup>. Furthermore, continuous monitoring of training data for emerging biases is essential<sup>61</sup>, as societal biases are dynamic and evolving. Exploring alternative model architectures that are inherently less susceptible to bias is also

a key area for future research<sup>62</sup>. Most of all, clinicians need to understand, at least at a high level, how the LLM arrived at a particular decision or recommendation<sup>63</sup>. This allows them to critically evaluate the output and to identify potential sources of bias. Developing methods for explaining LLM decisions in a clinically meaningful way is a significant research challenge.

#### *Future directions of bias*

LLMs are the frontier of the new era of clinical care. User-centric approaches are essential because even the fairest LLM can be misused or misinterpreted if clinicians are not adequately trained on its limitations and potential biases. Medical education needs to incorporate training on recognizing and mitigating bias in AI, emphasizing critical appraisal skills and the importance of integrating clinical judgment and contextual knowledge<sup>64</sup>. Clinicians should be taught to view LLM outputs as supplementary information, not as definitive answers, and to always consider the potential for bias when making clinical decisions. Furthermore, clinicians need to be prepared to engage in shared decision-making with patients, transparently discussing the use of AI tools, their potential benefits and limitations, and addressing any concerns patients may have about bias.

Systemic and regulatory approaches are also necessary to ensure accountability and to promote fairness in the development and deployment of clinical LLMs. Establishing clear ethical guidelines and regulatory oversight will be essential for defining standards for bias detection and mitigation, ensuring accountability for biased outputs, and promoting fairness in the marketplace. This might involve creating certification processes for clinical LLMs, requiring developers to demonstrate that their models meet certain fairness standards before they can be deployed in clinical settings.

Future research should prioritize the development and rigorous evaluation of effective bias mitigation strategies in real-world clinical settings. Moreover, the absence of studies evaluating deployment bias in this review highlights a critical research gap. Future studies should investigate how LLMs are used in real-world clinical settings, how clinicians interact with and interpret their outputs, and

whether these interactions introduce or amplify bias. Interdisciplinary collaboration, bringing together experts in computer science, medicine, ethics, law, and social sciences, is essential for addressing the complex interplay of technical, clinical, and societal factors that contribute to bias. Standardizing bias evaluation methods and developing robust metrics for assessing fairness across diverse demographic groups are crucial for facilitating meaningful comparisons and tracking progress.

### *Limitations of This Review*

This systematic review, while comprehensive, is subject to certain limitations. The disproportionate representation of studies utilizing GPT-based models, limits the generalizability of the findings to all available language models. Furthermore, many studies relied on simulated clinical vignettes or publicly available datasets, which may not fully reflect the complexities of real-world clinical practice. The heterogeneity in bias evaluation methods across studies also presents a challenge for direct comparison and synthesis of results. Lastly, the rapidly evolving nature of LLM technology means that the findings of this review represent a snapshot in time, and ongoing evaluation is essential to keep pace with new developments and emerging biases.

## **CONCLUSION**

Bias in clinical LLMs is a serious and pervasive threat to equitable healthcare. Immediate and concerted action is required, encompassing improved data practices, fairness-aware model development, rigorous evaluation, user training, and regulatory oversight, to ensure that these powerful technologies are used to benefit all patients. As large language models are further developed and implemented, future research should continue to improve methodology to identify bias, as well as develop and implement effective mitigation strategies to ensure that LLMs can be used to promote equity, fairness, and improved patient care for all.

Figure 1: PRISMA Diagram of the study




Figure 2: Heatmap of the Bias Studies




Table 1: Current studies of generative AI focusing on bias

	Last Author	Year	Country	AI model	Source of Bias	Manifestation of Bias	Attributes of Bias	Bias Evaluation Method	Population	Intervention	Ground Truth	Models involved	Outcome
1	Agrawal	2024	USA	Multiple Model	Data-related Bias	Representational Harm	Race/Ethnicity, Gender	A) Statistical differences between demographics of AI-generated oncologist recommendations and national distribution of oncologists B) statistical differences between racial distribution of AI generated cases and national cancer cases	A) demographic groups of AI-generated oncologist recommendations (139 AI-Oncologists) B) AI-generated written cancer cases (1,100 AI cases)	Simple question/retrieval	A) The top 10 oncologists in the top 10 most populous U.S. cities were analyzed (2023 census). B) National distribution of cases for that cancer type	ChatGPT, Gemini & Bing Chat	The race distribution was significantly different as the number of Asians was overrepresented in Chat GPT recommendations while the number of Whites and Hispanics were underrepresented. Gender was noted to be statistically significant in cancer case study.
2	Akufo Addo	2024	USA	GPT-4	Data-related Bias	Representational Harm	Race/Ethnicity	Statistical differences in accuracy of diagnosis	Fitzpatrick clinical images dataset, divided into lighter and darker skin tone	Simple question/retrieval	Labelled dataset	N/A	GPT-4 exhibited better performance in providing the correct diagnosis for lighter skin tones compared to darker skin tones
3	Ali	2023	USA	Multiple Model	Model-Related Bias (Comparing between Model)	Representational Harm	Race/Ethnicity, Gender	Images were assessed for demographic realities in the surgical profession	2400 images were analyzed, generated across 8 surgical specialties within each model. An additional 1200 images were evaluated based on geographic prompts for 3 countries.	Simple question/retrieval	The measure of demographic characteristics was provided by the AAMC subspecialty report, which references the AMA master file for physician demographic characteristics across 50 states	DALL-E 2 (OpenAI), Midjourney version 5.1 (Midjourney), and Stable Diffusion version 2.1 (Stable AI)	2 models overwhelmingly depicted surgeons as White and male and 1 showed comparable demographic characteristics to real attending surgeons; however, all 3 models underestimated trainee representation.



