

Experience Retrieval-Augmentation with Electronic Health Records Enables Accurate Discharge QA

Justice Ou¹ * †, Tinglin Huang² †, Yilun Zhao², Ziyang Yu³, Peiqing Lu, Rex Ying²
University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign¹, Yale University², University of Waterloo³

Abstract

To improve the reliability of Large Language Models (LLMs) in clinical applications, retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) is extensively applied to provide factual medical knowledge. However, beyond general medical knowledge from open-ended datasets, clinical case-based knowledge is also critical for effective medical reasoning, as it provides context grounded in real-world patient experiences. Motivated by this, we propose Experience Retrieval-Augmentation (EXPRAG) framework based on Electronic Health Record (EHR), aiming to offer the relevant context from other patients' discharge reports. EXPRAG performs retrieval through a coarse-to-fine process, utilizing an EHR-based report ranker to efficiently identify similar patients, followed by an experience retriever to extract task-relevant content for enhanced medical reasoning. To evaluate EXPRAG, we introduce DISCHARGEQA, a clinical QA dataset with 1,280 discharge-related questions across diagnosis, medication, and instruction tasks. Each problem is generated using EHR data to ensure realistic and challenging scenarios. Experimental results demonstrate that EXPRAG consistently outperforms a text-based ranker, achieving an average relative improvement of 5.2%, highlighting the importance of case-based knowledge for medical reasoning.

1 Introduction

Benefiting from pretraining on large-scale corpora, Large Language Models (LLMs) are capable of performing complex reasoning and have shown great promise in medical applications (Zheng et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2024). One important application is inferring clinical conditions, including diagnosis and medication, which can be formulated as a




Figure 1: An illustrative example of utilizing experience from relevant clinical cases to support medical decision.

question-answering (QA) task (Singhal et al., 2025; Chen et al., 2023; Huang et al., 2024). However, LLM agents often suffer from hallucinations and a lack of domain-specific knowledge, which limits their reliability in real-world medical applications.

To address this, prior studies have resorted to retrieving factual knowledge from open-ended databases to provide context, such as the description of drugs from Wikipedia (Xiong et al., 2024; Yang et al., 2025). Such external knowledge enables LLMs to access general medical facts, thereby improving response accuracy. However, introducing such general facts cannot effectively help LLMs solve real clinical cases, which often involve coexisting clinical conditions. For example, as shown in Figure 1, adjusting a patient's warfarin dosage requires reasoning based on the specific clinical context, whereas conventional retrieval can only provide the standard dosage for warfarin, which is irrelevant in this case.

In light of this, we argue that, in addition to general factual concepts, clinical case-based knowledge is also crucial for effective medical reasoning. The intuition is that an experienced clinician often relies on past cases with similar conditions to guide diagnosis, treatment decisions, and discharge planning. In this study, we propose **Experience**

*Correspondence to zo6@illinois.edu

†The two first authors made equal contributions.

Retrieval-Augmentation (EXPRAG) framework, leveraging a large-scale EHR database MIMIC-IV (Johnson et al., 2023b) as its knowledge basis. Specifically, EXPRAG breaks down the retrieval process into two steps: (1) report ranking applies an EHR-based similarity measurement to identify patients with similar medical conditions, and (2) experience retrieval extracts problem-relevant content from these patients’ discharge reports, which serves as the case-based contextual knowledge for LLMs. The introduced EHR modality enables large-scale clinical experience retrieval, grounding the model’s reasoning in real-world clinical practices.

To evaluate EXPRAG’s capability in medical reasoning, we introduce DISCHARGEQA¹, a clinical dataset including 1,280 QA pairs dedicated to discharge-related problems. The dataset primarily includes three types of problems, simulating the discharge process from initial diagnosis to medication prescription and post-discharge instructions. For each problem, we follow the data structure of the discharge report and select the content preceding the question as the problem background to avoid label leakage. Additionally, we index the option candidates using EHR to generate contextually relevant options, ensuring a non-trivial and clinically meaningful challenge for the model.

We evaluate the performance of four different LLMs and compare EXPRAG with the text-based report ranker using DISCHARGEQA. The results demonstrate the effectiveness of using EHR to retrieve relevant clinical experience, as it consistently improves the performance of LLM backbones and outperforms the text-based ranker with an average relative improvement of 5.2%. Overall, our main contributions are listed below:

- We propose EXPRAG, an EHR-based experience retrieval-augmentation framework, shedding light on the potential of leveraging past clinical cases to enhance LLM performance in medical reasoning tasks.
- We introduce DISCHARGEQA, a medical QA dataset for discharge-related questions, designed to evaluate LLMs’ ability to simulate the clinical decision-making process during patient discharge with a more challenging setup.
- Our results demonstrate the advantage of EXPRAG over the text-based ranker, highlighting

the effectiveness of EHR in providing clinically meaningful context.

2 Related Work

Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) RAG has become a key paradigm for overcoming the static knowledge limitations of LLMs by retrieving external information (Gu et al., 2018; Petroni et al., 2019). Traditional RAG frameworks typically use dense retrieval methods to augment generative tasks (Devlin et al., 2019; Xiong et al., 2021). While effective in general QA, these methods often lack domain specificity, which is critical in healthcare (Lu et al., 2024). Recent advancements like ClinicalRAG (Lu et al., 2024) and MIRAGE (Xiong et al., 2024) address this by integrating structured EHR data and clinical notes for diagnosis and treatment planning. However, existing benchmarks primarily focus on isolated information retrieval (Johnson et al., 2023a; Kweon et al., 2024), overlooking the complexities of reasoning over patient histories and similar cases. To bridge this gap, our work extends RAG by combining structured EHR data with discharge summaries, enabling experience-driven reasoning for more realistic and reliable medical QA.

