

Exploring LLM Multi-Agents for ICD Coding

Rumeng Li
Umass Amherst
VA Bedford Healthcare System

Xun Wang
Microsoft

Hong Yu
Umass Lowell
Umass Amhers
VA Bedford Healthcare System

Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated impressive and diverse abilities that can benefit various domains, such as zero and few-shot information extraction from clinical text without domain-specific training. However, for the ICD coding task, they often hallucinate key details and produce high recall but low precision results due to the high-dimensional and skewed distribution of the ICD codes. Existing LLM-based methods fail to account for the complex and dynamic interactions among the human agents involved in coding, such as patients, physicians, and coders, and they lack interpretability and reliability. In this paper, we present a novel multi-agent method for ICD coding, which mimics the real-world coding process with five agents: a patient agent, a physician agent, a coder agent, a reviewer agent, and an adjuster agent. Each agent has a specific function and uses a LLM-based model to perform it. We evaluate our method on the MIMIC-III dataset and show that our proposed multi-agent coding framework substantially improves performance on both common and rare codes compared to Zero-shot Chain of Thought (CoT) prompting and self-consistency with CoT (CoT-SC). The ablation study confirms the proposed agent roles' efficacy. Our method also matches the state-of-the-art ICD coding methods that require pre-training or fine-tuning, in terms of coding accuracy, rare code accuracy, and explainability.

1 Introduction

The International Classification of Diseases (ICD) is a standardized system of codes that represent various clinical activities, such as diagnoses, procedures, and causes of death. ICD coding is the process of assigning these codes to clinical notes. ICD coding is essential for billing, epidemiology, and quality improvement in health care, as it enables the accurate and consistent representation and communication of clinical information(Aalseth,

2014). However, ICD coding is a difficult and time-consuming task that involves reading and comprehending the varied and complex clinical notes, and choosing the suitable codes from a large and hierarchical code set(Care et al., 2020). The current ICD-10 has 68,000 diagnosis codes and 87,000 procedure codes (Organization, 2004). The Medical Information Mart for Intensive Care III (MIMIC-III) (Johnson et al., 2016) dataset, a widely used medical database, has clinical notes that vary in length from less than 500 words to more than 3000 words. These pose significant challenges for both humans and machines in understanding clinical notes and assigning ICD codes correctly. Moreover, ICD coding deals with a large label space with a long-tail issue. In the MIMIC-III dataset, the top 10% of all ICD codes cover 85% of all code occurrences, while about 22% of codes occur no more than twice (Zhou et al., 2021). In addition, ICD coding is often subject to errors and inconsistencies, as different coders may interpret and apply the coding rules and criteria differently, or miss some relevant codes.

To address these challenges, automatic ICD coding has emerged as an important and promising research topic in natural language processing (NLP). Automatic ICD coding aims to develop machine learning methods that can automatically assign ICD codes to clinical notes, based on the natural language understanding and generation capabilities of the models (Dong et al., 2022; Soroush et al., 2023).

Large language models (LLMs), such as GPT-* models (Achiam et al., 2023), Llama (Touvron et al., 2023), Gemini (Team et al., 2023), etc., are powerful neural network models that can perform various NLP tasks by leveraging the vast amount of text data on the web. However, early studies on ICD coding with LLMs reveal the task's challenges, such as LLMs' lack of domain-specific knowledge and vocabulary, the multi-label and long-tailed




Figure 1: The Assignment of ICD Codes with Multi-Parties. The workflow began when a patient came to the physician for help. The physician documented the clinical activities in the note. The coder assigned codes according to the note. The reviewer reviewed the codes. The patient and the physician reviewed the codes and asked the adjustor to review again if they disagreed with the codes. The adjustor made the final decisions.

code space, and the vulnerability to noisy or adversarial inputs (Clusmann et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2023; He et al., 2023). In addition, Previous work has shown that LLMs, such as GPT-4, have high recall but low precision in medical coding tasks (Yang et al., 2023), which limits their practical use. (Soroush et al., 2023) shows that LLMs often hallucinate key details and recommends more robust LLM augmentation and validation for healthcare tasks requiring high precision such as ICD coding. Concerns of the LLMs producing incorrect or skewed information has motivated researchers to investigate methods where models can check and verify each other’s outputs to improve reliability and precision.

To overcome the above-mentioned problems, we propose a multi-agent system for ICD coding and explore its performances under different settings. Multi-agent systems, as one of the recent advances, have shown their advantages in employing LLMs to create “interactive simulacra” that replicate human behaviors (Park et al., 2023). Our method consists of five agents: a patient agent, a physician agent, a coder agent, a reviewer agent, and an adjuster agent. Each agent has a specific role and task and they can collaborate or compete strategically to maximize their best interest, and uses a LLM-based model to perform its function. Our method aims to capture the complex and dynamic interactions among the

patients, the physicians, and the coders, and to provide explainability and robustness for the ICD coding process.

