



ChatGPT and Bing and Home Blood Pressure Monitoring (HBPM) knowledge

Hinpetch Daungsupawong¹ · Viroj Wiwanitkit²

Keywords Hypertension · Artificial intelligence · ChatGPT

Received: 5 March 2024 / Accepted: 17 March 2024

© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to The Japanese Society of Hypertension 2024

Dear Editor, we would like to discuss on “Comparing ChatGPT and Bing, in response to the Home Blood Pressure Monitoring (HBPM) knowledge checklist [1]”. An important worldwide health concern is high blood pressure, and as AI technologies like ChatGPT and Bing gain traction, patients are using these platforms more and more to get information on controlling their condition. The purpose of this study was to assess the precision, thoroughness, and repeatability of answers to a blood pressure control questionnaire that were given by Bing and ChatGPT. Cardiologists evaluated the responses on their own, and ChatGPT received higher marks than Bing for accuracy and thoroughness.

The study’s conclusions imply that ChatGPT can be a trustworthy informational resource for people looking for advice on controlling their blood pressure. Though Bing provides useful information as well, there are several restrictions that should be taken into account when evaluating its results. Patients should be cautious when relying on artificial intelligence for medical advice and should be aware of the tools’ limitations as their use in the field of healthcare grows. Subsequent investigations may concentrate on assessing the precision and dependability of various AI instruments in furnishing details regarding hypertension and additional medical ailments. Furthermore,

in order to guarantee that patients have accurate and thorough information to support their health management decisions, efforts could be undertaken to enhance the comprehensiveness and utility of the responses offered by these platforms.

Finally, as human user input is the foundation of any ChatGPT output, human user conduct code is required [2].

Author contributions HP 50% ideas, writing, analyzing, approval. VW 50% ideas, supervision, approval.

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflict of interest The authors declare no competing interests.

Publisher’s note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

References

1. Niko MM, Karbasi Z, Kazemi M, Zahmatkeshan M. Comparing ChatGPT and Bing, in response to the Home Blood Pressure Monitoring (HBPM) knowledge checklist. *Hypertens Res.* 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41440-024-01624-8>.
2. Kleebayoon A, Wiwanitkit V. ChatGPT, critical thing and ethical practice. *Clin Chem Lab Med.* 2023;61:e221.

✉ Hinpetch Daungsupawong
hinpetchdaung@gmail.com

¹ Private Academic Consultant, Phonhong, Lao People’s Democratic Republic

² Medical College, Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Sciences Saveetha University India, Chennai, India