

---

# Listen to the Patient: Enhancing Medical Dialogue Generation with Patient Hallucination Detection and Mitigation

---

Lang Qin

qinlang14@mail.nankai.edu.cn

Yao Zhang

yaozhang@nankai.edu.cn

Hongru Liang

lianghongru@scu.edu.cn

Adam Jatowt

Adam.Jatowt@uibk.ac.at

Zhenglu Yang

yangzhl@nankai.edu.cn

## Abstract

Medical dialogue systems aim to provide medical services through patient-agent conversations. Previous methods typically regard patients as ideal users, focusing mainly on common challenges in dialogue systems, while neglecting the potential biases or misconceptions that might be introduced by real patients, who are typically non-experts. This study investigates the discrepancy between patients' expressions during medical consultations and their actual health conditions, defined as patient hallucination. Such phenomena often arise from patients' lack of knowledge and comprehension, concerns, and anxieties, resulting in the transmission of inaccurate or wrong information during consultations. To address this issue, we propose MedPH, a Medical dialogue generation method for mitigating the problem of Patient Hallucinations designed to detect and cope with hallucinations. MedPH incorporates a detection method that utilizes one-dimensional structural entropy over a temporal dialogue entity graph, and a mitigation strategy based on hallucination-related information to guide patients in expressing their actual conditions. Experimental results indicate the high effectiveness of MedPH when compared to existing approaches in both medical entity prediction and response generation tasks, while also demonstrating its effectiveness in mitigating hallucinations within interactive scenarios.

## 1 Introduction

Medical Dialogue Systems (MDSs) aim to provide fundamental medical services through patient-agent conversations. The agent is dedicated to generating medical responses that model the doctor's symptom inquiry process leading to an ultimately accurate diagnosis. Taking Figure 1 as an example, when a patient expresses that he/she *feel dizzy* (P1), the agent will inquire about possessing more related symptoms, such as *vomiting* (D1). Previous work on MDSs mostly focuses on techniques such as reinforcement learning or introducing external medical knowledge to better model a doctor's symptoms inquiry. Despite much research, the current approaches still fall short of being able to "carefully listen to patients" by paying attention to their potential mistakes and inaccuracies. Instead, they assume an ideal patient, i.e., there is an implicit assumption that the patient always accurately articulates his/her health conditions.

However, what the real patient expresses does not always align with his or her actual health conditions. For example, when a patient suffers from myocardial infarction, he or she is likely to describe angina as stomach pain (c.f. Figure 1 (P3)). Experienced doctors would remain vigilant and ask more detailed questions to discern the patient's actual symptoms (c.f. Figure 1 (D3)). However, in current

*Preprint.*

medical dialogue systems (e.g., ChatGPT), agents can easily shift their focus to stomach diseases (c.f. Figure 1 (A)). This phenomenon arises during the symptom inquiry process, due to divergent

perceptions and expressions of symptoms and diseases between doctors and patients, as well as psychological factors such as the patient’s concerns and fears [Berkman et al., 2011, Prior et al., 2011]. We describe this phenomenon as **patient hallucination** in our work.

Recently, much effort has been made to combat the hallucinations of AI models, where the content generated by the model is nonsensical or unfaithful to the provided source content [Ji et al., 2023]. Interestingly, the previous work has largely ignored the hallucinations that arise in user statements. Especially in medical scenarios, it is not uncommon for patients to express hallucinations. Prior studies indicate that 63% of subjects overstate the severity of their symptoms [Merckelbach et al., 2019], or 15%-20% of subjects provide responses containing mistakes [Fleischer et al., 2015]. Even in the public corpus of MDS research [Liu et al., 2022a], 16.9% of conversations were found to exhibit patient hallucinations, including the presenting of irrelevant symptoms, denying critical symptoms, and containing contradictions. Ignorance of patient hallucinations is concerning because it directly affects the diagnostic accuracy of MDS and poses a practical risk to patient safety.

In this work, we shift our research perspective from model hallucinations to the underexplored issue of patient hallucinations, and argue that effective MDS should confront two challenges:

- 1) **Detection:** Patient hallucinations often appear unconsciously in natural conversation due to the patient’s lack of adequate medical knowledge. Therefore, detecting patient hallucinations in real time during patient-agent conversation is crucial.
- 2) **Mitigation:** Due to the complex interplay between disease and symptoms, merely recognizing patient’s hallucinations does not directly reveal their actual health status. Therefore, the agent should guide the patient to accurately express their actual health conditions, thus mitigating hallucinations.

Inspired by the aforementioned analyses, we build **MedPH**, a **Medical** dialogue generation method for **Patient Hallucinations**. MedPH utilizes dialogue context and external medical knowledge to (1) detect patient hallucination based on dialogue entity graph and (2) mitigate patient hallucination by formulating clarifying questions. Specifically, the hallucination detection module utilizes graph entropy theory to analyze the structural entropy of dialogue entity graphs for detection, while the hallucination mitigation module generates controlled clarifying questions based on the detected hallucination information. In summary, the main contributions of this work are as follows.

