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ABSTRACT

Simultaneous administration of multiple drugs can have synergistic or antagonistic effects as one drug can affect activities of other drugs. Synergistic effects lead to improved therapeutic outcomes, whereas, antagonistic effects can be life-threatening, may lead to increased healthcare cost, or may even cause death. Thus identification of unknown drug-drug interaction (DDI) is an important concern for efficient and effective healthcare. Although multiple resources for DDI exist, they are often unable to keep pace with rich amount of information available in fast growing biomedical texts. Most existing methods model DDI extraction from text as a classification problem and mainly rely on hand-crafted features. Some of these features further depend on domain specific tools. Recently neural network models using latent features have been shown to give similar or better performance than the other existing models dependent on handcrafted features. In this paper, we present three models namely, B-LSTM, AB-LSTM and Joint AB-LSTM based on long short-term memory (LSTM) network. All three models utilize word and position embedding as latent features and thus do not rely on explicit feature engineering. Further use of bidirectional long short-term memory (Bi-LSTM) networks allow implicit feature extraction from the whole sentence. The two models, AB-LSTM and Joint AB-LSTM also use attentive pooling in the output of Bi-LSTM layer to assign weights to features. Our experimental results on the SemEval-2013 DDI extraction dataset show that the Joint AB-LSTM model outperforms all the existing methods, including those relying on handcrafted features. The other two proposed LSTM models also perform competitively with state-of-the-art methods.
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1. INTRODUCTION

There has been a significant rise in a number of persons taking multiple drugs at the same time. According to the numbers released in 2010 by the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, one in ten Americans is on five or more medications [17]. Similar statistics can be expected from other countries as well. When multiple drugs are administered together, there is an inevitable risk of a drug affecting activities of other drugs. Effect of DDI can be either synergistic or antagonistic. Adverse drug reaction (ADR) is an example of antagonistic effect [6]. With the rise in people taking multiple drugs, it is very important to have DDI information available in structured form. DrugBank [2] and Stockley [3] are examples of knowledge bases (KBs) keeping DDI information in a structured form. However, keeping KBs update with growing rate of biomedical literature is a challenging task [30] [29]. PubMed, a database of biomedical articles, contains about 27 million citations[4] and approximately 0.8 million articles are being added annually[4]. The growing rate of this number in recent years has necessitated the development of efficient automatic tools for information extraction across biomedical domain [24] [31].

Identifying DDIs in text is the process of recognizing how two drugs in a given sentence are related [29]. We illustrate different interaction types between two drugs through examples in Table 1. The two pairs (Fluoxetine, Phenelzine) and (Crocin, Phenelzine) in the sentence $S_1$ fall into Interaction category as they are suggested to be not taken together. Similarly, interacting drug pairs (PGF2alpha, Oxytocin) in the sentence $S_2$ and (Ketamine, Halothane) in $S_3$ belong to Effect and Mechanism categories respectively, since impact and mechanism of impact are present in the respective sentences. Sentence $S_4$ does not say anything more than that the two drugs (Warfarin and Rifampin) are interacting, so it falls into Interaction (Int) class. Identifying this kind of information can also be useful for other applications such as drug repurposing, semantic search and other information retrieval tasks.

Realizing the importance of automatic extraction of drug interaction information, two challenges were organized. The first DDI extraction challenge [30], organized as a workshop in the SEPLN 201 conference, focused on the DDI extrac-

https://www.drugbank.ca/  
Fluoxetine and crocin should not be administered to patients receiving phenelzine

Advice(Fluoxetine, Phenelzine)

Both PGF2alpha and Oxytocin induced dopamine release in the nucleus accumbens

Effect(PGF2alpha, Oxytocin)

The half life of ketamine in plasma and brain was longer in the presence of halothane

Mechanism(Ketamine, Halothane)

The drug interaction between warfarin and rifampin is not well known

Int (Warfarin, Rifampin)