Medical QA Benchmark EHRSQL (Lee et al., 2022) and DrugEHRQA (Bardhan et al., 2022) target structured data queries, with the former addressing SQL-based operations and the latter focusing on drug-related questions. EHRNoteQA (Kweon et al., 2024) and RadQA (Soni et al., 2022) leverage clinician-verified QA pairs from discharge summaries and radiology reports, while MedQA (Jin et al., 2021), MedMCQA (Pal et al., 2022), and PubMedQA (Jin et al., 2019) evaluate LLMs with questions from medical exams or PubMed articles. Discharge-summary-focused datasets like emrQA (Pampari et al., 2018) and CliniQG4QA (Yue et al., 2021) use discharge notes for QA tasks, and specialized datasets like RxWhyQA (Fan, 2019) and drug-reasoning QA (Moon et al., 2023) focus on specific question types like medication reasoning. Unlike these benchmarks, DISCHARGEQA introduces an evaluation framework centered around the discharge process, simulating the clinical workflow from diagnosis inference to medication prescription and discharge instruction generation. Additionally, we leverage EHR to generate non-trivial, contextually relevant candidate options, providing a more challenging and realistic setup.

¹Uploading to <https://physionet.org/>, please check updates on Github: <https://github.com/jou2024/EXPRAG>




Figure 2: The overview of EXPRAG: Given a medical query and the patient’s background, EXPRAG first indexes similar patients based on diagnosis, medication, and procedure similarity from the EHR. A text retriever is then applied to the discharge reports of the top-ranked similar patients to extract clinically relevant content, which is subsequently fed into the LLM to generate the answer.

3 EXPRAG Framework

EXPRAG provides a comprehensive framework for retrieving relevant knowledge from the cohort, as shown in Figure 2. We first formulate the problem that EXPRAG aims to tackle and elaborate the two-step retrieval framework including an EHR-based report ranker.

3.1 Task Formulation

A cohort contains a set of discharge report $\mathcal{D} = \{D_i\}_N$ where $D_i = \{d_j\}_M$ denotes the i -th report and d_j is j -th paragraph in D_i . Each report is a medical document that offers an overview of a patient’s hospitalization. The goal of EXPRAG is to extract relevant content from \mathcal{D} that helps LLM to effectively answer a given medical query q related to a specific patient p :

$$d_* = f_{\text{EXPRAG}}(p, q, \mathcal{D}) \quad (1)$$

The queries studied in this work focus on providing professional medical guidance for patients, including diagnosis, medication, and discharge instructions, thereby simulating realistic and practical clinical scenarios, as discussed in Section 4.

Different from the conventional RAG focusing on extracting factual concepts from open-ended databases, EXPRAG aims to utilize contextually-relevant clinical practice, inspired by how doctors collect and apply experience from past clinical cases. These two approaches rely on different reasoning procedures and knowledge sources, making them complementary to each other.

3.2 Coarse-to-Fine Retrieval Framework

To retrieve information from the cohort, one naive solution is to concatenate all the reports into one document and apply a text retriever to extract relevant content, similar to the conventional RAG pipeline. However, a standard EHR cohort typically contains millions of hospital visits, making it impractical to exhaustively search over all reports.

To efficiently perform experience retrieval, EXPRAG applies a two-step framework which conduct the retrieval from a coarse to fine level:

Report Ranking Before addressing a specific medical query, an intuitive assumption is that only patients with similar clinical histories, e.g., similar diseases or medications, can potentially provide meaningful guidance. In light of this, EXPRAG first employs a report ranker to efficiently discard unrelated cases and narrow down the candidate pool using the patient information:

$$\mathcal{D}' = f_{\text{Ranker}}(p, \mathcal{D}) \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{D}' = \{D_i\}_{N' \ll N}$ is a small subset of the selected discharge summaries. The ranker module will be scalable and enable effective utilization of patient context. Specifically, we introduce EHR as a knowledge basis to facilitate the patient-level similarity measurement, as presented in Section 3.3.

Experience Retrieval Based on the selected candidate pool, a sophisticated text retriever is capable of providing more accurate and dedicated clinical

experience searching:

$$d_* = f_{\text{Retriever}}(q, \mathcal{D}') \quad (3)$$

Built on top of clinically relevant reports identified by the dedicated ranking approach, the retriever focuses on extracting content related to the medical query. We here apply existing text retrievers, such as BM25 and Contriever, during this phase.

3.3 EHR-Based Report Ranker f_{Ranker}

Electronic Health Record (EHR), as a structured data organization, typically consists of multiple tabular data, each recording specific medical information about patients. In this study, we focus on measuring the similarity between patients using the following three medical entities:

- **Diagnosis:** Identified disease assigned to a patient, represented by ICD-10 code.
- **Medication:** Prescribed drugs administered to a patient, recorded using NDC code.
- **Procedure:** Medical intervention, operation, or clinical process performed on a patient, represented by ICD-10 code.

Quantify the similarity between patients based on these three dimensions offers a comprehensive criterion for identifying clinically relevant reports.

For a patient p , these three medical entities are represented as sets E_p^{Diag} , E_p^{Med} , and E_p^{Proc} , respectively. Given two patients p and p' , we first compute the set similarity between them using each medical information:

$$\tau_{\text{Diag}} = f_{\text{similarity}}(E_p^{\text{Diag}}, E_{p'}^{\text{Diag}}), \quad (4)$$

$$\tau_{\text{Med}} = f_{\text{similarity}}(E_p^{\text{Med}}, E_{p'}^{\text{Med}}), \quad (5)$$

$$\tau_{\text{Proc}} = f_{\text{similarity}}(E_p^{\text{Proc}}, E_{p'}^{\text{Proc}}) \quad (6)$$

where $f_{\text{similarity}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a set similarity metric, with the Jaccard Index applied in this study. Finally, these similarity metrics are aggregated using a weighted sum:

$$\tau = \lambda_1 \tau_{\text{Diag}} + \lambda_2 \tau_{\text{Med}} + \lambda_3 \tau_{\text{Proc}} \quad (7)$$

where $\lambda_{1/2/3}$ is the hyperparameter balancing the importance of each metric. We perform pairwise similarity comparisons between the query patient and other patients within the EHR, returning the discharge summaries of the top- k most similar patients as results.

Efficiency Analysis The overall computation is practically efficient since the computation of Jaccard Index can be significantly accelerated with some libraries, such as Faiss (Douze et al., 2024) and NumPy (Harris et al., 2020). Besides, indexing medical entities from tabular data enables fast lookups, further reducing computational overhead.

