ChatGPT responded to biomedical queries from HS Kumar within 120 seconds (about 2 minutes) with 300–500-word responses that were innovative and well-structured but lacked academic rigor and precision. (HS Kumar, 2023) ChatGPT was employed to summarize Chinese articles, but its reply was with accuracy and citation issues. They encouraged users not to rely entirely on its feedback. (Chen, 2023) Medical chatbot's efficiency in identifying external writing was commendable, but they proposed concerns regarding unfairness and plagiarism in the responses need to be addressed.(Kitamura, 2023) The user tested ChatGPT on various medical topics and obtained responses with unrealistic insights and text similarity. Therefore, the user advises against using ChatGPT for research articles and recommends cross-checking for originality and accuracy. (Lubowitz, 2023) A study measured ChatGPT ability to provide clinical and mathematical input for cardiovascular nursing. It generated concise explanations and cited evidence-based journals. However, it lacked recent evidence beyond 2021. (Moons & Van Bulck, 2023) The application of ChatGPT in stem cell research revealed that the answers were superficial, lacking depth and complexity. It may function as a timesaving tool but should not be relied upon as a sole source of information. (Cahan & Treutlein, 2023) They conducted nursing discussions with ChatGPT and found it to be a positive experience, however, it was lacking emotional and distinctive touch. (Gunawan, 2023) With 96 objective and 30 subjective queries, the obtained credit line using ChatGPT was 89.5%, and the responses were relevant and knowledgeable.(Fijačko et al., 2023) ChatGPT underwent rigorous training and was able to pass the USMLE exam, however, it cannot replace nurses due to its inability to provide human interaction. (Mbakwe et al., 2023) ChatGPT demonstrated potential in aiding medical papers, histories, and Computer Aided Design systems. However, the flaws of ChatGPT must be put into action due to the risk of providing outdated or hallucinatory information. (Shen et al., 2023) The study yielded insightful results concerning the applicability of ChatGPT in surgical procedures. 15 diverse questions were posed to the model, spanning various time periods and categories, resulting in favorable patient outcomes. (Hassan et al., 2023) It is important to be mindful of cybersecurity when using ChatGPT and avoid sharing confidential information to obtain better results. (Mijwil et al., 2023) The user should be cautious of false experts and aware of issues related to attribution and originality. This was demonstrated through a study that analyzed 20 papers sourced from Google Scholar and PubMed. (Fatani, 2023) A study on ChatGPT reveals inconsistencies, inaccuracies, and disregard for fundamental medical journal writing conventions. While utilizing ChatGPT can improve medical writing efficiency, but total reliance on it should be cautioned. (S. Biswas, 2023) A study comparing ChatGPT responses to those of Korean students on parasitology questions revealed a 67.4% acceptability rate for ChatGPT, compared to 87.3% for students. Inaccuracy was identified as the primary reason for the lower acceptability score. (Huh, 2023) Researchers assessed ChatGPT proficiency in producing discharge reports and outcomes. ChatGPT provided results like those of medical experts, albeit with a quicker turnaround time. Nevertheless, it occasionally provided ambiguous information that did not align with medical protocols. (Patel & Lam, 2023) A survey of seafarers showed overall satisfaction with ChatGPT electronic consultation and health condition identification. However, few researchers expressed concern about potential biases towards certain ethnic groups and the risk of generating misleading data with harmful consequences. (Sharma & Sharma, 2023) Research supports the use of ChatGPT in clinical decision-making, but only after ensuring its accuracy. However, some companies have banned its use due to concerns regarding plagiarism and inaccurate information. (Kleesiek et al., 2023) Supports ChatGPT's use for research and analysis but emphasizes the need for human oversight. While ChatGPT can accelerate operations and generate ideas, it cannot replace human expertise. ChatGPT should be used as a tool to complement human judgment, not as a substitute for it. (Salvagno et al., 2023) Researchers surveyed 100,000 health workers using ChatGPT to estimate the impact of vaccination, finding a hazard ratio of 0.48 and reducing research time. However, questions of research ownership arose, raising concerns over whether ChatGPT should be credited for its contributions. (Macdonald et al., 2023) The use of large data sets to improve health policy and decision-making is supported, with credit given to ChatGPT for its valuable input. (Sifat, 2023) Researchers analyzed ChatGPT use in four clinical areas: practice support, scientific production, misuse in medicine, and public health research. They concluded