

Enhancing In-Hospital Mortality Prediction Using Multi-Representational Learning with LLM-Generated Expert Summaries

Harshavardhan Battula, Jiacheng Liu, Jaideep Srivastava
Department of Computer Science and Engineering
University of Minnesota Twin Cities
Minneapolis
{battu018, liu00520, srivasta}@umn.edu

November 27, 2024

Abstract

Objective

In-hospital mortality (IHM) prediction for ICU patients is critical for timely interventions and efficient resource allocation. While structured physiological data provides quantitative insights, clinical notes offer unstructured, context-rich narratives. This study integrates these modalities with Large Language Model (LLM)-generated expert summaries to improve IHM prediction accuracy.

Materials and Methods

Using the MIMIC-III database, we analyzed time-series physiological data and clinical notes from the first 48 hours of ICU admission. Clinical notes were concatenated chronologically for each patient and transformed into expert summaries using Med42-v2 70B. A multi-representational learning framework was developed to integrate these data sources, leveraging LLMs to enhance textual data while mitigating direct reliance on LLM predictions, which can introduce challenges in uncertainty quantification and interpretability.

Results

The proposed model achieved an AUPRC of 0.6156 (+36.41%) and an AUROC of 0.8955 (+7.64%) compared to a time-series-only baseline. Expert summaries outperformed clinical notes or time-series data alone, demonstrating the value of LLM-generated knowledge. Performance gains were consistent across demographic groups, with notable improvements in underrepresented populations, underscoring the framework's equitable application potential.

Conclusions

By integrating LLM-generated summaries with structured and unstructured data, the framework captures complementary patient information, significantly improving predictive performance. This approach showcases the potential of LLMs to augment critical care prediction models, emphasizing the need for domain-specific validation and advanced integration strategies for broader clinical adoption.

Keywords

electronic health records; in-hospital mortality; large language models; machine learning; ICU; clinical notes.

Introduction

Predicting In-hospital mortality (IHM) in Intensive Care Unit (ICU) is critical for improving patient outcomes and optimizing healthcare resources. Timely identification of high-risk patients enables early interventions, potentially saving lives and reducing healthcare costs. Advances in machine learning and the widespread adoption of Electronic Health Records (EHRs) have facilitated the development of predictive models in critical care settings. These models traditionally rely on structured data, such as vital signs and laboratory results, which are continuously recorded in ICUs [8, 10, 14, 15]. However, such models often fail to incorporate unstructured clinical data, which provides valuable contextual information about patient conditions.

Clinical notes, a key component of EHRs, capture detailed observations, assessments, and care plans from healthcare providers. These notes offer a qualitative dimension that complements the quantitative nature of structured data. Despite their value, integrating clinical notes into predictive models is challenging due to the variability of natural language and the need for domain expertise to extract meaningful insights. Recent advancements in Natural Language Processing (NLP) have enabled the processing of unstructured text, transitioning from traditional feature-based methods [2] to sophisticated transformer-based architectures like ClinicalBERT and BioBERT [1, 13].

Domain-specific LLMs, such as Med42, MedPaLM, and GPT-4o, represent a new frontier for understanding clinical narratives [4–6]. These models embed extensive medical knowledge in their parameters and have demonstrated proficiency in generating summaries and interpreting nuanced clinical information. By leveraging these capabilities, LLMs can distill critical insights from clinical notes, enhancing predictive model accuracy. However, directly using LLMs for predictions introduces challenges, particularly in quantifying uncertainty [3, 17]. In high-stakes settings like ICUs, such limitations could lead to unintended consequences in clinical decision-making. To address these risks, this study focuses on transforming clinical notes into Expert-Based Clinical Representations (EBCRs) by infusing domain knowledge from LLMs rather than relying on LLMs directly for predictions. This approach ensures the predictive model remains interpretable and improves uncertainty quantification.

This study proposes a novel multi-representational learning framework that integrates structured time-series physiological data with unstructured clinical notes and LLM-generated expert summaries through EBCRs. Structured data provides quantitative insights, while clinical notes and LLM-generated summaries contribute qualitative perspectives, enabling a comprehensive understanding of patient health. By incorporating domain knowledge from LLMs, the proposed approach bridges the gap between structured and unstructured data, enhancing predictive performance and robustness.

