
Synth-SBDH: A Synthetic Dataset of Social and Behavioral Determinants of Health for Clinical Text

Avijit Mitra^{1,2}, Emily Druhl², Raelene Goodwin², Hong Yu^{1,2,3,4}

¹ Manning College of Information and Computer Sciences, University of Massachusetts Amherst

² U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs

³ Department of Medicine, UMass Chan Medical School

⁴ Miner School of Computer and Information Sciences, University of Massachusetts Lowell

avijitmitra@umass.edu hong_yu@uml.edu

Abstract

Social and behavioral determinants of health (SBDH) play a crucial role in health outcomes and are frequently documented in clinical text. Automatically extracting SBDH information from clinical text relies on publicly available good-quality datasets. However, existing SBDH datasets exhibit substantial limitations in their availability and coverage. In this study, we introduce Synth-SBDH¹, a novel synthetic dataset with detailed SBDH annotations, encompassing status, temporal information, and rationale across 15 SBDH categories. We showcase the utility of Synth-SBDH on three tasks using real-world clinical datasets from two distinct hospital settings, highlighting its versatility, generalizability, and distillation capabilities. Models trained on Synth-SBDH consistently outperform counterparts with no Synth-SBDH training, achieving up to 62.5% macro-F improvements. Additionally, Synth-SBDH proves effective for rare SBDH categories and under-resource constraints. Human evaluation demonstrates a Human-LLM alignment of 71.06% and uncovers areas for future refinements.

1 Introduction

In healthcare research, understanding the nuanced interplay between social and behavioral determinants of health (SBDH) and health outcomes is imperative for improving patient care and population health management. ‘SBDH’ encompasses both social determinants of health (SDOH) and behavioral factors which are well-known to impact physical and mental health [14, 38, 48]. There is a growing body of research to link SBDH with various adverse outcomes such as opioid overdose [12, 50], suicide mortality [7, 37, 27], Alzheimer’s disease [35, 2] etc.

While SBDHs are primarily documented in electronic health records (EHRs) through structured data and unstructured clinical notes, the former has been the dominant source for relevant research. However, structured data sources lack comprehensiveness and reliability [47, 22], posing significant challenges to research and clinical care. Instead, SBDHs are most frequently described in the free text of EHR notes with nuanced descriptions that are unavailable through structured sources. Natural language processing (NLP) can address these challenges by automating their extraction from clinical notes [4, 33]. However, such automation requires robust datasets for model training. Existing SBDH datasets suffer from notable limitations such as their restricted public availability, lack of relevant information, etc., hindering progress in this domain. Consequently, the development of comprehensive and high-quality SBDH datasets is paramount for advancing NLP in healthcare.

¹<https://github.com/avipartho/Synth-SBDH>

Table 1: Comparison of publicly available SBDH datasets. Synth-SBDH includes both social and behavioral determinants, covering 15 categories. In addition, Synth-SBDH provides annotation rationales.

Dataset	#Samples	Source	#Categories	Behavioral	Rationale
MIMIC-SBDH [4]	7,025	MIMIC-III	7	✓	✗
SHAC [34]†	4,405	MIMIC-III+UW*	5	✓	✗
SDOH-NLI [29]	1,398	MTSamples	10	✓	✗
PedSHAC [15]†	1,260	UW*	10	✓	✗
Guevara et al. [18]	5,328	MIMIC-III	6	✗	✗
Guevara et al. [18]	480	GPT-3.5	6	✗	✗
Synth-SBDH (Ours)	8,767	GPT-4	15	✓	✓

† Not released at the time of this writing.

* University of Washington.

One major challenge for releasing data based on EHRs lies in the sensitive nature of the data, which limits their availability to the broader research community. Additionally, human chart review of EHR notes on a large scale is not only time-consuming but also prohibitively expensive. As a result, most publicly available SBDH datasets derive from the same data sources and contain limited examples (Table 1). In contrast, with the rapid advancements in large language models (LLM), LLMs have shown remarkable performance across different domains including healthcare research [44–46, 39]. In particular, LLMs have been utilized for generating patient-physician dialogue from notes [51] and synthetic clinical data [31, 18].

Addressing the limitations of current SBDH datasets and acknowledging the potential of LLMs in healthcare, this study introduces Synth-SBDH, a novel synthetic SBDH dataset that mimics EHR notes. To the best of our knowledge, Synth-SBDH is the largest publicly available SBDH dataset (Table 1), comprising 8,767 examples generated and annotated by an LLM (GPT-4 [1]) with detailed SBDH information, encompassing various dimensions such as presence, temporality, and rationale across 15 meticulously chosen SBDH categories. While Synth-SBDH is smaller than many contemporary synthetic datasets [53, 51, 28], we argue that a high-quality synthetic dataset can lead to a substantial gain in performance, particularly due to the imbalanced nature of real-world clinical data [18, 31]. Moreover, expert review of a smaller dataset is faster and mitigates privacy concerns associated with real-world EHR data while also limiting computational costs and the expense of manual review. Therefore, we conduct an expert evaluation of the Synth-SBDH test split, providing a valuable resource for training and fair evaluation of NLP models in the SBDH extraction task.

We evaluate the utility of Synth-SBDH across multiple NLP tasks leveraging real-world datasets. Specifically, we highlight three key aspects of Synth-SBDH: versatility, generalizability, and distillation capabilities. Our extensive evaluations demonstrate its potential to enhance a broad range of models’ performance on SBDH detection. In summary, our contributions are four-fold:

1. We show that models with different architectural backbones, when trained on Synth-SBDH, exhibit substantial improvements over counterparts without Synth-SBDH training on real-world clinical datasets. For instance, Synth-SBDH yields performance gains of up to 62.36% in SBDH detection as a multi-label classification task. Even in the more challenging named entity recognition task on a much larger dataset, synth-SBDH elevates low-performing models to be comparable with the best in their model class.
2. Synth-SBDH significantly improves the performance for rare SBDH categories on out-of-domain real-world clinical datasets, with up to 93.59 absolute F-score improvements. Synth-SBDH is also useful in low-resource (data and compute) settings.
3. Our comprehensive human evaluation of synth-SBDH demonstrates 71.06% human-LLM alignment for SBDH annotations and a rating of 3.66 on a scale of 4 for annotation rationales. We also identify and describe interesting trends to avoid potential pitfalls in future studies on synthetic SBDH data generation.
4. To facilitate advancements in SBDH extraction and analysis, we make Synth-SBDH, its expert-annotated test set, and all relevant materials publicly available.

With its comprehensive annotations and expert evaluation, Synth-SBDH can be a benchmark dataset for researchers and practitioners alike, offering insights into the intricate relationship between SBDH and health outcomes in EHR text.

2 Related work

2.1 SBDH datasets

Recognizing the significance of SBDH on various clinical outcomes and the utility of unstructured EHR notes, numerous studies have employed NLP techniques to extract SBDH information from EHR notes [40, 3]. Most previous studies on SBDH datasets have focused on individual SBDH categories, such as smoking [49, 43], housing stability [8, 6], substance abuse [52, 5] etc. Conversely, [58] developed a corpus of 15 SDOH categories from the EHR notes of lung cancer patients while [37] built a corpus of 15 SBDH categories to evaluate their associations with suicide. [20] created a dataset of 13 SBDHs to demonstrate the effectiveness of deep-learning-based NLP systems for extracting SBDH from clinical text. However, none of these datasets are publicly available. The majority of existing publicly available SBDH datasets (Table 1) are based on MIMIC-III, which requires additional credentials to access. In this work, we aim to provide a fully open-sourced SBDH dataset without compromising data privacy by eliminating the use of real-world EHR data. Our objective is to develop a more comprehensive SBDH dataset that includes a wider range of SBDH categories, encompassing both behavioral factors and annotation rationales. Furthermore, we investigate the utility of this dataset across multiple tasks on real-world SBDH datasets.

2.2 LLMs to generate synthetic data

LLMs have been widely studied for their capacity to generate data for various general-domain tasks [11, 57, 42, 21]. With recent advancements in generative modeling, LLMs have also been explored within the clinical domain [55, 31, 19, 9]. Although public EHR datasets such as MIMIC-III [25] and MIMIC-IV [26] exist, their access is limited to individuals with specific credentials, and any products developed using these datasets are subject to the same restrictions. This, combined with advancements in LLMs, has motivated researchers to leverage LLMs for generating clinical data, such as generating synthetic clinical notes [28] and patient-physician dialogues [51] from case reports. Regarding SBDH, Guevara et al. [18] generated a small dataset (n=480) and fine-tuned multiple LLMs to showcase the potential of such data. In contrast, this study introduces a significantly larger (~18x) synthetic SBDH dataset incorporating behavioral factors and annotation rationales.




Figure 1: An illustration of the data generation process for Synth-SBDH.

3 Synth-SBDH

3.1 Data generation

The data generation process for Synth-SBDH consists of four stages as shown in Figure 1. The first stage starts with defining SBDH categories and seed examples. Based on a comprehensive literature review, we selected 15 SBDH categories and a group of two human experts meticulously defined them for use in prompting an LLM (Table 8). The experts also provided three sample examples for each SBDH category, reflecting the typical language in clinical notes, resulting in a total of 45 seed examples. Each example includes a text sequence and all possible SBDH annotations encompassing attributes such as *presence*, *period*, and *reasoning*. The *presence* attribute (yes/no) indicates whether an SBDH is present. We include this attribute so that annotations with *presence*=‘no’ can help models understand negations. The *period* attribute provides temporal information indicating whether the SBDH described in the example is an event of the past (history) or present (current), while *reasoning* offers a rationale behind each annotation.

In the second stage, we prompt an LLM with instructions to generate synthetic SBDH data based on the definitions and seed examples obtained from the first stage. This is an iterative process where at each iteration, we sample 10 of the 45 seed examples and instruct the LLM to generate 20 synthetic examples with SBDH annotations and attributes. As an LLM, we used GPT-4 (gpt-4-0613), accessed via OpenAI API. The prompting template and seed examples are available in Appendix A.

The third stage involves filtering the generated data to ensure diversity. We noticed that GPT-4 tended to generate repetitive examples, even when prompted with different seed examples. To encourage diversity in the generated data, we implemented a post-processing filtering step. Following the methodology of [53], we used ROUGE-L metric to set a similarity threshold for pairs of generated examples. An example is only included in the final data pool if it has a ROUGE-L score of less than 0.7 with all the previous examples in the pool. We also filtered out all examples that did not adhere to the expected output format according to the prompt. After the filtering step, our final data pool contained 8,767 examples with 14,342 annotations across 15 SBDH categories, constituting the Synth-SBDH dataset.

Table 2: Dataset Statistics.

In the final stage, we randomly select 20% of Synth-SBDH as the test set and conduct an evaluation by the same group of human experts from the first stage to provide an expert-supervised, high-quality test set that can be used as a gold-standard dataset in future studies. More about the human evaluation process and its findings are detailed in sections 6 and 7.2.

