GLiNER-biomed: A Suite of Efficient Models for Open Biomedical Named Entity Recognition

Anthony Yazdani¹, Ihor Stepanov², Douglas Teodoro¹

¹Department of Radiology and Medical Informatics, Faculty of Medicine, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland ²Knowledgator Engineering, Kyiv, Ukraine

Correspondence: anthony.yazdani@unige.ch, ingvarstep@knowledgator.com, douglas.teodoro@unige.ch

Abstract

Biomedical named entity recognition (NER) presents unique challenges due to specialized vocabularies, the sheer volume of entities, and the continuous emergence of novel entities. Traditional NER models, constrained by fixed taxonomies and human annotations, struggle to generalize beyond predefined entity types or efficiently adapt to emerging concepts. To address these issues, we introduce GLiNERbiomed, a domain-adapted suite of Generalist and Lightweight Model for NER (GLiNER) models specifically tailored for biomedical NER. In contrast to conventional approaches, GLiNER uses natural language descriptions to infer arbitrary entity types, enabling zero-shot recognition. Our approach first distills the annotation capabilities of large language models (LLMs) into a smaller, more efficient model, enabling the generation of high-coverage synthetic biomedical NER data. We subsequently train two GLiNER architectures, uni- and biencoder, at multiple scales to balance computational efficiency and recognition performance. Evaluations on several biomedical datasets demonstrate that GLiNER-biomed outperforms state-of-the-art GLiNER models in both zeroand few-shot scenarios, achieving 5.96% improvement in F1-score over the strongest baseline. Ablation studies highlight the effectiveness of our synthetic data generation strategy and emphasize the complementary benefits of synthetic biomedical pre-training combined with fine-tuning on high-quality generaldomain annotations. All datasets, models, and training pipelines are publicly available at https://github.com/ds4dh/GLiNER-biomed.

1 Introduction

Named entity recognition (NER) is a fundamental task in biomedical natural language processing (BioNLP), facilitating the automated extraction of key entities such as diseases, genes, and chemicals from scientific literature, clinical notes, and other biomedical texts. As biomedical knowledge rapidly evolves, NER models must adapt to emerging terminology, diverse subdomains, and highly specialized vocabularies (Park et al., 2024).

Early biomedical NER systems were primarily rule-based or dictionary-driven, such as MetaMap (Aronson and Lang, 2010) and cTAKES (Savova et al., 2010), relying on structured biomedical ontologies like UMLS (Bodenreider, 2004). These approaches provided high precision for known terms but suffered from low recall and poor generalization to novel or polysemous entities (Park et al., 2024). Statistical methods like conditional random fields improved generalization but required extensive feature engineering and human annotations (Lafferty et al., 2001; Xu et al., 2012; Liu et al., 2015). The emergence of transformer-based architectures such as BioBERT (Lee et al., 2020), significantly advanced biomedical NER by utilizing contextual embeddings and transfer learning from domain-specific text (Lee et al., 2020; Li et al., 2024). However, the conventional classification head approach for NER (Devlin et al., 2019) used on top of these models remains constrained by fixed taxonomies, restricting pre-training and inference to a static set of entity categories. As a result, models struggle to generalize beyond predefined labels, limiting their ability to recognize new, domain-specific, or emerging biomedical entities (Laparra et al., 2021; Jolly et al., 2024).

To overcome these constraints, recent research introduced open NER methods capable of recognizing entities dynamically in zero-shot settings. For example, Li et al. (2020) framed NER as a questionanswering task, allowing entity detection through query-based prompts. Aly et al. (2021) introduced a similar approach, leveraging textual entity type descriptions instead. Approaches such as UniversalNER (Zhou et al., 2023) and BioNER-LLaMA (Keloth et al., 2024), have reframed NER as generative tasks, enabling zero-shot entity recognition. However, these generative methods pose significant challenges, including high computational costs and inconsistent predictions (Dietrich and Hollstein, 2024). Addressing these issues, Zaratiana et al. (2024) introduced Generalist and Lightweight Model for NER (GLiNER), an efficient encoderbased alternative that leverages natural language label descriptions. GLiNER's key innovation lies in framing NER as a matching problem within a single encoder that jointly represents text and labels, enabling a lightweight and generalizable model for various information extraction tasks. GLiNER consistently outperformed generative models like ChatGPT and fine-tuned GPT-style models such as UniversalNER, operating at a fraction of their parameter size and computational cost (Zaratiana et al., 2024).

