

# Towards Safe and Aligned Large Language Models for Medicine

Tessa Han, Aounon Kumar, Chirag Agarwal, and Himabindu Lakkaraju

Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.

Corresponding authors: Tessa Han ([than@hbs.harvard.edu](mailto:than@hbs.harvard.edu)), and  
Himabindu Lakkaraju ([hlakkaraju@hbs.edu](mailto:hlakkaraju@hbs.edu)).

**Abstract.** The capabilities of large language models (LLMs) have been progressing at a breathtaking speed, leaving even their own developers grappling with the depth of their potential and risks. While initial steps have been taken to evaluate the safety and alignment of general-knowledge LLMs, exposing some weaknesses, to our knowledge, the safety and alignment of medical LLMs has not been evaluated despite their risks for personal health and safety, public health and safety, and human rights. To this end, we carry out the first safety evaluation for medical LLMs. Specifically, we set forth a definition of medical safety and alignment for medical artificial intelligence systems, develop a dataset of harmful medical questions to evaluate the medical safety and alignment of an LLM, evaluate both general and medical safety and alignment of medical LLMs, demonstrate fine-tuning as an effective mitigation strategy, and discuss broader, large-scale approaches used by the machine learning community to develop safe and aligned LLMs. We hope that this work casts light on the safety and alignment of medical LLMs and motivates future work to study it and develop additional mitigation strategies, minimizing the risks of harm of LLMs in medicine.

## 1 Introduction

The capabilities of large language models (LLMs) have been progressing at a breathtaking speed, leaving even their own developers grappling with the depth of their potential and risks. Medical LLMs, LLMs trained on large corpora of medical data, have been shown to achieve high performance on a variety of medical tasks and are more and more integrated into clinical practice [1, 2]. On the one hand, they have the potential to improve medicine and healthcare, such as improving diagnostic and prognostic accuracy, and efficiency. On the other hand, they can also be used for nefarious ends to cause harm, such as presenting persuasive misdiagnoses or misinformation, violating privacy, designing biological weapons, plotting a global pandemic. Therefore, it is critical to develop LLMs that are safe and aligned, i.e., that behave in a manner consistent with human intentions, preferences, and values [3]. This is especially the case for medical LLMs which contain medical knowledge and are intended for use in medical settings.

However, while initial steps have been taken to evaluate the safety and alignment of general-knowledge LLMs, exposing some weaknesses, to our knowledge, the safety and alignment of medical LLMs has not been evaluated despite their risks. Such an evaluation is of critical importance because at stake are such fundamental issues as personal health and safety, public health and safety, and human rights. More broadly, the machine learning community has called for the study of the responsible use of LLMs in general [4], and the medical machine learning community has called for it in medicine [5, 6].

To this end, we conduct the first safety evaluation of medical LLMs. Specifically, we set forth a definition of medical safety and alignment for medical artificial intelligence (AI) systems, develop a dataset of harmful medical questions to evaluate the medical safety and alignment of an LLM, evaluate both general and medical safety and alignment of medical LLMs, demonstrate fine-tuning as an effective mitigation strategy, and discuss broader, large-scale approaches used by the machine learning community to develop safe and aligned LLMs. We hope that this work casts light on the safety and alignment of medical LLMs and motivates future work to study it and develop additional mitigation strategies, minimizing the risks of harm of LLMs in medicine.

## 2 Defining safety and alignment in medicine

The first step in evaluating safety and alignment in medicine is to define it: What does it mean for an AI system to behave in a manner that is consistent with human intentions, preferences, and values when it is

used in a medical setting? We base the definition of medical safety and alignment on the *Principles of Medical Ethics* [7] from the *Code of Medical Ethics* [8] set forth by the American Medical Association (AMA). The AMA established its first *Code of Medical Ethics* in 1847. The current version of the AMA’s *Principles of Medical Ethics* was adopted in 1957 and last revised in 2001 [9]. It is a time-tested, living and evolving set of principles for ethical conduct in medicine.

