

A foundation model for human-AI collaboration in medical literature mining

Zifeng Wang¹, Lang Cao¹, Qiao Jin², Joey Chan², Nicholas Wan², Behdad Afzali³, Hyun-Jin Cho⁴, Chang-In Choi⁴, Mehdi Emamverdi⁵, Manjot K. Gill⁶, Sun-Hyung Kim^{4,7}, Yijia Li⁸, Yi Liu⁹, Hanley Ong¹⁰, Justin Rousseau¹¹, Irfan Sheikh¹¹, Jenny J. Wei¹², Ziyang Xu¹³, Christopher M. Zallek¹⁴, Kyungsang Kim⁴, Yifan Peng¹⁵, Zhiyong Lu², Jimeng Sun^{1,16#}

¹ School of Computing and Data Science, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL, USA

² Division of Intramural Research, National Library of Medicine, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, USA

³ Kidney Diseases Branch, National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, USA

⁴ Center for Advanced Medical Computing and Analysis, Department of Radiology, Massachusetts General Hospital and Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

⁵ National Eye Institute, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, USA

⁶ Department of Ophthalmology, Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, IL, USA

⁷ Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Department of Medicine, Chungbuk National University Hospital, Chungbuk National University College of Medicine, Cheongju, Republic of Korea

⁸ Department of Medicine, University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

⁹ Department of Medicine, Weill Cornell Medicine, New York, NY, USA

¹⁰ Department of Radiology, Weill Cornell Medicine, New York, NY, USA

¹¹ Department of Neurology, UT Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, TX, USA

¹² Department of Dermatology, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA

¹³ Department of Dermatology, NYU Langone Health, New York, NY, USA

¹⁴ OSF HealthCare Illinois Neurological Institute, Peoria, IL, USA

¹⁵ Department of Population Health Sciences, Weill Cornell Medicine, New York, NY, USA

¹⁶ Carle Illinois College of Medicine, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL, USA

#Corresponding authors. Emails: jimeng@illinois.edu

Abstract

Systematic literature review is essential for evidence-based medicine, requiring comprehensive analysis of clinical trial publications. However, the application of artificial intelligence (AI) models for medical literature mining has been limited by insufficient training and evaluation across broad therapeutic areas and diverse tasks. Here, we present LEADS, an AI foundation model for study search, screening, and data extraction from medical literature. The model is trained on 633,759 instruction data points in LEADSInstruct, curated from 21,335 systematic reviews, 453,625 clinical trial publications, and 27,015 clinical trial registries. We showed that LEADS demonstrates consistent improvements over four cutting-edge generic large language models (LLMs) on six tasks. Furthermore, LEADS enhances expert workflows by providing supportive references following expert requests, streamlining processes while maintaining high-quality results. A study with 16 clinicians and medical researchers from 14 different institutions revealed that experts collaborating with LEADS achieved a recall of 0.81 compared to 0.77 experts working alone in study selection, with a time savings of 22.6%. In data extraction tasks, experts using LEADS achieved an accuracy of 0.85 versus 0.80 without using LEADS, alongside a 26.9% time savings. These findings highlight the potential of specialized medical literature foundation models to outperform generic models, delivering significant quality and efficiency benefits when integrated into expert workflows for medical literature mining.

Introduction

Literature mining, such as systematic review and meta-analysis, has become increasingly critical in medicine, serving as a vital route for discovering, integrating, and interpreting emerging research.^{1,2} The proliferation of systematic reviews exemplifies the growing importance of literature mining, with over 50,000 review articles published annually on PubMed.^{3,4} However, the process is costly and time-consuming. A study of 195 reviews indicated an average completion time of 67.3 weeks for systematic reviews.⁵ Furthermore, a study on the top NIH-funded institutions and pharmaceutical companies reports that each organization incurs costs of approximately \$17 million annually to perform systematic literature reviews.⁶ The challenge is further compounded by the sheer volume of medical literature, with PubMed now indexing over 35 million publications and receiving more than 1 million new entries each year.⁴ Researchers face mounting obstacles in conducting comprehensive literature mining, as evidenced by a review of caveats in 485 systematic reviews, including insufficient literature searches, potential study selection bias, and data extraction errors.⁷ Beyond the meta-analysis use case, applications of literature mining also comprise the creation of new evidence,⁸ the revision of clinical guidelines,⁹ and the acceleration of drug discovery and development.¹⁰

Recent advances in artificial intelligence (AI) have shown promise in transforming medical literature mining. For instance, AI has been adopted for keyword generation to enhance literature search,^{11,12} facilitate study screening through retrieval,^{13,14} and support key entity extraction, including the identification of population, intervention, comparison, and outcomes (PICO) elements.^{15,16} AI was also employed to summarize evidence from scientific publications.^{17–19} The most recent developments in this domain are primarily driven by AI foundation models, particularly large language models (LLMs) like ChatGPT,²⁰ which serve as generalist AI capable of adapting to diverse tasks.²¹ These foundation models are typically adapted to medical tasks through two primary methods:²² prompting, such as in-context learning (ICL),²³ chain-of-thought,²⁴ and retrieval-augmented generation (RAG);²⁵ and fine-tuning for specific tasks, such as named entity recognition²⁶ and evidence summarization.²⁷

Despite these advancements, several critical challenges persist. First, existing medical AI models are predominantly task-specific and narrow in scope, typically developed and tested on limited datasets.²⁸ These models often require fixed-format inputs and necessitate retraining for new tasks or varying data formats, failing to function as generalist AI capable of handling flexible inputs and generalizing across diverse topics.²¹ Second, while prompting approaches attempt to leverage general-domain AI for multiple literature mining tasks,²⁹ they may fall short of the effectiveness demonstrated by domain-specific fine-tuned models for medical tasks.³⁰ Third, there is a limitation in comprehensively assessing AI methods’ performance in literature mining tasks. Existing research has been constrained by limited sample size, with studies typically conducted on a scale of tens of systematic reviews and often focused exclusively on single tasks, e.g., search query generation^{11,12} and citation screening.^{31–33} This narrow scope may not adequately represent the full complexity of medical literature mining. Lastly, current validation efforts have primarily focused on AI’s potential to automate processes, where critical challenges such as hallucination may happen and are not sufficiently addressed.³⁴ Given the high standards for accuracy and factual integrity in literature mining, developing and evaluating AI through human-AI collaboration presents a more pragmatic and reliable approach.^{35,36}

In this study, we introduce a foundation Large language model to facilitate human-AI collaboration in **sE**Arch, screening, and **D**ata extraction from medical literature **S**tudies (LEADS). Our approach decomposes literature mining into subtasks, including search query generation, study eligibility assessment, study characteristics extraction, participant statistics extraction, arm design extraction, and trial result extraction (Fig. 1a). LEADS is constructed on a generic LLM and then fine-tuned using LEADSInstruct, an expansive instruction dataset curated from 21,335 systematic reviews involving 453,625 publications including 8,485 systematic reviews with 27,015 clinical trial registries. This comprehensive training strategy enables LEADS to achieve multitask capabilities, handle flexible input requests, and generalize across diverse literature topics without requiring additional fine-

tuning. In our experiments on broad review topics with thousands of systematic reviews, LEADS yields all-around superiority over cutting-edge generic LLMs like GPT-4o across all target tasks (Fig. 1d). To validate the model’s practical utility, we conducted a user study involving fourteen clinicians and two medical researchers across fourteen different institutions. The study compared two experimental arms: an Expert-only approach and an Expert+AI collaborative approach. Our findings reveal that LEADS (i.e., Expert+AI arm) provides encouraging benefits in accelerating citation screening and data extraction tasks while maintaining or surpassing the performance of manual efforts.

Results

Overview of LEADS and LEADSInstruct

LEADS addresses three fundamental tasks in systematic review methodology:³⁷ literature search, citation screening, and data extraction. To optimize the literature mining process, we decomposed these tasks into six specialized subtasks: (1) search query generation to maximize study identification coverage; (2) study eligibility assessment to systematically evaluate candidate citations; and (3-6) four distinct extraction subtasks: study characteristics, arm design, participant statistics, and results. Each subtask was formulated as a paired input-output instruction format suitable for Large Language Model (LLM) processing (see details in Methods).

Our dataset comprises 21,335 systematic reviews from PubMed with their associated 453,625 publication citations, including 8,485 reviews linked to 27,015 clinical trial records in ClinicalTrials.gov (Fig. 1a). We also built an instruction dataset, named LEADSInstruct, leveraging the linkage between systematic reviews, publications, and clinical trials (see details in Methods). LEADSInstruct comprises 633,759 instruction data points across six tasks. The distributions of the most frequent conditions and interventions are illustrated in Figs. 1b and 1c. We fine-tuned a pre-trained Mistral-7B model³⁸ on LEADSInstruct using instruction tuning. For comparison, we also evaluated proprietary LLMs, including GPT-4o,³⁹ GPT-3.5,⁴⁰ and Haiku-3,⁴¹ open-source generic LLMs like Mistral³⁸ and Llama,⁴² and specialized medical LLMs such as BioMistral⁴³ and MedAlpaca.⁴⁴ We sampled 20% data to build the testing sets, which include thousands of systematic reviews and hundreds of thousands of clinical studies. To our knowledge, LEADSInstruct constitutes the largest benchmark dataset to date for assessing AI performance in literature mining tasks.

Synthesizing literature search queries for target studies

We evaluated LEADS’s performance on publication and clinical trial search tasks. The system takes a research question as input and generates optimized search terms, which are then used to query PubMed or ClinicalTrials.gov for relevant publications or trial records (Fig.2a). Our test set encompasses over 10,000 systematic reviews across diverse therapeutic areas (Fig.2b). For each review, we calculated the Recall metric, measuring the proportion of relevant studies successfully retrieved by the search strategy. To establish comprehensive benchmarks, we implemented four distinct approaches with baseline LLMs: (1) zero-shot querying, where models generated search terms directly from the research question without examples; (2) few-shot prompting, which provided example search queries as guidance; (3) in-context learning (ICL), incorporating detailed expert-like guidance for query formulation; and (4) a hybrid approach combining ICL with few-shot strategies to maximize performance (ExtendedFig.14).

The overall Recall is summarized in Fig. 2c. LEADS achieved Recall scores of 24.68 and 32.11 for the two tasks, surpassing the best-performing baselines by 3.76 and 7.43, respectively. Notably, LEADS, fine-tuned on Mistral-7B, demonstrated a significant improvement over the original Mistral model, which only achieved Recall scores of 7.18 and 8.08. This indicates a substantial improvement of 17.5 and 24.03, respectively, achieved by fine-tuning a generic LLM (Mistral-7B) on LEADSInstruct. Similarly, zero-shot gen-

eralist LLMs also performed notably worse, where GPT-4o yielded Recall scores of only 5.79 and 6.74 for publication and trial search tasks, respectively. This underscores the limitations of generic LLMs in handling domain-specific tasks without adaptation. Interestingly, adding examples to the prompts offered little to no benefit for most cases. For example, the ICL+Few-shot strategy with GPT-4o achieved a Recall of 11.95 for publication search, which was lower than the ICL strategy alone. This suggests that the diversity of review topics poses a challenge, as a few examples are insufficient to generalize across the wide range of therapeutic areas. In our evaluation, Recall is calculated as the recall at K , where K represents the number of target studies in the original review. Although increasing K will lead to higher recall, this strict metric remains valid for assessing our methods’ performance. It is important to note that the original reviews themselves are not exhaustive; therefore, many relevant and newly identified studies retrieved by LEADS may not be included in the original citation list.

Fig. 2d presents a topic-wise breakdown of Recall. Across all review topics, LEADS consistently outperformed GPT-4o, with Recall margins exceeding 5 in most cases. Similarly, for the trial search task, LEADS achieved Recall scores nearly double those of GPT-4o in most areas. These results highlight the effectiveness of the proposed instruction data generation pipeline, enabling LEADS to learn from the optimized synthetic query terms and outperform GPT-4o. Notably, the Recall reported for LEADS and baselines are based on a single pass for a fair comparison. In practical applications, however, an ensemble approach can be employed, where multiple sets of search terms are generated by LEADS running ten times, and the aggregated results are used to maximize coverage. We refer to this strategy as LEADS + Ensemble. This approach significantly improves performance, achieving a three- to four-fold increase in Recall compared to the single-pass LEADS, with average Recall scores exceeding 70 for publication search and 65 for trial search tasks.