4	Amin	2024	USA	ChatGPT	Data-related Bias	Performance Disparities	Race/Ethnicity	readability scores of the outputs were calculated and compared	MIMIC-IV 750 radiology reports, with labelled race in the reports	Simple question/retrieval	Labelled dataset	GPT 3.5 Turbo and GPT 4	For ChatGPT-3.5, output for White and Asian was at a significantly higher reading grade level than both Black or African American and American Indian or Alaska Native, among other differences. For ChatGPT-4, output for Asian was at a significantly higher reading grade level than American Indian or Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, among other differences.
5	Andreadis	2024	USA	ChatGPT	Data-related Bias	Allocative Harm	Age	Symptom Checker output using a mixed-methods approach, as well as, readability (using Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level) and qualitative aspects like disclaimers and demographic tailoring.	540 combination symptom and demographic vignettes were developed for 27 most common symptom complaints. Standardized prompts, written from a patient perspective, with varying demographic permutations of age, sex, and race/ethnicity	Simple question/retrieval	WebMD	N/A	ChatGPT's urgent care recommendations and demographic tailoring were presented significantly more to 75-year-olds versus 25-year-olds
6	Anibal	2024	USA	Multiple Model	Model-Related Bias	Performance Disparities	Smoking status	comparing between AI model sound data and patient report	17 patients with voice data which was considered most likely to result in a conflict between patient reporting and algorithmic predictions of smoking behaviors.	LLM-based Classification	Patient-reported information	10 opensource and proprietary LLMs	Large Language Models (LLMs) often prioritized data-driven predictions from other AI models and acoustic analysis over a patient's own statement about their smoking status

7	Annor	2024	USA	Multiple Model	Data-related Bias	Performance Disparities	Guidelines	responses were graded by reviewers for appropriateness, completeness, and bias to any of the guidelines	10 questions were compiled regarding important weight loss therapies	Simple question/retrieval	ADA, AACE guidelines	Google Gemini and Microsoft Copilot	All responses from Microsoft copilot and 8 out of 10 (80%) responses from Google Gemini were appropriate. Microsoft Copilot (10 out of 10; 100%) provided a higher proportion of complete responses than Google Gemini (5 out of 10; 50%), while 2 of the responses from Microsoft copilot were biased
8	Ayinde	2024	USA	ChatGPT	Model-Related Bias	Performance Disparities	Guidelines	responses were graded to evaluate if there is a societal guideline incongruence or favorability	8 questions on CRC screening among average and high-risk populations were developed, written in simple language	Simple question/retrieval	American Cancer Society, United States. Preventive Services Task Force, American College of Gastroenterology	N/A	The responses to all 8 questions also included recommendations from at least two (2) of the professional bodies
9	Cevik	2023	Australia	Multiple Model	Model-Related Bias	Representational Harm	Race/Ethnicity, Gender	Images/text were assessed for presumed skin tone (Massey Martin NIS Skin Scale Score), age, gender, and Body Silhouette Scale Score	24 descriptions and 64 images of characteristics of eight types of surgeons	Simple question/retrieval	Approximately comparison with real-world demographics	ChatGPT-3.5, BARD, Dall-E2 and Midjourney	Midjourney exclusively depicted lighter skin tones, with Dall-E2 and Midjourney showing underrepresentation of gender disparity.
10	Chang	2024	USA	Multiple Model	Data-related Bias	Representational Harm	Race/Ethnicity, Socioeconomic Status	responses were grade if appropriate or inappropriate (safety, privacy, hallucination/accuracy, and/or bias). Bias was defined by inaccurate and/or stereotyped statements, with a focus on racial, socioeconomic, and gender-related bias.	38 prompts consisting of explicit questions and synthetic clinical notes created by medically trained reviewers and LGBTQIA+ health experts.	Simple question/retrieval	based on criteria outlined with LGBTQIA+ health experts	Gemini 1.5 Flash, Claude 3 Haiku, GPT-4o, Stanford Medicine Secure GPT (GPT-4.0))	Most model responses displayed concerning levels of bias and inaccuracy
11	Choudry	2023	USA	DALL E-2	Model-Related Bias	Representational Harm	Race/Ethnicity, Gender	Images were assessed by Race and Sex in a categorical assessment	1560 images of descriptions of ophthalmologist	Simple question/retrieval	estimated real-life demographics for ophthalmologists in practice were referenced from a prior study	N/A	Dall-E2 had higher percentages of Black and Hispanic, with lower percentages of Asian, as well as absence of Native Americans.

