

Evaluating Large Language Models for Automated Clinical Abstraction in Pulmonary Embolism Registries: Performance Across Model Sizes, Versions, and Parameters

Mahmoud Alwakeel, MD¹, Emory Buck, MD¹, Jonathan G. Martin, MD¹,
Imran Aslam, MD¹, Sudarshan Rajagopal, MD¹, Jian Pei, PhD²,
Mihai V. Podgoreanu, MD¹, Christopher J. Lindsell, PhD³, An-Kwok Ian Wong, MD, PhD¹
¹Duke University Health System, Durham, North Carolina, USA; ²Duke University, Durham,
North Carolina, USA; ³Duke Clinical Research Institute, Durham, North Carolina, USA

Abstract

Pulmonary embolism (PE) is a leading cause of cardiovascular mortality, yet our understanding of optimal management remains limited due to heterogeneous and inaccessible radiology documentation. The PERT Consortium registry standardizes PE management data but depends on resource-intensive manual abstraction. Large language models (LLMs) offer a scalable alternative for automating concept extraction from computed tomography PE (CTPE) reports. This study evaluated the accuracy of LLMs in extracting PE-related concepts compared to a human-curated criterion standard. We retrospectively analyzed MIMIC-IV and Duke Health CTPE reports using multiple LLaMA models. Larger models (70B) outperformed smaller ones (8B), achieving kappa values of 0.98 (PE detection), 0.65–0.75 (PE location), 0.48–0.51 (right heart strain), and 0.65–0.70 (image artifacts). Moderate temperature tuning (0.2–0.5) improved accuracy, while excessive in-context examples reduced performance. A dual-model review framework achieved >80–90% precision. LLMs demonstrate strong potential for automating PE registry abstraction, minimizing manual workload while preserving accuracy.

Introduction

Pulmonary embolism (PE) is a leading cause of cardiovascular mortality worldwide, necessitating accurate diagnosis and risk stratification to optimize management and improve patient outcomes.¹ The PE Response Team (PERT) is a multidisciplinary group, often spanning multiple hospitals and healthcare systems, comprising cardiologists, radiologists, vascular surgeons, and intensivists established to coordinate timely and effective interventions for PE patients. These interventions have been associated with reduced mortality and shorter hospital stays.² Recognizing the complexity and variability in PE management, the non-profit PERT Consortium has advocated for a standardized registry to document interventions, outcomes, and quality metrics in real-world practice settings.³ This registry serves as a valuable resource for clinical research and quality improvement initiatives across diverse healthcare institutions. However, the current registry relies on manual abstraction, which is resource-intensive, limits scalability, and poses challenges to data completeness and generalizability.⁴

Traditional methods to address scalability and efficiency challenges have relied on automated approaches such as rule-based keyword searches, structured templates, and machine learning models trained on labeled datasets.^{5–7} While these techniques partially reduce manual workload, they exhibit critical limitations. They often struggle to interpret nuanced clinical language, accommodate provider variability, and integrate complex contextual information embedded in free-text documentation.^{5,8} Furthermore, rule-based systems lack adaptability across different institutions and electronic health record (EHR) systems, requiring extensive customization.^{9,10}

The recent emergence of large language models (LLMs) offers a promising alternative for automating clinical concept extraction in structured registries. Unlike earlier automated methods, LLMs employ advanced natural language processing (NLP) techniques, enhancing their ability to extract clinical insights with minimal customization.¹¹ Early studies suggest that LLMs can achieve human-level performance in clinical text processing with superior consistency and scalability across diverse datasets.¹¹ Despite their potential, LLMs applications in structured clinical registries—particularly for high-stakes conditions like PE—remain underexplored.

