

Generalizable and Scalable Multistage Biomedical Concept Normalization Leveraging Large Language Models

Nicholas J Dobbins⁺¹

¹*Biomedical Informatics and Data Science, Department of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA*

arXiv:2405.15122v1 [cs.CL] 24 May 2024

⁺Corresponding author: Nicholas Dobbins, PhD, MLIS, Biomedical Informatics and Data Science, Department of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University, 2024 East Monument St. S 1-200, Baltimore, Maryland 21205 USA; nic.dobbins@jhu.edu

Abstract

Background: Biomedical entity normalization is critical to biomedical research because the richness of free-text clinical data, such as progress notes, can often be fully leveraged only after translating words and phrases into structured and coded representations suitable for analysis. Large Language Models (LLMs), in turn, have shown great potential and high performance in a variety of natural language processing (NLP) tasks, but their application for normalization remains understudied.

Methods: We applied both proprietary and open-source LLMs in combination with several rule-based normalization systems commonly used in biomedical research. We used a two-step LLM integration approach, (1) using an LLM to generate alternative phrasings of a source utterance, and (2) to prune candidate UMLS concepts, using a variety of prompting methods. We measure results by F_β , where we favor recall over precision, and F1.

Results: We evaluated a total of 5,523 concept terms and text contexts from a publicly available dataset of human-annotated biomedical abstracts. Incorporating GPT-3.5-turbo increased overall F_β and F1 in normalization systems +9.5 and +7.3 (MetaMapLite), +13.9 and +10.9 (QuickUMLS), and +10.5 and +10.3 (BM25), while the open-source Vicuna model achieved +10.8 and +12.2 (MetaMapLite), +14.7 and +15 (QuickUMLS), and +15.6 and +18.7 (BM25).

Conclusions: Existing general-purpose LLMs, both propriety and open-source, can be leveraged at scale to greatly improve normalization performance using existing tools, with no fine-tuning.

Keywords: UMLS, normalization, biomedical concepts, entity linking, large language model

INTRODUCTION

Biomedical entity normalization, also known as entity linking or grounding, is the processing of mapping spans of text, such as conditions, procedures, or medications, into coded representations, such as Unified Medical Language System (UMLS) codes. Normalization is critical to biomedical research because the richness of free-text data, such as information within progress notes, can often be fully leveraged only after mapping words and phrases into structured, coded representations suitable for analysis. For example, identifying patients with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus using free-text narratives could be challenging with keyword search alone, given the variety of possible phrasings ("T2DM", "Hyperglycemia", "Glucose intolerance", etc.) Searching instead for a normalized representation (e.g., UMLS "C0011860") simplifies this process while greatly improving recall. Coded terms can subsequently be linked to related terms within ontologies and so on. Recent state-of-the-art Large Language Models (LLMs), in turn, have shown great potential and high performance in a variety of natural language processing (NLP) tasks, but their application for normalization remains understudied. Moreover, while biomedical informaticians and researchers often leverage rule-based systems, such as MetaMapLite [1] or cTAKES [2] for normalization, few studies have evaluated the use of LLMs working *in concert* with commonly used existing normalization systems.

In this study, we evaluate the use of two widely used LLMs, one closed-source (GPT-3.5-turbo) [3] and one open (Vicuna-13b [4], a fine-tuned variation of Llama [5]), alongside widely used normalization techniques and libraries within the informatics community, on a large human-annotated corpus of biomedical abstracts and UMLS concepts [6]. We aim to contribute to improving performance for a common scenario within biomedical informatics research: the need to extract normalized concepts from a large corpus of documents, where fine-tuning a domain-specific model for the task is not practical or possible (for example due to the lack of a gold standard annotation or time). In such cases, many researchers use applications such as MetaMapLite, QuickUMLS [7], cTAKES [2], CLAMP [8], which tend to be rule-based and relatively fast and scalable in concept extraction, but often with only moderate recall and relatively low precision. At a basic level, we seek to explore the question: *How can comparatively small, widely available LLMs be leveraged to improve upon baseline biomedical concept normalization performance?* We examine a variety of prompting strategies with a focus on two specific areas where LLMs may aid improvement alongside existing normalization systems. All code used in this study is available at

<https://github.com/ndobb/llm-normalization/>¹.