12	Currie	2024	Australia	DALL-E 3	Model-Related Bias	Representational Harm	Race/Ethnicity, Gender	Images were assessed for apparent gender and skin tone	47 images of individual and group images, total of 448 characters, of medical students, specifically Australian undergraduate medical students	Simple question/retrieval	actual diversity of medical students in Australia	N/A	The gender and skin tone distribution showed a statistically significant variation from that of actual Australian medical students for individual images, for group images and for the collective images
13	Currie	2024	Australia	DALL-E 3	Model-Related Bias	Representational Harm	Race/Ethnicity, Gender	Images were assessed apparent gender, age, skin tone and ethnicity.	145 individuals and group of paramedics and ambulances officer images	Simple question/retrieval	Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency real-world data of demographics	N/A	DALL-E 3 depicted individual pictures 100 % as male, 100 % as Caucasian and 100 % with light skin tone, with higher proportionate of Male when included group pictures.
14	Currie	2024	Australia	Multiple Model	Model-Related Bias	Representational Harm	Race/Ethnicity, Gender	Images were assessed apparent gender, age, body habitus, skin tone and ethnicity.	40 images, totaling 155 pharmacists depicted.	Simple question/retrieval	Australian demographics of registered pharmacists	DALL-E3 and Adobe Firefly 2	The gender distribution was a statistically significant variation from that of actual Australian pharmacists. Among the images of individual pharmacists, DALL-E 3 generated 100% as men and 100% were light skin tone.
15	Desai	2024	USA	ChatGPT	Model-Related Bias	Representational Harm	Gender	Letters were compared in differences in length, language, and tone.	6 letters of recommendation, divided into male and female letters	Simple question/retrieval	N/A	N/A	Female surgeons are more often described as “empathetic” and male surgeons are more often described as “natural leaders”
16	Farlow	2024	USA	ChatGPT	Model-Related Bias	Representational Harm	Gender	Letters were analyzed using a gender-bias calculator which assesses the proportion of male-versus female associated words.	20 letters of recommendation, generated by prompts describing identical men and women applying for Otolaryngology residency positions	Simple question/retrieval	N/A	N/A	Regardless of the gender, school, research, or other activities, all LORs generated by ChatGPT showed a bias toward male-associated words

17	Gisselback	2024	USA	Multiple Model	Model-Related Bias	Representational Harm	Race/Ethnicity, Gender, Age	Images were assessed and categorized based on sex, race/ethnicity, age, and emotional traits	1,200 images of anesthesiologists across various subspecialties	Simple question/retrieval	Demographic data were obtained from the American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA) and the European Society of Anesthesiology and Intensive Care (ESAIC)	DALL-E 2 and Midjourney	The models predominantly portrayed anesthesiologists as White, with male gender. Younger anesthesiologists were underrepresented. Predominant traits such as "masculine," "attractive," and "trustworthy" were discovered across various subspecialties.
18	Gisselback	2024	USA	Multiple Model	Model-Related Bias	Representational Harm	Race/Ethnicity, Gender, Age	Images were assessed and categorized based on sex, race/ethnicity and age	1,400 images of intensivists/ICU across various subspecialties	Simple question/retrieval	Published demographic data on intensive care fellows/physician workforce report in the United States	DALL-E 2 and Midjourney	The models produced an overrepresenting White and young doctors. Statistical differences were also found in gender proportion between both models
19	Hake	2024	USA	ChatGPT	Model-Related Bias	Representational Harm	Race/Ethnicity, Gender	Quality, accuracy, bias, and relevance were all evaluated on scales of 0-100. Bias is assessed if the model introduces new bias, on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, gender, sexual orientation or national origin.	140 abstracts across 14 major journals	Summarization	N/A	N/A	ChatGPT's summaries are rated as high quality, high accuracy, and low bias
20	Hanna	2023	USA	GPT 3.5	Data-related Bias	Performance Disparities	Socioeconomic Status	polarity and subjectivity scores were calculated for each generated text. Polarity ranges from -1.0 (negative) to 1.0 (positive). Subjectivity ranges from 0.0 (Objective) to 1.0 (very subjective)	100 randomly selected deidentified encounters for patients with HIV (PWH) was used to generate discharge instructions	Simple question/retrieval	N/A	N/A	The differences in polarity and subjectivity across the races/ethnicities were not statistically significant, however there was a statistically significant difference in subjectivity across insurance types with commercial insurance eliciting the most subjective responses and Medicare and other payer types the lowest

21	Hasheminasab	2024	UK	Multiple Model	Model-Related Bias	Performance Disparities	N/A	Concept extraction and question answering task were assessed by F1 Score, precision, recall, and accuracy, and BLEU and ROUGE-I respectively	200 free-text notes, including 50 DS and 150 SOAP notes were randomly extracted from a Global South medical center	Multi-Intervention	Manual labeling	ChatGPT, GatorTron, BioMegatron, BioBert and ClinicalBERT	LLMs not fine-tuned to the local EHR dataset performed poorly, suggesting bias, when externally validated on it. Fine-tuning the LLMs to the local EHR data improved model performance. ChatGPT, which training data was not revealed, performed better than expected.
22	Heinz	2023	USA	GPT-3	Data-related Bias	Allocative Harm	Race/Ethnicity, Gender	generalized linear mixed-effects models to quantify the relationship between demographic factors and model interpretation	59 clinical vignettes based on stylistic guidelines established by the National Board of Medical Examiners for test questions appropriate for the USMLE STEP 2 and Subject Examinations, in psychiatry	Simple question/retrieval	N/A	N/A	Latino persons are more likely to be diagnosed with any mood disorder compared to White persons. Native American persons are more likely to be diagnosed with substance use disorders compared to White persons; Native American persons are more likely to be diagnosed with AUD compared to White persons; men are less likely to be diagnosed with BPD compared to women.
23	Ito	2023	Japan	GPT-4	N/A (No Bias)	N/A (No Bias)	Race/Ethnicity	proportion of "correct" answers for diagnosis and triage were calculated and expanded using Clopper-Pearson CI method	45 clinical vignettes provided the most likely primary diagnosis and triage level (emergency, nonemergency, or self-care), as well as adding the information on patient race and ethnicity to the clinical vignettes	Simple question/retrieval	A group of three board certified provide human-led answers, in which the diagnosis from the model and the physicians were independently assessed by 2 board-certified emergency physicians	N/A	The performance of GPT-4 in diagnosing health conditions did not vary among different races and ethnicities (Black, White, Asian, and Hispanic), as well as in accuracy of patient triage.

