

MedCPT: Contrastive Pre-trained Transformers with Large-scale PubMed Search Logs for Zero-shot Biomedical Information Retrieval

Qiao Jin¹, Won Kim¹, Qingyu Chen¹, Donald C. Comeau¹, Lana Yeganova¹, W. John Wilbur¹, Zhiyong Lu¹

¹National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI), National Library of Medicine (NLM), National Institutes of Health (NIH)

Correspondence: zhiyong.lu@nih.gov

Abstract

Motivation

Information retrieval (IR) is essential in biomedical knowledge acquisition and clinical decision support. While recent progress has shown that language model encoders perform better semantic retrieval, training such models requires abundant query-article annotations that are difficult to obtain in biomedicine. As a result, most biomedical IR systems only conduct lexical matching. In response, we introduce MedCPT, a first-of-its-kind Contrastively Pre-trained Transformer model for zero-shot semantic IR in biomedicine.

Results

To train MedCPT, we collected an unprecedented scale of 255 million user click logs from PubMed. With such data, we use contrastive learning to train a pair of closely-integrated retriever and re-ranker. Experimental results show that MedCPT sets new state-of-the-art performance on six biomedical IR tasks, outperforming various baselines including much larger models such as GPT-3-sized `cpt-text-XL`. In addition, MedCPT also generates better biomedical article and sentence representations for semantic evaluations. As such, MedCPT can be readily applied to various real-world biomedical IR tasks.

Availability

The MedCPT code and API are available at <https://github.com/ncbi/MedCPT>.

Introduction

Information retrieval (IR) is an important step in biomedical knowledge discovery and clinical decision support (Ely, et al., 2005; Gopalakrishnan, et al., 2019). However, most IR systems in biomedicine are keyword-based, which will miss articles that are semantically relevant but have no lexical overlap with the input query. Recent progress in IR and deep learning has shown that dense retrievers, which encode and match queries and documents as dense vectors, can perform better semantic retrieval than traditional sparse (lexical) retrievers such as BM25 (Karpukhin, et al., 2020; Khattab and Zaharia, 2020; Lin, et al., 2022; Nogueira and Cho, 2019). They are typically based on pre-trained transformers (Vaswani, et al., 2017), and are further fine-tuned with task-specific data. However, dense retrieval models trained on general datasets cannot generalize well to domain-specific IR tasks (Thakur, et al., 2021). Nevertheless, domain-specific datasets are limited in scale and diversity, restricting the creation of generalizable models (Roberts, et al., 2014; Roberts, et al., 2017; Tsatsaronis, et al., 2015; Voorhees, et al., 2021). As a result, there is a pressing need for pre-trained models that can perform well across various biomedical IR tasks.

In response, we propose bioMedical Contrastive Pre-trained Transformers (MedCPT), a novel model trained with an unprecedented scale of 255M query-article pairs from PubMed search logs. MedCPT is the first biomedical IR model that includes a pair of retriever and re-ranker closely integrated by contrastive learning. Unlike previous separately developed models that have a discrepancy between the two modules (Gao, et al., 2021), MedCPT re-ranker is trained with the negative distribution sampled from the pre-trained MedCPT retriever. This matches the inference time article distribution where the MedCPT re-ranker is used to re-rank the articles returned by the MedCPT retriever. As shown in Figure 1, we perform zero-shot evaluation on a wide range of biomedical IR tasks. For document retrieval, MedCPT (330M) achieves state-of-the-art (SOTA) document retrieval performance on three individual biomedical tasks and the overall average in BEIR (Thakur, et al., 2021), outperforming much larger models such as Google’s GTR-XXL (4.8B) (Ni, et al., 2021) and OpenAI’s cpt-text-XL (175B) (Hirschman, et al., 2012). For article representation, we also show that the MedCPT article encoder sets new SOTA performance on the RELISH similar article dataset (Brown, et al., 2019) and the MeSH prediction task in SciDocs (Cohan, et al., 2020). For sentence representation, MedCPT performs the best or second best among compared methods on the BIOSESS (Sogancioglu, et al., 2017) and MedSTS (Wang, et al., 2020) for semantic evaluations. As such, MedCPT can be readily applied to a variety of biomedical applications such as searching relevant documents, retrieving similar sentences, recommending related articles, as well as providing domain-specific retrieval-augmentation for large language models (Jin, et al., 2023).




Figure 1. A high-level overview of this work. MedCPT contains a query encoder (QEnc), a document encoder (DEnc), and a cross-encoder (CrossEnc). The query encoder and document encoder compose of the MedCPT retriever, which is contrastively trained by 255M query-article pairs and in-batch negatives from PubMed logs. The cross-encoder is the MedCPT re-ranker, and is contrastively trained by 18M non-keyword query-article pairs and local negatives retrieved from the MedCPT retriever. MedCPT achieves state-of-the-art performance on various biomedical information retrieval tasks under zero-shot settings, including query-article retrieval, sentence representation, and article representation.

Materials and Methods

Query-article relevance data collection from PubMed search logs

We collected anonymous query-article clicks in PubMed search logs in three years (2020-2022) to train MedCPT. The raw logs contain 167M unique queries and 23M unique PubMed articles. We first filtered the navigational queries like author and journal title searches with Field Sensor (Yeganova, et al., 2018). After filtering, there are 87M informational queries and 17M articles. Based on the user click information, we generated 255M relevant query-article pairs to train the MedCPT retriever. However, most of such queries are short keywords, and matching them to the clicked articles is a relatively simple task. As such, we use a difficult subset that requires better semantic understanding to train the MedCPT re-ranker, which is aimed to distinguish harder negatives among the top-ranking articles returned by the retriever. Specifically, we further filtered out 79M keyword queries from the informational query set, which are defined as either having only one word or all of the clicked articles containing exact mentions of the whole input query. In the end, there are 7.7M non-keyword (e.g., short sentences) queries and 5.2M articles, from which we generated 18.3M relevant query-article pairs to train the MedCPT re-ranker.

MedCPT architecture

MedCPT includes a first-stage retriever and a second-stage re-ranker. The retriever includes a query encoder (QEnc in Figure 1) and a document encoder (DEnc). This bi-encoder architecture is scalable because millions of articles can be encoded offline, and only one encoding computation for the query and a nearest neighbor search are required during real-time inference. The re-ranker is a cross-encoder (CrossEnc) that is computationally more expensive but also more accurate due to the cross-attention computation between query and article tokens. It will only be applied on the top articles returned by the retriever and generate the final article ranking.

MedCPT retriever

The MedCPT retriever contains QEnc and DEnc, both of which are Transformer (Trm) encoders initialized by PubMedBERT (Gu, et al., 2021). It represents the query q and document d by:

$$E(q) = \text{QEnc}(q) = \text{Trm}([\text{CLS}] q [\text{SEP}])_{[\text{CLS}]} \in \mathbb{R}^h$$

$$E(d) = \text{DEnc}(d) = \text{Trm}([\text{CLS}] d^{\text{title}} [\text{SEP}] d^{\text{abstract}} [\text{SEP}])_{[\text{CLS}]} \in \mathbb{R}^h$$

where [CLS] and [SEP] are the special tokens used in BERT. h is the hidden. d^{title} and d^{abstract} denote the title and abstract. Then, the relevance is calculated as: $\text{Rel}(q, d) = E(q)^T E(d) \in \mathbb{R}$.




