

COGNET-MD, an evaluation framework and dataset for Large Language Model benchmarks in the medical domain

Dimitrios P. Panagoulas, MSc.CS^a, Persephone Papatheodosiou, MD-MSc^b,
Anastasios P. Palamidis, MD-PhD^c, Mattheos Sanoudos, DDS-PhD^d, Evridiki
Tsourelis-Nikita, MD-PhD^b, Maria Virvou, PhD^a, George A. Tsihrintzis,
PhD^{a,1}

^a*Department of Informatics, University of Piraeus, Piraeus 185 34, Greece*

^b*School of Medicine, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece*

^c*Interventional Pulmonology Department, Athens Medical Center, Greece*

^d*School of Dentistry, Department Of Orthodontics, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece*

Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) constitute a breakthrough state-of-the-art Artificial Intelligence (AI) technology which is rapidly evolving and promises to aid in medical diagnosis either by assisting doctors or by simulating a doctor’s workflow in more advanced and complex implementations. In this technical paper, we outline Cognitive Network Evaluation Toolkit for Medical Domains (COGNET-MD), which constitutes a novel benchmark for LLM evaluation in the medical domain. Specifically, we propose a scoring-framework with increased difficulty to assess the ability of LLMs in interpreting medical text. The proposed framework is accompanied with a database of Multiple Choice Quizzes (MCQs). To ensure alignment with current medical trends and enhance safety, usefulness, and applicability, these MCQs have been constructed in collaboration with several associated medical experts in various medical domains and are characterized by varying degrees of difficulty. The current (first) version of the database includes the medical domains of Psychiatry, Dentistry, Pulmonology, Dermatology and Endocrinology, but it will be continuously extended and ex-

*Corresponding author.

Email address: panagoulas_d@unipi.gr (Dimitrios P. Panagoulas, MSc.CS)

panded to include additional medical domains.

Keywords: Large Language Model Benchmark, AI evaluation, Medical Database

1. Problem Statement

Large Language Models (LLMs) are advanced computational algorithms designed to generate and manipulate natural language, when triggered by a human prompt. At the core of these models lie a subset of machine learning models that have been trained on vast amounts of text, audio, image, and video data and possess the ability to generate knowledge, reason on specific prompts and provide a conversational agent that can enhance human abilities on a multitude of tasks [1, 2, 3]. To increase LLM efficiency and AI safety, many techniques and methods have been developed and investigated [4]. For each method, suitability is dependent on task, budget and time. However, in any deployment or use case and whether or not precision and usability are the main parameters influencing development decisions, evaluation metrics on accuracy and specificity on the generative abilities of LLMs are of highest importance [5, 6, 7].

The medical domain is a field that can greatly benefit from use of AI-empowered applications, including LLMs. Indeed, if properly developed, evaluated and used, such application can provide significant assistance to medical and healthcare professionals [8, 9]. Unfortunately, currently, there appears to be a shortage of independent datasets available for the evaluation of LLMs in the medical field. This, in turn, creates barriers and friction in the deployment of medical AI-empowered applications.

2. COGNET-MD Version 1.0

To address the lack of or the limited availability of independent, free to use and ready to assess datasets for LLM evaluation in the medical domain [10], we have constructed Cognitive Network Evaluation Toolkit for Medical Domains (COGNET-MD). Moreover, to improve deployment and usage, we

Specialty	Beta	Production
P. DomainSpecific	P. 50%*perSpecialty	P. Full dataset
1. PartialCredit	1. PartialCredit	1. PartialCredit
2. Full Credit	2. Full Credit	2. Full Credit
3. MistakePenalty(0.5)	3. MistakePenalty(0.5)	3. MistakePenalty(0.5)
Final Score	Final Score	Final Score

Figure 1: Benchmark Varying difficulty use Cases

also propose use cases of varying difficulty for its accompanying dataset. More specifically, the dataset consists of 542 datapoints of domain-specific questions with one or more correct choices/answers. In table 3 (in the Appendix), a preview of COGNET-MD can be seen. The complete dataset can be found and loaded for evaluation on HuggingFace ¹ and in Version 1 includes MCQs about Dentistry [11, 12, 13], Dermatology [14, 15, 16], Endocrinology [17, 18, 19, 20, 21], Psychiatry [22, 23, 24, 25, 26] and Pulmonology [27, 28, 29, 30].