A retrospective cohort analysis was conducted using the MIMIC-III (Medical Information Mart for Intensive Care III) database [12], focusing on ICU patients admitted for at least 48 hours. A neural network model was developed to integrate the multi-representational data sources through a joint learning framework, with performance evaluated using the Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristic Curve (AUROC) and Area Under the Precision-Recall Curve (AUPRC). Comparative analyses were performed against baseline models that used only structured data or single textual representations.

Materials and Methods

Dataset

This study utilized the Medical Information Mart for Intensive Care III (MIMIC-III) database, a publicly available dataset containing de-identified health records of ICU patients at the Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center [12]. The analysis focused on patients admitted to the ICU for at least 48 hours, as this period is critical for predicting in-hospital mortality due to the heightened risk of acute deterioration during early ICU stages [9, 10]. We constructed the dataset based on the preprocessing pipeline suggested by [10], we selected 10 clinical variables with minimal missing data: diastolic blood pressure, systolic blood pressure, mean arterial blood pressure, heart rate, temperature, respiration rate, oxygen saturation (SpO₂), fraction of inspired oxygen (FiO₂), blood pH value, and blood glucose levels. Missing values were imputed, and corresponding imputation masks were added for robustness. Abnormal values, such as negative SpO₂ readings, were excluded, and extreme outliers were truncated. The variables were aggregated into hourly time series by calculating the average of

all available measurements recorded within the most recent hour. The demographic characteristics of the patient cohort, including age, sex, race, and outcomes, are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics and Outcome Prevalence by Inpatient Cohort

Characteristic	Overall (n = 15,337)
Median Age [IQR]	66.96 [18.08, 90.0]
Sex, n (%)	
Male	8,559 (55.8%)
Female	6,778 (44.2%)
Race, n (%)	
White	10,806 (70.5%)
Other	2,427 (15.8%)
Black/African American	1,120 (7.3%)
Hispanic/Latino	456 (3.0%)
Asian	362 (2.4%)
Declined to Answer	166 (1.1%)
Outcomes, n (%)	
Alive	13,348 (87.0%)
Death	1,989 (13.0%)
Length of Stay [IQR] (Days)	3.80 [0.43, 87.64]

Clinical notes, including radiology reports and nurse assessments from the first 48 hours of ICU admission, were extracted for each patient. These notes were sorted chronologically and concatenated into a single document per patient, with a maximum token limit of 4096 to ensure compatibility with downstream text processing models. Notes without associated chart times and patients lacking any recorded notes were excluded to maintain data integrity. The final dataset consisted of 15,337 patients, which was randomly divided into training (60%), validation (20%), and testing (20%) sets.

Methods

In this section, we outline the models employed in this study, beginning with the notations, followed by the baseline architecture, and concluding with a description of the proposed multi-representational learning framework. The framework integrates time-series data with multiple textual representations, specifically clinical notes and their corresponding expert summaries generated by a Large Language Model (LLM). The in-hospital mortality (IHM) prediction problem involves estimating the likelihood of a patient dying before discharge based on their clinical and physiological data during their ICU stay. This task is particularly significant for ICU patients due to the high risk of rapid clinical deterioration, necessitating timely and accurate risk stratification to inform clinical decision-making.

In-hospital Risk of Mortality Prediction for ICU Patients

Below, we present the mathematical definitions for each component and detail the structure of the multi-representational learning approach. Let $\mathcal{X} = \{\mathbf{x}_t\}_{t=1}^T$ represent the time-series physiological data, where T is the total number of time steps (measured in hours), and $\mathbf{x}_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denotes the vector of d physiological measurements at time t . In this study, T is set to 48 hours. Let N_T denote the chronological concatenation of clinical notes recorded during the first 48 hours for a given patient. The LLM-generated expert summary, represented as $N_{\text{expert}} = f_{\text{LLM}}(N_T)$, is treated as an auxiliary transformation of the original textual data. The target variable $y \in \{0, 1\}$ indicates in-hospital mortality, with $y = 1$ if the patient died prior to discharge and $y = 0$ otherwise.