that ChatGPT was proficient in language generation but lacked medical expertise and experience. Additionally, ethical concerns were raised regarding plagiarism and nonsensical output. (Cascella et al., 2023) Researcher suggested using ChatGPT to answer health queries and devise disease prevention tactics while acknowledging its drawbacks, like no direct communication with health experts and plagiarism risk. Nevertheless, he asserted that ChatGPT could expedite research and advance medical innovations. (S. S. Biswas, 2023) Speaker noted ChatGPT proficiency in handling big data, streamlining repetitive tasks, and enhancing research precision. Nevertheless, they cautioned that ChatGPT still requires refinement before being applied to challenging subjects and recommended additional investigations. (Doshi et al., 2023) A team of researchers assessed ChatGPT performance in generating ideas for plastic surgery. They reviewed 12 topics and obtained 10 specific ideas. ChatGPT overall accuracy was 55%, with 35% accuracy for general ideas and 75% for specific ideas. The team found ChatGPT to be a useful tool for plastic surgeons, especially for consultation, patient support, and marketing purposes. (Gupta et al., 2023) A team of researchers studied the possible health risks of using ChatGPT and found that it could be addictive. However, it could also promote healthy habits, such as exercise, reading, and cooking. Further research is needed to determine whether ChatGPT is a safe personal assistant. (Haman & Školník, 2023) The scholar expressed concern over promoting flawed or fabricated research and suggested that higher education institutions develop curricula to instruct students about the safe and ethical use of AI (Artificial Intelligence). He emphasized the importance of careful management, regulation, and monitoring of LLMs like ChatGPT, particularly in dentistry, where they could be beneficial. (Hill-Yardin et al., 2023) The benefits of ChatGPT were acknowledged, but concerns were raised about its lack of distinct writing style, transparency, and critical thinking skills. The argument was made that innovative technologies should be embraced, but with human oversight and input. ChatGPT was integrated into an emergency department triage system and accurately identified urgency to prioritize patients for treatment. (Eggmann et al., 2023) Study found ChatGPT could aid nurses with repetitive duties, yet it also poses the risk of deskillment and furnishing erroneous or partial data. Researchers concluded that ChatGPT could not substitute human nurses who offer patients a compassionate approach and an ameliorating setting. (Scerri & Morin, 2023) ChatGPT utilized to study the 2022 monkeypox outbreak, identified a range of factors that contributed to the emergence of the disease, including environmental changes, human behavior, pathogen evolution, immunocompromised individuals, and public health response. (Cheng et al., 2023) criticized current medical education after ChatGPT passed USMLE. He emphasized teaching students to identify gaps in knowledge.(Solomon et al., 2023) The speaker criticized medical education after ChatGPT passing of USMLE and emphasized teaching students to recognize knowledge gaps. (Mbakwe et al., 2023b) The author employed ChatGPT to examine patients in reproductive endocrinology and infertility. However, due to limited knowledge of the physical realm, the results were prejudiced. The author proposed that experts in the domain should participate in developing and applying AI technology to enhance processes. (Alvero, 2023) JAMA (Journals of the American Medical Association) will require authors to disclose AI use in manuscripts and take responsibility for accuracy of content and images to address errors in literature reviews and inaccuracies about patient populations. (Thomas, 2023) ChatGPT is useful, but not a substitute for rheumatologists. Ethical and philosophical issues arise, including authorship, plagiarism, and critical thinking. Its impact on the field will depend on its appropriate use. (Verhoeven et al., 2023) A study demonstrated ChatGPT ability to create clinically accurate letters on skin cancer care. The researcher recommended close regulatory monitoring and a "human-in-the-loop" approach during the initial phases of integration. (Ali et al., 2023) ChatGPT abstracts mislead reviewers in 32% of cases. Proper citation of sources is recommended, and KSSTA is working on developing detectors to identify AI-generated manuscripts. (Johnson et al., 2023) A study reported that ChatGPT has a 96.1% accuracy rate in responding to cancer-related inquiries, compared to the National Cancer Institute's 100% accuracy. The author urged more research to guarantee that ChatGPT can offer precise and impartial information to patients. (Dahmen et al., 2023) ChatGPT can aid urologists in prioritizing patient care by lessening their physical workload. Nonetheless, its use should be judicious and accompanied by human supervision. (Gabrielson et al., 2023)