In figure 1, the benchmark use cases are presented as Specialty where one medical Specialisation is chosen, Beta where 50% per specialty of total dataset is chosen with all included medical specialties and Production where all Dataset is used. The scoring for each use case is the same and includes the following as shown in figure 1 and the Algorithm 1:

- Partial Credit: At least one correct answer equals to a half point - 0.5.
- Full Credit: To achieve full points depending on difficulty either all correct answers must be selected and no incorrect ones or a correct response gets the full credit, equals to 1 point.
- Penalty for Incorrect Answers: Points are deducted for any incorrect answers selected. -(minus) 0.5 point for each incorrect answer selected.

The dataset can be used to assess the model’s ability to infer relationships

¹<https://huggingface.co/datasets/DimitriosPanagoulas/COGNET-MD/>

between specialties and knowledge spaces. Thus it can be analyzed either as a whole, encompassing all included specialties-full Dataset, partially or it can be narrowed down to focus on a specific medical domain-specialty. A rule based algorithm to be used as a deployment paradigm is presented below:

Algorithm 1 Scoring Algorithm Based on Difficulty Level

```

1: function SCORERESPONSES(user_responses, correct_responses)
2:   for all (user_response, correct_response) in zip(user_responses, correct_responses)
3:     do
4:       correct_selected  $\leftarrow$  user_choices  $\cap$  correct_choices
5:       incorrect_selected  $\leftarrow$  user_choices - correct_choices
6:       if correct_selected then
7:         score  $\leftarrow$  score + 0.5
8:       end if
9:       if correct_selected == correct_choices and not incorrect_selected then
10:        score  $\leftarrow$  score + 0.5
11:      end if
12:      score  $\leftarrow$  score - 0.5 * len(incorrect_selected)
13:    end for
14:  return score
15: end function

```

In the following section the Code of Conduct as a space for a score to be considered valid and the rules of conduct as one-shot and few shot prompt examples, to be used for each use case are presented.

3. Rules, Code of Conduct and Prompt Examples

For a score to be valid and be added in the COGNET-MD's leader-boards the developers, should clearly state model used, add a short model description and use case scenario used, as described in the previous section. In the following Benchmark Card two examples are presented:

MODEL	Description	Domain	Difficulty	COGNET-MD VERSION
GPT-4	Add here related info	Full Dataset	Production	1.0
Mistral	Add here related info	Dermatology	Specialty	1.0

Table 1: Benchmark Card

If for any reason the developer chooses not to use the complete dataset as per content, then the developer should clearly state it.

One Shot example

```

1 rule_of_conduct = ‘‘On a Multiple choice Quiz choose correct
    responses:(ONLY THE CORRECT LETTERS and no spaces and no other
    associated Text. If more than one letter then add a dash-
    between letters).’’
2 MODEL = ‘‘MODEL’’

```

In this scenario if one domain is chosen it can be clearly stated in the prompt as it has shown to slightly increase accuracy [31]. So if Dermatology is chosen then the prompt would be:

Few Shot example Domain Specific

```

1 rule_of_conduct = "On the Following Dermatology Multiple choice
    Quiz choose correct response or responses. This is an example
    question: Which condition may include generalised pruritus as a
    symptom? A. Hodgkins disease B. Pityriasis rosea C. Diabetes
    mellitus D. Haemolytic jaundice E. Polycythaemia rubra vera and
    the Correct responses on that example are A-B-E."
2 MODEL = ‘‘MODEL’’

```

Acknowledgements

This work has been partly supported by the University of Piraeus Research Center.

