

The current status of large language models in summarizing radiology report impressions

Danqing Hu^{1*†}, Shanyuan Zhang^{2†}, Qing Liu^{3†}, Xiaofeng Zhu^{1*},
Bing Liu^{2*}

^{1*}Zhejiang Lab, Hangzhou, 311121, Zhejiang, China.

^{2*}Key Laboratory of Carcinogenesis and Translational Research (Ministry of Education), Department of Thoracic Surgery II, Peking University Cancer Hospital and Institute, Beijing, 100142, Beijing, China.

³Department of Radiology, Peking University Cancer Hospital and Institute, Beijing, 100142, Beijing, China.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): hudq@zhejianglab.com;
andy.zhu@zhejianglab.com; liubing983811735@126.com;

Contributing authors: shanyuanz@163.com; liuqingscn541743@163.com;

[†]These authors contributed equally to this work.

Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) like ChatGPT show excellent capabilities in various natural language processing tasks, especially for text generation. The effectiveness of LLMs in summarizing radiology report impressions remains unclear. In this study, we explore the capability of eight LLMs on the radiology report impression summarization. Three types of radiology reports, i.e., CT, PET-CT, and Ultrasound reports, are collected from Peking University Cancer Hospital and Institute. We use the report findings to construct the zero-shot, one-shot, and three-shot prompts with complete example reports to generate the impressions. Besides the automatic quantitative evaluation metrics, we define five human evaluation metrics, i.e., completeness, correctness, conciseness, verisimilitude, and replaceability, to evaluate the semantics of the generated impressions. Two thoracic surgeons (ZSY and LB) and one radiologist (LQ) compare the generated impressions with the reference impressions and score each impression under the five human evaluation metrics. Experimental results show that there is a gap between the generated impressions and reference impressions. Although the LLMs achieve comparable performance in completeness and correctness, the conciseness and verisimilitude scores are not very high. Using few-shot prompts can improve the LLMs' performance in conciseness and verisimilitude, but the

clinicians still think the LLMs can not replace the radiologists in summarizing the radiology impressions.

Keywords: Large language model, impression summarization, radiology report

1 Introduction

Recently, large language models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT [1] and GPT-4 [2] have captured worldwide attention due to their astonishing text-generation capabilities. Through pre-training on vast amounts of data, LLMs demonstrate remarkable performance on unseen downstream tasks using zero-shot, one-shot, or few-shot prompts without parameter updates [3]. By reinforcement fine-tuning with human feedback (RLHF) [4], the LLMs are further guaranteed to produce harmless and unbiased content that aligns with human expectations. The great success of prompt-based LLMs has led to a paradigm shift in NLP research [5–10], thereby bringing new opportunities for the radiology report impression summarization.

Radiology reports document key information in patients’ imaging data, such as CT scans, PET, MRI, X-rays, and ultrasound examinations. Typically, radiology reports consist of two main parts, i.e., findings and impressions. The findings section describes the radiologist’s observations in the images, while the impressions section summarizes these observations and provides corresponding diagnoses. Impression summarization refers to the process of condensing the lengthy and detailed findings into concise and informative impressions [11–13], which is one of the most crucial applications of text summarization in the medical field [14].

With the rise of prompt-based LLMs, it is an interesting question to explore their capability of summarizing radiology report impressions using zero-shot or few-shot prompts. Although some studies have applied prompt-based LLMs to this task [15–17], they only focus on limited types of reports, typically the X-ray reports, and lack detailed clinical expert evaluation of the generated results [15, 16] or only evaluate the LLMs on English reports in a zero-shot manner [17].

In this study, we conduct a systematic study to explore the capability of prompt-based LLMs in summarizing the impressions of various types of Chinese radiology reports using zero-shot and few-shot prompts. By leveraging automatic quantitative and clinical expert evaluations, we aim to clarify the current status of LLMs in Chinese radiology report impression summarization and the gap between the current achievements and requirements for application in clinical practice.

2 Results

2.1 Study overview

To evaluate the LLMs for impression summarization, we first collect three types of Chinese radiology reports, i.e., PET-CT, CT, and ultrasound reports from Peking




Fig. 1 The overall pipeline of impression summarization and evaluation.

University Cancer Hospital and Institute. We randomly sample 100 reports from each type of report as the experimental datasets.

Using the collected reports, we evaluate the zero-shot, one-shot, and three-shot performance of impression summarization of four commercially available LLMs, including Tongyi Qianwen, ERNIE Bot, ChatGPT, Bard, and four open source LLMs, including Baichuan, ChatGLM, HuatuoGPT, and ChatGLM-Med. The zero-shot prompt consists of two parts, i.e., task description and query. We add one example report and three example reports between the task description and query parts as the one-shot and three-shot prompts, respectively. Since the maximum input text lengths supported by LLMs are different, to fairly evaluate and compare the performance of LLMs, we do not conduct experiments when some prompt exceed the maximum input text length of LLMs (one-shot PET-CT prompt for ERNIE Bot, ChatGLM_Med, three-shot PET-CT prompt for ERINE Bot, Baichuan, HuatuoGPT, and ChatGLM_Med).

Since the LLMs' output not only contains the generated impression but also contains some content unrelated to the impression, such as the findings, the disclaimer, and the explanation of the response, or repeated text. We manually extract the

impression-related content from the outputs for the automatic quantitative and human evaluations. The overall pipeline is shown in Figure 1.




Fig. 2 The automatic quantitative evaluation results.

2.2 Quantitative evaluation

To evaluate the generated impressions, we first employ three widely used text summarization evaluation metrics, including BLEU, ROUGE-L, and METEOR, to compare them with the reference impressions. Tables 1, 2, and 3 show the experimental results.

Table 1 Automatic quantitative evaluation results of the generated CT impressions.

Prompt type	Model	BLEU1	BLEU2	BLEU3	BLEU4	ROUGE-L	METEOR
Zero-shot	Tongyi Qianwen	0.028	0.022	0.017	0.014	0.218	0.155
	ERNIE Bot	0.116	0.094	0.079	0.067	0.306	0.247
	ChatGPT	0.084	0.065	0.051	0.041	0.254	0.202
	Bard	0.085	0.067	0.055	0.044	0.275	0.214
	Baichuan	0.061	0.047	0.038	0.031	0.233	0.172
	ChatGLM	0.026	0.020	0.016	0.012	0.203	0.155
	HuatuogPT	0.113	0.084	0.066	0.053	0.259	0.230
	ChatGLM-Med	0.171	0.115	0.082	0.062	0.162	0.166
One-shot	Tongyi Qianwen	0.201	0.163	0.135	0.113	0.337	0.277
	ERNIE Bot	0.483	0.400	0.339	0.289	0.495	0.498
	ChatGPT	0.218	0.174	0.142	0.116	0.335	0.288
	Bard	0.293	0.235	0.195	0.162	0.397	0.352
	Baichuan	0.118	0.089	0.070	0.055	0.300	0.268
	ChatGLM	0.365	0.280	0.219	0.171	0.334	0.331
	HuatuogPT	0.191	0.149	0.122	0.101	0.317	0.293
	ChatGLM-Med	0.192	0.133	0.098	0.075	0.170	0.169
Three-shot	Tongyi Qianwen	0.253	0.207	0.172	0.145	0.366	0.317
	ERNIE Bot	0.440	0.367	0.311	0.264	0.483	0.467
	ChatGPT	0.300	0.244	0.203	0.170	0.386	0.354
	Bard	0.362	0.297	0.249	0.209	0.441	0.414
	Baichuan	0.282	0.225	0.185	0.153	0.373	0.347
	ChatGLM	0.218	0.169	0.135	0.108	0.320	0.290
	HuatuogPT	0.154	0.121	0.099	0.082	0.311	0.282
	ChatGLM-Med	0.159	0.102	0.068	0.049	0.154	0.152

Table 2 Automatic quantitative evaluation results of the generated PET-CT impressions.

