

Adapting Biomedical Abstracts into Plain language using Large Language Models

Haritha Gangavarapu^{2*}, Giridhar Kaushik Ramachandran^{1*}, Kevin Lybarger¹,
Meliha Yetisgen³, Özlem Uzuner¹

¹Department of Information Sciences & Technology, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA
²CGI inc. ³University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA

Abstract

A vast amount of medical knowledge is available for public use through online health forums, and question-answering platforms on social media. The majority of the population in the United States doesn't have the right amount of health literacy to make the best use of that information. Health literacy means the ability to obtain and comprehend the basic health information to make appropriate health decisions. To build the bridge between this gap, organizations advocate adapting this medical knowledge into plain language. Building robust systems to automate the adaptations helps both medical and non-medical professionals best leverage the available information online. The goal of the Plain Language Adaptation of Biomedical Abstracts (PLABA) track is to adapt the biomedical abstracts in English language extracted from PubMed based on the questions asked in MedlinePlus for the general public using plain language at the sentence level. As part of this track, we leveraged the best open-source Large Language Models suitable and fine-tuned for dialog use cases. We compare and present the results for all of our systems and our ranking among the other participants' submissions. Our top performing GPT-4 based model ranked first in the avg. simplicity measure and 3rd on the avg. accuracy measure.

1 Introduction

The TAC-2023 Plain Language Adaptation of Biomedical Abstracts (PLABA)^{1,2} focused on adapting technical language in biomedical abstracts into plain language for the general public use. The PLABA dataset is curated from sources like MedlinePlus and PubMed. MedlinePlus is an online health information resource by the National Library of Medicine (NLM), that contains the relevant health and wellness information available and accessible for free for medical professionals as well as the general public. PubMed supports the search and retrieval of biomedical literature. Due to the availability of vast information from these reliable resources, the public can easily access and search for any health-related question to get the answers they are seeking. However, the content available may not always be suitable for the general public with limited or no medical background as these sources contain information from scientific journals which may not be easily understood without relevant education and prior knowledge.

Studies^{3,4} have analyzed the impact of poor health literacy on health outcomes. So organizations like Centers for Disease Control (CDC), and (NIH) maintain materials and resources that are helpful for the public to understand the research in health and also promote plain language adaptation by providing guidelines for effective adaptation^{5,6}. Prior research on the readability of Patient Education Materials highlights the need to simplify the available biomedical information⁷⁻¹¹ to promote effective self-disease management^{4,12} and awareness to identify existing medical conditions¹³.

In this paper, we explore automatically adapting biomedical abstracts into plain language using Large Language Models. We use the Large Language models with parameter efficient fine-tuning as well as In Context Learning approach, to make the models adapt to the dataset by learning from the analogy. In our work, we compare the different versions of GPT-J and LLaMa second generation models. Our system ranked 1st in the external manual evaluation on the overall average simplicity measure and 3rd on the average accuracy measure.

2 Related Work

There has been a great level of advocacy for plain language adaptation in the biomedical domain because of its helpfulness to the public. Research has been conducted to assess the availability of plain-language summaries¹⁴ and explore

*Equal contribution

ways to improve consumer engagement¹⁵. To transform the available biomedical information into informed actions that are helpful for the patients, it is important to have systems that automate the task of simplifying the language. Methods in Natural Language Processing were explored to adapt the biomedical language semantically¹⁶ and syntactically to automatic plain language at the sentence level¹⁷ and paragraph level¹⁸. While some research focused on producing a corpus for facilitating Complex word identification¹⁹. There is still a shortage of high-quality parallel datasets for training and fine-tuning the models. PLABA was benchmarked using transformer-based models in both zero-shot setting and with fine-tuning. The models for benchmarking PLABA include Text-to-text transfer transformer (T5)-base²⁰, Pre-training with extracted gap-sentences for abstractive summarization sequence-to-sequence (PEGASUS)-large²¹, Bidirectional autoregressive transformer (BART)-base and large²², T Zero plus plus (TOPP)²³. Recent advancements in the creation and availability of high-quality Pre-Trained Large Language Models have created many opportunities to explore their application in generative tasks such as summarization, reasoning, etc. The availability of the fine-tuned versions of these Pre-Trained language models created to serve the dialog use cases, can be leveraged for any given use case without having to use traditional training techniques to adapt to the dataset²⁴. However, the quality of these examples will affect the quality of the model output²⁵. The abstract-level benchmarked results of the PLABA show that using it to further train or fine-tune models could help in automating the adaptation to plain language.

