

Prompt-based vs. Fine-tuned LLMs Toward Causal Graph Verification

Yuni Susanti

Artificial Intelligence Lab., Fujitsu Limited
Tokyo, JAPAN
susanti.yuni@fujitsu.com

Nina Holsmoelle*

n.holsmoelle@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This work aims toward an application of natural language processing (NLP) technology for automatic verification of causal graphs using text sources. A causal graph is often derived from unsupervised causal discovery methods and requires manual evaluation from human experts. NLP technologies, i.e., Large Language Models (LLMs) such as BERT [6] and ChatGPT, can potentially be used to verify the resulted causal graphs by predicting if causal relation can be observed between node pairs based on the textual context. In this work, we compare the performance of two types of NLP models: (1) Pre-trained language models fine-tuned for causal relation classification task (*supervised*) and, (2) prompt-based LLMs (*unsupervised*). Contrasted to previous studies where prompt-based LLMs work relatively well over a set of diverse tasks [1, 12, 25], preliminary experiments on biomedical and open-domain datasets suggest that the fine-tuned models far outperform the prompt-based LLMs, up to 20.5 points improvement of F1 score. We shared the code and the pre-processed datasets.¹

KEYWORDS

Causal Graph, Causal Relation, Large Language Models

1 INTRODUCTION

One of the fundamental tasks in various disciplines of science is to find the underlying causal relations and make use of them. Causal discovery methods [21, 22] are able to estimate the causal structures from observational data and further generate causal graphs. A causal graph, as illustrated in Figure 1, is a directed graph visualizing causal relationships between the observed variables; a node represents a variable and an edge represents a causal relationship. As with the progress in the field of causal discovery, we are faced with the challenge of how to verify the causal graph estimated with causal discovery methods, which are often *unsupervised*. Essentially, experts are required to manually verify the validity of the causal graph, such as by conducting a controlled experiment. However, depending on the field, conducting such experiments is often expensive, or even infeasible due to the ethical concerns.




Figure 1: Example of a causal graph.

*Work performed while at Fujitsu Limited (internship).

¹<https://github.com/littleflow3r/causal-llm>

Another method to verify a causal graph is using external knowledge such as text sources. Information on causality is largely dispersed in text sources, and they are indispensable to assist human experts in verifying the validity of causal graphs. However, verifying a causal graph with a large number of variables becomes difficult due to the rapid growth of text sources. Natural Language Processing (NLP) technologies, i.e., Large Language Models (LLMs) such as BERT [6] or ChatGPT, can potentially be used to verify the causal graphs by predicting if a causal relation exists between the node pairs based on the textual context. In this work, we discuss the feasibility of applying NLP technologies for causal graph verification through quantitative evaluation experiments on causal text datasets. We investigated two types of NLP models: (1) Pre-trained language models fine-tuned for causal relation classification task (*supervised*) and, (2) prompt-based LLMs.

To summarize, the main contributions of this work are:

- (1) To our knowledge, this is the first work to study the feasibility of applying NLP for causal graph verification, with quantitative evaluation experiments on causal text datasets. Specifically, we introduce prompt-based LLMs to predict the causal relationship between pair of entities, comparing it to supervised causal relation classification model.
- (2) We demonstrate that prompt-based LLMs do not necessarily perform better than supervised model on a causal relation classification task, despite its relatively satisfactory performance on clinical NLP over a set of diverse tasks [1]. We also provide a discussion of why this might be the case, and also the limitations of this work.

2 RELATED WORK

The research on causal relation extraction/classification from text sources has been done mostly in supervised setting, especially in biomedical-chemistry domains [4, 8, 13, 14, 18, 20], and open-domain [2, 3, 5, 15]. The pre-training and fine-tuning paradigm in NLP led to state-of-the-art performance in many downstream tasks; likewise, most of the related works listed above fine-tune the pre-trained language models such as BERT [7], or propose some sort of enhancement for BERT such as the work by Su and Vijay-Shanker [23]. Their results on relation extraction on biomedical datasets has been encouraging, motivating us to choose the BERT models as the main baselines for our fine-tuning experiments.

