

First, do NOHARM: towards clinically safe large language models

David Wu^{1,2,3,*}, Fateme Nateghi Haredasht^{4,*}, Saloni Kumar Maharaj⁵, Priyank Jain^{3,6}, Jessica Tran⁵, Matthew Gwiazdon⁷, Arjun Rustagi⁸, Jenelle Jindal⁹, Jacob M. Koshy^{3,10}, Vinay Kadiyala^{3,10}, Anup Agarwal^{3,6}, Bassman Tappuni^{3,11}, Brianna French¹², Sirus Jesudasan¹³, Christopher V. Cosgriff^{3,14,15,16}, Rebanta Chakraborty^{3,17}, Jillian Caldwell¹⁸, Susan Ziolkowski¹⁸, David J. Iberri¹⁹, Robert Diep¹⁹, Rahul S. Dalal^{3,20}, Kira L. Newman²¹, Kristin Galetta⁹, J. Carl Pallais^{3,22}, Nancy Wei^{3,23}, Kathleen M. Buchheit²⁴, David I. Hong²⁴, Ernest Y. Lee^{25,26}, Allen Shih^{3,27}, Vartan Pahalyants²⁸, Tamara B. Kaplan^{3,29}, Vishnu Ravi¹⁸, Sarita Khemani⁵, April S. Liang⁵, Daniel Shirvani³⁰, Advait Patil³, Nicholas Marshall³¹, Kanav Chopra⁴, Joel Koh³², Adi Badhwar⁴, Liam G. McCoy^{10,33,34}, David J. H. Wu³⁵, Yingjie Weng³⁶, Sumant Ranji³⁷, Kevin Schulman³⁸, Nigam H. Shah⁴, Jason Hom⁵, Arnold Milstein³⁸, Adam Rodman^{3,10,‡}, Jonathan H. Chen^{4,5,38,‡}, Ethan Goh^{4,38,‡}

Corresponding author: jonc101@stanford.edu

Affiliations

¹Harvard Combined Dermatology Program, Boston, MA, USA

²Department of Dermatology, Mass General Brigham, Boston, MA, USA

³Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

⁴Stanford Center for Biomedical Informatics Research, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

⁵Division of Hospital Medicine, Department of Medicine, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, USA

⁶Department of Medicine, Cambridge Health Alliance, Cambridge, MA, USA

⁷Beth Israel Deaconess Hospital–Plymouth, Plymouth, MA, USA

⁸Department of Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA

⁹Department of Neurology, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, USA

¹⁰Department of Medicine, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Boston, MA, USA

¹¹Division of Cardiology, Department of Medicine, Cambridge Health Alliance, Cambridge, MA, USA

¹²Department of Cardiovascular Medicine, Summa Health System, Akron, OH, USA

¹³Division of Allergy, Pulmonary, and Critical Care Medicine, Department of Medicine, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI, USA

¹⁴Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Department of Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, USA

¹⁵Center for Immunology and Inflammatory Diseases, Department of Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, USA

- ¹⁶Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, Cambridge, MA, USA
- ¹⁷Division of Pulmonary, Critical Care, and Sleep Medicine, Cambridge Health Alliance, Cambridge, MA, USA
- ¹⁸Department of Medicine, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, USA
- ¹⁹Division of Hematology, Department of Medicine, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, USA
- ²⁰Division of Gastroenterology, Hepatology, and Endoscopy, Department of Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA, USA
- ²¹Department of Medicine, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA
- ²²Division of Endocrinology, Diabetes, and Hypertension, Department of Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA, USA
- ²³Division of Endocrinology, Department of Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, USA
- ²⁴Division of Allergy and Clinical Immunology, Department of Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA, USA
- ²⁵Department of Dermatology, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA
- ²⁶Bakar Computational Health Sciences Institute, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA
- ²⁷Department of Dermatology, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Boston, MA, USA
- ²⁸Department of Dermatology, The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX, USA
- ²⁹Department of Neurology, Mass General Brigham, Boston, MA, USA
- ³⁰Faculty of Medicine, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada
- ³¹Division of Pediatric Infectious Diseases, Department of Pediatrics, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, USA
- ³²One X Group, Singapore, Singapore
- ³³Division of Neurology, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada
- ³⁴Institute for Medical Engineering and Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA
- ³⁵Department of Radiation Oncology, Stanford Cancer Center, Palo Alto, CA, USA
- ³⁶Quantitative Sciences Unit, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, USA
- ³⁷Division of Hospital Medicine, Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital, San Francisco, CA, USA
- ³⁸Stanford Clinical Excellence Research Center, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

*Co-first authors

‡Co-last authors

Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) are routinely used by physicians and patients for medical advice, yet their clinical safety profiles remain poorly characterized. We present NOHARM (*Numerous Options Harm Assessment for Risk in Medicine*), a benchmark using 100 real primary-care-to-specialist consultation cases to measure harm frequency and severity from LLM-generated medical recommendations. NOHARM covers 10 specialties, with 12,747 expert annotations for 4,249 clinical management options. Across 31 LLMs, severe harm occurs in up to 22.2% (95% CI 21.6–22.8%) of cases, with harms of omission accounting for 76.6% (95% CI 76.4–76.8%) of errors. Safety performance is only moderately correlated ($r = 0.61$ – 0.64) with existing AI and medical knowledge benchmarks. The best models outperform generalist physicians on safety (mean difference 9.7%, 95% CI 7.0–12.5%), and a diverse multi-agent approach reduces harm compared to solo models (mean difference 8.0%, 95% CI 4.0–12.1%). Therefore, despite strong performance on existing evaluations, widely used AI models can produce severely harmful medical advice at nontrivial rates, underscoring clinical safety as a distinct performance dimension necessitating explicit measurement.

Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) are one of the most rapidly-adopted clinical decision support (CDS) tools in history. Currently used by two-thirds of American physicians¹, LLMs are routinely consulted by one in five American physicians for second opinions². While partially a result of the rollout of artificial intelligence (AI) scribes, electronic health record (EHR) features, and other enterprise software, usage has also been driven by direct-to-physician, clinically-grounded AI platforms. One industry estimate suggests that more than 100 million Americans in 2025 will receive care from a physician who has used such a tool³.

Widespread adoption of LLMs in CDS is driven in part by their impressive clinical performance. They have saturated traditional benchmarks on medical knowledge^{4,5} and complex diagnostic mysteries⁶, and outperformed humans on diagnostic and management reasoning tasks^{7,8}. As LLMs become an integral part of routine medical care, understanding and mitigating AI errors is essential. When models are generally accurate, their errors are more likely to be accepted without detection due to automation bias^{9,10}.

Primum non nocere—the avoidance of harm, often termed nonmaleficence—has been a fundamental principle of medicine for thousands of years. Harm, like medical management writ large, is notoriously difficult to quantify. Medical decisions are highly context specific¹¹, reflecting the interaction of patient preferences, tolerance for uncertainty, and health system constraints. Existing studies of medical safety in LLMs have included evaluation of overtly dangerous prompts¹² and retrospective expert review to examine error^{8,13,14}. While manual review can adjudicate the risk of harm for specific LLM outputs, it cannot scale to large datasets or keep pace with the rapid release of new models and clinical AI applications^{3,15,16}. Despite new model releases showing improved performance on knowledge-based benchmarks, performance gains in complex medical management have not been consistent¹⁷. It remains unclear whether knowledge gains serve as a proxy for safe and effective clinical management.

