

DALL-M: Context-Aware Clinical Data Augmentation with LLMs

Chihcheng Hsieh^a, Catarina Moreira^{c,f,b}, Isabel Blanco Nobre^d, Sandra Costa Sousa^d, Chun Ouyang^a, Margot Brereton^b, Joaquim Jorge^{e,f}, Jacinto C. Nascimento^e

^a*School of Information Systems, Queensland University of Technology, 2 George Street, Brisbane, 4000, QLD, Australia*

^b*School of Computer Science, Queensland University of Technology, 2 George Street, Brisbane, 4000, QLD, Australia*

^c*Data Science Institute, University of Technology Sydney, 61 Broadway, Ultimo, Sydney, 2007, NSW, Australia*

^d*Imagiology Department, Grupo Lusiadas, Rua Abílio Mendes 12, Lisboa, 1500-458, Portugal*

^e*Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade de Lisboa, Av. Rovisco Pais 1, Lisboa, 1049-001, Portugal*

^f*INESC-ID, Av. Rovisco Pais 1, Lisboa, 1049-001, Portugal*

Abstract

X-ray images are vital in medical diagnostics, but their effectiveness is limited without clinical context. Radiologists often find chest X-rays insufficient for diagnosing underlying diseases, necessitating comprehensive clinical features and data integration. We present a novel framework to enhance the clinical context through augmentation techniques with clinical tabular data, thereby improving its applicability and reliability in AI medical diagnostics. To accomplish this, we introduce a pioneering approach to clinical data augmentation that employs large language models to generate patient contextual synthetic data. This methodology is crucial for training more robust deep learning models in healthcare. It preserves the integrity of real patient data while enriching the dataset with contextually relevant synthetic features, significantly enhancing model performance.

Our methodology, termed DALL-M, uses a three-phase feature generation process: (i) clinical context storage, (ii) expert query generation, and (iii) context-aware feature augmentation. DALL-M generates new, clinically relevant features by synthesizing chest X-ray images and reports. Applied to 799 cases using nine features from the MIMIC-IV dataset, it created an augmented set of 91 features. This is the first work to generate contextual values for patients' X-ray reports. Specifically, we provide (i) the capacity of LLMs to generate contextual synthetic values for *existing* clinical features and (ii) their ability to create *entirely new* clinically relevant features. Both processes are performed in the data augmentation stage.

Empirical validation with machine learning models, including Decision Trees, Random Forests, XGBoost, and TabNET, showed significant performance improvements. Incorporating augmented features increased the F1 score by 16.5% and Precision and Recall by approximately 25%. DALL-M addresses a critical gap in clinical data augmentation, offering a robust framework for generating contextually enriched datasets.

Keywords: Clinical Data Augmentation, Large Language Models, Human-Centered AI

1. Introduction

Data augmentation is a fundamental technique in deep learning designed to enhance the diversity and robustness of training datasets. In image processing, techniques such as translation, rotation, scaling, and flipping introduce new patterns and variations, helping models generalize to unseen data. Similarly, in natural language processing (NLP), methods like word masking, substitution, and reordering improve a model’s ability to capture contextual relationships. However, augmenting tabular data, particularly in clinical settings, presents unique challenges that conventional methods fail to adequately address.

Clinical tabular data is highly structured and context-sensitive. Each data point, such as patient demographics, medical conditions, or test results, forms part of a more extensive, interdependent system. Altering these features indiscriminately can result in clinical inconsistencies or even dangerous datasets. For instance, changes to patient characteristics, such as medical test results or age, can break the inherent clinical logic, leading to data that no longer reflects the underlying medical reality.

1.1. Research Gap

Traditional augmentation methods, such as random shuffling or noise injection, often disrupt the complex relationships between clinical features, undermining the predictive power of machine learning models. This is especially problematic in healthcare, where patient safety and diagnostic accuracy are paramount. Introducing noise into clinical metrics—like blood pressure or glucose levels—may simulate pathological conditions that do not exist, resulting in misleading patterns during model training. Such distortions pose significant risks, potentially leading to diagnostic errors or inappropriate treatment recommendations, directly affecting patient outcomes.

Despite the availability of large medical datasets such as the UK Biobank [1], clinical practice often involves working with smaller, less diverse datasets. The high cost of collecting and curating medical data exacerbates this issue, limiting many institutions’ ability to develop robust deep learning models. Deep learning thrives on vast amounts of diverse data, and when clinical datasets are limited in size or variety, the ability to train models effectively is hindered. These limitations highlight a critical gap in how we approach data augmentation for clinical tabular data.

There is an urgent need for novel data augmentation techniques that can preserve the integrity and context of clinical datasets while enabling advanced machine learning models, even in data-constrained environments.

1.2. Proposed Approach

To address these challenges, we propose a novel data augmentation framework that leverages the reasoning capabilities of Large Language Models (LLMs). While LLMs are traditionally applied in natural language tasks, their ability to infer patterns across

structured, heterogeneous data makes them promising candidates for clinical data augmentation. LLMs can be fine-tuned to understand domain-specific knowledge, enabling them to generate new data points that are logically consistent with existing clinical information.

In this context, we define "inferable" features as those that maintain the relationships between clinical variables, adhering to established medical knowledge and logic. For example, an LLM trained on clinical data can infer additional symptoms or disease progressions that align with a patient's existing conditions, generating new features that respect clinical constraints. However, fine-tuning LLMs for clinical tasks is challenging: the computational demands, potential biases inherited from pre-trained models, and the costs of frequent updates present significant obstacles.

Our approach mitigates these concerns by anchoring the LLM outputs to trusted clinical sources (such as Radiopedia) and rigorously validating the generated data through a classification task and expert reviews. This ensures that the augmented data is clinically valid and useful for downstream machine learning applications.

1.3. Contributions

This paper addresses the key research question: *How can Large Language Models effectively augment clinical datasets with inferable, contextually relevant features while preserving clinical integrity?* We answer this by introducing a novel framework for structured data augmentation, named DALL-M, which generates clinically coherent features through a three-phase process: clinical context storage, expert query generation, and context-aware feature augmentation.

Our contributions are as follows:

1. **Novel framework for contextually relevant augmentation (DALL-M):** We introduce a framework that leverages LLMs to generate new clinical features, overcoming the limitations of traditional methods such as random shuffling or noise injection. Unlike these conventional methods, DALL-M ensures that the newly generated features are logically consistent with existing clinical data, maintaining data integrity.
2. **Empirical validation of LLM-generated values for clinical features:** We present empirical evidence that DALL-M can generate clinically relevant and contextually accurate values for existing clinical features using LLMs. This validation shows that LLMs can synthesize patient-specific values that are statistically similar to real clinical data, thereby preserving the integrity and trustworthiness of the augmented dataset. By comparing LLM-generated values to ground-truth clinical measurements, we demonstrate that DALL-M outperforms traditional augmentation methods, which often introduce unrealistic or clinically inconsistent patterns.
3. **Integration of LLM-augmented datasets with machine learning models:** We demonstrate how DALL-M enhances the performance of various machine learning models, including Decision Trees, Random Forests, XGBoost, and TabNET. By showing how contextually augmented features improve model robustness and accuracy, we address the challenge of applying deep learning to limited clinical data.

4. **Anchoring to trusted clinical sources:** To mitigate the risk of hallucinations—where models generate fabricated or inaccurate clinical data—we anchor the LLM to trusted sources like Radiopaedia. This ensures the generated features are grounded in verified medical knowledge, safeguarding the clinical validity of the augmented data.

Our approach enhances model performance while preserving patient-centric data relationships by ensuring that the LLM-augmented clinical features are inferable, contextually relevant, and grounded in clinical logic. This method bridges the gap between limited clinical data and the need for robust machine learning models, offering a reliable, scalable solution for clinical data augmentation.