On the other hand, recent work by Agrawal et al. [1] shows that Large Language Models (LLMs) perform well at zero and few-shot information extraction from clinical text, despite not being trained specifically for the clinical domain. Similarly, other works [12, 25] suggest that LLMs (i.e., InstructGPT [19], ChatGPT, GPT-3.5, etc.), perform well in various downstream tasks even without tuning the

parameters, but only with few examples as instructions/prompts. This inspires us to evaluate such instruction, or prompt-based LLMs, on our causal relation classification task. In this work, we compare the prompt-based LLMs against the *more traditional* supervised model where it is trained/fine-tuned using the training data for causal relation classification task.

3 METHODS

Given a pair of entities e_1 and e_2 , i.e., variables/node pairs of the causal graph such as *smoking* and *lung cancer*, the task is to predict if a causal relation can be observed between the pair based on its textual context. Therefore, it is essentially a *binary classification* task, classifying the relation as *causal* or *non-causal*. A causal graph from the causal discovery method does not normally include any textual context. In this work, we used the data commonly used for evaluating NLP models for a causal relation classification task, which already includes textual contexts for each pairs.

3.1 Prompt-based LLMs

In prompt-based learning, a pre-trained language model is adapted to a specific task via priming on natural language prompts—pieces of text that are combined with an input and then fed to the language model to produce an output for that task [1]. Prompt-based learning requires the specification of a prompt template to be applied to the input, thus we designed two settings for the prompt-based LLMs experiments: (1) **Single-Prompt** and (2) **Few-Shot Prompt** settings, as described in the following.

3.1.1 Single-Prompt. In the Single-Prompt setting, we designed the prompt to directly ask the LLMs to answer a question about causality between a pair of entities, without providing any example of the training data in the prompt (i.e., *zero-shot* approach). For the pair e_1 and e_2 with textual context S , we hand-crafted the following three prompt variations.

- (A) **two-choices, no-context:** *There is a causal relationship between e_1 and e_2 . Answer with 'True.' or 'False.'*
- (B) **two-choices, with-context:** *Given the following context, classify the relationship between e_1 and e_2 as causal or non-causal. Answer with 'Causal' or 'Non-Causal'. Context: S*
- (C) **three-choices, with-context:** *Given the cancer research-related context below, is there a causal relationship between e_1 and e_2 ? In case the relationship shows only a correlation, but no strict causation between e_1 and e_2 , answer with 'False.' In case of uncertainty, answer with 'Maybe.' In a case where there is clearly a causal relationship, and not just a correlation between e_1 and e_2 , answer with 'True.' Context: S*

The LLMs are strictly forced to respond with two choices, as in variation (A) and (B), which is necessary for a fair comparison with the fine-tuned model. In variation (C), however, we allow the LLMs to return a 'Maybe' because occasionally the LLMs implies that there is not enough evidence to decide the causality. We skip the 'Maybe' response in calculating the accuracy to get the truest accuracy score. We also varied the prompt by *including* and *not including* the textual context sentence S in the prompt (**with-context** and **no-context**).

3.1.2 Few-Shot Prompt. In the Few-Shot prompt setting, we designed a specific format that includes n examples of training data

in the prompt, allowing the LLMs to process some examples before answering. We include the following information from the training data: (a) the pair e_1 and e_2 , (b) the relation labels (*causal*, *non-causal*) and (c) the sentence S as the context, practically giving the LLMs guidance on how to extract and classify the unseen pair from the test data. Furthermore, we also add a specific instruction at the beginning of the prompt, as illustrated in the following example.

Example: Illustration of the Few-Shot Prompt setting. In this example, $n=1$ training examples is included in the prompt, with the red-marked example acts as the test data. The beginning of the prompt provides the instruction.

```
PROMPT:
Given the context sentence, classify the
relationship between the entities marked
with e1 and e2 as 'causal' or 'non-causal'
## Context Sentence: Increased expression of <e1
> osteopontin </e1> contributes to the
progression of <e2> prostate cancer </e2>.
Result: 'e1': 'osteopontin', 'relation': '
causal', 'e2': 'prostate cancer'
## Context Sentence: Increased expression of <
e1> cyclin B1 </e1> sensitizes <e1>
prostate cancer </e1> cells to apoptosis
induced by chemotherapy.
Result:
EXPECTED OUTPUT:
'e1': 'cyclin B1', 'relation': 'causal', 'e2':
'prostate cancer'
```

By inserting “<e1>” and “<e2>” to mark the location of the pair, the model technically only has to *binary-classify* the relationship between the pair. We conducted the Few-Shot Prompt experiment by varying the number of the training data n to be included in the prompt as examples. In this work, we used the official OpenAI API with *gpt-3.5-turbo* and *text-davinci-003* engines.