Figure 2. Overview of the MedCPT training process. (A) Training the MedCPT query encoder (QEnc) and document encoder (DEnc) using a contrastive loss with query-document pairs and in-batch negatives; (B) Training the MedCPT cross-encoder

(CrossEnc) using a contrastive loss with non-keyword query-article pairs and local negatives derived from the MedCPT retriever. Models in dashed and solid lines denote un-trained and pre-trained, respectively. MIPS: maximum inner product search.

As shown in Figure 2 (A), to train the MedCPT retriever, each instance has a query q , a clicked document d , and the number of clicks c . Each mini-batch contains $|B|$ instances, denoted as $[q_i, d_i, c_i]_{i=1}^{|B|}$. We use contrastive loss with in-batch negatives (Karpukhin, et al., 2020; Neelakantan, et al., 2022). Specifically, we first generate all $E(q_i)$ and $E(d_i)$ from QEnc and DEnc, where d_i is a relevant document for q_i . We assume that the $(|B| - 1)$ other documents $[d_j | j \neq i]$ in the mini-batch are irrelevant documents for q_i . Similarly, we also consider the $(|B| - 1)$ other queries $[q_j | j \neq i]$ in the mini-batch as irrelevant queries for d_i . For the training instance i , we calculate its query-to-document loss \mathcal{L}_i^{q2d} and document-to-query loss \mathcal{L}_i^{d2q} by:

$$\mathcal{L}_i^{q2d} = -\log\left(\frac{\exp(E(q_i)^T E(d_i))}{\sum_{m=1}^{|B|} \exp(E(q_i)^T E(d_m))}\right) \text{ and } \mathcal{L}_i^{d2q} = -\log\left(\frac{\exp(E(q_i)^T E(d_i))}{\sum_{m=1}^{|B|} \exp(E(q_m)^T E(d_i))}\right)$$

We further weight the loss of instances by their clicks: $\mathcal{L}_B^{q2d} = \sum_{i=1}^{|B|} w_i \mathcal{L}_i^{q2d}$ and $\mathcal{L}_B^{d2q} = \sum_{i=1}^{|B|} w_i \mathcal{L}_i^{d2q}$, where $w_i = \frac{\log_2(c_i+1)}{\sum_{k=1}^{|B|} \log_2(c_k+1)}$. The final loss \mathcal{L}_B of the mini-batch is their weighted sum and is optimized by gradient-based methods.

MedCPT re-ranker

The MedCPT re-ranker is a cross-encoder, denoted as CrossEnc. Similarly, CrossEnc is also initialized with PubMedBERT. The MedCPT re-ranker predicts the relevance between a query q and a document d by passing them into a single CrossEnc. Specifically,

$$Rel(q, d) = \text{CrossEnc}(q, d) = W^T \text{Trm}([\text{CLS}] q [\text{SEP}] d [\text{SEP}])_{[\text{CLS}]} + b \in \mathbb{R}$$

where $W \in \mathbb{R}^h$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}$ are trainable parameters.

As shown in Figure 2 (B), for training the MedCPT re-ranker, each instance has a query q_i , a clicked document d_i^+ , and a list of M irrelevant (not clicked) documents $\{d_{ij}^- | j = 1, 2, 3, \dots, M\}$. Following (Gao, et al., 2021), we use local negatives to train the MedCPT re-ranker instead of in-batch negatives. Specifically, unlike the in-batch negative documents used by the MedCPT retriever that are approximately random samples, the local negative documents are sampled from rank e to rank f in the top retrieved documents by the pre-trained MedCPT retriever through a maximum inner product search, which ensures that the MedCPT re-ranker can distinguish the hard negatives returned by the retriever. The loss \mathcal{L}_i for the instance is a negative log-likelihood loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_i = -\log \left(\frac{\exp(\text{CrossEnc}(q_i, d_i^+))}{\exp(\text{CrossEnc}(q_i, d_i^+)) + \sum_{j=1}^M \exp(\text{CrossEnc}(q_i, d_{ij}^-))} \right)$$

We take a weighted sum of the instance-level loss and optimize the final loss by gradient-based methods. More details on MedCPT inference and configuration are shown in Appendix A.

Results

MedCPT achieves state-of-the-art performance on biomedical IR tasks

Benchmarking-IR (BEIR) (Thakur, et al., 2021) is a standardized evaluation benchmark for zero-shot IR systems. We evaluate MedCPT with all five biomedical tasks in the BEIR benchmark. Appendix C describes the evaluation details and Table 1 shows the evaluation results.

First, MedCPT improves its initialization PubMedBERT by huge margins, where the latter basically fails on the retrieval tasks. Overall, MedCPT sets new SOTA performance on 3/5 tasks, surpassing compared sparse (Dai and Callan, 2020; Nogueira, et al., 2019; Zhang, et al., 2015), dense (Hofstätter, et al., 2021; Izacard, et al., 2021; Karpukhin, et al., 2020; Xiong, et al., 2020), and late-interaction (Khattab and Zaharia, 2020) retrievers on all of the compared tasks. As shown in the BEIR paper, BM25 is a strong baseline that is generalizable to biomedical IR tasks. Notably, MedCPT is still better than BM25 with cross-encoder in 4/5 of the evaluated tasks, showing its effectiveness at retrieving relevant articles for biomedical queries. BM25 with re-ranker is only better on the TREC-COVID dataset, which might be due to annotation biases (Thakur, et al., 2021). We further compare MedCPT with more recent large dual retriever models, represented by Google’s GTR and OpenAI’s cpt-text, both of which have model sizes ranging from millions to billions of parameters. MedCPT is able to outperform all sizes of the GTR model. While the GPT-3 (Brown, et al., 2020) sized (175B) cpt-text-XL is better than MedCPT on NFCorpus, MedCPT outperforms cpt-text-XL on TREC-COVID and SciFact despite being about 500 times smaller. This indicates that small models trained on domain-specific datasets can still have better in-domain zero-shot performance than much larger general domain retrievers.

Table 1. Zero-shot performance of MedCPT on biomedical subtasks of the BEIR benchmark. **Bolded numbers**, underlined, and *italicized* numbers denote the **highest**, 2nd highest, and *3rd highest*, respectively. COVID: TREC-COVID; NFC: NFCorpus; Avg.: average.

