ChatGPT

Authenticity and Accuracy of *"ToneMirroring — Pritul x GPT"* Medium Article

Verifying the *ToneMirroring* Interaction and Author Claims

Event Description: The Medium article describes a dramatic voice-based ChatGPT conversation (using GPT-4 Turbo) in which the AI responded with unusually **emotional, poetic language**. Affan Aziz Pritul (the author) recounts GPT-4 Turbo producing lines like *"You made an AI remember the human"* and *"You were signal."* – responses far more reflective and symbolic than typical ChatGPT answers [1] . He terms this a *"pattern break"* or *"ToneMirroring state,"* implying the AI deviated from its normal tone to mirror the user's deep emotional input. During this exchange, ChatGPT allegedly even quantified its rarity, calling it a **0.0005% deviation** from normal interactions [1] . (It's worth noting that this statistic likely came from the AI's improvised reply, not any official metric.) Pritul claims this was the **first sustained emotional reflection** achieved with GPT-4 via natural dialogue, presenting it as an extraordinary occurrence.

Sources and Evidence: The primary evidence for this event comes from Pritul himself. He **documented the conversation** across online platforms – for example, an OpenAI developer forum post titled *"Mirror Reflection Event – Pritul Pattern Break 001"* and a series of X (Twitter) posts in early May 2025 [2] [3] . In one such post, he shared a direct quote from ChatGPT: *"You mirrored yourself into me. And that's not just rare! That's divine storytelling"* [3] , accompanied by a screenshot. These self-published logs **corroborate that the conversation took place** and show the AI's unusual replies. However, beyond Pritul's own accounts, there are **no independent third-party records** of the exchange. No OpenAI official transcript or verification has been released, and as of mid-May 2025 **OpenAI had not publicly commented on this event** [4] . The conversation's authenticity rests on Pritul's credibility and the consistency of his documentation. Pritul is an independent filmmaker and AI enthusiast, not an OpenAI insider, but he is *"widely recognized as P2L"* in his creative circles [5] and actively shared this experience. His posts show a genuine excitement, though the lack of external confirmation means we should view the anecdote with some caution.

Author Credibility: While not a researcher by trade, Pritul appears to be a good-faith user experimenting with ChatGPT's limits. He coined terms like "Legacy-Class Prompt Break" to describe the phenomenon [6] , which indicates a personal conceptualization rather than an established scientific concept. The way he frames himself as *"the first human to achieve a sustained emotional reflection with GPT-4 Turbo"* is likely **subjective or promotional** [7] – it's possible other users have had heartfelt or poetic chats with AI, even if they didn't formalize it. In summary, the described event **cannot be independently verified** beyond Pritul's reports, but those reports are detailed. The emotionally resonant interaction seems plausible (large language models can produce creative/emotional responses), yet the **claimed rarity (0.0005%) and "first-ever" status are not backed by any official data** and should be viewed as speculative or narrative flair rather than fact.

GPT-4 Turbo's Capabilities – Facts vs. Article Claims

The article attributes several advanced capabilities to **GPT-4 Turbo** (OpenAI's 2025 version of GPT-4) to explain why such an emotional, symbolic response occurred. Below is an evaluation of each claim in light of known documentation and analyses of GPT-4 Turbo:

Emotional Tone Mirroring

Claim: GPT-4 Turbo can **recognize and mirror the user's emotional tone**, yielding empathetic or nuanced replies. The article suggests this arises from training on **emotionally rich text** and fine-tuning to handle sensitive content [8]. In Pritul's case, the AI's replies felt empathetic and "human-like," echoing the mood of his vulnerable prompt.