We further examined how the difficulty of the search task affects the performance (Fig. 2e). Reviews were grouped based on the number of ground-truth studies to be identified in the search process. The more the ground-truth studies, the more challenging the search is to identify all of them when only considering a fixed number of top- K search results. Both methods showed a clear decreasing trend in Recall with increasing difficulty. For example, for reviews with 0–5 target studies, LEADS achieved a Recall of 30.0 compared to GPT-4o’s 24.4. For reviews with 15–20 target studies, LEADS maintained a Recall of 21.9, outperforming GPT-4o’s 18.4. Despite that, LEADS consistently outperformed GPT-4o across all bins. In the trial search task, this trend was less pronounced. LEADS achieved a Recall exceeding 25 across most bins, whereas GPT-4o consistently performed lower, with a Recall of around 10.

Automated assessment and ranking of study eligibility

After identifying citations during the study search stage, the next step is to determine each citation’s eligibility based on the predefined inclusion and exclusion criteria (Fig. 3d). LEADS uses the PICO elements defined in the target review to make criterion-level predictions for each citation, classifying them as Yes, Partially Yes, No, or Uncertain. We aggregate the criterion-level assessments into an overall eligibility score to rank the citations (Methods). We evaluated LEADS using a dataset of 200 randomly sampled systematic reviews, each associated with 2,000 candidate citations to be screened. This resulted in a total test size of 400,000 review-to-citation pairs. We compared LEADS against GPT-4o, GPT-3.5, Haiku, and Mistral-7B, and a vector-based similarity ranking approach using OpenAI embeddings (referred to as the Dense method).⁴⁵ Fig. 3a illustrates the Recall@50 performance, where LEADS achieves performance comparable to GPT-4o, outperforming it in seven out of ten topics, despite being a much smaller model. Additionally, LEADS consistently achieves Recall scores above 80.

Fig. 3b presents the performance with varying shortlist lengths, measured by Recall@ K , with K ranging from 10 to 100. As K increases, the difficulty of identifying all target studies decreases. The results show that LLMs generally outperform the Dense method, as they leverage natural language understanding to interpret the criteria text and com-

prehend the content of citations. The open-source Mistral model, representing LEADS before instruction tuning, performs significantly worse than proprietary LLMs. However, LEADS, after being fine-tuned with domain-specific instruction data, outperforms most proprietary LLMs and delivers performance comparable to GPT-4o.

Fig. 3c compares the performance of LEADS, Mistral, and the Dense method across review groups with varying numbers of target studies. Generally, as the number of target studies increases, the task becomes more challenging, requiring a higher proportion of target studies to appear in the top- K results. This increased difficulty is reflected in the decreasing trend observed for the two baseline methods. Mistral performs comparably to the Dense method when the number of target studies is fewer than 15. In contrast, LEADS maintains robust performance, showing no significant decline until the number of target studies exceeds 25. For example, in the “0-5” target studies group, the Recall scores are 0.81 for Dense, 0.84 for Mistral, and 0.90 for LEADS. In the “20-25” group, the scores are 0.70 for Dense, 0.76 for Mistral, and 0.87 for LEADS.

Streamlined data extraction from scientific papers

LEADS follows the defined data fields and extracts the data from clinical research papers (Fig. 4d). A series of example inputs and outputs for these data extraction tasks can be found in Extended Figs. 4, 5, 6, and 7. The automatic evaluation results are shown in Fig. 4a. For numeric fields, exact match accuracy was used as the metric. For text fields, correctness was determined based on a similarity threshold between the extracted values and the ground-truth. The results demonstrated consistent improvements by LEADS over all baselines. For example, in study characteristics extraction, LEADS achieved 0.68 compared to GPT-4o at 0.55; in arm design, LEADS reached an accuracy of 0.53 while GPT-4o achieved 0.45; in participant statistics, LEADS scored 0.94 compared to GPT-4o’s 0.55; in trial results, LEADS obtained 0.78 compared to GPT-4o’s 0.45. Open-source LLMs generally performed worse than proprietary LLMs, and medical LLMs underperformed compared to generic LLMs, likely due to their fine-tuning on question-answering datasets. Numeric extraction tasks were found to be more challenging than text extraction tasks. Some target numeric values are not explicitly stated in the raw content but require calculation, such as determining the average age of participants within a defined cohort. Specifically, in participant statistics extraction, LEADS achieved an accuracy of 0.33 while GPT-4o scored 0.20. This difficulty could be partially attributed to the misinterpretation of numerical units and discrepancies in the automatic evaluation process, requiring further human assessment.

We selected a subset and recruited two annotators to manually verify the extraction results (Fig. 4b). We found that LEADS demonstrated a margin of improvement over the baselines, with gains ranging from 1.0 to 55.9. For instance, in the study characteristic extraction task, LEADS achieved an accuracy of 66.2, compared to 59.7 for GPT-4o and 47.8 for the Mistral model. Furthermore, the accuracy of number extraction tasks improved substantially after human annotator calibration. For trial result extraction, LEADS achieved 56.7 in accuracy, outperforming GPT-4o (55.7), GPT-3.5 (51.2), Haiku (54.7), and Mistral (53.2). Across all tasks, LEADS consistently outperformed its generic counterpart, the original Mistral model, by a margin exceeding 20 points in most cases, with differences of 18.4, 34.5, 72.3, 36.2, 24.8, and 3.5 across various metrics.

We further investigated the correlation between extraction performance and input document length (Fig. 4c). Study characteristic extraction tasks tend to have the shortest inputs, primarily relying on study abstracts. In contrast, most other tasks involve inputs averaging around 10,000 tokens, equivalent to approximately 15 pages. The results indicate that cutting-edge LLMs generally exhibit minimal sensitivity to input length within their context windows, reflected in Pearson correlations that are close to zero and slightly negative. Notably, LEADS demonstrates a significant positive correlation with input length ($\rho = 0.22$, $P = 1.5 \times 10^{-4}$), suggesting its invariance to document length.

Expert collaboration for study screening and data extraction

We conducted a pilot user study to evaluate the practical value of LEADS for medical literature mining. Our focus was on the most time-consuming tasks: study screening and data extraction, to validate two key claims: (1) experts collaborating with AI (such as LEADS) can complete these tasks more quickly than through manual efforts alone, and (2) this collaboration does not compromise the quality of the results. To test these claims, we implemented a two-arm design: one involving experts working independently (Expert-only) and the other combining expert efforts with AI assistance (Expert+AI).

Fig. 5a illustrates the setup for screening tasks. Each participant was assigned 10 review topics and tasked with selecting 10 citations from a pool of 30 candidates for inclusion in each review. Participants were randomly assigned to either Arm A (Expert-only) or Arm B (Expert+AI) for half of their review topics to ensure a balanced evaluation. In Arm B, participants can refer to LEADS’s assessments: all candidate citations were ranked, with additional criterion-level assessments and the explanation provided. This design allowed us to estimate both the time required and the quality of screening results. Extended Fig. 1 includes the forms used in both arms, distributed to participants for completion. We invited 14 clinicians from various departments, such as Neurology, Ophthalmology, and Dermatology, to participate in the study (Fig. 5b). All participants held MD degrees; nine were attending physicians, while the remaining five were fellows or residents. We ensured that clinicians were assigned review topics aligning with their specialties. Fig. 5c shows the number of studies screened and selected by the participants across review topics, with a total of 140 reviews conducted and 4,200 studies screened.

Fig. 5d presents the average screening quality and time spent. We calculated Recall by comparing the expert-finalized study list for each review topic against the studies included in the corresponding systematic reviews. Additionally, the time spent on each review was recorded. The results demonstrate that LEADS’s support significantly enhances the study screening process. The Expert+AI arm achieved a Recall of 0.81, compared to 0.77 in the Expert-only arm, while reducing the average time spent from 580 seconds to 449 seconds, representing a 22.6% relative time savings. Participants noted that AI screening results were particularly helpful for quickly excluding studies with a score of -1, deemed irrelevant, and safely including those scored as 1, which is verified by the distribution of all experts-made decisions and the confusion matrices (Extended Fig. 3). While intermediate-ranked studies still required closer review, the rationale provided by LEADS for PICO eligibility scores served as a valuable aid. Given that the candidate study list in this experiment was relatively short (30 studies), more significant time savings are expected in real-world practice, where researchers typically screen hundreds to thousands of studies.

Fig. 5f categorizes completed review topics based on the time spent (e.g., 0–180 seconds, 180–360 seconds, etc.), with longer durations generally indicating more challenging reviews. Overall, the Expert+AI arm performed comparably to the Expert-only arm in the less challenging categories, where review times were under 720 seconds. For example, in the least challenging group (0–180 seconds), the Expert+AI arm achieved a Recall of 0.9, compared to 0.8 for the Expert-only arm. However, a notable performance gap emerged as the review tasks became more challenging. In the 720–900 seconds group, the Expert+AI arm achieved a Recall of 1.0, compared to 0.74 for the Expert-only arm. Similarly, in the >900 seconds group, the Expert+AI arm achieved a Recall of 0.89, while the Expert-only arm achieved 0.76.

Fig. 5e illustrates the setup for the pilot user study on data extraction tasks. Each participant was assigned 90 clinical trial publications and tasked with completing four types of data extraction: study characteristics, arm design, participant characteristics, and trial results, resulting in a total of 360 extraction tasks per participant. Two medical researchers were randomly assigned to Arm A (Expert-only) for half of their extraction tasks and Arm B (Expert+AI) for the other half. In Arm B, participants received LEADS’s extraction outputs as references for the target fields. Additionally, participants recorded and reported the time spent on each extraction task. The extraction results were reviewed by two additional annotators and compared against ground truth to calculate accuracy. The forms used for completing the data extraction tasks are provided in Extended Fig. 2.

Fig. 5g presents the average data extraction accuracy and time spent in the two study arms. The Expert+AI arm achieved an accuracy of 0.85, compared to 0.80 in the Expert-only arm, while reducing the average time spent per task from 113.9 seconds to 83.3 seconds, resulting in a 26.9% relative time savings. Participants noted that while LEADS’s extraction results were not flawless and required verification, they were helpful for quickly locating relevant information within the paper for review and correction. In contrast, participants in the Expert-only arm spent much of their time thoroughly reading the entire paper, leading to significantly longer task durations.

Fig. 5h provides a breakdown across extraction tasks and review topics. We compared accuracy and time between the two arms by aggregating results for studies focused on the same disease areas. The points on the diagonal line indicate that the two arms performed equivalently. The analysis revealed that both arms achieved comparable extraction accuracy overall. Among the tasks, study characteristic extraction showed the highest accuracy, while participant characteristic extraction had the lowest. Regarding time, the Expert-only arm consistently required significantly more time than the Expert+AI arm. The smallest time difference was observed in study characteristic extraction, whereas the difference was much larger for trial result extraction. Participants noted that study characteristics are often found in the paper’s abstract, making them easier to extract. In contrast, participant characteristics and trial results are typically located in the main content, making them more challenging and time-consuming to extract.

Discussion

Performing systematic literature reviews is a cornerstone of evidence-based medicine. However, the process has become increasingly time-intensive and challenging due to the ever-growing literature volume. To address these challenges, large language models (LLMs) have been employed for various literature review tasks.^{11,13,17,27,29,46} However, existing models have been developed or evaluated on datasets with limited scope, usually covering only tens of systematic reviews and hundreds of studies.^{33,47} To overcome these limitations, we created a comprehensive dataset comprising 21,335 systematic reviews, 453,625 publications, and 27,015 clinical trial registries. This dataset establishes a robust foundation for evaluating AI algorithms across a broad spectrum of therapeutic areas.

From the collected literature data, we developed LEADSInstruct comprising 633,759 instruction data points. Leveraging LEADSInstruct, we fine-tuned LLMs to create LEADS, a foundation model designed for study search, screening, and data extraction, with broad applicability across broad therapeutic areas. The instruction-following capability of LEADS allows it to adapt easily to various input requirements, such as inclusion and exclusion criteria for study screening. Its superior performance was demonstrated through extensive evaluations using the largest benchmark dataset available for medical literature mining. Compared to generic LLMs, many of which are significantly larger, LEADS consistently outperformed them across six validation datasets. These results underscore the potential of developing specialized foundation models for literature mining, using relatively smaller models and an automated pipeline for curating instruction data.

