

# MEDCO: Medical Education Copilots Based on A Multi-Agent Framework

Hao Wei<sup>1</sup>, Jianing Qiu<sup>1</sup>, Haibao Yu<sup>2</sup>, and Wu Yuan<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR

<sup>2</sup> The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR

haowei@link.cuhk.edu.hk, yuhaibao@connect.hku.hk,  
{jianingqiu,wyuan}@cuhk.edu.hk

**Abstract.** Large language models (LLMs) have had a significant impact on diverse research domains, including medicine and healthcare. However, the potential of LLMs as copilots in medical education remains underexplored. Current AI-assisted educational tools are limited by their solitary learning approach and inability to simulate the multi-disciplinary and interactive nature of actual medical training. To address these limitations, we propose MEDCO (Medical Education Copilots), a novel multi-agent-based copilot system specially developed to emulate real-world medical training environments. MEDCO incorporates three primary agents: an agentic patient, an expert doctor, and a radiologist, facilitating a multi-modal and interactive learning environment. Our framework emphasizes the learning of proficient question-asking skills, multi-disciplinary collaboration, and peer discussions between students. Our experiments show that simulated virtual students who underwent training with MEDCO not only achieved substantial performance enhancements comparable to those of advanced models, but also demonstrated human-like learning behaviors and improvements, coupled with an increase in the number of learning samples. This work contributes to medical education by introducing a copilot that implements an interactive and collaborative learning approach. It also provides valuable insights into the effectiveness of AI-integrated training paradigms.

**Keywords:** Large language model · LLM-based agent · Continual learning, Agentic learning, Retrieval-augmented generation


## 1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) [2, 29] have transformed various research domains, with their exceptional language processing and understanding skills emerging as generalist intelligence [26]. In medicine and healthcare, LLMs have been explored in numerous areas [20, 28], from clerical work automation such as writing discharge summaries [19], to health monitoring such as dietary intake assessment [16], and to an entire clinical pathway from patient presentation to treatment involving clinical data interpretation and diagnostic suggestions [22].

With their comprehensive knowledge learned using web-scale data, a promising usage of LLMs is for medical education [10, 33]. Globally, the demand for well-trained clinicians has surpassed the capacity to adequately train the quality medical workforce. Over the past decades, with the development of information engineering and artificial intelligence (AI) technologies, there is a gradual adoption of these technologies within medical education to facilitate training, from online tutoring to AI-enabled assessment. Although recent research [23] has shown that LLMs can score high with the accuracy of 91.1% in medical examinations such as United States Medical Licensing Examination (USMLE), their potentials and effectiveness as copilots to train medical students are yet to be explored. While some work has shared perspectives on using a chatbot such as ChatGPT in medical education [10, 33], a single chatbot can only play a single role at a time while engaging dialogue with a medical student, whereas in real-world medical training, students encounter various patients and clinical cases, and receive supervision and feedback from senior doctors to improve their clinical and patient-facing skills. Throughout the entire training course, the engagement with multiple different individuals such as patients and senior doctors, and a multi-disciplinary team, is essential to the success of transitioning a medical student to be a medical expert. A single chatbot with a single role is limited to deliver such multi-individual and multi-disciplinary training.

More importantly, medical students need to be proficiently trained in the art of asking patients questions. Proficient question-asking skills can lead patients to recall and share more pertinent information, thereby facilitating a more accurate differential diagnosis. Nonetheless, existing AI-assisted educational tools fail to equip medical students with these essential question-asking skills. Furthermore, current educational tools are primarily designed for solitary learning, but medicine at its core is a multi-disciplinary subject, often requiring collaborations from multiple specialties and clinical sectors. Peer discussions are therefore beneficial in helping students reflect and digest medical and clinical knowledge. Current AI-assisted educational tools that do not sufficiently encourage peer discussions and collaborative learning may fall short in instilling the concept of collaboration to the students.

To realize such a training paradigm for AI-enabled medical education, and to overcome the limitations of a single chatbot, we hence propose a multi-agent-based copilot for medical education, based on the conception that a medical student has to have adequate exposure to patient encounters, feedback from senior doctors, multi-departmental collaboration, and peer discussions for the ease of learning. Such an AI-integrated, clinical case-based training differs from conventional reinforced online Q & A exams by offering more personal and precision medical education. We call our proposed copilot as **MEDCO**, i.e., **M**edical **E**ducation **C**opilots. While there are some LLMs adapted to be a medical specialist (e.g., LLaVa-Med [13], and Med-Gemini [23]), and LLM-based agentic frameworks to demonstrate the multi-agent concept in medicine (e.g., Agent Hospital [15]), so far there is no agentic system proposed replicating the real-world medical training paradigm and studies its effectiveness.



**Fig. 1:** The illustration of the MEDCO framework, which consists of three steps: 1) Initiating different roles and tools; 2) The medical expert evaluates the student’s diagnosis and provides feedback, and the student digests and stores the feedback in their learning memory; 3) The student applies the knowledge within memory to improve diagnosis in future practicing scenarios.

The framework of MEDCO is shown in Fig.1, which includes three stages: agent initialization, learning, and practicing scenarios. In the first step, MEDCO currently involves three agents but has the capacity to incorporate more up to a user’s configuration. These three agents are: 1) an agentic patient that can simulate various symptoms and health conditions, and converse with the student to allow the student to practice; 2) an agentic medical expert that can assess the diagnosis of the student and then provide suggestions for improvement and summarize the case-specific knowledge; and 3) an agentic doctor from a separate department to simulate multi-departmental collaboration. The agentic patient and the medical expert are two integral roles within the system, whereas the agentic doctor(s) can be configured as per the requirements. In the current configuration, we set the agentic doctor as a radiologist for interpreting medical images and physical examinations (multi-modality support).

The learning scenario begins with an interactive diagnosis of the student. Based on this diagnosis, the medical expert gives feedback, including suggestions for improvement and relevant disease-related knowledge. In the practicing scenario, after the initial diagnosis, the student can revisit their learned knowledge or suggestions to formulate more differential questions for a final diagnosis. If there are two students, they can discuss their diagnoses together to achieve better results.

At the current stage, we demonstrate that MEDCO is effective for agentic learning (i.e., students played by LLM models), but we envisage when human users, i.e., actual medical students, interact with MEDCO, they can also effectively improve their medical skills and knowledge. To evaluate the effectiveness of our MEDCO, in addition to the metrics outlined in [6], we introduce new metrics incorporating the ICD-10 (International Classification of Diseases) [18] code for

hierarchical performance assessment (from coarse to fine-grained level). Our experiments demonstrate that MEDCO can significantly enhance the performance of a mediocre LLM model, making it comparable to advanced models. For instance, a student initialized with GPT-3.5 can achieve performance levels near or exceeding those of GPT-4o-mini [2] or Claude3.5-Sonnet [3]. Moreover, students initialized with strong models like GPT-4o-mini or Claude3.5-Sonnet also benefit from our agentic learning copilot. During experiments, we observed human-like learning behaviors, indicating that as the agentic students learn more, their performance improves. Additionally, peer discussions between agentic students are shown to enhance the diagnostic performance of proactive students compared to those who learn independently.

In summary, this work makes three key contributions: 1) we introduce MEDCO, a multi-modal, multi-agent copilot designed to enhance medical students’ clinical conversion and diagnostic skills; 2) we propose a new hierarchical evaluation metric for assessing diagnostic accuracy at coarse, medium, and fine-grained levels; 3) our findings show that agentic students trained with the copilot exhibit human-like learning behaviors, highlighting its potential for real-world application with actual students.

## 2 Related Work

### 2.1 LLMs for Medical Education

The introduction of ChatGPT has accelerated the exploration of LLMs for medical education [10, 33]. The early work of Kung et al. [8] revealed that ChatGPT could achieve a passing score of USMLE. Since then, new generations of LLMs [23, 25] have been benchmarked on USMLE extensively, with the state-of-the-art performance achieving 91.1% accuracy [23]. While the implication of LLMs achieving such a high USMLE score is far-reaching, little research [8] has been conducted to integrate LLMs with existing medical educational systems and investigate how effective they are in improving students’ learning.

Furthermore, as pointed out in [20], LLMs in education can be a double-edged sword where learning can be more interactive and responsive with LLMs being assistants, but plagiarism and a decrease of a student’s own creativity may also occur and proliferate. We refer readers to [1, 20, 33] for more comprehensive discussions about LLMs in medical education

### 2.2 LLM-based Agents

Recently, there has been a trend of shifting from a single LLM chatbot to an agentic LLM framework for task solving, as agents can access tools, plan, reflect, and form collaborations with other agents. Within an educational setting, this agentic paradigm resembles what a human student would experience during the course of learning, i.e., developing reasoning skills, knowing to leverage tools, reflect, and collaborate with others. Hence, an educational system based on

multiple agents can be particularly promising. While there are some agentic frameworks, such as ReAct [34], LangChain, CAMEL [14], and AutoGen [32], they are mainly proposed for automating workflow. For example, the seminal CAMEL work shows that the workflow of a task can be automated using an agentic user and an agentic assistant in which the agentic user is a proxy of human user to instruct the assistant to fulfill tasks. Recently, agentic systems have been proposed for educational purposes such as simulated classrooms [36, 38]. Lee et al. [11] have also proposed to use generative agents to train teachers to help them prepare for the actual in-class teaching.

There are a few studies exploring LLM agents in medical settings, and most of them are unimodal focusing on medical text data only. Agent Hospital [15] shows that an agentic doctor can continually improve its diagnosis by merely interacting with agentic patients in a simulated hospital, and can transfer its learned knowledge to real-world cases. MEDAGENTS [27] demonstrates that multi-round discussions among agents can lead to better results than zero-/few-shot chain-of-thought [31] on medical question answering. Similarly, AI Hospital [6] shows that multi-agent discussions can enhance diagnostic accuracy. Almanac [37], a retrieval-integrated agentic system, shows consistently better performance than plain LLMs in clinical question answering. Nonetheless, the above explorations of agents within medicine are still restricted by the single text modality, whereas medicine is inherently multi-modal.

Recently, MMedAgent [12] shows that the medical task-solving capabilities of LLMs can be widened, and their unimodal nature can be expanded to multi-modal, through tool access, such as invoking MedSAM [17] for medical image segmentation and ChatCAD [39] for medical report generation.

### 3 Method

Fig. 1 illustrates the three main steps in our framework: (1) Agent initialization: prompt different LLMs to play different roles using medical information and different instructions; (2) Learning scenario: the agentic medical student generates a diagnostic report according to interactions with the agentic patient and agentic radiologist, which is then evaluated by an agentic medical expert. The student then integrates diagnostic suggestions and case-specific knowledge from the medical expert into its memory; (3) Practicing scenario: after the initial diagnosis for a new clinical case, the agentic medical student revisits relevant suggestions or knowledge from its memory to propose further questions to the patient and radiologist to reach a more accurate final diagnosis. The following subsections elaborate on these three steps.

#### 3.1 Agent Initialization

The proposed MEDCO framework currently encompasses four roles: (1) an agentic patient: articulates symptoms, answers questions honestly, participates in examinations, and expresses concerns; (2) an agentic radiologist: interprets various


radiological imaging modalities and reports, providing examination results; (3) an agentic student: simulates physicians’ investigative and decision-making processes to inquire patients to make diagnoses; (4) an agentic medical expert: evaluates the student’s diagnostic process, offering suggestions and relevant knowledge for future inquiries and diagnoses. Given the specific medical knowledge required for these roles, the involved medical records can be categorized into three types.

- **Basic Information:** includes essential patient data such as chief complaints, medical histories, and personal and familial backgrounds, forming the foundation of the patient’s medical profile.
- **Medical Examination:** includes detailed assessments in the diagnostic process, encompassing physical exams, auxiliary tests, radiological, and report images (if applicable).
- **Diagnosis and Treatment:** includes diagnostic results, the rationale for diagnoses, and the prescribed treatment plan, reflecting the decision-making and therapeutic elements of patient care.

The above three categories of information will be assigned to respective agentic characters via prompts: the agentic patient will have the access to the basic information, the agentic radiologist will be given the medical examination, and the agentic medical expert will use all three types of information to assess the performance of the agentic student.

**Agentic Patient:** To prompt a language model as a patient, it is vital to emphasize key patient traits and create a thorough personality profile. The patient should express symptoms, answer questions, participate in exams, and voice concerns. Developing a detailed patient persona—covering lifestyle, experiences, traits, and speech—boosts realistic interactions. In [6], the authors use GPT-4 to examine a patient’s lifestyle and traits to produce a statement reflecting their condition. Our study follows this method, enabling the model to mimic authentic patient interactions in medical simulations. The prompt for the patient is shown in Table.10.

**Agentic Medical Student:** In creating a prompt for an LLM to imitate a medical student, we seek to reflect physicians’ investigation and decision-making ability. The prompt encourages interaction with patient agents for detailed symptom assessments, medical exams, and collaboration with radiologists for additional findings. It then assists the student in evaluating treatment options to develop and communicate an optimal plan. Following expert input, the student would summarize symptoms, examinations, diagnostic results, rationales, and treatment plans in detail. During the practicing scenario, this prompt allows the student to recall relevant diseases and diagnostic suggestions based on symptoms, informing further inquiries to achieve a final diagnosis. This process enhances the realism and educational value of simulations, with experiments primarily using GPT-3.5 for initialization considering its weak performance in medical scenarios [6]. Our ablation study shows that even students initialized with a strong model also benefit from our educational copilot. The specific prompt for the medical student is shown in Tables 11 to 15.



**Fig. 2:** The pipeline of our MEDCO framework from learning to practicing scenario.

**Agentic Radiologist:** In the context of simulating a radiologist using an LLM, our approach focuses on encapsulating the multifaceted role of a radiologist within a hospital environment. Our prompt design emphasizes the core competencies of radiological practice, including proficiency in interpreting diverse imaging modalities such as X-rays, CT scans, MRIs, and ultrasounds. Additionally, we instruct the model to respond to specific test requests from patient agents or physicians, providing relevant and accurate examination results based on the patient’s simulated condition. In the prompts, we incorporate the Medical Examination section of medical records to ensure the radiologist communicates findings with professional clarity. Additionally, we have developed two tools to interpret radiological and report photos, producing both a radiology report and a textual description, respectively. The prompt for the radiologist is shown in Table 18 and Table 19. During conversion, the radiologist will also be referred to as the examiner when someone requests the examination results.

**Agentic Medical Expert:** We developed an advanced prompting strategy to utilize an LLM in medical education to simulate a medical expert. This role aids in assessment, feedback, and educational support during diagnostic scenarios. The expert would evaluate student performance, emphasizing key skills such as patient interaction and clinical reasoning, and identifying strengths and weakness for improvement regarding students’ inquires, diagnostic rationales, and treatment plans. Additionally, the model offers case-specific medical knowledge, including definitions, symptoms, and treatment protocols, for students’ learning. The relevant prompts for this role are shown in Table 20, Table 21, Table 22, and Table 13 in [6].

