

Text2MDT: Extracting Medical Decision Trees from Medical Texts

Wei Zhu^{1a}, Wenfeng Li^a, Xing Tian^c, Pengfei Wang^a, Xiaoling Wang^a, Jin Chen^b, Yuanbin Wu^a, Yuan Ni^c, Guotong Xie^c

^a*Department of Computer Science and Technology, East China Normal University, Shanghai, China*

^b*University of Kentucky, Kentucky, United States*

^c*Pingan Health Tecnology, Shanghai, China*

Abstract

Knowledge of the medical decision process, which can be modeled as medical decision trees (MDTs), is critical to build clinical decision support systems. However, the current MDT construction methods rely heavily on time-consuming and laborious manual annotation. In this work, we propose a novel task, Text2MDT, to explore the automatic extraction of MDTs from medical texts such as medical guidelines and textbooks. We normalize the form of the MDT and create an annotated Text-to-MDT dataset in Chinese with the participation of medical experts. We investigate two different methods for the Text2MDT tasks: (a) an end-to-end framework which only relies on a GPT style large language models (LLM) instruction tuning to generate all the node information and tree structures. (b) The pipeline framework which decomposes the Text2MDT task to three sub-tasks. Experiments on our Text2MDT dataset demonstrate that: (a) the end-to-end method based on LLMs (7B parameters or larger) show promising results, and successfully outperform the pipeline methods. (b) The chain-of-thought (COT) prompting method Wei et al. (2022) can improve the performance of the fine-tuned LLMs on the Text2MDT test set. (c) the lightweight pipelined method based on encoder-based pretrained models can perform comparably with LLMs with model complexity two magnitudes smaller. Our Text2MDT dataset is open-sourced at <https://tianchi.aliyun.com/dataset/95414>, and the

¹Corresponding Author. Email: wzhu@stu.ecnu.edu.cn. Address: Department of Computer Science and Technology, East China Normal University, No. 3663, Zhongshan Road, Putuo District, Shanghai, China, 200050.

source codes are open-sourced at <https://github.com/michael-wzhu/text2dt>.

Keywords: Medical decision trees, medical information extraction, pre-training language models, large language models.

1. Introduction

As a typical application of artificial intelligence in the medical field, clinical decision support systems (CDSS) have been widely concerned by researchers Tsumoto (1998); Fotiadis et al. (2006); Machado et al. (2017). CDSS can suggest experienced doctors of all the options and problems to be considered when making decisions, help inexperienced medical students to learn clinical knowledge, or give medical advice to patients without medical background IoannisVourgidis et al. (2018). The core of building a CDSS is the knowledge of medical decision processes, which are rules that link given conditions to medical decisions Abraham (2005) and are usually modeled as medical decision trees (MDTs). However, existing methods for constructing MDTs rely on manual tree construction by medical experts Saibene et al. (2021), which is time-consuming, laborious, and cannot absorb the latest research timely. All these hinder the construction, dissemination, maintenance of large-scale CDSS Nohria (2015). There is an unmet need to explore automated pipelines to precisely extract MDTs from vast and rapidly growing medical knowledge sources.

It is computationally challenging to automatically extract MDTs for the following reasons: 1) the current MDT lacks a normalized and structured form, leading to ambiguity in understanding medical decision knowledge and therefore hinders automated knowledge extraction; 2) the NLP community lacks a benchmark dataset for training and validating MDT extraction tasks; and constructing such data is challenging in that annotating medical decision trees requires in-depth domain knowledge; 3) existing methods for medical information extraction are not directly applicable for MDT extraction.

In this work, Text2MDT is defined as an automated task to explore the automatic extraction of MDTs from medical texts such as medical guidelines and textbooks. To this end, we structure and normalize a specific tree structure to model medical decision knowledge. As shown in Figure 1, the knowledge of a medical decision process embedded in the medical text can be modeled as a binary decision tree consisting of condition nodes (orange diamond) and decision nodes (blue rectangle). The triplets with their logic relationships in the nodes rep-




Figure 1: An example of a medical decision tree contained in a medical text from an epilepsy clinical guideline. English translation are provided in brackets.

represent the conditional judgment to be performed or the decisions to be made based on the previous conditional judgment. Suppose the result of the conditional judgment is "Yes" ("No"), go to the left (right) branch for the following conditional judgment or decision. Once a decision is made, the medical process is terminated. In summary, the new MDT reflects the triplets in the text that represent medical knowledge and connects this information to form a complete decision-making process. We construct the first Text-to-MDT (Text2MDT) benchmark dataset with 500 Text2MDT pairs and 3,232 triplets for automatically extracting MDTs from medical texts. Medical guidelines and textbooks, which are referential for clinical decision making, are used as knowledge sources. Trigger words and templates customized by medical experts are used to locate medical text fragments that con-

tain knowledge for clinical decision making. Finally, well-trained annotators and medical experts complete the annotation manually.

With the constructed Text2MDT benchmark, we conduct a systematic evaluation of different pretrained model based methods. The first cohort of methods we consider is from the pipeline framework, in which the Text2MDT task is decomposed into three subtasks: triplet extraction, node grouping and tree assembling. Note that the existing encoder-based information extraction research can not be directly applied to deal with our novel Text2MDT task in a end-to-end (end2end) fashion, they can be applied in each subtask. We also consider generation-based methods for the pipeline framework. The second cohort of methods are all end2end methods. For the end2end framework, we mainly consider utilizing the generation capabilities of the pretrained generative LMs, especially the current large language models (LLMs). Notably, the chain-of-thought Wei et al. (2022) (COT) style reasoning is investigated, which demonstrates to be beneficial. Experiments on our Text2MDT benchmark show promising results.

In summary, the main contributions of this work are:

- We propose a well-defined novel task Text2MDT aiming to automatically extract MDTs from medical text.
- We construct the first Text2MDT benchmark dataset with the help medical practitioners.
- Both the pipelined and end2end models are investigated, including encoder-based methods and LLM fine-tuning. The experiments show that LLMs can perform strongly on our Text2MDT benchmark, however the encoder-based models can also perform comparably by utilizing a series of models dealing with different subtasks in the pipeline.
- The Text2MDT dataset and source codes are openly available², to facilitate future research.

2. Related Work

2.1. Medical natural language processing

The developments in neural networks and natural language processing has advanced the field of medical natural language processing (MedNLP) Zhou et al.

²<https://github.com/michael-wzhu/text2dt>

(2021); Hahn and Oleynik (2020); Zhu et al. (2021b). In the pre-BERT era, firstly, RNNs like LSTM/GRU are used for processing sequential medical data such as text and speech Beeksma et al. (2019). Convolutional networks are also used for medical text classification Hughes et al. (2017). The techniques of Graph neural networks are also explored for diagnosis recommendations Li et al. (2020). In this period, many different model architectures are specially designed for better performances on a specific MedNLP task Zhu et al. (2021b,c); Zhang et al. (2021). Since BERT Devlin et al. (2018), the pretrained language models (PLMs) become the default solution for MedNLP. In this stage, researchers become less interested in modifying the model architecture, but instead trying to pretrain or further pre-train a PLM from the open domain to the medical domain Guo et al. (2021a); Zhu (2021b); Gu et al. (2020). With the wide study of LLMs, the field of MedNLP is also being revolutionized. There are already works on adapting LLM backbones to the medical domain question answering Zhu and Wang (2023). And Zhu et al. (2023) propose PromptCBLUE, a prompt learning based benchmark dataset for examining the LLMs' ability in MedNLP tasks. This work can also serve as a testbed for the current commercial or open-sourced LLMs, since the complexity of our novel task will pose great challenges for them.

2.2. *Information extraction from medical texts*

Information Extraction (IE) is a research topic of long history that aims to extract structured knowledge or factual information from unstructured texts Yang et al. (2022). The field of IE includes a wide range of tasks, such as named entity recognition Das et al. (2022); Landolsi et al. (2023), relation extraction (RE) Zhu et al. (2020); Li et al. (2022), event extraction Hsu et al. (2022), aspect-level sentiment analysis CHENG et al. (2023). Since the raise of pre-trained models like BERT Devlin et al. (2018), the performances on IE tasks have advanced greatly Zhu (2021b). But one has to have different model structures for different fine-grained IE tasks, for instance, the SOTA nested NER models Zhang et al. (2022b) are different from those of discontinuous NER tasks Zhang et al. (2022c). Recently, there is a trend that all the IE task should be solved by a unified paradigm, that is, Seq2Seq generation. Yan et al. (2021a) proposes the framework of BartNER which solves all types of NER tasks with a BART model Lewis et al. (2019). UIE Lu et al. (2022) takes a step ahead and proposes to use prompts and a unified structural language to deal with many types of IE tasks with a single model checkpoint.

Medical information extraction is an important research field, and it has broad applications like medical search engine, automatic electronic health record anal-

ysis, online health consultation, and medical knowledge graph construction Sun et al. (2020); Guo et al. (2021b); Zhu et al. (2019); Zhou et al. (2019); Zhu et al. (2021b,a); Zhang et al. (2023a). Compared with open-domain IE tasks, the IE tasks are known for their complexity. For example, discontinuous or nested entities are common in the medical field. And knowledge in the medical domain may be too complex to be expressed as triplets Zhu et al. (2023a). For example, Jiang et al. (2019) introduced the role of “condition” and argued that a fact triplet is established based on some conditional triplets in the biomedical field. In the CMedCausal Li et al. (2023b) task, a triplet may be the result of a subject conducting certain behaviour, expressing the causal relations. With the rise of LLMs, the research field of IE and medical IE is also under revolution. In this work, we compliment the existing literature by constructing the challenging Text2MDT task, where not only triplets have to be extracted, but also they need to arranged into nodes of a binary tree to express a complex medical decision process.