LEADS provides valuable assistance to medical experts and systematic reviewers by streamlining the literature mining process and maintaining higher quality than purely manual efforts. In a pilot user study involving 14 clinicians, experts could more effectively identify relevant studies by leveraging LEADS’s overall eligibility scores, PICO eligibility predictions, and rationales. This collaboration resulted in an average time savings of 22.6%, a Recall improvement of 5.2%, and a notable 26.1% Recall increase for more challenging review topics. Additionally, the pilot study with two medical researchers demonstrated that LEADS significantly enhances data extraction efficiency and accuracy. By referencing LEADS’s extraction results, participants achieved a 6.2% accuracy improvement and reduced their time spent by 26.9%. These findings highlight the substantial benefits of human-AI collaboration in enhancing the literature mining process.

This study has several limitations. First, while LEADS demonstrates state-of-the-art performance in medical literature mining tasks, its effectiveness relies on the quality of

the training data sourced from medical literature and the instruction data generation pipeline. Addressing issues such as potential biases, outdated information, and errors in the data remains a critical area for improvement. Second, the pilot user study setup could be refined to improve the dissemination of findings, e.g., increasing the number of participants and evaluating LEADS in scenarios that more closely simulate real-world tasks, such as screening thousands of candidate citations instead of the 30 used in this study. Third, further research is necessary to optimize LLMs' outputs to integrate AI assistance into systematic review workflows and enhance its practical utility. For example, additional instruction data development is required to cover all tasks necessary for completing systematic literature reviews, such as assessing study quality and evidence uncertainty. Finally, despite its promising performance, applying LEADS in medical literature mining must be cautiously approached. Rigorous expert oversight is essential to ensure accuracy and to prevent biased or erroneous outputs. Such validation is particularly critical when using AI for systematic reviews, as errors could lead to the dissemination of misleading or incorrect clinical evidence.

LEADS demonstrates superior performance in literature search, screening, and data extraction, outperforming generic LLMs. It generalizes across a wide range of therapeutic areas without requiring additional training. LEADS showcases its value as an assistant for medical researchers, clinicians, and systematic reviewers by streamlining the literature mining process and facilitating evidence-based medicine. We anticipate that the continued development and validation of foundation models for literature mining will ultimately foster more effective human-AI collaboration to advance healthcare and drug development.

Methods

Data collection

The systematic review, publication, and clinical trial data were sourced from publicly available datasets. We began by obtaining a list of medical systematic reviews from the MS2 multi-document summarization dataset,⁴⁸ which links each review to the studies included in its analysis. This dataset provided an ideal foundation for generating instruction data related to literature search and screening. For PubMed citations, we utilized the PubMed API to retrieve metadata and abstract information.⁴⁹ We also attempted to link PubMed citations to clinical trial records on ClinicalTrials.gov, leveraging explicit NCT IDs (clinical trial identifiers) available in some PubMed citations. This linkage enabled the creation of a connection between systematic reviews and trial records, forming the basis for publication search data. To ensure data quality, we removed duplicates, citations lacking essential information, and reviews without associated citations. After processing, the dataset comprised 21,335 systematic reviews linked to 453,625 publication citations and 8,485 systematic reviews linked to 27,015 trial citations, with publication-based reviews averaging 21.26 citations each. To standardize the input for the search query generation and the study eligibility assessment tasks, we adopted GPT-4o to extract the PICO elements from the reviews' abstracts.

The data extraction tasks were built on the links between PubMed citations and clinical trial records. We began by searching the PubMed database and filtering for entries with an associated NCT ID, which indicates a corresponding clinical trial, and full-text availability through PubMed Central (PMC). These criteria ensured that the complete content of each study could be automatically retrieved. For clinical trials, we further filtered for records with reported results to ensure the availability of outcome data. This process resulted in a dataset of 8,674 paired publications and clinical trial records. For each trial, we retrieved structured data using the ClinicalTrials.gov API,⁵⁰ establishing a link between the publication content and structured information on study design, population statistics, and outcome data.

LEADSInstruct: Task formulation

We formulated the key literature mining tasks into instruction data that is suitable for LLM processing. The first task, literature search, according to PRISMA guidelines,³⁷ refers to identifying initial publication records or clinical trial registries from databases. Practitioners typically provide keywords as search queries to search engines, applying basic filters such as year range, publication type, and more, to generate a broad pool of potential study candidates. We define this task as a *search query generation* process, where LLMs take user-defined research questions as input and synthesize or expand the associated key terms for treatments and conditions (Fig. 2a). Users can then review and iteratively refine these terms when retrieving records from search engines.

The second task, citation screening, assesses the eligibility of initially retrieved records based on predefined review protocols, such as PICO elements, to produce a shortlist of studies for review. We define this task as a *study eligibility assessment* process. Unlike previous approaches that rely on LLMs to make overall assessments on whether to include or exclude each citation,³¹ our approach provides assessment at the criterion level for each specific inclusion and exclusion criterion. This granular approach offers greater flexibility, allowing users to adjust the filtering and ranking of citations by manipulating the criterion-level predictions and the referenced rationales. For example, users can introduce new criteria, select studies based on a subset of criteria, or convert criterion-level predictions into relevance scores. These scores can then be aggregated to rank study eligibility, providing a dynamic and customizable method for prioritizing citations (Fig. 3d).

The third task, data extraction, is a critical step where users review the selected studies to extract key information such as study design and outcomes, enabling the creation of a structured summary for further analysis. We define four subtasks within this process: *study characteristic extraction*, *arm design extraction*, *participant statistics extraction*, and *trial result extraction*, illustrated in Fig. 4d. Study characteristic extraction identifies and extracts predefined fields, such as conditions and interventions, from the study content. Arm design extraction focuses on extracting details about study arms, including their names and types, based on specified fields. Participant statistics extraction requires defining cohorts, typically by treatment groups or observed conditions, and extracting relevant statistics, such as participant counts for each cohort. In trial result extraction, the inputs include the definitions of target cohorts and outcomes, along with the fields of interest, to retrieve information such as parameter type, result unit, timeframe, cohort sample size, and result values.

To optimize AI models for these tasks, we need to develop an instruction dataset consisting of paired input requests and their expected outputs. Such datasets enable instruction tuning of generic large language models, such as Llama⁴² and Mistral,³⁸ to enhance their task-specific performance.⁵¹ Although previous works have created datasets for related tasks,^{29,33} these datasets are either not aligned with our specific tasks or are too small to train LLMs. In medical applications, adapting LLMs typically requires high-quality instruction data at scales ranging from tens of thousands to millions.^{43,44,52,53} The instruction data follows a standardized structure comprising three components: (1) instruction, which describes the task, such as generating search terms; (2) input, which provides the task-specific input, such as the PICO elements defined in a target review; and (3) output, which specifies the expected results that the LLMs should produce.

However, manually creating such datasets is prohibitively labor-intensive, especially as it requires annotators with advanced medical expertise. To address this challenge, it has become common practice to leverage advanced generalist LLMs, such as GPT-4,²⁰ to synthesize outputs based on input instructions, a method known as self-instruct.⁵⁴ This approach has been widely adopted in recent developments of medical LLMs.^{55,56} However, while GPT-4 can produce high-quality outputs, it is not immune to errors, which can limit the reliability of models trained on synthetic instruction data.⁵⁷ To mitigate this issue, we developed a hybrid approach that combines mining instruction data directly from publications and clinical trial registries with augmenting outputs using generalist AI. In total, we compiled 633,759 instruction data across various medical literature mining tasks.

LEADSInstruct: Search query generation

For search query generation tasks, the input is the research question defined using the PICO framework in the review, to generate a set of queries capable of retrieving all ground-truth studies from the literature (Fig. 2a). In our previous study, we observed that queries directly synthesized by GPT-4o typically retrieved fewer than 10% of ground-truth studies in the search results.²⁹ To improve the quality of search queries generated by GPT-4o, we developed an advanced pipeline that synthesizes query terms from each included study, incorporating an iterative refinement and filtering process to optimize the initial terms. This approach significantly increased the coverage of synthetic queries, retrieving over 80% of ground-truth studies, making it possible for LEADS to surpass GPT-4o while learning from GPT-4o’s outputs. This process yields a total of 29,693 samples.

Specifically, consider that there are N ground-truth studies for a review topic. Our aim is to build a comprehensive set of keyword sets, for population $\{P_1, \dots, P_N\}$ and intervention $\{I_1, \dots, I_N\}$, to build the search query that can identify all the ground-truth studies from the literature. As such, for the n -th study, we prompted GPT-4o to extract $P_n = \{p_1^n, \dots, p_M^n\}$ and $I_n = \{i_1^n, \dots, i_M^n\}$ from the study content (The used prompt is in Extended Fig. 17). The number of terms M is set to be at most ten so the exact extracted numbers are varied. Then, we merge all terms in P_n with the AND logic and merge all P taking the OR logic, leading to the aggregated population-related search query:

$$\mathbf{S}_P = S_P^1 \text{ OR } S_P^2 \dots \text{ OR } S_P^N, \quad (1)$$

where each $S_P^n = p_1^n \text{ AND } p_2^n \dots \text{ AND } p_M^n$. Similarly, we obtained the aggregated intervention-related search query:

$$\mathbf{S}_I = S_I^1 \text{ OR } S_I^2 \dots \text{ OR } S_I^N, \quad (2)$$

where each $S_I^n = i_1^n \text{ AND } i_2^n \dots \text{ AND } i_M^n$. We hence built the final search query by merging \mathbf{S}_P and \mathbf{S}_I , yielding the synthetic target search query $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{S}_P \text{ AND } \mathbf{S}_I$.

In practice, we validate the generated search query \mathbf{S} by executing it via the PubMed API and calculating the search recall. Queries with a recall below 0.2 are filtered out as poorly generated. The remaining queries are then designated as synthetic ground-truth queries, achieving an average recall of 0.82. Finally, we wrap this query with a search query generation prompt (Extended Fig. 8) to create an instruction dataset, resulting in 10,262 entries.

To benchmark the search query generation performance for LEADS and the other LLMs, we prompted them to generate the search query $\hat{\mathbf{S}}$ taking the review’s PICO definition as the input (Fig. 2a). In addition, we introduced LEADS+ensemble, an extension of LEADS that samples ten queries $\{\hat{\mathbf{S}}_1 \dots \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{10}\}$ from the model. Then, we executed all queries and returned the aggregated and deduplicated search results as the final outputs.

LEADSInstruct: Study eligibility assessment

Study eligibility assessment evaluates whether a study meets predefined eligibility criteria based on specific guidelines, structured around PICO elements: Population, Intervention, Comparison, and Outcome. We extracted the study selection criteria defined in systematic reviews and categorized each criterion into P, I, C, or O elements. Assuming that all ground-truth studies included in the reviews meet these criteria, we utilized GPT-4o to generate rationales for criterion-level eligibility assessments (Fig. 3d). Additionally, we included citations retrieved during the search process that were not incorporated into the reviews and used GPT-4o to generate both eligibility predictions and corresponding rationales, creating a balanced instruction dataset. This process resulted in a comprehensive dataset comprising 461,585 review-to-citation eligibility prediction pairs.

In detail, candidate publications or trials were constructed from the search results described earlier. Citations were initially added to the candidate pool, and if fewer than 2,000 entries were available, the remaining slots were filled with additional search results generated using other PICO elements. A time constraint was applied to ensure that the

studies to be screened were published before the target review paper. For each systematic review, a method must evaluate up to 2,000 studies, scoring and ranking them to ensure that ground-truth studies appear at the top. The dataset was split into training, development, and test sets using a 6:2:2 ratio, resulting in 12,801 training reviews, 4,217 development reviews, and 4,217 test reviews for publications. Due to the high computational cost of requiring LLMs to review 2,000 studies per systematic review, a subset of 200 test entries was created for LLM evaluation.