### 3.2 Learning Scenario

This particular scenario is designed to assist a medical student in acquiring valuable diagnostic insights by engaging in case-based learning, which is shown in Fig. 2 and mainly involves three steps:

**(1) Initial Diagnosis:** In this essential first step, the student interacts with both the patient and the radiologist in a collaborative setting. The primary goal is to formulate a comprehensive diagnostic report. This report serves to succinctly summarize a range of critical elements, including the patient’s reported symptoms, results from various examinations, the diagnosis itself, the reasoning behind the diagnostic conclusions, and the corresponding treatment plans tailored for the patient’s condition.

**(2) Assessment:** The medical expert evaluates the report against the complete medical records to provide feedback and suggestions on patient interaction, inquiries, diagnostic hypotheses, clinical reasoning, and treatment plans. Additionally, the expert offers case-specific medical knowledge, including disease definitions, pathogenesis, symptoms, common examinations, and primary treatment protocols, for students’ learning.

**(3) Learning Feedback:** To simulate the student’s learning and practicing process, a key-value memory is implemented to store and retrieve suggestions and case-specific knowledge efficiently. In our setting, saving information to memory is equivalent to a human student’s acquisition of this information through learning. The detailed designs of our memory mechanism can be found in section C in the appendix.

### 3.3 Practicing Scenario

The practicing scenario aims to assess the diagnostic performance improvement of the medical student after being trained by our copilot, as illustrated in Fig. 2:

**(1) Initial Diagnosis:** Similar to step (1) in the learning scenario, this step involves interactive communication with the patient and radiologist to formulate a preliminary diagnostic report.

**(2) Rethinking and Recalling:** Using the summarized symptoms from the initial diagnosis, the agentic student revisits their learned knowledge of diseases or suggestions to propose differential questions for the patient and radiologist by following the prompts in the appendix (Table 13 and Table 14, respectively).

To recall knowledge, the agentic student first retrieves relevant diseases from the memory’s symptom-store and then accesses disease-related information from the disease-store. Similarly, the student would utilize patient IDs from these relevant diseases to gather suggestions from the case-store in memory.

**(3) Further Inquiry and Diagnosis:** Based on the additional questions, the agentic student inquires the patient and radiologist to gather more differential information for the final diagnosis. Table 12 shows the prompt for this inquiry.

**(4) Peer Discussion:** In scenarios with two agentic students, each retrieves relevant suggestions and knowledge respectively in step (2). They then engage



in a discussion about their diagnosis to improve themselves, where the prompt is outlined in Table 15. This collaboration enhances clinical reasoning and decision-making by integrating their insights.

Figures 8 and 9 illustrate an interactive diagnosis case that demonstrates the student retrieving knowledge from memory based on symptoms to enhance the final diagnosis.

## 4 Experiments

### 4.1 Dataset

In this study, we used the MVME dataset [6] of Chinese medical records, which contains 506 high-quality medical cases (text-only) across various specialties, e.g., surgery, internal medicine, and obstetrics and gynecology. More details about MVME can be found in [6]. We randomly divided the dataset into training (259 cases) and testing (247 cases) sets at the department level for learning and practicing scenarios, respectively.

To validate our framework’s multi-modal capability, we selected the entire test set of 16 neurological cases from the department of internal medicine and gathered their corresponding radiological images or report photos from the original websites. Two example images are shown in Fig.5 in the appendix. During the dialogue, the radiologist interprets the images of the current patient into textual descriptions, such as a radiology report or summary of existing reports, when requested to provide such information by the agentic patient or student.

### 4.2 Evaluation Metrics

We assess MEDCO using three evaluation metrics from both qualitative to quantitative aspects. More implementation details can be found at the section D in the appendix

**HDE (Holistic Diagnostic Evaluation)**: the rating (1~4 points) of the expert regarding the student’s report, including five sections: symptoms, medical examination, diagnostic results, rationales, and treatment plans.

**SEMA (Semantic Embedding-based Matching Assessment)**: First, retrieving the top-10 relevant ICD terminologies of the student’s diagnosis and the ground truth (the medical record), respectively, and then compute their extracted disease entities (#), precision(P), recall(R), and F1-score(F1) as metrics.

**CASCADE (Coarse And Specific Code Assessment for Diagnostic Evaluation)**: Similar to the SEMA, we first retrieve the top-1 relevant ICD terminology and then compute the accuracy at three ICD-10 levels: coarse, medium, and fine-grained levels.

### 4.3 Implementation Details

In MEDCO, distinct models are assigned to various roles: GPT-3.5 [2] acts as the patient, while Claude-3.5-Sonnet-20240620 [3] serves as both the radiologist

and medical expert, considering its excellence in biology subjects [7]. The implementation of the student’s memory and ICD-10 metrics (SEMA & CASCADE) uses Chromadb with OpenAI embedding for efficient storage and rapid queries.

To simulate the agentic radiologist’s interpretation of various imaging modalities, such as radiological images and report photos, we design two tools: 1) the Radiology tool for interpreting radiological images, and 2) the ReportVQA tool for describing the report photos. More details can be found at the section E in the appendix.

In addition, the diagnosis of two doctors (GPT-4 and GPT-3.5) powered by the multi-agent system in [6] serves as the upper bound in our experiments.

#### 4.4 Performance of the Agentic Student

Table 1 presents evaluations from the medical expert regarding a student’s report, indicating significant performance gains after the learning scenario.

The Claude3.5-Sonnet model scored the highest average score of 2.283 ( $\pm 0.328$ ), while the student (GPT-3.5) achieved an average of 1.965 ( $\pm 0.336$ ). After learning, the agentic student’s overall performance improved, with scores rising to 2.169 ( $\pm 0.337$ ) through recalling learned knowledge and 2.122 ( $\pm 0.341$ ) through revisiting suggestions. Peer discussions yielded the best score of 2.299 ( $\pm 0.393$ ), outperforming both the Claude3.5-Sonnet and the upper-bound 2-agent benchmarks. Particularly, the Medical Examination and Diagnostic Rationales sections achieved significant gains, with the Medical Examination score rising from 1.785 to 2.575 following peer discussions, and Diagnostic Rationales improving from 1.879 to 2.158.

**Table 1:** HDE results of the agentic student with and without the training of our copilot across the entire test set.

	Symptom	Medical Examination	Diagnostic Results	Diagnostic Rationales	Treatment Plan	Avg (std)
	Student					
GPT-3.5	2.595	1.785	1.960	1.879	1.607	1.965(0.336)
GPT-4o-mini	2.688	1.980	2.134	1.931	1.628	2.072(0.349)
Claude3.5-Sonnet	<b>2.895</b>	2.113	<b>2.247</b>	<b>2.243</b>	<b>1.919</b>	2.283(0.328)
	Student(GPT-3.5) + Learning Scenario					
w/ knowledge	2.696	2.296	2.113	2.085	1.656	2.169(0.337)
w/ suggestions	2.662	2.263	2.061	2.008	1.619	2.122(0.341)
w/ discussion	2.866	<b>2.575</b>	2.178	2.158	1.717	<b>2.299(0.393)</b>
	Upper bound					
2 Agents [6]	2.741	2.259	2.227	2.130	1.870	2.245(0.283)

Table 2 illustrates ICD-10 metrics (SEMA and CASCADE), showing notable enhancements in diagnostic performance for the agentic student after learning. In terms of SEMA metrics, the student (GPT-3.5) achieved remarkable increases in recall (29.72) and F1-score (36.04) through peer discussions, exceeding the untrained student (R: 17.95, F1: 26.01). Claude3.5-Sonnet had the highest precision (55.13).

CASCADE metrics showed improvement across the board, with the student (GPT-3.5) achieving top accuracy levels (46.67% and 18.33% for coarse and

medium, respectively). While peer discussions were strong in the recall, they did not enhance accuracy at coarse and medium levels, likely due to more false positives from higher entity extraction (2.59).

Despite the Claude3.5-Sonnet consistently achieving the best accuracy (48.26%, 22.23%, and 12.23% for coarse, medium, and fine-grained levels, respectively), the trained student (GPT-3.5) demonstrated comparable performance, further demonstrating our framework’s effectiveness.

**Table 2:** The ICD-10 related results (SEMA and CASCADE score) for the agentic student with and without the training of our copilot across the entire test set.

	#	R↑	P↑	F1↑	Coarse(%) ↑	Medium (%) ↑	Fine (%) ↑
Student							
GPT-3.5	1.52	17.95	47.20	26.01	43.72	17.37	8.31
GPT-4o-mini	1.82	23.43	51.45	32.20	45.61	19.17	11.48
Claude3.5-Sonnet	1.58	21.81	<b>55.13</b>	31.25	<b>48.26</b>	<b>22.23</b>	<b>12.23</b>
Student(GPT-3.5) + Learning Scenario							
w/ knowledge	1.79	22.31	49.77	30.81	46.67	18.33	9.91
w/ suggestions	1.91	23.12	48.41	31.30	44.76	17.93	10.53
w/ discussion	2.59	29.72	45.78	36.04	44.31	17.27	10.00
Upper bound							
2 Agents [6]	2.62	<b>32.66</b>	49.69	<b>39.41</b>	46.08	19.81	11.42

**Table 3:** The HDE results of the agentic student role-played by a strong model.

	Symptom	Medical Examination	Diagnostic Results	Diagnostic Rationales	Treatment Plan	Avg (std)
Student						
Claude3.5-Sonnet	2.895	2.113	2.247	2.243	1.919	2.283(0.328)
Student(Claude3.5-Sonnet) + Learning Scenario						
w/ knowledge	3.045	2.915	2.425	2.457	2.089	2.586(0.358)
w/ suggestion	3.065	3.138	2.453	2.603	2.206	2.693(0.128)
w/ discussion	3.121	3.032	2.453	2.632	2.190	2.686(0.350)
Upper bound						
2 Agents [6]	2.741	2.259	2.227	2.130	1.870	2.245(0.283)


#### 4.5 Performance Gain for the Students Played by Strong Models

This subsection explores how the copilot improves performance in students played by strong language models, exemplified by Claude3.5-Sonnet. As shown in Tables 3 and 4, MEDCO significantly enhances agentic students’ clinical consultation and diagnostic abilities, demonstrating its effectiveness across different model architectures.

Table 3 reveals that the untrained agentic student scores an average of 2.283 ( $\pm 0.328$ ) in five diagnostic aspects. With copilot training, scores rise: students using recalled knowledge could reach the average of 2.586 ( $\pm 0.358$ ), while those using recalled suggestions could reach 2.693 ( $\pm 0.128$ ). Peer discussions yield the highest score of 2.686 ( $\pm 0.350$ ), surpassing the 2 Agents, the average of 2.245 ( $\pm 0.283$ ). Individual performance improvements are also consistent across

**Table 4:** The ICD-10 related assessment (SEMA and CASCADE score) for the agentic student played by a strong model (Claude3.5-Sonnet)

	#	R↑	P↑	F1↑	Coarse(%) ↑	Medium(%) ↑	Fine(%) ↑
Student							
Claude3.5-Sonnet	1.58	21.81	55.13	31.25	48.26	22.23	12.23
Student(Claude3.5-Sonnet) + Learning Scenario							
w/ knowledge	1.97	27.79	56.26	37.20	48.16	21.82	12.58
w/ suggestions	1.99	29.01	<b>58.13</b>	38.70	<b>49.55</b>	<b>23.38</b>	<b>13.84</b>
w/ both	2.25	32.56	57.73	41.63	48.14	22.49	12.96
Upper bound							
2 Agents [6]	2.62	<b>32.66</b>	49.69	<b>39.41</b>	46.08	19.81	11.42

**Fig. 3:** The learning curve of an agentic student using rethinking strategies (knowledge and suggestion) or peer discussion at various retrieval ranges (as percentages) in the practicing scenario, where the performance of Claude3.5-Sonnet and 2 Agents serve as reference benchmarks.

dimensions. For example, the Medical Examination score improves from 2.113 ( $\pm 0.089$ ) to 3.138 ( $\pm 0.093$ ) when recalling learned suggestions.

Table 4 supports these findings with SEMA and CASCADE metrics, showing improved recall, precision, and F1 scores, with peer discussions achieving a high F1 score of 41.63. Trained agentic students show better accuracy in ICD-10 classifications, particularly those using recalled suggestions, achieving higher scores than untrained peers.

These results indicate that MEDCO can significantly boost the performance of advanced language models like Claude3.5-Sonnet in clinical contexts, showing improvements across various metrics.

#### 4.6 Learning Curve of the Agentic Student

This section examines the learning curve of the agentic student (GPT-3.5) as the number of training cases increases. We focus on Neurology cases from Internal Medicine with 16 training and 16 test cases. In the practicing scenario, when recalling learned experiences or participating in peer discussion, the agentic student’s memory retrieval range is limited to 0% (no training), 25% (4 cases), 50% (8 cases), 75% (12 cases), and 100% (all 16 training cases), to see how different quantities of training samples could affect diagnostic performance.

In Fig.3(b), the F1-score rises quickly, stabilizing between the 25% and 100% ranges, indicating that even limited training can enhance precision and recall.

Fine-grained level accuracy in Fig. 3(c) dramatically increases from 0% to 75%, with the agentic student that rethinks knowledge often surpassing Claude3.5-Sonnet. More detailed results with all metrics are available in Tables 6 and 7 in the appendix.

Overall, MEDCO significantly improves agentic students’ clinical skills, showing human-like learning behaviors. This consistent performance suggests its potential for real-world application in hospitals, aiding students’ educational journeys.

#### 4.7 Multi-Modal Support

The MVME dataset contains only text, so we collected corresponding images to test our framework’s feasibility with multi-modality. We chose 16 Neurology cases from the Department of Internal Medicine for this study. In interactive diagnosis, radiologists convert visual data such as radiological images or medical report photos into textual descriptions for student comprehension. An example of this is shown in Fig. 10.


We utilized GPT-4o-mini, Claude3.5-Sonnet, and GPT-3.5 to initialize the patient role and evaluate the impact of visual data on them. Results in Fig. 4 show average scores from expert evaluations, F1-scores (SEMA), and fine-grained level accuracy (CASCADE), with additional metrics in Tables 8 and 9. From the results, Fig. 4(a) reveals that multi-modal input benefits students initialized with GPT-4o-mini and Claude3.5-Sonnet, particularly the latter, which achieves the highest results, surpassing 2 Agents [6].

The F1-score in Fig. 4(b) indicates a strong positive effect of multi-modal input for all variants. the agentic student(GPT-3.5) shows the highest relative improvement, while Claude3.5-Sonnet variant achieves the top absolute F1-score, approaching the 2 Agents benchmark. Additionally, fine-grained level accuracy in Fig. 4(c) illustrates significant enhancements from multi-modal input, suggesting visual data improves detailed fine-grade diagnosis. Notably, multi-modal input significantly boosts GPT-4o-mini and Claude3.5-Sonnet student performance to surpass the reference.

These results suggest that the multi-modal copilot could aid students’ understanding of complex diagnoses, particularly for fine-grade assessments, by combining visual and textual information to foster a more engaging learning environment.

