(HS Kumar, 2023) In 2023, HS Kumar posed random questions on biomedical subjects to ChatGPT. The responses generated were evaluated for originality, and had to be produced within a time frame of 120 seconds, with a target word count of 300-500 words. Although the answers were well-organized, precise, and inventive, they were deemed to be lacking in quality and academic rigor. Issues such as insufficient word count and errors in referencing were identified as shortcomings.

(Chen, 2023)used ChatGPT for testing the summarization chinese articles where they found problems of accuracy, citation and user should not be fully dependent of its answer.

(Kitamura, 2023) found medical writing to be efficient and used to grasp foreign writing easily but addressed bias problems and plagiarism in the writings.

(Lubowitz, 2023) after testing on various medical topics got text duplicacy and false information so he forbidden to use ChatGPT for research article and human should cross check for originality and scientific work.

(Moons & Van Bulck, 2023) tested the ChatGPT by prompting clinical and statistical input questions related to cardiovascular nursing provided specific answers, recognized evidence based journals but due to limited knowledge up to 2021 latest evidence is missed out.

(Cahan & Treutlein, 2023) used ChatGPT during stem cell research and found surficial answers and only to be used to save time.

(Gunawan, 2023) also conducted several conversation about nursing with ChatGPT and deduced very good experience but emotional and personal touch was missing.

(Fijačko et al., 2023) tested with 96 objective and 30 subjective question and found overall LOC to be 89.5%. they concluded that it was insufficient for passing exams but accurate and insightful response.

(Mbakwe et al., 2023) tested with increasing complexity for several weeks and got result that made ChatGPT passed the USMLE exam. They deduced that ChatGPT can be used for research purposes but time hasn’t come for the replacement of nurses with AI as they still lack human interaction.

(Shen et al., 2023) found it can assist for medical papers, histories, correspondence and increases more efficiency of CAD system but not to use for scientific research as it can misguide you with hallucination and old data.

(Hassan et al., 2023) used 15 question from different timeline and category. The answer they received comprehensive approach, ideas to handle difficulty in surgery and suggest key factor for innovation and higher patient outcomes and ChatGPT can be handy on surgery implication.

(Mijwil et al., 2023) suggested not to give the private data on attempt to achieve more with ChatGPT and suggested to aware more people about cybersecurity.

(Fatani, 2023) did researched by choosing 20 relevant paper out of 69 taken from google scholar and PubMed, on medical research, he predicted the creation of false experts in this field, and we should be well prepared of knowing attribution and originality In today’s world.

(S. Biswas, 2023)also did well researched on literature, guidance, format generated by ChatGPT and was surprised with result being inconsistent and inaccurate sometime, and not even following a basic rule of writing medical journals. He insisted to take medical writer side by side with ChatGPT for better and faster outcome, though should not rely heavily on its data.

(Huh, 2023)also compared way of looking ability to with Korean students studying parasitology. With 100 students and 79 questions they found that 67.4% of answers were acceptable than of students of getting 87.3%. Its inaccuracy to some answer was main reason to score lower in acceptability.

(Patel & Lam, 2023) took their research into next level by testing the capability of ChatGPT on preparing discharge reports and results. They used ChatGPT to generate for different group of patients and compared with the results produced in medical experts and they got similar result like medical doctors and faster then experts. But, sometimes it presented a vague data, like it was not matching with medical procedure and information.

(Sharma & Sharma, 2023) inquired ChatGPT for contentment of seafarers for providing electronic discussion and identification of different physical condition and mental health. They compiled input of numerous seafarers with the help of elicitation techniques and suggested that it is still in maturation stage for health services, but it was claimed reliable for minor disease and infection. But they conceived that its intelligence was partially sided for some ethnic groups and population. They were in terror of its proficiency that humanity is hunted down of misleading data and information which apparently looks true but generated by ChatGPT.

(Kleesiek et al., 2023) has argued in General Purpose AI and Medical AI. After literature review of numerous articles, he suggested integrating the clinical decision (in multimodal data and documentation) with ChatGPT but only after its guarantee of well and depth research. ChatGPT was also banned for this reason by various companies because of plagiarism and inaccurate information.

(Salvagno et al., 2023) told to make expert judgment should be compulsion before using in critical decision making. He was supporting the idea that ChatGPT should be used for summarizing research and searching for gaps but with full human intervention. Immediate and depth responses could fasten the operation, but any wrong judgment could be dangerous. He chatted with ChatGPT and concluded that ChatGPT should generate ideas with taking care of future perspective and used as tools not alternative of human expertise.

(Macdonald et al., 2023) addressed 100,000 health workers to estimate of effect of vaccination and found the hazard ratio of 0.48. They used ChatGPT while adhering to STROBE guidelines in every stage of research with human oversight and found that their research timing has hugely reduced. They also addressed a new issue, about the ownership of research, should be provided to chatgpt or not if it has done large part of the research.

(Sifat, 2023)has mentioned that we should focus on using large amount of data for creating better policy for transparency and creating informed decision making process for health issues. He repetidely stand out on his point of using valuable input generated by chatGPT for better and efficient decision making process.

(Cascella et al., 2023)and his team performed research on four sector of clinical sector: practice support, scientific production, misuse in medicine and research and reasoning about public health topics and found that it was pretty good at language generating process but due to lacking in medical expertise and in field experience, some ethical concern were raised and need of creating a particular margin of plagiarism. ChatGPT could not perform Statistical analysis and was behind on automatically advising on limitation, and also could produce nonsensical answer which sounds right was some area for further research and development.

(S. S. Biswas, 2023)said ChatGPT could be used in solving and producing answer about health issues and disease prevention strategies and also shed light upon its limitation and challenges like it lacks direct interaction with health professional and risk of originality. Anyway, the article published by himself was written partially by ChatGPT but editing and supervision was done by human author. Same way, we could use in medical field to accelerate the research and quality medical invention.

(Doshi et al., 2023)saw ChatGPT was good in analysing big data, automating menial task, and improving accuracy and democratization of research. He said three things need to be well thought: reflection, caution, and responsibility. ChatGPT has good ability to improve its outputs in medical sector but when it hits difficult topics its accuracy misses the track, he suggested further centralized medical research should be done for ChatGPT to perform well in medical sector.

(Gupta et al., 2023) and with his team performed review with 12 topics around the plastic surgery to produce 10 specific ideas to calculate accuracy of ChatGPT, and they got overall of 55% accuracy and 35% for general ideas and 75% for specific ideas. They also concluded with good response about ChatGPT and surgeons should keep using it as it has far very good research on consultation, patient support and marketing.

(Haman & Školník, 2023) did research on output of chatgpt whether, it will lead to health problem like addiction or not. To do this they marketed and influenced to use chatgpt vigrouroulsy, especially in night time alone with multi-tab open in their browser. But, they were shocked that it became key reason for improvement like exercising, reading books, cooking food and it might be because ChatGPT used to give answer with its sideffect too. But, they concluded that still a long and quality testing is need before encouraging people use as personal assistant.