3.2 Fine-tuned LLMs

The pre-training of LLMs usually utilizes a great quantity of unlabeled data, and the fine-tuning involves training these pre-trained LLMs on a smaller dataset labeled with examples relevant to the target task. By exposing the model to these new labeled examples, the model adjusts its parameters and internal representations suited for the target task. In this work, we experimented with two models: (1) BERT [6] and (2) GPT models, for the fine-tuning experiments.

3.2.1 Fine-tuning BERT model. Figure 2 shows our model architecture of fine-tuning BERT pre-trained model for the causal relation classification task. We opt for a simple fine-tuning architecture for a fair comparison with the prompt-based LLMs.

For an input sequence S including a pair of two entities e_1 and e_2 , we extract the representation for the input sequence from BERT pre-trained model. Following the original paper [6], we use the last hidden state vector output of the [CLS] token representation as the input sequence for the fine-tuning. We further apply a *Tanh* activation function and a fully-connected layer (FC) to this representation




Figure 2: Model architecture of the fine-tuning BERT model for causal relation classification task.

to obtain the final sequence representation H'_{cls} , as follows.

$$H'_{cls} = W_0(\tanh(H_{cls})) + b_0 \quad (1)$$

We used the *binary cross entropy* as the loss function during the training. In this work, we experimented with two BERT models adapted for the biomedical domain: BioBERT [17], and PubMedBERT [9]. BERT (*base, uncased*)² is used for experiment on open-domain data. The detailed hyper-parameters and other experiment details are provided in our Github.

3.2.2 Fine-tuning GPT model. Fine-tuning the GPT model includes formatting each training example into *prompt-completion* pair, consisting of a single input example (**prompt**) and its associated output (**completion**). The format of the training example is different depending on the use case. Our task is essentially a relation *classification* task; however, it can also be formulated as a relation *extraction* task between pair of entities. We followed the GPT fine-tuning instruction and formatted the examples into **classification** and **extraction** task formats, as shown in the following.

Fine-tuning GPT: classification/extraction example format.

```
{ "prompt": "The results provide evidence for altered plasticity of synaptic morphology in memory mutants <e1>dnc</e1> and <e2>rut</e2> and suggest a role...\n\n###\n\n",
  "completion": " non-causal" }
{ "prompt": "The results provide evidence for altered plasticity of synaptic morphology in memory mutants <e1>dnc</e1> and <e2>rut</e2> and suggest a role...\n\n###\n\n",
  "completion": " dnc\n rut\n non-causal END" }
```

GPT model fine-tuning is currently available only for some of the base models; in this work, we experimented with the *ada* model for its fast training and relatively good performance.

²<https://huggingface.co/bert-base-uncased>

4 EXPERIMENTS

4.1 Datasets

Causality is often observed in the biomedical domain, thus we conducted the experiments mainly in biomedical datasets, and one open-domain dataset (SEMEVAL). We created a new data where two experts in biomedical research annotates the causal relation between genes in homo sapiens (GENE). We also modified some relation extraction benchmark data (DDI, COMAGC) to only include causal relation. The datasets are summarized in Table 1.

dataset	type	instances#
DDI [11]	Biomedical/drug-drug	33,508
COMAGC [16]	Biomedical/gene-disease	821
GENE (ours)	Biomedical/gene-gene	789
SEMEVAL [10]	Open-domain	10,717

Table 1: Dataset types and sizes.

4.2 Results and Discussion

Table 2 summarizes the experiment results. Precision (P), Recall (R), and F1-score (F1) metrics are employed, and as with the general practice in binary classification task, the metrics are calculated on the non-negative class. We apply 5-fold cross-validation and the scores are averaged. We report the standard deviation values of the F1 scores over the 5-folds as shown in parenthesis in Table 2.