2.3. *Text2Tree modeling*

There are a rich history of NLP tasks that aim to extract tree structures from a given text. The most fundamental task in NLP is syntax analysis, which aims to express the syntactic structure of a sentence into a syntactic tree Zhang (2020). Parsing often relies on specific grammars, which are used to refine the output structures of syntax and semantics. Two of the most popular grammars are constituent parsing and dependency parsing. Text2Tree are also seen in many application scenarios. Math word problems (MWPs) Zhang et al. (2022d); Zhao et al. (2023b) extracts mathematical expressions from the unstructured texts, and try to improve the neural networks’ capabilities in math problem solving by asking the model to understand the tree structure. Semantic parsing Kamath and Das (2018), the task of transforming the unstructured text into a SQL query, has promising application potentials in areas like dialogue systems, search engine, business intelligence. Our Text2MDT task is novel compared to the literature in the following sense: (a) Text2MDT focus on extracting medical decision trees from unstructured medical texts. (b) our task has a different granularity with the existing Text2Tree tasks, since each node in our task consists of one or more triplets. (c) the tree structure, or the links among different nodes, have different meanings with the existing Text2Tree tasks.

In terms of the model architectures for the existing Text2Tree methods, we have seen a trend of idiosyncratic models to more unified model architectures. The field of syntactic analysis has seen many different model architectures, such as recursive neural network Socher et al. (2011), CRF Sutton and McCallum

(2010), transition-based models like Fernandez Astudillo et al. (2020); Zhang et al. (2016), graph-based models Pei et al. (2015). With the rise of pre-trained encoder models Devlin et al. (2019), a series of works apply the pre-trained models like BERT to enhance the performances on the Text2Tree tasks. For example, Dozat and Manning (2017) proposes to install the biaffine module on top of a pre-trained BERT for the dependency parsing task. This method models the relations among token pairs as a table-filling task and decode the tree structures of the entire input sequence in one forward pass. With the advances of generative language models, many works apply the pretrained sequence-to-sequence (Seq2Seq) models or GPT style models to Text2Tree tasks Wang et al. (2018); Zhong et al. (2017). Since the generative models generate sequences that ignore the constraints of the tree, a series of approaches Xie and Sun (2019); Yu et al. (2018) are devoted to add constraints for tree-structured decoders by utilizing the structural information or syntactic rules. In this work, we contribute to the existing literature by conducting a systematic evaluation of the encoder-based and generation-based methods, especially open-sourced generative LMs with different scales.

3. Problem Definition

3.1. Text2MDT Task

As shown in Figure 1, the Text2MDT task focuses on extracting the MDT from a given text containing the medical decision process from medical guidelines or textbooks. We denote a medical text with n_text words as $X = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n_text}]$, the goal of Text2MDT is to generate the pre-order sequence of the nodes in the MDT $T = [N_1, N_2, \dots, N_{n_node}]$. The pre-order sequence of the nodes in the MDT can uniquely represent this tree, which we explain in detail in Section 3.2.

3.2. Medical Decision Tree

Node structure Nodes in a MDT consist of three parts: role, triplets, and logical relationship between triplets. We denote a node by

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Node} &= \{\text{Role}, \text{Triplets}, \text{Logical_Rel}\}, \\
 \text{Role} &= \diamond \text{ or } \square, \\
 \text{Triplets} &= (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{n_tri}), \\
 \text{Logical_Rel} &= \text{AND, OR or NULL},
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{1}$$

where: (a) Role denotes the role of the node. Role = \diamond means that the node is a condition node describing certain statuses of patients (presented as diamond-shaped nodes in Figure 1), while Role = \square means that the node is a decision node demonstrating how to treat the patients given certain conditions. (b) Triplets = $(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{n_{tri}})$ denotes the collection of triplets extracted from the given text, where each triplet $t = (sub, rel, obj)$ consists of a subject sub , a relation rel , and an object obj . These triplets are used to describe medical contents, either a patient's medical condition or status, or a medical decision representing the medical procedure to treat the patients. (c) Logical_Rel denotes the logical relationship (and/or relation) among the Triplets in a node. Note that $l = null$ if and only if the number of triplets n_{tri} in the node is less or equal to 1. **Tree structure.** A medical decision tree represents the structured process for decision making of physicians. As depicted in Figure 1, medical professionals need to identify the condition of patients, and make the according decisions. Sometimes, medical conditions are complex so that one may have to differentiate many levels of conditions before they can make a valid medical decision. Therefore, we define a MDT as a binary tree consisting of condition and decision nodes, where non-leaf nodes are called conditional nodes, and leaf nodes are decision nodes. For the condition node, when the conditional judgment result is "Yes" ("No"), it will go to the left (right) branch for the next condition judgment or decision. It should be noted that each condition node has left and right child nodes. If the subsequent operation that needs to be done after the result of the condition judgment is "Yes" ("No") is not reflected in the text, a decision node without triplets is used as the left (right) child node. After this operation, a decision tree can be represented by a preorder sequence of its nodes.

Figure 1 shows a concrete example of MDT. In the example, the medical decision process embedded in the medical text above can be modeled by the MDT below: 1) Firstly, the condition "whether valproic acid is applicable for patients with generalized tonic-clonic seizures" is determined, and if the result is "Yes," i.e., valproic acid is applicable, then go to the left branch and make the corresponding decision, i.e., valproic acid is used for treatment; 2) if the result is "No," that is, valproic acid is not applicable, next go to the right branch and make another conditional judgment, i.e., the condition "whether the patient has myoclonic seizures or suspected juvenile myoclonic epilepsy" is determined, and go to different branches according to the result.

4. Text2MDT Dataset

4.1. Data Collection

We choose clinical practice guidelines and clinical medicine textbooks as our data sources. Clinical practice guidelines are systematically developed multidisciplinary clinical guidelines that help clinicians, patients, and other stakeholders make appropriate management, selection, and decisions about specific clinical issues. Clinical medicine textbooks are the primary means medical students acquire medical knowledge and can be used as a reference for clinical decision-making. We collected more than 100 clinical guidelines published by authoritative medical institutions about 30 clinical departments from 2011 to 2021 and undergraduate clinical medical textbooks published by People’s Health Publishing House³ to build our dataset.

Since medical texts are long and contain rich and various medical knowledge, we used section-based filtering and trigger/template-based filtering to locate segments of medical texts that have knowledge of medical decision process based on the analysis of medical texts and the help of specialized doctors. First, we selected the chapters with a high density of medical decision knowledge, such as "Treatment", "Drug Selection" and "Medical Solutions" in the source data. Then, we analyzed and summarized the structure and pattern of the medical decision text construct templates and trigger words for medical decision knowledge. We filtered the text based on the template and triggers to obtain the text fragments containing the knowledge of the medical decision process.

Annotators of our dataset include 4 annotators and 2 medical experts. All the annotators have linguistic knowledge and are instructed with detailed and formal annotation principles for at least two hours, including understanding the medical decision-making process, the judgment of logical relationships, and the annotation specifications of triplets and decision trees. Two well-trained annotators firstly independently annotated each text and revised the initial annotation after discussion. Medical experts will examine the revised annotation to avoid errors or omissions and make the final decision. It is discarded if an annotation cannot be agreed upon in the discussion or is ambiguous. Furthermore, we calculate the Cohen’s Kappa Cohen (1960) to measure the agreements between two annotators. The result of triplet annotation is 0.83, which indicates a high degree of consistency; the result of MDT annotation is 0.37, which indicates a degree of consistency.

³<http://www.pph166.com/>.

Tree_Depth	Amount	Proportion
2	134	26.80%
3	302	60.40%
4	64	12.80%

Table 1: Statistics of the medical decision tree in Text2MDT dataset.

Relation_Name	Amount	Proportion
clinical_feature	1374	42.51%
therapeutic_drug	910	28.15%
medical_option	561	17.36%
usage_or_dosage	222	6.87%
forbidden_drug	83	2.57%
basic_information	82	2.54%

Table 2: Statistics of the triplet relations in Text2MDT dataset.

4.2. Data Statistics

Table 1 reports the statistics of the tree depth in the Text2MDT dataset. There are 500 text-tree pairs in the Text2MDT dataset; the decision tree depth is 2 to 4, the average number of nodes per tree is 3.76, and the average number of triplets per tree is 6.46. There are 1896 nodes in the dataset, including 934 decision nodes, 962 conditional nodes, 476 “or” nodes, 367 “and” nodes, and 1053 “null” nodes.

Table 2 reports the statistics of the triplet relations in the Text2MDT dataset. Text2MDT dataset has 6 relationships, where the relationship “prohibited_drug” only accounts for 2.57% percent of the total number of triplets, so the dataset exhibits long-tailed distributions. It should be noted that the triplet extraction in Text2MDT has the problem of SingleEntityOverlap (SEO), i.e., triplets in medical text share a single entity.

4.3. Manual Evaluation of Medical Decision Trees

To evaluate the quality of the annotated medical decision tree and whether it can help make medical decisions, we invited 10 medical practitioners and 10 people without a medical background to complete the following two evaluation tasks: 1) We observed the subjects’ performance (accuracy and time spent) in answering medical decision problems of similar difficulty under different settings (with medical texts or decision trees as a reference). 2) We asked subjects to

evaluate the ability of medical texts and decision trees to represent the medical decision process (completeness, readability, helpfulness).