3 Methods

3.1 Dataset

PLABA contains the health-related questions asked by the consumers of MedlinePlus. These questions were filtered based on their frequency and relevance and 75 of them were selected. The focus and question type of each of these questions were sourced by an expert as the keywords to retrieve the 10 most relevant abstracts from PubMed per question, resulting in 750 abstracts in total. Each of these retrieved PubMed abstracts was manually adapted at the sentence level to plain language by at least one annotator. With this, a total of 921 adaptations were created for 750 abstracts. The manual adaptations were created by the annotators following the adaptation guidelines. The adaptation was done by considering the targeted audience’s education level as K8. The adaptation guidelines allowed the annotators to drop the complex sentences, retain the simple sentences that need no further simplification as is in the adaptation, splitting the sentences when required, which would allow one or more sentences in the adaptation for each sentence in the abstract. Other guidelines included expansion of abbreviations, omitting statistical figures like p-values, explaining medical jargon with parentheses or nonrestrictive clauses in the first mention as needed, for example, when an abstract introduces a medicine “Duloxetine”, adapting it like “Duloxetine (a common antidepressant)”

	abstract	adaptations
total	750	921
total sentences	7612	9087*
avg. no.of sentences	10.15	10.12
avg. tokens per sentence	22.54	24.07

Table 1: PLABA statistics. * indicates that 235 sentences in the adaptations that are blanks are excluded in this table.

3.2 Plain language adaptation using LLMs

Recent work^{26,27} evaluating LLMs in clinical and biomedical tasks has shown that LLMs are capable of high performance in an array of tasks, including question-answering, information extraction, and summarization. Our experimentation focused on evaluating LLMs for adapting technical language into plain language adaptations. Specifically, we deployed LLMs in both fine-tuned using Parameter Efficient Fine-Tuning (PEFT)²⁸ and in-context learning settings, tuning the models using short instructive sentences to detailed guidelines. We evaluated the models using automatic evaluation metrics and performed human evaluation on a sample of internal test set model generations.

Fine-tuning LLMs using PEFT Prior work² in PLABA demonstrated the performance of fine-tuned T5²⁰ model. We evaluated T5 to replicate the results from prior work but at the sentence level. Additionally, to evaluate the

performance of larger generative LLMs, we fine-tuned LLaMa2(13B-chat and 70B-chat)²⁹ models using Parameter-Efficient Fine-Tuning (PEFT). PEFT allows for fine-tuning the Large Pre-trained models efficiently by reducing the trainable parameters that are suitable for low-resource settings. LLaMa-2 chat models are instruction-tuned using the second-generation LLaMa models from Meta. Two types of fine-tuning are supported in these models - Supervised Fine-Tuning(SFT) and Reinforcement Learning with Human Feedback (RLHF). Further Fine-tuning the instruction-tuned models on a high-quality dataset has proven their efficiency^{24,30}. We trained the LLaMa2 chat models using SFT by providing instructions in the form of a short instructive sentence, including the Medline search query (‘Simplify the following sentence given the context of the question <consumer question>’). Our additional experiments training the LLaMa2 70B-chat model and including abstract-specific inter-sentence context for a target sentence did not significantly improve performance. Figure1 has the prompt structure used for the LLaMa model.




Figure 1: elements of the Prompt structure for Fine-tuning LLaMa-2 models

In-context learning(ICL) using GPT-J We adapt GPT-3.5^{31,32} and GPT-4³³ for PLABA using in-context learning and fine-tuning. We experimented with a variety of in-context learning strategies for GPT-4, ranging from short prompt instructions to detailed guidelines. Our final GPT-4-based model included a detailed distilled version of the PLABA annotation guideline³⁴ with one training example that illustrates a majority of annotation guideline instructions. We used the openAI’s training application program interface (API) to train GPT-3.5 on the same instruction used for GPT-4, albeit with all abstracts in the training set. Figure 2 shows the details of the prompt used for GPT-4 and GPT-3.5




