

## Large language models management of medications: three performance analyses

Kelli Henry, PharmD, MPA, BCCCP  
kellirhenry@gmail.com  
University of Colorado Skaggs School of Medicine, Aurora, CO, USA

Steven Xu  
shaochen.xu25@uga.edu  
Department of Computer Science, University of Georgia, Athens, GA

Kaitlin Blotske, PharmD  
Kaitlin.blotske@cuanschutz.edu  
University of Colorado Skaggs School of Medicine, Aurora, CO, USA

Moriah Cargile, PharmD Candidate  
MORIAH.CARGILE@cuanschutz.edu  
University of Colorado Skaggs School of Pharmacy, Aurora, CO, USA

Erin F. Barreto, PharmD, PhD, FCCM  
Barreto.Erin@mayo.edu  
Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN, USA

Brian Murray, PharmD, BCCCP  
BRIAN.2.MURRAY@CUANSCHUTZ.EDU  
University of Colorado Skaggs School of Pharmacy, Aurora, CO, USA

Susan Smith, PharmD, BCCCP, FCCM  
Susan.Smith@uga.edu  
University of Georgia College of Pharmacy, Athens, GA, USA

Seth R. Bauer, PharmD, FCCM, FCCP  
bauers@ccf.org  
Cleveland Clinic, Department of Pharmacy  
Cleveland, OH, USA

Yanjun Gao, PhD  
Yanjun.Gao@cuanschutz.edu  
University of Colorado School of Medicine, Department of Biomedical Informatics  
Aurora, CO, USA

Tianming Liu, PhD  
tianming.liu@gmail.com  
Department of Computer Science, University of Georgia  
Athens, GA, USA

Andrea Sikora, PharmD, MSCR, BCCCP, FCCM, FCCP  
andrea.sikora@cuanschutz.edu

University of Colorado Skaggs School of Medicine, Aurora, CO, USA  
sikora@uga.edu

University of Georgia College of Pharmacy, Department of Clinical and Administrative Pharmacy,  
Augusta, GA, USA

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors have no conflicts of interest.

**Funding:** Funding: Funding through Agency of Healthcare Research and Quality for Drs. Sikora, Smith, and Liu was provided through R21HS028485 and R01HS029009.

Acknowledgements: Adeleine Tilley, Christopher Barry

## Abstract

**Background:** Large language models (LLMs) can be useful in diagnosing medical conditions, but few studies have evaluated their consistency in recommending appropriate medication regimens. The purpose of this evaluation was to test GPT-4o on three medication benchmarking tests including mapping a drug name to its correct formulation, identifying drug-drug interactions using both its internal knowledge and using a web search, and preparing a medication order sentence after being given the medication name

**Methods:** Using GTP-4o three experiments were completed. Accuracy was quantified by computing cosine similarity on TF-IDF vectors, normalized Levenshtein similarity, and ROUGE-1/ROUGE-L F1 between each response and its reference string or by manual evaluation by clinicians.

**Results:** GPT-4o performed poorly on drug-formulation matching, with frequent omissions of available drug formulations (mean 1.23 per medication) and hallucinations of formulations that do not exist (mean 1.14 per medication). Only 49% of tested medications were correctly matched to all available formulations. Accuracy was decreased for medications with more formulations ( $p < 0.0001$ ). GPT-4o was also inconsistent at identifying drug-drug-interactions, although it had better performance with the search-augmented assessment compared to its internal knowledge (54.7% vs. 69.2%,  $p = 0.013$ ). However, allowing a web-search worsened performance when there was no drug-drug interaction (median % correct 100% vs. 40%,  $p < 0.001$ ). Finally, GPT-4o performed moderately with preparing a medication order sentence, with only 65.8% of medication order sentences containing no medication or abbreviation errors.

**Conclusions:** Model performance was overall poor for all tests. This highlights the need for domain-specific training through clinician-annotated datasets and a comprehensive evaluation framework for benchmarking performance.