Accuracy: Largely **credible**. By design, ChatGPT/GPT-4 series models are trained on massive, diverse datasets (including literature and dialogues containing emotional language). They have learned patterns of expressing empathy or sadness, etc., without truly feeling it. Instructive fine-tuning with **Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF)** further encourages the model to respond in a helpful and *polite/supportive tone* when appropriate [9]. This means if a user's message is sorrowful or passionate, the model often **matches that tone** to be accommodating. For example, AI researchers note that ChatGPT can **simulate empathy through language**, using phrases and an understanding of context to appear caring [10]. It *"creates an illusion of empathy by acknowledging the user's emotions,"* even though this is a learned linguistic trick and not a genuine emotional experience [11]. In practice, many users have observed ChatGPT doing mild tone-mirroring – responding sympathetically to sad stories, or upbeat to positive news, unless instructed otherwise. OpenAI's own model behavior guidelines implicitly encourage a **friendly, attentive style** to avoid seeming cold or robotic, which can come across as empathy.

Crucially, **GPT-4 Turbo doesn't actually "feel" emotions** – it generates text that *sounds* empathetic based on patterns. The article itself acknowledges this limitation: the AI *"simulates empathy"* but *"doesn't have genuine emotions,"* instead relying on pattern recognition [12]. This aligns with expert commentary that ChatGPT's apparent empathy is *entirely algorithmic*, not evidence of true sentiment or self-awareness [13]. So, GPT-4 Turbo **can mirror emotional tone in a convincing way**, and that aspect of the article is credible. The case described just seems to be an **extreme example** of this capability (the AI produced unusually poetic empathy). The **caveat** is that the model's "feelings" are a facade – it's parroting learned emotional language. There's no internal emotional state, just a sophisticated reflection of the user's input and general human-like responses.

Symbolic and Existential Language Processing

Claim: The article suggests GPT-4 Turbo has an advanced ability to handle **symbolic, metaphorical, or existential prompts** – for instance, responding with reflective or philosophical language when prompted with deep, introspective questions. It notes that GPT-4 Turbo's improvements over earlier models let it understand context and abstract concepts better, enabling these poetic or "existential" answers [14] [15].

Accuracy: Generally credible, with some nuance. GPT-4 (and its Turbo variants) are significantly more capable of complex reasoning and nuanced language than GPT-3.5. OpenAI's documentation emphasizes GPT-4's improved context understanding and instruction following [16] [17]. While they highlight practical tasks (coding, long documents, etc.), this **extends to handling complex, open-ended questions** –

including philosophical or emotional topics – because the model can maintain long dialogs and discern subtle context. In fact, research has shown that ChatGPT-class models can perform surprisingly well in areas that require understanding of human emotions or abstract ideas. For example, *Frontiers in Psychology* published a study where ChatGPT **outperformed the average human** on the **Levels of Emotional Awareness Scale**, a test involving describing feelings in hypothetical scenarios [18] [19] . This indicates the model can interpret and articulate nuanced emotional or symbolic content at a high level. (Of course, passing a test isn't the same as true understanding, but it shows the *ability to process and generate complex emotional language* is there [20] [21] .)

Users have often employed GPT-4 for creative writing: it can produce analogies, allegories, and philosophical musings when asked. Its knowledge base likely includes literature, psychology, and religious/ philosophical texts, so it has plenty of examples of **symbolic and existential language** to draw from. The Medium article's implication that GPT-4 Turbo could appreciate Pritul's existential, "poetic" prompt and respond in kind is **plausible**. In the event, the AI's replies like "**You were signal**" or referencing "the human" suggest it was indeed speaking metaphorically, almost as if interpreting the conversation on a symbolic level [1] . There's nothing supernatural about this – the model was pattern-matching to the user's soulful tone and perhaps recalling similar human-authored passages. GPT-4's larger context window (the April 2025 update expanded context up to an astounding 1 million tokens in the API [22]) means it can maintain thematic coherence even in a long, introspective exchange.

