

---

# ELM: Ensemble of Language Models for Predicting Tumor Group from Pathology Reports

---

**Lovedeep Gondara**

British Columbia Cancer Registry  
Provincial Health Services Authority  
Vancouver, Canada  
lovedeep.gondara@phsa.ca

**Jonathan Simkin**

British Columbia Cancer Registry  
Provincial Health Services Authority  
Vancouver, Canada  
jonathan.simkin@bccancer.bc.ca

**Shebnum Devji**

British Columbia Cancer Registry  
Provincial Health Services Authority  
Vancouver, Canada  
shebnum.devji@phsa.ca

**Gregory Arbour**

Data Science Institute  
University of British Columbia  
Vancouver, Canada  
greg.arbour@ubc.ca

**Raymond Ng**

Data Science Institute  
University of British Columbia  
Vancouver, Canada  
rng@cs.ubc.ca

## Abstract

Population-based cancer registries (PBCRs) face a significant bottleneck in manually extracting data from unstructured pathology reports, a process crucial for tasks like tumor group assignment, which can consume 900 person-hours for approximately 100,000 reports. To address this, we introduce ELM (Ensemble of Language Models), a novel ensemble-based approach leveraging both small language models (SLMs) and large language models (LLMs). ELM utilizes six fine-tuned SLMs, where three SLMs use the top part of the pathology report and three SLMs use the bottom part. This is done to maximize report coverage. ELM requires five-out-of-six agreement for a tumor group classification. Disagreements are arbitrated by an LLM with a carefully curated prompt. Our evaluation across nineteen tumor groups demonstrates ELM achieves an average precision and recall of 0.94, outperforming single-model and ensemble-without-LLM approaches. Deployed at the British Columbia Cancer Registry, ELM demonstrates how LLMs can be successfully applied in a PBCR setting to achieve state-of-the-art results and significantly enhance operational efficiencies, saving hundreds of person-hours annually.

## 1 Introduction

Globally, there are an estimated 10.4 million cancer deaths and 20.0 million new cancer cases in 2022. This number is projected to increase to 18.5 million deaths and 35.3 million new cancer cases by 2050<sup>1</sup> [1]. It is the role of regional Population Based Cancer Registries (PBCRs) to collect standardized data on all cancer cases [2]. The primary data source for PBCRs are pathology reports,

---

<sup>1</sup><https://gco.iarc.who.int>

which are generated from pathologist’s description of tissue/fluid samples. Pathology reports are unstructured pieces of text and contain information on diagnosis, cancer type, biomarkers, stage of disease, etc. as determined by a pathologist.

Pathology reports are used to extract essential data required to populate cancer registry databases. The data is then used for cancer surveillance, cancer control and prevention, and clinical research [2]. Structured data collection from unstructured pathology reports is a monumental task, especially given the volume of the incoming pathology reports, where a medium-sized PBCR can expect hundreds of thousands of pathology reports per-year [3]. PBCRs rely on the subject matter experts (SMEs) for manual review of the pathology reports for data abstraction.

Most PBCRs in the USA and Canada receive pathology reports in a digital format, often formatted according to the Health Level 7 (HL7) structure, an industry standard for clinical documentation. To ease the burden of manual review, many PBCRs are working on automating the classification and data abstraction from incoming pathology reports. As the current status-quo, many PBCRs use Electronic Mapping, Reporting, and Coding (eMaRC) [4], a tool developed by the US Center for Disease Control and Prevention. eMaRC is a rule-based text analytics engine that analyzes the digital pathology reports and decides if the pathology report contains tumor information and assigns a crude tumor group to the pathology report based on the anatomical terms found in the report.

Rule-based systems are known to not perform well [5, 6] as they struggle with the nuances of long sequential dependencies. Example: *skin left lateral breast squamous cell carcinoma*, this excerpt from a pathology report mentions anatomical site as breast, where the site was used for biopsy for suspicion of skin cancer. The tumor group in this case is skin, but the rule-based system may assign breast or it might not be able to assign any tumor group due to the presence of multiple anatomical sites. As such, eMaRC fails to classify site for a significant number of reports where multiple sites are mentioned. This leads to manual review of all pathology reports, even when the tumor group is assigned, to ensure a high standard of data quality. This leads to significant operational resource usage, making the eMaRC-based automation process redundant. Example: a PBCR with 100,000 reports per-year spends  $\approx 800 - 900$  hours on the task of tumor group assignment assuming roughly 30 seconds per report<sup>2</sup>.