Table 1: Examples illustrating different types of interactions between two drugs. All examples are taken from the dataset described in Sec. 3.
Figure 1: Block diagram of all three models

Feature Layer

We represent each word in the sentence with three discrete local features, namely: word \((W)\), distance \(1\) \((P_1)\), distance \(2\) \((P_2)\). Here \(W\) denotes the exact word appeared in the sentence. \(P_1\) indicates distance (in terms of words) from the first targeted drug name \([9, 28]\). This value will be zero for the first targeted drug name. \(P_2\) is similar to \(P_1\) but considers distance from the second targeted drug name. This way a word \(w \in D_1 \times D_2 \times D_3\), where \(D_i\) is the dictionary for \(i\)th local features. This feature layer constitutes the first layer for all models.

Embedding Layer

In embedding layer, each discrete feature is mapped to a real-valued vector representation using a lookup or embedding matrix. Let us say \(M_i\) is an embedding matrix for \(i\)th feature. Here each column of \(M_i\) is a vector for the value in \(i\)th feature. Mapping can be done by taking product of one hot vector of feature value with its embedding matrix \([9]\). Suppose \(a_j^{(i)}\) is the one hot vector for \(j\)th feature value of \(i\)th feature then embedding layer will output:

\[
f_j^{(i)} = M_i \cdot a_j^{(i)}
\]

(1)

Here \(\oplus\) is concatenation operation so \(x^i \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_1+\ldots+n_k)}\) is feature vector for \(i\)th word in sentence and \(n_k\) is dimension of \(k\)th feature. Pre-trained word vectors are used for word embedding matrix and other feature matrices are initialized with random values.

Bi-LSTM Layer

Recurrent neural network is a powerful model for modeling sequential data \([21]\). It is a network with loop, allowing information to persist throughout the sequence. However it may suffer with vanishing or exploding gradient problems \([10, 22]\) for instances of longer sentence. LSTM aims to overcome this problem by using gate and memory mechanism. LSTM layer is just another way to compute a hidden state which introduces a new structure called a memory cell \((c_t)\) and three gates called as input \((i_t)\), output \((o_t)\) and forget \((f_t)\) gates. These gates are composed of sigmoid activation function and responsible for regulating information in memory cell. The final output of LSTM will be calculated on the basis of new states of memory cell.

Consider \(x^i x^2 \ldots x^m\) is the sequence of feature vectors of a sentence, where \(m\) is the length of sentence and \(x^i \in \mathbb{R}^d\)

\[
x^i = f_1^{(i)} \oplus f_2^{(i)} \oplus f_3^{(i)}
\]

(2)
is a vector obtained by concatenating all feature vector of \( t^{th} \) word. Let \( h^{(t-1)} \) and \( c^{(t-1)} \) be previous hidden and cell states of LSTM layer (LSTM) respectively, then current hidden state \( (h^{(t)}_t) \), cell state \( c^{(t)}_t \) and output of Bi-LSTM \((z^{(t)})\) can be computed as

\[
\begin{align*}
    i^{(t)}_t &= \sigma(U^{(i)}_t x^{(t)} + W^{(i)}_t h^{(t-1)}_t + b^{(i)}_t) \\
    f^{(t)}_t &= \sigma(U^{(f)}_t x^{(t)} + W^{(f)}_t h^{(t-1)}_t + b^{(f)}_t) \\
    o^{(t)}_t &= \sigma(U^{(o)}_t x^{(t)} + W^{(o)}_t h^{(t-1)}_t + b^{(o)}_t) \\
    g^{(t)}_t &= \tanh(U^{(g)}_t x^{(t)} + W^{(g)}_t h^{(t-1)}_t + b^{(g)}_t) \\
    c^{(t)}_t &= c^{(t-1)}_t \odot f^{(t)}_t + g^{(t)}_t \odot o^{(t)}_t \\
    h^{(t)}_t &= \tanh(c^{(t)}_t) \odot o^{(t)}_t \\
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \sigma \) is sigmoid activation function, \( \odot \) is an element wise product, \( U^{(i)}, U^{(f)}, U^{(o)}, U^{(g)}, W^{(i)}, W^{(f)}, W^{(o)}, W^{(g)} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d} \), \( b^{(i)}, b^{(f)}, b^{(o)}, b^{(g)} \in \mathbb{R}^{N} \), \( h^{(t)}_t, c^{(t)}_t, o^{(t)}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{N} \) are learning parameters for LSTM. Here \( d \) is dimension of input feature vector and \( N \) is hidden layer size. \( h^{(t)}_t \) is output of LSTM at time step \( t \). We compute \( h^{(t)}_t \) in similar manner as \( h^{(t)}_1 \) by reversing the words of sentence. A separate LSTM is used for this calculation. The final output for \( t^{th} \) word by Bi-LSTM would be:

\[
    z^{(t)} = (h^{(t)}_t \odot h^{(t)}_r)
\]

**Pooling Layer**

The objective of pooling layer is to get a fixed length features from a variable length word features. We experiment with two different kinds of pooling schemes:

**(A) Max Pooling**

Max pooling takes one optimal over complete sequence. As Bi-LSTM accumulates information in both forward and backward directions, each node is assumed to have information of complete sentence. Max pooling takes the maximum over sentence assuming all important and relevant information are accumulated in that position. Let \( z^1, z^2, ..., z^m \) \((z^i \in \mathbb{R}^N)\) be the sequence of vectors obtained after concatenating forward and backward LSTM output of each word then:

\[
    z = \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} [z^i],
\]

where \( z \in \mathbb{R}^N \) is dimension wise \( \max \) of entire \( z^i \)'s.

**(B) Attentive Pooling**

Max pooling may fail to perform well when important clues for the DDIs are present in different clauses or lie faraway in the sentence. Consider an example belonging to mechanism class: Preliminary evidence suggests that cimetidine\(_{drug}\) inhibits mebendazole\(_{drug}\) metabolism and may result in an increase in plasma concentrations of mebendazole\(_{drug}\). The first clue inhibits mebendazole metabolism indicates interaction class likely to be effect but the second clue increase in plasma concentration makes it belong to the mechanism class. Taking one optimal over the complete sentence may incorrectly classify this instance. To overcome this issue we use attentive pooling which takes optimal based on weighted linear combination of feature vectors. Weights of the feature vectors are computed using attention mechanism which assigns weights based on importance of that features \[1, 39, 41\]. The attention mechanism produces a vector \( \alpha \) of size equal to length of sentence. The values in this vector are the weights we would assign to each word feature vectors. Weighted linear combination of Bi-LSTM outputs and attention weights are the output of attentive pooling layer. Let \( Z \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times m} \) be the matrix of outputs obtained by Bi-LSTM then, output of attentive pooling would be:

\[
    H = \tanh(Z) \\
    \alpha = \text{Softmax}(w^a T H) \\
    z = \alpha Z^T,
\]

where \( w^a \in \mathbb{R}^N \) is the learning parameter, \( \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^m \) is attention weights and \( z \in \mathbb{R}^N \) would be the output of attentive pooling layer. Important thing to notice here is that \( \alpha \) would be different for every sentence, i.e., indicating relevant context words may appear in distinct positions in different sentences.

**Fully Connected and Softmax**

Output of pooling layer would be a fixed length vector. This vector undergoes non-linear transformation by applying \( \tanh \) activation and which is then fed to fully connected neural layer. In fully connected layer we maintain the number of node equals to number of class.

\[
    h^3 = \tanh(h^2) \\
    p(y|x) = \text{Softmax}(h^3 T W^o + b^o)
\]

Here \( h^2 \) would be the output of pooling layer, \( W^o \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times C} \), \( b^o \in \mathbb{R}^C \) are parameters of fully connected neural network and \( C \) is number of class in our model. To make classification, we use \text{softmax} function in the output of fully connected layer. \text{Softmax} will give normalized probability score for each class.

