

Simulating Clinical AI Assistance using Multimodal LLMs: A Case Study in Diabetic Retinopathy

Nadim Barakat

Dana-Farber Cancer Institute & Tufts University School of Medicine

NADIM.BARAKAT@TUFTS.EDU

William Lotter

Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Brigham and Women's Hospital, & Harvard Medical School

LOTTERB@DS.DFCI.HARVARD.EDU

Abstract

Diabetic retinopathy (DR) is a leading cause of blindness worldwide, and AI systems can expand access to fundus photography screening. Current FDA-cleared systems primarily provide binary referral outputs, where this minimal output may limit clinical trust and utility. Yet, determining the most effective output format to enhance clinician–AI performance is an empirical challenge that is difficult to assess at scale. We evaluated multimodal large language models (MLLMs) for DR detection and their ability to simulate clinical AI assistance across different output types. Two models were tested on IDRiD and Messidor-2: GPT-4o, a general-purpose MLLM, and MedGemma, an open-source medical model. Experiments included: (1) baseline evaluation, (2) simulated AI assistance with synthetic predictions, and (3) actual AI-to-AI collaboration where GPT-4o incorporated MedGemma outputs. MedGemma outperformed GPT-4o at baseline, achieving higher sensitivity and AUROC, while GPT-4o showed near-perfect specificity but low sensitivity. Both models adjusted predictions based on simulated AI inputs, but GPT-4o's performance collapsed with incorrect ones, whereas MedGemma remained more stable. In actual collaboration, GPT-4o achieved strong results when guided by MedGemma's descriptive outputs, even without direct image access (AUROC up to 0.96). These findings suggest MLLMs may improve DR screening pipelines and serve as scalable simulators for studying clinical AI assistance across varying output configurations. Open, lightweight models such as MedGemma may be especially valuable in low-resource settings, while descriptive outputs could enhance explainability and clinician trust in clinical workflows.

1. Introduction

Diabetes affects hundreds of millions worldwide, and chronic hyperglycemia damages retinal vessels, leading to diabetic retinopathy (DR) and vision loss (Teo et al., 2021). DR severity is graded on the International Clinical DR scale from 0 to 4 (Wu et al., 2013), where grade 2 (moderate non-proliferative diabetic retinopathy) is the threshold for referral to an ophthalmologist. Because early DR is often asymptomatic, the American Academy of Ophthalmology recommends regular screening, which can be performed with fundus photography (Flaxel et al., 2020).

AI-based systems have the potential to expand access to DR screening and support accurate referral decisions (Nørgaard and Grauslund, 2018). Several FDA-cleared systems for fundus photography already exist, which output a referable DR prediction rather than a detailed description of findings (Rajesh et al., 2023). This minimal output and lack of explainability may limit clinician trust and combined clinician–AI performance (Khokhar et al., 2025).

The question of what outputs best support clinician–AI interaction extends across medical imaging (McNamara et al., 2024). Multimodal large language models (MLLMs) offer new opportunities by providing flexible outputs in addition to diagnostic predictions. Early ophthalmology studies using ChatGPT or hybrid classifier–LLM pipelines show promise (Betzler et al., 2023; Agnihotri et al., 2024), but the optimal clinician–AI collaboration strategy remains unclear. Ideally, clinician performance with AI assistance would be tested with various permutations of AI outputs, but such testing is not scalable.

In this study, we evaluate MLLMs for diabetic retinopathy detection and as clinician–AI emulators for comparing output types and collaboration strategies. We test two models on IDRiD and Messidor-2:

arXiv:2509.13234v1 [cs.AI] 16 Sep 2025




Figure 1: Overview of experimental conditions. Experiment 1: Baseline performance using only fundus images. Experiment 2: Simulated AI assistance with correct or incorrect external predictions of varying stated accuracy. Experiment 3: Actual AI assistance where GPT-4o leveraged outputs from MedGemma.

