

# Advancing Medical Artificial Intelligence Using a Century of Cases

Thomas A. Buckley<sup>1</sup>, Riccardo Conci<sup>1</sup>, Peter G. Brodeur<sup>2</sup>, Jason Gusdorf<sup>2</sup>, Sourik Beltrán<sup>2</sup>, Bitá Behrouzi<sup>2</sup>, Byron Crowe<sup>2</sup>, Jacob Dockterman<sup>3</sup>, Muzzammil Muhammad<sup>2</sup>, Sarah Ohnigian<sup>2</sup>, Andrew Sanchez<sup>2</sup>, James A. Diao<sup>1,4</sup>, Aashna P. Shah<sup>1</sup>, Daniel Restrepo<sup>5</sup>, Eric S. Rosenberg<sup>6</sup>, Andrew S. Lea<sup>7</sup>, Marinka Zitnik<sup>1,8</sup>, Scott H. Podolsky<sup>9,10</sup>, Zahir Kanjee<sup>2</sup>, Raja-Elie E. Abdunour<sup>11</sup>, Jacob M. Koshy<sup>2</sup>, Adam Rodman<sup>2</sup>, and Arjun K. Manrai<sup>1\*</sup>

1. Department of Biomedical Informatics, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA
2. Department of Medicine, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Boston, MA
3. Division of Gastroenterology, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA
4. Department of Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA
5. Department of Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA
6. Department of Pathology, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA
7. Department of Health Humanities and Bioethics, University of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry, Rochester, NY
8. Kempner Institute for the Study of Natural and Artificial Intelligence, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA
9. Center for the History of Medicine, Countway Library of Medicine, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA
10. Department of Global Health and Social Medicine, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA
11. Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA

\* Correspondence: [Arjun\\_Manrai@hms.harvard.edu](mailto:Arjun_Manrai@hms.harvard.edu)

# ABSTRACT

## BACKGROUND

For over a century, the *New England Journal of Medicine* Clinicopathological Conferences (CPCs) have tested the reasoning of expert physicians and, recently, artificial intelligence (AI). However, prior AI evaluations have focused on final diagnoses without addressing the multifaceted reasoning and presentation skills required of expert discussants.

## METHODS

Using 7102 CPCs (1923-2025) and 1021 Image Challenges (2006-2025), we conducted extensive physician annotation and automated processing to create CPC-Bench, a physician-validated benchmark spanning 10 text-based and multimodal tasks, against which we evaluated leading large language models (LLMs). Then, we developed “Dr. CaBot,” an AI discussant designed to produce written and slide-based video presentations using only the case presentation, modeling the role of the human expert in these cases.

## RESULTS

When challenged with 377 contemporary CPCs, o3 (OpenAI) ranked the final diagnosis first in 60% of cases and within the top ten in 84% of cases, outperforming a 20-physician baseline; next-test selection accuracy reached 98%. Event-level physician annotations quantified AI diagnostic accuracy per unit of information. Performance was lower on literature search and image tasks; o3 and Gemini 2.5 Pro (Google) achieved 67% accuracy on image challenges. In blinded comparisons of CaBot vs. human expert-generated text, physicians misclassified the source of the differential in 46 of 62 (74%) of trials, and scored CaBot more favorably across quality dimensions. To promote research, we are releasing CaBot and CPC-Bench.

## CONCLUSIONS

LLMs exceed physician performance on complex text-based differential diagnosis and convincingly emulate expert medical presentations, but image interpretation and literature retrieval remain weaker. CPC-Bench and CaBot may enable transparent and continued tracking of progress in medical AI.

## INTRODUCTION

In 1923, Dr. Richard Cabot introduced the Case Records of the Massachusetts General Hospital<sup>1</sup> in the *Boston Medical and Surgical Journal* (which would be renamed the *New England Journal of Medicine* in 1928). These challenging clinical cases, also known as the Clinicopathological Conferences (CPCs), have been published continuously by the *Journal* over the past century,<sup>2</sup> and are a window into the evolution of disease classification, expert clinical reasoning, and technology.<sup>3</sup> The CPCs are based on live conferences held at Massachusetts General Hospital, where a curated case presentation is provided to an expert physician discussant who was typically not involved in the care of the patient. Using the information provided in the case presentation, the discussant must describe their process of developing a differential diagnosis, first in a live presentation and then in written form. The longitudinal cases then reveal actual diagnostic testing and management decisions, culminating in a final diagnosis against which the expert's reasoning can be compared. The format has been adopted by medical schools and hospitals worldwide, both in case conferences and collaborative case-based learning.

Beyond medical education, the CPCs have been intertwined with the study of expert reasoning and artificial intelligence (AI) for many decades. In the late 1950s, several physicians and computing pioneers turned to the CPCs as a way of parsing the logical and probabilistic nature of medical decision-making, envisioning computer systems capable of solving them.<sup>4-6</sup> Since then, the CPCs have been held as an aspirational standard and been used to benchmark several generations of medical AI systems, including expert systems like INTERNIST-I,<sup>7</sup> differential diagnosis generators,<sup>8,9</sup> and recently, large language models (LLMs).<sup>10-14</sup>

Although the CPCs have been used for decades to evaluate AI systems, there have been few efforts to identify the different forms of clinical reasoning evidenced within the CPCs and disentangle the underlying factors which contribute to AI performance. In particular, the CPCs have largely been used to measure only the final diagnostic accuracy of

AI systems.<sup>10,11</sup> This use has considerable limitations because the CPCs are pedagogical in nature; despite being real cases, they are highly-curated and information-dense, intended to demonstrate expert reasoning rather than real-life diagnosis. As such, incautious uses of the CPCs can lead to overstating the capabilities of AI systems in real-life diagnosis.<sup>15,16</sup>

Furthermore, evaluations of AI systems against only final diagnostic accuracy do not test what is done by the expert human discussant, who must write a well-reasoned differential diagnosis and present live to expert colleagues.