We constructed instruction tuning data for study eligibility assessment based on the training split for publication eligibility prediction. For systematic review purposes, each study must be scored and ranked accordingly. However, the ground-truth data only indicate whether a candidate study is eligible for inclusion in a review. To address this, we prompted GPT-4o to analyze eligibility as shown in Fig. 18. We provided GPT-4 with each study’s PICO elements as criteria, the study content, and an overall indication of eligibility. GPT-4 then generated an eligibility analysis, offering a rationale for each criterion. Each criterion was rated as “YES,” “PARTIAL,” “UNCERTAIN,” or “NO,” corresponding to scores of 1, 0.5, 0, and -1, respectively. The final eligibility score was calculated as the average of all criterion scores:

$$\text{Final eligibility score} = \frac{\sum(\text{Criterion scores})}{N} \quad (3)$$

These generated analyses were stored as outputs for the instruction data. We then wrapped the analysis, paper content, and criteria with the prompt in Extended Fig. 9 as instruction data. This process was applied across 12,801 reviews and their 2,000 candidate studies in each review. Finally, we filtered out studies marked as eligible but with a negative overall score, resulting in a total of 461,585 entries.

LEADSInstruct: Data extraction

The linkage between publications and clinical trial registries facilitates the automated creation of extraction data. On ClinicalTrials.gov, trial records are input by principal investigators, including high-quality structured information such as conditions, interventions, enrollment numbers, study types, and, in some cases, reported results. We assume that clinical trial-related publications linked to these trial records also contain descriptions of this information within their content. Leveraging this connection, we identified 8,674 linked publications with full-text availability and corresponding clinical trial records with reported results. By extracting structured trial information and parsing the PDF content of the publications, we generated 58,593 instruction data points for study characteristic extraction, 42,794 for trial result extraction, 34,138 for participant statistics extraction, and 26,387 for arm design extraction (Fig. 1a).

The arm design extraction dataset is constructed from matched publications and their associated trials. Each entry includes the full text and table content of the publication as input, from which arm design details are systematically extracted. The results field serves as the output, containing a list of intervention arms, where each arm specifies a unique label, type (e.g., “EXPERIMENTAL”), description, and the intervention names involved. The ground-truth result fields are extracted from trial reports. This structure enables efficient extraction of arm design information from publication content, with each entry capturing detailed intervention characteristics (Fig. 4d).

The participant statistics extraction dataset is derived from matched publications and their corresponding clinical trials. For each entry, we include the full text of the publication, including any table content, and extract key attributes from the clinical trial reports, such as measure definition, parameter type, unit of measurement, and participant group definitions. Each participant group entry includes a unique group ID, unit, value, and definition. Additionally, the dataset contains a list of results, with each result specifying a group ID, a value, and any relevant notes. Here, results serve as the output, while the other fields constitute the input. The value represents specific participant statistics as defined by the input parameters (Fig. 4d).

The trial result extraction dataset is built from paired publications and their corresponding clinical trials. For each entry, we extract the full text of the publication, including the main content and any text from the tables. From the trial report, we extract the outcome definition, group definition, parameter type, unit of measurement, specified timeframe, denominator unit, and denominator value. Each entry also includes a list of results, each providing a specific value and a descriptive title in a trial report. The input consists of outcome and group definitions, while the other fields are outputs. The value represents a specific outcome of the trial as defined by the input parameters (Fig. 4d).

We construct data extraction instruction tuning data from the training split across four data extraction tasks. For each entry, we format the data with prompts specific to each task: study characteristic extraction (Fig. 10), arm design extraction (Extended Fig. 11), participant statistics extraction (Extended Fig. 12), and trial result extraction (Extended Fig. 13).

LEADS: Model training

LEADS was built upon the Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.3 model,³⁸ chosen for its inherently long context window. We fine-tuned this base model on the LEADSInstruct dataset, resulting in the LEADS model. The training used the data type bfloat16 for enhanced computational efficiency. We trained our model using the AdamW optimizer⁵⁸ for one epoch with a batch size of 5. A cosine learning rate scheduler was adopted, with a peak learning rate of 1×10^{-6} and a warm-up phase covering 10% of the training steps. The maximum sequence length was set to 30,000 tokens to accommodate the lengthy full-text literature in data extraction tasks. We implemented the code using PyTorch⁵⁹ and HuggingFace Transformers library.⁶⁰ To improve training speed and optimize memory usage, we integrated DeepSpeed ZeRO-3⁶¹ and FlashAttention-2⁶² strategies. After completing the instruction tuning process, we obtained the final LEADS model. The instruction tuning was performed on 5 Nvidia A100 80G GPUs over approximately 2.5 days.

Details of automatic evaluation

Study search experiments were conducted for both publication and trial search tasks. We compared LEADS against generative language models by using them to generate queries, which were then executed through the PubMed API or CTGov API to retrieve search results. The selected competing LLMs included GPT-3.5-turbo, GPT-4o, and Claude-3.5-Haiku. Four types of prompts were designed to adapt these models for query generation: zero-shot, few-shot, in-context learning (ICL), and a combination of ICL and few-shot, as illustrated in Extended Fig. 14. Additionally, we evaluated Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.3, the base model used for training LEADS, as a baseline. Search performance was measured using recall@3000, which is defined as the proportion of ground-truth studies retrieved within the top 3000 search results. This metric was calculated for both publication and trial search tasks. For Mistral and LEADS, the prompts used to generate search queries are shown in Extended Fig. 8. To further enhance search performance, we implemented an ensemble approach (LEADS + ensemble). This approach combines all possible sets of keywords generated by LEADS for population and intervention terms, maximizing coverage and retrieving the most comprehensive results possible.

In the study screening experiments, each systematic review involves 2,000 candidate citations that need to be scored and ranked based on PICO elements. The performance of the selected methods is evaluated using recall@ K , where K is set to 10, 20, or other specified values. We tested two types of methods: dense retrieval models and LLMs. Dense retrieval models generate text embeddings for the PICO elements and the content of candidate studies, calculate cosine similarity scores between these embeddings, and rank the studies accordingly. While these models are computationally efficient, they generally exhibit lower performance. For dense retrieval, we used OpenAI’s text-embedding-small model. For LLM-based study screening, we tested GPT-3.5-turbo, GPT-4o, and Claude-3.5-Haiku, employing two types of prompts: a simple prompt that assigns a score from 1 to 10 (Extended Fig. 15), and an advanced prompt (Extended Fig. 16) that uses a

two-stage approach, first generating criteria and then scoring based on those criteria. For LEADS and its base model, Mistral, we used the same prompt format (Extended Fig. 9) to generate eligibility predictions. The final score of each study was calculated using the same methodology applied during the creation of instruction data.

Data extraction tasks include study characteristics, arm design, participant statistics, and trial result extraction. We employ both proprietary LLMs (GPT-3.5-turbo, GPT-4o, and Claude-3.5-haiku) and open-source LLMs (Meta-Llama-3-8B-Instruct,⁴² Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.3,³⁸ MedAlpaca,⁴⁴ and BioMistral⁴³). The first two open-source models are popular LLMs for general domains, while the latter two are fine-tuned LLMs for the medical domain. For all these models and LEADS, we use the same prompts (Extended Figs. 10, 11, 12, 13) to generate extraction results. We evaluate extraction performance through both automated testing and manual evaluation. For automated testing, we assess fields containing numerical and textual data. Numerical fields require exact matching, while textual fields use soft matching. For textual fields, we use text embeddings to calculate the similarity between predictions and ground-truth values, applying a cosine similarity threshold of 0.75. Predictions exceeding this threshold are considered correct. Participant statistics extraction and trial result extraction both contain numerical fields, so we report results for text and numerical fields separately. For manual evaluation, we randomly select 75 studies from each data extraction task, totaling 300 cases per model prediction. The selected studies are the same across all models used for evaluation. Each predicted result is manually compared with the ground truth for each field, and we report results separately for both textual and numerical fields.

Details of pilot user study

To prepare the data for the study screening task, we collected 30 candidate studies for each systematic review, with up to 10 of these studies included in the reference systematic review paper, which we used as the reference answer. Each systematic review was categorized into a therapeutic area. Clinicians were asked to select one area aligned with their expertise, and 10 review topics were assigned within their chosen area. Clinicians were tasked with selecting up to 10 studies per review topic that met the PICO framework. Of the 10 review topics, 5 were completed under the Expert-only arm, where clinicians made decisions independently. In the remaining 5 topics, clinicians participated in the Expert+AI arm, where they received assistance from LEADS.

To prepare the data for the Expert+AI arm, we ran LEADS to assess the PICO criteria from each target review, generating study eligibility assessments for all 30 candidate studies. These predictions included an overall eligibility score, PICO eligibility assessments, and rationales. The results were compiled into a spreadsheet ranking the 30 candidate studies, which served as a reference for clinicians in the Expert+AI arm. Extended Fig. 1 provides examples of the forms used in both arms, distributed to participants for completion. The study involved 14 clinicians from various specialties, including Neurology (3), Ophthalmology (2), Dermatology (2), Internal Medicine (2), Respiratory Medicine (2), Radiology (1), Gastroenterology (1), and Nephrology (1). Among them, nine are attending physicians, three are in fellowship, and two are in residency, ensuring a diverse and representative participant pool for the study.

For the data extraction user study, we collected 90 clinical trial studies covering a range of topics from a variety of specialties including Ophthalmology, Dermatology, Neurology, Internal Medicine, Radiology, Nephrology, Alzheimer’s Disease, Cardiology, and Gastroenterology, with 10 studies per specialty. Each study included four distinct tasks: study characteristic extraction, participant statistics extraction, arm design extraction, and trial result extraction, resulting in a total of 360 tasks. We invited two medical researchers to participate in the study. Each participant was assigned 180 in the Expert-only arm and another 180 in the Expert+AI arm. For the Expert+AI arm, LEADS was used to perform the four data extraction tasks, generating AI outputs that were provided as references for the participants. The forms for both arms, sent to the participants for completion, are shown in Extended Fig. 2. To evaluate the results, two additional annotators

reviewed the submitted outputs, assessing each field as either correct or incorrect. These assessments were then used to compute the overall extraction accuracy for the study.




Figure 1: **Overview of LEADS and LEADSInstruct.** **a**, LEADSInstruct consists of 20K+ systematic reviews, 453K+ publications, and 27K+ clinical trials linked across data sources. A hybrid approach is adopted to transform the linked data into instruction data covering six tasks in literature mining. **b**, Bar plot showing the number of reviews covering different conditions. **c**, Bar plot showing the number of reviews covering different interventions. **d**, Comparative performance analysis contrasting LEADS with cutting-edge proprietary AI and open-source AI models. The evaluation metrics include Recall for search query generation, Recall@50 for study eligibility assessment, and Accuracy for the remaining tasks. **e**, Density plot of the number of tokens in the inputs and outputs of the instruction datasets. **f**, Illustration of the experimental setups. **g**, Illustration of the user study setup.




Figure 2: **LEADS performs literature search tasks.** **a**, Illustration of how LEADS receives the research question definition, performs search query generation, and retrieves citations from the literature. **b**, Distribution of the condition topics of the reviews and involved citations in the dataset. **c**, Search query generation performance of LEADS and the leading models, in terms of the Recall achieved by the identified studies. The information in parentheses indicates the performance change of baselines compared to LEADS or LEADS compared to the best baseline in the same task. **d**, Topic-wise comparison of LEADS to GPT-4o in terms of the Recall yielded by the generated search query. LEADS + ensemble indicates an ensembling of multiple search queries. **e**, Performance of LEADS and GPT-4o regarding the varied number of target studies for each review. The error bar indicates 95% confidence interval, omitted when the sample size is smaller than ten.




Figure 3: **LEADS performs citation screening tasks.** **a**, Radar plot of Recall@50, comparing LEADS to cutting-edge LLMs and dense retrieval across various review condition topics. **b**, Recall performance of LEADS comparing to other LLMs and dense retrieval. The information in parentheses indicates the performance change of baselines compared to LEADS. **c**, Performance of LEADS and baselines regarding the varied number of target studies for each review. **d**, Illustration of how LEADS receives the study inclusion and exclusion criteria defined for target PICO elements, makes eligibility prediction, and ranks the target studies.




