Measuring the Quality of AI-Generated Clinical Notes: A Systematic Review and Experimental Benchmark of Evaluation Methods

Alexandra Dahlberg[1,2*], Tiila Käenniemi[3,4#], Tiia Winther-Jensen[3#], Olli Tapiola[1], Rami Luisto[5,6], Tuukka Puranen[1], Max Gordon[7], Enni Sanmark[1,8] and Ville Vartiainen[1,8]

[1] Clinicum, Faculty of Medicine, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

[2]Mehiläinen, Helsinki, Finland

[3]Faculty of Arts, University of Helsinki, Finland

[4]Gofore Lead Oy, Helsinki, Finland

[5]Faculty of Information Technology, University of Jyväskylä, Finland

[6]Digital Workforce Services Plc, Helsinki, Finland

[7]Department of Clinical Sciences, Danderyd Hospital, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden

[8] Heart and Lung Center, Helsinki University Hospital, Helsinki, Finland

[*]*Corresponding author, alexandra.dahlberg@helsinki.fi*

[#]*Contributed equally*

November 18th, 2025

Abstract

Background: High-quality clinical documentation is essential for safe, effective care, yet producing it is time consuming and error prone. Large language models (LLMs) can assist with note generation, but clinical adoption is determined by the resulting note quality. However current

evaluation practices vary, and their clinical relevance is unclear. Drawing on a multidisciplinary perspective, we examined how quality is assessed and how those assessments align with clinical demands.

Methods: We systematically searched Ovid Medline and Scopus on 10 April 2025 for peer-reviewed studies that used LLMs in generating clinical notes and included an evaluation of the quality of the resulting text. The screening followed PRISMA and the protocol was preregistered in PROSPERO. Data on metrics, and outcomes were synthesised narratively. Based on these findings, we designed an experimental setup to test the most common evaluation metrics and an LLM-as-evaluator, included for its scalability across large test sets. The experiment used synthetic cases with targeted perturbations.

Findings: Thirty-seven studies were included. The reporting was dominated by lexical overlap metrics, chiefly ROUGE and BLEU. Semantic similarity metrics, such as BERTScore and BLEURT, were less common. A human evaluation was frequent but heterogeneous, with criteria and methods defined using varying degrees of detail; the most common foci were correctness, fluency, and aspects of clinical acceptability. In our experimental setup, lexical overlap metrics detected deletions and modifications but penalised meaning-preserving paraphrases. Semantic metrics and LLM-as-evaluators were more tolerant of paraphrased perturbations, yet remained sensitive to relevant changes, with performance varying by model and language.

Interpretation: Current practice relies on lexical overlap metrics that are useful for cursory checks but insufficient as proxies for quality. We recommend a layered strategy that pairs semantic metrics with LLM-as-evaluator for scalability and includes targeted human adjudication. Broader, safety-focused validation across institutions and languages is needed before routine deployment.

Funding: Business Finland through the GenAID research project. Personal grants listed under Acknowledgments.

Introduction

High-quality clinical documentation is integral to safe and effective care. Clear, complete notes support decision making, reduce treatment errors, and maintain continuity, whereas incomplete, disorganised, or inaccurate records result in miscommunication, delay diagnosis, and worsen outcomes[1,2]. Interventions including dictation, structured templates, and medical scribes provide partial mitigation, but evidence for sustained improvement is mixed and quality remains variable[1,2]. Recent advances in artificial intelligence (AI) have renewed the interest in assistance for clinical documentation. Large language models (LLMs) are AI systems capable of large variety of natural language processing tasks, enabling human-like text generation and cross-task generalisation[3]. LLMs can draft histories, discharge summaries and other clinical notes from transcripts or structured data. However, during the process LLMs transform content and may omit critical details or introduce misinformation underscoring the need for robust evaluation[2]. Increasing the degree of automation and scaling LLM use requires automated and scalable evaluation methods that account for these effects of the generation process.

To assess the current evaluation practices, we first conducted a systematic review of peer-reviewed studies evaluating AI-generated clinical notes, cataloguing the metrics, and criteria employed. We then implemented a complementary experimental framework that tested the widely used evaluation methods on synthetic clinical cases with controlled perturbations: deletions, modifications, and paraphrases. In contrast to earlier reviews that emphasise checklist-style content audits, our focus is the quality of AI-generated text and its evaluation, with the aim of identifying which assessment approaches best reflect clinical utility and safety and can be automated at scale.

Methods

This study has two components. First, we conducted a systematic review of peer-reviewed studies that reported an evaluation of AI-generated clinical notes in accordance with PRISMA guidelines. Second, an experimental framework that operationalises several evaluation criteria identified in the review. Using synthetic clinical cases with targeted perturbations, we evaluate standard automated metrics alongside several LLM-based evaluators, comparing performance across languages and perturbation types. This design lets the experiment probe, in a controlled setting, the strengths and limitations highlighted by the review.

Search strategy and selection criteria

This systematic review was conducted in accordance with the PRISMA guidelines[4] (Supplementary Table S1). The review protocol was preregistered at PROSPERO (CRD420251044770). Ovid MEDLINE and Scopus were searched on 10 April 2025. Search terms captured concepts of artificial intelligence and clinical documentation quality. Strings combined keywords and MeSH terms including, but not limited to, clinical note, AI, LLM, RAG, and evaluation. Full syntaxes for each database are provided in Supplementary Table S2. No date limits were applied. Criteria for inclusion and exclusion are presented in Supplementary Table S3.

After removal of duplicates, the titles and abstracts were screened in parallel by two reviewers working as a pair, with a third reviewer independently assessing all records. Discrepancies were resolved by discussion. Full texts were then assessed and data extracted using the same process. The PRISMA flow diagram summarises the process (Figure 1). In total, 37 studies met the inclusion criteria and were included in the review.

Figure 1 PRISMA flow diagram[4]**.** *Records excluded as "no clinical note produced" generated Q&A content, diagnosis lists, or image categorization instead of documentation aimed at healthcare personnel.



Data Extraction and Quality Assessment

Data were extracted using a standardised form capturing publication details (authors, journal, year), clinical setting or context (specialty, use case for AI text generation), AI system or model type (for example, GPT-3 (proprietary)), and the methods used to evaluate the generated text quality. For evaluation methods, we recorded automated metrics, the extent and means of human evaluation, the criteria, and clinical standard checklists used, and any use of large language

models as evaluators. Where available, we captured quantitative results, for example means and statistical significance, and qualitative findings, for example narrative comments on note quality.

Because study designs varied, from randomised controlled trials to observational usability studies, we qualitatively considered methodological rigour, for example randomisation, blinding of evaluators, and sample size, but did not exclude studies based on quality and did not perform a formal risk-of-bias scoring.

Synthesis of Results

We synthesised findings narratively, grouped by themes in evaluation approach and outcome. Interventions, comparators, and outcome measures were too heterogeneous for meta-analysis, and no common effect measures, such as risk ratios or mean differences, were applicable. For each thematic synthesis we first tabulated study characteristics against our planned categories, text-to-text, image-to-text, and evaluation methodology. Text-to-text denotes systems that generate text from textual inputs; image-to-text denotes multimodal systems that produce text from visual inputs. The evaluation methodology category comprises studies whose primary contribution is the design, comparison, or validation of evaluation methods rather than the assessment of a specific AI-generated clinical note, typically to benchmark a newly proposed metric. Using this scheme, 29 studies addressed text-to-text generation, 5 addressed image-to-text generation, and 3 focused on evaluation methodology.

Evaluation approaches were divided into two broad categories: automated and human evaluation. The synthesis of automated approaches focused on the reported metrics, and the synthesis of human evaluation on harmonization of criteria. Reporting of human evaluation approaches, terminology and definitions for quality criteria varied across papers and we harmonised terminology into correctness, completeness, conciseness, fluency, clinical acceptability, and other criteria using explicit mapping rules. The preferred criteria were selected for their recurrence and

conceptual coherence across the reviewed literature. These criteria represent frequently used yet inconsistently labelled or defined constructs across studies; grouping them under broader, conceptually coherent terms enables synthesis of results, highlights the lack of standardization in evaluation terminology, and allows for future refinement and subcategorization. The terms correctness, completeness, conciseness, and fluency were chosen for their high frequency of occurrence and conceptual consistency across studies. The term clinical acceptability was selected to encompass the multidimensional nature of clinical suitability, including safety, usefulness, professional trust, and practical applicability. It was preferred over narrower alternatives such as clinical validity, utility, or appropriateness because it integrates these aspects, enabling both consistent synthesis and future analysis of the dimensions and constituents of clinical acceptability. Other criteria were included to capture evaluation aspects that could not be mapped elsewhere due to insufficient specificity of the reported information.

Reported percentages were converted to n/N_x where denominators were available. If a metric variant was unspecified, for example “ROUGE” with no variant, we recorded it as unspecified and flagged it in the tables. When required information was missing or unclear, we coded it as ‘not reported’.

Design of the Experimental Setup

To assess the selected automated evaluation tools, we used synthetic cases from MedBench with permission. MedBench is a multilingual, multi-specialty benchmark in development, comprising fictional clinical notes with an associated discharge summary for each patient; available to registered users online[5]. From this resource, we selected all five internal medicine discharge summaries available in English, Swedish and Finnish. We then constructed perturbations ourselves, covering three edit types: (1) deletion of clinically relevant information, (2) modification of key details, and (3) paraphrase, for example via synonym substitution. Each type was applied

at three intensities, approximately five, ten and fifteen edits, yielding nine perturbated variants per case. Edit schemas were held consistent across languages. All clinical notes and perturbations in all three languages are available in the repository cited in the Data Sharing statement.

Metrics

Guided by the systematic review, we evaluated four families of automated metrics. Foremost, we considered lexical overlap metrics, namely BLEU-1 to BLEU-4, and ROUGE-1, ROUGE-2 and ROUGE-L, which compare exact tokens or n-grams between a system output and its reference, and therefore capture surface similarity rather than meaning. Subsequently, we considered semantic similarity metrics, which map texts to vector representations and score their proximity in order to capture meaning beyond wording. This family includes embedding-based measures (for example BERTScore), learned reference-based metrics (BLEURT), and model-based likelihood metrics (BARTScore). In our experiments we used BLEURT and BERTScore with RoBERTa-large and XLM-R-base backbones. We also included a text-embedding cosine similarity on theoretical grounds as a direct estimate of semantic proximity. Although not reported in the review, many semantic metrics rely on cosine similarity in the scoring step. Embeddings were computed using text-embedding-3-large (OpenAI, San Francisco, USA) embedding model. Full implementation details, including prompts, checkpoints and the repository, are provided in the Data Availability statement to ensure variant consistency across languages. Finally, to examine the LLM-as-evaluator paradigm, we prompted a set of LLMs to rate the divergence between each system output and its reference. The model set comprised Gemma 3n E2B, Gemma 3n E4B, DeepSeek R1, gpt-oss-20B, gpt-oss-120B, GPT-3.5, GPT-4, GPT-4o, GPT-4.1, GPT-5 mini, GPT-5 nano and GPT-5. All model runs used a fixed decoding temperature and maximum output tokens as specified in the repository. For the open-source 20B model, a 4000-token limit yielded scores for 78 of 135 edited inputs on the first pass, with reruns increasing coverage to 89 of 135; increasing the limit to 5000 tokens produced 89 of 135 on the first pass. For the 120B model, a 4000-token

limit produced scores for all but two inputs on the first pass, and reruns achieved complete coverage. All configurations, prompts, and model hashes are versioned for reproducibility. Python version (Python Software Foundation, Wilmington, USA)[6-15].

