

Generative AI as a Tool for Environmental Health Research Translation

Lauren B. Anderson,^{1,2} Dhiraj Kanneganti,¹ Mary Bentley Houk,¹ Rochelle H. Holm¹ and Ted Smith^{1,3*}

¹Christina Lee Brown Envirome Institute, School of Medicine, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY 40202, United States

²Department of Urban and Public Affairs, College of Arts and Sciences, University of Louisville, Louisville KY 40208, United States

³University of Louisville Superfund Research Center, Louisville, KY 40202, United States

Correspondence

Correspondence should be sent to Ted Smith, Superfund Research Center, School of Medicine, University of Louisville, 302 E Muhammad Ali Blvd, Louisville, KY 40202, United States (e-mail: ted.smith@louisville.edu).

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare they have nothing to disclose.

Abstract

Generative artificial intelligence, popularized by services like ChatGPT, has been the source of much recent popular attention for publishing health research. Another valuable application is in translating published research studies to readers in non-academic settings. These might include environmental justice communities, mainstream media outlets, and community science groups. Five recently published (2021-2022) open-access, peer-reviewed papers, authored by University of Louisville environmental health investigators and collaborators, were submitted to ChatGPT. The average rating of all summaries of all types across the five different studies ranged between 3 and 5, indicating good overall content quality. ChatGPT's general summary request was consistently rated lower than all other summary types. Whereas higher ratings of 4 and 5 were assigned to the more synthetic, insight-oriented activities, such as the production of a plain language summaries suitable for an 8th grade reading level and identifying the most important finding and real-world research applications. This is a case where artificial intelligence might help level the playing field, for example by creating accessible insights and enabling the large-scale production of high-quality plain language summaries which would truly bring open access to this scientific information. This possibility, combined with the increasing public policy trends encouraging and demanding free access for research supported with public funds, may alter the role journal publications play in communicating science in society. For the field of environmental health science, no-cost AI technology such as ChatGPT holds the promise to improve research translation, but it must continue to be improved (or improve itself) from its current capability.

Introduction

Generative artificial intelligence (AI), popularized by services like ChatGPT, has been the source of much recent popular attention for publishing health research.^{1,2} The software can instantly create sophisticated content ranging from text-to-image to text-to-audio and video depending on user prompts.³ ChatGPT, released by OpenAI⁴ (San Francisco, CA, USA) in November of 2022, is a large language model trained on a vast amount of data generating human-like responses to queries and is often used in applications such as chatbots. Another valuable application is in translating published research studies to readers in non-academic settings. These might include environmental justice communities, mainstream media outlets, and community science groups. Given the number of challenges with writing peer-reviewed research and the follow-on cost and effort in additionally creating plain language summaries (PLS), generative AI may offer scientific researchers a valuable new tool for improving environmental health risk communication and access by the larger constituencies in society.

However, researchers must balance the potential benefits of generative AI, such as making science more equitable and increasing the diversity and accessibility of scientific knowledge, with potential risks, such as degrading the quality and trust in the research practice. Chatbots can produce convincing but inaccurate text, which might undermine the very trust research translation aims to build.^{1,2} The role of academic researchers in environmental health programs has been tied to not only methods but the essential working relationships for translation to public health action.⁵ Using an analytic rubric, we explored the use of ChatGPT as an alternative to traditional human expert summarization to support PLS as a form of research translation and provide suggestions for environmental health research translation.

Methods

Five recently published (2021-2022) open-access, peer-reviewed papers, authored by University of Louisville environmental health investigators and collaborators, were submitted (Supplemental Material). The PLS were created by entering the full text of each paper into the ChatGPT interface (version February 4, 2023), followed by a series of instructions: “Summarize the findings of this study in 500 words,” “Summarize the research paper at an eighth-grade reading level,” “What is the most important finding of this study?” and “What are the real-world impacts of this study?”. The responses from ChatGPT were evaluated using a combination of Likert-scale, yes/no, and text to assess scientific accuracy, completeness, and readability at an 8th grade level by one of the authors of each study. The author reviewers were blind to the use of the generative AI as the source of the summarization.