To sum up, the results suggest that the fine-tuned models far outperform the prompt-based LLMs in predicting the causal relationship between the entity pairs in all of the datasets used in this work. This contrasted with the previous studies [12, 25] where LLMs perform relatively well, if not better than the fine-tuned models in various tasks including in clinical NLP tasks [1]. We conducted error analysis and outlined the following discussion.

4.2.1 Discussion 1: Explicit-implicit mention of causality, and the effect of training sample.

Based on our error analysis, one possible reason the prompt-based model does not perform as well as the fine-tuned model is because causality is rarely written explicitly using causal cues such as “*cause*”, “*causing*” or “*caused*”. Instead, it is often described rather implicitly/ambiguously with keywords such as “*contribute*” or “*play a role*” Consider the following example from the test data, where the fine-tuned model correctly predicted the causal relation while the prompt-based model failed:

Example 4.1. ..hepatocyte growth factor contribute to the growth of ovarian cancer by activating autocrine...

In the Example 4.1 above, human experts are aware that the keyword “*contribute to the growth*” implicitly describes causality, thus annotated the pair as a *causal* pair. The fine-tuned model most likely has been exposed to many similar examples in the training data and learned that such keywords can be an identifier of a causal relation. Meanwhile, without being exposed to any training sample, the prompt-based model missed this pattern indicating causality, resulted in wrong prediction. This suggests that, finding the causality pattern from training samples is an important step in identifying the causal relation.

Prompt-based	type	(Biomed) COMAGC			(Biomed) DDI			(Biomed) GENE			(News) SEMEVAL		
		P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
Single-Prompt	A	28.2	61.0	38.1 (.06)	52.2	25.7	34.3 (.02)	23.6	26.6	24.2 (.07)	64.6	66.0	65.3 (.06)
Single-Prompt	B	28.2	94.2	43.2 (.05)	65.1	69.0	66.7 (.04)	34.3	59.6	42.3 (.01)	77.7	84.7	80.8 (.04)
Single-Prompt	C	48.8	100	64.2 (.14)	52.9	93.2	67.4 (.02)	27.4	71.9	39.5 (.05)	57.4	82.8	67.7 (.03)
<i>n</i>													
Few-Shot Prompt	5	37.2	83.5	51.0 (.03)	100	37.6	53.1 (.15)	22.1	25.7	22.7 (.28)	100	46.0	62.7 (.06)
Few-Shot Prompt	15	52.8	41.4	46.1 (.08)	51.4	27.0	35.1 (.05)	26.0	29.1	26.2 (.18)	100	47.9	64.6 (.04)
Few-Shot Prompt	20	50.2	70.4	57.0 (.08)	*	*	*	31.7	39.5	34.3 (.08)	58.9	57.7	58.2 (.02)
Fine-tuning													
BioBERT		77.9	84.4	80.8 (.01)	97.0	76.2	85.2 (.03)	46.1	65.2	53.5 (.07*)	*	*	*
PubmedBERT		80.7	87.4	83.9 (.03)	93.2	83.3	87.9 (.01)	50.6	62.1	55.1 (.03)	*	*	*
BERT-large		*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	93.0	93.0	93.0 (.01)
GPT/ada (classify)		80.5	70.1	74.1 (.06)	99.4	78.1	87.4 (.03)	58.6	23.1	31.4 (.08)	99.9	94.8	96.8 (.03)
GPT/ada (extraction)		75.6	58.1	65.5 (.07)	100	62.9	77.1 (.02)	52.4	21.2	30.1 (.06)	100	91.9	95.7 (.03)

Table 2: Experiment results. Values in bold indicates the best F1 score for each method and dataset. *type* refers to Single-Prompt variations as explained in 3.1.1, *n* refers to the number of training data included in the prompt for Few-Shot setting. Values in parenthesis represent standard deviations of F1 scores over the 5 cross-validation test folds.

Nevertheless, in the Few-Shot prompt experiments where *n* number of training samples are included in the prompt, the performance is not necessarily better compared to the models without training samples. This is shown in the Table 2, where surprisingly, the highest F score for the prompt-based methods is achieved with Single-Prompt B and C; both are the model without any training samples. We hypothesized this could be due to the limited size of the training samples, and adding more training data might improve the performance. Unfortunately, the current token limitation of the API prevented us to experiment with larger numbers of *n*.