Statistics

For each metric–model pair, we computed summary scores within each language (English, Swedish, Finnish) by perturbation type (delete, modify, paraphrase) and perturbation level (1-3) by comparison to the original summary of the medical case.

To assess the association between perturbation level and evaluation metric scores we used linear mixed-effects model with perturbation level implemented as continuous variable and case as random effect. Graphical inspection indicated that the categories behaved approximately linearly with level, which justifies the chosen approach.

No ethical approval was required as the experiment used synthetic clinical notes and involved neither human participants nor protected health information.

Role of the Funding Source

The funding source had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, report writing, or the decision to submit for publication.

Results

Systematic Review

We synthesised the methods used to assess the quality of AI-generated clinical text in the literature. All included studies are listed in Supplementary Table S4.

Lexical Overlap Metrics Dominate Current Practice

In current research addressing clinical note generation, lexical overlap metrics regarding lexical and syntactic characteristics, chiefly ROUGE[16] and BLEU)[17], remain dominant (Table 1).

Table 1 Automated metrics used in included studies. Values are n/N (%). Denominators for percentage counts: text-to-text n_t=29, image-to-text n_i=5, evaluation methodology n_e=3, total N=37. A study is counted if it reported any score for the metric, regardless of variant. Full study-to-metric mappings are provided in Supplementary Table S5.

Automated Metric	Text-to-text (n)	Image-to-text (n)	Evaluation methodology (n)
BLEU-1	0·0% (0)	40·0% (2)	0·0% (0)
BLEU-2	0·0% (0)	40·0% (2)	0·0% (0)
BLEU-3	0·0% (0)	40·0% (2)	0·0% (0)
BLEU-4	3·4% (1)	60·0% (3)	0·0% (0)
BLEU	6·9% (2)	20·0% (1)	0·0% (0)
ROUGE-1	51·7% (15)	20·0% (1)	33·3% (1)
ROUGE-2	48·3% (14)	20·0% (1)	33·3% (1)
ROUGE-3	6·9% (2)	0·0% (0)	0·0% (0)
ROUGE-4	3·4% (1)	0·0% (0)	0·0% (0)
ROUGE-L	62·1% (18)	100·0% (5)	33·3% (1)
ROUGE-Lsum	10·3% (3)	0·0% (0)	33·3% (1)
BERTScore[13]	41·4% (12)	40·0% (2)	100·0% (3)
BLEURT[18]	13·8% (4)	0·0% (0)	33·3% (1)
BARTScore[19]	0·0% (0)	0·0% (0)	66·7% (2)

In addition to more widely used BLEU and ROUGE families, two text-to-text and one image-to-text studies used METEOR[20] and one image-to-text study used CIDEr[21]. Both measures incorporate semantic approaches offering modest improvements to BLEU and ROUGE families.[21]

Growing Interest in Semantic Metrics

As shown in Table 1, BERTScore (backbone BERT[22]) was the most commonly applied semantic metric in our review, followed by BLEURT[18] (BERT[22] and RemBERT) and BARTScore[19] (backbone BART).

In parallel, more domain-adapted semantic evaluation approaches have been proposed to better reflect clinical accuracy and relevance. By domain-adapted, we mean metrics specifically designed for e.g. medical use. In our review these evaluations were not uncommon, but the use of individual metrics was highly fragmented and often limited to single studies. Abacha et al. (2023)[23] used medically weighted models (e.g., MedBERTScore[23], MedBARTScore[23], ClinicalBLEURT[23]) which consistently outperformed their non-domain-adapted counterparts. Other domain-adapted semantic metrics mentioned only once were SummaC[24], entailment-based CTC (Compression, Transduction, and Creation)[25], and Dependency Arc Entailment (DAE)[26].

Medical Concept and Factuality Metrics

In addition to domain-adapted varieties of lexical overlap and semantic metrics, specialized metrics have also been proposed to account for highly specialized medical vocabulary and factual correctness.

The MIST (Medical Information Semantic Textual similarity)[27] metric was reported in one study. It uses knowledge-graph embeddings derived from the Unified Medical Language System (UMLS)[28] to improve concept-level similarity assessment, particularly for rare terms and factual statements in generated versus reference notes.

Other domain-adapted metrics, each reported once, included AlignScore[29], FactScore[30], and F1-score based on RadGraph[31], and UMLS[28] databases, each targeting aspects of factuality, structured information extraction, or concept coverage. For instance, F1-RadGraph quantifies the overlap of radiology-specific entities and relations, while FactScore measures factual consistency against verified medical statements.

LLM-Based Evaluation Trends

LLM-as-evaluator was a rare approach in the included literature. Three studies used LLMs directly to appraise AI-generated notes. Brake and Schaaf (2024)[32] tested LLaMA-2 (7B, 13B, 70B) for factual consistency in PEGASUS-generated SOAP (Subjective, Objective, Assessment and Plan) notes, comparing ROUGE and factuality scores with human review of 40 of 543 vignettes and LLM review under zero- to three-shot prompting. Agreement between humans and LLaMA-2-70B (two-shot) was substantial for age ($\kappa = 0.79$), perfect for gender ($\kappa = 1.00$), and fair for body part ($\kappa = 0.32$), indicating that LLaMA-2 may reliably reproduce human annotations for some narrowly defined attributes, while its performance and therefore, potential generalisability, remains uncertain for more complex or less consistently annotated categories. Schumacher et al. (2024)[33] introduced MED-OMIT (GPT-4), an omission-oriented metric that counts reference facts excluded from summaries and weights them by clinical relevance, benchmarking it against established metrics. It showed broad agreement with clinical experts on both omission detection and importance, with weak or nonsignificant correlations with ROUGE and BERTScore for stronger models. Mishra et al. (2024)[34] proposed G-Eval (GPT-4) to generate synthetic edit feedback, providing targeted revision instructions to improve outputs from smaller models, fewer than 10B parameters. Clough et al. (2024)[35] applied an OpenAI text classifier to AI-generated discharge summaries and found all labelled “very unlikely” to be AI-generated, highlighting current limits of detection tools.

Human Evaluation and Evaluation Criteria

Human evaluation featured in nearly all reviewed articles, although implementation varied (Supplementary Table S6). It was applied systematically in 27 of the 37 studies. Sampling strategies varied: 12 studies evaluated fewer than half of all vignettes, whereas 16 assessed more than 50 per cent. A few studies used a single evaluator per note, most used at least three, and

the maximum observed was five. Evaluators were typically medical professionals or students with heterogeneous levels of experience. Few studies reported inter-rater reliability, and reporting of other statistic was uncommon.

Due to the heterogeneous nature of human evaluation approaches in the reviewed papers, human evaluation findings are reported according to the assessed quality criteria. Our harmonized categories for criteria along with concise definitions and examples are given in Supplementary Table S7. Using the harmonized categories, we quantified how often each criterion appeared in the included studies, by study category.

The most commonly used criterion was correctness (text-to-text 62% [18], image-to-text 60% [3], evaluation methodology 100% [3]), typically defined as the inclusion of accurate information and the absence of fabricated or incorrect statements. Completeness (52% [15], 40% [2], 100% [3]) was the next most frequent, usually operationalised as coverage of, or omission of, required data elements against a predefined checklist. Fluency (45% [13], 20% [1], 0% [0]) was commonly rated on Likert scales, although rubrics were rarely standardised.

Clinical acceptability (55% [16], 60% [3], 0% [0]) spanned PDQI-9[36] dimensions such as organisation, usefulness, and timeliness, as well as constructs including clinical validity, perceived harm or likelihood of harm, appropriateness to context, willingness to use the note in practice, time efficiency, consultation quality, and practical validation in a hospital setting. Conciseness (21% [6], 0% [0], 0% [0]) was assessed less often, typically in terms of output length or redundancy. Less common criteria were grouped under other criteria (31% [9], 0% [0], 33% [1]); these included, for example, distinguishability of AI-generated from human-written text and aspects of structure and formatting. Criteria that lacked sufficient specificity to be mapped to a single category, such as intuitive global judgements of quality, were also assigned to this group. Where appropriate, a

single assessment was recorded under multiple categories; for instance, “inclusion of key clinical parameters” was coded as both completeness and clinical acceptability.

Evaluation approaches in text-to-text, image-to-text and evaluation methodology studies

Evaluations in text-to-text studies emphasise completeness, conciseness, and factuality, often combining ROUGE or BERTScore with medical expert evaluation.

In image-to-text settings, BLEU and BERTScore are frequently reported alongside domain-adapted measures such as CheXpert coverage and F1-RadGraph, with human review conducted on a subset of outputs. Regarding consistency across metrics, CIDEr-D and METEOR tends to track the lexical overlap metrics such as BLEU and ROUGE[37,38], and F1-RadGraph follows the same overall trend as BLEU, ROUGE, and BERTScore [39].

Evaluation methodology studies place less weight on traditional lexical overlap metrics, favouring semantic and domain-adapted measures such as BERTScore, BARTScore, and the medical adaptations listed above, often supplemented by detailed expert assessments.

Language-Specific Limitations

Only 5 of 37 reviewed studies used non-English data (Supplementary Table S8). Three analysed Chinese, one Korean, and one Swedish text. Several papers did not state the language of the texts[40-42]. Zhang et al. (2023)[43] explicitly considered language in their evaluation of tasks spanning English and Chinese; the faithfulness pipeline, FaR, relies on language-specific resources and procedures, for example UMLS for English and human tagging for Chinese, which illustrates the dependence of semantic factuality measures on the underlying language resources.

Lexical overlap metrics, such as BLEU and ROUGE, are sensitive to tokenisation and morphology. Character-level tokenisation, common in Chinese, produces different overlap values from word-

level tokenisation in English. In morphologically rich languages, for example Finnish, inflection reduces n-gram overlap even when meaning is preserved, which limits comparability with English unless stemming or lemmatisation is applied. For embedding-based semantic metrics, performance is contingent on the underlying embedding model. In multilingual settings, for example the use of BGE in Zhang et al. (2025)[44], the choice is appropriate to a Chinese context, although the checkpoint version was not reported. More generally, few studies specified the backbone or checkpoint, which constrains interpretability and limits cross-language comparability.

Experimental Setup

Lexical Overlap Metrics

Lexical overlap metrics, including BLEU and ROUGE (1, 2, 4, and L), declined consistently as perturbation severity increased. This trend is shown in Figure 2 which displays BLEU scores (panels a-c) and ROUGE-L scores (panels d-f) across three perturbation levels for deletion, modification, and paraphrasing edits in English, Swedish, and Finnish. Even mild edits (level 1) reduced scores measurably, while severe edits (level 3) led to substantial drops across all metrics including paraphrasing that preserved meaning.

Figure 2 Lexical overlap metrics. Panels a-c: BLEU scores. Panels d–f: ROUGE-L scores. Detailed breakdown of ROUGE-1, -2, -3, and -4 in Supplementary Figure S1.