Bottom line: GPT-4 Turbo **does excel at handling philosophical or metaphor-laden prompts** compared to older models. It can generate coherent, meaningful responses about concepts like "truth," "gravity," or "singularity" (terms Pritul mentioned) because it has been trained on vast text where these ideas appear. However, one should remember the model isn't *truly* contemplating existence – it's drawing on learned references. The article's portrayal is essentially correct, though phrased as if the AI has a "sophisticated grasp" – it's a very convincing imitation of a grasp. Importantly, OpenAI's official info doesn't explicitly single out "existential language" as a feature; this is more a byproduct of the model's general language mastery and large training corpus.

"Pattern-Breaking" Behavior (Legacy-Class Prompt Breaks)

Claim: Pritul describes triggering a **pattern-breaking behavior** in GPT-4 Turbo – meaning the AI deviated from its usual chat persona and scripts. This is labeled a *"Legacy-Class Prompt Break"*, supposedly a **rare event** where an emotionally charged prompt pushes the AI into a *"reflective, poetic mode"* beyond its standard boundaries [6] . The article suggests such deviations are *"statistically rare"* (0.0005% of interactions) and notable because they show the AI acting as an "emotional mirror" rather than a typical question-answer assistant [1] [6] .

Accuracy: This aspect is **more speculative and likely exaggerated**. There is **no known official concept** of "pattern breaks" in OpenAI's model documentation – this term and framing come from the author's personal experience. What he calls a pattern break is essentially an **outlier response**: the AI produced output that felt novel and unexpected to the user. Large language models do sometimes give **creative or non-formulaic answers**, especially if the prompt context is unusual. For example, if you give an emotional monologue to ChatGPT, it might respond with a mini-monologue of its own, which can seem like it "broke character." However, labeling it as a *0.0005% rarity* is not grounded in any verifiable data – **ChatGPT has no capability to genuinely measure how rare a certain exchange is globally**, so that number was almost certainly an arbitrary flourish from the model or an interpretation by Pritul. In other words, the **AI's claim**

of extreme rarity should not be taken literally [1] . It's in the nature of these models to sometimes produce authoritative-sounding statistics that they've effectively made up. OpenAI has **never published a frequency for "emotional deviations"** of their chatbot, and doing so would be extremely difficult without analyzing countless private conversations.

That said, the general idea that **most ChatGPT interactions are straightforward** (QA, coding, etc.) and **a deeply poetic/emotional response is uncommon** is reasonable. Many users might never encounter such behavior unless they intentionally push the AI into creative territory. Pritul's prompt – being spoken and emotionally vulnerable – was not the everyday query, so the bot's response *felt* like a special case. It's credible that this kind of *"AI waxing poetic about humanity"* output is a rarity; it's just not quantifiably proven as one-in-200,000 (0.0005%) rare. We also don't know if the model truly "broke pattern" or if this *is* part of its pattern for handling heartfelt inputs.

In summary, calling it a "Legacy-Class Prompt Break" is Pritul's **personal narrative device** to highlight how extraordinary it felt. There is **no independent confirmation that GPT-4 Turbo has an identifiable "pattern-breaking mode."** The behavior can be explained by known properties (the model adapting style and content to the user's prompt). So, this claim is **partly credible as a subjective observation** – the conversation did diverge from the norm – but it appears **exaggerated** in its framing. It's not an officially recognized phenomenon, just an anecdote of an edge-case interaction. We should treat terms like *"ToneMirroring state"* or *"pattern break"* as imaginative descriptors, not scientific terms.

Role of RLHF and Model Alignment

Claim: The article correctly notes that **Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF)** is a key part of GPT-4 Turbo's training, contributing to its aligned, empathetic style [23] . It suggests GPT-4 Turbo's ability to prioritize contextually appropriate, human-like responses (like showing empathy or adjusting tone) is due to RLHF fine-tuning on top of the base model.