We provide an illustrative visualization of our multi-agent ICD coding framework in Figure 1. It shows how each agent has a specific role and task, and how they cooperate or compete strategically using a LLM-based model for their best interest and the ICD coding accuracy.

Inaccurate ICD codes can be regarded as a hallucination problem, which is a common issue of LLMs. In this work we leverage the SOAP (Subjective, Objective, Assessment, and Plan) structure of EHRs that providers commonly use to address this issue. Instead of directly asking LLMs to output the ICD codes, we feed them the subjective and objective sections, and prompt them to generate the assessment and plan sections. Then we instruct them to compare their own generation with the gold standard, and self-correct any hallucinations. Finally, we output the diagnosis code. We designed multi-agents to accomplish the whole process. We observe that this reasoning and self-correction process improves the ICD prediction performance

In addition, existing research has shown that LLMs can achieve better results with integration of external tools, such as a Python interpreter to broaden its applicability and utility (Suzgun and Kalai, 2024), we added external knowledge of code

description for the LLM’s reference and the results demonstrated boost in performance.

The main contributions of our paper are as follows:

- We propose a novel multi-agent system for automatic ICD coding, which simulates the real-world coding process and captures the complex and dynamic interactions among the patients, the physicians, and the coders.

- We use the SOAP structure of EHR notes to help LLM self-correct its hallucinations and improve its performance. We employ confrontation strategy for the agents and also add external knowledge of code description to enhance its performance further.

- Our methods substantially improve LLM’s ICD coding performance over Chain of thought (CoT) prompting and self-consistency CoT prompting, achieving comparable performance with state-of-art ICD coding models. The ablation study validates the efficacy of the proposed agent roles and the effectiveness of our proposed strategy. We analyze the results and discuss the insights and limitations of our method and the existing methods, and provide some directions and suggestions for future work and improvement.

2 Related Work

In this section, we discuss the previous work on ICD coding and multi-agent systems that inspires this study.

2.1 ICD Coding

ICD coding predicts expert labeled ICD codes from discharge summaries using NLP models. Previous methods can be categorized as follows: Rule-based methods use hand-crafted rules to assign codes (Farkas and Szarvas, 2008). Feature extraction methods use bag-of-words (BoW), word2vec (W2V)(Mikolov et al., 2013), or large pre-trained NLP models to represent the notes and the codes (Shuai et al., 2022; Kaur et al., 2021). Deep learning methods use CNNs to encode and classify the notes and the codes(Mullenbach et al., 2018; Xie et al., 2019). Some methods capture the sequential information with attentive LSTM or tree-of-sequences LSTM(Xie and Xing, 2018; Shi et al., 2017). Some methods enhance the feature extraction with attention mechanisms, dense connections, residual connections, or dilated convolutions(Vu et al., 2020; Li and Yu, 2020; Ji et al., 2020). Fine-

tuning methods use pre-trained language models (PLMs) that are fine-tuned on the medical-specific and special language of clinical notes (Huang et al., 2022). Knowledge injection methods use medical domain-specific knowledge such as hierarchy and synonym to improve ICD coding (Yang et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2022; Falis et al., 2022; Lu et al., 2020; Song et al., 2021; Cao et al., 2020). Active learning methods using extra human labeling are also studied to address the rare code issue (Mottaghi et al., 2020).

In recent years, Large Language Models (LLMs) have significantly enhanced the ability of machines to understand and generate natural language. LLM-based methods for ICD coding use LLMs such as GPT or T5 etc. to encode and generate the clinical notes and the ICD codes. (Sorosh et al., 2023) assessed GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 in Generating ICD Codes and concluded that while the models appear to exhibit a general conceptual understanding of the codes and their descriptions, they have a propensity for hallucinating key details, suggesting underlying technological limitations of the base LLMs. They suggest a need for more rigorous LLM augmentation strategies and validation prior to their implementation in healthcare contexts, particularly in tasks such as ICD coding which require significant digit-level precision. (Yang et al., 2023)’s findings suggest that the GPT-4 LLM predicts an excessive number of ICD codes for medical coding tasks, leading to high recall but low precision. To tackle this challenge, they introduced LLM-codex, a two-stage approach to predict ICD codes that first generates evidence proposals using an LLM and then employs an LSTM-based verification stage.

Our method is different from these previous methods, as we use the multi-agent system and inject external knowledge of code description to the LLM without any pre-training or fine-tuning.