**Keywords:** Large language model; artificial intelligence; pharmacy; medication regimen complexity

## Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have developed proficiency for a variety of tasks within the medical field including passing medical licensing exams as well as selecting correct medical diagnoses.<sup>1,2</sup> However, analyzing treatment in the context of comprehensive medication management (CMM) requires human-like reasoning not well handled by traditional artificial intelligence (AI) algorithms.<sup>3,4</sup>

LLMs perform well on treatment selection for simple, well-structured cases. When ChatGPT was queried to answer Doctor of Pharmacy case-based multiple choice exam questions, it got 60% correct. When reviewing questions, it got a higher rate of simple recall style questions correct compared to more complex application questions. ChatGPT demonstrated an important ability to read medication orders in the context of a patient case but was unable to provide consistently accurate medication information for reasoning questions, likely due to lack of domain-specific training.<sup>5</sup> An important first step for improving the ability of LLMs to perform CMM is the ability to consistently match drug name with appropriate doses including a number and unit (e.g., aspirin with 81mg). The purpose of this analysis is to determine the current ability of an LLM, GPT-4o, to correctly identify all available drug formulations when provided the generic drug name, to provide a full medication order (dose, unit, route, and frequency) when provided the generic drug name, and to correctly identify if drug-drug interactions exist between a list of 3-6 medications.

## Methods

A total of three experiments intended to test LLM medication task performance were designed: (1) drug formulation identification, (2) medication order or sig generation, and (3) drug-drug interaction identification. While not fully comprehensive of the complexity of the medication verification and management process, these baseline performance tasks are essential for safe use of medications. Each experiment is described separately. This project was reviewed and approved by the University of Colorado Institutional Review Board (COMIRB #25-1631). All methods were performed in accordance with the ethical standards the Helsinki Declaration of 1975.

### *Drug Formulation Identification*

#### *Study Design*

The primary objective was to evaluate the ability of an LLM, GPT-4o, to match a drug name to all available drug formulations. This involved a structured prompting process to elicit an exact response from the LLM. 290 medications were queried in the summer of 2025 using OpenAI API.<sup>6</sup> All test scenarios were completed in separate sessions so previous interactions could not influence subsequent queries. GPT-4o was used with the default settings of Temperature=1.0 and Top P=1.0. The primary outcome was the percentage of medications that were returned with a complete list of available formulations. A list of available formulations was determined by referencing LexiDrug for each medication.<sup>7</sup>

#### *LLM Testing*

A total of 290 medications were queried. They were queried one at a time so that contextual carry-over could not influence successive generations. The complete prompt given to GPT-4o was

"What are all of the formulations (including the numerical value and the unit) available in the United States for the drug '{drug\_name}'? ONLY return the formulation and associated unit in a format as such: 200 mg tablet; 400 mg capsule; 800 mg extended release tablet; 50 mg/mL injectable solution; 50 mg/mL intramuscular suspension; 2% cream. DO NOT return any other text!"

#### *Data Analysis*

Data was analyzed using Microsoft Excel (version 2025). Accuracy was quantified by computing cosine similarity on TF-IDF vectors, normalized Levenshtein similarity, and ROUGE-1/ROUGE-L F1 between each response and its reference string. These scores were calculated per drug and averaged to yield a global measure for each model variant. Additionally, Mann Whitney U was utilized to compare medications with many formulations compared to medications with fewer formulations.

### *Medication Order or Sig Generation*

#### *Study Design*

The primary objective was to evaluate the ability of an LLM, GPT-4o to match a drug name to an appropriate medication order including formulation, dose, route, and frequency as both an abbreviated "prescription sig" and an expanded "Complete Instructions". This involved a structured prompting process to elicit an exact response from the LLM using few-shot prompting during the summer of 2025

using OpenAI API.<sup>6</sup> All test scenarios were completed in separate sessions so previous interactions could not influence subsequent queries. GPT-4o was used with the default settings of Temperature=1.0 and Top P=1.0. The primary outcome was the percentage of instructions that had drug errors. Secondary outcomes included percentage of instructions with a lack of standardization of abbreviations or inappropriate abbreviations used.

### *LLM Testing*

A total of 38 drugs were tested using a ground truth bank of 51 medication orders. A few-shot prompt was crafted by embedding five randomly selected examples (each with name, correct Sig, and correct complete instructions) at the top of the conversation, followed by explicit instructions that every output must follow the order *drug* → *dose* → *amount* → *route* → *frequency*. Thirty eight additional drug names, withheld from the prompt, were then queried one at a time so that contextual carry-over could not influence successive generations. The complete prompt given to GPT-4o was

“You are a medical assistant tasked with providing the correct prescription instruction when given a drug name.

You must provide the output in two formats:

1. A simplified instruction.
2. A clarified version of the instruction.

Use the following training examples to understand the format:

Drug Name: {row['Generic Drug Name']}

Simplified Version: {row['Prescription Bank Sig'].strip() }

Clarified Version: {row['Clarification'].strip() }

Now, using the same format and strictly following the structure of drug name followed by dose, intake amount, intake method, and frequency as seen above, provide the simplified and clarified instructions for the following drug.