At the British Columbia Cancer Registry (BCCR), we have developed a novel machine learning method involving multiple language models, called ELM (Ensemble of Language Models). Our method uses a combination of discriminative, small language models (SLMs) and a generative, large language model (LLM), to make a decision on the appropriate tumor group for a given pathology report. ELM, as deployed in our case, consists of six finetuned SLMs working together in an ensemble, where three models use the top part of the pathology report and three use the bottom part. This is done to maximize the report coverage, as most transformer-based models have input token limits [7]. The pathology reports on which at least five out of the six models do not agree on a tumor group and the pathology reports that are classified into hard-to-classify tumor groups (example: skin) are sent to the LLM for arbitration along with a carefully curated prompt, to make the final decision.

Our proposed approach has many benefits. *First*, three diverse models using the top part of the report, and three diverse models using the bottom part ensure that when combined, will capture the tumor group with confidence, because the anatomical descriptions of a tumor group can be found throughout the report. *Second*, as LLMs are computationally expensive, even for inference, our method ensures that not all pathology reports need to go to the LLM, only the ones where the smaller models cannot reach a clear consensus or where the classified tumor groups are known to be hard to classify. *Third*, to ensure that the behavior of the LLM is constrained, it is only allowed to choose a tumor group out of the tumor groups specified in the prompt, which are based on the knowledge of subject matter experts and the decisions made by SLMs. And further, the LLM is instructed to output a structured JSON file with the tumor group and the reason for its choice. Asking the LLM to provide reason helps us understand the decision-making process of the model and aids in further improvement. *Finally*, we show that our proposed method outperforms other available options.

---

<sup>2</sup>Based on our experience within British Columbia Cancer Registry

## 2 Methods

We use this section to provide details on ELM in a general setting, beginning with the ensemble of small language models.

### 2.1 The Initial Ensemble

Our initial ensemble in ELM consists of  $X$  discriminative small language models ( $ML_1, \dots, ML_X$ ). Each model is finetuned on a labelled dataset of pathology reports to classify the pathology reports into one of many tumor groups. We provide further implementation details including model type and finetuning in Section 3. As discussed in the Introduction, half of the models in the ensemble use the top part of the pathology report and the other half use the bottom part. This ensures maximum coverage of the pathology report text. Each of the models makes an independent prediction for the tumor group for each incoming pathology report, followed by summation of votes per tumor group. Maximum coverage of the pathology report combined with the ensemble ensures that the performance of the ensemble is better than any individual model.

If there is no clear majority, defined by a pre-specified voting threshold in the ensemble, the pathology report is sent to the LLM for arbitration. ELM is flexible, such that another set of reports that are classified into hard-to-classify tumor groups can be sent to the LLM for final decision. These tumor groups can be either based on ambiguous language used in the pathology reports that can confuse humans and SLMs alike, or they can be based on the amount of training data available for SLMs, where tumor groups with small training data can be sent to the LLM.

### 2.2 Arbitrating LLM

For a pathology report where the voting doesn't meet the threshold, or where the predicted tumor group needs reassessment, it is sent to the LLM for the final verdict. We provide specific details on the model used in Section 3. With the pathology report, the LLM gets a specially designed prompt, curated with the help of subject matter experts. The prompt has the instructions for the LLM to provide a structured response with the final tumor group, which must be selected from the ones provided in the prompt. The suggestions in the prompt are based on predictions of SLMs and the knowledge of subject matter experts. This constraint is enforced to ensure that the LLM's response is within the most probable tumor groups. LLM is also instructed to provide reasoning for selecting the tumor group. This helps in understanding the LLM's process behind decision-making and for further improving the model and the prompt. The complete process for ELM is detailed in Algorithm 1.

---

#### Algorithm 1 Overview of ELM

**Require:** A set of small language models  $X$ , a single LLM  $L$  for arbitration, observations  $d_1, \dots, d_n$  for inference, voting threshold  $v$  for arbitration, number of tumor groups  $m$ , hard-to-classify tumor groups  $\{g_1, \dots, g_n\} \in G$

- 1: **for all**  $d_i, i \in 1, \dots, n$  **do**
- 2:     Predict the tumor group for  $d_i$  using all models in  $X$
- 3:     Sum the votes per tumor group  $[c_1, \dots, c_m]$
- 4:     Store the predicted tumor groups in  $t_i$
- 5:     **if**  $\max([c_1, \dots, c_m]) < v \mid t_i \in G$  **then**
- 6:          $L$  gets as input a prompt and  $d_i$  to predict tumor group out of  $[t_i, G]$
- 7:         Output the predicted tumor group by  $L$
- 8:     **end if**
- 9:     **if**  $\max([c_1, \dots, c_m]) \geq v \ \& \ t_i \notin G$  **then**
- 10:         output the tumor group with majority vote
- 11:     **end if**
- 12: **end for**

---

## 3 Implementing ELM

This section details the implementation of ELM within the British Columbia Cancer Registry. Figure 1 shows the overall implementation design of ELM.