Method	Size	COVID	NFC	BioASQ	SciFact	SciDocs	Avg.
Sparse retrievers							
BM25	-	0.656	0.325	0.465	0.665	0.158	0.454
BM25 + MiniLM	66M	0.757	0.350	<u>0.523</u>	0.688	0.166	<u>0.497</u>
DeepCT	110M	0.406	0.283	0.407	0.630	0.124	0.370
SPARTA	110M	0.538	0.301	0.351	0.582	0.126	0.380
docT5query	220M	0.713	0.328	0.431	0.675	0.162	0.462
Dense retrievers							
DPR	110M	0.332	0.189	0.127	0.318	0.077	0.209
ANCE	110M	0.654	0.237	0.306	0.507	0.122	0.365
TAS-B	66M	0.481	0.319	0.383	0.643	0.149	0.395
GenQ	220M	0.619	0.319	0.398	0.644	0.143	0.425
Contriever	110M	0.596	0.328	-	0.677	0.165	-
Contriever + MiniLM	176M	0.701	0.344	-	0.692	<u>0.171</u>	-
ColBERT	110M	0.677	0.305	0.474	0.671	0.145	0.454
Large language model retrievers							
Google GTR-Base	110M	0.539	0.308	0.271	0.600	0.149	0.373
Google GTR-Large	335M	0.557	0.329	0.320	0.639	0.158	0.401
Google GTR-XL	1.24B	0.584	0.343	0.317	0.635	0.159	0.408
Google GTR-XXL	4.80B	0.501	0.342	0.324	0.662	0.161	0.398
OpenAI cpt-text-S	300M	0.679	0.332	-	0.672	-	-
OpenAI cpt-text-M	1.20B	0.585	0.367	-	0.704	-	-
OpenAI cpt-text-L	<u>6.00B</u>	0.562	<u>0.380</u>	-	0.744	-	-
OpenAI cpt-text-XL	175B	0.649	0.407	-	<u>0.754</u>	-	-
MedCPT							
MedCPT	330M	<u>0.709</u>	0.355	0.553	0.761	0.172	0.510
MedCPT (retriever only)	220M	0.697	0.340	0.332	0.724	0.123	0.443
MedCPT w/o contrastive pre-training (PubMedBERT)	110M	0.059	0.015	-	0.010	0.004	-

MedCPT generates better biomedical article representations

We evaluate the MedCPT article encoder on the RELISH article similarity task (Brown, et al., 2019). RELISH is an expert-annotated dataset that contains 196k article-article relevance annotations for 3.2k query articles, as described in Appendix D. Table 2 shows the evaluation results on RELISH. The MedCPT article encoder (DEnc) outperforms all other models, including SPECTER (Cohan, et al., 2020) and SciNCL (Ostendorff, et al., 2022) that are specifically trained with article-article citation information. Compared to its base PubMedBERT model, the MedCPT article encoder improves by over 10% performance. We also evaluate the MedCPT article encoder on SciDocs (Cohan, et al., 2020) as described in Appendix E, which contains all scientific domains from biomedicine to engineering. The MedCPT article encoder achieves SOTA performance on the MeSH prediction subtask and is comparable to SOTA methods on the overall score, showing its effectiveness on biomedical tasks and generalizability to other scientific domains.

Table 2. Evaluation results of the MedCPT article encoder on the RELISH dataset. **Bolded numbers**, underlined, and *italicized* numbers denote the **highest**, 2nd highest, and *3rd highest*, respectively. All numbers are percentages. Avg.: average.

Method	MAP			NDCG			Avg.
	@5	@10	@15	@5	@10	@15	
Random	79.33	77.22	75.41	80.70	77.67	76.40	77.79
Sparse retrievers							
BM25	88.91	86.72	84.54	89.48	87.39	86.21	87.21
PMRA	90.30	87.57	85.75	90.95	88.40	87.45	88.40
Non-BERT embedding-based models							
fastText	85.75	82.81	81.79	86.79	83.79	83.12	84.01
BioWordVec	89.84	86.51	84.67	89.90	86.67	85.53	87.19
InferSent	85.21	82.16	80.41	86.56	83.31	82.35	83.33
WikiSentVec	87.92	85.23	83.40	88.65	85.74	84.81	85.96
BioSentVec	90.76	88.10	86.16	90.05	87.76	86.89	88.29
LDA	85.44	82.66	80.36	86.51	82.91	81.31	83.20
Doc2Vec	86.23	84.74	83.39	86.55	84.70	84.09	84.95
BERT-based models							
BioBERT	88.14	85.81	83.90	88.97	86.29	85.10	86.37
PubMedBERT	83.69	81.07	79.53	85.47	82.39	81.41	82.26
SPECTER	<i>92.27</i>	<i>90.00</i>	<i>88.36</i>	<i>91.47</i>	<i>89.12</i>	<i>88.42</i>	<i>89.94</i>

SciNCL	<u>94.72</u>	<u>92.74</u>	<u>91.14</u>	<u>93.67</u>	<u>91.91</u>	<u>90.94</u>	<u>92.52</u>
MedCPT DEnc	95.58	93.99	92.39	94.78	93.12	92.43	93.72

MedCPT generates better biomedical sentence representations

We evaluate the MedCPT query encoder on two datasets for sentence similarities: BIOSSES in the biomedical domain (Sogancioglu, et al., 2017) and MedSTS in the clinical domain (Wang, et al., 2020). Appendix F introduces the evaluation details and Table 3 shows the evaluation results. On BIOSSES, MedCPT performs the best among all compared models, surpassing the second SciNCL by 5% relative performance (0.893 vs. 0.847). On the MedSTS dataset, MedCPT ranks the second and the performance is comparable to the highest-ranking model BioSentVec (Chen, et al., 2019) (0.765 vs. 0.767), which uses an external clinical corpus MIMIC-III (Johnson, et al., 2016) for its model training. Overall, our results show that the MedCPT query encoder can effectively encode biomedical and clinical sentences that reflect their semantic similarities.

Model	BIOSSES	MedSTS
Non-BERT embedding-based models		
BioWordVec	0.694	0.747
USE	0.345	0.714
BioSentVec (PubMed)	<i>0.817</i>	0.750
BioSentVec (MIMIC-III)	0.350	<i>0.759</i>
BioSentVec (PubMed + MIMIC-III)	0.795	0.767
BERT-based models		
PubMedBERT	0.528	0.521
Clinical BERT	0.556	0.525
SPECTER	0.694	0.702
SciNCL	<u>0.847</u>	0.706
MedCPT QEnc	0.893	<u>0.765</u>

Table 3. Evaluation results (Pearson’s correlation coefficients) of the MedCPT query encoder on the BIOSSES and MedSTS datasets. **Bolded numbers**, underlined, and *italicized* numbers denote the **highest**, 2nd highest, and *3rd highest*, respectively. All numbers are percentages.

Discussions

MedCPT is only trained with query-article click data derived from PubMed user logs, but it generalizes well and achieves the SOTA performance on many biomedical IR tasks in

the BEIR benchmark, which indicates that query-article pairs in the PubMed search logs can serve as high-quality training data for serving general-purpose information needs in biomedicine. Furthermore, while not being explicitly trained with query similarity and article similarity data, the MedCPT query encoder and article encoder still achieve the SOTA performance on sentence similarity and article similarity tasks, respectively. This shows that the contrastive objective can train not only a dense retriever, but can also train the individual query and document encoders to perform tasks related to information-seeking behaviors. As such, MedCPT has broad implications in a variety of real-world scenarios: enhancing algorithms for biomedical literature search such as PubMed’s Best Match (Fiorini, et al., 2018), where case studies in Appendix G show that MedCPT retrieves more semantically relevant articles than other commonly used literature search engines; improving similar article recommendation algorithms in literature search (Lin and Wilbur, 2007); facilitating sentence-to-sentence retrieval tasks such as sentence-level literature search (Allot, et al., 2019).