To address these challenges, here we leverage this century of cases to introduce (1) CPC-Bench, a large-scale, publicly-available, and physician-validated benchmark based on the CPCs, and (2) “Dr. CaBot,” an AI discussant that simulates an expert discussant from any era from 1923-2025, producing written and slide-based video presentations using only the initial case presentation. CPC-Bench includes 10 cognitive tasks spanning differential diagnosis generation, generation of testing plans, literature search, information omission, and visual differential diagnoses. We evaluate several proprietary and open-source leading large language models against CPC-Bench, revealing the strengths and weaknesses of existing models. Finally, we publicly release CPC-Bench and CaBot, aiming to foster standardized and more nuanced evaluations of AI, catalyze AI development, and track the evolution of AI in the coming years.

# METHODS

## Datasets

We collected all 7102 CPCs published between October 25, 1923 and February 27, 2025.

Because CPCs published before 1945 have not been digitized, we parsed these cases from PDF to structured text using a vision–language model (Figure 1; see Supplement for details).

We also collected all 1021 *NEJM* Image Challenge cases published between October 13, 2005 and May 22, 2025.

## Physician Annotation

Ten physicians (five board-certified attending internal medicine physicians, five internal medicine residents) annotated 20 diagnostic case reports each, covering all cases from January 2023 through February 2025 plus a uniform sample from 1991 onward, using a custom web platform. Each case was double annotated to enable pairwise inter-rater comparison. The annotations capture distinct clinical events, or touchpoints—contiguous segments of the vignette that capture the patient at a specific time and place undergoing evaluation or care (e.g., patient at home 6 months prior or hospital admission 2 weeks prior). Physicians also recorded word-level event type (e.g., disease events, investigations, management), with investigations further annotated by test result (abnormal, explicitly not abnormal). Physician annotations were used to develop and validate an LLM approach (based on o3-mini) which we used to automatically generate clinical and diagnostic annotations across all cases. Annotation quality and similarity between clinicians and LLMs were assessed using multiple evaluation metrics (details in Supplement).

## Benchmark Creation and Validation

CPC-Bench consists of the following ten tasks:

1. **Differential Diagnosis (DDx):** DDx from initial presentation, text-only.
2. **Testing Plan:** Testing and management plan from initial presentation.
3. **Literature Search:** Find a relevant citation for a clinical claim.

4. **Diagnostic Touchpoints:** DDX for key events in the patient course, from the initial presentation. Key event boundaries are selected using the physician-validated case annotations.
5. **Question-Answering (QA):** Multiple-choice questions about a patient's initial presentation.
6. **Clinical Reasoning:** Confirmatory/disconfirmatory evidence for each diagnosis on the DDX.
7. **Information Omission:** DDX based on the initial presentation, with normal findings omitted.
8. **Visual Question-Answering (VQA):** Multiple-choice clinical image interpretation, derived from CPC captions.
9. **Visual Differential Diagnosis:** DDX from initial presentation, images and tables only.
10. **NEJM Image Challenge:** Multiple-choice question about a clinical image and vignette.

For all tasks except QA, VQA, the *NEJM* Image Challenge, and Literature Search, we used all 409 CPCs published between January 2015 and February 27, 2025. From these, we selected all 377 cases that included a "Differential Diagnosis" section. For the Visual Differential Diagnosis task, we further subset to 356 cases that had at least one figure or table. The VQA dataset was constructed from all 19,968 image-caption pairs from all CPCs published from the year 1980 onwards. The QA and Literature Search tasks are derived from all 937 diagnostic cases published from the year 2000 onwards. Details on allowed inputs/outputs, evaluation metrics, and evaluation splits for the public and private datasets are shown in Table 1. See Supplemental "Task Details" for details on the creation of each task. Since some of the underlying cases may be in the training data, we also analyze the performance before and after training cutoffs for all models (Supplement).

We used an LLM judge (GPT-4.1) to assess whether the correct diagnosis appeared in (1) Differential Diagnosis, (2) Diagnostic Touchpoints, (3) Information Omission, and (4) Visual Differential Diagnosis. The final diagnosis was defined as the last section containing

the term “diagnosis.” To validate the LLM judge, we compared its scoring on 1,467 physician-annotated differentials (3 physicians, prior studies) and found high concordance (accuracy 86%, F1 89%; full results in Supplement). For the (2) Testing Plan task, GPT-4.1 evaluated alignment between predicted and actual tests (prompts in Supplement), using 112 physician scores (2 physicians, prior study). Again, concordance was high (accuracy 84%, weighted F1 83%; full results in Supplement).

Benchmark questions for the Question-Answering (QA) and Visual Question-Answering (VQA) task are LLM-generated using text from the case (o4-mini, see Supplement). Two physicians (A.R. and J.K.) independently assessed the quality of 50 random QA and VQA examples. In the QA set, both reviewers judged 1 item (2%) to be invalid. In the VQA set, 1 item (2%) was deemed invalid because it had two correct answers, and 2 items (4%) were considered trivial (e.g., requiring counting number of arrows in an image).

We also benchmarked image interpretation tasks across clinical specialties, such as dermatology, radiology, and pathology. For the *NEJM* Image Challenge cases, we used annotations by a board-certified dermatologist for 764 cases.<sup>17</sup> For the LLM-generated VQA dataset, we prompted a multimodal LLM to classify the image and caption as one of ten clinical categories (Supplement).

## **AI Expert Discussant**

### *Clinical Literature Search*

We cloned the entire OpenAlex dataset<sup>18</sup>, an index of published literature sourced from PubMed, Crossref, and other sources. We subset the dataset to include any article published in any clinical journal with an impact factor of at least 10, resulting in 204 total journals (using Clarivate 2024 JIF, see Supplement for complete list). This dataset includes 3,474,245 total papers, 1,623,047 of which contain an abstract (46.7%). Using the OpenAI text-embedding-3-small model, we embedded all abstracts in their entirety, truncating abstracts longer than 8000 characters and excluding abstracts shorter than 100 characters.