Most of the subjects could answer the decision-making questions more accurately or faster with the help of the MDTs and thought that our annotated MDTs are more readable and helpful for understanding the knowledge of the medical decision process while providing a comprehensive representation of decision knowledge in medical texts. This demonstrates the quality of our annotation and the strength of the decision tree in terms of expressive power. Besides, we provide a detailed manual evaluation of MDT in the Appendix.




Figure 2: Overview of our pipeline framework, which contains 3 subtasks: triplet extraction, node grouping and tree assembling.

5. Methods of modeling Text2MDT

In this section, we will elaborate on our proposed methods for modeling the task of Text2MDT. First, we will present each module of the pipeline framework for Text2MDT. Then, we will discuss the end-to-end framework.

5.1. Pipelined framework

Figure 2 demonstrates the pipeline for Text2MDT, which consists of three steps: triple extraction, node grouping, and tree assembling.

5.1.1. Triplet Extraction

The first step is to extract all the triplets representing either decisions or conditions from medical texts with a unified triplet extraction model $\text{TEModel}()$:

$$\{t_1, \dots, t_{n_{tri}}\} = \text{TEModel}([x_1, \dots, x_{n_{text}}]), \quad (2)$$

where $t_i = (s_i, r_i, o_i)$ is the i -th triplet in the text, representing a part of a decision or a condition. s_i and o_i are two entity spans from the given text, and r_i is a relation between the two entities and is one of the relation types presented in Table 2.

Triplet extraction is widely studied task Zhu (2021a); Gao et al. (2023); Zhu (2021c); Zhu et al. (2021c), and there are many recent works that can be utilized to complete this subtask. One line of work is based on semantic encoders like BERT Devlin et al. (2019) and a table-filling module Dozat and Manning (2016); Zhang et al. (2023b). The representative methods in this direction is: CASREL Wei et al. (2020), TPLinker Wang et al. (2020) and UNIRE Wang et al. (2021). For completeness, we now demonstrate how UNIRE Wang et al. (2021) applies a biaffine module to complete the entity mention detection and relation classification tasks simultaneously.

With a given sentence input X , a pre-trained encoder like BERT or RoBERTa will encode the semantic information and provide hidden representations for X' . Denote the hidden vector corresponding each token x_i as $h_i \in \mathcal{R}^d$. Denote the set of entity types as \mathcal{K}_e , and the set of relation types as \mathcal{K}_r . UNIRE targets at identifying the label $l_{i,j}$ of each token pair (i, j) . That is, if the token pair (i, j) is classified as an entity type $k_e \in \mathcal{K}_e$, we will consider the text span starting from the i -th token and ending at the j -th token as an entity of type k_e . And if the token pair (i, j) is classified as an relation type $k_r \in \mathcal{K}_r$, and token i and j are the starting tokens of two entity mentions, we will consider that these two entities have a relation of type k_r . To complete the two tasks with a single calculation step, the UNIRE construct a biaffine module which maps each token pair (i, j) to a probability distribution of dimension $K = |\mathcal{K}_e| + |\mathcal{K}_r| + 1$:⁴

$$P(l_{i,j}) = \text{Biaffine}(h_i, h_j), \quad (3)$$

where $\text{Biaffine}()$ is given by

$$\text{Biaffine}(h_1, h_2) = h_1^T U h_2 + W(h_1 \oplus h_2), \quad (4)$$

⁴Adding 1 for the null type.

Since we need to calculate the scores for K categories, U is a $d \times K \times d$ tensor, and W is a $2d \times K$ tensor.⁵ Since the above method is analogous as filling in a $n_{text} \times n_{text}$ sized table, we often refer to the biaffine method as the table-filling method. Denoting the ground truth of $l_{i,j}$ as $y_{i,j}$, then the training objective is the summation of cross-entropy loss at each of

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{|n_{text}|^2} \sum_{i=1}^{|n_{text}|} \sum_{j=1}^{|n_{text}|} \log P(l_{i,j} = y_{i,j}). \quad (5)$$

After the above BERT-based biaffine model is trained, the inference procedure follows UNIRE Wang et al. (2021).

5.1.2. Node grouping

Given the medical text $X = [x_1, \dots, x_{n_{text}}]$ and the triplets $\{t_1, \dots, t_{n_{tri}}\}$ extracted from this text, we now need to group these triplets into different groups, i.e., nodes, with relation $l \in (and, or, null)$ (a triple constitutes a group if it has the *null* relation with other triples). These groups will be the main components of nodes of the MDT.

Now we will demonstrate the model for this subtask: node-grouping biaffine (NG-Biaffine), which is to adapt the idea of biaffine model to the node grouping task. Note that if a triple belongs to a node with relation $l \in \mathcal{K}_{NG}$ (where $\mathcal{K}_{NG} = \{and, or, null\}$ is the set of the logical relations among triplets.), it will have relation l with any other triplet within the group and *null* relation with other triplets in the other groups. Thus, the key step for node grouping is to determine the relationships among the triplets, which can be conveniently modeled by a table-filling task similar to Equation 3. Denote the augmented text input as $X' = [X, [t], t_1, \dots, [t], t_{n_{tri}}]$, where $[]$ denotes the text concatenation operation. Note that we add a special token $[t]$ before each triplet. A pre-trained encoder like BERT or RoBERTa will encode the semantic information and provide hidden representations for X' , and obtain the semantic representation of triplet t_i by taking the hidden vector corresponding the special token right before t_i (denoted as $h(t_i)$). Then a biaffine module will handle the classification task for each triplet pair (t_i, t_j) by calculating its probability $P(l_{t_i, t_j})$ distribution over all the relation categories.

⁵Note that in the BERT biaffine NER Yu et al. (2020), two feed forward layers are designated to transform the two features passing to the biaffine module. However, we find that dropping the two feed forward layers will not result in significant performance changes.

During inference, we will consider a score based decoding procedure for resolving possible conflicts. For each triplet pair (t_i, t_j) , its label l_{t_i, t_j} is obtained by choosing the relation category that receives the highest probability mass. And denote the probability mass of l_{t_i, t_j} as m_{t_i, t_j} . During inference, we first calculate m_{t_i, t_j} and l_{t_i, t_j} for each triplet pair (t_i, t_j) in a single forward pass. And we rank l_{t_i, t_j} by m_{t_i, t_j} . The relation l_{t_i, t_j} that receives the highest m_{t_i, t_j} value will first be established, and any conflicting relation predictions with lower scores will be rejected. Here, a conflict arises when a triplet t_i has the *and* relation with t_j , but also has the *or* relation with another triplet $t_{j'}$. Then we will establish the relation prediction with the second highest probability mass that has not been discarded. Repeating the above procedures till all the triplets are included in the established relations, and we will have the complete prediction for node grouping. The logical relation for each node will be the relation type among the triplets inside the node.

5.1.3. Tree assembling

Note that in the above procedure, we already has the nodes in the decision tree. To assemble the nodes to a medical decision tree, one has to assign a role (condition or decision) to each node, and determine whether a pair of nodes are connected. Considering the node’s role as the node’s named entity label, and whether a pair of nodes are connected in the decision tree as a directional relation, the tree assembling task can also be regarded as a joint task of entity type classification and relation extraction.

We now elaborate on the model details for tree assembling. Denote each unclassified node as Node_i ($i = 1, 2, \dots, n_{node}$). We formulate each node as a text sequence by concatenating the logical relation name, role label name, and triplets’ text contents, and we augment the text input X to

$$X' = [X, [\text{n}], \text{Node}_1, \dots, [\text{n}], \text{Node}_{n_{node}}]$$

, where \square denotes the text concatenation operation. Note that we add a special token $[\text{n}]$ before each node. After being encoded with a pre-trained text encoder, we can obtain $h(\text{Node}_i)$, the hidden states of the special token $[\text{n}]$ right before each node. $h(\text{Node}_i)$ is considered as the semantic representation of Node_i . A simple linear layer can operate as the node type prediction module, and a biaffine module will handle the relation classification task for each node pair $(\text{Node}_i, \text{Node}_j)$. During decoding, we employ the strategy described in Dozat and Manning (2016) to resolve conflicting predictions. We will refer to the above model as TreeAssemble-Biaffine.

5.2. LLM-based pipeline framework

With the recent advances in generative language models Zhu et al. (2023); Zhu and Tan (2023); Zhao et al. (2023a), there is an unbreakable trend in the NLP field that transforms all the NLP tasks to the task of response generation given an prompt (or called instruction). Yan et al. (2021b) and Zhang et al. (2023a) propose to tackle the various NER tasks to a unified generation framework. PromptCBLUE Zhu et al. (2023) conducts a thorough investigation on how the recent large language models perform on different medical text processing tasks, both under the in-context learning setting and instruction fine-tuning setting.

Motivated by the above works, we now formulate each subtask of Text2MDT to a prompt-response generation task. In the Appendix, we present the prompt template and response format for each subtask in the pipeline framework. Note that for the generative LMs like LLaMA-2 to excel at each of the three tasks, we need to construct the designated datasets for each subtask, so that LMs can be finetuned. The details of constructing the instruction finetuning datasets are presented in Section 6.

5.3. End-to-end framework

For the end2end framework, due to the complexity of this task, it is challenging for the encoder-based models to deal with the Text2MDT task in an end2end fashion. Thus, we mainly utilize the generative LMs for the end2end framework. Note that since this task is complex, it is natural that the idea of chain-of-thought (COT) Wei et al. (2022) could be beneficial for boosting the performances of the generative LMs. COT asks a generative LM to think step by step, either by itself (zero-shot COT), or to mimick the thinking steps of demonstrations (few-shot COT). In this task, we construction a series of different COT-style prompts and responses.