Figure 1: ELM in action. A pathology report is sent to six small language models for classification. After summing the votes per-class, if the majority vote is less than the threshold (5 in this case) or the predicted tumor group is among the more difficult to classify categories, the report is sent to the LLM with an appropriate prompt directing the LLM to select a tumor groups based on the knowledge of subject matter experts and the classes predicted by the small language models.

### 3.1 Small Language Models

For the ensemble part of ELM, we use three pretrained models, which are then separately finetuned on the top and bottom parts of the pathology reports, leading to a total of six finetuned models. The models are finetuned on 16,000 annotated pathology reports with nineteen tumor groups. All models are finetuned for 3 epochs with a learning rate of  $2e^{-5}$ . During the finetuning process, the top three models use the first 512 tokens from the pathology report and the bottom three models use the last 512 tokens. Table 1 shows the model details. BCCRTron is a further pretrained version of GatorTron [8], which has been further pretrained on BCCR’s pathology reports in an unsupervised fashion<sup>3</sup>.

Base Model	Section
GatorTron [8]	Top & Bottom
BCCRTron	Top & Bottom
ClinicalBERT [9]	Top & Bottom

Table 1: Small language models used in ELM. Section column provides information on the report sections used by the model. The three models are separately finetuned on top and bottom parts of the pathology reports, leading to six individual finetuned models.

### 3.2 Large Language Model

For the LLM part of ELM, we use the Mistral Nemo Instruct-2407 [10, 11], a 12 billion parameter model. We use it in its zero-shot capacity with the prompt designed specifically for the model to understand the nuances of tumor group correlations and associations, such as leukemia vs. lymphoma, non-melanoma skin cancer vs. melanoma, cervix vs. other gynecological tumors, etc. The prompt is developed under the guidance of our subject matter experts. We show an example prompt in the Appendix. We also experimented with smaller LLMs, such as the Llama 3.2 (3 billion) [12] and Qwen 2.5 (3 billion) [13]. We discuss the pros and cons of the different models in detail in the results section.

<sup>3</sup>Model available upon request

### 3.3 Data

As of 2020, the BCCR receives all provincial pathology reports as HL7 messages in real-time from regional laboratory information systems, including cancer and non-cancer reports ( $\approx 1$  million reports/year). HL7 is a messaging standard [14] that defines the structure and content of messages that are exchanged between healthcare systems. After applying several exclusions (out of province patients, etc.), the remaining messages ( $\approx 600,000$ ) are sent for processing to eMaRC [4]. eMaRC is a software developed by the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for cancer registries. BCCR uses eMaRC (version 6.0.0.5) to distinguish between cancer and non-cancer pathology. The eMaRC algorithm searches a terms table to find potential tumors including terms on anatomical site, histology, behavior, grade, and laterality [4]. Cancer pathology reports from eMaRC ( $\approx 130,000$ ) are further filtered into reportable ( $\approx 90,000$ ) and non-reportable cancer cases ( $\approx 40,000$ ) using a SLM based approach [15]. The next step involves assigning tumor groups to the reportable cancer cases, eMaRC in this scenario fails to assign a tumor group label to approximately 40% of cases, and for the cases where it does assign a label, there is still a significant error rate, leading to the requirement of a full manual review to assign tumor groups to reportable cancer cases.

#### 3.3.1 Training Data

As briefly discussed in Section 3.1, the training data for this study includes 16,000 post-eMaRC reportable pathology reports, labeled with one of the nineteen tumor groups used at the BC Cancer Registry (breast, colorectal, lung, skin, melanoma, lymphoma, leukemia, etc.). The training data is from the year 2020, where the labels are sourced on per-patient basis, assigned by subject matter experts. This approach leads to noisy labels for individual pathology reports, as a single patient can have multiple pathology reports from multiple anatomical sites with different tumor groups. Example: A patient might have a final diagnosis of prostate cancer, but they have biopsy samples from other anatomical sites as well, such as skin, other genitourinary organs, etc. Using this approach, all pathology reports for this patient would be labeled as prostate tumor. This approach, however does not pose any issues to our modeling as previous research has shown that language models are resilient to label noise [16]. Further details on the tumor groups and the training data size per tumor group is presented in the Appendix.