Figure 2: Prompt structure for the ICL using GPT-4 and Fine-tuning GPT-3.5

3.3 Experimental setup

We used the PLABA dataset containing 750 abstracts and 921 adaptations for training and fine-tuning our models. 171 abstracts are adapted more than once, in order to create abstract-adaptation sentence pairs for training, we repeat the sentences in the abstract as many times as the number of corresponding adaptations creating a total of 9216 abstract-adaptation sentence pairs. We split the PLABA dataset into *internal* training (70%), validation (15%), and test sets (15%). The internal training and validation sets were used to train and assess the model during the training phase. The internal test set was used to comparatively evaluate all our models to select the most promising models based on automatic and human evaluation. We used internal training, validation and test sets to fine-tune GPT-3.5, LLaMa2 (13b-chat) and T5-Large. GPT-4 on the other hand, used only the internal test set and a single example from train set as we didn’t fine-tune the GPT-4 model. For fine-tuning T5-Large model, we used batch sizes 8 and 16 with a max sequence length of 256 and 512 and trained for 20 epochs. However, the automatic evaluation scores for all our T5 fine-tuning experiments didn’t differ much from each other. We fine-tuned Llama2 chat models in 4-bit precision using the Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA), a type of Parameter Efficient Technique for fine-tuning pre-trained language

models. We used a LoRA rank set to 16 that allowed training only 0.05% of the entire trainable parameters.

3.4 Evaluation

Automatic evaluation metrics such as BLEU or ROUGE are most commonly used in machine translation. However, there is a need for human judgment to assess the quality and accuracy of the Plain language adaptations because the automatic metrics operate on the n-gram level and are not efficient in capturing the semantics of the generated text.

3.4.1 Evaluation on internal test set

We evaluate the automatically generated adaptations using automatic and human evaluation methods– (1) Automatic evaluation metrics include- Recall-Oriented Understudy for Gisting Evaluation (ROUGE)³⁵, BLEU³⁶, and SARI³⁷. BLEU captures the percentage of words in the automatic adaptations that appear in the given manual adaptations, although it doesn’t measure recall directly, it has a brevity penalty to account for shorter auto adaptations. ROUGE on the other hand is a recall-based metric that measures the percentage of words in the manual adaptations that appear in the automatic adaptations. While BLEU and ROUGE compare only the automatic adaptations against the reference text i.e., manual adaptations, SARI considers the abstracts to ensure that the original meaning is preserved and it measures the quality of the words that are added, deleted, and retained from the original text. (2) Human evaluation– sentence simplicity, completeness, accuracy, fluency, and faithfulness criteria. For human evaluation, the lead authors randomly chose five Medline consumer questions and two abstract adaptations per question (approx. 100 sentences per model) and evaluated all our fine-tuned and in-context learning models using a simple preference ranking mechanism. Our fine-tuned models were then trained on the entire PLABA corpus and predicted on the *external* test set shared by the organizers.

3.4.2 External evaluation on the task test set

Each participating team was allowed up to three submissions for the final automatic evaluation. Organizers used sentence-level SARI scores to automatically evaluate our submissions on the task test set. For the manual evaluation, task organizers asked the teams to rank each of their three submissions in their preferred order of evaluation, and then they considered the top-ranked submission for the manual evaluation. The evaluation was primarily based on two axes³⁸ - (1) Simplicity axis comprising of sentence simplicity, term simplicity, term accuracy, and fluency measured at a sentence level (2) Accuracy axis comprising of faithfulness and completeness measured for up to 3 sentences that are most relevant to the question determined by the annotators. In addition, average scores for each of these axes were shared by the organizers. Table 2 has a detailed description of the evaluation metrics.

Evaluation axis	Evaluation criteria	Description of Evaluation criteria
Simplicity axis (determined for each sentence)	Sentence simplicity	Are long, complex sentences appropriately split?
	Term simplicity	Are expert terms in the source replaced with alternatives or explained in the output?
	Term accuracy	Are substitutions and explanations of expert terms accurate?
	Fluency	Does the output follow grammatical rules and read smoothly?
Accuracy axis (determined for up to 3 most relevant sentences)	Completeness	How much of the source information does the output provide?
	Faithfulness	Do points made in the output match those of the source?