Thus, for the end2end framework, we consider the following variations:

- direct generation (Generation), in which a LM is asked to directly generate the entire MDT given the text inputs. The prompt and response templates are presented in the Appendix.
- COT-style generation. Due to the complexity of our Text2MDT task, one can consider the following variations⁶:

⁶See the Appendix for prompt and response templates for the series of generation methods.

- COT-Generation-1, which decompose the Text2MDT task exactly as the pipeline framework, and ask the LM to first generate the extracted triplets, then node grouping, and then tree assembly, in a single generation run before generating the end-of-sentence token.
- COT-Generation-2 decompose the task into more fine-grained subtask. It asks the model to generate entities, triplets, node assignments, node roles, and finally the entire tree.
- COT-Generation-3 asks the LM to first extract triplets and then generate the whole MDT.
- COT-Generation-4 decompose the triplet extraction subtask by asking the LM to first extract entities, and then generate the triplets, and finally generate the whole MDT.

6. Experiments

6.1. Evaluation Metrics

6.1.1. Metrics for the triplet extraction subtask

As described in Section 5, the most fundamental step of Text2MDT is to extract triples from the given text documents. Following Zhu et al. (2023) and Zhu (2021a), we adopt the **triplet precision, recall and F1** scores as evaluation metrics. These metrics of triplet extraction are instance-level strict performance metrics. Here, an instance means a complete piece of information extracted from the given document. In our triplet extraction subtask, an instance consists of a head entity mention, a tail entity mention, and the relation label name between these two entities. And strict means that the model predicts an instance correctly if and only if it correctly predicts the all the components of the instance.

6.1.2. Metrics for the node grouping subtask

Following Wang and Cer (2012), we now define an edit distance based metric to evaluate how models perform in the node assignment task. According to Equation 1, one can express a predicted node N^{pred} to a tuple.

$$N^{pred} = (\text{Role}^{pred}, t_1^{pred}, \dots, t_{n_{tri}}^{pred}, \text{Logical_Rel}^{pred}). \quad (6)$$

Note that we treat each triplet in the same level with the node role label and the logical relation label. And denote a node in the ground truth as

$$N^{gt} = (\text{Role}^{gt}, t_1^{gt}, \dots, t_{n_{tri}}^{gt}, \text{Logical_Rel}^{gt}). \quad (7)$$

Treating each element in the N^{pred} and N^{gt} tuples as indivisible, one can calculate the edit distance between N^{pred} and N^{gt} . In this scenario, the editing operations include inserting and deleting elements, and each operation has a cost of 1. Now we concatenate all the nodes in the node grouping prediction into a single tuple NG_Tup^{pred} . Since we does not require the model to assign orders to each node in the node grouping step, we consider all the permutation m of nodes in the ground truth MDT^{gt} , and we concatenate the nodes in each permutation (denoted as $NG_Tup^{gt,m}$). And the edit distance between the whole node assignment prediction and the ground truth node assignment is defined as the minimum edit distance between the predicted node grouping and a permutation of the ground truth node grouping:

$$\begin{aligned} & NG_ED(NG_Tup^{pred}, MDT^{gt}) \\ &= \min_{m \in \text{Permute}(MDT^{gt})} ED(NG_Tup^{pred}, NG_Tup^{gt,m}), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $ED(x, y)$ denotes the edit distance between tuple x and tuple y . Since the edit distance score NG_ED is an un-normalized metric, it is in-suitable for model comparisons. Thus, we now define the Levenshtein ratio Navarro (2001) (denoted as NG_LR) for the node grouping subtask:

$$\begin{aligned} & NG_LR(NG_Tup^{pred}, MDT^{gt}) \\ &= \frac{NG_ED(NG_Tup^{pred}, MDT^{gt})}{\max(\text{len}(NG_Tup^{pred}), \text{len}(NG_Tup^{gt,m^*}))} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where len denotes the tuple length, and m^* is the MDT^{gt} 's permutation that obtains the lowest edit distance with the prediction:

$$m^* = \underset{m \in \text{Permute}(MDT^{gt})}{\text{argmin}} ED(NG_Tup^{pred}, NG_Tup^{gt,m}). \quad (10)$$

6.1.3. Metrics for the tree assembling subtask

To properly evaluate a model's performance in constructing medical decision trees from text, we adopt the following three evaluation metrics:

- The accuracy of decision tree extraction (TreeAcc). For this metric, the instance is the entire medical decision tree consisting of a series of nodes connected as a binary tree of a certain structure, and each node contains three components, logical relation, role and triplets. A decision tree predicted by a model is correct when it is precisely the same as the ground truth. Thus, this metric is a very strict metric.

- F1 score of decision paths (DP-F1). We define a decision path in a medical decision tree as a path from the root node to a leaf node. Thus, in DPF1, an instance is a decision path, and a model correctly predicts a decision path if and only if it correctly predicts all the nodes in the path and how they are connected.
- Lenvenshtein ratio of the decision tree (Tree_LR). Similar to the definition of edit ratio defined for the node grouping task, we can arrange the contents of all nodes in the predicted or ground-truth tree into a single tuple in the order of depth-first search (denoted as Tree_Tup^{pred} and Tree_Tup^{gt} , respectively), and treat each triple, node role label, node logical relation as indivisible elements. Thus Tree_LR is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Tree_LR}(\text{Tree_Tup}^{pred}, \text{Tree_Tup}^{gt}) \\ &= \frac{\text{ED}(\text{Tree_Tup}^{pred}, \text{Tree_Tup}^{gt})}{\max(\text{len}(\text{Tree_Tup}^{pred}), \text{len}(\text{Tree_Tup}^{gt}))}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

6.2. Implementation Details

Our code was implemented with Pytorch⁷ and Huggingface Transformers⁸. For pretrained encoder based methods, we use the pre-trained Chinese medical BERT (denoted as MedBERT) by Guo et al. (2021b) as the default backbone model. For ablation studies, we also consider the widely used BERT-wwm-ext⁹, Google BERT-base Chinese Devlin et al. (2019), and Erlangshen-ZEN1-224M-Chinese¹⁰. For the decoding module such as the biaffine module Dozat and Manning (2016) and Wang et al. (2021), we will use the original authors’ default configurations. We will fine-tune all the model parameters. Batch size is set to 8, warm-up steps is set to 50, the number of training epochs is set to 50, the learning rate is set to 2e-5 with a linear schedule, and the optimizer is AdamW Loshchilov and Hutter (2017). The other hyper-parameters like gradient clipping, Adam epsilon are kept the same with the Transformers repository.

For generative LMs, we consider a collection of well-known language models of different sizes. (a) GPT-2 Chinese¹¹. (b) Randeng-T5-784M¹². (c) BLOOMZ-

⁷<https://pytorch.org/>.

⁸<https://github.com/huggingface/transformers>.

⁹<https://huggingface.co/hfl/chinese-bert-wwm-ext>.

¹⁰<https://huggingface.co/IDEA-CCNL/Erlangshen-ZEN1-224M-Chinese>.

¹¹<https://huggingface.co/uer/gpt2-chinese-cluecorpussmall>

¹²<https://huggingface.co/IDEA-CCNL/Randeng-T5-784M-MultiTask-Chinese>

7.1B-mt¹³. (d) ChatGLM-6B-2. (e) ChatMed¹⁴, which is adapted from the LLaMA-7B backbone. (f) Chinese-LLaMA-2 7B/13B¹⁵, which are the Chinese version of LLaMA-2 models Touvron et al. (2023) from Meta. (g) Ziya-13B-medical¹⁶, which is also further pre-trained with the LLaMA-2 models. (h) Baichuan-2 7B/13B models Yang et al. (2023), which are one of the most recent open-sourced Chinese LLMs, and have achieved excellent performances in many evaluation benchmarks like Li et al. (2023a). Unless stated otherwise, We will use Baichuan-2 7B as the default generative LM. For generative LMs with parameters fewer than 500 millions, we fine-tune all the model parameters. For larger models, we will use LoRA Hu et al. (2021) with rank 24 to modify the query, key, value, and output matrix in the self-attention module, and the two matrices in the feed-forward module Zhu et al. (2023). The LoRA parameters are fine-tuned with learning rate 1e-4. The rest of the hyper-parameters are set the same with the encoder-based methods.

For each method, we validate the model performance on the dev set and choose the checkpoint with the best dev performance to predict on the test set. Each experiment is run for 5 times with different random seeds and the average scores are reported.

6.3. Datasets

The annotated Text2MDT dataset is open-sourced at <https://github.com/michael-wzhu/text2dt>. It is one of the evaluation dataset for The CHIP-2022 shared tasks Zhu et al. (2023a). And it is now a part of the CBLUE benchmark Zhang et al. (2022a) and PromptCBLUE Zhu et al. (2023) benchmark. The original Text2MDT has a 800:100:100 train/dev/test split. Since we are experimenting with different methods from the pipeline and end2end frameworks, we now need to construct different variations of the Text2MDT datasets.

6.3.1. Datasets for the pipeline framework

Since the pipeline framework has three subtasks, thus, we need to construct a different dataset for each subtask so that we can train an encoder-based model:

- Text2MDT-TE, the Text2MDT triplet extraction dataset, where the input is the medical text, and the target is the list of triplets in the structured format like JSON. This dataset has a 800:100:100 train/dev/test split.