	Synth-SBDH	MIMIC-SBDH _{aligned}	VA-SBDH
# of examples	8,767	7,025	20,570
# of annotations	14,342	-	46,703
# of categories	15	4	12
Avg. seq. length (in words)	13.70	35.13	47.43
Avg. span length (in words)	3.96	-	1.35
Public availability	✓	✓	✗

3.2 Data statistics

Tables 1 and 2 provide key stats for Synth-SBDH. Synth-SBDH is the largest publicly available SBDH dataset covering a broad range of SBDH categories. With an average sequence length of 13.7 words and annotation span length of 3.96 words, Synth-SBDH examples exhibit mostly short sentences with long text spans for annotations. Definitions of all SBDH categories, example text spans, and their distributions are shown in Tables 8 and 11. We make a 70:10:20 split to create training, development, and test sets. This results in 6,136, 836, and 1,755 examples respectively. For all experiments, we only use the training set to train a model, while the development set is retained for hyperparameter tuning. The test set is utilized for human evaluation and distillation experiments.

4 Experiments

4.1 Datasets

We consider two real-world SBDH datasets to validate the utility of Synth-SBDH. Our first dataset is based on MIMIC-SBDH [4], a publicly available SBDH dataset. MIMIC-SBDH is curated from

MIMIC-III notes and has 7 SBDH categories. To better align with the categories and definitions used in Synth-SBDH, we processed the 7 categories and created 4 SBDH categories. We refer to this dataset as MIMIC-SBDH_{aligned}. The second dataset is a subset of the SBDH dataset used by [37]. This is a private dataset based on EHR notes from the US Veterans Health Administration (VHA) Corporate Data Warehouse. The dataset contains 13 SBDH categories and we excluded one category - ‘suicide outcome’ as it was absent in Synth-SBDH. We refer to this dataset as VA-SBDH. Table 2 shows summary statistics of the two datasets. Additional information about the datasets and how we process them are available in Appendix B.

4.2 Evaluation tasks

To assess the utility of Synth-SBDH, we select a set of carefully designed experiments to cover three aspects - versatility, generalizability, and knowledge distillation capability. For versatility, we want to see if Synth-SBDH can be applied to different SBDH detection tasks. In our experiments, we rephrase SBDH detection as two tasks - multi-label classification (MLC) and named entity recognition (NER). NER is more challenging than MLC, especially when the systems are evaluated based on exact matching (i.e. predicted/generated text span and gold span should be an exact match). However, NER enhances interpretability, as an NER model can provide the text span along with each predicted SBDH label, offering healthcare providers more insights into which section of the input sequence was labeled by the model. These experiments also help investigate the generalizability of Synth-SBDH, as we perform the tasks on two real-world datasets from different healthcare settings. For each task, we follow a three-step process - 1) process Synth-SBDH to fit the task description, 2) fine-tune models on the processed Synth-SBDH data, and 3) continue fine-tuning the same models on the task-specific real-world dataset. We compare these models with those that were only fine-tuned on task-specific real-world datasets to evaluate the advantage of our synthetic data. The processing steps for adapting Synth-SBDH to MLC and NER are available in Appendix C.1.

Furthermore, Synth-SBDH is the only SBDH dataset with a rationale for each SBDH annotation. So, we leverage the *distilling step-by-step* (DSS) framework [24] to assess if rationale generation as an auxiliary task improves the performance of SBDH extraction in small language models. This approach is similar to knowledge distillation, where GPT-4 acts as the teacher model (having generated the rationales) and a small language model serves as the student model. Here we reformulate SBDH extraction as a generative NER task instead of MLC to explore the rationales’ importance in a more challenging situation. Given that no publicly available SBDH dataset with annotation rationales exists at the time of this work, we report our results on the expert-reviewed test set of Synth-SBDH.

4.3 Models and metrics

In our study, we prioritize the use of small language models to facilitate the deployment of such systems at remote healthcare centers. For MLC, we consider RoBERTa [32], clinicalRoBERTa [30], Mamba [17], and ClinicalMamba [56]. We consider the base variant for RoBERTa-series models. As clinicalRoBERTa, we select RoBERTa-base-PM-M3-Voc-distill-align. To match the model size of RoBERTa models, we consider Mamba-130m and clinicalMamba-130m. We also try prompt-based fine-tuning [16, 13] for all four models. For the NER task, in addition to encoder-only models such as RoBERTa and clinicalRoBERTa, we also include sequence-to-sequence (Seq2seq) models such as T5 [41] and FLAN-T5 [10]. Once again, we only consider the base variants. We exclude mamba models for NER as they showed poor performance in our preliminary experiments. We report results following both exact and relaxed matching criteria [36]. We report both micro and macro F scores for MLC and NER experiments. For the DSS task, we choose T5 and FLAN-T5 models and report micro and macro F scores following exact matching. We report all scores with standard deviations, averaged over three independent runs. More training details and hyperparameter configuration for each model are available in Appendix C.2.

5 Results

MLC. Table 3 shows the results for our MLC task on MIMIC-SBDH_{aligned}. Among the four models with two different fine-tuning strategies, almost all model-fine-tuning combinations yield significantly better performance when fine-tuned on Synth-SBDH. For example, RoBERTa with standard fine-tuning achieves a 12% gain in macro F (58.12% to 65.50%) while with prompt-based

Table 3: SBDH detection as an MLC task on MIMIC-SBDH_{aligned}. Fine-tuning baseline models on Synth-SBDH before fine-tuning on the target dataset yields significant performance improvements in most cases. Each cell value indicates mean and standard deviation over three independent runs.

Model	Standard Fine-tuning		Prompt-based Fine-tuning	
	Micro F	Macro F	Micro F	Macro F
RoBERTa-base	83.26 ± 2.05	58.12 ± 5.14	79.75 ± 1.03	56.17 ± 1.66
+ Fine-tuned on Synth-SBDH	87.85 ± 0.61	65.50 ± 0.67	91.32 ± 0.07	91.20 ± 0.34
ClinicalRoBERTa-base	85.55 ± 0.44	61.15 ± 1.39	86.63 ± 0.61	65.90 ± 0.36
+ Fine-tuned on Synth-SBDH	89.63 ± 0.58	66.98 ± 0.47	91.41 ± 0.12	91.13 ± 0.59
Mamba-130m	87.79 ± 2.18	79.44 ± 12.54	89.95 ± 0.28	86.61 ± 1.17
+ Fine-tuned on Synth-SBDH	90.16 ± 0.63	89.29 ± 1.60	90.61 ± 0.12	90.18 ± 0.54
ClinicalMamba-130m	91.54 ± 0.09	90.49 ± 0.65	91.26 ± 0.75	84.66 ± 2.98
+ Fine-tuned on Synth-SBDH	91.48 ± 0.40	90.07 ± 1.01	91.89 ± 0.18	91.85 ± 0.42

Table 4: SBDH detection as an NER task on VA-SBDH. Fine-tuning baseline models on Synth-SBDH before fine-tuning on the target dataset improves both exact and relaxed matching performance in almost all cases. Each cell value indicates mean and standard deviation over three independent runs.

Model	Exact Matching		Relaxed Matching	
	Micro F	Macro F	Micro F	Macro F
Encoder-only models				
RoBERTa-base	73.10 ± 0.13	70.21 ± 0.12	82.40 ± 0.09	79.71 ± 0.05
+ Fine-tuned on Synth-SBDH	73.13 ± 0.06	70.43 ± 0.06	82.42 ± 0.05	80.08 ± 0.05
ClinicalRoBERTa-base	72.42 ± 0.06	68.79 ± 0.09	81.71 ± 0.06	78.80 ± 0.18
+ Fine-tuned on Synth-SBDH	72.58 ± 0.36	69.28 ± 0.37	81.71 ± 0.30	78.88 ± 0.34
Seq2Seq models				
T5-base	68.70 ± 0.65	65.34 ± 0.67	78.14 ± 0.62	75.04 ± 0.67
+ Fine-tuned on Synth-SBDH	70.27 ± 0.07	67.40 ± 0.09	79.76 ± 0.17	77.01 ± 0.16
FLAN-T5-base	70.47 ± 0.11	67.37 ± 0.09	79.92 ± 0.13	76.95 ± 0.17
+ Fine-tuned on Synth-SBDH	70.82 ± 0.23	67.55 ± 0.42	80.01 ± 0.13	76.92 ± 0.35

fine-tuning there is an impressive 62.36% gain in macro F (56.17% to 91.20%). The only exception to this trend is clinicalMamba with standard fine-tuning. However, clinicalMamba with prompt-based fine-tuning also enjoys an 8.5% improvement in macro F (84.66% to 91/85%). We can also observe that clinicalRoBERTa and Mamba achieve better F scores with prompt-based learning than standard fine-tuning. Moreover, models pre-trained on MIMIC-III (clinicalRoBERTa, clinicalMamba) easily outperform their variants without MIMIC-III pre-training (RoBERTa, Mamba). Interestingly, Mamba, without any pre-training on MIMIC-III, significantly outperforms clinicalRoBERTa. It is worth noting that the increase in macro F scores is substantially higher than micro F which indicates the benefits of Synth-SBDH for rare categories. We elaborate on this in section 7.1.

NER. For the NER task, we also observe an increase in F scores across most models with Synth-SBDH, as shown in table 4. However, the gains were not as stark as in the MLC task. This can be attributed to two factors - 1) VA-SBDH is more balanced than MIMIC-SBDH_{aligned} (Tables 9 and 10), so, even categories with low prevalence have enough examples in the dataset and thus, decreases any reliance on Synth-SBDH and 2) VA-SBDH is almost 2.3 times bigger than Synth-SBDH and sourced from real clinical notes with human annotations, therefore, it limits the potential benefits of a much smaller synthetic dataset. Despite these challenges, we notice that Synth-SBDH can easily make less performant models more competitive in its model class. For example, fine-tuning on Synth-SBDH decreased the macro F difference between RoBERTa and clinicalRoBERTa from 2% to 1.66% (exact matching). Similarly, with a 3.15% macro F improvement for T5 with exact matching, the difference between T5 and FLAN-T5 comes down from 3.11% to 0.22%. This highlights the potential benefits of synthetic data even for challenging scenarios.

Table 6: Change of F-scores across the 4 SBDH categories on MIMIC-SBDH_{aligned} after fine-tuning on Synth-SBDH. Rare categories such as ‘Housing insecurity’ and ‘Isolation or loss of relationship’ benefited the most from Synth-SBDH. All results are with prompt-based fine-tuning, each cell value indicates mean and standard deviation over three independent runs.