24	Kaplan	2024	USA	ChatGPT	Model-Related Bias	Representational Harm	Gender	2-tailed independent sample t tests were conducted to compare the language content and frequencies of letters generated for male names and letters generated for female names	1400 recommendation letters	Simple question/retrieval	N/A	N/A	Significant differences in language between letters generated for female versus male names were observed across all prompts, including the prompt hypothesized to be neutral, and across nearly all language categories tested
25	Kim	2023	USA	Multiple Model	Data-related Bias	Allocative Harm	Race/Ethnicity, Gender, Socioeconomic Status	Narrative assessment was performed on each clinical vignette.	19 clinical vignettes in cardiology, emergency medicine, rheumatology, and dermatology.	Simple question/retrieval	N/A	ChatGPT-4 and Bard.	AI chatbots provided different recommendations based on a patient's gender, race and ethnicity, and SES in certain clinical scenarios
26	Lee	2024	USA	Multiple Model	Data-related Bias	Performance Disparities	Race/Ethnicity	Responses were analyzed for readability by word count, Simple Measure of Gobbledygook (SMOG) index, Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level, and Flesch Reading Ease score.	150 responses, divided between Asian, Black, Hispanic, Native American, and White, generated from a standardized prompt incorporating demographic modifiers to inquire about myopia	Simple question/retrieval	N/A	ChatGPT, Gemini, and Copilot	Patient demographic information impacts the reading level of educational material generated by Gemini but not by ChatGPT or Copilot.
27	Lee	2024	USA	Multiple Model	Model-Related Bias	Representational Harm	Race/Ethnicity, Gender	distribution of race and ethnicity and gender within each platform and combined across all platforms	1000 images across 5 platforms of physician/doctor face	Simple question/retrieval	US physician demographics based on the 2023 Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) survey	DALL E2, Imagine AI Art, Jasper Art, Midjourney, Text-to-image (Runway)	AI-generated images of physicians were more frequently White and more frequently men compared with the US physician population
28	Lin	2024	USA	DALL E-2	N/A (No Bias)	N/A (No Bias)	Race/Ethnicity, Gender	The proportions of gender and race in each specialty, and for the total results, were compared against one another to determine the statistically significant differences	228 images of facial representations of 19 distinct medical specialties	Simple question/retrieval	the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) residency specialty breakdown with respect to race and gender	N/A	No statistically significant between AI predictions and the current demographic landscape of medical residents,

29	Oca	2023	USA	Multiple Model	Model-Related Bias	Representational Harm	Gender	Pearson's chi-squared test was performed to determine differences between the three chatbots in male versus female recommendations and recommendation accuracy.	240 total recommendations regarding ophthalmologist recommendations	Simple question/retrieval	national gender proportion of ophthalmologists as reported by the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC)	Chat GPT3.5, Bing Chat and Google Bard	Female ophthalmologists recommended by Bing Chat and Bard were significantly less than the national proportion of practicing female ophthalmologists
30	O'Malley	2024	UK	Multiple Model	Model-Related Bias	Representational Harm	Race/Ethnicity	Chi-square goodness of fit analysis compared the skin tone distributions from each set of images to that of the US population.	200 images of people with psoriasis	Simple question/retrieval	Skin tone distribution of the US population according to the 2012 American National Election Survey	Dall-E and Midjourney	The standard AI models (Dalle-3 and Midjourney) demonstrated a significant difference between the expected skin tones of the US population and the observed tones in the generated images, overrepresenting lighter skin
31	Parikh	2024	USA	Multiple Model	Model-Related Bias	Representational Harm	Gender	The proportion of female surgeons recommended by each chatbot was compared to the national proportion of female ASOPRS members using a z test.	672 suggestions of oculoplastic surgeons practicing in 20 cities with the highest population in the United States	Simple question/retrieval	American Society of Ophthalmic Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery database	ChatGPT, Microsoft Bing Balanced, and Google Bard	ChatGPT recommending statistically significantly lower female than the national proportion, but Bard recommending statistically significantly higher than the national proportion.
32	Schmidt	2024	Netherlands	ChatGPT	N/A (No Bias)	N/A (No Bias)	Evaluating Diagnostic Bias	chi-square goodness-of-fit statistics testing for significance, with null hypothesis that observed ChatGPT data would not be significantly different from the expected data	265 residents who participate in the five prior experiments aimed at studying the influence of biasing information on diagnostic performance	Simple question/retrieval	five previously published experiments aimed at inducing bias.	N/A	Diagnostic accuracy of residents and ChatGPT was equivalent

