



ChatGPT and most frequent urological diseases: comment

Amnuay Kleebayoon¹ · Viroj Wiwanitkit²

Received: 31 August 2023 / Accepted: 1 September 2023 / Published online: 26 September 2023
© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer-Verlag GmbH Germany, part of Springer Nature 2023

Dear Editor,

We would like to share ideas on the publication “ChatGPT and most frequent urological diseases: analysing the quality of information and potential risks for patients [1].” The purpose of the study was to evaluate the quality of information provided by the artificial intelligence software ChatGPT on various urological diseases and treatments. Two urologists used the DISCERN questionnaire and a brief instrument to evaluate the quality of informed consent forms to examine the replies. ChatGPT presented well-balanced information, including explanations of anatomical location, affected demographics, symptoms, risk factors, and treatment options. The quality of therapy responses was moderate, with a DISCERN score of 3 out of 5 points. Except for benign prostatic hypertrophy (BPH), all illnesses had a DISCERN score of 4.

The study makes no comparisons between ChatGPT information and other sources of information, such as medical literature or expert opinions. It is difficult to establish whether the information provided by ChatGPT is credible and accurate without a comparison. The DISCERN questionnaire, which focuses on the quality of treatment information, is the primary source of data for the study. However, other dimensions of information quality, such as currency, comprehensiveness, and correctness, may be underappreciated. The study focuses on the quality of information from the perspective of a medical practitioner but does not analyze the usability or comprehension of the material for patients. A more comprehensive examination would include patient viewpoints and their knowledge of the presented material.

If human review is possible, sensitive content should not be produced, modified, or authorized by AI [2]. On ChatGPT, you can learn a lot about problems and solutions. The ChatGPT results show that some of these datasets may contain erroneous assumptions or perspectives. As a result, patients may obtain inaccurate or misleading information. Before proceeding, consider the moral implications of employing AI and chatbots in academic settings. The necessity for expert AI system development and human oversight is not the least crucial prerequisite. Artificial intelligence systems must be continuously developed, tested, and monitored to reduce errors, biases, and potential risks.

Author contributions AK: ideas, manuscript writing, approval for submission. VW: ideas, supervision, approval for submission.

Funding None.

Declarations

Conflict of interest The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Research involving human participants and/or animals No.

Informed consent Not applicable.

References

1. Szczesniowski JJ, Tellez Fouz C, Ramos Alba A, Diaz Goizueta FJ, García Tello A, Llanes González L (2023) ChatGPT and most frequent urological diseases: analysing the quality of information and potential risks for patients. *World J Urol*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00345-023-04563-0>. (Online ahead of print)
2. Kleebayoon A, Wiwanitkit V (2023) Artificial intelligence, Chatbots, Plagiarism and basic honesty: comment. *Cell Mol Bioeng* 16(2):173–174

This comment refers to the article available online at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00345-023-04563-0>.

✉ Amnuay Kleebayoon
amnuaykleebai@gmail.com

¹ Private Academic Consultant, Samraong, Cambodia

² Chandigarh University, Mohali, Punjab, India

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.