(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 collecting 20 relevant paper on medical research and concluded not be to