Table 2: Human Evaluation criteria

4 Results and Discussion

4.1 Automatic evaluation

We evaluated our models on the automatic metrics– BLEU, ROUGE-1,2 (based on 1 and 2 grams), ROUGE-L (based on longest shared subsequence between candidate and reference), and SARI scores. While the fine-tuned models T5 and LLaMa show higher performance than the GPT-J models in automatic evaluation, upon manual evaluation of these results, we observed that T5 and LLaMa2 tend to frequently repeat the abstract sentence as is with minimal simplifications, leading to higher ROUGE and BLEU scores. GPT models, on the other hand, captured the goal of the adaptation

task by frequently simplifying complex medical condition-related descriptions (e.g. “macular degeneration”) into understandable plain language (e.g. “damage to the central part of the retina”) adaptations.

		T5-large	³ LLaMa2 (13B)	² GPT3.5	¹ GPT4- guide+ oneshot
Internal	BLEU	0.232	0.258	0.176	0.176
	ROUGE-1	0.536	0.568	0.481	0.503
	ROUGE-2	0.341	0.357	0.257	0.261
	ROUGE-L	0.488	0.522	0.425	0.448
	SARI	0.398	0.424	0.388	0.396
External	SARI	0.398	0.383	0.400	0.395
				Top score	0.446
				Median score	0.395

Table 3: Automatic evaluation on the internal test set and task test set (external). 1, 2, and 3 denote the ranking of our systems based on internal human evaluation. Final automatic evaluation scores (sentence level SARI score) of all our three submissions. Comparison of our rank1 system’s score with the top and median scores of other rank1 systems

For the evaluation of the task test set, all the participating teams were allowed to submit up to three submissions. We submitted our runs from GPT-4, GPT-3.5, and LLaMa-2 models. All these systems were automatically scored at the sentence level using the SARI score metric by the task organizers. Table 3 contains the performance of our LLM-based fine-tuned and in-context learning models on the internal test set as well as on the task test set and top and median scores of the other rank1 submissions for comparison.

4.2 Human evaluation

We performed an internal human evaluation on the internal test set to rank our submissions. GPT-4 ranked first overall with first preference in 9 out of 10 randomly selected abstracts, followed by the fine-tuned GPT-3.5 and LLaMa2 model-generated adaptations. The performance of our GPT-4 model was remarkably higher in internal human evaluation, showing significantly concise and faithfulness in adaptations compared to GPT-3.5 and LLaMa2- whose generations were longer and verbose or were simply repetitions of the complex abstract sentence without any simplification. Among our three submissions, we chose the results from our GPT-4 model as rank 1 based on our internal human evaluation.

To score the systems, organizers chose one abstract per question for all 40 questions in the evaluation test set. Each of these summaries was scored by annotators on a score of -1, 0, 1 which were then transformed into a scale of 1-100. So the evaluation scores we received were on a 1-100 scale.

		Ours	Top score	Median score	Rank
Simplicity axis	Sentence simplicity	91.63	94.33	91.45	3
	Term simplicity	91.74	91.74	81.94	1
	Term accuracy	88.26	94.11	87.5	3
	Fluency	93.49	95.25	92.96	2
	Simplicity axis avg.	91.28	91.28	88.86	1
Accuracy axis	Completeness	94.44	95.73	90.17	3
	Faithfulness	90.6	94.44	88.46	3
	Accuracy axis avg.	92.52	94.87	89.32	3

Table 4: Final Human Evaluation scores of our system and comparison

There were a total of 7 participating teams and all participants' top-ranked systems were manually evaluated by the expert(s). Simplicity axes evaluation was performed on a total of 430 sentences from the sampled abstracts for each question, while the accuracy axis evaluation was done on a total of 117 sentences. Table 4 provides the final human evaluation results for our top-ranked submission. In addition, for each evaluation criterion, we present the top score, median score, and our ranking among all the 7 participating teams for comparison.

5 Conclusions

In this work, we propose multiple state-of-the-art LLM-based systems, including T5-large, LLaMa2, GPT-3.5, and GPT4, for plain language adaptation of biomedical abstracts. We trained our LLMs using (1) fine-tuning and (2) in-context learning methods to elicit adaptations. We used both automatic metrics and human evaluation (ranking) to evaluate the model-generated adaptations. While LLaMa2 performed best in automatic evaluation, our best-performing system in human evaluation was the annotation-guideline-instructed GPT-4-based one-shot in-context learning model. Our experiments show that LLMs hold a lot of promise in making complex language in biomedical abstracts more accessible to the consumer audience.

