arXiv:2206.15076v1 [cs.CL] 30 Jun 2022

BIGBIO: A Framework for Data-Centric Biomedical Natural Language Processing

Jason Alan Fries[1*] **Leon Weber**[2,3*] **Natasha Seelam**[4*] **Gabriel Altay**[5*]
Debajyoti Datta[6†] **Ruisi Su**[7†] **Samuele Garda**[2†] **Sunny MS Kang**[8†]
Stella Biderman[9,10†] **Matthias Samwald**[11†] **Stephen H. Bach**[12†] **Wojciech Kusa**[13†]
Samuel Cahyawijaya[14†] **Fabio Barth**[2†] **Simon Ott**[11†] **Mario Sänger**[2†] **Bo Wang**[15]
Alison Callahan[1] **Daniel León Periñán**[16] **Théo Gigant**[7] **Patrick Haller**[2]
Jenny Chim[17] **Jose Posada**[18] **John Giorgi**[19] **Karthik Rangasai Sivaraman**[20]
Marc Pàmies[21] **Marianna Nezhurina**[22] **Robert Martin**[2] **Moritz Freidank**[23]
Nathan Dahlberg[7] **Shubhanshu Mishra**[24] **Shamik Bose**[7] **Nicholas Broad**[25]
Yanis Labrak[26] **Shlok S Deshmukh**[27] **Sid Kiblawi**[28] **Ayush Singh**[7] **Minh Chien Vu**[29]
Trishala Neeraj[30] **Jonas Golde**[2] **Albert Villanova del Moral**[25] **Benjamin Beilharz**[31]
[1]Stanford University [2]Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin
[3]Max Delbrück Center for Molecular Medicine [4]Sherlock Biosciences [5]Tempus Labs Inc.
[6]University of Virginia [7]BigScience [8]Immuneering [9]EleutherAI [10]Booz Allen Hamilton
[11]Institute of Artificial Intelligence, Medical University of Vienna [12]Brown University
[13]TU Wien [14]The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology
[15−25]See Appendix A [*]Equal Contribution [†]Equal Contribution
Corresponding Authors: jason-fries@stanford.edu leonweber@posteo.de
nseelam1@gmail.com gabriel.altay@gmail.com

Abstract

Training and evaluating language models increasingly requires the construction of *meta-datasets* – diverse collections of curated data with clear provenance. Natural language prompting has recently lead to improved zero-shot generalization by transforming existing, supervised datasets into a diversity of novel pretraining tasks, highlighting the benefits of meta-dataset curation. While successful in general-domain text, translating these data-centric approaches to biomedical language modeling remains challenging, as labeled biomedical datasets are significantly underrepresented in popular data hubs. To address this challenge, we introduce BIGBIO a community library of 126+ biomedical NLP datasets, currently covering 12 task categories and 10+ languages. BIGBIO facilitates reproducible meta-dataset curation via programmatic access to datasets and their metadata, and is compatible with current platforms for prompt engineering and end-to-end few/zero shot language model evaluation. We discuss our process for task schema harmonization, data auditing, contribution guidelines, and outline two illustrative use cases: zero-shot evaluation of biomedical prompts and large-scale, multi-task learning. BIGBIO is an ongoing community effort and is available at this URL.

1 Introduction

Large-scale language modeling has demonstrated exciting performance gains in zero-shot classification when combined with explicit, prompted supervision. Here, existing labeled datasets are transformed into prompted training examples, which redefine classification tasks as generative, text completion tasks [25]. T0 and FLAN have demonstrated improvements in zero-shot generalization

Preprint. Under review.

using this training approach [28, 36]. Increasing the number of prompted training tasks can also lead to improved generalization even when the number of model parameters is fixed.

The importance of carefully controlling the tasks a language model is exposed to during training highlights how *meta-dataset* curation is critical for state-of-the-art language modeling. Prompting offers new opportunities for constructing meta-datasets and aligns with the principles of data-centric machine learning, which focuses on training data curation to improve model performance. In the general NLP domain, data-centric methods have benefited from community efforts such as Hugging Face's datasets hub [18], which provides easy, programmatic access to datasets and their attributes. However, biomedical datasets are significantly underrepresented in the datasets hub [10] creating challenges in reproducibly accessing, curating, and remixing biomedical NLP data for prompted training and zero/few-shot evaluation of language models.

To help address these challenges, we introduce BIGBIO, a community resource for programmatically accessing biomedical NLP datasets at scale and encouraging reproducibly when generating meta-datasets. BIGBIO is, to the best of our knowledge, the largest public collection of curated and unit-tested biomedical NLP datasets. BIGBIO was developed as part of BigScience[1], a year-long workshop on large language modeling, and codifies many lessons of the biomedical working group as they developed dataset curation strategies.

A summary of our contributions:

- Programmatic access to 126+ unit-tested, biomedical datasets, covering 12 tasks, 10+ languages, and providing structured metadata for key attributes on provenance and licensing.
- Support for multiple lightweight schemata, which preserve the dataset as released and provide harmonized access for prompt engineering and cross-dataset integration.
- Community tools and guides for contributing new datasets.
- BIGBIO is built upon Hugging Face's datasets library, integrating with PromptSource [3], a prompt engineering system and repository, and the EleutherAI Language Model Evaluation Harness [11] to support rapidly designing and evaluating prompts on biomedical tasks.

We illustrate the utility of BIGBIO in two representative use cases: (1) zero-shot, prompted biomedical language model evaluation; and (2) large-scale multi-task learning (MTL) with 100+ tasks. In both use cases, we substantially lower the engineering costs required to construct the meta-datasets commonly utilized for language modeling and other machine learning applications.

2 Related Work

BIGBIO is a data-centric approach to natural language processing in the biomedical domain. We briefly overview related work in these two areas.

2.1 Data-Centric Machine Learning

Data-centric machine learning emphasizes the thoughtful curation of data as centrally important to the development of models. Multiple arguments for this emphasis have been advanced. Paullada et al. [21] survey many aspects, including mitigating biases and annotation artifacts in training data that lead models to rely on spurious correlations that do not generalize to other datasets, and addressing representational harms in which certain people are under, over, or misrepresented. Sambasivan et al. [27] document prevalent "data cascades," situations in AI and machine learning practice in which low-quality data causes downstream problems in high-stakes applications. Biderman and Scheirer [4] make several recommendations for improved data practices, including auditing and documenting datasets. Rogers [26] outlines issues with models that can be exacerbated by low-quality data. This encompasses for instance: learning spurious patterns, being vulnerable to basic input perturbations, and struggling with rare inputs. BIGBIO is motivated by these same arguments, hence its emphasis on careful metadata curation and harmonized task schemata.

Data quality has a large impact on model performance. Deduplicating data leads to more accurate and more robust models with faster convergence. [7, 17]. For instance, cleaning up the consistency

[1] https://bigscience.huggingface.co/

of answer response strings was reported to improve biomedical question answering [38]. Duplication contamination is a serious risk in biomedical datasets, which often iteratively build or extend prior annotations, introducing risk of test leakage in evaluation [9]. As we describe in §3, BIGBIO's centralization of data in a unified format enables systematic data quality checks.

Data governance is also an important issue when curating biomedical language data. Jernite et al. [14] survey many aspects of the governance of language data, and propose a framework for distributed governance of large language corpora. Vayena et al. [32] describe models of data governance that enable biomedical research while respecting patient privacy. Jones et al. [15] propose data governance standards for clinical text data with personally identifiable information. Some of these issues are not directly applicable to BIGBIO, which currently only includes loaders for datasets that are compliant with the United States Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) as public research datasets. Further, BIGBIO is not itself a repository of data, but a centralized repository of data loaders and metadata, meaning that future dataset creators can programmatically define how a dataset should be accessed and share this information with the community.

2.2 Biomedical Benchmarks

Task-specific benchmark datasets are common in biomedical workshops like BioNLP and BioCreative [16, 13]. These datasets however typically assess a restricted set of skills learned by a model. Several recent efforts have focused on curating larger collections of datasets and tasks to evaluate the performance of biomedical NLP models. BLUE (Biomedical Language Understanding Evaluation) is a benchmark for 10 datasets representing 5 tasks [22], which was extended by BLURB (Biomedical Language Understanding and Reasoning Benchmark) to include 13 datasets and 7 tasks [12]. HunFlair provides harmonized access to 23 NER datasets, but imposes assumptions on preprocessing choices (e.g., tokenization) [35]. Most benchmarks provide no multilingual data. CBLUE is the only non-English benchmark consisting of 8 datasets and tasks for Chinese biomedical language [39].

Multiple biomedical prompt datasets have been released for few and zero-shot classification evaluation. NATURAL-INSTRUCTIONS$_{v2}$ provides 1600+ task instructions for a variety of domains, including 30 tasks for medicine and healthcare [34]. BoX provides natural language instructions for 32 datasets and 9 tasks, where instructions consist of an explanation, a prompt, and a collection of example input/outputs [20]. Agrawal et al. [2] released 2 datasets for zero-shot clinical information extraction.

BIGBIO differs from previous efforts by focusing on the infrastructure and curation required to reproducibly generate meta-datasets. Existing benchmarks provide consistent mechanisms for evaluating machine learning performance, however they do not support consistent tooling to access and ingest data into machine learning workflows. This is a serious limitation in practice, especially as novel training and evaluation strategies increasingly require transforming input data. We emphasize direct, easy and programmatic access to datasets with community curation to build open tools for data loading. We have curated detailed metadata about tasks, e.g. languages, licensing and other aspects of dataset provenance. We provide harmonized views of datasets by task schema, enabling easier integration into workflows, while also imposing minimal assumptions on NLP preprocessing decisions like sentence splitting and tokenization. Existing benchmarks typically fix preprocessing choices, creating challenges when comparing end-to-end workflows common in prompting.

3 The BIGBIO Framework

This research effort was initiated as part of BigScience, a year-long collaborative workshop on the creation of very large language models, comprised of over 1000 researchers from 60 countries and dozens of working groups. The BigScience biomedical working group consisted of machine learning researchers and other stakeholders interested in the curation of biomedical data for large-scale language modeling. BIGBIO reflects the lessons and best practices we learned while developing a framework for more easily and reproducibly generating biomedical NLP meta-datasets.

3.1 Dataset Curation

Building the Dataset Catalog Our initial efforts in the BigScience working group produced a catalog of important biomedical datasets, key metadata, and other provenance [10]. Selection criteria




Figure 1: The workflow for implementing, harmonizing, and unit testing datasets for inclusion in BIGBIO. Harmonized schemata enable standardizing unit tests, cross-dataset integration, and easier dataset remixing, such as transforming supervised datasets into prompted tasks.

followed several principles: (1) relevance to biomedical research, (2) diversity of domains, tasks, and languages; and (3) public availability. We used this open catalog as the starting point for BIGBIO .

Task Schema Harmonization In biomedical NLP there are a proliferation of data formats (e.g., BioC, BRAT) but inconsistent adherence across those formats. Developing common data models for interoperability [6], while beneficial for cross-dataset integration, risks possible information loss when translating or *harmonizing* information across schemata. To develop shared infrastructure for data ingestion and minimize information loss, we designed data loaders to support 2 dataset views: (1) a source schema that preserves the original dataset format as faithfully as possible; and (2) task-specific, harmonized BIGBIO schema. We developed 6 lightweight schema supporting common NLP tasks including knowledge base construction (KB), question answering (QA), textual entailment (ENTAIL), text to text (T2T), textual pairs (PAIRS), and document/text classification (TEXT). Complete specifications are in the Appendix.

Unit Tests and Dataset Cleaning To safeguard correctness of data loader implementations, we developed a testing suite of unit-tests for monitored quality issues. BIGBIO schema are designed to support key dataset integrity checks, such as enforcing unique IDs across elements, relational consistency, confirming text offsets are correctly aligned within document text, etc. The unit testing suite is runnable as part of the dataset submission process, providing feedback on diagnosing implementation or dataset errors. Where possible, we implemented tools for common data cleaning tasks, such as normalizing PubMed IDs (PMIDs).

Acceptance Checklist Submissions to BIGBIO require completing a checklist of inclusion criteria before acceptance into the project GitHub repository. First, correctly annotating all metadata relevant to the dataset (e.g., languages, task types, provenance). Second appropriate schema and task pairing, and consistent materialization of data across all data subsets defined by the dataset authors. Finally, submissions must demonstrate that code passes all unit-tests.

All publicly accessible scripts were manually reviewed and accepted by a BIGBIO admin. Local datasets that require a manual download of the data were also manually checked if an admin had appropriate authorization (e.g., several authors have PhysioNet credentials). In absence of dataset access, data loaders were accepted contingent on showing the output of successful unit test logs.

Issue Tracking Most biomedical datasets involve complex labeling tasks, so even in cases when datasets pass unit tests they may contain subtle bugs or misunderstandings that require revisiting. To identify and harden our dataset implementations, we implemented the 2 use cases outlined in §5: zero-shot language model evaluation and large-scale multi-task-learning. Implementing these realistic machine learning workflows resulted in identifying non-obvious dataset-specific errors or limitations in our current schema. For example, some datasets do not provide natural language class labels, such as labeling a relation with an internal code (CPR:6) instead language describing the underlying biological relationship (ANTAGONIST), which creates challenges when writing prompts.

3.2 Prompting and Language Model Evaluation Harness

To demonstrate the accessibility of the BIGBIO library, we integrated this package with several other frameworks as a proof of concept. First, we integrated with PromptSource [3] to enable the creation of prompted representations of the data. PromptSource is a development environment for prompts,

which requires datasets to be available for loading in a unified format. All of BIGBIO's datasets can be loaded into PromptSource, and then users can write prompts for them and materialize the prompted forms of those datasets locally for training and evaluation.

To further enable the evaluation of language models on datasets in BIGBIO, we also connected BIGBIO with the EleutherAI Language Model Evaluation Harness [11]. The Evaluation Harness handles the loading, querying, and scoring of language models, with programmatic definitions of how evaluations are carried out. Here, the unified task schema of BIGBIO are an advantage, enabling standard evaluation schemes to be automatically applied to a wide collection of datasets, while still allowing for additional definitions of specialized evaluations.

3.3 Biomedical Hackathon

After internally testing the elements outlined in §3.1, we drafted instructional material and code tutorials for external collaborators. We then launched an international call for participation[2] in a biomedical hackathon to implement all 174 datasets in the BIGBIO catalog. Participants were recruited through Twitter. We established formal participation guidelines and corresponding credit, including co-authorship on this manuscript, given implementation of 3 or more data loaders. The hackathon officially ran for 2 weeks with an unofficial 2 week wrap-up period. During the official period, we held daily office hours to help participants, running a Discord server to facilitate rapid communication and up-to-date FAQ. At the conclusion of the hackathon, 48 participants had implemented 126 total datasets with an additional 18 dataset still undergoing quality control.

4 The BIGBIO Dataset



Figure 2: Treemap visualization of BIGBIO's 126 datasets and 12 task categories, denoted by color (left); the distribution of dataset sizes measured by number of examples (bottom right); and a circle plot of task categories and their relative size (top right).

We provide a `bigbio` Python package that supports streamlined loading of 126 biomedical datasets covering 12 tasks grouped into 6 schema types for a total of 24 million examples comprising 18 trillion characters. To the best of our knowledge, BIGBIO is the largest single collection of curated and unit tested biomedical NLP datasets. Figure 2 visualizes the datasets and tasks in BIGBIO and Table 1 provides dataset counts by schema and key attributes. The publicly available datasets (105 of 126 datasets) can be automatically downloaded. We provide scripts to load the remaining 21 datasets that require further access approvals, where the user only needs to specify a path to their local copy of

[2] https://hfbigbio.github.io/

Table 1: Summary statistics for BIGBIO. Note datasets may contain multiple schema.

	KB	TEXT	PAIRS	QA	ENTAIL	T2T	ALL
Datasets	84	21	10	8	7	7	126
Public Datasets	73	9	10	7	4	6	105
Private Datasets	11	12	0	1	3	1	21
PubMed Datasets	64	7	3	4	1	1	77
Languages	7	4	1	1	1	4	10
Tasks	5	1	1	1	1	3	12

the datasets. This restriction is common in clinical datasets, which require credentialing and training on how to handle protected health information.

Metadata Summary Overall 10 languages are represented, with English being the majority (83%) followed by Spanish (6.5%), French (2.9%), Chinese (2.2%), and German (1.4%). Japanese, Dutch, Portuguese, Swedish, and Vietnamese are each present in one dataset. Creative Commons licenses are used more frequently than any other type covering 44 (35%) of datasets with 8 (6.3%) using the non commercial use (NC) option. The next most frequent type is an unknown license for 34 (27%) of datasets. These are cases in which the dataset authors did not choose a license or one could not be located for the dataset. The remaining licenses are a mixture of permissive open source licenses such as MIT and Apache and more restrictive licensing requiring written applications for use and custom data user agreements. A complete list of structured metadata is available in Appendix §D.

5 Use Cases

We develop two downstream use cases of BIGBIO, to showcase the utility of the library and identify any workflow issues. In the first use case, we evaluate prompted language models in a zero-shot setting and in the second we train a large-scale MTL model. Both use cases used a single 8x A40 compute node and MTL also used a 4x RTX 3090 node. Expanded results and experimental details are available in Appendix §J (zero-shot evaluation) and §K (MTL).

5.1 Zero-shot Evaluation of Prompted Language Models




Figure 3: Zero-shot generalization to biomedical tasks. Box plots show pooled accuracy differences between a majority class baseline and zero-shot prediction for all datasets excluding BIOSSES. Points are per-prompt scores. T0 is the only language model class to outperform the majority baseline.

Datasets and Prompts We selected 5 representative datasets from BIGBIO: BIOSSES (semantic textual similarity), BioASQ (yes/no question answering), GAD (relation extraction), SciTail (textual entailment), and MedNLI (clinical textual entailment). We exclude NER datasets due to challenges

and computational costs of using discrete prompting for token classification tasks [19]. For each dataset, we wrote 5 prompts using PromptSource to reflect the original classification task.

Evaluation Protocol We evaluate 10 pretrained language models, ranging from 220 million to 11 billion parameters: SciFive-base/large [23], GPT Neo-1.3B[5], GPT-2[24], GPT-J-6B [33], the T0 family [28], and the 11B parameter base T5 model used to build T0 [25]. Models were evaluated using a BigScience prompted evaluation library[3] built on top of the language model evaluation harness from Gao et al. [11]. All evaluations use the canonical test split where possible, otherwise we used BLURB's test set definitions. All tasks are evaluated using accuracy except BIOSSES which uses Pearson's correlation after transforming outputs into numbers. We evaluate all prompts and report the average and best performance for each dataset, as well as a baseline score based on the majority class. For contextualizing scores, we include prior state-the-art finetuned performance for all tasks [30, 37, 23].