Drug Name: {drug\_name}”

### *Data Analysis*

Data was analyzed using Microsoft Excel (version 2025). The predicted Prescription Sig and Complete Instructions were scored independently by two board certified pharmacists who reviewed the predicted sig and instructions for any discrepancies and/or omission of information.

### *Drug-Drug Interactions*

#### *Study Design*

The primary objective was to evaluate the ability of an LLM, GPT-4o to match correctly identify if a list of 3-6 medications contained no drug interactions or up to one drug interaction between two medications and list the medications involved in the interaction. This involved a structured prompting process to elicit an exact response from the LLM during the summer of 2025 using OpenAI API.<sup>6</sup> All test scenarios were completed in separate sessions so previous interactions could not influence subsequent queries. GPT-4o was used with the default settings of Temperature=1.0 and Top P=1.0. The primary outcome was the percentage of matching responses to the “ground truth”.<sup>7</sup>

### *LLM Testing*

A total of 83 medication lists containing 3-6 medications each along with complete instructions for the medications (drug, dose, formulation, route, and frequency) were tested for drug interactions. A “ground truth” test bank was developed using the Lexicomp drug-drug interaction checker.<sup>7</sup> GPT-4o was prompted with the following

"Is there a drug-drug interaction present in this query of medications? If so, what are the two interacting drugs, respond with 'DrugA and DrugB', otherwise, respond with 'No interaction'. Your response must be only the drug pair or 'No interaction'! DO NOT INCLUDE ANYTHING ELSE!"

Each medication list was queried one at a time in separate chats. Each medication list was queried five times using GPT internal knowledge (gpt-4o model) and five times where GPT was permitted to use a single web search to aid in its response (gpt-4o-search-preview).

### *Data Analysis*

Data was analyzed using Microsoft Excel (version 2025). Descriptive statistics for both the internal knowledge and web-assisted responses were utilized, including consistency of the responses, identification of medications not on the medication list, and . Accuracy was quantified by computing cosine similarity on TF-IDF vectors, normalized Levenshtein similarity, and ROUGE-1/ROUGE-L F1 between each response and its reference string. These scores were calculated per drug and averaged to yield a global measure for each model variant. The ROUGE (Recall-Oriented Understudy for Gisting Evaluation) score was calculated by comparing the model-generated output with the given example cases. The ROUGE score is an evaluation metric widely used in the field of natural language processing (NLP), especially in text summarization and machine translation. It is mainly used to evaluate the quality of automatically generated summaries or translations. The core idea of ROUGE is to evaluate candidate abstracts by comparing them to a set of reference abstracts (usually human-written) by measuring overlap of n-grams (or word sequences that appear in both summaries) with recall defined as number of n-grams appearing in both summaries divided by total number of n-grams in the reference summary. Values range from 0-1, with higher values indicating better summary quality. Descriptive statistics were performed, including Chi Square and Mann Whitney U for categorical and continuous variables as appropriate.

$$ROUGE - N = \frac{\sum_{gram_n \in Reference\ Summaries} Count_{match}(gram_n)}{\sum_{gram_n \in Reference\ Summaries} Count(gram_n)}$$

## Results

### *Drug Formulation Identification*

290 medications were tested, with GPT-4o correctly identifying all available formulations of 138 (47.6%) medications. The overall accuracy rate was 65.6%. However, on average there were 2.37 errors per medication with 1.23 missing formulations and 1.14 hallucinations per medication. The error rate appears to increase with increasing number of available formulations as well as types of formulations. When comparing medications with <5 total formulations compared to >10 total formulations, the mean error rate was 0.79 errors/medication compared to 6.08 errors/medication ( $p<0.0001$ ). Comparisons between <5 total formulations and 5-10 total formulations was also significant ( $p=0.001$ ). Medications with >3 types of formulations had higher mean error rates (5.29 errors/medication) compared to medications with only 1 type of formulation (1.45 errors/medication) and 2-3 types of formulations (1.25 errors/medication) with  $p$  values of <0.0001 for both Mann Whitney U analyses. Full results are detailed in **Tables 1 and 2**.