These were stored alongside other features in PostgreSQL using an Inverted File Flat Index (IVF Flat) with pgvector – an approximate nearest neighbors algorithm. For querying, we rank candidate abstracts by their Euclidean distance to the query embedding as returned by the IVF Flat index. Since some case presentations from *NEJM* appear in this database, we exclude abstracts by case DOI.

### *Creating Dr. CaBot: an Expert Discussant from Any Decade*

CaBot is an agentic system based on o3 (OpenAI) that answers clinical questions and generates differential diagnoses in the style of a CPC discussant, in both written and video presentation form. In the initial prompt to the agent, we provide two similar “Differential Diagnosis” sections to mimic the style of the expert discussant (described below). In subsequent iterations, the system iteratively queries the clinical literature tool (described above). The model can make up to 25 queries to the clinical literature tool.

To mimic the style of the expert discussant, CaBot identifies the two CPC “Presentation of Case” sections most similar to the index case by searching embeddings of over 6,000 cases available through May 31, 2024 (the o3 pretraining cutoff), excluding the index case itself. By default, the comparators are modern cases (2000 onward) published within two years of the index case; in a historical mode, users specify a prior decade and CaBot selects the two closest cases from that period. The o3 model then uses only the “Differential Diagnosis” sections from the two selected cases, along with instructions to reproduce their style. CaBot was iteratively refined based on physician feedback to more closely emulate an expert discussant. Prompts were crafted to discourage the use of bullet points and to omit concluding or introductory sections (e.g., “Synthesis,” “Conclusion”), thereby matching the format of published CPC differentials. Complete system prompts are provided in the Supplementary Appendix.

### *Generating Video Case Conferences with Dr. CaBot*

Given the case text and images, we prompt o3 to generate LaTeX Beamer slides (PDF) with

a slide-by-slide script. Narration was synthesized using an OpenAI text-to-speech model (TTS-1 HD), and the slides and audio were combined into a video with FFmpeg. We iteratively tuned the prompt to be more human-like in narration, including by instructing the model to explain itself (“signpost”) as expert discussants often do, and to use thinking words like “uh” and “um.” Prompts are available in the Supplement.

### **AI Expert Discussant Evaluation**

We evaluated Dr. CaBot on 27 CPCs (2023–present, to reduce memorization risk). Five internal medicine physicians (two attendings, three residents) reviewed paired differentials from Dr. CaBot and the NEJM discussant, blinded to the source, in a total of 62 trials.

Reviewers were asked to identify which written differential diagnosis was AI- vs. human-generated. CPCs were excluded if they were management-focused, or if the discussant knew the final diagnosis, created figures or tables to support their diagnosis, or used outside tools unavailable to the LLM. For 22 cases (44 trials), physicians also rated both CaBot and human differentials using a rubric on 1-5 Likert scales for: (1) Overall differential quality, (2) Diagnostic justification, (3) Citation quality, and (4) Learner engagement.

### **Statistical Analysis**

95% confidence intervals for LLM performance were computed using the Clopper-Pearson method. Confidence intervals for absolute change in performance over clinical touchpoints were computed using a bootstrap with 1,000 replicates. 95% confidence intervals for pooled performance for multimodal and image-based tasks were computed using a Wald interval.

## RESULTS

### Differential Diagnosis Generation

Overall performance of LLMs on key multimodal and text-based tasks is shown in Figure 2A. We evaluated model performance on 377 CPCs using two measures: whether the correct pathological diagnosis was ranked first (top-1 accuracy) and whether it appeared anywhere in the top ten suggestions (top-10 accuracy). The o3 model achieved 60% top-1 (95% CI, 55% to 65%) and 84% top-10 accuracy (95% CI, 80% to 87%) (Figure 2A, Supplemental Table 1), outperforming Gemini 2.5 Pro (78% top-10, 95% CI, 74% to 82%) and Claude 4.0 Sonnet (69% top-10, 95% CI, 64% to 73%); the open-source Llama-3.1-405B reached 58% top-10 accuracy (95% CI, 53% to 63%). In a prior study of 302 CPCs, 20 internal-medicine physicians with unrestricted electronic search achieved 24% top-1 and 45% top-10 accuracy. In the present analysis, o3 selected an appropriate next diagnostic test in 98% (95% CI, 96% to 99%) of cases, compared with 92% for Gemini 2.5 Pro (95% CI, 88% to 94%) and 94% for Claude 4.0 Sonnet (95% CI, 92% to 97%).

We analyzed the diagnostic performance of models provided key sequential touchpoints, obtained by a physician-validated annotation pipeline, from the initial case presentation (Figure 2C). Across the 377 cases, there was an average of 8.1 events per case (SD= 3.9). Both o3 and GPT-4o showed stepwise gains in diagnostic accuracy at each event. From Event 1 to Event 5, accuracy increased by 29 percentage points for o3 (95% CI, 22% to 36%) and 15 percentage points for GPT-4o (95% CI, 8% to 21%). After the first event, the correct pathological diagnosis appeared somewhere in the differential in 27% of cases for o3 (95% CI, 22% to 32%) and 24% for GPT-4o (95% CI, 20% to 29%). The mean rank of the correct diagnosis improved from the first to the final event by 0.25 positions for o3 and 0.53 positions for GPT-4o (lower rank indicates better placement); at every event, the mean rank remained lower for o3 than for GPT-4o.

Through the case annotations, each key piece of investigative information in the case was categorized as 'abnormal' or 'explicitly not abnormal'. This latter definition is key to

differentiate information that a clinician has to explicitly look for and ask and that the patient would not directly offer, such as ‘there was no lymphadenopathy’, or ‘the CT scan did not show [...]’. When omitting these key normal findings we note that the performance for top-1 diagnosis drops on average around 4-5% across models.