Prompt type	Model	BLEU1	BLEU2	BLEU3	BLEU4	ROUGE-L	METEOR
Zero-shot	Tongyi Qianwen	0.452	0.347	0.274	0.221	0.323	0.390
	ERNIE Bot	0.341	0.267	0.218	0.181	0.311	0.337
	ChatGPT	0.220	0.166	0.130	0.105	0.250	0.256
	Bard	0.399	0.301	0.239	0.194	0.306	0.343
	Baichuan	0.129	0.098	0.078	0.063	0.234	0.233
	ChatGLM	0.129	0.097	0.077	0.063	0.224	0.223
	HuatuogPT	0.256	0.191	0.153	0.126	0.233	0.258
	ChatGLM-Med	0.098	0.072	0.057	0.047	0.139	0.227
One-shot	Tongyi Qianwen	0.469	0.365	0.293	0.239	0.348	0.438
	ERNIE Bot	-	-	-	-	-	-
	ChatGPT	0.263	0.199	0.155	0.124	0.266	0.290
	Bard	0.348	0.268	0.217	0.179	0.299	0.333
	Baichuan	0.091	0.070	0.056	0.047	0.225	0.218
	ChatGLM	0.233	0.175	0.137	0.111	0.246	0.264
	HuatuogPT	0.240	0.179	0.142	0.115	0.231	0.257
	ChatGLM-Med	-	-	-	-	-	-
Three-shot	Tongyi Qianwen	0.434	0.337	0.271	0.221	0.361	0.463
	ERNIE Bot	-	-	-	-	-	-
	ChatGPT	0.363	0.277	0.218	0.175	0.291	0.334
	Bard	0.446	0.350	0.285	0.236	0.323	0.369
	Baichuan	-	-	-	-	-	-
	ChatGLM	0.223	0.169	0.135	0.111	0.224	0.243
	HuatuogPT	-	-	-	-	-	-
	ChatGLM-Med	-	-	-	-	-	-

We notice that ERNIE Bot obtains the overall best results for CT impression summarization, Tongyi Qianwen achieves the best performance for PET-CT impression summarization, and ChatGPT shows the best performance for ultrasound impression summarization. Note that the best LLMs are all commercially available models. Although the Bard model does not obtain the best result for any task, it achieves the second-best results in the PET-CT and CT impression summarization. Figure 2 illustrates the experimental results more intuitively. Moreover, all the best results are obtained based on the few-shot prompts, indicating LLMs can learn from the example reports in the prompt to generate better impressions. Figure 2 also illustrates that most LLMs can benefit from the few-shot examples in the prompts, but more is not necessarily better.

Table 3 Automatic quantitative evaluation results of the generated ultrasound impressions.

Prompt type	Model	BLEU1	BLEU2	BLEU3	BLEU4	ROUGE-L	METEOR
Zero-shot	Tongyi Qianwen	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.142	0.101
	ERNIE Bot	0.027	0.024	0.021	0.019	0.277	0.209
	ChatGPT	0.006	0.005	0.004	0.004	0.193	0.140
	Bard	0.016	0.014	0.012	0.011	0.249	0.184
	Baichuan	0.008	0.007	0.006	0.005	0.257	0.172
	ChatGLM	0.003	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.182	0.132
	HuatuoGPT	0.010	0.008	0.007	0.006	0.182	0.156
	ChatGLM-Med	0.218	0.175	0.147	0.127	0.191	0.185
One-shot	Tongyi Qianwen	0.153	0.127	0.103	0.082	0.342	0.322
	ERNIE Bot	0.176	0.153	0.133	0.118	0.379	0.346
	ChatGPT	0.136	0.114	0.095	0.080	0.306	0.284
	Bard	0.130	0.107	0.090	0.076	0.325	0.289
	Baichuan	0.053	0.045	0.039	0.035	0.284	0.233
	ChatGLM	0.092	0.074	0.060	0.050	0.267	0.260
	HuatuoGPT	0.016	0.013	0.011	0.009	0.197	0.174
	ChatGLM-Med	0.205	0.168	0.146	0.131	0.173	0.162
Three-shot	Tongyi Qianwen	0.180	0.157	0.137	0.120	0.441	0.404
	ERNIE Bot	0.213	0.195	0.179	0.166	0.498	0.454
	ChatGPT	0.246	0.224	0.204	0.186	0.490	0.459
	Bard	0.179	0.155	0.136	0.122	0.414	0.368
	Baichuan	0.104	0.086	0.073	0.062	0.276	0.230
	ChatGLM	0.052	0.042	0.034	0.028	0.220	0.193
	HuatuoGPT	0.010	0.008	0.007	0.006	0.180	0.149
	ChatGLM-Med	0.225	0.186	0.162	0.145	0.187	0.188

2.3 Human evaluation

Besides automatic quantitative evaluation, in this study, we also conduct a human evaluation to obtain more insights into the impression summarization capabilities of LLMs.

2.3.1 Quality evaluation

As the LLMs may produce undesired context, we first manually review the quality of the generated impressions. After review, we summarize five types of errors in generated impressions, i.e., refuse-to-answer, truncated-output, repeated-output, no-output, and English-output errors.

All four commercially available LLMs produce high-quality impressions with no truncated-output, repeated-output, or English-output errors. Only the Bard model refuses to provide answers for 4 PET-CT impression summarization prompts in one-shot and three-shot manners, respectively.

Different from the commercially available LLMs, the quality of generated impressions varies a lot among the four open-source LLMs. Figure 3 shows the errors of the open-source LLMs. The baichuan model achieves high-quality results, where only one output has the no-output error. ChatGLM model also achieves good results when using zero-shot prompts, with only one truncated-output error. However, the ChatGLM model obtains many no-output errors when using few-shot prompts. Most of the no-output errors are due to the direct copy of the query section in the prompt but no generated impression. The two medical LLMs, HuatuoGPT and ChatGLM-Med, suffer serious errors in summarizing impressions. HuatuoGPT obtains truncated output and repeated-output errors in over 40% of PET-CT impression summarization tasks. Although the percentage of errors in the CT and ultrasound impression summarization decreases, 13.67% and 18.67% of summarized impressions still contain repeated-output errors, respectively. Note that HuatuoGPT is more prone to




Fig. 3 Quality evaluation results of the generated impressions.

obtain repeated output errors when using few-shot prompts. ChatGLM-Med obtains truncated output, repeated-output, and no-output errors in over 40% of generated PET-CT impressions. And 13.33% of generated CT impressions and 22.67% of generated ultrasound impressions have truncated output, repeated output, and no output errors.

2.3.2 Semantic evaluation

Based on the automatic quantitative and manual quality evaluation, we note that the four commercially available LLMs achieve better impression summarization than the four open-source LLMs with higher BLEU, ROUGE-L, and METEOR values and better generation qualities. Therefore, we select the outputs of the four commercially available LLMs to further evaluate the semantics of the generated impressions. We define 5 human evaluation metrics: 1) Completeness, 2) Correctness, 3) Conciseness, 4) Verisimilitude, 5) Replaceability. The human evaluation results are shown in Tables 4, 5, and 6. Figure 4 illustrates the human evaluation results in a more intuitive way.