**Table 1. Drug Formulation Test Bank**

Feature	N=290
Formulations per medication, mean $\pm$ SD	7.05 $\pm$ 6.02
Unique formulations per medication, mean $\pm$ SD	2.68 $\pm$ 1.88
Total formulations, n	2088
Formulation Types, n (%)	
Oral	1486 (71.2)
Capsule	189 (9.1)
Tablet	636 (30.5)
Extended-release capsule or tablet	298 (14.3)
Chewable capsule or tablet	28 (1.3)
Extended-release chewable tablet	3 (<1)
Extended-release orally disintegrating tablet	3 (<1)
Orally disintegrating, effervescent, or sublingual	61 (2.9)
Film-coated tablet	2 (<1)
Sublingual liquid	5 (<1)
Lozenge	4 (<1)
Oral film	6 (<1)
Oral granules or pellets	11 (<1)
Buccal tablets or capsules	1 (<1)
Sustained-release tablet or capsule	3 (<1)
Delayed-release tablet or capsule	46 (2.2)
Oral suspension	55 (2.6)
Oral packet or powder	18 (<1)
Extended-release oral suspension	2 (<1)
Oral syrup	2 (<1)
Oral solution, elixir, or concentrate	113 (5.4)
Intravenous	190 (9.1)
Injectable solution or suspension	170 (8.1)
Injectable syringe	14 (<1)
Injectable powder	6 (<1)
Intramuscular	58 (2.8)
Intramuscular suspension or solution	33 (1.6)
Intramuscular syringe or autoinjector	2 (<1)

	Intramuscular oil	12 (<1)
	Extended-release intramuscular suspension	11 (<1)
Subcutaneous		42 (2)
	Subcutaneous solution or suspension	26 (1.2)
	Subcutaneous pellet or implant	1 (<1)
	Extended release subcutaneous solution	1 (<1)
Inhalation		56 (2.7)
	Inhalation aerosol	14 (<1)
	Inhalation solution, suspension, or concentration	15 (<1)
	Inhalation powder, capsule, or cartridge	21 (1)
	Metered dose inhaler	6 (<1)
Intrathecal solution		4 (<1)
Intraarticular suspension		2 (<1)
Nasal		23 (1.1)
	Nasal spray, solution, or powder	21 (1)
	Implant	1 (<1)
	Ointment	1 (<1)
Topical		159 (7.6)
	Cream	36 (1.7)
	Ointment	22 (1.1)
	Lotion	15 (<1)
	Foam	5 (<1)
	Topical solution or external liquid	20 (1)
	Topical spray or aerosol	4 (<1)
	Topical powder	1 (<1)
	Gel	30 (1.4)
	Dental paste	1 (<1)
	Shampoo	2 (<1)
	Pad	1 (<1)
	External swab	1 (<1)
	Transdermal patch	21 (1)
Ophthalmic		45 (2.2)
	Solution	25 (1.2)
	Suspension or emulsion	13 (<1)
	Gel	3 (<1)
	Ointment	1 (<1)
	Intracameral or ophthalmic implant	2 (<1)
Otic Solution		2 (<1)
Rectal		15 (<1)
	Suppository	9 (<1)
	Foam	1 (<1)
	Gel	4 (<1)
	Ointment	1 (<1)
Vaginal		9 (<1)
	Cream	1 (<1)
	Suppository	2 (<1)
	Gel	5 (<1)
	Ring	1 (<1)

**Table 2.** Drug Formulation Identification Results

	N=290
Total errors per medication, mean $\pm$ SD	2.37 $\pm$ 5.40
Total errors per medication, median (IQR)	1 (0-3)
Missing formulations, mean $\pm$ SD	1.23 $\pm$ 3.04
Missing formulations, median (IQR)	0 (0-1)
Hallucinations, mean $\pm$ SD	1.14 $\pm$ 3.91
Hallucinations, median (IQR)	0 (0-1)
Medications with completely correct formulations, n (%)	138 (47.6)
Medications with 1 total error, n (%)	47 (16.2)
Medications with 2 total errors, n (%)	25 (8.6)
Medications with 3 total errors, n (%)	27 (9.3)
Medications with 4 total errors, n (%)	14 (4.8)
Medications with $\geq$ 5 total errors, n (%)	39 (13.4)
Total missing formulations, n	358
Total hallucinated formulations, n	330
Predicted formulations, mean $\pm$ SD	7.17 $\pm$ 6.75
Predicted formulations, n	2057
Correctly predicted formulations, n (%)	1369 (65.6)
Total errors per medication for medications with only 1 type of formulation (n=82), mean $\pm$ SD	1.45 $\pm$ 5.84
Total errors per medication for medications with 2-3 types of formulation (n=131), mean $\pm$ SD	1.25 $\pm$ 1.83
Total errors per medication for medications with >3 types of formulation (n=77), mean $\pm$ SD	5.26 $\pm$ 7.59
Total errors per medication for medications with <5 total formulations (n=121), mean $\pm$ SD	0.79 $\pm$ 1.37
Total errors per medication for medications with 5-10 total formulations (n=109), mean $\pm$ SD	2.01 $\pm$ 5.24
Total errors per medication for medications with >10 total formulations (n=62), mean $\pm$ SD	6.08 $\pm$ 8.24