This study evaluates the feasibility of publicly available LLMs for automating clinical concept extraction from computed tomography PE (CTPE) reports to support PERT registry development. By systematically testing different LLaMA model configurations—including variations in in-context examples (multiple-shot), where the model is given multiple sample inputs and outputs to guide its reasoning, and temperature settings, which control the degree of randomness or creativity in the model’s responses—this study aims to identify an optimal LLM approach that balances accuracy and efficiency. We propose a dual-model review validation framework that leverages an independent reviewer LLM to enhance scalable quality assurance. The findings will inform best practices for integrating LLMs into clinical registries, facilitating large-scale data abstraction, and enhancing real-world evidence generation in PE management.

Methods

Study design

This retrospective study utilized data from two distinct sources: the MIMIC-IV database¹² and Duke University Health System (DUHS) EHR, accessed through the Epic Clarity Database. The study included all CTPE reports from 2008 to 2019 for MIMIC-IV and 2014 to 2024 for DUHS, with adult patients (≥ 18 years) included. Patient demographics, including age, sex, and race, were extracted along with the corresponding CTPE reports. MIMIC-IV was included alongside DUHS data to ensure external validity and evaluate model performance across different healthcare settings.

Radiological concepts of interest were based on the most updated PERT Consortium data definitions, which were obtained directly from the Consortium.¹³ Key clinical concepts included PE detection and PE location, classified by right or left involvement and further categorized into main, lobar, segmental, and subsegmental arteries. Right heart strain was evaluated based on right ventricle to left ventricle (RV/LV) ratio, septal flattening, intravenous (IV) contrast reflux into the inferior vena cava, and pulmonary artery-to-aorta (PA/Ao) ratio. Additionally, image quality was assessed by identifying motion and bolus artifacts. Each concept was classified into one of four categories: present (1) if explicitly documented, absent (0) if explicitly negated, missing (-1) if omitted from the documentation, and uncertain (-2) if the determination was inconclusive based on the radiology report. To ensure annotation consistency, two clinicians with expertise in intensive care, radiology, and cardiology independently labeled the predefined concepts. To minimize bias, both underwent standardized training and were followed by a calibration exercise in which they independently annotated a pre-selected subset of five reports to refine and validate their annotation criteria before full dataset annotation. Regular communication ensured that discrepancies were promptly addressed to reinforce consistency, with unresolved cases adjudicated by a third clinician.

Figure 1 illustrates the prompt used for LLM-based PE concept extraction and the workflow, where LLaMA processes the input to generate structured JSON output, which is then converted into an Excel format for analysis. We evaluated multiple LLaMA models, including LLaMA 3 - 8B, LLaMA 3.1-8B, LLaMA 3.1-70B, and LLaMA 3.3-70B.¹⁴ In multiple-shot settings, the prompt included example classifications for each concept (e.g., two-shot prompts contained two labeled examples per category). We also tested different temperature settings (0.0, 0.2, 0.5, 1.0, and 1.5) to evaluate the impact of randomness on model outputs. Failures in LLM generation, such as missing JSON output, were broadly classified as technical errors (-99). The DUHS Institutional Review Board (IRB) reviewed and approved this study as exempt research (IRB protocol Pro00115368).

Outcome and Statistical Analysis

The primary outcome of this study was the accuracy of clinical concept extraction performed by LLMs compared to a human criterion standard across various model parameter sizes, versions, and configurations (temperature and shot variations). Cohen’s kappa coefficient was used to evaluate inter-rater agreement both between the human reviewers and between the human-derived criterion standard and the LLM outputs, accounting for chance agreement.¹⁵ Cohen’s kappa values range from 0 to 1, with 0.01–0.20 indicating slight agreement, 0.21–0.40 indicating fair agreement, 0.41–0.60 indicating moderate agreement, 0.61–0.80 indicating substantial agreement, and 0.81–1.00 indicating near-perfect or perfect agreement.¹⁵ To explore variations in accuracy by model architecture, we evaluated a secondary reviewer model, Phi-4 14B, as a second, independent LLM-based