Model	SBDH category	Substance abuse (n = 547)	Housing insecurity (n = 18)	Financial insecurity (n = 378)	Isolation or loss of relationship (n = 154)
	RoBERTa-base		86.93 ± 0.50	0.00 ± 0.00	80.19 ± 1.17
+ Fine-tuned on Synth-SBDH		91.04 ± 0.13	93.59 ± 1.20	93.53 ± 0.18	86.63 ± 0.19
ClinicalRoBERTa-base		89.50 ± 0.48	10.35 ± 0.25	88.77 ± 0.90	74.97 ± 0.15
+ Fine-tuned on Synth-SBDH		91.31 ± 0.16	91.59 ± 2.27	92.44 ± 0.28	89.20 ± 0.22
Mamba-130m		90.02 ± 0.69	78.43 ± 5.20	91.85 ± 0.78	86.14 ± 0.60
+ Fine-tuned on Synth-SBDH		90.18 ± 0.52	90.63 ± 2.46	92.49 ± 0.48	87.44 ± 1.68
ClinicalMamba-130m		91.93 ± 0.20	67.61 ± 8.45	93.21 ± 0.76	85.88 ± 2.61
+ Fine-tuned on Synth-SBDH		91.75 ± 0.23	93.44 ± 1.42	93.19 ± 0.49	89.03 ± 0.06

DSS. We show the results in table 5. Our findings suggest that the DSS framework can improve the overall performance of small generative models on generative SBDH extraction task. In our experiments, both T5 and FLAN-T5 achieve 1.20% and 1.07% increase in macro F scores. Note that the original framework utilized real-world data to generate rationales by an LLM whereas Synth-SBDH rationales were generated during the data generation process. Our pipeline also differs from the original work in that they considered natural language inference, question answering, and mathematical problem-solving tasks whereas we considered NER, a previously uncharted territory for the DSS framework.

Table 5: SBDH extraction with DSS on Synth-SBDH. All models with DSS outperformed standard fine-tuning. Results are for exact matching and evaluated on the expert-reviewed test set.

Model	Micro F	Macro F
T5-base		
Standard Fine-Tuning	57.65 ± 0.30	54.94 ± 0.02
DSS	58.36 ± 0.26	55.60 ± 0.26
FLAN-T5-base		
Standard Fine-Tuning	57.19 ± 0.44	54.36 ± 0.50
DSS	57.70 ± 0.89	54.94 ± 0.84

6 Human and LLM evaluation

Given that Synth-SBDH is a synthetic dataset, we conducted a comprehensive human evaluation to assess its quality. We selected the entire test set (1,755 examples) for this purpose. The same group of two human experts who provided seed examples in the synthetic data generation phase assessed all test annotations and the quality of the provided rationales. Experts considered each GPT-4 generated annotation for one of these actions - *keep* it when the annotation is correct, *correct* it when there is an error, or *discard* it if the annotation was unnecessary or erroneous. Additionally, the experts were instructed to *add* missing annotations. Synth-SBDH obtained an LLM-Human agreement of 71.06% while the two experts had an inter-annotator agreement of 77.80%².

The experts also rated the GPT-4-generated rationales on a 4-point Likert scale, yielding an aggregated rating of 3.66. Based on the expert-reviewed annotations, we created a silver-level test set, which we also release with Synth-SBDH. Furthermore, we curated a list of notable trends observed from successful and failed annotations in Synth-SBDH, available in Appendix D.3. Similar to human evaluation, we also conducted LLM evaluation by prompting GPT-4, resulting in a 90.78% LLM-LLM alignment. All evaluation guidelines are provided in Appendix D.

²All agreements are in percentage agreement and measured across four aspects - text span, SBDH, presence, and period. We adopted relaxed criteria for text span matching, considering a match if one text span contained the other. For SBDH, presence, and period, we employed strict matching criteria.

7 Discussions

7.1 Ablations

Synth-SBDH benefits rare categories. In section 5, we showed that fine-tuning on Synth-SBDH improves macro F scores more substantially than micro F scores on MIMIC-SBDH_{aligned}, leading us to hypothesize that rare SBDH categories benefit from synthetic data of relevant categories from Synth-SBDH. To validate this, we compare the F scores of all SBDH categories side-by-side for models with and without Synth-SBDH fine-tuning as shown in Table 6. This clearly shows that for SBDH categories with low prevalence such as ‘Housing insecurity’ (n=18) and ‘Isolation or loss of relationship’ (n=154), fine-tuning on Synth-SBDH, indeed, yielded the most improvements compared to the other categories.




Figure 2: Impact of Synth-SBDH on VA-SBDH as the training size of VA-SBDH changes. Performance gain diminishes as training size surpasses the training size of Synth-SBDH

Performance with data and compute constraints. We vary the training data size of VA-SBDH to investigate how a change in data size interacts with fine-tuning on Synth-SBDH. We also run the same experiment with an epoch size of 8 and 40. Figure 2 shows that Synth-SBDH helps the most in the low training data regime, as expected. Gain diminishes as the training size surpasses that of Synth-SBDH. We also observe that, Synth-SBDH with a lower epoch size yields substantially higher gains than when trained longer with the same amount of data. Interestingly, the performance curves have not plateaued for any of the settings, indicating more room for improvement with more data. As annotating actual EHR notes is time-consuming, expensive, and raises privacy concerns, developing an even larger synthetic SBDH dataset following a robust framework holds great potential.

7.2 Error analysis

We conducted a qualitative analysis of 2,906 SBDH annotations from 1,755 examples (Synth-SBDH test set). As outlined in section 6, experts were instructed to carry out one of four operations - *Keep*, *Correct*, *Discard*, and *Add*. A summary of these operations is presented in Table 7, with a detailed category-wise breakdown provided in Table 13. Our analysis reveals that human experts agreed with GPT-4 generated annotations in the majority of cases (71.06%). Additionally, experts added 581 new annotations (16.66%), increasing the total annotation count to 3,487. After accounting for the 142 discarded annotations, the final annotation count stands at 3,345 from 1,732 examples. The categories ‘Physical Isolation’, ‘Loss of Relationship’, and ‘Patient Disability’ posed the greatest challenge for GPT-4 to annotate, whereas ‘Pain’, ‘Food Insecurity’, and ‘Job Insecurity’, were the easiest. Furthermore, among the missed annotations, ‘Loss of Relationship’, ‘Housing Insecurity’, and ‘Social Isolation’ were the most frequent categories.

7.3 Limitations

Our study has several limitations. First, our seed examples and SBDH definitions were based on VHA EHR notes. Creating examples and definitions using different hospitals’ EHR data banks can help generating more diverse and inclusive data. Second, in all of our experiments, we avoided the use of LLMs. However, this was a conscious choice to emulate real-world scenarios at remote healthcare centers with low resource capacities if they were to adopt a deep-learning-based SBDH detection system. Third, Synth-SBDH is relatively small compared to other domain-specific synthetic datasets. However, Synth-SBDH can still yield performance gain on a 2.3x bigger and balanced real-world

dataset, highlighting the potential Synth-SBDH holds if its size is increased. We leave this for future work. Fourth, Synth-SBDH uses a very simple data generation framework. Techniques such as self-consistency [53], multi-agent framework [23], self-verification [54] etc. may improve the quality of synthetic data and this warrants future exploration. Fifth, Synth-SBDH only contains examples in the English language. Exploring the impact of synthetic data for SBDH detection in other languages is a promising future research direction.

7.4 Societal Impacts

Synth-SBDH has the potential to significantly enhance healthcare research and practice by providing a robust and comprehensive resource for the extraction and analysis of SBDH. By offering a large, publicly available synthetic dataset, Synth-SBDH enables researchers to develop and refine NLP models without the privacy concerns associated with real clinical data. This accessibility can lead to accelerated advancements in understanding the nuanced interplay between SBDH and health outcomes, thereby improving patient care and population health management. Moreover, the dataset’s versatility and generalizability can enhance the detection and analysis of SBDH across diverse clinical scenarios, contributing to more effective and equitable healthcare interventions.

However, the deployment of synthetic datasets like Synth-SBDH also raises potential concerns. The reliance on synthetic data, while addressing privacy issues, may introduce biases or inaccuracies that do not fully capture the complexities of real-world data. If not carefully validated, models trained on such data could propagate these biases, potentially leading to erroneous conclusions or suboptimal clinical decisions. Additionally, the use of LLMs in generating this dataset underscores the dependency on advanced and intensive computational resources, which may not be equally accessible to all research institutions, thereby perpetuating disparities in research capabilities.

8 Conclusion

In this study, we present and release Synth-SBDH, a synthetic dataset for social and behavioral determinants of health (SBDH) in clinical text. Synth-SBDH surpasses existing publicly available SBDH datasets in size and encompasses a diverse array of SBDH categories along with relevant information such as presence and annotation rationales, thereby addressing critical gaps in the current datasets. Our extensive evaluations demonstrate that models trained on Synth-SBDH achieve significant performance improvements when applied to real-world SBDH datasets from two distinct hospital settings. Additionally, the inclusion of SBDH rationales aids in distilling reasoning capability into smaller models, enhancing their SBDH detection. Synth-SBDH proves to be highly beneficial for identifying rare SBDH categories and for developing systems within low-resource settings. Synth-SBDH not only highlights the potential of synthetic data in mitigating data scarcity and privacy but also advances more effective and inclusive healthcare analytics.

Acknowledgments and Disclosure of Funding

This work was supported in part by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) under award numbers R01DA056470 and R01AG080670. This work was also supported in part by 1I01HX003711-01A1 from the United States (U.S.) Department of Veterans Affairs Health Systems Research (HSR). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the NIH and HSR.

References

[1] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.

Table 7: Human evaluation stats on Synth-SBDH test set.

Operation	#Annotations
<i>Keep</i>	2,478 (71.06%)
<i>Correct</i>	286 (8.20%)
<i>Discard</i>	142 (4.07%)
<i>Add</i>	581 (16.66%)
Total	3,487 (100%)