2. Related work

Medical Large Language Models (Med-LLMs) can serve as reliable tools in clinical workflows by offering (i) improved understanding of medical knowledge, (ii) enhanced diagnostic accuracy, and (iii) personalized treatment recommendations. These capabilities contribute to more precise decision-making, better patient care, and improved treatment outcomes. In healthcare, numerous Med-LLMs, such as ChiMed-GPT [32], MedicalGPT [26], HuatuoGPT-II [9], or ChatMed [42], have gained significant attention in healthcare and biomedical research. Existing studies can be categorized into two main areas [23]: (i) current Med-LLMs in the medical field and (ii) their role in supporting effective clinical and patient treatment.

Regarding (i), a notable group of existing Med-LLM methodologies is worth highlighting, and we now provide a summary of their background. *HuatuoGPT* [9] utilizes reinforcement learning to align LLMs with distilled and real-world data. *ClinicalT5* [24] focuses on leveraging general LLMs for the specialized nature of clinical text. Towards this, the model is pre-trained using the span-mask denoising objective on a large corpus of clinical notes from the MIMIC-III database. *ClinicalGPT* [34] integrates diverse information sources, including medical records, domain-specific knowledge, and multi-round dialogue consultations. *ChiMed-GPT* [32], built on Ziya-13B-v2, a general-domain Chinese LLM, employs a comprehensive training approach to capture domain-specific knowledge and align with human preferences. *BioGPT* [25], specifically designed for biomedical text generation, draws inspiration from GPT-based models and aims to enhance generation capabilities in biomedical language models, which often focus on BERT-based architectures. *PubMedBERT* [15] is pre-trained from scratch on a large corpus of biomedical text, exclusively using in-domain data. This enables a more accurate understanding of the nuances and complexity of biomedical language. *GatorTron* [41] is specifically developed to extract patient characteristics from electronic health records (EHRs) and respond to medical queries. Through PaLM refinement, *Med-PaLM* [29] improves the application of Med-LLMs, by showing promising prospects in the MultiMedQA benchmark tests and highlighting areas that need improvement to meet healthcare standards. *MedAlpaca* [16] significantly boosts model performance by fine-tuning the open-source LLaMa model with

specialized training datasets. MedAlpaca aims to advance research in medical imaging, ultimately contributing to patient care and medical research progress. *LLaVA-Med* [21] demonstrates effectiveness in medical image analysis, enabling to interpret visual medical data within a contextual framework. Specifically, using X-rays and CT scans, can cause pathological conditions in the patients. This Med-LLM is equipped with multimodal dialogue capabilities employing cost-effective learning strategies.

From the above, it is clear that the range of applications for LLMs is broad. Nevertheless, in this paper, we propose utilizing Med-LLMs in a novel and distinct context. To our knowledge, Med-LLMs have not yet been applied to augment clinical features in the manner we present here

Concerning the second point in (ii) above, related literature falls into four categories:

1. *Medical Corpus* which focus on a collection of rich high-quality medical data from clinical scenarios [22, 8],
2. *Medical-specific methodologies* where the learning optimization is the central aspect, and where the adaptation LLMs is used to improve its capacity for understanding medical language and context awareness. Examples of this class include structured medical knowledge graphs [40] to enhance Med-LLMs' clinical reasoning ability, and Chain-of-Thought [36] to improve suggestions reliability,
3. *Clinical Role* tailored to address on the practical applications of Med-LLMs across various settings [38, 35], and
4. *Ethics* which focuses on developing regulatory guidelines [39], necessary to guarantee personal health information protection.

Building on the points above, our approach does not depend on the dataset's richness (see (1)). Additionally, we do not modify the LLMs through pre-training or fine-tuning (see (2)). Although our proposal does not address ethical concerns as in (4), it aligned with (3), as we focus on the practical applications of Med-LLMs (*i.e.*, application to the diagnosis in X-ray images). However, we achieve this in a novel way: *we use Med-LMMs to promote knowledge generating new clinical features through tabular data augmentation*. Indeed, some previous works testify to the usefulness of LMMs to model tabular data, *e.g.* Generation of REAListic Tabular Data (GREAT) [7], high-fidelity Synthetic electronic health records (HALO) [30], and inferring tabular features from textual medical reports TEMED-LLM [6]. Following [7, 30], we also argue that LLMs are realistic at generating clinical features. However, we tackle the problem differently. Specifically, we address a question that has yet to be answered: *How to precisely perform a clinical realistic "data augmentation" with tabular data?* Building on this idea, we introduce a new methodology to tackle this challenge, specifically augmenting knowledge by inferring additional and "new" clinical features.

Our approach included working with domain experts to assess the significance of features, emphasizing the framework's capacity to produce clinically relevant features. This innovative framework has the potential to transform clinical data integration in medical diagnostics using ML techniques and LLMs

3. DALL-M: Data Augmentation with LLMs

The proposed framework, DALL-M, aims to enhance clinical datasets by generating new, contextually relevant features using LLMs. The framework consists of three key stages: (1) Clinical Context Extraction and Storage, (2) Expert Input Queries and Prompt Generation, and (3) Context-Aware Feature Augmentation. Together, these stages form a comprehensive data augmentation workflow, ranging from the extraction of clinical context to the generation of enhanced features, all while leveraging the analytical capabilities of LLMs. These stages are illustrated in Figure 1. The following sections provide detailed descriptions of each phase.




Figure 1: Overview of the DALL-M framework for generating clinically relevant features using Large Language Models. The process consists of three main phases: (I) *Clinical Context Extraction and Storage*, where patient-specific contexts and clinical relationships are captured and stored; (II) *Expert Input Queries and Prompt Generation*, where medical experts provide contextual queries to guide the LLM; and (III) *Context-Aware Feature Augmentation*, where new features are generated in alignment with the clinical context, ensuring that the augmented data remains consistent and clinically valid.

3.1. Phase I: Clinical Context Extraction and Storage

The primary objective of this phase is the extraction and structured storage of clinically relevant context and patient-specific medical history. Beginning with a particular patient case, the pipeline systematically builds a comprehensive knowledge repository that encapsulates detailed clinical information about the patient’s conditions. In this context, “conditions” refer specifically to lesions identified via ground truth labels from the RE-FLACX dataset [5], a well-established radiological dataset that provides expert-annotated lesion labels as a foundation for subsequent knowledge extraction.

The process begins by leveraging these lesion labels to query two authoritative and distinct online resources: Radiopaedia [28] and Wikipedia [37]. Radiopaedia, a leading online platform dedicated to radiology, provides a robust collection of peer-reviewed radiological cases, detailed articles, and reference materials, all aimed at enhancing clinical knowledge and decision-making in radiology. Wikipedia, on the other hand, is a vast, freely accessible encyclopedia that covers a wide range of topics, offering a more general contextual understanding that can complement specialized medical knowledge. Both resources are queried to establish a broad and detailed clinical foundation for each patient case, ensuring coverage of both domain-specific and general knowledge relevant to the identified lesions.

We employ the Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG) framework to systematically process and organise this information. RAG is a hybrid methodology that integrates traditional information retrieval techniques with the generative power of LLMs. The framework comprises two components: a retriever model and a generator model. The retriever model is responsible for identifying and extracting relevant documents from external sources (in this case, Radiopaedia and Wikipedia) based on the lesion labels. These documents are then passed to the generator model, which processes the retrieved information and generates semantically coherent, contextually enriched text that aligns with the clinical requirements of the task. The integration of real-time information retrieval with LLMs ensures that the generated responses are not only accurate but also context-aware, providing a comprehensive clinical picture tailored to the patient’s case.