Baseline: Time-Series LSTM Model

The baseline model employed in this study is inspired by previous works such as [10]. For predicting in-hospital mortality, we utilized a Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) network [11] to capture temporal dependencies within the time-series physiological data $\{\mathbf{x}_t\}_{t=1}^T$. At each time step, the LSTM takes the current input \mathbf{x}_t and the previous hidden state \mathbf{H}_{t-1} to compute the updated hidden state \mathbf{H}_t :

$$\mathbf{H}_t = \text{LSTM}(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{H}_{t-1}), \quad \text{for } t = 1 \text{ to } T.$$

The final hidden state at $t = 48$ is used to generate the prediction for in-hospital mortality:

$$\hat{y} = \sigma(\mathbf{W}_m \mathbf{h}_{48} + b_m),$$

where \hat{y} represents the predicted probability of in-hospital mortality, $\sigma(\cdot)$ is the sigmoid activation function, \mathbf{W}_m is the weight matrix of the final fully connected layer, and b_m is the bias term. The model was trained using binary cross-entropy loss to minimize the error in predicting mortality outcomes. To address potential overfitting, L_2 regularization was incorporated during training.

Textual Representations Embedding

Both the original clinical notes and the LLM-generated summaries were encoded using a Feature Extractor built on ClinicalBERT [1], a transformer-based language model trained on clinical text. Since modeling clinical notes involves sequential prediction, it requires aligning discrete textual events with continuous time-series data recorded at hourly intervals. To achieve this, feature maps U_i were generated by independently processing each note N_i through the Feature Extractor. For every time step $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$, the aggregated text representation U_t was computed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} U_i &= \text{FeatureExtractor}(N_i) \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, K, \\ w(t, i) &= \exp(-\lambda \cdot (t - \text{CT}(i))), \\ U_t &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M U_i w(t, i), \end{aligned}$$

where M is the total number of notes available before time step t , and λ is a decay hyperparameter optimized using the validation set. The term $w(t, i)$ represents a temporal weighting function that applies an exponential decay based on the difference between the current time step t and the chart time $\text{CT}(i)$ of the note. This approach ensures that recent notes, which are more indicative of the patient’s current condition, are given greater importance in the aggregated representation U_t .

LLM-Generated Summary Embedding

The expert summary generated by the LLM, denoted as N_{expert} , was processed to derive the auxiliary text embedding V_t . To create the input for the LLM, all clinical notes N_1 through N_K , documented during the time period $t = 1$ to $t = T$, were concatenated (\otimes) in chronological order to form a single document N_T :

$$N_T = N_1 \otimes N_2 \otimes \dots \otimes N_K.$$

The LLM-generated summary was then produced by applying the LLM function f_{LLM} to N_T , where f_{LLM} utilized a hard prompt to generate a structured summary. Details of the prompt used can be found in the supplementary materials.

$$N_{\text{expert}} = f_{\text{LLM}}(N_T).$$

The resulting expert summary N_{expert} was subsequently encoded into its corresponding embedding V_t using a Feature Extractor,

$$V_t = \text{FeatureExtractor}(N_{\text{expert}}).$$

Joint Learning

To effectively capture complementary information from the different data modalities, the embeddings were combined through a joint fusion mechanism, specifically using concatenation:

$$\mathbf{h}_{\text{concat}} = [\mathbf{H}_t; \mathbf{U}_t; \mathbf{V}_t] \in \mathbb{R}^{h+2b},$$

where b is the embedding size generated by the Feature Extractor, and $[\cdot; \cdot]$ denotes concatenation of vectors along the feature dimension. The joint embedding $\mathbf{h}_{\text{concat}}$ was then passed through a fully connected layer to compute the final output:

$$z = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{h}_{\text{concat}} + b,$$

where $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{(h+2b)}$ represents the weight matrix, and b is the bias term. The final probability of in-hospital mortality, \hat{y} , was obtained by applying a sigmoid activation function to z :

$$\hat{y} = \sigma(z),$$

where $\sigma(\cdot)$ is the sigmoid function. Figure 1 provides a visual representation of the joint learning framework.