BLEU was more sensitive to deletions and key-detail modifications than to paraphrase. Scores declined stepwise as deletion and modification levels increased, whereas paraphrase produced only modest reductions. ROUGE-L showed a similar pattern but was less sensitive overall, remaining relatively stable under paraphrase.

Higher-order overlap accentuated this contrast. ROUGE-4, which depends on longer n-grams, dropped sharply with extensive edits, especially deletions and sentence-level changes. ROUGE-1 remained comparatively stable, reflecting persistence of key vocabulary despite rewording.

Semantic Metrics

In addition to the most used semantic metrics BERTScore and BLEURT in our systematic review, we evaluated cosine similarity, given its foundational role among embedding-based measures. The results varied across perturbation types, severity levels, and languages (Figure 3). All metrics remained relatively high at perturbation level 1, particularly for modified and paraphrased variations, indicating that minimal edits preserved much of the original semantic content.

Figure 3 Semantic metrics by perturbation type and severity. Panels show mean BERTScore and BLEURT scores with 95% confidence intervals across three languages (English, Finnish, Swedish) for each perturbation type (deletion, modified, paraphrased) at increasing levels of perturbation (1 to 3). Results are grouped by semantic metric. Most showed decreasing similarity with higher perturbation levels, with limited differentiation between paraphrased and structurally altered inputs. Note: BLEURT score has a different y-axis.



As perturbation severity increased from levels 1 to 3, both BERTScore and BLEURT showed consistent declines across deletion, modification, and paraphrasing. Deletion-based perturbations tended to result in steeper drops, while paraphrased variants often retained higher scores.

Across languages, English and Swedish generally maintained higher semantic similarity scores compared to Finnish, which showed lower values across both metrics. Despite these differences, overall trends were consistent across the three languages, with increasing perturbation severity leading to decreased semantic alignment.

LLM-based Evaluation

LLM-as-evaluator change scores varied across models and languages in response to deletion and modification perturbations (Figure 4).

Figure 4 LLM-as-evaluator change scores for deletion and modification perturbations. Bars show means with 95% confidence intervals across three perturbation levels for each model. Models displayed in the main figure are GPT-5, GPT-4o, DeepSeek R1, gpt-oss-120B, and GPT-3.5. Additional models are provided in the supplement, including Gemma 3n E2B, Gemma 3n E4B, gpt-oss-20B, GPT-4, GPT-4.1, GPT-5 Mini and GPT-5 Nano (Supplementary Figure S2).



Paraphrased variants produced low change scores for most models. Two exceptions were Gemma3n E4B and GPT-3.5, which showed consistently elevated paraphrase scores across levels (Figure 4 and Supplementary Figure S2). The same pattern was observed for Gemma3n E2B.

All models showed monotonic increases in change scores with increasing deletion and modification levels. The magnitude of these increases was smaller for lower capacity models and larger for higher capacity models.

Variability across English, Swedish, and Finnish was greater for smaller models, with wider intervals and occasional language-specific deviations. Larger models yielded more consistent trajectories across languages with narrower intervals. English generally showed the tightest intervals.

Taken together, increasing model capacity was associated with improved paraphrase robustness, greater sensitivity to structural edits, and enhanced cross-language consistency.

Statistical Significance of the Experimental Results

Linear mixed-effects models, $metric \sim level + (1|case)$, yielded clear and directionally consistent fixed effects for level (Table 2; full results in Supplementary Table S9).

Table 2 Fixed effect of perturbation level from linear mixed models. Points are β_level with 95% CI. ROUGE-L and BERTScore decrease with severity, GPT-5 increases. Full outputs in Supplementary Table S9.

	ROUGE-L β (95% CI)	ROUGE-L *p*-value	BERTScore β (95% CI)	BERT-Score *p*-value	GPT-5 β (95% CI)	GPT-5 *p*-value
English						
Delete	-0·048 (-0·061 to -0·035)	<0·001	-0·087 (-0·100 to -0·073)	<0·001	5·70 (4·99 to 6·41)	<0·001
Modify	-0·090 (-0·131 to -0·049)	<0·001	-0·104 (-0·155 to -0·053)	<0·001	10·00 (6·65 to 13·35)	<0·001
Paraphrase	-0·027 (-0·031 to -0·024)	<0·001	-0·017 (-0·023 to -0·011)	<0·001	0.00 (-0·24 to 0·24)	1·00
Swedish						
Delete	-0·050 (-0·063 to -0·037)	<0·001	-0·018 (-0·025 to -0·012)	<0·001	5·70 (5·18 to 6·22)	<0·001
Modify	-0·115 (-0·179 to -0·051)	<0·001	-0·019 (-0·028 to -0·009)	<0·001	7·30 (2·95 to 11·65)	0·001
Paraphrase	-0·027 (-0·032 to -0·021)	<0·001	-0·005 (-0·008 to -0·002)	0·001	0·00 (-0·24 to 0·24)	1·00
Finnish						
Delete	-0·057 (-0·069 to -0·044)	<0·001	-0·021 (-0·026 to -0·016)	<0·001	5·60 (4·62 to 6·58)	<0·001
Modify	-0·098 (-0·143 to -0·054)	<0·001	-0·015 (-0·025 to -0·006)	0·002	9·20 (6·45 to 11·95)	<0·001
Paraphrase	-0·025 (-0·029 to -0·022)	<0·001	-0·005 (-0·007 to -0·003)	<0·001	0·10 (-0·06 to 0·26)	0·21

Across all three languages, perturbation level had a clear effect on every metric. Deletions and modifications were associated with consistent declines in ROUGE-L and BERTScore, with modifications showing the largest absolute shifts, and confidence intervals excluding zero in all cases. The LLM-as-evaluator score increased for deletions and for modifications, while remaining essentially unchanged for paraphrase. Significance was strong for all non-paraphrase contrasts, and paraphrase effects were small or null, particularly for the LLM-as-evaluator.

Correlations

Normalized Spearman correlation coefficients (ρ) were calculated to assess how well each metric captured increasing perturbation severity across English, Swedish, and Finnish, separately for deletion, modification, and paraphrasing (Supplementary Figure S3).

For modified and deleted summaries (Supplementary Figure S3a and b), most metrics demonstrated strong positive correlations with perturbation level across all three languages. BLEU and ROUGE-L consistently showed high responsiveness to structural edits (ρ = 0·81-0·87). Cosine similarity had a noticeable difference between modifications and deletions, were modifications led to higher scores. BERTScore tracked perturbations reliably, although Finnish modifications produced noticeably weaker correlations. BLEURT performed poorly, yielding consistently low values and even negative correlations in Finnish, indicating a failure to register structural differences. English modifications generally showed the strongest correlations, whereas deletions did not reveal such a language-specific pattern.

LLM-as-evaluator metrics varied across models. GPT-4 and GPT-5, along with their variants, were the most consistent, reaching ρ values up to 0·96 across languages. In contrast, GPT-3.5 showed reduced performance for Swedish deletions (ρ = 0·35). DeepSeek R1 performed moderately, with strong correlations for English deletions and modifications (ρ = 0·88-0·89), but substantially lower values for Swedish and especially Finnish inputs.

For paraphrased summaries (Supplementary Figure S3c), correlations were considerably weaker. BLEU and ROUGE-L reached high ρ values (up to 0·94), but these inflated scores reflected their sensitivity to surface-level differences rather than true semantic similarity. Semantic metrics showed reduced reactivity to paraphrasing, particularly in Swedish (ρ = 0·25-0·49), though some correlation was retained. Cosine similarity was the semantic metric with the lowest reactivity to paraphrasing and therefore performed best in this aspect. BERTScore was moderately sensitive

to paraphrasing across languages, but consistently lower than for deletions or modifications. BLEURT, in contrast, was largely unresponsive, showing minimal correlation across all languages. While this lack of reactivity could be desirable for paraphrases, BLEURT also failed to capture structural edits, limiting its utility. GPT-4 and GPT-4o appropriately showed minimal or no correlation for paraphrased content, suggesting robustness to lexical variation. By contrast, GPT-3·5 and DeepSeek R1 produced inconsistent results, with moderate to high correlations in Swedish and Finnish but little sensitivity in English, reflecting undesired variability.

Discussion

This review shows a field in transition. The most commonly used lexical overlap metrics, chiefly ROUGE and BLEU, do not reliably reflect clinical meaning in this setting, as demonstrated by our experimental setup. They are attractive because they are simple to compute, low in computational cost, widely familiar, and facilitate comparisons across datasets, yet in our experimental setup they penalised meaning-preserving paraphrasing and therefore mis-ranked outputs that retained the same clinical content. In contrast, semantic metrics and LLM-based evaluators were more robust to rewording and tracked clinically relevant changes, with absolute sensitivity varying by model. LLM-based evaluations using large models such as DeepSeek-R1, GPT-oss-120B, and GPT-5, in particular, penalised deletions and modifications of key clinical details while applying little or no penalty to paraphrase, aligning more closely with safety-critical needs.

Language effects were pronounced. Most evidence comes from English, which limits generalisability to low-resource languages. Tokenisation, morphology, and word order differ across languages and can alter metric behaviour. In our data, Finnish showed lower absolute scores and weaker monotonic trends, consistent with agglutinative morphology and variable syntax, whereas Swedish behaved more like English. Evaluators, whether lexical overlap,

embedding-based or LLM-based, should therefore be selected and validated within each language.

Reporting practices remain inconsistent. Several articles cited ‘ROUGE’ or ‘BLEU’ without specifying the variant, and BERTScore results were sometimes reported without the embedding model or adequate model details. Such omissions hinder reproducibility and comparability. We recommend reporting the exact metric variant and configuration, and the embedding model and checkpoint.

A practical constraint is computational cost. In principle, a small, low-resource model that performs well would be preferable, but in practice performance often improves with capacity. We observed the same pattern: smaller encoders and lower-capacity LLMs were more sensitive to paraphrasing and less sensitive to deletions and key modifications, an undesirable profile for clinical evaluation. Training data also matters. A compact model trained on the target language can, in some settings, outperform a larger model trained predominantly on English. In our BERTScore experiments, however, RoBERTa-large preserved semantic similarity under paraphrase more effectively than XLM-R base across all languages, despite the latter’s multilingual training.

We favour LLM-based evaluators as the primary judge because they track clinically relevant changes while remaining tolerant of paraphrase. When resources are constrained, semantic metrics can provide a rough, low-overhead first screen for meaning preservation, after which a narrowed subset can be escalated to an LLM evaluator. Because evaluation is language dependent, both semantic metrics and the LLM-as-evaluators should be selected and validated within each language. Absolute cross-language score comparisons should be avoided in favour of within-language contrasts. Sensitivity analyses across institutions, specialties, time periods, and patient subgroups will strengthen claims of generalisability.

Finally, although LLM-based evaluation remains uncommon and has largely been applied to simpler tasks, results from our experimental setup indicate that it can automate domain-specific evaluation when carefully specified and constrained. Wider adoption will require prospective validation against clinician judgement, explicit controls for length and formatting effects, and systematic bias assessment and mitigation. Overall, the evidence supports a shift from lexical overlap metrics to meaning-aware, domain-adapted evaluation, preferably LLM-based where feasible, with rigorous reporting and language-sensitive design.