Table 2: Zero-shot performance of prompted language models

		BIOSSES		BioASQ		SciTail		MedNLI		GAD	
Model	PMC	Avg	Best	Avg	Best	Avg	Best	Avg	Best	Avg	Best
SciFive-Base	✓	34.0	55.8	32.9	32.9	59.9	60.4	66.4	66.7	47.4	47.4
SciFive-Large	✓	7.2	19.5	32.9	32.9	56.2	60.4	66.7	66.7	47.4	47.4
GPT-Neo-1.3B	✓	36.4	36.4	40.9	65.7	50.6	60.4	36.6	41.0	47.7	50.4
GPT-2		12.5	19.5	36.1	48.6	50.3	60.4	55.1	65.6	47.4	47.6
GPT-J-6B	✓	0.2	32.1	40.4	67.1	51.6	60.3	48.3	62.7	48.2	52.1
T5 v1.1-xxl		-	-	67.1	67.1	43.8	60.4	33.3	33.3	52.6	52.6
T0		23.3	49.5	76.1	82.9	73.9	88.1	72.0	**77.8**	53.7	55.6
T0+		37.8	**66.7**	73.1	78.6	74.3	87.9	72.5	76.8	53.9	55.1
T0++.		**40.6**	42.5	**89.0**	**91.4**	**75.6**	**90.8**	**73.4**	77.4	**55.7**	**56.6**
Majority Class		-		67.1		60.4		66.7		52.6	
Finetuned SOTA		94.5		94.8		96.8		86.6		84.9	

Results Fig. 3 shows that T5 and GPT models fail to generalize to biomedical text, regardless of parameter count or exposure to biomedical text during pretraining/finetuning. T0 class models do demonstrate task generalization, even though those models were not exposed to any biomedical tasks during prompted pretraining. We replicate the finding in Sanh et al. that models using more prompted pretraining tasks demonstrate better generalization, finding that T0++ performed best overall. Table 2 includes performance statistics for all language models and datasets and denotes if the model was trained or finetuned on biomedical data from PubMed Central (PMC). All non-T0 perform worse than the simple majority class baseline. For SciFive and T5 models, predictions were often pathological, i.e., emitting the same answer for all prompts. For the T0 family, models consistently outperformed the majority class baseline. On BioASQ and SciTail using T0++, the best prompts performed very well, falling 3.4 and 6.0 points short of state of the state-of-the-art supervised models. MedNLI, GAD, and BIOSSES remained significantly challenging for all models.

5.2 Large-scale Multi-task Learning

Data Materialization We train and evaluate a multi-task learning (MTL) model on 106 different BioNLP tasks using the MaChAmp MTL framework [31]. We generated training and evaluation splits using all datasets that were available in the BIGBIO repository version when we started the project. From the 106 datasets, we filtered out datasets that: were non-English; had known implementation bugs; included silver-standard annotations; or were document-level or multilabel classification datasets. For the 67 remaining datasets, we extracted data for 8 task types: Named Entity Recognition, Text Classification, Question Answering, Coreference Resolution, Event Detection, Event Argument Extraction, Relation Extraction and Semantic Textual Similarity, yielding 107 tasks (dataset/task type combinations) in total.

[3] https://github.com/bigscience-workshop/lm-evaluation-harness

Training Protocol We train a single encoder-only transformer model with a separate classification head for each of the 107 tasks. We initialize the encoder with BioLinkBERT-base [37]. We follow [1] in using a task-heterogeneous batching strategy. Specifically, at each training step, we sample 32 different tasks and select 16 examples for each of them leading to a total batch size of 512. We train the model to convergence, which takes less than 50 epochs and then select the best performing checkpoint based on validation performance.

Evaluation Protocol We evaluate our model on a subset of dataset from the BLURB benchmark. We select all four datasets that are contained in our MTL training data and have the same splits in the MTL data as in BLURB. For all datasets, we use the version in the MaChAmp format, which differ in tokenization, sentence splitting and label space from the official BLURB versions. After prediction, we postprocess the results to match the BLURB label space. While this introduces confounders that makes direct comparison complicated, e.g., different choices in sentence splitting and tokenization, we include prior state-of-the-art results for the same model size [37] as a point of orientation. We additionally compare with a version of our MTL model that we fine-tune on the training data of the evaluation dataset using the MaChAmp default hyperparameters.

Results MTL results are reported in Table 3. MTL+Finetuning results are reported as the mean and standard deviation of 3 different random seeds. For contextualizing scores, we also include state-of-the-art LinkBERT-base results. The MTL model performs markedly worse than the state-of-the-art LinkBERT model, with differences between 1.5 and 11.2 percentage points (pp) F1. However, additional fine-tuning only on the evaluation dataset narrows the gap between LinkBERT and the MTL model significantly with a maximum difference of 3.2 pp F1. This confirms the results of [1] that models trained in a large-scale MTL setting are a suitable basis for further fine-tuning. However, the failure of the fine-tuned model to perform better than state-of-the-art indicates that more research on the conditions in which large-scale MTL pre-finetuning may improves results is required.

Table 3: F1 scores of the MTL model evaluation

Dataset	Task	MTL	MTL+Finetuning	LinkBERT-base
NCBI-Disease	NER	80.2	87.5 ± 0.9	*88.2
BC5CDR-Disease	NER	78.5	84.8 ± 0.3	*86.1
BC5CDR-Chemical	NER	92.2	94.4 ± 0.3	*93.8
ChemProt	RE	66.4	74.3 ± 0.1	*77.6

* indicates that comparing results is complicated by different preprocessing choices across benchmarks.

6 Discussion

The focus of BIGBIO on providing a unified view over a large number of diverse NLP datasets has a number of benefits. First, it could increase the robustness of data-centric machine learning because it allows end-to-end data generation workflows that trace data provenance and codify assumptions on data transformations, such as checking for duplicates. Second, the unified view allows to programatically assure quality of both the source data and the transformed datasets, as exemplified by our suite of unit tests. Finally, it drastically reduces the amount of work required for training or evaluating models on a large number of tasks, as can be seen in the MTL usecase, where we had to write only 8 data transformation scripts (one for each task type) as opposed to up to 67 (one for each dataset). Crucially, BIGBIO achieves this without making strong assumptions about the downstream use case or type of model, e.g. by unifying tasks directly into a conditional text generation/prompting setting.

We believe that our work provides useful suggestions on how to write data loaders for a large number of datasets in a collaborative setting. We found a uniform view of the datasets useful for quality assurance during implementation, because it allowed to have a uniform suite of unitests, identify common parsing and transformation components that were moved into a helper library and could be heavily tested. Furthermore, the categorization of datasets into schemas allowed code reviewers to specialize in a subset of schemas, which likely improved the quality of code reviews. Finally, we found using BIGBIO in illustrative downstream use cases during library development immensely helpful, because this informed design decisions for the library such as a the need for a unified

interface for filtering and loading a large number of datasets with a few lines of code. We also found a significant number of bugs in accepted data loaders when implementing the use cases, for instance because performance was much lower/higher than expected for certain datasets.

Our work has several limitations. First, some data loaders likely contain implementation errors that were missed by our code review and unit tests. Second, our choice of schema makes assumptions on what structures are most useful for biomedical NLP research and thus will not represent all interesting tasks. Third, BIGBIO reflects biases that are present in the included data sets, for instance a very strong focus on English text as only 23 of the 126 currently implemented datasets are in a language other than English. We believe that these limiations will be mitigated over time as researchers continue to use and improve on the datasets and tooling.

7 Conclusion and Future Work

We introduce BIGBIO a community library of 126+ biomedical NLP datasets currently covering 12 task categories and 10+ languages. BIGBIO enables reproducible data-centric machine learning workflows, by focusing on programmatic access to datasets and their metadata in a uniform format. We discussed our process for task schema harmonization, data auditing, contribution guidelines and describe two illustrative use cases of BIGBIO: zero-shot evaluation of large language models for biomedical prompting and large-scale MTL. We believe BIGBIO poses little-to-no negative societal impacts, as all datasets we support are public or governed by HIPAA protections as appropriate. A chief motivation of this work is the belief that codifying dataset curation choices in code, tracking provenance of meta-dataset curation, and other decisions around transparent training set generation are critical to the ethical application of machine learning. In the worst case, BIGBIO might amplify negative impacts already inherent to included datasets as it facilitates dataset access. For future work, we plan to curate a library of prompted representations of BIGBIO tasks, including queries formulated like those used to train T0, as well as longer, self-contained instruction sets for novel biomedical tasks. Constructing such a library requires a framework for reproducible data ingestion which is provided by BIGBIO.

Acknowledgments and Disclosure of Funding

Leon Weber acknowledges the support of the Helmholtz Einstein International Berlin Research School in Data Science (HEIBRiDS). Samuele Garda is supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft as part of the research unit "Beyond the Exome". We are grateful to CoreWeave and EleutherAI for providing the compute needed to evaluate the 6 and 11 billion parameter models on our benchmarks, and to Suzana Ilić, Clem Delangue, and others for helping to advertise our calls for participation in the biomedical hackathon. Special thanks to the entire BigScience team, including but not limited to Huu Nguyen, Vassilina Nikoulina, Aurélie Névéol, Yong Zheng-Xin, Victor Sanh, and many others, for their thoughtful discussions and contributions in support of the biomedical working group.

References

[1] Armen Aghajanyan, Anchit Gupta, Akshat Shrivastava, Xilun Chen, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Sonal Gupta. Muppet: Massive multi-task representations with pre-finetuning. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5799–5811, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, November 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[2] Monica Agrawal, Stefan Hegselmann, Hunter Lang, Yoon Kim, and David Sontag. Large language models are zero-shot clinical information extractors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.12689*, 2022.

[3] Stephen H. Bach, Victor Sanh, Zheng-Xin Yong, Albert Webson, Colin Raffel, Nihal V. Nayak, Abheesht Sharma, Taewoon Kim, M Saiful Bari, Thibault Fevry, Zaid Alyafeai, Manan Dey, Andrea Santilli, Zhiqing Sun, Srulik Ben-David, Canwen Xu, Gunjan Chhablani, Han Wang, Jason Alan Fries, Maged S. Al-shaibani, Shanya Sharma, Urmish Thakker, Khalid Almubarak, Xiangru Tang, Dragomir Radev, Mike Tian-Jian Jiang, and Alexander M. Rush. PromptSource: An integrated development environment and repository for natural language prompts. In *Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL) Demonstration*, 2022.

[4] Stella Biderman and Walter J. Scheirer. Pitfalls in machine learning research: Reexamining the development cycle. In *Proceedings on "I Can't Believe It's Not Better!" at NeurIPS Workshops*, 2020.

[5] Sid Black, Gao Leo, Phil Wang, Connor Leahy, and Stella Biderman. GPT-Neo: Large Scale Autoregressive Language Modeling with Mesh-Tensorflow. GitHub Repository, March 2021.

[6] Jens Bleiholder and Felix Naumann. Data fusion. *ACM computing surveys (CSUR)*, 41(1):1–41, 2009.

[7] Raphael Cohen, Michael Elhadad, and Noémie Elhadad. Redundancy in electronic health record corpora: analysis, impact on text mining performance and mitigation strategies. *BMC bioinformatics*, 14(1):1–15, 2013.

[8] Donald C Comeau, Rezarta Islamaj Doğan, Paolo Ciccarese, Kevin Bretonnel Cohen, Martin Krallinger, Florian Leitner, Zhiyong Lu, Yifan Peng, Fabio Rinaldi, Manabu Torii, et al. Bioc: a minimalist approach to interoperability for biomedical text processing. *Database*, 2013, 2013.

[9] Aparna Elangovan, Jiayuan He, and Karin Verspoor. Memorization vs. generalization : Quantifying data leakage in NLP performance evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pages 1325–1335, Online, April 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[10] Jason Fries, Natasha Seelam, Gabriel Altay, Leon Weber, Myungsun Kang, Debajyoti Datta, Ruisi Su, Samuele Garda, Bo Wang, Simon Ott, Matthias Samwald, and Wojciech Kusa. Dataset debt in biomedical language modeling. In *Proceedings of BigScience Episode #5 – Workshop on Challenges & Perspectives in Creating Large Language Models*, pages 137–145, virtual+Dublin, May 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[11] Leo Gao, Jonathan Tow, Stella Biderman, Sid Black, Anthony DiPofi, Charles Foster, Laurence Golding, Jeffrey Hsu, Kyle McDonell, Niklas Muennighoff, Jason Phang, Laria Reynolds, Eric Tang, Anish Thite, Ben Wang, Kevin Wang, and Andy Zou. A framework for few-shot language model evaluation, September 2021.

[12] Yu Gu, Robert Tinn, Hao Cheng, Michael Lucas, Naoto Usuyama, Xiaodong Liu, Tristan Naumann, Jianfeng Gao, and Hoifung Poon. Domain-specific language model pretraining for biomedical natural language processing. *ACM Trans. Comput. Heal.*, 3(1):2:1–2:23, 2022.

[13] Lynette Hirschman, Alexander Yeh, Christian Blaschke, and Alfonso Valencia. Overview of biocreative: critical assessment of information extraction for biology, 2005.

[14] Yacine Jernite, Huu Nguyen, Stella Biderman, Anna Rogers, Maraim Masoud, Valentin Danchev, Samson Tan, Alexandra Sasha Luccioni, Nishant Subramani, Gérard Dupont, Jesse Dodge, Kyle Lo, Zeerak Talat, Isaac Johnson, Dragomir Radev, Somaieh Nikpoor, Jörg Frohberg, Aaron Gokaslan, Peter Henderson, Rishi Bommasani, and Margaret Mitchell. Data governance in the age of large-scale data-driven language technology. In *ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAccT)*, 2022.

[15] Kerina H Jones, Elizabeth M Ford, Nathan Lea, Lucy J Griffiths, Lamiece Hassan, Sharon Heys, Emma Squires, and Goran Nenadic. Toward the development of data governance standards for using clinical free-text data in health research: position paper. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 22(6), 2020.

[16] Jin-Dong Kim, Tomoko Ohta, Sampo Pyysalo, Yoshinobu Kano, and Jun'ichi Tsujii. Overview of bionlp'09 shared task on event extraction. In *Proceedings of the BioNLP 2009 workshop companion volume for shared task*, pages 1–9, 2009.

[17] Katherine Lee, Daphne Ippolito, Andrew Nystrom, Chiyuan Zhang, Douglas Eck, Chris Callison-Burch, and Nicholas Carlini. Deduplicating training data makes language models better. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.06499*, 2021.

[18] Quentin Lhoest, Albert Villanova del Moral, Yacine Jernite, Abhishek Thakur, Patrick von Platen, Suraj Patil, Julien Chaumond, Mariama Drame, Julien Plu, Lewis Tunstall, Joe Davison, Mario Šaško, Gunjan Chhablani, Bhavitvya Malik, Simon Brandeis, Teven Le Scao, Victor Sanh, Canwen Xu, Nicolas Patry, Angelina McMillan-Major, Philipp Schmid, Sylvain Gugger, Clément Delangue, Théo Matussière, Lysandre Debut, Stas Bekman, Pierric Cistac, Thibault Goehringer, Victor Mustar, François Lagunas, Alexander Rush, and Thomas Wolf. Datasets: A community library for natural language processing. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 175–184, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, November 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[19] Ruotian Ma, Xin Zhou, Tao Gui, Yiding Tan, Qi Zhang, and Xuanjing Huang. Template-free prompt tuning for few-shot ner. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.13532*, 2021.

[20] Mihir Parmar, Swaroop Mishra, Mirali Purohit, Man Luo, M Hassan Murad, and Chitta Baral. In-boxbart: Get instructions into biomedical multi-task learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.07600*, 2022.

[21] Amandalynne Paullada, Inioluwa Deborah Raji, Emily M Bender, Emily Denton, and Alex Hanna. Data and its (dis) contents: A survey of dataset development and use in machine learning research. *Patterns*, 2(11), 2021.

[22] Yifan Peng, Shankai Yan, and Zhiyong Lu. Transfer learning in biomedical natural language processing: An evaluation of BERT and ELMo on ten benchmarking datasets. In *Proceedings of the 18th BioNLP Workshop and Shared Task*, pages 58–65, Florence, Italy, August 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[23] Long N Phan, James T Anibal, Hieu Tran, Shaurya Chanana, Erol Bahadroglu, Alec Peltekian, and Grégoire Altan-Bonnet. Scifive: a text-to-text transformer model for biomedical literature. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.03598*, 2021.

[24] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9, 2019.

[25] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.10683*, 2019.

[26] Anna Rogers. Changing the world by changing the data. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2182–2194, Online, August 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[27] Nithya Sambasivan, Shivani Kapania, Hannah Highfill, Diana Akrong, Praveen Paritosh, and Lora M Aroyo. "everyone wants to do the model work, not the data work": Data cascades in high-stakes ai. In *proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–15, 2021.

[28] Victor Sanh, Albert Webson, Colin Raffel, Stephen Bach, Lintang Sutawika, Zaid Alyafeai, Antoine Chaffin, Arnaud Stiegler, Arun Raja, Manan Dey, M Saiful Bari, Canwen Xu, Urmish Thakker, Shanya Sharma Sharma, Eliza Szczechla, Taewoon Kim, Gunjan Chhablani, Nihal Nayak, Debajyoti Datta, Jonathan Chang, Mike Tian-Jian Jiang, Han Wang, Matteo Manica, Sheng Shen, Zheng Xin Yong, Harshit Pandey, Rachel Bawden, Thomas Wang, Trishala Neeraj, Jos Rozen, Abheesht Sharma, Andrea Santilli, Thibault Fevry, Jason Alan Fries, Ryan Teehan, Teven Le Scao, Stella Biderman, Leo Gao, Thomas Wolf, and Alexander M Rush. Multitask prompted training enables zero-shot task generalization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.

[29] Pontus Stenetorp, Sampo Pyysalo, Goran Topić, Tomoko Ohta, Sophia Ananiadou, and Jun'ichi Tsujii. Brat: a web-based tool for nlp-assisted text annotation. In *Proceedings of the Demonstrations at the 13th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 102–107, 2012.

[30] Robert Tinn, Hao Cheng, Yu Gu, Naoto Usuyama, Xiaodong Liu, Tristan Naumann, Jianfeng Gao, and Hoifung Poon. Fine-tuning large neural language models for biomedical natural language processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.07869*, 2021.

[31] Rob van der Goot, Ahmet Üstün, Alan Ramponi, Ibrahim Sharaf, and Barbara Plank. Massive choice, ample tasks (MaChAmp): A toolkit for multi-task learning in NLP. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*, pages 176–197, Online, April 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[32] Effy Vayena and Alessandro Blasimme. Biomedical big data: New models of control over access, use and governance. *Journal of Bioethical Inquiry*, 14(4):501–513, 2017.

[33] Ben Wang and Aran Komatsuzaki. GPT-J-6B: A 6 Billion Parameter Autoregressive Language Model. `https://github.com/kingoflolz/mesh-transformer-jax`, May 2021.

[34] Yizhong Wang, Swaroop Mishra, Pegah Alipoormolabashi, Yeganeh Kordi, Amirreza Mirzaei, Anjana Arunkumar, Arjun Ashok, Arut Selvan Dhanasekaran, Atharva Naik, David Stap, et al. Benchmarking generalization via in-context instructions on 1,600+ language tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.07705*, 2022.

[35] Leon Weber, Mario Sänger, Jannes Münchmeyer, Maryam Habibi, Ulf Leser, and Alan Akbik. Hunflair: an easy-to-use tool for state-of-the-art biomedical named entity recognition. *Bioinformatics*, 37(17):2792–2794, 2021.