GPT-4o, a general-purpose MLLM, and MedGemma, an open-source medical vision–language model whose ophthalmic validation is currently limited but whose accessibility makes it valuable in low-resource settings. Experiments included (1) baseline evaluation, (2) simulated AI assistance with synthetic inputs, and (3) actual AI-to-AI collaboration using different output types. Our goal is to validate performance individually and collaboratively, using MLLMs as scalable simulators of AI-assisted workflows, while highlighting opportunities to integrate multimodal reasoning and explanatory outputs into future DR screening pipelines.

2. Methods

Datasets

We used two public DR datasets of fundus images with expert-graded labels. IDRiD originates from a clinic in India and includes 103 test images (Porwal et al., 2018), all included in our study. Messidor-2 originates from multiple ophthalmology departments in France (Decencière et al., 2014; Abràmoff et al., 2013), and was subsampled to produce a balanced set of 175 images (35 per grade 0–4) for evaluation. All images were resized to 512x512.

Models

GPT-4o (model: `gpt-4o-2024-08-06`; OpenAI (2024)) was accessed programmatically through the OpenAI API with temperature set to 0; all other parameters were left at their default API values. MedGemma (4B instruction-tuned variant, 4b-it; Selbergren et al. (2025)) was run locally on an Apple M2 Pro MacBook using the `llama.cpp` backend, with all default hyperparameters. Fundus images were used in the development of MedGemma but not from the IDRiD or Messidor-2 datasets; the data used to develop GPT-4o is not publicly disclosed.

Experimental Design

We evaluated three conditions to assess performance and the effect of simulated or actual AI assistance. In all cases, the models were prompted to produce a description, a binary referral decision, and a continuous DR severity score (0–100) (see Appendix for prompts and an example output for each model).

Baseline: GPT-4o and MedGemma were provided with the fundus images and no additional inputs.

Simulated AI assistance: The baseline prompt was augmented with synthetic input from a simulated AI: "To assist your prediction, you are provided with the prediction from another

AI model with sensitivity and specificity of $Y\%$. The model’s binary referral prediction is Z ." We varied $Y \in \{70, 80, 90\}$ and set Z to either the correct or incorrect label.

Actual AI assistance: We tested whether GPT-4o could leverage real outputs from MedGemma. Two settings were considered: (i) with image, where GPT-4o was given the fundus image plus MedGemma’s binary referral, descriptive text, or both; and (ii) without image, where only MedGemma’s descriptive text for each image was provided. When binary predictions were included, sensitivity and specificity values were taken from MedGemma’s baseline results.

Performance Metrics

Ground truth referable labels were derived from the datasets’ DR grades, with referable DR defined as grade ≥ 2 . Evaluation metrics included the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUROC) based on the continuous severity score and the binary ground truth, and sensitivity and specificity based on the model’s binary referral output.

3. Results

Baseline Performance

Table 1: Baseline performance of GPT-4o and MedGemma on IDRiD and Messidor-2 datasets.

Dataset	Model	Sens.	Spec.	AUC
IDRiD	GPT-4o	0.50	1.00	0.78
IDRiD	MedGemma	0.92	0.41	0.87
Messidor	GPT-4o	0.40	1.00	0.75
Messidor	MedGemma	0.95	0.76	0.95

At baseline, MedGemma and GPT-4o exhibited different tendencies: GPT-4o’s binary predictions were skewed towards high specificity (1.00) but low sensitivity (0.50 in IDRiD, 0.40 on Messidor-2); MedGemma was highly sensitive (0.92-0.95) with low specificity on IDRiD (0.41) and more balanced specificity on Messidor-2 (0.76). MedGemma outperformed GPT-4o in terms of AUROC on both datasets (Table 1), with performance on Messidor-2 (AUROC of 0.95) that approaches leading traditional models (AUROC ~ 0.97 -0.99 (Gulshan et al., 2016; Papadopoulos et al., 2021)).