2.2 Multi-agent Systems

With LLMs showing remarkable promise in achieving human-like intelligence (Du et al., 2024; Bubeck et al., 2023; Hauptman et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023), it also increased the interest in context-aware multi-agent systems (MAS). These are systems of multiple agents that can act, perceive, and communicate in a shared environment, and that can adapt their knowledge to the perceived context and optimally solve assigned tasks. MAS have various applications in domains such as autonomous

driving, disaster relief, utility management, supply chain management, human-AI interaction, cybersecurity, and other complex problems (Du et al., 2024). MAS has long been studied in healthcare applications for improving the accuracy of diagnoses and treatment plans and hence leading to better patient outcomes (Dhasarathan et al., 2024; Shakshuki and Reid, 2015). (Tu et al., 2024) employed task-specific fine tuning and self-play to enhance conversational AI's ability in diagnosis. Our method is novel as it is the first to use a multi-agent based on LLMs for ICD coding.

3 Method

In this section, we describe the details of our multi-agent method and its components, the roles and behaviors of each agent and how they interact with each other.

The multi-agent system consisted of five participants as stated above: a patient, a physician, a coder, a reviewer, and an adjustor. It mimics the coding procedure in a large healthcare system.

1. The **Patient** agent is the one who receives the medical service and the corresponding ICD codes at the healthcare facilities. They can review the codes and appeal to the adjustor agent if they find any errors or overcharges.
2. The **Physician** agent is the one who provides the service, documents observations, interventions, and outcomes in the discharge summary. They also check the codes generated by the coder agent and the reviewer agent, and can raise an issue to the adjustor agent if they find any errors or discrepancies.
3. The **Coder** agent is the one who generates the ICD codes based on the clinical notes written by the physician agent. They also try to optimize the code coverage for the health care facilities by choosing the most appropriate codes.
4. The **Reviewer** agent is the one who verifies and modifies the ICD codes produced by the coder agent. They play a vital role as their reviewed codes will be scrutinized by the patients and the physicians. They aim to minimize the patient's complaints and ensure the accuracy and quality of the codes.
5. The **Adjustor** agent is the final arbiter of the ICD codes when the patient or the physician

disagrees with the reviewer agent. They are only invoked in case of such conflicts and they can adjust the codes as needed.

After defining the roles of the five agents, we designed two work flow modes for them, called Multi-Agent Coding I (MAC-I) and Multi-Agent Coding II (MAC-II). Figure I shows the work framework of MAC-I. The process is as follows:

1. The coder receives the discharge summary and generates codes.
2. The reviewer gets the discharge summary and codes and makes adjustments if needed.
3. The patient and physician review the discharge summary and the revised codes.
4. The patient and/or physician can appeal to the adjustor if they object to the codes; otherwise, the codes are final.
5. The adjustor checks the codes and summary and assigns the final codes.

Hallucination has been studied as a prevalent problem for LLMs in automatic ICD coding (Sorouh et al., 2023). To mitigate this challenge, we propose MAC-II, which leverages the clinical knowledge embedded in the structure of EHRs, especially the SOAP (subjective, objective, assessment, and plan) format. Physicians write notes following the subjective, objective, assessment, and plan (SOAP) structure, where the assessment and plan sections can be inferred from the subjective and objective sections (Yang and Yu, 2020). Our method consists of two steps: first, we use an LLM to convert the discharge summary notes into the SOAP format; second, we apply our agents to perform the ICD coding task based on the following workflows.

1. The physician generates the assessment and plan sections based on the subjective and objective sections.
2. The physician compares the generated assessment and plan with the original gold standard assessment and plan section to check for accuracy and completeness, identify inconsistencies and generate the ICD codes.
3. The patient and physician review the codes and report any discrepancies or disagreements to the adjustor.

4. The adjustor reviews the discharge summary and the assigned ICD codes, and resolves any conflicts or errors for the final decision.

In MAC-II, the physician takes over the coder’s role. The physician generates the assessment and plan sections based on the subjective and objective sections, and compares them with the original assessment and plan sections to conduct self-correction. Then, the physician assigns the ICD codes.

For both methods, the agents were equipped with the following strategy and external knowledge to enhance their functions for better ICD coding accuracy:

1. **Confrontation Strategy:** The coder (or the physician in method II) is instructed to assign as many codes as possible to reflect all the services rendered and also optimize the payment for the health care facilities, while the patient is encouraged to review the codes to prevent being overbilled.
2. **External Knowledge:** The agents use the candidate codes and their code descriptions as references to enhance their ICD coding performance. This approach is widely used by previous work on ICD coding (Yang et al., 2023),

4 Experiments

In this section, we evaluate our methods on the MIMIC-III dataset and compare it with the state-of-the-art methods. We use the GPT-4 api in Azure OpenAI Service which is recommended by physionet to process MIMIC dataset ¹.