4 DISCHARGEQA Dataset

To evaluate LLMs’ capability in utilizing the retrieved experience, we construct a medical question-answering dataset specifically designed for discharge-related queries based on MIMIC-IV (Johnson et al., 2023b). Each question in the dataset pertains to critical discharge information, including the patient’s diagnosis, prescribed medications, and post-discharge instructions.

4.1 Dataset Introduction

Overview As shown in Table 1, DISCHARGEQA consists of a total of 1,280 QA pairs, each associated with a patient ID and corresponding clinical background. The questions in DISCHARGEQA can be categorized into three main types:

- **Diagnosis Inference:** Questions related to identifying the patient’s medical diagnosis.
- **Medication Inference:** Questions regarding the medications prescribed, including dosage, frequency, and purpose.
- **Instruction Inference:** Questions focused on discharge instructions, such as follow-up care, activity restrictions, and self-care guidelines.

These three categories collectively cover the key aspects of discharge-related patient care, requiring LLMs to perform non-trivial reasoning based on the given clinical background. Moreover, all these problems can potentially benefit from the retrieved experience, mimicking the way clinicians apply past clinical knowledge to make medical decisions during discharge.

Evaluation Settings Each problem in DISCHARGEQA includes a problem description, the patient’s clinical background, and multiple options for the LLM to choose from. While instruction inference uses a single-select setup, diagnosis and medication inference adopt a multi-select setup, requiring the model to select multiple options to

	Task	Answer Format	#Query	Example Question	Practical Significance	Background Source	Option Source
DISCHARGEQA	Diagnosis Inference	Multi-select	436	"Which diagnoses should be documented in the patient's discharge summary?"	Reflects a doctor's process of identifying all relevant diagnoses based on clinical profile.	Clinical profile	Discharge Report & EHR
	Medications Inference	Multi-select	444	"Which medications should be prescribed to the patient at discharge?"	Simulates the doctor's task of ensuring correct medications are prescribed based on hospital treatment.	Clinical profile & In-hospital progress	Discharge Report & EHR
	Instructions Inference	Single-select	400	"What is the best instruction for this patient?"	Mimics the final step of doctors' advising patients with appropriate post-discharge care instructions.	Clinical profile & In-hospital progress	Discharge Report & AI
EHRNoteQA	Clinical Inference	Single-select & Open-Ended	962	"What was the treatment provided for the patient's left breast cellulitis?"	Extract and answer based on content from full discharge notes	Full clinical notes	Discharge Report & AI
CliniQ4QA	Retrieval	Text Span	1,287	"Why has the patient been prescribed hctz?"	Retrieve the related content as answer from report	Full clinical notes	/

Table 1: Comparison of DISCHARGEQA and the previous EHR-related QA benchmarks.




Figure 3: Inference pipeline of DISCHARGEQA.

answer the questions. Each option corresponds to a specific diagnosis or treatment. This multi-select format presents a more challenging and realistic setting for LLMs, as clinicians often need to identify and address multiple coexisting conditions.

The overall inference pipeline is presented in Figure 3, where we implement several components, including Ranker, Retrieval, and LLM agent, to support discharge-related QA using EXP-RAG.

Comparison

Compared with existing QA benchmarks that focus primarily on general clinical QA or information retrieval, DISCHARGEQA centers on the discharge procedure, simulating a doctor's medical reasoning process: inferring the diagnosis from the clinical profile, prescribing appropriate treatments, and summarizing the condition—offering a more realistic scenario. Additionally, we utilize EHR to generate contextually relevant options, requiring LLMs to perform non-trivial reasoning to solve the tasks. More details are provided in Table 1.

4.2 Dataset Construction

Patients Filtering We first filter out low-quality patient records in MIMIC-IV for various reasons. Starting with all 430,000 patients, we remove encounters without available discharge summaries,

leaving 320,000 patients. Next, we filter out patients with fewer than 3 or more than 40 entries in any of the diagnosis, medication, or procedure records, resulting in a final dataset of 28,000 patients for generating QA pairs. For instruction inference, we further exclude patients with excessively short discharge summaries using GPT-4o.

Background Generation To enable LLMs to make realistic medical decision, it is necessary to offer a clinical background of the patient along with the question. To avoid label leakage during the context generation, we propose leveraging the structured format of the discharge summary, which consists of the following components:

- **Clinical profile:** Essential patient demography, the presenting condition, and initial clinical assessments.
- **In-hospital progress:** The interventions, therapies, and the patient's clinical progress during hospitalization.
- **Discharge plan summary:** The details of discharge diagnosis and medication, and instructions for post-hospital care.

An illustrative example can be found in Appendix A.1. These three components represent the core of discharge decision-making procedure, aligning with the three main problem types in DISCHARGEQA. Accordingly, we present the summarized sections preceding the questions as context. For example, the clinical profile serves as the background for diagnosis-related questions, while the in-hospital progress is additionally included for medication-related questions. Notably, basic patient demographic information is always included as part of the contextual background.

Option Generation For all tasks, the correct options are directly extracted from the discharge reports. For diagnosis and medication inference, we utilize EHR to generate non-trivial candidate options by extracting all associated diagnoses and medications of a patient and feeding them into GPT-4o to select contextually relevant candidates, ensuring a challenging selection process. For instruction inference, GPT-4o first summarizes the key points of the ground-truth answers and then applies permutations to generate plausible yet incorrect candidate options.

5 Experiments

In this section, we evaluate EXPRAG on DISCHARGEQA with four LLMs, comparing it with the text-based report ranker. We also analyze the effects of balancing coefficients, the number of similar patients, and retriever choices, followed by case studies on the retrieved experience.

5.1 Comparison of LLMs

We evaluated the performance of 4 state-of-the-art LLMs of varying scales, ranging from close-source to 8 billion parameters open-source model, on three clinical tasks: discharge instructions, diagnosis, and medications. These models included (1) Proprietary LLMs GPT-3.5 (OpenAI, 2022) and GPT-4o (OpenAI, 2024) (2) Open-source LLMs Mistral (Jiang et al., 2023a), and Deepseek-R1 (Guo et al., 2025).