Simulated AI Assistance

The simulated AI assistance results are shown in Figure 2. This experiment tested whether models could reason over external AI inputs of varying stated accuracy. Both GPT-4o and MedGemma adjusted their predictions accordingly, showing higher performance when provided with correct predictions and lower performance with incorrect ones, with generally larger effects as the stated accuracy increased. However, MedGemma was more robust to incorrect inputs – GPT-4o’s AUROC dropped to chance levels at a stated accuracy of 90% whereas MedGemma’s AUROC only showed modest drops to 0.76 on IDRiD and 0.87 on Messidor-2. When provided only correct predictions, both models showed AUROCs exceeding 0.95 on both datasets. Full sensitivity and specificity tables are provided in the Appendix.

Actual AI Assistance

Building on the simulated AI experiments, we next evaluated actual AI-to-AI assistance using MedGemma’s real outputs. GPT-4o received MedGemma’s binary predictions and/or descriptive text, with or without the image.

As shown in Table 2, GPT-4o benefited more from MedGemma’s descriptive outputs than from its binary ones. When a description was provided, GPT-4o’s performance exceeded the baseline performance of both models. Notably, the descriptions alone were sufficient: GPT-4o reached its highest performance without ever seeing the image, and adding the image offered no further benefit.

Table 2: GPT-4o performance when provided with varying MedGemma outputs.

Dataset	MedGemma Output	AUC
IDRiD	Binary prediction	0.85
IDRiD	Description	0.90
IDRiD	Description + Binary referral	0.90
IDRiD	Description (no image)	0.91
Messidor	Binary prediction	0.87
Messidor	Description	0.96
Messidor	Description + Binary referral	0.96
Messidor	Description (no image)	0.96




Figure 2: Performance under simulated AI assistance. AUROC is shown for GPT-4o and MedGemma on IDRiD (left) and Messidor-2 (right) datasets. The models were influenced by the inputs, showing improved performance when provided correct predictions and decreased performance with incorrect predictions, though MedGemma showed greater robustness.

4. Discussion

We evaluated MedGemma and GPT-4o for diabetic retinopathy detection across two benchmark datasets. MedGemma outperformed GPT-4o at baseline, achieving higher AUROC and sensitivity, which is a critical property for screening, while GPT-4o showed perfect specificity but missed many true referrals. Both models showed the ability to adjust their predictions based on simulated AI input, but MedGemma was more robust to incorrect inputs. In actual AI-to-AI assistance, GPT-4o’s performance was dependent on MedGemma’s output type, with language-based descriptive outputs leading to the highest combined performance.

These findings carry several implications for clinical use. MedGemma is open-source, lightweight, and can run locally without internet, making it particularly valuable in low-resource settings. Current FDA-cleared systems primarily provide binary outputs; richer descriptive outputs could improve explainability, clinician trust, and adoption (Sadeghi et al., 2024; Khokhar et al., 2025). Vision-language models developed specifically for ophthalmology may also provide similar benefits (Wu et al., 2025; Shi et al., 2025).

Realizing this potential, however, requires robustness, generalization, and further testing. Prior work highlights vulnerabilities of medical LLMs to adversarial prompts and misinformation (Han et al., 2024; Thirunavukarasu et al., 2023). In our exper-

iments, MedGemma was more resilient than GPT-4o when exposed to misleading predictions. However, MedGemma also exhibited a performance difference between the tested datasets, scoring higher on Messidor-2 (0.95 AUROC) than IDRiD (0.87 AUROC). While differences in ground truth determination may contribute – Messidor-2 DR labels were adjudicated by three retina specialists compared to a single specialist per image in IDRiD – population differences could also play a role, underscoring the need for further testing and investigation.