Despite GLiNER's promising performance in open NER tasks, directly applying it to biomedical texts remains challenging due to specialized vocabulary, sheer volume of entities, evolving terminology, and complex semantic structures unique to biomedical corpora (Lee et al., 2020; Gu et al., 2021). Dedicated biomedical adaptation is thus essential. To address this gap, in this work, we introduce GLiNER-biomed, a suite of GLiNER foundation models specifically tailored for biomedical NER. Our contributions include:

- Synthetic data generation: We develop a high-throughput pipeline by distilling OpenBioLLM-70B's (Ankit Pal, 2024) capability to generate synthetic biomedical NER data into a more efficient 8B model, generating synthetic data to pre-train biomedical NER models.
- **Pre-trained GLiNER-biomed models:** We release several pre-trained GLiNER-biomed models across multiple sizes (small, base, large) and architectural variants (uni- and bi-encoder), ensuring applicability across diverse biomedical use cases.
- Large scale open biomedical NER evaluation: We perform a large-scale evaluation of GLiNER-biomed zero- and few-shot performance across eight biomedical NER benchmarks, demonstrating its effectiveness in identifying a wide range of entity types.
- Comprehensive open-source release: All trained GLiNER-biomed models, datasets,

and the complete training and synthetic data generation pipelines are publicly available to foster reproducibility and future research. All resources are available at https://github.com/ds4dh/GLiNER-biomed.

2 Method

2.1 Data collection, cleaning, and preprocessing

To develop a high-coverage biomedical NER dataset, we curated a diverse set of free-text biomedical corpora that would later be annotated using our 8B distilled generative model. Our primary objective was to assemble a corpus that encompasses a broad spectrum of biomedical knowledge, including pharmacological information, clinical trial details, biomedical literature, and patent records. We describe below our methodology for corpus selection, text extraction, quality filtering, and deduplication.

2.1.1 Corpus selection and data acquisition

We collected text from five biomedical sources, ensuring domain coverage across pharmaceutical regulatory documents, clinical research, biomedical publications, and intellectual property records. The sources and their respective retrieval methodologies are as follows:

- Human prescription labels (HPLs) from DailyMed: We retrieved all available HTML files for HPLs and extracted structured text passages based on HTML headings.
- Clinical trials from Clinicaltrials.gov: We extracted two types of text from all registered clinical trials: *i) detailed descriptions*, which provide in-depth study overviews, and *ii) arm-level treatment regimens*, which describe intervention details for each study arm.
- Scientific abstracts from PubMed: We collected all abstracts published between January 1, 2024, and December 16, 2024, under the MeSH term *pathological conditions, signs, and symptoms.*
- Biomedical patents from IPC publications: We gathered full-text descriptions of patents classified under three biomedical categories: *i*) A61P: Specific therapeutic activity of chemical compounds or medicinal preparations, *ii*) G16H: Healthcare informatics, and *iii*) A61K:

Preparations for medical, dental or toiletry purposes.

2.1.2 Text quality filtering

Given raw biomedical texts' inherent noise and variability, we implemented a heuristic-based pipeline to filter out low quality text passages. For most collected corpora, we quantified text quality through a set of lexical and structural metrics, filtering passages based on their special character frequency, overall sentence count, average words per sentence, capital-to-lower-case character ratio, lexical diversity, stopword prevalence, degree of word repetition, and newline-to-sentence ratio. Passages not meeting predefined quality thresholds were systematically excluded. Additionally, recognizing the structural specificity required for clinical trial treatment regimen descriptions, we enforced more stringent criteria for this corpus subset. Specifically, we retained only those passages beginning with a capital letter, containing at least one digit, ending with a period, and encompassing at least two well-formed sentences.

2.1.3 Graph-based deduplication

To mitigate redundancy while preserving corpus diversity, we applied a graph-based deduplication strategy to each biomedical corpus independently. Text passages were first transformed into TF-IDF representations, capturing their semantic content in a vector space. We then constructed a similarity graph, where nodes represented individual texts and edges were formed between passages exceeding a cosine similarity threshold of 0.9. Within this graph, connected components naturally emerged as clusters of redundant or near-duplicate texts. To retain a maximally informative yet diverse corpus, the most representative passage within each community, i.e., the one with the highest average similarity to others, was selected as the canonical representative, and all the other instances were excluded.

2.1.4 Stratified sampling

Following corpus curation, filtering, and deduplication, we performed stratified sampling to construct a balanced dataset for synthetic NER annotation. Prior to sampling, our curated corpus comprised 31,778 passages from HPLs, 76,145 from clinical trial detailed descriptions, 88,867 from clinical trial arm-level regimens, 106,982 from PubMed abstracts, and 114,609 from biomedical patents. To optimize computational efficiency while preserving domain diversity, we selected approximately 115,000 passages with equal representation from all sources. From this balanced subset, 10,000 samples were first used to distill NER annotation capabilities from OpenBioLLM-70B into a compact 8B model. After optimizing this distilled model for efficient annotation, we applied it to annotate the remaining 105,000 samples, yielding the final synthetic NER dataset.