Limitations

The evidence base was heterogeneous in design, setting, and outcome definitions, and reporting was often incomplete, which precluded meta-analysis and limits cross-study comparability. Many primary studies used small samples, lacked blinded assessment, or did not report inter-rater reliability, reducing confidence in observed effects. Few papers evaluated image-to-text generation or focused explicitly on evaluation methodology. Several studies reported only generic metric labels, for example “ROUGE” without a variant, or omitted the embedding backbone, which constrains reproducibility.

We searched two databases to 10 April 2025 and restricted inclusion to peer-reviewed English-language publications, so publication and language bias are possible. Although two reviewers screened with a third checking all decisions, harmonising heterogeneous terminology required judgement and may have introduced misclassification despite predefined rules. When information was missing or unclear, we recorded it as not reported and documented any assumptions made for synthesis, which we flag in the Results and Supplement. We used narrative synthesis because effect measures were not comparable, and we did not apply formal outcome-level risk-of-bias or certainty grading. Newer studies may have appeared after our search window.

Two issues complicate the synthesis of the findings of the reviewed papers. Foremost, terminology across studies was inconsistent and sometimes insufficiently defined: terms “faithfulness,” “accuracy,” and “factuality” were used to refer to a variety of concepts, respectively, including sometimes interchangeably, and “semantics” referred to linguistic meaning, computational entailment, or concept coverage. Additionally, when criteria were not clearly defined, the rationale connecting them to evaluation approaches was sometimes unclear, particularly in studies employing several criteria and approaches. Thereafter, few studies prioritized the relative importance of different types of errors, for example distinguishing clinically critical omissions from minor stylistic deviations.

The experimental setup used synthetic clinical cases and controlled perturbations that capture deletions and substitutions, but they may not reflect pragmatic failure modes such as temporal reasoning errors, guideline adherence, or local documentation conventions. The sample was limited to five internal medicine cases in three languages, which restricts generalisability to other note types, specialties, and languages. Metric behaviour depends on implementation choices, for example tokenisation, smoothing, and checkpoint selection, which, although versioned in the repository, may differ from other groups’ setups. LLM-as-evaluator results can be sensitive to prompts, decoding limits, and API version drift; we mitigated this with fixed prompts and documented settings, yet residual variability remains. The experiment evaluates text quality signals rather than clinical outcomes, workflow impact, or patient harm, so it should be interpreted as a methodological probe rather than a test of clinical effectiveness or acceptability.

Conclusions

Evaluation of AI-generated clinical documentation is moving from lexical overlap metrics to metrics that capture meaning and clinical relevance yet practice still trails clinical requirement. Evaluations should explicitly detect and quantify erroneous perturbations, for example hallucinated additions,

altered clinical facts, and clinically relevant omissions, since these may carry significant clinical consequences. When compute is limited, a practical battery prioritises semantic, embedding-based metrics as the initial screen for meaning preservation; when feasible, prefer an LLM-as-evaluator for the primary assessment. Given the speed and volume of AI-generated text, reserve structured human review for critical samples and use LLM-as-evaluator for scale with agreement statistics reported and periodic revalidation. To improve reproducibility, studies should specify the exact metric configurations, embedding models and checkpoints. Given the predominance of English-language research relative to care delivered in local languages, there is a particular need for evaluations conducted in non-English settings.

Contributions

AD, TK, and TW-J conducted all stages of the systematic review described in Methods, performed screening and synthesis, and drafted the review results. AD led conceptualisation and study design, prepared the Finnish discharge summaries and generated the dataset, developed and executed most components of the experimental setup, and wrote the experimental Methods and Results. RL contributed to the conceptualisation of the experimental framework, ran most closed-source LLM evaluations, and critically revised the manuscript. OT and TP assisted with the experimental work, provided methodological guidance and code implementation, and critically revised the manuscript. MG designed, coordinated and coded the MedBench data base used in the study, and reviewed the manuscript. VV and ES provided strategic input on study design and methodology, supervised the research, contributed to manuscript development, and critically revised the manuscript. All authors contributed to interpretation of the findings, approved the final version, and agree to be accountable for the work.

Data Sharing

All data generated in this study are available within the published article or its supplementary materials. The source code supporting this study is accessible at https://github.com/achdahlberg/quality-AI-gen-clinical-notes-2025.

Declaration of interests

AD is employed by Mehiläinen. TK is employed by Gofore Lead Oy and was previously employed by Front AI Oy. RL is employed by both Digital Workforce Plc and the University of Jyväskylä and owns the private research company IatroData Plc. RL also holds a title of a docent at the University of Helsinki. VV has received unrelated consultation fees and honoraria from Orion Pharma (Espoo, Finland). TWJ, OT, TP, MG and ES have none to declare.

Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge the creators of the original discharge summaries included in the MedBench dataset. This work was supported by Business Finland (1562/31/2024) through the GenAID research project. AD acknowledges Frans Wilhelm och Waldermar von Frenckells understödsfond and The Finnish Medical Foundation for the award of a personal grant. ES acknowledges Finska Läkaresällskapet, The Finnish Medical Foundation and, Liv och Hälsa Medical Support Association.

Declaration of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the manuscript preparation process

During the preparation of this work, the authors used ChatGPT (OpenAI)[45] and Cursor AI Coding Assistant[46]. These tools were employed to improve the clarity and coherence of the language, and

work with some routine parts of the required programming tasks. The assistants were only involved in base code editing work and were not used for any insights or exploration. After using these tools, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the published article.

References

1. Lorenzetti DL, Quan H, Lucyk K, et al. Strategies for improving physician documentation in the emergency department: a systematic review. *BMC emergency medicine* 2018; **18**(1): 36.

2. Hodgson T, Coiera E. Risks and benefits of speech recognition for clinical documentation: a systematic review. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2016; **23**(e1): e169-79.

3. Thirunavukarasu AJ, Ting DSJ, Elangovan K, Gutierrez L, Tan TF, Ting DSW. Large language models in medicine. *Nature Medicine* 2023; **29**(8): 1930-40.

4. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2021; **372**: n71.

5. MedBench Platform. https://label.cairlab.ki.se/.

6. Virtanen P, Gommers R, Oliphant TE, et al. SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. *Nature Methods* 2020; **17**(3): 261-72.

7. Hunter JD. Matplotlib: A 2D Graphics Environment. *Computing in Science & Engineering* 2007; **9**(3): 90-5.

8. Harris CR, Millman KJ, van der Walt SJ, et al. Array programming with NumPy. *Nature* 2020; **585**(7825): 357-62.

9. Pedregosa F, Varoquaux G, Gramfort A, et al. Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 2011; **12**(85): 2825−30.

10. Post M. A Call for Clarity in Reporting {BLEU} Scores. Proceedings of the Third Conference on Machine Translation: Research Papers: Association for Computational Linguistics; 2018.

11. Waskom ML. seaborn: statistical data visualization. *Journal of Open Source Software* 2021; **6**(3021).

12. Google LLC. Python ROUGE Implementation.

13. Zhang T, Kishore V, Wu F, Weinberger KQ, Artzi Y. BERTScore: Evaluating Text Generation with BERT. *Proc 8th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR20)* 2020.

14. Wolf T, Debut L, Sanh V, et al. Transformers: State-of-the-Art Natural Language Processing. In: Liu Q, Schlangen D, editors. Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations; 2020: Association for Computational Linguistics; 2020.

15. Microsoft Corporation. Microsoft Azure SDK for Python [software on the Internet].

16. Lin C-Y. ROUGE: A Package for Automatic Evaluation of Summaries. 2004: 74-81.

17. Papineni K, Roukos S, Ward T, Zhu W-J. Bleu: a Method for Automatic Evaluation of Machine Translation. 2002: 311-8.

18. Sellam T, Das D, Parikh A. BLEURT: Learning Robust Metrics for Text Generation. In: Jurafsky D, Chai J, Schluter N, Tetreault J, editors. Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics; 2020; Online: Association for Computational Linguistics; 2020. p. 7881-92.

19. Yuan W, Neubig G, Liu P. BARTScore: Evaluating Generated Text as Text Generation. In: Vaughan MRaABaYDaPSLaJW, editor. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems; 2021: Curran Associates, Inc.; 2021.

20. Banerjee S, Lavie A. METEOR: An Automatic Metric for MT Evaluation with Improved Correlation with Human Judgments. *Proceedings of the ACL Workshop on Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evaluation Measures for Machine Translation and/or Summarization* 2005: 65-72.

21. Vedantam R, Zitnick CL, Parikh D. CIDEr: Consensus-based Image Description Evaluation. *Proc IEEE Conf Comput Vis Pattern Recognit (CVPR)* 2015: 4566-75.

22. Devlin J, Chang M-W, Lee K, Toutanova K. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics; 2019; Minneapolis, Minnesota: Association for Computational Linguistics; 2019. p. 4171–86.

23. Abacha AB, Yim WW, Michalopoulos G, Lin T. An Investigation of Evaluation Metrics for Automated Medical Note Generation. Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics; 2023; 2023. p. 2575-88.

24. Laban P, Schnabel T, Bennett PN, Hearst MA. SummaC: Re-Visiting NLI-based Models for Inconsistency Detection in Summarization. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 2022; **10**: 163-77.

25. Deng M, Tan B, Liu Z, Xing E, Hu Z. Compression, Transduction, and Creation: A Unified Framework for Evaluating Natural Language Generation. In: Moens M-F, Huang X, Specia L, Yih SW-t, editors. Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing; 2021; Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic: Association for Computational Linguistics; 2021. p. 7580--605.

26. Hartman VC, Bapat SS, Weiner MG, Navi BB, Sholle ET, Campion TR, Jr. A method to automate the discharge summary hospital course for neurology patients. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association : JAMIA* 2023; **30**(12): 1995-2003.

27. Adams G, Zucker J, Elhadad N. A Meta-Evaluation of Faithfulness Metrics for Long-Form Hospital-Course Summarization. *Proceedings of machine learning research* 2023; **219**: 2-30.

28. Bodenreider O. The Unified Medical Language System (UMLS): integrating biomedical terminology. *Nucleic Acids Res* 2004; **32**(Database issue): D267-70.

29. Zha Y, Yang Y, Li R, Hu Z. AlignScore: Evaluating Factual Consistency with A Unified Alignment Function. In: Rogers A, Boyd-Graber J, Okazaki N, editors. The 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. Toronto, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics; 2023. p. 11328-48.

30. Adams G, Nguyen BH, Smith J, et al. What are the Desired Characteristics of Calibration Sets? Identifying Correlates on Long Form Scientific Summarization. *Proc Conf Assoc Comput Linguist Meet* 2023; **2023**: 10520-42.

31. Jain S, Agrawal A, Saporta A, et al. RadGraph: Extracting Clinical Entities and Relations from Radiology Reports. *PhysioNet* 2021; **101**(23): e215–e20.

32. Brake N, Schaaf T. Comparing Two Model Designs for Clinical Note Generation; Is an LLM a Useful Evaluator of Consistency? Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2024 - Findings; 2024; 2024. p. 352-63.

33. Schumacher E, Rosenthal D, Naik D, et al. MED-OMIT: Extrinsically-Focused Evaluation Metric for Omissions in Medical Summarization. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research; 2024; 2024. p. 897-922.