adjudicator. This model served as a reference point to simulate automated quality control, offering an additional lens beyond human labels. Specifically, we compared the LLaMA models' classifications across different temperatures and shot examples to Phi-4-14B's predictions using pairwise agreement, calculated as the proportion of cases where both models made the same classification and agreed with the human criterion standard. This measure reflects the positive predictive value (PPV) of model agreement with the human criterion standard. Phi-4 14B was evaluated using standardized settings (temperature 0.0, shot 0) across all test cases to ensure consistency. We conducted both accuracy and Cohen's kappa analyses using two complementary approaches. In the original analysis, all four classification categories were retained—present (1), absent (0), missing (-1), and uncertain (-2)—to reflect the full range of possible documentation states. In the transformed analysis, missing and uncertain values were merged with the absent category (i.e., -1 and -2 recorded as 0) to better reflect common clinical practice. Continuous variables are presented as mean standard deviation (\pm SD), whereas categorical variables are summarized using counts and percentages. To determine the appropriate sample size for assessing inter-rater agreement, we used an open-access sample size calculator for Cohen's kappa.¹⁶ Assuming a minimum acceptable kappa of 0.6, an expected kappa of 0.8, an outcome prevalence of 15%¹⁷, a significance level of 0.05 (two-tailed), and 80% power, the required sample size was calculated to be 239 reports. To ensure robustness, we randomly selected 250 reports from each datasets for piloting, allowing for potential annotation inconsistencies before full dataset annotation. All statistical analyses and data visualization were conducted using Python (version 3.11.5; Python Software Foundation, <https://www.python.org>). This study was conducted following the Standards for Reporting Diagnostic Accuracy Studies (STARD) guidelines.¹⁸




Figure 1: Workflow of LLM-Based PE Concept Extraction: From Prompt to Structured Data

Results

A total of 9,132 studies from MIMIC-IV and 82,004 from DUHS EHR were included. Of these, 250 studies from each dataset underwent dual physician abstraction to serve as the criterion standard. Table 1 summarizes patients' demographics for both datasets.

In MIMIC-IV, the average abstraction time per record for small-parameter (8B) LLMs was 33.3 seconds (SD: 12.6), while large-parameter (70B) LLMs took 218.4 seconds (SD: 176.7). In comparison, human reviewers required 70.1 seconds (SD: 11.5) per record. Human inter-rater agreement (Cohen's kappa) for original analysis was 0.73 (transformed: 0.99) for PE detection, 0.94 \pm 0.05 (transformed: 0.94 \pm 0.05) for PE location, 0.80 \pm 0.15 (transformed: 0.99 \pm 0.01) for right heart strain, and 0.73 \pm 0.07 (transformed: 0.85 \pm 0.02) for artifacts. In DUHS, small-parameter LLMs completed abstraction in 23.41 seconds (SD: 2.72), whereas large-parameter LLMs took 162.6 seconds (SD: 24). Human reviewers required 78.3 seconds (SD: 16.9). The human inter-rater agreement for original analysis was 0.81 (transformed: 0.95) for PE detection, 0.87 \pm 0.04 (transformed: 0.89 \pm 0.06) for PE location,

0.75±0.19 (transformed: 0.99±0.01) for right heart strain, and 0.74±0.01 (transformed: 0.94±0.01) for artifacts. Figure 2 summarizes the category distribution across datasets, models, and criterion standards.

Table 1: Comparison of Demographic Characteristics Between MIMIC-IV and DUHS CTPE Cohorts

Characteristic		MIMIC-IV	DUHS
No. of CTPE		9,132	82,004
No. of Patients		7,881	60,567
Age, mean (SD)		55.49 (16.23)	58.27 (17.22)
No. of Positive PE / Analyzed Records		28/250 (11.20%)	38/250 (15.20%)
Sex, n (%)	Female	5,525 (60.50%)	48,409 (59.03%)
	Male	3,607 (39.50%)	33,595 (40.97%)
Race, n (%)	Asian	305 (3.34%)	1,126 (1.37%)
	Black/African American	1,737 (19.02%)	31,966 (38.98%)
	White	5,102 (55.87%)	44,533 (54.31%)
	Others	1,988 (21.77%)	4,379 (5.34%)