2.2 Pre-training dataset

To construct a large-scale synthetic NER dataset, we designed a multi-stage process integrating fewshot prompting and model distillation. First, we leveraged OpenBioLLM-70B to annotate a 10,000sample subset in a few-shot setting, incorporating four in-context examples presented in a conversational format. Unlike traditional setups, where models identify entity spans from free text, we enforced explicit control over entity selection by extracting all noun phrases from the input and instructing the model to annotate each one. This constraint was designed to maximize recall, ensuring that no valid entity was omitted due to model stochasticity. To ensure output consistency and facilitate downstream parsing, logit processing was applied to enforce JSON-formatted annotations.

Instead of relying on the computationally expensive 70B model, we fine-tuned OpenBioLLM-8B using low-rank adaptation (Hu et al., 2022) to internalize the annotation behavior of its larger counterpart using the 10,000 annotated samples. This distillation eliminated the need for in-context examples during inference, significantly reducing context length requirements and making annotation more efficient. This step yielded a model with drastically reduced memory requirements, allowing us to scale annotation to 105,000 additional samples while operating at a fraction of the computational cost required by the original 70B model.

The final pre-training dataset yielded 2.3 million entity mentions spanning 640,000 unique entities across a diverse range of biomedical texts.

2.3 Post-training dataset

To enhance zero-shot performance, we constructed a post-training dataset by combining synthetic and manually curated general-domain data. The synthetic subset consists of approximately 10,000 examples derived from the FineWeb dataset (Penedo et al., 2024). These texts were annotated using Qwen2.5 72B (Yang et al., 2024), which was prompted to perform multiple NLP tasks - including NER, relation extraction, and question answering - all formulated as entity recognition tasks to align with the GLiNER framework. The manually curated subset includes OntoNotes5 (Hovy et al., 2006), MultiNERD (Tedeschi and Navigli, 2022), and WNUT2017 (Derczynski et al., 2017). This combination of synthetic and manually curated data enabled us to create a high-quality, diverse dataset for post-training. Unlike our large-scale pre-training dataset, which is machine annotated, we excluded entity types appearing in our evaluation datasets to ensure that performance remains unaffected by human-labeled supervision of target entity types. Altogether, the final post-training dataset comprises 19,000 annotated instances, containing 360,000 entity mentions and 13,500 unique entity types across various general-domain texts.

2.4 Model architectures and training

GLiNER-biomed introduces two distinct model architectures, uni- and bi-encoder, each trained across three parameter scales (small, base, and large). These architectural variations allow for flexibility by balancing computational efficiency and performance across diverse use cases.

2.4.1 Uni-encoder architecture

As shown in Figure 1A, the uni-encoder GLiNER architecture follows the design proposed by Zaratiana et al. (2024), where a single encoder processes the input text while dynamically integrating natural language descriptions of entity types. For our implementation, we maintain architectural consistency with GLiNER by adopting DeBERTa-v3 backbones (He et al., 2021) across small, base and large parameter sizes. In this architectural variant, the encoder operates over a concatenated sequence of input tokens and entity type descriptions, leading to an overall complexity of $\mathcal{O}([n_e + n_t]^2)$, where n_t is the number of tokens in the input text and n_e is the number of entity types. As n_e increases, the cost of pairwise interactions grows rapidly. This becomes computationally prohibitive in scenarios such as normalization to extensive biomedical ontologies like UMLS.

2.4.2 Bi-encoder architecture

The bi-encoder architecture (Figure 1B) employed in this work builds upon a recently proposed yet unpublished variant of GLiNER¹. This architecture extends the uni-encoder approach by employing two separate encoders, i.e., one dedicated to processing the input text and the other to encoding entity types independently. This explicit separation allows entity representations to be precomputed and stored at inference time, reducing the computational overhead of incorporating label descriptions into the input sequence. In this setting, the entity type encoder yields a fixed complexity of $\mathcal{O}(n_e)$, independent of the input text length. Meanwhile, the text encoder operates solely over n_t , maintaining the $\mathcal{O}(n_t^2)$ complexity inherent to transformerbased architectures. This approach is particularly advantageous in settings that require handling a large number of entity types simultaneously. To implement this architecture, we used DeBERTa-v3 for text encoding, pairing it with retrieval models for label encoding. Specifically, the small variant employs DeBERTa-v3 small alongside all-MiniLM-L6-v2 (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019), the base variant uses DeBERTa-v3 base with bge-small-en-v1.5 (Xiao et al., 2023), and the large variant integrates DeBERTa-v3 large with bge-base-en-v1.5 (Xiao et al., 2023).

2.4.3 Training procedure

All model variants were trained in a two-stage process. In the first stage, we pre-trained the models on our fully synthetic biomedical dataset (see Section 2.2). This step enabled the models to learn a broad range of biomedical entity patterns in a high-coverage, automatically labeled setting. In the second stage, we fine-tuned the models on the post-training dataset (see Section 2.3), ensuring alignment with high-quality and human-annotated entity boundaries.