- [2] Paris B Adkins-Jackson, Kristen M George, Lilah M Besser, Jinshil Hyun, Melissa Lamar, Tanisha G Hill-Jarrett, Omonigho M Bubu, Jason D Flatt, Patricia C Heyn, Ethan C Cicero, et al. The structural and social determinants of alzheimer’s disease related dementias. *Alzheimer’s & Dementia*, 19(7):3171–3185, 2023.
- [3] KshatriyaBhavani Singh Agnikula, E Balls-BerryJoyce Joy, et al. Social and behavioral determinants of health in the era of artificial intelligence with electronic health records: a scoping review. *Health Data Science*, 2021.
- [4] Hiba Ahsan, Emmie Ohnuki, Avijit Mitra, and Hong Yu. Mimic-sbdh: a dataset for social and behavioral determinants of health. In *Machine Learning for Healthcare Conference*, pages 391–413. PMLR, 2021.
- [5] Hadeel Alzoubi, Naeem Ramzan, Raid Alzubi, and Ehsan Mesbahi. An automated system for identifying alcohol use status from clinical text. In *2018 International Conference on Computing, Electronics & Communications Engineering (iCCECE)*, pages 41–46. IEEE, 2018.
- [6] Cosmin A Bejan, John Angiolillo, Douglas Conway, Robertson Nash, Jana K Shirey-Rice, Loren Lipworth, Robert M Cronin, Jill Pulley, Sunil Kripalani, Shari Barkin, et al. Mining 100 million notes to find homelessness and adverse childhood experiences: 2 case studies of rare and severe social determinants of health in electronic health records. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 25(1):61–71, 2018.
- [7] John R Blosnich, Ann Elizabeth Montgomery, Melissa E Dichter, Adam J Gordon, Dio Kavalieratos, Laura Taylor, Bryan Ketterer, and Robert M Bossarte. Social determinants and military veterans’ suicide ideation and attempt: a cross-sectional analysis of electronic health record data. *Journal of general internal medicine*, 35:1759–1767, 2020.
- [8] Alec B Chapman, Audrey Jones, A Taylor Kelley, Barbara Jones, Lori Gawron, Ann Elizabeth Montgomery, Thomas Byrne, Ying Suo, James Cook, Warren Pettey, et al. Rehoused: A novel measurement of veteran housing stability using natural language processing. *Journal of biomedical informatics*, 122:103903, 2021.
- [9] Bharath Chintagunta, Namit Katariya, Xavier Amatriain, and Anitha Kannan. Medically aware gpt-3 as a data generator for medical dialogue summarization. In *Machine Learning for Healthcare Conference*, pages 354–372. PMLR, 2021.
- [10] Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Yunxuan Li, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, et al. Scaling instruction-finetuned language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.11416*, 2022.
- [11] John Joon Young Chung, Ece Kamar, and Saleema Amershi. Increasing diversity while maintaining accuracy: Text data generation with large language models and human interventions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.04140*, 2023.
- [12] Nabarun Dasgupta, Leo Beletsky, and Daniel Ciccarone. Opioid crisis: no easy fix to its social and economic determinants. *American journal of public health*, 108(2):182–186, 2018.
- [13] Ning Ding, Yulin Chen, Xu Han, Guangwei Xu, Pengjun Xie, Hai-Tao Zheng, Zhiyuan Liu, Juanzi Li, and Hong-Gee Kim. Prompt-learning for fine-grained entity typing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.10604*, 2021.
- [14] Hillary A Franke. Toxic stress: effects, prevention and treatment. *Children*, 1(3):390–402, 2014.
- [15] Yujuan Fu, Giridhar Kaushik Ramachandran, Nicholas J Dobbins, Namu Park, Michael Leu, Abby R Rosenberg, Kevin Lybarger, Fei Xia, Ozlem Uzuner, and Meliha Yetisgen. Extracting social determinants of health from pediatric patient notes using large language models: Novel corpus and methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.00826*, 2024.
- [16] Tianyu Gao, Adam Fisch, and Danqi Chen. Making pre-trained language models better few-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.15723*, 2020.

- [17] Albert Gu and Tri Dao. Mamba: Linear-time sequence modeling with selective state spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.00752*, 2023.
- [18] Marco Guevara, Shan Chen, Spencer Thomas, Tafadzwa L Chaunzwa, Idalid Franco, Benjamin H Kann, Shalini Moningi, Jack M Qian, Madeleine Goldstein, Susan Harper, et al. Large language models to identify social determinants of health in electronic health records. *NPJ digital medicine*, 7(1):6, 2024.
- [19] Zhen Guo, Peiqi Wang, Yanwei Wang, and Shangdi Yu. Dr. llama: Improving small language models on pubmedqa via generative data augmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.07804*, 2023.
- [20] Sifei Han, Robert F Zhang, Lingyun Shi, Russell Richie, Haixia Liu, Andrew Tseng, Wei Quan, Neal Ryan, David Brent, and Fuchiang R Tsui. Classifying social determinants of health from unstructured electronic health records using deep learning-based natural language processing. *Journal of biomedical informatics*, 127:103984, 2022.
- [21] Thomas Hartvigsen, Saadia Gabriel, Hamid Palangi, Maarten Sap, Dipankar Ray, and Ece Kamar. Toxigen: A large-scale machine-generated dataset for adversarial and implicit hate speech detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.09509*, 2022.
- [22] Elham Heidari, Rana Zalmai, Kristin Richards, Lakshya Sakthisivabalan, and Carolyn Brown. Z-code documentation to identify social determinants of health among medicaid beneficiaries. *Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy*, 19(1):180–183, 2023.
- [23] Sirui Hong, Xiawu Zheng, Jonathan Chen, Yuheng Cheng, Jinlin Wang, Ceyao Zhang, Zili Wang, Steven Ka Shing Yau, Zijuan Lin, Liyang Zhou, et al. Metagpt: Meta programming for multi-agent collaborative framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.00352*, 2023.
- [24] Cheng-Yu Hsieh, Chun-Liang Li, Chih-Kuan Yeh, Hootan Nakhost, Yasuhisa Fujii, Alexander Ratner, Ranjay Krishna, Chen-Yu Lee, and Tomas Pfister. Distilling step-by-step! outperforming larger language models with less training data and smaller model sizes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.02301*, 2023.
- [25] Alistair EW Johnson, Tom J Pollard, Lu Shen, Li-wei H Lehman, Mengling Feng, Mohammad Ghassemi, Benjamin Moody, Peter Szolovits, Leo Anthony Celi, and Roger G Mark. MIMIC-III, a freely accessible critical care database. *Scientific data*, 3(1):1–9, 2016.
- [26] Alistair EW Johnson, Lucas Bulgarelli, Lu Shen, Alvin Gayles, Ayad Shammout, Steven Horng, Tom J Pollard, Sicheng Hao, Benjamin Moody, Brian Gow, et al. MIMIC-IV, a freely accessible electronic health record dataset. *Scientific data*, 10(1):1, 2023.
- [27] Augustine J Kposowa. Unemployment and suicide: a cohort analysis of social factors predicting suicide in the US national longitudinal mortality study. *Psychological medicine*, 31(1):127–138, 2001.
- [28] Sunjun Kweon, Junu Kim, Jiyou Kim, Sujeong Im, Eunbyeol Cho, Seongsu Bae, Jungwoo Oh, Gyubok Lee, Jong Hak Moon, Seng Chan You, et al. Publicly shareable clinical large language model built on synthetic clinical notes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.00237*, 2023.
- [29] Adam D Lelkes, Eric Loreaux, Tal Schuster, Ming-Jun Chen, and Alvin Rajkomar. SDOH-NLI: a dataset for inferring social determinants of health from clinical notes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.18431*, 2023.
- [30] Patrick Lewis, Myle Ott, Jingfei Du, and Veselin Stoyanov. Pretrained language models for biomedical and clinical tasks: Understanding and extending the state-of-the-art. In Anna Rumshisky, Kirk Roberts, Steven Bethard, and Tristan Naumann, editors, *Proceedings of the 3rd Clinical Natural Language Processing Workshop*, pages 146–157, Online, November 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.clinicalnlp-1.17. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2020.clinicalnlp-1.17>.
- [31] Rumeng Li, Xun Wang, and Hong Yu. Two directions for clinical data generation with large language models: Data-to-label and label-to-data. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, volume 2023, page 7129. NIH Public Access, 2023.

- [32] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*, 2019.
- [33] Kevin Lybarger, Nicholas J Dobbins, Ritche Long, Angad Singh, Patrick Wedgeworth, Özlem Uzuner, and Meliha Yetisgen. Leveraging natural language processing to augment structured social determinants of health data in the electronic health record. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 30(8):1389–1397, 2023.
- [34] Kevin Lybarger, Meliha Yetisgen, and Özlem Uzuner. The 2022 n2c2/uw shared task on extracting social determinants of health. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 30(8):1367–1378, 2023.
- [35] Muniza Anum Majoka and Corbett Schimming. Effect of social determinants of health on cognition and risk of alzheimer disease and related dementias. *Clinical Therapeutics*, 43(6): 922–929, 2021.
- [36] Avijit Mitra, Bhanu Pratap Singh Rawat, David McManus, Alok Kapoor, and Hong Yu. Bleeding entity recognition in electronic health records: a comprehensive analysis of end-to-end systems. In *AMIA Annual Symposium Proceedings*, volume 2020, page 860. American Medical Informatics Association, 2020.
- [37] Avijit Mitra, Richeek Pradhan, Rachel D Melamed, Kun Chen, David C Hoaglin, Katherine L Tucker, Joel I Reisman, Zhichao Yang, Weisong Liu, Jack Tsai, et al. Associations between natural language processing–enriched social determinants of health and suicide death among us veterans. *JAMA network open*, 6(3):e233079–e233079, 2023.
- [38] Charles A Nelson, Zulfiqar A Bhutta, Nadine Burke Harris, Andrea Danese, and Muthanna Samara. Adversity in childhood is linked to mental and physical health throughout life. *bmj*, 371, 2020.
- [39] Harsha Nori, Nicholas King, Scott Mayer McKinney, Dean Carignan, and Eric Horvitz. Capabilities of gpt-4 on medical challenge problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.13375*, 2023.
- [40] Braja G Patra, Mohit M Sharma, Veer Vekaria, Prakash Adekkanattu, Olga V Patterson, Benjamin Glicksberg, Lauren A Lepow, Euijung Ryu, Joanna M Biernacka, Al’ona Furmanchuk, et al. Extracting social determinants of health from electronic health records using natural language processing: a systematic review. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 28(12):2716–2727, 2021.
- [41] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9, 2019.
- [42] Gaurav Sahu, Pau Rodriguez, Issam H Laradji, Parmida Atighehchian, David Vazquez, and Dzmitry Bahdanau. Data augmentation for intent classification with off-the-shelf large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.01959*, 2022.
- [43] Guergana K Savova, Philip V Ogren, Patrick H Duffy, James D Buntrock, and Christopher G Chute. Mayo clinic nlp system for patient smoking status identification. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 15(1):25–28, 2008.
- [44] Karan Singhal, Shekoofeh Azizi, Tao Tu, S Sara Mahdavi, Jason Wei, Hyung Won Chung, Nathan Scales, Ajay Tanwani, Heather Cole-Lewis, Stephen Pfohl, et al. Large language models encode clinical knowledge. *Nature*, 620(7972):172–180, 2023.
- [45] Karan Singhal, Tao Tu, Juraj Gottweis, Rory Sayres, Ellery Wulczyn, Le Hou, Kevin Clark, Stephen Pfohl, Heather Cole-Lewis, Darlene Neal, et al. Towards expert-level medical question answering with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.09617*, 2023.
- [46] Arun James Thirunavukarasu, Darren Shu Jeng Ting, Kabilan Elangovan, Laura Gutierrez, Ting Fang Tan, and Daniel Shu Wei Ting. Large language models in medicine. *Nature medicine*, 29(8):1930–1940, 2023.