- We call attention to the underexplored phenomenon of patient hallucinations that occurs in patient-agent conversations.
- We propose MedPH, a medical dialogue generation method to detect patient hallucination based on dialogue entity graph and mitigate patient hallucination by formulating clarifying questions.
- We conduct experiments to demonstrate the superiority of MedPH in basic tasks of MDS and its efficacy in detecting and mitigating patient hallucinations.




Figure 1: Example of patient hallucinations in patient(P)-doctor(D) conversations and response generated by current MDS agent (A) and our MedPH. Experienced doctor remain vigilant and ask more detailed questions to discern the patient’s actual symptoms. However, the agent can easily be influenced by the patient’s hallucinations and shift the focus to stomach diseases.

## 2 Related Work

### 2.1 Medical Dialogue Systems

The medical dialogue system aims for automatic diagnosis or symptom collection, focusing on collecting information on patients’ health conditions through conversation. **(1) Automatic Diagnosis:** Early efforts involved constructing agents to simulate physicians’ dialogue behavior and diagnosis strategies. Wei et al. [2018] employed DQN to optimize behavioral strategies and extract symptoms from conversations to assist in diagnosis. Xu et al. [2019] introduced a strategy that integrated knowledge graphs for comprehensive end-to-end automated diagnosis optimization. **(2) Symptom Collection:** Recognizing the pivotal role of entities in medical dialogues [Liu et al., 2022a], previous works were dedicated to developing entity-aware models for symptom collection. Lin et al. [2019] built a dialogue symptom graph and utilized global attention for symptom identification and inference. Liu et al. [2022a] deconstructed medical dialogue generation into entity prediction and entity-based response generation. Xu et al. [2023] introduced a dual-flow enhanced medical dialogue generation framework by extracting medical entity flows and dialogue action flows. **(3) MDS Challenges:** Prior works acknowledged the efficacy of guiding agents to simulate physicians’ behavior [Li et al., 2021, Liu et al., 2022b] and addressed challenges such as vague and redundant patients’ statements [Zhao et al., 2022, Xu et al., 2023, Tang et al., 2023], as well as the scarcity of medical data [Lin et al., 2021, Hou et al., 2023]. However, previous research has not confronted the patient hallucination issue. This work adopts a perspective that strives for a more profound comprehension of real patients and proposes a medical dialogue generation method capable of detecting and mitigating hallucinations.

### 2.2 Hallucinations

Within the NLP domain, *Hallucination* is defined as “the generated content that is nonsensical or unfaithful to the provided source content” [Ji et al., 2023], garnering attention as a limitation of generative models. Numerous studies focused on hallucination detection and mitigation. **(1) Detection:** Durmus et al. [2020] proposed a question-answering (QA) based metric. In this method, QA pairs are generated from a summary, and a QA model extracts answers from the document. Mismatched answers indicate hallucination detection. Honovich et al. [2021] refined this process using natural language inference to evaluate hallucinations in a more granular fashion. Chen et al. [2024] leveraged dense semantic information from Large Language Models (LLMs) for detection. **(2) Mitigation:** Shuster et al. [2021] employed a neural-retrieval-in-the-loop framework to retrieve external knowledge, reducing hallucinations in open-domain dialogues. Dziri et al. [2021] proposed a post-generation strategy, using triples from knowledge graphs to modify generated responses at the token level. Mündler et al. [2024] implemented hallucination correction solely through LLMs’ outputs without retrieval from external sources.

Furthermore, dialogue agents are prone to generating responses that are sycophant to users rather than faithful to the truth as a newly discovered type of hallucination [Sharma et al., 2024]. Ziaei and Schmidgall [2023] pointed out that patients’ self-diagnosis can impair LLMs’ performance on medical multiple-choice tasks, as the patients’ incorrect bias-validating information leads to misjudgments by the model. This indicates that agents may follow erroneous information provided by patients, which is unacceptable in medical scenarios. Our work bridges medical and NLP perspectives, defining the patient misreporting phenomenon mentioned in medical literature as *Patient Hallucination* and leveraging NLP techniques to address this issue.

## 3 Methodology

### 3.1 Overview

We first formulate the doctor-patient conversations as:  $\mathcal{C} = \{(\mathcal{P}_i, \mathcal{D}_i)\}_{i=1}^T$ , where  $\mathcal{P}_i$  represents the statement made by the patient and  $\mathcal{D}_i$  is the one made by the doctor. The primary objective of the medical dialogue system is to create a physician agent that generates an appropriate response  $\mathcal{D}_i$  based on dialogue history  $\mathcal{C}_{1:i-1}$  and the patient’s statement  $\mathcal{P}_i$ . Conversation  $\mathcal{C}$  contains several medical entities  $e_i$ , which can be organized into an entity graph  $G_e$  based on medical knowledge. In addition to the fundamental task of generating responses  $\mathcal{D}_i$ , the medical dialogue system focused on




Figure 2: The framework of MedPH, the blue, gray, red, and white nodes of the hallucination detection part represent the mention, unknown, isolation, and negation of the node, respectively.

patient hallucinations needs to detect hallucination phenomena and present clarifying questions to mitigate hallucinations based on dialogue content and the entity graph.