Implementation Details

The implementation of the model involved specific hyperparameters and training strategies. For the time-series data, the LSTM network used a hidden size of $h = 256$, while textual embeddings were generated using ClinicalBERT, which produces embeddings of size $b = 768$. The joint fusion of time-series and textual representations was implemented via concatenation of embeddings. Optimization was performed using the Adam optimizer with a learning rate of 1×10^{-4} , and L_2 regularization was applied with $\lambda = 1 \times 10^{-5}$ to mitigate overfitting. The models were trained with a batch size of 32, and early stopping was employed to monitor performance on the validation set, halting training if the validation loss did not improve for 5 consecutive epochs.

Since the data usage agreement of the MIMIC-III dataset explicitly limits the use of cloud-hosted LLMs like GPT-4 [16], we relied on open-source model, Med42v2-70B, which can be run locally. Due to limited computational resources, we did not test our approach with other open-source, medical-specialized LLMs. As for smaller-sized LLMs, such as the Med42-8B model, a visual quality check of its outputs revealed that hallucination problems were so pervasive that the outputs were often unreliable. This experiment was conducted using an NVIDIA A100 80GB GPU, and it required approximately 80 hours to process the clinical notes and generate expert opinions using Med42v2-70B.




Figure 1: Diagram of the joint learning framework integrating time-series and textual representations.

Results

We evaluated the performance of various models for predicting in-hospital mortality. Given the class imbalance in the dataset, where only 13% of patients experienced mortality, the AUPRC was chosen as the primary evaluation metric because it is well-suited for imbalanced classification problems [7]. Additionally, the AUROC was reported to provide a complementary assessment of model performance.

The baseline time-series-only model achieved an AUROC of 0.8320 and an AUPRC of 0.4513, establishing a foundation for comparison. Incorporating textual data from clinical notes significantly improved predictive performance. The model using clinical notes alone achieved an AUROC of 0.8488 and an AUPRC of 0.5337, representing a 2.02% and 18.26% improvement, respectively, over the baseline. This suggests the added predictive power of clinical notes, which capture qualitative aspects of patient health not present in structured time-series data.

Using only the LLM-generated expert summaries led to further performance improvements, with the model achieving an AUROC of 0.8873 and an AUPRC of 0.5978. This corresponds to a 6.65% improvement in AUROC and a 32.46% improvement in AUPRC compared to the baseline. These results indicate that expert summaries, represented as EBCRs incorporating domain knowledge from the LLM, effectively enhance predictive performance by providing a distilled and complementary representation of clinical notes.

The integration of multiple modalities through joint fusion yielded the best results. Combining time-series data with clinical notes achieved an AUROC of 0.8853 and an AUPRC of 0.6056, representing 6.41% and 34.19% improvements over the baseline, respectively. Finally, the proposed multi-representational model, which integrates time-series data, clinical notes, and expert summaries through EBCRs, achieved the highest performance metrics, with an AUROC of 0.8955 and an AUPRC of 0.6156. This corresponds to a 7.63% improvement in AUROC and a 36.41% improvement in AUPRC compared to the baseline. Notably, adding expert summaries to the joint fusion model led to a 1.15% improvement in AUROC and a 1.65% improvement in AUPRC compared to the model that excluded them.

These results demonstrate the utility of integrating LLM-generated summaries with other data modalities. Expert summaries not only outperformed individual modalities such as time-series data or clinical notes alone but also significantly enhanced the performance of joint fusion models. This suggests that the summaries capture complementary information that enhances the overall predictive capability. Table 2 provides a detailed comparison of the performance metrics for all model configurations.

Table 2: Performance Metrics for In-Hospital Mortality Prediction with improvements over the Time-Series (Only) baseline. The Med42v2-70B model serves as our medical expert LLM for generating EBCRs.