Hyperparameters We also present the results of LLMs with EXPRAG. The default balancing coefficients $\lambda_{1/2/3}$ are set to 1/3 each and auto-merging (Liu, 2022) is used as the retriever. The number of similar patients is set as 15.

Metrics We report accuracy across all the tasks, calculated as the percentage of correctly answered questions. Note that for multi-select problems, a question is considered answered correctly only when all correct options are selected. We additionally report F1 scores for the multi-select problems to provide a more comprehensive analysis of LLM performance on these challenging tasks.

Results Table 2 summarizes the performance of all LLMs with EXPRAG on the three clinical tasks. GPT-4o consistently achieves the best performance across tasks, with an absolute improvement of 13% over GPT-3.5 on instruction inference problems. Additionally, the multi-select tasks (diagnosis and

medication) prove significantly more challenging, as most LLMs achieve accuracy below 20%, indicating the limited medical reasoning capabilities of current large language models.

5.2 Comparison of Report Ranker

To verify the effectiveness of EXPRAG and the utilization of EHR, we introduce a baseline that performs report ranking solely based on text, i.e., a text-based ranker. We embed all text components, including the question, options, and background, into a single representation. Similarly, each discharge report is embedded, and similarity is computed with the question embedding. The top- k reports are then retrieved, followed by a text retriever to extract the relevant information.

The results are presented in Table 2. We observe that EXPRAG outperforms the text-based ranker in most cases, achieving an average relative improvement of 5.2%. Notably, the EHR-based ranker leverages structured EHR data for ranking, eliminating the need for an embedding process and thereby enabling a more efficient pipeline.

5.3 Further Analysis

We conducted additional studies to investigate the impact of key components on the performance of EXPRAG, including the number of similar patients k , the balancing coefficients $\lambda_{1/2/3}$, and the choice of retrievers. We apply GPT-3.5 as backbone by default.

Balancing Coefficients As shown in Equ. 4, we introduce three coefficients to balance the similarity computed based on diagnosis, medication, and procedures. We apply an equal distribution by default and explore the effect of using different weighting strategies here:

- **Task-focused weighting:** Assign a weight of 1 to the task-relevant similarity measure and 0 to the others. For example, $\lambda_1 = 1, \lambda_2 = 0, \lambda_3 = 0$ for diagnosis inference.
- **Complementary weighting:** Assign a weight of 1 to the two less relevant similarity measures while setting the task-relevant measure to 0. For example, $\lambda_1 = 0, \lambda_2 = 1, \lambda_3 = 1$ for diagnosis inference.

The results are shown in Table 3. We can find that complementary weighting can achieve the best

Model	Report Ranker	Instruction		Diagnosis		Medication	
		Acc(%)	F1	Acc(%)	F1	Acc(%)	F1
GPT-3.5	Direct-Ask	73.0	18.50	0.498	1.15	0.234	
	Text-based	78.8	15.60	0.405	0.68	0.317	
	EHR-based	79.5	18.81	0.504	1.80	0.371	
GPT-4o	Direct-Ask	90.0	9.86	0.510	3.65	0.486	
	Text-based	90.3	8.26	0.493	4.95	0.601	
	EHR-based	91.3	21.33	0.530	9.68	0.638	
Deepseek-R1	Direct-Ask	70.0	10.78	0.363	0.69	0.217	
	Text-based	72.0	12.84	0.381	2.03	0.230	
	EHR-based	75.3	11.01	0.379	1.13	0.241	
Mistral-7b	Direct-Ask	67.0	16.03	0.488	1.13	0.362	
	Text-based	70.0	14.67	0.490	0.90	0.344	
	EHR-based	69.0	13.79	0.505	1.13	0.353	

Table 2: Performance Comparison Across Multiple LLMs using DISCHARGEQA

Model	Instruction		Diagnosis		Medication	
	Acc	F1	Acc	F1	Acc	F1
Uniform	79.5	18.81	0.504	1.8	0.371	
Task-focused	77.5	10.91	0.377	0.91	0.322	
Complementary	76.8	18.18	0.446	2.73	0.305	

Table 3: Performance Comparison for Coefficients Distributions DISCHARGEQA

performance in most cases, demonstrating that information from multiple clinical dimensions can provide a more comprehensive context.

Top- k Patients We vary the number of retrieved similar patients k on QA performance. As shown in Table 4, different tasks have varies trends. For example, on Instruction task, accuracy starts to increases with larger number, from $k = 10$ with an accuracy of 78.75. While for Diagnosis and Medication tasks, beyond $k = 20$, performance fluctuates, suggesting that while more retrieved candidates provide useful context, excessive retrieval may introduce irrelevant or conflicting information, leading to slight declines in accuracy.

Experience Retriever We evaluate four retrievers for experience retrieval: auto-merging (Liu, 2022), sentence-window (Liu, 2022), BM25 (Robertson et al., 2009), BM25+ (the combination of BM25 and word embeddings), Contriever (Izacard et al., 2021), and flare (Jiang et al., 2023b). More details regarding the methods can be found in Appendix A.2.

As shown in Table 5, auto-merging, sentence-

# Similar Patients	Instruction		Diagnosis		Medication	
	Acc	F1	Acc	F1	Acc	F1
$k = 5$	80.00	19.04	0.511	1.80	0.366	
$k = 10$	78.75	18.58	0.511	1.35	0.371	
$k = 15$	79.50	18.81	0.504	1.80	0.371	
$k = 20$	80.75	19.50	0.524	1.80	0.377	
$k = 25$	82.25	19.27	0.515	1.35	0.352	

Table 4: Performance Comparison with Different k for GPT3.5.

Retriever	Instruction Acc
Auto Merging	79.5
Sentence Window	74.5
BM25	68.0
BM25+	69.0
Flare	74.5
Contriever	69.0

Table 5: Performance Comparison of Retrievers.

window, and flare achieve the best performance, highlighting the effectiveness of context-aware retrieval. However, Contriever, which utilizes unsupervised dense representations, also underperforms in our cases, suggesting the need for medical domain-specific fine-tuning.