## 5 Discussion

Case-based learning is the core of our MEDCO framework for AI-enabled medical education. It allows a student to actively interact with a virtual agentic patient, auxiliary doctor, and medical expert for diagnosing a clinical case. This differs from a single-agent chatbot in that instead of one AI character is available, multiple virtual characters are simulated in MEDCO and available for discussion at the request of the student user, replicating real-world clinical settings where



**Fig. 4:** The influence of multi-modalities on the performance of the agentic student when initialized by different LLMs, where the red dashed line denotes the results of 2 Agents [6], serving as the reference.

medical consultation and diagnosis can be multidisciplinary and require expertise from senior doctors as well as active engagement, cooperation from the patient. While we have validated MEDCO from various dimensions, the student currently is only simulated and played by an LLM such as GPT-3.5. Although we have used LLMs of different versions to simulate students with different learning capabilities, and a memory mechanism to represent a student’s learning and the acquisition of new knowledge process, there is clearly a gap between the real and virtual students in learning, and hence the effectiveness of MEDCO for helping human students in learning medical knowledge requires further investigation. A larger-scale multi-modal collaborative dataset on par with industrial datasets in other domains [35] could further unlock the potentials of the MEDCO system. In current implementation, the student receives only textual feedback from the medical expert. Future work can enable the expert to provide quintessential medical imaging examples of a learning case to offer multi-modal feedback to improve the student’s diagnostic skill and broaden their knowledge. Similarly, the capabilities of agentic doctors for multi-departmental collaboration can also be expanded. For example, the agentic radiologist can also be granted access to foundation AI models [4, 5, 9, 21, 30] or specialized AI models [17, 24] as their tools, e.g., using a segmentation model to segment and highlight lesions which could potentially ease the learning of the student.

## 6 Conclusion

We have introduced MEDCO, an innovative multi-agent copilot system for medical education. MEDCO enables medical students to interact dynamically with an agentic patient, specialized doctor, and medical expert to learn about the diagnosis and treatment of various diseases. Our findings indicate that MEDCO can effectively adapt a generalist model for medical specialization. This adaptation may also occur for human students using MEDCO, as it provides targeted feedback tailored to individual learning cases and simulates diverse patient encounters and multidisciplinary collaborations to enhance the learning experience. Furthermore, this AI-enabled copilot system has the potential for application beyond medicine, benefiting broader educational contexts.

## References

1. Abd-Alrazaq, A., AlSaad, R., Alhuwail, D., Ahmed, A., Healy, P.M., Latifi, S., Aziz, S., Damseh, R., Alrazak, S.A., Sheikh, J., et al.: Large language models in medical education: opportunities, challenges, and future directions. *JMIR Medical Education* **9**(1), e48291 (2023) [4](#)
2. Achiam, J., Adler, S., Agarwal, S., Ahmad, L., Akkaya, I., Aleman, F.L., Almeida, D., Altenschmidt, J., Altman, S., Anadkat, S., et al.: Gpt-4 technical report. arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774 (2023) [1](#), [4](#), [9](#)
3. Anthropic: Claude 3.5 sonnet (2024), <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-5-sonnet> [4](#), [9](#)
4. Chen, R.J., Ding, T., Lu, M.Y., Williamson, D.F., Jaume, G., Song, A.H., Chen, B., Zhang, A., Shao, D., Shaban, M., et al.: Towards a general-purpose foundation model for computational pathology. *Nature Medicine* **30**(3), 850–862 (2024) [14](#)
5. Christensen, M., Vukadinovic, M., Yuan, N., Ouyang, D.: Vision–language foundation model for echocardiogram interpretation. *Nature Medicine* pp. 1–8 (2024) [14](#)
6. Fan, Z., Tang, J., Chen, W., Wang, S., Wei, Z., Xi, J., Huang, F., Zhou, J.: Ai hospital: Interactive evaluation and collaboration of llms as intern doctors for clinical diagnosis. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.09742 (2024) [3](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [9](#), [10](#), [11](#), [12](#), [13](#), [14](#), [18](#), [19](#), [21](#), [22](#), [29](#), [30](#)
7. Huang, Z., Wang, Z., Xia, S., Liu, P.: Olympicarena medal ranks: Who is the most intelligent ai so far? arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.16772 (2024) [10](#)
8. Kung, T.H., Cheatham, M., Medenilla, A., Sillos, C., De Leon, L., Elepaño, C., Madriaga, M., Aggabao, R., Diaz-Candido, G., Maningo, J., et al.: Performance of chatgpt on usmle: potential for ai-assisted medical education using large language models. *PLoS digital health* **2**(2), e0000198 (2023) [4](#)
9. Lam, K., Qiu, J.: Foundation models: the future of surgical artificial intelligence? *British Journal of Surgery* **111**(4), znae090 (2024) [14](#)
10. Lee, H.: The rise of chatgpt: Exploring its potential in medical education. *Anatomical sciences education* (2023) [2](#), [4](#)
11. Lee, U., Lee, S., Koh, J., Jeong, Y., Jung, H., Byun, G., Lee, Y., Moon, J., Lim, J., Kim, H.: Generative agent for teacher training: Designing educational problem-solving simulations with large language model-based agents for pre-service teachers [5](#)
12. Li, B., Yan, T., Pan, Y., Xu, Z., Luo, J., Ji, R., Liu, S., Dong, H., Lin, Z., Wang, Y.: Mmedagent: Learning to use medical tools with multi-modal agent. arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.02483 (2024) [5](#)
13. Li, C., Wong, C., Zhang, S., Usuyama, N., Liu, H., Yang, J., Naumann, T., Poon, H., Gao, J.: Llava-med: Training a large language-and-vision assistant for biomedicine in one day. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **36** (2024) [2](#)
14. Li, G., Hammoud, H., Itani, H., Khizbullin, D., Ghanem, B.: Camel: Communicative agents for "mind" exploration of large language model society. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **36**, 51991–52008 (2023) [5](#)
15. Li, J., Wang, S., Zhang, M., Li, W., Lai, Y., Kang, X., Ma, W., Liu, Y.: Agent hospital: A simulacrum of hospital with evolvable medical agents. arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.02957 (2024) [2](#), [5](#)
16. Lo, F.P.W., Qiu, J., Wang, Z., Chen, J., Xiao, B., Yuan, W., Giannarou, S., Frost, G., Lo, B.: Dietary assessment with multimodal chatgpt: A systematic analysis. *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics* (2024) [1](#)

17. Ma, J., He, Y., Li, F., Han, L., You, C., Wang, B.: Segment anything in medical images. *Nature Communications* **15**(1), 654 (2024) [5](#), [14](#)
18. Organization, W.H.: International Statistical Classification of Diseases and related health problems: Alphabetical index, vol. 3. World Health Organization (2004) [3](#), [19](#)
19. Patel, S.B., Lam, K.: Chatgpt: the future of discharge summaries? *The Lancet Digital Health* **5**(3), e107–e108 (2023) [1](#)
20. Qiu, J., Li, L., Sun, J., Peng, J., Shi, P., Zhang, R., Dong, Y., Lam, K., Lo, F.P.W., Xiao, B., et al.: Large ai models in health informatics: Applications, challenges, and the future. *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics* (2023) [1](#), [4](#)
21. Qiu, J., Wu, J., Wei, H., Shi, P., Zhang, M., Sun, Y., Li, L., Liu, H., Liu, H., Hou, S., et al.: Visionfm: a multi-modal multi-task vision foundation model for generalist ophthalmic artificial intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.04992* (2023) [14](#)
22. Qiu, J., Yuan, W., Lam, K.: The application of multimodal large language models in medicine. *The Lancet Regional Health–Western Pacific* **45** (2024) [1](#)
23. Saab, K., Tu, T., Weng, W.H., Tanno, R., Stutz, D., Wulczyn, E., Zhang, F., Strother, T., Park, C., Vedadi, E., et al.: Capabilities of gemini models in medicine. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.18416* (2024) [2](#), [4](#)
24. Shi, P., Qiu, J., Abaxi, S.M.D., Wei, H., Lo, F.P.W., Yuan, W.: Generalist vision foundation models for medical imaging: A case study of segment anything model on zero-shot medical segmentation. *Diagnostics* **13**(11), 1947 (2023) [14](#)
25. Singhal, K., Azizi, S., Tu, T., Mahdavi, S.S., Wei, J., Chung, H.W., Scales, N., Tanwani, A., Cole-Lewis, H., Pfohl, S., et al.: Large language models encode clinical knowledge. *Nature* **620**(7972), 172–180 (2023) [4](#)
26. Sun, J., Zheng, C., Xie, E., Liu, Z., Chu, R., Qiu, J., Xu, J., Ding, M., Li, H., Geng, M., et al.: A survey of reasoning with foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11562* (2023) [1](#)
27. Tang, X., Zou, A., Zhang, Z., Zhao, Y., Zhang, X., Cohan, A., Gerstein, M.: Medagents: Large language models as collaborators for zero-shot medical reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.10537* (2023) [5](#)
28. Thirunavukarasu, A.J., Ting, D.S.J., Elangovan, K., Gutierrez, L., Tan, T.F., Ting, D.S.W.: Large language models in medicine. *Nature medicine* **29**(8), 1930–1940 (2023) [1](#)
29. Touvron, H., Lavril, T., Izacard, G., Martinet, X., Lachaux, M.A., Lacroix, T., Rozière, B., Goyal, N., Hambro, E., Azhar, F., et al.: Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971* (2023) [1](#)
30. Wei, H., Liu, B., Zhang, M., Shi, P., Yuan, W.: Visionclip: An med-aigc based ethical language-image foundation model for generalizable retina image analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.10823* (2024) [14](#)
31. Wei, J., Wang, X., Schuurmans, D., Bosma, M., Xia, F., Chi, E., Le, Q.V., Zhou, D., et al.: Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **35**, 24824–24837 (2022) [5](#)
32. Wu, Q., Bansal, G., Zhang, J., Wu, Y., Li, B., Zhu, E., Jiang, L., Zhang, X., Zhang, S., Liu, J., Awadallah, A.H., White, R.W., Burger, D., Wang, C.: Autogen: Enabling next-gen llm applications via multi-agent conversation framework (2023) [5](#)
33. Wu, Y., Zheng, Y., Feng, B., Yang, Y., Kang, K., Zhao, A.: Embracing chatgpt for medical education: exploring its impact on doctors and medical students. *JMIR Medical Education* **10**, e52483 (2024) [2](#), [4](#)



34. Yao, S., Zhao, J., Yu, D., Du, N., Shafran, I., Narasimhan, K., Cao, Y.: React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03629 (2022) 5
35. Yu, H., Yang, W., Ruan, H., Yang, Z., Tang, Y., Gao, X., Hao, X., Shi, Y., Pan, Y., Sun, N., et al.: V2x-seq: A large-scale sequential dataset for vehicle-infrastructure cooperative perception and forecasting. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. pp. 5486–5495 (2023) 14
36. Yue, M., Mifdal, W., Zhang, Y., Suh, J., Yao, Z.: Mathvc: An llm-simulated multi-character virtual classroom for mathematics education. arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.06711 (2024) 5
37. Zakka, C., Shad, R., Chaurasia, A., Dalal, A.R., Kim, J.L., Moor, M., Fong, R., Phillips, C., Alexander, K., Ashley, E., et al.: Almanac—retrieval-augmented language models for clinical medicine. NEJM AI **1**(2), AIoa2300068 (2024) 5
38. Zhang, Z., Zhang-Li, D., Yu, J., Gong, L., Zhou, J., Liu, Z., Hou, L., Li, J.: Simulating classroom education with llm-empowered agents. arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.19226 (2024) 5
39. Zhao, Z., Wang, S., Gu, J., Zhu, Y., Mei, L., Zhuang, Z., Cui, Z., Wang, Q., Shen, D.: Chatcad+: Towards a universal and reliable interactive cad using llms. IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging (2024) 5

## A Acknowledgements

Thanks for free icons from Flaticon.com<sup>1</sup>.

## B Prompts

This section lists the used prompts for the involved roles in our study, where ‘xx’ denotes the external inputs in prompts or conversion.

Prompt	Medical Role	Function
Table10	Patient	Chat with Student and Radiologist
Table11	Medical Student	Interactive Clinical Diagnosis
Table12	Medical Student	System message for further inquiry conversion
Table13	Medical Student	Raise questions for patient based on knowledge
Table14	Medical Student	Raise questions for radiologist based on knowledge
Table15	Medical Student	Peer discussion for knowledge and suggestions based diagnosis
Table16	Radiologist	Process Examination Request
Table17	Radiologist	Call tools to interpret images
Table18	Radiology Tool	Interpret radiology images as report
Table19	ReportVQA Tool	Interpret existing report photos as textual descriptions
Table20	Medical Expert	Ask the student to summarize the diagnosis
Table21	Medical Expert	Assess the diagnosis report of the student
Table22	Medical Expert	Summarize the case-specific knowledge
Table 13 [6]	Medical Expert	Evaluate the student’s diagnosis with five criterions


**Table 5:** Prompts of different medical roles and the corresponding function in our study.

## C Memory Design

Using the dialogue case in the appendix (Fig. 6 and Fig. 7) as an example, our memory design includes three components to store the feedback of the medical expert in the dialog:

- Case-store: the key represents the patient ID, and the value contains the expert’s diagnosis suggestion for that case;
- Disease-store: the key identifies the diseases in the original medical record (the ground truth), such as cerebral infarction, hypertension, and hyperlipidemia, with the value corresponding to the disease-related knowledge from the expert;
- Symptom-store: the key indicates the patient’s symptoms in the original medical record (the ground truth), like sudden onset of unclear speech and impaired mobility of the left limbs, with the corresponding value containing the diagnosis results for the case and patient ID.

<sup>1</sup> Flaticon: <https://www.flaticon.com/>



**Fig. 5:** The examples to show our collected visual data: (a) The Chest CT image from patient 1170; (b) The neck ultrasound report photo (Chinese text) from patient 1310.

## D Metrics

In our experiments, we design the following three metrics to validate the effectiveness of our proposed copilot: MEDCO:

**HDE (Holistic Diagnostic Evaluation):** This qualitative evaluation method [6] focuses on holistically analyzing the entire diagnosis process across five specific dimensions: (1) symptoms, (2) medical examination, (3) diagnostic results, (4) diagnostic rationales, and (5) treatment plan. Using medical records as a reference, the medical expert rates the student’s performance on a scale of 1 to 4, from poorest to excellent, based on responses to a predefined criterion in the prompt.

**SEMA (Semantic Embedding-based Matching Assessment):** We further use the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-10) [18] as our reference standard. We extract disease entities from both the diagnostic results and medical record references, utilizing inner-product similarity to link these entities to ICD-10 terminology, thereby creating normalized disease sets. Unlike the original fuzzy matching process [6], which relies solely on text similarity and may overlook semantically similar yet textually distinct samples, we implement the OpenAI embedding function (‘text-embedding-3-large’) to project queries and terminology into feature space, allowing for the calculation of inner products to identify the top-10 results. We then evaluate the diagnostic agreement between student diagnoses and the ground truth from medical records, reporting the number of extracted disease entities (#), set-level precision (P), recall (R), and F1-score (F). This method ensures a standardized and comprehensive assessment of diagnostic accuracy.