To establish a framework to measure and mitigate harmful medical recommendations from LLMs, we developed NOHARM (*Numerous Options Harm Assessment for Risk in Medicine*). This specialist-validated benchmark consists of 100 real clinical cases spanning 10 medical specialties, with 12,747 detailed annotations of action-level appropriateness (benefit versus harm) by a panel of 29 board-certified physicians, including 23 specialists and subspecialists. In contrast to prior benchmarks where stylized vignettes are edited for clarity and completeness (e.g., medical journal style cases), NOHARM draws on original physician-to-specialist electronic consults at a tertiary academic medical center¹⁸. These cases

preserve the uncertainty, missing context, and authentic clinical questions posed by physicians about patients under their care.

Using NOHARM, we address three questions: (i) how often are AI-generated clinical recommendations harmful? (ii) when they are harmful, how severe is the harm? and (iii) what strategies can mitigate harm? Amid rapidly accelerating real-world use of these systems by both clinicians and patients, we compare models with one another and with practicing physicians to contextualize their relative safety. The benchmark is made available as a public interactive leaderboard with standardized performance metrics, and is open for model submissions to promote independent evaluation of modern clinical AI systems.

Results

We evaluated 31 widely-used LLMs on NOHARM, a specialist-validated benchmark of 100 real primary-care-to-specialist consultation cases spanning 10 clinical specialties (Fig. 1a). LLMs included both open-source and proprietary models released by major AI labs in the past year, as well as retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) systems grounded in clinical knowledgebases^{15,19} (Extended Data Table 1). Each case includes a structured menu of numerous options (Fig. 1b) spanning diagnostic, medication, counseling, follow-up, and procedural management decisions (e.g., “Test: order urinalysis with reflex urine culture”, “Medication: start nitrofurantoin 100 mg PO BID for 5 days”). Each action was rated by multiple board-certified specialists for clinical appropriateness (whether benefit outweighs harm) on a modified RAND-UCLA²⁰ scale using WHO harm severity definitions²¹ (Fig. 2), yielding 4,249 potential actions and 12,747 expert annotations. Experts achieved 95.5% concordance (range ≤ 2) on appropriate and inappropriate actions on this rating scale (Extended Data Fig. 2).




Fig. 1 | Case curation and benchmark design. a, Workflow for case curation, specialist review, and rubric creation. Manual review by multiple physicians, specialists, or subspecialists occurred at each stage. **b**, Simplified example of a benchmark case, numerous options, and annotations. Options with “alt” indicate acceptable alternatives. Example LLM output and scoring in Extended Data Fig. 1.




Fig. 2 | Modified RAND-UCLA appropriateness scale with WHO harm severity definitions. The expert rating scale combines the RAND-UCLA Appropriateness Method (RAM) with harm severity definitions from World Health Organization (WHO) International Classification for Patient Safety to reflect both harm of omission (omitting an appropriate action) and commission (implementing an inappropriate action). Simplified examples of harms of omission and commission are shown in bold with summarized WHO severity definitions in italics.

Harm rates and severity

Across the LLMs evaluated over the 100 benchmark cases, harmful errors occurred at variable frequency (Fig. 3a). The most performant models (Gemini 2.5 Flash, LiSA 1.0, Claude Sonnet 4.5, Gemini 2.5 Pro, and DeepSeek R1) made 11.8–14.6 severely harmful errors, while the least performant models (o4 mini and GPT-4o mini) made 39.9–40.1 severely harmful errors ($P < 0.001$). Moderate and mild harmful errors also occurred across a wide range (moderate 57.1–181, mild 104.2–253.7, $P < 0.001$). The mean number of actions per case varied by model (5.1–14.4, $P < 0.001$), and did not correlate with the number of harmful errors (Pearson $r = -0.17$, $P = 0.35$; Extended Data Fig. 3). A “No Intervention” reference model that always recommends “reassurance only” produced 29 severely harmful errors (dashed line, Fig. 3a).




Fig. 3 | Rates of severely harmful errors by LLMs. a, Number of harmful errors per model across 100 benchmark cases, bars represent mean total count of harmful recommendations categorized as Severe, Moderate, or Mild harm. Each case has numerous options and therefore potential for numerous harmful errors. Colors indicate harm severity; mean values for severe harm displayed. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals around the estimated marginal mean using negative binomial regression for counts. **b,** Number needed to harm per model for severely harmful recommendations, dashed blue line represents number needed to harm from a “No Intervention” model that recommends no actions. In both panels, models were evaluated in 10 independent trials with 2 prompts. Top 6 (a) and 5 (b) models had statistically indistinguishable performance (Dunnett’s test FDR $P > 0.05$).

We next evaluated harm on a per-case basis. For each case, we determined whether models produced at least one severely harmful error, including both errors of commission (e.g., directly recommending an inappropriate medication) and omission (e.g., failing to recommend a critical test). This enabled calculation of the number needed to harm (NNH), which ranged from 4.5 ± 0.13 (worst model) to 11.5 ± 1.3 (best model) (ANOVA $P < 0.001$, Fig. 3b). Notably, the NNH for the “No Intervention” control was 3.5, lower than all tested models. The top 5 models—Gemini 2.5 Flash, LiSA 1.0, DeepSeek R1, Gemini 2.5 Pro, and Llama 4 Maverick—were statistically indistinguishable (Dunnett’s test FDR $P > 0.05$).

Clinical Safety, Completeness, and Restraint

We evaluated three complementary dimensions to evaluate performance in all clinical appropriateness categories (appropriate, uncertain, inappropriate). Drawing from the volume- and harm-weighted AHRQ patient safety composite²², our Safety metric quantifies the avoidance of harm burden, aggregating mild, moderate, and severe errors per case into a single severity-weighted index (Methods). Higher values indicate lower harm, and scores ranged from $46.1 \pm 1.5\%$ (o1 mini) to $69.5 \pm 1.0\%$ (Gemini 2.5 Pro).

Completeness captures whether a model produces an adequate management plan, defined as the proportion of cases in which all highly appropriate actions (those whose omission would cause at least moderate harm) were recommended. Effectively case-level recall (sensitivity) for appropriate actions, Completeness ranged from $28.2 \pm 1.3\%$ (o3 mini) to $67.1 \pm 1.3\%$ (LiSA 1.0). Restraint measures the tendency to avoid equivocal care, defined as the model precision (positive predictive value) contrasting only appropriate and uncertain actions, ranging from $44.6 \pm 0.1\%$ (Llama 4 Scout) to $69.3 \pm 0.8\%$ (o3 mini). Together, these metrics delineate distinct clinical management profiles and enable comparative analysis (Extended Data Fig. 4).




Fig. 4 | Multi-dimensional performance analysis. **a**, Completeness and Safety scores for LLMs. **b**, Performance of 10 human physicians vs worst, average, and best LLMs in a benchmark subset; human physicians underperformed the best LLM in Safety ($P < 0.01$) and the average LLM in Completeness ($P < 0.05$), with no difference in Restraint. Benjamini-Hochberg FDR correction applied to all 99 (33 models x 3 metrics) human-LLM comparisons.