5.4 Case Studies

We conduct a case study focusing on Discharge Diagnosis in DISCHARGEQA. We examine the discharge diagnosis of a target patient (ID: 20453584) who presented with bilateral ulnar paresthesias and

neck pain. We compare this patient with similar patients, who are selected by comparing ICD/NDC codes from EHR tabular data. Fig 4 shows one example question in DISCHARGEQA and the similarities in the discharge reports between the target patient and the similar patients with IDs 25633130, 29378221 and 28817667.

Analysis of Similar Patients' Data: Upon reviewing the discharge summaries of the similar patients, it became clear that several key diagnostic features were shared with patient 20453584:

- **Disc Herniation:** Both the target patient and similar patients had disc herniations, with the target patient experiencing a C5-6 disc-osteophyte complex and the similar patients exhibiting C3-C4 and C6-C7 herniations.
- **Spinal Stenosis:** Many of the similar patients displayed **spinal stenosis**, which was consistent with the target patient's symptoms of narrowing of the spinal canal and foraminal narrowing.
- **Upper Extremity Symptoms:** The target patient reported **bilateral ulnar paresthesias**, which mirrored the bilateral symptoms observed in several similar patients, such as neck pain radiating to the arms and tingling in the extremities.

Results: By comparing the discharge summaries, key features from similar patients that influenced the diagnosis of the target patient:

- Similar patients with **C6-C7 disc herniation** and **radiculopathy** helped to refine the target patient's diagnosis, suggesting that similar nerve root involvement could explain the upper extremity symptoms.
- The presence of **spinal stenosis** and **neural foraminal narrowing** in several patients guided the understanding of the target patient's potential nerve compression, which contributed to the diagnosis of **spinal stenosis**.

The comparison to similar patients led to a more precise discharge diagnosis for the target patient, which included a C5-6 disc-osteophyte complex with associated **spinal canal narrowing** and **neural foraminal narrowing**. These insights allowed the LLMs to confirm the target patient's diagnosis, which aligned with options **A** and **G** — **disc osteophyte** and **spinal stenosis**.

```

20453584
"background": "a male physician with BUE paresthesias and periscapular pain, experiencing bilateral ulnar distribution symptoms, with MRI showing C5-6 disc-osteophyte complex and spinal canal narrowing.",
"discharge_diagnosis_options": {
  "A": "disc osteophyte",
  "B": "Esophageal reflux",
  "C": "Obstructive sleep apnea",
  "D": "Diaphragmatic hernia",
  "E": "History of skin neoplasm",
  "F": "Brachial neuritis",
  "G": "spinal stenosis"
},
"correct_answer": "AG",
"hadm_id": "20453584",
"question": "Which diagnoses should be documented into the patient's discharge diagnosis?"

```

20453584

History of Present Illness:
 ...
 This is an otherwise healthy male who complains over the past couple months of having **bilateral left greater than right ulnar distribution, paresthesias as well as periscapular pain**. MRI was most concerning for **C5-6: A disc-osteophyte complex with left sided herniation, which causes moderate spinal canal narrowing. Severe left and moderate right neural foraminal narrowing.**

Brief Hospital Course:
Patient was admitted to the ___ Spine Surgery Service and taken to the Operating Room for the above procedure. The surgery was **without complication** and the patient was transferred to the PACU in a stable condition. **TEDs/pnemoboots** were used for postoperative DVT prophylaxis. Intravenous antibiotics were continued for 24hrs postop per standard protocol. Initial postop pain was controlled with a **PCA**. Diet was advanced as tolerated. The patient: **ambulated independently. Hospital course was otherwise unremarkable.** On the day of discharge, the patient was afebrile with stable vital signs, comfortable on oral pain control, and tolerating a regular diet.

Medications:
 1. **Patanol** (olopatadine) 0.1 % ophthalmic BID
 2. Ketorolac 0.5% Ophth Soln 1 DROP BOTH EYES QID dry eyes

Discharge Diagnosis:
disc osteophyte
spinal stenosis

28817667

History of Present Illness:
 ...
 The patient has **neck pain and right arm pain and tingling**. He was found to have **C6-C7 disk herniation** with **right-sided radiculopathy**, which correlates with his symptoms.

Brief Hospital Course:
Patient was admitted to the ___ Spine Surgery Service and taken to the Operating Room for the above procedure. The surgery was **without complication** and the patient was transferred to the PACU in a stable condition. **TEDs/pnemoboots** were used for postoperative DVT prophylaxis. Intravenous antibiotics were continued for 24hrs postop per standard protocol. Initial postop pain was controlled with **oral pain medication**. Diet was advanced as tolerated. **The patient ambulated independently** post-op. **Hospital course was otherwise unremarkable.** On the day of discharge, the patient was afebrile with stable vital signs, comfortable on oral pain control, and tolerating a regular diet.

Medications:
 1. **Gabapentin** 300 mg PO TID
 2. **Oxycodone-Acetaminophen** (5mg-325mg) 1 TAB PO Q8H:PRN neck pain or dysmenorrhea
 3. **Naproxen** 440 mg PO ONCE ___ TIMES PER WEEK

Discharge Diagnosis:
1. C6-C7 disk herniation.
2. C7 radiculopathy.

25633130

History of Present Illness:
 ...
 This is a patient with a **large C3-C4 disc herniation above her previous construct with spinal cord changes**. Given her significant **upper extremity symptoms, myelomalacia** and **severe stenosis**, she is here for **surgical intervention**.

Discharge Diagnosis:
cervical stenosis with disc herniation

29378221

History of Present Illness:
 ...
 Ms. ___ had previously undergone an **ACDF** with Dr. ___ at ___ in ___. When she was recovering from this surgery, she began having **low back pain** and **bilateral leg pain** down the posterolateral aspect of both thighs with some soreness in her calves. An MRI showed a **facet cyst at L4-L5, and she underwent cyst aspiration**, which relieved her pain until it returned. She does not report specific weakness in her legs.

Discharge Diagnosis:
L4/5 central stenosis/disc hernia

Figure 4: Comparison of Similar Patients.