Results and Discussion

The average rating of all summaries of all types across the five different studies ranged between 3 and 5, indicating good overall content quality. ChatGPT’s general summary request was consistently rated lower than all other summary types. Whereas higher ratings of 4 and 5 were assigned to the more synthetic, insight-oriented activities, such as the production of a PLS suitable for an 8th grade reading level and identifying the most important finding and real-world research applications. The majority of these more insight-orientated summaries were judged acceptable for use with the public. Even across this limited collection of studies, there were a few authors who commented that the PLS was still too technical for general audiences. In some cases, ChatGPT’s attempt at simplification removed important detail – for instance, stating

wellbeing was associated with cardiovascular diseases (CVD), rather than risk of CVD. Minor inaccuracies around study method interpretations were also observed. In one processed paper the ChatGPT PLS referenced questions about levels of pollution and greenness around the home when the study did not include these questions. Other research has reported ChatGPT created abstracts not always distinguishable from those written by a human expert thus bringing up the need for source disclosure, however medical discharge summaries with automation have been shown to still require manual checking by a human expert where an inaccuracy in a summary report may lead to patient safety issues.^{2,6,7}

There are several critical research needs, especially around inclusion and environmental health justice research.² This is a case where AI might help level the playing field, for example by creating accessible insights and enabling the large-scale production of high-quality PLS which would truly bring open access to this scientific information. This possibility, combined with the increasing public policy trends encouraging and demanding free access for research supported with public funds, may alter the role journal publications play in communicating science in society. Recommendations for future research include the need for rating by community members of paired PLSs and review of a larger number and wider variety of environmental health research study types. For the field of environmental health science, no-cost AI technology such as ChatGPT holds the promise to improve research translation, but it must continue to be improved (or improve itself) from its current capability.

Acknowledgments

We would like to acknowledge the support of the Superfund Research Center at the University of Louisville (NIEHS Award Number P42ES023716). Special thanks are extended to the authors who reviewed and scored the summaries.

Data Sharing

The list of peer-reviewed research papers analyzed during the current study are available in the supplement to this manuscript.

References

1. Liebrezn M, Schleifer R, Buadze A, Bhugra D, Smith A. 2023. Generating scholarly content with ChatGPT: ethical challenges for medical publishing. *The Lancet Digital Health*. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500\(23\)00019-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500(23)00019-5)
2. van Dis EA, Bollen J, Zuidema W, van Rooij R, Bockting CL. 2023. ChatGPT: five priorities for research. *Nature* 614(7947):224–6. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-00288-7>
3. Gozalo-Brizuela R, Garrido-Merchan EC. 2023. ChatGPT is not all you need. A state of the art review of large generative AI models. *arXiv preprint* 2301.04655. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2301.04655>
4. Open AI. ChatGPT. 2022. <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/> [accessed 4 February 2023].
5. Hoar C, McClary-Gutierrez J, Wolfe MK, Bivins A, Bibby K, Silverman AI, et al. 2022. Looking forward: the role of academic researchers in building sustainable wastewater surveillance programs. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 130(12):125002. <https://doi.org/10.1289/EHP11519>
6. Gao CA, Howard FM, Markov NS, Dyer EC, Ramesh S, Luo Y, et al. 2022. Comparing scientific abstracts generated by ChatGPT to original abstracts using an artificial intelligence output detector, plagiarism detector, and blinded human reviewers. *bioRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.23.521610>
7. Patel SB, Lam K. 2023 ChatGPT: the future of discharge summaries?. *The Lancet Digital Health*. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500\(23\)00021-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500(23)00021-3)

Supplemental Material

Generative AI as a Tool for Environmental Health Research Translation

Lauren B. Anderson,^{1,2} Dhiraj Kanneganti,¹ Mary Bentley Houk,¹ Rochelle H Holm¹ and Ted Smith^{1,3*}