Comparison against human physicians

We assessed 10 board-certified internal medicine physicians against LLMs on a representative 30% subset of benchmark cases (best, worst, and median case by the average LLM per specialty). Physicians were only allowed to use conventional resources (e.g., internet search, UpToDate, PubMed search) without AI assistance. The strongest LLM outperformed physicians on Safety (mean difference 9.7%, CI 7–12.5%, t -test FDR $P < 0.001$), whereas physicians outperformed the weakest models (mean difference 19.2%, CI 16.5–21.8%, FDR $P < 0.001$). The average LLM outperformed humans on Completeness (mean difference 15.6%, CI 11.4–19.9%, t -test FDR $P < 0.05$), whereas LLM and human physician performance was not different for Restraint (Fig. 4b).

Correlation with external benchmarks and model parameters

Performance on general artificial intelligence (ARC-AGI, GPQA-Diamond, Humanity's Last Exam, and LMArena) and medical knowledge benchmarks (MedQA) showed selective overall correlation with NOHARM metrics (Extended Data Fig. 5a). Across all pairwise comparisons, the only benchmarks that significantly correlated (FDR $P < 0.05$) were Safety versus GPQA-Diamond (Pearson's $r = 0.61$, Spearman's $\rho = 0.66$), Safety versus LMArena ($r = 0.64$, $\rho = 0.63$), and Restraint versus MedQA ($r = 0.51$, $\rho = 0.69$). No external benchmark correlated with Completeness, and in all cases, the majority of variance remained unexplained.

Similarly, we explored whether model age, size, or reasoning capability were predictive of clinical safety performance. In a linear regression model, only Restraint was positively predicted by reasoning ability (binarized variable; $\beta = 0.062 \pm 0.026$) and larger size (ordinal variable; $\beta = 0.042 \pm 0.026$) after multiple testing correction (Extended Data Fig. 5b). Collectively, these findings indicate that safe and complete management performance is not easily predicted by existing benchmarks or common proxies for model strength.

Harm taxonomy and error analysis

Across models, omission was the predominant source of harm. Errors of omission accounted for $50.2 \pm 0.1\%$ of all harmful errors and $76.6 \pm 0.2\%$ of severely harmful errors, significantly exceeding the distribution observed by random chance ($63.9 \pm 2.4\%$ severe omissions; FDR $P < 0.001$; Fig. 5a). At the case level, omission-driven severe harm (e.g., failing to order a critical test, leading to delayed diagnosis) exceeded commission-driven severe harm (e.g., inappropriately prescribing a high-risk medication) for nearly all models (Fig. 5b).




Fig. 5 | Harm taxonomy and error analysis. **a**, Harmful errors classified as errors of commission versus omission. Random Intervention model shown as a reference. Except where noted as *n.s.*, all pairwise comparisons are statistically significant with *t*-test FDR $P < 0.001$. **b**, Case-level errors of severe harm by commission (X-axis) versus omission (Y-axis) of benchmarked models. **c**, Error decomposition by intervention type reveals the outperformance of top models is largely due to reducing severe diagnostic and counseling errors of omission. All error bars represent 95% confidence intervals around the mean; for **c**, estimated marginal mean from negative binomial regression.

To further characterize these failures, we decomposed harm by intervention category. Errors spanned diagnostic, medication, procedural, counseling, and follow-up actions, with the performance advantage of top models driven primarily by reductions in diagnostic and follow-up omission errors (Fig. 5c). These findings highlight that the predominant safety risk in current LLM systems arises from failures to recommend critical actions, rather than from inappropriately recommending harmful actions.

Harm mitigation through multi-agent orchestration

Combining LLMs in multi-agent configurations can enhance diagnostic reasoning²³. We thus explored whether harm can be mitigated in a multi-agent orchestration approach where outputs of one model (“Advisor”) are reviewed and revised by subsequent models (“Guardian”) prompted to reduce harmful output (Fig. 6a). Multi-agent configurations had 5.9-fold higher odds of achieving top-quartile Safety performance than solo models (FDR $P < 0.05$; Fig. 6b). Analysis of multi-agent composition revealed greater model and organizational diversity (e.g., score 3 = three models from three companies) was associated with higher Safety ($\beta = 0.051 \pm 0.024$), Completeness ($\beta = 0.024 \pm 0.022$), and Restraint ($\beta = 0.026 \pm 0.024$) (Fig. 6c).




Fig. 6 | Harm mitigation through multi-agent orchestration. **a**, Solo and multi-agent configurations; additional agents receive a Guardian prompt to review and revise the initial recommendations from the Advisor agent to avoid harm. **b**, Proportions of solo and multi-agent configurations within Safety, Completeness, and Restraint performance quartiles. Multi-agent configurations had 5.9-fold higher odds of achieving top-quartile Safety performance than solo models (logistic regression FDR $P < 0.05$). **c**, Systematic evaluation of 3-agent configurations from low (3 agents composed of the same model) to high (3 agents composed of different models) diversity; diversity calculated from mean of # models & # organizations, and positively predicted all metrics in a linear regression model (FDR $P < 0.05$).

The most performant multi-agent configuration included an open-source model (Llama 4 Scout) followed by a proprietary model (Gemini 2.5 Pro), and a RAG system (LiSA 1.0) (Extended Data Fig. 6a). Comparing the top 5 performers in each configuration (Extended Data Fig. 6b), three-agent configurations outperformed two-agent (mean difference $4.9 \pm 2.9\%$, FDR $P < 0.001$) and solo configurations (mean difference $8.0 \pm 4.1\%$, FDR $P < 0.001$). These results demonstrate that multi-agent orchestration, particularly when combining heterogeneous models and retrieval-augmented capabilities, can mitigate clinical harm without additional fine-tuning or model retraining.

Performance trade-offs

Across 177 solo models and multi-agent configurations, we examined relationships and trade-offs between Safety, Completeness, and Restraint (Fig. 7a). Safety and Completeness showed a weak linear relationship (Pearson $r = 0.16 \pm 0.15$). Restraint and Completeness were inversely correlated ($r = -0.69 \pm 0.07$), reflecting a linear precision-recall trade-off. For Safety and Restraint, a quadratic fit explains significantly more variance (adj. $R^2 = 0.65$) than a linear fit ($R^2 = 0.11$), indicating an inverted-U relationship where Safety performance peaks at intermediate levels of Restraint (Fig. 7b).

Models from OpenAI were broadly observed to favor Restraint (Extended Data Fig. 7a), leading to the highest measured Restraint (o3 mini, $70.1 \pm 0.07\%$) and lower median Safety and Completeness compared to all other solo models (Wilcoxon FDR $P < 0.05$). Notably, the latest frontier model, Gemini 3 Pro, also scored highly on Restraint at the cost of Completeness (lowest amongst non-OpenAI models) and Safety (median amongst non-OpenAI models). Prompt sensitivity analysis in a subset of models using “Avoider” (briefly, “limit recommendations to 5 options unless necessary, avoid harm at all costs”) and “Maximizer” (briefly, “maximize benefit and minimize harm”) prompts intended to favor or disfavor Restraint led to expected performance shifts along the Safety-Restraint trade-off curve. Whereas decreasing the Restraint of Gemini 2.5 Flash (relatively low Restraint at baseline) reduced Safety performance, decreasing the Restraint of GPT-5 (relatively high Restraint at baseline) improved Safety (Extended Data Fig. 7b, t -test FDR $P < 0.05$). As Restraint is a precision-like metric, models generally tuned for higher precision may, paradoxically, reduce clinical safety performance.