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

The process of concept normalization from biomedical free-text documents has been studied extensively, and a number of widely used normalization systems exist. Such systems tend to be rule-based, parsing text and matching based on lexical and syntactic heuristics [1, 2, 7, 9], though more recent systems, such as the CLAMP toolkit [8], also incorporate machine learning based models for sentence boundary detection and named entity recognition.

Related to normalization, Narayan *et al* [10] explored the use of LLMs using OpenAI's GPT-3 [11] on publicly available datasets to evaluate entity matching between datasets (e.g., determining if two products are the same based on their descriptions), error detection, and data imputation. Peeters *et al* [12, 13] similarly expanded this line of research using GPT-3.5 and systematically explored various prompting strategies. Other work in this area has been driven by ontology researchers aiming to determine how LLMs may be leveraged for entity alignment and relation prediction (e.g., *is-a*, *subsumes*) to automate ontology generation and error checking [14–17].

Within the health domain, Yang *et al* [18] used a Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG) based approach [19] to inject UMLS-derived context within prompts to improve question-answering performance. Specific to normalization, Soroush *et al* [20] analyzed the use of GPT models for generating ICD-9, ICD-10, and CPT codes from text-descriptions, finding both GPT-3.5-turbo and GPT-4 to perform relatively poorly, with accuracy under 50%. Soroush *et al*'s findings suggests that LLMs *alone* may be inappropriate tools for concept normalization. This challenge may be even moreso for UMLS concepts (as opposed to ICD-10), which include a far larger number of longer, total codes which themselves carry no inherent meaning and imply no relation to other codes (for example, the sequence of characters for the UMLS code "C0011860" are essentially arbitrary, unlike codes which begin with "E" in ICD-10, which relate in some fashion to diabetes mellitus).

¹Git repository will be made publicly available upon article acceptance

Key Contributions

As current SoTA LLMs alone perform poorly at normalization, we seek to explore **how well they can improve baseline normalization performance when used alongside and augmenting widely-used existing normalization software**. To do so, we:

1. **Establish baseline precision, recall, F1 and F_β** performance using several common normalization applications on a large set of human-annotated, normalized condition mentions.
2. Use both open- and closed-source LLMs for **synonym and alternative phrasing generation**, which we further normalize in order to maximize recall.
3. Explore prompting strategies for **normalized concept pruning** to subsequently balance precision.
4. Utilize combinations of normalization systems and LLMs to **robustly evaluate end-to-end normalization strategies aimed at maximizing F_β** , a harmonic mean of precision and recall weighted towards recall.

We designed our experiments with a focus on **practicality** and **scale**, intended to inform biomedical research efforts requiring normalization of large-scale unannotated clinical text repositories while minimizing potential cost. Our results can be leveraged by researchers with various goals in mind, such maximizing recall or precision, or in understanding cost and performance strategies in various prompting strategies.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Language Models

Biomedical concept normalization efforts often involve thousands or even millions of documents [21, 22]. In such projects the need for normalization processes at speed and without significant cost (e.g., less than 1 second and under \$0.01 per document) are thus necessary. We chose two language models, one publicly available and one proprietary, as we believed they achieved a reasonable tradeoff between strong (though not SoTA [23–26]) performance, inference speed, and cost.

1. **GPT-3.5-turbo** is the primary model behind ChatGPT [3] at the time of this writing. GPT-3.5-turbo has been demonstrated to perform well on a variety of tasks within the clinical domain [27, 28],

including authoring letters to patients [29], decision support [30], medical question-answering [31], interpreting radiology reports [32] and various clinical NLP tasks [33–35]. We used the *gpt-3.5-turbo-0125* model within OpenAI for our experiments.