¹Christina Lee Brown Envirome Institute, School of Medicine, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY 40202, United States

²Department of Urban and Public Affairs, College of Arts and Sciences, University of Louisville, Louisville KY 40208

³University of Louisville Superfund Research Center, Louisville, KY 40202, United States

Correspondence

Correspondence should be sent to Ted Smith, Superfund Research Center, School of Medicine, University of Louisville, 302 E Muhammad Ali Blvd, Louisville, KY 40202 (e-mail: ted.smith@louisville.edu).

List of peer-reviewed research papers authored by University of Louisville Envirome Institute environmental health investigators and collaborating research partners entered into the ChatGPT interface:

1. McLeish AC, Smith T, Riggs DW, Hart JL, Walker KL, Keith RJ, et al. 2022. Community-based evaluation of the associations between well-being and cardiovascular disease risk. *Journal of the American Heart Association* 11(22):e027095. <https://doi.org/10.1161/JAHA.122.027095>
2. El-Mallakh TV, Hedges S, Rai JP, Bhatnagar A, Moyer S, El-Mallakh RS. 2022. Suicide and homicide more common with limited urban tree canopy cover. *Cities and the Environment* 14(2):4. <https://doi.org/10.15365/cate.2022.140204>
3. Pfeiffer JA, Hart JL, Wood LA, Bhatnagar A, Keith RJ, Yeager RA, et al. 2021. The importance of urban planning: Views of greenness and open space is reversely associated with self-reported views and depressive symptoms. *Population medicine* 3:20. <https://doi.org/10.18332/popmed/139173>
4. Coleman CJ, Yeager RA, Riggs DW, Coleman NC, Garcia GR, Bhatnagar A, et al. 2021. Greenness, air pollution, and mortality risk: A US cohort study of cancer patients and survivors. *Environment International* 157:106797. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2021.106797>
5. Coleman CJ, Yeager RA, Pond ZA, Riggs DW, Bhatnagar A, Pope III CA. 2022. Mortality risk associated with greenness, air pollution, and physical activity in a representative US cohort. *Science of The Total Environment* 824:153848. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.153848>

