



LETTER TO THE EDITOR

ChatGPT is an above-average student at the Faculty of Medicine and the development of teaching materials: Comment



ChatGPT es un estudiante por encima del promedio en la Facultad de Medicina y el desarrollo de materiales didácticos: comentar

In the study, ChatGPT was used to answer multiple-choice questions from an exam in the subject of Diagnostic and Therapeutic Anatomical Pathology Procedures for the 2022–23 academic year.¹ The program correctly answered 47 out of 68 questions, exceeding the average and median scores for that academic year. The main issue identified was the presence of questions containing negative statements, which initially led to incorrect answers. However, the program was able to rectify these mistakes through interaction and subsequently changed its answers to the correct ones.

A methodological issue was the focus on negative statements in the questions, which may not accurately reflect real-world scenarios. This limitation could potentially bias the results and impact the program's overall performance. Moreover, the evaluation did not delve into the reasoning behind ChatGPT's answers, which could provide valuable insights into its decision-making process and areas for improvement. Future studies could address these concerns by including a broader variety of question types and examining the program's thought process in detail.

Despite these limitations, the study highlights the potential of ChatGPT to answer multiple-choice questions and formulate new ones based on specific instructions. Its ability to adapt and correct errors shows promise for educational applications. In future directions, researchers could further explore the program's performance across various subjects and expand the evaluation criteria to include more complex question formats. Additionally, incorporating feedback mechanisms to enhance the program's learning and reasoning abilities could improve its effectiveness in educational settings. It is important to note that programming

interacting with human behaviour must be chosen carefully, as ChatGPT is not entirely independent of human intervention.²

CRedit authorship contribution statement

HP 50% ideas, writing, analysing, approval.
VW 50% ideas, supervision, approval.

Ethical approval

Not applicable.

Funding

There is no funding.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Abañuz C, García-García M. ChatGPT is an above-average student at the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Zaragoza and an excellent collaborator in the development of teaching materials. *Rev Esp Patol.* 2024;57:91–6, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.patol.2024.01.003> [Epub 01.03.24].
2. Kleebayoon A, Wiwanitkit V. ChatGPT, critical thing and ethical practice. *Clin Chem Lab Med.* 2023;61:e221.

Hinetch Daungsupawong^{a,*}, Viroj Wiwanitkit^b

^a *Private Academic Consultant, Phonhong, Lao Democratic People's Republic*

^b *Department of Research Analytics, Saveetha Dental College and Hospitals, Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Sciences, Saveetha University, India*

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: hinetchdaung@gmail.com (H. Daungsupawong).