Model	AUROC (% , \uparrow)	AUPRC (% , \uparrow)
Time-Series Only	(0.8320, 0.00%)	(0.4513, 0.00%)
Clinical Notes Only (Text)	(0.8488, 2.02%)	(0.5337, 18.26%)
Expert Opinion Only (Text)	(0.8873, 6.65%)	(0.5978, 32.46%)
Time-Series w/ Clinical Notes (Joint Fusion)	(0.8853, 6.41%)	(0.6056, 34.19%)
Time-Series w/ Clinical Notes + Expert Opinion (Joint Fusion)	(0.8955, 7.63%)	(0.6156, 36.41%)

Discussion

Qualitative Evaluation

This study shows the effectiveness of integrating multiple data representations using joint fusion to improve in-hospital mortality prediction. By combining time-series data, clinical notes, and LLM-generated expert summaries, the proposed multi-representational learning framework captures complementary information, and improving the model’s predictive performance. The inclusion of expert summaries through EBCRs, which infuse domain knowledge from an LLM conditioned on clinical notes, provides distilled insights and highlights critical aspects that may not be explicitly captured in

the raw notes or physiological data. These findings have significant clinical implications, enabling early and accurate identification of high-risk patients, which is crucial for timely interventions and efficient resource allocation.

To further assess the effectiveness of the proposed framework, we conducted t-SNE visualizations of the intermediate hidden representations from the time-series model, pooled clinical note embeddings, and EBCRs. These visualizations (Figure 2) illustrate that the positive and negative classes are well separable in the EBCRs, indicating that the integration of complementary representations enhances discriminative power.




Figure 2: t-SNE plots of different embeddings

Performance across Various Racial Groups

We also evaluated the model’s performance across demographic groups in the test set to ensure fairness and robustness. Table 3 presents the AUROC and AUPRC metrics for both the Time-Series (Only) baseline and the multi-representational model. The results indicate that the multi-representational model consistently outperformed the baseline across all demographic groups, particularly in AUPRC, which is crucial for handling imbalanced datasets. These findings demonstrate the model’s potential to provide equitable performance across diverse populations.

Table 3: Performance metrics for Time-Series (Only) and Multi-Representational Models evaluated across demographic groups, using AUROC and AUPRC as evaluation criteria.

Group	Time-Series (Only)	Multi-Representational Model
Hispanic/Latino	(0.90, 0.14)	(0.98, 0.50)
White	(0.84, 0.46)	(0.90, 0.59)
African American	(0.89, 0.48)	(0.89, 0.56)
Declined to Answer	(0.70, 0.50)	(0.90, 0.85)
Other	(0.82, 0.50)	(0.87, 0.62)
Asian	(0.82, 0.58)	(0.97, 0.92)

Limitations and Future Work

The experimental results demonstrate that models using LLM-generated expert summaries through EBCRs outperformed those relying solely on time-series data or clinical notes. The superior performance of the joint fusion model indicates that leveraging complementary modalities creates a more robust representation of patient status. These findings underscore the potential of LLMs in augmenting textual data representations without directly relying on them for prediction, which mitigates challenges related to the quantification of uncertainty in LLM-driven predictions.

However, there are several limitations to consider. The study utilized a single dataset, MIMIC-III, which, while comprehensive, may not fully capture the diversity of ICU populations and care protocols across different hospitals or geographic regions. External validation on datasets from other institutions is necessary to confirm the generalizability of the proposed framework. Additionally, the quality of

the expert summaries depends on the LLM’s ability to interpret and generate accurate clinical information. Any biases or errors in the LLM-generated summaries could impact model performance, emphasizing the need for careful validation of the generated outputs. Computational resource requirements for generating and processing LLM summaries also present scalability challenges for real-world implementation.

Future work should explore fine-tuning LLMs on domain-specific datasets to enhance the quality and relevance of the expert summaries. Incorporating more advanced fusion techniques, such as attention mechanisms or gating networks, could further improve the integration of different modalities. Additionally, developing interpretability methods to analyze the contributions of each modality to the model’s predictions could enhance trust and adoption in clinical settings.

