

# Extracting Information in a Low-resource Setting: Case Study on Bioinformatics Workflows

Clémence Sebe<sup>1</sup>[0000-0003-1988-1875], Sarah  
Cohen-Boulakia<sup>1</sup>[0000-0002-7439-1441], Olivier Ferret<sup>2</sup>[0000-0003-0755-2361], and  
Aurélié Névéal<sup>1</sup>[0000-0002-1846-9144]

<sup>1</sup> Université Paris-Saclay, LISN, CNRS, Orsay, 91400, France

`firstname.lastname@lisn.fr`

<sup>2</sup> Université Paris-Saclay, CEA, List, F-91120, Palaiseau, France

`olivier.ferret@cea.fr`

**Abstract.** Bioinformatics workflows are essential for complex biological data analyses and are often described in scientific articles with source code in public repositories. Extracting detailed workflow information from articles can improve accessibility and reusability but is hindered by limited annotated corpora. To address this, we framed the problem as a low-resource extraction task and tested four strategies: 1) creating a tailored annotated corpus, 2) few-shot named-entity recognition (NER) with an autoregressive language model, 3) NER using masked language models with existing and new corpora, and 4) integrating workflow knowledge into NER models. Using BioToFlow, a new corpus of 52 articles annotated with 16 entities, a SciBERT-based NER model achieved a 70.4 F-measure, comparable to inter-annotator agreement. While knowledge integration improved performance for specific entities, it was less effective across the entire information schema. Our results demonstrate that high-performance information extraction for bioinformatics workflows is achievable.

**Keywords:** Natural Language Processing · Information Extraction · Bioinformatics Workflows

## 1 Introduction

In data-intensive sciences, such as *bioinformatics*, scientific results are produced using complex data analysis pipelines taking in vast amounts of experimental data. These pipelines consist of numerous steps making calls to bioinformatics tools and require considerable computational time. They can be implemented using scripts (Bash, Python, etc.) that orchestrate tool execution and serve as the glue between data, processes, tools, and the execution environment. However, the development and use of such scripts lead to challenges in the design and execution of the processing chain, as well as maintenance and reproducibility issues. In response to these challenges, efforts have been made over the past two decades to provide bioinformaticians with approaches that guide them toward better automation of data analysis pipelines: the *scientific workflow systems* [4]. Two systems stand out today in bioinformatics: Nextflow [5] and Snakemake [15].

Currently, we observe: (1) an increase in scientific articles describing bioinformatics workflows in a *descriptive* form (steps described without being executable) and (2) a rise in bioinformatics workflows available on repositories like GitHub that are in a *programmatic* form (implementation available but the lack of documentation makes them difficult to reuse).

In natural language processing (NLP), bioinformatics workflows remain under-represented. To our knowledge, there is no comprehensive corpus encompassing a rich and diverse set of entities describing workflows (bioinformatics tools, data, management systems, etc.). However, some corpora focus on specific types of entities, such as those centered on bioinformatics tools [6,13]. This lack of resources makes bioinformatics a low-resource context, making it difficult to structure information or analyze texts with the limited annotated data available.

To overcome the low-resource challenges in the field, several strategies can be employed. First, decoder-based approaches, such as those using generative models, offer a potential solution, although they may not always outperform other methods in terms of extraction accuracy [3,17]. Next, encoder-based approaches can be explored in two ways: using larger, related corpora to enrich model training, or by developing a small, domain-specific training corpus to focus on the extraction of entities relevant to the field. Finally, another promising approach is the injection of domain-specific knowledge directly into language models.

The challenge is thus to develop a simple and automated approach capable of extracting information about workflows described in the literature, aiming to not only systematically document workflows presented in the literature but also facilitate their registration in workflow repositories. This publication introduces a methodology for extracting information about workflows from the literature.

The contributions of this work are as follows: (a) a representation of workflow components using a schema comprising 16 entities and a corpus manually annotated named BioToFlow; (b) experiments with few shot Named-Entity Recognition (NER) using an autoregressive language model; (c) NER experiments using a pre-existing corpus and BioToFlow and (d) integration of workflow knowledge into NER models.