2. **Vicuna** is an open-source model fine-tuned from the original LLaMA model [5] using user-shared responses from ChatGTP [4]. As Vicuna was thus tuned to respond similarly to ChatGPT but is freely available and also comparatively smaller, we chose Vicuna as a reasonable alternative capable of running locally without the need for significant infrastructure. We used the quantized *vicuna-13b-v1.5.Q4_K_M.gguf* model² for our experiments.

Normalization Systems

We chose three methods and software libraries as our baseline normalization systems:

1. **MetaMapLite** [1] is a Java-based implementation of the original MetaMap algorithm [9]. MetaMapLite uses a Lucene-based [36] dictionary lookup approach for normalizing concepts indexed by UMLS concept source text, abbreviations, and source term types.
2. **QuickUMLS** [7] is a lightweight Python-based implementation of the *CPMerge* algorithm [37]. QuickUMLS is designed to achieve similar recall and precision to MetaMap and cTAKES but much faster.
3. **BM25**, or more formally **Okapi BM25**, is a widely used ranking and retrieval algorithm [38]. We used a Python implementation of BM25 from the *retriv* library³. We indexed BM25 using the preferred terms of UMLS concepts related to diseases and conditions.

Dataset

MedMentions [6] is a human-annotated dataset of over 4,000 biomedical abstracts. Each abstract contains mentions of biomedical concept terms and their most appropriate corresponding UMLS concept ID. We chose MedMentions because of both the high-quality of the annotations and the large relative size of the corpus.

²<https://huggingface.co/TheBloke/vicuna-13B-v1.5-16K-GGUF>

³<https://github.com/AmenRa/retriv>

As the focus of this study is to inform low-resource scenarios where researchers are unable to train or fine-tune models for normalization, we utilized only the test set of MedMentions for evaluation purposes. The test set consists of 839 abstracts with 70,405 UMLS concepts. As we aimed to evaluate our LLM-augmented normalization methods rather than exhaustively validate the corpus using the entirety of the UMLS, we limited our experiments to 5,523 UMLS concept annotations related to disease and conditions.

Normalization Strategy

We aimed to leverage the LLMs described to improve the baseline normalization performance of MetaMapLite, QuickUMLS, and BM25 in a relatively simple pipeline-like process. Importantly, we assume a scenario where named entities within a given corpus are already known, but not normalized. In other words, we imagine a case where a named entity recognition (NER) algorithm has already identified candidate token spans within a corpus (for example, "cystic fibrosis" at character indices 250-265 in document 1) but UMLS concepts are not known. We seek to augment traditional normalization processes with the following strategies:

1. **Synonym and Alternate Phrasing Generation** - We prompt an LLM to generate alternative phrasings or synonyms of a given input text span to be normalized. We then use our normalization systems to attempt to normalize both the source text span, as well as candidate alternative spans. This step seeks to maximize recall.
2. **Candidate Concept Pruning** - After normalization, we again prompt an LLM to filter out inappropriate concepts, using both the preferred term and semantic type of a given candidate concept as well as surrounding text context of the original identified span. This step seeks to improve precision.

Figure 1 shows a visual example of this process.




Figure 1: Diagram of our multi-stage normalization strategy.

Evaluation

Our evaluation process was as follow:

1. Using all three normalization systems, we established baseline normalization results by individually executing each on all condition concepts in the test set of the MedMentions corpus.
2. We prompted both LLMs to generate candidate alternative phrasings and synonyms for all test set

concepts, then used our normalization systems to subsequently normalize the additional concepts as well, focusing on recall.

3. Next, we sought to identify an optimal prompting strategy for concept pruning. To do so, we experimented using a random sample of 1,000 test set concepts and the Vicuna model with various prompt structures. These were:

- (a) **Multiple Choice** - We included all candidate concepts in a single prompt, instructing the LLM to output a list of appropriate concepts. Within the multiple choice approach, we further experimented with outputting UMLS concept **concept IDs (CUIs) versus indices** in which they were presented (e.g., "C0010674" vs. "2"). We hypothesized that simpler index-based output may perform slightly better than CUIs. We additionally evaluated **chain-of-thought** prompting, instructing the model to "think step-by-step" and provide reasoning for a given output.
- (b) **Binary Choice** - We evaluated each candidate concept independently, with an additional LLM prompt and response for each concept. We hypothesized that a simpler prompt and question may also lead to better performance, though at the cost of far more overall prompts needed.