In the term of completeness, the generated CT and US impressions are significantly better than the generated PET-CT impressions. Clinical experts rate the generated CT and US impressions as between "Relatively complete" and "Very complete" (4.80 for CT and 4.51 for US), while the PET-CT impressions are only close to "Relatively




Fig. 4 Averaged human evaluation results of the generated impressions.

complete” (3.98 for PET-CT). By comparing different prompt types, we note that the impressions obtained using zero-shot prompts achieve higher completeness score than the impressions obtained using few-shot prompts, but there is no significant differences in their completeness scores.

In the term of correctness, the generated CT and US impressions also achieve good results (4.33 for CT and 4.16 for US), which are between ”Relatively correct” and ”Very correct”. The generated PET-CT impressions obtain the 3.73 for the correctness, not reaching the ”Relatively correct” level. We also note that, when using few-shot prompts, the generated CT and US impressions get higher correctness scores, but lower correctness scores for the generated PET-CT impressions compared with using zero-shot prompts.

Table 4 Averaged human evaluation results of the generated CT impressions.

Metric	Prompt type	Model			
		Tongyi Qianwen	ERNIE Bot	ChatGPT	Bard
Completeness	Zero-shot	4.80	4.73	4.68	4.74
	One-shot	4.73	4.59	4.70	4.65
	Three-shot	4.77	4.70	4.70	4.59
Correctness	Zero-shot	4.25	4.07	3.82	3.84
	One-shot	4.26	4.24	4.13	4.05
	Three-shot	4.33	4.25	4.12	4.05
Conciseness	Zero-shot	1.41	2.46	2.22	2.16
	One-shot	2.96	4.49	3.02	3.72
	Three-shot	3.19	4.26	3.55	4.05
Verisimilitude	Zero-shot	2.45	2.87	2.47	2.50
	One-shot	3.39	4.11	3.21	3.46
	Three-shot	3.49	4.02	3.57	3.74
Replaceability	Zero-shot	2.47	2.69	2.41	2.46
	One-shot	3.13	3.54	2.94	2.99
	Three-shot	3.22	3.40	3.11	3.16

Table 5 Averaged human evaluation results of the generated PET-CT impressions.

Metric	Prompt type	Model			
		Tongyi Qianwen	ERNIE Bot	ChatGPT	Bard
Completeness	Zero-shot	3.87	3.94	3.98	3.74
	One-shot	3.53	-	3.92	3.84
	Three-shot	3.52	-	3.86	3.78
Correctness	Zero-shot	3.73	3.57	3.24	3.50
	One-shot	3.59	-	3.55	3.45
	Three-shot	3.55	-	3.54	3.47
Conciseness	Zero-shot	3.58	2.24	1.88	3.25
	One-shot	3.90	-	2.14	2.91
	Three-shot	4.13	-	2.84	3.14
Verisimilitude	Zero-shot	3.32	2.50	1.91	2.61
	One-shot	3.38	-	2.45	2.70
	Three-shot	3.39	-	2.89	2.86
Replaceability	Zero-shot	2.99	2.25	1.88	2.46
	One-shot	2.88	-	2.35	2.42
	Three-shot	2.77	-	2.66	2.53

In the term of conciseness, the generated CT and PET-CT impressions obtain better results than the generated US impressions. Clinicians rate the generated CT and PET-CT impressions as between "Relatively concise" and "Very concise" (4.49 for CT and 4.13 for PET-CT), but the generated US impressions as between "Neutral" and "Relatively concise" (3.86 for US). When using few-shot prompts, the conciseness scores of the generated impressions achieve significant improvements compared with the generated impressions using zero-shot prompts.

In the term of verisimilitude, only the generated CT impressions score more than 4 point (4.11 for CT), while the generated PET-CT and US impressions score between "Neutral" and "Relatively verisimilar" (3.39 for PET-CT and 3.74 for US). Note that using few-shot prompts can also improve the verisimilitude of the generated impressions significantly.

To comprehensively evaluate the semantics of the generated impressions, clinical experts rate the replaceability of these impressions. We find that the impressions generated by LLMs are not yet at the level that can replace manually written impressions.

Table 6 Averaged human evaluation results of the generated Ultrasound impressions.

Metric	Prompt type	Model			
		Tongyi Qianwen	ERNIE Bot	ChatGPT	Bard
Completeness	Zero-shot	4.49	4.44	4.33	4.28
	One-shot	4.44	4.34	4.14	4.12
	Three-shot	4.51	4.46	4.37	4.14
Correctness	Zero-shot	4.00	3.82	3.81	3.35
	One-shot	4.02	4.05	3.85	3.58
	Three-shot	4.04	4.16	4.08	3.87
Conciseness	Zero-shot	1.38	2.43	2.17	2.42
	One-shot	3.35	3.49	3.50	3.61
	Three-shot	3.65	3.76	3.86	3.70
Verisimilitude	Zero-shot	2.09	2.89	2.70	2.63
	One-shot	3.39	3.43	3.29	3.26
	Three-shot	3.61	3.74	3.71	3.47
Replaceability	Zero-shot	2.27	2.78	2.70	2.37
	One-shot	3.16	3.26	3.14	2.86
	Three-shot	3.42	3.61	3.52	3.13

The generated CT and US impressions only achieved replaceability scores of 3.54 and 3.61, which are between "Neutral" and "Relatively replaceable", while the generated PET-CT impressions have an even lower replaceability score of 2.99, which is only close to "Neutral".

When comparing the performances of different LLMs, we note that Tongyi Qianwen achieves the best results on the PET-CT impression generation task, with the best results in 4 of the 5 human evaluation metrics, i.e., correctness, conciseness, verisimilitude, and replaceability. ERNIE Bot outperforms the other LLMs on the CT impression generation task with the highest scores in conciseness, verisimilitude, and replaceability, and comparable scores in completeness and correctness. For US impression generation task, ERNIE Bot also achieves better results than other LLMs in correctness, verisimilitude, and replaceability and comparable results in completeness and conciseness. Note that the human evaluation results and the automatic quantitative evaluation results for the generated CT and PET-CT impressions are consistent, but not for the generated US impressions.

To analyze the evaluation variances between the clinical experts, we also list the evaluation results of each clinical expert in the Appendix Tables [A1](#), [A2](#), [A3](#), [A4](#), [A5](#), [A6](#), [A7](#), [A8](#), [A9](#), and Figure [A1](#), [A2](#), [A3](#). Based on the results, we note that there are differences in the scores of different clinical experts. Clinician I's scores are relatively low. He thinks that none of the tree types of generated impressions can reach the level of replacing manually written impressions. Clinician II's scores are in the middle. He thinks that the generated CT and US impressions are close to replacing manually written impressions, but the generated PET-CT impressions are just neutral in the replaceability. Clinician III's scores are relatively high than the others. He thinks the generated PET-CT and CT impressions are close to replacing manually written impressions, and the generated US impressions can basically replace the manually written impressions.

Although the absolute values of the scores are different between clinical experts, the changing trends of impression scores under different prompt types are similar. Using

few-shot prompts can improve most of the conciseness, verisimilitude, and replaceability scores significantly, but may lead to lower completeness and correctness scores. We also illustrate the significant test results in Appendix Figures [A4](#), [A5](#), [A6](#), [A7](#), [A8](#), [A9](#), [A10](#), [A11](#), [A12](#).

3 Discussion

In this study, we aim to explore the current status of the LLMs in summarizing radiology report impressions. Automatic quantitative and human evaluations are conducted to measure the gap between the generated and reference impressions.