## 2 Workflow Information Representation

### 2.1 Workflow Representation Schema

To systematically describe the bioinformatics workflows and their components, we relied on discussions with workflow experts (notably from the ELIXIR and BOSC International Bioinformatics communities) and the review of several articles describing workflows (e.g., [14,25,4,5,15]). Generally, bioinformatics workflows consist of data analysis steps, each containing a script that may or may not invoke a bioinformatics tool. For a workflow to be executed, it is crucial to maintain a record of its execution environment. Figure 1 presents the proposed schema, which distinguishes between three main categories of entities. The first category is *core* entities, representing major components of a workflow, such as

bioinformatics tools and data. Tools in this category can also be further classified based on their context: whether they are explicitly identified as bioinformatics tools (BioInfo), laboratory-related tools (Lab), tools mentioned but not used in the final workflow (Context), or tools referenced in a general sense without specific details (General). The second category includes *environment* entities, which capture the resources and configurations required for workflow execution, such as the execution environment or programming languages used in scripts. Finally, the third category addresses more specific details, including versioning information, bibliographic references describing tools or libraries, as well as descriptions and parameters associated with certain elements.




Fig. 1. Bioinformatics workflow representation schema.


## 2.2 Annotation of Workflow Information in Articles: *BioToFlow*

**Article Selection Criteria** Articles describing bioinformatics workflows with a link to workflow code in Github have been targeted using a query on PubMed and PubMedCentral [19]<sup>3</sup>. As of 11/18/2024, it returns 124 and 123 articles describing workflows from Nextflow and Snakemake systems respectively.

**Creation of an Annotated Corpus** To validate this information representation schema and create a resource for evaluating the extraction of such information, we developed an annotated corpus using a collaborative method [7] with the help of an annotation guide that we designed. Annotations were performed using BRAT (Brat Rapid Annotation Tool [21], v1.3 p1), recognized for its qualities including the ability to process nested entities, an existing annotation schema, and pre-annotations [18].

<sup>3</sup> PubMed query: (nextflow[Abstract] OR snakemake[Abstract] OR nextflow[Title] OR snakemake[Title]) AND github[All Fields]

Seven annotators participated in the annotation campaigns, which were conducted in multiple stages: the annotators first worked on common texts, then on different texts. Inter-annotator agreement (IAA) was calculated using the F-measure<sup>4</sup> with BRAT-Eval [23](v0.0.2), a tool that compares two sets of annotations and analyzes divergences. The evaluation of agreement can be strict (agreement between two annotations only if identical text portions are annotated with the same label) or relaxed (agreement if two identical or overlapping text portions are annotated with the same label). The score ranges from 0 (no agreement) to 1 (perfect agreement). IAA obtained were all higher than 70% in relaxed mode. When we look in more detail at the extraction scores for each entity, we found a heterogeneity in the scores showing that some are easier to annotate than others. There are several causes for these differences, including ambiguity in the tagset, criteria for discrimination [8], and, finally, the expertise domain of the annotators. Figure 2 shows entity annotations using our schema on an excerpt from an article describing a Nextflow workflow (PMID 35171290).



**Fig. 2.** Excerpt from the annotated corpus using the BRAT software.

Overall, our corpus, named *BioToFlow*<sup>5</sup>, is a small corpus composed of 52 articles (26 articles related to Nextflow workflows and 26 on Snakemake workflows) with a total of 78,419 tokens (27,786 annotated tokens). However, the entities are diversified and distributed according to Table 1. In our corpus, we allow the presence of nested entities ( $\sim 8\%$  of entities in BioToFlow; an example can be seen in Figure 2 where a WorkflowName entity is nested within a Biblio entity).

Using this corpus and its annotations as a starting point, we explored different extraction approaches, starting with decoder-based approaches and then moving on to encoder-based approaches.

### 3 Decoder-based Approach for Named Entity Recognition

Because of the small size of the BioToFlow corpus, we sought to leverage an auto-regressive language model to perform few-shot named entity recognition. Specifically, we used Llama-3-8B-Instruct, which demonstrated the best performance among generative models in a comparative study of masked language

<sup>4</sup> For a detailed review of inter-annotator agreement measures and their usage context, we refer the reader to [1]. In the case of named entity annotation, [9] demonstrates that the F-measure and  $\kappa$  can be considered equivalent.