3 Evaluation

We evaluate the zero-shot performance of GLiNERbiomed across eight biomedical NER datasets, comprising 10,918 samples and 85,959 entity mentions spanning 58 unique biomedical entity types. These datasets cover diverse biomedical domains, including regulatory documents, clinical narratives, patient-generated content, and scientific literature. To ensure a comprehensive assessment, we compute four key performance metrics: *i) Micro F1score*, which aggregates true positives, false positives, and false negatives across all entity types to provide an overall measure of precision-recall balance; *ii) Macro mean F1*, which averages F1-scores per entity type, treating all entity categories equally

¹https://blog.knowledgator.com/meet-the-new-zero-shot-ner-architecture-30ffc2cb1ee0



Figure 1: (A) Uni-encoder GLiNER: An encoder framework that dynamically integrates natural language entity descriptions, E_i , with the input text, enabling contextualized entity recognition. (B) Bi-encoder GLiNER: A dual-stream design that decouples text and label encoding into two dedicated modules. This architecture reduces the quadratic complexity inherent in cross-attention between labels E_i and the input text, thereby enhancing scalability and efficiency.

regardless of their frequency; *iii*) *Macro median F1*, which reports the median F1-score across all entity types, mitigating the influence of outliers; and *iv*) *Weighted F1*, which calculates a support-weighted average of per-entity F1-scores.

3.1 Benchmark datasets

To rigorously evaluate GLiNER-biomed's ability to generalize across different biomedical domains, we assess its performance on eight diverse NER datasets. The TAC dataset (Roberts et al., 2017) focuses on the extraction of adverse drug events (ADEs) from structured drug labels, providing a controlled evaluation of pharmacovigilance-related NER. CADEC (Karimi et al., 2015) shifts this focus to patient-reported ADEs in online health forums, introducing greater linguistic variability and informal phrasing. N2C2 2018 (Henry et al., 2020) targets ADE recognition within clinical discharge summaries, emphasizing drug-related entities and prescription details. BC5CDR (Li et al., 2016), a widely adopted benchmark in biomedical text mining, focuses on chemical and disease entity recognition in scientific abstracts. Expanding beyond disease and chemical entities, BioRED (Luo et al., 2022) includes a diverse set of biomedical concepts beyond diseases and chemicals, covering genes, diseases, chemicals, genomic and protein variants, species, and specific cell lines used in PubMed abstracts. CHIA (Kury et al., 2020) is a large annotated corpus of clinical trial eligibility criteria that captures 15 entity types, including domain entities like conditions, drugs, measurements, and procedures. Biomed NER² introduces a large annotated

dataset covering diverse entity types across regulatory, clinical, and biological domains, including chemicals, drugs, anatomical structures, disorders, and broader concepts like intellectual property and legal regulations. Finally, NCBI Disease (Doğan et al., 2014) serves as a benchmark for disease entity recognition in biomedical abstracts.

3.2 Results on zero-shot performance

We benchmark GLiNER-biomed against 19 stateof-the-art GLiNER-based models, covering both general-domain and biomedical-specialized variants. Our evaluation includes the original GLiNER suite (v1.0), which set a new standard by surpassing ChatGPT and UniversalNER (Zaratiana et al., 2024) on plethora of benchmarks, along with subsequent releases, namely GLiNER v2.0, v2.1, and v2.5. Additionally, we compare against NuNER Zero and NuNER Zero span, GLiNER-based models that incorporate LLM-annotated pre-training data for token classification and span-based NER, respectively (Bogdanov et al., 2024).

Beyond general-domain models, we evaluate biomedical-specialized GLiNER variants, including GLiNER bio v 0.1^3 and GLiNER bio v 0.2^4 , which are pre-trained on PubMed data. Finally, we assess GLiNER news v2.1, which has been optimized for news-related entity extraction (Törnquist and Caulk, 2024).

All models are evaluated in a zero-shot setting, meaning that no fine-tuning was performed on the evaluation datasets. The results, presented in Table 1, indicate that GLiNER-biomed consistently outperforms all baseline models across