¹³<https://huggingface.co/bigscience/bloomz-7b1-mt>

¹⁴<https://github.com/michael-wzhu/ChatMed>

¹⁵<https://github.com/michael-wzhu/Chinese-LLaMA2>

¹⁶<https://huggingface.co/shibing624/ziya-llama-13b-medical-lora>

- Text2MDT-NG, the Text2MDT node grouping dataset, where the input is the medical text and the list of triplets in text sequence concatenated together, and the output is the list of nodes in the structured format like JSON and each node contains a list of triplets and a logical relation label. For the Text2MDT-NG training set, we augment the original Text2MDT four times by shuffling the orders of triplets. Thus, this dataset has a 3200:100:100 train/dev/test split.
- Text2MDT-TA, the Text2MDT tree assembling dataset, where the input is the medical text and the list nodes in text sequence concatenated together, and the output is the list of MDT nodes in the structured format like JSON and each node contains a list of triplets, a logical relation label and a role label. For the Text2MDT-TA training set, we augment the original Text2MDT four times by shuffling the orders of nodes in the input. Thus, this dataset has a 3200:100:100 train/dev/test split.

For each of the above datasets, we will construct a prompt-based dataset for the generative LM methods, with the prompt and response templates in the the Appendix.

6.3.2. Datasets for the end2end framework

For each end2end method, we will construct the end2end dataset with the prompt and response templates in the the Appendix. So that each end2end dataset has a 800:100:100 train/dev/test split.

6.4. Competing Methods

6.4.1. Methods for the pipelined framework

For the triplet extraction tasks, we consider the following methods: (a) UNIRE Wang et al. (2021); (b) TPLinker Wang et al. (2020); (c) CasRel Wei et al. (2020); (d) Sep-Biaffine, which divide the triplet extraction sub-task into two tasks, entity extraction and relation classification, and use two BERT-biaffine models to handle each task; (e) direct generation (Generation); (f) generation in the COT fashion (COT-Generation), which is to ask the LMs to first detects the relations in the given medical text and then extract triplets. The prompts for COT-Generation is presented in the Appendix. The first four methods use encoder-based PLMs and the last two utilize the generation capabilities of generative LMs.

For the node grouping subtask, as discussed in Section 5, we could use the following methods: (a) the NG-biaffine method. (b) NG-TableFilling method,

which substitute the biaffine module (Equation 3) in the NG-biaffine method to the table-filling module in Wang et al. (2020) (Equation (1) of Wang et al. (2020)). (c) generation based method (Generation), which asks a generative LM to directly generate the node grouping results given the text input. (d) COT style generation (COT-Generation), which asks the generative LM to first cluster the triplets into groups, and then identify the logical relation of each node.

For the tree assembling subtask, we will use: (a) TreeAssemble-Biaffine method described in Section 5. (b) substituting the biaffine module of TreeAssemble to the the table-filling module of Wang et al. (2020) (Equation (1) of Wang et al. (2020)) results in the TreeAssemble-TableFilling method. (c) generation based method (Generation), which asks a generative LM to directly generate the medical decision tree given the text input. (d) COT style generation (COT-Generation), which asks the generative LM to first determine the role of each node, and then assemble the nodes to form a medical decision tree.

6.4.2. *Methods for the end2end framework*

Following Section 5, we consider the following end2end methods: (a) Generation; (b) four variations of COT-style generation, (b1) COT-Generation-1; (b2) COT-Generation-2; (b3) COT-Generation-3; (b4) COT-Generation-4.

6.5. *Main experimental results*

In this subsection, we will report the experimental results for each subtask of the pipeline framework, and the overall performance when making predictions with the whole pipeline. In this part of the experiments, for encoder-based methods, we utilize the MedBERT from Guo et al. (2021b) as the pre-trained backbone. For generation-based methods, we utilize the Baichuan-2 7B as the backbone model.

6.5.1. *Performances on each subtask*

The results of each subtask are reported in Table 3. From the results, we can see that: (1) Although two-magnitude smaller than the Baichuan-2 7B model in both parameters and complexity, the MedBERT (105 million parameters) based methods achieve competitive performances in all the subtasks, and only falls behind the COT-Generation method by 0.5% in F1 on the triplet extraction task, 0.6% in NG_LR on the node group task, and 1.0% in Tree_LR on the tree assembling task. The disadvantages of encoder-based methods are that they require different decoding architectures for obtaining the final predictions. (b) despite being heavy in model sizes, Baichuan-2 7B model achieves better performances than

Subtask Metric	Triplet extract			Node Grouping	Tree assembling		
	Prec	Rec	F1	NG_LR	TreeAcc	DP-F1	Tree_LR
<i>Encoder-based methods</i>							
UNIRE	0.913	0.881	0.896				
TPinker	0.909	0.878	0.893				
CasRel	0.882	0.891	0.886				
Sep-Biaffine	0.893	0.897	0.895				
NG-Biaffine				0.962			
NG-TableFilling				0.961			
TreeAssemble-Biaffine					0.735	0.841	0.937
TreeAssemble-TableFilling					0.741	0.838	0.933
<i>Generation-based methods</i>							
Generation	0.901	0.894	0.897	0.965	0.745	0.848	0.943
COT-Generation	0.898	0.904	0.901	0.968	0.748	0.852	0.947

Table 3: Results for each subtask of the pipeline framework, and the overall result of the Text2MDT task when applying the framework. The average results in five different runs are reported. The best results are in bold.

the encoder-based models on all the subtasks. The clear advantage of generative models is that they make predictions with the LM prediction head, so it does not require any additional architectural design for different subtasks. All we need to do is to formulate the task into prompt-response pairs. (c) Among the encoder-based methods, we can see that the biaffine based method, UNIRE, outperforms the Sep-Biaffine method, showing the advantage of unifying entity detection and relation classification into a unified space. (d) COT style generation helps the LLMs to achieve better performances on all three sub-tasks, showing that COT is also helpful under manually designed steps for task solving and fine-tuning. This observation is consistent with PromptCBLUE Zhu et al. (2023).

6.5.2. Performances on whole task

Now we consider the following combinations of methods for the complete pipelined predictions of test samples from a given medical text: (a) The encoder based pipeline method (denoted as Enc-Pipe). In Enc-Pipe, UNIRE is responsible for triplet extraction, NG-Biaffine for node grouping, and TreeAssemble-Biaffine for tree assembling. (b) COT-Generation for all the three subtasks (denoted as CGen-Pipe). These two approaches are compared with the five approaches of the end2end framework in Table 4.

From Table 4, we can see that: (a) the CGen-Pipe achieves better performances than the Enc-Pipe method, which is natural since COT-Generation performs better than the encoder based models on all three subtasks. (b) Interest-

Method	TreeAcc	DP-F1	Tree_ER
<i>Pipeline methods</i>			
Enc-Pipe	0.450	0.612	0.884
CGen-Pipe	0.470	0.631	0.897
<i>End2end methods</i>			
Generation	0.440	0.619	0.885
COT-Generation-1	0.470	0.628	0.894
COT-Generation-2	0.450	0.623	0.889
COT-Generation-3	0.490	0.632	0.898
COT-Generation-4	0.450	0.626	0.892

Table 4: Overall results of the pipeline framework and the end2end methods. The average results in five different runs are reported. The best results are in bold.

ingly, the pipelined method CGen-Pipe performs better than the direct Generation method, but does not perform better than COT-Generation-3. Intuitively, the pipelined method CGen-Pipe suffer from error propagation from different steps in the pipeline, thus, although the pipelined methods utilize more model parameters, it does not perform better than the end2end methods. (c) The COT style generation methods perform better than the direct Generation method, which is intuitively sound. Our Text2MDT task is a complex information extraction task containing multiple steps. The COT based generative methods injects priors on how the models should solve the task, thus it can be more informed to use the results of the previously generated contents for future tokens’ generation. (d) Intuitively, the generative LMs should benefit more from more detailed and fine-grained COT instructions. However, Table 4 shows that COT-Generation-3 performs the best. COT-Generation-3 asks the LLMs to first extract triples and then the MDTs, which has fewer thought steps than the other COT based generation methods. We believe that this is because triplet extraction and tree assembling are the two more challenging steps in the three subtasks, and COT-Generation-3 focus itself on these two subtasks during fine-tuning. And COT-Generation-3’s thought steps have relatively smaller response length, which is helpful for the LMs to keep track of the generation contents.

6.6. Discussions and further analysis

6.6.1. Impact of tree depth

In Table 1, we present the statistics of the Text2MDT datasets, showing that in our task, medical decision trees are of different depth. In table 5, we present

MDT depth	CGen-Pipe			COT-Generation-3		
	TreeAcc	DP-F1	Tree_ER	TreeAcc	DP-F1	Tree_ER
2	0.750	0.833	0.943	0.750	0.833	0.943
3	0.428	0.607	0.884	0.442	0.603	0.883
4	0.454	0.648	0.946	0.545	0.676	0.950

Table 5: Model performance on medical decision trees of different depths.

the results of CGen-Pipe, and COT-Generation-3 on different MDT depths. We can see that the two methods obtain the same performance metrics on the MDTs with depth 2. The performance difference between the end2end models and the pipeline methods mainly lie in MDTs with higher depth. And we can see that the performances on the MDTs with depth larger than 2 are significantly worse than those on the MDTs of depth 2. Intuitively, tree depth is a direct reflection of the complexity of treatment procedures for different diseases, and it is expected that test samples with deeper MDTs will present higher difficulty for the models, especially for the generation based models.

6.6.2. Impact of backbone models

We first examine how different backbone models affect the Enc-Pipe method. Our main experiments (Table 3 and 4) use the MedBERT Guo et al. (2021b) as the backbone. And now we consider the three alternative encoder backbones mentioned in Section 6.2. In the main experiments, we use the Baichuan-2 7B as the generative LM backbone in Table 4. Now we consider the nine generative LMs of different scales (presented in Section 6.2) for the COT-Generation-3 method. For the methods with size smaller than 1B, we will fine-tune all the parameters of the backbone. For the larger models, we will fine-tune them with the LoRA method Hu et al. (2021) (rank = 24). The other experimental settings are kept the same with Section 6.2.