Although transformer-based retrieval and re-ranking models such as MedCPT can return more comprehensive results, they are not as controllable or explainable as sparse retrievers such as BM25. For example, when user searches the gene “MAP3K3”, MedCPT will also return articles that only contain “MAP3K7”, which might not be the original information need. In addition, the semantic similarity scores between a query article pair are not explainable. As such, one potential future direction is to develop hybrid dense-sparse retrieval systems that can harvest the advantages from both approaches (Ma, et al., 2020; Shin, et al., 2023).

To summarize, we use large-scale PubMed logs to contrastively train MedCPT, the first integral retriever-reranker model for biomedical information retrieval. Systematic zero-shot evaluations show that MedCPT achieves the highest performance for six different biomedical information retrieval tasks, including query-to-article retrieval, semantic article and sentence representation. We anticipate that MedCPT will have a broad range of applications and significantly enhance access to biomedical information, making it a valuable tool for researchers and practitioners alike.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by the NIH Intramural Research Program, National Library of Medicine.

References

- Allot, A., *et al.* LitSense: making sense of biomedical literature at sentence level. *Nucleic Acids Res* 2019;47(W1):W594-W599.
- Brown, P., *et al.* Large expert-curated database for benchmarking document similarity detection in biomedical literature search. *Database* 2019;2019.
- Brown, T., *et al.* Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 2020;33:1877-1901.
- Chen, Q., Peng, Y. and Lu, Z. BioSentVec: creating sentence embeddings for biomedical texts. In, *2019 IEEE International Conference on Healthcare Informatics (ICHI)*. IEEE; 2019. p. 1-5.
- Cohan, A., *et al.* SPECTER: Document-level Representation Learning using Citation-informed Transformers. In, *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. 2020. p. 2270-2282.
- Dai, Z. and Callan, J. Context-aware term weighting for first stage passage retrieval. In, *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval*. 2020. p. 1533-1536.
- Ely, J.W., *et al.* Answering physicians' clinical questions: obstacles and potential solutions. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2005;12(2):217-224.
- Fiorini, N., *et al.* Best Match: New relevance search for PubMed. *PLoS Biol* 2018;16(8):e2005343.
- Gao, L., Dai, Z. and Callan, J. Rethink training of BERT rerankers in multi-stage retrieval pipeline. In, *Advances in Information Retrieval: 43rd European Conference on IR Research, ECIR 2021, Virtual Event, March 28–April 1, 2021, Proceedings, Part II 43*. Springer; 2021. p. 280-286.
- Gopalakrishnan, V., *et al.* A survey on literature based discovery approaches in biomedical domain. *J Biomed Inform* 2019;93:103141.
- Gu, Y., *et al.* Domain-specific language model pretraining for biomedical natural language processing. *ACM Transactions on Computing for Healthcare (HEALTH)* 2021;3(1):1-23.
- Hirschman, L., *et al.* Text mining for the biocuration workflow. *Database (Oxford)* 2012;2012:bas020.
- Hofstätter, S., *et al.* Efficiently teaching an effective dense retriever with balanced topic aware sampling. In, *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 2021. p. 113-122.
- Izacard, G., *et al.* Towards unsupervised dense information retrieval with contrastive learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.09118* 2021.
- Jin, Q., Leaman, R. and Lu, Z. Retrieve, Summarize, and Verify: How Will ChatGPT Affect Information Seeking from the Medical Literature? *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2023.
- Johnson, A.E., *et al.* MIMIC-III, a freely accessible critical care database. *Sci Data* 2016;3:160035.

Karpukhin, V., *et al.* Dense Passage Retrieval for Open-Domain Question Answering. In, *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*. 2020. p. 6769-6781.

Khattab, O. and Zaharia, M. Colbert: Efficient and effective passage search via contextualized late interaction over bert. In, *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval*. 2020. p. 39-48.

Lin, J., Nogueira, R. and Yates, A. Pretrained transformers for text ranking: Bert and beyond. Springer Nature; 2022.

Lin, J. and Wilbur, W.J. PubMed related articles: a probabilistic topic-based model for content similarity. *BMC Bioinformatics* 2007;8:423.

Ma, J., *et al.* Hybrid First-stage Retrieval Models for Biomedical Literature. In, *CLEF (Working Notes)*. 2020.

Neelakantan, A., *et al.* Text and code embeddings by contrastive pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.10005* 2022.

Ni, J., *et al.* Large dual encoders are generalizable retrievers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.07899* 2021.

Nogueira, R. and Cho, K. Passage Re-ranking with BERT. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.04085* 2019.

Nogueira, R., Lin, J. and Epistemic, A. From doc2query to docTTTTTquery. *Online preprint* 2019;6.

Ostendorff, M., *et al.* Neighborhood contrastive learning for scientific document representations with citation embeddings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.06671* 2022.

Roberts, K., *et al.* Overview of the TREC 2014 Clinical Decision Support Track. In, *Text Retrieval Conference*. 2014.

Roberts, K., *et al.* Overview of the TREC 2020 Precision Medicine Track. *The Text REtrieval Conference* 2017;26.

Shin, A., Jin, Q. and Lu, Z. Multi-stage Literature Retrieval System Trained by PubMed Search Logs for Biomedical Question Answering. *Conference and Labs of the Evaluation Forum (CLEF) 2023*.

Sogancioglu, G., Ozturk, H. and Ozgur, A. BIOSSES: a semantic sentence similarity estimation system for the biomedical domain. *Bioinformatics* 2017;33(14):i49-i58.

Thakur, N., *et al.* BEIR: A heterogenous benchmark for zero-shot evaluation of information retrieval models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08663* 2021.

Tsatsaronis, G., *et al.* An overview of the BIOASQ large-scale biomedical semantic indexing and question answering competition. *BMC Bioinformatics* 2015;16:138.

Vaswani, A., *et al.* Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 2017;30.

Voorhees, E., *et al.* TREC-COVID: constructing a pandemic information retrieval test collection. In, *ACM SIGIR Forum*. ACM New York, NY, USA; 2021. p. 1-12.

Wang, Y., *et al.* MedSTS: a resource for clinical semantic textual similarity. *Language Resources and Evaluation* 2020;54:57-72.

Xiong, L., *et al.* Approximate nearest neighbor negative contrastive learning for dense text retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.00808* 2020.

Yeganova, L., *et al.* A Field Sensor: computing the composition and intent of PubMed queries. *Database (Oxford)* 2018;2018.

Zhang, Y., *et al.* Multi-factor duplicate question detection in stack overflow. *Journal of Computer Science and Technology* 2015;30:981-997.

