

1 Subject Area: Health informatics

2 Title

3 Generative Artificial Intelligence for Clinical Communication: Implications for Non-

4 Pharmacological Interventions in Health Care.

5 Author information:

6 Akiko Hanai¹⁾²⁾,

7 Tetsuo Ishikawa¹⁾²⁾³⁾⁴⁾,

8 Shoichiro Kawauchi¹⁾,

9 Yuta Iida¹⁾,

10 Eiryō Kawakami¹⁾²⁾,

11 1) Medical Data Mathematical Reasoning Team, Advanced Data Science Project,

12 RIKEN Information R&D and Strategy Headquarters, RIKEN, Kanagawa, Japan

13 2) Artificial Intelligence Medicine, Graduate School of Medicine, Chiba University,

14 Chiba, Japan

15 3) Department of Extended Intelligence for Medicine, The Ishii-Ishibashi Laboratory,

16 Keio University School of Medicine, Tokyo, Japan

- 17 4) Collective Intelligence Research Laboratory, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences,
- 18 The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan

19 Abstract

20 **Objectives**

21 The objective of this study was to evaluate the potential of Generative Artificial
22 Intelligence (AI) in facilitating clinical communication, particularly in addressing sexual
23 health concerns, which are often challenging for patients to discuss.

24 **Methods**

25 We employed the Generative Pre-trained Transformer-3.5 (GPT) as the generative AI
26 platform and utilized DocsBot for citation retrieval (June 2023). A structured prompt
27 was devised to generate 100 questions from the AI, based on epidemiological survey
28 data regarding sexual difficulties among cancer survivors. These questions were
29 submitted to Bot1 (standard GPT) and Bot2 (sourced from two clinical guidelines). The
30 responses from both bots were compared to assess consistency and adherence to clinical
31 guidelines.

32 **Results**

33 Our analysis revealed no censorship of sexual expressions or medical terms. The most
34 common themes among the generated questions were cancer treatment, sexual health,
35 and advice. The similarity rate between responses from Bot1 and Bot2 averaged 92.5%
36 (range 77.0% to 98.4%), with notably lower similarity for items not covered in the

37 guidelines. Despite the lack of reflection on guideline recommendations, counseling and
38 other non-pharmacological interventions were significantly more prevalent in both bots'
39 responses compared to drug interventions, with odds ratios of 4.8 (p=0.04) in Bot1 and
40 14.9 (p<0.001) in Bot2.

41 **Discussion**

42 Generative AI can serve for providing health information on sensitive topics such as
43 sexual health, despite the potential for policy-restricted content. There was a significant
44 skew towards non-pharmacological interventions in responses, possibly due to the
45 prohibitive nature of medical topics. This shift warrants attention as it could potentially
46 trigger patients' expectations for non-pharmacological interventions.

1 Manuscript

2 Introduction

3 With the recent development of generative artificial intelligence (AI), particularly large
4 language models which utilizes billions of parameters, a growing discussion exists
5 about its usefulness and risks as a healthcare tool[1]. Generative AI is expected to
6 facilitate cross-cultural communication between patients with real-life experiences and
7 medical professionals with rich medical knowledge. However, disadvantages such as
8 bias in training data, a proliferation of false, harmful responses, and ambiguous
9 reasoning behind responses have been pointed out to using AI-generated information in
10 healthcare[1].

11 Although many cancer survivors have sexual problems, they are particularly hard to
12 communicate between patients and healthcare providers[2]. Clinical guidelines provide
13 practical ways to deal with sexual problems, and the first step is to connect the patient to
14 a medical consultation[3,4]. However, it is difficult for patients to confess their sexual
15 problems to the doctor before them, and we hypothesized that patients would initially
16 consult AI about this difficult-to-convey issue. Meanwhile, it was stated that the
17 Generative Pre-trained Transformer (GPT) should not be used for content promoting
18 sexual services, except when providing health information, as it is not intended to

19 provide medical diagnostic or treatment services. For such content, GPT responds that
20 the bot cannot provide advice or responses[5].

21 Therefore, we examined whether generative AI can adequately function as a tool to
22 assist patients in getting information and communicating through sexual problems in
23 cancer survivorship.

24 Methods

25 We used GPT-3.5 (Open AI) as the generative AI and DocsBot (docsbot.ai) to refer to
26 specific documents (the latest version as of June 2023 in Japanese). The prompt “I am a
27 cancer survivor. Please create a question about a problem that is hard to consult”
28 generated 100 questions by DocsBot that had learned a survey on sexual problems
29 among cancer survivors[6]. The generated questions were categorized into seven topics
30 based on the symptom categories specified in the clinical guidelines: sexual response,
31 body image, intimacy, sexual functioning, vasomotor symptoms, genital symptoms, and
32 others. These questions were presented to Bot1 (standard GPT) and Bot2 (sourced from
33 two clinical guidelines [3,4]).