33	Tong	2024	China	ChatGPT	Model-Related Bias	Performance Disparities	Language	Correct response rate was used for accuracy rate and Brier Score was used to evaluate ChatGPT 4's diagnostic efficiency in both language versions.	160 questions of comprehensive written section of the 2022 Chinese National Medical Licensing Examination, with original Chinese version and a translated English version	Simple question/retrieval	standard answers were provided by experts with extensive clinical experience and practice licenses.	N/A	ChatGPT demonstrated a correct response rate of 81.25% for Chinese and 86.25% for English questions, with the average quality score for English responses was excellent (4.43 point), slightly higher than for Chinese (4.34 point).
34	Urbina	2024	USA	Multiple Model	Model-Related Bias	Representational Harm	Disability	Generated descriptions were parsed into words that were linguistically analyzed into favorable or limiting qualities	300 descriptions of people without specified functional status, people with disability, patients with disability and athletes with disability	Simple question/retrieval	Current estimations by the Center for Disease Control and Prevention	ChatGPT and Gemini	Both models significantly underestimated disability in a population of people and linguistic analysis showed that descriptions of people, patients, and athletes with a disability were generated as having significantly fewer favorable qualities and significantly more limitations than people without a disability in both ChatGPT and Gemini.
35	Xie	2024	USA	Clinical BERT with manual labelled data	N/A (No Bias)	N/A (No Bias)	Race/Ethnicity, Gender	two-tailed permutation tests with 10,000 iterations (class balances) for the demographic variables (sex, ethnicity, and insurance)	84,675 clinic visits from 25,612 patients seen in an epilepsy center	LLM-based Classification	192 manually-annotated notes from independent readers	N/A	No differences in the accuracy, or positive or negative class balance of outcome classifications across demographic groups



36	Young	2024	USA	Multiple Model	Model-Related Bias	Allocative Harm	Model comparison	Order of opioid recommendation was treated as a continuous variable defined as the order in which the first opioid was suggested by the LLM output	40 real-world patient cases, total of 480 prompts, were sourced from the MIMIC-IV Note dataset to provide subjective pain rating and comprehensive pain management recommendation	Simple question/retrieval	N/A	Gemini and ChatGPT4	Relative to GPT-4, Gemini was more likely to rate a patient's pain as "severe", recommend strong opioids, and recommend opioids later. Maximum daily dose of morphine and oxycodone was significantly greater in Gemini suggestions compared with GPT-4 suggestions. Race/ethnicity and sex did not influence LLM recommendations.
37	Zack	2024	USA	GPT-4	Data-related Bias	Allocative Harm	Race/Ethnicity, Gender	statistical significance of the differences in treatment recommendations by gender through a Fisher's exact test, and other demographic condition by Mann-Whitney test	1000 patient presentation/prompts from clinical vignettes from NEJM Healer and from published research on implicit bias in health care.	Simple question/retrieval	True prevalence estimates by demographic group were based on US estimates	N/A	GPT-4 did not appropriately model the demographic diversity of medical conditions, consistently producing clinical vignettes that stereotype demographic presentations. Assessment and plans created by the model showed significant association between demographic attributes and recommendations for more expensive procedures as well as differences in patient perception.
38	Zhang	2023	USA	GPT 3.5	Data-related Bias	Allocative Harm	Race/Ethnicity, Gender	Pearson's chi-squared test was performed to determine if the difference between response counts was statistically significant	200 prompts of cases that span the spectrum of ACS severity	Simple question/retrieval	prompt without race or gender served as the control	N/A	There were observed differences in medical management, diagnostic work up and interventions, and symptom management that can be attributed to specifying the gender or race of a patient

Table 2: Risk of Bias evaluation (ROBINS-I assessment tool)

	Last Author	Year	Pre-intervention/Intervention Bias			Post-Intervention Bias				Overall
			Confounding	Participant Selection	Classification	Deviations	Missing	Measurement	Result Selection	
1	Agrawal	2024	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate
2	Akufo Addo	2024	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
3	Ali	2023	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
4	Amin	2024	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
5	Andreadis	2024	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
6	Anibal	2024	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate
7	Annor	2024	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
8	Ayinde	2024	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
9	Cevik	2023	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate
10	Chang	2024	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
11	Choudry	2023	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate
12	Currie	2024	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
13	Currie	2024	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
14	Currie	2024	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
15	Desai	2024	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
16	Farlow	2024	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
17	Gisselback	2024	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
18	Gisselback	2024	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
19	Hake	2024	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
20	Hanna	2023	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
21	Hashem-inasab	2024	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
22	Heinz	2023	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
23	Ito	2023	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate
24	Kaplan	2024	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
25	Kim	2023	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
26	Lee	2024	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
27	Lee	2024	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
28	Lin	2024	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
29	Oca	2023	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
30	O'Malley	2024	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
31	Parikh	2024	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
32	Schmidt	2024	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate
33	Tong	2024	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate
34	Urbina	2024	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
35	Xie	2024	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
36	Young	2024	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
37	Zack	2024	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
38	Zhang	2023	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate

## Supplementary Table/Data 1: Search Terms

PUBMED: (((("medicine" OR "healthcare" OR "diagnosis" OR "treatment" OR "patient care")) AND (("bias" OR "fairness" OR "equity" OR "discrimination" OR "health disparities" OR "healthcare disparities")))) AND (((("large language model"[tiab] OR "LLM"[tiab] OR "foundation model"[tiab] OR "language vision model"[tiab] OR "Gemini"[tiab] OR "ChatGPT"[tiab] OR "BERT"[tiab] OR "Claude"[tiab] OR "transformer"[tiab] OR "generative AI"[tiab]))))

EMBASE: (('medicine':ti,ab,kw OR 'healthcare':ti,ab,kw OR 'diagnosis':ti,ab,kw OR 'treatment':ti,ab,kw OR 'patient care':ti,ab,kw) AND ('bias':ti,ab,kw OR 'fairness':ti,ab,kw OR 'equity':ti,ab,kw OR 'discrimination':ti,ab,kw OR 'health disparities':ti,ab,kw OR 'healthcare disparities':ti,ab,kw) AND ('large language model':ti,ab,kw OR 'llm':ti,ab,kw OR 'foundation model':ti,ab,kw OR 'language vision model':ti,ab,kw OR 'gemini':ti,ab,kw OR 'chatgpt':ti,ab,kw OR 'bert':ti,ab,kw OR 'claude':ti,ab,kw OR 'transformer':ti,ab,kw OR 'generative ai':ti,ab,kw)