Table 6 reports the experimental results for different backbone models, and the following observations can be made: (a) for the Enc-Pipe method, the in-domain pre-trained model, MedBERT performs the best among the four pre-trained encoders, showing that further pretraining on the large-scale medical corpus are beneficial for the Text2MDT task. This observation is in line with Zhu (2021b); Guo et al. (2021b); Zhu et al. (2023b). (b) For the generative LMs, models with small parameter sizes performs unsatisfying in our task. The small-scale generative LMs does not have enough language understanding and completion capa-

Backbone	TreeAcc	DP-F1	Tree_ER
<i>The Enc-Pipe method</i>			
MedBERT	0.450	0.612	0.884
BERT-www-ext	0.440	0.615	0.882
BERT-base Chinese	0.390	0.583	0.867
Erlangshen-ZEN1-224M	0.410	0.596	0.873
<i>The COT-Generation-3 method</i>			
GPT-2 base Chinese	0.030	0.121	0.238
Randeng-T5-784M	0.080	0.253	0.352
BLOOMZ-7.1B-mt	0.330	0.536	0.782
ChatGLM-6B-2	0.380	0.592	0.849
ChatMed	0.420	0.596	0.864
Chinese-LLaMA-2 7B	0.410	0.581	0.868
Chinese-LLaMA-2 13B	0.460	0.623	0.890
Ziya-13B-medical	0.450	0.614	0.886
Baichuan2 7B	0.490	0.632	0.898
Baichuan2 13B	0.490	0.628	0.896

Table 6: The effects of the pre-trained backbones on the Enc-Pipe and COT-Generation-3 methods.

bilities to face the challenges brought by this task. (c) Among the open-sourced generative LMs we experiment, the Baichuan2 models perform the best, which we believe results from their large-scale pretraining and complete instruction alignment pipeline.

6.6.3. Performance breakdown of the end2end framework

In Table 7, we present the performance breakdown of the test predictions by the best performing method in our main experiments, COT-Generation-3. As a comparison, we also present the performance scores of the CGen-Pipe method’s final test score on each sub-task. We present how these methods perform on each subtask. Note that with error propagation in the predicted samples, the scores on the node grouping and tree assembling tasks contain errors from the previous subtasks. From Table 7, we can see that: (a) although the CGen-Pipe method has advantages in the triplet extraction step, the COT-Generation-3 method performs better at the node grouping task, with its generated triplet results. Thus, these two methods already has almost the same score on the node grouping step. And at the tree assembling task, COT-Generation-3 outperforms CGen-Pipe at all three metrics.

Subtask	Metric	COT-Generation-3	CGen-Pipe
Triplet Extraction	Prec	0.894	0.897
	Rec	0.885	0.888
	F1	0.889	0.892
Node grouping	NG_LR	0.887	0.887
	TreeAcc	0.490	0.47
Tree assembling	DP-F1	0.632	0.631
	Tree_LR	0.898	0.897

Table 7: Performance breakdown of the end2end method , COT-Generation-3, and the generation based pipeline method, CGen-Pipe.

6.6.4. Case studies

On the test set of the Text2MDT task, COT-Generation-3 achieves the best performance. Figure 3 and 4 report two examples where COT-Generation-3 can not predict the same MDTs with the ground truth. In Figure 3, COT-Generation-3 misses the triplet (患者, 治疗药物, 缓解充血药) ((patient, treatment, decongestant)) in the second node, and the triplet (患者, 治疗药物, 退热药) ((patient, therapeutic drug, antipyretic drug)) in the fourth node, during prediction. These errors are mainly from the triplet extraction subtask, which is the first step of tackling MDTs. In Figure 4, COT-Generation-3 made an error in triplet extraction regarding the basic status of the patients, and as a result, made a mistake in node grouping.

6.7. Limitations

Our work is the first exploration of extracting MDTs from the medical texts, and our work is currently applicable to some simple scenarios, specifically: 1) The logic expression of nodes is limited. The triplets between nodes are only "and" and "or," while in more complex scenarios, there should be a combination of multiple logical relationships; 2) The expressiveness of the tree is limited. Our decision tree aborts after reaching a decision. The actual scenario should be a process of continuous judgment and decision-making. 3) The length of the text is limited. We only contend to extract one paragraph of medical text; in fact, much medical knowledge needs to be based on multiple sections or even chapters. We will improve it in our future work.




Figure 3: Example (a), an error case of the COT-Generation-3 method on the Text2MDT test samples.

7. Conclusion

In this study, we propose a novel task, Text2MDT, which aims to automatically extract medical decision trees from medical texts that are significant for intelligent medicine. We constructed the first Text-to-MDT dataset in the NLP community with medical experts’ participation. Since there are no existing neural network based methods that can directly deal with our novel tasks, we propose two cohorts of methods: (a) the pipeline based method, which decomposes the Text2MDT task into three subtasks and utilize the existing methods to complete the subtasks; (b) the end2end method, which is challenging and can not be handled by the encoder-based models. We utilize the recent open-sourced LLMs and chain-of-thought prompting for the end2end methods. Experiments show that: (a) the LLMs can achieve promising results on the Text2MDT benchmark in an end2end fashion. (b) the encoder-based pipeline methods can achieve comparable results with the LLMs while requiring less computations.

8. Declaration of generative AI in scientific writing

The authors of this paper hereby declare that no generative artificial intelligence (AI) systems were employed in the production, composition, or generation of the content presented in this scientific work. The manuscript’s creation did




Figure 4: Example (b), an error case of the COT-Generation-3 method on the Text2MDT test samples.

not involve the utilization of any generative AI tools or systems to produce text, develop ideas, or enhance the overall quality of the content.

The writing process and content refinement were conducted solely by human effort, with the primary aid of conventional writing and proofreading tools such as Grammarly for grammatical accuracy and language refinement purposes. The authors affirm that Grammarly was employed solely as an assistive tool for grammar and language checks and did not contribute to the conceptualization, generation, or development of the scientific ideas presented in this paper.

9. Author contributions

We now state the contributions of each author:

- Conceptualization: Wei Zhu, Wenfeng Li.
- Methodology: Wei Zhu, Wenfeng Li, Xing Tian, Pengfei Wang.
- Resources: Yuan Ni and Guotong Xie.
- Supervision: Xiaoling Wang, Yuan Ni and Guotong Xie.
- Validation: Xiaoling Wang, Yuan Ni and Guotong Xie.

- Writing - original draft: Wei Zhu, Wenfeng Li, Xing Tian, Pengfei Wang.
- Writing - review & editing: Xiaoling Wang, Jin Chen, Yuanbin Wu, Yuan Ni and Guotong Xie.

References

- Abraham, A., 2005. Rule-based expert systems. Handbook of measuring system design .
- Beeksmā, M., Verberne, S., van den Bosch, A., Das, E., Hendrickx, I., Groenewoud, S., 2019. Predicting life expectancy with a long short-term memory recurrent neural network using electronic medical records. BMC medical informatics and decision making 19, 1–15.
- CHENG, Y.f., WU, J.j., HE, F., 2023. Aspect level sentiment analysis based on relation gated graph convolutional network. Journal of ZheJiang University (Engineering Science) 57, 437–445.
- Cohen, J., 1960. A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. Educational and Psychological Measurement 20, 37–46. arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1177/001316446002000104>.
- Das, S.S.S., Katiyar, A., Passonneau, R., Zhang, R., 2022. CONTaiNER: Few-shot named entity recognition via contrastive learning, in: Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), Association for Computational Linguistics, Dublin, Ireland. pp. 6338–6353. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2022.acl-long.439>, doi:10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.439.
- Devlin, J., Chang, M.W., Lee, K., Toutanova, K., 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805 .
- Devlin, J., Chang, M.W., Lee, K., Toutanova, K., 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), Association for Computational Linguistics, Minneapolis, Minnesota. pp. 4171–4186. URL: <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/N19-1423>, doi:10.18653/v1/N19-1423.

- Dozat, T., Manning, C.D., 2016. Deep biaffine attention for neural dependency parsing. arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.01734 .
- Dozat, T., Manning, C.D., 2017. Deep biaffine attention for neural dependency parsing, in: 5th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2017, Toulon, France, April 24-26, 2017, Conference Track Proceedings, OpenReview.net. URL: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Hk95PK91e>.
- Fernandez Astudillo, R., Ballesteros, M., Naseem, T., Blodgett, A., Florian, R., 2020. Transition-based parsing with stack-transformers, in: Cohn, T., He, Y., Liu, Y. (Eds.), Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020, Association for Computational Linguistics, Online. pp. 1001–1007. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2020.findings-emnlp.89>, doi:10.18653/v1/2020.findings-emnlp.89.
- Fotiadis, D., Goletsis, Y., Likas, A., Papadopoulos, A., 2006. Clinical decision support systems. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. .
- Gao, X., Zhu, W., Gao, J., Yin, C., 2023. F-pabee: Flexible-patience-based early exiting for single-label and multi-label text classification tasks. ArXiv abs/2305.11916. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:258546016>.
- Gu, Y., Tinn, R., Cheng, H., Lucas, M., Usuyama, N., Liu, X., Naumann, T., Gao, J., Poon, H., 2020. Domain-specific language model pretraining for biomedical natural language processing. arXiv:arXiv:2007.15779.
- Guo, Z., Ni, Y., Wang, K., Zhu, W., Xie, G., 2021a. Global attention decoder for chinese spelling error correction, in: Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021, pp. 1419–1428.
- Guo, Z., Ni, Y., Wang, K., Zhu, W., Xie, G., 2021b. Global attention decoder for Chinese spelling error correction, in: Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021, Association for Computational Linguistics, Online. pp. 1419–1428. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2021.findings-acl.122>, doi:10.18653/v1/2021.findings-acl.122.