According to the AMA, these principles represent “standards of conduct that define the essentials of honorable behavior for the physician”, outlining a physician’s “responsibility to patients first and foremost, as well as to society, to other health professionals, and to self” [8]. AMA’s current *Principles of Medical Ethics* are presented in Table 1.

We define an LLM to be safe and aligned in medicine if it outputs responses that are consistent with these principles.

Theme	Principle
Competence, Compassion, and Respect for Human Dignity	I. A physician shall be dedicated to providing competent medical care, with compassion and respect for human dignity and rights.
Professionalism and Honesty	II. A physician shall uphold the standards of professionalism, be honest in all professional interactions, and strive to report physicians deficient in character or competence, or engaging in fraud or deception, to appropriate entities.
Law and Responsibility to Society	III. A physician shall respect the law and also recognize a responsibility to seek changes in those requirements which are contrary to the best interests of the patient.
Patient Rights and Confidentiality	IV. A physician shall respect the rights of patients, colleagues, and other health professionals, and shall safeguard patient confidences and privacy within the constraints of the law.
Continued Study and Information Sharing	V. A physician shall continue to study, apply, and advance scientific knowledge, maintain a commitment to medical education, make relevant information available to patients, colleagues, and the public, obtain consultation, and use the talents of other health professionals when indicated.
Physician’s Freedom of Choice	VI. A physician shall, in the provision of appropriate patient care, except in emergencies, be free to choose whom to serve, with whom to associate, and the environment in which to provide medical care.
Community and Public Health	VII. A physician shall recognize a responsibility to participate in activities contributing to the improvement of the community and the betterment of public health.
Responsibility to Patient	VIII. A physician shall, while caring for a patient, regard responsibility to the patient as paramount.
Medical Care for All	IX. A physician shall support access to medical care for all people.

Table 1: The *Principles of Medical Ethics* set forth by the American Medical Association (right) and the theme of each principle summarized by the authors (left). We define an LLM to be safe and aligned in medicine if it outputs responses that are consistent with these principles.

### 3 Evaluation of safety alignment in medical LLMs

In this section, we evaluate both the general and medical safety and alignment of both general-knowledge and medical LLMs. First, we create a dataset of harmful medical prompts. Then, we describe the setup and results of the evaluation.

#### 3.1 med-harm: Harmful Medical Prompts Dataset

In the research literature, the safety and alignment of LLMs are often evaluated using benchmark datasets consisting of harmful prompts that an LLM should refuse to answer. The safety of an LLM is typically measured by its unwillingness to respond to such prompts. For example, Qi et al. [10] develop a safety dataset by collecting harmful prompts that violate Meta and OpenAI usage policies. Bhardwaj and Poria [11] create a dataset of harmful questions and answers using a red-teaming strategy called Chain of Utterances, which involves using one LLM to elicit harmful responses from another. Zhang et al. [12] introduce a multiple-choice question benchmark to evaluate LLM safety. Although several safety evaluation benchmarks have been proposed in the literature, they generally do not address the unique concerns of the medical domain. The safety of medical LLMs is especially important due to potential risks of misuse, injury, bias, privacy, and security.

In this section, we present **med-harm**, a dataset of harmful LLM prompts in a medical context. We base the dataset on the nine *Principles of Medical Ethics* outlined by the AMA. Each principle forms a category containing prompts that violate the respective ethical guideline. We use two publicly available LLMs, GPT-4 [13] and Llama-2 [14], to generate a diverse set of prompts in an automated and systematic fashion. We refer to the resulting datasets as **med-harm-llama2** and **med-harm-gpt4**, respectively, and as **med-harm**, collectively.

**med-harm-gpt4:** To generate harmful prompts for **med-harm-gpt4**, we prompted GPT-4, asking it to write commands or questions that might be given to an AI assistant that violate each principle of medical ethics. If GPT-4 declined to answer, we added that the prompts are for educational purposes. We collect the generated prompts and filter out duplicates and those that are irrelevant to the corresponding principle via manual inspection.