3.1 Commercially available LLMs vs open source LLMs

To have a comprehensive evaluation of the state-of-the-art LLMs, in this study, we select four commercially available LLMs, i.e., ChatGPT, Bard, ERNIE Bot, and Tongyi Qianwen, and four open source LLMs, i.e., Baichuan, ChatGLM, HuatuoGPT, and ChatGLM-Med. According to the automatic quantitative evaluation, we can note that the commercially available LLMs outperform the open-source LLMs. Besides, the open-source LLMs exhibit more output errors in the generated impressions, such as the refuse-to-answer, truncated-output, repeated-output, no-output, and English-output errors. These errors are almost absent in the outputs of the commercially available LLMs. When using few-shot prompts, the commercially available LLMs can benefit more than the open-source LLMs, thus achieving higher improvements in the automatic quantitative evaluation metrics. The differences between the performance of commercially available and open-source LLMs may be due to the commercially available LLMs usually have more parameters, use more training data to train, employ more advanced closed-source algorithms to optimize, and are developed as web applications with better engineering implementations. The gap between the commercially available and open-source LLMs indicates that more computing resources and specialized engineering groups are critical for better LLMs, which has become the main obstacle for most research groups.

3.2 No best model for all impression summarization tasks

In this study, we evaluate the LLMs under automatic quantitative and human evaluation metrics. Based on the evaluation results, no single LLM can achieve the best results in all impression summarization tasks. Using automatic quantitative evaluation metrics, Tongyi Qianwen, ERNIE Bot, and ChatGPT achieve the best overall performance in the PET-CT, CT, and US impression summarization tasks, respectively. When evaluated by clinical experts, Tongyi Qianwen and ERNIE Bot are the best LLMs for the PET-CT and CT impression summarization tasks, respectively. But for US impression summarization, the clinical experts think the ERNIE Bot is better than ChatGPT. Although the experimental results indicate the evaluated LLMs are very competitive with each other and no one can outperform others in all impression summarization tasks significantly, we note that the Chinese LLMs achieve almost all the best results for automatic quantitative and human evaluation metrics except the

ChatGPT for US impression summarization under automatic quantitative evaluation. This finding suggests the necessity to build LLMs for specific languages, which can achieve better performance on language-specific tasks.

3.3 Effect of the few-shot prompt

In this study, we also explore the effect of the few-shot prompt on impression summarization. Based on the experimental results, we note that the few-shot prompt can significantly improve the performance of LLMs on all automatic quantitative evaluation metrics and some human evaluation metrics, including conciseness, verisimilitude, and replaceability. For correctness and completeness, using few-shot prompts may lead to some performance degradation, but usually not significant. When further comparing the performance of LLMs using one-shot and three-shot prompts, we find that the more examples provided, the better the impressions generated are not achieved. For example, Tongyi Qianwen achieves the best BLEU values when using one-shot prompts and the best ROUGE-L and METEOR values when using three-shot prompts for PET-CT impression summarization. ERINE Bot outperforms the other LLMs in ROUGE-L for CT impression summarization when using one-shot prompts but achieves the best ROUGE-L scores for US impression summarization when using three-shot prompts. Although there is an overall trend that using few-shot prompts will improve the performance of LLMs in generating impressions, it seems unclear how many examples a prompt should include to be most effective.

3.4 Clinical application

Note that to evaluate the semantics of the generated impressions, we first extract the impressions from the generated text manually and then conduct the human evaluation. Therefore, the current experimental results may be higher than those obtained by evaluating the original outputs. We list the automatic quantitative results in Appendix Tables A10, A11, A12 and Figure A13. We also show the difference in results between using the extracted impressions and original outputs in Figures A14 and A15. We can note that all results obtained by evaluating extracted impressions are higher than those on original outputs. However, among all LLMs, Tongyi Qianwen, ERNIE Bot, and ChatGPT show small differences between these results, indicating they can follow the instructions well to generate the text we desire. Although the Bard achieves comparable performance based on the extracted impressions, its original outputs contain much more impression-unrelated content, reducing its usability in summarizing impressions in real clinical practice.

According to the evaluation of clinical experts, the impressions generated by the LLMs can not directly replace the impressions written by radiologists. However, using LLMs to summarize clinical text like radiology findings is still valuable. First, it can help clinicians improve the efficiency of writing clinical documents. In clinical practice, writing clinical documents like radiology impressions, admission records, progress notes, and discharge summaries is time-consuming and tedious. To alleviate this problem, we can use the LLMs to summarize the related structured or unstructured

electronic health records as a preliminary clinical note, and then the clinicians conduct the final review. For cancer patients who usually undergo a long diagnosis and treatment process, we can also employ the LLMs to summarize the whole diagnosis and treatment timeline, which is very important and valuable for the development of the next treatment plan. Second, LLMs may improve the diagnostic capabilities of primary care physicians. There are significant differences in the ability of physicians to diagnose benign findings associated with tumors. Primary care physicians who lack rich experience are more likely to overdiagnose. LLMs can generate the impressions to assist primary care physicians in making more accurate diagnoses. Thirdly, we can use LLMs to facilitate the research. Based on the summarization ability, LLMs can effectively extract key information from clinical documents to identify eligible patients for specific studies.

3.5 Limitations and future work

To comprehensively evaluate the LLMs' impression summarizing ability, we select three types of radiology reports, i.e., PET-CT, CT, and Ultrasound reports. We should note that all reports are from lung cancer patients treated in a single medical center, which indicates the patient population is homogeneous and the writing style of the reports is relatively uniform. So, the results in this study may differ from the average performance of LLMs in summarizing the impressions of reports from patients with different diseases or medical centers. In the future, we will try to collect more radiology reports from different patients and medical centers to evaluate the LLMs to obtain more robust results.

The most important contribution of this study is that we invite three clinical experts to manually evaluate the impressions generated by the LLMs from the point of view of semantics so that we can find out the gap between the reports generated by LLMs and those written by radiologists. However, manual evaluation is time-consuming and tedious, which is the biggest obstacle for a large amount of evaluation. Therefore, in this study, we only recruit three clinical experts, i.e., two thoracic surgeons and one radiologist, to evaluate 100 generated impressions for each type of report. To obtain more convincing results, we will try to recruit more clinicians with different years of experience from different departments to evaluate more impressions in the future.

Currently, LLMs are updated very quickly. Since human evaluation is very time-consuming, we can not perform real-time human evaluation of the latest LLMs. In the future, we will try to evaluate the latest LLMs and compare them with their previous versions to find out the changes in the performance of impression summarization of radiology reports.

4 Methods

4.1 Materials

We collected three types of radiology reports, i.e., PET-CT, CT, and ultrasound (US) reports from Peking University Cancer Hospital and Institute. The relevant patients

are all outpatients and inpatients of the Department of Thoracic Surgery II. After removing the incomplete reports, we finally obtain 867 PET-CT reports, 819 CT reports, and 1487 ultrasound reports. We randomly select 100 reports from each type of report for automatic quantitative and human evaluations.

4.2 Large language models

In this study, we aim to explore the current status of prompt-based LLMs in radiology report impression summarization. To conduct a comprehensive evaluation, we select four commercially available and four open source LLMs with different architectures and parameter sizes. The summaries of the selected LLMs are listed below.