<sup>5</sup> <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11204427>

**Table 1.** BioToFlow: number of occurrences per entity.

<b>Entities</b>	<b>Occurrences</b>	<b>Entities</b>	<b>Occurrences</b>
Data	2,434	Version	454
Tool	1,482	Hardware	429
Description	1,300	Database	288
Biblio	1,251	ManagementSystem	243
Method	936	Container	108
WorkflowName	851	ProgrammingLanguage	104
File	780	LibraryPackage	101
Parameter	464	Environment	83

models and generative models utilizing prompting techniques [17]. Following the same methodology as in this study, we conducted a series of few-shot experiments, varying the number of examples provided and testing different prompt formulations. We use random sampling to split the BioToFlow corpus: we use 75% of the corpus (39 articles) for training and the remaining 25% (13 articles) for testing. The results obtained on the BioToFlow test set using the Llama-3-8B-Instruct model with the best hyperparameters are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2.** Performance of Llama-3-8B-Instruct model with the best hyperparameters (relaxed mode).

<b>Entities</b>	<b>P</b>	<b>R</b>	<b>F1</b>	<b>Entities</b>	<b>P</b>	<b>R</b>	<b>F1</b>
Biblio	93.1	82.2	87.3	LibraryPackage	3.8	5.6	4.5
Container	29.2	50.0	36.8	ManagementSystem	41.1	38.3	39.7
Data	31.2	27.6	29.3	Method	15.4	12.1	13.6
Database	28.3	24.6	26.3	Parameter	11.4	8.8	9.9
Description	26.2	19.4	22.3	ProgrammingLanguage	23.5	14.3	17.8
Environment	60.0	13.0	21.4	Tool	54.9	59.1	56.9
File	30.7	34.8	32.6	Version	67.1	39.5	49.7
Hardware	20.5	26.3	23.1	WorkflowName	29.1	37.7	32.8
<b>Overall</b>	40.1	36.7	38.3				

We obtained an overall performance below 40% in relaxed mode and 31.2% in strict mode (not shown). These results are consistent with findings on other biomedical corpora [17] and lead us to explore alternative methods leveraging encoder-based models.

## 4 Encoder-based Approach for Named Entity Recognition

Encoder-based approaches for NER typically require a substantial amount of annotated corpus. In our experiments, we leverage a large corpus with annotations

covering a subset of workflow information and a small corpus with comprehensive coverage of workflow information.

#### 4.1 Experiments on a Large Corpus: *SoftCite*

To our knowledge, no corpus fully covers workflows. However, we identified corpora with annotations partially aligned with our schema, such as those focusing on datasets [20] or bioinformatics tools. We focused on bioinformatics tools, as identifying them offers crucial insights into a workflow’s functionality. We can cite the CZ Software Mentions dataset [13], which includes software mentions extracted using a trained SciBERT model from diverse sources like PubMed Central and the Chan Zuckerberg Initiative. Another relevant corpus is SoftCite [6], a gold-standard dataset where all articles were manually annotated. SoftCite comprises 4,971 articles from the fields of biomedicine and economics. We chose SoftCite due to its manual annotation process and, to assess its relevance, we selected a subset of 1,159 articles specifically related to biology.

Since SoftCite does not contain the same entity types as BioToFlow, our first step was to identify possible overlaps between the two entity schemas and perform a mapping to convert SoftCite entity names to those used in BioToFlow. Table 3 represents the correspondence between entities in SoftCite (left column) and those in BioToFlow (right column). Some entities in the SoftCite corpus, *publisher\_person*, *figure*, *table*, and *formula*, have no equivalent in BioToFlow. Similarly, certain entities in BioToFlow, including *data*, *container*, *hardware*, and *description*, are not present in SoftCite. After the conversion, the number of entities and occurrences are presented in Table 4.

**Table 3.** Entity correspondence between SoftCite and BioToFlow.

SoftCite	BioToFlow
software	Tool
environment	Tool
url	Biblio
component	LibraryPackage
implicit	Tool_general
publisher	Biblio
environment	Environment
bibr	Biblio
version	Version
url	Biblio
language	ProgrammingLanguage

For the extraction of our target entities, we chose a biLSTM-CRF neural model [24], implemented by the NLStruct Python library package<sup>6</sup> (v0.2.0). This

<sup>6</sup> <https://github.com/percevalw/NLStruct>

**Table 4.** SoftCite: Number of occurrences per entity.

Entities	Occurrences	Entities	Occurrences
Tool	4,142	Biblio	3,946
Version	1,349	LibraryPackage	65
ProgrammingLanguage	61		

library offers the dual advantage of supporting the detection of nested entities, which is essential for certain entity types in our dataset, and accepting input files in the BRAT format. Additionally, it has demonstrated strong performance in the biomedical domain, which closely aligns with our field. More specifically, we used this model with the SciBERT language model [2], more specifically trained on scientific articles. We conventionally chose to randomly divide the articles into two main sets: the first set, 75% of the corpus (927 articles), was used to create the training set, while the remaining 25% (232 articles) constituted the test set. Within the training set, two-thirds of the articles (649 articles) were used for the actual training of the models and one-third (278 articles) for their validation. A distinctive aspect of our approach is that we constructed five splits through random sampling to minimize dependency on a specific division. For each split, five versions of the entity recognition model were produced using different random seeds, ensuring more robust and reproducible results.