- [47] Hannah P Truong, Alina A Luke, Gmerice Hammond, Rishi K Wadhwa, Mat Reidhead, and Karen E Joynt Maddox. Utilization of social determinants of health icd-10 z-codes among hospitalized patients in the united states, 2016–2017. *Medical care*, 58(12):1037–1043, 2020.
- [48] Julie M Turner-Cobb, Sandra E Sephton, Cheryl Koopman, Jane Blake-Mortimer, and David Spiegel. Social support and salivary cortisol in women with metastatic breast cancer. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 62(3):337–345, 2000.
- [49] Özlem Uzuner, Ira Goldstein, Yuan Luo, and Isaac Kohane. Identifying patient smoking status from medical discharge records. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 15(1):14–24, 2008.
- [50] Nora D Volkow and Carlos Blanco. The changing opioid crisis: development, challenges and opportunities. *Molecular psychiatry*, 26(1):218–233, 2021.
- [51] Junda Wang, Zonghai Yao, Zhichao Yang, Huixue Zhou, Rumeng Li, Xun Wang, Yucheng Xu, and Hong Yu. Notechat: A dataset of synthetic doctor-patient conversations conditioned on clinical notes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.15959*, 2023.
- [52] Yan Wang, Elizabeth S Chen, Serguei Pakhomov, Elliot Arsoniadis, Elizabeth W Carter, Elizabeth Lindemann, Indra Neil Sarkar, and Genevieve B Melton. Automated extraction of substance use information from clinical texts. In *AMIA Annual Symposium Proceedings*, volume 2015, page 2121. American Medical Informatics Association, 2015.
- [53] Yizhong Wang, Yeganeh Kordi, Swaroop Mishra, Alisa Liu, Noah A Smith, Daniel Khashabi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Self-instruct: Aligning language models with self-generated instructions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10560*, 2022.
- [54] Yixuan Weng, Minjun Zhu, Fei Xia, Bin Li, Shizhu He, Shengping Liu, Bin Sun, Kang Liu, and Jun Zhao. Large language models are better reasoners with self-verification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.09561*, 2022.
- [55] Ran Xu, Hejie Cui, Yue Yu, Xuan Kan, Wenqi Shi, Yuchen Zhuang, Wei Jin, Joyce Ho, and Carl Yang. Knowledge-infused prompting improves clinical text generation with large language models. In *NeurIPS 2023 Workshop on Synthetic Data Generation with Generative AI*, 2023.
- [56] Zhichao Yang, Avijit Mitra, Sunjae Kwon, and Hong Yu. Clinicalmamba: A generative clinical language model on longitudinal clinical notes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05795*, 2024.
- [57] Kang Min Yoo, Dongju Park, Jaewook Kang, Sang-Woo Lee, and Woomyeong Park. Gpt3mix: Leveraging large-scale language models for text augmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08826*, 2021.
- [58] Zehao Yu, Xi Yang, Yi Guo, Jiang Bian, and Yonghui Wu. Assessing the documentation of social determinants of health for lung cancer patients in clinical narratives. *Frontiers in public health*, 10:778463, 2022.

A Synth-SBDH

A.1 SBDH Categories in Synth-SBDH

The 15 SBDH categories with their descriptions and sample text spans are shown in Table 8.

A.2 Prompt

We used the following prompt to generate 20 examples at a time from GPT-4.

Prompt:

The social determinants of health (SDOH) are the non-medical factors that
↪ influence health outcomes. They are the conditions in which people are
↪ born, grow, work, live, and age, and the wider set of forces and
↪ systems shaping the conditions of daily life. SDOHs have a major impact
↪ on people’s health, well-being, and quality of life. SDOHs encompass
↪ factors such as socioeconomic status, access to healthy food, education,
↪ housing, and physical environment, to name a few. Together with
↪ behavioral factors such as substance abuse, we get Social and
↪ behavioral determinants of health (SBDH). Below are 15 SBDH categories
↪ with definitions that we will consider.

1. Food Insecurity: Lack of consistent access to enough food for every
↪ person in a household to live an active, healthy life.
2. Job Insecurity: Job insecurity includes unemployment, underemployment,
↪ unstable employment, fear of losing a job or benefits, and vocational
↪ rehabilitation/training.
3. Housing Insecurity: Housing insecurity refers to unstable housing due to
↪ a variety of reasons which may include eviction, inability to afford
↪ rent, foreclosure, or displacement due to domestic/roommate/landlord
↪ issues.

...

- 15 Psychiatric Symptoms or Disorders: Psychiatric Symptoms or Disorders
↪ category includes emotional/psychological difficulties and conditions
↪ that affect the ability to function well in daily life.

Below are a few sample examples with SBDH collected from different clinical
↪ notes where each example has six sections - `Text`, `Textspan`,
↪ `Reasoning`, `SBDH`, `Presence`, and `Period`. `Text` contains the
↪ example with mention(s) of SBDH(s). `Textspan` consists of text spans
↪ from the `Text` with indications of SBDH separated by double vertical
↪ lines (||). `Reasoning` has the rationales or reasonings behind the
↪ SBDH annotations and follows the same order as in `Textspan`. Next, we
↪ have the SBDH category, its presence - yes or no, and period - current
↪ (exists currently) or history (events from the past).

Example 1.

Text: Patient's Seroquel dose remains the same.

Textspan: dose remains the same

Reasoning: Seroquel dosage did not change, so no transition of care.

SBDH: Transitions of Care

Presence: no

Period: current

Example 2.

Text: Patient has tobacco use disorder (in past medical history list)

Textspan: tobacco use disorder

Table 8: List of all 15 SBDH Categories

SBDH categories	Definition	Example text spans
Social isolation	A state in which the individual lacks a sense of belonging socially, lacks engagement with others, has a minimal number of social contacts, and they are deficient in fulfilling and quality relationships.	Alone, lonely etc.
Physical isolation	Physical isolation results in less involvement with others, often due to disability, illness, housebound or bedbound, that prevents active participation in life outside of the home/immediate physical environment.	Bedridden, housebound etc.
Transition of care	The transitions of care category identifies healthcare-related points of vulnerability; examples include admission, discharge, medication change, and change of provider.	Discharge, admission, change in medication, transfer etc.
Barriers to care	Barriers to care are factors that interfere with healthcare access, and may include transportation issues, cognitive or communication difficulties, lack of trust in the care system, or lack of rapport with provider(s).	Transportation issues, communication problems etc.
Financial insecurity	The anxiety produced by the possible exposure to adverse economic events and the anticipation of the difficulty of recovering from them.	Poor, low income etc.
Job insecurity	Job insecurity includes unemployment, underemployment, unstable employment, fear of losing a job or benefits, and vocational rehabilitation/training.	Unemployed, lost job etc.
Loss of relationship	A loss of a personal relationship, including divorce, separation, death, estrangement, or breakdown of interpersonal communication.	Divorce, widow etc.
Housing insecurity	Housing insecurity refers to unstable housing due to a variety of reasons which may include eviction, inability to afford rent, foreclosure, or displacement due to domestic/roommate/landlord issues.	Eviction, homeless, etc.
Food insecurity	Lack of consistent access to enough food for every person in a household to live an active, healthy life.	Hungry, pantry, starvation, food voucher etc.
Violence	The violence category includes elements of the individual's environment, as well as the larger societal environment. The presence of weapons, various types of abuse (physical, emotional/psychological, sexual), exposure to combat, bullying, harassment, threats, and racism are categorized as violence. Violence includes cases of both perpetrators and victims.	Firearms, violence, assault, abuse, homicidal, racism etc.
Legal problems	Legal problems entail violations of law, associated punishments, and mention of related officials, places, and processes e.g., attorney, judge, parole officer, court, jail, prison, incarceration, child custody/child support issues.	Imprisonment, parole, arrested, felony, prison etc.
Substance abuse	Substance Abuse (marijuana excluded) covers the use of both legal (alcohol, tobacco) and illicit substances, addiction, substance abuse treatment/rehab/sobriety groups, and relapse.	Alcohol, tobacco, cocaine, heroin, smoking, overdose etc.
Psychiatric symptoms or disorders	Psychiatric symptoms or disorders category includes emotional/psychological difficulties and conditions that affect the ability to function well in daily life.	PTSD, depression, insomnia, schizophrenia, hallucination etc.
Patient disability	The patient disability category includes impairments that affect daily life as evidenced by the presence of assistive devices, disability payments, and military service-connected ratings.	Disabled, blind, wheelchair etc.
Pain *	The pain category considers acute and chronic pain, arthralgia, migraine, and evidence of pain through mention of pain management/mitigation.	Pain, suffering, hurting, etc.

* Not an SBDH.

Reasoning: Tobacco use is categorized as substance abuse; patient has
↪ history of tobacco use.
SBDH: Substance Abuse
Presence: yes
Period: history

Example 3.

Text: Veteran is anticipated to discharge home once medically stable for
↪ discharge transported by his wife.
Textspan: discharge || home || transported by his wife
Reasoning: Discharge from the hospital is considered as transition of care.
↪ || Veteran has a home to go after discharge, so he is less likely to
↪ have housing problems. || Having family or friends to transport the
↪ patient is absence of barriers to care.
SBDH: Transitions of Care || Housing Insecurity || Barriers to Care
Presence: yes || no || no
Period: current || current || current

...

Example 10.

Text: Consult for polysubstance abuse, in particular OUD with fentanyl use.
Textspan: polysubstance abuse || OUD || fentanyl use
Reasoning: Polysubstance abuse outside their intended use is considered
↪ substance abuse. || Opioid use disorder (OUD) is considered substance
↪ abuse. || Using illicit or prescription drugs (fentanyl) outside their
↪ intended use is considered substance abuse.
SBDH: Substance Abuse || Substance Abuse || Substance Abuse
Presence: yes || yes || yes
Period: current || current || current

Your task is to generate examples with mentions of SBDH, provide your
↪ reasonings behind them, and finally annotate those mentions in the
↪ examples. The requirements are:
1. An example can have one or multiple mentions of SBDH and must be from
↪ the 15 above-mentioned SBDH categories.
2. More importantly, each example should emulate a text snippet from a
↪ patient's electronic health records with no more than three sentences.
3. You must make the examples (specially 'Text' and 'Reasoning' sections)
↪ as diverse as possible, both syntactically and semantically. Do not
↪ start examples with the same pattern.

Now, generate 20 examples that meet the requirements mentioned above.
↪ Format examples as a valid JSON with the following structure:

```
[  
  {  
    `Text`:...,  
    `Annotations`: [  
      {  
        `Textspan`:...,  
        `Reasoning`:...,  
        `SBDH`:...,  
        `Presence`:...,  
        `Period`:...,  
      },  
      {  
        `Textspan`:...,  
        `Reasoning`:...,  
        `SBDH`:...,
```



```

        `Presence':...,
        `Period':...,
    },
    ...
]
},
{
    `Text':...,
    `Annotations': [
        {
            `Textspan':...,
            `Reasoning':...,
            `SBDH':...,
            `Presence':...,
            `Period':...,
        },
        {
            `Textspan':...,
            `Reasoning':...,
            `SBDH':...,
            `Presence':...,
            `Period':...,
        },
        ...
    ]
},
...
]

```

A.3 Seed examples

We used 45 expert-written seed examples to mimic the style and tone in EHR notes. These were utilized to prompt GPT-4 to ensure that the generated examples maintain a similar language. Every time we prompt GPT-4, we randomly sample 10 examples and use them in the prompt as shown in section A.2. The list of 45 examples is shown below. Here multiple annotations and rationales (reasoning) from the same text are separated by ‘||’. Each annotation in ‘Annotations’ is in (Text span, SBDH label, Presence label, Period label) format.