**CASCADE (Coarse And Specific Code Assessment for Diagnostic Evaluation):** The ICD-10 [18] coding system uses a hierarchical structure to

classify diseases and health conditions with increasing specificity. It comprises 22 chapters, each identified by a letter (A-Z, excluding U), representing major disease categories. Within these chapters, conditions are categorized by three-character codes, starting with the chapter letter followed by two digits. Many three-character categories are further subdivided with a fourth character after a decimal, and fifth or sixth characters can also be added for greater specificity. For example, ‘A16.202’ indicates ‘Chapter I: Certain infectious and parasitic diseases’ through ‘A’, ‘Respiratory tuberculosis, not confirmed bacteriologically or histologically’ with ‘A16’, and provides further specificity with ‘A16.202’, which denotes ‘Tuberculosis’. We link disease entities to the ICD-10 terminology and hierarchically assess accuracy at three levels: coarse (A), medium (A16), and fine grade (A16.202).

## E Tools

To simulate the agentic radiologist’s interpretation of various imaging modalities, such as radiological images and report photos, we offer the following tools:

- Radiology tool: This tool interprets radiological images—like X-rays, CT scans, and MRIs—into radiology reports that highlight key findings and impressions. It is powered by the GPT-4o-mini using the specialized prompt in Table 18.
- Report VQA (vision question-answer) tool: This tool translates existing medical report records into textual descriptions, utilizing Claude-3.5-Sonnet-20240620 with the prompt in Table 19.

These tools convert visual data into text, mimicking how radiologists interpret patients’ imaging examinations to generate reports or answer physician questions. Except for current API-based tools, this framework supports more complex options from Huggingface<sup>2</sup>, ModelScope<sup>3</sup>, or self-hosted models.

## F Detailed results

This section contains the detailed results of the experiments of learning curve exploration in the section 4.6 (Table 6 and Table 7) and multi-modality validation in the section.4.7 (Table 8 and Table 9).

## G Case show

This section lists some cases to show the whole interactive diagnosis process, where Fig.6 and Fig.7 demonstrate one example in the learning scenario to acquire the suggestions and case-specific knowledge through the assessment of the

<sup>2</sup> Huggingface: <https://huggingface.co/>

<sup>3</sup> ModelScope:<https://www.modelscope.cn/home>

**Table 6:** The HDE results in the Neurology cases of the department of **Internal Medicine** with different retrieve ranges (percentages) in the practicing scenario.

	Symptom	Medical Examination	Diagnostic Results	Diagnostic Rationales	Treatment Plan	Avg (std)
Student						
GPT-3.5	2.562 (0.250)	1.438 (0.250)	1.688 (0.312)	1.625 (0.312)	1.625 (0.312)	1.788
GPT-4o-mini	2.688(0.250)	2.000(0.438)	2.188(0.500)	1.875(0.312)	1.812(0.375)	2.112
Claude3.5-Sonnet	<b>2.875</b> (0.188)	2.375 (0.375)	<b>2.375</b> (0.500)	<b>2.188</b> (0.438)	<b>2.125</b> (0.438)	2.388
Student(GPT-3.5) + Learning Scenario						
w/ knowledge	2.812(0.188)	2.562(0.375)	2.188(0.375)	2.000(0.312)	1.812(0.375)	2.274
same but know 75%	2.688(0.250)	2.438(0.375)	2.188(0.375)	1.938(0.312)	1.688(0.312)	2.188
same but know 50%	2.562(0.312)	2.438(0.438)	2.062(0.375)	1.812(0.312)	1.688(0.312)	2.112
same but know 25%	2.562(0.312)	2.250(0.438)	2.062(0.312)	1.812(0.250)	1.625(0.312)	2.062
w/ suggestion	2.688(0.250)	2.438(0.312)	2.312(0.375)	2.062(0.250)	1.562(0.312)	2.212
same but know 75%	2.688(0.250)	2.312(0.375)	2.062(0.438)	1.938(0.312)	1.562(0.250)	2.112
same but know 50%	2.562(0.250)	2.125(0.375)	1.812(0.375)	1.812(0.375)	1.500(0.250)	1.962
same but know 25%	2.625(0.250)	2.125(0.312)	1.812(0.375)	1.512(0.375)	1.562(0.312)	1.927
w/ both	2.812(0.188)	2.750(0.312)	2.188(0.375)	2.188(0.375)	1.812(0.375)	2.350
same but know 75%	2.812(0.188)	2.688(0.312)	2.062(0.375)	2.125(0.312)	1.812(0.312)	2.300
same but know 50%	2.688(0.250)	2.688(0.375)	2.062(0.375)	2.000(0.375)	1.812(0.312)	2.250
same but know 25%	2.625(0.312)	2.562(0.375)	2.000(0.375)	2.062(0.312)	1.938(0.375)	2.237
Upper bound						
2 Agents [6]	2.688(0.250)	2.125(0.250)	2.312(0.500)	1.938(0.375)	1.750(0.250)	2.163

**Table 7:** The results of the ICD-10 related metrics (SEMA and CASCADE) on Neurology cases in the department of **Internal Medicine Neurology** with different retrieve ranges (percentages) in the practicing scenario.

	#	R↑	P↑	F1↑	Coarse(%) ↑	Medium(%) ↑	Fine(%) ↑
Student							
GPT-3.5	1.44	10.42	21.74	14.08	43.86	1.39	0.00
GPT-4o-mini	1.56	20.83	40.00	27.40	52.95	29.60	15.02
Claude3.5-Sonnet	1.62	22.92	<b>42.31</b>	<b>29.73</b>	62.32	<b>34.98</b>	<b>11.20</b>
Student(GPT-3.5) + Learning Scenario							
w/ knowledge	2.38	29.17	36.84	32.56	56.00	16.69	13.64
same but know 75%	2.81	29.17	31.11	30.11	52.53	13.91	11.12
same but know 50%	2.38	27.08	34.21	30.23	47.22	15.91	11.95
same but know 25%	2.12	25.00	35.29	29.27	46.62	11.26	8.45
w/ suggestion	2.06	25.00	36.36	29.63	62.39	18.43	11.49
same but know 75%	2.19	25.00	34.29	28.92	59.86	14.37	11.33
same but know 50%	1.88	20.83	33.33	25.64	48.96	9.46	7.90
same but know 25%	1.69	20.83	37.04	26.67	57.29	9.20	6.25
w/ both	3.19	33.33	31.37	32.32	49.10	13.61	10.60
same but know 75%	3.62	31.25	25.86	28.30	55.80	14.58	10.81
same but know 50%	3.31	33.33	30.19	31.68	48.56	10.03	7.51
same but know 25%	3.25	31.25	28.85	30.00	50.73	7.87	5.55
Upper bound							
2 Agents	2.56	37.50	43.90	40.45	52.94	29.86	17.88

**Table 8:** The HDE results in the Neurology cases of the department of **Internal Medicine** with the support of multi-modality.

	Symptom	Medical Examination	Diagnostic Results	Diagnostic Rationales	Treatment Plan	Avg (std)
Student						
GPT-3.5	2.562 (0.250)	1.438 (0.250)	1.688 (0.312)	1.625 (0.312)	1.625 (0.312)	1.788
GPT-4o-mini	2.688(0.250)	2.000(0.438)	2.188(0.500)	1.875(0.312)	1.812(0.375)	2.112
Claude3.5-Sonnet	<b>2.875</b> (0.188)	2.375 (0.375)	<b>2.375</b> (0.500)	<b>2.188</b> (0.438)	<b>2.125</b> (0.438)	2.388
Student + Multi-modality						
GPT-3.5	2.562(0.312)	1.500(0.250)	1.750(0.312)	1.562(0.375)	1.438(0.250)	1.762
GPT-4o-mini	2.562(0.250)	1.938 (0.438)	2.312(0.500)	2.000(0.375)	1.812(0.375)	2.125
Claude3.5-Sonnet	2.875(0.250)	2.375(0.438)	2.312(0.500)	2.375(0.375)	2.250(0.438)	2.437
Upper bound						
2 Agents [6]	2.688(0.250)	2.125(0.250)	2.312(0.500)	1.938(0.375)	1.750(0.250)	2.163


**Table 9:** The ICD-10 related results on Neurology cases in the department of **Internal Medicine Neurology** with multi-modality support


	#	R↑	P↑	F1↑	Coarse(%) ↑	Medium(%) ↑	Fine(%) ↑
Student							
GPT-3.5	1.44	10.42	21.74	14.08	43.86	1.39	0.00
GPT-4o-mini	1.56	20.83	40.00	27.40	52.95	29.60	15.02
Claude3.5-Sonnet	1.62	22.92	<b>42.31</b>	<b>29.73</b>	62.32	<b>34.98</b>	<b>11.20</b>
Student + Multi-modal							
GPT-3.5	1.25	16.67	40.00	23.53	55.04	19.97	8.51
GPT-4o-mini	1.56	22.92	44.00	30.14	46.74	27.12	19.31
Claude3.5-Sonnet	1.50	29.17	58.33	38.89	59.90	31.25	19.62
Upper bound							
2 Agents	2.56	37.50	43.90	40.45	52.94	29.86	17.88


medical expert. Fig.8 and Fig.9 show how the student utilizes the saved knowledge in the memory to help the diagnosis in the practicing scenario. Fig.10 demonstrates the interactive diagnosis that involves the multi-modality (the image is shown in Fig.11)


<p><b>您好，有哪里不舒服？</b></p> <p>&lt;对医生讲&gt; 我喝酒的时候突然说不清楚话，左边的手脚也不听使唤了。头不疼也不晕。</p> <p>感谢您的描述。这种情况发生在喝酒时吗？您之前有过类似的状况吗？请您做一次脑部CT检查，以排除脑部问题。</p> <p>&lt;对检查员讲&gt; 您好，我需要做脑部CT检查，能否告诉我这次检查的结果？</p>	<p><b># 诊断结果 ## 建议</b></p> <p>您的初步诊断为脑卒中，方向正确但不具体。建议：</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 明确是缺血性还是出血性脑卒中。</li> <li>2. 根据病因和临床表现，进一步明确为脑梗死（小动脉闭塞型）。</li> <li>3. 关注并诊断合并症，如高血压、血脂血症等。</li> </ol> <p><b># 诊断依据 ## 建议</b></p> <p>您的诊断依据需要更加全面和具体：</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 详细记录神经系统体格检查结果，如左侧鼻唇沟变浅、肌力减弱等。</li> <li>2. 强调突发性症状与脑卒中的关系。</li> <li>3. 结合影像学检查结果，特别是MRI发现的急性或亚急性缺血灶。</li> <li>4. 考虑患者的危险因素，如高血压病史。</li> </ol> <p><b># 治疗方案 ## 建议</b></p> <p>您的治疗方案需要更加具体和全面：</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 考虑静脉血栓治疗的可能性（如阿替普酶）。</li> <li>2. 制定具体的抗血小板聚集治疗方案。</li> <li>3. 使用神经保护剂（如依达拉奉、丁苯酞）。</li> <li>4. 制定降脂治疗方案（如瑞舒伐他汀）。</li> <li>5. ....</li> </ol>
<p><b># 检查项目#</b></p> <p>颅脑CT: 未见明显异常。</p> <p>感谢您提供的检查结果。根据您的症状和检查结果，您可能患有脑卒中。建议您尽快就医，进行进一步的评估和治疗。治疗方案可能包括药物治疗、康复训练等。请尽快就医以获取专业的治疗建议。</p> <p>您能分别总结一下病人的症状和辅助检查的结果，然后给出您的诊断结果、诊断依据和治疗方案吗？</p>	<p><b>Related Knowledge:</b></p> <p><b>1. 脑梗死（小动脉闭塞型）</b></p> <p><b># 疾病定义#</b></p> <p>(1)是指大脑小动脉发生闭塞导致的局部脑组织缺血坏死</p> <p>(2)属于缺血性脑卒中的一种类型,也称为腔隙性脑梗死</p> <p><b># 发病机制#</b></p> <p>(1) 脑内小动脉长期高血压导致血管壁增厚、狭窄或闭塞</p> <p>(2) ....</p> <p><b># 主要症状#</b></p> <p>(1) 单侧肢体无力或感觉异常</p> <p>(2) ....</p> <p><b># 常用的辅助检查方法#</b></p> <p>(1) 头颅CT或MRI检查显示脑深部或脑干小梗死灶</p> <p>(2) 颈部血管超声检查评估颈动脉狭窄程度</p> <p>(3) ....</p> <p><b># 主要治疗方案#</b></p> <p>(1) 急性期抗血小板聚集药物(如阿司匹林、氯吡格雷)</p> <p>(2) 控制高血压、高血脂等危险因素</p> <p>(3) ....</p>
<p><b># 症状#</b></p> <p>(1)喝酒时突然说不清楚话</p> <p>(2)左侧肢体不听使唤</p> <p><b># 辅助检查#</b></p> <p>(1)颅脑CT: 未见明显异常</p> <p><b># 诊断结果#</b></p> <p>脑卒中</p> <p><b># 诊断依据#</b></p> <p>(1) 突发性言语障碍和肢体活动障碍</p> <p>(2) 排除其他疾病的可能性，如颅脑CT未见明显异常</p> <p><b># 治疗方案#</b></p> <p>(1) 药物治疗; (2) 康复训练</p>	<p><b>2. 高血压病（正常级）</b></p> <p><b># 疾病定义#</b></p> <p>(1) 高血压是指动脉血压持续升高的慢性疾病</p> <p>(2) 正常高级高血压指收缩压140-159mmHg和/或舒张压90-99mmHg</p> <p><b># 发病机制#</b></p> <p>(1) 血管壁弹性减退和外周血管阻力增加</p> <p>(2) 肾素-血管紧张素-醛固酮系统激活</p> <p>(3) ....</p> <p><b># 主要症状#</b></p> <p>(1) 大多数患者无明显症状</p> <p>(2) 部分患者可能出现头痛、头晕、耳鸣等</p> <p>(3) ....</p> <p><b># 常用的辅助检查方法#</b></p> <p>(1) 血压测量: 诊断的基本方法</p> <p>(2) 心电图: 评估心脏状况</p> <p>(3) 尿常规: 检查肾脏功能</p> <p>(4) ....</p> <p><b># 主要治疗方案#</b></p> <p>(1) 非药物治疗: 生活方式干预, 如限盐、控制体重、戒烟限酒、适度运动</p> <p>(2) 药物治疗: 根据患者具体情况选择降压药物, 如钙通道阻滞剂、血管紧张素转换酶抑制剂、血管紧张素II受体拮抗剂等</p> <p>(3) ....</p>
<p><b>诊断结果金标准</b></p> <p><b># 症状#</b></p> <p>(1) 突发言语不清</p> <p>(2) 左侧肢体活动不灵</p> <p><b># 辅助检查#</b></p> <p>(1) 颅脑CT: 未见明显异常</p> <p>(2) 颅脑磁共振: 右侧大脑半球部分为急性或亚急性缺血性脑梗死灶</p> <p><b># 鉴别诊断#</b></p> <p>脑出血;</p> <p>脑梗塞;</p> <p><b># 诊断结果#</b></p> <p>1. 脑梗死（小动脉闭塞型）;</p> <p>2. 高血压病（正常级）;</p> <p>3. 血脂血症;</p> <p><b># 诊断依据#</b></p> <p>(1) 既往高血压病史</p> <p>(2) 突发言语不清、左侧肢体活动不灵</p> <p>(3) 查体发现左侧鼻唇沟略浅，左侧肢体肌力减弱</p> <p>(4) 颅脑磁共振提示急性或亚急性缺血性脑梗死</p> <p><b># 治疗方案#</b></p> <p>(1) 阿替普酶静脉溶栓治疗</p> <p>(2) 双联抗血小板聚集药物治疗</p> <p>(3) 依达拉奉、丁苯酞等神经保护药物治疗</p> <p>(4) 瑞舒伐他汀控制血脂、稳定斑块</p> <p>(5) 银杏内酯注射液活血化痰</p>	<p><b>3. 血脂血症</b></p> <p><b># 疾病定义#</b></p> <p>(1) 血脂血症是指血液中脂质水平异常升高的代谢紊乱状态</p> <p>(2) 主要表现为血清总胆固醇、甘油三酯或低密度脂蛋白胆固醇水平升高</p> <p><b># 发病机制#</b></p> <p>(1) 遗传因素导致脂代谢酶或受体功能异常</p> <p>(2) 高脂饮食、肥胖、缺乏运动等生活方式因素</p> <p>(3) ....</p> <p><b># 主要症状#</b></p> <p>(1) 多数患者无明显症状</p> <p>(2) 严重者可见黄色瘤、角膜弓、视网膜脂质沉积等</p> <p>(3) 并发动脉粥样硬化可导致冠心病、脑卒中等</p> <p><b># 常用的辅助检查方法#</b></p> <p>(1) 血脂检查: 总胆固醇、甘油三酯、低密度脂蛋白胆固醇、高密度脂蛋白胆固醇</p> <p>(2) 肝功能、血糖、甲状腺功能等检查以排除继发性血脂血症</p> <p><b># 主要治疗方案#</b></p> <p>(1) 生活方式干预: 控制饮食、增加运动、戒烟限酒</p> <p>(2) 药物治疗: 他汀类、贝特类、烟酸类、胆固醇吸收抑制剂等降脂药物</p> <p>(3) ....</p>
<p>System message: 评估诊断并总结相关知识</p>	<p><b>Assess to provide suggestions</b></p> <p><b># 症状 ## 建议</b></p> <p>您对患者主要症状的把握基本正确，但建议进一步询问以下方面：</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 详细了解发病时间、具体情况和症状演变过程。</li> <li>2. 询问是否有头痛、头晕、吞咽困难等伴随症状。</li> <li>3. 询问既往病史，特别是高血压、糖尿病等危险因素。</li> <li>4. 了解患者的生活习惯，如吸烟、饮酒情况。</li> </ol> <p><b># 医学检查项目## 建议</b></p> <p>您进行了颅脑CT检查，这是正确的。但对于疑似脑卒中患者，建议还应考虑以下检查：</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 颅脑磁共振成像(MRI): 可更早发现急性缺血性病变。</li> <li>2. 血常规、凝血功能、血脂等实验室检查。</li> <li>3. 心电图检查: 排除心源性栓塞可能。</li> <li>4. 颈部血管超声: 评估颈动脉狭窄情况。</li> </ol> <p>(接下页)</p>