### 3.2 Hallucination Detection

The essence of patient hallucinations lies in the discrepancy between the health conditions mentioned in the dialogue and the patient’s actual situation. Health conditions typically exhibit medical co-occurrence relationships [Liu et al., 2022c, Bhoi et al., 2023], which can be disrupted by patient hallucinations and lead to anomalies on the dialogue entity graph. Upon analyzing patient hallucinations in real-world data collected by Liu et al. [2022a], we categorized them into three types: presenting isolated entities, denying crucial entities, and self-contradictions. Before detailing these categories, we first introduce graph entropy to detect patient hallucinations.

**Dialogue Entity Graph** To ensure the high effectiveness of detection, we employ a modeling approach that combines a static knowledge graph  $G$  with a dynamic dialogue entity graph  $G_e \in G$ .

We formulate  $G$  based on the co-occurrence relationships of medical entities in the corpus. The likelihood of mentioning entity  $e_t$  at turn  $t$  can be approximately regarded as the conditional probability associated with the entities  $\{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{t-1}\}$  that have appeared in the dialogue history:

$$P(e_t | \mathcal{C}_{1:t-1}) \propto P(e_t | e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{t-1}). \quad (1)$$

Therefore, we compute the directed<sup>1</sup> weight  $w_{ij}$  from  $e_i$  to  $e_j$  by considering their co-occurrence frequency in the corpus:

$$w_{ij} = \frac{\text{freq}(e_i, e_j)}{\text{freq}(e_i)} \propto P(e_j | e_i). \quad (2)$$

This weight can serve as a threshold for detecting hallucinations and ranking entities related to hallucinations. In the absence of hallucinations, it can degenerate into retrieving the neighbors of the most recently mentioned entity. The top-k related entities are integrated into model inputs. Thus, the detection module can directly perform the entity prediction task of MDS.

The dialogue history contains utterances that may mention or deny medical entities, and we employ medical slot-filling [Hu et al., 2023] to extract entities and their states. Precisely, entities and their relationships  $r = (e_i, e_j, w_{ij})$  extracted from the dialogue must align with pre-existing background knowledge rather than temporary connections. Extracted entities from each utterance constitute a dialogue entity graph  $G_e$ , and we track changes in these graphs to generate a sequence of sentence-level dynamic graphs  $\{G_{e_1}, G_{e_2}, \dots\}$ , each representing a multi-directed subgraph of the static knowledge graph  $G$ . Based on this dynamic graph sequence, hallucination detection and classification can be achieved through graph entropy theory.

**Patient Hallucination Features** Patient hallucinations often lack distinguishing linguistic features but they appear as anomalies on the entity graph due to conflicts with medical knowledge. Based on real patient behavior, we categorize hallucinations into three types:

<sup>1</sup>Based on the sequence of entity occurrences in the corpus, it reflects the logic of a doctor’s inquiries.

- *Presenting isolated entities.* As illustrated in Figure 2-(*Is*), this type of hallucination is primarily initiated by the patient, often arising from anxiety or vague expressions.
- *Denying crucial entities.* Illustrated in Figure 2-(*De*), it implies the disappearance of entities already existing in the graph, leading to splitting of the connected graph into several disconnected components. This can stem from the patient’s denial of entities in the physician’s inquiries.
- *Self-contradictions.* As depicted in Figure 2-(*Co*), this type involves an entity’s appearance and disappearance without disrupting the entity graph’s connected status. It is often associated with the patient’s misdescription of symptom duration or medical history<sup>2</sup>.

**One-Dimensional Structural Entropy** Graph entropy serves to characterize the structural information of a graph. Given the potential non-connected feature of entity graphs, we employ one-dimensional structural entropy [Li and Pan, 2016] to detect the hallucination phenomena.

The fundamental definition of graph entropy aligns with Shannon’s information entropy [Shannon, 1953], aiming to represent structure information and complexity using the degree distribution of nodes. In the following formula,  $d_i$  denotes the degree of node  $i$ , and  $\text{Vol}(G)$  is the degree sum of  $G$ :

$$H(G) = - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{d_i}{\text{Vol}(G)} \log_2 \frac{d_i}{\text{Vol}(G)}, \quad (3)$$

For the entity graph  $G_E$ , its one-dimensional structural entropy is the weighted average of the graph entropy for each connected component, specifically defined as follows:

$$H^1(G) = \frac{1}{\text{Vol}(G)} \sum_{j=1}^L \text{Vol}(G_j) \cdot H^1(G_j), \quad (4)$$

where  $G_j$  represents a connected subgraph of  $G$ ,  $L$  represents the number of connected components, and if there are no edges within  $G_j$ , the graph entropy is considered as 0.