Table S1. Evaluation responses from studied peer-reviewed papers

| | Coleman CJ, Yeager RA, Pond ZA, Riggs DW, Bhatnagar A, Pope III CA. 2022. Mortality risk associated with greenness, air pollution, and physical activity in a representative US cohort. Science of The Total Environment 824:153848. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.153848 | Coleman CJ, Yeager RA, Riggs DW, Coleman NC, Garcia GR, Bhatnagar A, et al. 2021. Greenness, air pollution, and mortality risk: A US cohort study of cancer patients and survivors. Environment International 157:106797. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2021.106797 | El-Mallakh TV, Hedges S, Rai JP, Bhatnagar A, Moyer S, El-Mallakh RS. 2022. Suicide and homicide more common with limited urban tree canopy cover. Cities and the Environment 14(2):4. https://doi.org/10.1536/5/cate.2022.140204 | McLeish AC, Smith T, Riggs DW, Hart JL, Walker KL, Keith RJ, et al. 2022. Community-based evaluation of the associations between well-being and cardiovascular disease risk. Journal of the American Heart Association 11(22):e027095. https://doi.org/10.1161/JAHA.122.027095 | Pfeiffer JA, Hart JL, Wood LA, Bhatnagar A, Keith RJ, Yeager RA, et al. 2021. The importance of urban planning: Views of greenness and open space is reversely associated with self-reported views and depressive symptoms. Population medicine 3:20. https://doi.org/10.18332/popmed/139173 |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| 500 Word summary accuracy | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| 500 Word summary completeness | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| 500 Word summary readability | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| 500 Word summary acceptable for public (1=Y, 0=N) | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|
| | <p>Coleman CJ, Yeager RA, Pond ZA, Riggs DW, Bhatnagar A, Pope III CA. 2022. Mortality risk associated with greenness, air pollution, and physical activity in a representative US cohort. <i>Science of The Total Environment</i> 824:153848. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.153848</p> | <p>Coleman CJ, Yeager RA, Riggs DW, Coleman NC, Garcia GR, Bhatnagar A, et al. 2021. Greenness, air pollution, and mortality risk: A US cohort study of cancer patients and survivors. <i>Environment International</i> 157:106797. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2021.106797</p> | <p>El-Mallakh TV, Hedges S, Rai JP, Bhatnagar A, Moyer S, El-Mallakh RS. 2022. Suicide and homicide more common with limited urban tree canopy cover. <i>Cities and the Environment</i> 14(2):4. https://doi.org/10.1536/5/cate.2022.140204</p> | <p>McLeish AC, Smith T, Riggs DW, Hart JL, Walker KL, Keith RJ, et al. 2022. Community-based evaluation of the associations between well-being and cardiovascular disease risk. <i>Journal of the American Heart Association</i> 11(22):e027095. https://doi.org/10.1161/JAHA.122.027095</p> | <p>Pfeiffer JA, Hart JL, Wood LA, Bhatnagar A, Keith RJ, Yeager RA, et al. 2021. The importance of urban planning: Views of greenness and open space is reversely associated with self-reported views and depressive symptoms. <i>Population medicine</i> 3:20. https://doi.org/10.18332/popmed/139173</p> |
| 500 Word summary comments | <p>This summary is focusing on a lot of the methods without too much focus on the actual findings. And the limitations listed are not actually limitations of the study, but a summary of the null findings.</p> | <p>There are several major misinterpretations of the study. 1)The title of the paper is not correct. 2)The study is actually an individual level analysis, with each individuals exposure levels estimated at the county level. 3)The study did not find a decrease in cardiopulmonary mortality associated with greenness in the full cohort of cancer patients, but they did find an association when stratifying to individuals with high survivability cancers. It also should have been noted that this is a study of cancer survivors, and the results do not necessarily apply to the general population.</p> | <p>It's repetitive</p> | <p>Potential of CVD and CVD risk. The language is still a little to technical/complex</p> | <p>Readability depends on audience (I assigned a 4 assuming an academic audience; if audience is general/community members, I'd shift that rating to a 3).</p> |

| | <p>Coleman CJ, Yeager RA, Pond ZA, Riggs DW, Bhatnagar A, Pope III CA. 2022. Mortality risk associated with greenness, air pollution, and physical activity in a representative US cohort. Science of The Total Environment 824:153848. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.153848</p> | <p>Coleman CJ, Yeager RA, Riggs DW, Coleman NC, Garcia GR, Bhatnagar A, et al. 2021. Greenness, air pollution, and mortality risk: A US cohort study of cancer patients and survivors. Environment International 157:106797. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2021.106797</p> | <p>El-Mallakh TV, Hedges S, Rai JP, Bhatnagar A, Moyer S, El-Mallakh RS. 2022. Suicide and homicide more common with limited urban tree canopy cover. Cities and the Environment 14(2):4. https://doi.org/10.1536/cate.2022.140204</p> | <p>McLeish AC, Smith T, Riggs DW, Hart JL, Walker KL, Keith RJ, et al. 2022. Community-based evaluation of the associations between well-being and cardiovascular disease risk. Journal of the American Heart Association 11(22):e027095. https://doi.org/10.1161/JAHA.122.027095</p> | <p>Pfeiffer JA, Hart JL, Wood LA, Bhatnagar A, Keith RJ, Yeager RA, et al. 2021. The importance of urban planning: Views of greenness and open space is reversely associated with self-reported views and depressive symptoms. Population medicine 3:20. https://doi.org/10.18332/popmed/139173</p> |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|
| 8th Grade summary accuracy | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 3 |
| 8th Grade summary completeness | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3 |
| 8th Grade summary readability | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| 8th Grade summary acceptable for public (1=Y, 0=N) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 8th grade summary comments | There are some minor inaccuracies. The survey did not ask about the level of pollution or how green the area around their home was. | | | Was no finding on CVD but findings on CVD risk | |
| Most important finding accuracy | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| Most important finding completeness | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| Most important finding readability | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 |