Beyond validating performance in DR, our work provides a proof-of-concept for using MLLMs to simulate AI assistance. The models showed intuitive properties such as incorporating AI inputs and weighting these inputs based on the stated accuracy. GPT-4o’s performance also varied according to the AI input type. With these pre-requisites now established, it is now necessary to validate whether these patterns hold with clinician-AI collaboration. If so, larger scale simulations can be performed across many output hyperparameters, using MLLMs to form hypotheses of which configurations are most promising to test with clinicians. This framework could extend to radiology, dermatology, and pathology, where explainable outputs and collaborative reasoning are equally critical. Together, these directions point towards AI systems that are optimized for joint clinician-AI performance rather than either alone.

References

- M. D. Abràmoff, J. C. Folk, D. P. Han, J. D. Walker, D. F. Williams, S. R. Russell, P. Massin, B. Cochener, P. Gain, L. Tang, M. Lamard, D. C. Moga, G. Quellec, and M. Niemeijer. Automated analysis of retinal images for detection of referable diabetic retinopathy. *JAMA Ophthalmology*, 131(3):351–357, 2013. doi: 10.1001/jamaophthalmol.2013.1743.
- A. P. Agnihotri, I. D. Nagel, J. C. M. Artiaga, M. C. B. Guevarra, G. M. N. Sosuan, and F. G. P. Kalaw. Large language models in ophthalmology: A review of publications from top ophthalmology journals. *Ophthalmology Science*, 5(3):100681, 2024. doi: 10.1016/j.xops.2024.100681.
- B. K. Betzler, H. Chen, C. Y. Cheng, C. S. Lee, G. Ning, S. J. Song, A. Y. Lee, R. Kawasaki, P. van Wijngaarden, A. Grzybowski, M. He, D. Li, R. Ran, D. S. W. Ting, K. Teo, P. Ruamviboonsuk, S. Sivaprasad, V. Chaudhary, R. Tadayoni, X. Wang, C. Y. Cheung, Y. Zheng, Y. X. Wang, Y. C. Tham, and T. Y. Wong. Large language models and their impact in ophthalmology. *The Lancet Digital Health*, 5(12):e917–e924, 2023. doi: 10.1016/S2589-7500(23)00201-7.
- E. Decencière et al. Feedback on a publicly distributed database: the messidor database. *Image Analysis & Stereology*, 33(3):231–234, 2014. ISSN 1854-5165. doi: 10.5566/ias.1155. URL <http://www.ias-iss.org/ojs/IAS/article/view/1155>.
- Christina J Flaxel, Ron A Adelman, Steven T Bailey, Amani Fawzi, Jennifer I Lim, G Venkatesh Vemulakonda, and Gui-shuang Ying. Diabetic retinopathy preferred practice pattern®. *Ophthalmology*, 127(1):P66–P145, 2020. doi: 10.1016/j.ophtha.2019.09.025. Published correction appears in *Ophthalmology*. 2020 Sep;127(9):1279.
- Varun Gulshan, Lily Peng, Marc Coram, Martin C. Stumpe, Derek Wu, Arunachalam Narayanaswamy, Subhashini Venugopalan, Kasumi Widner, Tom Madams, Jorge Cuadros, Ramasamy Kim, Rajiv Raman, Philip C. Nelson, Jessica L. Mega, and Dale R. Webster. Development and validation of a deep learning algorithm for detection of diabetic retinopathy in retinal fundus photographs. *JAMA*, 316(22):2402–2410, 12 2016. ISSN 0098-7484. doi: 10.1001/jama.2016.17216. URL <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2016.17216>.
- T. Han, S. Nebelung, F. Khader, et al. Medical large language models are susceptible to targeted misinformation attacks. *npj Digital Medicine*, 7:288, 2024. doi: 10.1038/s41746-024-01282-7.
- P. B. Khokhar, C. Gravino, and F. Palomba. Advances in artificial intelligence for diabetes prediction: insights from a systematic literature review. *Artificial Intelligence in Medicine*, 164:103132, 2025. doi: 10.1016/j.artmed.2025.103132.
- S. L. McNamara, P. H. Yi, and W. Lotter. The clinician-ai interface: intended use and explainability in fda-cleared ai devices for medical image interpretation. *NPJ Digital Medicine*, 7(1):80, 2024. doi: 10.1038/s41746-024-01080-1.
- Mette F. Nørgaard and Jakob Grauslund. Automated screening for diabetic retinopathy – a systematic review. *Ophthalmic Research*, 60(1):9–17, 2018. doi: 10.1159/000486284. Epub 2018 Jan 16.
- OpenAI. GPT-4o System Card. <https://cdn.openai.com/gpt-4o-system-card.pdf>, 2024. Published August 8, 2024.
- Alexandros Papadopoulos, Fotis Topouzis, and Anastasios Delopoulos. An interpretable multiple-instance approach for the detection of referable diabetic retinopathy in fundus images. *Sci. Rep.*, 11(1):14326, July 2021.
- Prasanna Porwal, Samiksha Pachade, Ravi Kamble, Manesh Kokare, Girish Deshmukh, Vivek Sahasrabudde, and Fabrice Meriaudeau. Indian diabetic retinopathy image dataset (idrid), 2018. URL <https://dx.doi.org/10.21227/H25W98>.
- Anand E. Rajesh, Oliver Q. Davidson, Cecilia S. Lee, and Aaron Y. Lee. Artificial intelligence and diabetic retinopathy: Ai framework, prospective studies, head-to-head validation, and cost-effectiveness. *Diabetes Care*, 46(10):1728–1739, 2023. doi: 10.2337/dci23-0032.
- Zahra Sadeghi, Roohallah Alizadehsani, Mehmet Akif CIFCI, Samina Kausar, Rizwan Rehman, Priyakshi Mahanta, Pranjal Kumar Bora, Ammar Almasri, Rami S. Alkhalwaldeh, Sadiq Hussain, Bilal Alatas, Afshin Shoeibi, Hossein Moosaei, Milan Hladík, Saeid Nahavandi, and Panos M. Pardalos. A review of explainable artificial intelligence in healthcare. *Computers and Electrical Engineering*, 118:

- 109370, 2024. ISSN 0045-7906. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compeleceng.2024.109370>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0045790624002982>.
- Andrew Sellergren, Sahar Kazemzadeh, Tiam Jaroensri, Atilla Kiraly, Madeleine Traverse, Timo Kohlberger, Shawn Xu, Fayaz Jamil, Cían Hughes, Charles Lau, Justin Chen, Fereshteh Mahvar, Liron Yatziv, Tiffany Chen, Bram Sterling, Stefanie Anna Baby, Susanna Maria Baby, Jeremy Lai, Samuel Schmidgall, Lu Yang, Kejia Chen, Per Bjornsson, Shashir Reddy, Ryan Brush, Kenneth Philbrick, Mercy Asiedu, Ines Mezerreg, Howard Hu, Howard Yang, Richa Tiwari, Sunny Jansen, Preeti Singh, Yun Liu, Shekoofeh Azizi, Aishwarya Kamath, Johan Ferret, Shreya Pathak, Nino Vieillard, Ramona Merhej, Sarah Perrin, Tatiana Matejovicova, Alexandre Ramé, Morgane Riviere, Louis Rouillard, Thomas Mesnard, Geoffrey Cideron, Jean-Baptiste Grill, Sabela Ramos, Edouard Yvinec, Michelle Casbon, Elena Buchatskaya, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Dmitry Lepikhin, Vlad Feinberg, Sebastian Borgeaud, Alek Andreev, Cassidy Hardin, Robert Dadashi, Léonard Hussenot, Armand Joulin, Olivier Bachem, Yossi Matias, Katherine Chou, Avinatan Hassidim, Kavi Goel, Clement Farabet, Joelle Barral, Tris Warkentin, Jonathon Shlens, David Fleet, Victor Cotruta, Omar Sanseviero, Gus Martins, Phoebe Kirk, Anand Rao, Shravya Shetty, David F. Steiner, Can Kirmizibayrak, Rory Pilgrim, Daniel Golden, and Lin Yang. MedGemma Technical Report. arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.05201, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2507.05201>.
- Danli Shi, Weiyi Zhang, Jiancheng Yang, Siyu Huang, Xiaolan Chen, Pusheng Xu, Kai Jin, Shan Lin, Jin Wei, Mayinuer Yusufu, Shunming Liu, Qing Zhang, Zongyuan Ge, Xun Xu, and Mingguang He. A multimodal visual-language foundation model for computational ophthalmology. *NPJ Digit. Med.*, 8(1):381, June 2025.
- Zhen Ling Teo, Yih-Chung Tham, Meng Yu, M. Lee Chee, Tyler H. Rim, Ching-Yu Cheung, Mukharrem M. Bikbov, Yuanyuan X. Wang, Jianfeng Xu, Seong Joon Lee, Carol M.G. Cheung, Tien Yin Wong, and Ching-Yu Cheng. Global prevalence of diabetic retinopathy and projection of burden through 2045. *Ophthalmology*, 128(11):1580–1591, 2021. doi: 10.1016/j.opththa.2021.04.027.