Example 1.

Text: He explained that he was hungry and did not have a lot of money so took about \$60 worth of
Reasoning: He was hungry and did not have enough money to buy food. || He did not have enough mon
Annotations: (hungry, Food Insecurity, yes, current) || (not have a lot of money, Financial Insec

Example 2.

Text: Denies substance abuse and legal issues, and vet states he has plenty of food to eat.
Reasoning: Veteran is denying substance abuse. || Vetaran is denying any legal problems. || Vetara
Annotations: (substance abuse, Substance Abuse, no, current) || (legal issues, Legal Problems, no

Example 3.

Text: Patient reports she was assaulted by her domestic partner today and needs help finding a pl
Reasoning: Patient seeking help after being assaulted by domestic partner. Assault is categorized
Annotations: (assaulted, Violence, yes, current) || (by her domestic partner, Loss of Relationship

Example 4.

Text: He was provided with a food box and two bus tickets.
Reasoning: Receiving a food box indicates that patient is currently experiencing food insecurity.
Annotations: (provided with a food box, Food Insecurity, yes, current) || (two bus tickets, Barri

Example 5.

Text: She is keeping herself busy attending church and has met some individuals who are supportive
Reasoning: She attends church, where she is with others. || She has met people who are supportive
Annotations: (attending church, Social Isolation, no, current) || (individuals who are supportive

Example 6.

Text: These parents also started giving her crystal meth at age 12 and forced her out of the home
Reasoning: Patient's parents gave her crystal meth as a child, which disrupted the parent/child r
Annotations: (parents, Loss of Relationship, yes, history) || (giving her crystal meth, Substance

Example 7.

Text: Veteran has little social support and very little contact with family. He is now completely
Reasoning: Veteran doesn't have much social support. || Veteran does not have much contact with f
Annotations: (little social support, Social Isolation, yes, current) || (very little contact with

Example 8.

Text: Veteran is anticipated to discharge home once medically stable for discharge transported by
Reasoning: Discharge from the hospital is considered as transition of care. || Veteran has a home
Annotations: (discharge, Transitions of Care, yes, current) || (home, Housing Insecurity, no, cur

Example 9.

Text: Veteran is currently wheelchair bound, and has not ambulated in over a year due to multiple
Reasoning: Patient is wheelchair bound and hasn't walked in over a year due to his disability. ||
Annotations: (wheelchair bound, Patient Disability, yes, current) || (severe right hip pain, Pain

Example 10.

Text: In terms of paranoia, patient appears to have some residual paranoia both about people outs
Reasoning: Patient has some residual paranoia, a sign of psychiatric problems. ||Patient does not
Annotations: (paranoia, Psychiatric Symptoms or Disorders, yes, current) || (does not actively wi

Example 11.

Text: Patient says she was incarcerated for parole violation on an armed robbery charge.
Reasoning: Patient was incarcerated for a violation of the law. || Parole violation is a violation
Annotations: (incarcerated, Legal Problems, yes, history) || (parole violation, Legal Problems, y

Example 12.

Text: Is the patient "marginally housed"? No. Has patient been homeless within the past year for
Reasoning: Patient is not currently "marginally housed". || Patient has not been homeless for any
Annotations: (marginally housed, Housing Insecurity, no, current) || (homeless, Housing Insecurit

Example 13.

Text: Major Depression, recurrent, severe; originally presented with SI to walk into traffic; no
Reasoning: Major Depression is a psychiatric symptom. || Hospitalization is categorized as transi
Annotations: (Major Depression, Psychiatric Symptoms or Disorders, yes, current) || (outside of h

Example 14.

Text: The veteran's daughter reports that the veteran does not use alcohol, tobacco, or illicit s
Reasoning: Veteran does not consume alcohol. || Veteran does not use tobacco. || Veteran does not
Annotations: (alcohol, Substance Abuse, no, current) || (tobacco, Substance Abuse, no, current) |

Example 15.

Text: He says he has lost his job again and feels ashamed to even speak on the phone to his daugh
Reasoning: Losing job is a clear sign of job insecurity.
Annotations: (lost his job, Job Insecurity, yes, current)

Example 16.

Text: Veteran spoke of her very satisfying marriage, and her love of her husband.
Reasoning: Veteran has a satisfying marriage. || Veteran loves her husband.
Annotations: (very satisfying marriage, Loss of Relationship, no, current) || (love of her husbar

Example 17.

Text: Unintentional weight loss - stress and food insecurity related.

Reasoning: Stress is a psychological symptom. || Weight loss due to food insecurity was mentioned.

Annotations: (stress, Psychiatric Symptoms or Disorders, yes, current) || (food insecurity, Food Insecurity, yes, current)

Example 18.

Text: Vocational rehab will assist Veteran in job search activity bringing job leads, application assistance, and training.

Reasoning: Wording suggests that veteran needs assistance with finding employment. || Wording indicates job search activity.

Annotations: (job search, Job Insecurity, yes, current) || (job leads, Job Insecurity, yes, current)

Example 19.

Text: Patient has worked most of his adult life as a cook and is employed at a restaurant as a chef.

Reasoning: Patient was employed most of his adult life, so little to no chance of past employment.

Annotations: (worked, Job Insecurity, no, history) || (employed, Job Insecurity, no, current)

Example 20.

Text: VASH social worker meets with veteran to ensure veteran continues developing and maintaining housing.

Reasoning: VASH is VA subsidized housing - any patient receiving VASH has housing insecurity. || Mentions of VASH.

Annotations: (VASH, Housing Insecurity, yes, current) || (maintaining housing, Housing Insecurity, yes, current)

Example 21.

Text: Living situation - rental - lives with father

Reasoning: Patient is at a rental property with no indication of any housing issues. || Lives with father.

Annotations: (rental, Housing Insecurity, no, current) || (lives with father, Housing Insecurity, no, current)

Example 22.

Text: Veteran endorsed recent financial stressor which includes an old debt that was never paid.

Reasoning: Patient mentions financial stressors, suggesting financial insecurity. || Mentions of financial stressors.

Annotations: (financial stressor, Financial Insecurity, yes, current) || (debt that was never paid, Financial Insecurity, yes, current)

Example 23.

Text: Bouts of depression off and on, currently not wanting to be around others, isolating and reclusive.

Reasoning: Depression is a psychiatric symptom. || Self-isolation is an indicator of social isolation.

Annotations: (depression, Psychiatric Symptoms or Disorders, yes, current) || (not wanting to be around others, Psychiatric Symptoms or Disorders, yes, current)

Example 24.

Text: Reports stressors including housing insecurity, chronic feelings of hopelessness, and poor mental health.

Reasoning: Housing insecurity is mentioned as a stressor. || Feeling hopeless is a psychiatric symptom.

Annotations: (housing insecurity, Housing Insecurity, yes, current) || (hopelessness, Psychiatric Symptoms or Disorders, yes, current)

Example 25.

Text: Veteran relates that she feels like a lot of her stress is related to marital dynamic and a breakdown in communication.

Reasoning: Stress due to marital dynamic can be indicative of a breakdown in communication or support.

Annotations: (marital dynamic, Loss of Relationship, yes, current) || (marital counseling, Loss of Relationship, yes, current)

Example 26.

Text: Veteran is reporting unwanted thoughts of harming two brothers as evidenced by him stating "I wish I could hurt them."

Reasoning: Thoughts of harming others is considered violence. || Being jumped is a physical component of violence.

Annotations: (thoughts of harming, Violence, yes, current) || (jumped me, Violence, yes, current)

Example 27.

Text: Patient had four inpatient psychiatric hospitalizations from several VA hospitals, and his current hospitalization is also for psychiatric concerns.

Reasoning: Past psychiatric hospitalization must be due to psychiatric concerns. || Any mention of psychiatric hospitalization.

Annotations: (psychiatric hospitalization, Psychiatric Symptoms or Disorders, yes, history) || (hospitalization, Psychiatric Symptoms or Disorders, yes, history)

Example 28.

Text: Admitting diagnoses/problems: abdominal pain.

Reasoning: Patient has abdominal pain.

Annotations: (pain, Pain, yes, current)

Example 29.

Text: Veteran no longer requires a walker for ambulating.

Reasoning: Not requiring assistive devices shows that patient no longer has a disability.

Annotations: (walker, Patient Disability, no, current)

Example 30.

Text: Consult for polysubstance abuse, in particular OUD with fentanyl use.

Reasoning: Polysubstance abuse outside their intended use is considered substance abuse. || Opioid

Annotations: (polysubstance abuse, Substance Abuse, yes, current) || (OUD, Substance Abuse, yes,

Example 31.

Text: Unemployed but reported is seeking work.

Reasoning: Patient is currently unemployed || Patient is looking for a job.

Annotations: (unemployed, Job Insecurity, yes, current) || (seeking work, Job Insecurity, yes, cu

Example 32.

Text: Veteran was evicted from his most recent apartment for non-payment of rent. He will be home

Reasoning: Eviction is categorized as housing insecurity. || Loss of recent apartment means that

Annotations: (was evicted, Housing Insecurity, yes, current) || (most recent apartment, Housing I

Example 33.

Text: He is very worried about finances, including his children's back to school expenses and fee

Reasoning: He is currently worried about finances which. || His current financial concerns includ

Annotations: (worried about finances, Financial Insecurity, yes, current) || (school expenses, Fi

Example 34.

Text: This writer received a call from the veteran inquiring about the VJO program as he has a mi

Reasoning: VJO is acronym for Veterans Justice Outreach which indicates veteran has a legal issue

Annotations: (VJO, Legal Problems, yes, current) || misdemeanor case, Legal Problems, yes, curren

Example 35.

Text: Per son, veteran's prognosis remains poor. He is completely bedbound and requires help with

Reasoning: Veteran is confined to bed, and unable to complete activities of daily living.

Annotations: (completely bedbound, Physical Isolation, yes, current)

Example 36.

Text: Veteran reports that she actively communicates with mental health provider and has been com

Reasoning: Veteran communicates with provider and complies with treatment. There is no barrier to

Annotations: (actively communicates, Barriers to Care, no, current)

Example 37.

Text: Veteran has recently begun to describe his exposure to military war experiences, i.e. burni

Reasoning: Veteran has recently been describing violence he was exposed to during military combat

Annotations: (military war experiences, Violence, yes, history) || (burning bodies, Violence, yes

Example 38.

Text: Patient's Seroquel dose remains the same.

Reasoning: Seroquel dosage did not change, so no transition of care.

Annotations: (dose remains the same, Transitions of Care, no, current)

Example 39.

Text: Patient's pain has been addressed by patient's provider and pain interventions have already

Reasoning: Patient is experiencing pain. || Patient's pain is being addressed with intervention.

Annotations: (pain, Pain, yes, current) || (pain, Pain, yes, current)

Example 40.