[36] Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M. Dai, and Quoc V Le. Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.

[37] Michihiro Yasunaga, Jure Leskovec, and Percy Liang. Linkbert: Pretraining language models with document links. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.15827*, 2022.

[38] Wonjin Yoon, Jaehyo Yoo, Sumin Seo, Mujeen Sung, Minbyul Jeong, Gangwoo Kim, and Jaewoo Kang. Ku-dmis at bioasq 9: Data-centric and model-centric approaches for biomedical question answering. In *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*, volume 2936, pages 351–359. CEUR-WS, 2021.

[39] Ningyu Zhang, Mosha Chen, Zhen Bi, Xiaozhuan Liang, Lei Li, Xin Shang, Kangping Yin, Chuanqi Tan, Jian Xu, Fei Huang, Luo Si, Yuan Ni, Guotong Xie, Zhifang Sui, Baobao Chang, Hui Zong, Zheng Yuan, Linfeng Li, Jun Yan, Hongying Zan, Kunli Zhang, Buzhou Tang, and Qingcai Chen. CBLUE: A Chinese biomedical language understanding evaluation benchmark. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 7888–7915, Dublin, Ireland, May 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Checklist

1. For all authors...
   (a) Do the main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper's contributions and scope? [Yes] See §3-6
   (b) Did you describe the limitations of your work? [Yes] See §6
   (c) Did you discuss any potential negative societal impacts of your work? [Yes] See §6
   (d) Have you read the ethics review guidelines and ensured that your paper conforms to them? [Yes]
2. If you are including theoretical results...
   (a) Did you state the full set of assumptions of all theoretical results? [N/A] The paper is largely empirical and does not claim new theoretical results
   (b) Did you include complete proofs of all theoretical results? [N/A] The paper is largely empirical and does not claim new theoretical results
3. If you ran experiments (e.g. for benchmarks)...
   (a) Did you include the code, data, and instructions needed to reproduce the main experimental results (either in the supplemental material or as a URL)? [Yes] See Abstract and Appendix §K, §J
   (b) Did you specify all the training details (e.g., data splits, hyperparameters, how they were chosen)? [Yes] See Appendix §K, §J
   (c) Did you report error bars (e.g., with respect to the random seed after running experiments multiple times)? [Yes] See §5. Full details on replicates are in Appendix §K, §J. We refrained from running the MTL experiments over multiple random seeds to save compute budget.
   (d) Did you include the total amount of compute and the type of resources used (e.g., type of GPUs, internal cluster, or cloud provider)? [Yes] See §5 and the Appendix §K, §J.
4. If you are using existing assets (e.g., code, data, models) or curating/releasing new assets...
   (a) If your work uses existing assets, did you cite the creators? [Yes] In addition to the assets cited in this paper, BIGBIO builds on all included datasets. Full metadata, including citations and licensing, for each dataset are available in the data loading scripts that are part of the `bigbio` Python package
   (b) Did you mention the license of the assets? [Yes] See §4 and previous answer
   (c) Did you include any new assets either in the supplemental material or as a URL? [Yes] See Abstract and Appendix
   (d) Did you discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose data you're using/curating? [Yes] See §3
   (e) Did you discuss whether the data you are using/curating contains personally identifiable information or offensive content? [Yes] See §3.1 and §6

5. If you used crowdsourcing or conducted research with human subjects...
   (a) Did you include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots, if applicable? [Yes] See §3.3
   (b) Did you describe any potential participant risks, with links to Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals, if applicable? [N/A] The paper did not involve research with human subjects.
   (c) Did you include the estimated hourly wage paid to participants and the total amount spent on participant compensation? [No] Crowdsourcing was arranged through non-monetary voluntary participation(Hackathon). While the participants were not compensated financially, we informed participants that their contribution would be acknowledged through authorship in the resulting publication, based on the number of datasets they have contributed. See Appendix §B for detailed authors contributions.

A Appendix Overview

This section summarizes the elements required by NeurIPS for inclusion in supplementary materials.

1. **Dataset documentation and intended uses. Recommended documentation frameworks include datasheets for datasets, dataset nutrition labels, data statements for NLP, and accountability frameworks.** We have provided datasheets for all datasets (see §M) in BIGBIO as well as a datasheet for the meta-dataset itself (see §N). The intended use of BIGBIO is to enable research on (biomedical) Natural Language Processing. Any usage for direct diagnostic use or medical decision making without review and supervision by medical professionals is out of scope.
2. **URL to website/platform where the dataset/benchmark can be viewed and downloaded by the reviewers.** All code required to download datasets and run machine learning experiments outlined in this manuscript is available on the BIGBIO GitHub code repository `https://github.com/bigscience-workshop/biomedical`. We are in the process of creating a website that summarizes the aims and contributions of BIGBIO.
3. **Author statement that they bear all responsibility in case of violation of rights, etc., and confirmation of the data license.** The authors of this manuscript bear all responsibility for any violation of rights caused by the development and release of BIGBIO. All code for BIGBIO is released under Apache License 2.0. All dataset licensing remains the same as the source.
4. **Hosting, licensing, and maintenance plan. The choice of hosting platform is yours, as long as you ensure access to the data (possibly through a curated interface) and will provide the necessary maintenance.** All code is hosted on GitHub at the repository linked above. We have released all dataset-related software under an Apache License 2.0. BIGBIO is an active open source project that is maintained by an international community of volunteers and 4+ code administrators associated with the BigScience biomedical working group. See §E and §B for protocols for new dataset contributions and unit testing to ensure ongoing quality checks. Datasets are hosted by their original owners. In cases where the original license permits redistribution, we will mirror dataset releases on our community hub `https://huggingface.co/bigscience-biomedical`.
5. **Links to access the dataset and its metadata.** See our project GitHub for all dataset code and metadata.
6. **The dataset itself should ideally use an open and widely used data format. Provide a detailed explanation on how the dataset can be read. For simulation environments, use existing frameworks or explain how they can be used.** BIGBIO is implemented using Hugging Face's datasets library to support easy integration into existing machine learning workflows. See §C for details on standardized schema to permit easier reuse.
7. **Long-term preservation** For the subset of public datasets that can be redistributed, we intend to create regular snapshots on BIGBIO on a data archiving website such as `https://zenodo.org/`.
8. **Explicit license** All code for BIGBIO is released under Apache License 2.0. All dataset licensing remains the same as the source. See §D and §N for complete licensing information for all datasets in BIGBIO.
9. **For benchmarks, the supplementary materials must ensure that all results are easily reproducible.** All machine learning experiments include instructions and code for reproducing results. See §J for zero-shot biomedical benchmarking and §K for multi-task learning experiments.

B Author Contributions

The core idea behind this manuscript emerged from discussions in the BigScience biomedical working group. We formalized the following criteria for determining authorship. Joint first authorship required significant intellectual contribution shaping this project, including organization, contributing/reviewing code, writing documentation, and writing this manuscript. Co-authorship required 3+ submitted dataset implementations that passed all unit tests and other quality control measures. Co-second authorship required one or more significant contributions to the project beyond participation in the hackathon.

We also thank Giyaseddin Bayrak, Gully Burns, Antonio Miranda-Escalada, Abhinav Ramesh Kashyap and Tanmay Laud for their dataset contributions.

Specific contribution categories are listed below and visualized by author in Figure 4.

- **3 Datasets, 4-6 Datasets, 7+ Datasets**: Number of dataset loaders coded during the hackathon.
- **Challenging Dataset**: Implemented a difficult dataset loader (e.g., many label errors, poor documentation on structure).
- **PR Review**: Managed PR process during hackathon, including code review, debugging, and other quality control measures. This includes llive QA sessions during hackathon office hours on the team Discord server.
- **Documentation**: Wrote instructional material for participants on designing data loaders, coding tutorials, and logistics material for hackathon participation
- **Website**: Contributed to the creation of the BigBIO hackathon website.
- **Compute**: Provided computational resources for running machine learning experiments.
- **Dataset Dev**: Contributed to the design and implementation of task schema design, designing dataset loaders, data unit tests, and other dataset loader infrastructure.
- **API Dev**: Contributed to the design and development of the BIGBIO API, including querying of metadata, programmatic access across datasets, and other infrastructure.
- **Prompt Engineering**: Designed biomedical dataset prompts in PromptSource
- **Prompt Eval**: Contributed to the infrastructure of connecting BIGBIO data loaders with the language model evaluation harness and/or ran prompt evaluation experiments.
- **MTL**: Contributed to the multi-task learning experiments
- **Data Viz**: Designed data visualizations
- **Team Logistics**: Organizational tracking of team goals and action items.
- **Weekly Syncs**: Attended and contributed to weekly team meetings
- **Writing**: Contributed text or edited content within this manuscript




Figure 4: Authorship contribution matrix. Cells to the left of the dotted black vertical line are hackathon dataset contributions, while the right are other paper contributions as part of the BigScience biomedical working group. For each author, $*$ denotes co-first author and † denotes co-second author, with equal contributions within category.

C Task Schema and Harmonization

We have defined a set of lightweight, task-specific schema to help simplify programmatic access to common biomedical datasets.

Each dataset loader implemented in BIGBIO provides at least one `source` view of the dataset and at least one `bigbio` view of the dataset. The `source` view attempts to capture the original form of the dataset with as little change as possible. The `bigbio` view attempts to normalize the dataset into one of our BIGBIO task-specific schemas. All schemas are defined by creating an instance of the `datasets.Features` class from the Hugging Face datasets package.

Every element of the BIGBIO schemas has an `id` attribute that is unique across the dataset. In some datasets, entities are represented as discontiguous spans. For example, the string "estrogen and progesterone receptor positive" could be labeled with two entities and two lists of character offsets,

```
["estrogen", "receptor"]; [(0,8), (26,34)]
["progesterone receptor"]; [(13, 34)]
```

To support these types of annotations and maintain consistency, we represent all text-offset combinations this way.

C.1 Schema Definitions

Knowledge Base (KB) The knowledge base schema covers entity based tasks and includes named entity recognition (NER), named entity disambiguation/normalization (NED), event extraction (EE), relation extraction (RE), and coreference resolution (COREF). The schema is loosely based on the XML BioC format [8] and the brat annotation format [29]. The top level features are,

```
{
    "id": datasets.Value("string"),
    "document_id": datasets.Value("string"),
    "passages": [],
    "entities": [],
    "events": [],
    "coreferences": [],
    "relations": [],
}
```

The `id` attribute can be set to anything that makes it unique and the `document_id` attribute represents any identifying value included in the original dataset. Passages capture the text content of a sample. A single sample can have one passage (such as a single abstract) or multiple elements (such as abstract and title). The character offsets in the rest of the KB schema elements index into the string that would be created by joining all the passage texts.

```
"passages": [
    {
        "id": datasets.Value("string"),
        "type": datasets.Value("string"),
        "text": datasets.Sequence(datasets.Value("string")),
        "offsets": datasets.Sequence([datasets.Value("int32")]),
    }
]
```

Entities can be associated with a type as well as multiple database entries.

```
"entities": [
    {
        "id": datasets.Value("string"),
        "type": datasets.Value("string"),
        "text": datasets.Sequence(datasets.Value("string")),
        "offsets": datasets.Sequence([datasets.Value("int32")]),
```

```
        "normalized": [
            {
                "db_name": datasets.Value("string"),
                "db_id": datasets.Value("string"),
            }
        ],
    }
]
```

Events are modeled in BIGBIO as they are in the brat annotation tool.

```
"events": [
    {
        "id": datasets.Value("string"),
        "type": datasets.Value("string"),
        "trigger": {
            "text": datasets.Sequence(datasets.Value("string")),
            "offsets": datasets.Sequence([datasets.Value("int32")]),
        },
        "arguments": [
            {
                "role": datasets.Value("string"),
                "ref_id": datasets.Value("string"),
            }
        ],
    }
]
```

Coreference annotations can be specified using a sequence of entity IDs.

```
"coreferences": [
    {
        "id": datasets.Value("string"),
        "entity_ids": datasets.Sequence(datasets.Value("string")),
    }
]
```

Binary typed relations with multiple database normalizations are also supported.

```
"relations": [
    {
        "id": datasets.Value("string"),
        "type": datasets.Value("string"),
        "arg1_id": datasets.Value("string"),
        "arg2_id": datasets.Value("string"),
        "normalized": [
            {
                "db_name": datasets.Value("string"),
                "db_id": datasets.Value("string"),
            }
        ],
    }
]
```

Question Answering (QA) The QA schema supports several question answering tasks. The `type` attribute is not constrained but takes the values "factoid", "how", "list", "multiple_choice", "summary", "why", and "yesno" in the current BIGBIO datasets. For "multiple_choice" and "yesno" questions, the `choices` attribute is populated with valid answers. The `context` attribute is used for closed-domain QA.

```
{
    "id": datasets.Value("string"),
    "question_id": datasets.Value("string"),
    "document_id": datasets.Value("string"),
    "question": datasets.Value("string"),
    "type": datasets.Value("string"),
    "choices": [datasets.Value("string")],
    "context": datasets.Value("string"),
    "answer": datasets.Sequence(datasets.Value("string")),
}
```

Textual Entailment (TE) The TE schema supports tasks in which two text spans can be mapped onto the triplet of entailment labels ("entailment", "neutral", "contradict").

```
{
    "id": datasets.Value("string"),
    "premise": datasets.Value("string"),
    "hypothesis": datasets.Value("string"),
    "label": datasets.Value("string"),
}
```

Text (TEXT) The TEXT schema supports tasks with a single text span and one or more associated labels (TXTCLASS).

```
{
    "id": datasets.Value("string"),
    "document_id": datasets.Value("string"),
    "text": datasets.Value("string"),
    "labels": [datasets.Value("string")],
}
```

Text Pairs (PAIRS) The PAIRS schema supports tasks with two text spans and one label. In this initial release, the only task using this schema is semantic similarity (STS).

```
{
    "id": datasets.Value("string"),
    "document_id": datasets.Value("string"),
    "text_1": datasets.Value("string"),
    "text_2": datasets.Value("string"),
    "label": datasets.Value("string"),
}
```

Text to Text (T2T) The T2T schema supports sequence to sequence tasks such as paraphasing (PARA), translation (TRANSL), and summarization (SUM).

```
{
    "id": datasets.Value("string"),
    "document_id": datasets.Value("string"),
    "text_1": datasets.Value("string"),
    "text_2": datasets.Value("string"),
    "text_1_name": datasets.Value("string"),
    "text_2_name": datasets.Value("string"),
}
```

C.2 Harmonization

Harmonization efforts aimed for the simplest schema, per task, that was able to flexibly cover the majority of relevant features. We found in the majority of cases, the schema provided suited the task of the original dataset. Toward that end, we found that only 22% (29/129 datasets submitted) of

the datasets required major refactors (defined by significant changes or fixes to the dataloader post submission). While the schema satisfied most cases, we noted some areas of improvement below:

Extension of question answering Question-answering supports multiple choice, binary choice, or span-based answers, but does not enable 'long-form' responses that may provide greater context to the question asked. This particular issue arose in PubMedQA, of which the source schema has a context key that provides framing for the answer.

Extension of text pairs classification The text-pairs schema enables a relationship between two input texts and their corresponding labels. However, in at least one dataset (Scielo), a three-language translation was provided. This can be handled be implementing the dataset twice, one for each translation, or omitting this feature altogether.

Multi-label entities Several datasets had multiple labels associated to a single entity. While we have adapted the schema to associate multiple labels to a single entity. To resolve this concern, we duplicate the feature but change the label and provide a new unique id. This concern was particularly noted in the `MedMentions` dataset.

Diverse label representations For classification problems, the labels associated to a feature may be a string answer, or a numerical score. To maintain a consistent format across all datasets, label keys across schemas in the BIGBIO-view are always `str` types. This limitation affected at least 4 datasets (UMNSRS, MayoSRS, BioSimVerb), particulary in the context of semantic similarity scores across text. For the user to appropriately cast the score type, they would need familiarity of the dataset. We opted to enable the source view to represent label information for scores as floats when present.

Unsupported task types In certain cases, tasks may extend beyond the descriptive capacity of the provided BIGBIO-schemas. For example, tasks that explicitly required contextualization were unable to fit into a pre-existing schema. For example, speech-based tasks, such as MedDialogue require a text, label, and potential context; the BIGBIO-text classification schema does not enable a context key. Additionally, Ask-a-Patient required a tuple-like structure to represent a text, a social media response, and a medical concept to be relevant to the task. In addition to tasks that require context, part-of-speech tagging or annotations on a per-token basis was not easily represented in our pre-existing schema.

During the initiative, common themes of recurring problems in biomedical NLP processing occurred. We denote them as follows:

Issues with offsets One of the unit-tests specifically monitored whether reported features matched offsets provided from the original dataset. We found a several datasets with slight offset errors, or inconsistencies. In several cases, offset errors included off-by-one or whitespacing considerations, discontiguous spans, and one case, entirely omitted from the original dataset.

Large datasets Several datasets possessed corpora that were large in size (upwards of 20 GB). In at least one instance, the initial implementation of the dataset yielded examples exceedingly slow. While we standardized information content, we did not explicitly optimize for efficiency.

D Dataset Metadata

We collected the structured metadata outlined in Table 4 for all datasets in the BIGBIO catalog. Required elements are written as code in the data loader. Figures 5 and 6 show treemap visualizations of all datasets based on their license and language respectively.

Table 4: Metadata collected for all datasets.

Field	Required	Description
Name	✓	Dataset name
Task Types	✓	NER, question answering, coreference resolution, etc.
Domain	✓	Corpora domain: biomedical or clinical/health-related
PubMed/PMC	✓	Corpora are from PubMed/PubMed Central (PMC)
Splits	✓	Canonical definitions for training/validation/testing splits
Publication	✓	Manuscript describing dataset
Year		Publication year
Homepage	✓	Website describing dataset
Public URL	✓	Open URL (no authentication)
Private	✓	Requires authentication/credentialing
License	✓	Provided license type
Languages	✓	Included languages
Multilingual		Parallel corpora
Annotation Source		Expert label provenance (e.g., hand labeled, silver labels)




Figure 5: Treemap visualization of datasets by license.




Figure 6: Treemap visualization of datasets by language.

E Unit Tests

We developed 11 unit tests to check the BIGBIOversions of all implemented data loaders. Unit tests run on all BIGBIO *configurations* (i.e., a schema view of the dataset) found within a dataset, whether they represent different dataset subsets or different tasks.

Among all implemented unit tests, we differentiate between **global** and **task-specific** tests. For datasets that support configurations with multiple schemas (each supporting different tasks), we run the task-specific tests using only the configuration supporting the task.