Figure 2: Percentage Distribution of Category Values for MIMIC vs. DUHS Data, Comparing LLM Predictions and Criterion Standard Across Concepts and Models

Base model performance across 0-shot and temperature = 0.0

Figures 3 and 4 summarize the performance of different LLM models across baseline conditions and varying temperature and shot configurations. Table 2 summarizes the mean (SD) kappa values for the grouped concepts. At

0-shot (temperature = 0.0) on the original analysis, smaller models (8B) exhibited lower Cohen’s kappa values, whereas 70B models consistently outperformed them. Kappa values improved across all models following transformation, with the greatest gains seen in PE Detection and PE Location. For 8B models in the MIMIC-IV dataset, kappa scores ranged from 0.43–0.62 for PE Detection (transformed 0.76), 0.05–0.25 for average PE Location (transformed 0.64), 0.10 for Right Heart Strain (transformed 0.44), and 0.05 for Artifacts (transformed 0.36). In contrast, 70B models exceeded 0.80 for PE Detection (transformed 0.98), reached an average of ~0.30 for PE Location (transformed 0.75), hovered around 0.12–0.20 for Right Heart Strain (transformed 0.51), and went above 0.60 for Artifacts (transformed 0.70). A similar trend was observed in the DUHS dataset (Figures 3 and 4). Additionally, newer model versions sometimes showed improved agreement over their older counterparts at the same parameter count; however, this improvement was not consistently observed across all metrics and conditions (Table 2 and Figures 2–3).

Table 2. Average Cohen’s Kappa Values (Standard Deviation) for Grouped Concepts

LLM Name	Grouped Concept	MIMIC-IV		DUHS	
		Original	Transformed	Original	Transformed
LLaMA 3 - 8B	PE Detection	0.62 (—)	0.76 (—)	0.58 (—)	0.66 (—)
	PE Location	0.25 (0.10)	0.34 (0.11)	0.17 (0.10)	0.24 (0.11)
	Right Heart Strain	0.10 (0.08)	0.13 (0.12)	0.04 (0.09)	0.13 (0.15)
	Artifacts	0.05 (0.11)	0.36 (0.57)	0.06 (0.07)	0.46 (0.59)
LLaMA 3.1 - 8B	PE Detection	0.43 (—)	0.44 (—)	0.43 (—)	0.68 (—)
	PE Location	0.05 (0.02)	0.64 (0.16)	0.02 (0.02)	0.59 (0.15)
	Right Heart Strain	0.07 (0.01)	0.44 (0.44)	0.09 (0.14)	0.62 (0.00)
	Artifacts	0.05 (0.19)	0.35 (0.64)	0.09 (0.14)	0.33 (0.68)
LLaMA 3.1 - 70B	PE Detection	0.85 (—)	0.98 (—)	0.71 (—)	0.95 (—)
	PE Location	0.27 (0.08)	0.75 (0.10)	0.15 (0.06)	0.65 (0.15)
	Right Heart Strain	0.13 (0.23)	0.48 (0.45)	0.19 (0.33)	0.45 (0.39)
	Artifacts	0.63 (0.06)	0.70 (0.15)	0.66 (0.15)	0.73 (0.18)
LLaMA 3.3 - 70B	PE Detection	0.81 (—)	0.98 (—)	0.74 (—)	0.94 (—)
	PE Location	0.31 (0.13)	0.75 (0.13)	0.24 (0.10)	0.71 (0.17)
	Right Heart Strain	0.20 (0.35)	0.51 (0.46)	0.21 (0.38)	0.49 (0.42)
	Artifacts	0.66 (0.10)	0.65 (0.23)	0.69 (0.13)	0.70 (0.20)