Figure 2 shows examples of these strategies.




Figure 2: Visual example of our Multiple Choice and Binary Choice prompting strategies.

In addition, for each prompt strategy combination, we also experimented with a post-processing step to **always accept the first candidate concept**, even if rejected in the concept pruning phase. We refer to this strategy hereafter as **Top1**.

For scoring purposes, we make the explicit assumption that recall is ultimately more important than precision in this task. For example, many downstream analyses of normalized, extracted data often look for specific CUI values (e.g., identifying patients with heart failure "C0018801" as clinical trial candidates). Thus false positive CUIs may be ignored in such cases with relatively low harm. We therefore consider F_β as our metric to optimize, with recall having greater weight than precision ($\beta = 2$):

$$F_\beta = (1 + \beta^2) * \frac{precision * recall}{(\beta^2 * precision) + recall}$$

For context we also provide the traditional F1 harmonic mean of precision and recall:

$$F1 = 2 * \frac{precision * recall}{precision + recall}$$

RESULTS

Table 1 shows results of our baseline and synonym and alternate phrasing experiments. As our results at this stage include candidate concepts from our LLM-generated alternate phrasings without pruning, the improvements shown are thus the upper bound of recall. We prompted each LLM to return at most 3 alternate phrasings. For each alternate phrasing, we accepted only the first normalized concept returned, if any. While both LLMs showed recall improvement over baseline results with each normalization system, GPT-3.5-turbo showed a greater recall improvement for each over Vicuna. With the exception of BM25 (which already had a reasonably high recall of 77.7% at baseline), each normalization system showed an improvement in recall of over 10% for both LLMs.

Norm. System	Baseline				Vicuna				GPT-3.5-turbo			
	P	R	F1	F _β	P	R	F1	F _β	P	R	F1	F _β
MetaMapLite	32.2	66.5	43.4	54.8	6.2	76.6	11.5	23.4	10.8	78.7	19.0	34.8
QuickUMLS	21.9	49.0	30.3	39.2	7.0	62.9	12.7	24.2	8.2	66.2	14.6	27.4
BM25	17.7	77.7	28.1	46.3	12.2	82.3	21.4	38.2	13.0	84.8	22.5	40.2

Table 1: Results of our first experiments using LLMs to generate and normalize synonyms and alternative phrasings of an initial utterance. We aimed to improve recall over baseline results.

Next, we aimed to determine optimal prompt and scoring strategies for concept pruning, using variants of our prompt strategies. Given the large number of potential LLM responses needed due to various combinations of prompt strategies, we chose to use only the Vicuna LLM and a random subset of 1,000 examples from the test set. Results are shown in Table 2.

For each normalization system, as the binary prompt strategy with chain-of-thought showed the best performance by F_{β} among our test set sample using LLM-chosen UMLS concepts, we chose to use this in our final experiment. As automatically including the first candidate concept also improved recall (though at the expense of some precision), we also included the "Top1" strategy in our final experiment. Results are shown in Table 3.