4.2.2 Discussion 2: Effect of the context sentence. As mentioned in section 3.1.1, we created variations of the Single-Prompt setting by *including* and *not including* the context sentence *S* in the prompt (**with-context** and **no-context**). Context sentence provides the model with a *context*, which in this work we define as *the text surrounding the entity pair*. We expect the model to look at these surrounding texts in determining the relationship between the target entity pair.

The result suggests that for prompt-based methods, including the context sentence in the prompt proves to be effective, as shown in the Table 2 where the Single-Prompt type B, C (**with-context**) consistently gives better scores than type A (**no-context**). Rather than solely relying on the knowledge of the model obtained during the pre-training, the context gives the model additional knowledge in predicting the relationship between the entity pair.

4.2.3 Discussion 3: Biomedical vs. Open-domain datasets. As shown in Table 2, in general, we observe better scores in the results of the open-domain dataset compared to the biomedical datasets. This is expected because LLMs are mostly trained on open-domain texts, i.e., books and online content. Another reason could be due to the complexity of the texts in biomedical datasets, which include more domain-specific or technical terms.

5 CONCLUSION

We present a preliminary study discussing the feasibility of applying NLP technologies for causal graph verification. We compare the prompt-based and fine-tuned LLMs for predicting the causality between pair of entities based on their textual context. Experiments on biomedical and open-domain datasets suggest that the fine-tuned models outperforms the prompt-based LLMs, up to 20.5% F score. However, due to limitation of the data, we were only able to *quantitatively* evaluate the methods on a binary-task setting, without considering the direction of causality. The target causal graph is directed, thus evaluating the direction of causality is our main future work. Other future work includes optimizing the prompt-based LLMs with more advanced prompting methods e.g., chain-of-thought [24], or by giving the model additional knowledge and a more precise instruction.

Despite the result of the current experiment, a fine-tuned model needs a sufficient expert-annotated data for training, and this could hinder the progress of the research. Training data construction (i.e., *data annotation*) requires human expert knowledge, and is often difficult and costly. In this regard, we believe that the LLMs, especially through the prompt engineering method, could be a breakthrough for the causal relation classification/extraction research.

A PROMPT-BASED LLMS HYPERPARAMETER

In this work, we used OpenAI³ API with *gpt-3.5-turbo* engine for the Single-Prompt and *text-davinci-003* engine for the Few-Shot experiments. For all prompt-based settings, in general we assume only query access to the LLMs (i.e., no gradients, no log probabilities). Table 3 summarizes the hyperparameter values for the Few-Shot setting experiment.

³<https://platform.openai.com/>

Parameter	Value
<i>temperature</i>	0.7
<i>max_token</i> ($n = 5$)	800~1200
<i>max_token</i> ($n = 15, 20$)	200~250
<i>top_p</i>	0.7
<i>frequency_penalty</i>	0.7
<i>presence_penalty</i>	0.7

Table 3: LLMs hyperparameter values.

In the fine-tuning of the BERT-based causal relation extraction models, batch sizes of 16 were used for the DDI dataset, while batch sizes of 8 were used for the COMAGC dataset. At both the beginning and the end of the first and second entity, we insert a special token “\$” and “#”, respectively. This is useful to make the model capture the location information of the two target entities. We also add special tokens [CLS] to the beginning and [SEP] to the end of each input sequence, following the standard fine-tuning practice using the pre-trained BERT model [7].

B BERT FINE-TUNING HYPERPARAMETER

In preparing the data, we insert a special token “\$” and “#” at both the beginning and the end of the first and second entity, respectively. This is useful to make the model captures the location information of the target entities. We also add special tokens “[CLS]” to the beginning and “[SEP]” to the end of each input sequence, following the standard fine-tuning practice using the pre-trained BERT model [7].

In the fine-tuning of the BERT pre-trained model for the biomedical dataset, batch sizes of 16 were used for the DDI, SEMEVAL, and GENE dataset, while batch sizes of 8 were used for the COMAGC dataset. We used the *BioBERT-large-cased*⁴ for the BioBERT pre-trained model and *PubMedBERT-base-uncased-abstract-fulltext*⁵ for the PubMedBERT pre-trained model, for all biomedical datasets fine-tuning. Table 4 summarizes the hyperparameter values for fine-tuning the BERT model experiments.