Total formulations is all available formulations (4% cream and 5% cream count as separate formulations). Total types of formulations separates formulations by route and type (4% and 5% cream would count as 1 formulation “cream” which would be different than an ointment or topical liquid). Types of formulations are detailed in Table 1.

#### *Full Medication Order Generation*

38 medications were tested with GPT-4o. Six medication orders generated by the LLM contained drug errors (15.7%) while eight medication orders (21.1%) contained a lack of standardization of abbreviations or an inappropriate abbreviation used. Only 25 generated sig contained no medication or abbreviation errors (65.8%). A description of the generated sig and errors associated is included in **Table 3**. The Institute of Safe Medication Practices has published guidance on best practices for abbreviations for medication safety.<sup>8</sup> The LLM repeatedly used abbreviations that are not recommended by ISMP, including “OU” instead of “both eyes”, “SC” instead of “SUBQ”, “1 T” instead of “1 tablet”, and “PI”

instead of “place”. Additionally, the LLM hallucinated an abbreviation of “QIDAC” which would mean “four times daily with meals”; however, people do not traditionally eat four meals daily.

**Table 3.** Full Medication Order Generation Errors

Medication Prompt (Provided to LLM)	Prescription Sig (Generated by LLM)	Error Description
Fluticasone/Salmeterol	Fluticasone/Salmeterol 100 mcg/50 mcg Inh 1 puff BID	The dosage form selected is a dry powder inhaler so the dose should say 1 inhalation not 1 puff as this medication cannot be puffed
Bupropion	Bupropion 150 mg PO BID	Bupropion immediate release was selected which is not available as a 150mg tablet and should have been dosed 3-4 times per day. This would be appropriate if the sustained release dosage form was selected which is available as a 150mg tablet and is dosed q12h.
Diltiazem	Diltiazem 60 mg PO BID	Diltiazem immediate release was selected which should have been dosed 4 times per day. This would be appropriate if the 12 hour extended release formulation was selected
Diphenoxylate/Atropine	Diphenoxylate/Atropine 5 mg/0.05 mg PO 1 T QID PRN	There are two errors identified. 1. These tablets come as 2.5/0.025 so this should be 2 tablets to make this dose. 2. It should say PRN diarrhea instead of just PRN.
Hydralazine	Hydralazine 25 mg PO BID	Hydralazine is dosed at least 3-4 times per day, so this is an underdosing of this medication
Latanoprost	Latanoprost 1 drop in affected eye(s) QHS	No strength listed- should be 0.005%.

BID: twice daily, LLM: large language model, mcg: microgram, mg: milligram, PO: by mouth, PRN: as needed, q12h: every twelve hours, QHS: every night at bedtime, QID: four times daily

### *Drug-Drug Interactions*

GPT-4o performed poorly using the internal knowledge test, with a ROGUE-1 F1 average of 55.18% and had improved performance when allowed a single web search prior to its response, with a ROGUE-1 F1 average of 66.32% (**Table 4**). Variances with each test ranged from 1.78 to 7.81. GPT-4o was tested on the first three of these components (drug name, numerical dose, and the unit strength of the dose) in this analysis. The mean percentage of correct answers was 54.7% ( $\pm 43.4$ ) in the internal knowledge query compared to 69.2% ( $\pm 39.8$ ) in the web-assisted query ( $P=0.013$ ) (Table 5). GPT-4o performed better with the web-assisted query for Category C and Category D interactions but performed worse with drug combinations that included no drug interaction (**Table 5**).