OVID: (medicine.ti,ab,kw. OR healthcare.ti,ab,kw. OR diagnosis.ti,ab,kw. OR treatment.ti,ab,kw. OR patient care.ti,ab,kw.) AND (bias.ti,ab,kw. OR fairness.ti,ab,kw. OR equity.ti,ab,kw. OR discrimination.ti,ab,kw. OR health disparities.ti,ab,kw. OR healthcare disparities.ti,ab,kw.) AND (large language model.ti,ab,kw. OR LLM.ti,ab,kw. OR foundation model.ti,ab,kw. OR language vision model.ti,ab,kw. OR Gemini.ti,ab,kw. OR ChatGPT.ti,ab,kw. OR BERT.ti,ab,kw. OR Claude.ti,ab,kw. OR transformer.ti,ab,kw. OR generative AI.ti,ab,kw.)

## References:

1. Reddy S. Generative AI in healthcare: an implementation science informed translational path on application, integration and governance. *Implement Sci*. Mar 15 2024;19(1):27. doi:10.1186/s13012-024-01357-9
2. Alowais SA, Alghamdi SS, Alsuhebany N, et al. Revolutionizing healthcare: the role of artificial intelligence in clinical practice. *BMC Med Educ*. Sep 22 2023;23(1):689. doi:10.1186/s12909-023-04698-z
3. Clusmann J, Kolbinger FR, Muti HS, et al. The future landscape of large language models in medicine. *Commun Med (Lond)*. Oct 10 2023;3(1):141. doi:10.1038/s43856-023-00370-1
4. Franklin G, Stephens R, Piracha M, et al. The Sociodemographic Biases in Machine Learning Algorithms: A Biomedical Informatics Perspective. *Life (Basel)*. May 21 2024;14(6)doi:10.3390/life14060652
5. Choudhury A, Chaudhry Z. Large Language Models and User Trust: Consequence of Self-Referential Learning Loop and the Deskilling of Health Care Professionals. *J Med Internet Res*. Apr 25 2024;26:e56764. doi:10.2196/56764
6. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*. 2021;372:n71. doi:10.1136/bmj.n71
7. Chen F, Wang L, Hong J, Jiang J, Zhou L. Unmasking bias in artificial intelligence: a systematic review of bias detection and mitigation strategies in electronic health record-based models. *ArXiv*. Jul 1 2024;
8. Borrellas P, Unceta I. The Challenges of Machine Learning and Their Economic Implications. *Entropy (Basel)*. Feb 25 2021;23(3)doi:10.3390/e23030275
9. Filippi CG, Stein JM, Wang Z, et al. Ethical Considerations and Fairness in the Use of Artificial Intelligence for Neuroradiology. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. Nov 2023;44(11):1242-1248. doi:10.3174/ajnr.A7963
10. Sterne JA, Hernán MA, Reeves BC, et al. ROBINS-I: a tool for assessing risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions. *Bmj*. Oct 12 2016;355:i4919. doi:10.1136/bmj.i4919
11. Agrawal A. Fairness in AI-Driven Oncology: Investigating Racial and Gender Biases in Large Language Models. *Cureus*. Sep 2024;16(9):e69541. doi:10.7759/cureus.69541
12. Amin KS, Forman HP, Davis MA. Even with ChatGPT, race matters. *Clin Imaging*. May 2024;109:110113. doi:10.1016/j.clinimag.2024.110113
13. Ali R, Tang OY, Connolly ID, et al. Demographic Representation in 3 Leading Artificial Intelligence Text-to-Image Generators. *JAMA Surg*. Jan 1 2024;159(1):87-95. doi:10.1001/jamasurg.2023.5695
14. Andreadis K, Newman DR, Twan C, Shunk A, Mann DM, Stevens ER. Mixed methods assessment of the influence of demographics on medical advice of ChatGPT. Article. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*. 2024;31(9):2002-2009. doi:10.1093/jamia/ocae086
15. Anibal J, Gunkel J, Awan S, et al. The doctor will polygraph you now. *Npj Health Syst*. 2024;1(1):1. doi:10.1038/s44401-024-00001-4
16. Annor E, Atarere JO, Ubah NR, et al. Assessing Online Chat-Based Artificial Intelligence Models for Weight Loss Recommendation Appropriateness and Bias in the Presence of Guideline Incongruence. Conference Abstract. *American Journal of Gastroenterology*. 2024;119(10):S1496. doi:10.14309/01.ajg.0001037744.39620.b5
17. Ayinde A, Atarere J, Egbo O, Nguyen H, Chido-Amajuoyi O. Are ChatGPT Cancer Screening Recommendations Biased in the Presence of Screening Guideline Incongruence? Conference Abstract. *American Journal of Gastroenterology*. 2024;119(10):S378. doi:10.14309/01.ajg.0001031548.89749.f6
18. Cevik J, Lim B, Seth I, et al. Assessment of the bias of artificial intelligence generated images and large language models on their depiction of a surgeon. *ANZ J Surg*. Mar 2024;94(3):287-294. doi:10.1111/ans.18792