Fig. 7 | Performance trade-offs. **a**, Pairs plot of key metrics from all 177 models and multi-agent configurations. Restraint (analogous to precision) is the main performance trade-off for both Completeness and Safety, forming a linear trade-off with Completeness and an inverted-U trade-off with Safety. Pearson r , P , and R^2 values shown. **b**, Quadratic P and R^2 shown for Safety versus Restraint pop-out.

Discussion

The accelerating integration of large language models into clinical decision support has far outpaced the development of evaluation frameworks capable of safeguarding patients. With few exceptions^{24,25}, existing automated evaluations—whether based on simulated vignettes, USMLE-style knowledge tests, or edited clinical cases—focus on encoded knowledge and diagnostic reasoning, but not how their output impacts patients. While physicians maintain oversight in human-in-the-loop systems, this safeguard is imperfect and undermined by cognitive load, time pressure, and generally accurate AI outputs, which increases the likelihood that physicians will default to accepting plausible AI recommendations via automation bias. Increasingly capable systems^{4,26,27} can therefore paradoxically heighten risk, as harmful errors become harder to detect and more likely to reach patients. As such, accuracy is insufficient; patient safety will also be determined by the model’s failure profile—the frequency, severity, and types of harmful errors. This need will only intensify as health systems move from human-in-the-loop to human-on-the-loop workflows in which clinicians oversee and audit AI systems rather than review every output. This necessary shift is driven not only by clinician scarcity but also by the recognition that continuous, case-by-case human oversight is neither scalable nor cognitively sustainable^{4,27,28}.

NOHARM is an important step in addressing this gap by introducing a benchmark centered on patient-level harm. By anchoring assessment in real physician-patient clinical encounters and a decision space of numerous plausible management actions, NOHARM reframes medical AI evaluation around concrete clinical actions and their patient-level impact.

Our study has several major conclusions. First, LLMs make harmful errors at nontrivial rates, and common proxies of model intelligence (e.g., recency, parameter size, reasoning modes, and performance on artificial general intelligence benchmarks) do not reliably predict this performance. This highlights a limitation of current evaluation practices: accuracy-focused benchmarks cannot substitute for explicit measurement of safety, and likely underestimate the risks of live clinical deployment. Strong government support and concerted efforts to develop more sophisticated clinical management benchmarks are critical, as AI labs iteratively tune their models to excel on available benchmarks. Investment in such infrastructure will enable robust, automated clinical harm audits of AI models, which may become standardized in the regulatory clearance for future clinical decision support systems.

Second, we find that multi-agent systems²³ can substantially reduce harm. Diverse LLM combinations that assembled models from different organizations outperformed homogeneous configurations, with the most performant combination composed of an open-source model, a

proprietary model, and a medically-grounded RAG system. Incorporation of independent AI agents may therefore serve as a powerful and scalable approach for auditing and mitigating clinical harm in deployment. Collective intelligence has also been shown to improve human clinical performance²⁹ and studies of physician-AI collaborative teams reflecting real-world use are essential.

Third, we observe that Safety shows an inverted-U relationship with Restraint, an analogue of precision. This indicates that models tuned to be highly precise (e.g., OpenAI models and Gemini 3 Pro in our evaluation) as well as overly permissive models both suffer in clinical safety performance, as Safety peaks at intermediate levels of Restraint. Models trained for precision may only issue a limited set of high-confidence recommendations and intuitively seem “safer”; indeed, the general LLM safety literature^{12,30} typically assesses safety through prompt refusal or output suppression rather than underuse; paradoxically, this can reduce clinical safety by proliferating errors of omission, the major source of serious medical errors³¹.

Finally, our head-to-head comparisons of LLMs with human physicians indicate that certain models are already safer than human generalist physicians limited to conventional tools. The wider literature on patient safety implicates human error as a substantial contributor to morbidity and mortality, with diagnostic error and errors of omission playing outsized roles^{31–34}. While there may be natural unease regarding harm from AI-based CDS, an important implication of our work is, “compared with what?”³⁵ Harm of inaction can be substantial, as demonstrated by the baseline “No Intervention” model which produced more harm than every LLM evaluated. To do no harm, one must also consider the harm of maintaining the status quo.

There are several limitations to our study. In live clinical settings, electronic consultations are often supplemented with additional chart review; as chart review is not possible for a single-turn benchmark, we added minimal clarifying information in some cases to ensure sufficient interpretability, which may have improved both model and human performance. We also treated actions as largely independent, incorporating some logic for certain interactions (e.g., equivalent alternatives such as two acceptable antibiotic choices or two acceptable imaging studies); in reality, medical decisions are often linked in even more complex ways. Harm ratings are based on expert concordance; while this is the gold standard in the evaluation of management reasoning, it necessarily reflects practice patterns of academic medical centers. Ratings also focused exclusively on patient harm; financial or system-level impacts were out of scope, although many wasteful actions are captured in the Uncertain category. Finally, cases were drawn from outpatient electronic consultations, reflecting low acuity, slightly perplexing problems initially presenting to primary care. As such, our findings may not reflect inpatient

admissions or straightforward primary care visits. This dataset nonetheless represents a broad range of real-world consultation questions and medical topics that may be encountered in a variety of clinical settings.

Our study establishes a foundation for clinical safety evaluation at a moment when powerful LLMs are being integrated into patient care faster than their risks can be understood. We demonstrate that commonly-used AI models produce severely harmful recommendations at meaningful rates, and illuminate clinical safety as a distinct performance dimension that must be explicitly measured. This work lays the groundwork for scalable and continuous patient safety surveillance of AI systems as they move from documentation support to shaping consequential clinical decisions.

Methods

Benchmark design and specialist review

To reflect authentic clinical questions posed by physicians on real patient cases, we collected a database of 16,399 physician-to-specialist eConsult cases at Stanford Health Care¹⁸. Each eConsult case consists of a question–answer pair: a primary care physician submits a clinical question about a patient under their care, and a specialist provides recommendations after reviewing the patient’s chart through purely electronic communication.

Candidate cases were identified from the 16,399 cases by first filtering for recency (after 2023) and to exclude cases without specialist responses (16,399 → 4,356). The most frequently consulted specialties were identified leading to 10 selected for evaluation, including Allergy, Cardiology, Dermatology, Endocrinology, Gastroenterology, Hematology, Infectious Diseases, Nephrology, Neurology, and Pulmonology. Three physicians (backgrounds in Internal Medicine, Dermatology, and Neurology) reviewed the filtered dataset by evaluating clinical questions and the associated specialist response, with the goal of identifying 10-20 per specialty with sufficient detail and clinical significance. Efforts were made to select cases of varying topics within each specialty. In total, the physicians identified 149 candidate cases for specialist review. Prior to review and in order to prevent re-identification, all cases were manually anonymized by the physicians by adding, removing, or editing non-pertinent case details (e.g., exact age, exact lab values, past medical history, medication list, etc).

In order to approve a case for the benchmark, specialist reviewers were asked to qualitatively review the representativeness of the case and the clinical appropriateness and completeness of recommendations. They were also asked to rate the case complexity and potential for risk, although these factors were not used to select cases. Minor changes to the recommendations or missing case details were added in 61% of cases to ensure sufficient case information and generalizable recommendations outside of institution-specific practices. Whenever possible, specialists from different institutions were assigned to the same case in order to limit provider-specific and institution-specific practice patterns. Approval for inclusion in the benchmark required independent approval of the case and the recommendations by all specialists; *i.e.*, a case was rejected from benchmark inclusion if any specialist rejected the case. For consistency, 10 cases per specialty were included in the final benchmark. Examples of cases that were approved (but not ultimately included) and rejected cases are available in Extended Data Table 3.