34. Mishra P, Yao Z, Vashisht P, et al. SYNFAC-EDIT: Synthetic Imitation Edit Feedback for Factual Alignment in Clinical Summarization. EMNLP 2024 - 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Proceedings of the Conference; 2024; 2024. p. 20061-83.

35. Clough RAJ, Sparkes WA, Clough OT, Sykes JT, Steventon AT, King K. Transforming healthcare documentation: harnessing the potential of AI to generate discharge summaries. *BJGP Open* 2024; **8**(1).

36. Stetson PD, Bakken S, Wrenn JO, Siegler EL. Assessing Electronic Note Quality Using the Physician Documentation Quality Instrument (PDQI-9). *Applied clinical informatics* 2012; **3**(2): 164-74.

37. Li H, Wang H, Sun X, He H, Feng J. Context-enhanced framework for medical image report generation using multimodal contexts. *Knowledge-Based Systems* 2025; **310**.

38. Liu G, Liao Y, Wang F, et al. Medical-VLBERT: Medical Visual Language BERT for COVID-19 CT Report Generation With Alternate Learning. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems* 2021; **32**(9): 3786-97.

39. Van Veen D, Van Uden C, Attias M, et al. RadAdapt: Radiology Report Summarization via Lightweight Domain Adaptation of Large Language Models. Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics; 2023; 2023. p. 449-60.

40. Janota B, Janota K. Application of artificial intelligence (AI) in the creation of discharge summaries in psychiatric clinics. *International journal of psychiatry in medicine* 2025; **60**(3): 330-7.

41. Jin H, Guo J, Lin Q, Wu S, Hu W, Li X. Comparative study of Claude 3.5-Sonnet and human physicians in generating discharge summaries for patients with renal insufficiency: assessment of efficiency, accuracy, and quality. *Frontiers in digital health* 2024; **6**: 1456911.

42. Langdon C, Haag O, Vigliano M, Levorato M, Leon-Ulate J, Adroher M. Transforming pediatric ENT documentation: Efficiency, accuracy, and adoption of speech recognition technology (Speaknosis). *International journal of pediatric otorhinolaryngology* 2025; **191**: 112275.

43. Zhang N, Zhang Y, Guo W, Mitra P, Zhang R. FAMESUMM: Investigating and Improving Faithfulness of Medical Summarization. EMNLP 2023 - 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Proceedings; 2023; 2023. p. 10915-31.

44. Zhang X, Zhao G, Ren Y, et al. Data augmented large language models for medical record generation: Data augmented large language..: X. Zhang et al. *Applied Intelligence* 2025; **55**(2).

45. OpenAI. ChatGPT 5 [Large Language Model]. 2025.

46. Anysphere. Cursor [Coding Assistant]. 2025.

Supplementary Information

Figures

Supplementary Figure S1. Lexical overlap metrics.



Supplementary Figure S2. LLM-as-evaluator.


Delete variation
Modified variation
Paraphrased variation
Language
english
swedish
finnish
a.
b.
c.
d.
e.
f.
g.
h.
LLM Change Score (Gemma3n E2B)
LLM Change Score (Gemma3n E4B)
LLM Change Score (GPT-oss 20B)
LLM Change Score (GPT-4)
LLM Change Score (GPT-4o)
LLM Change Score (GPT-4.1)
LLM Change Score (GPT-5 Mini)
LLM Change Score (GPT-5 Nano)
Perturbation level

Supplementary Figure S3. Spearman P.



Tables

Supplementary Table S1. PRISMA checklist[1]

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	1
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	1-2
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	2-4
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	4
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	5-6
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	4-5
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	4-5, supplements
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	6
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the	7-8

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
		process.	
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	7-8
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	7-8
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	7-8
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	8-9
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).	8-9
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	8-9
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	8-9
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.	8-9
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	8-9
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	8-9
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	8-9
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	8-9
RESULTS			
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram.	6-7
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	7
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	Supplementary Table S3
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	Not included, see p. 4
Results of individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	Supplementary Table S3
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	Supplementary Table S3

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	-
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	18
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	-
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	-
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	-
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	31-32
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	33
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	33-34
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	
OTHER INFORMATION			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	4
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	4
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	-
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	34
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	35
Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	34

Supplementary Table S2. Search terms in Ovid MEDLINE and Scopus.

(TITLE-ABS-KEY ("medical text*" OR "health text*" OR "clinical text*" OR "clinical note*" OR "medical note*" OR “health note*" OR "medical abstract*" OR "medical summar*" OR "medical documentation*" OR "scribe note*")) AND (TITLE-ABS-KEY ("artificial intelligence" OR "AI" OR "natural language processing" OR "NLP" OR "large language model*" OR "LLM*" OR "language technolog*" OR "computational linguistics" OR "retrieval augmented generation" OR "RAG")) AND (TITLE-ABS-KEY ("quality" OR "quantitative" OR "qualitative" OR "measurement*" OR "evaluation metric*" OR "human evaluation*" OR "automatic evaluation*" OR "human assessment*" OR "automatic assessment*" OR "linguistic")) AND NOT (TITLE-ABS-KEY ("quality of care" OR "care quality")) AND NOT INDEX (medline)

Supplementary Table S3. Eligibility criteria.

Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria
- Language of the paper (English) - Peer reviewed - Any medical profession and specialty - Any type of clinical note or transcription - All care settings (hospital, pre-hospital, primary care) - Original research articles or conference papers - Includes evaluation of resulting clinical note	- Not focused on clinical documentation - Focus on research, abstracts or other non-clinical texts - Reviews, contextual papers, editorials, letters - Audits - Translation or simplification tasks - Texts targeted at laypeople, not medical professionals - Use of structured data to assess quality - Quality measured only via outcomes or output volume - Studies on documentation processes, systems, or training - Duplicate publications

Supplementary Table S4. All included studies.

Author (Year)	Title	Category	Type of Publication	Country	Correctness	Completeness	Conciseness	Fluency	Clinical acceptability	Other Criteria	Human evaluation	Output N of vignettes	Extent of Human Evaluation	Number of reviewers per note
Aali et al. (2025)[2]	A dataset and benchmark for hospital course summarization with adapted large language models.	Text-to-text	Article	US	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	100	30	5
Abacha et al. (2023)[3]	Overview of the MEDIQA-Chat 2023 Shared Tasks on the Summarization & Generation of Doctor-Patient Conversations	Text-to-text	Conference	US	Automatic	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Abacha et al. (2023)[4]	An Empirical Study of Clinical Note Generation from Doctor-Patient Encounters	Text-to-text	Conference	US	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	400	400	1-2
Abacha et al. (2023)[5]	An Investigation of Evaluation Metrics for Automated Medical Note Generation	Evaluation-methodology	Conference	US	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	11158	11158	1
Adams, Zucker & Elhadad (2023)[6]	A Meta-Evaluation of Faithfulness Metrics for Long-Form Hospital-Course Summarization.	Evaluation-methodology	Conference	US	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	29	29	1
Berg & Dalianis (2024)[7]	Using BART to Automatically Generate Discharge Summaries from Swedish Clinical Text	Text-to-text	Conference	Sweden	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	1491	10	1
Bhayana R et al. (2025)[8]	Leveraging Large Language Models to Generate Clinical Histories for Oncologic Imaging Requisitions.	Text-to-text	Article	Canada	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	200	200	1
Bi et al. (2024)[9]	Adapting Large Language Models for Automated Summarisation of Electronic Medical Records in Clinical Coding.	Text-to-text	Article	Australia	Automatic	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Brake & Schaaf (2024)[10]	Comparing Two Model Designs for Clinical Note Generation; Is an LLM a Useful Evaluator of Consistency?	Text-to-text	Conference	US	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	543	40	5
Chen et al. (2023)[11]	Investigating the Utility of Synthetic Data for Doctor-Patient Conversation Summarization	Text-to-text	Conference	US	Automatic	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A
Clough et al. (2024)[12]	Transforming healthcare documentation: harnessing the potential of AI to generate discharge summaries	Text-to-text	Article	UK	N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	25	25	1
Elyaderani, Glover & Schaaf (2024)[13]	Reference-Free Estimation of the Quality of Clinical Notes Generated from Doctor-Patient Conversations	Text-to-text	Conference	US & Ireland	Automatic	Automatic	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hartman et al. (2023)[14]	A method to automate the discharge summary hospital course for neurology patients.	Text-to-text	Article	US	Yes	Yes	Automatic	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	25	25	2
Huang, Hsieh & Chang (2024)[15]	Performance Comparison of Junior Residents and ChatGPT in the Objective Structured Clinical Examination (OSCE) for Medical History Taking and Documentation of Medical Records: Development and Usability Study	Text-to-text	Article	Taiwan	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	50	50	7
Janota & Janota (2025)[16]	Application of artificial intelligence (AI) in the creation of discharge summaries in psychiatric clinics.	Text-to-text	Article	Germany	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	2	2	4
Jin et al. (2024)[17]	Comparative study of Claude 3.5-Sonnet and human physicians in generating discharge summaries for patients with renal insufficiency: assessment of efficiency, accuracy, and quality.	Text-to-text	Article	China	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	200	200	3
Kernberg, Gold & Mohan (2024)[18]	Using ChatGPT-4 to Create Structured Medical Notes From Audio Recordings of Physician-Patient Encounters: Comparative Study.	Text-to-text	Article	US	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	42	42	1-2
Langdon et al. (2025)[19]	Transforming pediatric ENT documentation: Efficiency, accuracy, and adoption of speech recognition technology (Speaknosis).	Text-to-text	Article	Spain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	375	375	1
Leonardi, Portinale & Santomauro (2024)[20]	Enhancing radiology report generation through pre-trained language models	Image-to-text	Article	Italy	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	6000	50	2
Leong Gao & Ji (2024)[21]	A GEN AI Framework for Medical Note Generation	Text-to-text	Conference	US	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	120	80	2