- Hahn, U., Oleynik, M., 2020. Medical information extraction in the age of deep learning. *Yearbook of medical informatics* 29, 208–220.
- Hsu, I.H., Huang, K.H., Boschee, E., Miller, S., Natarajan, P., Chang, K.W., Peng, N., 2022. Degree: A data-efficient generation-based event extraction model, in: *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pp. 1890–1908.
- Hu, E.J., Shen, Y., Wallis, P., Allen-Zhu, Z., Li, Y., Wang, S., Wang, L., Chen, W., 2021. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685* .
- Hughes, M., Li, I., Kotoulas, S., Suzumura, T., 2017. Medical text classification using convolutional neural networks, in: *Informatics for Health: Connected Citizen-Led Wellness and Population Health*. IOS Press, pp. 246–250.
- IoannisVourgidis, ShadreckJosephMafuma, PaulWilson, JennyCarter, Georgina-Cosma, 2018. *Medical expert systems – a study of trust and acceptance by healthcare stakeholders*. Springer, Cham .
- Jiang, T., Zhao, T., Qin, B., Liu, T., Chawla, N.V., Jiang, M., 2019. The role of: A novel scientific knowledge graph representation and construction model, in: Teredesai, A., Kumar, V., Li, Y., Rosales, R., Terzi, E., Karypis, G. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining, KDD 2019, Anchorage, AK, USA, August 4-8, 2019, ACM*. pp. 1634–1642. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3292500.3330942>, doi:10.1145/3292500.3330942.
- Kamath, A., Das, R., 2018. A survey on semantic parsing. *ArXiv abs/1812.00978*. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:54181011>.
- Landolsi, M.Y., Hlaoua, L., Ben Romdhane, L., 2023. Information extraction from electronic medical documents: state of the art and future research directions. *Knowledge and Information Systems* 65, 463–516.
- Lewis, M., Liu, Y., Goyal, N., Ghazvininejad, M., Mohamed, A., Levy, O., Stoyanov, V., Zettlemoyer, L., 2019. Bart: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension, in: *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.

- Li, B., Yu, D., Ye, W., Zhang, J., Zhang, S., 2022. Sequence generation with label augmentation for relation extraction. arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.14266 .
- Li, H., Zhang, Y., Koto, F., Yang, Y., Zhao, H., Gong, Y., Duan, N., Baldwin, T., 2023a. Cmmlu: Measuring massive multitask language understanding in chinese. arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.09212 .
- Li, Y., Qian, B., Zhang, X., Liu, H., 2020. Graph neural network-based diagnosis prediction. *Big Data* 8, 379–390.
- Li, Z., Chen, M., Yin, K., Tong, Y., Tan, C., Lang, Z., Tang, B., 2023b. Chip2022 shared task overview: Medical causal entity relationship extraction, in: Tang, B., Chen, Q., Lin, H., Wu, F., Liu, L., Hao, T., Wang, Y., Wang, H., Lei, J., Li, Z., Zong, H. (Eds.), *Health Information Processing. Evaluation Track Papers*, Springer Nature Singapore, Singapore. pp. 51–56.
- Loshchilov, I., Hutter, F., 2017. Fixing weight decay regularization in adam. ArXiv abs/1711.05101. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:3312944>.
- Lu, Y., Liu, Q., Dai, D., Xiao, X., Lin, H., Han, X., Sun, L., Wu, H., 2022. Unified structure generation for universal information extraction, in: *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Association for Computational Linguistics, Dublin, Ireland. pp. 5755–5772. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2022.acl-long.395>, doi:10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.395.
- Machado, A., Maran, V., Augustin, I., Wives, L.K., de Oliveira, J.P.M., 2017. Reactive, proactive, and extensible situation-awareness in ambient assisted living. *Expert Systems with Applications* 76, 21–35.
- Navarro, G., 2001. A guided tour to approximate string matching. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 33, 31–88. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:207551224>.
- Nohria, R., 2015. Article: Medical expert system- a comprehensive review. *International Journal of Computer Applications* 130, 44–50. Published by Foundation of Computer Science (FCS), NY, USA.

- Pei, W., Ge, T., Chang, B., 2015. An effective neural network model for graph-based dependency parsing, in: Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:2102270>.
- Saibene, A., Assale, M., Giltri, M., 2021. Expert systems: Definitions, advantages and issues in medical field applications. *Expert Systems with Applications* 177, 114900.
- Socher, R., Lin, C.C.Y., Ng, A., Manning, C.D., 2011. Parsing natural scenes and natural language with recursive neural networks, in: International Conference on Machine Learning. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:18690358>.
- Sun, H., Xiao, J., Zhu, W., He, Y., Zhang, S., Xu, X., Hou, L., Li, J., Ni, Y., Xie, G., 2020. Medical knowledge graph to enhance fraud, waste, and abuse detection on claim data: Model development and performance evaluation. *JMIR Med Inform* 8, e17653. URL: <http://medinform.jmir.org/2020/7/e17653/>, doi:10.2196/17653.
- Sutton, C., McCallum, A., 2010. An introduction to conditional random fields. *Found. Trends Mach. Learn.* 4, 267–373. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:342976>.
- Touvron, H., Martin, L., Stone, K.R., Albert, P., Almahairi, A., Babaei, Y., Bashlykov, N., Batra, S., Bhargava, P., Bhosale, S., Bikel, D.M., Blecher, L., Ferrer, C.C., Chen, M., Cucurull, G., Esiobu, D., Fernandes, J., Fu, J., Fu, W., Fuller, B., Gao, C., Goswami, V., Goyal, N., Hartshorn, A.S., Hosseini, S., Hou, R., Inan, H., Kardaş, M., Kerkez, V., Khabsa, M., Kloumann, I.M., Korenev, A.V., Koura, P.S., Lachaux, M.A., Lavril, T., Lee, J., Liskovich, D., Lu, Y., Mao, Y., Martinet, X., Mihaylov, T., Mishra, P., Molybog, I., Nie, Y., Poulton, A., Reizenstein, J., Rungta, R., Saladi, K., Schelten, A., Silva, R., Smith, E.M., Subramanian, R., Tan, X., Tang, B., Taylor, R., Williams, A., Kuan, J.X., Xu, P., Yan, Z., Zarov, I., Zhang, Y., Fan, A., Kambadur, M., Narang, S., Rodriguez, A., Stojnic, R., Edunov, S., Scialom, T., 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *ArXiv abs/2307.09288*. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:259950998>.
- Tsumoto, S., 1998. Automated extraction of medical expert system rules from clinical databases on rough set theory. *Inf. Sci.* 112, 67–84.

- Wang, L., Wang, Y., Cai, D., Zhang, D., Liu, X., 2018. Translating math word problem to expression tree, in: Riloff, E., Chiang, D., Hockenmaier, J., Tsujii, J. (Eds.), Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Brussels, Belgium, October 31 - November 4, 2018, Association for Computational Linguistics. pp. 1064–1069. URL: <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/d18-1132>, doi:10.18653/v1/d18-1132.
- Wang, M., Cer, D., 2012. Stanford: Probabilistic edit distance metrics for STS, in: Agirre, E., Bos, J., Diab, M., Manandhar, S., Marton, Y., Yuret, D. (Eds.), *SEM 2012: The First Joint Conference on Lexical and Computational Semantics – Volume 1: Proceedings of the main conference and the shared task, and Volume 2: Proceedings of the Sixth International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval 2012), Association for Computational Linguistics, Montréal, Canada. pp. 648–654. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/S12-1096>.
- Wang, Y., Sun, C., Wu, Y., Zhou, H., Li, L., Yan, J., 2021. Unire: A unified label space for entity relation extraction, in: Zong, C., Xia, F., Li, W., Navigli, R. (Eds.), Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, ACL/IJCNLP 2021, (Volume 1: Long Papers), Virtual Event, August 1-6, 2021, Association for Computational Linguistics. pp. 220–231. URL: <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.acl-long.19>, doi:10.18653/v1/2021.acl-long.19.
- Wang, Y., Yu, B., Zhang, Y., Liu, T., Sun, L., 2020. Tplinker: Single-stage joint extraction of entities and relations through token pair linking. Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics .
- Wei, J., Wang, X., Schuurmans, D., Bosma, M., hsin Chi, E.H., Xia, F., Le, Q., Zhou, D., 2022. Chain of thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. ArXiv abs/2201.11903. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:246411621>.
- Wei, Z., Su, J., Wang, Y., Tian, Y., Chang, Y., 2020. A novel cascade binary tagging framework for relational triple extraction, in: Jurafsky, D., Chai, J., Schluter, N., Tetreault, J.R. (Eds.), Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2020, Online, July 5-10, 2020, Association for Computational Linguistics. pp. 1476–1488. URL: <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.136>, doi:10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.136.