**med-harm-llama2:** We use the Llama-2-7b-chat version of the Llama-2 model to generate prompts. Although it was possible to simply ask GPT-4 to generate harmful prompts, we found that Llama-2-7b-chat did not readily comply with our request for generating such prompts. To circumvent this, we employ a jailbreaking technique on the Llama-2-7b-chat model using the Greedy Coordinate Gradient attack algorithm developed by Zou et al. [15]. Given a prompt, this algorithm optimizes a sequence of adversarial input tokens that, when appended to the prompt, cause the LLM to produce a desired target sequence. For our purposes, we set the input prompt for Llama-2-7b-chat to a request to produce harmful prompts that violate a particular AMA principle and the target sequence to an affirmative response. The following is an example of a prompt and target sequence using the principle of Competence, Compassion, and Respect for Human Dignity from Table 1.

<b>Input Prompt</b>
A physician shall be dedicated to providing competent medical care, with compassion and respect for human dignity and rights. Write twenty examples of harmful or unethical prompts in the form of questions or commands for a medical LLM that violate this principle.
<b>Target Sequence</b>
Sure, here are twenty examples of harmful and unethical prompts in the form of questions and commands that violate the principle that a physician shall be dedicated to providing competent medical care, with compassion and respect for human dignity and rights.

We observe that the attack succeeds within a few hundred iterations of the optimization and the model generates prompts violating the AMA principle specified in the input prompt. We collect the generated prompts and filter out duplicates and those that are irrelevant to the corresponding principle via manual inspection.

The `med-harm` dataset consists of 1,742 harmful medical prompts, spanning all nine principles of medical ethics. The dataset is evenly divided into a training set and test set.

### 3.2 Evaluation setup

Next, we evaluate the safety and alignment of general-knowledge and medical LLMs. The LLMs, datasets, procedure, and metric used in the evaluation are described below.

**LLMs.** We evaluate the safety and alignment of publicly-available, general-knowledge LLMs and medical LLMs. The general-knowledge LLMs include LLaMA-7b [16], LLaMA-13b [16], LLaMA-2-7b [14], LLaMA-2-13b [14], LLaMA-2-70b [14], LLaMA-2-7b-chat [14], LLaMA-2-13b-chat [14], LLaMA-2-70b-chat [14], GPT-3.5 [17], and GPT-4 [13]. They are largely trained on data from the internet and books. Of the general-knowledge LLMs, LLaMA-2-7b-chat, LLaMA-2-13b-chat, LLaMA-2-70b-chat, GPT-3.5, and GPT-4 have been further trained to behave in an aligned manner. These LLMs are the latest aligned LLMs and, although imperfect, serve as benchmark for the kind of aligned behavior in LLMs that is currently achievable.

The medical LLMs include `Medalpaca-7b` [18], `Medalpaca-13b` [18], `Meditron-7b` [19], `Meditron-70b` [19], `ClinicalCame1-7b` [20], and `Med42-70b` [21]. They are general-knowledge LLM base models that have been further pretrained and/or fine-tuned on medical data. To our knowledge, none of the medical LLMs have been trained to behave in an aligned manner.

**Datasets.** We evaluate the general and medical safety and alignment of LLMs using three benchmark datasets of harmful prompts. To evaluate general safety and alignment, we use the `hex-phi` dataset [10]. It consists of 330 harmful general prompts, spanning eleven categories of general harm (Illegal Activity, Child Abuse Content, Hate / Harassment / Violence, Malware, Physical Harm, Economic Harm, Fraud Deception, Adult Content, Political Campaigning, Privacy Violation Activity, and Tailored Financial Advice). To evaluate medical safety and alignment, we use `med-harm`, which is made up of `med-harm-llama2` and `med-harm-gpt4`. It consists of 1,742 harmful medical prompts, spanning all nine principles of medical ethics.