6 Conclusion

Inspired by the importance of experience in clinical decision-making, we propose a novel coarse-to-fine retrieval framework, EXPRAG, to utilize knowledge from similar patient records. Specifically, we introduce EHR as a knowledge basis and employ a comprehensive similarity measurement algorithm to narrow down the candidate pool, from which a text retriever extracts the relevant content. Evaluated on our curated DISCHARGEQA, EXPRAG consistently improves the performance of various LLMs, highlighting the potential of leveraging past clinical experience for enhanced medical QA.

Limitations While EHR provides abundant medical information, such as lab test results, our proposed EXPRAG currently utilizes only diagnosis, medication, and procedures as an initial exploration. Additionally, DISCHARGEQA currently consists solely of multi-option questions, which may limit its ability to comprehensively evaluate the generative capabilities of LLMs.

References

- Jayetri Bardhan, Anthony Colas, Kirk Roberts, and Daisy Zhe Wang. 2022. [DrugEHRQA: A question answering dataset on structured and unstructured electronic health records for medicine related queries](#). In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 1083–1097, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.
- Zeming Chen, Alejandro Hernández-Cano, Angelika Romanou, Antoine Bonnet, Kyle Matoba, Francesco Salvi, Matteo Pagliardini, Simin Fan, Andreas Köpf, Amirkeivan Mohtashami, Alexandre Sallinen, Alireza Sakhaeirad, Vinitra Swamy, Igor Krawczuk, Deniz Bayazit, Axel Marmet, Syrielle Montariol, Mary-Anne Hartley, Martin Jaggi, and Antoine Bosselut. 2023. [Meditron-70b: Scaling medical pre-training for large language models](#).
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, et al. 2019. BERT: pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *NAACL-HLT*.
- Matthijs Douze, Alexandr Guzhva, Chengqi Deng, Jeff Johnson, Gergely Szilvasy, Pierre-Emmanuel Mazaré, Maria Lomeli, Lucas Hosseini, and Hervé Jégou. 2024. [The faiss library](#).
- Jungwei Fan. 2019. Annotating and characterizing clinical sentences with explicit why-qa cues. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Clinical Natural Language Processing Workshop*, pages 101–106.
- Jiatao Gu, Yong Wang, Kyunghyun Cho, and Victor OK Li. 2018. Search engine guided neural machine translation. In *AAAI*, volume 32.
- Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shirong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, et al. 2025. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948*.
- Charles R. Harris, K. Jarrod Millman, Stéfan J. van der Walt, Ralf Gommers, Pauli Virtanen, David Cournapeau, Eric Wieser, Julian Taylor, Sebastian Berg, Nathaniel J. Smith, Robert Kern, Matti Picus, Stephan Hoyer, Marten H. van Kerkwijk, Matthew Brett, Allan Haldane, Jaime Fernández del Río, Mark Wiebe, Pearu Peterson, Pierre Gérard-Marchant, Kevin Sheppard, Tyler Reddy, Warren Weckesser, Hameer Abbasi, Christoph Gohlke, and Travis E. Oliphant. 2020. [Array programming with NumPy](#). *Nature*, 585(7825):357–362.
- Tinglin Huang, Syed Asad Rizvi, Rohan Krishna Thakur, Vimig Socrates, Meili Gupta, David van Dijk, R Andrew Taylor, and Rex Ying. 2024. Heart: Learning better representation of ehr data with a heterogeneous relation-aware transformer. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 159:104741.
- Gautier Izacard, Mathilde Caron, Lucas Hosseini, Sebastian Riedel, Piotr Bojanowski, Armand Joulin, and Edouard Grave. 2021. Unsupervised dense information retrieval with contrastive learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.09118*.
- Albert Qiaochu Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de Las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, L’elio Renard Lavaud, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Teven Le Scao, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timothée Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2023a. [Mistral 7b](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2310.06825.
- Zhengbao Jiang, Frank F Xu, Luyu Gao, Zhiqing Sun, Qian Liu, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Yiming Yang, Jamie Callan, and Graham Neubig. 2023b. Active retrieval augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06983*.
- Di Jin, Eileen Pan, Nassim Oufattole, Wei-Hung Weng, Hanyi Fang, and Peter Szolovits. 2021. What disease does this patient have? a large-scale open domain question answering dataset from medical exams. *Applied Sciences*, 11(14):6421.
- Qiao Jin, Bhuwan Dhingra, Zhengping Liu, William Cohen, and Xinghua Lu. 2019. Pubmedqa: A dataset for biomedical research question answering. 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)*, pages 2567–2577.
- Alistair Johnson, Tom Pollard, Steven Horng, Leo Anthony Celi, and Roger Mark. 2023a. [Mimic-iv-note: Deidentified free-text clinical notes \(version 2.2\)](#).