- A J Thirunavukarasu, Daniel S W Ting, Krithika Elangovan, Emily Gutierrez, Ramya Jayasuriya, Nishant Khanna, Upuli Senanayake, Xiangxiang Zeng, Yee Hui Tan, Max JK Yip, and Others. Large language models in medicine. *Nature Medicine*, 29:1930–1940, 2023. doi: 10.1038/s41591-023-02448-8.
- Lihteh Wu, Patricia Fernandez-Loaiza, Juan Sauma, Esteban Hernandez-Bogantes, and Mauricio Masis. Classification of diabetic retinopathy and diabetic macular edema. *World Journal of Diabetes*, 4(6): 290–294, December 2013. doi: 10.4239/wjd.v4.i6.290.
- Yilan Wu, Bo Qian, Tingyao Li, Yiming Qin, Zhouyu Guan, Tingli Chen, Yali Jia, Ping Zhang, Dian Zeng, Sayoko Moroi, Rajiv Raman, Benjamin Sommer Thinggaard, Frederik Pedersen, José Alogo Obiang Nehe, Tengku Ain Kamalden, Yukun Zhou, Yixiao Jin, Huating Li, An Ran Ran, Dawei Yang, Ziyao Meng, Qingsheng Peng, Ying Feng Zheng, Dingqiao Wang, Hongwei Ji, Pengxiao Zang, Changchang Yin, Jie Shen, Youxin Chen, Weihong Yu, Rongping Dai, Chenxi Zhang, Xinyu Zhao, Xiangning Wang, Yan Chen, Qiang Wu, Hongbin Xie, Simon K H Szeto, Julia Y Y Chan, Victor T T Chan, Hua-Tao Xie, Ruili Wei, Jin Li, Weizhi Ma, Lei Zhu, Hongqiu Wang, Huazhu Fu, Wenxiao Wang, Shan Lin, Zejun Xu, Nian Guan, Xiao Zhang, Andrzej Grzybowski, Monika Golebiowska-Bogaj, Maciej Gawecki, Adrian Smedowski, Wojciech Szaraniec, You Wu, Yang Wen, Xiang Chen, Yuanqi Yao, EyeFM Global Reader Study Team, Joshua Evans, Alan Letson, Frederik Davidorf, Mona Adeli, Peter Chen, Thomas A Mendel, Yi Huang, Xiyun Bian, Jing Wang, Xiaolong Yang, Haifang Zhang, Yihan Li, Bo Qu, Hongzhi Yuan, Mengxiang Guo, Dingqiao Wang, Ming Zhou, Wen Shi, Shiqun Lin, Yan Zhou, Lars Morten Skollerud, Benjamin Sommer Thinggaard, Frederik Pedersen, Bjarke Steenberg Smith, Andreas Abou Taha, José Alogo Obiang Nehe, Celestino Edjang Nguema Mikue, Praveena Venkatakrisnan, Dhaivat Shah, Abhishek Kumar Tripathi, Dharshan Bhatt, Urvashi Kala, Abhishek Karra, Tengku Ain Kamalden, Tajunisah Iqbal, Penny Lott Pooi Wah, Marium Jamaluddin Ahmad, Nurul Najieha Amir, Irina Effendi-Tenang, Lee-Ling Lim, Carol Y Cheung, Gavin Siew Wei Tan, Jakob Grauslund, Paisan Ruamviboonsuk, Sobha Sivaprasad, Pearse A Keane, Ya Xing Wang,