**Training and Implementation**

All three models use cross entropy loss function for training the entire network. Adam’s technique \[19\] is used for optimization. We use batch size of 200 for training each model. Implementation\[6\] is done in python language using \text{Tensorflow} package.

### 2.1 B-LSTM Model

B-LSTM is similar to the model proposed in \[20, 28\] for DDI extraction and clinical relation extraction tasks. Here we use Bi-LSTM in place of convolution neural network used in \[20, 28\]. As shown in figure 1a this model apply Max pooling on the output of Bi-LSTM to get optimal fixed length features. Max pooling is obtained from Equation 4 for every instance. These features are then fed to fully connected neural layer followed by \text{softmax} layer to obtain final classification.

### 2.2 AB-LSTM Model

Figure 1b is the graphical representation of AB-LSTM model. In this case we apply attentive pooling on Bi-LSTM output. Attention weights are obtained from Equation 5 for

\[5\]

\[\text{https://www.tensorflow.org}\]

\[\text{https://github.com/sunilitggu/DDI-extraction-through-LSTM}\]
each sentence. Output of attentive pooling layer was used as features and passed to fully connected and softmax layers to obtain final classification.

2.3 Joint AB-LSTM Model

The objective of using Joint AB-LSTM is to take the advantage of both max and attentive pooling techniques. As shown in figure 1c, Joint AB-LSTM model uses two separate modules each with a Bi-LSTM network. Both Bi-LSTM take same feature vectors as input and produce output for every word in the sentence. We applied Max pooling on the first and attentive pooling on the second Bi-LSTM layer to get features from both the modules. Concatenation of both features are used for classification using fully connected and softmax layers.

3. DATASET DESCRIPTION

We obtained the dataset from the shared challenge SemEval-2013 Task-9 [29, 15]. This dataset contains annotated sentences from two sources, Medline abstracts and DrugBank database. Medline contains biomedical research articles and DrugBank contains manually entered texts collected from various sources and verified by accredited experts. The dataset is annotated with following four kinds of interactions:

- **Advice**: The text states an opinion or recommendation related to the simultaneous use of two drugs, e.g. "alpha-blockers should not be combined with urozatral".
- **Effect**: The sentence notes the effect of the drug-drug interaction or pharmacodynamic mechanism of interaction. For example "Warfarin users who initiated fluoxetine had an increased risk of hospitalization for gastrointestinal bleeding".
- **Mechanism**: The sentence describes a pharmacokinetic mechanism, as in "Paroxetine reduce the plasma concentration of endoxifen by about 20%".
- **Int**: The text mentions a drug interaction without providing any other information. For example, "This is typical of the interaction of meperidine and MAOIs.".

Dataset provides the training and test instances as sentences. If a sentence has more than two drug names, all possible pairs of drugs in the sentence have been separately annotated. This way single sentence having multiple drug names leads to separate instances of drug pairs and corresponding interaction. Statistics of the dataset is shown in Table 2. Finally the objective of model is to identify exact corresponding interaction. Statistics of the dataset is shown in Table 2. Statistics of the dataset before and after filtering.

3.1 Pre-processing

The following pre-processing is done in the dataset before using it in our model:

- **Genia tagger** is used for tokenization. All digits are normalized by replacing them with a special token DG and all letters are changed to lowercase.

- The two targeted drug names are replaced with **DRUG-A** and **DRUG-B** respectively, and other drug names in the same sentence are replaced with **DRUG-N**. Earlier studies [26, 20] have reported that this step helps in improving the model performance.