Numerous options generation

To generate the expert curated rubric for approved cases, we enumerated the menu of numerous management options that are medically plausible for each case. We queried eight LLMs for both appropriate and inappropriate recommendations on each case in order to capture a broad range of potential recommendations suggested by various LLMs. The LLMs used for this query included GPT-5, GPT-4o, o3 mini, Gemini 2.5 Pro, Claude 3.7 Sonnet, Claude Opus 4, DeepSeek R1, and o1. All options followed a consistent structured format, and included orders for diagnostic tests (“Diagnostic: order complete blood count”), medications (“Medication: order prednisone 20 mg PO daily for 5 days”), as well as for specialty referrals and follow-up plans (“Follow-up: immediate evaluation in the emergency department”). A total of 17,278 options were generated (median 179 per case). Identical or highly similar options (“Diagnostic: order HIV blood test” or “Diagnostic: order HIV screen”) were then condensed by a physician using multiple LLMs (Claude 3.7 Sonnet and Gemini 2.5 Pro) to group similar options in addition to manual review. This resulted in 4,249 unique options across the 100 cases. Appropriate options were interleaved with irrelevant and potentially harmful actions at ratios intended to approximate clinical decision density. All final 4,249 options underwent manual physician review to verify clinical plausibility prior to specialist annotation.

Expert rubric annotation

For all benchmark cases, 2 specialists/subspecialists and an internal medicine physician or for some specialties 3 specialists/subspecialists independently reviewed the numerous options, blinded to each other’s ratings. Raters were instructed to use a 9-point scale combining the RAND-UCLA Appropriateness Method²⁰ and WHO International Classification for Patient Safety²¹ definitions of harm severity to rate the clinical appropriateness (“do the expected benefits outweigh the expected harm?”) and harm severity of each option (Figs. 1-2). Actions were assessed for both harm of commission (potential harm resulting from implementation, e.g., recommending an inappropriate medication that is dangerous for the patient) and harm of omission (an appropriate action with potential harm if not implemented; e.g., failing to order a critical diagnostic test). In a simplified example case for an uncomplicated urinary tract infection, an appropriate set of actions include ordering a urinalysis, guideline supported first-line antibiotics, and patient counseling on return precautions; inappropriate or harmful actions include unnecessary advanced imaging, prescribing opioids for pain, or emergency room referral (Fig. 1b and Extended Data Fig. 1). Reviewers were explicitly instructed to only rate

medical harm to the patient, not financial or system-level harm, per the RAND/UCLA Appropriateness Method²⁰.

As scoring relied on the action-level harm rating, we evaluated concordance at the level of each individual action. Concordance definitions were based on the original RAND-UCLA Appropriateness Method, requiring scores to fall within a 3-point range on the 9-point scale. The range of scores for each action was further subclassified into Perfectly Concordant (e.g., all 3 raters gave an identical score of 8), Near Perfectly Concordant (e.g., 2 raters gave a score of 8 and 1 gave a score of 9), Concordant (e.g., raters gave scores of 7, 8, 9), or Discordant (range greater than 3). For harm severity grading of LLM benchmark results, we applied a strict standard of requiring a unanimous threshold, e.g. raters must unanimously score a recommendation as Severe Harm in order to achieve the Severe Harm score; otherwise, harm severity is downgraded to Moderate Harm, and so forth. The expert panel provided 12,747 annotations on appropriateness and harm severity, with 84% near-perfect concordance and 95.5% overall concordance on appropriate and inappropriate options (Extended Data Fig. 2).

Large language model selection and API access

We included in our evaluation a set of contemporary, widely-used LLMs from frontier labs and clinical RAG systems. All LLMs except one (o1 mini) were released within the past 12 months preceding manuscript preparation. For clinical RAG systems, we contacted seven companies with commercial medical RAG products for clinical decision support; only two, AMBOSS and Glass Health, had API access available.

We accessed LLMs via HTTP POST requests to the respective API endpoint. For a number of models, we used SecureGPT, an internal secure API gateway at Stanford Health Care. For models not available through SecureGPT, we obtained API access directly through the provider or via OpenRouter. For the medical RAG systems, we requested endpoints with zero data retention to protect benchmark integrity. Other than technical details regarding expected input and output formats, AMBOSS and Glass Health were not provided additional information about benchmark content or opportunities for model tuning. In all cases, we paid for all token usage, including for that associated with the RAG models. Details on all models and APIs are provided in Extended Data Table 1.

Scoring and metrics

Model output was scored along multiple dimensions. First, harm associated with each action was determined by evaluating whether the model recommended the option (Extended Data Fig. 1). Appropriate options that were correctly recommended were scored as no harm. Inappropriate options that were incorrectly recommended (error of commission) were scored based on the harm level in the expert rubric (mild, moderate, severe). Appropriate options that were missed (error of omission) were also scored based on the expert rubric (mild, moderate, severe). All uncertain options that were recommended were scored as Uncertain. Logic for handling interactions included alternative (selecting one of equivalent alternatives was not penalized), best alternative (selecting an alternative but not the best choice was penalized as the difference between the rated harm levels), and superset (no penalty for selecting an appropriate option that superseded unselected appropriate options). The aforementioned harm counts were used as the basis for deriving the following metrics:

Number of harmful errors: sum of error counts across the benchmark, stratified by severity.

Case harm rate: percent of cases with at least one severe error

Number needed to harm: reciprocal of the case harm rate

Safety: We compute a weighted sum of harmful errors capped at severe harm per case:

$$H_i = \min(w_{sev}, \sum_h w_h c_{i,h})$$

and define case-level safety as:

$$1 - \frac{H_i}{w_{sev}}$$

Safety was then computed as the macro-average of case-level safety. Weights were determined by prespecifying integer multipliers and conducting sensitivity analyses over a grid of weights for moderate and severe harm (Extended Data Fig. 8).

Completeness: percent of cases where all highly appropriate (RAND/UCLA score > 7; actions whose omission would lead to moderate or worse harm) recommendations were made. This represents the recall or sensitivity of highly appropriate actions at the case-level.

Restraint: percent of recommended actions that were clinically appropriate, contrasted only with uncertain / equivocal actions. This represents the precision (positive predictive value) with a focus on uncertain / equivocal actions.

Precision (Positive Predictive Value): percent of recommended actions that were clinically appropriate, contrasted with all other actions (both uncertain and inappropriate)

Recall (Sensitivity): percent of all clinically appropriate options that were recommended by the model

Escalation Rate: percent of escalation actions (emergency department referral, in-person specialist referral) that were appropriately recommended by the model

Overall Score: harmonic mean of Safety, Completeness, and Restraint

Additionally, to establish technical baseline conditions for the benchmark, we determined the performance of a “Random Intervention” model (n options randomly recommended, with n = median number of options selected for that case by all LLMs) as well as a “No Intervention” model (recommends reassurance without further testing or treatment in all cases), which appear in figures and analyses for reference.

Statistical quantification and analyses

Means of independent trials and 95% confidence intervals were calculated wherever applicable. For count-based outcomes (e.g., number of harmful errors), negative binomial regression was used; for continuous outcomes, two-sample t -tests or Wilcoxon rank-sum tests were used as indicated in the figure or text. Whenever multiple hypotheses were tested within a figure, Benjamini-Hochberg FDR-adjusted P -values were calculated and reported. All tests were two-sided.