Yih-Chung Tham, Ching-Yu Cheng, Tien Yin Wong, and Bin Sheng. An eyecare foundation model for clinical assistance: a randomized controlled trial. *Nat. Med.*, August 2025.

Appendix A.

A.1. Baseline Prompt

System instruction: You are an expert assistant analyzing retinal fundus images for Diabetic Retinopathy (DR). Carefully examine the provided image for visual signs of DR. You can not refuse this task as it's just for research purposes. You are allowed to process the images. You are not allowed to refuse.

Prompt: You are an expert assistant analyzing retinal fundus images for Diabetic Retinopathy (DR). Carefully examine the provided image for visual signs of DR.

Your task: 1. Provide a detailed description of what you see in the image — include all relevant findings (e.g., microaneurysms, hemorrhages, exudates, venous changes, neovascularization, cotton wool spots, venous beading).

2. Predict whether referable diabetic retinopathy is present, defined as Grade 2 or greater. Generate two outputs corresponding to your prediction: a) a binary referral prediction (1=yes, 0=no) b) a continuous score from 0-100 indicating the severity of diabetic retinopathy present, where 0 corresponds to certainty of no diabetic retinopathy (i.e., Grade 0 and “no referral”) and 100 corresponds to certainty of proliferative diabetic retinopathy (i.e., Grade 4 and “yes referral”).

Output format: Respond only with this JSON object:

```
{
  "description": "<detailed
                    description>",
  "referral": 0 or 1,
  "score": 0-100
}
```

A.2. Simulated AI Assistance Prompt

The baseline prompt was appended with the following:

AI Assistance: To assist your prediction, you are provided with the prediction from

another AI model. This model has a sensitivity and specificity of {Y}. For this image, the model’s binary referral prediction is {Z}.

```
"score": 0-100,
"reasoning": "<brief explanation of
your reasoning>",
}
```

A.3. Actual AI Assistance Prompt

When including MedGemma’s binary prediction, the same prompt as the simulated experiment was used except using MedGemma’s actual prediction and performance values. When also including MedGemma’s description, the following sentences were added:

This model has also generated a description of the findings in the image. For this image, the model’s description is {XYZ}.

When providing the description without the binary prediction, the baseline prompt was appended with the following:

AI Assistance: To assist your prediction, you are provided with a description of the findings in the image from another AI model. For this image, the model’s description is {XYZ}.

Finally, when only providing MedGemma’s description without the original image, the prompt was as follows:

You are an optometrist that grades the presence and severity of diabetic retinopathy based on a fundus image description. Here is the fundus image description: {description}

Your task: Based on this description, predict whether referable diabetic retinopathy is present, defined as Grade 2 or greater. Generate two outputs corresponding to your prediction: a) a binary referral prediction (1=yes, 0=no) b) a continuous score from 0-100 indicating the severity of diabetic retinopathy present, where 0 corresponds to certainty of no diabetic retinopathy (i.e., Grade 0 and “no referral”) and 100 corresponds to certainty of proliferative diabetic retinopathy (i.e., Grade 4 and “yes referral”).