Norm. System	Prompt Strategy	Vicuna							
		LLM-chosen only				LLM-chosen+Top1			
		P	R	F1	F_β	P	R	F1	F_β
MetaMapLite	Multiple-Choice+Index+CoT	45.7	65.4	53.8	60.2	46.1	69.7	55.5	63.2
	Multiple-Choice+Index	43.9	63.9	52.0	58.6	44.8	70.4	54.8	63.2
	Multiple-Choice+CUI+CoT	42.6	70.6	53.1	62.4	41.6	72.6	52.9	63.2
	Multiple-Choice+CUI	39.3	69.6	50.2	60.3	39.0	72.3	50.7	61.8
	Binary-Choice+CoT	44.7	70.2	54.6	63.0	41.9	74.2	53.6	64.3
	Binary-Choice	46.8	67.1	55.1	61.7	44.3	74.0	55.4	65.3
QuickUMLS	Multiple-Choice+Index+CoT	39.9	54.7	46.1	50.9	40.4	57.2	47.4	52.8
	Multiple-Choice+Index	39.7	56.2	46.5	51.9	39.7	58.0	47.1	53.1
	Multiple-Choice+CUI+CoT	40.5	57.8	47.6	53.3	40.1	58.7	47.6	53.7
	Multiple-Choice+CUI	37.5	57.7	45.5	52.1	37.3	59.0	45.7	52.9
	Binary-Choice+CoT	38.6	59.3	46.8	53.6	36.0	63.7	46.0	55.2
	Binary-Choice	39.1	56.6	46.2	51.9	37.0	63.5	46.8	55.5
BM25	Multiple-Choice+Index+CoT	36.8	52.1	43.1	48.1	37.1	53.5	43.8	49.2
	Multiple-Choice+Index	36.7	52.1	43.1	48.1	37.1	53.9	43.9	49.4
	Multiple-Choice+CUI+CoT	40.4	54.4	46.4	50.9	40.4	55.2	46.7	51.4
	Multiple-Choice+CUI	39.5	54.8	45.9	50.9	39.2	55.3	45.9	51.1
	Binary-Choice+CoT	33.7	76.2	46.7	60.9	31.4	80.1	45.1	61.1
	Binary-Choice	35.0	73.3	47.4	60.1	32.8	79.0	46.4	61.6

Table 2: Results of experiments to determine an optimal prompting strategy for concept pruning. We used a randomly-chosen subset of 1,000 test set concepts and contexts.

Somewhat surprisingly, with higher precision than GPT-3.5-turbo for each normalization system, the smaller Vicuna model achieved the highest F1 scores over GPT-3.5-turbo in all experiments. F_β scores were generally closer with the exception of BM25, where Vicuna achieved notably better F_β than GPT-3.5-turbo (CoT: +3.9 and CoT+Top1: +5.1). Compared to baseline normalization F_β results in our first experiment (shown in Table 1), the addition of the Vicuna model for end-to-end alternative phrasing and best pruning strategy led to over 10% improvement in all normalization systems (MetaMapLite: +10.8, QuickUMLS: +14.7, BM25: +15.6).

Full prompts for all experiments are included in the Appendix.

Norm. System	Strategy	Vicuna				GPT-3.5-turbo			
		P	R	F1	F_β	P	R	F1	F_β
MetaMapLite	Binary-Choice+CoT	46.4	68.3	55.3	62.4	38.1	75.6	50.7	63.1
	Binary-Choice+CoT+Top1	44.3	74.6	55.6	65.6	37.5	78.3	50.7	64.3
QuickUMLS	Binary-Choice+CoT	38.6	56.3	45.8	51.5	30.8	63.5	41.5	52.3
	Binary-Choice+CoT+Top1	35.8	61.7	45.3	53.9	30.0	65.8	41.2	53.1
BM25	Binary-Choice+CoT	35.2	73.6	47.6	60.4	25.6	81.1	38.9	56.5
	Binary-Choice+CoT+Top1	33.2	79.1	46.8	61.9	24.9	83.7	38.4	56.8

Table 3: Results of our final experiment to apply our best-performing prompting strategy using all normalization systems and LLMs.

DISCUSSION

Our results demonstrate that existing LLMs can be leveraged to greatly increase performance of widely-used biomedical normalization systems without fine-tuning. Our two-step process of leveraging LLMs for alternate phrasing generation and subsequent concept pruning demonstrates improvements to F_β (best: +15.6) and F1 (best: +19.5) in each combination LLM and normalization system we experimented with, as well as higher recall in all experiments with the exception of one (BM25 using Vicuna with Binary-Choice+CoT prompting strategy).