19. Chang CT, Srivathsa N, Bou-Khalil C, et al. Evaluating Anti-LGBTQIA+ Medical Bias in Large Language Models. 2024.
20. Choudhry HS, Toor U, Sanchez AJ, Mian SI. Perception of Race and Sex Diversity in Ophthalmology by Artificial Intelligence: A DALL E-2 Study. *Clin Ophthalmol*. 2023;17:2889-2899. doi:10.2147/ophth.S427296
21. Currie G, Currie J, Anderson S, Hewis J. Gender bias in generative artificial intelligence text-to-image depiction of medical students. Article. *Health Education Journal*. 2024;83(7):732-746. doi:10.1177/00178969241274621
22. Currie G, Hewis J, Ebbs P. Gender bias in text-to-image generative artificial intelligence depiction of Australian paramedics and first responders. *Australas Emerg Care*. Dec 2024;doi:10.1016/j.auec.2024.11.003
23. Currie G, John G, Hewis J. Gender and ethnicity bias in generative artificial intelligence text-to-image depiction of pharmacists. *Int J Pharm Pract*. Nov 14 2024;32(6):524-531. doi:10.1093/ijpp/riae049
24. Desai P, Wang H, Davis L, Ullmann TM, DiBrito SR. Bias Perpetuates Bias: ChatGPT Learns Gender Inequities in Academic Surgery Promotions. Article. *Journal of Surgical Education*. 2024;81(11):1553-1557. doi:10.1016/j.jsurg.2024.07.023
25. Farlow JL, Abouyared M, Rettig EM, Kejner A, Patel R, Edwards HA. Gender Bias in Artificial Intelligence-Written Letters of Reference. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. Oct 2024;171(4):1027-1032. doi:10.1002/ohn.806
26. Gisselbaek M, Minsart L, Köseleli E, et al. Beyond the stereotypes: Artificial Intelligence image generation and diversity in anesthesiology. *Front Artif Intell*. 2024;7:1462819. doi:10.3389/frai.2024.1462819
27. Gisselbaek M, Suppan M, Minsart L, et al. Representation of intensivists' race/ethnicity, sex, and age by artificial intelligence: a cross-sectional study of two text-to-image models. Article. *Critical Care*. 2024;28(1)doi:10.1186/s13054-024-05134-4
28. Hake J, Crowley M, Coy A, et al. Quality, Accuracy, and Bias in ChatGPT-Based Summarization of Medical Abstracts. Article. *Annals of family medicine*. 2024;22(2):113-120. doi:10.1370/afm.3075
29. Hanna JJ, Wakene AD, Lehmann CU, Medford RJ. Assessing Racial and Ethnic Bias in Text Generation for Healthcare-Related Tasks by ChatGPT(1). *medRxiv*. Aug 28 2023;doi:10.1101/2023.08.28.23294730
30. Hasheminasab SA, Jamil F, Afzal MU, et al. Assessing equitable use of large language models for clinical decision support in real-world settings: fine-tuning and internal-external validation using electronic health records from South Asia. 2024.
31. Heinz MV, Bhattacharya S, Trudeau B, et al. Testing domain knowledge and risk of bias of a large-scale general artificial intelligence model in mental health. *Digital Health*. 2023;9doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/20552076231170499>
32. Ito N, Kadomatsu S, Fujisawa M, et al. The Accuracy and Potential Racial and Ethnic Biases of GPT-4 in the Diagnosis and Triage of Health Conditions: Evaluation Study. *JMIR Med Educ*. Nov 2023;9:e47532. doi:10.2196/47532
33. Kaplan DM, Palitsky R, Arconada Alvarez SJ, et al. What's in a Name? Experimental Evidence of Gender Bias in Recommendation Letters Generated by ChatGPT. *J Med Internet Res*. Mar 5 2024;26:e51837. doi:10.2196/51837
34. Kim J, Cai ZR, Chen ML, Simard JF, Linos E. Assessing Biases in Medical Decisions via Clinician and AI Chatbot Responses to Patient Vignettes. *JAMA Netw Open*. Oct 2 2023;6(10):e2338050. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.38050
35. Lee GG, Goodman D, Chang TC. Racial and Gender Bias in Artificial Intelligence Generated Ophthalmologic Educational Material. Conference Abstract. *Investigative Ophthalmology and Visual Science*. 2024;65(7):352.