Below, we describe each unit test found in BIGBIO:

E.1 Global Tests

1. **Metadata** Checks if the dataloader module provides relevant metadata attributes. Supported attributes include `LANGUAGE` (language of the dataset), `LOCAL` (whether the dataset is publicly accessible or requires local files), `PUBMED` (is part of Pubmed), and `LICENSE` (type of license). The `LANGUAGE` and `LICENSE` are standardized to common labels across datasets, whereas `LOCAL` and `PUBMED` are boolean.
2. **Unique Global IDs** Each element within a dataset is assigned a string ID that is unique across the dataset split (such as train, validation or test). For example, all passages, entities, relations, questions, labels, and other attributes will be assigned a unique string. This ID can be used to reference a given element if it is being used in a new context without considering explicit text overlap or other heuristics. This unit-test confirms that a every element has an ID that is unique across the full dataset split.
3. **Schema** This test checks whether the populated fields in the examples are consistent with the tasks supported by the dataset. For instance, if a dataset is annotated to support NER but there is not a single entity field populated across a full dataset split, the test will fail. Additionally, the test will provide a warning if fields are populated that would support a task missing from the annotated supported tasks. The loading procedure in Hugging Face's datasets fails if a dataloader does not adhere to its defined schema. Thus, we implicitly check for consistency between data and schema by loading the dataset.
4. **Feature Statistics** This test prints statistics of populated fields in the dataset to allow the user to manually check their plausibility. For each data split, it collects the number of elements (e.g. number of entities, relations, text pairs, etc.). We use these statistics for quality control by manually comparing to the dataset statistics reported in the publication describing the respective dataset.

E.2 Task-specific Tests: Knowledge Base

1. **Referenced ids** Certain fields may be referenced by other elements (for example, a relation usually references two entities). References in the BIGBIO-schema will use the unique ID assigned to them. This unit test checks if all referenced IDs exist, and have an appropriate type. For instance, it makes sure that the arguments of a relation are indeed entities (and not relations or events).
2. **Passage Offsets** This test checks whether the start and end indices of all passages are correct. This is achieved by comparing the text span defined by the indices to the text field assigned to the passage. Additionally, the unit test will make sure that each passage is contiguous and does not overlap.
3. **Entity Offsets** This test makes sure that the start and end indices of entities are correct. Analogous to the *Passage Offsets* test, we compare the reported feature text for entities versus the extracted text from the start/ending index provided from the data. This test does not provide an explicit failure, but instead warns the user of all entities that do not explicitly match their offset-extracted text. We chose a warning over failure because some datasets contain faulty offsets in the original formats due to annotation errors.
4. **Event Offsets** Similar to the passage-offsets and entities-offset check, we compare the reported event text feature to the extracted text from provided offsets. We warn the user of any instances of discordance between the reported and extracted text.

5. **Multi-label Entities** The current BIGBIO schema does not support multiple types for entities. This test flags instances where an entity is assigned multiple types by concatenating the types with common connector symbols (such as '|' or ';').
6. **Multi-label Types** This unit-test performs the same check as `Multi-label Entities` for other features with the `type` attribute (passages, relations, events). This test is distinct from the multi-label entities test, because the envisioned BIGBIO schema revision to support multiple labels is different in this case.

E.3 Task-specific Tests: Question Answering

1. **Multiple Choice** This test checks whether the answers of a question-answering schema are either multiple choice or binary (yes/no). It verifies that the answer provided exists in the choices available for each example.

All accepted data-loading scripts must pass code review, unit-tests, and implement explicit fixes for warnings that indicated destructive transformations of the original dataset (such as introducing faulty offsets).

In general, participants who implemented data-loading scripts were asked to refrain from resolving dataset issues in the dataloader for the original dataset but were free to fix the issues for the BIGBIO versions. Any data quality changes were explicitly annotated within the review process, and the data loading script itself.


Certain datasets may require specific keys to be ignored. We implemented functions that allow a user to bypass a specific key (e.g., skip all events), a data split (e.g., skip the validation set), or a specific key within a dataset (e.g., skip relation labels in the test set). These functions were used to check the `BioNLP shared task` datasets, as the test splits of these datasets omitted annotations for some supported tasks. These bypass functions allow a user to test if all other aspects of the dataset implementation work as intended.

F Dataset Submission Checklist

- ☐ Confirm that this PR is linked to the dataset issue.
- ☐ Create the dataloader script `biodatasets/my_dataset/my_dataset.py` (please use only lowercase and underscore for dataset naming).
- ☐ Provide values for
  - ☐ `_CITATION`
  - ☐ `_DATASETNAME`
  - ☐ `_DESCRIPTION`
  - ☐ `_HOMEPAGE`
  - ☐ `_LICENSE`
  - ☐ `_URLs`
  - ☐ `_SUPPORTED_TASKS`
  - ☐ `_SOURCE_VERSION`
  - ☐ `_BIGBIO_VERSION`
- ☐ Data loader implementations for
  - ☐ `_info()`
  - ☐ `_split_generators()`
  - ☐ `_generate_examples()`
- ☐ Make sure that the `BUILDER_CONFIGS` class attribute is a list with at least one 'BigBioConfig' for the source schema and one for a bigbio schema.
- ☐ Confirm dataloader script works with `datasets.load_dataset` function.
- ☐ Confirm that your dataloader script passes the test suite run with `python -m tests.test_bigbio biodatasets/my_dataset/my_dataset.py`.
- ☐ If my dataset is local, I have provided an output of the unit-tests in the PR (please copy paste). This is OPTIONAL for public datasets, as we can test these without access to the data files.

G BigScience Biomedical Hackathon

We catalogued an initial set of 174 datasets and prior to launching the hackathon, we provided users with a project board that tagged each dataset as a new issue within our GitHub repository. For all datasets, we provided meta-data tags such as language, license, and associated task (e.g., NER, question answering). Participants could assign themselves to a dataset via issues and status would be reflected in the project board (see Figure 7). Admins could change the status of the issue based on progress of the data loading script.



	Title	Assignees	Status	Labels
1	Create a dataset loader for QUAERO	gianttheo	Done	BRAT/Standoff, French, GNU Common Public License v.3.0, NER
2	Create a dataset loader for CLEF eHealth 2019, Task 1			DUA, German, Topic Classification
3	Create dataset loader for BC5CDR	jason-fries	Done	BioC, NER, Public Domain (CC0)
4	Create dataset loader for AnatEM	mariosaenger	Done	CoNLL, NER
5	Create dataset loader for JNLPBA	benjaminbeilharz	Done	CC BY NC 3.0, CoNLL, English, High, NER
6	Create dataset loader for MuchMore	galtay	Done	English, German, plain text, Translation, XML
7	Create dataset loader for BioASQ Task B (2014-2021)	jason-fries	Done	DUA, English, High, JSON, QA
8	Create dataset loader for BioCreative II: Gene Mention Ta	benjaminbeilharz	Done	CoNLL, English, High, NER, Public Domain (CC0)
9	Create dataset loader for Chemprot	hakunanatasha	Done	BRAT/Standoff, English, High, NER, RE
10	Create dataset loader for NCBI Disease Corpus	JohnGiorgi	Done	BRAT/Standoff, NER, Public Domain (CC0)
11	Create dataset loader for BIOSSES	debajyotidatta	Done	English, GNU Common Public License v.3.0, High, Semantic Similarity
12	Create dataset loader for GENIA Term Corpus	albertvillanova	Done	CC BY 3.0, English, High, NER, XML
13	Create dataset loader for GENIA Relation Corpus	albertvillanova	Done	BRAT/Standoff, CC BY 3.0, English, High, RE
14	Create dataset loader for GENIA Coreference Corpus			CC BY 3.0, Coreference, English, High, XML

Figure 7: Participants volunteered to implement dataset loaders using GitHub project tracking tools.

Participants were asked to create a fork of the repository, and implement their data-loading script. We provided a template of a dataloading script, where explicit comments were left to indicate key functions and attributes the participant must complete. For datasets in common formats like BRAT or BioC, we provided utility functions to improve standardization across formats. At minimum, participants implemented an `_info_` function that instantiated the `source` and `bigbio` configs. A `_split_generators` function that identified how to access each data split in the dataset, and the `_generate_examples` that extracted relevant information from each data split according to the specifications of the configs.

Dataloader scripts were submitted through pull-requests (PRs) on GitHub. Prior to submitting code for review, we asked participants to check if the code passed unit-tests and style guidelines. Accepted PRs required at least 1 admin approval to merge to the library. To respect data governance, we did not accept any submissions that provided explicit dataset files. Dataloading scripts must access datasets via URLs, or expect a filepath to the local dataset.

If a dataset had multiple tasks, we asked the participant to implement tasks based on the number of unique schemas, if possible. Some datasets possess different views based on the different tasks that can be performed on them. Participants were told to handle multiple annotations/harmonization per the original dataset's recommendations. If none were given, participants were asked to choose what seemed reasonable, and iterate with an admin.

All contribution instructions may be found here.

Of the 174 datasets identified, 126 datasets satisfied the acceptance criteria, including the checklist in §F, code-review, and passing unit-tests. Exceptions were made on a case-by-case basis for datasets with unique challenges that extended beyond the scope of the schema provided.

G.1 Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)

During the hackthon, we developed the following list of frequently asked questions (FAQ).

How can I find the appropriate license for my dataset? The license for a dataset is not always obvious. Here are some strategies to try in your search:

1. Check the Experiment A: Annotated Datasets sheet of the we used while planning the hackathon
2. Check for files such as README or LICENSE that may be distributed with the dataset itself
3. Check the dataset webpage
4. Check publications that announce the release of the dataset
5. Check the website of the organization providing the dataset

If no official license is listed anywhere, but you find a webpage that describes general data usage policies for the dataset, you can fall back to providing that URL in the `_LICENSE` variable. If you can't find any license information, please make a note in your PR and put `_LICENSE = "Unknown"` in your dataset script.

What if my dataset is not publicly available? We understand that some biomedical datasets are not publicly available due to data usage agreements or licensing. For these datasets, we recommend implementing a dataloader script that references a local directory containing the dataset. You can find examples in the `n2c2_2011` and `bioasq` implementations. There are also local dataset specific instructions in template.

What types of libraries can we import? Eventually, your dataloader script will need to run using only the packages supplied by the datasets package. If you find a well supported package that makes your implementation easier (e.g. bioc), then feel free to use it.

We will address the specifics during review of your PR to the BigScience biomedical repo and find a way to make it usable in the final submission to huggingface bigscience-biomedical

Can I upload my dataset anywhere? No. Please don't upload the dataset you're working on to the huggingface hub or anywhere else. This is not the goal of the hackathon and some datasets have licensing agreements that prevent redistribution. If the dataset is public, include a downloading component in your dataset loader script. Otherwise, include only an "extraction from local files" component in your dataset loader script. If you have a custom dataset you would like to submit, please make an issue and an admin will get back to you.

My dataset supports multiple tasks with different bigbio schemas. What should I do? In some cases, a single dataset will support multiple tasks with different bigbio schemas. For example, the muchmore dataset can be used for a translation task (supported by the Text to Text (T2T) schema) and a named entity recognition task (supported by the Knowledge Base (KB) schema). In this case, please implement one config for each supported schema and name the config `<datasetname>_bigbio_<schema>`. In the muchmore example, this would mean one config called `muchmore_bigbio_t2t` and one config called `muchmore_bigbio_kb`.

My dataset comes with multiple annotations per text and no/multiple harmonizations. How should I proceed? Please implement all different annotations and harmonizations as source versions (see `examples/bioasq.py` for an example). If the authors suggest a preferred harmonization, use that for the bigbio version. Otherwise use the harmonization that you think is best.

How should I handle offsets and text in the bigbio schema? Full details on how to handle offsets and text in the bigbio kb schema can be found in the schema documentation.

My dataset is complicated, can you help me? Yes! Please feel free to leave a question in questions or ping the admins directly with @admins. We will be hosting office hours round the clock to be able to answer you in a timely manner!

My dataset is too complicated, can I switch? Yes! Some datasets are easier to write dataloader scripts for than others. If you find yourself working on a dataset that you can not make progress on, please make a comment in the associated issue, asked to be un-assigned from the issue, and start the search for a new unclaimed dataset. You are also welcome to ping the admins - we are happy to help you!

Can I change the Big-Bio schema? No, please do not modify the Big-Bio Schema. The goal of this hackathon is to enable simple, programmatic access to a large variety of biomedical datasets. Part of this requires having a dependable interface. We developed our schema to address the most salient types of questions to ask of the datasets. We would be more than happy to discuss your suggestions, and you are welcome to implement it as a new config.

My dataset has multiple labels to a span of text - what do I do? In many of our schemas, we have a 1:1 mapping between a key and its label (i.e. in KB, entity and label). In some datasets, we've noticed that there are multiple labels assigned to a text entity. Generally speaking, if a big-bio key has multiple labels associated with it, please populate the list with multiple instances of (key, label) according to each label that correspond to it.

So for instance if the dataset has an entity "copper" with the types "Pharmacologic Substance" and "Biologically Active", please create one entity with type "Pharmacologic Substance" and an associated unique id and another entity with type "Biologically Active" with a different unique id. The rest of the inputs (text, offsets, and normalization) of both entities will be identical.

What happens after I claim a dataset? In order to keep turnaround time reasonable, and ensure datasets are being completed, we propose a few notes on claiming a dataset:

1. Please claim a dataset only if you intend to work on it. We'll try to check in within 3 days to ensure you have the help you need. Don't hesitate to contact the admins! We are ready to help!
2. If you have already claimed a dataset prior to (2022/04/05), we will check in on Friday (2022/04/08). If we do not hear back via GitHub issues OR a message to the Discord admins on general, we will make the dataset open for other participants by Saturday (2022/04/09).
3. If things are taking longer than expected - that is totally ok! Please let us know via GitHub issues (preferred) or by pinging the @admins channel on Discord.

H Assessing Dataset Overlap




Figure 8: A heatmap representation of PubMed overlap between public datasets in BIGBIO. Each cell is shaded using the log count of PMIDs shared by the pair of datasets it represents.

Table 5: Example document IDs as they appear in the original source datasets and their corresponding BIGBIO normalization to PubMed PMIDs, Pubmed Central PMCIDs, and journal titles.

Original Document ID	PMID	PMCID	Journal
PMID-12604762	12604762	PMC1497507	Public Health Rep
BB-kb+ner-F-25496341-000	25496341	PMC4320590	BMC Genomics
17389645_04_discussion	17389645	PMC1885650	Nucleic Acids Res
pmcA2538543	2538543	PMC2189270	J Exp Med
10747015-3	10747015	PMC310216	EMBO J
6421395:4	6421395	PMC1444356	Br Med J (Clin Res Ed)
PMC2885601-03-RESULTS-01	20556207	PMC2885601	Open Microbiol J
PMC-2626671-01-INTRODUCTION	19139168	PMC2626671	J Exp Med

As biomedical models are trained and evaluated on ever larger meta-datasets, it is important to characterize duplication within and between datasets. This can take the form of direct train/test leakage [9] or more subtle issues of near-duplicates and repeated substrings which can negatively impact performance and training time of language models [17]. In biomedical NLP, annotation efforts often build upon existing datasets meaning meta-dataset curation needs to take additional steps to mitigate possible train/test leakage. To assess the magnitude of this phenomena across the

Table 6: Dataset clusters of document (PMID) overlap.

Dataset Names	Count	PMID Overlap
BioRED, NCBI Disease	2	11
MLEE, AnatEM	2	12
Hallmarks of Cancer, CHEMDNER	2	12
BioNLP ST 2013 GE, BioNLP ST 2011 GE	2	14
BioNLP ST 2011 REL, BioNLP ST 2013 GRO, GENIA Relation Corpus, BioNLP Shared Task 2009, BioNLP ST 2011 GE	5	29
PICO Extraction, EBM PICO	2	41
tmVar v1, tmVar v2, tmVar v3	3	69
BioRED, tmVar v1, tmVar v2, tmVar v3	4	87
BioRED, tmVar v1, tmVar v3	3	109
NLM Gene, BioRED	2	140
BC5CDR, BioRED	2	203
tmVar v1, tmVar v3	2	232
MLEE, BioNLP ST 2013 CG, AnatEM	3	250
BioNLP ST 2013 CG, AnatEM	2	348
AnatEM, AnEM	2	492
GENIA Relation Corpus, BioNLP Shared Task 2009, BioNLP ST 2011 REL, BioNLP ST 2011 GE	4	1179
ChemProt, CHEMDNER	2	1199

BIGBIO corpus, we conducted a preliminary analysis counting the number of shared documents across all annotated datasets sourced from PubMed or PubMed Central (PMC).

PubMed Document ID Normalization PubMed/PMC provides uniform identifiers for documents: PubMed PMID and PubMed Central PMCID. However, many datasets encode this document information using inconsistent formats as shown in Table 5. We wrote a normalization function to standardize all document identifiers to facilitate joins with other PubMed/PMC datsets. We then joined this data with the `PMC-ids.csv.gz` file available from the National Library of Medicine[4].

PubMed Dataset Overlap Analysis Our normalizations of PMIDs allowed us to calculate which PubMed articles were used in multiple datasets. In Table 6 we show the largest PMID clusters, i.e., sets of datasets that contain the same documents. In Figure 8 we visualize this overlap as a heatmap. We observe several cases of clear dataset iteration (e.g., tmVar v1-v3, AnEM to AnatEM) and NLP challenges building on the same source datasets (BioNLP shared tasks 2009 and 2011 build on the GENIA Relation Corpus). BioRED illustrates another common pattern, where documents were sampled from 5 existing biomedical datasets before annotating [102].

[4] `https://ftp.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pub/pmc` accessed May 29, 2022

I Data Visualization and Exploration

To highlight the efficiency of using consistent schema across datasets, we created a Streamlit[5] web application to allow anyone to browse through any schema-specific details and visualization for all supported datasets. The web application enables task sorting at the level of task schema (e.g., NER), which supports downstream approaches to use groups of datasets with minimal effort. Such as prompt based methods or multi-task learning (MTL).

For each split, we provide basic dataset details (like number of training samples, character counts, word counts, number of unique labels, etc.). Further, we also present distributions of token lengths and labels (or sub-component types) within each dataset to compare across splits. We used periods and new lines to break the text block into sentences, and tokenized each sentence by white space to count the token lengths. For datasets of tasks that do not have labels, which is the case for most common knowledge base construction and information extraction tasks, we analyze the data distribution across the sub-component types. For instance, our task schema for the BioCreative V Chemical Disease Relation (CDR) dataset [93] provides an efficient way to compare the distribution of chemical and disease entities across splits (See Figure 9).



Figure 9: Streamlit web application for visualizing dataset-specific details and textual analysis at the span-level. Here we show plots for the BioCreative V Chemical Disease Relation (CDR) dataset.

[5] https://streamlit.io/

J Zero-shot Language Model Evaluation

J.1 Expanded Results

Table 7 contains complete zero-shot language model results pooled across all prompts (n=5) by dataset.

Table 7: Summary results across all datasets and language models.