3.2 Negative Instance Filtering

Consideration of all possible pairs of drug names in a sentence as separate instances for our model made the resultant dataset very imbalanced. We have 1:5.9 ratio of positive to negative instances. However, one can follow some strategies to remove negative instances. Earlier studies [40, 18, 20] have shown positive impact of negative instance filtering. We filter negative samples based on the following rules:

1. If both targeted drug mentions have the same name, remove the corresponding instance. Assumption behind this rule is drug doesn’t interact with itself. We use string matching on both drug names to identify such cases.
2. Remove the instance, if one drug is a kind of or a special case of the other one in the corresponding sentence. To identify such cases, we use regular expression by observing patterns in the dataset. "**DRUG-A (DRUG-B)**", "**DRUG-A such as DRUG-B**" are examples of such patterns.
3. If both target drugs appear in same coordinate structure, then remove the corresponding instance. We use several regular expressions based on observing the patterns in training set to filter out such instances. Examples of such pattern is "**DRUG-A , (DRUG-N ,)**\" DRUG-B."

Similar to [20], our rules have not eliminated any positive instances from the test set. However, 144 positive instances (54 **Mechanism**, 65 **Effects**, 49 **Int** and 6 **Advice**) are removed from the training set. Table 2 summarizes statistics of dataset before and after filtering.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>Dropout</th>
<th>l2 regu.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNN</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-LSTM</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB-LSTM</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint AB-LSTM</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Values of different regularization parameters used in the three models.

4. EXPERIMENT DESIGN

We train and evaluate three LSTM models on the DDI classification task. As mentioned earlier, if a sentence contains more than two drug names then all possible pairs with the sentence constitute separate instances/samples. We use the same evaluation scheme as used in the challenge 29.
### 4.1 Hyper-parameters

As there is no separate development or validation set available, we divided the original training dataset into two parts, 80% as training and rest 20% as validation sets. Hyper-parameters are tuned using this validation set. Hidden layer size in B-LSTM and AB-LSTM are kept as 200, and 150 for Joint AB-LSTM. Pre-trained word embedding of 100 dimensions and distance embedding of 10 dimensions are used in all three LSTM models. Word embedding are obtained using GloVe tool [23] on a corpus of PubMed open source articles [35]. We used both $l_2$ regularization and dropout [33] techniques for regularization. We applied dropout only on the output of the pooling layers. Different values of the regularization parameters are shown in the Table 3. Next to decide about the early-stopping criteria (i.e. number of epochs neural network models will be trained), we again split the original training dataset into two parts containing 95% and 5% of all samples. Now we trained the model on 95% set using above selected hyper-parameters and selected the epoch giving the best result on the left out 5% of the original training data. Trained model on the 95% set is used on the independent test set and corresponding results are discussed in the respective sections.

### 4.2 Baseline Methods for comparison

We compare performance of the three proposed models with several baseline methods. Approaches based on conventional features, kernel methods and on neural networks are included as baseline methods. Below we briefly describe about the baseline methods, where superscript one ($^1$) indicates one stage and superscript two ($^2$) indicates two stages methods:

**Linear Methods:** In this class of methods, a linear classifier is used to identify the correct class of interaction for each instance. All instances are represented by a vector of manually designed features. UTurku$^4$ used Turku event extraction system (TEES) [2] for drug interaction extraction. The major features used by TEES comes from dependency parsing and domain dependent resources such as MetaMap. UWM-TRIADS$^2$ [26] and Kim$^2$ [18] are two stage methods. In both the stages SVM with contextual, lexical, semantic and tree structured features was used.

**Kernel Methods:** Kernel methods are powerful techniques for utilizing graph based features in any natural language processing task. WBI-DDI$^1$ and FBKirst$^2$ are two stage methods [7, 36] for DDI classification. First stage of both models used different kernels methods for utilizing syntax tree and dependency tree features. In the second stage WBI-DDI$^2$ used TEES and FBKirst$^2$ used SVM with non-linear kernel for classification. NIL UCM$^1$ used multi-class SVM as kernel methods in one stage framework.