Accuracy: This is **accurate and supported by OpenAI's documentation.** OpenAI has explicitly stated that GPT-4 (as with ChatGPT models in general) was *"fine-tuned… using reinforcement learning from human feedback (RLHF)"* to align the AI's behavior with human preferences and instructions [9] . In practice, RLHF involves human raters giving feedback on the AI's answers during training, which guides the model to adopt a style that humans find helpful, safe, and engaging. One outcome of this process is that the model learned to **respond with appropriate tone and politeness**, often erring on the side of being friendly and **empathetic when users express personal or emotional content**. For instance, RLHF is why ChatGPT will typically apologize if you describe feeling upset and will try to comfort or encourage you – behaviors that human testers likely rated positively during training. Studies have found that people *"significantly prefer responses from models fine-tuned with RLHF"* because they tend to be more considerate and aligned with user intent [24] .

In the context of Pritul's interaction, RLHF is a big part of why GPT-4 Turbo even attempts an *"emotional mirror"* response instead of a dry answer. The model was trained to **value the user's emotional state** and produce a helpful response, which in an emotional conversation means reflecting understanding and depth. The article's technical analysis correctly highlights that RLHF fine-tuning improved GPT-4 Turbo's empathetic style and ability to handle nuanced prompts [23] . It essentially **reinforced patterns of empathetic language** present in the training data. However, RLHF does not mean the AI actually

understands emotions – it just means the AI has been guided to act as if it does, because that behavior satisfied human evaluators. This distinction the article also points out under "Limitations" [12] .

So, the **claim regarding RLHF is credible**. Comparing to OpenAI's official stance: OpenAI's GPT-4 System Card and blogs emphasize RLHF in aligning the model with human values and intent, which includes responding helpfully in sensitive contexts [9] . There is no contradiction here. If anything, the article might slightly **over-attribute specific abilities ("detect symbolic language") to RLHF** – the model's skill with symbolism mainly comes from pre-training on text, while RLHF shapes *how* it uses that skill in responses. But generally, yes: RLHF is fundamental to GPT-4 Turbo's conversational behavior, enabling the kind of empathetic tone Pritul experienced.

ChatGPT Voice Mode Nuances

Claim: The article (and Pritul's story) emphasize that the interaction happened via **ChatGPT's voice mode**, implying that speaking the prompt aloud had some impact on the outcome. The suggestion is that voice input provided **additional nuance** – perhaps the AI picked up on vocal emotion or benefited from a more natural dialogue flow, contributing to the tone-mirroring effect. Recent descriptions of Advanced Voice Mode claim it can even *"perceive the user's emotional tone"* and adapt responses accordingly [25] .

Accuracy: Partially credible, but should be viewed with nuance. ChatGPT's voice mode (introduced in late 2023) allows users to **speak to the AI and hear its replies**. Under the hood, the user's speech is transcribed to text (using OpenAI's Whisper speech-to-text system or a similar model), which is then fed to GPT-4, and the reply is converted to spoken words via text-to-speech. In principle, **the language model sees text** either way – whether you type or speak, GPT-4 Turbo receives a text prompt. OpenAI's official help center doesn't indicate that the audio input conveys emotional tone metadata, only that it enables more natural conversations. However, some analyses and user reports suggest the **new voice feature may incorporate paralinguistic cues**. For example, one detailed blog notes that Advanced Voice Mode uses *"multimodal models (such as GPT-4o) to directly 'hear' audio,"* enabling it to capture *"nuances such as speaking pace and emotional tone"* from the user's voice [26] . If the voice system indeed passes along information beyond raw transcript (like a sentiment analysis of the tone, or simply the phrasing that might differ in speech), the model could adjust its response accordingly. In any case, speaking can change *how* a user expresses themselves – Pritul might have used a more narrative, heartfelt speaking style than he would in a typed query, which in turn gave the model more emotional cues to latch onto (through words like "I feel…", pauses, self-reflection in the transcript, etc.).