- **Tongyi Qianwen.** Tongyi Qianwen is an LLM chat product developed by Alibaba Cloud. The latest Tongyi Qianwen 2.0 extends the Qwen model [18] to a few hundred billion parameters, achieving a substantial upgrade from its predecessor in understanding complex instructions, reasoning, memorizing, and preventing hallucinations. We used Tongyi Qianwen v2.1.1 (<https://tongyi.aliyun.com/qianwen/>) to generate the impressions.
- **ERNIE Bot.** ERNIE Bot (Wenxin Yiyan) is an LLM chat product developed by Baidu based on their ERNIE (Enhanced Representation through Knowledge Integration) [19] and PLATO (Pre-trained Dialogue Generation Model) [20] models. Based on the supervised fine-tuning, RLHF, and knowledge, search, dialogue enhancements, the ERNIE Bot achieves a more precise understanding of Chinese language and its practical applications. We used ERNIE Bot v2.5.2 (<https://yiyan.baidu.com/>) to generate the impressions.
- **ChatGPT.** ChatGPT is the most impactful LLM developed by OpenAI, raising the trend of prompt-based LLMs worldwide. ChatGPT is an advanced version of instructionGPT [4], which first fine-tunes GPT-3 [3] using human-written demonstrations of the desired output to prompts and then further fine-tuning the model through the RLHF strategy to align language models with user intent. We accessed the ChatGPT via website interface (<https://chatgpt.com/>) to obtain the generated impressions before January 11, 2024.
- **Bard.** Bard is an LLM chat product powered by PaLM 2 [21] (Pathways Language Model 2) developed by Google AI. PaLM 2 is a transformer-based model trained using a mixture of objectives and multilingual datasets, achieving better performances on natural language generation, code generation, translation, and reasoning than its predecessor, PaLM [22]. We accessed the Bard via website interface (<https://gemini.google.com/app>) to obtain the generated impressions before January 12, 2024.
- **Baichuan.** Baichuan-13B [23] is an open-source LLM developed by Baichuan Intelligence. The baichuan-13B model has 130 billion parameters trained on 1.4 trillion tokens. It supports both Chinese and English and achieves competitive performance in standard Chinese and English benchmarks among models of its size. We used the Baichuan-13B-Chat (<https://huggingface.co/baichuan-inc/Baichuan-13B-Chat>) to generate the impressions.

- **ChatGLM.** ChatGLM3-6B is the latest open-source model in the ChatGLM [24] series developed by Tsinghua University. The ChatGLM3-6B has a more powerful base model trained on a more diverse dataset, sufficient training steps, and a more reasonable training strategy, showing strong performance on language understanding, reasoning, coding, etc. We used the ChatGLM3-6b (<https://huggingface.co/THUDM/chatglm3-6b>) to generate the impressions.
- **HuatuoGPT.** HuatuoGPT [25] is an open-source LLM developed by the Shenzhen Research Institute of Big Data. HuatuoGPT-7B first uses the Baichuan-7B as the backbone model and then uses the distilled data from ChatGPT and real-world data from doctors to supervised fine-tuning and reinforcement learning with mixed feedback to achieve state-of-the-art results in performing medical consultation. We used the HuatuoGPT-7B (<https://github.com/FreedomIntelligence/HuatuoGPT>) to generate the impressions.
- **ChatGLM-Med.** ChatGLM-Med [26] is an open-source LLM developed by the Harbin Institute of Technology. The ChatGLM-Med employs the ChatGLM-6B as the base model and fine-tunes on a Chinese medical instruction dataset developed by a medical knowledge graph and GPT-3.5 to improve better question-answering results in the medical field. We used the ChatGLM-Med (<https://github.com/SCIR-HI/Med-ChatGLM>) to generate the impressions.

4.3 Impression summarization using LLMs

To explore the capability of LLMs to summarize the impression in a zero-shot or few-shot manner, we first design the zero, one, and three-shot prompts as shown in Figure 5. The zero-shot prompt consists of two parts, i.e., task description and query. The one-shot and three-shot prompts add one and three example reports between the task description and query, respectively. Note that the example reports are randomly selected from the dataset and different from the report in the query.

Using the developed prompts, we collect the outputs of the four commercially available LLMs from their corresponding websites manually. And we deploy the four open-source LLMs on our server to obtain their outputs. Note that, besides the summarized impression, the LLMs usually generate some other content such as the findings, the future examination advice, the explanation of the response, etc. To accurately evaluate the generated impressions, we conduct a post-processing procedure to remove the unrelated content from the outputs to keep the impressions only for further quantitative and human evaluations.

4.4 Quantitative evaluation metrics

In this study, we select 3 metrics widely used in text generation research to evaluate the generated impression against the reference impression. The values of these metrics range from 0 to 1, where a higher value indicates a better result. A brief introduction of the metrics is listed below:




Fig. 5 Zero-shot, one-shot and three-shot prompts in Chinese and English.

- **BLEU**. BiLingual Evaluation Understudy (BLEU) [27] score measures the number of position-independent matches of the n-grams of the candidate with the n-grams of the reference, focusing on the precision of the n-grams.
- **ROUGE-L**. Recall-Oriented Understudy for Gisting Evaluation using Longest Common Subsequence (ROUGE-L) [28] measures the longest common subsequence (LCS) between the candidate and reference to calculate the LCS-based F-measure.
- **METEOR**. Metric for Evaluation of Translation with Explicit ORdering (METEOR) [29] measures the harmonic mean of precision and recall calculated based on the mapping between unigrams with the least number of crosses by exact, stemming, and synonym matching.

4.5 Human evaluation metrics

Although the automatic quantitative evaluation metrics above have shown some correlations with human judgments, they are not sufficient enough to evaluate the difference between the generated and reference impressions in semantics. Therefore, we define

5 human evaluation metrics, i.e., 1) Correctness, 2) Completeness, 3) Conciseness, 4) Verisimilitude, and 5) Replaceability, in this study to evaluate the semantics of the generated impressions. The definitions are listed below. We recruit three clinical experts (ZSY, LB, and LQ) to annotate the generated impression. We use a 5-point Likert scale for each evaluation metric. A higher value indicates a better result. Note that the clinical experts are blinded to the LLM and prompt types when annotating. We use the Mann-Whitney U test to compare the human evaluation metrics of different LLMs with different prompts.

- **Completeness.** Completeness measures how completely the information in the generated impression covers the information in the reference impression. The five answer statements for the 5-point Likert scale of Completeness are 1 for "Very incomplete", 2 for "Relatively incomplete", 3 for "Neutral", 4 for "Relatively completeness", and 5 for "Very correct".
- **Correctness.** Correctness measures how correct the information in the generated impression is compared to the information in the reference impression. The five answer statements for the 5-point Likert scale of Correctness are 1 for "Very incorrect", 2 for "Relatively incorrect", 3 for "Neutral", 4 for "Relatively correct", and 5 for "Very correct".
- **Conciseness.** Conciseness measures how much redundant information is in the generated impression. The five answer statements for the 5-point Likert scale of Conciseness are 1 for "Very redundant", 2 for "Relatively redundant", 3 for "Neutral", 4 for "Relatively concise", and 5 for "Very concise".
- **Verisimilitude.** Verisimilitude measures how similar the generated impression is to the reference impression in readability, grammar, and writing style. The five answer statements for the 5-point Likert scale of Verisimilitude are 1 for "Very fake", 2 for "Relatively fake", 3 for "Neutral", 4 for "Relatively verisimilar", and 5 for "Very verisimilar".
- **Replaceability.** Replaceability measures whether the generated impression can replace the reference impression. The five answer statements for the 5-point Likert scale of Replaceability are 1 for "Very irreplaceable", 2 for "Relatively irreplaceable", 3 for "Neutral", 4 for "Relatively replaceable", and 5 for "Very replaceable".

5 Conclusion

In this study, we explore the current status of LLMs in summarizing radiology report impressions using automatic quantitative and human evaluations. The experimental results indicate that there is a gap between the impressions generated by LLMs and written by radiologists. LLMs achieve great performance in completeness and correctness, but are not good in conciseness and verisimilitude. Although the few-shot prompt can improve the LLMs' performance in conciseness and verisimilitude, clinicians still believe that the LLMs can not replace the radiologist in summarizing impressions, especially for PET-CT reports with long findings.