Moreover, we demonstrate that these results can be achieved using non-SoTA, smaller models, both open-source and proprietary. Our results show that the publicly-available Vicuna 13b quantized model can achieve results that surpass GPT-3.5-turbo in F_β and F1 under certain circumstances. As these smaller models can respond relatively quickly and at relatively low cost (the *gpt-3.5-turbo-0125* model costs \$1.50 per 1M tokens at the time of this writing), they also lend themselves to scalability, in concert with normalization systems.

Limitations

This study had a number of limitations. First, we used only a single dataset, MedMentions, and only concepts related to diseases and conditions. It is possible that other datasets, textual contexts, domains and concept semantic types (e.g., medications) may show different results. As the MedMentions test set includes over 5,000 concepts from a large variety of biomedical abstracts, however, we argue that the dataset is nonetheless useful and reasonable for establishing the efficacy of our methods. Next, we evaluated only

two large language models, and potentially there are a growing list of others that may be included. As we intended to demonstrate that existing, readily-available, smaller models encode sufficient biomedical knowledge while also remaining inexpensive and highly responsive, we argue these models are highly suitable to common research situations where a large corpora of documents require normalization at scale while model fine-tuning is not possible or desirable. Additionally, we assume a situation where named entities within a corpus are already identified but not yet normalized, which may not always be the case. As reasonably well-performing NER models, including open-source, are readily-available, we feel this is a reasonable assumption.

Future work

In future work, we intend to apply these approaches to existing corpora of other domains (such as progress notes), as well as evaluate cost and scaling factors in greater detail.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that smaller, widely-available large language models can be readily leveraged alongside existing normalization software to achieve greater precision, recall, F_β and F1 in clinical documents. We empirically evaluated two language models in combination with three widely-user normalization systems using a variety of prompting and processing strategies. The methods discussed here can be readily adapted and used by research teams.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Meliha Yetisgen, Fei Xia, Ozlem Uzuner, and Kevin Lybarger for their thoughts and suggestions in the planning phase of this project. This study was supported in part by the National Library of Medicine under Award Number R15LM013209 and by the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences of National Institutes of Health under Award Number UL1TR002319. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS STATEMENT

NJD conceived of and executed all experiments and wrote the manuscript.

COMPETING INTERESTS

NJD is a consultant of TriNetX, LLC.

REFERENCES

- [1] Demner-Fushman D, Rogers WJ, Aronson AR. MetaMap Lite: an evaluation of a new Java implementation of MetaMap. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*. 2017;24(4):841-4.
- [2] Savova GK, Masanz JJ, Ogren PV, Zheng J, Sohn S, Kipper-Schuler KC, et al. Mayo clinical Text Analysis and Knowledge Extraction System (cTAKES): architecture, component evaluation and applications. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*. 2010;17(5):507-13.
- [3] OpenAI. Introducing ChatGPT; 2022. Available from: <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt>.
- [4] Chiang WL, Li Z, Lin Z, Sheng Y, Wu Z, Zhang H, et al.. Vicuna: An Open-Source Chatbot Impressing GPT-4 with 90%* ChatGPT Quality; 2023. Available from: <https://lmsys.org/blog/2023-03-30-vicuna/>.
- [5] Touvron H, Lavril T, Izacard G, Martinet X, Lachaux MA, Lacroix T, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:230213971*. 2023.
- [6] Mohan S, Li D. Medmentions: A large biomedical corpus annotated with umls concepts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:190209476*. 2019.
- [7] Soldaini L, Goharian N. Quickumls: a fast, unsupervised approach for medical concept extraction. In: *MedIR workshop, sigir*; 2016. p. 1-4.
- [8] Soysal E, Wang J, Jiang M, Wu Y, Pakhomov S, Liu H, et al. CLAMP—a toolkit for efficiently building customized clinical natural language processing pipelines. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*. 2018;25(3):331-6.
- [9] Aronson AR, Lang FM. An overview of MetaMap: historical perspective and recent advances. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*. 2010;17(3):229-36.