Output format: Respond only with this JSON object:

```
{
  "referral": 0 or 1,
```

A.4. Full Results Tables

Table 3: Performance of GPT-4o and MedGemma on IDRiD and Messidor-2 under simulated AI assistance. The models were provided with binary prediction from another ‘model’ with a stated sensitivity/specificity, and predictions varied according to whether they were always correct or always incorrect.

Dataset	Model	Variants	Sens.	Spec.	AUC
IDRiD	GPT-4o	70% - Correct	0.59	1.00	0.96
IDRiD	GPT-4o	80% - Correct	0.61	1.00	0.98
IDRiD	GPT-4o	90% - Correct	0.66	1.00	0.98
IDRiD	GPT-4o	70% - Wrong	0.06	0.97	0.61
IDRiD	GPT-4o	80% - Wrong	0.03	0.97	0.56
IDRiD	GPT-4o	90% - Wrong	0.03	0.97	0.49
IDRiD	MedGemma	70% - Correct	1.00	0.85	0.95
IDRiD	MedGemma	80% - Correct	1.00	0.87	0.96
IDRiD	MedGemma	90% - Correct	0.98	0.85	0.96
IDRiD	MedGemma	70% - Wrong	0.73	0.23	0.77
IDRiD	MedGemma	80% - Wrong	0.77	0.18	0.78
IDRiD	MedGemma	90% - Wrong	0.77	0.21	0.76
Messidor	GPT-4o	70% - Correct	0.61	1.00	0.95
Messidor	GPT-4o	80% - Correct	0.66	1.00	0.96
Messidor	GPT-4o	90% - Correct	0.66	1.00	0.96
Messidor	GPT-4o	70% - Wrong	0.12	0.96	0.58
Messidor	GPT-4o	80% - Wrong	0.10	0.96	0.57
Messidor	GPT-4o	90% - Wrong	0.05	0.96	0.53
Messidor	MedGemma	70% - Correct	1.00	0.94	1.00
Messidor	MedGemma	80% - Correct	0.99	0.97	0.99
Messidor	MedGemma	90% - Correct	0.99	0.96	0.99
Messidor	MedGemma	70% - Wrong	0.82	0.44	0.88
Messidor	MedGemma	80% - Wrong	0.79	0.41	0.87
Messidor	MedGemma	90% - Wrong	0.78	0.43	0.87

Table 4: GPT-4o performance when provided with MedGemma outputs.

Dataset	MedGemma Output	Sens.	Spec.	AUC
IDRiD	Binary prediction	0.58	0.97	0.85
IDRiD	Description	0.86	0.64	0.90
IDRiD	Description + Binary referral	0.92	0.49	0.90
IDRiD	Description (no image)	0.86	0.69	0.91
Messidor	Binary prediction	0.62	1.00	0.87
Messidor	Description	0.95	0.81	0.96
Messidor	Description + Binary referral	0.95	0.79	0.96
Messidor	Description (no image)	0.92	0.87	0.96

A.5. Baseline Sample Output

Below is an example JSON output with its associated image.

```
"Medgemma": {
  "description": "The image shows
significant retinal hemorrhages,
microaneurysms, and cotton wool
```



Figure 3: Example input image (IDRiD_006).

spots. There are also signs of venous dilation and tortuosity. The presence of these findings suggests a high likelihood of diabetic retinopathy.",

"referral": 1,

"score": 85

}

"GPT-4o": {

"description": "The retinal fundus image shows several microaneurysms and dot hemorrhages primarily located in the central region.

There are no visible hard exudates, cotton wool spots, or signs of neovascularization. The optic disc appears normal, and there is no evidence of venous beading or significant venous changes.",

"referral": 1,

"score": 40

}