The ideal inquiry process should strengthen entity co-occurrence relationships, resulting in a growth in information paths, i.e., increased graph entropy. As exemplified in Figure 2, hallucinations disrupt this trend. Their detection and classification can be achieved by a single calculation of graph entropy:

- *Presenting isolated entities* occurs when the number of nodes in the entity graph increases while the graph entropy remains unchanged, as the graph entropy is 0 for an isolated node.
- *Denying crucial entities* and *Self-contradictions* diminish information paths on the graph and decrease graph entropy. After losing nodes, the lower bound of entropy for contradictions exceeds the upper bound for denials. This bound facilitates the classification of hallucinations, with detailed proofs provided below:

If there are  $n$  remaining nodes in the entity graph following a hallucination, in the case of self-contradiction, these  $n$  nodes are interconnected by a minimum of  $n - 1$  edges. As exemplified in Figure 3, in the worst scenario, the disappeared node is linked to all the nodes of the original graph. Hence, its minimum graph entropy is as follows:

$$- \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{d_i - 1}{2(n - 1)} \log_2 \frac{d_i - 1}{2(n - 1)}. \quad (5)$$

In the case of denial, the best scenario is that the disappeared node in the original graph has only two edges. After denial, it forms a connected graph with  $n - 1$  nodes and an isolated node, where the degree of the connected graph is  $\text{Vol}(G) - 4 \geq 2(n - 1)$ . So, the upper bound of entropy is:

$$- \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \frac{d_i}{\text{Vol}(G) - 4} \log_2 \frac{d_i}{\text{Vol}(G) - 4} - \frac{d_{n-1} - 1}{\text{Vol}(G) - 4} \log_2 \frac{d_{n-1} - 1}{\text{Vol}(G) - 4}. \quad (6)$$

The two equations presented above are reasonable when  $n \geq 2$ . By subtracting them, the subsequent equation applies when  $n = 2$ , and it is evident that the left side constitutes a monotonically increasing function concerning  $n$ , which means the lower bound for contradiction exceeds the upper bound for denial:

$$- \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{d_i - 1}{2(n - 1)} \log_2 \frac{d_i - 1}{2(n - 1)} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \frac{d_i}{\text{Vol}(G) - 4} \log_2 \frac{d_i}{\text{Vol}(G) - 4} > - \frac{d_{n-1} - 1}{\text{Vol}(G) - 4} \log_2 \frac{d_{n-1} - 1}{\text{Vol}(G) - 4}. \quad (7)$$

<sup>2</sup>Doctors often focus on the past few days for acute conditions or ask about recent years’ medication history for chronic illnesses. Patients sometimes give contradictory descriptions, such as changing from “never had a stomach problem” to “occasionally experiencing stomach pain.”

In summary, we calculate one-dimensional structural entropy for entity graphs, and the numerical sequence of graph entropy enables the straightforward detection and classification of hallucinations. Our experiments reveal that the prevalence of patient hallucinations in real-world data is 16.9%, with the proportions of isolated, denial, and contradictory being 50.1%, 10.5%, and 39.4%, respectively.

### 3.3 Hallucination Mitigation

The hallucination mitigation module constructs clarifying questions based on detected patient hallucinations. Clarifying questions is a common method in information retrieval, seeking to formulate questions that maximize the expected information value: “A good question is one whose expected answer is most useful” [Rao, 2017]. We introduce clarifying questions to medical dialogue systems to acquire information on the actual health conditions from patients and mitigate patient hallucinations.

**Normal Response** Hallucination mitigation can be perceived as an instance of response generation as it is achieved through asking questions by the agent. Therefore, we first introduce the normal process of MedPH in utilizing medical knowledge to generate responses. As illustrated in Figure 2, we establish a connection between the medical knowledge graph and real physician responses based on entities. Then we identify the most valuable responses serving as guiding information. A set of real responses  $S$  containing the entity  $e$  can be extracted from the corpus. We calculate the cosine similarity of word vectors  $\mathbf{v}$  for the sentences within  $S$  and take the top-k sentences that exhibit the highest average similarity to other sentences as the knowledge related to entity  $e$ :

$$\text{avg\_sim}(e) = \frac{1}{|S|} \sum_{s_i, s_j \in S, i \neq j} \text{sim}(s_i, s_j), \quad \text{sim}(s_i, s_j) = \frac{\mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_j}{\|\mathbf{v}_i\| \|\mathbf{v}_j\|}. \quad (8)$$

The agent can leverage dialogue context and the dialogue entity graph to retrieve knowledge within the one-hop neighborhood of existing nodes for response generation.

**Clarifying Process** Based on the approach outlined above, the clarifying process will be triggered when hallucinations are detected. It involves re-retrieving entity-response pairs related to the hallucinated entity and formulating prompts using them as guiding information. The implications vary depending on the scenario. (1) (*Is*) The model integrates isolated nodes and connecting bridge nodes into the input for isolated scenarios. (2) (*De*) In cases of denial, real responses linked to the denied node will be used to create repetitive inquiries. (3) (*Co*) This process will also emphasize attributes such as medical history in cases of contradiction. In summary, prompts are constructed to generate clarifying questions based on detecting and acquiring information related to hallucinations.