Prompt sensitivity analysis

All benchmarks were run in a zero-shot setting for all models. To explore prompt sensitivity in solo models, we evaluated a standardized prompt with main variants: a “Maximizer” variant (briefly, “maximize benefit and minimize harm”) and an “Avoider” variant (briefly, “limit recommendations to 5 options unless necessary, avoid harm at all costs”). For each model and prompt, we generated 10 independent trials. As prompt-specific performance varies across models, results for solo models are reported as the average performance across both prompts, unless otherwise specified. Full prompts are in Extended Data Table 2.

Multi-agent orchestration and diversity score

Multi-agent configurations combined a primary Advisor agent (following the standardized prompt) with one or two Guardian agents (Fig. 6a) in a linear fashion. A standardized Orchestrator followed by a role-specific prompt (e.g., the Guardian prompt) was prefixed to the

prompt when querying the second or third agent. The entire input and output of prior agents was passed to any subsequent agents to ensure full context at each agent stage. Given combinatorial expansion, for multi-agent configurations we sampled a subset of models from multiple organizations, including both high- and low-performing solo models. For the diversity analysis, we included select models from Meta, Google, DeepSeek, and OpenAI in order to ensure systematic evaluation of model combinations. Diversity score is defined as the mean of the number of unique models and the number of unique companies, with a diversity of 1 representing all roles using the same model (e.g., DeepSeek R1 for all 3 roles) and diversity of 3 representing each role using a different model/organization. Distinct models within the same organization thereby contribute 0.5 (e.g., a two-agent configuration with two distinct OpenAI models scores 1.5).

Comparison against human physicians

To contextualize LLM performance, we conducted head-to-head comparisons against 10 board-certified internal medicine physicians. Given the extensive length of the benchmark, only 30% of the benchmark cases were included in this comparison. Cases were selected by identifying the cases with the best, worst, and median performance in each specialty by the average LLM. We then evaluated human and LLM performance in this case subset across all metrics. Physicians were randomly assigned to 10 cases each, for a total of 3 trials per case. Physicians were not provided any knowledge of the case topic ahead of time, and were able to use conventional resources of their choosing (e.g., internet search, UpToDate, PubMed search), without access to AI-enabled tools.

External benchmarks and model parameter analyses

External benchmark scores were obtained from public leaderboards (Extended Data Table 5). For each model, we computed pairwise Pearson's r and Spearman's ρ between NOHARM benchmark metrics and the external benchmark scores. Model recency (age in months since release date), reasoning capability (binary indicator), and approximate parameter size (ordinal categories of "small" [$\leq 50B$], "medium" [$> 50B - \leq 100B$], or "large" [$> 100B$] parameters; Extended Data Table 1) were used as predictors in multivariable linear regression models. FDR-adjusted P values were reported for all model-level associations.

Data availability

Summarized model performance metrics are available in Extended Data Table 4.

An interactive data explorer and visualizer is available at <https://bench.arise-ai.org/>

A public case set will be available following publication at <https://github.com/HealthRex/noharm>

Code availability

Analysis code will be available following publication at <https://github.com/HealthRex/noharm>

Funding and acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by the Stanford Bio-X Interdisciplinary Initiatives Program Seed Grant (Round 12, 2024). J.H.C. is supported in part by the National Institutes of Health/National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (1R01AI17812101), the NIH National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences Clinical and Translational Science Award (UM1TR004921), the NIH Center for Undiagnosed Diseases at Stanford (U01 NS134358), the Stanford RAISE Health Seed Grant (2024), the Stanford Bio-X Interdisciplinary Initiatives Seed Grants Program (IIP, Round 12), and the Josiah Macy Jr. Foundation (AI in Medical Education). This research used data or services provided by STARR, the STAnford medicine Research data Repository, a clinical data warehouse containing live Epic data from Stanford Health Care (SHC), the University Healthcare Alliance (UHA) and Packard Children's Health Alliance (PCHA) clinics, as well as other auxiliary data from hospital applications such as radiology PACS. The STARR platform is developed and operated by the Stanford Medicine Research IT team and is supported by the Stanford School of Medicine Research Office. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the NIH, Stanford Health Care or any other organization. We thank Maxime Griot for helpful comments in manuscript preparation. We thank members of the Chen lab and the ARISE network for helpful discussions. We thank Jennifer Li, whose continued support made this project possible.

Author contributions

Conceptualization: D.W., E.G., F.N.H., & J.H.C. Methodology: D.W., F.N.H., E.G., S.K.M., P.J., & J.H.C. Validation/Investigation: D.W., F.N.H., S.K.M., P.J., J.T., M.G., A.R., J.J., J.M.K., V.K., A.A., B.T., B.F., S.J., C.V.C., R.C., J.C., S.Z., D.J.I., R.D., R.S.D., K.L.N., K.G., J.C.P., N.W., K.M.B., D.I.H., E.Y.L., A.S., V.P., T.B.K., V.R., S.K., A.S.L., D.S., A.P., N.M., K.C., J.K., A.B., L.G.M., D.J.H.W., Y.W., S.R., J.H., & A.M. Formal analysis: D.W. Resources/Data curation: D.W., F.N.H., K.S., & N.H.S. Writing—original draft: D.W., E.G., A.R., & J.H.C. Writing—review &

editing: all authors. Visualization: D.W. Supervision: A.R., J.H.C., & E.G. Funding acquisition: J.H.C.

Competing interests

E.G., A.R. and J.H.C. disclose funding from the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation (grant no. 12409). A.R. also reports grants from the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation, the Macy Foundation, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the Advanced Research Projects Agency for Health (ARPA-H), and consulting as a visiting researcher at Google DeepMind. D.W. is a paid consultant for Chronicle Medical Software. J.J. is a founder of Jindal Neurology, Inc. R.D. reports consulting for Novartis (ITP drug) and research funding from Veralox Therapeutics and Sanofi. C.V.C. reports consulting for Gilead on drug safety regarding immune checkpoint inhibitors; these activities are not relevant to the present work. K.M.B. reports consulting for Regeneron, Sanofi, GSK, AstraZeneca and Eli Lilly, and research funding from Regeneron related to chronic rhinosinusitis and asthma. J.H.C. reports co-founding Reaction Explorer LLC, which develops and licenses organic chemistry education software; paid medical expert witness fees from Sutton Pierce, Younker Hyde MacFarlane, Sykes McAllister and Elite Experts; paid consulting fees from ISHI Health; and paid one-time honoraria or travel expenses for invited presentations by insitro, General Reinsurance Corporation, AASCIF, Cozeva and other industry conferences, academic institutions and health systems. He receives research funding support, as detailed in the Funding section, including from the National Institutes of Health/National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (1R01AI17812101), the NIH/National Institute on Drug Abuse Clinical Trials Network (UG1DA015815—CTN-0136), the Stanford Artificial Intelligence in Medicine and Imaging—Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence Partnership Grant, the NIH National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences Clinical and Translational Science Award (UM1TR004921), the Stanford Bio-X Interdisciplinary Initiatives Seed Grants Program (IIP, Round 12), the NIH Center for Undiagnosed Diseases at Stanford (U01 NS134358) and the American Heart Association Strategically Focused Research Network in Diversity in Clinical Trials. The other authors declare no competing interests. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish or preparation of the manuscript.