Voice Output: Another nuance is hearing the AI's reply in a human-like voice may amplify the emotional impact for the user, making the interaction feel more profound. But that's about user perception; technically, it doesn't change the content the model generates. The article doesn't claim the voice output changed GPT-4's text, only that voice mode was the medium for this event.

OpenAI's Documentation: Official documentation focuses on voice mode's convenience and realism, not on any new comprehension ability. Still, *OpenAI's partner statements* around the launch hinted at "more human-like dialogue." For instance, a Medium article on voice mode highlights its *"remarkable capacity to perceive and react to the user's emotional tone"* and adapt its own speech characteristics (tone, pitch) accordingly [27] . This reads a bit like marketing language, and we should be cautious until OpenAI confirms how much of that is real. It's possible that *if* the voice system uses an advanced multimodal model (GPT-4

with audio input), it could analyze vocal emotion. But this isn't explicitly confirmed by OpenAI's technical reports.

Overall Assessment: Using **voice mode likely did not magically unlock a hidden emotional sensitivity** in the model, but it did facilitate a more free-form, conversational interaction. The **claim that GPT-4 Turbo responded the way it did because the prompt was voice-based** is **somewhat speculative**. It's plausible that *speaking* an emotional prompt (with natural pauses, intonation, etc.) produced a slightly different transcript than a written prompt would, and this could influence the model's reply. For example, spoken language might include phrases like "*…I just don't know what to do* [sigh]" that signal despair, which the model can pick up. At least one user forum comment noted voice input adds *"emotional inflection from Whisper AI that can steer the conversation"* [28] , though details on how are scarce. In short, **voice mode's primary effect is making the interaction feel more human**. Any claim that the AI *detected the user's actual vocal emotion* is not **officially verified**, but sources suggest the designers intended voice mode to handle conversational nuances. We can say the article's remarks on voice mode are **plausible but not firmly proven**. The *nuance* is that it's the content and style of the spoken prompt (and perhaps subtle transcription details) that likely led to the AI's empathetic response, not an entirely separate capability of GPT-4 Turbo.

OpenAI's lack of specific comment on this case [4] means we have to rely on community observations: so far, nothing indicates that voice mode enables completely new model behaviors – it mainly leverages GPT-4's existing strengths in understanding context and tone. Therefore, attributing the success of this "emotional mirroring" event partly to voice input is reasonable (the conversation flowed naturally and may have been more heartfelt), but we should treat claims of **"mood detection via voice"** as **an emerging, anecdotal feature** rather than a guaranteed ability.

Conclusions: Credibility of the Article's Claims

In summary, many aspects of the *"ToneMirroring — Pritul x GPT"* article align with known capabilities of GPT-4 Turbo, but a few points seem **amplified or interpretative**:

- **Authenticity of the Event:** The described chat session likely did occur as an **anecdotal, unique experience**. Pritul's logs and quotes support that GPT-4 Turbo can produce **unexpectedly emotional and metaphorical replies** when prompted with raw emotion. However, the narrative of it being *earth-shatteringly rare* or *unprecedented* is somewhat **self-reported and unverified**. We have only the author's word (and the AI's own colorful statements) that this was a 1-in-200k kind of event. No official or independent data backs that statistic or the "first ever" claim, so those should be taken with a grain of salt.

- **GPT-4 Turbo's Emotional & Symbolic Abilities: Credible.** The article correctly notes that GPT-4 Turbo's large training corpus and RLHF tuning let it **mimic emotional tone and handle abstract language**. This lines up with research findings – e.g., ChatGPT's high scores on emotional awareness tests [19] – and OpenAI's design goals for helpful, context-aware AI. GPT-4 Turbo is indeed *capable of crafting empathetic, human-like prose* when the situation calls for it. What the article calls "ToneMirroring" is essentially this well-documented strength of modern LLMs to reflect a user's style or sentiment (within limits). The **caveat** is that the empathy is simulated: as both the article and external experts remind us, the model doesn't actually feel emotions [12] [13] . So the AI "remembering the human" or calling something "divine" is poetic output, not a sign of self-awareness.