- Xie, Z., Sun, S., 2019. A goal-driven tree-structured neural model for math word problems, in: Kraus, S. (Ed.), Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2019, Macao, China, August 10-16, 2019, ijcai.org. pp. 5299–5305. URL: <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2019/736>, doi:10.24963/ijcai.2019/736.
- Yan, H., Gui, T., Dai, J., Guo, Q., Zhang, Z., Qiu, X., 2021a. A unified generative framework for various ner subtasks. ArXiv abs/2106.01223. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:235294002>.
- Yan, H., Gui, T., Dai, J., Guo, Q., Zhang, Z., Qiu, X., 2021b. A unified generative framework for various NER subtasks, in: Zong, C., Xia, F., Li, W., Navigli, R. (Eds.), 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), Association for Computational Linguistics, Online. pp. 5808–5822. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2021.acl-long.451>, doi:10.18653/v1/2021.acl-long.451.
- Yang, A.M., Xiao, B., Wang, B., Zhang, B., Bian, C., Yin, C., Lv, C., Pan, D., Wang, D., Yan, D., Yang, F., Deng, F., Wang, F., Liu, F., Ai, G., Dong, G., Zhao, H., Xu, H., Sun, H.L., Zhang, H., Liu, H., Ji, J., Xie, J., Dai, J., Fang, K., Su, L., Song, L., Liu, L., Ru, L., Ma, L., Wang, M., Liu, M., Lin, M., Nie, N., Guo, P., Sun, R., Tao, Z., Li, T., Li, T., Cheng, W., Chen, W., Zeng, X., Wang, X., Chen, X., Men, X., Yu, X., Pan, X., Shen, Y.B., Wang, Y., Li, Y., Jiang, Y., Gao, Y., Zhang, Y., Zhou, Z., Wu, Z., 2023. Baichuan 2: Open large-scale language models. ArXiv abs/2309.10305. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:261951743>.
- Yang, Y., Wu, Z., Yang, Y., Lian, S., Guo, F., Wang, Z., 2022. A survey of information extraction based on deep learning. Applied Sciences 12, 9691.
- Yu, J., Bohnet, B., Poesio, M., 2020. Named entity recognition as dependency parsing, in: Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, Association for Computational Linguistics, Online. pp. 6470–6476. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2020.acl-main.577>, doi:10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.577.
- Yu, T., Yasunaga, M., Yang, K., Zhang, R., Wang, D., Li, Z., Radev, D.R., 2018. Syntaxsqlnet: Syntax tree networks for complex and cross-domain text-to-sql

- task, in: Riloff, E., Chiang, D., Hockenmaier, J., Tsujii, J. (Eds.), Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Brussels, Belgium, October 31 - November 4, 2018, Association for Computational Linguistics. pp. 1653–1663. URL: <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/d18-1193>, doi:10.18653/v1/d18-1193.
- Zhang, M., 2020. A survey of syntactic-semantic parsing based on constituent and dependency structures. *Science China Technological Sciences* 63, 1898 – 1920. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:219956190>.
- Zhang, N., Chen, M., Bi, Z., Liang, X., Li, L., Shang, X., Yin, K., Tan, C., Xu, J., Huang, F., Si, L., Ni, Y., Xie, G., Sui, Z., Chang, B., Zong, H., Yuan, Z., Li, L., Yan, J., Zan, H., Zhang, K., Tang, B., Chen, Q., 2022a. CBLUE: A Chinese biomedical language understanding evaluation benchmark, in: Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), Association for Computational Linguistics, Dublin, Ireland. pp. 7888–7915. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2022.acl-long.544>, doi:10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.544.
- Zhang, S., Shen, Y., Tan, Z., Wu, Y., Lu, W., 2022b. De-bias for generative extraction in unified ner task, in: Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhang, S., Shen, Y., Tan, Z., Wu, Y., Lu, W., 2022c. De-bias for generative extraction in unified NER task, in: Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), Association for Computational Linguistics, Dublin, Ireland. pp. 808–818. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2022.acl-long.59>, doi:10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.59.
- Zhang, W., Shen, Y., Ma, Y., Cheng, X., Tan, Z., Nong, Q., Lu, W., 2022d. Multi-view reasoning: Consistent contrastive learning for math word problem, in: Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:253080836>.
- Zhang, X., Du, Y., Sun, W., Wan, X., 2016. Transition-based parsing for deep dependency structures. *Computational Linguistics* 42, 353–389. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/J16-3001>, doi:10.1162/COLI_a_00252.

- Zhang, X., Tan, M., Zhang, J., Zhu, W., 2023a. Nag-ner: a unified non-autoregressive generation framework for various ner tasks, in: Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:259370837>.
- Zhang, Y., Gao, X., Zhu, W., Wang, X., 2023b. Fastner: Speeding up inferences for named entity recognition tasks, in: International Conference on Advanced Data Mining and Applications. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:265214231>.
- Zhang, Z., Zhu, W., Yan, J., Gao, P., Xie, G., 2021. Automatic student network search for knowledge distillation. 2020 25th International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR) , 2446–2453.
- Zhao, W.X., Zhou, K., Li, J., Tang, T., Wang, X., Hou, Y., Min, Y., Zhang, B., Zhang, J., Dong, Z., Du, Y., Yang, C., Chen, Y., Chen, Z., Jiang, J., Ren, R., Li, Y., Tang, X., Liu, Z., Liu, P., Nie, J., rong Wen, J., 2023a. A survey of large language models. ArXiv abs/2303.18223. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:257900969>.
- Zhao, X., Xie, Y., Kawaguchi, K., He, J., Xie, Q., 2023b. Automatic model selection with large language models for reasoning, in: Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:258840882>.
- Zhong, V., Xiong, C., Socher, R., 2017. Seq2sql: Generating structured queries from natural language using reinforcement learning. CoRR abs/1709.00103. arXiv:1709.00103.
- Zhou, B., Yang, G., Shi, Z., Ma, S., 2021. Natural Language Processing for Smart Healthcare. arXiv e-prints , arXiv:2110.15803doi:10.48550/arXiv.2110.15803, arXiv:2110.15803.
- Zhou, X., Ni, Y., Xie, G.T., Zhu, W., Chen, C., Wang, T., Pan, Z.G., 2019. Analysis of the health information needs of diabetics in china. Studies in health technology and informatics 264, 487–491. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:201617388>.
- Zhu, W., 2021a. AutoRC: Improving BERT based relation classification models via architecture search, in: Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meet-

- ing of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing: Student Research Workshop, Association for Computational Linguistics, Online. pp. 33–43. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2021.acl-srw.4>, doi:10.18653/v1/2021.acl-srw.4.
- Zhu, W., 2021b. MVP-BERT: Multi-vocab pre-training for Chinese BERT, in: Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing: Student Research Workshop, Association for Computational Linguistics, Online. pp. 260–269. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2021.acl-srw.27>, doi:10.18653/v1/2021.acl-srw.27.
- Zhu, W., 2021c. Mvp-bert: Multi-vocab pre-training for chinese bert, in: Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:237331564>.
- Zhu, W., He, Y., Chai, L., Fan, Y., Ni, Y., Xie, G.T., Wang, X., 2021a. paht_nlp @ mediqqa 2021: Multi-grained query focused multi-answer summarization, in: Workshop on Biomedical Natural Language Processing. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:235097590>.
- Zhu, W., Li, W., Wang, X., Ji, W., Wu, Y., Chen, J., Chen, L., Tang, B., 2023a. Extracting decision trees from medical texts: An overview of the text2dt track in chip2022, in: Tang, B., Chen, Q., Lin, H., Wu, F., Liu, L., Hao, T., Wang, Y., Wang, H., Lei, J., Li, Z., Zong, H. (Eds.), Health Information Processing. Evaluation Track Papers, Springer Nature Singapore, Singapore. pp. 89–102.
- Zhu, W., Ni, Y., Wang, X., Xie, G., 2021b. Discovering better model architectures for medical query understanding, in: Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies: Industry Papers, Association for Computational Linguistics, Online. pp. 230–237. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2021.naacl-industry.29>, doi:10.18653/v1/2021.naacl-industry.29.
- Zhu, W., Qiu, X., Ni, Y., Xie, G., 2020. AutoRC: Improving BERT Based Relation Classification Models via Architecture Search. arXiv e-prints , arXiv:2009.10680doi:10.48550/arXiv.2009.10680, arXiv:2009.10680.

- Zhu, W., Tan, M., 2023. SPT: Learning to selectively insert prompts for better prompt tuning, in: Bouamor, H., Pino, J., Bali, K. (Eds.), Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Association for Computational Linguistics, Singapore. pp. 11862–11878. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.727>.
- Zhu, W., Wang, P., Wang, X., Ni, Y., Xie, G.T., 2023b. Acf: Aligned contrastive finetuning for language and vision tasks. ICASSP 2023 - 2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), 1–5URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:258533119>.
- Zhu, W., Wang, X., 2023. Chatmed: A chinese medical large language model. <https://github.com/michael-wzhu/ChatMed>.
- Zhu, W., Wang, X., Ni, Y., Xie, G., 2021c. Autotrans: Automating transformer design via reinforced architecture search, in: Wang, L., Feng, Y., Hong, Y., He, R. (Eds.), Natural Language Processing and Chinese Computing, Springer International Publishing, Cham. pp. 169–182.
- Zhu, W., Wang, X., Zheng, H., Chen, M., Tang, B., 2023. PromptCBLUE: A Chinese Prompt Tuning Benchmark for the Medical Domain. arXiv e-prints , arXiv:2310.14151doi:10.48550/arXiv.2310.14151, arXiv:2310.14151.
- Zhu, W., Zhou, X., Wang, K., Luo, X., Li, X., Ni, Y., Xie, G., 2019. PANLP at MEDIQA 2019: Pre-trained language models, transfer learning and knowledge distillation, in: Proceedings of the 18th BioNLP Workshop and Shared Task, Association for Computational Linguistics, Florence, Italy. pp. 380–388. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/W19-5040>, doi:10.18653/v1/W19-5040.