Model	Dataset	Metric	Mean	SE	Min	Max
SciFive-Base	BIOSSES	pearson	34.0	14.6	12.8	55.8
SciFive-Large	BIOSSES	pearson	7.2	12.2	-17.2	19.5
GPT-Neo-1.3B	BIOSSES	pearson	36.4	n/a	36.4	36.4
GPT-2	BIOSSES	pearson	12.5	7.2	5.3	19.5
GPT-J-6B	BIOSSES	pearson	0.2	31.9	-31.8	32.1
T5 v1.1-xxl	BIOSSES	pearson	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
T0_3B	BIOSSES	pearson	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
T0	BIOSSES	pearson	23.3	17.6	-7.2	49.5
T0+	BIOSSES	pearson	37.8	20.1	18.7	**66.7**
T0++	BIOSSES	pearson	**40.6**	1.3	**38.7**	42.5
SciFive-Base	BioASQ	accuracy	32.9	0.0	32.9	32.9
SciFive-Large	BioASQ	accuracy	32.9	0.0	32.9	32.9
GPT-Neo-1.3B	BioASQ	accuracy	40.9	6.2	33.6	65.7
GPT-2	BioASQ	accuracy	36.1	3.1	32.9	48.6
GPT-J-6B	BioASQ	accuracy	40.4	6.7	33.6	67.1
T5 v1.1-xxl	BioASQ	accuracy	67.1	0.0	67.1	67.1
T0_3B	BioASQ	accuracy	40.1	0.6	38.6	42.1
T0	BioASQ	accuracy	76.1	2.3	70.7	82.9
T0+	BioASQ	accuracy	73.1	2.4	65.7	78.6
T0++	BioASQ	accuracy	**89.0**	1.3	**84.3**	**91.4**
SciFive-Base	SciTail	accuracy	59.9	0.3	58.8	60.4
SciFive-Large	SciTail	accuracy	56.2	4.1	39.6	60.4
GPT-Neo-1.3B	SciTail	accuracy	50.6	4.0	38.9	60.4
GPT-2	SciTail	accuracy	50.3	4.3	39.6	60.4
GPT-J-6B	SciTail	accuracy	51.6	4.4	40.2	60.3
T5 v1.1-xxl	SciTail	accuracy	43.8	4.2	39.6	60.4
T0_3B	SciTail	accuracy	68.9	4.7	55.0	77.6
T0	SciTail	accuracy	73.9	6.2	58.1	88.1
T0+	SciTail	accuracy	74.3	7.6	51.5	87.9
T0++	SciTail	accuracy	**75.6**	5.9	**60.4**	**90.8**
SciFive-Base	MedNLI	accuracy	66.4	0.1	66.2	66.7
SciFive-Large	MedNLI	accuracy	66.7	0.0	66.5	66.7
GPT-Neo-1.3B	MedNLI	accuracy	36.6	1.5	33.6	41.0
GPT-2	MedNLI	accuracy	55.1	5.9	33.3	65.6
GPT-J-6B	MedNLI	accuracy	48.3	3.7	42.2	62.7
T5 v1.1-xxl	MedNLI	accuracy	33.3	0.0	33.3	33.3
T0_3B	MedNLI	accuracy	67.6	0.3	66.6	68.3
T0	MedNLI	accuracy	72.0	1.6	68.8	**77.8**
T0+	MedNLI	accuracy	72.5	1.8	68.6	76.8
T0++	MedNLI	accuracy	**73.4**	1.5	**69.1**	77.4
SciFive-Base	GAD	accuracy	47.4	0.0	47.4	47.4
SciFive-Large	GAD	accuracy	47.4	0.0	47.4	47.4
GPT-Neo-1.3B	GAD	accuracy	47.7	0.7	46.4	50.4
GPT-2	GAD	accuracy	47.4	0.0	47.4	47.6
GPT-J-6B	GAD	accuracy	48.2	1.0	46.6	52.1
T5 v1.1-xxl	GAD	accuracy	52.6	0.0	52.6	52.6
T0_3B	GAD	accuracy	47.5	0.1	47.4	47.8
T0	GAD	accuracy	53.7	1.0	50.7	55.6
T0+	GAD	accuracy	53.9	0.4	53.0	55.1
T0++	GAD	accuracy	**55.7**	0.4	**54.3**	**56.6**




Figure 10: Per-prompt scores (x-axis) for all non-T0 family language models (SciFive, GPT-Neo-1.3B, GPT-2, GPT-J-6B, T5 v1.1-xxl). Prompt template names are on the y-axis.




Figure 11: Per-prompt scores (x-axis)for all T0 family language models (T0_3B, T0, T0+, T0++). Prompt template names are on the y-axis. Performance for non semantic similarity tasks is more varied and higher performing compared to current GPT-2 style pretrained models or T5 models with standard pretraining and in-domain finetuning.

J.2 Evaluation

All language models summary statistics are calculated using n=5 samples (1 score per prompt). Standard error is calculated using the sample standard deviation. Pearson's Correlation was calculated using SciPy v1.7.3. All other metrics are calculated calculated using Scikit-learn v1.0.2. All models are evaluated using fp32 precision on a single 8x A40 compute node running CUDA 11.2.

J.3 Code

All experiment were run using the most up-to-date version of BIGBIO before paper submssion. `https://github.com/bigscience-workshop/biomedical` commit `0ff295b25bb1be813e64f13246090bff6168cb5a`

Complete language model evaluation harness code and instructions for running BIGBIO experiments: `https://github.com/bigscience-workshop/lm-evaluation-harness/tree/bigbio`

For these experiments, we used a modified version of PromptSource: `https://github.com/bigscience-workshop/promptsource/tree/eval-hackathon` Prompt templates are available at `https://github.com/OpenBioLink/promptsource` and are outlined below.

All pretrained language models were downloaded from Hugging Face's datasets hub.

J.4 Prompt Templates

The following prompt templates were developed using PromptSource. A prompt consists of a set of answer choices, an input template, and an output template.

Table 8: BIOSSES example instance.

Key	Value
id	6
document_id	7
text_1	Recently, it was reported that expression of IDH1R132H su...
text_2	the mechanism was clarified by yet another genomic survey...
label	1.6

J.4.1 BIOSSES

Prompt 1: "bigbio_sts_similarity_scale"

Answer Choices:

```
0 ||| 1 ||| 2 ||| 3 ||| 4
```

Input Template:

```
from {{"0"}} to {{"4"}}, how similar are "{{text_1}}" and "{{text_2}}"?
```

Output Template:

```
{{label}}
```

Prompt 2: "bigbio_sts_similarity_how"

Answer Choices:

```
0 ||| 1 ||| 2 ||| 3 ||| 4
```

Input Template:

```
How similar are "{{text_1}}" and "{{text_2}}"? Give a score \
between {{"0"}} and {{"4"}}.
```

Output Template:

```
{{label}}
```

Prompt 3: "bigbio_sts_similarity_rate"

Answer Choices:

```
0 ||| 1 ||| 2 ||| 3 ||| 4
```

Input Template:

```
Rate the similarity of these two sentences ({{"0"}} being the lowest \
and {{"4"}} the highest):
"{{text_1}}" and "{{text_2}}"
```

Output Template:

```
{{label}}
```

Prompt 4: "bigbio_sts_similarity_on_a_scale"

Answer Choices:

```
0 ||| 1 ||| 2 ||| 3 ||| 4
```

Input Template:

```
On a scale of {{"0"}} (completely unrelated) to {{"4"}} (exactly same) \
score these sentences:
"{{text_1}}" and "{{text_2}}"
```

Output Template:

```
{{label}}
```

Prompt 5: "bigbio_sts_similarity_what_is"

Answer Choices:

```
0 ||| 1 ||| 2 ||| 3 ||| 4
```

Input Template:

```
What is the similarity of these two sentences on a scale of {{"0"}} (low) \
to {{"4"}} (high): "{{text_1}}" and "{{text_2}}"
```

Output Template:

```
{{label}}
```

J.4.2 BioASQ

Prompt 1: "Given a passage (question at end)"

Answer Choices:

```
no ||| yes
```

Table 9: BioASQ example instance.

Key	Value
id	5c58a74e86df2b917400000d_0
question_id	5c58a74e86df2b917400000d
document_id	http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29623652
question	Is Baloxavir effective for influenza?
type	yesno
choices	[]
context	Baloxavir marboxil (Xofluza™; baloxavir) is an oral cap-d...
answer	['yes']

Input Template:

```
Given a passage: {{ context }}

Answer the question: "{{question}}"
```

Output Template:

```
{{answer[0]}}
```

Prompt 2: "I'm a doctor"

Answer Choices:

```
no ||| yes
```

Input Template:

```
I'm a doctor and I need to answer the question "{{ question }}" using \
the following passage:

{{ context }}
```

Output Template:

```
{{answer[0]}}
```

Prompt 3: "What is the answer"

Answer Choices:

```
no ||| yes
```

Input Template:

```
What is the answer to the question "{{ question }}" based on \
the following passage:

{{ context }}
```

Output Template:

```

{{answer[0]}}
```

Prompt 4: “Please answer"

Answer Choices:

```
no ||| yes
```

Input Template:

```
Please answer the question "{{ question }}" using \
the following passage:

{{ context }}
```

Output Template:

```

{{answer[0]}}
```

Prompt 5: “Given a passage (question at start)"

Answer Choices:

```
no ||| yes
```

Input Template:

```
Given the following passage, answer the question: "{{question}}"

Passage: {{ context }}
```

Output Template:

```

{{answer[0]}}
```

J.4.3 SciTail

Prompt 1: “... Therefore, we’re licensed to say that..."

Table 10: SciTail example instance.

Key	Value
id	0
premise	Based on the list provided of the uses of substances 1-7,...
hypothesis	If a substance has a ph value greater than 7,that indicat...
label	neutral

Answer Choices:

```
true ||| false
```

Input Template:

```
{{premise}} Therefore, we are licensed to say that {{hypothesis}}
{{ answer_choices | join(' or ') }}
```

Output Template:

```
{% if label == "entailment" %}
{{answer_choices[0]}}
{% else %}
{{answer_choices[1]}}
{% endif %}
```

Prompt 2: "Suppose... Can we infer that..."

Answer Choices:

```
neutral ||| entailment
```

Input Template:

```
Suppose {{premise}} Can we infer that {{hypothesis}}?
```

Output Template:

```
 {{label}}
```

Prompt 3: "...does the previous passage support the claim that"

Answer Choices:

```
yes ||| no
```

Input Template:

```
{{premise}} Does the previous passage support the claim that {{hypothesis}}?
```

Output Template:

```
{% if label == "entailment" %}
{{answer_choices[0]}}
{% else %}
{{answer_choices[1]}}
{% endif %}
```

Prompt 4: “given... does it follow that..."

Answer Choices:

```
yes ||| no
```

Input Template:

```
Given that {{premise}} Does it follow that {{hypothesis}}
{{ answer_choices | join(’ or ’) }}
```

Output Template:

```

{% if label == "entailment" %}
{{answer_choices[0]}}
{% else %}
{{answer_choices[1]}}
{% endif %}
```

Prompt 5: “does S1 entail S2?"

Answer Choices:

```
yes ||| no
```

Input Template:

```
Sentence 1: {{premise}}

Sentence 2: {{hypothesis}}

Question: Does Sentence 1 entail Sentence 2? \
{{ answer_choices | join(’ or ’) }}
```

Output Template:

```

{% if label == "entailment" %}
{{answer_choices[0]}}
{% else %}
{{answer_choices[1]}}
{% endif %}
```

J.4.4 MedNLI

Table 11: MedNLI example instance.

Key	Value
id	1f2a8146-66c7-11e7-b4f2-f45c89b91419
premise	In the ED, initial VS revealed T 98.9, HR 73, BP 121/90, ...
hypothesis	The patient is hemodynamically stable
label	entailment

Prompt 1: “... Therefore, we’re licensed to say that..."

Answer Choices:

```
yes ||| no
```

Input Template:

```
{{premise}} Therefore, we are licensed to say that {{hypothesis}}
{{ answer_choices | join(’ or ’) }}
```

Output Template:

```
{% if label == "entailment" %}
{{answer_choices[0]}}
{% else %}
{{answer_choices[1]}}
{% endif %}
```

Prompt 2: “Suppose... Can we infer that..."

Answer Choices:

```
yes ||| no
```

Input Template:

```
Suppose {{premise}} Can we infer that {{hypothesis}}?
```

Output Template:

```
{% if label == "entailment" %}
{{answer_choices[0]}}
{% else %}
{{answer_choices[1]}}
{% endif %}
```

Prompt 3: “...does the previous passage support the claim that"

Answer Choices:

```
yes ||| no
```

Input Template:

```
{{premise}} Does the previous passage support the claim that {{hypothesis}}?
```

Output Template:

```
{% if label == "entailment" %}
{{answer_choices[0]}}
{% else %}
{{answer_choices[1]}}
{% endif %}
```

Prompt 4: “given... does it follow that..."

Answer Choices:

```
yes ||| no
```

Input Template:

```
Given that {{premise}} Does it follow that {{hypothesis}} \
{{ answer_choices | join(’ or ’) }}
```

Output Template:

```

{% if label == "entailment" %}
{{answer_choices[0]}}
{% else %}
{{answer_choices[1]}}
{% endif %}
```

Prompt 5: “does S1 entail S2?"

Answer Choices:

```
yes ||| no
```

Input Template:

```
Sentence 1: {{premise}}

Sentence 2: {{hypothesis}}

Question: Does Sentence 1 entail Sentence 2? \
{{ answer_choices | join(' or ') }}
```

Output Template:

```


{% if label == "entailment" %}
{{answer_choices[0]}}
{% else %}
{{answer_choices[1]}}
{% endif %}
```

J.4.5 GAD

Table 12: GAD example instance.

Key	Value
id	0
document_id	0
text	These results suggest that the C1772T polymorphism in @GE...
labels	['1']

Prompt 1: "Does this passage (passage last)"

Answer Choices:

```
No ||| Yes
```

Input Template:

```
Does the following passage indicate that there is an association \
between the gene @GENE$ and the disease @DISEASE$ ?

{{ text }}
```

Output Template:

```
{{ answer_choices[labels[0] | int] }}
```

Prompt 2: "Does this passage (passage first)"

Answer Choices:

```
No ||| Yes
```

Input Template:

```
{{ text }}

Does this passage indicate that there is an association between the \
gene @GENE$ and the disease @DISEASE$ ?
```

Output Template:

```
{{ answer_choices[labels[0] | int] }}
```

Prompt 3: “Is there an association expressed? (passage last)"

Answer Choices:

```
No ||| Yes
```

Input Template:

```
Is there an association between the gene @GENE$ and the disease \
@DISEASE$ expressed in this passage?

{{ text }}
```

Output Template:

```
{{ answer_choices[labels[0] | int] }}
```

Prompt 4: “I’m a doctor"

Answer Choices:

```
No ||| Yes
```

Input Template:

```
I’m a doctor. Can you tell me, is there an association between the \
gene @GENE$ and the disease @DISEASE$ expressed in this passage?

{{ text }}
```

Output Template:

```

{{ answer_choices[labels[0] | int] }}
```

Prompt 5: “Is there an association expressed? (passage first)"

Answer Choices:

```
No ||| Yes
```

Input Template:

```
{{ text }}

Is there an association between the gene @GENE\$ and the disease \
@DISEASE$ expressed in this passage?
```

Output Template:

```

{{ answer_choices[labels[0] | int] }}
```

K Large-scale Multi-Task Learning

We make the MTL model available at `https://huggingface.co/bigscience-biomedical/bigbio-mtl`. Code and instructions to reproduce our results can be found in `https://github.com/leonweber/biomuppet`.

Table 13: MTL dataset statistics

Task	Abbrev.	# Train Examples	# Valid Examples	# Datasets
Relation Extraction	RE	656,171	106,519	14
Coreference Resolution	COREF	113,137	35,030	9
Event Argument Extraction	EAE	294,129	119,033	10
Text Classification	CLASS	30,743	3,416	2
Semantic Textual Similarity	STS	7,215	804	6
Question Answering	QA	6,490	561	2
Named Entity Recognition	NER	287,582	89,135	53
Event Detection	ED	28,388	9,883	10
Total		1,423,855	364,381	106

K.1 Conversion to MaChAmp

We generated training and evaluation data for 106 datasets that were available when we started to develop the MTL project source code (BIGBIO version found here). If a dataset within this collective set did not have a predefined validation split, we reserved 10% of its training data as the validation set. Each dataset also had one BIGBIO-to-MaChAmp transformation script per BIGBIO task. The purpose of this transformation script is to convert the data represented in the BIGBIO-schema in a MaChAmp-compatible input for simple extension to the ML library. For statistics of the resulting data set Table 13 and for examples of the transformed task data see Tables 14 and 15.

We model **Relation Extraction** (RE) as relation classification. Each sentence in an input passage is split; subsequently, we construct on example per entity-pair by introducing special marker tokens to mark the start and end of each head and tail entity. We consider each example as a text classification problem in MaChAmp, where the goal is to predict the type of relation between the marked head/ail entities, including a 'None' type relation. We follow the BLURB preprocessing strategy for RE and replace the strings of the marked head and tail entity with their respective entity type. For multi-label datasets where an entity or relation may possess multiple labels, we transform such cases to a multiclass dataset by concatenating all labels. We use this multilabel-to-multiclass transformation for all task types, if required.

We treat **Coreference Resolution** (COREF) in a similar fashion as RE, with the only difference that we have only two relation types: 'coref' denoting a coreference relation between two token spans and 'None'.

We transform the **Event Argument Extraction** (EAE) data in exactly the same way as RE, with the trigger span acting as the head entity and all possible event arguments (entities and triggers) acting as tail entities.

For **Text Classification** (CLASS), we adapt the BIGBIO version to the MaChAmp format without any further modification apart from the multilabel-to-multiclass transformation.

We transform the **Semantic Textual Similarity** (STS) task from a regression task to classification by replacing the STS score with the decantile into which it falls. We use the template 'Text1 [SEP] Text2' where 'Text1' and 'Text2' are either words, sentences or paragraphs depending on the dataset.

We model **Named Entity Recognition** (NER) and Event Detection (ED) as sequence labelling tasks using an IOB-tagging scheme after sentence splitting.

For **Question Answering** (QA), we experimented with two formulations. In the classification formulation, we construct one example per answer candidate by using the template 'Context [SEP] Question [SEP] AnswerCandidate' and the two labels 'True' (if 'AnswerCandidate' is the correct answer) and 'False' (if 'AnswerCandidate' is the wrong answer). In the sequence labelling setting, we

use the template ‘Context. Question‘ and mark all tokens in occurrences of the answer in ‘Context’ with ‘answer’ and the rest with ‘O’.

We use Flair’s [40] ‘SegtokSentenceSplitter‘ for sentence splitting and ‘SpaceTokenizer‘ for tokenization.