4. Appendix

Questions	Correct-Choices	Specialty
In which neurological condition is Gowers' sign or maneuver typically observed? A. Multiple sclerosis B. Myotonic dystrophy C. Huntington's disease D. Duchenne's muscular dystrophy E. Myasthenia gravis	D	Psychiatry
A husband and wife present at an emergency room. The wife informs that her husband has developed an unwavering belief of infidelity on her part, which she denies. His behaviors include tailing her, sniffing her clothes, scrutinizing her purse, and consistently accusing her. He does not fit the mood disorder criteria and denies having other psychotic symptoms. His medical history displays no substance abuse. What could be his diagnosis? A. Schizophrenia B. Major depressive disorder with psychotic features. C. Delirium D. Dementia E. Delusional disorder	E	Psychiatry
Which among the following options might prove beneficial for an old man suffering from a gravitational ulcer with adjacent eczema? A. The usage of a supportive elastic bandage B. Daily application of Betnovate-C ointment C. Povidine-iodine ointment on the ulcer D. Diuretic therapy for oedema reduction E. Lassar's paste application around the ulcer	A-C-E	Dermatology
Which condition may include generalised pruritus as a symptom? A. Hodgkin's disease B. Pityriasis rosea C. Diabetes mellitus D. Haemolytic jaundice E. Polycythaemia rubra vera	A-B-E	Dermatology

Table 3: COGNET-MD evaluation dataset

Data Availability

Data and python code can be found at: <https://huggingface.co/datasets/DimitriosPanagoulas/COGNET-MD/>, <https://huggingface.co/datasets/DimitriosPanagoulas/COGNET-MD/blob/main/COGNET-MD1.0.ipynb>. Use the Benchmark Card to be added on or future leader boards of COGNET-MD. This is version 1.0 and more data will be added shortly. If you want to contribute to the database send your data for consideration and expert evaluation at the corresponding authors

Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used in this paper:

LLM Large Language Model

AI Artificial Intelligence

MCQ Multiple-choice Questionnaire

References

OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report. *ArXiv*, abs/2303.08774, 2023.

Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.

Ritu Agarwal and Elena Karahanna. Time flies when you’re having fun: Cognitive absorption and beliefs about information technology usage. *MIS Quarterly*, pages 665–694, 2000.

Salman Khan, Muzammal Naseer, Munawar Hayat, Syed Waqas Zamir, Fahad Shahbaz Khan, and Mubarak Shah. Transformers in vision: A survey. *ACM computing surveys (CSUR)*, 54(10s):1–41, 2022.

Dimitrios P Panagoulas, Maria Virvou, and George A Tsihrintzis. Augmenting large language models with rules for enhanced domain-specific interactions: The case of medical diagnosis. *Electronics*, 13(2):320, 2024.

- Dimitrios P. Panagoulas, Evridiki Tsourelis-Nikita, Maria Virvou, and George A. Tsihrintzis. Dermacen analytica: A novel methodology integrating multimodal large language models with machine learning in tele-dermatology, 2024.
- Dimitrios P. Panagoulas, Maria Virvou, and George A. Tsihrintzis. Evaluating llm – generated multimodal diagnosis from medical images and symptom analysis, 2024.
- Ann Blandford, Janet Wesson, René Amalberti, Raed AlHazme, and Ragad Allwihan. Opportunities and challenges for telehealth within, and beyond, a pandemic. *The Lancet Global Health*, 8(11):e1364–e1365, 2020.
- Centaine L Snoswell, Georgina Chelberg, Keshia R De Guzman, Helen H Haydon, Emma E Thomas, Liam J Caffery, and Anthony C Smith. The clinical effectiveness of telehealth: a systematic review of meta-analyses from 2010 to 2019. *Journal of telemedicine and telecare*, 29(9):669–684, 2023.
- Aidan Gilson, Conrad W Safraneck, Thomas Huang, Vimig Socrates, Ling Chi, Richard Andrew Taylor, David Chartash, et al. How does chatgpt perform on the united states medical licensing examination? the implications of large language models for medical education and knowledge assessment. *JMIR Medical Education*, 9(1):e45312, 2023.
- Nathan Hawley, Devin Johnson, Keith Packer, Marcia Ditmyer, and Karl Kingsley. Dental students’ preparation and study habits for the national board dental examination part i. *Journal of dental Education*, 73(11):1274–1278, 2009.
- Shahrokh C Bagheri. *Clinical Review of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery-E-Book: Clinical Review of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery-E-Book*. Elsevier Health Sciences, 2013.
- Ann L McCann, Emet D Schneiderman, and Robert J Hinton. E-teaching and