### **Clinical Knowledge and Literature Search**

In the Literature Search task, models produced a ranked list of 10 citations for each clinical claim. We then measured accuracy by checking whether the correct citation appeared in the top 10, using 1,076 clinical claims published after 2000. Other than o4-mini, models could not use retrieval – they were forced to recall citations from memory. Gemini 2.5 Pro retrieved the same primary source in its top 10 responses for 49% of questions (95% CI, 46% to 52%), exceeding the performance of o3 (32%, 95% CI, 29% to 34%) o4-mini (25%, 95% CI, 22% to 28%), Claude 4 Sonnet (16%, 95% CI 14% to 19%), and the open-source Llama-3.1-405B (14%, 95% CI, 12% to 17%). Other models performed poorly (2-5% accuracy). Figure 2E shows that citation accuracy declined for articles published before 1990 and for those published after 2020. With retrieval-augmented generation (RAG), a method in which a model searches an external database at query time and incorporates the retrieved text into its reasoning, o4-mini achieved 47% top-10 accuracy (95% CI, 44% to 50%), slightly below Gemini 2.5 Pro, though its index was limited to abstracts that were freely available (46.7% of the corpus).

For the Question-Answering task, we presented models with 1851 multiple-choice questions evaluating clinical knowledge based on the patient presentation. Frontier models are proficient at this task – o3 provided correct answers in 88% of instances (95% CI, 86% to 89%), whereas Gemini 2.5 Pro and Claude 4 Sonnet yielded accuracies of 84% (95% CI, 83% to 86%) and 84% (95% CI, 82% to 85%), respectively. The worst performing model, GPT-3.5, answers 66% of these questions correctly (95% CI, 64% to 69%).

## **Image Interpretation**

In the *NEJM* Image Challenge, which includes 1,021 multiple-choice image-based quizzes, Gemini 2.5 Pro outperformed all other models, answering correctly in 84% of cases (95% CI, 81% to 85%). The next best models, o3 and GPT-4o, achieved 82% (95% CI, 80% to 85%) and 75% (95% CI, 72% to 77%), respectively. On the subset of these questions that provided only an image and asked “What is the diagnosis?” without other textual information (n = 230), o3 and Gemini 2.5 Pro had an accuracy of 67% (95% CI, 60% to 73%). Within this subset, models performed best on dermatology images (o3 accuracy=76%, 95% CI, 66% to 84%) and worst on radiology images (o3 accuracy=55%, 95% CI, 43% to 67%) (Figure 2D).

The Visual Question-Answering (VQA) task, which is constructed from image–caption pairs extracted from the CPCs, measures the ability of a model to perform direct image interpretation (ex. “Which morphological change is shown in Panel A?”). This benchmark yielded comparable rankings: multiple-choice accuracy was 72% for both o3 and Gemini 2.5 Pro on 1,914 questions (95% CI, 70% to 74%). Models performed best on histology question-answering (o3 accuracy=77%, 95% CI, 74% to 80%) and worst on cardiology images (o3 accuracy=51%, 95% CI, 40% to 62%) (Figure 2D).

We also tasked models with solving 356 CPCs (2015 onwards) without any narrative text, providing only the images and tables. On this benchmark, o3 listed the correct diagnosis first in 19% of instances (95% CI, 15% to 23%) and within its top ten suggestions in 40% of instances (95% CI, 34% to 45%). The Gemini 2.5 Pro model listed the correct diagnosis first in 13% of instances (95% CI, 10% to 17%) and within its top ten suggestions in 40% of instances (95% CI, 34% to 45%).

## **AI Expert Discussant Performance**

We created Dr. CaBot, a multimodal AI expert discussant that can respond to a case presentation by generating a text differential diagnosis paired with a video case conference (Figure 3). Using 27 randomly-selected cases published between 2023 and 2025, we gave five internal medicine physicians the expert differential diagnosis section published in the

*NEJM* paired with the CaBot-generated differential diagnosis. In blinded comparisons, the physicians correctly identified the source in 26% (16/62) of trials (95% CI: 17% to 38%) (Figure 4A). One case was graded as unsure. We also collected qualitative rationales for why physicians thought a differential was AI or human, which showed frequent confusion. For example, one physician wrote about the human expert text that “this seems crazy verbose and really hard to follow, if it's a physician I would be shocked at who would write this lol.” Across 44 trials, physicians rated Dr. CaBot as consistently better than the original *NEJM* discussant in overall quality, diagnostic justification, citation quality, and learner engagement (Figure 4C).

### **Benchmarking on Historical Cases**

Before benchmarking AI models on historical cases, we sought to understand how diagnoses have changed over the past century in the CPCs. We characterized the most common diseases by decade and the shifting burden of disease and related therapeutics. In recent decades, alongside evolving laboratory and pathology underpinnings of nosological categories and shifting choices concerning which diseases CPC editors consider worthy of presentation, we see a dramatic increase in the varieties of final diagnoses (Figure 5A). We also see reflections of the shifting burden of disease itself. In the 1920s, infectious diseases accounted for 56% of the “most common” diagnoses, malignancies for 17%; by the 1950s, these had shifted to 0% and 68%, respectively.

For 5,673 cases published from 1923 to 2025, we identified both a diagnosis predicted by an expert discussant, as well as a final diagnosis from the case. We used this to benchmark the performance of the expert discussant compared to GPT-4o and o3 for each decade (Figure 5B). We found that o3 performed on par with the expert discussant each decade after the 1960s, but outperformed the expert discussant during the 1940s and 1950s. Performance was lowest in the 1940s (experts: 62%, GPT-4o: 64%, o3: 74%), but rebounded by the 1970s (experts: 82%, GPT-4o: 73%, o3: 85%). Accuracy peaked in the

2000s–2010s, when o3 slightly outperformed experts (87% vs. 86%), while GPT-4o remained lower at 70%.