**Neural Network Methods:** Neural network or deep learning methods use latent features in place of manually designed features. This class of algorithms use neural network to encode word level features for generation of sentence level features. Final classification happens with sentence level features. Classification happens with sentence level features. SCNN$^{1,2,40}$ used convolution neural network with max pooling layer to learn higher level discriminative features over entire sentence. SCNN also utilized PoS tags and dependency tree based features apart from latent word embedding and distance embedding features. MV-RNN$^1$ [34] is also a neural network based model. In particular, MV-RNN used recursive neural network [32] for learning embedding of sentence or part of sentence recursively and thus obtained final vector is used for classification. To analyze the performance of RNN and CNN based models, we implemented CNN with max pooling technique for this task. We implemented the similar model, as discussed in [20], due to unavailability of the source code and referred to it as CNN$^{*}$. Initially, the results were obtained with similar parameter settings as discussed in [20] but we could not obtain the similar results, as mentioned in that research article. So we tuned the model hyper-parameters and used them in subsequent analysis. The difference in performance could be due to change in training dataset after negative instance filtering as well as due to use of different pre-trained embedding vectors.

## 5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

### 5.1 Effect of Negative Instance Filtering

Following our filtering rules, a large number of negative in-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Precision</td>
<td>Recall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNN$^*$</td>
<td>62.11</td>
<td>63.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-LSTM</td>
<td>69.07</td>
<td>64.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB-LSTM</td>
<td>70.75</td>
<td>60.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint AB-LSTM</td>
<td>67.77</td>
<td>66.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Performance improvement after filtering negative instance from the dataset. $\Delta$ indicates percentage of relative improvement in F1 score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>B-LSTM</th>
<th>AB-LSTM</th>
<th>Joint AB-LSTM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanism</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Relative change in class-wise performance measures after negative filtering. ↓ indicates value got reduced after filtering step compared to the value obtained using the complete data. Similarly ↑ indicates increase in value and ~ indicates value remain almost same after filtering step.
stances along with few positive instances are removed from the dataset. However none of the positive instances from test set are removed. There was a significant change in imbalance ratios of interaction classes due to the filtering step. For example, imbalance ratio changed from 1:32.6 to 1:19.1 for the interaction class Advice and from 1:146 to 1:116.8 for the interaction class Int. Table 7 shows performance of different models on test set while training is done using either complete or filtered dataset. All models when using filtered dataset gave improved performance in terms of F1 score. All three LSTM models obtained more than 3% of relative improvement with the use of filtered dataset. Performance improvement can be attributed to two factors: cleaner data and reduction of imbalance. Both these factors are result of the data filtering step.

We next look at class-wise performance of all LSTM models to see how change in imbalance ratio affected the model performance at individual class level. For this we compared the relative changes in precision, recall and F1 score, when models trained on the filtered dataset vs the complete dataset. The results are summarized in the Table 5. The overall F1 score for individual class increases in almost all the cases. For Advice class, all three models have similar effect on precision and recall. All three LSTM models have obtained better precision but recall got reduced or remained almost same for the Mechanism class. For the Effect class, Joint AB-LSTM model obtained reduced recall, but all the models have obtained better or similar precision values after filtering. The performance pattern of the B-LSTM and AB-LSTM models were same for the Int class. It is very difficult to reason out the effect of filtering step due to inconsistent effect of it on the three models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>Precision</th>
<th>Recall</th>
<th>F Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCNN(^1)</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNN(^2)</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>63.63</td>
<td>62.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-LSTM(^3)</td>
<td>69.07</td>
<td>64.35</td>
<td>66.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB-LSTM(^4)</td>
<td>70.75</td>
<td>60.06</td>
<td>64.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint AB-LSTM(^5)</td>
<td>67.77</td>
<td>66.90</td>
<td>67.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Performance comparison of proposed models with existing models on complete dataset, i.e. without using negative instance filtering, for DDI classification task.