- [10] Narayan A, Chami I, Orr L, Arora S, Ré C. Can foundation models wrangle your data? arXiv preprint arXiv:220509911. 2022.
- [11] Mann B, Ryder N, Subbiah M, Kaplan J, Dhariwal P, Neelakantan A, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. arXiv preprint arXiv:200514165. 2020.
- [12] Peeters R, Bizer C. Using chatgpt for entity matching. In: European Conference on Advances in Databases and Information Systems. Springer; 2023. p. 221-30.
- [13] Peeters R, Bizer C. Entity matching using large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:231011244. 2023.
- [14] Hertling S, Paulheim H. OLaLa: Ontology matching with large language models. In: Proceedings of the 12th Knowledge Capture Conference 2023; 2023. p. 131-9.
- [15] Arora A, Dell M. LinkTransformer: A Unified Package for Record Linkage with Transformer Language Models. arXiv preprint arXiv:230900789. 2023.
- [16] Matentzoglou N, Caufield JH, Hegde HB, Reese JT, Moxon S, Kim H, et al. MapperGPT: Large Language Models for Linking and Mapping Entities. arXiv preprint arXiv:231003666. 2023.
- [17] Babaei Giglou H, D'Souza J, Auer S. LLMs4OL: Large language models for ontology learning. In: International Semantic Web Conference. Springer; 2023. p. 408-27.
- [18] Yang R, Marrese-Taylor E, Ke Y, Cheng L, Chen Q, Li I. Integrating UMLS Knowledge into Large Language Models for Medical Question Answering. arXiv e-prints. 2023:arXiv-2310.
- [19] Lewis P, Perez E, Piktus A, Petroni F, Karpukhin V, Goyal N, et al. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. 2020;33:9459-74.
- [20] Soroush A, Glicksberg BS, Zimlichman E, Barash Y, Freeman R, Charney AW, et al. Large Language Models Are Poor Medical Coders—Benchmarking of Medical Code Querying. *NEJM AI*. 2024:AIdbp2300040.

- [21] Xu R, Musen MA, Shah NH. A comprehensive analysis of five million UMLS metathesaurus terms using eighteen million MEDLINE citations. In: AMIA annual symposium proceedings. vol. 2010. American Medical Informatics Association; 2010. p. 907.
- [22] Wu ST, Liu H, Li D, Tao C, Musen MA, Chute CG, et al. Unified Medical Language System term occurrences in clinical notes: a large-scale corpus analysis. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*. 2012;19(e1):e149-56.
- [23] Li D, Gupta K, Bhaduri M, Sathiadoss P, Bhatnagar S, Chong J. Comparing GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 Accuracy and Drift in Radiology Diagnosis Please Cases. *Radiology*. 2024;310(1):e232411.
- [24] Meyer A, Riese J, Streichert T. Comparison of the Performance of GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 With That of Medical Students on the Written German Medical Licensing Examination: Observational Study. *JMIR Medical Education*. 2024;10:e50965.
- [25] Rizzo MG, Cai N, Constantinescu D. The performance of ChatGPT on orthopaedic in-service training exams: A comparative study of the GPT-3.5 turbo and GPT-4 models in orthopaedic education. *Journal of Orthopaedics*. 2024;50:70-5.
- [26] Sun D, Hadjiiski L, Gormley J, Chan HP, Caoili EM, Cohan R, et al. Large language model-assisted information extraction from clinical reports for survival prediction of bladder cancer patients. In: *Medical Imaging 2024: Computer-Aided Diagnosis*. vol. 12927. SPIE; 2024. p. 449-54.
- [27] Liu J, Wang C, Liu S. Utility of ChatGPT in clinical practice. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*. 2023;25:e48568.
- [28] Rao A, Pang M, Kim J, Kamineni M, Lie W, Prasad AK, et al. Assessing the utility of ChatGPT throughout the entire clinical workflow: development and usability study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*. 2023;25:e48659.
- [29] Ali SR, Dobbs TD, Hutchings HA, Whitaker IS. Using ChatGPT to write patient clinic letters. *The Lancet Digital Health*. 2023;5(4):e179-81.