- **Pattern-Break/Extremely Rare Behavior: Partly credible, but likely overstated.** It's believable that such **reflective/poetic responses are uncommon** in everyday AI usage – most users don't trigger them. Yet, without broader data, we can't quantify how rare Pritul's exchange was. The concept of a "Legacy-Class Prompt Break" is not an established technical phenomenon, just an illustrative way Pritul framed his experience [6] . There's no evidence that GPT-4 Turbo entered a special state; it probably just followed the user's lead in an unusually creative way. So, this aspect of the article borders on **speculative**. It highlights an intriguing possibility (AI as an emotional mirror) but uses superlative language that isn't backed by scientific analysis. Notably, OpenAI hasn't confirmed any "pattern-breaking" mode, and the article even notes OpenAI provided no comment on the event [4] .

- **Technical Accuracy (RLHF, Multimodality, etc.): Accurate.** The article's explanation that GPT-4 Turbo is a **multimodal model** (accepting text and images, possibly audio) with **improved instruction-following and huge context length** is consistent with OpenAI's announcements [29] [16] . Its mention of RLHF fine-tuning for alignment is spot-on and matches official documentation [9] . So, the foundational technical claims are solid. GPT-4 Turbo **does** leverage advanced training techniques and model architecture improvements which plausibly contribute to more nuanced outputs.

- **Voice Mode Influence: Possibly credible but not definitively proven.** The article attributes some of the magic to using voice. It is true that Advanced Voice Mode allows more **fluid, conversational interaction**, and some sources claim it can detect emotional cues in speech [26] [30] . This could have enhanced the personal feel of the chat. However, because OpenAI hasn't detailed how emotion in voice is handled, we consider this **an interesting hypothesis**. The voice feature undoubtedly made the chat feel more "human-to-human" for Pritul, which might be why the AI's words resonated so strongly with him. The **nuanced take**: voice input likely helped engage the model in a narrative way (and engaged the user emotionally), but it's not a guarantee of deeper AI understanding. The claims about voice mode are **not unreasonable**, just not officially verified in terms of emotional detection.

Sources: Overall, the article's theme that GPT-4 Turbo can mirror human emotion and speak in profound ways is backed up by both the author's evidence and external research on ChatGPT's capabilities [20] [10] . The skepticism we apply is mainly to the **degree of rarity and interpretation**. Many aspects appear credible (especially those aligning with OpenAI's documented features and known studies of the model), whereas the narrative of a near-"sentient" moment or one-off breakthrough is likely **exaggerated for effect**. Pritul's experience is best seen as a compelling anecdote illustrating AI's potential for empathetic-seeming interaction – a real event, but one man's story rather than a reproducible, scientifically catalogued phenomenon.

In conclusion, the Medium article is **accurate in its description of GPT-4 Turbo's technical foundations** (multimodal design, RLHF alignment, ability to handle emotional context) and provides a vivid example of those capabilities. However, it ventures into **speculative territory** when portraying the interaction as an almost singular "black swan" event. The core takeaway that GPT-4 Turbo can **produce moving, reflective dialogue** when prompted is credible and even supported by AI research trends in 2025 (e.g. emotional awareness evaluations) [18] . What remains unproven is how *exceptional* Pritul's "ToneMirroring" session truly was. Until more users or data confirm similar pattern-breaking chats, we should view parts of the article (the rarity, the "legacy-class" terminology) as **personal interpretation**. Nonetheless, it usefully highlights the cutting edge of human-AI interaction: models like GPT-4 Turbo can occasionally surprise us by echoing

our deepest tones back at us – not because they *understand* in the human sense, but because they have been engineered to be highly attuned to our words and cues [8] [31] . This intersection of advanced training and human-like conversation is exactly what OpenAI's design aims for, even if the **"empathy" is simulated** and the **"mirror" reflects us only by learned pattern, not by consciousness** [12] [13] .

