

Letter to the Editor

# Evaluating GPT-4's Cognitive Functions Through the Bloom Taxonomy: Insights and Clarifications

Kuan-Ju Huang, MS

Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, National Taiwan University Hospital Yunlin Branch, Yunlin County, Taiwan

**Corresponding Author:**

Kuan-Ju Huang, MS

Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology

National Taiwan University Hospital Yunlin Branch

No 579, Sec 2, Yunlin Rd, Douliu City

Yunlin County, 640

Taiwan

Phone: 886 55323911 ext 563413

Fax: 886 55335325

Email: [restroomer@icloud.com](mailto:restroomer@icloud.com)

**Related Articles:**

Comment on: <http://www.jmir.org/2024/1/e52113/>

Comment in: <http://www.jmir.org/2024/1/e57778/>

(*J Med Internet Res* 2024;26:e56997) doi: [10.2196/56997](https://doi.org/10.2196/56997)

**KEYWORDS**

artificial intelligence; ChatGPT; Bloom taxonomy; AI; cognition

We are inspired by Herrmann-Werner et al's [1] article, which assesses GPT-4's cognitive functions based on the Bloom taxonomy. Adopting the Bloom taxonomy for evaluating GPT-4's understanding of specific knowledge, traditionally applied to humans, is a novel concept. The results could also offer insights into whether GPT-4 can think like a human. However, some points in this article need clarification.

First, in Figure 3, the difficulty of the questions might have been inversely reported in the abstract, with 0 representing a very difficult question and 1 representing a very easy question, according to the description in the Quantitative Data Analysis subsection of the Methods. Consequently, GPT-4 performed better on easy questions than on hard ones.

Second, since a large language model (LLM) like GPT-4 operates by predicting the next word from its memory-based archive [2], it seems unlikely that GPT-4 would perform worst in the "remember" domain of the Bloom taxonomy in this study (42.65%) and excel in higher cognitive domains such as analyze, evaluate, and create, with incorrect reasoning accounting for 0%, 0.15%, and 0%, respectively, as reported in Table 3 [1]. The Bloom taxonomy categorizes the aims of questions, not the answers, in evaluating a "student's" cognitive level within specific domains. Therefore, evaluating GPT-4's cognitive functions by analyzing its responses presupposes that GPT-4 can think like a human. However, given our current understanding of how LLMs generate answers—essentially predicting the next word based on probabilities within a database—it is doubtful that GPT-4's cognitive levels in

responses can be accurately assessed using the Bloom taxonomy, especially with high scores in advanced cognitive domains [2].

For example, when evaluating "memory" (eg, definitions, guidelines, or facts), if the combination of elements exists in its database, GPT-4 can readily produce the most likely answers from its "memory." Conversely, when elements are incorrectly combined, it may produce "hallucinated" answers [2]. In complex questions that test higher cognitive domains (eg, analyzing a previously unpublished case report with findings from subjective and objective medical evaluations to deduce the most likely diagnosis), if a similar case or key elements exist in GPT-4's database, it might still produce a result from its "memory," seemingly "analyzing, evaluating, and creating" an answer as it has "learned" from human problem-solving in similar cases. This "memory" function, considered LLM's most potent capability compared to humans, can yield incorrect answers if the "memory" does not exist in the database (eg, news) or is not predicted as the next word. The apparent high cognitive function might result from the model's ability to extract multiple human thought processes about a specific question from its vast database, akin to a well-trained system mimicking human cognitive processes [3,4].

Since most medical qualifying exams consist mainly of "memory" tests, the actual count of incorrect reasoning in the "memory" domain could be lower when both correct and incorrect answers are combined. Until more evidence proving that LLMs can think like humans is available, evaluating

LLM-generated answers through the Bloom taxonomy may yield misleading results.

### Conflicts of Interest

None declared.

### References

1. Herrmann-Werner A, Festl-Wietek T, Holderried F, Herschbach L, Griewatz J, Masters K, et al. Assessing ChatGPT's mastery of Bloom's taxonomy using psychosomatic medicine exam questions: mixed-methods study. *J Med Internet Res*. Jan 23, 2024;26:e52113. [FREE Full text] [doi: [10.2196/52113](https://doi.org/10.2196/52113)] [Medline: [38261378](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38261378/)]
2. GPT-4 system card. OpenAI. Mar 23, 2023. URL: <https://cdn.openai.com/papers/gpt-4-system-card.pdf> [accessed 2024-04-09]
3. Stanovich KE, West RF. Individual differences in reasoning: implications for the rationality debate? *Behav Brain Sci*. Oct 2000;23(5):645-65; discussion 665. [doi: [10.1017/s0140525x00003435](https://doi.org/10.1017/s0140525x00003435)] [Medline: [11301544](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11301544/)]
4. Kahneman D. *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. New York. Farrar, Straus and Giroux; 2011.

### Abbreviations

**LLM:** large language model

*Edited by T Leung; this is a non-peer-reviewed article. Submitted 01.02.24; accepted 04.04.24; published 16.04.24.*

*Please cite as:*

*Huang KJ*

*Evaluating GPT-4's Cognitive Functions Through the Bloom Taxonomy: Insights and Clarifications*

*J Med Internet Res* 2024;26:e56997

URL: <https://www.jmir.org/2024/1/e56997>

doi: [10.2196/56997](https://doi.org/10.2196/56997)

PMID: [38625725](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38625725/)

©Kuan-Ju Huang. Originally published in the Journal of Medical Internet Research (<https://www.jmir.org>), 16.04.2024. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work, first published in the Journal of Medical Internet Research, is properly cited. The complete bibliographic information, a link to the original publication on <https://www.jmir.org/>, as well as this copyright and license information must be included.