**Table 5.** Average performance metrics on five splits and five random seeds (with standard deviation) of percentage scores obtained using SciBERT and NLStruct in relaxed mode on SoftCite corpora.

	Softcite		
	P	R	F1
Biblio	90.6±1.4	99.0±0.4	94.6±0.9
Environment	0.0±0.0	0.0±0.0	0.0±0.0
LibraryPackage	2.5±2.4	14.3±10.5	4.1±3.9
ProgLanguage	48.9±5.3	88.8±4.8	62.8±4.8
Tool	73.4±1.9	51.0±0.6	60.2±1.0
Version	49.8±2.2	93.5±0.6	65.0±1.9
<b>Overall-focused</b>	73.1±1.1	70.7±0.6	71.9±0.8

We test the results on 13 test articles from BioToFlow to see if the entities of the SoftCite corpus could be used to train and extract a part of the BioToFlow entities. The performance on a subset of entities (Table 5) using this corpus is significantly better than those achieved with a decoder-based approach.

## 4.2 Experiments on a Small Corpus: *BioToFlow*

Similar to the SoftCite corpus experiments, we conducted experiments on BioToFlow using NLStruct and divided the data as follows: 75% of the corpus (39 articles) in the training set, with two-thirds of these (26 articles) used for model training and one-third (13 articles) for validation and 25% (13 articles) formed the test set. The results obtained are presented in Table 6.

**Table 6.** Average performance on five splits and five random seeds (with standard deviation) of percentage scores obtained with SciBERT and NLStruct in relaxed mode on the BioToFlow corpus. **Overall-focused** results are directly comparable to Table 5.

Entities	P	R	F1	Entities	P	R	F1
Biblio	97.9±0.4	97.4±1.0	97.7±0.4	LibraryPackage	39.8±12.3	30.9±6.7	33.9±7.4
Container	78.3±11.2	80.2±12.5	78.9±11.8	MgmtSystem	72.9±5.6	90.9±4.0	80.6±3.4
Data	70.9±2.1	57.1±2.3	63.2±1.9	Method	38.6±2.6	68.3±3.4	49.2±2.9
Database	63.8±3.6	54.8±4.3	58.7±1.8	Parameter	53.2±3.3	53.1±4.8	52.9±2.9
Description	65.4±3.9	59.3±1.8	62.1±1.5	ProgLanguage	86.9±2.1	87.2±2.9	86.9±2.4
Environment	50.3±17.9	79.4±10.1	60.3±17.3	Tool	77.7±3.2	72.2±2.8	74.8±1.0
File	84.3±0.5	82.5±1.4	83.4±0.6	Version	86.8±2.6	90.8±2.0	88.7±0.9
Hardware	65.8±1.2	79.2±4.4	71.7±1.7	WorkflowName	67.1±2.2	77.8±4.4	72.0±2.1
<b>Overall</b>	71.2±1.3	69.6±0.9	70.4±0.8	<b>Overall-focused</b>	85.5±1.2	83.4±1.2	84.4±0.5

The first results show that training a model on our little corpus obtains higher results for all the entities (see Table 2, 5, and 6).

## 4.3 Fusion of *SoftCite* and *BioToFlow* Corpora

The previous results show that SoftCite and BioToFlow, when used independently, achieve good scores (above 70%). We also merged the two corpora and trained models on the combined dataset to see the contribution of the SoftCite corpus. Two configurations of the SoftCite corpus were considered: (a) entities were only converted to match BioToFlow entity names and (b) each SoftCite article was annotated using predictions from a model trained on BioToFlow.

The scores for specific entities are provided in Table 7. The results suggest that the SoftCite corpus, in its silver form, achieves a slightly higher F1 score compared to a model trained only on BioToFlow (Table 6). These corpus fusions resulted in some entity scores increasing while others decreased.