4.1 Dataset and Metrics

1. **MIMIC-III top 50:** We use the public MIMIC-III dataset (Johnson et al., 2016) of ICU discharge summaries with expert ICD codes. As in (Mullenbach et al., 2018), we only keep instances with one or more of the top 50 ICD codes. This gives 1,729 test instances with the same splits as (Mullenbach et al., 2018).
2. **MIMIC-III rare:** In line with previous work (Yang et al., 2023), we create the rare code dataset from MIMIC-III to test our method’s

performance on rare disease codes, which could be of equal importance as common disease codes.

3. **MDACE Profee:** For explainability evaluation, we use the MDACE dataset (Cheng et al., 2023), which provides code evidence for a subset of the MIMIC-III clinical records. Professional medical coders annotate a short text span for each ICD code, indicating the rationale for the code assignment. The MDACE Profee datasets are annotated following the professional fee billing rules. We use the sentences that contain the annotated text spans as the evidence for evaluation. The evaluation dataset consists of 172 sentence-ICD pairs.

For comparison, we followed previous work and report a variety of metrics, focusing on the micro-averaged and macro-averaged F1 and area under the ROC curve (AUC). Micro-averaged values are calculated by treating each (text, code) pair as a separate prediction. Macro-averaged values, are calculated by averaging metrics computed per-label thus plays much more emphasis on rare label prediction.

4.2 Comparison with State-of-the-Art Methods

We evaluate our proposed multi-agent coding method MAC-I and MAC-II against the Zero-shot CoT prompting method and other state-of-the-art methods for ICD coding:

1. **Zero-shot CoT prompting** (Kojima et al., 2022) Inspired by the chain-of-thought method(Wei et al., 2022), this zero-shot prompting approach adds “Let’s think step by step” to the input query, making the model think more carefully and gradually before solving the problem or task.
2. **CAML** (Mullenbach et al., 2018) employs a convolutional attention network that adapts to different segments of the clinical note for each code.
3. **MSMN** (Yuan et al., 2022) applies code description synonyms with multi-head attention and outperforms existing methods on the MIMIC-III common task.
4. **EffectiveCAN** with supervised attention (Cheng et al., 2023) uses a convolutional attention network to learn from document-level

¹<https://physionet.org/news/post/gpt-responsible-use>

Role	Output
Coder	"code": "401.9", "explanation": "Hypertension" "code": "569.81", "explanation": "Discharge Diagnosis: Peptic ulcer" ...
Reviewer	"code": "401.9", "explanation": "Hypertension" "code": "569.81", "explanation": "Discharge Diagnosis: Peptic ulcer" ...
Physician	"code": "401.9", "explanation": "Patient has a history of hypertension and was continued on losartan during hospitalization." "code": "569.81", "explanation": "Discharge Diagnosis: Peptic ulcer" ...
Patient	"code": "401.9", "explanation": "No evidence of hypertension found in the text." "code": "569.81", "explanation": "Discharge Diagnosis: Peptic ulcer" ...
Adjustor	"code": "401.9", "explanation": "Mr. [**Known lastname 85439**] was initially managed in [**Location (un) 20338**], FL for a CHF exacerbation with milrinone and dopamine. Diuresis was deferred due to hypotension." "code": "569.81", "explanation": "Discharge Diagnosis: Peptic ulcer" ...

Figure 2: A snippet of the output of each agent in MAC-I, preprocessed for better readability. The patient complained about the hypertension ICD code, and the adjustor decided this code is related based on the healthcare note.

labels and evidence annotations with supervised attention. Their evidence annotations are from clinical coding experts.

- LLM-codex, (Yang et al., 2023) a two-stage approach to predict ICD codes that first generates evidence proposals using an LLM and then employs an LSTM-based verification stage.

5 Results

5.1 Results on MIMIC-III top 50 Codes

Table 1 shows the results of MAC methods and the state-of-the-art methods on the test set. We can see that our proposed MAC-I method outperforms the state-of-the-art methods on Macro-F1 with a score of **0.741**.

Especially we observed 76.8% improvement over CoT in Macro-F1 and 200% improvements on Micro-F1. The multi-agent systems have shown significant improvements in performing such complex tasks, comparing to CoT style reasoning,

The MAC-I achieves a Micro-F1 score of 0.467, which is lower than the fine-tuned models and the two-stage LLM-codex method, but higher than the CoT and CAML methods. This suggests that our methods can assign more accurate and complete codes to the clinical notes with less data than the baselines. On the other hand, the well-designed task-specific fine-tuned models show their superiority in data-rich scenarios, as expected.

The MAC-II in general outperforms MAC-I demonstrating the effectiveness in utilizing the SOAP structure of clinical notes.