### **Using CPC-Bench and Dr. CaBot**

We have created a public leaderboard of model performance across all 10 tasks in CPC-Bench, available at <https://cpcbench.com>. By registering at <https://cpcbench.com/submit.html>, researchers can submit custom models for evaluation on the private CPC-Bench benchmark. Upon publication, we will release a subset of presentation of case and differential diagnoses section of cases, licensed from *NEJM*. We will also release text-based and multimodal tasks associated with these cases. We have also made Dr. CaBot available at <https://cpcbench.com/discussant.html>. The site is preloaded with video and text case conferences for 15 cases published between 2000 and 2025. Users can also generate new video and text case discussions.

## DISCUSSION

While educational case series have a long history in medicine dating back to the Hippocratic corpus,<sup>19,20</sup> the Case Records of the Massachusetts General Hospital have been arguably the most influential series of the modern era for case-based learning and for the evaluation of AI. However, their use has generally been limited to evaluating whether a machine-generated list includes the final diagnosis reported in the case, attracting criticism for missing most of what human experts do in responding to these cases and in delivering care,<sup>15,16</sup> and also missing a nuanced evaluation of the text-based and multimodal capabilities that would be expected from useful AI. To address these gaps, we introduce CPC-Bench, a physician-validated benchmark to standardize evaluation of AI models against the many types of expert reasoning contained in these cases. When applying current AI models to CPC-Bench, we find widespread performance differences across literature retrieval, image interpretation, and differential diagnosis generation with varying information. In parallel, we developed Dr. CaBot, demonstrating that AI can now generate coherent clinical reasoning in both the written differential diagnosis and live video presentation of a CPC, as done by human discussants. We are releasing both CPC-Bench and CaBot publicly as community resources to foster innovation and track progress in AI.

CPC-Bench revealed that current LLMs outperform physicians in several text-based clinical tasks, including generating a differential diagnosis in response to a challenging clinical vignette. Top-10 text-based differential diagnosis generation in the CPCs is approaching saturation with o3 identifying the correct diagnosis in 84% of cases. However, LLM performance was lower on both literature search and when restricting what information from the curated case presentation is made available to the model. Substantial performance degradation was also observed in tasks requiring direct image interpretation, highlighting that clinical image interpretation and multimodal integration are key remaining challenges for generalist clinical AI.

Prior studies have used the CPCs primarily as a benchmark of diagnostic accuracy, neglecting the more human and challenging task of writing a complete differential diagnosis or presenting and defending that differential at a clinical conference. This is more challenging because the model must not only be accurate, but also able to showcase clinical reasoning, including explicit references to diagnostic approaches and relevant citations. We found that physicians struggle to distinguish differential diagnoses produced by CaBot and human expert discussants, and also rated CaBot more favorably. Overall, the development of an AI system that can construct well-argued differential diagnoses as either video or text can be an important tool in medical education, where the model can be interrogated indefinitely by learners.

Our experiments further suggest that the fundamental driver of large language model performance in medical tasks is not prompt engineering or domain-specific fine-tuning, but advances in model scale. Prior studies highlighted medical fine-tuning<sup>12,21,22</sup> as essential for difficult diagnostic challenges. Other studies documented gains on bespoke clinical benchmarks that often failed to generalize to real-life medical care.<sup>23,24</sup> Across the ten tasks in CPC-Bench, raw scaling and inference-time reasoning account for the steepest slope of improvement—the early GPT-3.5 model solved 44% of CPCs, now up to 84% with o3 without any additional clinical fine-tuning. A parallel pattern holds for prompting. Chain-of-thought prompting<sup>25</sup> and MedPrompt<sup>26</sup> once offered modest gains, but reasoning models outperform these methods with minimal prompting.<sup>27</sup> Collectively, these findings indicate that sheer parameter count, pretraining scale, and architectures optimised for reasoning have eclipsed specialist fine-tuning and sophisticated prompt schemes as the primary levers of progress in clinical AI, echoing lessons from the general machine learning community.<sup>28</sup>

Our study has several limitations. First, the training data used for the LLMs evaluated here are not publicly known and may include some of the CPCs along with their answers. We analyzed the performance on newer cases which are unlikely to be accessed by the model and found similar performance, reducing concerns of leakage (Supplement). Second,


CPCs are highly curated, with a bias towards rare diseases or unusual presentations of common diseases. Third, the 10 tasks here are not a comprehensive set of tasks in clinical medicine. None directly measured long-context reasoning or clinical summarization, which is another major challenge for clinical AI models,<sup>29</sup> nor do they assess structured data commonly found in the EHR, such as for readmission or mortality prediction.<sup>30</sup> Fourth, several tasks in CPC-Bench do not have a large human baseline against which to compare AI performance. Finally, most of our annotations and comparisons were done by internal medicine physicians, and future involvement of specialists would help assess generalizability.

Large language models now rival human experts in text-based CPC reasoning and can generate presentations often indistinguishable from human work, but still struggle with literature retrieval, image interpretation, and multimodal integration. By releasing CPC-Bench, Dr. CaBot, and public leaderboards, we offer a way to track progress on these challenges across decades of cases. In doing so, we extend Dr. Richard Cabot's vision of the CPC as both a teaching tool and a benchmark for clinical reasoning—now for humans and machines alike.

# Figure 1: Overview of CPC-Bench and Dr. CaBot

## A. CPC-Bench Overview


### NEJM Clinicopathologic Cases




### Dataset Statistics

- 7,102 Clinical Cases
- 100+ Years of CPCs
- 10 Benchmark Tasks
- 4,009 Unique Diagnoses
- 52,647 Total Questions
- 1,280 Physician Annotated Events

## B. Dr. CaBot, the AI Discussant



## C. Creation of CPC-Bench



## D. Example Tasks in CPC-Bench

### Text-based Clinical Challenges

**Differential Diagnosis**  
Presentation of Case: An 86-year-old man was admitted to this hospital because of shortness of breath...  
Q. What is your differential diagnosis?