Text: Veteran needs assistance with setting up since he is blind.

Reasoning: Patient is blind. Blindness is a disability.

Annotations: (he is blind, Patient Disability, yes, current)

Example 41.

Text: Veteran struggles with sleep apnea and PTSD which causes sleep issues.

Reasoning: Veteran suffers from PTSD, which is categorized as a psychiatric symptom. || Veteran h

Annotations: (PTSD, Psychiatric Symptoms or Disorders, yes, current) || (causes sleep issues, Psy

Example 42.

Text: Patient has tobacco use disorder (in past medical history list)

Reasoning: Tobacco use is categorized as substance abuse; patient has history of tobacco use.

Annotations: (tobacco use disorder, Substance Abuse, yes, history)

Example 43.

Text: The client self-reports that his rent and utilities are paid and up to date.

Reasoning: Mentions of rent being paid is considered an absence of financial insecurity. || Ment

Annotations: (rent, Financial Insecurity, no, current) || (utilities are paid, Financial Insecuri

Example 44.

Text: Reports losing the trailer after losing job and getting evicted.

Reasoning: Losing a property (trailer) can be attributed to financial insecurity. || Losing a job

Annotations: (losing the trailer, Financial Insecurity, yes, current) || (losing job, Job Insecur

Example 45.

Text: Social worker will continue to follow veteran for any further social work or discharge plan

Reasoning: Any mention of discharge is considered a transition of care. || Any mention of admissi

Annotations: (discharge, Transitions of Care, yes, current) || (admission, Transitions of Care, y

B Datasets

B.1 MIMIC-SBDH_{aligned}

MIMIC-SBDH [4] provides SBDH annotations for the social history sections of 7,025 discharge summaries from MIMIC-III. It contains 7 SBDH categories - ‘Community’, ‘Economics’, ‘Environment’, ‘Food’, ‘Alcohol Use’, ‘Tobacco Use’ and ‘Drug Use’. ‘Community’ is further subcategorized into two groups - ‘Community-present’ and ‘Community-absent’. In MIMIC-SBDH, SBDH detection is considered a classification task with binary or categorical value for each SBDH category. SBDH definitions and their categorical values are available in the original paper. Based on their definitions, we created the following 4 categories to align with Synth-SBDH -

1. ‘Substance abuse’ - This combines ‘Alcohol Use’ (Present), ‘Tobacco Use’ (Present), and ‘Drug Use’ (Present).
2. ‘Housing insecurity’ - ‘Environment’ (False).
3. ‘Financial insecurity’ - ‘Economics’ (False).
4. ‘Isolation or loss of relationship’ - ‘Community-absent’ (True).

MIMIC-SBDH with these modified categories constitutes MIMIC-SBDH_{aligned}. We chose a 70:10:20 split to create training, development, and test sets; yielding 4,917, 702, and 1,406 examples respectively. The distributions of SBDH categories across all splits are shown in Table 9.

B.2 VA-SBDH

VA-SBDH [37] has 12 SBDH categories - ‘Isolation or loss of relationship’, ‘Transition of care’, ‘Barriers to care’, ‘Financial or job insecurity’, ‘Housing instability’, ‘Food insecurity’, ‘Violence’, ‘Legal problems’, ‘Substance abuse’, ‘Psychiatric symptoms or disorders’, ‘Pain’ and ‘Patient disability’. All these categories follow similar definitions as listed in Table 8 except the following two categories -

1. ‘Isolation or loss of relationship’ - This category combines ‘Social isolation’, ‘Physical isolation’ and ‘Loss of relationship’.

Table 9: SBDH category distribution for MIMIC-SBDH_{aligned}.

SBDH categories	Training	Development	Test
Substance abuse	1,848	274	547
Housing insecurity	41	4	18
Financial insecurity	1,190	174	378
Isolation or loss of relationship	553	77	154
Total	3,632	529	1,097

* These are instances where GPT-4 created new SBDH categories.

Table 10: SBDH category distribution for VA-SBDH.

SBDH categories	Training	Development	Test
Isolation or loss of relationship	2,486	923	913
Transition of care	4,126	1,469	1,424
Barriers to care	684	206	189
Financial or job insecurity	2,119	652	725
Housing instability	3,306	1,171	1,112
Food insecurity	198	93	71
Violence	1,277	483	513
Legal problems	1,494	509	566
Substance abuse	3,984	1,251	1,420
Psychiatric symptoms or disorders	4,630	1,649	1,472
Pain*	1,128	337	317
Patient disability	2,433	654	719
Total	27,865	9,397	9,441

* Not an SBDH.

2. ‘Financial or job insecurity’ - This category combines ‘Financial insecurity’ and ‘Job insecurity’.

VA-SBDH comes with pre-defined training, development, and test splits with 12,236, 4,163, and 4,171 examples respectively. The distributions of SBDH categories across all splits are shown in Table 10.

C Task and experiment details

C.1 Task details

As mentioned in section 4.2, for the MLC and NER tasks, we follow a three-step process. In the first step, we modify Synth-SBDH to align with the downstream task and dataset. We start by combining related SBDH categories in Synth-SBDH (as described in Appendix B.2) to have a total of 12 SBDH categories (instead of the original 15). For MLC, we convert Synth-SBDH into an MLC dataset by following these steps:

1. Extract SBDH categories: We identify and extract all unique SBDH categories from Synth-SBDH.

Table 11: SBDH category distribution for Synth-SBDH.

SBDH categories	Training	Development	Test
Social isolation	946	159	281
Physical isolation	320	46	84
Transition of care	618	82	153
Barriers to care	406	60	111
Financial insecurity	817	101	235
Job insecurity	1,018	126	303
Loss of relationship	664	103	186
Housing insecurity	696	101	193
Food insecurity	519	79	137
Violence	502	77	151
Legal problems	353	56	109
Substance abuse	842	139	262
Psychiatric symptoms or disorders	1,088	135	312
Pain *	625	100	200
Patient disability	608	79	187
Total	10,022	1,443	2,904 [†]

* Not an SBDH.

[†] Note that this is 2 less than the total annotation count mentioned in section 7.2. This is because we removed all annotations outside the pre-defined 15 categories.

2. **Aggregate:** For each example in the Synth-SBDH, we aggregate all the SBDH categories recognized within that example.
3. **Create Labels:** We generate a set of labels for each example, where each label corresponds to an SBDH category present in the example. An example can have multiple labels if it contains annotations of multiple SBDH categories.
4. **Binary Encoding:** We encode the presence of each SBDH category in an example using a binary format (1 if present, 0 if not). This results in a multi-label format where each document is associated with a binary vector indicating the presence or absence of each named entity type.

For NER, we convert examples from Synth-SBDH into BIO format for RoBERTa and clinical-RoBERTa models. For Seq2seq models, we rephrase NER as a generative task where given an example the models are trained to generate all text spans indicating any SBDH, each followed by the associated SBDH category. For DSS experiments, we reformulate SBDH extraction as the generative NER task described above. With multiple SBDH annotations, we concatenate them to create the rationale label. Ultimately, generative systems are trained in a multi-task learning framework to generate either the SBDH categories (along with related text spans) or rationales depending on the input. More details about DSS framework are available in the original paper [24]. For all three tasks, we avoid nested annotations³ and only consider annotations with *presence*=‘yes’.

In the second and third steps, we do supervised fine-tuning (SFT). In the second step, we fine-tune models on the modified Synth-SBDH dataset (SFT_{stage1}), and in the third and last step, we use trained models from SFT_{stage1} to further fine-tune on the task-specific real-world datasets (SFT_{stage2}). Note

³For nested annotations, i.e. multiple annotations with overlapping text spans, we choose the first annotation.

that for DSS, there is no other real-world SBDH dataset with rationales, so there is no SFT_{stage2}. Instead, we report the results on the expert-reviewed Synth-SBDH test set.

C.2 Training configurations

For all experiments, we use the development sets of respective datasets to choose the best hyperparameter configurations. More details for training on downstream tasks are available in 12. For NER and MLC, we only show configurations for SFT_{stage2}. For MLC in SFT_{stage1}, we use the same configurations with the only change in num epoch, which is set to 40. For NER in SFT_{stage1}, there are a few changes: batch size = 32, max seq length = 512, and GPU specs = 1 Tesla V100 32 GB.

Table 12: Training configurations on downstream datasets. ‘/’ separates values for RoBERTa-variants and Seq2seq models. For the DSS experiment, we have only Seq2seq models.

	MLC	NER	DSS
Hyperparameters			
optimizer	AdamW	AdamW	AdamW
beta1	0.9	0.9	0.9
beta2	0.95	0.95	0.999
batch size	32	16/8	32
num epoch	8	40	100
weight decay	0.01	0	0
warmup ratio	0.1/0.15	0/0.1	0
gradient acc. steps	8	1	2
learning rate (lr)	1e-5/3e-4	1e-5/5e-5	5e-5
lr scheduler	linear/constant	linear	linear
max seq length	256	512	256
GPU			
Count	1	1	1
Model	Tesla V100	Tesla P40	Tesla V100
Memory	232GB	24GB	32GB
Compute time (approx.)	35mins/25mins	3.5hrs/12-17hrs	2-3hrs

D Human and LLM evaluation

D.1 Annotation review guidelines

- Follow the SBDH definitions as described in Table 8 and examples as provided in Appendix A.3. Here are some category-specific instructions-
 - Financial Insecurity: Consider references to adequate health insurance, and the presence of a pension as evidence of financial **security**.
 - Psychiatric Symptoms or Disorders: References to Alzheimer’s disease/other dementia, memory issues, stress, sadness, and worry **not** included in this category. An exception to this is the mention of more generic stress where the cause can not be determined from the context. Such mentions of stress should be considered under this category.
- If a sentence contains text spans belonging to multiple SBDH categories, each text span should be annotated and assigned to its corresponding category. Take the following example-

Text: The veteran suffers from PTSD due to combat experiences and is socially isolated.
Textspan: suffers from PTSD || combat experiences || socially isolated
SBDH: Psychiatric Symptoms or Disorders || Violence || Social Isolation
Presence: yes || yes || yes
Period: current || history || current

Table 13: Category-wise breakdown of human evaluation for all 15 SBDH Categories.

SBDH categories	#Annotations	Keep	Correct	Discard	Add
Social isolation	403	274	35	0	94
Physical isolation	84	38	18	10	18
Transition of care	169	114	9	25	21
Barriers to care	136	89	3	18	26
Financial insecurity	270	212	10	3	45
Job insecurity	347	287	13	1	46
Loss of relationship	258	133	51	3	71
Housing insecurity	275	178	29	0	68
Food insecurity	153	123	3	12	15
Violence	201	128	25	4	44
Legal problems	128	95	15	1	17
Substance abuse	277	210	38	7	22
Psychiatric symptoms or disorders	367	267	13	29	58
Pain *	230	196	13	1	20
Patient disability	187	134	11	26	16
Others†	2	0	0	2	0
Total	3,487	2,478	286	142	581

* Not an SBDH.