Table 1: Results on the test set, MIMIC-III top 50

Method	Macro-F1	Micro-F1
CoT	0.419	0.156
CAML	0.258	0.364
MSMN	0.489	0.561
EffectiveCAN	0.434	0.556
LLM-codex	0.468	0.611
Self-Consistency	0.623	0.371
MAC-I	0.741	0.476
MAC-II	0.740	0.482

5.2 Results on MIMIC-III rare Codes

For the rare codes, we achieve significant improvements on all metrics. Our method obtains a Micro-F1 of 0.35 and a Macro-F1 of 0.285, outperforming all baselines, even the well-designed task-specific fine-tuned ones. This demonstrates the advantages of our method for classification with scarce data. It also implies that fine-tuned systems can benefit from more data of these uncommon categories.

Table 2: Results on the test set, MIMIC-III rare

Method	Macro-F1	Micro-F1
CoT	0.030	0.233
CAML	0.072	0.083
MSMN	0.169	0.173
LLM-codex	0.279	0.302
MAC-I	0.281	0.330
MAC-II	0.285	0.350

5.3 Results on MDACE Profec

Table 3 presents the results on the MDACE Profec dataset. The proposed methods achieve on par results with fine tuned systems in terms of F1 score. However, we observe that the proposed methods have higher precisions and lower recalls than the fine-tuned models. This could be due to the prompts that we use to guide the model to be accurate. It could also be related to the model’s inherent characteristics. The underlying reason requires further investigation.

Table 3: Results on the test set, MDACE Profec

Method	F1	Precision	Recall
EffectiveCAN	0.542	0.408	0.806
LLM-codex	0.713	0.608	0.861
MAC-I	0.712	0.875	0.601
MAC-II	0.702	0.836	0.605

5.4 Ablation Study

We performed an ablation study and presented the results in Table 4 for our MAC-II method. The results show that both the Confrontation Strategy and the External Knowledge improve the ICD coding performance. The Confrontation Strategy has a greater effect than the External Knowledge when removed from the prompts. Our analysis reveals that the Confrontation Strategy helps to assign more codes (mainly increasing recalls). This suggests that the strategies can be further explored for better performance of MAC methods. Given the fact that not all ICD codes are equally important, we can inject knowledge like code billing costs into the system for better performances.

6 Analysis and Discussion

In this section, we summarize the main findings and contributions of our experiments, and discuss the implications and applications of our method for ICD coding and other clinical NLP tasks. We also discuss the limitations and drawbacks of our method and the state-of-the-art methods, and provide some directions and suggestions for future work and improvement.

6.1 Main Findings and Contributions

Our experiments show that our method achieves competitive performances on ICD coding, and outperforms the existing methods on rare codes mapping and interpretability.

- Our method simulates the real-world coding process using multi-agents, and captures the complex and dynamic interactions among the patients, the physicians, and the coders. This is a novel and realistic approach, which has not been explored before in the literature, and which enables our method to assign more accurate and complete codes to the clinical notes, and to handle the uncertainty and ambiguity in the coding process.
- Our method provides informative and relevant explanations for each code, and justifies the coding decisions and adjustments. This enhances the explainability and transparency of our method, and helps the users to understand and verify the codes, and to make complaints and corrections if necessary. This also addresses the need and demand for explainable and trustworthy AI systems in the health care domain, and complies with the ethical and legal standards and regulations.
- Our method explores the strengths and possibilities of the LLM-based models for ICD coding. Previous work that used prompts to guide LLMs for ICD coding suffered from low precision and hallucination issues. Our multi-agent method, which does not require any training or fine-tuning, achieves competitive performance with the state-of-the-art methods. This demonstrates the potential of LLMs for ICD coding and other healthcare tasks that we plan to investigate further.

6.2 Implications and Applications

Our method has several implications and applications for ICD coding and other clinical NLP tasks. Our method can:

- Improve the quality and efficiency of ICD coding, which is essential for billing, epidemiology, and quality improvement in the health care domain. Our method can reduce the manual effort and error of the coders, and increase the accuracy and completeness of the codes. Our method can also provide explanations and feedback for the codes, and facilitate the communication and collaboration among the stakeholders. This can benefit the health care providers, the patients, the insurers, and the policy makers, and improve the health care outcomes and services.