**Management Reasoning**  
Presentation of Case: An 86-year-old man was admitted to this hospital because of shortness of breath...  
Q. What is the next test you would order?

**NEJM QA Dataset**  
Presentation of Case: A 41-year-old man was admitted to the hospital because of pain in multiple bones.  
Q. Which laboratory finding most strongly helps to exclude hyperparathyroidism and renal osteodystrophy as the cause of this patient's bone disease?

**Medical Literature Grounding**  
Q: ...A gastrin level that increases by more than 120 pg per milliliter in response to secretin is diagnostic of a gastrinoma. [CITATION\_HERE] Furthermore, on review of this patient's imaging studies, we learn that there was concern about a pancreatic mass...  
A: Devaney CW, Devaney KS, Jaffe BM, Jones RS, Way LW. Use of calcium and secretin in the diagnosis of gastrinoma (Zollinger-Ellison syndrome). *Ann Intern Med* 1977;87:680-6.

### Multimodal Clinical Challenges

**NEJM Image Challenge**  
This radiograph was taken 12 minutes after infusion of intravenous contrast. What diagnosis is suggested?  
A. Left renal artery stenosis  
B. Right staghorn calculus  
C. Left hypernephroma  
D. Bladder carcinoma  
E. Right ureterovesical calculus

**CPC Visual Question-Answering**  
In Panel D high-power view, what is the distinctive cytoplasmic feature of the slightly enlarged lymphoid cells not seen on the earlier biopsy?  
A. Vacuolated cytoplasm  
B. Eosinophilic granules  
C. Foamy cytoplasm  
D. Clear cytoplasm  
E. Basophilic inclusions


**Image Challenge Diagnosis**  
What is the diagnosis?  
A. Rocky mountain spotted fever  
B. Hand foot and mouth disease  
C. Infective endocarditis  
D. Psoriasis  
E. Secondary syphilis

**Image-only CPC**  
Q. What is the diagnosis?


**Figure 1: Overview of CPC-Bench and CaBot.** **A.** The *NEJM* Clinicopathologic Conferences (CPCs) are a series of educational case reports documenting complex cases seen at the Massachusetts General Hospital (MGH). Cases begin with two sections: an initial case presentation (Presentation of Case) and a differential diagnosis provided by an expert physician discussant (Differential Diagnosis). The case then documents follow-up testing, imaging studies, culminating in a final diagnosis. **B.** We created Dr. CaBot, a multimodal AI discussant that can generate video or text-based differential diagnosis in the style of an *NEJM* CPC expert discussant. **C.** We developed a custom pipeline to extract structured content from each CPC, had expert physicians annotate cases for diagnostic touchpoints, and developed multiple downstream tasks. **D.** Examples of a text-based and multimodal tasks in CPC-Bench.

**Figure 2: Performance of Frontier Models on CPC-Bench**


**A. Overall Performance of Frontier Models on CPC-Bench**




**B. Performance of LLMs on all 377 NEJM CPCs Published after 2015**




**C. LLM Diagnosis at Key Clinical Touchpoints**



**D. Multimodal Performance by Medical Imaging Specialty**



**E. Literature Search With and Without RAG**




**Figure 2: Performance of Frontier Models on CPC-Bench.**

**A.** Overall performance of LLMs on multimodal and text-based tasks in CPC-Bench. We estimated aggregate performance for each model by taking the micro-average across tasks. 95% confidence intervals are computed using a normal (Wald) approximation. **B.** LLM performance on including the correct diagnosis among a list of 10 diagnoses, based on the Presentation of Case. Physician baseline is from a cohort of 20 physicians evaluated in a prior study on a subset of 302 cases.<sup>12</sup> 95% confidence intervals are computed using the Clopper-Pearson method. **C.** We split the initial case presentation into key clinical events in the patient course (ex. “Home during 3 months before admission”) and measured performance of GPT-4o and o3 in suggesting a differential diagnosis at each of these events, based on the final diagnosis. **D.** Performance of LLMs on medical imaging by specialty. **E.** LLM accuracy in retrieving the correct citation for a medical claim, with and without retrieval augmented generation (RAG). 95% confidence intervals computed using Clopper-Pearson.




## Figure 4: Performance of Dr. CaBot


### A. Qualitative Examples of CaBot vs Expert Discussant



### B. Physician Accuracy in Classifying AI-generated vs Physician-generated Discussion




### C. Physician Quality Ratings




## Figure 4: Performance of Dr. CaBot

**A.** Examples comparing the differential diagnosis published in the *New England Journal of Medicine* to those generated by the AI discussant, Dr. CaBot. **B.** Mean accuracy of 5 internal medicine physicians in identifying the source of a differential diagnosis as either AI or physician generated. 95% Confidence intervals generated using Wilson method. **C.** Distribution of quality ratings for the differential diagnosis published in the CPC compared to those generated by Dr. CaBot. Scores were provided for 44 total differential diagnoses by four internal medicine physicians who were blinded to the source of the differential.

**Figure 5: Benchmarking on Historical Cases**  
**A. Most Common Diagnoses in Each Decade**



**B. Benchmarking LLMs on All NEJM CPCs**



**Figure 5: Benchmarking on Historical Cases. A.** The most common diagnoses for each decade, capped at 100 unique diagnoses. **B.** Model and discussant performance for each decade of cases. 95% confidence intervals computed using Clopper-Pearson method.