²https://hf.co/datasets/knowledgator/biomed_NER

³https://hf.co/urchade/gliner_large_bio-v0.1

⁴https://hf.co/urchade/gliner_large_bio-v0.2

Model	F1-score	Macro mean F1	Macro median F1	Weighted F1
Large models				
NuNER Zero	40.87	21.79	13.94	33.67
NuNER Zero span	40.26	22.51	14.27	32.52
GLiNER bio v0.1	42.34	27.10	24.44	38.38
GLiNER bio v0.2	38.66	25.36	17.02	32.42
GLiNER v1.0	47.77	29.60	21.13	40.78
GLiNER v2.0	37.38	21.42	15.44	33.11
GLiNER v2.1	48.04	29.75	28.20	43.43
GLiNER news v2.1	48.99	31.79	33.77	45.13
GLiNER v2.5	53.81	35.22	35.65	<u>51.57</u>
GLiNER-biomed	59.77	40.67	42.65	58.40
GLiNER-biomed-bi	<u>54.90</u>	<u>35.78</u>	31.66	50.46
Base models				
GLiNER v1.0	41.61	24.98	10.27	31.59
GLiNER v2.0	34.33	24.48	22.01	30.58
GLiNER v2.1	40.25	25.26	14.41	32.64
GLiNER news v2.1	41.59	27.16	17.74	34.44
GLiNER v2.5	46.49	30.93	25.26	44.68
GLiNER-biomed	54.37	36.20	41.61	53.05
GLiNER-biomed-bi	58.31	<u>35.22</u>	<u>32.39</u>	54.91
Small models				
GLiNER v1.0	40.99	22.81	7.86	31.15
GLiNER v2.0	33.55	21.12	15.76	28.78
GLiNER v2.1	38.45	23.25	10.92	30.67
GLiNER news v2.1	39.15	24.96	14.48	33.10
GLiNER v2.5	38.21	28.53	18.01	36.88
GLiNER-biomed	52.53	34.49	38.17	50.87
GLiNER-biomed-bi	56.93	<u>33.88</u>	33.61	53.12

Table 1: Zero-shot biomedical NER performance comparison of GLiNER-biomed and GLiNER-biomed-bi against 19 baseline GLiNER models across three model sizes (large, base, small). Scores are aggregated over eight benchmark datasets. The best score in each category is highlighted in bold, while the second-best score is underlined.

all model sizes. In the large model category, GLiNER-biomed attains a F1-score of 59.77%, which is a 5.96 percentage point improvement over GLiNER v2.5-large (53.81%), the second-best performing model. Notably, despite having seven times fewer parameters, GLiNER-biomed-small (52.53%) rivals the performance of GLiNER v2.5-large (53.81%). This result suggests that domain adaptation in biomedical NER plays a greater role than sheer model scale.

GLiNER-biomed-bi, the bi-encoder variant, presents a distinct performance trend. As shown in Table 1, GLiNER-biomed-bi outperforms the uni-encoder GLiNER-biomed at the base and small scales, achieving 58.31% and 56.93% micro F1-score, respectively, which are the highest scores in

these categories. However, this advantage does not persist at the larger scale, where GLiNERbiomed-bi-large (54.90%) falls short of GLiNERbiomed-large (59.77%). We hypothesize that the biencoder framework improves performance in small and base models by effectively doubling encoder capacity, mitigating their inherent parameter limitations. However, at larger scales, this advantage fades, as uni-encoder architectures might already have sufficient capacity.

3.3 Results on few-shot performance

Real-world biomedical applications often benefit from fine-tuning with limited labeled data, especially in scenarios involving scarce or emerging biomedical entities not covered by existing annotations. Few-shot learning capabilities are thus essential for rapid adaptation to evolving biomedical taxonomies and novel concepts. To assess the few-shot learning capabilities of GLiNERbiomed, we fine-tune both GLiNER-biomed-large and GLiNER-biomed-bi-large models across progressively larger training sets, comparing them against GLiNER v2.5-large, which is the strongest baseline. Each model is trained separately on 10, 20, and 50-shot subsets per dataset, as well as the full training datasets. Evaluations are performed on the full test sets to ensure consistency with zero-shot evaluation. The results, shown in Table 2, reveal that GLiNER-biomed models consistently outperform the general-domain baseline across all settings, with the bi-encoder variant proving particularly effective in low-data regimens. With just 10 labeled examples, GLiNERbiomed-bi-large achieves 70.39% F1-score, surpassing both GLiNER-biomed-large (66.07%) and GLiNER v2.5-large (65.93%). This advantage persists at 20 and 50-shot, where GLiNER-biomedbi-large reaches 73.07% and 76.02% F1-score, respectively, maintaining a strong lead over the best general-domain model.

N-shot	v2.5	biomed	biomed-bi
10-shot	65.93	66.07	70.39
20-shot	69.15	<u>71.98</u>	73.07
50-shot	73.52	<u>73.70</u>	76.02
Full dataset	84.64	84.95	<u>84.91</u>

Table 2: Few-shot biomedical NER performance comparison of GLINER-biomed-large models vs. GLINER v2.5-large. N-shot denotes using N samples for training. A corresponding set of N validation samples was used for early stopping during training. The final reported metrics are calculated on the full test sets. The best-performing model per setting is in bold, while the second-best is underlined. All reported metrics are micro-averaged F1-scores.