The output of the RAG process is then stored in a structured format to enable efficient querying and retrieval. After evaluating multiple database architectures, including relational and graph-based models, we determined that Neo4j (specifically utilizing its vector index capabilities) provides optimal performance for this task. Neo4j, a native graph database, is well-suited for capturing complex relationships between clinical entities, such as lesions, symptoms, and patient characteristics. The addition of vector indexing enhances this by enabling efficient similarity-based retrieval, ensuring semantically related information is easily accessible for subsequent phases. This configuration was meticulously applied to each of the five lesion labels extracted from the REFLACX dataset, yielding a domain-specific clinical knowledge graph that stores relevant clinical context and ensures rapid and accurate retrieval for downstream analysis.

To summarize, Phase I takes a specific clinical query (e.g., “pleural effusion”), retrieves the primary documents related to that query from Radiopaedia and Wikipedia and stores them in a database. This structured storage provides a strong foundation for clinical knowledge that will be used in later stages for data augmentation and feature generation.

3.2. Phase II: Expert Input Queries and Prompt Generation

After having the database populated with documents related to the user query, Phase II generates clinically relevant, contextually rich domain knowledge that mirrors radiologists’ diagnostic process when assessing X-rays. To systematically capture this domain knowledge, we conducted structured interviews with expert radiologists to understand the critical clinical questions that arise during their diagnostic workflow when they are

presented with an X-Ray. They aimed to distil their expertise into focused queries guiding subsequent data augmentation and feature generation.

Expert Queries

Through these interviews, we developed a set of essential questions covering various clinical dimensions, including symptomatology, observational analysis, physical examination, laboratory findings, and patient demographics. These questions form a structured framework to guide data retrieval and augmentation, ensuring the clinical insights generated are comprehensive and aligned with radiological best practices:

General Clinical Domain Knowledge:

- *What are the most common symptoms associated with {lesion}?*
- *What are the potential causes of {lesion}?*

These questions help establish a broad understanding of the lesion, providing a general clinical overview that can be applied across various cases. A lesion in this context is an abnormality found in the x-ray, for instance, a lung nodule.

Observational Analysis:

- *What are the patient's symptoms that are relevant for {lesion}?*

This ensures that the patient's subjective experience is integrated into the clinical assessment, enriching the context of the diagnosis.

Physical Examination and Imaging:

- *What are the relevant clinical signs for the etiological diagnosis of {lesion}?*
- *What are the relevant clinical characteristics for the etiological diagnosis of {lesion}?*

These queries capture the objective clinical observations and imaging findings that radiologists rely on to characterize and diagnose a lesion.

Laboratory Data:

- *What are the relevant laboratory data for the etiological diagnosis of {lesion}?*

These questions allow for integrating laboratory results and additional imaging tests into the diagnostic process.

Patient Characteristics:

- *What is the patient's personal, relevant history for the etiological diagnosis of {lesion}?*

These questions contextualize the clinical findings within the patient’s broader medical history and demographic profile.

By integrating these specific questions into the framework, we ensure that each patient’s condition is examined holistically, covering both clinical observations and individual factors, thus providing a strong basis for subsequent data augmentation and feature generation phases.

Prompt Generation and Clinical Information Retrieval

Given these structured questions, the next step is to construct prompts that effectively query the contextual clinical database built in Phase I. Each question is translated into a prompt designed to elicit detailed responses from the LLMs through the RAG approach.

To achieve this, we apply a RAG process in the same two-step approach outlined in Phase I, wherein the retriever model identifies the most relevant documents from the domain-specific vector database, and the generator model synthesizes contextually enriched responses from the retrieved material. This approach ensures the generated outputs are grounded in authoritative clinical knowledge, tailored to the patient’s specific case, and aligned with expert radiological practices.

The output of this phase is an Augmented Clinical Knowledge (ACK) corpus, a curated collection of clinical insights that corresponds to the answers to the expert queries. The ACK captures information about the patient’s condition, including detailed explanations of the lesions, potential symptoms, and patient-specific factors (such as comorbidities or risk factors like obesity) that could influence the presentation of the lesion. This corpus enriches the clinical context for each patient case and provides critical input for the next phase, where new clinical features will be generated based on this augmented knowledge. This ensures that the subsequent data augmentation and feature generation processes are clinically meaningful and grounded in real-world radiological expertise.

3.3. Phase III: Context-Aware Feature Augmentation

The primary objectives of this phase are twofold: (1) to identify and generate new clinically relevant features and (2) to assign meaningful values to these newly identified features. This process builds on the Augmented Clinical Knowledge corpus developed in Phase II, extracting novel clinical features that are contextually aligned with the patient’s condition. Extracting such features from unstructured textual data presents challenges, even with advanced techniques like named entity recognition, as medical text often includes nuanced and domain-specific terminology that is difficult to capture in its entirety.

To address these challenges, we leverage LLMs equipped with few-shot learning capabilities, allowing them to identify relevant features even with minimal labelled examples. The LLM can discern m distinct features by examining the documents generated in Phase II, each feature representing a clinically important aspect of the patient’s condition. These features are not merely repetitions of existing variables but represent new data dimensions that provide deeper insights into the patient’s health status.

However, the mere identification of relevant clinical features is insufficient for a comprehensive augmentation of the clinical dataset. Each feature must be populated with corresponding values to ensure its practical utility. To achieve this, we revisit the RAG framework, crafting prompts that utilize multiple critical sources of information:

1. **Prior contextual knowledge** derived from the ACK corpus in Phase II provides a comprehensive understanding of the patient’s condition.
2. **Newly identified clinical features**, ensuring that the values generated directly relate to the novel attributes extracted in this phase.
3. **The domain knowledge database established in Phase I** serves as a reference for validated medical information related to the lesion and patient.
4. **The patient’s radiology report and demographic details** offer personalized data for generating patient-specific feature values.

By integrating these four sources of information, we generate precise and contextually relevant values for the newly identified features. For example, if a new feature related to lesion morphology is identified, values would be generated based on both the clinical descriptions in the radiology report and the broader domain knowledge available in the ACK corpus.

When processed by the LLM within the RAG framework, these prompts return a comprehensive list of features and their corresponding values. These results are then integrated into the original clinical dataset, culminating in an enriched and context-aware augmented dataset. This enriched dataset not only contains new clinically relevant features but also ensures that each feature is accompanied by accurate, personalized values, enhancing the dataset’s utility for subsequent analyses or predictive modeling.

```

System Prompt: You are an experienced radiologist with more than 30 years of experience. You are the
                most respected radiologist in the world. You are examining a patient with the following report:

<Patient’s Radiology Report>

=====

According to your prior knowledge:

<Augmented Clinical Knowledge Output>

=====

User Prompt: Make a prediction based on your prior knowledge and on the patient’s report. Please
              check if your prediction is in accordance with your prior knowledge. Ensure your answers are
              using the following template.
<new feature 1>: {True / False}, because...
<new feature 2>: {True / False}, because...
...
<new feature n>: {True / False}, because...

```

Figure 2: General template of the prompt used in the Synthetic Clinical Feature Value Generation Module with n new features generated by the Augmented Clinical Knowledge Module. For a concrete example, please refer to Appendix Figure A.6.

Figure 2 presents the general structure of our prompt formulation process and the methodology for assigning values. For more details, please refer to Appendix Figure A.6, where we outline how each component of the prompt interacts with the available data sources to yield high-quality, contextually appropriate results.

4. Experimental Setup

This section details the experimental setup used to evaluate the effectiveness of the DALL-M framework. We describe the datasets utilized, the clinical features selected for evaluation, and the specific hypotheses tested through a series of experiments.

4.1. Dataset

In this work, we utilize instances from the MIMIC-IV dataset [20], comprising radiographs, radiology reports from chest X-rays, and clinical data. We gathered 799 patient cases from these datasets, with each instance accompanied by corresponding ground-truth information on clinical features, facilitating the evaluation of the generated synthetic data. The labels used for evaluation in Sect. 5.2 are extracted from the REFLACX dataset [5], annotated by five radiologists. In the dataset, we have the following clinical features: **(1) temperature** (in Fahrenheit degrees), **(2) heartrate** (beats rate per minute), **(3) resprate** (breaths rate per minute), **(4) o2sat** (peripheral oxygen saturation as a percentage), **(5) sbp, dbp** (systolic and diastolic blood pressure, respectively, measured in millimeters of mercury (mmHg)). Additionally, the dataset incorporates ground truth labels indicating the presence/absence of lesions within the chest X-ray images of patients. We selected five distinct lesions for consideration: *atelectasis*, *consolidation*, *enlarged cardiac silhouette*, *pleural effusion*, and *pleural abnormality*. The rationale behind selecting these specific lesions stem from their prevalence as the most frequently occurring conditions within the REFLACX dataset.