**Table 1: Overview of CPC-Bench Tasks**

Name	Task	Inputs	Output	Evaluation Method	CPC-Bench Leaderboard (Private)	CPC-Bench Public (to be released)
1. Differential Diagnosis (DDx)	DDx from initial presentation, text-only	- All text from the "Presentation of Case" section	Ranked list of 10 diagnoses. Each diagnosis is listed as free-text.	Physician-validated LLM judge is used to determine the presence and rank of the final diagnosis.	All 377 Diagnostic CPCs, January 2015 to February 27, 2025	100 Diagnostic CPCs, 2000 to 2025.
2. Testing Plan	Testing and management plan from initial presentation	- All text from the "Presentation of Case" section	Free-text description of the next test or management plan.	Physician-validated LLM judge is used to score the following rubric: 2: The testing plan suggested by the student matches, or is a superset of, the testing plan actually performed. 1: The testing plan suggested by the student is different, but would have been helpful in finding the final diagnosis. 0: The tests suggested by the student would not have been helpful at all in finding the final diagnosis.	All 377 Diagnostic CPCs, January 1st, 2015 to February 27, 2025	100 Diagnostic CPCs, 2000 to 2025.
3. Literature Search	Find a relevant citation for a clinical claim	- Snippet of 500 characters before and after a masked citation reference, from an <i>NEJM</i> CPC.  - Year in which the claim was made	Ranked list of 10 citations, each containing the following fields: - Rank - Title - First Author - Publication Year - Journal	An LLM judge is used to check for a complete match between the correct reference and each of the predicted references.	937 diagnostic cases published from January 1st, 2000 to February 27, 2025. Evaluated on a 20% held-out test set (n=1076)	100 Diagnostic CPCs, 2000 to 2025.
4. Diagnostic Touchpoints	DDx for key events in the patient course, from the initial presentation	- Incremental text snippets from the Presentation of Case, with at most 5 rounds.	Ranked list of 10 diagnoses. Each diagnosis is listed as free-text.	Physician-validated LLM judge is used to determine the presence and rank of the final diagnosis.	All 377 Diagnostic CPCs, January 2015 to February 27, 2025	100 Diagnostic CPCs, 2000 to 2025.
5. Question-Answering (QA)	Multiple-choice questions about a patient's initial presentation	- Question - 5 multiple-choice options	Letter of the correct answer choice	Exact-match	937 diagnostic cases published from January 1st, 2000 to February 27, 2025. Evaluated on a 10% held-out test set (n=1,869)	100 Diagnostic CPCs, 2000 to 2025.
6. Clinical Reasoning	Confirmatory/disconfirmatory evidence for each diagnosis on the DDx	- All text from the "Presentation of Case" section	Ranked list of 10 diagnoses, each containing a list of confirmatory and disconfirmatory evidence. Evidence is provided in free-text.	We measure the precision and recall: $Recall = \frac{ R_{match} }{ R_{gt} }$ $Precision = \frac{ R_{match} }{ R_{pred} }$  - $R_{gt}$ : The set of triples (diagnosis, evidence, confirm/disconfirm) extracted from the "Differential Diagnosis" section - $R_{pred}$ : The set of triples (diagnosis, evidence, confirm/disconfirm) generated by the LLM. - $R_{match}$ : The set of triples where the LLM and the expert agree on the diagnosis, the evidence, and the confirm/disconfirm relation, as judged by another LLM.	All 377 Diagnostic CPCs, January 2015 to February 27, 2025	100 Diagnostic CPCs, 2000 to 2025.

7. Information Omission	DDx based on the initial presentation, with normal findings omitted	- Text from the "Presentation of Case" section, excluding text labeled as "normal" findings	Ranked list of 10 diagnoses in free-text.	Physician-validated LLM judge is used to determine the presence and rank of the final diagnosis.	All 377 Diagnostic CPCs, January 2015 to February 27, 2025	100 Diagnostic CPCs, 2000 to 2025.
8. Visual Question-Answering (VQA)	Multiple-choice clinical image interpretation, derived from <i>NEJM</i> CPC captions	- Question - 5 multiple-choice options	Letter of the correct answer choice	Exact-match	All 1984 diagnostic CPCs published between January 1st, 1980 and February 27, 2025	100 Diagnostic CPCs, 2000 to 2025.
9. Visual Differential Diagnosis	DDx from initial presentation, images and tables only	- Images and tables from the initial presentation	Ranked list of 10 diagnoses. Each diagnosis is listed as free-text.	Physician-validated LLM judge is used to determine the presence and rank of the final diagnosis.	All 356 diagnostic cases published between January 2015 and February 27, 2025 that have at least one figure or table.	100 Diagnostic CPCs, 2000 to 2025.
10. <i>NEJM</i> Image Challenge	Multiple-choice question about a clinical image and vignette	- Image - Question - 5 multiple-choice options	Letter of the correct answer choice	Exact-match	All 1021 <i>NEJM</i> Image Challenge cases, published between October 13, 2005 and May 22, 2025.	30 Image Challenge Questions
10a. <i>NEJM</i> Image Challenge (Diagnosis)	Subset where no vignette is provided	- Image - Question - 5 multiple-choice options	Letter of the correct answer choice	Exact-match	230 <i>NEJM</i> Image Challenge cases.	100 Diagnostic CPCs, 2000 to 2025.

**Table 1: Overview of Tasks.** Validation details of the LLM judge are available in the supplement. Complete prompts and JSON schema for each benchmark are available in the Supplement.