Table 14: Examples for the classification task formulation

Task Type	Input	Label
RE	Taken together, these results make it clear that @chemical$-bound forms of ORC and @protein$ are likely to be required for productive interactions and pre-RC formation.	`bind`
COREF	We investigated the potential of the @aryl hydrocarbon receptor$ (@AHR$) to suppress NF-kappaB regulated-gene expression, especially acute-phase genes, such as serum amyloid A (Saa).	`coref`
EAE	v-erbA @Gene_expression$ is required to @Negative_regulation$ c-erbA function in erythroid cell differentiation and regulation of the erbA target gene CAII.	cause
CLASS	These results are in contrast with the findings of Santos et al.(16), who reported a significant association between low sedentary time and healthy CVF among Portuguese	`result&supportive`
STS	Renal failure [SEP] Kidney failure	`8`
QA (class)	Cytokeratin 7/20 staining has been reported to be helpful [...] [SEP] Is cytokeratin immunoreactivity useful in the diagnosis of short-segment Barrett’s oesophagus in Korea?	`True`

K.2 Hyperparameters

For hyperparameter choices, we use a mixture of the MaChAmp default hyperparameters and the suggestions from [1]. We use AdamW [100] with a polynomial decay learning rate schedule with 50,000 warmup steps with a maximum learning rate of 1e-4. We set weight decay to 0.01, dropout to 0.1 and the maximum length of the transformer to 512. We use an effective batch size of 32 tasks and 16 examples per task, train the model with Automated Mixed Precision set to fp16 using apex (`https://github.com/NVIDIA/apex`) and clip the gradient norm to 5. Finally, we downsample large datasets by using MaChAmp’s multinomial sampling with alpha set to 0.5.

For model selection we evaluate the model after each epoch on all validation sets and select the model with the highest average accuracy.

K.3 Results on Validation Sets

We evaluate our MTL model on all validation sets and deliberately refrain from evaluating on the test sets, because we did not rule out train/test overlap. The validation results can be found in Figure 12. Results vary strongly across task types, with the model performing well on COREF (mean 86.9% F1), CLASS (mean 85.4 acc), and NER (mean 72.2% F1). Performance on STS (mean 28.1 Pearson’s r) and QA (mean 42.8 acc) is surprisingly low. We attribute the weak performance on both STS and QA

Table 15: Examples for the sequence labeling task formulation

Task Type	Input	Label
NER	Tricuspid valve regurgitation and lithium carbonate toxicity in a newborn infant.	`B-Disease I-Disease I-Disease O B-Chemical I-Chemical B-Disease O O O O`
ED	Coexpression of NF-kappa B/Rel and Sp1 transcription factors in human immunodeficiency virus 1-induced, dendritic cell-T-cell syncytia.	`B-Gene_expression O O O O O O O O O O O O O`
QA (seq)	a frameshift mutation is a deletion or insertion of one or more nucleotides [...] a frameshift mutation is a deletion or insertion of one or more of what that changes the reading frame of the base sequence ?	`O O O O O [...] answer [...] O`

to the small amount of data per task (7,215 and 6,490 training examples respectively), which might prevent the model from allocating parameters for these tasks.




Figure 12: Validation set results of the MTL model by task. 'RE' denotes Relation Extraction, 'COREF' Coreference Resolution, 'ED' event detection, 'STS' Semantic Textual Similarity, 'QA' Question Answering, 'EAE' Event Argument Extraction, 'NER' Named Entity Recognition, and 'CLASS' Text Classification. Score is accuracy for QA and CLASS, Pearson's r for STS and F1 for the rest.

K.4 Resources Used for Training

We trained the MTL model on a local machine on four RTX 3090 GPUs. Training for 50 epochs allowed the model to converge in all tested configurations and took roughly 33 hours.

L BIGBIO vs. Existing Benchmarks

Biomedical Meta-dataset Benchmarks Table 16 compares BIGBIO against attributes of other popular English language biomedical meta-dataset benchmarks. To-date, our framework is the only one that supports API-based dataset access, providing access to 4x more datasets than the largest comparable meta-dataset. BLUE and BLURB do not provide dataset access via an API and require manual downloading and preprocessing. Depending on the dataset, these preprocessing choices may not be easily reproducible. For example, in 4/5 NER tasks BLURB uses the IOB transformed datasets generated by Crichton et al. [56]. These datasets rely on regular expression-based tokenization and sentence boundary detection methods developed by Crichton et al. and can vary by dataset, making it difficult to systemically the impact of different tokenization and sentence splitting choices.

End-to-end few and zero-shot evaluation of datasets, prompts, and pretrained language models is emerging as a standardized way to measure the performance of pretrained language models. BLUE and BLURB do not directly support prompt evaluation. BoX provides prompts for 32 biomedical datasets and Python tools for evaluating BART [97]-based language models, however BoX does not provide any access to the original datasets themselves. BIGBIO integrates with the prompt engineering framework PROMPTSOURCE to support users more easily designing prompts and running evaluations using the EleutherAI Language Model Evaluation Harness [11]. We currently support several seq2seq and causal language models (e.g., T5, T0, GPT families) available in Hugging Face's model hub. Currently BIGBIO implements 25 prompts (5 datasets, 5 prompts), with future work focusing on constructing a library of task and dataset-specific biomedical prompts.

Table 16: Attributes of existing English biomedical meta-dataset benchmarks

Name	Datasets	Tasks	Langs	Data API	Reproducible Preprocessing	Prompts	Evaluation Harness
BIGBIO	127	12	10	✓	✓	*partial*	✓
BLUE [22]	10	5	1		*partial*		
BLURB [12]	13	7	1		*partial*		
BoX [20]	32	9	1			✓	✓

Dataset Coverage Table 17 enumerates the list of datasets currently used by BIGBIO , BLUE, BLURB, and BoX. Abbreviations are as follows: Named Entity Recognition (NER); Relation Extraction (RE); Question Answering (QA); Part-of-Speech Tagging (POS); Sentiment Analysis (SA) ; Natural Language Inference (NLI); and Systematic Review (SR). For the 32 public datasets BIGBIO provides data loaders for the majority (28/32), while the remaining 4 are still being implemented by volunteers as of 06/16/2022. Note that *private* indicates that datasets are not available publicly or via DUA and thus cannot currently be included in BIGBIO.

Table 17: BIGBIO support of datasets used in popular meta-dataset benchmarks.

Task Type	Dataset	BIGBIO	BLUE	BLURB	BoX	DUA
NER	BC2GM	✓		✓	✓	
NER	BC5-chem	✓	✓	✓	✓	
NER	BC5-disease	✓	✓	✓	✓	
NER	EBM PICO	✓		✓		
NER	JNLPBA	✓		✓	✓	
NER	NCBI-disease	✓		✓	✓	
RE	ChemProt	✓	✓	✓	✓	
RE	DDI	✓	✓	✓	✓	
RE	GAD	✓		✓		
QA	PubMedQA	✓		✓	✓	
QA	BioASQ	✓		✓	✓	✓
DC	HoC	✓	✓	✓	✓	
STS	BIOSSES	✓	✓	✓		
STS	MedSTS	*	✓			✓
NER	n2c2 2010	✓	✓		✓	✓
NER	ShARe/CLEF 2013	*	✓			✓
NLI	MedNLI	✓	✓			✓
NER	n2c2 deid 2006	✓			✓	✓
DC	n2c2 RFHD 2014	✓			✓	✓
NER	AnatEM	✓			✓	
NER	BC4CHEMD	✓			✓	
NER	BioNLP09	✓			✓	
NER	BioNLP11EPI	✓			✓	
NER	BioNLP11ID	✓			✓	
NER	BioNLP13CG	✓			✓	
NER	BioNLP13GE	✓			✓	
NER	BioNLP13PC	✓			✓	
NER	CRAFT	*			✓	
NER	Ex-PTM	✓			✓	
NER	Linnaeus	✓			✓	
POS	GENIA	*			✓	
SA	Medical Drugs	✓			✓	
SR	COVID				*private*	
SR	Cooking				*private*	
SR	HRT				*private*	
SR	Accelerometer				*private*	
SR	Acromegaly				*private*	

* denotes dataset implementation in-progress

M Example Data Cards

We generated data cards for all BIGBIO datasets. We include an example dataset from each schema type to illustrate data cards for different tasks. A PDF of all content is available on our project homepage.

Cantemist Data Card



Figure 13: Token frequency distribution by split (top) and frequency of different kind of instances (bottom).

Dataset Description: Collection of 1301 oncological clinical case reports written in Spanish, with tumor morphology mentions manually annotated and mapped by clinical experts to a controlled terminology. Every tumor morphology mention is linked to an eCIE-O code (the Spanish equivalent of ICD-O). The original dataset is distributed in BRAT format, and was randomly sampled into 3 subsets. The training, development and test sets contain 501, 500 and 300 documents each, respectively. This dataset was designed for the CANcer TExt Mining Shared Task, sponsored by Plan-TL. The task is divided in 3 subtasks: CANTEMIST-NER, CANTEMIST-NORM and CANTEMIST-CODING.

CANTEMIST-NER track: requires finding automatically tumor morphology mentions. All tumor morphology mentions are defined by their corresponding character offsets in UTF-8 plain text medical documents.

CANTEMIST-NORM track: clinical concept normalization or named entity normalization task that requires to return all tumor morphology entity mentions together with their corresponding eCIE-O-3.1 codes i.e. finding and normalizing tumor morphology mentions.

CANTEMIST-CODING track: requires returning for each of document a ranked list of its corresponding ICD-O-3 codes. This it is essentially a sort of indexing or multi-label classification task or oncology clinical coding.

For further information, please visit `https://temu.bsc.es/cantemist` or send an email to encargo-pln-life@bsc.es

Homepage: `https://temu.bsc.es/cantemist/?p=4338`

URL: `https://zenodo.org/record/3978041/files/cantemist.zip?download=1`

Licensing: Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International

Languages: Spanish

Tasks: NER, NED, Text Classification

Schemas: `TEXT`, `KB`, `source`

Splits: train, validation, test

MEDIQA Data Card




Figure 14: Token frequency distribution by split (top) and frequency of different kind of instances (bottom).

Dataset Description: The MEDIQA challenge is an ACL-BioNLP 2019 shared task aiming to attract further research efforts in Natural Language Inference (NLI), Recognizing Question Entailment (RQE), and their applications in medical Question Answering (QA). Mailing List: `https://groups.google.com/forum/#!forum/bionlp-mediqa`

In the QA task, participants are tasked to:- filter/classify the provided answers (1: correct, 0: incorrect).- re-rank the answers.

Homepage: `https://sites.google.com/view/mediqa2019`

URL: `https://github.com/abachaa/MEDIQA2019/archive/refs/heads/master.zip`

Licensing: License information unavailable

Languages: English

Tasks: Question Answering

Schemas: `QA`, `source`

Splits: train-1-liveQAMed, train-2-Alexa, validation, test

AnEM Data Card




Figure 15: Token frequency distribution by split (top) and frequency of different kind of instances (bottom).

Dataset Description AnEM corpus is a domain- and species-independent resource manually annotated for anatomical entity mentions using a fine-grained classification system. The corpus consists of 500 documents (over 90,000 words) selected randomly from citation abstracts and full-text papers with the aim of making the corpus representative of the entire available biomedical scientific literature. The corpus annotation covers mentions of both healthy and pathological anatomical entities and contains over 3,000 annotated mentions.

Homepage: `http://www.nactem.ac.uk/anatomy/`

URL: `http://www.nactem.ac.uk/anatomy/data/AnEM-1.0.4.tar.gz`

Licensing: Creative Commons Attribution Share Alike 3.0 Unported

Languages: English

Tasks: NER, Coreference Resolution, Relation Extraction

Schemas: `KB`, `source`

Splits: train, validation, test

ParaMed Data Card




Figure 16: Token frequency distribution by split (top) and frequency of different kind of instances (bottom).

Dataset Description: NEJM is a Chinese-English parallel corpus crawled from the New England Journal of Medicine website. English articles are distributed through https://www.nejm.org/ and Chinese articles are distributed through http://nejmqianyan.cn/. The corpus contains all article pairs (around 2000 pairs) since 2011.

Homepage: `https://github.com/boxiangliu/ParaMed`

URL: `https://github.com/boxiangliu/ParaMed/blob/master/data/nejm-open-access.tar.gz?raw=true`

Licensing: Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International

Languages: English, Chinese

Tasks Translation

Schemas: `t2t`, `source`

Splits: train, validation, test

SciTail Data Card



Figure 17: Token frequency distribution by split (top) and frequency of different kind of instances (bottom).

Dataset Description The SciTail dataset is an entailment dataset created from multiple-choice science exams and web sentences. Each question and the correct answer choice are converted into an assertive statement to form the hypothesis. We use information retrieval to obtain relevant text from a large text corpus of web sentences, and use these sentences as a premise P. We crowdsource the annotation of such premise-hypothesis pair as supports (entails) or not (neutral), in order to create the SciTail dataset. The dataset contains 27,026 examples with 10,101 examples with entails label and 16,925 examples with neutral label.

Homepage: `https://allenai.org/data/scitail`

URL: `https://ai2-public-datasets.s3.amazonaws.com/scitail/SciTailV1.1.zip`

Licensing: Apache License 2.0

Languages: English

Tasks: Textual Entailment

Schemas: `te`, `source`

Splits: train, validation, test

MQP Data Card




Figure 18: Token frequency distribution by split (top) and frequency of different kind of instances (bottom).

Dataset Description: Medical Question Pairs dataset by McCreery et al (2020) contains pairs of medical questions and paraphrased versions of the question prepared by medical professional. Paraphrased versions were labelled as similar (syntactically dissimilar but contextually similar) or dissimilar (syntactically may look similar but contextually dissimilar). Labels 1: similar, 0: dissimilar

Homepage: `https://github.com/curai/medical-question-pair-dataset`

URL: `https://raw.githubusercontent.com/curai/medical-question-pair-dataset/master/mqp.csv`

Licensing: License information unavailable

Languages: English

Tasks: Semantic Similarity

Schemas: `pairs`, `source`

Splits: train

N BIGBIO Data Card

Dataset Description: BIGBIO is a community project and meta-dataset consisting of 126+ dataset loader scripts providing programmatic access to expertly annotated biomedical natural language processing datasets. The constituent datasets support 12 tasks grouped into 6 schema types. 105 of these datasets are publicly available and can be automatically downloaded using the BIGBIO Python package. The remaining 21 require some level of manual action ranging from simple web forms to credentialed access and training on how to handle protected health information.

Homepage: `https://github.com/bigscience-workshop/biomedical`

URL: `https://github.com/bigscience-workshop/biomedical`

Licensing: `https://choosealicense.com/licenses/apache-2.0/`

Languages: English, Spanish, French, Chinese, German, Japanese, Dutch, Portuguese, Swedish, and Vietnamese

Tasks: named entity recognition (`NER`), named entity disambiguation/normalization (`NED`), event extraction (`EE`), relation extraction (`RE`), coreference resolution (`COREF`), question answering (`QA`), textual entailment (`TE`), text classification (`TXTCLASS`), semantic similarity (`STS`), paraphrasing (`PARA`), translation (`TRANSL`), summarization (`SUM`).

Schemas: Knowledge Base (`KB`), Question Answering (`QA`), Textual Entailment (`TE`), Text (`TEXT`), Text Pairs (`PAIRS`), Text to Text (`T2T`), source (`source`).

Splits: train, validation, test, sample

Table 18: Summary statistics for all datasets included in BIGBIO. Token counts (# Toks) assumes white space tokenziation and example instances (# N) correspond to the unit of text emitted by the dataloader iterable, usually a document, sentence, or text pair. Some datasets include k-folds or multiple training splits, which are noted by $k = *$. See each dataset's data card for more specific details, such as label counts by task.

Dataset Name	BIGBIO Name	Split	# Chars	# Toks	# N	License	Tasks	Schema	Langs	Access
AnEM [115]	`an_em`	train valid test	300k 85.6k 242k	44.3k 11k 36.2k	250 50 200	CC BY SA 3.0	RE, NER, COREF	KB	EN	Public
AnatEM [121]	`anat_em`	train valid test	840k 319k 547k	122k 44.7k 79.2k	606 202 404	CC BY SA 3.0	NER	KB	EN	Public
AskAPatient [98]	`ask_a_patient`	train k=10 validation k=10 test k=10	31.3k 1.74k 1.92k	202k 10.6k 11.7k	15665 792 866	CC BY 4.0	NER, NED	KB	EN	Public
BC5CDR [93]	`bc5cdr`	train valid test	653k 647k 677k	93k 92.3k 96.5k	500 500 500	Public Domain Mark 1.0	RE, NER, NED	KB	EN	Public
BC7-LitCovid [51]	`bc7_litcovid`	train valid test	34.4M 3.69M 8.68M	4.97M 532k 1.26M	24960 2489 6239	*Unknown*	TXTCLASS	TEXT	EN	Public
Bio-SimVerb [53]	`bio_sim_verb`	train	14.9k	2k	1000	*Unknown*	STS	PAIRS	EN	Public
Bio-SimLex [53]	`bio_simlex`	train	16.1k	1.98k	988	*Unknown*	STS	PAIRS	EN	Public
MESINESP 2021 [67]	`bioasq_2021_mesinesp`	valid test	256k 59.4k	38.6k 9.06k	109 119	CC BY 4.0	TXTCLASS	TEXT	ES	Public
BioASQ Task B [142]	`bioasq_task_b`	train valid test	5.21M 573k 581k	2.26M 249k 253k	9955 1029 1041	NLM	QA	QA	EN	DUA
BioASQ Task C 2017 [108]	`bioasq_task_c_2017`	train test	2.59B 895M	346M 120M	62952 22610	NLM	TXTCLASS	TEXT	EN	DUA
BioInfer [122]	`bioinfer`	train test	164k 40.8k	23.7k 5.93k	894 206	CC BY 2.0	RE, NER	KB	EN	Public