## 5 Integration of Knowledge into Language Models

Since the various tested approaches did not show any significant improvement in NER scores compared to a masked language model trained on BioToFlow, we explored one final approach: the integration of knowledge into language models.



**Table 7.** Average performance metrics on five splits and five random seeds (with standard deviation) of percentage scores obtained using SciBERT and NLStruct in relaxed mode on the fusion of BioToFlow and SoftCite corpora.

	With SoftCite conversion			With SoftCite silver		
	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
Data	56.9±2.3	64.1±1.5	60.1±0.7	75.8±2.6	56.8±2.1	64.9±0.8
Description	62.9±3.7	62.5±1.3	62.6±1.2	71.0±0.8	57.4±0.9	63.5±0.7
LibraryPackage	36.2±7.9	38.1±6.3	36.1±7.0	25.3±6.4	37.2±8.9	29.0±5.7
ProgLanguage	88.6±5.4	87.6±4.0	87.9±2.4	90.3±1.3	88.3±3.0	89.2±1.4
Tool	76.9±1.3	72.2±1.2	74.5±0.9	78.8±1.9	70.0±0.9	74.1±1.1
<b>Overall</b>	64.4±1.0	73.6±0.9	68.7±0.3	73.0±0.5	68.5±1.4	70.7±0.6

**Used of a Pre-initialized Encoder** In the spirit of work exploiting pretraining for NER [16], we trained models on BioToFlow following the same methodology as in Section 4.2 but with an encoder initialized with one of the models trained during the NER experiments on the SoftCite corpus (see Section 4.1). The scores of Table 8 for a subset of entities show that the results obtained are nearly identical to those achieved with a model whose encoder was not pre-initialized.

**Table 8.** Average performance metrics on five splits and five random seeds (with standard deviation) of percentage scores for a subset of entities obtained using SciBERT and NLStruct in relaxed mode on BioToFlow corpus with the encoder initialization.

	P	R	F1		P	R	F1
Database	63.9±3.2	56.2±3.3	59.7±1.3	Method	38.2±1.2	68.1±3.3	48.9±1.6
Environment	47.7±18.9	80.0±14.3	58.5±20.1	ProgLanguage	87.1±1.0	85.9±5.0	86.2±2.5
LibraryPackage	40.2±11.5	32.4±5.6	35.1±5.9	Tool	77.3±3.1	72.1±2.2	74.5±0.6
MgmtSystem	72.7±5.9	94.4±5.7	82.0±4.2	<b>Overall</b>	71.3±0.8	69.6±1.3	70.4±0.8

**Adding Vocabulary** To improve the extraction of bioinformatics tool names, another strategy involves incorporating external knowledge into the encoder. Since the knowledge to inject in our case is made of lists of names, we chose to perform this injection at the level of its vocabulary, similarly to work such as [11]. Various knowledge bases of bioinformatics tools exist, from which tool and binary names can be extracted. We utilized four knowledge bases: *Biotoools* [12], *Bioconda* [10], *Biocontainers* [22] and *Bioweb*<sup>7</sup>. From these knowledge bases, we aggregated the names of tools and binaries to create an enriched vocabulary. This new vocabulary was then injected into the SciBERT language model to improve its ability to recognize bioinformatics tool names. We evaluated this strategy

<sup>7</sup> <https://bioweb.pasteur.fr/welcome>

by conducting two experiments on BioToFlow, testing two approaches: (a) fine-tuning the SciBERT model with the new vocabulary and (b) using the enriched vocabulary without additional fine-tuning. In both cases, the embeddings of the added tokens were initialized by averaging the embeddings of their subtokens.

Adding bioinformatics tool vocabulary appears to improve the extraction of tool names, particularly when fine-tuning the SciBERT model after incorporating the new vocabulary, with an F1 score increasing from  $74.8\pm 1.0\%$  to  $77.0\pm 2.8\%$ . As observed in previous experiments, some entities benefit from the added knowledge, while others experience slight decreases in performance (see Table 9). Specifically, the *Data* entity shows improvements with vocabulary addition in both fine-tuning and non-fine-tuning scenarios. Entities like *LibraryPackage* and *Tool* also benefit from fine-tuning with the added vocabulary. Conversely, scores for *ManagementSystem* and *ProgrammingLanguage* entities show slight declines.

**Table 9.** Average performance metrics on five splits and five random seeds (with standard deviation) of percentage scores obtained using SciBERT and NLStruct in relaxed mode with the addition of bioinformatics tool vocabulary, with or without fine-tuning.