As more training data becomes available, the performance gap between architectural variants and domain-specialized models narrows. Under full supervision, all models converge, with GLiNERbiomed-large (84.95%), GLiNER-biomed-bi-large (84.91%), and GLiNER v2.5-large (84.64%) reaching similar performance levels. This result suggests that GLiNER-biomed is best suited for zeroshot scenarios, while GLiNER-biomed-bi is the preferred choice for few-shot learning and computationally constrained settings. When sufficient labeled data is available, any GLiNER model can be used, as performance differences become negligible.

4 Ablation studies

We conduct ablation studies to evaluate the individual and combined contributions of synthetic biomedical pre-training and subsequent fine-tuning on our post-training data to the performance of GLiNER models. Results for these experiments are summarized in Table 3.

Initially, we establish a baseline using GLiNER v2.5-large, which has been pre-trained on generaldomain data, resulting in a zero-shot biomedical NER performance of 53.81% F1-score. When this general-domain pre-trained model is further finetuned on our post-training dataset (described in Section 2.3), performance marginally improves to 54.80% F1-score. While this indicates some benefit from the post-training data, this result still falls short of the performance achieved through domainspecific pre-training (59.77%), highlighting the crucial role of biomedical adaptation for capturing domain nuances effectively.

To further isolate the impact of the post-training data, we evaluate a randomly initialized GLiNERlarge model fine-tuned exclusively on the posttraining dataset. This configuration yields a comparable F1-score of 52.38%, underscoring the quality of our post-training dataset while also highlighting the limitations of training without specific biomedical domain exposure.

Conversely, pre-training a randomly initialized GLiNER-large model solely on synthetic biomedical data (described in Section 2.2) leads to an F1-score of 42.10%. Although this configuration achieves high precision (70.08%), it suffers from reduced recall (30.09%). This result indicates that synthetic biomedical pre-training effectively imparts domain-specific knowledge but lacks sufficient recall to achieve the highest F1-score.

The highest performance is achieved by combining synthetic biomedical pre-training with subsequent fine-tuning on our post-training data. Specifically, the GLiNER-biomed-large model obtains balanced precision (56.67%) and recall (63.22%), achieving an F1-score of 59.77%. This combined approach leverages the complementary strengths of synthetic pre-training, which introduces a broad, domain-specific vocabulary, and high-quality data post-training, which adds greater diversity and more accurate annotations. Consequently, this con-

Pre-	Precision	Recall	F1		
General-domain pre-training	Pre-training (Section 2.2)	Post-training (Section 2.3)			
\checkmark	×	×	56.19	51.62	53.81
\checkmark	×	\checkmark	55.56	54.06	54.80
×	×	\checkmark	51.53	53.25	52.38
×	\checkmark	×	70.08	30.09	42.10
×	\checkmark	\checkmark	56.67	63.22	59.77

Table 3: Ablation study evaluating the impact of different pre-training phases on biomedical NER performance. The evaluated model configurations are: (1) GLiNER v2.5-large pre-trained solely on general-domain data (baseline); (2) GLiNER v2.5-large pre-trained on general-domain data and further trained on our post-training data (Section 2.3); (3) randomly initialized GLiNER-large fine-tuned only on our post-training data; (4) randomly initialized GLiNER-large pre-trained exclusively on synthetic biomedical data (Section 2.2); and (5) randomly initialized GLiNER-large pre-trained on our synthetic biomedical data and subsequently fine-tuned on our post-training data (GLiNER-large biomed-large). Checkmarks (\checkmark) denote inclusion, and crosses (\times) denote omission of the respective pre-training phase. All reported metrics are micro-averaged.

figuration achieves substantial performance gains, with an increase of 17.67 percentage points in F1score compared to synthetic-only pre-training and an improvement of 5.96 percentage points compared to general-domain pre-training alone.

We hypothesize that fine-tuning with highquality annotated data is essential due to limitations inherent in the synthetic biomedical annotations produced by the distilled 8B model. Nevertheless, our ablation study demonstrates that domainspecific biomedical knowledge can be effectively distilled into the GLiNER framework using costeffective generative language models. The subsequent fine-tuning on high-quality general-domain data can then enhance the model's overall entity recognition performance.

5 Conclusion

In this work, we introduce the GLiNER-biomed models, a specialized suite of open biomedical NER models designed to address the challenges of dynamically evolving biomedical terminology. Unlike conventional NER models that rely on fixed taxonomies, GLiNER-biomed incorporates natural language descriptions of entity types, enabling more flexible and adaptive entity recognition. Our approach begins by distilling annotations from a large generative biomedical model into a smaller generative model, which is then used to generate a high-coverage synthetic biomedical NER dataset. We then pre-train GLiNER-based encoders on this synthetic dataset, followed by post-training on highquality general-domain data, enhancing annotation accuracy while preserving strong domain adaptation.