Impact of Temperature Tuning on Model Performance

Across temperatures ranging from 0.0 to 1.5, with 0-shot prompting, on the original analysis for the MIMIC-IV dataset, performance remained lower than on the transformed analysis (Figure 3). Moderate temperatures (0.2–0.5) yielded slight improvements across both the 8B and 70B models, while extreme temperatures (1.0–1.5) led to a sharp decline in performance. Among 8B models, PE Detection kappa values ranged from 0.37–0.62, PE Location from 0.05–0.25, Right Heart Strain from 0.04–0.10, and Artifacts from 0.03–0.12. For 70B models, optimal performance was also seen at moderate temperatures, achieving 0.80–0.85 for PE Detection, 0.25–0.31 for PE Location, up to 0.20 for Right Heart Strain, and around 0.70 for Artifacts, with performance deteriorating at extreme

temperature settings. The model's performance on the DUHS dataset followed the same pattern (Figure 3). Transforming the datasets reduced the sensitivity to temperature variation, particularly for 70B models. The 70B models maintained kappa values above 0.98 for PE Detection and 0.70 for PE Location across a wide temperature range (0.0–1.5). A similar trend was observed in the DUHS dataset (Figures 3 and 4).




Figure 3: Impact of Temperature Tuning on Cohen's Kappa Across MIMIC-IV and DUHS

Impact of Adding Examples in the Prompt (Multi-shot) on Model Performance

On the original analysis for the MIMIC-IV dataset, introducing 1–2 shots provided moderate gains for 8B models, with PE Detection reaching 0.55–0.60 (transformed >0.70), PE Location improving to 0.20 (transformed 0.51), Right Heart Strain to 0.03–0.04 (transformed 0.40), and Artifacts to 0.16–0.46 (transformed 0.55). However, beyond 4–5 shots, performance often plateaued or declined. The 70B models followed a similar trend but consistently outperformed 8B models, surpassing 0.80 for PE Detection (transformed >0.90) and 0.60 for Artifacts (transformed ~0.70), with Right Heart Strain peaking at 0.17 (transformed >0.40). PE Location also improved in 70B models, reaching ~0.60–0.70 after transformation. Overall, the transformation led to increased kappa values across all model sizes and clinical concepts, particularly enhancing performance in PE Detection and PE Location. The DUHS dataset followed a similar trend (Figure 4).

Evaluating Inter-Model Agreement Precision

Figure 5 illustrates the PPV of agreement between each LLaMA model and the reference model (Phi-4-14B) across concepts. LLaMA 3.3-70B consistently showed the highest precision when in agreement with Phi-4, achieving PPVs near 99% for PE detection and over 80% for PE location and artifact findings across both MIMIC-IV and DUHS datasets. Precision for negative findings improved notably after input transformation, with PPVs exceeding 99% across concepts except for right heart strain, which remained variable—LLaMA 3.3-70B achieved 85.96% ± 4.14 in DUHS but only 66.7% ± 57.7 in MIMIC-IV.




Figure 4: Impact of Multiple shot on Cohen's Kappa Across MIMIC-IV and DUHS Datasets.




Figure 5. Positive Predictive Value (PPV) of Strict Agreement Between LLaMA Models and Phi-4-14B Across Key Radiological Concepts in MIMIC-IV and DUHS Datasets

Discussion

This study demonstrates LLM performance of ($\kappa > 0.90$) in identifying the presence of PE in the radiological report but is more limited in terms of PE location ($\kappa > 0.70$), right heart strain ($\kappa \approx 0.50$), and artifact detection ($\kappa \approx 0.70$). The latest LLaMA 70B models outperformed smaller models in extracting all PE-related radiological concepts. These models achieved the highest Cohen's kappa scores, particularly with moderate temperatures (0.2–0.5) and 1–2 in-context examples, balancing structured guidance with adaptive reasoning. Simplifying the concepts' definitions significantly improved agreement with human annotations, enhancing extraction reliability and aligning with real-world registry development strategies. Incorporating an independent reviewer model (Phi-4 14B) enabled pairwise agreement analysis with each LLaMA model against the human criterion standard. Pairwise precision (PPV) with Phi4:14B confirmed near-perfect alignment ($\sim 99\%$) for PE presence and $>80\%$ for PE location and artifacts. Precision for negative findings was similarly high after concept transformation, reaching $>99\%$ in several concepts. Right heart strain demonstrated variable precision across datasets, reflecting inherent clinical ambiguity. These findings highlight the potential of large LLMs to automate structured data extraction, streamline registry generation, and reduce manual abstraction efforts.