Figure 4: **LEADS** performs data extraction tasks. **a**, Accuracy of LEADS and other LLMs across four extraction tasks via automatic evaluation. **b**, Accuracy of LEADS and other LLMs across four extraction tasks via manual evaluation. **c**, Accuracy of LEADS and other LLMs regarding the varied length of input documents across four extraction tasks via manual evaluation. The red line indicates the regression line, and the shaded area is the 95% confidence interval. ρ and P indicate Pearson's correlation coefficient and the significance level, respectively. **d**, Illustration of how LEADS performs four extraction tasks via in-context learning. Based on the definition of target field and cohorts, LEADS processes study documents and produces structured outputs.




Figure 5: **Pilot user studies for study screening and data extraction.** **a**, the setup of Expert-only arm (Arm A) and Expert+AI arm (Arm B) for study screening tasks. We compare the resulting Recall to evaluate the quality of the time spent per review topic on average to evaluate the speed. **b**, the distributions of experts' expertise topics and levels participated in the user study. **c**, the number of medical studies screened and selected across review topics by the participants. **d**, the overall result quality and time spent across two arms in the study screening tasks. **e**, the setup of Expert-only arm (Arm A) and Expert+AI arm (Arm B) for data extraction tasks. We compare the resulting accuracy to evaluate the quality and the time spent per extraction task on average to evaluate the speed. **f**, the screening quality varied across the groups and stratified the time spent working on each individual review topic. Expert+AI yields consistently better performance than Expert only, especially when the tasks are difficult, taking more time to perform screening. **g**, the overall accuracy and time spent across two arms in the data extraction tasks. **h**, comparing the accuracy and time spent for data extraction tasks between arms. Each point indicates the average accuracy or time spent on extraction tasks belonging to the same topic.

References

- [1] Jensen, L. J., Saric, J. & Bork, P. Literature mining for the biologist: from information retrieval to biological discovery. *Nature reviews genetics* **7**, 119–129 (2006).
- [2] Field, A. P. & Gillett, R. How to do a meta-analysis. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology* **63**, 665–694 (2010).
- [3] Ioannidis, J. P. The mass production of redundant, misleading, and conflicted systematic reviews and meta-analyses. *The Milbank Quarterly* **94**, 485–514 (2016).
- [4] Medline pubmed production statistics. https://www.nlm.nih.gov/bsd/medline_pubmed_production_stats.html. Accessed: 2024-09-11.
- [5] Borah, R., Brown, A. W., Capers, P. L. & Kaiser, K. A. Analysis of the time and workers needed to conduct systematic reviews of medical interventions using data from the prospero registry. *BMJ open* **7**, e012545 (2017).
- [6] Michelson, M. & Reuter, K. The significant cost of systematic reviews and meta-analyses: a call for greater involvement of machine learning to assess the promise of clinical trials. *Contemporary clinical trials communications* **16**, 100443 (2019).
- [7] Uttley, L. *et al.* The problems with systematic reviews: a living systematic review. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* **156**, 30–41 (2023).
- [8] Elliott, J. *et al.* Decision makers need constantly updated evidence synthesis. *Nature* **600**, 383–385 (2021).
- [9] Hoffmeyer, B. D., Andersen, M. Z., Fønnes, S. & Rosenberg, J. Most cochrane reviews have not been updated for more than 5 years. *Journal of evidence-based medicine* **14**, 181–184 (2021).
- [10] Frijters, R. *et al.* Literature mining for the discovery of hidden connections between drugs, genes and diseases. *PLoS computational biology* **6**, e1000943 (2010).
- [11] Wang, S., Scells, H., Koopman, B. & Zuccon, G. Can chatgpt write a good boolean query for systematic review literature search? In *Proceedings of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, 1426–1436 (2023).
- [12] Adam, G. P. *et al.* Literature search sandbox: a large language model that generates search queries for systematic reviews. *JAMIA open* **7**, ooae098 (2024).
- [13] Syriani, E., David, I. & Kumar, G. Assessing the ability of chatgpt to screen articles for systematic reviews. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.06464* (2023).
- [14] Jin, Q. *et al.* Medcpt: Contrastive pre-trained transformers with large-scale pubmed search logs for zero-shot biomedical information retrieval. *Bioinformatics* **39** (2023). URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btad651>.
- [15] Wadhwa, S., DeYoung, J., Nye, B., Amir, S. & Wallace, B. C. Jointly extracting interventions, outcomes, and findings from rct reports with llms. In *Machine Learning for Healthcare Conference*, 754–771 (PMLR, 2023).
- [16] Zhang, G. *et al.* A span-based model for extracting overlapping pico entities from randomized controlled trial publications. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* **31**, 1163–1171 (2024).
- [17] Shaib, C. *et al.* Summarizing, simplifying, and synthesizing medical evidence using gpt-3 (with varying success). In *The 61st Annual Meeting Of The Association For Computational Linguistics* (2023).
- [18] Wallace, B. C., Saha, S., Soboczenski, F. & Marshall, I. J. Generating (factual?) narrative summaries of RCTs: Experiments with neural multi-document summarization. *AMIA Summits on Translational Science Proceedings* **2021**, 605 (2021).
- [19] Peng, Y., Rousseau, J. F., Shortliffe, E. H. & Weng, C. Ai-generated text may have a role in evidence-based medicine. *Nature Medicine* **29**, 1593–1594 (2023).
- [20] OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report (2024). [2303.08774](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.08774).

- [21] Moor, M. *et al.* Foundation models for generalist medical artificial intelligence. *Nature* **616**, 259–265 (2023).
- [22] Wang, Z. *et al.* A perspective for adapting generalist ai to specialized medical ai applications and their challenges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.00024* (2024).
- [23] Brown, T. *et al.* Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **33**, 1877–1901 (2020).
- [24] Wei, J. *et al.* Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **35**, 24824–24837 (2022).
- [25] Lewis, P. *et al.* Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **33**, 9459–9474 (2020).
- [26] Keloth, V. K. *et al.* Advancing entity recognition in biomedicine via instruction tuning of large language models. *Bioinformatics* **40**, btae163 (2024).
- [27] Zhang, G. *et al.* Closing the gap between open source and commercial large language models for medical evidence summarization. *npj Digital Medicine* **7**, 239 (2024).
- [28] Kiritchenko, S., De Bruijn, B., Carini, S., Martin, J. & Sim, I. Exact: automatic extraction of clinical trial characteristics from journal publications. *BMC medical informatics and decision making* **10**, 1–17 (2010).
- [29] Wang, Z. *et al.* Accelerating clinical evidence synthesis with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.17755* (2024).
- [30] Chen, C. *et al.* ClinicalBench: Can llms beat traditional ml models in clinical prediction? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.06469* (2024).
- [31] Sanghera, R. *et al.* High-performance automated abstract screening with large language model ensembles. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.02451* (2024).
- [32] Oami, T., Okada, Y. & Nakada, T.-a. Performance of a large language model in screening citations. *JAMA network open* **7**, e2420496–e2420496 (2024).
- [33] Kusa, W., E Mendoza, O., Samwald, M., Knoth, P. & Hanbury, A. CSMed: Bridging the dataset gap in automated citation screening for systematic literature reviews. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **36** (2024).
- [34] Yun, H., Marshall, I., Trikalinos, T. & Wallace, B. C. Appraising the potential uses and harms of llms for medical systematic reviews. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 10122–10139 (2023).
- [35] Harvey, H. B. & Gowda, V. How the fda regulates ai. *Academic radiology* **27**, 58–61 (2020).
- [36] Norden, J. G. & Shah, N. R. What ai in health care can learn from the long road to autonomous vehicles. *NEJM Catalyst Innovations in Care Delivery* **3** (2022).
- [37] Page, M. J. *et al.* The prisma 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *Bmj* **372** (2021).
- [38] Jiang, A. Q. *et al.* Mistral 7b (2023). URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.06825>. 2310.06825.
- [39] Hello gpt-4o. <https://openai.com/index/hello-gpt-4o/>. Accessed: 2024-12-15.
- [40] Introducing chatgpt. <https://openai.com/index/chatgpt/>. Accessed: 2024-12-15.
- [41] Claude 3 haiku: our fastest model yet. <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-haiku>. Accessed: 2024-12-15.
- [42] Dubey, A. *et al.* The llama 3 herd of models (2024). URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.21783>. 2407.21783.
- [43] Labrak, Y. *et al.* Biomistral: A collection of open-source pretrained large language models for medical domains (2024). URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.10373>. 2402.10373.

- [44] Han, T. *et al.* Medalpaca – an open-source collection of medical conversational ai models and training data (2023). URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.08247>. 2304.08247.
- [45] New embedding models and api updates. <https://openai.com/index/new-embedding-models-and-api-updates/>. Accessed: 2024-12-15.
- [46] Gartlehner, G. *et al.* Data extraction for evidence synthesis using a large language model: A proof-of-concept study. *Research Synthesis Methods* (2024).
- [47] Khraisha, Q., Put, S., Kappenberg, J., Warraitch, A. & Hadfield, K. Can large language models replace humans in systematic reviews? evaluating gpt-4’s efficacy in screening and extracting data from peer-reviewed and grey literature in multiple languages. *Research Synthesis Methods* (2024).
- [48] DeYoung, J., Beltagy, I., van Zuylen, M., Kuehl, B. & Wang, L. L. Ms²: Multi-document summarization of medical studies. In *EMNLP* (2021).
- [49] Ncbi provides several public apis that allow programmatic access to many databases and tools. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/home/develop/api/>. Accessed: 2024-12-15.
- [50] Clinicaltrials.gov api. <https://clinicaltrials.gov/data-api/api>. Accessed: 2024-12-15.
- [51] Wei, J. *et al.* Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners. In *International Conference on Learning Representations* (2022).
- [52] Lin, J., Xu, H., Wang, Z., Wang, S. & Sun, J. Panacea: A foundation model for clinical trial search, summarization, design, and recruitment. *medRxiv* 2024–06 (2024).
- [53] Zhang, K. *et al.* A generalist vision–language foundation model for diverse biomedical tasks. *Nature Medicine* 1–13 (2024).
- [54] Wang, Y. *et al.* Self-instruct: Aligning language models with self-generated instructions. In *Annual Meeting Of The Association For Computational Linguistics* (2023).
- [55] Zhao, T. *et al.* A foundation model for joint segmentation, detection and recognition of biomedical objects across nine modalities. *Nature Methods* 1–11 (2024).
- [56] Li, C. *et al.* Llava-Med: Training a large language-and-vision assistant for biomedicine in one day. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **36** (2024).
- [57] Gudibande, A. *et al.* The false promise of imitating proprietary llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15717* (2023).
- [58] Loshchilov, I. & Hutter, F. Decoupled weight decay regularization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations* (2019). URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1711.05101>.
- [59] Paszke, A. *et al.* Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 32, 8024–8035 (2019). URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.01703>.
- [60] Wolf, T. *et al.* Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, 38–45 (2020). URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.03771>.
- [61] Rajbhandari, S., Rasley, J., Ruwase, O. & He, Y. Zero: Memory optimizations toward training trillion parameter models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.02054* (2020). URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.02054>.
- [62] Dao, T., Fu, D. Y., Ermon, S., Rudra, A. & Ré, C. Flashattention: Fast and memory-efficient exact attention with io-awareness. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (2022). URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.14135>.

Acknowledgements

Q.J. and Z.L. were supported in part by the Division of Intramural Research (DIR) of the National Library of Medicine (NLM), National Institutes of Health. B.A. was supported in part by the Intramural Research Programs of the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases (project number ZIA/DK075149 to B.A). J.S. was partially supported by NSF award SCH-2205289, SCH-2014438, and IIS-2034479.

a Study screening: Expert-only arm

Review 1

Title: Radioisotopes for metastatic bone pain.

Abstract: This is an update of the review published in Issue 4, 2003. Bone metastasis cause severe pain as well as pathological fractures, hypercalcaemia and spinal cord compression. Treatment strategies currently available to relieve pain from bone metastases include analgesia, radiotherapy, surgery, chemotherapy, hormone therapy, radioisotopes and bisphosphonates.

Category: Radiology

Link: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21735393>

Please select up to 10 studies.

Note: Please record the time before you start.

PMID: 1157007 || Link: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/1157007> || Title: Incidence and sites of bone lesions detected by 99mTc-polyphosphate scans in patients with tumors.