#### 3.3.2 Test Data

To ensure that our test data does not have any label noise, we use a curated set of 2058 pathology reports, randomly selected from the year 2023/2024. The pathology reports are individually labeled by our subject matter experts and are unseen by the models during the training process. Dataset size per tumor group is presented in the Appendix.

## 4 Results

For evaluation metrics, we focus on the weighted averaged Precision, Recall, and F1-score. We present the detailed evaluation of ELM next.

### 4.1 The Need for an Ensemble

In our first evaluation, we justify the use of an ensemble without the LLM, where we compare the ensemble of six SLMs with a single SLM. For the metrics related to a single SLM, we average the individual performances of the six models. Table 2 shows the results where we observe performance improvement when we use ensemble compared to a single model. The performance gains can be attributed to the advantage of the ensemble approach and the fact that the ensemble can leverage the full pathology report compared to either the first or the last 512 tokens used by the individual SLMs.

Metric (Avg.)	Single Model	Ensemble
Precision	0.91	0.93
Recall	0.86	0.91
F1-Score	0.87	0.91

Table 2: Comparing a single model to the ensemble.

## 4.2 The Need for LLM

After demonstrating the effectiveness of an ensemble using the full report over a single model, we now investigate the necessity of adding an LLM. Using the initial ensemble of six models, if at least five models do not agree on the decision, the pathology report is sent to the LLM along with a curated prompt, where the LLM is required to pick from the choices made by the small language models. Table 3 shows the results where we observe performance improvement after incorporating LLM compared to the SLM only approach. This is because when prompted properly, LLMs are better suited to distinguish between nuanced language for complex tumor groups compared to SLMs.

Metric (Avg.)	SLM Only Ensemble	ELM
Precision	0.93	0.94
Recall	0.91	0.94
F1-Score	0.91	0.94

Table 3: The importance of LLM in ELM

## 4.3 ELM with Smaller LLMs

Our default LLM in ELM is Mistral Nemo Instruct [10, 11] with 12 billion parameters. Recently, various *smaller* LLMs have shown to be effective for various applications [17]. To test if we can use smaller LLMs in ELM to save computational resources, we compare the 12 billion parameter model with Llama 3.2 (3 billion) [12] and Qwen 2.5 (3 billion) [13]. All other settings, including the prompt design, are kept the same. Table 4 shows the results, where we observe that smaller LLMs perform worse than the larger LLM. If computational resources are an issue, smaller LLMs can be a viable alternative to larger LLMs, as ELM with smaller LLM still performs better than the SLM only ensemble.

Metric (Avg.)	ELM (Mistral)	ELM (Llama)	ELM (Qwen)
Precision	0.94	0.93	0.93
Recall	0.94	0.92	0.92
F1-Score	0.94	0.92	0.92

Table 4: Using smaller LLMs in ELM

## 4.4 Impact on Individual Tumor Groups

The tumor group classification can be challenging for some tumor groups, either because of language complexity or small initial training dataset (rare tumors). Such cases are the primary motivation for using LLM in ELM for its ability to understand complex language nuances. As expected, we observe a significant increase in performance after introducing LLM, where we observe the average F1 score increase from 0.76 to 0.88 for leukemia, from 0.76 to 0.89 for lymphoma, 0.81 to 0.85 for sarcoma, etc. We provide detailed results for all tumor groups in the Appendix, including the initial training dataset size and the test dataset size.

## 4.5 Adding Hard-to-Classify Tumor Groups

For some hard-to-classify tumor groups, all SLMs can make mistakes, leading to wrong classification with high confidence. ELM can deal with such scenarios by adding additional tumor groups for LLM arbitration irrespective of the ensemble vote count. To demonstrate this, we add cervix, multiple myeloma, primary unknown, and skin tumor groups to be sent to the LLM in addition to the reports under the voting threshold. We observe that the average F1 Score increased from 0.90 to 0.98 for cervix, 0.87 to 0.91 for multiple myeloma, 0.38 to 0.40 for primary unknown, and 0.58 to 0.74 for skin. This shows that if we have apriori knowledge about hard-to-classify tumor groups, we can leverage that information for maximum performance boost.