Parameter	Value
<i>max_sequence_length</i>	128, 256
<i>epoch</i>	10
<i>optimizer</i>	Adam
<i>lr</i>	2e-5
<i>eps</i>	1e-08
<i>linear_warmup_proportion</i>	0.1
<i>dropout</i>	0.1
<i>hidden_layer</i>	1024 (FC layer)
<i>seed</i>	1234

Table 4: BERT hyperparameter values.

⁴<https://huggingface.co/dmis-lab/biobert-v1.1>

⁵<https://huggingface.co/microsoft/BiomedNLP-PubMedBERT-base-uncased-abstract-fulltext>

For the SEMEVAL dataset, we used the *bert-base-uncased* pre-trained model, with the same hyperparameters as the BioBERT/PubMedBERT model above. We implemented the fine-tuning of the BERT model using Pytorch. The random seed of 1234 is set for all experiments.

REFERENCES

- [1] Monica Agrawal, Stefan Heggelmann, Hunter Lang, Yoon Kim, and David Sontag. 2022. Large language models are few-shot clinical information extractors. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, 1998–2022. <https://aclanthology.org/2022.emnlp-main.130>
- [2] Ananth Balashankar, Sunandan Chakraborty, Samuel Fraiberger, and Lakshminarayanan Subramanian. 2019. Identifying Predictive Causal Factors from News Streams. 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)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Hong Kong, China, 2338–2348. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D19-1238>
- [3] Eduardo Blanco, Nuria Castell, and Dan Moldovan. 2008. Causal Relation Extraction. In *Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC’08)*. European Language Resources Association (ELRA), Marrakech, Morocco, 1161–1186. http://www.lrec-conf.org/proceedings/lrec2008/pdf/87_paper.pdf
- [4] Quoc-Chinh Bui, Breannán Ó Nualláin, Charles A. Boucher, and Peter MA Sloot. 2010. Extracting causal relations on HIV drug resistance from literature. *BMC Bioinformatics* 11, 1 (23 Feb 2010), 101. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-11-101>
- [5] Du-Seong Chang and Key-Sun Choi. 2006. Incremental cue phrase learning and bootstrapping method for causality extraction using cue phrase and word pair probabilities. *Information Processing & Management* 42, 3 (2006), 662–678. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipm.2005.04.004>
- [6] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. *CoRR* abs/1810.04805 (2018), 1161–1186. arXiv:1810.04805 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1810.04805>
- [7] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 4171–4186. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N19-1423>
- [8] Jinghang Gu, Longhua Qian, and Guodong Zhou. 2016. Chemical-induced disease relation extraction with various linguistic features. *Database* 2016 (04 2016), 1161–1186. <https://doi.org/10.1093/database/baw042> arXiv:<https://academic.oup.com/database/article-pdf/doi/10.1093/database/baw042/8223888/baw042.pdf> baw042.
- [9] Yu Gu, Robert Tinn, Hao Cheng, Michael Lucas, Naoto Usuyama, Xiaodong Liu, Tristan Naumann, Jianfeng Gao, and Hoifung Poon. 2021. Domain-Specific Language Model Pretraining for Biomedical Natural Language Processing. *ACM Trans. Comput. Healthcare* 3, 1, Article 2 (oct 2021), 23 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3458754>
- [10] Iris Hendrickx, Su Nam Kim, Zornitsa Kozareva, Preslav Nakov, Diarmuid Ó Séaghdha, Sebastian Padó, Marco Pennacchiotti, Lorenza Romano, and Stan Szpakowicz. 2010. SemEval-2010 Task 8: Multi-Way Classification of Semantic Relations between Pairs of Nominals. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Uppsala, Sweden, 33–38. <https://aclanthology.org/S10-1006>
- [11] María Herrero-Zazo, Isabel Segura-Bedmar, Paloma Martínez, and Thierry Declercq. 2013. The DDI corpus: An annotated corpus with pharmacological substances and drug–drug interactions. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics* 46, 5 (2013), 914–920. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2013.07.011>
- [12] Katharina Jeblick, Balthasar Schachtner, Jakob Dextl, Andreas Mittermeier, Anna Theresa Stüber, Johanna Topalis, Tobias Weber, Philipp Wesp, Bastian Sabel, Jens Rieke, and Michael Ingris. 2022. ChatGPT Makes Medicine Easy to Swallow: An Exploratory Case Study on Simplified Radiology Reports. arXiv:2212.14882 [cs.CL]
- [13] Vivek Khetan, Md Imbesat Rizvi, Jessica Huber, Paige Bartusiak, Bogdan Sacaleanu, and Andrew Fano. 2022. MIMICause: Representation and automatic extraction of causal relation types from clinical notes. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Dublin, Ireland, 764–773. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.findings-acl.63>
- [14] Christopher S. G. Khoo, Syin Chan, and Yun Niu. 2000. Extracting Causal Knowledge from a Medical Database Using Graphical Patterns. In *Proceedings of the 38th Annual Meeting on Association for Computational Linguistics (Hong Kong) (ACL ’00)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, USA, 336–343. <https://doi.org/10.3115/1075218.1075261>