Conclusion

This study demonstrates that integrating LLM-generated expert summaries as auxiliary textual representations through EBCRs and joint fusion enhances the predictive power of in-hospital mortality models. By leveraging the domain knowledge embedded in LLMs and conditioning it on patient-specific clinical notes, this approach captures complementary information from diverse data sources, improving model performance in critical care settings. The findings highlight the efficacy of simple fusion techniques in integrating structured and unstructured data, offering a practical pathway for developing robust clinical prediction models. Future work could explore fine-tuning LLMs on domain-specific datasets to improve the quality of expert summaries and investigate advanced fusion mechanisms, such as attention-based approaches, to further optimize multi-modal integration. Additionally, developing interpretability techniques to better understand the contributions of each modality would enhance the trustworthiness of these models in clinical applications. By advancing the integration of structured data and unstructured clinical narratives, this study provides a foundation for more accurate and comprehensive predictive models, paving the way for improved patient outcomes and resource allocation in critical care.

Acknowledgements

We thank the MIT Laboratory for Computational Physiology for access to the MIMIC-III database. We would also like to thank the authors of Med42v2-70B for publishing and sharing their large language models.

Funding

This research is not funded.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Data Availability

Data are available from the MIMIC-III database with credentialed access. We are planning to release the code upon the paper’s acceptance.

References

- [1] Emily Alsentzer, John R Murphy, Willie Boag, Wei-Hung Weng, Di Jin, Tristan Naumann, and Matthew McDermott. Publicly available clinical bert embeddings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.03323*, 2019.

- [2] Robert C Amland and Kristin E Hahn-Cover. Clinical decision support for early recognition of sepsis. *American Journal of Medical Quality*, 31(2):103–110, 2016.
- [3] Rishi Bommasani, Drew A. Hudson, Ehsan Adeli, Russ Altman, Simran Arora, Sydney von Arx, Michael S. Bernstein, Jeannette Bohg, Antoine Bosselut, Emma Brunskill, Erik Brynjolfsson, Shyamal Buch, Dallas Card, Rodrigo Castellon, Niladri Chatterji, Annie Chen, Kathleen Creel, Jared Quincy Davis, Dora Demszky, Chris Donahue, Moussa Doumbouya, Esin Durmus, Stefano Ermon, John Etchemendy, Kawin Ethayarajh, Li Fei-Fei, Chelsea Finn, Trevor Gale, Lauren Gillespie, Karan Goel, Noah Goodman, Shelby Grossman, Neel Guha, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Peter Henderson, John Hewitt, Daniel E. Ho, Jenny Hong, Kyle Hsu, Jing Huang, Thomas Icard, Saahil Jain, Dan Jurafsky, Pratyusha Kalluri, Siddharth Karamcheti, Geoff Keeling, Fereshte Khani, Omar Khattab, Pang Wei Koh, Mark Krass, Ranjay Krishna, Rohith Kuditipudi, Ananya Kumar, Faisal Ladhak, Mina Lee, Tony Lee, Jure Leskovec, Isabelle Levent, Xiang Lisa Li, Xuechen Li, Tengyu Ma, Ali Malik, Christopher D. Manning, Suvir Mirchandani, Eric Mitchell, Zanele Munyikwa, Suraj Nair, Avanika Narayan, Deepak Narayanan, Ben Newman, Allen Nie, Juan Carlos Niebles, Hamed Nilforoshan, Julian Nyarko, Giray Ogut, Laurel Orr, Isabel Papadimitriou, Joon Sung Park, Chris Piech, Eva Portelance, Christopher Potts, Aditi Raghunathan, Rob Reich, Hongyu Ren, Frieda Rong, Yusuf Roohani, Camilo Ruiz, Jack Ryan, Christopher Ré, Dorsa Sadigh, Shiori Sagawa, Keshav Santhanam, Andy Shih, Krishnan Srinivasan, Alex Tamkin, Rohan Taori, Armin W. Thomas, Florian Tramèr, Rose E. Wang, William Wang, Bohan Wu, Jiajun Wu, Yuhuai Wu, Sang Michael Xie, Michihiro Yasunaga, Jiaxuan You, Matei Zaharia, Michael Zhang, Tianyi Zhang, Xikun Zhang, Yuhui Zhang, Lucia Zheng, Kaitlyn Zhou, and Percy Liang. On the opportunities and risks of foundation models, 2022.
- [4] Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners, 2020.
- [5] Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, Parker Schuh, Kensen Shi, Sasha Tsvyashchenko, Joshua Maynez, Abhishek Rao, Parker Barnes, Yi Tay, Noam Shazeer, Vinodkumar Prabhakaran, Emily Reif, Nan Du, Ben Hutchinson, Reiner Pope, James Bradbury, Jacob Austin, Michael Isard, Guy Gur-Ari, Pengcheng Yin, Toju Duke, Anselm Levskaya, Sanjay Ghemawat, Sunipa Dev, Henryk Michalewski, Xavier Garcia, Vedant Misra, Robin Robison, Liam Fedus, Denny Zhou, Daphne Ippolito, David Luan, Hyeontaek Lim, Barret Zoph, Alexander Spiridonov, Ryan Sepassi, David Dohan, Shivani Agrawal, Mark Omernick, Andrew M. Dai, Thanumalayan Sankaranarayanan Pillai, Marie Pellat, Aitor Lewkowycz, Erica Moreira, Rewon Child, Aleksandr Polozov, Katherine Lee, Zongwei Zhou, Xuezhi Wang, Brennan Saeta, Mark Diaz, Orhan Firat, Michele Catasta, Jason Wei, Kathy Meier-Hellstern, Douglas Eck, Jeff Dean, Slav Petrov, and Noah Fiedel. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways, 2022.
- [6] Clément Christophe, Praveen K Kanithi, Prateek Munjal, Tathagata Raha, Nasir Hayat, Ronnie Rajan, Ahmed Al-Mahrooqi, Avani Gupta, Muhammad Umar Salman, Gurpreet Gosal, et al. Med42—evaluating fine-tuning strategies for medical llms: Full-parameter vs. parameter-efficient approaches. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14779*, 2024.
- [7] Jesse Davis and Mark Goadrich. The relationship between precision-recall and roc curves. In *Proceedings of the 23rd international conference on Machine learning*, pages 233–240, 2006.
- [8] Marzyeh Ghassemi, Marco Pimentel, Tristan Naumann, Thomas Brennan, David Clifton, Peter Szolovits, and Mengling Feng. A multivariate timeseries modeling approach to severity of illness assessment and forecasting in icu with sparse, heterogeneous clinical data. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 29, 2015.
- [9] David Gotz, Harry Stavropoulos, Jimeng Sun, and Fei Wang. Icd-a: a platform for intelligent care delivery analytics. In *AMIA annual symposium proceedings*, volume 2012, page 264. American Medical Informatics Association, 2012.