5.2 Comparison with Baseline Methods

Comparison based on the complete dataset: First we compare the three proposed models with other existing models on the complete dataset, i.e., without using the filtering step. Best results out of five runs are shown in Table 6. Here, we have included only those methods which explicitly mention about the similar steps and report corresponding results. B-LSTM and Joint AB-LSTM models have outperformed all other models. We performed t-test (one-sided null hypothesis: mean performance of model 1 is not less than that of model 2) on mean performance of model pairs. Mean performance of a model was calculated as the average of F1 score obtained in five different runs of the model. B-LSTM and Joint AB-LSTM models outperformed CNN\(^1\) model at the significance level of 0.05. In particular p-values of CNN\(^1\) vs B-LSTM, AB-LSTM, and Joint AB-LSTM comparisons were 0.0007, 0.04, 0.01 respectively. Among the LSTM models, no single model outperforms other models at the above chosen significance level.

Comparison based on the filtered dataset: Table 7 provides a comparison of our models with previous approaches. Joint AB-LSTM model obtained the best F1 score of 69.39%. There is 3.6% of relative improvement in F1 score on comparison with the best performing method (Kim\(^2\)) among feature based linear and kernel methods. In comparison to SCNN\(^2\) model, all three proposed models gave similar results for this task. SCNN\(^2\), a convolution neural network based model, uses higher order grammatical features based on parts of speech and shortest dependency path apart from pre-trained word embedding and position embedding features. If we remove shortest dependency path features from SCNN\(^2\) model, its performance decreases to 63.8% from 68.6%. On the other hand, apart from Joint AB-LSTM, the other two models also gave relatively much better performance than SCNN\(^2\) with only using simple features.

Among the three proposed models, Joint AB-LSTM always performs better than the other two methods. Based on the McNemar test B-LSTM, AB-LSTM, and Joint AB-LSTM models outperformed CNN\(^1\) model with p-values of 0.0005, 0.001 and 8.4 × 10\(^{-9}\) respectively. As results indicate all LSTM based models outperform CNN\(^1\) model significantly. Among the LSTM models, Joint AB-LSTM and B-LSTM models outperform AB-LSTM with p-values of 0.005 and 0.03 respectively on the DDI classification task. Further, the McNemar test suggests that there is no significant difference in performance of the two models on the DDI-classification task.

Class wise Performance Analysis: We compare class wise performance of the proposed models with existing models in Table 8. We observe that no single model outperforms others for all classes. FBK irs obtained the best performance for Int class. B-LSTM, AB-LSTM and Joint AB-LSTM obtained the best performance for Mechanism, Effect and Advice classes respectively. However, Joint AB-LSTM outperformed all other models on aggregate performance measure using macro-average F1 score. All models finds it easier to detect Advice interaction types compared to the instances of the other three interaction types. Simi-
Table 8: Performance comparison between the proposed methods and top-ranking approaches on the test data for DDI classification. Performance are measured through F1-Score for each class and Macro Average (MAVG). The highest scores are highlighted in bold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>Advice</th>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Int</th>
<th>MAVG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UTurku [2]</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWM-TRIADS [26]</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim [15]</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBK int [8]</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIL_UCM [3]</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBI-DDI [29]</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV-RNN [11]</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>50.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNN*</td>
<td>69.04</td>
<td>63.98</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>45.07</td>
<td>60.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-LSTM</td>
<td>75.92</td>
<td>72.66</td>
<td>65.15</td>
<td>47.40</td>
<td>65.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB-LSTM</td>
<td>69.68</td>
<td>68.06</td>
<td>68.28</td>
<td>54.10</td>
<td>65.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint AB-LSTM</td>
<td>80.26</td>
<td>72.26</td>
<td>65.46</td>
<td>54.11</td>
<td>65.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Contribution of each feature in Joint AB-LSTM model. Here P refers random position embedding for both P1 and P2, and X refers pre-trained word vector embedding.