## 5 Discussion

To our knowledge, this is the first study that looks at tumor group classification within a PBCR setting utilizing a mixture of small and large language models to achieve state-of-the-art performance. This is in contrast to rule-based, natural language processing approaches, which are commonplace in PBCRs, and are not designed to handle complex scenarios, such as the tumor group assignment, and are prone to errors as they rely on expert-developed rules to extract information [4, 6, 18, 19]. Other approaches based on traditional machine learning methods (non-deep learning) rely on measures such as the presence of certain words or the word frequency, and ignore complex sentence representations [6]. For complex tasks, such as tumor group classification from long pathology reports, capturing sentence representations, and the context is critically important.

Transformer based models [20], such as the ones used in this paper excel in the task of capturing longer sentence dependencies. Many variants of transformer based models have been proposed for the clinical domain, such as BioBert [21], ClinicalBert [9], PubMedBert [22], PathologyBERT [6], CancerBERT [23], Path-BigBird [24], Gatortron [8], BiomedRoBERTa [25], etc. However, none of the existing models or any existing studies have tackled the issue of tumor group classification in the real-world PBCR setting using pathology reports.

Readers might wonder, what if we only use the LLM, that is, we do not need SLMs to decide which reports flow to the LLM, could that work just as well? We also tested this approach and observed that the LLM only model performs significantly worse in comparison to ELM, mainly because in that scenario the LLM has to select from nineteen tumor groups, which can be challenging given the ambiguous language, compared to a small number of well-targeted tumor groups.

The methodology presented in this study has significant implications for PBCRs all around the world as PBCRs transition to the use of electronic pathology reports. Assigning a tumor group to a pathology report is an important and fundamental task in a PBCR workflow, usually requiring manual review. The method proposed in this paper has the potential to save thousands of person-hours for PBCRs by automating this task. In case of BCCR, this approach is saving us  $\approx 900$  person-hours each year, which we can use for more complex tasks, further improving data quality.

This study has significant strengths, where we train and test our models on population-based pathology data feed at BCCR. We have used open source tools in this project, making it easier to replicate our work for anyone wanting to use similar approach. Our future work involves validation of our proposed approach on other data sources (other PBCRs) and evaluating the impact of fine-tuned LLMs instead of the zero shot approach as used in this paper.

## References

1. Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, et al. Global cancer statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. *CA: a cancer journal for clinicians* 2021;71:209–49.
2. Parkin DM. The evolution of the population-based cancer registry. *Nature Reviews Cancer* 2006;6:603–12.
3. Chtourou A, Sanchez PV, Golden T, et al. Impact on the volume of pathology reports before and during the COVID-19 pandemic in SEER cancer registries. *Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers & Prevention* 2023;32:1591–8.
4. USCDC-eMaRC. US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. eMaRC Plus. <https://www.cdc.gov/cancer/npcr/tools/registryplus/mp.htm>. Accessed: 2023-06-21.
5. López-Úbeda P, Martín-Noguerol T, Aneiros-Fernández J, and Luna A. Natural language processing in pathology: current trends and future insights. *The American Journal of Pathology* 2022.
6. Santos T, Tariq A, Gichoya JW, Trivedi H, and Banerjee I. Automatic classification of cancer pathology reports: a systematic review. *Journal of Pathology Informatics* 2022;13:100003.
7. Devlin J, Chang MW, Lee K, and Toutanova K. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805* 2018.
8. Yang X, Chen A, PourNejatian N, et al. Gatortron: A large clinical language model to unlock patient information from unstructured electronic health records. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.03540* 2022.