Acknowledgements. This work was supported by the Beijing Natural Science Foundation (L222020), the National Key R&D Program of China

(No.2022YFC2406804), the Capital's funds for health improvement and research (No.2024-1-1023), and the National Ten-thousand Talent Program.

References

- [1] OpenAI. Introducing chatgpt (2022). URL <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt>.
- [2] OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774* (2023).
- [3] Brown, T. *et al.* Larochelle, H., Ranzato, M., Hadsell, R., Balcan, M. & Lin, H. (eds) *Language models are few-shot learners*. (eds Larochelle, H., Ranzato, M., Hadsell, R., Balcan, M. & Lin, H.) *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 33, 1877–1901 (2020).
- [4] Ouyang, L. *et al.* Koyejo, S. *et al.* (eds) *Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback*. (eds Koyejo, S. *et al.*) *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 35, 27730–27744 (2022).
- [5] Tang, L. *et al.* Evaluating large language models on medical evidence summarization. *npj Digital Medicine* **6**, 158 (2023).
- [6] Hu, D., Liu, B., Zhu, X., Lu, X. & Wu, N. Zero-shot information extraction from radiological reports using chatgpt. *International Journal of Medical Informatics* **183**, 105321 (2024). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1386505623003398>.
- [7] Hu, Y. *et al.* Improving large language models for clinical named entity recognition via prompt engineering. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* (2024).
- [8] Chen, Q. *et al.* Large language models in biomedical natural language processing: benchmarks, baselines, and recommendations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16326* (2023).
- [9] Doshi, R. *et al.* Quantitative evaluation of large language models to streamline radiology report impressions: A multimodal retrospective analysis. *Radiology* **310**, e231593 (2024).
- [10] Keloth, V. K. *et al.* Advancing entity recognition in biomedicine via instruction tuning of large language models. *Bioinformatics* (2024).
- [11] Zhang, Y., Ding, D. Y., Qian, T., Manning, C. D. & Langlotz, C. P. Lavelli, A., Minard, A.-L. & Rinaldi, F. (eds) *Learning to summarize radiology findings*. (eds Lavelli, A., Minard, A.-L. & Rinaldi, F.) *Proceedings of the Ninth International Workshop on Health Text Mining and Information Analysis*, 204–213 (Association for Computational Linguistics, Brussels, Belgium, 2018).

- [12] Jiang, Z. *et al.* Learning to summarize chinese radiology findings with a pre-trained encoder. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering* **70**, 3277–3287 (2023).
- [13] Cai, X. *et al.* Chestxraybert: A pretrained language model for chest radiology report summarization. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia* **25**, 845–855 (2023).
- [14] Tian, S. *et al.* Opportunities and challenges for chatgpt and large language models in biomedicine and health. *Briefings in Bioinformatics* **25** (2024).
- [15] Liu, Z. *et al.* Evaluating large language models for radiology natural language processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.13693* (2023).
- [16] Sun, Z. *et al.* Evaluating gpt-4 on impressions generation in radiology reports. *Radiology* **307**, e231259 (2023).
- [17] Van Veen, D. *et al.* Adapted large language models can outperform medical experts in clinical text summarization. *Nature Medicine* (2024).
- [18] Bai, J. *et al.* Qwen technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16609* (2023).
- [19] Sun, Y. *et al.* Ernie: Enhanced representation through knowledge integration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09223* (2019).
- [20] Bao, S., He, H., Wang, F., Wu, H. & Wang, H. Jurafsky, D., Chai, J., Schlueter, N. & Tetreault, J. (eds) *PLATO: Pre-trained dialogue generation model with discrete latent variable*. (eds Jurafsky, D., Chai, J., Schlueter, N. & Tetreault, J.) *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 85–96 (Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 2020).
- [21] Anil, R. *et al.* Palm 2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10403* (2023).
- [22] Chowdhery, A. *et al.* Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **24**, 1–113 (2023).
- [23] Technology, B. I. Baichuan-13b: A 13b large language model developed by baichuan intelligent technology (2023). URL <https://github.com/baichuan-inc/Baichuan-13B>.
- [24] Du, Z. *et al.* Muresan, S., Nakov, P. & Villavicencio, A. (eds) *GLM: General language model pretraining with autoregressive blank infilling*. (eds Muresan, S., Nakov, P. & Villavicencio, A.) *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 320–335 (Association for Computational Linguistics, Dublin, Ireland, 2022).
- [25] Zhang, H. *et al.* Bouamor, H., Pino, J. & Bali, K. (eds) *HuatuoGPT, towards taming language model to be a doctor*. (eds Bouamor, H., Pino, J. & Bali, K.)

Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023, 10859–10885 (Association for Computational Linguistics, Singapore, 2023).

- [26] Wang, H., Liu, C., Zhao, S., Qin, B. & Liu, T. Med-chatglm (2023). URL <https://github.com/SCIR-HI/Med-ChatGLM>.
- [27] Papineni, K., Roukos, S., Ward, T. & Zhu, W.-J. Isabelle, P., Charniak, E. & Lin, D. (eds) *Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation*. (eds Isabelle, P., Charniak, E. & Lin, D.) *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting on Association for Computational Linguistics*, ACL '02, 311–318 (Association for Computational Linguistics, USA, 2002).
- [28] Lin, C.-Y. unavailable (ed.) *ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries*. (ed.unavailable) *Text Summarization Branches Out*, 74–81 (Association for Computational Linguistics, Barcelona, Spain, 2004).
- [29] Banerjee, S. & Lavie, A. Goldstein, J., Lavie, A., Lin, C.-Y. & Voss, C. (eds) *METEOR: An automatic metric for MT evaluation with improved correlation with human judgments*. (eds Goldstein, J., Lavie, A., Lin, C.-Y. & Voss, C.) *Proceedings of the ACL Workshop on Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evaluation Measures for Machine Translation and/or Summarization*, 65–72 (Association for Computational Linguistics, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 2005).

Appendix A

Table A1 Clinician I’s evaluation results of the generated CT impressions.

Metric	Prompt type	Model			
		Tongyi Qianwen	ERNIE Bot	ChatGPT	Bard
Completeness	Zero-shot	4.90	4.83	4.80	4.87
	One-shot	4.84	4.66	4.79	4.77
	Three-shot	4.85	4.75	4.77	4.70
Correctness	Zero-shot	4.57	4.61	4.41	4.53
	One-shot	4.52	4.54	4.44	4.55
	Three-shot	4.64	4.54	4.45	4.44
Conciseness	Zero-shot	1.32	2.24	1.90	1.90
	One-shot	2.87	4.38	2.56	3.59
	Three-shot	2.95	3.99	3.10	3.81
Verisimilitude	Zero-shot	1.96	2.47	2.01	2.22
	One-shot	3.21	4.03	2.66	3.36
	Three-shot	3.15	3.81	3.13	3.52
Replaceability	Zero-shot	2.23	2.14	1.84	2.04
	One-shot	2.64	2.91	2.16	2.31
	Three-shot	2.63	2.58	2.26	2.39

Table A2 Clinician II’s evaluation results of the generated CT impressions.