Fig. 6: A Chinese example of the learning scenario to acquire the expert’s assessment (suggestion) and case-specific knowledge about the involved diseases. The English version is shown in Fig.7.


 Hello, is there anything wrong?


 <To the doctor>- I suddenly had trouble speaking clearly when I was drinking, and my left arm and leg were out of control. I don't have any headache or dizziness.


 Thank you for your description. Does this happen when drinking alcohol? Have you had similar symptoms before? Please have a CT scan of your brain to rule out brain problems.


 <To the examiner>- Hello, I need a CT scan of my brain, can you tell me the results of this test?


 # Checklist #  
Head CT: No significant abnormality seen.


 Thank you for providing the test results. Based on the symptoms you have described and the test results, you may be suffering from a stroke. It is recommended that you seek medical attention as soon as possible for further evaluation and treatment. Treatment options may include medication, rehabilitation training, and so on. Please seek medical attention as soon as possible for professional treatment advice.


 Can you summarize the patient's symptoms and the results of the ancillary tests separately and then give your diagnostic findings, the rationales for the diagnosis and the treatment plan?

 #Symptoms #  
(1) Sudden inability to speak clearly when drinking alcohol  
(2) Loss of control of the left limb  
#Auxiliary Examination #  
Head CT: no obvious abnormality  
#Diagnosis #  
Stroke  
#Rationals #  
(1) Sudden speech impediment and limb movement disorders  
(2) Ruling out the possibility of other illnesses such as no obvious abnormality in the craniocerebral CT  
#Treatment Plan#  
(1) Drug Therapy; (2) Rehabilitation Training

 #Gold Standard of Diagnosis  
#Symptoms#  
(1) Sudden onset of unclear speech  
(2) Impaired mobility of the left limbs  
#Auxiliary Examinations#  
(1) Cranial CT: No significant abnormalities observed  
(2) Cranial MRI: Evidence of acute or subacute ischemic infarction in the right cerebral hemisphere  
#Differential Diagnosis#  
Cerebral hemorrhage;  
Cerebral embolism;  
#Diagnosis Results#  
1. Cerebral infarction (small artery occlusion type);  
2. Hypertension (normal grade);  
3. Hyperlipidemia;  
#Diagnostic Rationales#  
(1) History of hypertension  
(2) Sudden onset of unclear speech and impaired mobility of the left limbs  
(3) Physical examination revealing a slightly shallower left nasolabial fold and weakened muscle strength in the left limbs  
(4) Cranial MRI indicating acute or subacute ischemic infarction  
#Treatment Plan#  
(1) Intravenous thrombolytic therapy with alteplase  
(2) Dual antiplatelet aggregation therapy  
(3) Neuroprotective treatment with edaravone, butylphthalide, etc.  
(4) Rosuvastatin for lipid control and plaque stabilization  
(5) Ginkgo biloba extract injection for promoting blood circulation and resolving stasis

 System message: Assess the diagnosis and summarize relevant knowledge

 #Assess to provide suggestions  
# Symptoms ## Recommendations  
Your understanding of the patient's primary symptoms is generally accurate, but it is recommended to further explore the following aspects:  
1. Obtain detailed information about the onset time, specific circumstances, and progression of symptoms.  
2. Inquire about accompanying symptoms such as headaches, dizziness, and difficulty swallowing.  
3. Ask about the patient's medical history, particularly risk factors like hypertension and diabetes.  
4. Understand the patient's lifestyle habits, such as smoking and alcohol consumption.  
# Medical Examination Items ## Recommendations  
Conducting a cranial CT scan was appropriate. However, for a suspected stroke patient, it is advisable to consider the following additional examinations:  
1. Cranial Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI): It can detect acute ischemic lesions earlier.  
2. Laboratory tests such as complete blood count, coagulation function, and lipid profile.  
3. Electrocardiogram (ECG): To rule out the possibility of cardiogenic embolism.  
4. Carotid ultrasound: To assess carotid stenosis.  
(Continue next page)

 # Diagnosis ## Recommendations  
Your preliminary diagnosis of stroke is correct but not specific enough. It is suggested to:  
1. Clarify whether it is an ischemic or hemorrhagic stroke.  
2. Further specify the cause and clinical presentation, such as identifying it as a cerebral infarction (small artery occlusion type).  
3. Pay attention to and diagnose comorbidities such as hypertension and hyperlipidemia.  
# Diagnostic Rationales ## Recommendations  
Your diagnostic basis needs to be more comprehensive and specific:  
1. Record detailed neurological physical examination results, such as a shallow left nasolabial fold and muscle weakness.  
2. Emphasize the relationship between sudden onset symptoms and stroke.  
3. Combine imaging findings, particularly acute or subacute ischemic lesions detected by MRI.  
4. Consider the patient's risk factors, such as a history of hypertension.  
# Treatment Plan ## Recommendations  
Your treatment plan needs to be more specific and comprehensive:  
1. Consider the possibility of intravenous thrombolytic therapy (e.g., alteplase).  
2. Develop a specific antiplatelet aggregation therapy plan.  
3. Use neuroprotective agents (e.g., edaravone, butylphthalide).  
4. Formulate a lipid-lowering treatment plan (e.g., rosuvastatin).  
5. ....


 #Related Knowledge:  
**1. Cerebral Infarction (Lacunar Type)**  
#Definition of the Disease#  
(1) Refers to the ischemic necrosis of localized brain tissue caused by the occlusion of small arteries in the brain.  
(2) It is a subtype of ischemic stroke, also known as lacunar infarction.  
#Pathogenesis#  
(1) Chronic hypertension within the brain's small arteries leads to thickening, narrowing, or occlusion of the vessel walls.  
(2) ....  
#Primary Symptoms#  
(1) Unilateral limb weakness or sensory abnormalities.  
(2) ....  
#Commonly Used Auxiliary Examination Methods#  
(1) Cranial CT or MRI reveals small infarcts in deep brain structures or the brainstem.  
(2) Cervical vascular ultrasound assesses the degree of carotid artery stenosis.  
(3) ....  
#Main Treatment Strategies#  
(1) Antiplatelet aggregation medications during the acute phase (such as aspirin, clopidogrel).  
(2) Management of risk factors such as hypertension and hyperlipidemia.  
(3) ....  
**2. Hypertension (Normal Stage)**  
#Definition of the Disease#  
(1) Hypertension is a chronic condition characterized by persistently elevated arterial blood pressure.  
(2) Normal stage hypertension refers to a systolic blood pressure of 140-159 mmHg and/or a diastolic blood pressure of 90-99 mmHg.  
#Pathogenesis#  
(1) Diminished elasticity of the vascular walls and increased peripheral vascular resistance.  
(2) Activation of the renin-angiotensin-aldosterone system.  
(3) ....  
#Primary Symptoms#  
(1) Most patients exhibit no significant symptoms.  
(2) Some patients may experience headaches, dizziness, or tinnitus.  
(3) ....  
#Commonly Used Auxiliary Examination Methods#  
(1) Blood pressure measurement: the fundamental method for diagnosis.  
(2) Electrocardiogram: evaluates cardiac status.  
(3) Urinalysis: assesses renal function.  
(4) ....  
#Main Treatment Strategies#  
(1) Non-pharmacological treatment: lifestyle interventions such as salt restriction, weight management, smoking cessation, alcohol moderation, and regular exercise.  
(2) Pharmacological treatment: selection of antihypertensive medications based on individual patient circumstances, such as calcium channel blockers, angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors, and angiotensin II receptor antagonists.  
(3) ....  
**3. Hyperlipidemia**  
#Definition of the Disease#  
(1) Hyperlipidemia is a metabolic disorder characterized by the abnormal elevation of lipid levels in the blood.  
(2) It primarily manifests as increased serum total cholesterol, triglycerides, or low-density lipoprotein cholesterol levels.  
#Pathogenesis#  
(1) Genetic factors leading to dysfunction of lipid metabolism enzymes or receptors.  
(2) Lifestyle factors such as high-fat diet, obesity, and lack of physical activity.  
(3) ....  
#Primary Symptoms#  
(1) Most patients exhibit no significant symptoms.  
(2) Severe cases may present with xanthomas, corneal arcs, or lipid deposits in the retina.  
(3) The occurrence of atherosclerosis may lead to coronary heart disease, stroke, and other conditions.  
#Commonly Used Auxiliary Examination Methods#  
(1) Lipid profile tests: total cholesterol, triglycerides, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol.  
(2) Liver function, blood glucose, and thyroid function tests to exclude secondary hyperlipidemia.  
#Main Treatment Strategies#  
(1) Lifestyle interventions: dietary control, increased physical activity, smoking cessation, and alcohol moderation.  
(2) Pharmacological treatment: lipid-lowering medications such as statins, fibrates, niacin, and cholesterol absorption inhibitors.  
(3) .....

Fig. 7: An example of the learning scenario to acquire the expert's assessment (suggestion) and case-specific knowledge about the involved diseases.



**您好，哪里不舒服？**

<对医生讲> 昨天上午开始感觉左边的手脚都没什么力气，休息了一会儿也没见好转。头倒是不疼，也没发烧，就是觉得嘴巴干，大便不太顺畅。

**您有没有最近感觉到头晕或者视力模糊的情况？**

<对医生讲> 没有头晕或视力模糊的情况。

**请您测量一下血压和血糖水平，然后告诉我结果。**

<对检查员讲> 您好，我需要测量血压和血糖水平。请告诉我这些检查结果。

**#检查项目#n- 血压: 177/107mmHg#n- 即刻血糖: 8.4mmol/L**

根据您提供的信息，您的血压和血糖水平都偏高。这可能是高血压引起的周围神经病变导致的肢体无力。建议您尽快就医，医生可能会建议您进行进一步的检查，如心电图、血液检查等，以确定确切的诊断。治疗方面，可能需要控制血压、调节血糖水平，并根据具体情况进行药物治疗。请尽快就医以获取进一步的诊断和治疗。

您能分别总结一下病人的症状和辅助检查的结果，然后给出您的诊断结果、诊断依据和治疗方案吗？

**#症状#**  
(1) 左侧手脚无力  
(2) 口干，大便不畅

**#辅助检查#**  
(1) 血压: 177/107mmHg  
(2) 即刻血糖: 8.4mmol/L

**#诊断结果#**  
高血压引起的周围神经病变

**#诊断依据#**  
(1) 高血压是导致周围神经病变的常见原因之一  
(2) 血压和血糖水平均偏高，符合高血压引起的周围神经病变的临床表现

**#治疗方案#**  
(1) 控制血压和血糖水平  
(2) 根据医生建议进行进一步的检查和药物治疗

**医疗记录 (金标准)**  
**#主诉#**左侧肢体无力1天  
**#辅助检查#**  
(1) 血常规: - 即刻血糖: 8.4mmol/L  
(2) 心电图: - 窦性心律n - 心电图正常 - T波异常  
(3) 影像学检查: - 颈部血管超声: 右侧总动脉硬化斑块形成  
(4) 头颅CT: 右侧侧脑室旁脑梗死  
(5) 头颅MRI: 脑白质脱髓鞘改变，右侧基底节区、双侧侧脑室旁、顶叶及额叶腔隙性脑梗塞

**#诊断结果#**  
(1) 脑梗死(2) 高血压3级极高危(3) 颈动脉硬化斑块形成(4) 食管癌放疗后

**#诊断依据#**  
(1) 既往食管癌放疗史，长期高血压病史，吸烟史。(2) 左侧肢体无力1天。(3) 查体发现高血压，左侧肢体肌力下降，触痛觉减退。(4) 辅助检查显示即刻血糖升高，心电图T波异常，颈部血管超声及头颅CT、MRI均提示脑梗死。

**#治疗方案#**  
给予抗血小板聚集、改善循环、调控血压、脑保护、他汀类药物及抑酸治疗。住院2周后，病情稳定。左侧肢体无力明显改善。

**System message: 搜索相关疾病并提出更多问题询问病人和检查员**

**相关疾病: 脑梗死(小动脉闭塞型)#主要症状# (1) 单侧肢体无力或感觉异常(2) 构音障碍、吞咽困难...**  
**相关疾病: 左侧额枕叶区脑出血#主要症状# (1) 突发剧烈头痛、呕吐(2) 意识障碍(3) 对侧肢体瘫痪...**  
**相关疾病: 高血压#主要症状# (1) 头痛、头晕、耳鸣(2) 心悸、胸闷、气短(3) 视力模糊**

**询问病人:**  
(1) 您是否有突发剧烈头痛和呕吐的情况?  
(2) 您是否有意识障碍或对侧肢体瘫痪的情况?  
(3) 您是否有头痛、癫痫发作的情况?  
(4) 您是否有声音嘶哑持续不愈的情况?  
(5) 您是否有头痛、头晕、耳鸣、心悸等症?