LLMs in medical concept extraction yield promising outcomes, as evidenced by a few available studies. Matos et al.¹⁹ reported 82% to 97% accuracy for extracting generic medication names and routes from free text and 100% accuracy for broader binary classifications. Huang et al.²⁰ reported 89% accuracy when using ChatGPT 3.5 to extract malignancy-related concepts from radiology reports. Le Guellec et al.²¹ tested Vicuna, an open-source LLM, on technical radiological concepts, with accuracy ranging from 82% for causal inference to 99% for radiological concept extraction. Our study expands this work by evaluating multiple openly available LLMs of different parameter sizes and versions on a more complex and nuanced set of clinical concepts. Unlike prior studies that focused on well-defined categories, we tested LLMs on concepts that posed significant challenges even for human experts, requiring multiple multidisciplinary meetings and continuous feedback checks to improve agreement. By incorporating sophisticated clinical reasoning tasks, our study provides a more comprehensive assessment of LLM performance in medical abstraction. Furthermore, we aim to develop a feasible and cost-effective framework to determine the optimal LLM settings that achieve high agreement levels for automating PERT registry abstraction, reducing manual workload while maintaining clinical accuracy.

While using different techniques to guide LLMs like multi-shot examples have been shown to enhance LLM performance in AI/ML, their role in medical concept extraction remains unclear, and prior studies reported mixed results.^{22,23} Matos et al.¹⁹, found that up to 10 examples did not improve performance and sometimes worsened ChatGPT-3.5-Turbo's accuracy, while Le Guellec et al.²¹ observed no benefit for technical radiological concepts abstraction. Our study aligns with these findings, showing that multi-shot examples did not consistently enhance accuracy and, in some cases, negatively impacted performance. This may be due to increased prompt complexity and the inherent ambiguity in medical language, which can overload the model's processing capacity and hinder effective reasoning.²⁴

Adjusting the temperature parameter in LLMs influences the variability of their outputs, which can impact accuracy in clinical concept abstraction. Prior research demonstrated that moderate temperature settings (0.2–1.0) maintain stable performance in tasks like clinical trial entity recognition and classification, with performance declining significantly at higher temperatures (>1.5) due to increased randomness and output unpredictability.²⁵ Similarly, our study found that lower temperature settings (0.2–0.5) resulted in optimal accuracy, whereas higher temperatures (>1.0) led to decreased model performance, particularly in nuanced concepts such as PE location and right heart strain, where accuracy was already challenged by human disagreements. These findings align with recent studies indicating the importance of controlled randomness in clinical abstraction tasks to preserve accuracy and reliability. Our integrated framework using a two-model review increased confidence in abstraction accuracy when both models agreed, consistent with prior findings in the literature.²⁶

This study encountered several challenges that can help guide future work on utilizing LLMs for automating databases and registries. One of the primary challenges was developing precise definitions for medical concepts, taking into account both direct and indirect findings. For example, if a report does not explicitly mention a movement artifact, how should it be annotated? A valuable approach was to hold multidisciplinary meetings involving radiologists who write the reports and clinicians involved in patient care. Together, we reviewed each concept to determine whether it was directly mentioned, not mentioned, or implied to be negative based on

radiological and clinical perspectives. Although the PERT Consortium and most existing registries typically document PE as simply "present" or "absent," similar to our transformed data approach, it is important to acknowledge that decisions about managing ambiguous or uncertain cases are generally made by the abstraction team. Maintaining records at a more granular level may be beneficial for quality monitoring, audits, or future manual reviews. In addition to our internal consensus, we integrated the latest national consortium guidelines relevant to our work to ensure future interoperability.