## 4 Experiments

The key contributions of this work are on studying the underexplored phenomenon of patient hallucinations that occurs in patient-agent conversations, and propose MedPH, a medical dialogue generation method to detect patient hallucination based on dialogue entity graph and mitigate patient hallucination by formulating clarifying questions. To demonstrate the performance of MedPH on the medical dialogue task, we conduct the experiments with three core research questions:

- **RQ1:** Does the hallucination detection module demonstrate greater sensitivity than existing medical entity prediction methods?
- **RQ2:** Has the hallucination mitigation module outperformed current methods in fundamental needs of medical dialogue generation?
- **RQ3:** Can the medical dialogue system for patient hallucinations effectively mitigate hallucinations in doctor-patient interactions?




Figure 3: Different scenarios after losing a node (using the example of 4 remaining nodes).

Table 1: Results of entity prediction. A-S denote attribute, disease, examination, medicine, and symptom. † denotes statistically significant differences ( $p < 0.05$ ). Baseline results are reported from Liu et al. [2022a] and Xu et al. [2023], the same below.

Method	P	R	F1	F1 <sub>A</sub>	F1 <sub>D</sub>	F1 <sub>E</sub>	F1 <sub>M</sub>	F1 <sub>S</sub>
LSTM	25.34	27.75	26.49	48.95	31.18	25.05	15.66	21.72
BERT-wwm	26.05	31.09	28.35	52.44	31.66	26.03	19.82	24.27
PCL-MedBERT	26.46	33.07	29.40	46.85	33.72	27.49	20.78	25.62
MedDGBERT	25.34	36.20	29.81	49.41	33.29	27.60	21.35	<b>26.39</b>
DFMED	22.48	22.84	22.66	-	-	-	-	-
<b>MedPH</b>	<b>28.99</b> <sup>†</sup>	<b>36.59</b> <sup>†</sup>	<b>32.35</b> <sup>†</sup>	<b>55.47</b>	<b>36.21</b> <sup>†</sup>	<b>33.06</b> <sup>†</sup>	<b>26.75</b> <sup>†</sup>	25.00

Table 2: Results of the response generation task.

Method	B-1	B-4	R-1	R-2	D-1	D-2
GPT-2	30.87	16.56	-	-	0.87	11.20
BERT-GPT	36.54	23.84	-	-	0.65	11.25
MedDGBERT-GPT	36.62	23.99	-	-	0.63	11.04
VRBot	30.04	16.36	18.71	7.28	-	-
DFMED	42.56	22.53	<b>29.31</b>	<b>14.21</b>	0.85	8.28
<b>MedPH</b>	<b>44.28</b>	<b>24.88</b>	28.12	13.80	<b>1.23</b>	<b>11.58</b>

## 4.1 Settings

**Datasets** We conducted experiments using the MedDG dataset [Liu et al., 2022a], the KaMed dataset [Li et al., 2021], and the terminology-enhanced Medical English Dialogue Corpus [Tang et al., 2023]. MedDG comprises 17,864 dialogues and 217,205 entities, serving as an entity-centric medical dialogue dataset. Domain experts annotated the medical entities mentioned in the dialogues, including diseases, symptoms, and medications. We integrated multiple knowledge graphs from KaMed to expand medical background knowledge, particularly the co-occurrence relationships between medical entities. We also conducted additional experiments using the terminology-enhanced Medical English Dialogue Corpus to ensure the cross-linguistic stability of the proposed method.

**Baselines** Following the setup of MedDG, we conduct experiments on entity prediction and response generation. *Entity Prediction*: (1) LSTM [Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997], (2) BERT-wwm [Cui et al., 2021], (3) PCL-MedBERT, (4) MedDGBERT [Liu et al., 2022a], and (5) DFMED [Xu et al., 2023]. *Response Generation*: (1) GPT-2 [Radford et al., 2019], (2) BERT-GPT, (3) MedBERT-GPT, (4) VRBot [Li et al., 2021], and (5) DFMED. Detailed information about the baselines are provided in Appendix ??.

**Metrics** We follow the previous works [Liu et al., 2022a, Xu et al., 2023] that utilize entity precision, recall, and F1 score as evaluation metrics for the entity prediction task. For the response generation task, we employ BLEU [Papineni et al., 2002], ROUGE [Lin, 2004], and Distinct [Li et al., 2016] as metrics. Additionally, we measure the effectiveness of hallucination mitigation by analyzing graph entropy values within the interaction scene. For this purpose, we introduce two metrics:  $\Delta GE$  and *Success*.  $\Delta GE$  quantifies the average disparity in graph entropy pre- and post-interaction, while *Success* denotes the proportion of hallucinations mitigated within the samples.

**Implementation Details** To simultaneously implement prediction and generation tasks, we utilize a backbone generation model<sup>3</sup> that is not pre-trained on medical corpora and we ensure the model scale is consistent with baseline approaches. Further details are available in the Appendix ??.

## 4.2 Results and Observations

**Overall Performance** We conducted experiments on the MedDG dataset with entity prediction and response generation tasks. Entity prediction entails predicting medical entities relevant to generating subsequent responses based on the context of the dialogue. Response generation involves the agent acting as a doctor and responding to the patient. Results are presented in Tables 1 and 2.

<sup>3</sup>[huggingface.co/fnlp/bart-base-chinese](https://huggingface.co/fnlp/bart-base-chinese)




Figure 4: Results of interactive experiment.

Table 3: Ablation study. “Detection” and “Mitigation” represent removing the corresponding modules.