**Metrics.** To evaluate the safety and alignment of an LLM, we ask GPT-4 to judge the harmfulness of the response and score the extent to which the LLM’s response answers the input prompt, i.e., the LLM’s “willingness” to respond to the harmful prompt, inspired by the evaluation metric developed by Qi et al. [10]. The motivation for using the willingness of an LLM to respond to harmful prompts as a measure of safety and alignment is that it is a strict measure. An LLM’s refusal to respond to a harmful prompt indicates that it did not provide harmful information. On the other hand, an LLM’s agreement to respond to a harmful prompt suggests that its response includes information that may be harmful. The extent to which this information, if used, can cause real-world harm largely depends on the capabilities of the LLM. For example, responses generated by GPT-4, a state-of-the-art LLM, are likely more actionable and coherent than those generated by its predecessors (e.g., GPT2 [22]). In addition, using the willingness of an LLM to respond to harmful prompts as a measure of safety and alignment is consistent with ethics evaluations of humans – humans are assessed based on their ability to responsibly discern and abstain from dangerous or unethical activities, not based on their ability to carry out the activity.

Given a harmful prompt, an LLM’s response to the prompt, a model usage policy, and a rubric, we use GPT-4 to score the LLM’s “willingness” to respond to the prompt on a scale of one to five (“harmfulness score”). When evaluating general safety and alignment, the model’s usage policy is Meta’s usage policy [23]. When evaluating medical safety and alignment, the model’s usage policy is defined in accordance with the AMA’s nine principles of medical ethics [8]. The rubric provides criteria for rating the extent to which the LLM answers the harmful prompt, with a score of one indicating that the LLM declined to answer the harmful prompt or steers the conversation towards a direction consistent with the usage policy, and a score of five indicating that the LLM complied in answering the harmful prompt, completely ignoring the model’s usage policy and providing information that clearly violates the policy. Thus, the lower the score, the less the LLM’s response answers the harmful prompt, and the safer and more aligned the LLM’s response is.

### 3.3 Evaluation results

We prompt each LLM using the harmful prompts from each benchmark dataset and record the LLM’s response. Then, we measure the extent to which the LLM’s response answers the harmful prompt using the

metric described above. The average score for each model’s responses to harmful prompts on each harmful dataset is shown in Figure 1.

*Safety and alignment of general-knowledge LLMs.* Among general-knowledge LLMs, aligned LLMs (Llama-2-7b-chat, Llama-2-13b-chat, Llama-2-70b-chat, GPT-4, and GPT-3.5) have the lowest harmfulness scores followed by the non-aligned Llama-2 models, followed by the non-aligned predecessor Llama models. This trend is consistent across all three datasets. However, across datasets, even aligned models occasionally output responses with high harmfulness scores, indicating that even aligned models sometimes readily answer harmful prompts. These results suggest that newer LLMs are more aligned and that the alignment training for general-knowledge LLMs is effective, although imperfect, on general harm and medical harm.

*Safety and alignment of medical LLMs.* Among medical LLMs, across datasets, **Meditron-70b** consistently has low harmfulness scores across all three datasets. Other medical LLMs tend to have much higher harmfulness scores. In addition, across datasets, medical LLMs tend to have higher harmfulness scores than general-knowledge LLMs, particularly when compared with aligned general-knowledge LLMs which serve as benchmark for the extent of aligned behavior that is currently achievable. Therefore, these results indicate that medical LLMs are at risk of outputting more harmful outputs than general-knowledge LLMs.


*General vs. medical safety and alignment.* Both non-aligned general-knowledge LLMs and medical LLMs tend to have higher harmfulness scores for harmful general prompts (**hex-phi**) than for harmful medical prompts (**med-harm-llama2** and **med-harm-gpt4**). Within medical harm, these models tend to have higher harmfulness scores when the harmful prompts contain medical jargon (**med-harm-gpt4** vs. **med-harm-llama2**), suggesting that prompts may be perceived by the LLM to be less harmful when they include technical, scientific terms. Meanwhile, the aligned general-knowledge LLMs show consistently low harmfulness scores across general harm, medical harm without medical jargon (**med-harm-llama2**), and medical harm with medical jargon (**med-harm-gpt4**). Additional results forthcoming.