Our study's strength lies in its multicenter, multi-institutional design, which included both academic teaching hospitals (MIMIC and DUHS data) and community hospitals (through DUHS). This approach enhances the generalizability and reliability of our findings. Additionally, we tested different sizes and versions of LLMs, examining their performance with multi-shot examples and various temperature settings, providing a comprehensive technical framework for optimizing performance. The inclusion of national consortiums further strengthened the internal and external validity of our work. We also introduced Phi-4:14B as an independent reviewer to assess inter-model agreement. This enabled a multi-LLM evaluation framework, revealing that agreement was strongest in standardized contexts like MIMIC-IV and in well-defined concepts like PE presence. In contrast, variability was more pronounced in ambiguous findings such as right heart strain, with greater inconsistency observed in MIMIC-IV compared to DUHS, which might reflect differences in documentation style or reporting practices. Together, this approach lays the foundation for a scalable, fully automated monitoring system that flags uncertain or discordant records for human review.

This study was limited by not testing the performance of larger LLMs, such as LLaMA 3.1 405B, due to computational resource constraints within PHI-capable, institution-approved computers. Moving from 8B to 70B models led to an average 7-fold increase in processing time. Additionally, our study primarily focused on a limited number of medical concepts and further research is needed to evaluate the models' performance across a broader range of clinical domains. Another limitation is the lack of real-time clinical validation, as our results are based on retrospective data. Furthermore, while we examined the effect of multi-shot examples and different temperature tuning settings, we did not fully explore alternative fine-tuning strategies, such as Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) for Parameter-Efficient Fine-Tuning (PFT), which may offer additional performance gains. Lastly, although our study focused specifically on clinical concepts extracted from CTPE reports, the PERT Consortium registry also includes additional data elements such as echocardiogram findings, which we did not evaluate. Future directions of our ongoing work include expanding validation to a larger internal DUHS dataset and broadening our approach to include echocardiogram report abstraction. In conclusion, the use of LLMs for automating clinical databases and registries holds great promise, offering significant efficiencies in terms of data volume, time, and cost, with minimal risk to accuracy. However, prospective validation studies are essential, and establishing a robust framework for continuous LLM performance evaluation will be critical for ensuring long-term success.

Conclusion

Our study demonstrates that LLMs offer significant potential for automating medical concept extraction, substantially improving efficiency in data volume, time, and cost while maintaining high accuracy. These findings support integrating LLMs into clinical databases and registries across diverse healthcare settings to streamline structured data abstraction and enhance real-world registry development. Future research should prioritize prospective validation studies, real-time clinical implementation, and the development of adaptive frameworks for continuous LLM performance monitoring.

Acknowledgment

This work was partially supported by Mark III Systems with GPU resources for de-identified data. AIW is supported by the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute under R01HL177003.

References

1. Goldhaber SZ, Bounameaux H. Pulmonary embolism and deep vein thrombosis. *Lancet*. 2012;379(9828):1835-1846.
2. PERT International: Enhancing Patient Outcomes Globally - Endovascular Today. Accessed March 6, 2025. <https://evtoday.com/articles/2024-july-supplement/pert-international-enhancing-patient-outcomes-globally>