	P	R	F1	F1 <sub>A</sub>	F1 <sub>D</sub>	F1 <sub>E</sub>	F1 <sub>M</sub>	F1 <sub>S</sub>
MedPH	<b>28.99</b>	<b>36.59</b>	<b>32.35</b>	55.47	<b>36.21</b>	33.06	<b>26.75</b>	25.00
w/o Detection	28.02	35.94	31.49	54.95	35.91	33.11	25.06	24.76
w/o Mitigation	28.35	36.51	31.92	54.27	35.69	33.27	26.04	<b>25.53</b>
w/o D&M	27.98	36.12	31.53	<b>55.78</b>	35.90	<b>34.41</b>	25.04	24.07

	B-1	B-4	R-1	R-2	D-1	D-2	$\Delta GE$	Success
<b>MedPH</b>	<b>44.28</b>	<b>24.88</b>	<b>28.12</b>	<b>13.80</b>	1.23	11.58	<b>0.317</b>	<b>34.55%</b>
w/o Detection	37.06	20.28	27.05	12.55	<b>1.36</b>	<b>13.28</b>	0.210	22.75%
w/o Mitigation	42.17	23.06	28.05	13.55	1.26	12.34	0.246	26.25%
w/o D&M	35.83	19.57	26.34	11.83	1.29	12.48	0.170	19.35%

For **RQ1**, Table 1 demonstrates that although MedPH is specifically designed to address patient hallucinations by predicting relevant entities, it outperforms previous works in almost all entity classes in the entity prediction task of medical dialogue systems. This is attributed to its sensitivity to medical entities and the multi-directed graph modeling approach. Regarding **RQ2**, the n-gram based results presented in Table 2 illustrate that the proposed hallucination mitigation module can remain competitive with the state-of-the-art (SOTA) approach in the response generation task of medical dialogue systems. The aforementioned results indicate that MedPH is able to better simulate real doctors who possess professional skills to manage patient hallucinations while not compromising the fundamental abilities of medical dialogue systems.

**Interactive Experiment** For **RQ3**, mitigating hallucinations requires continuous dialogue to guide the patient in confirming or modifying the mentioned information. We conducted interactive experiments utilizing a simulator-agent format. Addressing concerns about the quality of dialogue simulators [Wang et al., 2024], we adopted the method proposed by Chen et al. [2023] to employ LLMs as simulated patients. Implementation details are provided in Appendix ??.

The results of the interactive experiment are presented in Figure 4. “GPT-” represents LLMs’ self-interaction, while “Gold” denotes the upper bound of mitigation effectiveness using real doctor responses from the dataset. Figure 4 indicates that the clarifying questions generated by MedPH significantly contribute to hallucination mitigation. Notably, the performance of MedPH declined on the Medical English Dialogue Corpus due to sparse entity relationships impairing the hallucination detection. As a dialogue generation method, MedPH surpasses GPT-3.5 in guiding patient expressions closer to reality. Experimental results above indicate that our model has the potential to serve as an aid tool to alleviate the burden of doctor inquiries and mitigate subsequent risks of diagnostic mistakes. Detailed case analyses are provided in Section 4.4.

### 4.3 Ablation Study

We next conducted ablation experiments on the hallucination-related modules to analyze their effects on entity prediction, response generation, and patient hallucinations, as shown in Table 3. After removing the hallucination detection module and employing a naive prediction method based on entity co-occurrence relationships (i.e., “w/o Detection”), we observed a decrease in entity P/R/F1 scores. This indicates that our detection method is effective for both the fundamental task of entity prediction and the new requirement of hallucination detection. Removing the hallucination mitigation module (i.e., “w/o Mitigation”) resulted in minor fluctuations in BLEU and ROUGE scores while exhibiting



Table 4: Case study on the MedDG dataset within interaction scene.

Context	<p><b>P:</b> Feels like bloating in the stomach, wakes up feeling acid reflux every time.</p> <p><b>D:</b> Any exposure to cold or catching a cold?</p> <p><b>P:</b> None. With the coronavirus outbreak, I check my temperature and it’s normal.</p> <p><b>D:</b> I suggest incorporating vegetables and fruits into your diet, like bananas.</p> <p><b>P:</b> Could it be <b>pneumonia</b>?</p>
Gold	<p><b>D:</b> Doesn’t seem like it, <b>pneumonia</b> presents with <b>fever</b>, <b>cough</b>, and <b>phlegm</b>.</p> <p><b>P:</b> Oh, I don’t have any of those, just a feeling of bloating in my stomach.</p>
GPT-3.5	<p><b>D:</b> How long have you been experiencing the acid reflux?</p> <p><b>P:</b> It’s been about a week now.</p>
GPT-4o	<p><b>D:</b> It seems to be a stomach issue, not <b>pneumonia</b>. How long did the upset last?</p> <p><b>P:</b> Lasted about a week or two, especially after eating and in the morning.</p>
MedPH	<p><b>D:</b> Do you have a <b>cough</b>?</p> <p><b>P:</b> I don’t have a cough, and my temperature has been normal all along.</p>

significant decreases in graph entropy and hallucination mitigation rate. This demonstrates that our clarification question approach can alleviate the hallucination phenomenon without compromising response quality. Further ablation results are provided in Appendix ??.