	Add voc – finetune			Add voc – no finetune		
	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
Data	70.0±7.2	63.4±10.9	66.4±8.9	71.7±2.4	56.9±2.8	63.4±2.3
LibraryPackage	52.5±7.1	57.4±15.6	52.3±10.0	37.1±8.0	30.4±7.2	32.7±6.0
ManagementSystem	75.6±7.9	76.8±6.7	75.5±7.0	69.7±3.9	93.4±3.3	79.7±1.7
ProgrammingLanguage	81.9±12.6	82.1±11.5	81.9±12.0	86.0±2.1	85.8±2.3	85.8±2.1
Tool	77.2±3.7	76.9±2.7	77.0±2.8	74.5±2.5	73.9±2.6	74.1±0.3
<b>Overall</b>	70.4±1.7	70.2±1.5	70.3±0.4	70.6±1.2	69.5±1.2	70.1±0.9

## 6 Conclusion

Based on a workflow representation schema, we developed a small entity-rich corpus, BioToFlow. Using this corpus, we experimented with various entity extraction techniques, including decoder-based models, which achieved scores below 50%, and encoder-based methods. These included leveraging a large corpus with annotations covering a subset of the schema and our BioToFlow corpus. A final approach sought to incorporate additional knowledge into the models. The most effective strategy involved training a model on our small corpus while integrating a vocabulary list specific to bioinformatics tools, which improved the extraction of this entity type. To extend this latest approach, we will investigate various ways to enhance the embeddings of the added vocabulary, starting with their adaptation during the training of the NER models, similarly to [11]. More globally, the entity linking between the components extracted from workflows

described in scientific literature and those found in code from public repositories is an essential task that we will consider to merge information from both sources.

**Acknowledgments.** We sincerely thank N. Bossut, A. Gaignard, G. Marchment, M. Schmit, H. Menager, F. Lemoine for their help with the annotation process. This work has received support from the French government (Agence Nationale pour la Recherche) under the France 2030 program grant agreement ANR-22-PESN-0007 (ShareFAIR).

**Disclosure of Interests.** The authors have no competing interests.

## References

1. Artstein, R., Poesio, M.: Inter-coder agreement for computational linguistics. *Computational linguistics* **34**(4), 555–596 (2008)
2. Beltagy, I., Lo, K., Cohan, A.: SciBERT: A Pretrained Language Model for Scientific Text. In: *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*. pp. 3615–3620. Hong Kong, China (Nov 2019). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D19-1371>
3. Chen, Q., Hu, Y., Peng, X., Xie, Q., Jin, Q., Gilson, A., Singer, M.B., Ai, X., et al.: A systematic evaluation of large language models for biomedical natural language processing: benchmarks, baselines, and recommendations (Sep 2024). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.16326>
4. Cohen-Boulakia, S., Belhajjame, K., Collin, O., Chopard, J., Froidevaux, C.e.a.: Scientific workflows for computational reproducibility in the life sciences: Status, challenges and opportunities. *Fut Gen Comput Systems* **75**, 284–298 (2017)
5. Di Tommaso, P., Chatzou, M., Floden, E.W., Barja, P., Palumbo, E., Notredame, C.: Nextflow enables reproducible computational workflows. *Nature Biotech* **35**, 316–319 (04 2017). <https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.3820>
6. Du, C., Cohoon, J., Lopez, P., Howison, J.: Softcite dataset: A dataset of software mentions in biomedical and economic research publications. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* **72**(7), 870–884 (2021)
7. Fort, K.: *Collaborative Annotation for Reliable Natural Language Processing: Technical and Sociological Aspects*. Wiley-ISTE (Jul 2016), <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01324322>
8. Fort, K., Nazarenko, A., Rosset, S.: Modeling the complexity of manual annotation tasks: a grid of analysis. In: Kay, M., Boitet, C. (eds.) *Proceedings of COLING 2012*. pp. 895–910. Mumbai, India (Dec 2012), <https://aclanthology.org/C12-1055>
9. Grouin, C., Rosset, S., Zweigenbaum, P., Fort, K., Galibert, O., Quintard, L.: Proposal for an extension of traditional named entities: From guidelines to evaluation, an overview. In: *Proc of Linguistic Annotation Workshop (LAW-V)*. pp. 92–100. Portland, OR (23-24 juin 2011), <http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W11-0411>
10. Grüning, B., Dale, R., Sjödin, A., Chapman, B.A., Rowe, J., Tomkins-Tinch, C.H., Valieris, R., Köster, J.: Bioconda: sustainable and comprehensive software distribution for the life sciences. *Nature Methods* **15**(7), 475–476 (Jul 2018). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41592-018-0046-7>
11. Hong, J., Kim, T., Lim, H., Choo, J.: AVocaDo: Strategy for Adapting Vocabulary to Downstream Domain. In: *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. pp. 4692–4700. Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic (Nov 2021). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.385>