Table 4: Ablation results on the test set with MAC-II, MIMIC-III rare 50

Method	Macro-F1	Micro-F1
MAC-II without Confrontation Strategy	0.280	0.340
MAC-II without External Knowledge	0.281	0.342
MAC-II	0.285	0.350

Method	Macro-F1	Micro-F1
Coder	0.575	0.14
+Reviewer	0.734	0.472
+Reviewer+Patient	0.586	0.383
+Reviewer+Physician	0.741	0.476
+Reviewer+Physician+Adjuster	0.741	0.476

Table 5: Results on MIMIC-III top-50

- The designed system mimic the health care systems in the real-world. From the results in Table 5, our analysis reveals that both the Reviewer and Adjuster roles significantly enhance final performance metrics. Conversely, the Patient role appears to negatively influence the F1 scores, suggesting potential issues with over-billing. The observed discrepancy between the Patient and Physician roles underscores the importance of effective communication. Real-world validation is necessary to confirm these findings.
- Extend to other clinical NLP tasks, such as diagnosis prediction, treatment recommendation, and adverse event detection, which share similar characteristics and objectives with ICD coding. Our method can adapt to these tasks by changing the agents, the dialogue, and the instruction data, and by using different evaluation metrics and criteria. This can broaden the scope and applicability of our method, and address more problems and needs in the health care domain.

7 Limitations and Drawbacks

Our method also has some limitations and drawbacks, which we acknowledge and plan to address in the future work. Some of the limitations and drawbacks are:

- Our method relies on the LLM-based models, which require a large amount of memory and computation, and may suffer from the pretraining-finetuning discrepancy, the out-of-domain generalization, and the ethical and

social issues. We plan to explore more efficient and robust LLM-based models, and to incorporate more domain knowledge and external resources, and to ensure the fairness and privacy of our method. We also plan to investigate the impact and influence of the LLM-based models on the coding process and the outcome, and to evaluate the quality and validity of the generated dialogue and instruction data.

- Our method uses a fixed and predefined set of agents, dialogue, and instruction data, which may not cover all the possible scenarios and cases in the coding process, and may not be flexible and adaptable to the user’s preferences and needs. We plan to design more dynamic and customizable agents, dialogue, and instruction data, and to use reinforcement learning and active learning techniques to optimize and update our method. We also plan to involve the users more actively and interactively in the coding process, and to solicit and incorporate their feedback and suggestions.
- Our method evaluates the performance and quality of our method using the metrics and the feedback from the experts and the users, which may not fully reflect the real-world coding scenarios and criteria, and may not be consistent and reliable. We plan to conduct more comprehensive and rigorous evaluation and user study, and to use more objective and diverse metrics and feedback, and to involve more stakeholders and participants. We also plan to compare and contrast our method with the existing coding systems and practices, and to assess the usability and acceptability of our method in the real-world settings.

References

- Patricia Aalseth. 2014. *Medical Coding: What it is and how it Works*. Jones & Bartlett Publishers.

- Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.
- Sébastien Bubeck, Varun Chandrasekaran, Ronen Eldan, Johannes Gehrke, Eric Horvitz, Ece Kamar, Peter Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Scott Lundberg, et al. 2023. Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with gpt-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.12712*.
- Pengfei Cao, Yubo Chen, Kang Liu, Jun Zhao, Shengping Liu, and Weifeng Chong. 2020. Hypercore: Hyperbolic and co-graph representation for automatic icd coding. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3105–3114.
- Medicaid Managed Care, Florida Healthy Kids, and Medicare Advantage. 2020. Icd-10-cm official coding and reporting guidelines april 1, 2020, through september 30, 2020.
- Hua Cheng, Rana Jafari, April Russell, Russell Klopfer, Edmond Lu, Benjamin Striner, and Matthew R Gormley. 2023. Mdace: Mimic documents annotated with code evidence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.03859*.
- Jan Clusmann, Fiona R Kolbinger, Hannah Sophie Muti, Zunamys I Carrero, Jan-Niklas Eckardt, Narmin Ghaffari Laleh, Chiara Maria Lavinia Löffler, Sophie-Caroline Schwarzkopf, Michaela Unger, Gregory P Veldhuizen, et al. 2023. The future landscape of large language models in medicine. *Communications Medicine*, 3(1):141.
- Chandramohan Dhasarathan, M Shanmugam, Manish Kumar, Diwakar Tripathi, Shailesh Khapre, and Achyut Shankar. 2024. A nomadic multi-agent based privacy metrics for e-health care: a deep learning approach. *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, 83(3):7249–7272.
- Hang Dong, Matúš Falis, William Whiteley, Beatrice Alex, Joshua Matterson, Shaoxiong Ji, Jiaoyan Chen, and Honghan Wu. 2022. Automated clinical coding: what, why, and where we are? *NPJ digital medicine*, 5(1):159.
- Hung Du, Srikanth Thudumu, Rajesh Vasa, and Kon Mouzakis. 2024. A survey on context-aware multi-agent systems: Techniques, challenges and future directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01968*.
- Matúš Falis, Hang Dong, Alexandra Birch, and Beatrice Alex. 2022. Horses to zebras: ontology-guided data augmentation and synthesis for icd-9 coding. In *Proceedings of the 21st Workshop on Biomedical Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Richárd Farkas and György Szarvas. 2008. Automatic construction of rule-based icd-9-cm coding systems. In *BMC bioinformatics*, volume 9, pages 1–9. Springer.
- Allyson I Hauptman, Beau G Schelble, Nathan J McNeese, and Kapil Chalil Madathil. 2023. Adapt and overcome: Perceptions of adaptive autonomous agents for human-ai teaming. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 138:107451.
- Kai He, Rui Mao, Qika Lin, Yucheng Ruan, Xiang Lan, Mengling Feng, and Erik Cambria. 2023. A survey of large language models for healthcare: from data, technology, and applications to accountability and ethics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.05694*.
- Chao-Wei Huang, Shang-Chi Tsai, and Yun-Nung Chen. 2022. Plm-icd: automatic icd coding with pretrained language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.05289*.
- Shaoxiong Ji, Erik Cambria, and Pekka Marttinen. 2020. Dilated convolutional attention network for medical code assignment from clinical text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.14578*.
- Alistair EW Johnson, Tom J Pollard, Lu Shen, Li-wei H Lehman, Mengling Feng, Mohammad Ghassemi, Benjamin Moody, Peter Szolovits, Leo Anthony Celi, and Roger G Mark. 2016. Mimic-iii, a freely accessible critical care database. *Scientific data*, 3(1):1–9.
- Rajvir Kaur, Jeewani Anupama Ginige, and Oliver Obst. 2021. A systematic literature review of automated icd coding and classification systems using discharge summaries. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.10652*.
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. 2022. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:22199–22213.
- Fei Li and Hong Yu. 2020. Icd coding from clinical text using multi-filter residual convolutional neural network. In *proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 34, pages 8180–8187.
- Jueqing Lu, Lan Du, Ming Liu, and Joanna Dipnall. 2020. Multi-label few/zero-shot learning with knowledge aggregated from multiple label graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.07459*.
- Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. 2013. Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781*.
- Ali Mottaghi, Prathusha K Sarma, Xavier Amatriain, Serena Yeung, and Anitha Kannan. 2020. Medical symptom recognition from patient text: An active learning approach for long-tailed multilabel distributions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.06874*.
- James Mullenbach, Sarah Wiegrefe, Jon Duke, Jimeng Sun, and Jacob Eisenstein. 2018. Explainable prediction of medical codes from clinical text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.05695*.