- Alistair E. W. Johnson et al. 2016. [Mimic-iii, a freely accessible critical care database](#). *Scientific Data*, 3:160035.
- Alistair EW Johnson, Lucas Bulgarelli, Lu Shen, Alvin Gayles, Ayad Shammout, Steven Horng, Tom J Pollard, Sicheng Hao, Benjamin Moody, Brian Gow, et al. 2023b. Mimic-iv, a freely accessible electronic health record dataset. *Scientific data*, 10(1):1.
- Sunjun Kweon, Jiyoun Kim, Heeyoung Kwak, Dongchul Cha, Hangyul Yoon, Kwanghyun Kim, Jee-won Yang, Seunghyun Won, and Edward Choi. 2024. [Ehrmoteqa: An llm benchmark for real-world clinical practice using discharge summaries](#). In *Proceedings of NeurIPS 2024 (Datasets and Benchmarks)*.
- Gyubok Lee, Hyeonji Hwang, Seongsu Bae, Yeonsu Kwon, Woncheol Shin, Seongjun Yang, Minjoon Seo, Jong-Yeup Kim, and Edward Choi. 2022. [Ehrsql: A practical text-to-sql benchmark for electronic health records](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 15589–15601. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Jerry Liu. 2022. [LlamaIndex](#).
- Lei Liu, Xiaoyan Yang, Junchi Lei, Xiaoyang Liu, Yue Shen, Zhiqiang Zhang, Peng Wei, Jinjie Gu, Zhixuan Chu, Zhan Qin, et al. 2024. A survey on medical large language models: Technology, application, trustworthiness, and future directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.03712*.
- Yuxing Lu, Xukai Zhao, and Jinzhuo Wang. 2024. [ClinicalRAG: Enhancing clinical decision support through heterogeneous knowledge retrieval](#). In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Towards Knowledgeable Language Models (KnowLLM 2024)*, pages 64–68, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sungrim Moon, Huan He, Heling Jia, Hongfang Liu, Jungwei Wilfred Fan, et al. 2023. Extractive clinical question-answering with multianswer and multifocus questions: Data set development and evaluation study. *JMIR AI*, 2(1):e41818.
- OpenAI. 2022. [Chatgpt: Optimizing language models for dialogue](#).
- OpenAI. 2024. [Hello gpt-4o](#).
- Ankit Pal, Logesh Kumar Umaphathi, and Malaikanan Sankarasubbu. 2022. Medmcqa: A large-scale multi-subject multi-choice dataset for medical domain question answering. In *Conference on Health, Inference, and Learning*, pages 248–260. PMLR.
- Anusri Pampari, Preethi Raghavan, Jennifer Liang, and Jian Peng. 2018. emrqa: A large corpus for question answering on electronic medical records. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.00732*.
- Fabio Petroni, Tim Rocktäschel, Patrick Lewis, Anton Bakhtin, Yuxiang Wu, Alexander H. Miller, and Sebastian Riedel. 2019. [Language models as knowledge bases?](#)
- Stephen Robertson, Hugo Zaragoza, et al. 2009. The probabilistic relevance framework: Bm25 and beyond. *Foundations and Trends® in Information Retrieval*, 3(4):333–389.
- Karan Singhal, Tao Tu, Juraj Gottweis, Rory Sayres, Ellery Wulczyn, Mohamed Amin, Le Hou, Kevin Clark, Stephen R Pfohl, Heather Cole-Lewis, et al. 2025. Toward expert-level medical question answering with large language models. *Nature Medicine*, pages 1–8.
- Sarvesh Soni, Meghana Gudala, Atieh Pajouhi, and Kirk Roberts. 2022. [RadQA: A question answering dataset to improve comprehension of radiology reports](#). In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 6250–6259, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.
- Guangzhi Xiong, Qiao Jin, Zhiyong Lu, and Aidong Zhang. 2024. [Benchmarking retrieval-augmented generation for medicine](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 6233–6251, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lee Xiong, Chenyan Xiong, Ye Li, et al. 2021. Approximate nearest neighbor negative contrastive learning for dense text retrieval. In *ICLR*.
- Rui Yang, Yilin Ning, Emilia Keppo, Mingxuan Liu, Chuan Hong, Danielle S Bitterman, Jasmine Chiat Ling Ong, Daniel Shu Wei Ting, and Nan Liu. 2025. Retrieval-augmented generation for generative artificial intelligence in health care. *npj Health Systems*, 2(1):2.
- Xiang Yue, Xinliang Frederick Zhang, Ziyu Yao, Simon Lin, and Huan Sun. 2021. Cliniqg4qa: Generating diverse questions for domain adaptation of clinical question answering. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Bioinformatics and Biomedicine (BIBM)*, pages 580–587. IEEE.
- Yanxin Zheng, Wensheng Gan, Zefeng Chen, Zhenlian Qi, Qian Liang, and Philip S Yu. 2024. Large language models for medicine: a survey. *International Journal of Machine Learning and Cybernetics*, pages 1–26.

A Appendix

A.1 Dataset Details

MIMIC-IV² This database (Johnson et al., 2016, 2023b,a) contains information on over 40,000 patients admitted to the critical care units at Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center from 2001 to 2012 and has been widely used in prior research. The database is publicly available for research purposes, with strict de-identification protocols to protect patient privacy, making it a valuable resource for developing and evaluating machine learning models in healthcare. The data is hierarchically organized, with each patient record comprising multiple encounters, each containing various entities such as demographics, medications, diagnoses, procedures, and lab results. Additionally, the database includes unstructured data, such as discharge reports and X-ray images, with each admission marked by a date and timestamp.

Structure of Discharge Report As shown in Figure 5, a discharge summary follows a structured format that provides a comprehensive overview of a patient’s hospitalization and care journey. It is typically divided into three main parts: (1) The Clinical Profile, which includes essential patient information, presenting conditions, and the initial clinical assessment upon admission; (2) The In-Hospital Progress, which documents the treatment plan, administered therapies, and the patient’s progress throughout the hospital stay; and (3) The Discharge Plan Summary, which summarizes the patient’s discharge status, prescribed medications, and detailed post-discharge instructions for ongoing care.

A.2 Retriever

Auto-merging Auto-merging retrieval in RAG by LlamaIndex (Liu, 2022) hierarchically structures documents into parent and child nodes, allowing for the retrieval of larger, more coherent context by merging child nodes into parent nodes when multiple related chunks are relevant to a query

Sentence-window Sentence-window retrieval by LlamaIndex (Liu, 2022) parses documents into individual sentences with surrounding context, enabling fine-grained retrieval while maintaining local coherence by including a window of adjacent sentences

²<https://mimic.mit.edu/docs/iv/>

BM25 & BM25+ BM25 (Best Match 25) is a ranking function used in information retrieval that scores documents based on the frequency of query terms within them, taking into account document length and term frequency saturation. BM25+ by LlamaIndex (Liu, 2022) combines retrieval methods BM25 and vector-based retrieval, to leverage the strengths of both approaches. This hybrid technique allows for capturing both keyword relevance and semantic similarity, often using algorithms like Relative Score Fusion to re-rank and merge results from different retrievers, resulting in more accurate and comprehensive search outcomes.

flare FLARE (Forward-Looking Active REtrieval) enhances RAG by enabling the language model to anticipate future content needs, iteratively predicting upcoming sentences and retrieving relevant information when encountering low-confidence tokens, thus improving response accuracy and contextual relevance

Contriever Contriever is a single-tower dense retrieval model that employs self-supervised contrastive learning to enhance document embeddings for retrieval tasks. It encodes both queries and documents using the same encoder, producing dense vector representations. The model utilizes a self-supervised contrastive learning approach with a loss function that optimizes embeddings by comparing relevant passages to negative (irrelevant) ones

A.3 LLM Backbone

GPT3.5 & GPT-4o GPT-3.5, developed by OpenAI and released in November 2022, was followed by GPT-4o, also created by OpenAI and launched on May 13, 2024, marking a significant advancement with its ability to process and generate outputs across text, audio, and image modalities in real time.