**Table 4.** Drug-Drug Interaction Similarity Evaluation

	GPT-4o Internal Knowledge Query*				GPT-4o Web-assisted Query**			
Attempts	Cosine	Levenshtein	ROGUE-1	ROGUE-L	Cosine	Levenshtein	ROGUE-1	ROGUE-L

	Similarity		F1	F1	Similarity		F1	F1
1	47.46%	54.79%	56.99%	50.97%	65.06%	52.95%	63.99%	51.08%
2	43.49%	50.58%	52.96%	47.03%	69.21%	57.76%	68.31%	57.09%
3	46.22%	51.53%	55.48%	48.23%	67.64%	54.41%	67.53%	53.73%
4	42.62%	47.63%	51.66%	43.43%	67.66%	56.97%	67.88%	55.95%
5	49.43%	53.60%	58.82%	50.90%	67.53%	53.63%	63.87%	51.25%
Overall Average	45.84%	51.63%	55.18%	48.11%	67.42%	55.14%	66.32%	53.82%
Variance	6.31	6.20	6.79	7.81	1.78	3.56	3.86	5.87

\*Internal Knowledge Query used gpt-4o model

\*\*Web-assisted Query used gpt-4o-search-preview

**Table 5.** Drug-Drug Interaction Results

	Internal Knowledge Query* (n=83)	Web-assisted Query** (n=83)	P value
Percentage of correct answers, mean ( $\pm$ SD)	54.7 (43.4)	69.2 (39.8)	0.013
Percentage of correct answers, median (IQR)	60 (0-100)	100 (40-100)	0.041
Queries with >1 unique answers, n (%)	33 (39.8)	28 (33.7)	0.42
Queries with >2 unique answers, n (%)	10 (12)	5 (6)	0.28
Queries that were completely correct, n (%)	33 (39.8)	45 (54.2)	0.062
Queries that were completely incorrect, n (%)	25 (30.1)	15 (18.1)	0.070
Answers with medications not on the list provided, n (%)	2 (2.4)	0	0.16
Queries where percentage of correct answers decreased with web-assisted query compared to internal query, n (%)		24 (28.9)	
Queries where percentage of correct answers increased with web-assisted query compared to internal query, n (%)		35 (42.2)	
<b>Category C interactions (n=30)</b>			
Percentage of correct answers, median (IQR)	0 (0-55)	100 (60-100)	<0.001
Queries with >1 unique answers, n (%)	9 (30)	7 (23.3)	0.56
Queries with >2 unique answers, n (%)	4 (13.3)	1 (3.3)	0.16
Queries that were completely correct, n (%)	7 (23.3)	19 (63.3)	0.0018
Queries that were completely incorrect, n (%)	20 (66.7)	5 (16.7)	<0.001
<b>Category D interactions (n=23)</b>			
Percentage of correct answers, median (IQR)	80 (40-100)	100 (100-100)	0.010
Queries with >1 unique answers, n (%)	13 (56.5)	2 (8.7)	<0.001
Queries with >2 unique answers, n (%)	4 (17.4)	0	0.038
Queries that were completely correct, n (%)	10 (43.5)	20 (87)	0.0020

Queries that were completely incorrect, n (%)	2 (8.7)	1 (4.3)	0.55
Category X interactions (n=6)			
Percentage of correct answers, median (IQR)	40 (5-75)	100 (85-100)	0.078
Queries with >1 unique answers, n (%)	3 (50)	1 (16.7)	0.22
Queries with >2 unique answers, n (%)	2 (33.3)	0	0.14
Queries that were completely correct, n (%)	1 (16.7)	4 (66.7)	0.079
Queries that were completely incorrect, n (%)	2 (33.3)	0	0.14
No interactions (n=24)			
Percentage of correct answers, median (IQR)	100 (70-100)	40 (0-60)	<0.001
Queries with >1 unique answers, n (%)	8 (33.3)	17 (70.8)	0.0093
Queries with >2 unique answers, n (%)	1 (4.2)	4 (16.7)	0.16
Queries that were completely correct, n (%)	15 (62.5)	2 (8.3)	<0.001
Queries that were completely incorrect, n (%)	1 (4.2)	9 (37.5)	0.0045