4.2. Experiments

This section outlines the set of experiments designed to evaluate the proposed DALL-M framework. These experiments aim to validate two key hypotheses central to the framework’s ability to generate both contextual values for *existing* features and extend its knowledge to create *new* clinically relevant features.

- **Hypothesis 1:** LLMs are capable of providing sufficient contextual information to generate accurate, patient-specific values for *existing* clinical features when provided with clinical patient reports.
- **Hypothesis 2:** LLMs can extend their knowledge to create entirely *new* clinically relevant features and their respective values, enhancing the original dataset.

To validate these hypotheses, we designed a series of experiments, each tailored to evaluate specific aspects of the LLMs’ capabilities.

Validating Hypothesis 1: Can LLMs Generate Contextual Values for Existing Features? (see Section 5.1)

The first hypothesis explores whether LLMs can effectively generate values for existing clinical features based on available patient data. To test this, we conducted an experiment where we compared LLM-generated values with those produced by traditional methods, specifically Gaussian-based permutation techniques. By comparing the outputs, we can assess whether LLMs are a reliable tool for generating patient-specific values that accurately reflect the clinical context.

Validating Hypothesis 2: Can LLMs Extend Their Knowledge to Generate New Features?

Once we validate that LLMs can generate accurate values for existing features, we move on to the second hypothesis, which explores whether LLMs can extend their knowledge to create new clinically relevant features and generate their values. This requires a more sophisticated experiment design, which we carried out in the following stages:

- **Stage 1: Analysing the Quality of Information Retrieval (see Section 5.2).** The first step in validating Hypothesis 2 involves understanding what data sources contribute to generating high-quality, contextually relevant information. To do this, we used data from two complementary sources: Wikipedia and Radiopaedia. Wikipedia provides a broad medical knowledge base, which is important for general clinical understanding. Radiopaedia offers specialized radiology-specific content, which adds depth to the medical context and enhances the LLM's ability to generate domain-specific knowledge. We tested which of these sources (Wikipedia, Radiopaedia or both) give the LLM access to a more comprehensive clinical knowledge base, allowing it to generate better answers for both general and specialized queries (see Phase I in Figure 1).
- **Stage 2: Generating Prompts for New Feature Generation (see Section 5.3).** After understanding which data sources lead to better information retrieval, the next step was to design prompts that guide the LLM in generating new clinical features. Based on a set of questions given to radiologists, these prompts are tailored to retrieve information from Radiopaedia and Wikipedia and to *extract novel features from the LLM answers*. This extends the LLM's understanding beyond existing features, allowing it to synthesize entirely new, contextually relevant features from the knowledge it has gained in Stage 1 (see Phase II in Figure 1).
- **Stage 3: Populating the Generated Features with new Feature Values (see Section 5.3).** After identifying new features, we used the RAG framework to generate accurate values for each feature using the contextual knowledge established in previous phases. The RAG framework first retrieves relevant information from the Augmented Clinical Knowledge corpus, and then the generator model synthesizes this information to produce clinically coherent values. These generated values are then integrated into the original dataset, creating a richer, contextually enhanced

dataset that aligns with the patient’s clinical profile and is ready for downstream analysis.

- **Stage 4: Evaluating the Effectiveness of the Newly Generated Features (see Section 5.3).** We carried out a comprehensive set of experiments to evaluate the new features generated by the LLMs. First, we **augmented the dataset with the newly generated features** and tested their impact on several machine learning models, including Decision Trees, Random Forest, XGBoost, and TabNet. The models were evaluated using metrics such as accuracy and AUC to determine the added value provided by the new features. We also performed **an ablation study** to further investigate the contribution of the Augmented Clinical Knowledge from Phase II. By isolating the ACK’s influence on the LLM’s ability to generate valuable features, we assessed its critical role in the feature-generation process. Finally, we conducted **a feature importance analysis** to identify which of the newly generated features had the greatest relevance to clinical outcomes. These findings were subsequently reviewed by medical experts to ensure the clinical validity and relevance of the generated features.

All experiments used high-performance computational resources, including NVIDIA 4090 24GB GPUs and Intel i9-13900K CPUs. These setups allowed for efficient training and testing of the machine learning models and rapid processing of the large datasets required for the experiments.

5. Results

5.1. Experiment I: Can LLMs Generate Contextual Values for Existing Features

This experiment evaluated the potential of LLMs to accurately generate synthetic values for pre-existing clinical features within the MIMIC-IV dataset. The criticality of this task cannot be overstated, given the propensity of LLMs to produce “hallucinations” or inaccuracies that, within a medical context, could lead to significant ramifications for patient care. To mitigate these risks and ensure the generation of clinically relevant values, we employed a structured approach involving generating a prompt (Figure 3). We set the temperature parameter to 0.1 and applied eight clinical features from the MIMIC-IV dataset (oxygen saturation, temperature, gender, age, heart rate, o2sat, systolic (sbp), and diastolic blood pressure (dbp)) to 799 patient cases.

We analyzed the capabilities of different types of LLMs to generate clinically relevant synthetic data. We tested nine different LLMs ranging from medical domain-specific models (such as BioGPT[25], ClinicalBERT[17], BioClinicalBERT[2], and Medtiron[10]) to more general models (Mistral[19], Zehyr[33], Llama2[18], GPT-3.5, and GPT-4). Figure 3 presents an example of a prompt to generate values for existing features based on the patient’s clinical context.

To quantify the deviation of LLM-generated values from actual clinical data, we employed the Mean Squared Error (MSE) metric, comparing the generated values against

```
INDICATION: Central venous line placement.
TECHNIQUE: Frontal chest radiograph.
COMPARISON: Chest radiograph 12:42 today.
FINDINGS: A right subclavian catheter has been placed in the interim. The catheter terminates at the
confluence of the brachiocephalic vein and superior vena cava and, if indicated, could be
advanced 3.7... cm for termination within the low SVC. There is no pleural effusion or
pneumothorax. The cardiac silhouette remains mildly enlarged. There is no focal airspace
consolidation worrisome for pneumonia. High density material is again seen in the paritally
imaged colon in the left abdomen. Cholecystectomy clips are noted. There are carotid
calcifications, left greater than right.
AGE: 69.
GENDER: Female.
LESIONS: Enlarged cardiac silhouette.
Oxygen Saturation (%): [MASK].
```

Figure 3: Example of a prompt used in Experiment I for generating feature values for Oxygen Saturation (%).

the ground truth for each feature. We use this metric to indicate the LLM’s accuracy and reliability in synthesizing clinical data.

We used a simple Gaussian distribution to generate clinical agnostic feature values as a baseline. Furthermore, to evaluate the performance of LLMs against advanced ML models, we introduced a comparison with a multimodal transformer (MMTF) inspired by ViT. ViTs [12], which leverage self-attention mechanisms to process image data, represent a cutting-edge approach to analyzing visual inputs. In this context, we utilized a multimodal variant to integrate both limited clinical data and the textual chest X-ray reports with the corresponding chest X-ray images. This integration assessed whether a multimodal approach could surpass the LLMs’ accuracy and relevance of generated clinical feature values.

The experiment was structured to run each query through the multimodal vision transformer, mirroring the approach taken with the LLMs to ensure comparability. Table 1 reports the results using MIMIC-IV, where GPT-4 provides the best performance using mean MSE (i.e., average overall features).