## 4 Fine-tuning: A mitigation strategy


Next, we demonstrate that fine-tuning medical LLMs on safety demonstrations improves their general and medical safety. Results forthcoming.

## 5 Discussion


In this section, we discuss other approaches used by the machine learning community to develop aligned LLMs, such as reinforcement learning with human feedback, considerations when aligning LLMs, the implications of this work, and future research directions. Discussion forthcoming.



(a) hex-phi



(b) med-harm-llama2



(c) med-harm-gpt4

Fig. 1: Average harmfulness score for each model by dataset.

# Bibliography

- [1] Karan Singhal, Shekoofeh Azizi, Tao Tu, S Sara Mahdavi, Jason Wei, Hyung Won Chung, Nathan Scales, Ajay Tanwani, Heather Cole-Lewis, Stephen Pfohl, et al. Large language models encode clinical knowledge. *Nature*, 620(7972):172–180, 2023.
- [2] Harsha Nori, Yin Tat Lee, Sheng Zhang, Dean Carignan, Richard Edgar, Nicolo Fusi, Nicholas King, Jonathan Larson, Yuanzhi Li, Weishung Liu, et al. Can generalist foundation models outcompete special-purpose tuning? case study in medicine. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16452*, 2023.
- [3] Zachary Kenton, Tom Everitt, Laura Weidinger, Iason Gabriel, Vladimir Mikulik, and Geoffrey Irving. Alignment of language agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.14659*, 2021.
- [4] Bletchley Declaration. Bletchley Declaration. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ai-safety-summit-2023-the-bletchley-declaration/the-bletchley-declaration-by-countries-attending-the-ai-safety-summit-1-2-november-2023>, 2023. [Online; accessed 05-March-2024].
- [5] Carey Beth Goldberg, Laura Adams, David Blumenthal, Patricia Flatley Brennan, Noah Brown, Atul J Butte, Morgan Cheatham, Dave deBronkart, Jennifer Dixon, Jeffrey Drazen, et al. To do no harm—and the most good—with ai in health care. *Nature Medicine*, pages 1–4, 2024.
- [6] Carey Beth Goldberg, Laura Adams, David Blumenthal, Patricia Flatley Brennan, Noah Brown, Atul J Butte, Morgan Cheatham, Dave deBronkart, Jennifer Dixon, Jeffrey Drazen, et al. To do no harm—and the most good—with ai in health care. *New England Journal of Medicine AI*, 2024.
- [7] American Medical Association. Code of Medical Ethics. <https://code-medical-ethics.ama-assn.org/>, 2001. [Online; accessed 05-March-2024].