- [10] Hrayr Harutyunyan, Hrant Khachatrian, David C Kale, Greg Ver Steeg, and Aram Galstyan. Multitask learning and benchmarking with clinical time series data. *Scientific data*, 6(1):96, 2019.
- [11] Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber. Long short-term memory. *Neural computation*, 9(8):1735–1780, 1997.
- [12] 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.
- [13] Jinhyuk Lee, Wonjin Yoon, Sungdong Kim, Donghyeon Kim, Sunkyu Kim, Chan Ho So, and Jaewoo Kang. BioBERT: a pre-trained biomedical language representation model for biomedical text mining. *Bioinformatics*, 36(4):1234–1240, 2020.
- [14] Huan Song, Deepta Rajan, Jayaraman Thiagarajan, and Andreas Spanias. Attend and diagnose: Clinical time series analysis using attention models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 32, 2018.
- [15] Harini Suresh, Jen J Gong, and John V Guttag. Learning tasks for multitask learning: Heterogeneous patient populations in the ICU. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pages 802–810, 2018.
- [16] PhysioNet Team. GPT responsible use. <https://physionet.org/news/post/gpt-responsible-use>, 2024.
- [17] Katherine Tian, Eric Mitchell, Allan Zhou, Archit Sharma, Rafael Rafailov, Huaxiu Yao, Chelsea Finn, and Christopher D. Manning. Just ask for calibration: Strategies for eliciting calibrated confidence scores from language models fine-tuned with human feedback, 2023.