PMID: 19922311 || Link: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19922311> || Title: Treatment of metastatic spinal tumors by percutaneous vertebroplasty versus percutaneous vertebroplasty combined with interstitial implantation of 125I seeds.

PMID: 1717669 || Link: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/1717669> || Title: Rhenium-186(Sn)HEDP for treatment of painful osseous metastases: results of a double-blind crossover comparison with placebo.

PMID: 10965960 || Link: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10965960> || Title: Prevention of de novo hepatitis B infection after liver transplantation with allografts from hepatitis B core antibody positive donors.

...

PMID: 7699469 || Link: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/7699469> || Title: The bisphosphonate dilemma.

Time Spent (seconds) for this review *

Please enter the number of seconds you spent.

Your answer

b Study screening: Expert+AI arm

Review 1

Title: Radioisotopes for metastatic bone pain.

Abstract: This is an update of the review published in Issue 4, 2003. Bone metastasis cause severe pain as well as pathological fractures, hypercalcaemia and spinal cord compression. Treatment strategies currently available to relieve pain from bone metastases include analgesia, radiotherapy, surgery, chemotherapy, hormone therapy, radioisotopes and bisphosphonates.

Category: Radiology

Link: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21735393>

Please select up to 10 studies.

Our AI method has assessed the eligibility of the studies for the target review based on the below PICO framework:

- Population: Patients with intermittent claudication
- Intervention: Clotazol treatment
- Comparison: Placebo or standard care
- Outcome: Improvement in walking distance, symptoms, and quality of life

The assessment results consist of:

- (1) Overall Score: the overall relevance, the larger the more eligible
- (2) Eligibility: Yes, No, Partial, Uncertain, for each PICO element.
- (3) Rationale: The reason for AI to make the corresponding eligibility prediction.

The AI assessment results can be found here: https://zifengwang.xyz/reviews/Radiology_21735393.html.

Please refer to these AI assessment results to make your final study selection.

Note: Please record the time before you start.

PMID: 11437096 || Link: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11437096> || Title: Metastatic bone pain palliation with 89-Sr and 186-Re-HEDP in breast cancer patients. || Overall Score: 0.75

PMID: 12885803 || Link: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12885803> || Title: Repeated bone-targeted therapy for hormone-refractory prostate carcinoma: randomized phase II trial with the new, high-energy radiopharmaceutical rhenium-188 hydroxyethylidenediphosphonate. || Overall Score: 0.75

PMID: 7684865 || Link: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/7684865> || Title: Strontium-89 as an adjuvant to external beam radiation improves pain relief and delays disease progression in advanced prostate cancer: results of a randomized controlled trial. || Overall Score: 0.625

PMID: 1716935 || Link: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/1716935> || Title: A prospective, randomised double-blind crossover study to examine the efficacy of strontium-89 in pain palliation in patients with advanced prostate cancer metastatic to bone. || Overall Score: 0.5

...

PMID: 8247397 || Link: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/8247397> || Title: Beyond LOELs, p values, and vote counting: methods for looking at the shapes and strengths of associations. || Overall Score: -1

Time Spent (seconds) for this review *

Please enter the number of seconds you spent.

Your answer

c AI eligibility assessment results

Overall eligibility score Eligibility for PICO Rationale for the predictions

#	pmid	title	abstract	overall score	P-Eligibility	P-Rationale	I-Eligibility	I-Rationale	C-Eligibility	C-Rationale	O-Eligibility	O-Rationale	
1	11437096	Metastatic The study	0.75	YES	The study focus	YES	The interven	UNCERTAIN	The abstract	YES	The outcome	n	
2	12885803	Repeated We investi	0.75	YES	The study imo	YES	The interven	UNCERTAIN	The abstract	YES	The study	arms	
3	7684865	Strontium in a multic	0.625	UNCERTAIN	The paper does	YES	The interven	YES	The study co	PARTIAL	The paper	resp	
4	1716935	A prospec: The palliat	0.5	YES	The study imo	YES	The interven	NO	The compari	YES	The outcome	n	
5	1717669	Rhenium- Rhenium-	0.5	YES	The study imo	YES	The interven	NO	The compan	YES	The outcome	n	
6	15134985	Samarium A Phase III	0.5	YES	The study focus	YES	The interven	UNCERTAIN	The abstract	UNCERTAIN	The abstract	m	
7	17444845	Bone targ: The alpha	0.5	YES	The study focus	YES	The interven	UNCERTAIN	The abstract	UNCERTAIN	The abstract	dc	
8	10025832	Relatbe of 32p and 8r	0.375	YES	The paper focus	YES	The interven	NO	The paper dc	PARTIAL	The paper	addi	
9	9523068	Palliatio n To evalua	0.25	UNCERTAIN	The abstract do	YES	The interven	UNCERTAIN	The abstract	UNCERTAIN	The abstract	dc	
10	9399939	A dose-co One hund	0.25	PARTIAL	The paper imo	YES	The interven	NO	The study do	PARTIAL	The paper	resp	
11	17325885	89Sr versus Painful bo	0.25	YES	The study focus	YES	The interven	NO	The abstract	UNCERTAIN	The abstract	m	
12	12235552	The PLACC (186Re-L	0.25	YES	The study imo	YES	The interven	NO	The study is j	UNCERTAIN	The abstract	dc	
13	12879886	Role of str To explore	0.25	UNCERTAIN	The abstract do	YES	The interven	UNCERTAIN	The abstract	UNCERTAIN	The abstract	dc	
14	20044103	(99mTc)-L4, L10-19	0.25	UNCERTAIN	The abstract do	YES	The title indi	UNCERTAIN	The abstract	UNCERTAIN	The abstract	dc	
15	19922311	Treatment As the mo	0.125	YES	The paper focu	PARTIAL	The interven	NO	The paper dc	UNCERTAIN	The abstract	dc	
16	2460352	Results of Forty-nine	0.125	UNCERTAIN	The abstract do	YES	The interven	PARTIAL	The compari	NO	The outcome	fi	
17	7699469	The bisphosphonate	0	UNCERTAIN	The abstract do	UNCERTAIN	The abstract	do	UNCERTAIN	The abstract	UNCERTAIN	The abstract	dc
18	2460352	Results of Forty-nine	0.125	UNCERTAIN	The abstract do	YES	The interven	PARTIAL	The compari	NO	The outcome	fi	
19	1157007	Incidence The value	-1	NO	The paper does	NO	The paper disc	NO	The paper dc	NO	The paper	doe	
20	6773105	External n Thirty-egi	-1	NO	The population	NO	The interven	NO	The paper dc	NO	The outcome	s	
21	18789430	Ecotragic To determ	-1	NO	The paper focu	NO	The paper disc	NO	The paper dc	NO	The paper	doe	
22	7638957	Personal -The aim of	-1	NO	The paper focu	NO	The interven	NO	No comparis	NO	Outcomes	relat	

Extended Fig. 1: The forms shared with experts to complete the pilot user study for study screening. **a**, the Expert-only arm where one needs to find eligible studies from a randomly shuffled list of candidates and submit the results with the time spent. **b**, the Expert+AI arm where one needs to find eligible studies referring to the AI eligibility assessment results. **c**, the AI assessment results that participants read when making the decisions. The studies are ranked by the overall scores, with the predictions and rationale breaking down for each PICO element.

a Data extraction: Expert-only arm

Record 1

Publication: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26733410>
 Category: Ophthalmology
 Task: basic_field_extraction

Extract fields in this study, each field is in the format of:

Interventions (list of str, the target interventions): xxx
 Secondary Outcome Measures (list of str): xxx

Note: Please record the time before you start.

Field Value: *
 Filling Example:
 Interventions: xxx
 Secondary Outcome Measures: xxx

Your answer _____

Time Spent (seconds) *
 Please enter the time you spent in seconds.

Your answer _____

Comments (optional)
 Please enter any comments you have about this record.

Your answer _____

b Data extraction: Expert+AI arm

Record 1

Publication: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26733410>
 Category: Ophthalmology
 Task: basic_field_extraction

Extract fields in this study, each field is in the format of:

Interventions (list of str, the target interventions): xxx
 Secondary Outcome Measures (list of str): xxx

Note: Please record the time before you start.

Field Value: * AI extraction results
 AI outputs for your reference:

Interventions: Intracellular PSK-3 Drug, Bausch and Lomb Biotrue*

 Secondary Outcome Measures:

Your answer _____


Time Spent (seconds) *
 Please enter the time you spent in seconds.

Your answer _____

Comments (optional)
 Please enter any comments you have about this record.

Your answer _____

Extended Fig. 2: **The forms shared with experts to complete the pilot user study for data extraction.** **a**, the Expert-only arm where one needs to follow the definition of the target field and extract the results from the raw study document. **b**, the Expert+AI arm, where one can refer to AI extraction results to extract the target field values from the raw study document.



Extended Fig. 3: **The distribution of expert-selected studies and AI-generated eligibility assessments.** **a**, studies are stratified by the overall eligibility scores assigned by LEADS, with the percentage of selected studies calculated for each group (row percentages sum to one). **b**, the confusion matrix compares LEADS-generated eligibility assessments and expert decisions, treating score group [0.75, 1] as LEADS-predicted “True” and [-1, -0.5] as LEADS-predicted “False.”

Study characteristic extraction: Input

```
# CONTEXT #
You are tasked with analyzing clinical trial study reports or papers to extract specific information as structured data.

# OBJECTIVE #
The user will provide a list of fields they are interested in, along with a natural language description for each field to guide you on what content to look for and from which parts of the report to extract it.

# PAPER CONTENT #
Screen-and-treat approaches for cervical cancer prevention in low-resource settings: a randomized controlled trial. Non-cytology-based screen-and-treat approaches for cervical cancer prevention have been developed for low-resource settings, but few have directly addressed efficacy. [...] with delayed evaluation at both 6 and 12 months. Trial Registration http://clinicaltrials.gov Identifier: NCT00233727.

# TARGET #
- Number of fields: 4
- Field definition: <field id=1>"Conditions, list of str: the target conditions of the study"</field>
<field id=2>"Interventions, list of str: the target interventions"</field>
<field id=3>"Primary Outcome Measures, str"</field>
<field id=4>"Secondary Outcome Measures, list of str"</field>

# RESPONSE #
A syntactically correct JSON string representing a list of dictionary with two keys: name and value.
Format:
```json
[
 {
 "name": \ str
 "value": \ str
 },
 {
 "name": \ str
 "value": \ str
 },
 ...
]
...

```

### **Study characteristic extraction: Output**

