

# Comment on “Feasibility and acceptability of ChatGPT generated radiology report summaries for cancer patients”

DIGITAL HEALTH  
Volume 10: 1  
© The Author(s) 2024  
Article reuse guidelines:  
sagepub.com/journals-permissions  
DOI: 10.1177/20552076241253453  
journals.sagepub.com/home/dhj



Hinpetch Daungsupawong<sup>1</sup>  and Viroj Wiwanitkit<sup>2</sup>

Dear editor,


We would like to respond to a comment on the published article entitled “Feasibility and acceptability of ChatGPT generated radiology report summaries for cancer patients.”<sup>1</sup> The study used ChatGPT to summarize MRI reports for patients with prostate cancer. Three summarized reports were generated for each full MRI report, and their readability was assessed using the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level score. Radiation oncologists evaluated the AI-summarized reports through a questionnaire. Additionally, response rates for physician online portal for 50 newly diagnosed prostate cancer patients were assessed.

The results showed that ChatGPT generated 15 summarized reports from five full MRI reports. The difficulty in readability of the summarized reports was significantly lower than that of the full MRI reports. Twelve radiation oncologists evaluated the AI-summarized reports and rated them on various aspects. Although there was space for improvement, the ratings for factual correctness, comprehension, completeness, potential for harm, overall quality, and probability to send to the patient were mostly favorable.

The study’s negative point is that it only included data from one school, which could restrict how broadly it can be used. Chung et al. call attention to the disadvantage of being a single institutional study in the limitations section of their paper. Furthermore, the physician web portal had a comparatively low response rate. Nevertheless, this might not be a drawback. There is a gap, which is indicated by the physicians’ brief responses and low response rates. By responding, possibly in a more detailed manner, ChatGPT may be able to close this gap. Using ChatGPT as a feasible solution to provide patients some answer is the question, not how often should doctors respond.

According to a previous similar study,<sup>2</sup> ChatGPT can accurately summarize scientific abstracts for patients, and its user-friendliness is enhanced by thoughtfully designed prompts. While the summaries are adequate, greater accuracy requires professional verification.<sup>2</sup> According to a different study,<sup>3</sup> ChatGPT accurately responds to frequently asked patient inquiries about health issues, but its comprehension of available treatments is lacking, and the responses are written at a level that is too high for the typical patient to understand.

The current work may show the possibility that ChatGPT will be useful for laypeople. As noted in the current study by Chung et al., there may be space for improvement as there was less chance of providing the summarized reports to patients. In the future, the study may involve more institutions in order to diversify the cases and confirm that ChatGPT is a useful tool for summarizing MRI findings. Enhancing the AI system would also be advantageous in order to improve the completeness and quality of the reports that are summarized. Improving the portal’s usability or putting in place incentives for prompt responses are two ways to raise the response rates for the physician online portal. The decision to adhere to a just and moral norm ultimately rests with the AI system’s user.<sup>3</sup>

**ORCID iD:** Hinpetch Daungsupawong  <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-5881-2709>

## References

1. Chung EM, Zhang SC, Nguyen AT, et al. Feasibility and acceptability of ChatGPT generated radiology report summaries for cancer patients. *Digit Health* 2023; 9: 20552076231221620.
2. Eppler MB, Ganjavi C, Knudsen JE, et al. Bridging the gap between urological research and patient understanding: the role of large language models in automated generation of Layperson’s summaries. *Urol Pract* 2023; 10: 436–443.
3. Razdan S, Siegal AR, Brewer Y, et al. Assessing ChatGPT’s ability to answer questions pertaining to erectile dysfunction: can our patients trust it? *Int J Impot Res* 2023. DOI: 10.1038/s41443-023-00797-z.

<sup>1</sup>Private Academic Consultant, Phonhong, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Vientiane, Laos

<sup>2</sup>University Centre for Research and Development Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Chandigarh University Gharuan, Mohali, Punjab, India

### Corresponding author:

Hinpetch Daungsupawong, Private Academic Consultant, Phonhong, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Vientiane, Laos.  
Email: hinpetchdaung@gmail.com