Through extensive zero-shot and few-shot evaluations across eight biomedical datasets, GLiNERbiomed consistently outperforms state-of-the-art general-domain and biomedical-specific GLiNER models, achieving a 5.96-point F1-score improvement over the strongest baseline. Additionally, GLiNER-biomed-bi, the bi-encoder variant, proves particularly effective in low-data settings, achieving a 70.39% F1-score with as few as 10 annotated samples and further improving to 76.02% with 50 annotated instances. These results demonstrate its advantage over the uni-encoder model in fewshot learning scenarios, highlighting its potential for real-world biomedical applications where annotated data is scarce.

Future research could explore more capable generative language models for synthetic data annotations, multilingual adaptations, and continual learning strategies to ensure robust adaptation to the ever-evolving biomedical landscape.

6 Limitations

Although GLiNER-biomed achieves substantial gains, several limitations remain. First, our synthetic pre-training data, generated via distilled generative models, may introduce biases or fail to fully capture the complexity inherent in humanannotated data, potentially limiting generalizability. Additionally, despite their diversity, the evaluation datasets may not represent all biomedical subdomains or linguistic variations, especially less common areas, such as veterinary medicine or dentistry. Furthermore, despite optimization efforts, the computational resources required by our complete pipeline may pose barriers to reproducibility and adoption for researchers operating in resourceconstrained environments. Finally, while quantitatively extensive, our evaluation currently lacks detailed qualitative analysis, limiting deeper insights into model errors, interpretability, and possible directions for further improvement.

References

- Rami Aly, Andreas Vlachos, and Ryan McDonald. 2021. Leveraging type descriptions for zero-shot named entity recognition and classification. In *Proceedings* of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers), pages 1516–1528, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Malaikannan Sankarasubbu Ankit Pal. 2024. Openbiollms: Advancing open-source large language models for healthcare and life sciences. https://huggingface.co/aaditya/ OpenBioLLM-Llama3-70B.
- Alan R Aronson and François-Michel Lang. 2010. An overview of metamap: historical perspective and recent advances. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 17(3):229–236.
- Olivier Bodenreider. 2004. The unified medical language system (umls): integrating biomedical terminology. *Nucleic acids research*, 32(suppl_1):D267– D270.
- Sergei Bogdanov, Alexandre Constantin, Timothée Bernard, Benoit Crabbé, and Etienne Bernard. 2024. Nuner: entity recognition encoder pretraining via llm-annotated data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.15343*.
- Leon Derczynski, Eric Nichols, Marieke van Erp, and Nut Limsopatham. 2017. Results of the WNUT2017 shared task on novel and emerging entity recognition. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on Noisy User-generated Text*, pages 140–147, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers), pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Jürgen Dietrich and André Hollstein. 2024. Performance and reproducibility of large language models in named entity recognition: Considerations for the use in controlled environments. *Drug Safety*, pages 1–17.
- Rezarta Islamaj Doğan, Robert Leaman, and Zhiyong Lu. 2014. Ncbi disease corpus: a resource for disease name recognition and concept normalization. *Journal of biomedical informatics*, 47:1–10.
- Yu Gu, Robert Tinn, Hao Cheng, Michael Lucas, Naoto Usuyama, Xiaodong Liu, Tristan Naumann, Jianfeng Gao, and Hoifung Poon. 2021. Domain-specific language model pretraining for biomedical natural language processing. ACM Transactions on Computing for Healthcare (HEALTH), 3(1):1–23.
- Pengcheng He, Jianfeng Gao, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. Debertav3: Improving deberta using electra-style pretraining with gradient-disentangled embedding sharing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.09543*.
- Sam Henry, Kevin Buchan, Michele Filannino, Amber Stubbs, and Ozlem Uzuner. 2020. 2018 n2c2 shared task on adverse drug events and medication extraction in electronic health records. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 27(1):3–12.
- Eduard Hovy, Mitchell Marcus, Martha Palmer, Lance Ramshaw, and Ralph Weischedel. 2006. OntoNotes: The 90% solution. In *Proceedings of the Human Language Technology Conference of the NAACL, Companion Volume: Short Papers*, pages 57–60, New York City, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, Weizhu Chen, et al. 2022. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *ICLR*, 1(2):3.
- Aman Jolly, Vikas Pandey, Indrasen Singh, and Neha Sharma. 2024. Exploring biomedical named entity recognition via scispacy and biobert models. *The Open Biomedical Engineering Journal*, 18.
- Sarvnaz Karimi, Alejandro Metke-Jimenez, Madonna Kemp, and Chen Wang. 2015. Cadec: A corpus of adverse drug event annotations. *Journal of biomedical informatics*, 55:73–81.
- Vipina K Keloth, Yan Hu, Qianqian Xie, Xueqing Peng, Yan Wang, Andrew Zheng, Melih Selek, Kalpana Raja, Chih Hsuan Wei, Qiao Jin, et al. 2024. Advancing entity recognition in biomedicine via instruction tuning of large language models. *Bioinformatics*, 40(4):btae163.
- Fabrício Kury, Alex Butler, Chi Yuan, Li-heng Fu, Yingcheng Sun, Hao Liu, Ida Sim, Simona Carini, and Chunhua Weng. 2020. Chia, a large annotated corpus of clinical trial eligibility criteria. *Scientific data*, 7(1):281.