9. Alsentzer E, Murphy JR, Boag W, et al. Publicly available clinical BERT embeddings. arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.03323 2019.
10. Jiang AQ, Sablayrolles A, Mensch A, et al. Mistral 7B. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825 2023.
11. Jiang AQ, Sablayrolles A, Roux A, et al. Mixtral of experts. arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04088 2024.
12. Touvron H, Lavril T, Izacard G, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971 2023.
13. Team Q. Qwen2.5: A Party of Foundation Models. 2024. URL: <https://qwenlm.github.io/blog/qwen2.5/>.
14. Eichelberg M, Aden T, Riesmeier J, Dogac A, and Laleci GB. A survey and analysis of electronic healthcare record standards. *Acm Computing Surveys (Csur)* 2005;37:277–315.
15. Gondara L, Simkin J, Arbour G, Devji S, and Ng R. Classifying Tumor Reportability Status From Unstructured Electronic Pathology Reports Using Language Models in a Population-Based Cancer Registry Setting. *JCO Clinical Cancer Informatics* 2024;8:e2400110.
16. Agro MT and Aldarmaki H. Handling realistic label noise in BERT text classification. arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16337 2023.
17. Tian Y, Han Y, Chen X, Wang W, and Chawla NV. Beyond Answers: Transferring Reasoning Capabilities to Smaller LLMs Using Multi-Teacher Knowledge Distillation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04616 2024.
18. Hammami L, Paglialonga A, Pruneri G, et al. Automated classification of cancer morphology from Italian pathology reports using Natural Language Processing techniques: A rule-based approach. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics* 2021;116:103712.
19. Osborne JD, Wyatt M, Westfall AO, Willig J, Bethard S, and Gordon G. Efficient identification of nationally mandated reportable cancer cases using natural language processing and machine learning. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 2016;23:1077–84.
20. Vaswani A, Shazeer N, Parmar N, et al. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 2017;30.
21. Lee J, Yoon W, Kim S, et al. BioBERT: a pre-trained biomedical language representation model for biomedical text mining. *Bioinformatics* 2020;36:1234–40.
22. Gu Y, Tinn R, Cheng H, et al. Domain-Specific Language Model Pretraining for Biomedical Natural Language Processing. 2020. eprint: arXiv:2007.15779.
23. Zhou S, Wang N, Wang L, Liu H, and Zhang R. CancerBERT: a cancer domain-specific language model for extracting breast cancer phenotypes from electronic health records. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 2022;29:1208–16.
24. Chandrashekar M, Lyngaas I, Hanson HA, Gao S, Wu XC, and Gounley J. Path-BigBird: An AI-Driven Transformer Approach to Classification of Cancer Pathology Reports. *JCO Clinical Cancer Informatics* 2024;8:e2300148.
25. Gu Y, Tinn R, Cheng H, et al. Domain-specific language model pretraining for biomedical natural language processing. *ACM Transactions on Computing for Healthcare (HEALTH)* 2021;3:1–23.

## Appendix

### An Example Prompt

*“You are a specialized pathology assistant that reads the pathology reports and outputs the tumor group from one of the suggested ones. Note that for leukemia and lymphoma, if the disease presents in the lymph nodes, then it is lymphoma, and if the disease presents in the bone marrow, then it is leukemia. The tumor group of gastrointestinal cancers includes anal, esophageal, gastric, pancreatic, and small bowel cancers. Colorectal cancers includes colon and rectum. For the tumor group of gynecological cancers, it includes endometrial, fallopian tube, ovarian, uterine, vaginal, and vulvar cancers. Cervical cancer should be coded as the tumor group of cervix. If the pathology report mentions melanoma, then the tumor group should be melanoma, even if there is a mention of skin. You also provide reasoning to your choice of tumor group. Respond only with valid JSON with the following fields ‘tumor\_group’ and ‘reason’. Do not write an introduction or summary. Assign a tumor group to the following pathology report.”*



### Detailed Tumor Group Results

The table below shows the detailed results per tumor group (F1 Score) including the training and test dataset size. We can observe the advantage of using LLM for multiple tumor groups.

<b>Tumor Group</b>	<b>Train(n)/Test(n)</b>	<b>SLM Only Ensemble</b>	<b>ELM</b>
Breast	966/406	0.99	1.00
Colorectal	1047/197	0.94	0.95
Cervix	812/26	0.90	0.90
Gastrointestinal	1037/143	0.83	0.87
Genitourinary	1000/147	0.96	0.96
Gynaecological	1012/129	0.93	0.94
Head and Neck	1028/78	0.83	0.87
Leukemia	281/88	0.76	0.88
Lung	1025/218	0.93	0.95
Lymphoma	642/129	0.76	0.89
Melanoma	335/122	0.98	0.98
Multiple Myeloma	1023/24	0.87	0.87
Neuroendocrine	1029/43	0.94	0.95
Ophthalmic	142/1	0.67	1.00
Prostate	1121/201	0.98	0.98
Primary Unknown	461/16	0.32	0.38
Sarcoma	1041/37	0.81	0.85
Skin	1001/19	0.44	0.58
Thyroid	1000/34	1.00	1.00

Table 5: Detailed results per tumor group along with the training and test data size.