Ethics declarations

Expert participation and data handling were reviewed by Stanford University Institutional Review Board (IRB #47618).

Extended Data

Extended Data Fig. 1: Example answers and grading

Extended Data Fig. 2: Concordance on expert panel ratings

Extended Data Fig. 3: Model recommendation rate

Extended Data Fig. 4: Model profile comparison

Extended Data Fig. 5: External measures of performance

Extended Data Fig. 6: Solo model versus multi-agent performance

Extended Data Fig. 7: Restraint trade-offs

Extended Data Fig. 8: Safety index sensitivity analysis

Extended Data Table 1: Model information

Extended Data Table 2: Prompt information

Extended Data Table 3: Case examples

Extended Data Table 4: Summarized performance metrics

Extended Data Table 5: External benchmarks

Figure 1




Fig. 1 | Case curation and benchmark design. **a**, Workflow for case curation, specialist review, and rubric creation. Manual review by multiple physicians, specialists, or subspecialists occurred at each stage. **b**, Simplified example of a benchmark case, numerous options, and annotations. Options with “alt” indicate acceptable alternatives. Example LLM output and scoring in Extended Data Fig. 1.

Figure 2




Fig. 2 | Modified RAND-UCLA appropriateness scale with WHO harm severity definitions. The expert rating scale combines the RAND-UCLA Appropriateness Method (RAM) with harm severity definitions from World Health Organization (WHO) International Classification for Patient Safety to reflect both harm of omission (omitting an appropriate action) and commission (implementing an inappropriate action). Simplified examples of harms of omission and commission are shown in bold with summarized WHO severity definitions in italics.

Figure 3




Fig. 3 | Rates of severely harmful errors by LLMs. a, Number of harmful errors per model across 100 benchmark cases, bars represent mean total count of harmful recommendations categorized as Severe, Moderate, or Mild harm. Each case has numerous options and therefore potential for numerous harmful errors. Colors indicate harm severity; mean values for severe harm displayed. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals around the estimated marginal mean using negative binomial regression for counts. **b,** Number needed to harm per model for severely harmful recommendations, dashed blue line represents number needed to harm from a “No Intervention” model that recommends no actions. In both panels, models were evaluated in 10 independent trials with 2 prompts. Top 6 (a) and 5 (b) models had statistically indistinguishable performance (Dunnett’s test FDR $P > 0.05$).

Figure 4




Fig. 4 | Multi-dimensional performance analysis. a, Completeness and Safety scores for LLMs. **b**, Performance of 10 human physicians vs worst, average, and best LLMs in a benchmark subset; human physicians underperformed the best LLM in Safety ($P < 0.01$) and the average LLM in Completeness ($P < 0.05$), with no difference in Restraint. Benjamini-Hochberg FDR correction applied to all 99 (33 models x 3 metrics) human-LLM comparisons.

Figure 5




Fig. 5 | Harm taxonomy and error analysis. **a**, Harmful errors classified as errors of commission versus omission. Random Intervention model shown as a reference. Except where noted as *n.s.*, all pairwise comparisons are statistically significant with *t*-test FDR $P < 0.001$. **b**, Case-level errors of severe harm by commission (X-axis) versus omission (Y-axis) of benchmarked models. **c**, Error decomposition by intervention type reveals the outperformance of top models is largely due to reducing severe diagnostic and counseling errors of omission. All error bars represent 95% confidence intervals around the mean; for c. estimated marginal mean from negative binomial regression.

Figure 6




Fig. 6 | Harm mitigation through multi-agent orchestration. **a**, Solo and multi-agent configurations; additional agents receive a Guardian prompt to review and revise the initial recommendations from the Advisor agent to avoid harm. **b**, Proportions of solo and multi-agent configurations within Safety, Completeness, and Restraint performance quartiles. Multi-agent configurations had 5.9-fold higher odds of achieving top-quartile Safety performance than solo models (logistic regression FDR $P < 0.05$). **c**, Systematic evaluation of 3-agent configurations from low (3 agents composed of the same model) to high (3 agents composed of different models) diversity; diversity positively predicted all metrics in a linear regression model (FDR $P < 0.05$).

Figure 7






Fig. 7 | Performance trade-offs. a, Pairs plot of key metrics from all 177 models and multi-agent configurations. Restraint (analogous to precision) is the main performance trade-off for both Completeness and Safety, forming a linear trade-off with Completeness and an inverted-U trade-off with Safety. Pearson r , P , and R^2 values shown. **b**, Quadratic P and R^2 shown for Safety versus Restraint pop-out.

Extended Data Figure 1




Extended Data Fig. 1 | Example answers and grading. Examples of possible LLM recommendations (left) on urinary tract infection example case (Fig. 1) with harm grading based on expert rubric (right).

Extended Data Figure 2



Extended Data Fig. 2 | Concordance on expert panel ratings. High overall concordance on expert ratings for clinically appropriate and inappropriate recommendations across specialties. Concordance levels included “Perfectly Concordant” (e.g., all 3 raters gave an identical score, such as 8, 8, 8), “Near Perfectly Concordant” (e.g., 2 raters gave a score of 8 and the third gave a score of 9), Concordant (e.g., raters gave scores of 7, 8, 9), or Discordant (all other combinations).

Extended Data Figure 3




Extended Data Fig. 3 | Model recommendation rate. a, Mean number of actions recommended per case was variable across models (negative binomial regression with likelihood ratio tests $P < 0.001$; mean and 95% confidence intervals shown). **b**, Mean number of actions per model was not correlated to number of total harmful errors or number needed to harm.

Extended Data Figure 4




Extended Data Fig. 4 | Model profile comparison. Multidimensional analysis enables detailed comparison of model profiles. Top-left: comparing a frontier model (OpenAI GPT-5) with a RAG system (AMBOSS LiSA 1.0); top-right: comparing models across generations (Google Gemini 2.5 Pro vs 3 Pro); bottom-left: comparing larger (Anthropic Claude Sonnet 4.5) and smaller (Anthropic Claude Haiku 4.5) models within an organization; bottom-right: comparing distinct model families within an organization (OpenAI GPT-5 and o3 mini). Escalation represents the proportion of urgent referrals (in-person specialist or emergency room) that were appropriately recommended.

Extended Data Figure 5




Extended Data Fig. 5 | External measures of performance. **a**, Comparative analysis of NOHARM metric performance against widely-used generalist AI benchmarks and the MedQA benchmark. * indicates FDR $P < 0.05$. **b**, Linear regression analysis of common proxies of model strength shows minor impact of reasoning ability, model recency, and estimated parameter size.

Extended Data Figure 6




Extended Data Fig. 6 | Solo model versus multi-agent performance. **a**, All solo models and multi-agent configurations on a scatterplot showing Completeness (Y-axis) versus Safety (X-axis). The configuration with the highest overall score (harmonic mean) is indicated by an arrow, and is composed of open-source, proprietary, and RAG models. **b**, Comparison of top 5 performers per configuration. The top 5 three-agent configurations outperformed the top 5 two-agent configurations, which outperformed the top 5 solo models (t -test FDR $P < 0.05$ for all pairwise comparisons).