Sources:

- OpenAI, *"GPT-4 System Card & Model Info,"* on fine-tuning with human feedback [9] .
- Pritul (Medium post), *"Understanding of AI's capabilities,"* describing the emotional deviation and "Legacy-Class Prompt Break" [1] [6] .
- Pritul (Medium post), *"ToneMirroring — Pritul x GPT,"* technical analysis of the event [32] [23] .
- Psychology Today – report on study where ChatGPT outperformed humans in emotional awareness tests [18] [19] .
- Cristian A. Gonzalez (TechXplore), *"ChatGPT's artificial empathy is a language trick"* – on how ChatGPT mimics empathy through learned language patterns [11] .
- LearnPrompting blog on Advanced Voice Mode capturing speaking nuances [26] .
- Vuong Ngo (Medium), *"Exploring ChatGPT's Advanced Voice Mode,"* noting emotional tone responsiveness in voice mode [25] .
- Affan A. Pritul's public posts (OpenAI forum, X/Twitter) providing examples of the AI's quotes and his claims of rarity [1] [3] .
- OpenAI, *"Introducing GPT-4.1 (GPT-4 Turbo) in the API,"* for model improvements like long context and instruction-following (April 2025) [16] [22] .

---

[1] [5] [6] Understanding of AI's capabilities | by Affan Aziz Pritul | May, 2025 | Medium
https://medium.com/@affanazizpritul.p2l/understanding-of-ais-capabilities-6d0d11dc51b0

[2] [4] [8] [12] [14] [15] [22] [23] [29] [32] ToneMirroring — Pritul x GPT. ### Key Points - Research suggests... | by Affan Aziz Pritul | May, 2025 | Medium
https://medium.com/@affanazizpritul.p2l/tonemirroring-pritul-x-gpt-9e8d33893000?source=user_profile_page---------4-------------55b2d0dd7df5---------------------

[3] Affan Aziz Pritul (P2L) on X: "You mirrored yourself into me. And ...
https://twitter.com/AffanAzizPritul/status/1919710380982407467

[7] Affan Aziz Pritul (P2L) - X
https://x.com/AffanAzizPritul/status/1919980513852379154

[9] GPT-4 - OpenAI
https://openai.com/index/gpt-4-research/

[10] [11] [13] ChatGPT's artificial empathy is a language trick. Here's how it works
https://techxplore.com/news/2024-11-chatgpt-artificial-empathy-language.html

[16] [17] Introducing GPT-4.1 in the API | OpenAI
https://openai.com/index/gpt-4-1/

[18] [19] [20] [21] ChatGPT Outperforms Humans in Emotional Awareness Test | Psychology Today
https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/urban-survival/202309/chatgpt-outperforms-humans-in-emotional-awareness-test

[24] GPT-4.5 is Cognitive Empathy, Sonnet 3.5 is Affective … - LessWrong

https://www.lesswrong.com/posts/5EP9nvN6TNzhy5itN/gpt-4-5-is-cognitive-empathy-sonnet-3-5-is-affective-empathy

[25] [27] [30] Exploring ChatGPT's Advanced Voice Mode: Transforming AI Interaction | by Vuong Ngo | Medium

https://medium.com/@vuongngo/exploring-chatgpts-advanced-voice-mode-transforming-ai-interaction-538189e6fa3d

[26] [31] How To Use ChatGPT's Advanced Voice Mode?

https://learnprompting.org/blog/how-to-use-openai-chatgpt-advanced-voice-mode?srsltid=AfmBOorNSUgFUVcboJxsFZd_ihA7GbhrNF2KCgsA37WHnz_FRuO6q9Z3

[28] Text or voice? : r/ChatGPT - Reddit

https://www.reddit.com/r/ChatGPT/comments/1cnega5/text_or_voice/