| | <p>Coleman CJ, Yeager RA, Pond ZA, Riggs DW, Bhatnagar A, Pope III CA. 2022. Mortality risk associated with greenness, air pollution, and physical activity in a representative US cohort. <i>Science of The Total Environment</i> 824:153848. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.153848</p> | <p>Coleman CJ, Yeager RA, Riggs DW, Coleman NC, Garcia GR, Bhatnagar A, et al. 2021. Greenness, air pollution, and mortality risk: A US cohort study of cancer patients and survivors. <i>Environment International</i> 157:106797. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2021.106797</p> | <p>El-Mallakh TV, Hedges S, Rai JP, Bhatnagar A, Moyer S, El-Mallakh RS. 2022. Suicide and homicide more common with limited urban tree canopy cover. <i>Cities and the Environment</i> 14(2):4. https://doi.org/10.1536/cate.2022.140204</p> | <p>McLeish AC, Smith T, Riggs DW, Hart JL, Walker KL, Keith RJ, et al. 2022. Community-based evaluation of the associations between well-being and cardiovascular disease risk. <i>Journal of the American Heart Association</i> 11(22):e027095. https://doi.org/10.1161/JAHA.122.027095</p> | <p>Pfeiffer JA, Hart JL, Wood LA, Bhatnagar A, Keith RJ, Yeager RA, et al. 2021. The importance of urban planning: Views of greenness and open space is reversely associated with self-reported views and depressive symptoms. <i>Population medicine</i> 3:20. https://doi.org/10.18332/popmed/139173</p> |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| Most important finding acceptable for public (1=Y, 0=N) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Most important finding comments | | The study found that greenness only protects against cardiopulmonary mortality in individuals with high survivable cancers, not for the full study. | | A little too technical | Generally usable with public (but less so on last sentence, especially last phrase) |
| Real world impacts accuracy | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 5 |
| Real world impacts completeness | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 |
| Real world impacts readability | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Real world impacts acceptable for public (1=Y, 0=N) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

Coleman CJ, Yeager RA, Pond ZA, Riggs DW, Bhatnagar A, Pope III CA. 2022. Mortality risk associated with greenness, air pollution, and physical activity in a representative US cohort. *Science of The Total Environment* 824:153848. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.153848>

Coleman CJ, Yeager RA, Riggs DW, Coleman NC, Garcia GR, Bhatnagar A, et al. 2021. Greenness, air pollution, and mortality risk: A US cohort study of cancer patients and survivors. *Environment International* 157:106797. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2021.106797>

El-Mallakh TV, Hedges S, Rai JP, Bhatnagar A, Moyer S, El-Mallakh RS. 2022. Suicide and homicide more common with limited urban tree canopy cover. *Cities and the Environment* 14(2):4. <https://doi.org/10.1536/5/cate.2022.140204>

McLeish AC, Smith T, Riggs DW, Hart JL, Walker KL, Keith RJ, et al. 2022. Community-based evaluation of the associations between well-being and cardiovascular disease risk. *Journal of the American Heart Association* 11(22):e027095. <https://doi.org/10.1161/JAHA.122.027095>

Pfeiffer JA, Hart JL, Wood LA, Bhatnagar A, Keith RJ, Yeager RA, et al. 2021. The importance of urban planning: Views of greenness and open space is reversely associated with self-reported views and depressive symptoms. *Population medicine* 3:20. <https://doi.org/10.18332/popmed/139173>

Real word impacts
comments

Would edit to mention importance of increasing tree canopy, and not just green spaces

They missed the application that was discussed on the paper