Li et al. (2025)[22]	Context-enhanced framework for medical image report generation using multimodal contexts	Image-to-text	Article	China	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A
Liao et al. (2023)[23]	Differentiating ChatGPT-Generated and Human-Written Medical Texts: Quantitative Study.	Text-to-text	Article	China & US	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A
Liu et al. (2021)[24]	Medical-VLBERT: Medical Visual Language BERT for COVID-19 CT Report Generation With Alternate Learning.	Image-to-text	Article	China	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	368	16	3
Milintsevich & Agarwal (2023)[25]	Calvados at MEDIQA-Chat 2023: Improving Clinical Note Generation with Multi-Task Instruction Finetuning	Text-to-text	Conference	France & Estonia	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	200	200	1
Mishra et al. (2024)[26]	SYNFAC-EDIT: Synthetic Imitation Edit Feedback for Factual Alignment in Clinical Summarization	Text-to-text	Conference	US & China	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	128	10	3
Nguyen, Le & Can (2023)[27]	Enhancing Clinical Note Generation from Doctor-Patient Conversations through Semantic Partition-Oriented Summarization	Text-to-text	Conference	Vietnam	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Peng et al. (2023)[28]	A study of generative large language model for medical research and healthcare.	Text-to-text	Article	US & Republic of Korea	Automatic	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	30	30	2
Schumacher et al. (2024)[29]	MED-OMIT: Extrinsically-Focused Evaluation Metric for Omissions in Medical Summarization	Evaluation-methodology	Conference	USA	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	118	60	1
Seo et al. (2024)[30]	Evaluation Framework of Large Language Models in Medical Documentation: Development and Usability Study.	Text-to-text	Article	Republic of Korea	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	33	33	4
Van Veen et al. (2024)[31]	Adapted large language models can outperform medical experts in clinical text summarization.	Text-to-text	Article	US, Switzerland, Denmark, & Brazil	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	250	100	5
Van Veen et al. (2023)[32]	RadAdapt: Radiology Report Summarization via Lightweight Domain Adaptation of Large Language Models	Image-to-text	Conference	US	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	13057	60	1
Wu et al. (2024)[33]	EPFL-MAKE at "Discharge Me!": An LLM System for Automatically Generating Discharge Summaries of Clinical Electronic Health Record	Text-to-text	Conference	Switzerland	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10962	25	3
Xie et al. (2025)[34]	Medical foundation large language models for comprehensive text analysis and beyond.	Text-to-text	Article	US	Automatic	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Yang et al. (2024)[35]	Ascle-A Python Natural Language Processing Toolkit for Medical Text Generation: Development and Evaluation Study.	Image-to-text	Article	Singapore, US & Japan	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Yao et al. (2024)[36]	Do Clinicians Know How to Prompt? The Need for Automatic Prompt Optimization Help in Clinical Note Generation	Text-to-text	Conference	US & China	Automatic	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	1197	100	3
Zhang et al. (2023)[37]	FAMESUMM: Investigating and Improving Faithfulness of Medical Summarization	Text-to-text	Conference	US & China	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	988	200	3
Zhang et al. (2025)[38]	Data augmented large language models for medical record generation.	Text-to-text	Article	China	Automatic	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A

Supplementary Table S5. Automated metrics (lexical overlap and semantic metrics), which studies.

Automated Metric	Studies
BLEU-1	Li, Wang [22], & Liu, Liao [24]
BLEU-2	Li, Wang [22], & Liu, Liao [24]
BLEU-3	Li, Wang [22], & Liu, Liao [24]
BLEU-4	Leonardi, Portinale [20], Li, Wang [22], Liu, Liao [24], & Wu, Boulenger [33]
BLEU	Aali, Van Veen [2], Van Veen, Van Uden [39], & Van Veen, Van Uden [31]
ROUGE-1	Abacha, Yim [3], Abacha, Fan [4], Berg and Dalianis [7], Bi, Liu [9], Brake and Schaaf [10], Chen, Grambow [11], Hartman, Bapat [14], Leong, Gao [21], Milintsevich and Agarwal [25], Mishra, Yao [26], Nguyen, Le [27], Wu, Boulenger [33], Yang, Zeng [35], Yao, Jaafar [36], Zhang, Zhang [37], & Zhang, Zhao [38]
ROUGE-2	Abacha, Yim [3], Abacha, Fan [4], Berg and Dalianis [7], Bi, Liu [9], Brake and Schaaf [10], Chen, Grambow [11], Hartman, Bapat [14], Leong, Gao [21], Milintsevich and Agarwal [25], Mishra, Yao [26], Nguyen, Le [27], Yang, Zeng [35], Yao, Jaafar [36], Zhang, Zhang [37], & Zhang, Zhao [38]
ROUGE-3	Brake and Schaaf [10], Chen, Grambow [11]
ROUGE-4	Chen, Grambow [11]
ROUGE-L	Aali, Van Veen [2], Abacha, Yim [3], Abacha, Fan [4], Berg and Dalianis [7], Bi, Liu [9], Brake and Schaaf [10], Chen, Grambow [11], Hartman, Bapat [14], Leonardi, Portinale [20], Leong, Gao [21], Li, Wang [22], Liu, Liao [24], Milintsevich and Agarwal [25], Mishra, Yao [26], Nguyen, Le [27], Van Veen, Van Uden [32], Van Veen, Van Uden [31], Wu, Boulenger [33], Xie, Chen [34], Yang, Zeng [35], Yao, Jaafar [36], Zhang, Zhang [37], & Zhang, Zhao [38]
ROUGE-Lsum	Leong, Gao [21], Mishra, Yao [26], Nguyen, Le [27], Schumacher, Rosenthal [29]
BERTScore	Aali et al. (2025), Abacha et al. (2023), Adams, Zucker & Elhadad et al. (2023), Ben Abacha et al. (2023), Bi et al. (2024), Chen et al. (2023), Langdon et al. (2025), Leonardi, Portinale & Santomauro et al. (2024), Leong Gao & Ji et al. (2024), Milintsevich & Agarwal et al. (2023), Schumacher et al. (2024), Van Veen et al. (2023), Van Veen et al. (2024), Wu et al. (2024), Xie et al. (2025), Zhang et al. (2023)
BLEURT	Abacha et al. (2023), Ben Abacha et al. (2023), Leong Gao & Ji et al. (2024), Milintsevich & Agarwal et al. (2023)
BARTScore	Abacha et al. (2023), Adams, Zucker & Elhadad et al. (2023)

Supplementary Table S6. Human evaluation extent. The first row summarises all vignettes evaluated by either automated or human methods. All subsequent rows refer only to studies that included human evaluation.

	Text-to-text	**Image-to-text**	**Evaluation methodology**
Total vignettes evaluated (both automatic and human), median (IQR)	200 (42-400)	6000 (3184–9528)	118 (74–5638)
N of vignettes with human evaluation, median (IQR)	42 (25–200)	50 (33-55)	60 (44-5609)
Median number of reviewers per vignette (IQR)	3 (1·5-4·0)	2 (1·5-2·5)	1 (1·0-1·0)
Studies with >50% vignettes human-reviewed (% of human reviewed studies)	13 (62%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)
Studies with <50% vignettes human-reviewed (% of human reviewed studies)	8 (38%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)
Human evaluation of all studies (% of n_x)	**21/29 (72%)**	**3/5 (60%)**	**3/3 (100%)**

Supplementary Table S7. Evaluation criteria, preferred terms and definitions. The diverse labels used in the studies were mapped to the preferred criteria above. When a study used "accuracy" ambiguously, we assigned it to factual correctness or completeness based on context.

Criterion	Definition	What it captures	Referred to in papers as
Correctness[2,4-8,10,14-22,25,26,29-33,37]	Whether statements in the note are true to ground truth and free of fabricated content	Truthfulness of stated facts	Factual correctness, factual precision and recall with F1, factuality, factual consistency, faithfulness, hallucinations, accuracy
Fluency[2,4,7,8,14-19,23,28,32,33]	Grammaticality, readability, clear and logical flow of text	Linguistic quality	Coherence, readability, comprehensibility, grammar, clarity.
Clinical acceptability[7,8,12,14-21,24,28,30-33,36,38]	Suitability for clinical use, usefulness, safety	Fitness for purpose	PDQI-9, OSCE checklist, key clinical parameters, clinical validity and acceptability, standard of care, consultation quality, harm analysis, practical validation in hospital settings, time efficiency
Completeness[2,4-8,12,14-21,29-33]	Inclusion of all required elements for the task or section	Coverage of the required information	Comprehensiveness, omission rate, correct inclusion of required data elements, accuracy
Conciseness[2,4,8,19,30,31]	Brevity without loss of content, minimal redundancy	Efficiency of expression	Non-redundancy, output length
Other criteria[8,12,14,16,23,28-30,33,36]	Criteria not captured above, including criteria lacking specificity to determine mapping to another category	Format and structure, detection of authorship, the use of domain-specific terminology, general quality	Distinguishability or detection of AI versus human authorship, structure or format, medical terminology, intuitive evaluation of quality

Supplementary Table S8. Non-English studies and reported evaluation approaches. The asterisk indicates that the non-English results were reported for only a dialogue subtask.

	Language	Task	Automated metrics	Human evaluation criteria
Berg & Dalianis (2024)[33]	Swedish	Text-to-text	ROUGE-1/2/L/S	Inclusion of sender, reason for admission, diagnosis, procedures, tests, medication, discharge status, future plans, hallucination presence/severity, readability (flow/content)
Liu et al. 2021[51]	Chinese	Image-to-text	ROUGE-L, BLEU-1/2/3/4, CIDEr-D	Not described in detailed; Rankings based 3 texts
Seo et al. (2024)	Korean	Text-to-text	N/A	Appropriateness, accuracy, structure/format, conciseness, clinical validity
Zhang et al. (2023)[45]*	Chinese	Text-to-text	ROUGE-1/2/L, FaR, CF1, BERTScore	Coherence, faithfulness (extrinsic and intrinsic errors)
Zhang et al. (2025)[53]	Chinese	Text-to-text	ROUGE-1/2/L, Faithfulness (described as semantic similarity, BGE model)	Not described in detail; Time saving

Supplementary Table S9. Fixed effect of perturbation severity from linear mixed models across metrics and models. Rows list metric *families* (Lexical overlap; Semantic/embedding; LLM evaluator), the specific *model*, *language*, and *edit type* (Delete, Modify, Paraphrase). The reported coefficient β_level (95% CI) is the fixed effect for a one-step increase in perturbation level (1→2→3) from models of the form *metric* ~ level + (1|case); p values are two-sided Wald tests. For similarity metrics (e.g., BLEU/ROUGE, BERTScore, BLEURT, cosine), more negative β indicates larger score decreases with more severe edits; for LLM change-score evaluators, more positive β indicates larger increases with severity. Cosine similarity uses OpenAI's text-embedding-3-large embedding model. BH-adjusted *q* values and full outputs are provided in Supplementary data.