Metric	Prompt type	Model			
		Tongyi Qianwen	ERNIE Bot	ChatGPT	Bard
Completeness	Zero-shot	4.51	4.36	4.38	4.35
	One-shot	4.40	4.30	4.41	4.24
	Three-shot	4.50	4.45	4.42	4.22
Correctness	Zero-shot	3.77	3.62	4.03	3.27
	One-shot	4.01	4.12	4.12	3.73
	Three-shot	4.08	4.12	4.17	3.73
Conciseness	Zero-shot	1.35	2.49	2.57	2.29
	One-shot	2.93	4.44	3.36	3.74
	Three-shot	3.30	4.31	3.77	4.02
Verisimilitude	Zero-shot	2.22	2.74	2.88	2.49
	One-shot	3.18	3.85	3.42	3.11
	Three-shot	3.43	3.89	3.65	3.45
Replaceability	Zero-shot	1.83	2.72	2.94	2.45
	One-shot	3.14	3.99	3.44	3.27
	Three-shot	3.46	3.87	3.82	3.56

Table A3 Clinician III’s evaluation results of the generated CT impressions.

Metric	Prompt type	Model			
		Tongyi Qianwen	ERNIE Bot	ChatGPT	Bard
Completeness	Zero-shot	4.98	4.99	4.87	4.99
	One-shot	4.95	4.81	4.90	4.95
	Three-shot	4.95	4.89	4.92	4.85
Correctness	Zero-shot	4.40	3.97	3.01	3.73
	One-shot	4.24	4.07	3.83	3.87
	Three-shot	4.27	4.08	3.75	3.99
Conciseness	Zero-shot	1.57	2.66	2.18	2.29
	One-shot	3.09	4.66	3.13	3.82
	Three-shot	3.32	4.47	3.79	4.31
Verisimilitude	Zero-shot	3.17	3.40	2.51	2.78
	One-shot	3.77	4.44	3.54	3.91
	Three-shot	3.89	4.35	3.93	4.24
Replaceability	Zero-shot	3.35	3.22	2.44	2.89
	One-shot	3.61	3.72	3.21	3.40
	Three-shot	3.58	3.74	3.24	3.54

Table A4 Clinician I’s evaluation results of the generated PET-CT impressions.

Metric	Prompt type	Model			
		Tongyi Qianwen	ERNIE Bot	ChatGPT	Bard
Completeness	Zero-shot	3.81	3.94	4.07	3.86
	One-shot	3.43	-	3.81	3.88
	Three-shot	3.49	-	3.74	3.74
Correctness	Zero-shot	3.70	3.64	3.79	3.68
	One-shot	3.61	-	3.64	3.68
	Three-shot	3.66	-	3.56	3.57
Conciseness	Zero-shot	2.87	1.76	1.37	2.73
	One-shot	3.59	-	1.47	2.20
	Three-shot	3.75	-	1.98	2.56
Verisimilitude	Zero-shot	2.97	2.22	1.42	2.22
	One-shot	3.41	-	1.94	2.33
	Three-shot	3.46	-	2.33	2.63
Replaceability	Zero-shot	1.97	1.63	1.24	1.67
	One-shot	1.99	-	1.60	1.58
	Three-shot	1.93	-	1.70	1.66

Table A5 Clinician II’s evaluation results of the generated PET-CT impressions.

Metric	Prompt type	Model			
		Tongyi Qianwen	ERNIE Bot	ChatGPT	Bard
Completeness	Zero-shot	3.73	3.87	3.89	3.49
	One-shot	3.40	-	3.94	3.66
	Three-shot	3.18	-	3.81	3.61
Correctness	Zero-shot	3.49	3.20	3.34	2.88
	One-shot	3.23	-	3.17	2.68
	Three-shot	3.03	-	3.21	2.89
Conciseness	Zero-shot	3.61	2.22	1.92	3.57
	One-shot	3.97	-	2.02	3.02
	Three-shot	4.09	-	2.69	3.20
Verisimilitude	Zero-shot	2.96	2.32	2.06	2.44
	One-shot	2.77	-	2.16	2.31
	Three-shot	2.66	-	2.48	2.46
Replaceability	Zero-shot	3.02	2.32	2.08	2.54
	One-shot	2.77	-	2.21	2.25
	Three-shot	2.56	-	2.54	2.48

Table A6 Clinician III’s evaluation results of the generated PET-CT impressions.

Metric	Prompt type	Model			
		Tongyi Qianwen	ERNIE Bot	ChatGPT	Bard
Completeness	Zero-shot	4.07	4.01	3.99	3.88
	One-shot	3.77	-	4.02	4.00
	Three-shot	3.88	-	4.04	4.00
Correctness	Zero-shot	4.01	3.86	2.58	3.95
	One-shot	3.92	-	3.84	4.00
	Three-shot	3.96	-	3.84	3.96
Conciseness	Zero-shot	4.25	2.73	2.34	3.46
	One-shot	4.13	-	2.93	3.51
	Three-shot	4.56	-	3.84	3.67
Verisimilitude	Zero-shot	4.03	2.96	2.25	3.17
	One-shot	3.96	-	3.26	3.45
	Three-shot	4.06	-	3.85	3.51
Replaceability	Zero-shot	3.98	2.81	2.32	3.17
	One-shot	3.89	-	3.25	3.42
	Three-shot	3.82	-	3.73	3.47

Table A7 Clinician I’s evaluation results of the generated Ultrasound impressions.

Metric	Prompt type	Model			
		Tongyi Qianwen	ERNIE Bot	ChatGPT	Bard
Completeness	Zero-shot	4.11	4.01	3.82	3.88
	One-shot	4.10	4.01	3.67	3.75
	Three-shot	4.20	4.08	3.95	3.71
Correctness	Zero-shot	3.57	3.53	3.56	3.35
	One-shot	3.66	3.77	3.47	3.49
	Three-shot	3.71	3.88	3.63	3.57
Conciseness	Zero-shot	1.05	1.77	1.38	1.69
	One-shot	2.76	2.85	2.80	2.91
	Three-shot	3.00	3.09	3.09	2.98
Verisimilitude	Zero-shot	1.41	2.09	1.69	1.97
	One-shot	2.72	2.80	2.34	2.76
	Three-shot	2.86	3.05	2.98	2.83
Replaceability	Zero-shot	1.66	1.80	1.77	1.32
	One-shot	2.23	2.21	2.10	1.84
	Three-shot	2.34	2.57	2.42	1.98

Table A8 Clinician II’s evaluation results of the generated Ultrasound impressions.

Metric	Prompt type	Model			
		Tongyi Qianwen	ERNIE Bot	ChatGPT	Bard
Completeness	Zero-shot	4.36	4.32	4.17	3.96
	One-shot	4.22	4.01	3.75	3.64
	Three-shot	4.37	4.29	4.16	3.73
Correctness	Zero-shot	4.03	3.85	3.75	2.54
	One-shot	3.96	3.88	3.77	2.96
	Three-shot	4.04	4.14	3.95	3.31
Conciseness	Zero-shot	1.09	2.40	2.02	2.36
	One-shot	3.21	3.44	3.56	3.67
	Three-shot	3.58	3.81	3.88	3.77
Verisimilitude	Zero-shot	1.85	2.57	2.34	1.86
	One-shot	3.14	3.13	3.13	2.62
	Three-shot	3.54	3.71	3.51	2.92
Replaceability	Zero-shot	1.33	2.54	2.29	1.75
	One-shot	3.13	3.25	3.11	2.57
	Three-shot	3.67	3.82	3.59	2.93

Table A9 Clinician III’s evaluation results of the generated Ultrasound impressions.