- John Lafferty, Andrew McCallum, Fernando Pereira, et al. 2001. Conditional random fields: Probabilistic models for segmenting and labeling sequence data. In *Icml*, volume 1, page 3. Williamstown, MA.
- Egoitz Laparra, Aurelie Mascio, Sumithra Velupillai, and Timothy Miller. 2021. A review of recent work in transfer learning and domain adaptation for natural language processing of electronic health records. *Yearbook of medical informatics*, 30(01):239–244.
- Jinhyuk Lee, Wonjin Yoon, Sungdong Kim, Donghyeon Kim, Sunkyu Kim, Chan Ho So, and Jaewoo Kang. 2020. Biobert: a pre-trained biomedical language representation model for biomedical text mining. *Bioinformatics*, 36(4):1234–1240.
- Jiao Li, Yueping Sun, Robin J Johnson, Daniela Sciaky, Chih-Hsuan Wei, Robert Leaman, Allan Peter Davis, Carolyn J Mattingly, Thomas C Wiegers, and Zhiyong Lu. 2016. Biocreative v cdr task corpus: a resource for chemical disease relation extraction. *Database*, 2016.
- Xiaoya Li, Jingrong Feng, Yuxian Meng, Qinghong Han, Fei Wu, and Jiwei Li. 2020. A unified MRC framework for named entity recognition. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5849–5859, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yiming Li, Wei Tao, Zehan Li, Zenan Sun, Fang Li, Susan Fenton, Hua Xu, and Cui Tao. 2024. Artificial intelligence-powered pharmacovigilance: A review of machine and deep learning in clinical text-based adverse drug event detection for benchmark datasets. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, page 104621.
- Shengyu Liu, Buzhou Tang, Qingcai Chen, Xiaolong Wang, and Xiaoming Fan. 2015. Feature engineering for drug name recognition in biomedical texts: Feature conjunction and feature selection. *Computational and mathematical methods in medicine*, 2015(1):913489.
- Ling Luo, Po-Ting Lai, Chih-Hsuan Wei, Cecilia N Arighi, and Zhiyong Lu. 2022. Biored: a rich biomedical relation extraction dataset. *Briefings in Bioinformatics*, 23(5):bbac282.
- Yesol Park, Gyujin Son, and Mina Rho. 2024. Biomedical flat and nested named entity recognition: Methods, challenges, and advances. *Applied Sciences*, 14(20):9302.
- Guilherme Penedo, Hynek Kydlíček, Loubna Ben allal, Anton Lozhkov, Margaret Mitchell, Colin Raffel, Leandro Von Werra, and Thomas Wolf. 2024. The fineweb datasets: Decanting the web for the finest text data at scale. In *The Thirty-eight Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track.*
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical*

Methods in Natural Language Processing. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Kirk Roberts, Dina Demner-Fushman, and Joseph M Tonning. 2017. Overview of the tac 2017 adverse reaction extraction from drug labels track. In *TAC*.
- Guergana K Savova, James J Masanz, Philip V Ogren, Jiaping Zheng, Sunghwan Sohn, Karin C Kipper-Schuler, and Christopher G Chute. 2010. Mayo clinical text analysis and knowledge extraction system (ctakes): architecture, component evaluation and applications. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 17(5):507–513.
- Simone Tedeschi and Roberto Navigli. 2022. MultiN-ERD: A multilingual, multi-genre and fine-grained dataset for named entity recognition (and disambiguation). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022*, pages 801–812, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Elin Törnquist and Robert Alexander Caulk. 2024. Curating grounded synthetic data with global perspectives for equitable ai. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.10258*.
- Shitao Xiao, Zheng Liu, Peitian Zhang, and Niklas Muennighoff. 2023. C-pack: Packaged resources to advance general chinese embedding. *Preprint*, arXiv:2309.07597.
- Yan Xu, Kai Hong, Junichi Tsujii, and Eric I-Chao Chang. 2012. Feature engineering combined with machine learning and rule-based methods for structured information extraction from narrative clinical discharge summaries. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 19(5):824–832.
- An Yang, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Haoran Wei, et al. 2024. Qwen2. 5 technical report. arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.15115.
- Urchade Zaratiana, Nadi Tomeh, Pierre Holat, and Thierry Charnois. 2024. GLiNER: Generalist model for named entity recognition using bidirectional transformer. In Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers), pages 5364–5376, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wenxuan Zhou, Sheng Zhang, Yu Gu, Muhao Chen, and Hoifung Poon. 2023. Universalner: Targeted distillation from large language models for open named entity recognition. arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.03279.