



ChatGPT's thoughts: comment

Amnuay Kleebayoon¹ · Viroj Wiwanitkit^{2,3}

Accepted: 29 August 2023

© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, part of Springer Nature 2023

Dear Editor,

We found that the article on “Quid Pro Quo Doctor, I tell you things, you tell me things: ChatGPT's thoughts on a killer [1]” is interesting. One such critique is the ethical obligation of enabling an AI system to partake in debates concerning a “killer.” It raises worries about the implications of normalizing or trivializing such serious and sensitive matters. Furthermore, there may be issues about the veracity and relevance of the information produced by an AI system on such topics. To overcome these challenges, explicit standards and ethical bounds for AI systems like ChatGPT must be established. This involves ensuring that the AI system is trained to prioritize user safety, follow legal and ethical norms, and refrain from participating in debates that may encourage harm or misinformation. Implementing effective content moderation systems and include feedback loops for continual development can be beneficial. Furthermore, continued research and debates on the ethical implications of AI systems in sensitive fields will be critical in determining future standards and policies.

Importantly, to balance the advantages and potential disadvantages of generative AI, effective governance and monitoring techniques are required. Sensitive content should not be created, changed, or authorized by AI if human review is a possibility [2]. You can discover a lot about issues and

solutions on ChatGPT. The ChatGPT results suggest that some of these datasets might include false presumptions or viewpoints. Patients may receive false or misleading information as a result. Think about the moral dilemmas that utilizing AI and chatbots in academic research poses before moving on.

Author contribution AK 50% ideas, writing, analyzing, approval. VW 50% ideas, supervision, approval.

Declarations

Conflict of interest The authors declare no competing interests.

References

1. Menshawey R, Menshawey E. Quid Pro Quo Doctor, I tell you things, you tell me things: ChatGPT's thoughts on a killer. *Forensic Sci Med Pathol*. 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12024-023-00696-1>. Online ahead of print.
2. Kleebayoon A, Wiwanitkit V. artificial intelligence, chatbots, plagiarism and basic honesty: comment. *Cell Mol Bioeng*. 2023;16(2):173–4.

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

✉ Amnuay Kleebayoon
amnuaykleebai@gmail.com

¹ Samraong, Cambodia

² Dr DY Patil Vidhyapeeth, Pune, Pimpri-Chinchwad, India

³ Joesph Ayo Babalola University, Ikeji-Arakeji, Nigeria