- [15] CHRISTOPHER S. G. Khoo, JAKLIN KORNFILT, ROBERT N. ODDY, and SUNG HYON MYAENG. 1998. Automatic Extraction of Cause-Effect Information from Newspaper Text Without Knowledge-based Inferencing. *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 13, 4 (12 1998), 177–186. <https://doi.org/10.1093/lc/13.4.177> arXiv:<https://academic.oup.com/dsh/article-pdf/13/4/177/10888761/177.pdf>
- [16] Hee-Jin Lee, Sang-Hyung Shim, Mi-Ryoung Song, Hyunju Lee, and Jong C. Park. 2013. CoMAGC: a corpus with multi-faceted annotations of gene-cancer relations. *BMC Bioinformatics* 14, 1 (14 Nov 2013), 323. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-14-323>
- [17] Jinhyuk Lee, Wonjin Yoon, Sungdong Kim, Donghyeon Kim, Sunkyu Kim, Chan Ho So, and Jaewoo Kang. 2019. BioBERT: a pre-trained biomedical language representation model for biomedical text mining. *Bioinformatics* 36, 4 (09 2019), 1234–1240. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btz682> arXiv:https://academic.oup.com/bioinformatics/article-pdf/36/4/1234/48983216/bioinformatics_36_4_1234.pdf
- [18] Claudiu Mihăilă and Sophia Ananiadou. 2014. Semi-supervised learning of causal relations in biomedical scientific discourse. *BioMedical Engineering OnLine* 13, 2 (11 Dec 2014), S1. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-925X-13-S2-S1>
- [19] Long Ouyang, Jeff Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll L. Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. arXiv:2203.02155 [cs.CL]
- [20] Ioannis Reklou and Meroño-Peñuela Albert. 2022. MediCause: Causal Relation Modelling and Extraction from Medical Publications. In *Proceedings of the Text2KG 2022: International Workshop on Knowledge Graph Generation from Text*. Text2KG, Crete, Hersonissos, Greece, 1161–1186.
- [21] Shohei Shimizu, Patrik O. Hoyer, Aapo Hyvärinen, and Antti Kerminen. 2006. A Linear Non-Gaussian Acyclic Model for Causal Discovery. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 7 (dec 2006), 2003–2030.
- [22] P. Spirtes, C. Glymour, and R. Scheines. 2000. *Causation, Prediction, and Search* (2nd ed.). MIT press, mit.
- [23] Peng Su and K. Vijay-Shanker. 2022. Investigation of improving the pre-training and fine-tuning of BERT model for biomedical relation extraction. *BMC Bioinformatics* 23, 1 (04 Apr 2022), 120. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12859-022-04642-w>
- [24] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Ed H. Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. 2022. Chain of Thought Prompting Elicits Reasoning in Large Language Models. *CoRR abs/2201.11903* (2022), 1011. arXiv:2201.11903 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.11903>
- [25] Xiang Wei, Xingyu Cui, Ning Cheng, Xiaobin Wang, Xin Zhang, Shen Huang, Pengjun Xie, Jinan Xu, Yufeng Chen, Meishan Zhang, Yong Jiang, and Wenjuan Han. 2023. Zero-Shot Information Extraction via Chatting with ChatGPT. arXiv:2302.10205 [cs.CL]