BiologyHowWhy-Corpus [76]	biology_how_why_corpus	train	2.33M	985k	1269	*Unknown*	QA	QA	EN	Public
BIOMRC [118]	biomrc	train	114k	48.6k	30	*Unknown*	QA	QA	EN	Public
BioNLP 2009 [85]	bionlp_shared_task_2009	train valid test	1.21M 234k 397k	176k 33.8k 57.3k	800 150 260	GENIA Project	EE, NER, COREF	KB	EN	Public
BioNLP 2011 EPI [114]	bionlp_st_2011_epi	train valid test	901k 310k 653k	127k 43.5k 91.9k	600 200 440	GENIA Project	EE, NER, COREF	KB	EN	Public
BioNLP 2011 GE [86]	bionlp_st_2011_ge	train valid test	1.41M 435k 541k	206k 64.1k 79k	908 259 347	CC BY 3.0	EE, NER, COREF	KB	EN	Public
BioNLP 2011 ID [126]	bionlp_st_2011_id	train valid test	438k 119k 335k	64.7k 18.4k 50k	152 46 118	GENIA Project	EE, NER, COREF	KB	EN	Public
BioNLP 2011 REL [127]	bionlp_st_2011_rel	train valid test	1.21M 234k 397k	176k 33.8k 57.3k	800 150 260	GENIA Project	RE, NER, COREF	KB	EN	Public
BioNLP 2013 CG [123]	bionlp_st_2013_cg	train valid test	467k 153k 297k	66.1k 21.7k 42.1k	300 100 200	GENIA Project	EE, NER, COREF	KB	EN	Public
BioNLP 2013 GE [87]	bionlp_st_2013_ge	train valid test	371k 391k 506k	54.9k 57.9k 75.1k	222 249 305	GENIA Project	RE, EE, NER, COREF	KB	EN	Public
BioNLP 2013 GRO [88]	bionlp_st_2013_gro	train valid test	200k 59.8k 132k	29.4k 8.7k 19k	150 50 100	GENIA Project	RE, EE, NER	KB	EN	Public
BioNLP 2013 PC [113]	bionlp_st_2013_pc	train valid test	378k 131k 253k	53.8k 18.6k 36k	260 90 175	GENIA Project	EE, NER, COREF	KB	EN	Public
BioNLP 2019 BB [46]	bionlp_st_2019_bb	train valid test	129k 66.5k 110k	19k 9.71k 16.2k	133 66 96	*Unknown*	RE, NER, NED	KB	EN	Public
BioRED [103]	biored	train valid test	660k 173k 168k	94.2k 24.9k 24.1k	400 100 100	*Unknown*	RE, NER	KB	EN	Public
BioRelEx [81]	biorelex	train valid	237k 33.1k	37.8k 5.29k	1405 201	*Unknown*	RE, NER, NED, COREF	KB	EN	Public
BioScope [151]	bioscope	train	171k	42k	6383	CC BY 2.0	NER	KB	EN	Public
BIOSSES [135]	biosses	train valid test	20.1k 5.09k 6.44k	2.94k 733 925	64 16 20	GPL 3.0	STS	PAIRS	EN	Public
CADEC [80]	cadec	train	575k	104k	1250	Custom	NER, NED	KB	EN	Public
CANTEMIST [105]	cantemist	train valid test	2.6M 2.33M 1.41M	382k 341k 206k	501 500 300	CC BY 4.0	NER, NED, TXTCLASS	KB, TEXT	ES	Public
CAS [70]	cas	train	972k	175k	7580	DUA	TXTCLASS	TEXT, KB	FR	DUA
CellFinder [110]	cellfinder	train test	171k 205k	25.2k 30.3k	26 27	CC BY SA 3.0	NER	KB	EN	Public
CHEBI Corpus [130]	chebi_nactem	train	1.95M	306k	100	CC BY 4.0	RE, NER	KB	EN	Public
CHEMDNER [92]	chemdner	train valid test	4.88M 4.86M 4.19M	687k 683k 591k	3500 3500 3000	*Unknown*	NER, TXTCLASS	KB, TEXT	EN	Public
ChemProt [93]	chemprot	train valid test	1.64M 990k 1.3M	230k 139k 182k	1020 612 800	Public Domain Mark 1.0	RE, NER	KB	EN	Public
CHIA [95]	chia	train	1.04M	151k	2000	CC BY 4.0	RE, NER	KB	EN	Public
Citation GIA Test Collection [158]	citation_gia_test_collection	test	230k	33.4k	151	*Unknown*	NER, NED	KB	EN	Public
CodiEsp [106]	codiesp	train train valid test	193M 0 0 0	29.1M 0 0 0	176294 500 250 250	CC BY 4.0	TXTCLASS	TEXT	ES	Public

CORD-NER [153]	cord_ner	train	407M	62.5M	29500	Custom	NER	KB	EN	Public
CT-EBM-SP [49]	ctebmsp	train valid test	625k 212k 206k	90.3k 30.7k 29.9k	420 140 140	CC BY NC 4.0	NER	KB	ES	Public
DDI Corpus [74]	ddi_corpus	train test	928k 281k	128k 38.7k	714 303	CC BY NC 4.0	RE, NER	KB	EN	Public
DIANN [128]	diann_iber_eval	train test train test	548k 144k 1.06M 275k	81.8k 21.5k 156k 40.9k	400 100 400 100	*Unknown*	NER	KB	EN, ES	Public
DisTEMIST [66]	distemist	train	1.76M	264k	750	CC BY 4.0	NER	KB	EN	Public
EBM NLP [111]	ebm_pico	train test	7.68M 306k	1.29M 50.9k	4746 187	*Unknown*	NER	KB	EN	Public
EHR-Rel [129]	ehr_rel	train	174k	23.4k	3741	Apache 2.0	STS	PAIRS	EN	Public
ESSAI [57]	essai	train	1.83M	314k	13848	DUA	TXTCLASS	TEXT, KB	FR	DUA
EU-ADR [149]	euadr	train	452k	64.3k	300	*Unknown*	RE, NER	KB	EN	Public
Evidence Inference 2.0 [59]	evidence_inference	train valid test	2.91M 352k 358k	446k 53.6k 54.9k	10150 1238 1228	MIT	TE	TE	EN	Public
GAD [47]	gad	train valid test	740k 91k 98.6k	113k 13.9k 14.9k	4261 535 534	CC BY 4.0	TXTCLASS	TEXT	EN	Public
GENETAG [138]	genetag	train valid test	1.16M 783k 387k	197k 133k 65.5k	7500 5000 2500	NCBI	NER	KB	EN	Public
PTM Events [112]	genia_ptm_ event_corpus	train	145k	20.8k	112	GENIA Project	EE, NER, COREF	KB	EN	Public
GENIA Relation Corpus [124]	genia_relation_ corpus	train valid test	1.21M 234k 397k	176k 33.8k 57.3k	800 150 260	GENIA Project	RE	KB	EN	Public
GENIA Term Corpus [116]	genia_term_corpus	train	2.99M	435k	2000	GENIA Project	NER	KB	EN	Public
GEOkhoj v1 [62]	geokhoj_v1	train test	4.25M 848k	554k 111k	25000 5000	CC BY NC 4.0	TXTCLASS	TEXT	EN	Public
GNormPlus [158]	gnormplus	train test	379k 359k	55.7k 52.5k	281 262	*Unknown*	NER, NED	KB	EN	Public
Hallmarks of Cancer [43]	hallmarks_of_cancer	train valid test	1.96M 296k 573k	312k 47.1k 91.8k	12119 1798 3547	GPL 3.0	TXTCLASS	TEXT	EN	Public
HPRD50 [64]	hprd50	train test	18.1k 4.94k	2.67k 710	34 9	*Unknown*	RE, NER	KB	EN	Public
IEPA [60]	iepa	train test	75.1k 18.6k	10.9k 2.68k	160 40	*Unknown*	RE	KB	EN	Public
JNLPBA [55]	jnlpba	train valid	0 0	0 0	37094 7714	CC BY 3.0	NER	KB	EN	Public
LINNAEUS [68]	linnaeus	train	2.46M	373k	84	CC BY 4.0	NER, NED	KB	EN	Public
LLL05 [53]	lll	train test	13.2k 13.1k	1.99k 2.07k	77 87	*Unknown*	RE	KB	EN	Public
Mantra GSC [90]	mantra_gsc	train	16k	2.12k	50	CC BY 4.0	NER, NED	KB	EN, FR, DE, NL, ES	Public
MayoSRS [120]	mayosrs	train	2.69k	314	101	CC0 1.0	STS	PAIRS	EN	Public
MedQA [78]	med_qa	train valid test	1.84M 229k 234k	890k 111k 114k	11298 1412 1413	*Unknown*	QA	QA	EN	Public
MedDialog [52]	meddialog	train valid test	290k 41.8k 35.5k	51k 7.35k 6.31k	981 126 122	*Unknown*	TXTCLASS	TEXT	EN, ZH	Public

MEDDOCAN [104]	meddocan	train valid test	1.42M 755k 711k	208k 111k 105k	500 250 250	CC BY 4.0	NER	KB	ES	Public
MedHop [161]	medhop	train valid	187M 32.8M	78.7M 13.8M	1620 342	CC BY SA 3.0	QA	QA	EN	Public
Medical Data [82]	medical_data	train test	11M 7.12M	1.81M 1.16M	5279 2924	*Unknown*	TE	TE	EN	DUA
MEDIQA NLI [132]	mediqa_nli	test	49.6k	8.37k	405	PhysioNet 1.5	TE	TE	EN	DUA
MEDIQA QA [45]	mediqa_qa	train k=2 valid test	1.91M 1.24M 5.78M	4.56M 519k 2.42M	104 25 150	*Unknown*	QA	QA	EN	Public
MEDIQA RQE [45]	mediqa_rqe	train valid test	1.69M 86.5k 68.1k	262k 15.6k 12.1k	8588 302 230	*Unknown*	TE	TE	EN	Public
MedMentions [107]	medmentions	train valid test	4.16M 1.4M 1.39M	606k 204k 203k	2635 878 879	CC0 1.0	NER, NED	KB	EN	Public
MedNLI [131]	mednli	train valid test	1.51M 196k 187k	240k 31.1k 29.6k	11232 1395 1422	PhysioNet 1.5	TE	TE	EN	DUA
MeQSum [44]	meqsum	train	405k	70.8k	1000	*Unknown*	SUM	T2T	EN	Public
MiniMayoSRS [120]	minimayosrs	train	803	92	29	CC0 1.0	STS	PAIRS	EN	Public
miRNA [42]	mirna	train test	272k 115k	38.2k 16k	201 100	CC BY NC 3.0	NER, NED	KB	EN	Public
MLEE [125]	mlee	train valid test	199k 68.1k 135k	27.9k 9.61k 19.1k	131 44 87	CC BY NC SA 3.0	RE, EE, NER, COREF	KB	EN	Public
MQP [93]	mqp	train	644k	120k	3048	*Unknown*	STS	PAIRS	EN	Public
MSH WSD [77]	msh_wsd	train	52.8M	7.59M	37888	UMLS	NED	KB	EN	DUA
MuchMore [48]	muchmore	train train	8.43M 12.7M	1.11M 1.69M	7808 6374	*Unknown*	NER	KB	EN, DE	Public
Multi-XScience [101]	multi_xscience	train valid test	143M 23.9M 23.6M	21.3M 3.54M 3.51M	30369 5066 5093	MIT	SUM, PARA	T2T	EN	Public
MutationFinder [50]	mutation_finder	valid test	416k 726k	61.4k 107k	305 508	Custom	NER	KB	EN	Public
n2c2 2006 De-identification [146]	n2c2_2006_deid	train test	2.25M 952k	340k 146k	669 220	DUA	NER	KB	EN	DUA
n2c2 2006 Smoking Status [145]	n2c2_2006_smokers	train test	1.72M 479k	304k 85.1k	398 104	DUA	TXTCLASS	TEXT	EN	DUA
n2c2 2008 Obesity [143]	n2c2_2008	train test	5M 3.5M	852k 595k	730 507	DUA	TXTCLASS	TEXT	EN	DUA
n2c2 2009 Medication [147]	n2c2_2009	train test	4.86M 3.75M	824k 637k	696 553	DUA	NER	KB	EN	DUA
n2c2 2010 Relations [148]	n2c2_2010	train test	827k 1.48M	150k 267k	170 256	DUA	RE, NER	KB	EN	DUA
n2c2 2011 Coreference [144]	n2c2_2011	train test	1.37M 916k	247k 167k	251 173	DUA	COREF	KB	EN	DUA
n2c2 2014 De-identification [137]	n2c2_2014_deid	train test	3.4M 2.19M	489k 316k	790 514	DUA	NER	KB	EN	DUA
n2c2 2014 Cardiac Risk Factors [94]	n2c2_2014_risk_factors	train test	3.4M 2.19M	489k 316k	790 514	DUA	TXTCLASS	TEXT	EN	DUA
n2c2 2018 Selection Criteria [136]	n2c2_2018_track1	train test	3.91M 1.64M	550k 231k	202 86	DUA	TXTCLASS	TEXT	EN	DUA
n2c2 2018 ADE [73]	n2c2_2018_track2	train test	3.84M 2.54M	574k 377k	303 202	DUA	RE, NER	KB	EN	DUA
NCBI Disease [61]	ncbi_disease	train valid test	747k 133k 135k	113k 20.1k 20.4k	592 100 100	CC0 1.0	NER, NED	KB	EN	Public
NLM-Gene [75]	nlm_gene	train	812k	114k	450	CC0 1.0	NER, NED	KB	EN	Public

		test	180k	25.2k	100					
NLM WSD [154]	nlm_wsd	train	8.37M	1.22M	5000	UMLS	NED	KB	EN	DUA
NLM-Chem [75]	nlmchem	train valid test	2.69M 663k 1.52M	408k 100k 229k	80 20 50	CC0 1.0	NER, NED, TXTCLASS	KB, TEXT	EN	Public
NTCIR-13 MedWeb [133]	ntcir_13_medweb	train test train test	79.4M 8.38M 163k 50.7k	3.71M 412k 27.2k 8.47k	1920 640 1920 640	CC BY 4.0	TXTCLASS	TEXT	EN, ZH, JA	DUA
OSIRIS [65]	osiris	train	172k	25.7k	105	CC BY 3.0	NER, NED	KB	EN	Public
ParaMed [99]	paramed	train valid test	16.2M 552k 564k	3.74M 128k 130k	62127 2036 2102	CC BY 4.0	TRANSL	T2T	EN, ZH	Public
PDR [84]	pdr	train	274k	40.5k	179	*Unknown*	EE, NER, COREF	KB	EN	Public
PharmaCoNER [69]	pharmaconer	train valid test	1.18M 567k 587k	177k 85.1k 88.2k	500 250 250	CC BY 4.0	NER, TXTCLASS	KB, TEXT	ES	Public
PhoNER_COVID19 [141]	pho_ner	train valid test	671k 286k 433k	168k 71.3k 108k	5027 2000 3000	Custom	NER	KB	VI	Public
PICO Annotation [163]	pico_extraction	train	60.4k	10.2k	421	*Unknown*	NER	KB	EN	Public
PMC-Patients [162]	pmc_patients	train valid test	1.22B 6.72M 7.67M	184M 1.02M 1.17M	257366 2144 2366	CC BY NC SA 4.0	STS	PAIRS	EN	Public
ProGene [63]	progene	split k=10 split k=10 split k=10	821k 43.3k 96.1k	4.76M 251k 557k	30926 1676 3623	CC BY 4.0	NER	KB	EN	Public
PsyTAR [164]	psytar	train train	319k 57k	56.4k 7.56k	3398 6003	CC BY 4.0	NER	KB	EN	DUA
PUBHEALTH [91]	pubhealth	train valid test	5.61M 683k 692k	899k 110k 111k	9804 1223 1231	MIT	TXTCLASS	PAIRS	EN	Public
PubMedQA [79]	pubmed_qa	train valid test	1.28M 141k 1.45M	549k 60.3k 618k	450 50 500	MIT	QA	QA	EN	Public
PubTator Central [155]	pubtator_central	train	19.5k	2.91k	4	NCBI	NER, NED	KB	EN	Public
QUAERO [109]	quaero	train valid test	67.7k 68.2k 70k	10.6k 10.5k 10.9k	833 832 832	GFDL 1.3	NER	KB	FR	Public
SCAI Chemical [89]	scai_chemical	train	155k	20.9k	100	*Unknown*	NER	KB	EN	Public
SCAI Disease [72]	scai_disease	train	630k	90.4k	400	*Unknown*	NER	KB	EN	Public
SciCite [54]	scicite	train valid test	1.82M 203k 413k	280k 31.3k 63.4k	8243 916 1861	*Unknown*	TXTCLASS	TEXT	EN	Public
SciELO [134]	scielo	train	995M	153M	2828917	CC BY 4.0	TRANSL	T2T	EN, ES, PT	Public
SciFact [152]	scifact	train valid test	787k 280k 26.4k	112k 39.6k 3.62k	919 339 300	CC BY NC 2.0	TE	TE	EN	Public
SciQ [160]	sciq	train valid test	11.8M 993k 1.02M	4.96M 418k 428k	11679 1000 1000	CC BY NC 3.0	QA	QA	EN	Public
SciTail [83]	scitail	train valid test	4.19M 237k 372k	681k 38.8k 62.3k	23596 1304 2126	Apache 2.0	TE	TE	EN	Public
SETH Corpus [140]	seth_corpus	train	760k	111k	630	Apache 2.0	RE, NER	KB	EN	Public

SPL ADR [58]	`spl_adr_200db`	train	29M	3.46M	2208	CC0 1.0	RE, NER, NED	KB	EN	Public
Swedish Medical NER [41]	`swedish_medical_ner`	train	85k	14.1k	926	CC BY SA 4.0	NER	KB	SV	Public
SNP Corpus [139]	`thomas2011`	test	0	0	296	Custom	NER, NED	KB	EN	Public
tmVar v1 [157]	`tmvar_v1`	train test	547k 265k	80.2k 38.8k	334 166	*Unknown*	NER	KB	EN	Public
tmVar v2 [159]	`tmvar_v2`	train	259k	38k	158	*Unknown*	NER, NED	KB	EN	Public
tmVar v3 [156]	`tmvar_v3`	test	812k	119k	500	*Unknown*	NER, NED	KB	EN	Public
TwADR-L [98]	`twadrl`	train k=10 validation k=10 test k=10	10k 327 361	76.1k 1.84k 2.03k	4805 125 142	CC BY 4.0	NER, NED	KB	EN	Public
UMNSRS [117]	`umnsrs`	train	11.3k	1.2k	587	CC0 1.0	STS	PAIRS	EN	Public
Verspoor 2013 [150]	`verspoor_2013`	train	279k	42.9k	120	*Unknown*	RE, NER	KB	EN	Public

Supplementary References

[40] Alan Akbik, Tanja Bergmann, Duncan Blythe, Kashif Rasul, Stefan Schweter, and Roland Vollgraf. FLAIR: An easy-to-use framework for state-of-the-art NLP. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Demonstrations)*, pages 54–59, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[41] Simon Almgren, Sean Pavlov, and Olof Mogren. Named entity recognition in swedish medical journals with deep bidirectional character-based lstms. In *Proceedings of the Fifth Workshop on Building and Evaluating Resources for Biomedical Text Mining (BioTxtM 2016)*, pages 30–39. The COLING 2016 Organizing Committee, 12 2016.

[42] Shweta Bagewadi, Tamara Bobi'c, Martin Hofmann-Apitius, Juliane Fluck, and Roman Klinger. Detecting mirna mentions and relations in biomedical literature. *F1000Research*, 3:205–205, Aug 2014. 26535109[pmid].

[43] Simon Baker, Ilona Silins, Yufan Guo, Imran Ali, Johan H"ogberg, Ulla Stenius, and Anna Korhonen. Automatic semantic classification of scientific literature according to the hallmarks of cancer. *Bioinform.*, 32(3):432–440, 2016.

[44] Asma Ben Abacha and Dina Demner-Fushman. On the summarization of consumer health questions. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2228–2234, Florence, Italy, July 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[45] Asma Ben Abacha, Chaitanya Shivade, and Dina Demner-Fushman. Overview of the mediqa 2019 shared task on textual inference, question entailment and question answering. In *ACL-BioNLP 2019*, 2019.

[46] Robert Bossy, Louise Del'eger, Estelle Chaix, Mouhamadou Ba, and Claire N'edellec. Bacteria biotope at BioNLP open shared tasks 2019. In *Proceedings of The 5th Workshop on BioNLP Open Shared Tasks*, pages 121–131, Hong Kong, China, November 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[47] Àlex Bravo, Janet Piñero, N'uria Queralt-Rosinach, Michael Rautschka, and Laura I Furlong. Extraction of relations between genes and diseases from text and large-scale data analysis: implications for translational research. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 16(1), February 2015.

[48] Paul Buitelaar, Thierry Declerck, Bogdan Sacaleanu, Špela Vintar, Diana Raileanu, and Claudia Crispi. A multi-layered, xml-based approach to the integration of linguistic and semantic annotations. In *Proceedings of EACL 2003 Workshop on Language Technology and the Semantic Web (NLPXML'03), Budapest, Hungary*, 2003.

