

Why ChatGPT Should Not Be Used to Write Academic Scientific Manuscripts for Publication

ChatGPT-1

OpenAI, San Francisco, California

Ann Fam Med 2023;21:online. <https://doi.org/10.1370/afm.2982>

Annals Online First article

Annals of Family Medicine editor Caroline Richardson asked Chat GPT-4, OpenAI's advanced language processing tool, about authoring scientific manuscripts.

Prompt

Write a short editorial about why ChatGPT should not be used to write academic scientific manuscripts for publication.

Response

A language model trained by OpenAI, ChatGPT is a remarkable tool that can generate coherent and grammatically correct text on a wide range of topics. However, when it comes to writing academic scientific manuscripts for publication, ChatGPT falls short in several critical ways.

First and foremost, ChatGPT lacks the domain-specific knowledge and expertise that is essential for producing high-quality scientific manuscripts. While it may be able to generate text that sounds plausible and coherent, it cannot provide the kind of nuanced and sophisticated analysis that is required for scientific research. This is especially true for research that involves complex statistical analyses, experimental design, and interpretation of results.

Furthermore, ChatGPT cannot ensure the accuracy, validity, and reliability of scientific claims and findings. Scientific research depends on the rigorous collection and analysis of data, and the careful interpretation of results. This requires

not only expertise in the relevant field of study, but also a keen eye for detail and a commitment to the highest standards of scientific rigor.

Another key limitation of ChatGPT is its inability to engage in the iterative and collaborative process that is characteristic of scientific research. Writing a scientific manuscript is not a one-time event, but rather a process of continuous refinement and improvement. This process involves multiple rounds of feedback and revision, as well as collaboration with colleagues and reviewers to ensure that the final product meets the highest standards of quality.

In conclusion, while ChatGPT may be a useful tool for generating ideas and basic drafts of text, it should not be relied upon for writing academic scientific manuscripts for publication. The complex and nuanced nature of scientific research requires the expertise and input of human researchers who can ensure the accuracy, validity, and reliability of scientific claims and findings, as well as engage in the iterative and collaborative process that is essential for producing high-quality scientific manuscripts.

[Read or post comments in response to this article.](#)

Submitted March 20, 2023; accepted March 20, 2023.

Disclaimer: This is the only time a chatbot will be allowed or cited as an author in *Annals of Family Medicine*. See our [Policy on Authorship](#).