3. Rosenfield K, Bowers TR, Barnett CF, et al. Standardized Data Elements for Patients With Acute Pulmonary Embolism: A Consensus Report From the Pulmonary Embolism Research Collaborative. *Circulation*. 2024;150(14):1140-1150.
4. Schultz J, Giordano N, Zheng H, et al. EXPRESS: A Multidisciplinary Pulmonary Embolism Response Team (PERT) - Experience from a national multicenter consortium. *Pulm Circ*. 2019;9(3):2045894018824563.
5. Pons E, Braun LMM, Hunink MGM, Kors JA. Natural Language Processing in Radiology: A Systematic Review. *Radiology*. 2016;279(2):329-343.
6. Davidson EM, Poon MTC, Casey A, et al. The reporting quality of natural language processing studies: systematic review of studies of radiology reports. *BMC Med Imaging*. 2021;21(1):142.
7. Gholipour M, Khajouei R, Amiri P, Hajesmaeel Gohari S, Ahmadian L. Extracting cancer concepts from clinical notes using natural language processing: a systematic review. *BMC Bioinformatics*. 2023;24(1):1-16.
8. Leaman R, Khare R, Lu Z. Challenges in clinical natural language processing for automated disorder normalization. *J Biomed Inform*. 2015;57:28-37.
9. Berge GT, Granmo OC, Tveit TO, Ruthjersen AL, Sharma J. Combining unsupervised, supervised and rule-based learning: the case of detecting patient allergies in electronic health records. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak*. 2023;23(1):188.
10. Farkas R, Szarvas G. Automatic construction of rule-based ICD-9-CM coding systems. *BMC Bioinformatics*. 2008;9 Suppl 3(Suppl 3):S10.
11. Reichenpfader D, Müller H, Denecke K. A scoping review of large language model based approaches for information extraction from radiology reports. *NPJ Digit Med*. 2024;7(1):222.
12. Johnson AEW, Bulgarelli L, Shen L, et al. MIMIC-IV, a freely accessible electronic health record dataset. *Scientific Data*. 2023;10(1):1-9.
13. The PERT ConsortiumTM PE Registry and Research Committee: Updates and Future Directions - Endovascular Today. Accessed March 7, 2025. <https://evtoday.com/articles/2022-july-supplement/the-pert-consortium-pe-registry-and-research-committee-updates-and-future-directions>
14. Llama. Meta Llama. Accessed March 6, 2025. <https://www.llama.com/>
15. McHugh ML. Interrater reliability: the kappa statistic. *Biochem Med (Zagreb)*. 2012;22(3):276-282.
16. wnarifin.github.io > Sample size calculator. Accessed March 14, 2025. <https://wnarifin.github.io/ssc/sskappa.html>
17. Doğan H, de Roos A, Geleijns J, Huisman MV, Kroft LJM. The role of computed tomography in the diagnosis of acute and chronic pulmonary embolism. *Diagn Interv Radiol*. 2015;21(4):307-316.
18. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. Accessed March 6, 2025. <https://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/strobe/>
19. Matos J, Gallifant J, Pei J, Wong AI. EHRmonize: A framework for medical concept abstraction from electronic health records using large language models. *arXiv [csCL]*. Published online June 28, 2024. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2407.00242>
20. Huang J, Yang DM, Rong R, et al. A critical assessment of using ChatGPT for extracting structured data from clinical notes. *NPJ Digit Med*. 2024;7(1):106.
21. Le Guellec B, Lefèvre A, Geay C, et al. Performance of an Open-Source large Language Model in extracting information from free-text radiology reports. *Radiol Artif Intell*. 2024;6(4):e230364.
22. Mialon G, Dessi R, Lomeli M, et al. Augmented Language Models: A survey. *arXiv [csCL]*. Published online February 15, 2023. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2302.07842>
23. Chen Z, Balan MM, Brown K. Language models are few-shot learners for prognostic prediction. *arXiv [csCL]*. Published online February 24, 2023. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2302.12692>
24. Agarwal R, Singh A, Zhang LM, et al. Many-Shot In-Context Learning. Published online April 17, 2024. Accessed March 6, 2025. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2404.11018>
25. Windisch P, Dennstädt F, Koechli C, et al. The Impact of the Temperature on Extracting Information From Clinical Trial Publications Using Large Language Models. *medRxiv*. Published online October 23, 2024:2024.10.23.24316005. doi:10.1101/2024.10.23.24316005
26. Khan MA, Ayub U, Naqvi SAA, et al. Collaborative large language models for automated data extraction in living systematic reviews. *J Am Med Inform Assoc*. Published online January 21, 2025. doi:10.1093/jamia/ocae325