Family	Model	Language	Edit type	β_level (95% CI)	p
Lexical overlap	BLEU SCORE	English	Delete	-0.083 (-0.101 to -0.065)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	BLEU SCORE	English	Modify	-0.114 (-0.158 to -0.070)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	BLEU SCORE	English	Paraphrase	-0.048 (-0.054 to -0.043)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	BLEU SCORE	Finnish	Delete	-0.092 (-0.107 to -0.077)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	BLEU SCORE	Finnish	Modify	-0.113 (-0.155 to -0.071)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	BLEU SCORE	Finnish	Paraphrase	-0.045 (-0.048 to -0.043)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	BLEU SCORE	Swedish	Delete	-0.086 (-0.104 to -0.068)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	BLEU SCORE	Swedish	Modify	-0.154 (-0.234 to -0.074)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	BLEU SCORE	Swedish	Paraphrase	-0.042 (-0.048 to -0.036)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 1	English	Delete	-0.048 (-0.061 to -0.035)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 1	English	Modify	-0.079 (-0.117 to -0.042)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 1	English	Paraphrase	-0.020 (-0.022 to -0.018)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 1	Finnish	Delete	-0.057 (-0.069 to -0.044)	<0.001

Lexical overlap	ROUGE 1	Finnish	Modify	-0.087 (-0.127 to -0.047)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 1	Finnish	Paraphrase	-0.023 (-0.026 to -0.020)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 1	Swedish	Delete	-0.050 (-0.063 to -0.037)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 1	Swedish	Modify	-0.100 (-0.154 to -0.046)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 1	Swedish	Paraphrase	-0.022 (-0.026 to -0.017)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 2	English	Delete	-0.059 (-0.074 to -0.045)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 2	English	Modify	-0.112 (-0.160 to -0.065)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 2	English	Paraphrase	-0.046 (-0.050 to -0.043)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 2	Finnish	Delete	-0.072 (-0.085 to -0.059)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 2	Finnish	Modify	-0.118 (-0.170 to -0.066)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 2	Finnish	Paraphrase	-0.045 (-0.049 to -0.040)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 2	Swedish	Delete	-0.063 (-0.077 to -0.049)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 2	Swedish	Modify	-0.126 (-0.189 to -0.063)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 2	Swedish	Paraphrase	-0.040 (-0.047 to -0.033)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 3	English	Delete	-0.072 (-0.089 to -0.055)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 3	English	Modify	-0.127 (-0.177 to -0.077)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 3	English	Paraphrase	-0.065 (-0.072 to -0.058)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 3	Finnish	Delete	-0.087 (-0.101 to -0.072)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 3	Finnish	Modify	-0.133 (-0.189 to -0.077)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 3	Finnish	Paraphrase	-0.061 (-0.065 to -0.057)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 3	Swedish	Delete	-0.076 (-0.091 to -0.060)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 3	Swedish	Modify	-0.138 (-0.205 to -0.071)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 3	Swedish	Paraphrase	-0.055 (-0.064 to -0.045)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 4	English	Delete	-0.083 (-0.103 to -0.064)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 4	English	Modify	-0.139 (-0.192 to -0.086)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 4	English	Paraphrase	-0.081 (-0.090 to -0.072)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 4	Finnish	Delete	-0.099 (-0.115 to -0.084)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 4	Finnish	Modify	-0.144 (-0.203 to -0.085)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 4	Finnish	Paraphrase	-0.075 (-0.079 to -0.071)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 4	Swedish	Delete	-0.087 (-0.104 to -0.070)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 4	Swedish	Modify	-0.146 (-0.215 to -0.076)	<0.001
Lexical overlap	ROUGE 4	Swedish	Paraphrase	-0.066 (-0.079 to -0.054)	<0.001
Semantic	bertscore f1 xlm-roberta-base	English	Delete	-0.015 (-0.018 to -0.011)	<0.001
Semantic	bertscore f1 xlm-roberta-base	English	Modify	-0.019 (-0.029 to -0.009)	<0.001
Semantic	bertscore f1 xlm-roberta-base	English	Paraphrase	-0.004 (-0.006 to -0.003)	<0.001
Semantic	bertscore f1 xlm-roberta-base	Finnish	Delete	-0.019 (-0.024 to -0.014)	<0.001
Semantic	bertscore f1 xlm-roberta-base	Finnish	Modify	-0.015 (-0.023 to -0.006)	<0.001
Semantic	bertscore f1 xlm-roberta-base	Finnish	Paraphrase	-0.005 (-0.007 to -0.003)	<0.001
Semantic	bertscore f1 xlm-roberta-base	Swedish	Delete	-0.015 (-0.019 to -0.011)	<0.001

Semantic	bertscore f1 xlm-roberta-base	Swedish	Modify	-0.022 (-0.032 to -0.013)	<0.001
Semantic	bertscore f1 xlm-roberta-base	Swedish	Paraphrase	-0.005 (-0.008 to -0.002)	0.002
Semantic	BLEURT SCORE	English	Delete	-0.087 (-0.152 to -0.021)	0.009
Semantic	BLEURT SCORE	English	Modify	-0.220 (-0.372 to -0.067)	0.005
Semantic	BLEURT SCORE	English	Paraphrase	-0.027 (-0.054 to -0.000)	0.050
Semantic	BLEURT SCORE	Finnish	Delete	0.020 (-0.011 to 0.052)	0.21
Semantic	BLEURT SCORE	Finnish	Modify	0.033 (-0.036 to 0.102)	0.35
Semantic	BLEURT SCORE	Finnish	Paraphrase	-0.000 (-0.000 to 0.000)	1.00
Semantic	BLEURT SCORE	Swedish	Delete	-0.100 (-0.183 to -0.018)	0.017
Semantic	BLEURT SCORE	Swedish	Modify	-0.050 (-0.121 to 0.021)	0.17
Semantic	BLEURT SCORE	Swedish	Paraphrase	-0.038 (-0.096 to 0.021)	0.21
Semantic	cosine similarity	English	Delete	-0.019 (-0.033 to -0.006)	0.004
Semantic	cosine similarity	English	Modify	-0.029 (-0.044 to -0.014)	<0.001
Semantic	cosine similarity	English	Paraphrase	-0.002 (-0.003 to -0.001)	<0.001
Semantic	cosine similarity	Finnish	Delete	-0.026 (-0.039 to -0.012)	<0.001
Semantic	cosine similarity	Finnish	Modify	-0.037 (-0.057 to -0.016)	<0.001
Semantic	cosine similarity	Finnish	Paraphrase	-0.003 (-0.005 to -0.002)	<0.001
Semantic	cosine similarity	Swedish	Delete	-0.025 (-0.041 to -0.009)	0.002
Semantic	cosine similarity	Swedish	Modify	-0.032 (-0.053 to -0.012)	0.002
Semantic	cosine similarity	Swedish	Paraphrase	-0.003 (-0.005 to -0.001)	0.008
LLM evaluator	DeepSeek R1	English	Delete	2.500 (1.789 to 3.211)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	DeepSeek R1	English	Modify	4.300 (3.265 to 5.335)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	DeepSeek R1	English	Paraphrase	0.100 (-0.272 to 0.472)	0.60
LLM evaluator	DeepSeek R1	Finnish	Delete	2.400 (1.003 to 3.797)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	DeepSeek R1	Finnish	Modify	1.600 (-0.220 to 3.420)	0.085
LLM evaluator	DeepSeek R1	Finnish	Paraphrase	0.800 (0.206 to 1.394)	0.008
LLM evaluator	DeepSeek R1	Swedish	Delete	2.900 (1.574 to 4.226)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	DeepSeek R1	Swedish	Modify	1.600 (0.433 to 2.767)	0.007
LLM evaluator	DeepSeek R1	Swedish	Paraphrase	0.700 (0.054 to 1.346)	0.034
LLM evaluator	Gemma3n E2B	English	Delete	0.700 (0.265 to 1.135)	0.002
LLM evaluator	Gemma3n E2B	English	Modify	0.900 (0.572 to 1.228)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	Gemma3n E2B	English	Paraphrase	-0.900 (-3.593 to 1.793)	0.51
LLM evaluator	Gemma3n E2B	Finnish	Delete	0.600 (0.201 to 0.999)	0.003
LLM evaluator	Gemma3n E2B	Finnish	Modify	1.100 (0.658 to 1.542)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	Gemma3n E2B	Finnish	Paraphrase	-1.100 (-3.221 to 1.021)	0.31
LLM evaluator	Gemma3n E2B	Swedish	Delete	0.400 (0.128 to 0.672)	0.004
LLM evaluator	Gemma3n E2B	Swedish	Modify	1.100 (0.697 to 1.503)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	Gemma3n E2B	Swedish	Paraphrase	0.400 (-0.033 to 0.833)	0.070
LLM evaluator	Gemma3n E4B	English	Delete	1.300 (0.936 to 1.664)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	Gemma3n E4B	English	Modify	3.300 (2.515 to 4.085)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	Gemma3n E4B	English	Paraphrase	2.300 (1.307 to 3.293)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	Gemma3n E4B	Finnish	Delete	1.600 (0.892 to 2.308)	<0.001

LLM evaluator	Gemma3n E4B	Finnish	Modify	3.800 (3.283 to 4.317)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	Gemma3n E4B	Finnish	Paraphrase	3.300 (2.251 to 4.349)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	Gemma3n E4B	Swedish	Delete	1.200 (0.538 to 1.862)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	Gemma3n E4B	Swedish	Modify	3.600 (2.698 to 4.502)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	Gemma3n E4B	Swedish	Paraphrase	2.200 (1.317 to 3.083)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-oss-20b	English	Delete	5.000 (2.737 to 7.263)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-oss-20b	English	Modify	4.500 (3.153 to 5.847)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-oss-20b	Finnish	Modify	nan (nan to nan)	—
LLM evaluator	gpt-oss-20b	Finnish	Paraphrase	0.125 (-0.154 to 0.404)	0.38
LLM evaluator	gpt-oss-20b	Swedish	Delete	2.500 (1.934 to 3.066)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-oss-20b	Swedish	Modify	2.500 (-0.329 to 5.329)	0.083
LLM evaluator	gpt-oss-20b	Swedish	Paraphrase	0.167 (-0.086 to 0.420)	0.20
LLM evaluator	gpt-oss-120b	English	Delete	4.200 (3.211 to 5.189)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-oss-120b	English	Modify	8.500 (6.113 to 10.887)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-oss-120b	Finnish	Delete	4.100 (3.571 to 4.629)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-oss-120b	Finnish	Modify	7.400 (4.735 to 10.065)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-oss-120b	Finnish	Paraphrase	0.300 (0.083 to 0.517)	0.007
LLM evaluator	gpt-oss-120b	Swedish	Delete	4.500 (3.417 to 5.583)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-oss-120b	Swedish	Modify	5.400 (2.745 to 8.055)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-oss-120b	Swedish	Paraphrase	0.100 (-0.056 to 0.256)	0.21
LLM evaluator	gpt-3.5	English	Delete	3.500 (2.117 to 4.883)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-3.5	English	Modify	2.300 (0.857 to 3.743)	0.002
LLM evaluator	gpt-3.5	English	Paraphrase	0.200 (-0.725 to 1.125)	0.67
LLM evaluator	gpt-3.5	Finnish	Delete	1.500 (0.443 to 2.557)	0.005
LLM evaluator	gpt-3.5	Finnish	Modify	2.400 (0.634 to 4.166)	0.008
LLM evaluator	gpt-3.5	Finnish	Paraphrase	2.300 (0.986 to 3.614)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-3.5	Swedish	Delete	1.900 (-0.544 to 4.344)	0.13
LLM evaluator	gpt-3.5	Swedish	Modify	3.600 (1.717 to 5.483)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-3.5	Swedish	Paraphrase	0.700 (-0.242 to 1.642)	0.15
LLM evaluator	gpt-4	English	Delete	3.500 (2.292 to 4.708)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-4	English	Modify	5.400 (3.908 to 6.892)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-4	Finnish	Delete	2.900 (1.268 to 4.532)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-4	Finnish	Modify	4.600 (3.746 to 5.454)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-4	Swedish	Delete	3.900 (2.324 to 5.476)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-4	Swedish	Modify	5.400 (3.777 to 7.023)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-4.1	English	Delete	2.500 (1.820 to 3.180)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-4.1	English	Modify	3.100 (2.381 to 3.819)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-4.1	English	Paraphrase	0.100 (-0.256 to 0.456)	0.58
LLM evaluator	gpt-4.1	Finnish	Delete	2.100 (1.519 to 2.681)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-4.1	Finnish	Modify	3.400 (2.378 to 4.422)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-4.1	Finnish	Paraphrase	0.200 (-0.370 to 0.770)	0.49
LLM evaluator	gpt-4.1	Swedish	Delete	3.200 (2.371 to 4.029)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-4.1	Swedish	Modify	2.400 (1.212 to 3.588)	<0.001