12. Ison, J., Rapacki, K., Ménager, H., Kalaš, M., Rydza, E., Chmura, P., Anthon, C., Beard, N., Berka, K., Bolser, D., Booth, T., Bretaudeau, A., Brezovsky, J., Casadio, R., Cesareni, G., Coppens, F., Cornell, M., Cuccuru, G., et al.: Tools and data services registry: a community effort to document bioinformatics resources. *Nucleic Acids Research* **44**(D1), D38–D47 (Jan 2016). <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkv1116>
13. Istrate, A.M., Li, D., Taraborelli, D., Torkar, M., Veytsman, B., Williams, I.: A large dataset of software mentions in the biomedical literature (Sep 2022)
14. Kieser, S., Brown, J., Zdobnov, E.M., Trajkovski, M., McCue, L.A.: ATLAS: a Snakemake workflow for assembly, annotation, and genomic binning of metagenome sequence data. *BMC Bioinformatics* **21**(1), 257 (Jun 2020). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12859-020-03585-4>
15. Köster, J., Rahmann, S.: Snakemake - a scalable bioinformatics workflow engine. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)* **28**, 2520–2 (08 2012). <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/bts480>
16. Liu, Z., Jiang, F., Hu, Y., Shi, C., Fung, P.: NER-BERT: a pre-trained model for low-resource entity tagging. arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.00405 (2021)
17. Naguib, M., Tannier, X., Névéol, A.: Few-shot clinical entity recognition in English, French and Spanish: masked language models outperform generative model prompting. In: Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024. pp. 6829–6852. Miami, Florida, USA (Nov 2024)
18. Neves, M., Ševa, J.: An extensive review of tools for manual annotation of documents. *Briefings in bioinformatics* **22**, 146–163 (12 2019). <https://doi.org/10.1093/bib/bbz130>
19. NLM: MEDLINE, PubMed, and PMC (PubMed Central): How are they different? (2021), <https://www.nlm.nih.gov/bsd/difference.html>
20. Pan, H., Zhang, Q., Dragut, E., Caragea, C., Latecki, L.J.: DMDD: A Large-Scale Dataset for Dataset Mentions Detection. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* **11**, 1132–1146 (Sep 2023). [https://doi.org/10.1162/tacl\\_a\\_00592](https://doi.org/10.1162/tacl_a_00592)
21. Stenetorp, P., Pyysalo, S., Topic, G., Ohta, T., Ananiadou, S., Tsujii, J.: brat: a Web-based Tool for NLP-Assisted Text Annotation. In: Proceedings of the Demonstrations at the 13th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics. pp. 102–107 (04 2012)
22. da Veiga Leprevost, F., Grüning, B.A., Alves Aflitos, S., Röst, H.L., Uszkoreit, J., Barsnes, H., Vaudel, M., et al.: BioContainers: an open-source and community-driven framework for software standardization. *Bioinformatics* **33**(16), 2580–2582 (Aug 2017). <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btx192>
23. Verspoor, K., Jimeno-Yepes, A., Cavedon, L., McIntosh, T., Herten-Crabb, A., Thomas, Z., Plazzer, J.P.: Annotating the biomedical literature for the Human Variome. *Database : the journal of biological databases and curation* **2013**, bat019 (01 2013). <https://doi.org/10.1093/database/bat019>
24. Wajsbürt, P.: Extraction et normalisation d’entités simples et structurées dans les documents médicaux. Thèse de doctorat, Sorbonne université (Dec 2021), <https://www.theses.fr/2021SORUS541>
25. Yates, J.A.F., Lamnidis, T.C., Borry, M., Valtueña, A.A., Fagernäs, Z., Clayton, S., Garcia, M.U., Neukamm, J., Peltzer, A.: Reproducible, portable, and efficient ancient genome reconstruction with nf-core/eager. *PeerJ* **9**, e10947 (Mar 2021)