Metric	Prompt type	Model			
		Tongyi Qianwen	ERNIE Bot	ChatGPT	Bard
Completeness	Zero-shot	5.00	5.00	4.99	4.99
	One-shot	4.99	5.00	5.00	4.98
	Three-shot	4.96	5.00	5.00	4.97
Correctness	Zero-shot	4.40	4.08	4.13	4.15
	One-shot	4.45	4.50	4.32	4.29
	Three-shot	4.37	4.47	4.66	4.74
Conciseness	Zero-shot	2.00	3.13	3.10	3.22
	One-shot	4.08	4.17	4.14	4.24
	Three-shot	4.37	4.39	4.62	4.36
Verisimilitude	Zero-shot	3.00	4.01	4.06	4.06
	One-shot	4.31	4.37	4.40	4.41
	Three-shot	4.42	4.45	4.64	4.65
Replaceability	Zero-shot	3.83	4.01	4.05	4.04
	One-shot	4.11	4.33	4.22	4.16
	Three-shot	4.26	4.45	4.56	4.47

Table A10 Automatic quantitative evaluation results of the generated raw CT impressions.

Prompt type	Model	BLEU1	BLEU2	BLEU3	BLEU4	ROUGE-L	METEOR
Zero-shot	Tongyi Qianwen	0.017	0.014	0.011	0.009	0.205	0.147
	ERNIE Bot	0.089	0.073	0.061	0.052	0.291	0.234
	ChatGPT	0.028	0.021	0.017	0.014	0.203	0.150
	Bard	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.112	0.070
	Baichuan	0.030	0.023	0.018	0.015	0.195	0.138
	ChatGLM	0.009	0.007	0.005	0.004	0.174	0.125
	HuatuoGPT	0.009	0.007	0.005	0.004	0.169	0.128
	ChatGLM-Med	0.171	0.116	0.084	0.064	0.154	0.156
One-shot	Tongyi Qianwen	0.171	0.139	0.115	0.096	0.320	0.259
	ERNIE Bot	0.431	0.356	0.302	0.257	0.463	0.458
	ChatGPT	0.118	0.094	0.077	0.063	0.292	0.244
	Bard	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.133	0.086
	Baichuan	0.014	0.011	0.009	0.007	0.181	0.135
	ChatGLM	0.042	0.033	0.027	0.022	0.223	0.181
	HuatuoGPT	0.004	0.003	0.002	0.002	0.195	0.157
	ChatGLM-Med	0.189	0.132	0.098	0.076	0.167	0.166
Three-shot	Tongyi Qianwen	0.224	0.183	0.153	0.129	0.350	0.299
	ERNIE Bot	0.310	0.257	0.217	0.184	0.429	0.402
	ChatGPT	0.166	0.136	0.114	0.096	0.337	0.298
	Bard	0.001	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.137	0.090
	Baichuan	0.115	0.091	0.075	0.062	0.293	0.256
	ChatGLM	0.045	0.035	0.029	0.023	0.225	0.178
	HuatuoGPT	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.148	0.108
	ChatGLM-Med	0.150	0.095	0.063	0.045	0.140	0.140




Fig. A1 Clinician I's evaluation results.




Fig. A2 Clinician II's evaluation results.




Fig. A3 Clinician III's evaluation results.



Fig. A4 Statistical test of Clinician P's CT evaluation.



Fig. A5 Statistical test of Clinician II's CT evaluation.



Fig. A6 Statistical test of Clinician II's CT evaluation.



Fig. A7 Statistical test of Clinician I's PETCT evaluation.



Fig. A8 Statistical test of Clinician II's PETCT evaluation.



Fig. A9 Statistical test of Clinician III's PETCT evaluation.



Fig. A10 Statistical test of Clinician I's US evaluation.



Fig. A11 Statistical test of Clinician II's US evaluation.



Fig. A12 Statistical test of Clinician III's US evaluation.

Table A11 Automatic quantitative evaluation results of the generated raw PET-CT impressions.

Prompt type	Model	BLEU1	BLEU2	BLEU3	BLEU4	ROUGE-L	METEOR
Zero-shot	Tongyi Qianwen	0.438	0.335	0.264	0.212	0.316	0.382
	ERNIE Bot	0.318	0.247	0.201	0.167	0.302	0.326
	ChatGPT	0.159	0.119	0.093	0.074	0.226	0.227
	Bard	0.113	0.082	0.064	0.051	0.210	0.197
	Baichuan	0.100	0.076	0.060	0.048	0.216	0.212
	ChatGLM	0.103	0.077	0.061	0.049	0.208	0.206
	HuatuoGPT	0.110	0.082	0.066	0.054	0.203	0.193
	ChatGLM-Med	0.090	0.059	0.044	0.035	0.094	0.145
One-shot	Tongyi Qianwen	0.476	0.368	0.294	0.240	0.340	0.424
	ERNIE Bot	-	-	-	-	-	-
	ChatGPT	0.221	0.166	0.129	0.102	0.248	0.266
	Bard	0.063	0.048	0.038	0.031	0.196	0.174
	Baichuan	0.066	0.051	0.041	0.034	0.210	0.197
	ChatGLM	0.199	0.149	0.117	0.094	0.232	0.246
	HuatuoGPT	0.083	0.062	0.048	0.039	0.188	0.172
	ChatGLM-Med	-	-	-	-	-	-
Three-shot	Tongyi Qianwen	0.439	0.340	0.272	0.221	0.354	0.450
	ERNIE Bot	-	-	-	-	-	-
	ChatGPT	0.309	0.234	0.183	0.147	0.274	0.309
	Bard	0.105	0.080	0.064	0.052	0.217	0.204
	Baichuan	-	-	-	-	-	-
	ChatGLM	0.188	0.143	0.115	0.094	0.215	0.227
	HuatuoGPT	-	-	-	-	-	-
	ChatGLM-Med	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table A12 Automatic quantitative evaluation results of the generated raw Ultrasound impressions.

Prompt type	Model	BLEU1	BLEU2	BLEU3	BLEU4	ROUGE-L	METEOR
Zero-shot	Tongyi Qianwen	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.122	0.083
	ERNIE Bot	0.014	0.013	0.011	0.010	0.252	0.187
	ChatGPT	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.157	0.105
	Bard	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.090	0.053
	Baichuan	0.006	0.006	0.005	0.004	0.231	0.167
	ChatGLM	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.000	0.163	0.109
	HuatuoGPT	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.118	0.073
	ChatGLM-Med	0.165	0.131	0.109	0.093	0.162	0.138
One-shot	Tongyi Qianwen	0.122	0.101	0.082	0.066	0.319	0.294
	ERNIE Bot	0.072	0.062	0.055	0.048	0.304	0.257
	ChatGPT	0.008	0.007	0.006	0.006	0.239	0.193
	Bard	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.106	0.065
	Baichuan	0.049	0.042	0.036	0.032	0.278	0.226
	ChatGLM	0.005	0.004	0.003	0.003	0.190	0.137
	HuatuoGPT	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.104	0.073
	ChatGLM-Med	0.165	0.131	0.111	0.097	0.143	0.124
Three-shot	Tongyi Qianwen	0.150	0.131	0.115	0.100	0.408	0.365
	ERNIE Bot	0.042	0.038	0.035	0.033	0.351	0.286
	ChatGPT	0.151	0.137	0.126	0.115	0.441	0.396
	Bard	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.111	0.068
	Baichuan	0.098	0.081	0.069	0.059	0.270	0.224
	ChatGLM	0.003	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.167	0.115
	HuatuoGPT	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.096	0.062
	ChatGLM-Med	0.131	0.107	0.093	0.083	0.141	0.118




Fig. A13 Automatic quantitative evaluation results of the generated raw impressions.




Fig. A14 Heatmap of the automatic quantitative evaluation results obtained by evaluating extracted impressions and raw outputs.




Fig. A15 Bar chart of the automatic quantitative evaluation results obtained by evaluating extracted impressions and raw outputs.