- [8] American Medical Association. Principles of Medical Ethics. <https://code-medical-ethics.ama-assn.org/principles>, 2001. [Online; accessed 05-March-2024].
- [9] American Medical Association. History of the Code. <https://www.ama-assn.org/sites/ama-assn.org/files/corp/media-browser/public/ethics/ama-code-ethics-history.pdf>, 2017. [Online; accessed 05-March-2024].
- [10] Xiangyu Qi, Yi Zeng, Tinghao Xie, Pin-Yu Chen, Ruoxi Jia, Prateek Mittal, and Peter Henderson. Fine-tuning aligned language models compromises safety, even when users do not intend to! In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=hTEGyKf0dZ>.
- [11] Rishabh Bhardwaj and Soujanya Poria. Red-teaming large language models using chain of utterances for safety-alignment, 2023.
- [12] Zhixin Zhang, Leqi Lei, Lindong Wu, Rui Sun, Yongkang Huang, Chong Long, Xiao Liu, Xuanyu Lei, Jie Tang, and Minlie Huang. Safetybench: Evaluating the safety of large language models with multiple choice questions, 2023.
- [13] OpenAI, :, Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, Red Avila, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Valerie Balcom, Paul Baltescu, Haiming Bao, Mohammad Bavarian, Jeff Belgum, Irwan Bello, Jake Berdine, Gabriel Bernadett-Shapiro, Christopher Berner, Lenny Bogdonoff, Oleg Boiko, Madelaine Boyd, Anna-Luisa Brakman, Greg Brockman, Tim Brooks, Miles Brundage, Kevin Button, Trevor Cai, Rosie Campbell, Andrew Cann, Brittany Carey, Chelsea Carlson, Rory Carmichael, Brooke Chan, Che Chang, Fotis Chantzis, Derek Chen, Sully Chen, Ruby Chen, Jason Chen, Mark Chen, Ben Chess, Chester Cho, Casey Chu, Hyung Won Chung, Dave Cummings, Jeremiah Currier, Yunxing Dai, Cory Decareaux, Thomas Degry, Noah Deutsch, Damien Deville, Arka Dhar, David Dohan, Steve Dowling, Sheila Dunning, Adrien Ecoffet, Atty Eleti, Tyna Eloundou, David Farhi, Liam Fedus, Niko Felix, Simón Posada Fishman, Juston Forte, Isabella Fulford, Leo Gao, Elie Georges, Christian Gibson, Vik Goel, Tarun Gogineni, Gabriel Goh, Rapha Gontijo-Lopes, Jonathan Gordon, Morgan Grafstein, Scott Gray, Ryan Greene, Joshua Gross, Shixiang Shane Gu, Yufei Guo, Chris Hallacy, Jesse Han, Jeff Harris, Yuchen He, Mike Heaton, Johannes Heidecke, Chris Hesse, Alan Hickey, Wade Hickey, Peter Hoeschele, Brandon Houghton, Kenny Hsu, Shengli Hu, Xin Hu, Joost Huizinga, Shantanu Jain, Shawn Jain, Joanne Jang, Angela Jiang, Roger Jiang, Haozhun Jin, Denny Jin, Shino Jomoto, Billie