6 Acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by the National Institutes of Health, National Library of Medicine (NLM) (Grant numbers T15LM007442, R01 CA248422-01A1, R15 LM013209). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

References

1. track organizers P. Plain Language Adaptation of Biomedical Abstracts - A track of TAc 2023; 2023. <https://bionlp.nlm.nih.gov/plaba2023/>. Available from: <https://bionlp.nlm.nih.gov/plaba2023/>.
2. Attal K, Ondov B, Demner-Fushman D. A Dataset for Plain Language Adaptation of Biomedical Abstracts. *Scientific Data*. 2022.
3. Berkman ND, Sheridan SL, Donahue KE, Halpern DJ, Crotty K. Low Health Literacy and Health Outcomes: An Updated Systematic Review. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 2011;155(2):97-107. PMID: 21768583. Available from: <https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/abs/10.7326/0003-4819-155-2-201107190-00005>.
4. Pourhabibi N, Mohebbi B, Sadeghi R, Shakibazadeh E, Sanjari M, Tol A, et al. Determinants of Poor Treatment Adherence among Patients with Type 2 Diabetes and Limited Health Literacy : A Scoping Review. *Journal of diabetes research*. 2022.
5. CDC Plain Language Materials & Resources; 2023. Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/healthliteracy/developmaterials/plainlanguage.html>.
6. Plain Language at NIH; 2023. Available from: <https://www.nih.gov/institutes-nih/nih-office-director/office-communications-public-liaison/clear-communication/plain-language/>.
7. Jasem Z, AlMeraj Z, Alhuwail D. Evaluating breast cancer websites targeting Arabic speakers: empirical investigation of popularity, availability, accessibility, readability, and quality. *BMC medical informatics and decision making*. 2022:126.
8. Eltorai AE, P Thomas N, Yang H, Daniels AH, Born CT. Readability of Trauma-Related Patient Education Materials From the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons. *Trauma monthly*. 2016.
9. Tulbert B, Snyder C, Brodell R. Readability of Patient-oriented Online Dermatology Resources. *J Clin Aesthet Dermatol*. 2011:27-33. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21464884/>.
10. Kher A, Johnson S, Griffith R. Readability Assessment of Online Patient Education Material on Congestive Heart Failure. *Advances in preventive medicine*. 2017.
11. Stossel L, Segar N, Gliatto P, Fallar R, Karani R. Readability of patient education materials available at the point of care. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 2012.