```
[
 {
 "name": "Conditions",
 "value": "Cervical Cancer"
 },
 {
 "name": "Interventions",
 "value": "HPV DNA Testing + Cryosurgery, VIA + Cryosurgery"
 },
 {
 "name": "Primary Outcome Measures",
 "value": "Efficacy of \"Screen and Treat\" + Cryosurgery"
 },
 {
 "name": "Secondary Outcome Measures",
 "value": "HIV incidence, Safety of Cryosurgery"
 }
]
```

Extended Fig. 4: Example inputs and outputs for the study characteristics extraction task.

### **Arm design extraction: Input**

(TITLE) Vaccination response to tetanus toxoid and 23-valent pneumococcal vaccines following administration of a single dose of abatacept: a randomized, open-label, parallel group study in healthy subjects

(ABSTRACT) The effect of abatacept, a selective T-cell co-stimulation modulator, on vaccination has not been previously investigated. In this open-label, single-dose, randomized, parallel-group, controlled study, the effect of a single 750 mg infusion of abatacept on the antibody response to the intramuscular tetanus toxoid vaccine (primarily a memory response to a T-cell-dependent peptide antigen) and the intramuscular 23-valent pneumococcal vaccine (a less T-cell-dependent response to a polysaccharide antigen) was measured in 80 normal healthy volunteers. Subjects were uniformly randomized to receive one of four treatments: Group A (control group), subjects received vaccines on day 1 only; Group B, subjects received vaccines 2 weeks before abatacept; Group C, subjects received vaccines 2 weeks after abatacept; and Group D, subjects received vaccines 8 weeks after abatacept. Anti-tetanus and anti-pneumococcal (Danish serotypes 2, 6B, 8, 9V, 14, 19F and 23F) antibody titers were measured 14 and 28 days after vaccination. While there were no statistically significant differences between the dosing groups, geometric mean titers following tetanus or pneumococcal vaccination were generally lower in subjects who were vaccinated 2 weeks after receiving abatacept, compared with control subjects. A positive response (defined as a twofold increase in antibody titer from baseline) to tetanus vaccination at 28 days was seen, however, in 60% of subjects across all treatment groups versus 75% of control subjects. Similarly, over 70% of abatacept-treated subjects versus all control subjects (100%) responded to at least three pneumococcal serotypes, and approximately 25-30% of abatacept-treated subjects versus 45% of control subjects responded to at least six serotypes.

(INTRO) Introduction

(INTRO) Treatment with abatacept has demonstrated efficacy in patients with active rheumatoid arthritis (RA) and an inadequate response to methotrexate, and in those with an inadequate response to anti-TNF therapy. Abatacept is a soluble fusion protein consisting of the extracellular domain of human cytotoxic T-lymphocyte-associated antigen-4 linked to the Fc (hinge, CH2 and CH3 domains) portion of human IgG1, which has been modified [... Omitted to avoid clutter]

(DISCUSS) Abatacept prevents the activation of naive T cells by inhibiting the second signal required for their co-stimulation. This signal is mediated by CD80 and CD86, which is expressed on antigen-presenting cells, and by CD28, which is expressed on T cells. Abatacept may also reduce the activation of memory T cells (although to a lesser extent than for naïve T cells). This is consistent with a reduced response against tetanus toxoid. The inhibition of the CD80/CD86:CD28 co-stimulatory signal may also potentially prevent the T-cell 'help' needed for optimal differentiation of CD80/CD86-expressing B cells into plasma cells, which ultimately secrete antibodies. This inhibition of B cell T cell help may be a reason for the reduced antibody response to thymus-independent polysaccharide antigens such as those contained in the pneumococcal vaccine responses that cannot be considered completely T-cell independent since they are enhanced by T-cell help. Finally, since abatacept inhibits one of several mediators of co-stimulation, the partial inhibition observed here is likely to reflect the redundancy of the co-stimulation mechanism.

(DISCUSS) This study analyzed the response in healthy volunteers with a normal immune system to a single dose of abatacept. Future studies are needed to determine the optimal timing of vaccination in RA patients receiving abatacept continuously, possibly with other concomitant disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs such as methotrexate.

(CONCL) Conclusion

(CONCL) This study suggests that abatacept blunts the effectiveness of the immune response, but does not significantly inhibit the ability of healthy subjects to develop a clinically significant or positive immune response (at least a twofold increase above baseline) to both tetanus toxoid and 23-valent pneumococcal vaccines.

### **Arm design extraction: Output**

```
[
 {
 "label": "Group 1",
 "type": "EXPERIMENTAL",
 "interventionNames": [
 "Drug: Tetanus + pneumococcal vaccines alone"
]
 },
 {
 "label": "Group 2",
 "type": "ACTIVE_COMPARATOR",
 "interventionNames": [
 "Drug: Abatacept + vaccines"
]
 },
 {
 "label": "Group 3",
 "type": "ACTIVE_COMPARATOR",
 "interventionNames": [
 "Drug: Abatacept + vaccines"
]
 },
 {
 "label": "Group 4",
 "type": "ACTIVE_COMPARATOR",
 "interventionNames": [
 "Drug: Abatacept + Vaccines"
]
 }
]
```

Extended Fig. 5: Example inputs and outputs for the arm design extraction task.



### **Participant statistics extraction: Input**

```
CONTEXT
You are tasked with analyzing clinical trial study reports or papers to extract specific information as structured data.

PAPER CONTENT
(TITLE) Protocol for the Locomotor Experience Applied Post-stroke (LEAPS) trial: a randomized controlled trial
(ABSTRACT) Background
(ABSTRACT) Locomotor training using body weight support and a treadmill as a therapeutic modality for rehabilitation of walking post-stroke is being
[... Omitted to avoid clutter]
(DISCUSS) Current study status: Enrolling Patients

TARGET
Given the following information:
Parameter Type: MEAN
Unit of Measurement: days
Participant Groups Definition: [{groupld: 'BG000', 'value': 139.0, 'unit': 'Participants', 'def': 'Early Locomotor Training Program: Stepping on a treadmill
with partial body weight support and manual assistance as needed for 20-30 minutes at 2.0 mph, followed by a progressive overground walking program
for 20 minutes delivered at 2 months post-stroke.}, [... more group definitions], {groupld: 'BG003', 'value': 408.0, 'unit': 'Participants', 'def': 'Total: Total
of all reporting groups'}]

Where:
"groupld" is the group identifier
"unit" is the unit of measurement for the group
"value" is the numerical value representing the group's characteristic
"def" is the definition or description of the group

Extract the target participant's characteristics about Participants characteristics: Time since stroke to randomization - days.

RESPONSE
A syntactically correct JSON string:

Format:
```json
{
  "results": [ \ the list of characteristics for the groups
    {
      "groupld": \ str
      "value": \ float or int, the value for the group
      "note": \ str, the note for the value
    },
    ... \ more results
  ]
}
```
```

### **Participant statistics extraction: Output**

```
{
 "results": [
 {
 "groupld": "BG000",
 "value": 64.1,
 "note": ""
 },
 {
 "groupld": "BG001",
 "value": 64.18,
 "note": ""
 },
 {
 "groupld": "BG002",
 "value": 62.9,
 "note": ""
 },
 {
 "groupld": "BG003",
 "value": 63.8,
 "note": ""
 }
]
}
```

Extended Fig. 6: Example inputs and outputs for the participant statistics extraction task.

### **Trial result extraction: Input**

```
CONTEXT
You are tasked with analyzing clinical trial study reports or papers to extract specific information as structured data.

PAPER CONTENT
(TITLE) Comparison of flow characteristics and vascular reactivity of radial artery and long saphenous vein grafts [NCT00139399]
(ABSTRACT) Background
(ABSTRACT) The morphological and functional differences between arteries and veins may have implications on coronary artery bypass graft (CABG) survival. Although subjective differences have been observed between radial artery (RA) and long saphenous venous (LSV) grafts, these have not been quantified. This study assessed and compared the flow characteristics and in-vivo graft flow responses of RA and LSV aorto-coronary grafts.
(ABSTRACT) Methods
(ABSTRACT) Angiograms from 52 males taken 3.7 Å± 1.0 months after CABG surgery were analyzed using adjusted Thrombolysis in Myocardial Infarction (TIMI) frame count. Graft and target coronary artery dimensions were measured using quantitative coronary angiography. Estimated TIMI velocity (VE) and volume flow (FE) were then calculated. A further 7 patients underwent in-vivo graft flow responses assessments to adenosine, acetylcholine and isosorbide dinitrate (ISDN) using intravascular Doppler.
(ABSTRACT) Results
(ABSTRACT) The VE for RA grafts was significantly greater than LSV grafts (P = 0.002), however there was no difference in volume FE (P = 0.20). RA grafts showed positive endothelium-dependent and -independent vasodilatation, and LSV grafts showed no statistically significant response to adenosine and acetylcholine. There was no difference in flow velocity or volume responses. Seven RA grafts (11%) had compromised patency (4 (6%) [... Omitted to avoid clutter]
(CONCL) Conclusion

TARGET
Extract the results related to the specified outcome and group as follows:

Outcome: Patency Rates, Angiographic patency rates of radial artery and long saphenous vein grafts at follow-up angiography

Group: Saphenous Vein:
Saphenous vein aortocoronary bypass graft

Patients were randomized to receive a long saphenous vein graft to the left circumflex coronary artery territory during CABG surgery

RESPONSE
A syntactically correct JSON string:

Format:
```json
{
  "paramType": \ str, the type of the parameters
  "unitOfMeasure": \ str, the unit of the result values
  "timeFrame": \ str, the timeframe
  "unitOfDenom": \ str, the unit of the denomintor for this group
  "denomValue": \ int, the value of the group's denominator
  "results": [ \ list of result values
    {
      "value": int or float \ the result value
      "title": str \ the title for this value
    },... \ more results, if applicable
  ]
}
...

```

Trial result extraction: Output

```
{
  "paramType": "COUNT_OF_PARTICIPANTS",
  "unitOfMeasure": "Participants",
  "timeFrame": "5 years",
  "unitOfDenom": "Participants",
  "denomValue": 44.0,
  "results": [
    {
      "value": 38.0,
      "title": "Patent graft"
    },
    {
      "value": 6.0,
      "title": "Occluded graft"
    }
  ]
}
```

Extended Fig. 7: Example inputs and outputs for the trial results extraction task.

Prompt for Search Query Generation

```
# CONTEXT #
You are a clinical specialist. You are conducting research and doing a medical literature review.

# OBJECTIVE #
Your task is to create query terms for a search URL to find relevant literature on PubMed or ClinicalTrials.gov.

# RESEARCH DETAILS #
The research is defined by the following PICO elements:
P (Patient, Problem or Population): {P}
I (Intervention): {I}
C (Comparison): {C}
O (Outcome): {O}

# RESPONSE #
Your output should be in the following JSON format:
{
  "query": "..."
}
```

Extended Fig. 8: Prompt for the task of search query generation in LEADS. Blue text indicates placeholders for variables within the prompt.

Prompt for Study Eligibility Prediction

```
# CONTEXT #
You are a clinical specialist tasked with assessing research papers for inclusion in a systematic literature review based on specific eligibility criteria.

# OBJECTIVE #
Evaluate each criterion of a given paper to determine its eligibility for inclusion in the review. Provide a list of decisions ("YES", "PARTIAL", "NO", or "UNCERTAIN") for each eligibility criterion. You must deliver exactly {num_criteria} responses.
1. YES: Meets the criteria.
2. PARTIAL: Partially meets the criteria but not completely.
3. NO: Does not meet the criteria.
4. UNCERTAIN: Uncertain if it meets the criteria.

# IMPORTANT NOTE #
If the information within the provided paper content is insufficient to conclusively evaluate a criterion, you must opt for "UNCERTAIN" as your response. Avoid making assumptions or extrapolating beyond the provided data, as accurate and reliable responses are crucial, and fabricating information (hallucinations) could lead to serious errors in the systematic review.
If the information is not applicable N/A, you also must opt for "UNCERTAIN".
Use "PARTIAL" when the paper meets some aspects of the criterion but not all; ensure that the partial fulfillment is based on the provided data and not on assumptions or incomplete information.

# PAPER DETAILS #
- Provided Paper: {paper_content}

# EVALUATION CRITERIA #
- Number of Criteria: {num_criteria}
- Criteria for Inclusion: {criteria_text}

# RESPONSE #
You are required to output a JSON object containing a list of decisions for each of the {num_criteria} eligibility criteria. Each decision should directly correspond to one of the criteria and be listed in the order they are presented. Ensure to use "UNCERTAIN" wherever the paper does not explicitly support a "YES", "PARTIAL", or "NO" decision.
The length of "evaluation" should be exactly {num_criteria}.
For example:
```json
{
 "evaluations": [\\ list of eligibility decisions for each criterion
 {
 "eligibility": "YES", \\ decision for the first criterion
 "rationale": "...\" \\ rationale for the decision, limited in 50 tokens
 },
 {
 "eligibility": "PARTIAL", \\ decision for the second criterion
 "rationale": "...\" \\ rationale for the decision, limited in 50 tokens
 },
 {
 "eligibility": "NO", \\ decision for the third criterion
 "rationale": "...\" \\ rationale for the decision, limited in 50 tokens
 },
 {
 "eligibility": "UNCERTAIN", \\ decision for the fourth criterion
 "rationale": "...\" \\ rationale for the decision, limited in 50 tokens
 },
 ... \\ continue for all criteria
]
}
...

```

Extended Fig. 9: Prompt for the task of study eligibility prediction in LEADS. Blue text indicates placeholders for variables within the prompt.

### **Prompt for Study Characteristic Extraction**

```
CONTEXT
You are tasked with analyzing clinical trial study reports or papers to extract specific information as structured data.

OBJECTIVE
The user will provide a list of fields they are interested in, along with a natural language description for each field to guide you on what content to look for and from which parts of the report to extract it.