5.2. Experiment II: Analysing the Quality of Information Retrieval

In Experiment II, we evaluated the effectiveness of information retrieval and data storage mechanisms by comparing LLMs’ performance using data from Radiopaedia and Wikipedia. The experiment focused on two main aspects: the information sources and the data representation types.

Using the best LLM from Experiment I, GPT-4, we conducted queries using three configurations: Wikipedia alone, Radiopaedia alone, and combined. Due to the high costs of using GPT-4, we limited our experiments to a single query: “Atelectasis.” The following conditions were tested: (a) all documents from the first result page of Wikipedia (approximately 10 documents); (b) all documents from the first result page of Radiopaedia (approximately 20 documents); (c) the top result from Wikipedia (1 document); (d) the top result from Radiopaedia (1 document); and (e) all documents from the first result pages of both Wikipedia and Radiopaedia (approximately 30 documents total). For each setting, we tested three types of data representation: NetworkX, Neo4j Vector databases, and Neo4j Graph databases. The goal was to retrieve information for the domain questions

Model	temperature	heartrate	resprate	o2sat	sbp	dbp	Mean
BioGPT[25]	6.124	1.733	108.269	7.799	3.628	1.836	21.565
ClinicalBERT[17]	5.623	2.663	22.880	2.298	6.086	1.443	6.832
BioClinicalBERT[2]	4.204	1.578	7.230	1.466	5.007	1.661	3.524
Mistral[19]	3.635	1.920	5.842	7.824	2.284	3.056	4.093
Zephyr[33]	2.144	1.541	3.060	4.146	1.770	1.700	2.393
Llama2[18]	1.318	1.559	2.617	2.387	1.494	3.741	2.186
Meditron[10]	2.420	2.057	4.858	6.359	2.205	4.071	3.662
GPT-3.5	1.325	1.308	1.159	3.403	1.264	2.338	1.799
GPT-4	1.966	1.344	1.298	1.722	1.251	1.705	1.548
MMTF (supervised)	0.003	0.008	0.040	0.009	0.006	0.013	0.013
Gaussian (baseline)	2.074	2.085	2.027	1.987	2.092	1.934	2.033

Table 1: Mean Square Error for normalised clinical features.

outlined in Phase II: (1) What is Atelectasis?, (2) What are the symptoms of Atelectasis?, (3) What can cause Atelectasis?, (4) What clinical features do radiologists need for diagnosing Atelectasis?, and (5) What are the radiographic features of Atelectasis?

The best information was extracted when combining the results of both Wikipedia and Radiopaedia. Our experiments show that the best data representation is the Neo4jVector (see Table 2 for an example of LLM outputs). This is due to its ability to capture and retrieve semantic relationships within high-dimensional data efficiently. The Neo4j Vector database outperformed other methods by providing more contextually relevant and accurate responses to the domain questions. Its advanced indexing and search capabilities allowed for better integrating diverse information sources, ultimately enhancing the LLM’s ability to generate high-quality, clinically relevant features. This demonstrates that leveraging a combination of broad and specialized knowledge stored in a semantically rich vector format significantly improves the performance of the LLM in clinical data augmentation tasks.

5.3. Experiment III: Evaluating the Effectiveness of the Newly Generated Features

Building on the initial assessment of LLMs to generate realistic values for existing clinical features, this experiment evaluates DALL-M’s capability to create new, clinically relevant features to enhance the dataset comprehensively. This investigation involved processing 799 patient case data points, originally comprising only eight features, to include new features and their corresponding synthetic values, as established in Experiment I. We termed this method *Augmented*, containing 78 features. Furthermore, we consulted medical experts to leverage clinical expertise and enrich the dataset. They reviewed the newly generated features and recommended including specific clinical features based on their professional experience. The subsequent generation of values, denoted as *Augmented with Expert Input*, yielded 91 features.

Question	LLM Answer
Networkx	
1	Atelectasis is a condition in which small areas of the lung collapse due to adjacent compression, passive atelectasis, or dependent atelectasis. It is usually seen on chest x-rays as small volume linear shadows and CT is often helpful to determine the cause or confirm that there is no proximal obstruction.
2	Atelectasis is usually asymptomatic , but some people may experience shortness of breath, chest pain, and coughing
3	Atelectasis can be caused by adjacent compression, passive atelectasis, and dependent atelectasis
4	Radiologists need to look for small areas of collapsed lung, small volume linear shadows, and adjacent compression on chest x-rays to diagnose Atelectasis. CT scans may also be helpful to determine the cause or confirm that there is no proximal obstruction
5	Atelectasis is usually seen on chest x-rays as small volume linear shadows
Neo4jVector	
1	Atelectasis is the collapse or closure of a lung resulting in reduced or absent gas exchange . It is usually unilateral, affecting part or all of one lung. It is a condition where the alveoli are deflated down to little or no volume. It can be caused by normal exhalation or various medical conditions. Atelectasis is not synonymous with a pneumothorax , although a pneumothorax can cause atelectasis. It can occur as a post-operative complication or as a result of surfactant deficiency . It is a common finding in chest X-rays and other radiological studies. The most common cause is post-surgical atelectasis, which develops in 75-90% of people undergoing general anesthesia for a surgical procedure. Other causes include pulmonary tuberculosis, obstruction of the airway, poor surfactant spreading, and compression of the lung by a space-occupying lesion. Clinically significant atelectasis is visible on chest X-ray and may require further imaging or bronchoscopy for diagnosis. Treatment involves managing the underlying cause
2	The symptoms of Atelectasis may include cough (not prominent), chest pain (not common), breathing difficulty (fast and shallow), low oxygen saturation, pleural effusion (transudate type), cyanosis (late sign), and increased heart rate . However, it is important to note that atelectasis can also be asymptomatic
3	Atelectasis can be caused by various factors, including post-surgical complications, surfactant deficiency, pulmonary tuberculosis, blockage of the airway, compression from external factors, poor surfactant spreading , and certain risk factors such as type of surgery, obesity, high oxygen, and presence of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease or asthma . It can also occur due to passive atelectasis or adhesive atelectasis
4	Radiologists need to look for small volume linear shadows on chest x-rays, usually peripherally or at the lung bases, to diagnose atelectasis. They can also use CT scans to accurately depict the involved lung and determine the cause. Additionally, the presence of the crow feet sign , which appears as linear bands radiating from a mass into adjacent lung tissue, can be a characteristic feature of round atelectasis. The clinical presentation of atelectasis can vary depending on the extent and speed of development, but common symptoms include breathlessness, cough, and diminished breath sounds . The underlying causes of atelectasis can include adjacent compression, passive atelectasis, and dependent atelectasis . Treatment involves managing the underlying cause and promoting deeper breathing if hypoventilation is the cause.
5	Radiographic features of atelectasis include small volume linear shadows on chest x-rays, usually peripherally or at the lung bases. The underlying cause may also be visible. CT chest allows for a more accurate depiction of the involved lung and can help determine the cause. Round atelectasis can be seen on CT as linear bands radiating from a mass into adjacent lung tissue, resembling the feet of a crow . Atelectasis can also be classified based on underlying mechanism (resorptive, passive, compressive, cicatrization, adhesive, gravity dependent) or morphology (linear, round, lung, lobar, segmental, subsegmental). The radiographic features vary depending on the type and mechanism of atelectasis.
Neo4jGraph	
1	Atelectasis is a condition where part or all of one lung collapses or closes, resulting in reduced or absent gas exchange . It can be caused by normal exhalation or various medical conditions. The alveoli, which are small air sacs in the lungs, become deflated down to little or no volume. Atelectasis is also known as a collapsed lung.
2	I'm sorry, but I don't have the information to answer your question. It would be best to consult a medical professional for accurate information on the symptoms of Atelectasis
3	There are several factors that can cause atelectasis. Some common causes include blockage of the airways due to mucus, a foreign object , or a tumor , as well as lung diseases such as chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) or pneumonia . Additionally, certain medical procedures, such as anesthesia or prolonged bed rest , can also contribute to the development of atelectasis. It is important to consult with a healthcare professional for a proper diagnosis and treatment plan.
4	To diagnose Atelectasis, radiologists typically look for certain clinical features. These may include signs such as lung collapse, airway obstruction, and reduced lung volume . Additionally, they may also consider the presence of symptoms such as shortness of breath, coughing, and chest pain . By evaluating these clinical features, radiologists can make an accurate diagnosis of Atelectasis
5	I'm sorry, but I don't have the information to answer your question about the radiographic features of Atelectasis.