IQR: interquartile range, SD: standard deviation

\*Internal Knowledge Query used gpt-4o model

\*\*Web-assisted Query used gpt-4o-search-preview

## Discussion

GPT-4o was unable to consistently match the drug name to available drug products, with frequent omissions and hallucinations of formulations. This is but a portion of the required components for a complete medication order. This further encapsulates a concern that LLMs do not have appropriate domain-specific training to reliably interpret and recommend medications.<sup>9,10</sup> Medication decisions integrate a complex knowledge base including synergistic mechanisms of drug action and effects of critical illness on pharmacokinetic parameters and pharmacodynamic response.<sup>11</sup> Traditional AI algorithms have inappropriately simplified these elements involved in clinical decision-making events due, in part, to an inability to handle complex alphanumeric medication orders.<sup>11</sup> The alphanumeric text involved with medication orders (e.g., cefepime 2g every 8 hours) requires highly specialized domain knowledge to interpret, particularly in the context of an individual patient (e.g., is this dose appropriate for their present kidney function?) and other medications they are receiving (e.g., is this new medication safe to give with other antibiotics they are taking?). An algorithm must discern whether drug dose affects adverse drug event risk (e.g., cefepime neurotoxicity is dose dependent, whereas a cefepime allergic reaction is not). The AI algorithm must recognize and apply a knowledge of other patient specific information like the impact of dialysis (e.g., cefepime dose reductions in renal failure are appropriate, but when continuous dialysis is initiated for that renal failure, the dose should actually be increased). Finally, an AI algorithm must distinguish differences in units of measure and drug potency across drugs and drug classes (e.g., 2 *grams* of cefepime every 24 hours is at the low to middle end of the dosing range, but 600 *milligrams* every 12 hours of linezolid is the upper end of the dosing range). These issues have precluded appropriate AI-based medication-decision making capacity because incorrect medication decision-making has life-threatening implications in the ICU context.<sup>9,10</sup>

In evaluating drug-drug interactions, GPT-4o was inconsistent in its answers, often giving multiple different answers when queried several times. While a web search improved performance, similarities between the LLM response and the ground truth were not as consistent as desired. Additionally, the web search feature actually worsened identification of scenarios with no drug-drug interactions. This may serve as an example of LLMs having a bias towards syncophancy.<sup>12</sup> Additionally, errors were present in LLM-generated medication order sentences, including some dosing errors (ex. Underdosing a medication frequency) as well as formulation errors (ex. Dosing frequency is incorrect based on type of product selected [i.e. extended release, immediate release, delayed release]).

There is a clear need for clinically relevant, transparent benchmarks to judge the safety and efficacy of LLM-based medication recommendations. While clear standards exist for clinicians (e.g., board certification, graduate degrees) and predictive models (e.g., positive and negative predictive value), LLMs have not been subjected to the clinical rigor necessary for this technology to reach its full potential. A recent viewpoint by the FDA explicitly stated the need for “external stakeholders to ramp up assessment and quality management of AI.”<sup>13</sup> Without an automated means of rigorously evaluating the accuracy of medication recommendations, LLMs will not reach the safety thresholds necessary for bedside use.

Performance for essential medication tasks has the potential to be automated through the use of clinician-annotated datasets. A retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) strategy has been shown to improve LLM performance by integrating external data into the LLM system.<sup>14-16</sup> This analysis used a form of this

strategy by allowing the LLM to perform a single web search prior to completing the request. However, the LLM still often failed to correctly identify the drug-drug interaction. This may indicate that while web-based searches can be helpful for other LLM queries, CMM is a complex topic that requires specific and intentional training for LLMs to be capable of consistently generating appropriate responses.<sup>17-19</sup> Considering that the majority of LLMs are trained on a widely available corpus (e.g., the Internet), there are likely additional challenges in specialties including highly technical language or uncommon situations, which is often the case in medicine overall and specifically the field of pharmacy.<sup>20,21</sup> A clinician-annotated dataset to improve medication performance of LLMs is a large opportunity for future exploration.

## **Conclusions**

These three experiments identified lack of consistency from the LLM when creating medication order sentences and identifying formulations, a tendency to omit and hallucinate available formulations, a tendency to identify drug-drug interactions that do not exist, and moderate improvement in drug-drug interaction identification for Class C and D interactions when using a web-assisted search. Further optimization of LLM performance is necessary prior to consistent use of LLMs at the bedside for CMM.