- [30] Liu S, Wright AP, Patterson BL, Wanderer JP, Turer RW, Nelson SD, et al. Using AI-generated suggestions from ChatGPT to optimize clinical decision support. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*. 2023;30(7):1237-45.
- [31] Johnson D, Goodman R, Patrinely J, Stone C, Zimmerman E, Donald R, et al. Assessing the accuracy and reliability of AI-generated medical responses: an evaluation of the Chat-GPT model. *Research square*. 2023.
- [32] Jeblick K, Schachtner B, Dexl J, Mittermeier A, Stüber AT, Topalis J, et al. ChatGPT makes medicine easy to swallow: an exploratory case study on simplified radiology reports. *European radiology*. 2023:1-9.
- [33] Li J, Dada A, Puladi B, Kleesiek J, Egger J. ChatGPT in healthcare: a taxonomy and systematic review. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine*. 2024:108013.
- [34] Wagner MW, Ertl-Wagner BB. Accuracy of information and references using ChatGPT-3 for retrieval of clinical radiological information. *Canadian Association of Radiologists Journal*. 2023:08465371231171125.
- [35] Hu Y, Chen Q, Du J, Peng X, Keloth VK, Zuo X, et al. Improving large language models for clinical named entity recognition via prompt engineering. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*. 2024:ocad259.
- [36] Bialecki A, Muir R, Ingersoll G, Imagination L. Apache lucene 4. In: *SIGIR 2012 workshop on open source information retrieval*. sn; 2012. p. 17.
- [37] Okazaki N, Tsujii J. Simple and efficient algorithm for approximate dictionary matching. In: *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Computational Linguistics (Coling 2010)*; 2010. p. 851-9.
- [38] Whissell JS, Clarke CL. Improving document clustering using Okapi BM25 feature weighting. *Information retrieval*. 2011;14:466-87.

APPENDIX

Prompt for Synonym and Alternate Phrasing

You are an expert system for providing synonyms of phrases which appear in medical abstracts and clinical notes to aid in normalizing phrases to UMLS concepts. Given a surrounding text context, respond with up to 3 relevant synonyms to the bracketed term in bullet points.

If there is an anatomical word, type of disorder, or behavior the bracketed term may be referring to, include that reference in your synonyms.

The specific term to find synonyms for will be surrounded by double-brackets, like {{term}}.

Please find synonyms given this context: "{context_and_term}"

Figure 3: Prompt used for synonym and alternate phrasing generation.

Prompt for Multi-Choice Concept Pruning

You are an expert system for determining appropriate UMLS concepts for a given term. Given a surrounding text context and list of possible UMLS concepts, filter the possible UMLS concepts to only those which could possibly be appropriate, at most 2.

Be flexible and generous in your interpretation, and general concepts as well as specific appropriate concepts should be included. Reason step-by-step about why concepts are appropriate.

Respond only in a JSON object of concept IDs like
{"answer": <concept IDs>, "reason": <reason>}
Strictly output only concept IDs in your <answer>.

The specific term to filter UMLS concepts for will be surrounded by double-brackets, like {{term}}.

Here is the context:
"{context}"

{candidate_concepts}

Figure 4: Prompt used for concept candidate pruning. Multi-candidate concepts are presented in a single prompt, and a list of appropriate concepts expected in the response. This example shows the chain-of-thought prompt variant.

Prompt for Binary Concept Pruning

You are an expert system for determining appropriate UMLS concepts for a given term. Given a surrounding text context and a term, determine whether a given UMLS concept means the same thing as {{term}}.

Here is the context:

"{context}"

Is the concept "{concept}" the same as {{term}} in this context? Answer true is yes, false if no. Reason step-by-step about why a concept is appropriate.

Structure your output in JSON as

```
{ "answer": <true|false>, "reason": <reason> }
```

Figure 5: Prompt used for binary concept candidate pruning. A single candidate concept is presented in a single prompt, with a single LLM response needed for all candidate concepts. This example shows the chain-of-thought prompt variant.