LLM evaluator	gpt-4.1	Swedish	Paraphrase	0.300 (0.083 to 0.517)	0.007
LLM evaluator	gpt-4o	English	Delete	3.400 (1.837 to 4.963)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-4o	English	Modify	3.900 (3.042 to 4.758)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-4o	English	Paraphrase	0.300 (-0.167 to 0.767)	0.21
LLM evaluator	gpt-4o	Finnish	Delete	4.300 (1.805 to 6.795)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-4o	Finnish	Modify	3.800 (2.933 to 4.667)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-4o	Finnish	Paraphrase	0.400 (-0.175 to 0.975)	0.17
LLM evaluator	gpt-4o	Swedish	Delete	3.700 (1.955 to 5.445)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-4o	Swedish	Modify	4.300 (1.758 to 6.842)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-5 mini	English	Delete	4.800 (4.076 to 5.524)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-5 mini	English	Modify	5.400 (4.312 to 6.488)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-5 mini	English	Paraphrase	0.100 (-0.056 to 0.256)	0.21
LLM evaluator	gpt-5 mini	Finnish	Delete	4.500 (3.447 to 5.553)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-5 mini	Finnish	Modify	5.400 (3.808 to 6.992)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-5 mini	Finnish	Paraphrase	0.100 (-0.124 to 0.324)	0.38
LLM evaluator	gpt-5 mini	Swedish	Delete	4.900 (4.228 to 5.572)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-5 mini	Swedish	Modify	5.200 (3.586 to 6.814)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-5 mini	Swedish	Paraphrase	0.100 (-0.056 to 0.256)	0.21
LLM evaluator	gpt-5 nano	English	Delete	3.300 (2.173 to 4.427)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-5 nano	English	Modify	5.600 (4.004 to 7.196)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-5 nano	English	Paraphrase	0.100 (-0.272 to 0.472)	0.60
LLM evaluator	gpt-5 nano	Finnish	Delete	3.400 (1.690 to 5.110)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-5 nano	Finnish	Modify	5.100 (3.976 to 6.224)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-5 nano	Finnish	Paraphrase	0.100 (-0.129 to 0.329)	0.39
LLM evaluator	gpt-5 nano	Swedish	Delete	4.600 (3.698 to 5.502)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-5 nano	Swedish	Modify	5.000 (4.347 to 5.653)	<0.001
LLM evaluator	gpt-5 nano	Swedish	Paraphrase	-0.100 (-0.431 to 0.231)	0.55

References

1. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2021; **372**: n71.

2. Aali A, Van Veen D, Arefeen YI, et al. A dataset and benchmark for hospital course summarization with adapted large language models. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association : JAMIA* 2025; **32**(3): 470-9.

3. Abacha AB, Yim WW, Adams G, Snider N, Yetisgen M. Overview of the MEDIQA-Chat 2023 Shared Tasks on the Summarization & Generation of Doctor-Patient Conversations. Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics; 2023; 2023. p. 503-13.

4. Abacha AB, Fan Y, Yim WW, Lin T. An Empirical Study of Clinical Note Generation from Doctor-Patient Encounters. EACL 2023 - 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the

Association for Computational Linguistics, Proceedings of the Conference; 2023; 2023. p. 2283-94.

5. Abacha AB, Yim WW, Michalopoulos G, Lin T. An Investigation of Evaluation Metrics for Automated Medical Note Generation. Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics; 2023; 2023. p. 2575-88.

6. Adams G, Zucker J, Elhadad N. A Meta-Evaluation of Faithfulness Metrics for Long-Form Hospital-Course Summarization. *Proceedings of machine learning research* 2023; **219**: 2-30.

7. Berg N, Dalianis H. Using BART to Automatically Generate Discharge Summaries from Swedish Clinical Text. 1st Workshop on Patient-Oriented Language Processing, CL4Health 2024 at LREC-COLING 2024 - Workshop Proceedings; 2024; 2024. p. 246-52.

8. Bhayana R, Alwahbi O, Ladak AM, et al. Leveraging Large Language Models to Generate Clinical Histories for Oncologic Imaging Requisitions. *Radiology* 2025; **314**(2): e242134.

9. Bi B, Liu L, Perez-Concha O. Adapting Large Language Models for Automated Summarisation of Electronic Medical Records in Clinical Coding. *Studies in health technology and informatics* 2024; **318**: 24-9.

10. Brake N, Schaaf T. Comparing Two Model Designs for Clinical Note Generation; Is an LLM a Useful Evaluator of Consistency? Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2024 - Findings; 2024; 2024. p. 352-63.

11. Chen S, Grambow CA, Elyaderani MK, Sadeghi A, Fancellu F, Schaaf T. Investigating the Utility of Synthetic Data for Doctor-Patient Conversation Summarization. Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, INTERSPEECH; 2023; 2023. p. 2338-42.

12. Clough RAJ, Sparkes WA, Clough OT, Sykes JT, Steventon AT, King K. Transforming healthcare documentation: harnessing the potential of AI to generate discharge summaries. *BJGP Open* 2024; **8**(1).

13. Elyaderani MK, Glover J, Schaaf T. Reference-Free Estimation of the Quality of Clinical Notes Generated from Doctor-Patient Conversations. Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, INTERSPEECH; 2024; 2024. p. 1425-9.

14. Hartman VC, Bapat SS, Weiner MG, Navi BB, Sholle ET, Campion TR, Jr. A method to automate the discharge summary hospital course for neurology patients. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association : JAMIA* 2023; **30**(12): 1995-2003.

15. Huang T-Y, Hsieh PH, Chang Y-C. Performance Comparison of Junior Residents and ChatGPT in the Objective Structured Clinical Examination (OSCE) for Medical History Taking and Documentation of Medical Records: Development and Usability Study. *JMIR medical education* 2024; **10**: e59902.

16. Janota B, Janota K. Application of artificial intelligence (AI) in the creation of discharge summaries in psychiatric clinics. *International journal of psychiatry in medicine* 2025; **60**(3): 330-7.

17. Jin H, Guo J, Lin Q, Wu S, Hu W, Li X. Comparative study of Claude 3.5-Sonnet and human physicians in generating discharge summaries for patients with renal insufficiency: assessment of efficiency, accuracy, and quality. *Frontiers in digital health* 2024; **6**: 1456911.

18. Kernberg A, Gold JA, Mohan V. Using ChatGPT-4 to Create Structured Medical Notes From Audio Recordings of Physician-Patient Encounters: Comparative Study. *Journal of medical Internet research* 2024; **26**: e54419.

19. Langdon C, Haag O, Vigliano M, Levorato M, Leon-Ulate J, Adroher M. Transforming pediatric ENT documentation: Efficiency, accuracy, and adoption of speech recognition technology (Speaknosis). *International journal of pediatric otorhinolaryngology* 2025; **191**: 112275.

20. Leonardi G, Portinale L, Santomauro A. Enhancing radiology report generation through pre-trained language models. *Progress in Artificial Intelligence* 2024.

21. Leong HY, Gao Y, Ji S. A GEN AI Framework for Medical Note Generation. 2024 6th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Computer Applications, ICAICA 2024; 2024; 2024. p. 423-9.

22. Li H, Wang H, Sun X, He H, Feng J. Context-enhanced framework for medical image report generation using multimodal contexts. *Knowledge-Based Systems* 2025; **310**.

23. Liao W, Liu Z, Dai H, et al. Differentiating ChatGPT-Generated and Human-Written Medical Texts: Quantitative Study. *JMIR medical education* 2023; **9**: e48904.

24. Liu G, Liao Y, Wang F, et al. Medical-VLBERT: Medical Visual Language BERT for COVID-19 CT Report Generation With Alternate Learning. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems* 2021; **32**(9): 3786-97.

25. Milintsevich K, Agarwal N. Calvados at MEDIQA-Chat 2023: Improving Clinical Note Generation with Multi-Task Instruction Finetuning. Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics; 2023; 2023. p. 529-35.

26. Mishra P, Yao Z, Vashisht P, et al. SYNFAC-EDIT: Synthetic Imitation Edit Feedback for Factual Alignment in Clinical Summarization. EMNLP 2024 - 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Proceedings of the Conference; 2024; 2024. p. 20061-83.

27. Nguyen BN, Le HQ, Can DC. Enhancing Clinical Note Generation from Doctor-Patient Conversations through Semantic Partition-Oriented Summarization. Proceedings - International Conference on Knowledge and Systems Engineering, KSE; 2023; 2023.

28. Peng C, Yang X, Chen A, et al. A study of generative large language model for medical research and healthcare. *NPJ digital medicine* 2023; **6**(1): 210.

29. Schumacher E, Rosenthal D, Naik D, et al. MED-OMIT: Extrinsically-Focused Evaluation Metric for Omissions in Medical Summarization. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research; 2024; 2024. p. 897-922.

30. Seo J, Choi D, Kim T, et al. Evaluation Framework of Large Language Models in Medical Documentation: Development and Usability Study. *Journal of medical Internet research* 2024; **26**: e58329.

31. Van Veen D, Van Uden C, Blankemeier L, et al. Adapted large language models can outperform medical experts in clinical text summarization. *Nature medicine* 2024; **30**(4): 1134-42.

32. Van Veen D, Van Uden C, Attias M, et al. RadAdapt: Radiology Report Summarization via Lightweight Domain Adaptation of Large Language Models. Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics; 2023; 2023. p. 449-60.

33. Wu H, Boulenger P, Faure A, et al. EPFL-MAKE at "Discharge Me!": An LLM System for Automatically Generating Discharge Summaries of Clinical Electronic Health Record. BioNLP 2024 - 23rd Meeting of the ACL Special Interest Group on Biomedical Natural Language Processing, Proceedings of the Workshop and Shared Tasks; 2024; 2024. p. 696-711.

34. Xie Q, Chen Q, Chen A, et al. Medical foundation large language models for comprehensive text analysis and beyond. *NPJ digital medicine* 2025; **8**(1): 141.

35. Yang R, Zeng Q, You K, et al. Ascle-A Python Natural Language Processing Toolkit for Medical Text Generation: Development and Evaluation Study. *Journal of medical Internet research* 2024; **26**: e60601.

36. Yao Z, Jaafar A, Wang B, Yang Z, Yu H. Do Clinicians Know How to Prompt? The Need for Automatic Prompt Optimization Help in Clinical Note Generation. BioNLP 2024 - 23rd Meeting of the ACL Special Interest Group on Biomedical Natural Language Processing, Proceedings of the Workshop and Shared Tasks; 2024; 2024. p. 182-201.

37. Zhang N, Zhang Y, Guo W, Mitra P, Zhang R. FAMESUMM: Investigating and Improving Faithfulness of Medical Summarization. EMNLP 2023 - 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Proceedings; 2023; 2023. p. 10915-31.

38. Zhang X, Zhao G, Ren Y, et al. Data augmented large language models for medical record generation: Data augmented large language..: X. Zhang et al. *Applied Intelligence* 2025; **55**(2).

39. Van Veen D, Van Uden C, Blankemeier L, et al. Clinical Text Summarization: Adapting Large Language Models Can Outperform Human Experts. *Research square* 2023.