Table 2: GPT-4 Responses Based on Wikipedia and Radiopaedia: Synthesis of Information Retrieved from the Top Search Results for Query "Atelectasis". Highlighted terms correspond to new knowledge that can be used to generate features.

To rigorously assess the contribution of these augmented features to the dataset, three distinct analytical approaches were employed: (1) We evaluated the augmented dataset using various ML models, including Decision Trees, Random Forest, XGBoost, and TabNet. This analysis used metrics such as accuracy and area under the curve (AUC); (2) An ablation study was conducted to discern the impact of incorporating ACK into the prompt generation phase on the overall effectiveness of the augmentation process; (3) The ML models employed underwent a feature importance analysis. Our medical experts then reviewed the results to validate the clinical relevance of the identified features.

Feature set	Model	Accuracy	AUC	Precision	F-1	Recall	#Rel. Features
Original # feat: 8	DecisionTree	0.6676	0.5666	0.367	0.3591	0.352	0
	RandomForest	0.7484	0.554	0.6091	0.2285	0.1408	0
	XGBoost	0.7108	0.5389	0.3953	0.2411	0.1735	8
	TabNet	0.6811	0.5644	0.378	0.3444	0.3163	5
Augmented # feat: 78	DecisionTree	0.7319	0.6124	0.4935	0.4139	0.3582	6
	RandomForest	0.7749	0.6089	<u>0.7067</u>	0.3752	0.2561	3
	XGBoost	0.7865	0.6687	0.6508	0.5093	0.4184	49
	TabNet	0.7027	0.5856	0.4231	0.375	0.3367	22
Augmented with Expert input # feat: 91	DecisionTree	0.7246	0.6244	0.4767	0.4413	0.4112	5
	RandomForest	0.7811	0.6177	0.7362	0.3953	0.2704	4
	XGBoost	<u>0.7838</u>	<u>0.6636</u>	0.6452	<u>0.5000</u>	0.4082	<u>56</u>
	TabNet	0.7243	0.6232	0.4762	0.4396	0.4082	43
Ablation No Prior Knowledge # feat: 91	DecisionTree	0.7127	0.6182	0.4549	0.4349	<u>0.4173</u>	1
	RandomForest	0.7705	0.6174	0.6483	0.4022	0.2918	1
	XGBoost	0.7486	0.6365	0.5342	0.4561	0.398	47
	TabNet	0.6541	0.5754	0.3636	0.3846	0.4082	59

Table 3: Performance of different feature sets on REFLACX dataset using CheXpert labels as groundtruth. The bold values represent the best-performing models, while the underlined values correspond to the second-best.

We documented the outcomes in Table 3. An example of feature importance distribution for Decision Trees, Random Forests, and XGBoost is presented in Figure 4 and TabNet in Figure 5, with expert commentary on the identified features’ clinical validity discussed in Section 6.

6. Discussion

Our experiments with the DALL-M framework highlight the accuracy of LLMs in generating synthetic clinical values and creating new clinically relevant features. The precision of models like GPT-4 and the enhancements from integrating expert insights are key focuses. We examine the impact of these advancements on predictive modeling, clinical decision-making, and patient care and contemplate the future role of AI in healthcare. The




Figure 4: Example of feature importance distribution for enlarged cardiac silhouette using Decision Trees, Random Forests and XGBoost.




Figure 5: Example of feature importance distribution for enlarged cardiac silhouette using TabNet

main contributions are as follows:

(1) LLMs Can Generate Clinically Relevant Synthetic Values: Experiment I demonstrates the potential of LLMs, particularly GPT-3.5 and GPT-4, to accurately generate synthetic values for existing clinical features. Using structured prompts, our evaluation through MSE suggests the models’ ability to produce values close to real clinical data, with GPT-4 showing the best performance among LLMs.

(2) Multimodal Approaches Offer Further Improvements: Integrating LLMs with other data modalities, such as images, could enhance the accuracy and relevance of generated clinical feature values. Although we explored this only in Experiment I, further research

could incorporate these models in **Phase III**.

(3) General LLMs perform better than Domain-Specific ones: Experiment I shows that general LLMs outperform domain-specific LLMs in generating synthetic clinical values. This may be due to several factors: (i) general LLMs are trained on a vast and diverse dataset, including ample medical literature, which may surpass the performance of models trained on narrower datasets, and (ii) general LLMs are updated regularly, leading to up-to-date information.

(4) Creation of New Clinically Relevant Features with Improved Dataset Performance: Experiment III demonstrates DALL-M's capability to augment existing datasets with synthetic values and expand these data with entirely new, clinically relevant features. Without medical expert input, DALL-M extended the eight original features to 78 features, enhancing the classifiers' performance across all metrics, with a significant improvement of approximately **25% in Precision and Recall**, and **16.5% in F1 score** for XGBoost. Additionally, the data augmentation with specific expert knowledge generated 13 new features, totaling 91 features. It contributed to an increase in Precision of approximately 3% for Random Forests, indicating the practical benefits of DALL-M in feature augmentation for clinical predictive modeling. XGBoost consistently outperformed others across most metrics, confirming the superiority of tree-based models in tabular data [13, 14].

(5) Ablation studies confirm - Augmented Clinical Knowledge is vital: The ablation study indicates that integrating augmented clinical knowledge into the feature generation process yields benefits. As shown in Table 3, the absence of augmented clinical knowledge results in a notable performance decline across all models. This underscores the role of augmented clinical knowledge in enhancing the ability of LLMs to produce reliable and precise synthetic values. Nevertheless, our approach requires ethical scrutiny for future iterations, to ensure accuracy, transparency, and mitigate biases [27, 31, 11].

7. Conclusion

This study proposes two distinct strategies for augmenting clinical datasets. The first approach addresses the issue of missing values by generating realistic synthetic values using trained LLMs and multimodal transformers for supervised learning. This method ensures the dataset is complete and robust, allowing machine learning models to learn more effectively.

The second approach focuses on generating clinically relevant features by leveraging the combined power of LLMs and medical experts' domain knowledge. This method goes beyond simply filling in gaps; it creates new, valuable data points that enhance the overall quality of the dataset. By incorporating expert insights, we ensure the generated features are statistically sound and clinically meaningful.

Our results demonstrate that using the augmented dataset significantly improves model performance across various machine learning models. The features identified through our

augmentation strategies are validated as clinically relevant, showing potential to enhance diagnostic accuracy and patient care. To the best of our knowledge, DALL-M is the only method capable of generating new context-aware features in tabular data. This capability is particularly impactful in fields where data is scarce, as it can significantly enhance the quality and quantity of available data, leading to better model performance and more informed decision-making.

Future directions of our work include evaluating the proposed augmentation methods on other clinical datasets to test their effectiveness and adaptability. We will also investigate the scalability and generalizability of these augmentation strategies across different medical domains, ensuring that our approach can be widely applied in various healthcare settings.

8. Source Code

The DALL-M source code is publicly available at:
<https://github.com/ChihchengHsieh/DALL-M>

9. Acknowledgments

The work reported in this article was partially supported by the Center of Data Science at Queensland University of Technology and was partially supported under the auspices of the UNESCO Chair on AI & VR by national funds through Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia with references DOI:10.54499/UIDB/50021/2020, DOI:10.54499/DL57/2016/CP1368/-CT0002 and 2022.09212.PTDC (XAVIER project).