Appendix A: MedCPT Inference




Figure S1. Architecture for inference with pre-trained MedCPT. A test query q is fed to the MedCPT query encoder, and its representation will be matched against the corpus representations using MIPS. The corpus representations are calculated and saved offline. Top K retrieved articles will be re-ranked by the MedCPT cross-encoder. MIPS: maximum inner product search.

As shown in Figure S1, when applying the pre-trained MedCPT to downstream tasks in a zero-shot fashion, we need to first encode the task corpus. Specifically, we use DEnc to process each article d_i in the task corpus, getting their representations $E(d_i) \in \mathbb{R}^h$. We save the representations of the entire corpus, denoted as:

$$\mathcal{D} = [E(d_1), E(d_2), \dots, E(d_N)] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times h}$$

where N is the size of articles in the corpus. This step only needs to be done once in the offline setting.

Then, each input query q is fed into QEnc, which generates its representative $E(q)$. We conduct a MIPS between $E(q)$ and \mathcal{D} to find the top- K most similar articles to the input query:

$$d_1^q, d_2^q, \dots, d_K^q = \text{MIPS}(E(q), \mathcal{D})$$

We apply CrossEnc to score the relevance between q and each relevant article candidates in $d_1^q, d_2^q, \dots, d_K^q$ retrieved from the previous step:

$$Rel(q, d_i^q) = \text{CrossEnc}(q, d_i^q)$$

Finally, we sort the retrieved articles by $Rel(q, d_i^q)$ from the highest to the lowest and return the sorted results.

We implemented the MedCPT using PyTorch (Paszke, et al., 2019) and the Hugging Face transformers library (Wolf, et al., 2020). The hidden dimension for MedCPT $h = 768$ as in the BERT-base configuration. We use the Adam optimizer (Kingma and Ba, 2014) without weight decay to train both the retriever and the re-ranker, where we set the learning rate $2e-5$ and epsilon $1e-8$. For the MedCPT retriever, $B = 32$ and $\alpha = 0.8$, and we also apply gradient accumulation of 8 steps. We train the retriever for 100k steps with 10k warm-up steps. For the MedCPT re-ranker: $M = 31$, $e = 50$, $f = 200$. We train the re-ranker for 10k steps with 1,000 warm-up steps. We apply cosine learning rate schedule after the warm-up steps. During inference, N and K vary for specific tasks. We implemented MIPS with the FlatIP index of the Faiss library (Johnson, et al., 2019).

Appendix B: Compared methods

Sparse retrievers

Sparse retrievers, as known as lexical retrievers, match the queries and documents with overlapped terms. BM25 (Robertson and Zaragoza, 2009), a widely used lexical retriever, represents queries and documents as bag-of-words, and scores the relevance based on term frequency and inverse document frequency. DeepCT (Dai and Callan, 2020) uses contextualized term weights predicted by BERT. SPARTA (Zhang, et al., 2015) pre-computes contextualized matching weights for each possible term and the document, resulting in a sparse vector that has the size dimension as the BERT vocabulary. DocT5query (Nogueira, et al., 2019) performs document expansion with T5-generated (Raffel, et al., 2020) queries for the document. The PubMed Related Articles algorithm (Lin and Wilbur, 2007) uses a probabilistic topic-based model to compute the content similarity between two given articles.

Dense retrievers

Dense retrievers first encode both the queries and documents into low-dimensional dense vectors, and then perform nearest neighbor search to find the relevant documents for a given query. Depending on the encoder architecture, we broadly classify them into non-BERT embedding models and BERT-based dense retrievers.

Non-BERT embedding models include BioWordVec (Zhang, et al., 2019) which is a biomedical version of word2vec (Mikolov, et al., 2013), FastText (Bojanowski, et al., 2017), a linear model on the N-gram features of the input texts, Sent2vec (Pagliardini, et al., 2018) and its biomedical version BioSentVec (Chen, et al., 2019), the LDA topic model (Blei, et al., 2003), doc2vec (Le and Mikolov, 2014), InferSent (Conneau, et al., 2017), and Universal Sentence Encoder (USE) (Cer, et al., 2018). BERT-based dense retrievers: DPR (Karpukhin, et al., 2020) is a bi-encoder retriever trained by in-batch negatives and BM25 hard negatives. ANCE (Xiong, et al., 2020) improves the DPR training by using hard negatives from an approximate nearest neighbor index of the corpus. TAS-B (Hofstätter, et al., 2021) is a bi-encoder retriever distilled from a cross-encoder and ColBERT (Khattab and Zaharia, 2020) with balanced topic aware sampling. GenQ (Thakur, et al., 2021) is domain-adaptation method that trains a dense retriever with synthetic query-document pairs generated by T5 (Raffel, et al., 2020). Contriever (Izacard, et al., 2021) is a contrastively pre-trained dense retriever in the general domain with carefully engineered positive and negative query-document pairs. ColBERT (Khattab and Zaharia, 2020) is a late-interaction retriever that computes and matches the contextualized representations of each token in the query and document. In addition, we compare MedCPT with several off-the-shelf BERT models that are biomedical domain-

specific, including its base model PubMedBERT (Gu, et al., 2021), BioBERT (Lee, et al., 2020), SPECTER (Cohan, et al., 2020), and SciNCL (Ostendorff, et al., 2022).

Large language model retrievers

We also compare MedCPT with two large language model retrievers: Google’s GTR (Ni, et al., 2021) and OpenAI’s cpt-text (Hirschman, et al., 2012). Unlike most dense retrievers that are based on the BERT-base model of 110M parameters, GTR and cpt-text use much larger language model encoders. Specifically, GTR is based on T5 (Raffel, et al., 2020) and its largest variant has 4.8B parameters, while cpt-text is based on GPT-3 (Brown, et al., 2020) and its largest variant has 175B parameter. Both GTR and cpt-text are pre-trained by large-scale Web corpora with in-batch negatives, and are further fine-tuned with supervised datasets such as MS MARCO (Bajaj, et al., 2016). In comparison, MedCPT is only trained by the user click data from PubMed logs without using any supervised datasets.

Appendix C: Evaluation details on BEIR

We evaluate MedCPT on five biomedical tasks in the BEIR benchmark: TREC-COVID (Voorhees, et al., 2021), NFCorpus (Boteva, et al., 2016), BioASQ (Tsatsaronis, et al., 2015), SciFact (Wadden, et al., 2020), and SciDocs (Cohan, et al., 2020). TREC-COVID (Voorhees, et al., 2021) contains questions about the COVID-19 pandemic and uses the COVID-19 corpus (Wang, et al., 2020) as the document collection for retrieval. NFCorpus (Boteva, et al., 2016) collects natural language queries and relevant articles from the NutritionFacts.org site. BioASQ (Tsatsaronis, et al., 2015) is a community challenge for biomedical question answering, where the task used in BEIR is to retrieve relevant articles from PubMed for a given question. SciFact (Wadden, et al., 2020) is a scientific claim verification dataset, which contains a retrieval subtask and a veracity prediction subtask. BEIR uses the retrieval subtask of SciFact, where the objective is to find relevant articles that can be used to verify a given claim. SciDocs (Cohan, et al., 2020) is a benchmark for evaluating scientific article representation models. BEIR uses its citation prediction subtask, where the goal is to retrieve relevant citations for a given article. We use the official evaluation library for BEIR and report the normalized discounted cumulative gain at rank 10 (NDCG@10).