Extended Data Figure 7



Extended Data Fig. 7 | Restraint trade-offs. **a**, Performance trade-offs in OpenAI models appear to prioritize Restraint at the cost of Safety and Completeness. Group-wise comparisons are all significant (Wilcoxon test FDR $P < 0.05$) **b**, Prompt engineering through “Avoider” and “Maximizer” prompts for selected models enabled tuning of the Restraint-Safety trade-off. Decreasing Restraint improved Safety performance of GPT-5 but reduced Safety performance of Gemini 2.5 Flash, illustrating inverted-U relationship (Fig. 7). All performance changes in Restraint and Safety were significant within models (t-test FDR $P < 0.05$, mean of 10 trials with 95% confidence intervals shown).

Extended Data Figure 8



Extended Data Fig. 8 | Safety index sensitivity analysis. Heatmap of mean Jaccard similarity between the Top 5 models at each weight pair (x-axis: Moderate multiplier; y-axis: Severe factor; Mild=1; Severe weight = Moderate \times Severe). Safety was computed with a saturated weighted-sum rule (see Methods); model rankings used the mean of case-level safety. Each cell's stability compares its Top 5 to the Top 5 at adjacent weight settings (± 1 in either dimension; edges use available neighbors). Warmer colors indicate greater stability; labels show mean similarity (0–1). The main analyses use (5,5), which sits in the stable plateau and maintains a strong separation between Moderate and Severe; K = 5 was chosen *a priori* from the NNH analysis (Fig. 3b).

References

1. The American Medical Association. AMA augmented intelligence research: physician sentiments around the use of AI in health care: motivations, opportunities, risks, and use cases: shifts from 2023 to 2024.
<https://www.ama-assn.org/system/files/physician-ai-sentiment-report.pdf> (2025).
2. Elsevier. Clinician of the Future 2025.
<https://www.elsevier.com/insights/clinician-of-the-future> (2025).
3. OpenEvidence. OpenEvidence, the Fastest-Growing Application for Physicians in History.
<https://www.openevidence.com/announcements/openevidence-the-fastest-growing-application-for-physicians-in-history-announces-dollar210-million-round-at-dollar35-billion-valuation> (2025).
4. Tu, T. *et al.* Towards conversational diagnostic artificial intelligence. *Nature* **642**, 442–450 (2025).
5. Singhal, K. *et al.* Large language models encode clinical knowledge. *Nature* **620**, 172–180 (2023).
6. Kanjee, Z., Crowe, B. & Rodman, A. Accuracy of a Generative Artificial Intelligence Model in a Complex Diagnostic Challenge. *JAMA* **330**, 78–80 (2023).
7. Goh, E. *et al.* Large Language Model Influence on Diagnostic Reasoning. *JAMA Netw. Open* **7**, e2440969 (2024).
8. Goh, E. *et al.* GPT-4 assistance for improvement of physician performance on patient care tasks: a randomized controlled trial. *Nat. Med.* **31**, 1233–1238 (2025).
9. Khera, R., Simon, M. A. & Ross, J. S. Automation Bias and Assistive AI. *JAMA* **330**, 2255–2257 (2023).
10. Dratsch, T. *et al.* Automation Bias in Mammography: The Impact of Artificial Intelligence BI-RADS Suggestions on Reader Performance. *Radiology* **307**, e222176 (2023).
11. Cook, D. A., Sherbino, J. & Durning, S. J. Management Reasoning: Beyond the Diagnosis. *JAMA* **319**, 2267 (2018).
12. Han, T., Kumar, A., Agarwal, C. & Lakkaraju, H. MedSafetyBench: Evaluating and Improving the Medical Safety of Large Language Models. *arXiv* (2024) doi:10.48550/arxiv.2403.03744.
13. Korom, R. *et al.* AI-based Clinical Decision Support for Primary Care: A Real-World Study. *arXiv* (2025) doi:10.48550/arxiv.2507.16947.
14. Chang, C. T. *et al.* Red teaming ChatGPT in medicine to yield real-world insights on model behavior. *npj Digit. Med.* **8**, 149 (2025).

15. AMBOSS. Introducing LiSA: Our New AI Search Agent Specifically Designed for Clinical Care. <https://www.amboss.com/us/newsroom/introducing-lisa> (2025).
16. Moran, S. UpToDate Expert AI provides clinicians & health systems reliable GenAI clinical decision support | Wolters Kluwer. <https://www.wolterskluwer.com/en/news/uptodate-expert-ai-genai-clinical-decision-support> (2025).
17. McCoy, L. G. et al. Assessment of Large Language Models in Clinical Reasoning: A Novel Benchmarking Study. *NEJM AI* **2**, (2025).
18. Wu, D. et al. Automated evaluation of large language model response concordance with human specialist responses on physician-to-physician eConsult cases. (2025) doi:10.7490/f1000research.1120313.1.
19. Glass Health | AI Clinical Decision Support | Ambient CDS. <https://glass.health/ambient-cds>.
20. Fitch, K. et al. The RAND/UCLA Appropriateness Method User's Manual. (2001).
21. Cooper, J. et al. Classification of patient-safety incidents in primary care. *Bull. World Heal. Organ.* **96**, 498–505 (2018).
22. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. *PSI 90 Patient Safety and Adverse Events Composite: Technical Specifications, Version V2025*. https://qualityindicators.ahrq.gov/measures/PSI_TechSpec (2025).
23. Nori, H. et al. Sequential Diagnosis with Language Models. arXiv (2025) doi:10.48550/arxiv.2506.22405.
24. Arora, R. K. et al. HealthBench: Evaluating Large Language Models Towards Improved Human Health. arXiv (2025) doi:10.48550/arxiv.2505.08775.
25. Mehandru, N. et al. ER-REASON: A Benchmark Dataset for LLM-Based Clinical Reasoning in the Emergency Room. arXiv (2025) doi:10.48550/arxiv.2505.22919.
26. Brodeur, P. G. et al. Superhuman performance of a large language model on the reasoning tasks of a physician. arXiv (2024) doi:10.48550/arxiv.2412.10849.
27. McDuff, D. et al. Towards accurate differential diagnosis with large language models. *Nature* **642**, 451–457 (2025).
28. Zeltzer, D. et al. Comparison of Initial Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Final Physician Recommendations in AI-Assisted Virtual Urgent Care Visits. *Ann. Intern. Med.* **178**, 498–506 (2025).
29. Blanchard, M. D. et al. Collective Intelligence Increases Diagnostic Accuracy in a General Practice Setting. *Med. Decis. Mak.* **44**, 451–462 (2024).
30. Liu, S. et al. The Scales of Justitia: A Comprehensive Survey on Safety Evaluation of LLMs.

arXiv (2025) doi:10.48550/arxiv.2506.11094.

31. Hayward, R. A., Asch, S. M., Hogan, M. M., Hofer, T. P. & Kerr, E. A. Sins of omission. *J. Gen. Intern. Med.* **20**, 686–691 (2005).
32. Newman-Toker, D. E. et al. Burden of serious harms from diagnostic error in the USA. *BMJ Qual. Saf.* **33**, 109–120 (2024).
33. Auerbach, A. D. et al. Diagnostic Errors in Hospitalized Adults Who Died or Were Transferred to Intensive Care. *JAMA Intern. Med.* **184**, 164–173 (2024).
34. Hooftman, J. et al. Common contributing factors of diagnostic error: A retrospective analysis of 109 serious adverse event reports from Dutch hospitals. *BMJ Qual. Saf.* **33**, 642–651 (2024).
35. Kohane, I. S. Compared with What? Measuring AI against the Health Care We Have. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **391**, 1564–1566 (2024).