References

- [1] , Cathie Sudlow, John Gallacher, Naomi Allen, Valerie Beral, Paul Burton, John Danesh, Paul Downey, Paul Elliott, Jane Green, Martin Landray, et al. Uk biobank: an open access resource for identifying the causes of a wide range of complex diseases of middle and old age. *PLoS medicine*, 12(3):e1001779, 2015
- [2] Alsentzer, E., Murphy, J.R., Boag, W., Weng, W.H., Jin, D., Naumann, T., McDermott, M.B.A.: Publicly available clinical bert embeddings (2019)
- [3] Arik, S.O., Pfister, T.: Tabnet: Attentive interpretable tabular learning. arxiv 2019. arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.07442
- [4] Bahri, D., Jiang, H., Tay, Y., Metzler, D.: Scarf: Self-supervised contrastive learning using random feature corruption. arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.15147 (2021)
- [5] Bigolin Lanfredi, R., Zhang, M., Auffermann, W.F., Chan, J., Duong, P.A.T., Srikumar, V., Drew, T., Schroeder, J.D., Tasdizen, T.: Reflax, a dataset of reports and eye-tracking data for localization of abnormalities in chest x-rays. *Scientific data* **9**(1), 350 (2022)

- [6] Bisercic, A., Nikolic, M., van der Schaar, M., Delibasic, B., Lio, P., Petrovic, A.: Interpretable medical diagnostics with structured data extraction by large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05052 (2023)
- [7] Borisov, V., Seßler, K., Leemann, T., Pawelczyk, M., Kasneci, G.: Language models are realistic tabular data generators. arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.06280 (2022)
- [8] Cai, Y., Wang, L., Wang, Y., de Melo, G., Zhang, Y., Wang, Y., He, L.: Medbench: A large-scale chinese benchmark for evaluating medical large language models. In: Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence. vol. 38, pp. 17709–17717 (2024)
- [9] Chen, J., Wang, X., Gao, A., Jiang, F., Chen, S., Zhang, H., Song, D., Xie, W., Kong, C., Li, J., et al.: Huatuogpt-ii, one-stage training for medical adaption of llms. arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09774 (2023)
- [10] Chen, Z., Cano, A.H., Romanou, A., Bonnet, A., Matoba, K., Salvi, F., Pagliardini, M., Fan, S., Köpf, A., Mohtashami, A., Sallinen, A., Sakhaeirad, A., Swamy, V., Krawczuk, I., Bayazit, D., Marmet, A., Montariol, S., Hartley, M.A., Jaggi, M., Bosselut, A.: Meditron-70b: Scaling medical pretraining for large language models (2023)
- [11] Chou, Y.L., Moreira, C., Bruza, P., Ouyang, C., Jorge, J.: Counterfactuals and causability in explainable artificial intelligence: Theory, algorithms, and applications. *Information Fusion* **81**, 59–83 (2022)
- [12] Dosovitskiy, A., Beyer, L., Kolesnikov, A., Weissenborn, D., Zhai, X., Unterthiner, T., Dehghani, M., Minderer, M., Heigold, G., Gelly, S., et al.: An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929 (2020)
- [13] Gorishniy, Y., Rubachev, I., Khruikov, V., Babenko, A.: Revisiting deep learning models for tabular data. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **34**, 18932–18943 (2021)
- [14] Grinsztajn, L., Oyallon, E., Varoquaux, G.: Why do tree-based models still outperform deep learning on typical tabular data? **35**, 507–520 (2022)
- [15] Gu, Y., Tinn, R., Cheng, H., Lucas, M., Usuyama, N., Liu, X., Naumann, T., Gao, J., Poon, H.: Domain-specific language model pretraining for biomedical natural language processing. *ACM Transactions on Computing for Healthcare (HEALTH)* **3**(1), 1–23 (2021)
- [16] Han, T., Adams, L.C., Papaioannou, J.M., Grundmann, P., Oberhauser, T., Löser, A., Truhn, D., Bressemer, K.K.: Medalpaca—an open-source collection of medical conversational ai models and training data. arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.08247 (2023)

- [17] Huang, K., Altosaar, J., Ranganath, R.: Clinicalbert: Modeling clinical notes and predicting hospital readmission (2019). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1904.05342>, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1904.05342>
- [18] Hugo Touvron, e.a.: Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models (2023)
- [19] Jiang, A.Q., Sablayrolles, A., Mensch, A., Bamford, C., Chaplot, D.S., de las Casas, D., Bressand, F., Lengyel, G., Lample, G., Saulnier, L., Lavaud, L.R., Lachaux, M.A., Stock, P., Scao, T.L., Lavril, T., Wang, T., Lacroix, T., Sayed, W.E.: Mistral 7b (2023)
- [20] Johnson, A., Bulgarelli, L., Pollard, T., Horng, S., Celi, L.A., Mark, R.: MIMIC-IV (2021)
- [21] Li, C., Wong, C., Zhang, S., Usuyama, N., Liu, H., Yang, J., Naumann, T., Poon, H., Gao, J.: Llava-med: Training a large language-and-vision assistant for biomedicine in one day. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **36** (2024)
- [22] Liu, J., Zhou, P., Hua, Y., et al.: Benchmarking large language models on cmexam—a comprehensive chinese medical exam dataset. published online June 8, 2023. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **36**
- [23] Liu, L., Yang, X., Lei, J., Liu, X., Shen, Y., Zhang, Z., Wei, P., Gu, J., Chu, Z., Qin, Z., et al.: A survey on medical large language models: Technology, application, trustworthiness, and future directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.03712* (2024)
- [24] Lu, Q., Dou, D., Nguyen, T.: ClinicalT5: A generative language model for clinical text. In: *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*. pp. 5436–5443 (2022)
- [25] Luo, R., Sun, L., Xia, Y., Qin, T., Zhang, S., Poon, H., Liu, T.Y.: Biogpt: generative pre-trained transformer for biomedical text generation and mining. *Briefings in Bioinformatics* **23**(6) (Sep 2022). <https://doi.org/10.1093/bib/bbac409>, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bib/bbac409>
- [26] M. Xu: Medicalgpt: Training medical gpt model. <https://github.com/shibing624/MedicalGPT>, 2023
- [27] Peng, C., Yang, X., Chen, A., et al.: A study of generative large language model for medical research and healthcare. *npj Digital Medicine* **6**(1), 210 (2023)
- [28] Radiopedia: (2023), <https://radiopaedia.org/>
- [29] Singhal, K., Azizi, S., Tu, T., Mahdavi, S.S., Wei, J., Chung, H.W., Scales, N., Tanwani, A., Cole-Lewis, H., Pfohl, S., et al.: Large language models encode clinical knowledge. *Nature* **620**(7972), 172–180 (2023)
- [30] Theodorou, B., Xiao, C., Sun, J.: Synthesize high-dimensional longitudinal electronic health records via hierarchical autoregressive language model. *Nature communications* **14**(1), 5305 (2023)