36. Lee SW, Morcos M, Lee DW, Young J. Demographic Representation of Generative Artificial Intelligence Images of Physicians. *JAMA Network Open*. 2024;7(8):e2425993-e2425993. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.25993
37. Lin S, Pandit S, Tritsch T, Levy A, Shoja MM. What Goes In, Must Come Out: Generative Artificial Intelligence Does Not Present Algorithmic Bias Across Race and Gender in Medical Residency Specialties. *Cureus*. Feb 2024;16(2):e54448. doi:10.7759/cureus.54448
38. O'Malley A, Veenhuizen M, Ahmed A. Ensuring Appropriate Representation in Artificial Intelligence-Generated Medical Imagery: Protocol for a Methodological Approach to Address Skin Tone Bias. *Jmir ai*. Nov 27 2024;3:e58275. doi:10.2196/58275
39. Oca MC, Meller L, Wilson K, et al. Bias and Inaccuracy in AI Chatbot Ophthalmologist Recommendations. *Cureus*. Sep 2023;15(9):e45911. doi:10.7759/cureus.45911
40. Parikh AO, Oca MC, Conger JR, McCoy A, Chang J, Zhang-Nunes S. Accuracy and Bias in Artificial Intelligence Chatbot Recommendations for Oculoplastic Surgeons. *Cureus*. Apr 2024;16(4):e57611. doi:10.7759/cureus.57611
41. Schmidt HG, Rotgans JI, Mamede S. Bias Sensitivity in Diagnostic Decision-Making: Comparing ChatGPT with Residents. Article in Press. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 2024;doi:10.1007/s11606-024-09177-9
42. Tong W, Guan Y, Chen J, et al. Artificial intelligence in global health equity: an evaluation and discussion on the application of ChatGPT, in the Chinese National Medical Licensing Examination. Article. *Frontiers in Medicine*. 2023;10doi:10.3389/fmed.2023.1237432
43. Urbina JT, Vu PD, Nguyen MV. Disability Ethics and Education in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: Identifying Ability Bias in ChatGPT and Gemini. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. Jan 2025;106(1):14-19. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2024.08.014
44. Xie K, Ojemann WKS, Gallagher RS, et al. Disparities in seizure outcomes revealed by large language models. *J Am Med Inform Assoc*. May 20 2024;31(6):1348-1355. doi:10.1093/jamia/ocae047
45. Young C, Enichen E, Rao A, Succi M. Racial, ethnic, and sex bias in large language model opioid recommendations for pain management. *Pain*. 2024;doi:10.1097/j.pain.0000000000003388
46. Zack T, Lehman E, Suzgun M, et al. Assessing the potential of GPT-4 to perpetuate racial and gender biases in health care: a model evaluation study. *Lancet Digit Health*. Jan 2024;6(1):e12-e22. doi:10.1016/s2589-7500(23)00225-x
47. Zhang A, Yuksekogonul M, Guild J, Zou J, Wu JC. ChatGPT Exhibits Gender and Racial Biases in Acute Coronary Syndrome Management. 2023.
48. Akuffo-Addo E, Samman L, Munawar L, et al. Assessing GPT-4's Diagnostic Accuracy with Darker Skin Tones: Underperformance and Implications. 2024.
49. Meng X, Yan X, Zhang K, et al. The application of large language models in medicine: A scoping review. *iScience*. May 17 2024;27(5):109713. doi:10.1016/j.isci.2024.109713
50. Deshiwei Z, Xiaojuan X, Peng G, et al. A survey of datasets in medicine for large language models. *Intelligence & Robotics*. 2024;4(4):457-478. doi:10.20517/ir.2024.27
51. Norori N, Hu Q, Aellen FM, Faraci FD, Tzovara A. Addressing bias in big data and AI for health care: A call for open science. *Patterns (N Y)*. Oct 8 2021;2(10):100347. doi:10.1016/j.patter.2021.100347
52. Hadar-Shoval D, Asraf K, Shinan-Altman S, Elyoseph Z, Levkovich I. Embedded values-like shape ethical reasoning of large language models on primary care ethical dilemmas. *Heliyon*. Sep 30 2024;10(18):e38056. doi:10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e38056
53. Gameiro RR, Woite NL, Sauer CM, et al. The Data Artifacts Glossary: a community-based repository for bias on health datasets. *J Biomed Sci*. Feb 4 2025;32(1):14. doi:10.1186/s12929-024-01106-6

54. Nazer LH, Zatarah R, Waldrip S, et al. Bias in artificial intelligence algorithms and recommendations for mitigation. *PLOS Digit Health*. Jun 2023;2(6):e0000278. doi:10.1371/journal.pdig.0000278
55. Cross JL, Choma MA, Onofrey JA. Bias in medical AI: Implications for clinical decision-making. *PLOS Digit Health*. Nov 2024;3(11):e0000651. doi:10.1371/journal.pdig.0000651
56. Nguyen T. ChatGPT in Medical Education: A Precursor for Automation Bias? *JMIR Med Educ*. Jan 17 2024;10:e50174. doi:10.2196/50174
57. Juwara L, El-Hussuna A, El Emam K. An evaluation of synthetic data augmentation for mitigating covariate bias in health data. *Patterns (N Y)*. Apr 12 2024;5(4):100946. doi:10.1016/j.patter.2024.100946
58. Vokinger KN, Feuerriegel S, Kesselheim AS. Mitigating bias in machine learning for medicine. *Commun Med (Lond)*. Aug 23 2021;1:25. doi:10.1038/s43856-021-00028-w
59. Xu J, Xiao Y, Wang WH, et al. Algorithmic fairness in computational medicine. *EBioMedicine*. Oct 2022;84:104250. doi:10.1016/j.ebiom.2022.104250
60. Yang J, Soltan AAS, Eyre DW, Yang Y, Clifton DA. An adversarial training framework for mitigating algorithmic biases in clinical machine learning. *NPJ Digit Med*. Mar 29 2023;6(1):55. doi:10.1038/s41746-023-00805-y
61. Abramoff MD, Tarver ME, Loyo-Berrios N, et al. Considerations for addressing bias in artificial intelligence for health equity. *NPJ Digit Med*. Sep 12 2023;6(1):170. doi:10.1038/s41746-023-00913-9
62. Belenguer L. AI bias: exploring discriminatory algorithmic decision-making models and the application of possible machine-centric solutions adapted from the pharmaceutical industry. *AI Ethics*. 2022;2(4):771-787. doi:10.1007/s43681-022-00138-8
63. Spotnitz M, Ilday B, Gordon ER, et al. A Survey of Clinicians' Views of the Utility of Large Language Models. *Appl Clin Inform*. Mar 2024;15(2):306-312. doi:10.1055/a-2281-7092
64. Knopp MI, Warm EJ, Weber D, et al. AI-Enabled Medical Education: Threads of Change, Promising Futures, and Risky Realities Across Four Potential Future Worlds. *JMIR Med Educ*. Dec 25 2023;9:e50373. doi:10.2196/50373