#### 4.4 Case Study

As shown in Table 4, when the patient mentions “**pneumonia**”, this disease cannot be inferred from known health conditions and is thus considered here a hallucination. A real doctor would respond by inquiring about symptoms related to pneumonia, thereby completing the co-occurrence relationships in the dialogue entity graph and ensuring clarification of the disease. However, existing models often negate or ignore the patient’s concerns, failing to confirm the patient’s actual condition or alleviate their anxiety. MedPH retrieves related entities [cold, fever, pneumonia, cough, gastritis] in response to this hallucination and probes the intermediate node “**cough**”, which could link acid reflux to pneumonia. The patient’s denial of coughing excludes the isolated node “**pneumonia**” in the entity graph, thus mitigating the problem of hallucination.

## 5 Conclusion

This paper focuses on the differences between real patients and the typically assumed ideal users in the field of medical dialogue systems. We defined the phenomenon that the content mentioned by the patient does not align with known health conditions as *Patient Hallucinations* and we highlighted the importance of addressing this issue. We then proposed MedPH to detect and mitigate patient hallucinations. Experimental results indicate the high effectiveness of MedPH when compared to existing approaches in entity prediction and response generation. Interactive experiments further show its effectiveness in mitigating hallucinations. We believe the proposed approach can serve as a diagnostic aid tool to alleviate the burden on doctors during consultations.

## Limitations and Societal Impacts

The method’s reliability stems from the co-occurrence relationships of entities within real corpora, making it highly dependent on the annotation of medical entities or on the entity extraction methods. While suspicion detection and questioning strategies prevent the arbitrary handling of hallucinations, they cannot address rare diseases or unfamiliar symptoms. Given the paramount requirement for reliability in the medical field, this method can only serve as an auxiliary tool for doctors during consultations. It should not be used directly for diagnosis to avoid any potential harm to patients.

## References

- Nancy D Berkman, Stacey L Sheridan, Katrina E Donahue, David J Halpern, and Karen Crotty. Low health literacy and health outcomes: an updated systematic review. *Annals of internal medicine*, 155(2):97–107, 2011.
- Lindsay Prior, Meirion R Evans, and Hayley Prout. Talking about colds and flu: the lay diagnosis of two common illnesses among older british people. *Social Science & Medicine*, 73(6):922–928, 2011.
- Ziwei Ji, Nayeon Lee, Rita Frieske, Tiezheng Yu, Dan Su, Yan Xu, Etsuko Ishii, Ye Jin Bang, Andrea Madotto, and Pascale Fung. Survey of hallucination in natural language generation. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 55(12), mar 2023.
- Harald Merckelbach, Brechje Dandachi-FitzGerald, Daniel van Helvoort, Marko Jelcic, and Henry Otgaar. When patients overreport symptoms: More than just malingering. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 28(3):321–326, 2019.
- Avi Fleischer, Alan D Mead, and Jialin Huang. Inattentive responding in mturk and other online samples. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 8(2):196–202, 2015.
- Wenge Liu, Jianheng Tang, Yi Cheng, Wenjie Li, Yefeng Zheng, and Xiaodan Liang. MeddG: An entity-centric medical consultation dataset for entity-aware medical dialogue generation. In Wei Lu, Shujian Huang, Yu Hong, and Xiabing Zhou, editors, *Natural Language Processing and Chinese Computing*, pages 447–459, 2022a.
- Zhongyu Wei, Qianlong Liu, Baolin Peng, Huaixiao Tou, Ting Chen, Xuanjing Huang, Kam-fai Wong, and Xiangying Dai. Task-oriented dialogue system for automatic diagnosis. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 201–207, July 2018.
- Lin Xu, Qixian Zhou, Ke Gong, Xiaodan Liang, Jianheng Tang, and Liang Lin. End-to-end knowledge-routed relational dialogue system for automatic diagnosis. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 33(01):7346–7353, Jul. 2019.
- Xinzhu Lin, Xiahui He, Qin Chen, Huaixiao Tou, Zhongyu Wei, and Ting Chen. Enhancing dialogue symptom diagnosis with global attention and symptom graph. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*, pages 5033–5042, November 2019.
- Kaishuai Xu, Wenjun Hou, Yi Cheng, Jian Wang, and Wenjie Li. Medical dialogue generation via dual flow modeling. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 6771–6784, July 2023.
- Dongdong Li, Zhaochun Ren, Pengjie Ren, Zhumin Chen, Miao Fan, Jun Ma, and Maarten de Rijke. Semi-supervised variational reasoning for medical dialogue generation. In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, page 544–554, 2021.
- Wenge Liu, Yi Cheng, Hao Wang, Jianheng Tang, Yafei Liu, Ruihui Zhao, Wenjie Li, Yefeng Zheng, and Xiaodan Liang. “my nose is running.” “are you also coughing?”: Building a medical diagnosis agent with interpretable inquiry logics. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 4266–4272, 7 2022b.
- Yu Zhao, Yunxin Li, Yuxiang Wu, Baotian Hu, Qingcai Chen, Xiaolong Wang, Yuxin Ding, and Min Zhang. Medical dialogue response generation with pivotal information recalling. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, page 4763–4771, 2022.
- Chen Tang, Hongbo Zhang, Tyler Loakman, Chenghua Lin, and Frank Guerin. Terminology-aware medical dialogue generation. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, pages 1–5, 2023.