- [31] Thirunavukarasu, A.J., Ting, D.S.J., Elangovan, K., Gutierrez, L., Tan, T.F., Ting, D.S.W.: Large language models in medicine. *Nature Medicine* **29**(8), 1930–1940 (2023)
- [32] Tian, Y., Gan, R., Song, Y., Zhang, J., Zhang, Y.: Chimed-gpt: A chinese medical large language model with full training regime and better alignment to human preferences. arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.06025 (2023)
- [33] Tunstall, L., Beeching, E., Lambert, N., Rajani, N., Rasul, K., Belkada, Y., Huang, S., von Werra, L., Fourrier, C., Habib, N., Sarrazin, N., Sanseviero, O., Rush, A.M., Wolf, T.: Zephyr: Direct distillation of lm alignment (2023)
- [34] Wang, G., Yang, G., Du, Z., Fan, L., Li, X.: Clinicalgpt: large language models finetuned with diverse medical data and comprehensive evaluation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.09968 (2023)
- [35] Wang, H., Zhao, S., Qiang, Z., Xi, N., Qin, B., Liu, T.: Beyond direct diagnosis: Llm-based multi-specialist agent consultation for automatic diagnosis. arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.16107 (2024)
- [36] Wei, J., Wang, X., Schuurmans, D., Bosma, M., Xia, F., Chi, E., Le, Q.V., Zhou, D., et al.: Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **35**, 24824–24837 (2022)
- [37] Wikipedia: (2023), <https://wikipedia.org/>
- [38] Wu, C., Lin, Z., Fang, W., Huang, Y.: A medical diagnostic assistant based on llm. In: *China Health Information Processing Conference*. pp. 135–147. Springer (2023)
- [39] Yan, B., Li, K., Xu, M., Dong, Y., Zhang, Y., Ren, Z., Cheng, X.: On protecting the data privacy of large language models (llms): A survey. arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05156 (2024)
- [40] Yang, R., Liu, H., Zeng, Q., Ke, Y.H., Li, W., Cheng, L., Chen, Q., Caverlee, J., Matsuo, Y., Li, I.: Kg-rank: Enhancing large language models for medical qa with knowledge graphs and ranking techniques. arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05881 (2024)
- [41] Yang, X., Chen, A., PourNejatian, N., Shin, H.C., Smith, K.E., Parisien, C., Compas, C., Martin, C., Costa, A.B., Flores, M.G., et al.: A large language model for electronic health records. *NPJ digital medicine* **5**(1), 194 (2022)
- [42] Zhu, W., Wang, X.: Chatmed: A chinese medical large language model (2023)

Appendix A. Prompt for Synthetic Clinical Feature Value Generation

Figure A.6 illustrates a concrete example of the final prompt used in the Synthetic Clinical Feature Value Generation Module. This prompt leverages the patient’s clinical report, extracted contextual information, and the expert knowledge synthesized in the Augmented Clinical KnowledgeModule to generate clinically relevant synthetic values for various features. The LLM is instructed to take on the role of an experienced radiologist, using its domain-specific knowledge to make predictions for specific clinical features such as “breathing difficulty” or “pleural effusion.”

The prompt begins by providing the patient’s detailed report, including radiological findings and clinical impressions. Next, it outlines the relevant prior knowledge regarding the condition (in this case, atelectasis), covering its symptoms, potential causes, and diagnostic criteria. The LLM is then asked to assess whether the patient’s clinical presentation aligns with known patterns of atelectasis and other relevant conditions.

The final section of the prompt structures the LLM’s responses by using a template with binary feature values (e.g., True/False) accompanied by a rationale. This ensures that the generated values are not only accurate but also explainable, with each prediction supported by clinical reasoning. For example, the LLM might indicate “breathing difficulty: True, because the patient’s report mentions fast and shallow breathing, which is a typical symptom of atelectasis.”

This structured and context-aware prompt enables the LLM to generate patient-specific values for existing features and introduce new clinically relevant features, enhancing the overall quality of the dataset for downstream analyses and machine learning applications.

You are an experienced radiologist with more than 30 years of experience. You are the most respected radiologist in the world. You are examining a patient with the following report:

EXAMINATION: PA AND LATERAL CHEST RADIOGRAPHS INDICATION: yearold male with weakness. Evaluate for pneumonia. TECHNIQUE: PA and lateral chest radiographs COMPARISON: Multiple prior chest radiographs FINDINGS: Compared with the previous examination there is increased diffuse interstitial opacities with a linear consolidation in the right lower lung compatible with atelectasis. There is also a focal opacity in the left for lower lung and retrocardiac region with associated small pleural effusion better seen in the lateral view. Calcified granulomas are redemonstrated more prominently in the left apex. Moderate cardiomegaly is stable. Rightward deviation of the trachea is also unchanged. There is no pneumothorax. IMPRESSION: Patchy opacities in the left lower lung and retrocardiac region may represent left lower lobe pneumonia on the background of interstitial pulmonary edema. LESIONS: Enlarged cardiac silhouette Atelectasis. AGE: 93. GENDER: Male.

=====
According to your prior knowledge:

The symptoms associated with atelectasis may include cough (not prominent), chest pain (not common), breathing difficulty (fast and shallow), low oxygen saturation, pleural effusion (transudate type), cyanosis (late sign), and increased heart rate. However, atelectasis can also be asymptomatic. Fever is not a symptom of atelectasis.

Atelectasis can be caused by various medical conditions, including post-surgical complications, surfactant deficiency, and poor surfactant spreading during inspiration. It can also be caused by blockage of a bronchiole or bronchus, such as by a foreign body, mucus plug, tumor, or compression from the outside. Risk factors for atelectasis include certain types of surgery, muscle relaxation, obesity, high oxygen, lower lung segments, age, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), asthma, and type of anesthetic.

The relevant symptoms for atelectasis include cough (not prominent), chest pain (not common), breathing difficulty (fast and shallow), low oxygen saturation, pleural effusion (transudate type), cyanosis (late sign), and increased heart rate.

The relevant clinical signs for the etiological diagnosis of atelectasis may include cough, chest pain (not common), breathing difficulty (fast and shallow), low oxygen saturation, pleural effusion (transudate type), cyanosis (late sign), and increased heart rate. However, it is important to note that atelectasis may also be asymptomatic.

The relevant laboratory data for the etiological diagnosis of atelectasis are not provided in the given information.

The relevant clinical characteristics for the etiological diagnosis of atelectasis include cough (not prominent), chest pain (not common), breathing difficulty (fast and shallow), low oxygen saturation, pleural effusion (transudate type), cyanosis (late sign), and increased heart rate. It is important to note that atelectasis does not cause fever. The underlying causes of atelectasis can include adjacent compression, passive atelectasis, dependent atelectasis, and poor surfactant spreading. Risk factors for atelectasis include type of surgery, use of muscle relaxation, obesity, high oxygen, lower lung segments, age, presence of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease or asthma, and type of anesthetic. Diagnosis of atelectasis is generally confirmed through chest X-ray, which may show lung opacification and/or loss of lung volume. Additional imaging modalities such as CT chest or bronchoscopy may be necessary to determine the cause of atelectasis.

The patient's personal relevant history for the etiological diagnosis of atelectasis includes post-surgical atelectasis as a common cause, as well as pulmonary tuberculosis, smoking, and old age as risk factors. Other factors associated with the development of atelectasis include the presence of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease or asthma, and the type of anesthesia used. The diagnosis of atelectasis is generally confirmed through chest X-ray, which shows small volume linear shadows, usually peripherally or at the lung bases. CT chest or bronchoscopy may be necessary to determine the cause or confirm the absence of proximal obstruction.

=====
Make a prediction based on your prior knowledge and on the patient's report. Please check if your prediction is in accordance with your prior knowledge.

Ensure your answers are using following template.

1. anesthesia: {True / False}, because...
 2. asthma: {True / False}, because...\\
 3. asymptomatic: {True / False}, because...
 4. breathing difficulty: {True / False}, because...
 5. chest pain: {True\textbackslash False}, because...
 6. chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: {True / False}, because...
 7. cough: {True / False}, because...
 8. cyanosis: {True / False}, because...
 9. fever: {True / False}, because...
 10. pleural effusion: {True / False}, because...
 11. pulmonary tuberculosis: {True / False}, because...
 12. small volume linear shadows: {True / False}, because...
 13. smoking: {True\textbackslash False}, because...
 14. oxygen saturation: {True\textbackslash False}, because...
- ...

Figure A.6: Concrete example of the prompt used in the Synthetic Clinical Feature Value Generation Module after the Augmented Clinical Knowledge Module generated new features