5.3 Feature Analysis

In order to validate the importance of each feature, we further analyzed the performance of Joint AB-LSTM model by removing feature types one by one. It can be observed from Table 9 that the use of pre-trained word embedding is important feature. About 1.1% of relative decrement is observed if the model does not use position embedding. On the other hand, removal of position embedding as well as use of random vectors in place of pre-trained word vectors lead to 4.6% of relative decrements in the model’s performance. This analysis clearly indicates the importance of word and position embedding features.

5.4 LSTM vs CNN models

Earlier we discussed that intuitively it seems LSTM models are likely to perform better for longer sentences compared to CNN model. We performed an analysis on our results to see whether that is the case or not. For this we analyze length as well as entity separation between two targeted drugs of all those sentences which were predicted correctly by one model but incorrectly by the other. Figures 2a and 2b show the box plots for sentence length and separation length between targeted drugs. Here \{X\}-\{Y\} represent instances correctly predicted by X but not by Y. In all of these cases length represent number of words and numbers present at top of the boxes represent number of instances present in that category. From the figures we can observe that the proposed LSTM models performed better than CNN in both scenarios of instances having longer sentences and having larger entity separation length.

5.5 Error Analysis

Apart from imbalance issue, we try to find out whether there is any other factor which is adversely affecting performance of the models. For this we look at average sentence lengths of correctly and incorrectly classified instances by each of the four models for the DDI classification task (Table 10). We observe that, average sentence length and entity separation length for incorrectly classified instances are always high compared to the correctly classified sentences. Another aspect of incorrectly predicted instances was, presence of multiple drug entities in many such instances. Repetitive drug entities is more likely to behave like a noise, which may cause neural models to lose relevant information from other words likely to be contextually important. Hence a better strategy is required to deal with such cases. Considering limited context along with removal of repetitive entities can be one way to deal with extra large sentences.
5.6 Visual Analysis

In order to confirm that the model is able to learn attention weights based on importance of words, we visualize attention weights of some of the sentences after training Joint AB-LSTM. Figure 3 is the heat map of attention weights for 6 instances of test set. Here every line is a sentence with two targeted drug names replaced with special weights for 6 instances of test set. Here every line is a sentence with two targeted drug names replaced with special weights. Figure 3 shows that our model can select important words based on the task. For example in the sentence “DRUG-A may enhance the effects of DRUG-B”, the model is assigning high weights to “may enhance the effects” very well. Similarly, in the sentence “DRUG-N and DRUG-A increase the effects of DRUG-B”, the model is assigning high weights to the words increase and effect.

Table 10: Mean and standard deviations (in subscript) of length of sentence for True Positive and False Negative instance in DDI classification task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sentence Length</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Entity Separation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNN*</td>
<td>26.19(13.38)</td>
<td>42.51(21.06)</td>
<td>11.24(9.39)</td>
<td>15.17(12.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-LSTM</td>
<td>29.12(16.10)</td>
<td>37.34(22.49)</td>
<td>12.15(9.55)</td>
<td>13.92(13.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB-LSTM</td>
<td>28.52(17.57)</td>
<td>37.54(20.29)</td>
<td>11.12(10.11)</td>
<td>14.26(12.05)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Heat map of attention weights indicating importance of relevant words.
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6. CONCLUSION

In this work we proposed three LSTM based models B-LSTM, AB-LSTM and Joint AB-LSTM for DDI classification task. All the three models use simple word and distance embedding as features and learn higher level feature representation using Bi-LSTM network. Two of the proposed models also utilized neural attention mechanism to get higher level feature representation. To the best of our knowledge, it is the first study to use LSTM and attention mechanism for DDI extraction task. Performance of all three models are compared with the existing methods on SemEval-2013 DDI extraction dataset. Joint AB-LSTM model achieves state-of-the-art for the DDI classification task. Performance of the other two models, B-LSTM and AB-LSTM, are also found to be competitive. Analysis of the results indicates the following important points: imbalance and noise adversely affect all models, Advice interaction class is easiest to predict, repetitive entries of other drug names negatively affect all models, and models are likely to make incorrect classification for longer sentences.
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