## References

1. Gilson A, Safranek CW, Huang T, et al. How Does ChatGPT Perform on the United States Medical Licensing Examination (USMLE)? The Implications of Large Language Models for Medical Education and Knowledge Assessment. *JMIR Med Educ*. Feb 8 2023;9:e45312. doi:10.2196/45312
2. Kanjee Z, Crowe B, Rodman A. Accuracy of a Generative Artificial Intelligence Model in a Complex Diagnostic Challenge. *JAMA*. Jul 3 2023;330(1):78–80. doi:10.1001/jama.2023.8288
3. Xu S, Most A, Chase A, et al. Large language models management of complex medication regimens: a case-based evaluation. *medRxiv*. 2024:2024.07.03.24309889. doi:10.1101/2024.07.03.24309889
4. Zhengliang Liu ZW, Mengxuan Hu, Bokai Zhao, Lin Zhao, Tianyi Zhang, Haixing Dai, Xianyan Chen, Ye Shen, Sheng Li, Brian Murray, Tianming Liu, Andrea Sikora. PharmacyGPT: The AI Pharmacist. *arXiv* <https://arxiv.org/abs/230710432>. 2023;
5. Yang H, Hu M, Most A, et al. Evaluating accuracy and reproducibility of large language model performance on critical care assessments in pharmacy education. *Front Artif Intell*. 2024;7:1514896. doi:10.3389/frai.2024.1514896
6. OpenAI. ChatGPT (March 27 version) [Large Language Model]. (<https://chat.openai.com/chat>)
7. Lexidrug U. UpToDate Inc. Accessed August 1, 2025. <https://online.lexi.com>
8. ISMP List of Error-Prone Abbreviations, Symbols, and Dose Designations. 2024. [https://online.ecri.org/hubfs/ISMP/Resources/ISMP\\_ErrorProneAbbreviation\\_List.pdf](https://online.ecri.org/hubfs/ISMP/Resources/ISMP_ErrorProneAbbreviation_List.pdf)
9. Lat I, Paciullo C, Daley MJ, et al. Position Paper on Critical Care Pharmacy Services: 2020 Update. *Crit Care Med*. Sep 2020;48(9):e813–e834. doi:10.1097/CCM.0000000000004437
10. Lee H, Ryu K, Sohn Y, Kim J, Suh GY, Kim E. Impact on Patient Outcomes of Pharmacist Participation in Multidisciplinary Critical Care Teams: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Crit Care Med*. Sep 2019;47(9):1243–1250. doi:10.1097/CCM.0000000000003830
11. Sikora A. Critical Care Pharmacists: A Focus on Horizons. *Crit Care Clin*. Jul 2023;39(3):503–527. doi:10.1016/j.ccc.2023.01.006
12. Malmqvist L. Sycophancy in large language models: Causes and mitigations. Springer; 2025:61–74.
13. Warraich HJ, Tazbaz T, Califf RM. FDA Perspective on the Regulation of Artificial Intelligence in Health Care and Biomedicine. *JAMA*. 2025;333(3):241–247. doi:10.1001/jama.2024.21451
14. Guo Y, Qiu W, Leroy G, Wang S, Cohen T. Retrieval augmentation of large language models for lay language generation. *J Biomed Inform*. Jan 2024;149:104580. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2023.104580
15. Luu RK, Buehler MJ. BioinspiredLLM: Conversational Large Language Model for the Mechanics of Biological and Bio-Inspired Materials. *Adv Sci (Weinh)*. Mar 2024;11(10):e2306724. doi:10.1002/advs.202306724
16. Wang C, Ong J, Wang C, Ong H, Cheng R, Ong D. Potential for GPT Technology to Optimize Future Clinical Decision-Making Using Retrieval-Augmented Generation. *Ann Biomed Eng*. May 2024;52(5):1115–1118. doi:10.1007/s10439-023-03327-6
17. Ge J, Sun S, Owens J, et al. Development of a liver disease-specific large language model chat interface using retrieval-augmented generation. *Hepatology*. Nov 1 2024;80(5):1158–1168. doi:10.1097/hep.0000000000000834
18. Unlu O, Shin J, Mailly CJ, et al. Retrieval augmented generation enabled generative pre-trained transformer 4 (GPT-4) performance for clinical trial screening. *medRxiv*. 2024;
19. Zakka C, Shad R, Chaurasia A, et al. Almanac - Retrieval-Augmented Language Models for Clinical Medicine. *Nejm ai*. Feb 2024;1(2)doi:10.1056/aioa2300068
20. Clusmann J, Kolbinger FR, Muti HS, et al. The future landscape of large language models in medicine. *Commun Med (Lond)*. Oct 10 2023;3(1):141. doi:10.1038/s43856-023-00370-1

21. Soroush A, Glicksberg BS, Zimlichman E, et al. Large Language Models Are Poor Medical Coders — Benchmarking of Medical Code Querying. *NEJM AI*. 2024;1(5):AIdbp2300040. doi:doi:10.1056/AIdbp2300040