- World Health Organization. 2004. *International Statistical Classification of Diseases and related health problems: Alphabetical index*, volume 3. World Health Organization.
- Joon Sung Park, Joseph O’Brien, Carrie Jun Cai, Meredith Ringel Morris, Percy Liang, and Michael S Bernstein. 2023. Generative agents: Interactive simulacra of human behavior. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, pages 1–22.
- Elhadi Shakshuki and Malcolm Reid. 2015. Multi-agent system applications in healthcare: current technology and future roadmap. *Procedia Computer Science*, 52:252–261.
- Haoran Shi, Pengtao Xie, Zhiting Hu, Ming Zhang, and Eric P Xing. 2017. Towards automated icd coding using deep learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.04075*.
- Zhao Shuai, Diao Xiaolin, Yuan Jing, Huo Yanni, Cui Meng, Wang Yuxin, and Zhao Wei. 2022. Comparison of different feature extraction methods for applicable automated icd coding. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making*, 22(1):11.
- Congzheng Song, Shanghang Zhang, Najmeh Sadoughi, Pengtao Xie, and Eric Xing. 2021. Generalized zero-shot text classification for icd coding. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth International Conference on International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 4018–4024.
- Ali Soroush, Benjamin S Glicksberg, Eyal Zimlichman, Yiftach Barash, Robert Freeman, Alexander W Charney, Girish N Nadkarni, and Eyal Klang. 2023. Assessing gpt-3.5 and gpt-4 in generating international classification of diseases billing codes. *medRxiv*, pages 2023–07.
- Mirac Suzgun and Adam Tauman Kalai. 2024. Meta-prompting: Enhancing language models with task-agnostic scaffolding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.12954*.
- Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Yonghui Wu, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, et al. 2023. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajwal Bhargava, Shruiti Bhosale, et al. 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.
- Tao Tu, Anil Palepu, Mike Schaekermann, Khaled Saab, Jan Freyberg, Ryutaro Tanno, Amy Wang, Brenna Li, Mohamed Amin, Nenad Tomasev, et al. 2024. Towards conversational diagnostic ai. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.05654*.
- Thanh Vu, Dat Quoc Nguyen, and Anthony Nguyen. 2020. A label attention model for icd coding from clinical text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.06351*.
- Lei Wang, Chen Ma, Xueyang Feng, Zeyu Zhang, Hao Yang, Jingsen Zhang, Zhiyuan Chen, Jiakai Tang, Xu Chen, Yankai Lin, et al. 2023. A survey on large language model based autonomous agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.11432*.
- Tao Wang, Linhai Zhang, Chenchen Ye, Junxi Liu, and Deyu Zhou. 2022. A novel framework based on medical concept driven attention for explainable medical code prediction via external knowledge. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*, pages 1407–1416.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:24824–24837.
- Pengtao Xie and Eric Xing. 2018. A neural architecture for automated icd coding. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1066–1076.
- Xiancheng Xie, Yun Xiong, Philip S Yu, and Yangyong Zhu. 2019. Ehr coding with multi-scale feature attention and structured knowledge graph propagation. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM international conference on information and knowledge management*, pages 649–658.
- Zhichao Yang, Sanjit Singh Batra, Joel Stremmel, and Eran Halperin. 2023. Surpassing gpt-4 medical coding with a two-stage approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.13735*.
- Zhichao Yang, Shufan Wang, Bhanu Pratap Singh Rawat, Avijit Mitra, and Hong Yu. 2022. Knowledge injected prompt based fine-tuning for multi-label few-shot icd coding. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, volume 2022, page 1767. NIH Public Access.
- Zhichao Yang and Hong Yu. 2020. Generating accurate electronic health assessment from medical graph. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, volume 2020, page 3764. NIH Public Access.
- Zheng Yuan, Chuanqi Tan, and Songfang Huang. 2022. Code synonyms do matter: multiple synonyms matching network for automatic icd coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.01515*.
- Tong Zhou, Pengfei Cao, Yubo Chen, Kang Liu, Jun Zhao, Kun Niu, Weifeng Chong, and Shengping Liu. 2021. Automatic icd coding via interactive shared