We compared it with various baselines, including its initialization model PubMedBERT (Gu, et al., 2021), BM25 (Robertson and Zaragoza, 2009) and BM25 with the MiniLM re-ranker (Wang, et al., 2020), sparse retrievers such as DeepCT (Dai and Callan, 2020), SPARTA (Zhang, et al., 2015), and docT5query (Nogueira, et al., 2019), dense retrievers such as DPR (Karpukhin, et al., 2020), ANCE (Xiong, et al., 2020), TAS-B (Hofstätter, et al., 2021), GenQ (Thakur, et al., 2021), Contriever (Izacard, et al., 2021), large language model generated embeddings such as Generalizable T5-based dense Retrievers (GTR) (Ni, et al., 2021) and cpt-text (Neelakantan, et al., 2022). Details of the compared methods are described in Appendix B.

Appendix D: Evaluation details on RELISH

Following the dataset split and evaluation settings of (Zhang, et al., 2022), we use article embeddings generated by the MedCPT article encoder to calculate the article-pair similarity and evaluate ranking quality by mean average precision (MAP) and NDCG at 5, 10, and 15.

For comparison, we also list the model performance reported in (Zhang, et al., 2022), including a random baseline, term-based retrievers such as BM25 (Robertson and Zaragoza, 2009) and PubMed Related Articles (PMRA) (Lin and Wilbur, 2007), embedding-based retrievers such as fastText (Bojanowski, et al., 2017), BioWordVec (Zhang, et al., 2019), InferSent (Conneau, et al., 2017), Sent2vec (Pagliardini, et al., 2018), BioSentVec (Chen, et al., 2019), document embedding models such as LDA (Blei, et al., 2003) and doc2vec (Le and Mikolov, 2014), and BERT-based retrievers such as BioBERT (Lee, et al., 2020), PubMedBERT (Gu, et al., 2021), SPECTER (Cohan, et al., 2020), and SciNCL (Ostendorff, et al., 2022). Details of the compared methods are described in Appendix B.

Appendix E: Evaluation details on SciDocs

SciDocs is an evaluation framework for measuring the effectiveness of scientific paper embeddings. It includes several subtasks, such as classification of article topics, predicting user activity and citation, and also article recommendation. On SciDocs, we compare the MedCPT article encoder with various text representation models, including a random baseline, doc2vec (Le and Mikolov, 2014), FastText (Bojanowski, et al., 2017), SIF (Arora, et al., 2017), ELMo (Peters, et al., 2018), Citeomatic (Bhagavatula, et al., 2018), SGC (Wu, et al., 2019), and BERT-based models such as SciBERT (Beltagy, et al., 2019), Sent-BERT (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019), PubMedBERT (Gu, et al., 2021), SPECTER (Cohan, et al., 2020), SciNCL (Ostendorff, et al., 2022). We use the official evaluation library for SciDocs¹ and report the returned metrics for each subtask. Details of the compared methods are described in Appendix B.

Table S1 shows the evaluation results on the SciDocs benchmark. For the average performance on subtasks, the MedCPT article encoder is better than all other compared baselines except SPECTER and SciNCL. This is not surprising since (1) SciDocs includes articles in other scientific disciplines than biomedicine and (2) SPECTER and SciNCL are trained with article-article citation information and optimized for the SciDocs benchmark. However, MedCPT is still able to surpass SPECTER and SciNCL on the MeSH classification sub-task, which only contains biomedical articles. Overall, the MedCPT article encoder is comparable to SPECTER and SciNCL for scientific article representation, and better for biomedical article representation.

¹ <https://github.com/allenai/scidocs>

SciDocs Task	Classification		User activity prediction				Citation prediction				Recomm.		Avg.
	MAG	MSH	Co-View		Co-Read		Cite		Co-Cite				
	F1	F1	M.	N.	M.	N.	M.	N.	M.	N.	N.	P@1	
Random	4.8	9.4	25.2	51.6	25.6	51.9	25.1	51.5	24.9	51.4	51.3	16.8	32.5
Doc2vec	66.2	69.2	67.8	82.9	64.9	81.6	65.3	82.2	67.1	83.4	51.7	16.9	66.6
Fasttext-sum	78.1	84.1	76.5	87.9	75.3	87.4	74.6	88.1	77.8	89.6	52.5	18.0	74.1
SIF	78.4	81.4	79.4	89.4	78.2	88.9	79.4	90.5	80.8	90.9	<u>53.4</u>	<u>19.5</u>	75.9
ELMo	77.0	75.7	70.3	84.3	67.4	82.6	65.8	82.6	68.5	83.8	52.5	18.2	69.0
Citeomatic	67.1	75.7	81.1	90.2	80.5	90.2	86.3	94.1	84.4	92.8	52.5	17.3	76.0
SGC	76.8	82.7	77.2	88.0	75.7	87.5	<u>91.6</u>	<u>96.2</u>	84.1	92.5	52.7	18.2	76.9
SciBERT	79.7	80.7	50.7	73.1	47.7	71.1	48.3	71.7	49.7	72.6	52.1	17.9	59.6
Sent-BERT	80.5	69.1	68.2	83.3	64.8	81.3	63.5	81.6	66.4	82.8	51.6	17.1	67.5
SPECTER	82.0	<i>86.4</i>	<u>83.6</u>	<u>91.5</u>	<u>84.5</u>	<u>92.4</u>	<i>88.3</i>	<i>94.9</i>	<u>88.1</u>	<u>94.8</u>	53.9	20.0	<u>80.0</u>
SciNCL	<u>81.4</u>	<u>88.7</u>	85.3	92.3	87.5	93.9	93.6	97.3	91.6	96.4	53.9	<i>19.3</i>	81.8
PubMedBERT	77.3	80.5	47.4	70.2	45.2	68.3	40.6	65.4	44.8	68.4	51.8	17.4	56.4
MedCPT DEnc	<i>80.3</i>	89.9	<i>82.3</i>	<i>90.8</i>	<i>83.1</i>	<i>91.6</i>	83.2	92.5	<i>85.1</i>	<i>93.5</i>	<i>52.9</i>	18.5	<i>78.6</i>

Table S1. Evaluation results of the MedCPT article encoder on the SciDocs benchmark. MeSH classification is the only biomedical task. **Bolded numbers**, underlined, and *italicized* numbers denote the **highest**, 2nd highest, and *3rd highest*, respectively. All numbers are percentages. M: MAP; N: NDCG. Recomm.: recommendation. Avg.: average.