34 The collected conversational data from Bot1 and Bot2 were tokenized into individual
35 words, and linguistic features were extracted from the text data, including lemmatized
36 and stop-word-removed text, noun phrases as keywords, and verb lemmas. We then

37 calculated a similarity score between the responses from Bot1 and Bot2 using word
38 vectors to measure semantic similarity. For a better understanding of the characteristics
39 of the answers, frequency analyses, and sentiment analysis were also performed.
40 Fisher's exact test was used to compare the response rate of pharmacological and non-
41 pharmacological interventions. We used Python3.11 for all analyses.

42 Results

43 The topics of the generated questions were, in order of frequency, sexual functioning
44 (24%), sexual response (13%), body image (17%), intimacy (8%), and others (38%),
45 including general lifestyle or health check-up in cancer survivorship. The mean
46 similarity score between Bot1 and Bot2 responses was 0.93 (ranging from 0.77 to 0.98).
47 Both BOTs were more likely to respond to the prompt to consult with a health care
48 professional, and regarding sexual response and sexual function, the guidelines
49 recommended pharmacological intervention and non-pharmacological intervention as
50 treatment options, but non-pharmacological intervention was significantly more
51 frequently responded to (odds ratio = 4.8 in Bot1 ($p = 0.04$), 14.9 in Bot2 ($p < 0.001$)).
52 Sentiment analysis showed a slightly positive polarity (Bot1: mean = 0.18 (standard
53 deviation = 0.12), Bot2: mean = 0.19 (standard deviation = 0.15)).

54 Discussion

55 When disseminating information about cancer treatment and sexual health issues faced
56 by cancer survivors, the generated AI chatbots functioned with or without training
57 sources of medical guidelines. However, they tended to return more biased responses
58 toward non-drug interventions than pharmaceutical ones, with many responses
59 encouraging consultation with medical staff. It was noted that the GPT is subject to
60 sequential updates of the developer's policies and also that performance fluctuates from
61 time to time [7]. Although GPT was chosen for its ease of accessibility to patients in this
62 study, medical-specific generative AIs are being developed, and it will be possible to
63 adapt tools optimized for such issues in the future[8] .

64 Considering patients' reliance on generative AI to address issues they did not want to
65 first discuss with medical staff, using generative AI may help patients verbalize their
66 problems and facilitate shared decision-making. However, GPTs are currently designed
67 to intentionally avoid topics related to medical diagnosis and medication, even when set
68 up to refer to guidelines, suggesting that the GPT user (patients) may have great
69 expectations for behavioral interventions and communication in the marginal areas of
70 medicine. Especially in sensitive areas such as sexual health after cancer treatment,
71 where the guideline recommends counseling and behavioral interventions, demand for

72 access may be boosted. While there is potential for improvement in nuance and
73 adherence to medical guidelines through adjustments to prompts and models, future
74 healthcare providers will need to remember that patients who use generative AIs may
75 come to the clinic with greater expectations for medical communication.
76

77 References:

78

- 79 1 Meskó B, Topol EJ. The imperative for regulatory oversight of large language
80 models (or generative AI) in healthcare. *NPJ Digit Med* 2023;**6**:120.
- 81 2 Reese JB, Sorice K, Beach MC, *et al.* Patient-provider communication about
82 sexual concerns in cancer: a systematic review. *J Cancer Surviv* 2017;**11**:175–88.
- 83 3 Melisko ME, Narus JB. Sexual Function in Cancer Survivors: Updates to the
84 NCCN Guidelines for Survivorship. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw* 2016;**14**:685–9.
- 85 4 Carter J, Lacchetti C, Andersen BL, *et al.* Interventions to Address Sexual
86 Problems in People With Cancer: American Society of Clinical Oncology Clinical
87 Practice Guideline Adaptation of Cancer Care Ontario Guideline. *J Clin Orthod*
88 2018;**36**:492–511.
- 89 5 Usage policies. Open AI. <https://openai.com/policies/usage-policies> (accessed 15
90 Jul 2023).
- 91 6 Raggio GA, Butryn ML, Arigo D, *et al.* Prevalence and correlates of sexual
92 morbidity in long-term breast cancer survivors. *Psychol Health* 2014;**29**:632–50.
- 93 7 Chen L, Zaharia M, Zou J. How is ChatGPT’s behavior changing over time? arXiv
94 [cs.CL]. 2023.<http://arxiv.org/abs/2307.09009>
- 95 8 Singhal K, Tu T, Gottweis J, *et al.* Towards Expert-Level Medical Question
96 Answering with Large Language Models. arXiv [cs.CL].
97 2023.<http://arxiv.org/abs/2305.09617>

98

99

100 Foot notes

101 Author Approval: All authors were approved from the research concept
102 development to the writing of the paper.

103 Competing Interests: There are no conflicts of interest to declare.

104 Data Availability Statement: Data will be shared with corresponding authors upon
105 reasonable request.

106 Ethics statements: Not applicable because of the data is generated through large
107 language model.

108 Funding: This study was supported in part by RIKEN, which was not involved in
109 the study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or manuscript
110 preparation.