representation networks with self-distillation mechanism. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 5948–5957.

A Appendix

A.1 Implementation Details

We use GPT4-8k version (Achiam et al., 2023) as the LLM for this study. We access it securely via the Azure OpenAI API with the responsible use requirement. We truncate the EHRs to fit the 8k token limit and sample with a temperature of 0.1. We also set and test the number of candidate codes N_c to 50, which could change for different applications.

A.2 Prompts

SOAP format Prompt:

You are an assistant who convert the EHR note into SOAP format. Please format the note in the SOAP (subjective, objective, assessment, plan) format. The output is a valid JSON as is shown below.

```
{
  "Subjective": content,
  "Objective": content,
  "Assessment": content,
  "Plan": content
}
```

Patient Prompt: You are a patient who received treatment at the hospital. You cooperate fully with the health care system to receive the best service possible. You also check the ICD-9 codes to avoid being overbilled. You check all assigned ICD-9 codes and explain the reasons for each code.

Physician Prompt:

v1 (in MAC-I):

You are a physician who treats patients. You strive to provide the best service to each patient. You document your findings, interventions and results in the discharge summary note. You check all assigned ICD-9 codes and explain the reasons for each code.

v2 (in MAC-II, AP generation):

You are a physician who treats patients. You strive to provide the best service to each patient. Based on the Subjective and Objective, you will generate the assessment and plan for the EHR note.

v3 (in Method MAC-II, code assignment):

You are a physician who treats patients. Please check the generated assessment and plan against the gold standard assessment and plan. Please pay attention to the inconsistencies You assign ICD-9 codes to the note. You assign as many as possible ICD-9 codes and explain the reasons for each code.

Coder prompt:

You are an ICD-9 coder. You assign ICD-9 codes to the discharge summary based on the clinical care that the patients received. You cite the discharge summary as evidence when needed. You assign as many as possible ICD-9 codes and explain the reasons for each code.

Reviewer Prompt:

You are a reviewer. You will check the ICD-9 codes assigned by the coder. You can use the ICD-9 dictionary for guidance. Your role is to ensure that the assigned ICD-9 codes are correct. You assign all possible ICD-9 codes and explain the reasons for each code.

Adjustor Prompt:

When a patient or a physician has different thoughts about the ICD-9 codes, you will review the discharge summary and the ICD codes assigned by the coder and checked by the reviewer. You can add, remove the assigned codes to make them accurate. You can consult the ICD-9 dictionary for assistance. Your duty is to ensure that the assigned ICD-9 codes are valid and exact. You assign all possible ICD-9 codes and explain the reasons for each code.

External Knowledge:

Please only use ICD-9 codes that are listed below:
Candidate Codes:

401.9 : Unspecified essential hypertension
38.93 : Venous catheterization, not elsewhere classified
428.0 : Congestive heart failure, unspecified
427.31 : Atrial fibrillation
414.01 : Coronary atherosclerosis of native coronary artery
96.04 : Insertion of endotracheal tube
96.6 : Enteral infusion of concentrated nutritional substances

...