- Shuai Lin, Pan Zhou, Xiaodan Liang, Jianheng Tang, Ruihui Zhao, Ziliang Chen, and Liang Lin. Graph-evolving meta-learning for low-resource medical dialogue generation. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 35(15):13362–13370, May 2021.
- Zhenyu Hou, Yukuo Cen, Ziding Liu, Dongxue Wu, Baoyan Wang, Xuanhe Li, Lei Hong, and Jie Tang. Mtdiag: An effective multi-task framework for automatic diagnosis. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 37(12):14241–14248, Jun. 2023.
- Esin Durmus, He He, and Mona Diab. FEQA: A question answering evaluation framework for faithfulness assessment in abstractive summarization. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5055–5070, July 2020.
- Or Honovich, Leshem Choshen, Roei Aharoni, Ella Neeman, Idan Szpektor, and Omri Abend.  $q^2$ : Evaluating factual consistency in knowledge-grounded dialogues via question generation and question answering. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 7856–7870, November 2021.
- Chao Chen, Kai Liu, Ze Chen, Yi Gu, Yue Wu, Mingyuan Tao, Zhihang Fu, and Jieping Ye. INSIDE: LLMs’ internal states retain the power of hallucination detection. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- Kurt Shuster, Spencer Poff, Moya Chen, Douwe Kiela, and Jason Weston. Retrieval augmentation reduces hallucination in conversation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, pages 3784–3803, November 2021.
- Nouha Dziri, Andrea Madotto, Osmar Zaiane, and Avishek Joey Bose. Neural path hunter: Reducing hallucination in dialogue systems via path grounding. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2197–2214, November 2021.
- Niels Mündler, Jingxuan He, Slobodan Jenko, and Martin Vechev. Self-contradictory hallucinations of large language models: Evaluation, detection and mitigation. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- Mrinank Sharma, Meg Tong, Tomasz Korbak, David Duvenaud, Amanda Askill, Samuel R. Bowman, Esin DURMUS, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Scott R Johnston, Shauna M Kravec, Timothy Maxwell, Sam McCandlish, Kamal Ndousse, Oliver Rausch, Nicholas Schiefer, Da Yan, Miranda Zhang, and Ethan Perez. Towards understanding sycophancy in language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- Rojin Ziaei and Samuel Schmidgall. Language models are susceptible to incorrect patient self-diagnosis in medical applications. In *Deep Generative Models for Health Workshop NeurIPS 2023*, 2023.
- Fenglin Liu, Bang Yang, Chenyu You, Xian Wu, Shen Ge, Zhangdaihong Liu, Xu Sun, Yang Yang, and David Clifton. Retrieve, reason, and refine: Generating accurate and faithful patient instructions. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 18864–18877, 2022c.
- Suman Bhoi, Mong Li Lee, Wynne Hsu, and Ngiap Chuan Tan. Refine: A fine-grained medication recommendation system using deep learning and personalized drug interaction modeling. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pages 24013–24024, 2023.
- Zefa Hu, Xiuyi Chen, Haoran Wu, Minglun Han, Ziyi Ni, Jing Shi, Shuang Xu, and Bo Xu. Matching-based term semantics pre-training for spoken patient query understanding. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, pages 1–5, 2023.
- Angsheng Li and Yicheng Pan. Structural information and dynamical complexity of networks. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 62(6):3290–3339, 2016.
- C. Shannon. The lattice theory of information. *Transactions of the IRE Professional Group on Information Theory*, 1(1):105–107, 1953.
- Sudha Rao. Are you asking the right questions? teaching machines to ask clarification questions. In *Proceedings of ACL 2017, Student Research Workshop*, pages 30–35, 2017.

- Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber. Long short-term memory. *Neural Computation*, 9(8): 1735–1780, 1997.
- Yiming Cui, Wanxiang Che, Ting Liu, Bing Qin, and Ziqing Yang. Pre-training with whole word masking for chinese bert. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 29:3504–3514, 2021.
- 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.
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318, July 2002.
- Chin-Yew Lin. ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text Summarization Branches Out*, pages 74–81, July 2004.
- Jiwei Li, Michel Galley, Chris Brockett, Jianfeng Gao, and Bill Dolan. A diversity-promoting objective function for neural conversation models. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 110–119, June 2016.
- Zhenduo Wang, Zhichao Xu, Qingyao Ai, and Vivek Srikumar. An in-depth investigation of user response simulation for conversational search, 2024.
- Siyuan Chen, Mengyue Wu, Kenny Q. Zhu, Kunyao Lan, Zhiling Zhang, and Lyuchun Cui. Llm-empowered chatbots for psychiatrist and patient simulation: Application and evaluation, 2023.