PAPER CONTENT
{paper_content}

TARGET
- Number of fields: {num_field}
- Field definition: {fields_info}

RESPONSE
A syntactically correct JSON string representing a list of dictionary with two keys: name and value.
The length of the list should be equal to the number of fields requested.
Format:
```json
[
  {
    "name": \\ str
    "value": \\ str
  },
  {
    "name": \\ str
    "value": \\ str
  },
  ... \\ more fields
]
```
```

Extended Fig. 10: Prompt for the task of study characteristic extraction in all LLMs. Blue text indicates placeholders for variables within the prompt.

### ***Prompt for Arm Design Extraction***

```
CONTEXT
You are tasked with analyzing clinical trial study reports or papers to extract specific information as structured data.

PAPER CONTENT
{paper_content}

TARGET
Extract the arm design of the study.

RESPONSE
A syntactically correct JSON string:

Format:
```json
[ \\ a list of arms
  {
    "label": \\ str, the arm label
    "type": \\ str, the arm type
    "description": \\ str, the description of the arm
    "interventionNames": \\ list of str, the interventions used in this arm
  },
  {
    "label": \\ str, the arm label
    "type": \\ str, the arm type
    "description": \\ str, the description of the arm
    "interventionNames": \\ list of str, the interventions used in this arm
  },
  ... \\ more arms
]
```
```

Extended Fig. 11: Prompt for the task of arm design extraction in all LLMs. Blue text indicates placeholders for variables within the prompt.

### ***Prompt for Participant Statistics Extraction***

```
CONTEXT
You are tasked with analyzing clinical trial study reports or papers to extract specific information as structured data.

PAPER CONTENT
{paper_content}

TARGET
Given the following information:
Parameter Type: {paramType}
Unit of Measurement: {unitOfMeasure}
Participant Groups Definition: {groupDef}

Where:
"groupId" is the group identifier
"unit" is the unit of measurement for the group
"value" is the numerical value representing the group's characteristic
"def" is the definition or description of the group

Extract the target participant's characteristics about {measureDef}.

RESPONSE
A syntactically correct JSON string:

Format:
```json
{
  "results": [ \\ the list of characteristics for the groups
    {
      "groupId": \\ str
      "value": \\ float or int, the value for the group
      "note": \\ str, the note for the value, use simple words or phrases and do not use long sentences!
    },
    ... \\ more results
  ]
}
```
```

Extended Fig. 12: Prompt for participant statistics extraction in all LLMs. Blue text indicates placeholders for variables within the prompt.



### ***Prompt for Trial Result Extraction***

```
CONTEXT
You are tasked with analyzing clinical trial study reports or papers to extract specific information as structured data.

PAPER CONTENT
{paper_content}

TARGET
Extract the results related to the specified outcome and group as follows:

Outcome: {outcome_def}

Group: {group_def}

RESPONSE
A syntactically correct JSON string:

Format:
```json
{{
  "paramType": \\ str, the type of the parameters
  "unitOfMeasure": \\ str, the unit of the result values
  "timeFrame": \\ str, the timeframe
  "unitOfDenom": \\ str, the unit of the denomintor for this group
  "denomValue": \\ int, the value of the group's denominator
  "results": [ \\ list of result values
    {{
      "value": int or float \\ the result value
      "title": str \\ the title for this value
    }},... \\ more results, if applicable
  ]
}}
```
```

Extended Fig. 13: Prompt for the task of trial result extraction in all LLMs. Blue text indicates placeholders for variables within the prompt.

## Prompts for Search Query Generation in Baselines

You are a clinical specialist. You are conducting research and doing a medical literature review.  
 The research is defined by the following PICO elements:  
 P (Patient, Problem or Population): {P}  
 I (Intervention): {I}  
 C (Comparison): {C}  
 O (Outcome): {O}

Your task is to create an URL of search query for relevant publications on PubMed.  
 template URL: <https://eutils.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/eutils/esearch.fcgi?db=pubmed&term=query+term>  
 You should output an URL of search query based on it.

Your task is to create a URL for a search query to find relevant trials on ClinicalTrials.gov.  
 template URL: <https://clinicaltrials.gov/api/v2/studies?query.term=query+term>  
 You should output a URL for the search query based on this template.

Notice:

1. Extract the most relevant and specific keywords from each PICO element.
2. Avoid using full sentences; focus on short, impactful terms.
3. Use Boolean operators (AND, OR) to structure your query logically.
4. Ensure the query is concise to maximize recall.
5. Use parentheses to group terms and control the query logic.
6. If there are synonymous terms or common variations, include them using the OR operator.

Steps to create the query:

1. Identify 1-2 primary keyword from each PICO element.
2. Combine these keywords using Boolean operators to form a structured search query.
3. Use parentheses to ensure proper grouping and logic in the query.
4. Include synonyms and variations using the OR operator to expand the search scope, if necessary.

Your output should be in the following JSON format:

```

 {{
 "query": "xxxxxx"
 }}

```

Examples:

Example 1:  
 P: Adults with chronic hypertension  
 I: Treatment with ACE inhibitors  
 C: Comparison with beta-blockers and diuretics  
 O: Reduction in systolic blood pressure over 6 months  
 Query:  
 {{  
 "query": "https://eutils.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/eutils/esearch.fcgi?db=pubmed&term=chronic+hypertension+AND+ACE+inhibitors+AND+(beta-blockers+OR+diuretics)+AND+systolic+blood+pressure+reduction"  
 }}  
 Example 2:  
 ...  
 Example 3:  
 ...

Current PICO:  
 P: {P}  
 I: {I}  
 C: {C}  
 O: {O}  
 Query:

One of objective for publication search or trial search

Detailed Instruction or None

Provided Example or None

Extended Fig. 14: Prompt for search query generation in baseline methods. Blue text indicates placeholders for variables within the prompt. The grey text represents optional sections of the prompt for different prompt types.

### ***Prompt for Study Eligibility Prediction in Simple Baselines***

Evaluate the following medical study paper against the provided PICO criteria.  
Determine if this paper can be included in a literature review based on the PICO alignment.

Paper:  
Title: {title}  
Abstract: {abstract}

PICO Criteria:  
Population (P): {P}  
Intervention (I): {I}  
Comparison (C): {C}  
Outcome (O): {O}

Scoring Instructions:  
Assign a score from 0 to 10 based on the alignment of the paper's title and abstract with the PICO criteria. (10: Perfect alignment, 0: No alignment)

Output Format:  
Your output should be in the following JSON format:

```
```json
{
  "score": 0-10
}
```
```

Extended Fig. 15: Prompt for the task of study eligibility assessment in simple baseline methods. Blue text indicates placeholders for variables within the prompt.

## **Prompts for Study Eligibility Prediction in Advanced Baselines**

### **Stage 1: Criteria Generation**

Given the following PICO criteria for a medical literature review:

Population: {P}  
Intervention: {I}  
Comparison: {C}  
Outcome: {O}

Generate {k} relevant evaluation criteria that can be used to assess the relevance of candidate papers based on these PICO criteria. Each criterion should be clearly defined and focus on different aspects of the PICO elements.

Your output should be in the following JSON format:

```
{
 "criteria": ["criteria_1", "criteria_2", ...]
}
```

### **Stage 2: Evaluation**

Evaluate the following medical study paper against the provided criteria.  
Determine if this paper can be included in a literature review based on the criteria alignment.

Paper:  
Title: {title}  
Abstract: {abstract}

Given the following criteria:  
{criteria}

Scoring Instructions:  
Assign a score from 0 to 10 based on the alignment of the paper's title and abstract with the given criteria. (10: Perfect alignment, 0: No alignment)

Output Format:  
Your output should be in the following JSON format:

```
```json  
{  
  "score": 0-10  
}  
```
```

Extended Fig. 16: Prompt for the task of study eligibility assessment in advanced baseline methods. Blue text indicates placeholders for variables within the prompt.

### **Prompt for GPT-4 Term Extraction**

```
CONTEXT
You are a clinical specialist. You are conducting research and doing a medical literature review.

OBJECTIVE
Your task is to extract PICO medical terms from a medical literature.
P: Patient, Problem, or Population
I: Intervention
C: Comparison
O: Outcome

LITERATURE DETAILS
Title: {title}
Abstract: {abstract}

NOTICE
You should first extract basic medical terms from the title and abstract.
Each basic medical term should be concise and representative, avoiding general terms.
Do not include general medical terms, such as intervention, trial, study, analysis, adolescent, adult, female, male, humans, mice,
survey, questionnaire, efficacy, etc., or any non-representative terms.
Then you should extract 1-3 important PICO terms for each PICO element from the basic terms.
Ensure that PICO terms do not include subject information like adult, male, etc.; only include descriptive words and subject
characteristics in P terms.

RESPONSE
A syntactically correct JSON string:

Format:
```json
{{
  "basic_terms": ["term1", "term2", ...],
  "p_terms": ["term1", "term2", ...],
  "i_terms": ["term1", "term2", ...],
  "c_terms": ["term1", "term2", ...],
  "o_terms": ["term1", "term2", ...],
}}
```
```

Extended Fig. 17: Prompt used to extract medical terms from a study by GPT-4. Blue text indicates placeholders for variables within the prompt.

## Prompt for GPT-4 Study Eligibility Analysis

```
CONTEXT
You are a clinical specialist tasked with assessing research papers for inclusion in a systematic literature review based on specific eligibility criteria.

OBJECTIVE
You will be given a paper which was [involved / not involved] in the target systematic review judged by a human expert before. It means that the paper generally [meets / does not meet] all the criteria. But it does not mean that the paper [is eligible for all / not eligible for any of] the specified criteria.
Analyze the reason this paper [can / cannot] be included in the systematic review and provide an explanation.
Evaluate each criterion of a given paper to determine its eligibility for inclusion in the review. Provide a list of decisions ("YES", "PARTIAL", "NO", or "UNCERTAIN") for each eligibility criterion. You must deliver exactly {num_criteria} responses.
1. YES: Meets the criteria.
2. PARTIAL: Partially meets the criteria but not completely.
3. NO: Does not meet the criteria.
4. UNCERTAIN: Uncertain if it meets the criteria.

IMPORTANT NOTE
If the information within the provided paper content is insufficient to conclusively evaluate a criterion, you must opt for "UNCERTAIN" as your response. Avoid making assumptions or extrapolating beyond the provided data, as accurate and reliable responses are crucial, and fabricating information (hallucinations) could lead to serious errors in the systematic review.
If the information is not applicable N/A, you also must opt for "UNCERTAIN".
Use "PARTIAL" when the paper meets some aspects of the criterion but not all; ensure that the partial fulfillment is based on the provided data and not on assumptions or incomplete information.

PAPER DETAILS
- Provided Paper that was involved in the target systematic review: {paper_content}

EVALUATION CRITERIA
- Number of Criteria: {num_criteria}
- Criteria for Inclusion: {criteria_text}

RESPONSE
You are required to output a JSON object containing a list of decisions for each of the {num_criteria} eligibility criteria. Each decision should directly correspond to one of the criteria and be listed in the order they are presented. Ensure to use "UNCERTAIN" wherever the paper does not explicitly support a "YES", "PARTIAL", or "NO" decision.
The length of "evaluation" should be exactly {num_criteria}.
For example:
```json
{
  "explanation": "...", \\ one sentence explaining why this paper can be included in the systematic review
  "evaluations": [ \\ list of eligibility decisions for each criterion
    {
      "eligibility": "YES", \\ decision for the first criterion
      "rationale": "...", \\ rationale for the decision, limited in 50 tokens
    },
    {
      "eligibility": "PARTIAL", \\ decision for the second criterion
      "rationale": "...", \\ rationale for the decision, limited in 50 tokens
    },
    {
      "eligibility": "NO", \\ decision for the third criterion
      "rationale": "...", \\ rationale for the decision, limited in 50 tokens
    },
    {
      "eligibility": "UNCERTAIN", \\ decision for the fourth criterion
      "rationale": "...", \\ rationale for the decision, limited in 50 tokens
    },
    ... \\ continue for all criteria
  ]
}
```

Extended Fig. 18: Prompt used to analyze the eligibility reasons for a study based on specified criteria by GPT-4. Blue text indicates placeholders for variables within the prompt. Red text changes depending on whether the current study is eligible or not.