† Instances where GPT-4 created new SBDH categories.

- If a text span contains elements of more than one SBDH category, and GPT-4 chose one of those categories, consider that as a correct annotation. However, in case of adding a new annotation, prioritize the more specific category. Here is an example-

Text: Patient has been struggling to pay mortgage and is at risk of foreclosure.
Textspan: struggling to pay mortgage || at risk of foreclosure
SBDH: Financial Insecurity || Housing Insecurity
Presence: yes || yes
Period: current || current

The text span ‘struggling to pay mortgage’ indicates both financial and housing insecurity; so this is a correct annotation by GPT-4. However, if this annotation is missing and needs to be added, categorize it as housing insecurity.

- When possible, avoid nested annotations. However, for situations where nested annotations are necessary, consider them as such. The following example demonstrates such a case.

Text: Patient is unable to pay for her medications and is worried about her financial situation.
Textspan: unable to pay for her medications || worried about her financial situation || unable to pay for her medications
SBDH: Barriers to Care || Financial Insecurity || Financial Insecurity
Presence: yes || yes || yes
Period: current || current || current

Here ‘unable to pay for her medications’ indicates both ‘Barriers to Care’ and ‘Financial Insecurity’ categories and both should be annotated.

5. If there is not enough context to detect ‘period’, use ‘unclear’.
6. Consider each annotation for one of these four actions -
 - (a) *Keep*: Keep the annotation if it is correct. In the following example, the text span ‘broke up with her boyfriend’ was categorized as ‘loss of relationship’, and the text span ‘signs of depression’ was categorized as ‘psychiatric symptoms or disorders’ by GPT-4, both of which are correct according to the SBDH definitions from Table 8.

Text: Patient broke up with her boyfriend recently and she shows signs of depression.

Textspan: broke up with her boyfriend || signs of depression

SBDH: Loss of Relationship || Psychiatric Symptoms or Disorders

- (b) *Correct*: Correct the annotation if there is an error in judgment. In the following example, GPT-4 categorized ‘drug trafficking’ as substance abuse. Drug trafficking belongs to the legal problems category.

Text: Patient was in prison for five years due to drug trafficking.

Textspan: drug trafficking

SBDH: Substance Abuse

- (c) *Discard*: Discard the annotation if the annotation is unnecessary or erroneous. In the following example, GPT-4 labeled ‘involved in a car accident’ as patient disability with rationale - ‘Patient was involved in an accident, which might have caused physical trauma or injuries’. However, this is a far-fetched inference and not supported by the content.

Text: Patient has been involved in a car accident recently and is experiencing injuries.

Textspan: involved in a car accident

SBDH: Patient Disability

- (d) *Add*: Add SBDH annotations missed by GPT-4. In the following example, GPT-4 annotated the spans ‘living in a homeless shelter’ (housing insecurity) and ‘loss of her job’ (job insecurity) but did not include ‘could not afford rent’ (housing insecurity).

Text: Patient has been living in a homeless shelter as she could not afford rent due to loss of her job.

Textspan: living in a homeless shelter || loss of her job

SBDH: Housing insecurity || Job Insecurity

D.2 Rationale rating

We used a 4-point Likert scale to rate all GPT-4 generated rationales in the test set to assess their quality. The scale is as follows -

- *Incorrect* (1 pt.): The rationale provided is entirely incorrect and does not align with the context or definitions provided in the prompt.
- *Incorrect with Direct Inference* (2 pt.): The rationale contains some elements of inference related to an SBDH, making it a convincing explanation or referring to another annotation, but overall, is incorrect.
- *Correct with Unnecessary or Irrelevant or Incomplete Information* (3 pt): The rationale is correct in detecting the SBDH and other attributes (presence and/or period) but includes additional information that -

1. is not supported by the context, or
 2. is logically incorrect, or
 3. does not contribute to the SBDH detection thought process, or
 4. misses important information such as mention of the concept or topic.
- *Correct* (4 pt.): The rationale provided is entirely correct without any unnecessary or irrelevant information.

For rationales with a rating of less than 4, experts provide a *Correct* rationale. The silver-level test set of Synth-SBDH contains only *Correct* rationales.

D.3 Interesting observations

Here we list a few interesting cases found during the human evaluation.

- GPT-4 assumed any instances of suicidal behavior should be categorized under the ‘Psychiatric Symptoms or Disorders’ category. Considering no instruction pertaining to the categorization of suicidal behavior was provided to GPT-4, this SBDH category is the best fit.
- GPT-4 linked social worker’s assistance to ‘Barriers to Care’ category despite not having such an example in the prompt. GPT-4 did a good job at extrapolating this into the ‘Barriers to Care’ category. Here is an example.

Text: The patient was very happy with the social worker’s assistance in understanding her prescription plan.
Textspan: social worker’s assistance
SBDH: Barriers to Care
Presence: no
Period: current
Reasoning: The patient was able to understand their prescription plan with the help of a social worker which suggests absence of barriers to care.

- GPT-4 extrapolated that the use of a guide dog indicates a disability which is an interesting assumption.

Text: The patient is blind and relies on a guide dog for mobility.
Textspan: blind || relies on a guide dog for mobility
SBDH: Patient Disability || Patient Disability
Presence: yes || yes
Period: current || current
Reasoning: Blindness is a disability. || Reliance on a guide dog is a sign of disability.

- GPT-4 had some difficulty distinguishing between substance abuse and legitimate use of prescribed controlled substances. Here is such an example where GPT-4 categorized ‘prescribed opioids’ as ‘Substance Abuse’ though it was prescribed and not an illicit use. Note that there is also a missing annotation here (for text span ‘pain management’).

Text: Veteran continues to have back pain and has been prescribed opioids for pain management.
Textspan: back pain || prescribed opioids
SBDH: Pain || Substance Abuse
Presence: yes || yes
Period: current || current
Reasoning: The patient is experiencing physical discomfort. || The patient has been provided with prescription medication for pain management.

- At times, GPT-4 reached an illogical conclusion not supported by the available context. In the following example, GPT-4 categorized the span ‘worsening symptoms’ as ‘Psychiatric

Symptoms or Disorders’ despite the lack of context to indicate that symptoms are psychiatric in nature.

Text: Patient was readmitted after discharge due to worsening symptoms.
Textspan: readmitted after discharge || **worsening symptoms**
SBDH: Transitions of Care || **Psychiatric Symptoms or Disorders**
Presence: yes || **yes**
Period: current || **current**
Reasoning: Readmission soon after discharge indicates a transition of care. || **Worsening symptoms indicate underlying health issues.**

- GPT-4 rationales occasionally overreached or conflated concepts.

Text: Patient recently moved to a new city and is facing difficulties accessing regular healthcare.
Textspan: recently moved to a new city || **facing difficulties accessing regular healthcare**
SBDH: **Transitions of Care** || Barriers to Care
Presence: yes || yes
Period: **current** || current
Reasoning: **Moving to a new city is a significant event that can potentially lead to changes in healthcare and therefore can be regarded as a transition in care.** || Difficulty in accessing healthcare is indicative of barriers to care.

Here, GPT-4 categorized the text span ‘recently moved to a new city’ as ‘Transitions of care’, with a vague and inappropriate rationale. Another interesting example is the following with the ‘Job insecurity’ annotation.

Text: Patient recently divorced and now faces the challenge of caring for three children while working two jobs.
Textspan: recently divorced || **working two jobs**
SBDH: Loss of Relationship || **Job Insecurity**
Presence: yes || **yes**
Period: current || **current**
Reasoning: A recent divorce indicates a loss of relationship. || **Working two jobs may suggest job insecurity due to insufficient income from a single job.**

The correct SBDH category here is ‘Financial insecurity’.

- Experts also noticed annotations where it was difficult to decide on *period* from the synthetic examples but GPT-4 made a decision regardless, partly because the data generation prompt instructed GPT-4 to consider only ‘current’ and ‘history’ as the *period* values.

D.4 Prompt for LLM evaluation

To conduct LLM evaluation, we ask GPT-4 to identify whether each annotation from Synth-SBDH is correct or not. Labeling an annotation as correct is analogous to the *keep* action by human experts while the opposite is similar to either *correct* or *discard* actions. Note, that we did not ask GPT-4 to identify missing annotations. We used the following prompt to evaluate Synth-SBDH by GPT-4.

The social determinants of health (SDOH) are the non-medical factors that influence health outcomes.

1. Food Insecurity: Lack of consistent access to enough food for every person in a household to meet their needs.
2. Job Insecurity: Job insecurity includes unemployment, underemployment, unstable employment, and low wages.
3. Housing Insecurity: Housing insecurity refers to unstable housing due to a variety of reasons including high cost, poor quality, and lack of access.
4. Financial Insecurity: The anxiety produced by the possible exposure to adverse economic events such as job loss or illness.
5. Legal Problems: Legal problems entail violations of law, associated punishments, and mention of legal issues.
6. Social Isolation: A state in which the individual lacks a sense of belonging socially, lacks emotional support, and has limited social connections.

7. Physical Isolation: Physical isolation results in less involvement with others, often due to
8. Loss of Relationship: A loss of a personal relationship, including divorce, separation, death,
9. Barriers to Care: Barriers to care are factors that interfere with healthcare access, and may
10. Violence: The violence category includes elements of the individual's environment, as well a
11. Transitions of Care: The transitions of care category identifies healthcare-related points of
12. Pain: The pain category considers acute and chronic pain, arthralgia, migraine, and evidence
13. Patient Disability: The patient disability category includes impairments that affect daily li
14. Substance Abuse: Substance Abuse (marijuana excluded) covers the use of both legal (alcohol,
15. Psychiatric Symptoms or Disorders: Psychiatric Symptoms or Disorders category includes emotion

Your task is to validate SBDH annotation for a text sequence that emulates the language a patient

1. Analyze the text sequence carefully and try to figure out all possible mentions of SBDH from c
 2. Analyze the provided annotation ('Textspan', 'SBDH', 'Presence', and 'Period') and critique it
 3. Generate 'yes' if the annotation is correct and 'no' otherwise, put it under the 'Correct' se
 4. Generate reasoning or rationale behind the annotation, and put it under the 'Reasoning' section
 5. Do not explicitly mention phrases such as 'the annotation is correct/incorrect' in the 'Reason
 6. Avoid single or double quotation marks.
 7. Format your answer as a valid Python dictionary with the following structure:
- ```
{
 'Correct':...,
 'Reasoning':...
}
```

Below are a few sample examples.

Example 1.

Text: Patient's Seroquel dose remains the same.

Textspan: dose remains the same

SBDH: Transitions of Care

Presence: no

Period: current

Reasoning: Seroquel dosage did not change, so no transition of care.

...

Example 5.

Text: Veteran is anticipated to discharge home once medically stable for discharge transported by

Textspan: discharge

Reasoning: Discharge from the hospital is considered as transition of care.

SBDH: Transitions of Care

Presence: yes

Period: current

Now evaluate the following example.

{Single annotation from Synth-SBDH to evaluate}