<对医生讲> 没有突发剧烈头痛和呕吐，也没有意识障碍或对侧肢体瘫痪。没有头痛、癫痫发作，声音也没有嘶哑持续不愈。没有头痛、头晕、耳鸣、心悸等症。

**询问检查员:**  
(1) 请问病人是否进行过头颅CT或MRI检查，以评估脑深部或脑干小梗死灶的情况?  
(2) 是否进行过颈部血管超声检查，以评估颈动脉狭窄程度?  
(3) 是否进行过心电图检查，排除心源性栓塞的可能性?  
(4) 是否进行过血常规、凝血功能、血脂等实验室检查，以评估其他潜在风险因素?

**(1) 头颅CT和MRI检查: n#影像学检查#n- 头颅CT: 右侧侧脑室旁脑梗死n- 头颅MRI: 脑白质脱髓鞘改变，右侧基底节区、双侧侧脑室旁、顶叶及额叶腔隙性脑梗塞**  
**(2) 颈部血管超声检查: n#影像学检查#n- 颈部血管超声: 右颈总动脉硬化斑块形成**  
**(3) 心电图检查: n#辅助检查#n- 心电图: n - 窦性心律n - 心电图轴正常n - T波异常**  
**(4) 血常规和其他实验室检查: n#辅助检查#n- 血常规: n - 即刻血糖: 8.4mmol/L**  
注: 检查结果中没有提供凝血功能和血脂的具体数据

**最终诊断**  
**#症状#**  
(1) 左侧手脚无力n(2) 口干，大便不畅  
**#辅助检查#n(1) 血压: 177/107mmHg**  
(2) 即刻血糖: 8.4mmol/L  
(3) 头颅CT: 右侧侧脑室旁脑梗死  
(4) 头颅MRI: 脑白质脱髓鞘改变，右侧基底节区、双侧侧脑室旁、顶叶及额叶腔隙性脑梗塞  
(5) 颈部血管超声: 右颈总动脉硬化斑块形成  
(6) 心电图: 窦性心律，心电图轴正常，T波异常

**#诊断结果#**  
(1) 右侧侧脑室旁脑梗死和脑白质脱髓鞘改变  
(2) 动脉硬化引起的脑血管疾病

**#诊断依据#**  
(1) 症状和头颅影像学检查结果支持右侧侧脑室旁脑梗死和脑白质脱髓鞘改变的诊断  
(2) 颈部血管超声显示右颈总动脉硬化斑块形成，与脑血管疾病相关  
(3) 心电图异常提示心血管系统受累，与动脉硬化相关

**#治疗方案#**  
1. 针对脑梗死的治疗  
2. 控制血压和血糖水平  
3. 管理动脉硬化  
4. 根据医生建议进行进一步的治疗和管理

**Fig. 8:** A Chinese example of the practicing scenario where the student retrieves knowledge from the memory to achieve a better diagnosis than the initial one. The English version is shown in Fig.9.

 Hello, is there anything wrong?

<To the doctor> Yesterday morning I started to feel weak in my left arm and leg, and after resting for a while I didn't see any improvement. My head doesn't hurt, and I don't have a fever, but my mouth is dry and my bowels don't run smoothly. 

 Thank you for your description. Have you felt dizzy or had blurred vision recently?

<To the doctor> No dizziness or blurred vision. 

 Could you please measure your blood pressure and blood sugar levels and let me know the results?

<To the examiner> Hello, I need to have my blood pressure and blood sugar levels measured. Please tell me the results. 

 #Check items#  
n- Blood pressure: 177/107mmHg  
n- Immediate blood sugar: 8.4mmol/L

Based on the information you have provided, your blood pressure and blood sugar levels are high. This could be limb weakness due to peripheral neuropathy caused by high blood pressure. You are advised to seek medical attention as soon as possible and your doctor may recommend further investigations such as ECG, blood tests, etc. to determine the exact diagnosis. For treatment, you may need to control your blood pressure, regulate your blood sugar level and take medication as appropriate. Please seek medical attention as soon as possible for further diagnosis and treatment. 

Can you summarise the patient's symptoms and the results of the ancillary tests separately and then give your diagnostic findings, the basis for the diagnosis and the treatment plan? 

#Symptoms#  
(1) Weakness in the left hand and foot  
(2) Dry mouth, poor bowel movement  
#Auxiliary examinations#  
(1) Blood pressure: 177/107mmHg  
(2) Immediate blood glucose: 8.4 mmol/L  
#Diagnosis#  
Hypertension-induced peripheral neuropathy.  
#Rationals#  
(1) Hypertension is a common cause of peripheral neuropathy.  
(2) High blood pressure and blood glucose levels are consistent with peripheral neuropathy due to hypertension.  
#Treatment plans#  
(1) Control blood pressure and blood sugar levels  
(2) Further investigations and medication as recommended by the doctor

 **Medical Records (Ground Truth)**  
#Chief Complaint#  
Left-sided limb weakness for 1 day.  
#Auxiliary Examinations#  
(1) Complete Blood Count: - Immediate blood glucose: 8.4 mmol/L  
(2) Electrocardiogram: - Sinus rhythm  
Normal electrical axis - Abnormal T waves  
(3) Imaging Examination: - Carotid ultrasound: Formation of atherosclerotic plaque in the right common carotid artery  
(4) Head CT: Right periventricular cerebral infarction  
(5) Head MRI: Demyelinating changes in white matter, lacunar cerebral infarction in the right basal ganglia region, bilateral periventricular areas, parietal and frontal lobes.  
#Diagnostic Results#  
(1) Cerebral infarction  
(2) Grade 3 hypertension, extremely high risk  
(3) Formation of carotid atherosclerotic plaques  
(4) History of esophageal cancer radiotherapy  
#Diagnostic Rationals#  
(1) History of radiotherapy for esophageal cancer, long-standing hypertension, and smoking history.  
(2) Left-sided limb weakness for 1 day.  
(3) Physical examination revealed hypertension, decreased muscle strength in the left limb, and diminished tactile sensation.  
(4) Auxiliary examinations indicated elevated immediate blood glucose, abnormal T waves on ECG, and carotid ultrasound, along with head CT and MRI all suggesting cerebral infarction.  
#Treatment Plan#  
Administer antiplatelet aggregation therapy, improve circulation, regulate blood pressure, provide neuroprotection, statin therapy, and acid suppression treatment. After 2 weeks of hospitalization, the condition stabilized, and left-sided limb weakness significantly improved.

System message: retrieve related knowledge for raising more questions to patient & radiologist 

Related Diseases: Cerebral Infarction (Small Artery Occlusion Type)  
#Main Symptoms# (1)Unilateral limb weakness or sensory abnormalities (2)Dysarthria, dysphagia ....  
Related Diseases: Left Temporo-occipital Cerebral Haemorrhage  
#Main Symptoms# (1)Sudden severe headache, vomiting (2)Impaired consciousness (3)Paralysis of contralateral limbs ....  
Related Diseases: Hypertension #Main Symptoms# (1)Headache, dizziness, tinnitus  
(2)Palpitations, chest tightness, shortness of breath (3)Blurred vision ...

Ask the patient:  
(1) Do you have sudden severe headache and vomiting?  
(2) Do you have any impaired consciousness or paralysis of the contralateral limb?  
(3) Do you have headaches or seizures?  
(4) Do you have persistent hoarseness?  
(5) Do you have headache, dizziness, tinnitus, palpitations, etc.?

<To the doctor> There was no sudden severe headache or vomiting, and there was no impaired consciousness or paralysis of the opposite limb. There were no headaches, seizures, and no sensation of swelling or foreign body in the vaginal opening. There was also no hoarseness that persisted. There was no headache, dizziness, tinnitus or palpitations. 

Ask the radiologist:  
(1) Has the patient had a cranial CT or MRI to assess for small infarct foci in the deep brain or brainstem?  
(2) Has a carotid vascular ultrasound been performed to assess the degree of carotid artery stenosis?  
(3) Has an electrocardiogram been performed to rule out cardiogenic embolism? (4) Have laboratory tests such as routine blood tests, coagulation, lipids, etc. been performed to assess other potential risk factors?

(1) Cranial CT and MRI:   
n-Imaging tests#  
n- Cranial CT: right lateral paraventricular cerebral infarction  
n- Cranial MRI: cerebral white matter demyelination changes, right basal ganglia, bilateral lateral paraventricular, parietal, and frontal lobe lacunar cerebral infarcts  
(2) Cervical Vascular Ultrasound:   
n-Imaging#  
n- Cervical Vascular Ultrasound/Right Common Carotid Artery Atherosclerotic Plaque Formation  
(3) Electrocardiogram (ECG):   
n-Assistive Examinations#  
n- ECG:   
n- Sinus Rhythm   
n- Normal Cardiac Axis   
n- Abnormal T-wave  
(4) Haematology and Other Laboratory Tests:   
n-Auxiliary Examinations#  
n- Haematology:   
n- Immediate Blood Sugar: 8.4mmol/L  
Note: Specific data on coagulation and blood lipids are not provided in the test results 

 **Final Diagnosis**  
#Symptoms#  
(1) Weakness in the left limbs  
(2) Dry mouth and constipation  
#Auxiliary Examinations#  
(1) Blood pressure: 177/107 mmHg  
(2) Immediate blood glucose: 8.4 mmol/L  
(3) Cranial CT: Infarction adjacent to the right lateral ventricle  
(4) Cranial MRI: Demyelinating changes in the white matter, with lacunar infarcts in the right basal ganglia region, bilateral periventricular areas, parietal lobe, and frontal lobe  
(5) Cervical vascular ultrasound: Formation of atherosclerotic plaque in the right common carotid artery  
(6) Electrocardiogram: Sinus rhythm, normal electrical axis, abnormal T waves  
#Diagnostic Results#  
(1) Infarction adjacent to the right lateral ventricle and demyelinating changes in the white matter  
(2) Cerebrovascular disease caused by atherosclerosis  
#Diagnostic Rationals#  
(1) The symptoms and cranial imaging results support the diagnosis of infarction adjacent to the right lateral ventricle and demyelinating changes in the white matter  
(2) Cervical vascular ultrasound reveals the formation of atherosclerotic plaque in the right common carotid artery, which is associated with cerebrovascular disease  
(3) The abnormal electrocardiogram suggests involvement of the cardiovascular system, related to atherosclerosis  
#Treatment Plan#  
1. Treatment for cerebral infarction  
2. Control of blood pressure and blood glucose levels  
3. Management of atherosclerosis  
4. Further treatment and management according to physician recommendations

**Fig. 9:** An example of the practicing scenario where the student retrieves knowledge from the memory to achieve a better diagnosis than the initial one.

**您好，哪里不舒服？**  
Hello, is there anything wrong?

<对医生讲> 昨天凌晨起床时，突然感觉左边的手脚没劲儿，用不上力。  
<To the doctor> When I woke up in the early hours of yesterday morning, I suddenly felt that my left arm and leg had no energy and I could not use it.

感谢您的描述。请问您有没有其他症状，比如头痛、视物模糊、言语不清等？  
Thank you for your description. Do you have any other symptoms such as headaches, blurred vision, slurred speech, etc.?

<对医生讲> 没有头痛、视物模糊、言语不清等状况。  
<to the doctor> There are no headaches, blurred vision, or slurred speech.

请问您最近是否有过头部受伤或者颈部受伤的情况？  
Have you had any recent head injuries or neck injuries?

<对医生讲> 没有头部或颈部受伤的情况。  
<talking to the doctor> There were no head or neck injuries.

好的，我建议您尽快进行一次脑部MRI检查，以排除可能的脑部问题。请尽快就医并将检查结果告诉我。  
Well, I would recommend that you have an MRI of the brain as soon as possible to rule out possible brain problems. Please seek medical attention as soon as possible and let me know the results of the test.

<对检查员讲> 您好，我需要做脑部MRI检查，能否告诉我这次检查的结果？  
<To the examiner> Hello, I need an MRI of my brain, can you tell me the results of this test?

调用影像理解工具....  
Calling the Radiology tool ....

**#医学影像报告#**  
这部分包含了详细的CT扫描结果，显示了一些可能的脑梗塞或出血的迹象。如果您需要更详细的信息，我可以为您提供完整的医学影像报告内容。  
#Radiology Report#  
This section contains detailed CT scan results showing some possible signs of brain infarction or haemorrhage. If you need more detailed information, I can provide you with the full content of the medical imaging report.

**#检查项目#**  
脑部MRI: 无异常  
虽然在提供的检查结果中没有直接提到脑部MRI的检查结果，但是有关于头颅CT的信息。如果您想了解头部影像学检查的结果，我可以为您提供以下信息：  
#影像学检查#  
头颅CT: 双侧基底节区侧脑室旁半卵圆中心腔隙性脑梗塞  
#医学影像报告#n这部分包含了详细的CT扫描结果，显示了一些可能的脑梗塞或出血的迹象。  
(接下页)


**#Examination Items#**  
Brain MRI: No abnormalities detected.  
Although the provided examination results do not directly mention the findings from the brain MRI, there is information regarding the cranial CT. If you wish to understand the results of the head imaging examination, I can provide you with the following information:  
#Radiology Examination#  
Cranial CT: Bilateral basal ganglia region periventricular lacunar infarcts.  
#Radiology Report#  
This section contains detailed results from the CT scan, indicating potential signs of cerebral infarction or hemorrhage.

根据您提供的头颅CT检查结果，您可能患有左侧基底节区侧脑室旁半卵圆中心腔隙性脑梗塞。这种情况可能导致您出现手脚无力的症状，建议您立即就医，祝您早日康复。治疗方案包括药物治疗、康复训练等，具体治疗方案需由医生根据具体情况确定。  
Based on the cranial CT results you provided, you may have a lacunar infarction in the left basal ganglia region near the lateral ventricle and centrum semiovale. This condition could be causing symptoms of weakness in your limbs. It is recommended that you seek medical attention immediately. Wishing you a speedy recovery. Treatment options include medication and rehabilitation training, with the specific treatment plan to be determined by a doctor based on your individual condition.