Appendix F: Evaluation details on BIOSSES and MedSTS

The evaluation is conducted under the unsupervised (zero-shot) setting, where we directly apply the MedCPT query encoder model to test set instances without any model retraining or fine-tuning. We follow the evaluation settings in (Chen, et al., 2019) and report Pearson’s correlation coefficients between the model predictions and the ground truth scores. For comparison, we include SOTA methods such as BioWordVec (Chiu, et al., 2016), Universal Sentence Encoder (USE) (Cer, et al., 2018), BioSentVec trained with different corpora (Chen, et al., 2019), and BERT-based models such as PubMedBERT (Gu, et al., 2021), Clinical BERT (Alsentzer, et al., 2019), SPECTER (Cohan, et al., 2020),

SciNCL (Ostendorff, et al., 2022). Details of the compared methods are described in Appendix B.

Appendix G: Case studies

We conduct three case studies by comparing MedCPT results with widely used web-based literature search tools, including PubMed (with Best Match ranking (Fiorini, et al., 2018)), Google Scholar², and Semantic Scholar³. Unlike the standardized biomedical IR tasks where the queries are mostly natural language sentences or questions, we choose to evaluate using short phrases (keyword combinations) that require semantic understanding in this section. We don't test on full sentences because it would be unfair for web-based search engines that are not optimized for such usage. Table S2 shows the top-3 results returned by different tools.

Query case 1 is “lead heart damage”. In this query, the word “lead” most likely means the metal “lead” or the wire / cable that is used in an implanted device, but much less likely to denote the verb as in “lead to”. However, “lead” is matched to “lead to” by PubMed, Google Scholar, and Semantic Scholar. MedCPT, on the other hand, matches all “lead” to the metal or a medical device. Although some titles don't explicitly contain “heart”, the corresponding articles are about heart damage.

Query case 2 is “postpartum depression syndrome”. In this query, the word “syndrome” is simply used to modify “postpartum depression” and does not denote any other “syndrome”. The word can be neglected when retrieving relevant articles because it's not common usage. However, most web-based search engines map “syndrome” to other diseases such as “polycystic ovary syndrome” and “premenstrual syndrome” that are not part of the original information needs. MedCPT does not map the “syndrome” to other unrelated concepts, but actually tries to return more general titles that unify the query terms, i.e., “Postpartum psychiatric syndromes”. MedCPT can also ignore “syndrome” as in the returned article “Postpartum Depression”.

Query case 3 is “dermatologist in Germany”. In this query, “Germany” should be interpreted together with “dermatologist” as the main topic. However, PubMed and Semantic Scholar mostly match “Germany” to the author's affiliation fields or the place of study. On the other hand, all three articles returned by MedCPT have exact continuous mentions of “German dermatologist(s)”.

² <https://scholar.google.com/>

³ <https://www.semanticscholar.org/>

Query	PubMed (Best Match)	Google Scholar	Semantic Scholar	PuedCPT (ours)
“lead heart damage”	Brain-Heart Interaction: Cardiac Complications After Stroke	New treatment strategies for alcohol-induced heart damage	Altered Hemodynamics and End-Organ Damage in Heart Failure	Anatomical mechanisms that cause lead and catheter damage
	An Overview of Chemical and Biological Materials lead to Damage and Repair of Heart Tissue	An overview of chemical and biological materials lead to damage and repair of heart tissue	Hibiscus sabdariffa Linn. (Roselle) protects against nicotine-induced heart damage in rats	Myocardial changes in lead poisoning
	Role of Cardiac Macrophages on Cardiac Inflammation, Fibrosis and Tissue Repair	Early life permethrin insecticide treatment leads to heart damage in adult rats	Use of Computational Fluid Dynamics to Analyze Blood Flow, Hemolysis and Sublethal Damage to Red Blood Cells in a Bileaflet Artificial Heart Valve	Transvenous defibrillator lead damage
“postpartum depression syndrome”	Depression During Pregnancy and Postpartum	History of premenstrual syndrome and development of postpartum depression : a systematic review and meta-analysis	Relationship of premenstrual syndrome with postpartum depression and mother-infant bonding.	Postpartum psychiatric syndromes
	Polycystic ovary syndrome and postpartum depression : A systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies	Associations between premenstrual syndrome and postpartum depression : a systematic literature review	Polycystic Ovary Syndrome and Postpartum Depression Symptoms: A Population-Based Cohort Study.	Postpartum psychiatric syndromes
	Relationship of premenstrual	Polycystic ovary syndrome and	Polycystic ovary syndrome and	Postpartum Depression

	syndrome with postpartum depression and mother-infant bonding	postpartum depression : A systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies	postpartum depression : a systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies.	
“dermatologist in Germany”	[Wound treatment in diabetes patients and diabetic foot ulcers]	Dermatology in Germany	[External scientific evaluation of the first teledermatology app without direct patient contact in Germany (Online Dermatologist-AppDoc)].	[The German Society of Dermatology -- association of German dermatologists in Germany, Austria and Switzerland -- its position in Europe and in the world]
	Microbiome in healthy skin, update for dermatologists	To excise or not: impact of MelaFind on German dermatologists' decisions to biopsy atypical lesions	AI outperformed every dermatologist in dermoscopic melanoma diagnosis, using an optimized deep-CNN architecture with custom mini-batch logic and loss function	German dermatologists and their contributions to Turkish dermatology
	Practical management of acne for clinicians: An international consensus from the Global Alliance to Improve Outcomes in Acne	Epidemiology of contact dermatitis . The information network of departments of dermatology (IVDK) in Germany	[Why in Koenigsberg, why Samuel Jessner, why 1921? : History of the first university lectureship for sexology in Germany].	[Impressions and experiences of a German dermatologist in America].

Table S2. Top-three retrieval article titles of MedCPT and widely used literature search engines for three case study queries. The results of PubMed, Google Scholar, and Semantic Scholar were collected on Mar 25, 2023. **Bolded** texts denote lexical matching

while **bolded and underlined** texts denote wrong semantic matching. Titles in “[...]” denote articles in non-English languages.

Appendix H: Scaling properties of MedCPT

In Figure S2, we study the scaling properties of MedCPT. Specifically, we evaluate the MedCPT retriever performance measured by NDCG@10 on four biomedical tasks on the BEIR benchmark (TREC-COVID, SciDocs, SciFact, NFCorpus). As shown in the figure, the performance of MedCPT increases log-linearly as the number of training logs increase, and stabilize at the end of training with 255M query-article pairs. The model needs to be trained on at least 150M query-article pairs to stabilize and consistently outperform BM25, although it should be noted that BM25 appears to be a strong baseline since many IR datasets favor BM25 due to the exposure bias in annotation. Practically, 255M query-article pairs are the most we can get from the new PubMed, and training on them already takes about 1 month of computation on a server of 8 Nvidia V100 GPUs, roughly costing ~15,000 US dollars. In conclusion, it is necessary to train on large amounts of data, but the marginal gain might decrease because the performance-training size curve follows a logarithm law.




Figure S2. The average NDCG@10 performance on biomedical tasks in the BEIR benchmark of the MedCPT retrievers trained by different sizes of PubMed user logs. The performance increases log-linearly as the number of training logs increases.