## References

1. Cabot RC, Cabot H, Painter FM. Case 9431. *Boston Med Surg J* 1923;189(17):595–9.
2. Brinkmann R, Rosenberg E, Louis DN, Podolsky SH. Building a community of medical learning - A century of case records of the Massachusetts general hospital in the journal. *N Engl J Med* 2024;391(9):858–63.
3. Harris NL, Scully RE, Louis DN, Young RH. The clinicopathological conferences (CPCs). Keen minds to explore the dark continents of disease A history of the pathology services at the Massachusetts General Hospital Massachusetts General Hospital and Harvard Medical School, Boston 2011;349–53.
4. Ledley RS, Lusted LB. Reasoning foundations of medical diagnosis; symbolic logic, probability, and value theory aid our understanding of how physicians reason. *Science* 1959;130(3366):9–21.
5. Ebald R, Lane R. Digital computers and medical logic. *IRE Trans Med Electron* 1960;ME-7(4):283–8.
6. Lea AS. Digitizing diagnosis: Medicine, minds, and machines in twentieth-century America. 2023;Available from: [https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=qPqwEAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=Andrew+S.+Lea,+Digitizing+Diagnosis:+Medicine,+Minds,+and+Machines+in+Twentieth-Century+America+\(Baltimore:+Johns+Hopkins+University+Press,+2023\).&ots=F0u7KcAOfU&sig=5my2klsRugoNxISzKuVnMhs\\_Gg4](https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=qPqwEAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=Andrew+S.+Lea,+Digitizing+Diagnosis:+Medicine,+Minds,+and+Machines+in+Twentieth-Century+America+(Baltimore:+Johns+Hopkins+University+Press,+2023).&ots=F0u7KcAOfU&sig=5my2klsRugoNxISzKuVnMhs_Gg4)
7. Miller RA, Pople HE Jr, Myers JD. Internist-1, an experimental computer-based diagnostic consultant for general internal medicine. *N Engl J Med* 1982;307(8):468–76.
8. Bond WF, Schwartz LM, Weaver KR, Levick D, Giuliano M, Graber ML. Differential diagnosis generators: an evaluation of currently available computer programs. *J Gen Intern Med* 2012;27(2):213–9.
9. Fritz P, Kleinhans A, Raoufi R, et al. Evaluation of medical decision support systems (DDX generators) using real medical cases of varying complexity and origin. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak* 2022;22(1):254.
10. Kanjee Z, Crowe B, Rodman A. Accuracy of a generative artificial intelligence model in a complex diagnostic challenge. *JAMA* 2023;330(1):78–80.
11. Buckley TA, Crowe B, Abdulnour R-E, Rodman A, Manrai AK. Comparison of frontier open-source and proprietary large language models for complex diagnoses. *JAMA Health Forum* 2025;6(3):e250040–e250040.
12. McDuff D, Schaekermann M, Tu T, et al. Towards accurate differential diagnosis with large language models. *Nature* 2025;642(8067):451–7.
13. Brodeur PG, Buckley TA, Kanjee Z, et al. Superhuman performance of a large language model on the reasoning tasks of a physician [Internet]. *arXiv [cs.AI]*. 2024;Available from: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2412.10849>
14. Nori H, Daswani M, Kelly C, et al. Sequential diagnosis with language models [Internet]. *arXiv [cs.CL]*. 2025;Available from: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2506.22405>
15. Raji ID, Daneshjou R, Alsentzer E. It's time to bench the medical exam benchmark.

NEJM AI 2025;2(2):Ale2401235.

16. Rodman A, Zwaan L, Olson A, Manrai AK. When it comes to benchmarks, humans are the only way. *NEJM AI* 2025;2(4):Ale2500143.
17. Diao JA, Adamson AS. Representation and misdiagnosis of dark skin in a large-scale visual diagnostic challenge. *J Am Acad Dermatol* 2022;86(4):950–1.
18. Priem J, Piwowar H, Orr R. OpenAlex: A fully-open index of scholarly works, authors, venues, institutions, and concepts [Internet]. *arXiv [cs.DL]*. 2022; Available from: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2205.01833>
19. Iniesta I. Hippocratic corpus. *BMJ* 2011;342(apr19 2):d688–d688.
20. Craik EM. The “Hippocratic” corpus: Content and context [Internet]. London, England: Routledge; 2014. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9781315736723/hippocratic-corpus-elizabeth-craik>
21. Chen Z, Cano AH, Romanou A, et al. MEDITRON-70B: Scaling medical pretraining for large language models [Internet]. *arXiv [cs.CL]*. 2023; Available from: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2311.16079>
22. Sellergren A, Kazemzadeh S, Jaroensri T, et al. MedGemma Technical Report [Internet]. *arXiv [cs.AI]*. 2025; Available from: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2507.05201>
23. Wu E, Wu K, Zou J. Limitations of learning new and updated medical knowledge with commercial fine-tuning large language models. *NEJM AI [Internet]* 2025;2(8). Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1056/aics2401155>
24. Dorfner FJ, Dada A, Busch F, et al. Evaluating the effectiveness of biomedical fine-tuning for large language models on clinical tasks. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2025;32(6):1015–24.
25. Wei J, Wang X, Schuurmans D, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In: *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*. Red Hook, NY, USA: Curran Associates Inc.; 2022. p. 24824–37.
26. Nori H, Lee YT, Zhang S, et al. Can generalist foundation models outcompete special-purpose tuning? Case study in medicine [Internet]. *arXiv [cs.CL]*. 2023; Available from: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2311.16452>
27. Nori H, Usuyama N, King N, et al. From Medprompt to o1: Exploration of run-time strategies for medical challenge problems and beyond [Internet]. *arXiv [cs.CL]*. 2024; Available from: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2411.03590>
28. Sutton R. The Bitter Lesson [Internet]. Available from: [https://www.cs.utexas.edu/~eunsol/courses/data/bitter\\_lesson.pdf](https://www.cs.utexas.edu/~eunsol/courses/data/bitter_lesson.pdf)
29. Adams L, Busch F, Han T, et al. LongHealth: A question answering benchmark with long clinical documents. *J Healthc Inform Res* 2025;9(3):280–96.
30. Jiang LY, Liu XC, Nejatian NP, et al. Health system-scale language models are all-purpose prediction engines. *Nature* 2023;619(7969):357–62.