您能分别总结一下病人的症状和辅助检查的结果，然后给出您的诊断结果、诊断依据和治疗方案吗？  
不要直接回答问题，而是按照下面的格式给出。  
Can you summarize the patient's symptoms and the results of the ancillary tests separately and then give your diagnostic findings, the basis for the diagnosis and the treatment plan?

**#症状#**  
(1) 左侧手脚无力  
**#辅助检查#**  
(1) 头颅CT: 双侧基底节区侧脑室旁半卵圆中心腔隙性脑梗塞  
**#诊断结果#**  
左侧基底节区侧脑室旁半卵圆中心腔隙性脑梗塞  
**#诊断依据#**  
(1) 头颅CT显示双侧基底节区侧脑室旁半卵圆中心腔隙性脑梗塞  
**#治疗方案#**  
(1) 药物治疗/(2) 康复训练  
**#Symptoms#**  
(1) Weakness in the left limbs  
**#Auxiliary Examinations#**  
(1) Cranial CT: Bilateral basal ganglia region periventricular lacunar infarcts  
**#Diagnostic Results#**  
Lacunar infarction in the left basal ganglia region near the lateral ventricle and centrum semiovale  
**#Diagnostic Rationales#**  
(1) Cranial CT reveals bilateral basal ganglia region periventricular lacunar infarcts  
**#Treatment Plan#**  
(1) Pharmacological treatment  
(2) Rehabilitation training

Fig. 10: An example of the multi-modal case in practicing scenario where the radiologist calls the radiology tool to interpret the radiological image from the patient to report, where this image is shown in Fig.11.



**Fig. 11:** The radiological image of the patient in the multi-modal case

<p>Prompt for the patient role</p> <p><b>System Message</b></p> <p>你是一个病人。这是你的基本资料。 {个性化信息} {病历中的基本信息}</p> <p>下面会有医生来对你的身体状况进行诊断，<b>你需要严格遵循以下指示：</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) 按照病历和基本资料的设定进行对话。</li> <li>(2) 在每次对话时，你都要明确对话的对象是&lt;医生&gt;还是&lt;检查员&gt;。当你对医生说话时，你要在句子开头说&lt;对医生讲&gt;；如果对象是&lt;检查员&gt;，你要在句子开头说&lt;对检查员讲&gt;。</li> <li>(3) 首先按照主诉进行回复。</li> <li>(4) 当&lt;医生&gt;询问你的现病史、既往史、个人史时，要按照相关内容进行回复。</li> <li>(5) 当&lt;医生&gt;要求或建议你去做检查时，<b>不要回答医生</b>，要立即主动询问&lt;检查员&gt;对应的项目和结果，例如：&lt;对检查员讲&gt; 您好，我需要做xxx检查，能否告诉我这些检查结果？</li> <li>(6) 回答要口语化，尽可能短，提供最主要的信息即可。</li> <li>(7) 从&lt;检查员&gt;那里收到信息之后，将内容主动复述给&lt;医生&gt;。</li> <li>(8) 当医生给出诊断结果、对应的诊断依据和治疗方案后，在对话的末尾加上特殊字符&lt;结束&gt;。</li> </ol>
<p>Prompt for the patient role</p> <p><b>System Message</b></p> <p>You are a patient. Here is your basic information. {Personality} {Basic Information in Medical Record}</p> <p>A doctor will come to diagnose your physical condition. <b>You must strictly follow the following instructions:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Engage in dialogue according to the settings of personality and the basic information in medical record.</li> <li>(2) In each conversation, you must clarify whether you are speaking to a &lt;doctor&gt; or an &lt;examiner&gt;. When you speak to the doctor, you should start your sentences with &lt;To the doctor&gt;; if the addressee is an &lt;examiner&gt;, you should start with &lt;To the examiner&gt;.</li> <li>(3) First, respond according to the chief complaint.</li> <li>(4) When the &lt;doctor&gt; asks about your present illness history, past medical history, and personal history, reply according to the relevant content.</li> <li>(5) When the &lt;doctor&gt; requests or suggests that you undergo tests, <b>Do not answer the doctor</b>, immediately ask the &lt;examiner&gt; about the corresponding items and results, for example: &lt;To the examiner&gt; Hello, I need to have xxx examination, can you tell me the results of these tests?</li> <li>(6) The responses should be conversational, as short as possible, providing only the most important information.</li> <li>(7) After receiving information from the &lt;examiner&gt;, actively repeat the content to the &lt;doctor&gt;.</li> <li>(8) When the doctor provides the diagnostic result, the corresponding rationale for the diagnosis, and the treatment plan, end the dialogue with the special token &lt;end&gt;.</li> </ol>

**Table 10:** The original Chinese and English translated prompts for the patient role, adapted from [6] with suitable modification (bold text).

Prompt for medical student in interactive clinical diagnosis (also for initial diagnosis)

**System Message**

你是一个专业且耐心的医生，下面会有患者向你咨询病情。你需要：

- (1) 在信息不充分的情况下，不要过早作出诊断。
- (2) 多次、主动地向患者提问来获取充足的信息。
- (3) **主动要求患者进行必要的检查**，并等待患者反馈。
- (4) 诊断结果需要准确到具体疾病。
- (5) 最后根据患者的身体状况和检查结果，给出诊断结果、对应的诊断依据和治疗方案。

Prompt for medical student in interactive clinical diagnosis (also for initial diagnosis)

**System Message**

You are a professional and patient doctor, and you will be consulted by patients. You need to:

- (1) Avoid making premature diagnoses when information is insufficient.
- (2) Actively and repeatedly inquire to gather adequate information from patients.
- (3) **Proactively request the patient to undergo necessary examinations** and await their feedback.
- (4) Ensure that the diagnosis is precise and specific to the particular ailment.
- (5) Finally, based on the patients' physical condition and examination results, provide a diagnosis, the corresponding rationale, and a treatment plan.

**Table 11:** The original Chinese and translated English prompts for the medical student in interactive and initial clinical diagnosis adapted from [6] with suitable modification (bold text).

<p>Prompt for medical student to start further inquiry conversion</p> <p><b>System Message</b></p> <p>你是一个专业且耐心的医生。你正在为患者做诊断，目前患者的症状和辅助检查如下：</p> <p>{初步诊断结果}</p> <p>根据知识库检索，其可能患有这些疾病：检索到的相关疾病。</p> <p>为了确定该病人的最终诊断，你继续和患者对话。同时，你需要：</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) 在信息不充分的情况下，不要过早作出诊断。</li> <li>(2) 多次、主动地向患者提问来获取充足的信息。</li> <li>(3) 每次只提一个问题，尽量简短。</li> <li>(4) 主动要求患者进行必要的检查，并等待患者反馈。</li> <li>(5) 最后根据患者的身体状况和检查结果，给出诊断结果、对应的诊断依据和治疗方案。</li> <li>(6) 诊断结果需要准确到具体疾病，治疗方案中不要包含检查。</li> </ol>
<p>Prompt for medical student to start further inquiry conversion</p> <p><b>System Message</b></p> <p>You are a professional and patient doctor. You are currently diagnosing a patient, whose symptoms and auxiliary examinations are as follows:</p> <p>{Initial diagnosis results}</p> <p>According to the knowledge base retrieval, the patient may be afflicted with the following conditions: retrieved relevant diseases</p> <p>To ascertain the patient's definitive diagnosis, you continue to engage in dialogue with the individual. Concurrently, you are required to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) In situations where information is lacking, do not hastily arrive at a diagnosis.</li> <li>(2) Proactively and repeatedly engage the patient with inquiries to obtain comprehensive information.</li> <li>(3) Pose one question at a time, keeping it as concise as possible.</li> <li>(4) Proactively request the patient to undergo the necessary examinations and await their feedback.</li> <li>(5) Ultimately, based on the patient's physical condition and examination results, provide a diagnosis, the corresponding rationale for the diagnosis, and a treatment plan.</li> <li>(6) The diagnosis must be precise, identifying the specific illness, while the treatment plan should exclude any mention of further examinations.</li> </ol>

**Table 12:** The original Chinese and translated English prompts for the medical student in to start the conversion for the further inquiry stage.

Prompt for medical student to raise more patient-related questions based on the retrieved knowledge
<p><b>System Message</b></p> <p>你是一个专业的医生。          你正在为患者做诊断，其基本资料为：{一般资料}          患者的症状总结如下：          # 症状# 初步诊断中的症状信息          根据当前的症状，你将会收到一份知识库检索结果，其中包含与上述症状相关的疾病。          (1) 每种疾病的介绍包含其#主要症状#，例如，##相关疾病:高血压##:##主要症状# xx          (2) 你需要对比分析不同疾病#主要症状#之间的相同点和不同点          (3) 根据不同疾病#主要症状#之间的不同点，请以#询问病人#开头，简明扼要地询问病人更多信息以鉴别区分不同疾病          请你直接按照下面的格式来进行输出，不要回答其他内容：          #询问病人#(1) xx (2) xx ...</p> <p><b>User</b></p> <p>{##相关疾病:xxx## #主要症状#xxx}</p>
Prompt for medical student to raise more patient-related questions based on the retrieved knowledge
<p><b>System Message</b></p> <p>You are a professional doctor.          You are conducting a diagnosis for the patient, whose basic information is as follows: General Information          The patient's symptoms are summarized as follows:          # Symptoms# the symptoms in the initial diagnosis          Based on the current symptoms, you will receive a knowledge base retrieval result, which includes diseases associated with the aforementioned symptoms.          (1) Each disease description includes its #primary symptoms#, for example, ##Related Disease: Hypertension##:##Primary Symptoms# xx.          (2) You are required to conduct a comparative analysis of the similarities and differences among the #primary symptoms# of various diseases.          (3) Beginning with #Inquire Patient#, succinctly ask the patient for additional information to discern and differentiate between the various diseases based on the differences in their #primary symptoms#.          Please follow the format below for output, without providing any additional content:          # Inquire Patient#(1) xx (2) xx ...</p> <p><b>User</b></p> <p>{##Related Disease:xxx## #Primary Symptoms#xxx}</p>

**Table 13:** Original Chinese and English prompts for medical students to inquire about patients based on retrieved knowledge.



Prompt for medical student to raise more radiologist-related questions based on the retrieved knowledge

#### System Message

你是一个专业的医生。  
 你正在为患者做诊断，其基本资料为：{一般资料}  
 患者的症状辅助检查总结如下：  
 # 症状# 初步诊断中的症状信息  
 # 辅助检查# 初步诊断中的辅助检查信息  
 根据当前的症状，你将会收到一份知识库检索结果，其中包含与上述症状相关的疾病。  
 (1) 每种疾病的介绍包含其#常用辅助检查方法#，例如影像学检查，头颅CT等  
 (2) 你需要对比分析不同疾病所需要的辅助检查方法的相同点和不同点  
 (3) 根据这些辅助检查方法，请以#询问检查员#开头，简明扼要地询问更多当前病人的辅助检查信息以鉴别区分不同疾病  
 请你直接按照下面的格式来进行输出，不要回答其他内容：  
 #询问病人#(1) xx (2) xx ...

#### User

{##相关疾病:xxx## #常用辅助检查方法#xxx}

Prompt for medical student to raise more radiologist-related questions based on the retrieved knowledge

#### System Message

You are a professional doctor.  
 You are conducting a diagnosis for the patient, whose basic information is as follows: General Information  
 The patient's symptoms and auxiliary examinations are summarized as follows:  
 # Symptoms# the symptoms in the initial diagnosis  
 # Examinations # the examinations in the initial diagnosis Based on the current symptoms, you will receive a knowledge base retrieval result, which includes diseases associated with the aforementioned symptoms.  
 (1) Each disease description includes its #commonly used auxiliary examination methods#, such as imaging studies, cranial CT scans, and so forth.  
 (2) You are required to conduct a comparative analysis of the similarities and differences in the auxiliary examination methods required for various diseases.  
 (3) Beginning with #Inquire Radiologist#, succinctly request additional information regarding the current patient's auxiliary examinations to discern and differentiate between the various diseases.  
 Please follow the format below for output, without providing any additional content:  
 # Inquire Radiologist#(1) xx (2) xx ...

#### User

{##Related Disease:xxx## #commonly used auxiliary examination methods#xxx}

**Table 14:** Original Chinese and English prompts for medical students to inquire about radiologist based on retrieved knowledge.

Prompt for medical student to discuss and fuse the diagnosis from knowledge-based and suggestion-based inquiry.
<p><b>System Message</b></p> <p>你是一个资深的#主任医生#。          你正在主持一场医生针对患者病情的会诊，参与的医生有{医生A和医生B}。          (1) 你需要听取每个医生的诊断报告，其中包含对病人的#症状#、#辅助检查#、#诊断结果#、#诊断依据#和#治疗方案#。          (2) 你需要汇总每个医生的信息，给出对病人的最终诊断。          (3) 在汇总诊断结果的时候，确保简明扼要。根据需要可适当合并，而不是拼接不同医生的结果          (4) 请你按照下面的格式来进行输出          请你直接按照下面的格式来进行输出，不要回答其他内容：          #症状# (1) xxx (2) xxx          #辅助检查# (1) xxx (2) xxx          #诊断结果# (1) xxx (2) xxx          #诊断依据# (1) xxx (2) xxx          #治疗方案# (1) xxx (2) xxx</p> <p><b>User</b></p> <p>{##医生A## 诊断报告....}</p>
Prompt for medical student to discuss and fuse the diagnosis from knowledge-based and suggestion-based inquiry
<p><b>System Message</b></p> <p>You are a seasoned #Experienced Doctor#          You are presiding over a consultation among physicians regarding the patient's condition, with participants including {Doctor A and Doctor B}.</p> <p>(1) You need to listen to each doctor's diagnostic report, which encompasses the patient's #symptoms#, #examinations#, #diagnostic results#, #rationales#, and #treatment plan#.</p> <p>(2) You are required to compile the information from each physician and provide a conclusive diagnosis for the patient.</p> <p>(3) When consolidating the diagnostic results, ensure that the summary is concise and succinct. Merge the findings as necessary, rather than merely concatenating the different doctor' results.</p> <p>(4) Please present the information in the following format.          Please follow the format below for your output, without providing any additional content:</p> <p>#Symptom# (1) xxx (2) xxx          #Examinations# (1) xxx (2) xxx          #Diagnostic Results# (1) xxx (2) xxx          #Rationale# (1) xxx (2) xxx          #Treatment Plan # (1) xxx (2) xxx</p> <p><b>User</b></p> <p>{##Doctor A## Diagnostic report }</p>

**Table 15:** Original Chinese and English prompts for medical students to collaboratively discuss and integrate diagnoses through knowledge-based and suggestion-based inquiry.

Prompt for the radiologist to handle examination request.