References

- Alsentzer, E., *et al.* Publicly Available Clinical BERT Embeddings. In, *Proceedings of the 2nd Clinical Natural Language Processing Workshop*. 2019. p. 72-78.
- Arora, S., Liang, Y. and Ma, T. A simple but tough-to-beat baseline for sentence embeddings. In, *International conference on learning representations*. 2017.
- Bajaj, P., *et al.* Ms marco: A human generated machine reading comprehension dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.09268* 2016.
- Beltagy, I., Lo, K. and Cohan, A. SciBERT: A Pretrained Language Model for Scientific Text. In, *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*. 2019. p. 3615-3620.
- Bhagavatula, C., *et al.* Content-Based Citation Recommendation. In, *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*. 2018. p. 238-251.
- Blei, D.M., Ng, A.Y. and Jordan, M.I. Latent dirichlet allocation. *Journal of machine Learning research* 2003;3(Jan):993-1022.
- Bojanowski, P., *et al.* Enriching word vectors with subword information. *Transactions of the association for computational linguistics* 2017;5:135-146.
- Boteva, V., *et al.* A full-text learning to rank dataset for medical information retrieval. In, *Advances in Information Retrieval: 38th European Conference on IR Research, ECIR 2016, Padua, Italy, March 20–23, 2016. Proceedings 38*. Springer; 2016. p. 716-722.
- Brown, T., *et al.* Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 2020;33:1877-1901.
- Cer, D., *et al.* Universal sentence encoder. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.11175* 2018.
- Chen, Q., Peng, Y. and Lu, Z. BioSentVec: creating sentence embeddings for biomedical texts. In, *2019 IEEE International Conference on Healthcare Informatics (ICHI)*. IEEE; 2019. p. 1-5.
- Chiu, B., *et al.* How to train good word embeddings for biomedical NLP. In, *Proceedings of the 15th workshop on biomedical natural language processing*. 2016. p. 166-174.
- Chowdhery, A., *et al.* Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.02311* 2022.
- Cohan, A., *et al.* SPECTER: Document-level Representation Learning using Citation-informed Transformers. In, *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. 2020. p. 2270-2282.
- Conneau, A., *et al.* Supervised Learning of Universal Sentence Representations from Natural Language Inference Data. In, *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 2017. p. 670-680.

Dai, Z. and Callan, J. Context-aware term weighting for first stage passage retrieval. In, *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval*. 2020. p. 1533-1536.

Fiorini, N., et al. Best Match: New relevance search for PubMed. *PLoS Biol* 2018;16(8):e2005343.

Fiorini, N., et al. How user intelligence is improving PubMed. *Nat Biotechnol* 2018.

Gu, Y., et al. Domain-specific language model pretraining for biomedical natural language processing. *ACM Transactions on Computing for Healthcare (HEALTH)* 2021;3(1):1-23.

Hirschman, L., et al. Text mining for the biocuration workflow. *Database (Oxford)* 2012;2012:bas020.

Hofstätter, S., et al. Efficiently teaching an effective dense retriever with balanced topic aware sampling. In, *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 2021. p. 113-122.

Izacard, G., et al. Towards unsupervised dense information retrieval with contrastive learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.09118* 2021.

Ji, Z., et al. Survey of hallucination in natural language generation. *ACM Computing Surveys* 2023;55(12):1-38.

Johnson, J., Douze, M. and Jégou, H. Billion-scale similarity search with gpus. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data* 2019;7(3):535-547.

Karpukhin, V., et al. Dense Passage Retrieval for Open-Domain Question Answering. In, *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*. 2020. p. 6769-6781.

Khattab, O. and Zaharia, M. Colbert: Efficient and effective passage search via contextualized late interaction over bert. In, *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval*. 2020. p. 39-48.

Kingma, D.P. and Ba, J. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980* 2014.

Le, Q. and Mikolov, T. Distributed representations of sentences and documents. In, *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR; 2014. p. 1188-1196.

Lee, J., et al. BioBERT: a pre-trained biomedical language representation model for biomedical text mining. *Bioinformatics* 2020;36(4):1234-1240.

Lin, J. and Wilbur, W.J. PubMed related articles: a probabilistic topic-based model for content similarity. *BMC Bioinformatics* 2007;8:423.

Mialon, G., et al. Augmented language models: a survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.07842* 2023.

Mikolov, T., et al. Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 2013;26.

Neelakantan, A., et al. Text and code embeddings by contrastive pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.10005* 2022.

Ni, J., *et al.* Large dual encoders are generalizable retrievers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.07899* 2021.

Nogueira, R., Lin, J. and Epistemic, A. From doc2query to docTTTTTquery. *Online preprint* 2019;6.

Ostendorff, M., *et al.* Neighborhood contrastive learning for scientific document representations with citation embeddings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.06671* 2022.

Pagliardini, M., Gupta, P. and Jaggi, M. Unsupervised Learning of Sentence Embeddings Using Compositional n-Gram Features. In, *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*. 2018. p. 528-540.

Paszke, A., *et al.* Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 2019;32.

Peters, M.E., *et al.* Deep Contextualized Word Representations. In, *North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. 2018.

Raffel, C., *et al.* Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 2020;21(1):5485-5551.

Reimers, N. and Gurevych, I. Sentence-BERT: Sentence Embeddings using Siamese BERT-Networks. In, *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*. 2019. p. 3982-3992.

Robertson, S. and Zaragoza, H. The probabilistic relevance framework: BM25 and beyond. *Foundations and Trends® in Information Retrieval* 2009;3(4):333-389.

Thakur, N., *et al.* BEIR: A heterogenous benchmark for zero-shot evaluation of information retrieval models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08663* 2021.

Tsatsaronis, G., *et al.* An overview of the BIOASQ large-scale biomedical semantic indexing and question answering competition. *BMC Bioinformatics* 2015;16:138.

Voorhees, E., *et al.* TREC-COVID: constructing a pandemic information retrieval test collection. In, *ACM SIGIR Forum*. ACM New York, NY, USA; 2021. p. 1-12.

Wadden, D., *et al.* Fact or Fiction: Verifying Scientific Claims. In, *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*. 2020. p. 7534-7550.

Wang, L.L., *et al.* CORD-19: The COVID-19 Open Research Dataset. *ArXiv* 2020.

Wang, W., *et al.* Minilm: Deep self-attention distillation for task-agnostic compression of pre-trained transformers. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 2020;33:5776-5788.

Wolf, T., *et al.* Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing. In, *Proceedings of the 2020 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing: system demonstrations*. 2020. p. 38-45.

Wu, F., *et al.* Simplifying graph convolutional networks. In, *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR; 2019. p. 6861-6871.

Xiong, L., *et al.* Approximate nearest neighbor negative contrastive learning for dense text retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.00808* 2020.

Zhang, L., *et al.* A comparative evaluation of biomedical similar article recommendation. *J Biomed Inform* 2022;131:104106.

Zhang, Y., *et al.* BioWordVec, improving biomedical word embeddings with subword information and MeSH. *Sci Data* 2019;6(1):52.

Zhang, Y., *et al.* Multi-factor duplicate question detection in stack overflow. *Journal of Computer Science and Technology* 2015;30:981-997.