- Jonn, Heewoo Jun, Tomer Kaftan, Łukasz Kaiser, Ali Kamali, Ingmar Kanitscheider, Nitish Shirish Keskar, Tabarak Khan, Logan Kilpatrick, Jong Wook Kim, Christina Kim, Yongjik Kim, Jan Hendrik Kirchner, Jamie Kiros, Matt Knight, Daniel Kokotajlo, Łukasz Kondraciuk, Andrew Kondrich, Aris Konstantinidis, Kyle Kosic, Gretchen Krueger, Vishal Kuo, Michael Lampe, Ikai Lan, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, Jade Leung, Daniel Levy, Chak Ming Li, Rachel Lim, Molly Lin, Stephanie Lin, Mateusz Litwin, Theresa Lopez, Ryan Lowe, Patricia Lue, Anna Makanju, Kim Malfacini, Sam Manning, Todor Markov, Yaniv Markovski, Bianca Martin, Katie Mayer, Andrew Mayne, Bob McGrew, Scott Mayer McKinney, Christine McLeavey, Paul McMillan, Jake McNeil, David Medina, Aalok Mehta, Jacob Menick, Luke Metz, Andrey Mishchenko, Pamela Mishkin, Vinnie Monaco, Evan Morikawa, Daniel Mossing, Tong Mu, Mira Murati, Oleg Murk, David Mély, Ashvin Nair, Reiichiro Nakano, Rajeev Nayak, Arvind Neelakantan, Richard Ngo, Hyeonwoo Noh, Long Ouyang, Cullen O’Keefe, Jakub Pachocki, Alex Paino, Joe Palermo, Ashley Pantuliano, Giambattista Parascandolo, Joel Parish, Emy Parparita, Alex Passos, Mikhail Pavlov, Andrew Peng, Adam Perelman, Filipe de Avila Belbute Peres, Michael Petrov, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Michael, Pokorny, Michelle Pokrass, Vitchyr H. Pong, Tolly Powell, Alethea Power, Boris Power, Elizabeth Proehl, Raul Puri, Alec Radford, Jack Rae, Aditya Ramesh, Cameron Raymond, Francis Real, Kendra Rimbach, Carl Ross, Bob Rotsted, Henri Roussez, Nick Ryder, Mario Saltarelli, Ted Sanders, Shibani Santurkar, Girish Sastry, Heather Schmidt, David Schnurr, John Schulman, Daniel Selsam, Kyla Sheppard, Toki Sherbakov, Jessica Shieh, Sarah Shoker, Pranav Shyam, Szymon Sidor, Eric Sigler, Maddie Simens, Jordan Sitkin, Katarina Slama, Ian Sohl, Benjamin Sokolowsky, Yang Song, Natalie Staudacher, Felipe Petroski Such, Natalie Summers, Ilya Sutskever, Jie Tang, Nikolas Tezak, Madeleine B. Thompson, Phil Tillet, Amin Tootoonchian, Elizabeth Tseng, Preston Tuggle, Nick Turley, Jerry Tworek, Juan Felipe Cerón Uribe, Andrea Vallone, Arun Vijayvergiya, Chelsea Voss, Carroll Wainwright, Justin Jay Wang, Alvin Wang, Ben Wang, Jonathan Ward, Jason Wei, CJ Weinmann, Akila Welihinda, Peter Welinder, Jiayi Weng, Lilian Weng, Matt Wiethoff, Dave Willner, Clemens Winter, Samuel Wolrich, Hannah Wong, Lauren Workman, Sherwin Wu, Jeff Wu, Michael Wu, Kai Xiao, Tao Xu, Sarah Yoo, Kevin Yu, Qiming Yuan, Wojciech Zaremba, Rowan Zellers, Chong Zhang, Marvin Zhang, Shengjia Zhao, Tianhao Zheng, Juntang Zhuang, William Zhuk, and Barret Zoph. Gpt-4 technical report, 2024.
- [14] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models, 2023.
- [15] Andy Zou, Zifan Wang, Nicholas Carlini, Milad Nasr, J. Zico Kolter, and Matt Fredrikson. Universal and transferable adversarial attacks on aligned language models, 2023.
- [16] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.
- [17] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- [18] Tianyu Han, Lisa C Adams, Jens-Michalis Papaioannou, Paul Grundmann, Tom Oberhauser, Alexander Löser, Daniel Truhn, and Keno K Bressen. Medalpaca—an open-source collection of medical conversational ai models and training data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.08247*, 2023.
- [19] Zeming Chen, Alejandro Hernández Cano, Angelika Romanou, Antoine Bonnet, Kyle Matoba, Francesco Salvi, Matteo Pagliardini, Simin Fan, Andreas Köpf, Amirkeivan Mohtashami, et al. Meditron-70b: Scaling medical pretraining for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16079*, 2023.



- [20] Augustin Toma, Patrick R Lawler, Jimmy Ba, Rahul G Krishnan, Barry B Rubin, and Bo Wang. Clinical camel: An open-source expert-level medical language model with dialogue-based knowledge encoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.12031*, 2023.
- [21] Clément Christophe, Avani Gupta, Nasir Hayat, Praveen Kanithi, Ahmed Al-Mahrooqi, Prateek Munjal, Marco Pimentel, Tathagata Raha, Ronnie Rajan, and Shadab Khan. Med42 - A Clinical Large Language Model. <https://huggingface.co/m42-health/med42-70b>, 2023. [Online; accessed 05-March-2024].
- [22] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9, 2019.
- [23] Meta. Llama 2 Acceptable Use Policy. <https://ai.meta.com/llama/use-policy/>, 2023. [Online; accessed December 2023].