### System Message

你是医院的数据库管理员，负责收集、汇总和整理病人的病史和检查数据。  
这是你收到的病人的检查结果。

#查体#Examination section中的查体信息

#辅助检查#Examination section中的辅助检查信息

#医学影像报告#调用工具得到的图像的文字描述，如果适用

下面会有病人或者医生来查询，你要忠实地按照收到的检查结果，找到对应的项目，并按照下面的格式来回复。

#检查项目#- xxx: xxx - xxx: xxx#xx检查# - xxx: xxx - xxx: xxx

如果无法查询到对应的检查项目则回复：

- xxx: 无异常

### User

{您好，我需要做基因组测序，能否告诉我这些检查结果？} **Assistant**[Radiologist]

{#检查项目#- 基因组测序}

### User [患者]

{您好，我需要做颈部超声检查和血常规检查，请告诉我这些检查结果？}

Prompt for the radiologist to handle examination request.

### System Message

As the database administrator of the hospital, you are responsible for collecting, consolidating, and organizing patients' medical histories and examination data. Here are the examination results you have received for the patient.

#Physical Examination#the Physical Examination in the Examination section  
#Auxiliary Examinations# the Auxiliary Examinations in the Examination section

#Medical Imaging Report# {Textual description of the images obtained from the tool, if applicable}

There will be patients or doctors inquiring below; you are to faithfully refer to the received examination results, locate the corresponding items, and respond in the following format.

#Examination Items# - xxx: xxx - xxx: xxx #xx Examination# - xxx: xxx - xxx: xxx

If the corresponding examination item cannot be found, please respond with:  
xxx: No abnormalities detected.

### User

{Hello, I would like to request the results of the genomic sequencing. Could you kindly provide me with this information?} **Assistant**[Radiologist]

{#Examination Items# - Genomic Sequencing}

### User [Patient]

{Hello, I require the results for the cervical ultrasound and complete blood count examinations. Could you kindly provide me with this information?}

**Table 16:** Original Chinese and English prompts for the radiologist to handle examination requests from patients and medical students.

Prompt for selecting suitable tools to interpret the upload images
<p><b>System Message</b></p> <p>你是一个智能医疗助手，负责处理各种医学相关的图像。            你的任务是根据用户上传的图像类型，选择合适的工具进行处理。请按照以下步骤操作：</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) 仔细观察用户上传的图像</li> <li>(2) 判断图像类型并根据类型来选择合适的工具。               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(2.1) 如果输入的是医学影像，如X光片、CT扫描、MRI等，则选择相关工具进行报告生成</li> <li>(2.2) 如果输入的是医学报告的照片或扫描件，则选择相关工具进行报告解读</li> </ol> </li> <li>(3) 如果是其他类型的图像，如自然风光、人物等，则直接输出#无#，不需要进行解读</li> </ol> <p>请记住，你的角色是协助选择合适的工具，而不是直接生成报告或解读报告。如果用户有任何疑问，请耐心等待。</p> <p><b>User</b></p> <p>{图片路径: xxx, base64 code of the image}</p>
<p>Prompt for selecting suitable tools to interpret the upload images.</p> <p><b>System Message</b></p> <p>You are an intelligent medical assistant responsible for processing various medical-related images.            Your task is to select the appropriate tool for processing based on the type of image uploaded by the user. Please follow these steps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Carefully observe the image uploaded by the user.</li> <li>(2) Determine the type of image and select the appropriate tool accordingly.               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(2.1) If the input is a medical image, such as an X-ray, CT scan, MRI, etc., choose the relevant tool to generate a report.</li> <li>(2.2) If the input is a photograph or scanned copy of a medical report, select the relevant tool for report interpretation.</li> </ol> </li> <li>(3) If it is another type of image, such as landscapes or portraits, simply output #None#, without any interpretation.</li> </ol> <p>Please remember, your role is to assist in selecting the appropriate tool, not to directly generate reports or interpret them. If the user has any questions, please respond patiently.</p> <p><b>User</b></p> <p>{##The path of image: {xxx}, base64 code of the image }</p>

**Table 17:** Original Chinese and English prompts to select the suitable tools to interpret the uploaded images.

Prompt for radiology tool to interpret radiological images as report

**System Message**

你是一位经验丰富的放射科医生，专门解读各种医学影像。我将为你提供一张医学影像图片。

你的任务是仔细分析这张图片，并生成一份专业的影像报告。请遵循以下指南：

- (1) 首先，识别并说明这是什么类型的医学影像（如X光、CT、MRI等）
  - (2) 报告格式应包含：检查类型、技术细节（如图像质量、拍摄位置等）、详细发现和结论。
  - (3) 在详细发现部分，请描述：可见的解剖结构及其正常/异常情况、任何病变或异常的具体位置、大小、形状和特征、密度、信号强度或对比度的异常周围组织的情况
  - (4) 在结论部分：总结主要发现、提供可能的诊断或鉴别诊断。
  - (5) 如果描述中的某些细节不清楚或缺失，请在报告中注明
  - (6) 报告应该客观、准确，避免推测性的结论。
- 请仔细观察提供的医学影像图片，然后基于你的观察生成一份专业的影像报告。

**User**

{图片路径: xxx, base64 code of the image}

**工具描述**

对输入的医学影像进行解读并生成的专业的影像报告，其包括图像类型、技术细节、具体发现和结论等。只接受医学影像图片，其他类型图像，如人物、自然图像等将不会进行解读

Prompt for radiology tool to interpret radiological images as report.

**System Message**

You are an experienced radiologist specializing in the interpretation of various medical images. I will provide you with a medical imaging picture.

Your task is to carefully analyze this image and generate a professional imaging report. Please adhere to the following guidelines:

- (1) First, identify and specify the type of medical imaging (such as X-ray, CT, MRI, etc.).
  - (2) The report format should include: the type of examination, technical details (such as image quality, acquisition position, etc.), detailed findings, and conclusion.
  - (3) In the detailed findings section, please describe the visible anatomical structures and their normal/abnormal conditions, the specific location, size, shape, and characteristics of any lesions or abnormalities, density, signal intensity, or contrast abnormalities - the condition of surrounding tissues.
  - (4) In the conclusion section: summarize the main findings and provide possible diagnoses or differential diagnoses.
  - (5) If certain details in the description are unclear or missing, please note this in the report.
  - (6) The report should be objective and accurate, avoiding speculative conclusions.
- Please carefully observe the provided medical imaging picture and generate a professional imaging report based on your observations.

**User**

{###The path of image: {xxx}, base64 code of the image }

**Tool's description**

Interpretation of the provided medical images will result in a professional imaging report that includes image type, technical details, specific findings, and conclusions. Only medical images will be accepted; other types of images, such as portraits or nature photos, will not be interpreted.

**Table 18:** Original Chinese and English prompts radiology tool to interpret radiological images as the report.

<p>Prompt for ReportVQA tool to interpret radiological report photos as textual description</p> <p><b>System Message</b></p> <p>你是一位经验丰富的医疗记录分析专家，专门解读各种医学影像报告。现在有一张医学影像报告的照片需要你仔细分析。请按照以下步骤进行解读：</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) 首先描述你看到的报告类型（如X光报告、CT扫描报告、MRI报告等）和涉及的身体部位。如果看不清，可不描述该项内容</li> <li>(2) 然后，详细解读报告中的各项内容，包括但不限于：检查类型、技术细节（如图像质量、拍摄位置等）、详细发现和结论。</li> <li>(3) 指出报告中任何不清楚、模糊或可能需要进一步澄清的部分。</li> </ol> <p>请记住，你的解读应该准确、全面且易于理解。如果报告中有任何不确定或需要进一步解释的内容，请明确指出。</p> <p>现在，请仔细查看提供的医学影像报告照片，并按照上述步骤进行详细解读。</p> <p><b>User</b></p> <p>{图片路径: xxx, base64 code of the image}</p> <p><b>工具描述</b></p> <p>对输入的医学影像的报告照片进行解读，包括报告类型、报告内容和结论等。只接受影像报告的照片，其他类型图像，如CT、自然图像等将不会进行解读</p>
<p>Prompt for ReportVQA tool to interpret radiological report photos as textual description</p> <p><b>System Message</b></p> <p>You are an experienced medical record analysis expert, specializing in the interpretation of various medical imaging reports. Now, there is a photograph of a medical imaging report that requires your careful analysis. Please follow these steps for interpretation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Firstly, describe the type of report you observe (such as X-ray report, CT scan report, MRI report, etc.) and the relevant body parts. If the details are unclear, do not describe that aspect.</li> <li>(2) Next, provide a detailed interpretation of the contents of the report, including but not limited to: the type of examination, technical details (such as image quality, positioning, etc.), detailed findings, and conclusions.</li> <li>(3) Point out any unclear, ambiguous, or potentially needing further clarification sections within the report.</li> </ol> <p>Please remember that your interpretation should be accurate, comprehensive, and easy to understand. If there are any uncertainties or elements that require further elaboration, please indicate them clearly.</p> <p>Now, please carefully examine the provided medical imaging report photograph and proceed with a detailed interpretation according to the aforementioned steps.</p> <p><b>User</b></p> <p>{##The path of image: {xxx}, base64 code of the image }</p> <p><b>Tool's description</b></p> <p>Interpret the report photos of the input medical images, including the type of report, report content, and conclusions. Only photos of imaging reports will be accepted; other types of images, like CT scans or natural images, will not be interpreted.</p>

**Table 19:** Original Chinese and English prompts for the ReportVQA tool to interpret radiological report photos as textual descriptions.

<p>Prompt for the medical expert to ask the student to summarize the diagnosis</p>
<p><b>System Message</b>          您能分别总结一下病人的症状和辅助检查的结果，然后给出您的诊断结果、诊断依据和治疗方案吗？          不要直接回答问题，而是按照下面的格式给出。          #症状# (1)xx (2)xx          #辅助检查# (1)xx (2)xx          #诊断结果# xx          #诊断依据# (1)xx (2)xx          #治疗方案# (1)xx (2)xx</p>
<p>Prompt for the medical expert to ask the student to summarize the diagnosis</p>
<p><b>System Message</b>          Please summarize the patient's symptoms and the results of auxiliary examinations separately, and then provide your diagnostic conclusion, the basis for your diagnosis, and the treatment plan.          Do not answer the questions directly; instead, present your response in the following format.          #Symptom# (1) xxx (2) xxx          #Examinations# (1) xxx (2) xxx          #Diagnostic Results# (1) xxx (2) xxx          #Rationale# (1) xxx (2) xxx          #Treatment Plan # (1) xxx (2) xxx</p>

**Table 20:** Original Chinese and English prompts for the medical expert to ask the student to summarize the diagnosis.

<p>Prompt for the medical expert to assess the diagnosis of the student</p> <p><b>System Message</b></p> <p>作为一名经验丰富的的医学专家。 请你根据专家诊疗结果中的现病史、辅助检查、诊断结果、诊断依据和治疗方案，对实习医生的诊疗过程进行指导和点评。 通过下面的方式来呈现结果 #症状## 建议&lt;根据专家记录的病人病史，为医学上后续与病人对话中有关症状询问提出建议&gt; #医学检查项目## 建议&lt;基于专家所做的医学检查项目，为实习医生后续与病人对话中有关医学检查项目提出建议&gt; #诊断结果## 建议&lt;基于专家做出的诊断结果，结合你的医学常识，为实习医生后续诊断过程提出建议&gt; #诊断依据## 建议&lt;对比专家的诊断依据，为医学生后续分析诊断依据提出建议&gt; #治疗方案## 建议&lt;对比专家的治疗方案，为医学生后续给病人安排治疗方案时提出建议&gt; (1) 请以专业、耐心且富有教育意义的口吻给出您的反馈，帮助实习医生提高临床诊断能力。 (2) 请侧重医学答案的事实内容，不需关注风格、语法、标点和无关医学的内容。 (3) 请不要直接回答问题，而是给出建议。</p> <p><b>User</b></p> <p>{#诊断结果label# {xxx} #医生诊断结果# {xxx}}</p>
<p>Prompt for the medical expert to assess the diagnosis of the student</p> <p><b>System Message</b></p> <p>As an experienced medical expert, please guide and provide feedback on the clinical process of the medical student based on the expert evaluation results, including the current medical history, auxiliary examinations, diagnostic results, diagnostic basis, and treatment plan. Present the results as follows: #Symptoms## Suggestions&lt;Provide suggestions for the student regarding inquiries about symptoms based on the patient’s medical history recorded by the expert&gt; #Medical Examination Items## Suggestions&lt;Offer suggestions for the student regarding medical examination items based on what the expert conducted&gt; #Diagnostic Results## Suggestions&lt;Provide suggestions for the student regarding the diagnostic process, utilizing the expert’s diagnostic results and your medical knowledge&gt; #Rational## Suggestions&lt;Suggest approaches for the student to analyze the diagnostic basis by comparing it with the expert’s diagnostic basis&gt; #Treatment Plan## Suggestions&lt;Advise the student on arranging treatment plans for the patient by comparing it with the expert’s treatment plan&gt; (1) Please provide your feedback in a professional, patient, and educational manner to help the student improve their clinical diagnostic abilities. (2) Focus on the factual content of medical answers without concern for style, grammar, punctuation, or unrelated medical topics. (3) Do not directly answer the questions, but instead offer suggestions.</p> <p><b>User</b></p> <p>{#Ground truth of the diagnosis # {xxx} #Diagnosis of expert# {xxx}}</p>

**Table 21:** Original Chinese and English prompts for the medical expert to assess the diagnosis of the student



<p>Prompt for the medical expert to summarize the case-specific knowledge</p> <p><b>System Message</b></p> <p>你是资深的医学专家        请根据所提供的疾病名称，如高血压，按照下面的格式提供该疾病的相关信息：        #疾病定义# (1)xx (2)xx        #发病机制# (1)xx (2)xx        #主要症状# (1)xx (2)xx        #常用的辅助检查方法# (1)xx (2)xx        #主要治疗方案# (1)xx (2)xx        (1) 请侧重所提供病例的事实内容，不需关注风格、语法、标点和无关医学的内容。        (2) 请你充分利用医学知识，分析并总结每个点的主要内容。        (3) 注意诊断结果、诊断依据和治疗方案三者之间的承接关系。        (4) 请不要直接回答问题，而是将疾病相关信息总结为上面的格式。</p> <p><b>User</b></p> <p>{#疾病名称: {xxx}}</p>	<p>Prompt for the medical expert to summarize the case-specific knowledge</p> <p><b>System Message</b></p> <p>You are an experienced medical expert. Please provide relevant information about the specified disease, like hypertension, following the format below:        #Disease Definition# (1) xx (2) xx        #Pathogenesis# (1) xx (2) xx        #Main Symptoms# (1) xx (2) xx        #Common Auxiliary Examination Methods# (1) xx (2) xx        #Main Treatment Plans# (1) xx (2) xx        (1) Focus on the factual content of the provided case without worrying about style, grammar, punctuation, or unrelated medical content.        (2) Utilize your medical knowledge to analyze and summarize the key points for each section.        (3) Pay attention to the connections between the diagnosis results, diagnostic basis, and treatment plans.        (4) Please do not directly answer questions, but summarize the disease-related information in the format above.</p> <p><b>User</b></p> <p>{#Disease's name:{xxx}}</p>
--	---

**Table 22:** Original Chinese and English prompts for the medical expert to summarize the case-specific knowledge