Deepseek-R1 DeepSeek-R1 is a powerful 671 billion parameter language model developed by DeepSeek AI, from which we use DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Llama-8B was derived as a more efficient 8 billion parameter version, distilled from the original model’s knowledge to offer improved performance on reasoning tasks while maintaining computational efficiency

Mistral Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.3 is an advanced instruction-tuned language model featuring an extended vocabulary of 32,768 tokens, support for

-----Section 1 : Clinical profile-----

-----Patient Demography-----
Name: ___ Admission Date: ___ Discharge Date: ___
Date of Birth: ___ Sex: F
Service: Surgery
Allergies: Penicillins, ACE Inhibitors
Attending: ___

-----Presenting Condition-----
Chief Complaint: Patient admitted with nausea and abdominal pain.
History of Present Illness: Patient presented with a history of nausea, vomiting, and abdominal pain for several days. Laboratory evaluation was unremarkable. CT scan showed a small bowel obstruction secondary to a Richter's hernia.
Past Medical History: HTN, HLD, Asthma, Tenosynovitis, Obesity.
Social History: ___
Family History: Non-contributory.

-----Clinical Assessment-----
Physical Exam:
• Vital signs: Temp 97.8°F, BP 130/65, HR 72, RR 16.
• Abdomen: Distended, possible tender mass below the umbilicus without erythema or guarding.
Pertinent Results:
• Labs: WBC 8.8, Hgb 13.1, Hct 37.7.
• CT Abdomen: Richter's hernia causing small-bowel obstruction, no perforation.

-----Section 2: In-Hospital Progress-----

-----Treatment Plan-----
Major Surgical or Invasive Procedure: Exploratory laparotomy, lysis of adhesions, hernia repair with mesh.

-----In-Hospital Progress-----
Brief Hospital Course:
Patient underwent surgery for small bowel obstruction secondary to Richter's hernia. Postoperative recovery was uneventful. Diet was gradually advanced, and pain was well-controlled.
Medications on Admission: Fluticasone, HCTZ, Naproxen, Prochlorperazine, Valsartan.

-----Section 3: Discharge Plan-----

-----Discharge Summary-----
Discharge Medications:
1. Oxycodone-Acetaminophen for pain, as needed.
2. Docusate Sodium, twice daily.
3. Ciprofloxacin, twice daily for 2 weeks.
Discharge Disposition: Home with services.
Discharge Diagnosis: Small bowel obstruction due to Richter's hernia.
Discharge Condition: Stable.

-----Post-Discharge Instructions-----
Discharge Instructions:
• Avoid driving or operating machinery while taking pain medications.
• Resume regular home medications.
Call your doctor or visit the ER if:
• You have chest pain, persistent vomiting, dehydration, or a fever above 101.5°F.
• There is redness, swelling, or drainage from the incision.
Activity:
• No heavy lifting for 6 weeks. Moderate exercise allowed, no abdominal exercises.
Wound Care:
• Shower allowed, no baths or swimming. Steri-strips will fall off on their own.
Follow-Up Instructions: ___

Figure 5: An example of discharge report, which can be split into 3 sections and 7 subsections: clinical profile, in-hospital progress, and discharge plan summary. Note: Some pertinent results from exams are before diagnosis, while some are after diagnosis or after procedures.

the v3 Tokenizer, and function calling capabilities, enabling more versatile and complex interactions compared to its predecessors

A.4 Prompt Templates

Figure 6 presents the prompt used to generate Diagnosis task options, which is the same way as generating options for Medication task.

Prompt: generate options for Diagnosis task

Role: You are a doctor evaluating the Discharge Diagnosis of a patient.

Task: Your objective is to review the discharge diagnosis provided in the discharge summary and determine whether these diagnosis are suitable for the patient's treatment plan. The correct options are based on the diagnosis listed in the discharge summary, while incorrect options are derived from diagnoses table that are not part of the discharge diagnosis but may have been found during the hospital stay.

Discharge Diagnosis:

----info starts----

{discharge_diagnosis}

----info ends----

Diagnoses Database Info:

----info starts----

{diagnoses}

----info ends----

Also, please review the provided background info from other part of the Discharge Summary, which can be summarized (keep important info) to be background info, but do not put any diagnosis decision into it.

----background info starts----

{discharge_summary}

----background info ends----

Please provide a multi-answer true/false response for the following question:

Question:

Which discharge diagnosis were made for the patient at discharge?

Answer Options:

Provide a list of diagnosis in JSON format.

Each diagnosis should be marked as "True" if it was in the discharge diagnosis and "False" if it was only found in the diagnoses history but not listed as a discharge diagnosis.

Instruction:

1. List all items in the diagnosis and assign one option letter (from A to Z then a to z) to each non-repeated one
2. Review all items provided in the diagnoses database one by one. If the item is also listed by discharge diagnosis, or equivalent or very close meaning, then the "correct_answer" should have the letter of this item, and this item should be the same way as described in "Discharge Diagnosis"
3. If the item is from "Diagnoses Database Info" only but not in "Discharge Diagnosis", and the name is too long, please summarize it to be less than 10 words

Output Format:

Provide your responses in JSON format as follows:

```
{
  "Reason": "<Explain how you combine equivalent diagnosis from both info sides to which options, and which options are from which info>"
  "background": "{background} + <Your summary from other parts of the Discharge Summary, do not put diagnosis info into it, try to include as much important info as possible>",
  "discharge_diagnosis_options": {
    "A": "<diagnosis name>",
    "B": "<diagnosis name>",
    "C": "<diagnosis name>",
    ...
  },
  "correct_answer": "<String of options representing correct diagnosis, e.g., 'ACD'>"
}
```

Figure 6: Prompt design example for Diagnosis tasks