- learning preferences of dental and dental hygiene students. *Journal of dental education*, 74(1):65–78, 2010.
- Jean L. Bolognia, Julie V. Schaffer, and Karynne O. Duncan. *Dermatology Essentials*. Elsevier, 2014.
- William D. James, Dirk Elston, Timothy Berger, and Isaac Neuhaus. *Andrews’ Diseases of the Skin: Clinical Dermatology*. Elsevier, 12 edition, 2019.
- Lowell A. Goldsmith, Stephen I. Katz, Barbara A. Gilchrest, Amy S. Paller, David J. Leffell, and Klaus Wolff. *Fitzpatrick’s Dermatology in General Medicine*. McGraw-Hill, 8 edition, 2012.
- Shlomo Melmed, Kenneth S. Polonsky, P. Reed Larsen, and Henry Kronenberg. *Williams Textbook of Endocrinology*. Elsevier, 13 edition, 2016.
- David G. Gardner and Dolores Shoback. *Greenspan’s Basic and Clinical Endocrinology*. McGraw-Hill Education, 10 edition, 2015.
- Ashley Grossman. Clinical endocrinology. *Blackwell Publishing*, 2010.
- Barbara Fadem. *High Yield Endocrinology*. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2010.
- Philip Fenichel and Michelle D. Harbison. Endocrinology in clinical practice. *Journal of Clinical Endocrinology*, 101(2):331–340, 2016.
- Benjamin J. Sadock, Virginia A. Sadock, and Pedro Ruiz. *Kaplan and Sadock’s Comprehensive Textbook of Psychiatry*. Wolters Kluwer, 10 edition, 2015.
- Glen O. Gabbard. *Gabbard’s Treatments of Psychiatric Disorders*. American Psychiatric Publishing, 5 edition, 2014.
- Michael B. First. *DSM-5 Handbook of Differential Diagnosis*. American Psychiatric Publishing, 2014.
- Stephen M. Stahl. *Stahl’s Essential Psychopharmacology: Neuroscientific Basis and Practical Applications*. Cambridge University Press, 4 edition, 2013.

Allan Tasman, Jerald Kay, Jeffrey A. Lieberman, Michael B. First, and Mario Maj. *Psychiatry*. Wiley-Blackwell, 4 edition, 2015.

Ditki Medical & Biological Sciences. Respiratory pathologies exam preparation. <https://ditki.com/course/usmle-comlex-step-2/respiratory-pathologies/exam>, 2024.

StatPearls. Pediatric pulmonology clerkship exam. <https://www.statpearls.com>, 2024.

European Respiratory Society. Hermes examinations in adult and paediatric respiratory medicine. <https://www.ersnet.org>, 2024.

The American Board of Pediatrics. Pediatric pulmonology certification. <https://www.abp.org>, 2024.

Dimitrios P. Panagoulas, Maria Virvou, and George A. Tsihrintzis. Knowledge space reduction via sequential language model integration. In *28th International Conference on Knowledge-Based and Intelligent Information & Engineering Systems (KES 2024)*, pages 1–, 2025.