12. Marciano L, Camerini AL, Schulz PJ. The Role of Health Literacy in Diabetes Knowledge, Self-Care, and Glycemic Control: a Meta-analysis. *Journal of general internal medicine*. 2019:1007–1017.
13. Rogers ES, Wallace LS, Weiss BD. Misperceptions of medical understanding in low-literacy patients: implications for cancer prevention; 2006.
14. FitzGibbon H, King K, Piano C, Wilk C, Gaskarth M. Where are biomedical research plain-language summaries? *Health science reports*. 2020.
15. Penlington M, Silverman H, Vasudevan A, Pavithran P. Plain Language Summaries of Clinical Trial Results: A Preliminary Study to Assess Availability of Easy-to-Understand Summaries and Approaches to Improving Public Engagement. *Pharmaceutical medicine*. 2020:401–406.
16. Sulem E, Abend O, Rappoport A. Simple and Effective Text Simplification Using Semantic and Neural Methods. In: Gurevych I, Miyao Y, editors. *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Melbourne, Australia: Association for Computational Linguistics; 2018. p. 162-73. Available from: <https://aclanthology.org/P18-1016>.
17. Jonnalagadda S, Tari L, Hakenberg J, Baral C, Gonzalez G. Towards Effective Sentence Simplification for Automatic Processing of Biomedical Text. In: *Proceedings of Human Language Technologies: The 2009 Annual Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics, Companion Volume: Short Papers*. Boulder, Colorado: Association for Computational Linguistics; 2009. p. 177-80. Available from: <https://aclanthology.org/N09-2045>.
18. Devaraj A, Marshall IJ, Wallace BC, Li JJ. Paragraph-level Simplification of Medical Texts. *CoRR*. 2021;abs/2104.05767. Available from: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.05767>.
19. Shardlow M, Cooper M, Zampieri M. CompLex — A New Corpus for Lexical Complexity Prediction from Likert Scale Data. In: *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Tools and Resources to Empower People with READING Difficulties (READI)*. Marseille, France: European Language Resources Association; 2020. p. 57-62. Available from: <https://aclanthology.org/2020.readi-1.9>.
20. Raffel C, Shazeer N, Roberts A, et al.. Exploring the Limits of Transfer Learning with a Unified Text-to-Text Transformer; 2023.
21. Zhang J, Zhao Y, Saleh M, Liu PJ. PEGASUS: Pre-training with Extracted Gap-sentences for Abstractive Summarization. *ArXiv*. 2019;abs/1912.08777. Available from: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:209405420>.
22. Lewis M, Liu Y, Goyal N, et al. BART: Denoising Sequence-to-Sequence Pre-training for Natural Language Generation, Translation, and Comprehension. In: *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Online: Association for Computational Linguistics; 2020. p. 7871-80. Available from: <https://aclanthology.org/2020.acl-main.703>.
23. Sanh V, Webson A, Raffel C, et al. Multitask Prompted Training Enables Zero-Shot Task Generalization. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations*; 2022. Available from: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=9Vrb9D0WI4>.
24. Wei J, Bosma M, Zhao V, Guu K, Yu AW, Lester B, et al. Finetuned Language Models Are Zero-Shot Learners. *ArXiv*. 2021;abs/2109.01652. Available from: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:237416585>.
25. Zhao Z, Wallace E, Feng S, Klein D, Singh S. Calibrate Before Use: Improving Few-shot Performance of Language Models. In: Meila M, Zhang T, editors. *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*. vol. 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*. PMLR; 2021. p. 12697-706. Available from: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v139/zhao21c.html>.
26. M K, K M. Embracing Large Language Models for Medical Applications: Opportunities and Challenges.; 2023.
27. Singhal K, Azizi S, Tu T, et al.. Large Language Models Encode Clinical Knowledge; 2022.
28. Dettmers T, Pagnoni A, Holtzman A, Zettlemoyer L. QLoRA: Efficient Finetuning of Quantized LLMs; 2023.
29. Touvron H, Martin L, Stone K, et al.. Llama 2: Open Foundation and Fine-Tuned Chat Models; 2023.

30. Gupta H, Sawant SA, Mishra S, et al.. Instruction Tuned Models are Quick Learners; 2023. Available from: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.05539>.
31. Ye J, Chen X, Xu N, et al. A Comprehensive Capability Analysis of GPT-3 and GPT-3.5 Series Models. ArXiv. 2023;abs/2303.10420. Available from: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:257632113>.
32. Brown TB, Mann B, Ryder N, et al. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. In: Larochelle H, Ranzato M, Hadsell R, Balcan MF, Lin H, editors. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems. vol. 33. Curran Associates, Inc.; 2020. p. 1877-901. Available from: https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2020/file/1457c0d6bfc4967418bfb8ac142f64a-Paper.pdf.
33. OpenAI, Achiam J, Adler S, et al.. GPT-4 Technical Report; 2024. Available from: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.08774>.
34. track organizers P. PLABA data annotation guidelines; 2023. Available from: https://bionlp.nlm.nih.gov/plaba2023/annotation_guidelines.pdf.
35. Lin CY. ROUGE: A Package for Automatic Evaluation of Summaries. In: Text Summarization Branches Out. Barcelona, Spain: Association for Computational Linguistics; 2004. p. 74-81. Available from: <https://aclanthology.org/W04-1013>.
36. Papineni K, Roukos S, Ward T, Zhu WJ. Bleu: a Method for Automatic Evaluation of Machine Translation. In: Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA: Association for Computational Linguistics; 2002. p. 311-8. Available from: <https://aclanthology.org/P02-1040>.
37. Sun R, Jin H, Wan X. Document-Level Text Simplification: Dataset, Criteria and Baseline. In: Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic: Association for Computational Linguistics; 2021. p. 7997-8013. Available from: <https://aclanthology.org/2021.emnlp-main.630>.
38. track organizers P. PLABA evaluation notes; 2023. Available from: <https://bionlp.nlm.nih.gov/plaba2023/#evaluation>.