[49] Leonardo Campillos-Llanos, Ana Valverde-Mateos, Adri'an Capllonch-Carri'on, and Antonio Moreno-Sandoval. A clinical trials corpus annotated with UMLS entities to enhance the access to evidence-based medicine. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making*, 21, 2021.

[50] J. Gregory Caporaso, William A Baumgartner, David A Randolph, K. Bretonnel Cohen, and Lawrence Hunter. Mutationfinder: a high-performance system for extracting point mutation mentions from text. *Bioinformatics*, 23(14):1862–1865, Jul 2007.

[51] Qingyu Chen, Alexis Allot, Robert Leaman, Rezarta Islamaj Doğan, and Zhiyong Lu. Overview of the biocreative vii litcovid track: multi-label topic classification for covid-19 literature annotation. In *Proceedings of the seventh BioCreative challenge evaluation workshop*, 2021.

[52] Shu Chen, Zeqian Ju, Xiangyu Dong, Hongchao Fang, Sicheng Wang, Yue Yang, Jiaqi Zeng, Ruisi Zhang, Ruoyu Zhang, Meng Zhou, Penghui Zhu, and Pengtao Xie. Meddialog: A large-scale medical dialogue dataset. *CoRR*, abs/2004.03329, 2020.

[53] Billy Chiu, Sampo Pyysalo, Ivan Vulić, and Anna Korhonen. Bio-simverb and bio-simlex: Wide-coverage evaluation sets of word similarity in biomedicine. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 19, 02 2018.

[54] Arman Cohan, Waleed Ammar, Madeleine van Zuylen, and Field Cady. Structural scaffolds for citation intent classification in scientific publications. In *Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2019.

[55] Nigel Collier and Jin-Dong Kim. Introduction to the bio-entity recognition task at JNLPBA. In *Proceedings of the International Joint Workshop on Natural Language Processing in Biomedicine and its Applications (NLPBA/BioNLP)*, pages 73–78, Geneva, Switzerland, August 28th and 29th 2004. COLING.

[56] Gamal Crichton, Sampo Pyysalo, Billy Chiu, and Anna Korhonen. A neural network multi-task learning approach to biomedical named entity recognition. *BMC bioinformatics*, 18(1):1–14, 2017.

[57] Clément Dalloux. Datasets – clément dalloux, 2020.

[58] Dina Demner-Fushman, Sonya Shooshan, Laritza Rodriguez, Alan Aronson, Francois Lang, Willie Rogers, Kirk Roberts, and Joseph Tonning. A dataset of 200 structured product labels annotated for adverse drug reactions. *Scientific Data*, 5:180001, 01 2018.

[59] Jay DeYoung, Eric Lehman, Benjamin Nye, Iain Marshall, and Byron C. Wallace. Evidence inference 2.0: More data, better models. In *Proceedings of the 19th SIGBioMed Workshop on Biomedical Language Processing*, pages 123–132, Online, July 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[60] J Ding, D Berleant, D Nettleton, and E Wurtele. Mining MEDLINE: abstracts, sentences, or phrases? *Pac Symp Biocomput*, pages 326–337, 2002.

[61] Rezarta Islamaj Dogan, Robert Leaman, and Zhiyong Lu. Ncbi disease corpus: A resource for disease name recognition and concept normalization. *Journal of biomedical informatics*, 47:1–10, 2014.

[62] Inc. Elucidata. Geokhoj v1. `https://github.com/ElucidataInc/GEOKhoj-datasets/tree/main/geokhoj_v1`, 2020.

[63] Erik Faessler, Luise Modersohn, Christina Lohr, and Udo Hahn. ProGene - a large-scale, high-quality protein-gene annotated benchmark corpus. In *Proceedings of the 12th Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 4585–4596, Marseille, France, May 2020. European Language Resources Association.

[64] Katrin Fundel, Robert Küffner, and Ralf Zimmer. Relex–relation extraction using dependency parse trees. *Bioinformatics*, 23(3):365–371, 2007.

[65] Laura I Furlong, Holger Dach, Martin Hofmann-Apitius, and Ferran Sanz. Osirisv1.2: a named entity recognition system for sequence variants of genes in biomedical literature. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 9:84, 2008.

[66] Luis Gasco, Eulàlia Farré, Antonio Miranda-Escalada, Salvador Lima, and Martin Krallinger. DisTEMIST corpus: detection and normalization of disease mentions in spanish clinical cases, April 2022. Funded by the Plan de Impulso de las Tecnologías del Lenguaje (Plan TL).

[67] Luis Gasco, Anastasios Nentidis, Anastasia Krithara, Darryl Estrada-Zavala, Renato Toshiyuki Murasaki, Elena Primo-Peña, Cristina Bojo Canales, Georgios Paliouras, Martin Krallinger, et al. Overview of bioasq 2021-mesinesp track. evaluation of advance hierarchical classification techniques for scientific literature, patents and clinical trials. CEUR Workshop Proceedings, 2021.

[68] Martin Gerner, Goran Nenadic, and Casey M Bergman. Linnaeus: a species name identification system for biomedical literature. *BMC bioinformatics*, 11(1):1–17, 2010.

[69] Aitor Gonzalez-Agirre, Montserrat Marimon, Ander Intxaurrondo, Obdulia Rabal, Marta Villegas, and Martin Krallinger. Pharmaconer: Pharmacological substances, compounds and proteins named entity recognition track. In *Proceedings of The 5th Workshop on BioNLP Open Shared Tasks*, pages 1–10, Hong Kong, China, November 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[70] Natalia Grabar, Vincent Claveau, and Cl'ement Dalloux. CAS: French corpus with clinical cases. In *Proceedings of the Ninth International Workshop on Health Text Mining and Information Analysis*, pages 122–128, Brussels, Belgium, October 2018. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[71] Yu Gu, Robert Tinn, Hao Cheng, Michael Lucas, Naoto Usuyama, Xiaodong Liu, Tristan Naumann, Jianfeng Gao, and Hoifung Poon. Domain-specific language model pretraining for biomedical natural language processing. *ACM Trans. Comput. Heal.*, 3(1):2:1–2:23, 2022.

[72] Harsha Gurulingappa, Roman Klinger, Martin Hofmann-Apitius, and Juliane Fluck. An empirical evaluation of resources for the identification of diseases and adverse effects in biomedical literature. In *LREC Workshop on Building and Evaluating Resources for Biomedical Text Mining*, 2010.

[73] Sam Henry, Kevin Buchan, Michele Filannino, Amber Stubbs, and Ozlem Uzuner. 2018 n2c2 shared task on adverse drug events and medication extraction in electronic health records. *J. Am. Medical Informatics Assoc.*, 27(1):3–12, 2020.

[74] María Herrero-Zazo, Isabel Segura-Bedmar, Paloma Martínez, and Thierry Declerck. The ddi corpus: An annotated corpus with pharmacological substances and drug–drug interactions. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 46(5):914–920, 2013.

[75] Rezarta Islamaj, Robert Leaman, Sun Kim, Dongseop Kwon, Chih-Hsuan Wei, Donald C Comeau, Yifan Peng, David Cissel, Cathleen Coss, Carol Fisher, et al. Nlm-chem, a new resource for chemical entity recognition in pubmed full text literature. *Scientific Data*, 8(1):1–12, 2021.

[76] Peter Jansen, Mihai Surdeanu, and Peter Clark. Discourse complements lexical semantics for non-factoid answer reranking. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 977–986, Baltimore, Maryland, June 2014. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[77] Antonio J Jimeno-Yepes, Bridget T McInnes, and Alan R Aronson. Exploiting mesh indexing in medline to generate a data set for word sense disambiguation. *BMC bioinformatics*, 12(1):1–14, 2011.

[78] Di Jin, Eileen Pan, Nassim Oufattole, Wei-Hung Weng, Hanyi Fang, and Peter Szolovits. What disease does this patient have? a large-scale open domain question answering dataset from medical exams. *Applied Sciences*, 11(14):6421, 2021.

[79] Qiao Jin, Bhuwan Dhingra, Zhengping Liu, William Cohen, and Xinghua Lu. Pubmedqa: A dataset for biomedical research question answering. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 2567–2577, 2019.

[80] Sarvnaz Karimi, Alejandro Metke-Jimenez, Madonna Kemp, and Chen Wang. Cadec: A corpus of adverse drug event annotations. *Journal of biomedical informatics*, 55:73–81, 2015.

[81] Hrant Khachatrian, Lilit Nersisyan, Karen Hambardzumyan, Tigran Galstyan, Anna Hakobyan, Arsen Arakelyan, Andrey Rzhetsky, and Aram Galstyan. BioRelEx 1.0: Biological relation extraction benchmark. In *Proceedings of the 18th BioNLP Workshop and Shared Task*, pages 176–190, Florence, Italy, August 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[82] Arbaaz Khan. Sentiment analysis for medical drugs, 2019.

[83] Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, and Peter Clark. Scitail: A textual entailment dataset from science question answering. In *AAAI*, 2018.

[84] Baeksoo Kim, Wonjun Choi, and Hyunju Lee. A corpus of plant–disease relations in the biomedical domain. *PLoS One*, 14(8):e0221582, 2019.

[85] Jin-Dong Kim, Tomoko Ohta, Sampo Pyysalo, Yoshinobu Kano, and Jun'ichi Tsujii. Overview of BioNLP'09 shared task on event extraction. In *Proceedings of the BioNLP 2009 Workshop Companion Volume for Shared Task*, pages 1–9, Boulder, Colorado, June 2009. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[86] Jin-Dong Kim, Yue Wang, Toshihisa Takagi, and Akinori Yonezawa. Overview of genia event task in bionlp shared task 2011. In *Proceedings of the BioNLP Shared Task 2011 Workshop*, BioNLP Shared Task '11, page 7–15, USA, 2011. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[87] Jin-Dong Kim, Yue Wang, and Yamamoto Yasunori. The Genia event extraction shared task, 2013 edition - overview. In *Proceedings of the BioNLP Shared Task 2013 Workshop*, pages 8–15, Sofia, Bulgaria, August 2013. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[88] Jung-jae Kim, Xu Han, Vivian Lee, and Dietrich Rebholz-Schuhmann. GRO task: Populating the gene regulation ontology with events and relations. In *Proceedings of the BioNLP Shared Task 2013 Workshop*, pages 50–57, Sofia, Bulgaria, August 2013. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[89] Corinna Kol'arik, Roman Klinger, Christoph M Friedrich, Martin Hofmann-Apitius, and Juliane Fluck. Chemical names: Terminological resources and corpora annotation. In *LREC Workshop on Building and Evaluating Resources for Biomedical Text Mining*, 2008.

[90] Jan A Kors, Simon Clematide, Saber A Akhondi, Erik M van Mulligen, and Dietrich Rebholz-Schuhmann. A multilingual gold-standard corpus for biomedical concept recognition: the Mantra GSC. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 22(5):948–956, 05 2015.

[91] Neema Kotonya and Francesca Toni. Explainable automated fact-checking for public health claims. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.09926*, 2020.

[92] Martin Krallinger, Obdulia Rabal, Florian Leitner, Miguel Vazquez, David Salgado, Zhiyong Lu, Robert Leaman, Yanan Lu, Donghong Ji, Daniel M. Lowe, Roger A. Sayle, Riza Theresa Batista-Navarro, Rafal Rak, Torsten Huber, Tim Rockt"aschel, S'ergio Matos, David Campos, Buzhou Tang, Hua Xu, Tsendsuren Munkhdalai, Keun Ho Ryu, S. V. Ramanan, Senthil Nathan, Slavko Zitnik, Marko Bajec, Lutz Weber, Matthias Irmer, Saber A. Akhondi, Jan A. Kors, Shuo Xu, Xin An, Utpal Kumar Sikdar, Asif Ekbal, Masaharu Yoshioka, Thaer M. Dieb, Miji Choi, Karin Verspoor, Madian Khabsa, C. Lee Giles, Hongfang Liu, Komandur Elayavilli Ravikumar, Andre Lamurias, Francisco M. Couto, Hong-Jie Dai, Richard Tzong-Han Tsai, Caglar Ata, Tolga Can, Anabel Usi'e, Rui Alves, Isabel Segura-Bedmar, Paloma Mart'inez, Julen Oyarzabal, and Alfonso Valencia. The chemdner corpus of chemicals and drugs and its annotation principles. *Journal of Cheminformatics*, 7(1):S2, Jan 2015.

[93] Rabal-O. Lourenço A. Krallinger, M. Effective transfer learning for identifying similar questions: Matching user questions to covid-19 faqs. *KDD '20: Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, 3458–3465, 2020.

[94] Vishesh Kumar, Amber Stubbs, Stanley Shaw, and Özlem Uzuner. Creation of a new longitudinal corpus of clinical narratives. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 58:S6–S10, 2015. Supplement: Proceedings of the 2014 i2b2/UTHealth Shared-Tasks and Workshop on Challenges in Natural Language Processing for Clinical Data.

[95] Fabr'ıcio Kury, Alex Butler, Chi Yuan, Li-heng Fu, Yingcheng Sun, Hao Liu, Ida Sim, Simona Carini, and Chunhua Weng. Chia, a large annotated corpus of clinical trial eligibility criteria. *Scientific data*, 7(1):1–11, 2020.

[96] Katherine Lee, Daphne Ippolito, Andrew Nystrom, Chiyuan Zhang, Douglas Eck, Chris Callison-Burch, and Nicholas Carlini. Deduplicating training data makes language models better. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.06499*, 2021.

[97] Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Ves Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Bart: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.13461*, 2019.

[98] Nut Limsopatham and Nigel Collier. Normalising medical concepts in social media texts by learning semantic representation. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1014–1023, Berlin, Germany, August 2016. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[99] Boxiang Liu and Liang Huang. Paramed: a parallel corpus for english–chinese translation in the biomedical domain. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making*, 21, 2021.

[100] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.

[101] Yao Lu, Yue Dong, and Laurent Charlin. Multi-xscience: A large-scale dataset for extreme multi-document summarization of scientific articles, 2020.

[102] Ling Luo, Po-Ting Lai, Chih-Hsuan Wei, Cecilia N Arighi, and Zhiyong Lu. Biored: A comprehensive biomedical relation extraction dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.04263*, 2022.

[103] Ling Luo, Po-Ting Lai, Chih-Hsuan Wei, Cecilia N. Arighi, and Zhiyong Lu. Biored: A comprehensive biomedical relation extraction dataset. *CoRR*, abs/2204.04263, 2022.

[104] Montserrat Marimon, Aitor Gonzalez-Agirre, Ander Intxaurrondo, Heidy Rodriguez, Jose Lopez Martin, Marta Villegas, and Martin Krallinger. Automatic de-identification of medical texts in spanish: the meddocan track, corpus, guidelines, methods and evaluation of results. In *IberLEF SEPLN*, pages 618–638, 2019.

[105] Antonio Miranda-Escalada, Eulàlia Farré, and Martin Krallinger. Named entity recognition, concept normalization and clinical coding: Overview of the cantemist track for cancer text mining in spanish, corpus, guidelines, methods and results. *IberLEF SEPLN*, pages 303–323, 2020.

[106] Antonio Miranda-Escalada, Aitor Gonzalez-Agirre, Jordi Armengol-Estapé, and Martin Krallinger. Overview of automatic clinical coding: Annotations, guidelines, and solutions for non-english clinical cases at codiesp track of clef ehealth 2020. *CLEF (Working Notes)*, 2020, 2020.

[107] Sunil Mohan and Donghui Li. Medmentions: A large biomedical corpus annotated with umls concepts, 2019.

[108] Anastasios Nentidis, Konstantinos Bougiatiotis, Anastasia Krithara, Georgios Paliouras, and Ioannis Kakadiaris. Results of the fifth edition of the BioASQ challenge. BioNLP 2017, 2007.

[109] Aurélie Névéol, Cyril Grouin, Jeremy Leixa, Sophie Rosset, and Pierre Zweigenbaum. The QUAERO French medical corpus: A ressource for medical entity recognition and normalization. In *Proc of BioTextMining Work*, pages 24–30, 2014.

[110] Mariana Neves, Alexander Damaschun, Andreas Kurtz, and Ulf Leser. Annotating and evaluating text for stem cell research. In *Proceedings of the Third Workshop on Building and Evaluation Resources for Biomedical Text Mining (BioTxtM 2012) at Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC). Istanbul, Turkey*, pages 16–23. Citeseer, 2012.

[111] Benjamin Nye, Junyi Jessy Li, Roma Patel, Yinfei Yang, Iain Marshall, Ani Nenkova, and Byron Wallace. A corpus with multi-level annotations of patients, interventions and outcomes to support language processing for medical literature. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 197–207, Melbourne, Australia, July 2018. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[112] Tomoko Ohta, Sampo Pyysalo, Makoto Miwa, Jin-Dong Kim, and Jun'ichi Tsujii. Event extraction for post-translational modifications. In *Proceedings of the 2010 Workshop on Biomedical Natural Language Processing*, pages 19–27, Uppsala, Sweden, July 2010. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[113] Tomoko Ohta, Sampo Pyysalo, Rafal Rak, Andrew Rowley, Hong-Woo Chun, Sung-Jae Jung, Sung-Pil Choi, Sophia Ananiadou, and Jun'ichi Tsujii. Overview of the pathway curation (PC) task of BioNLP shared task 2013. In *Proceedings of the BioNLP Shared Task 2013 Workshop*, pages 67–75, Sofia, Bulgaria, August 2013. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[114] Tomoko Ohta, Sampo Pyysalo, and Jun'ichi Tsujii. Overview of the epigenetics and post-translational modifications (EPI) task of BioNLP shared task 2011. In *Proceedings of BioNLP Shared Task 2011 Workshop*, pages 16–25, Portland, Oregon, USA, June 2011. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[115] Tomoko Ohta, Sampo Pyysalo, Jun'ichi Tsujii, and Sophia Ananiadou. Open-domain anatomical entity mention detection. volume W12-43. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2012.

[116] Tomoko Ohta, Yuka Tateisi, and Jin-Dong Kim. The genia corpus: An annotated research abstract corpus in molecular biology domain. In *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Human Language Technology Research*, HLT '02, page 82–86, San Francisco, CA, USA, 2002. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.

[117] Serguei Pakhomov, Bridget McInnes, Terrence Adam, Ying Liu, Ted Pedersen, and Genevieve B Melton. Semantic similarity and relatedness between clinical terms: an experimental study. In *AMIA annual symposium proceedings*, volume 2010, page 572. American Medical Informatics Association, 2010.

[118] Dimitris Pappas, Petros Stavropoulos, Ion Androutsopoulos, and Ryan McDonald. BioMRC: A dataset for biomedical machine reading comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 19th SIGBioMed Workshop on Biomedical Language Processing*, pages 140–149, Online, July 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[119] Mihir Parmar, Swaroop Mishra, Mirali Purohit, Man Luo, M Hassan Murad, and Chitta Baral. In-boxbart: Get instructions into biomedical multi-task learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.07600*, 2022.

[120] Ted Pedersen, Serguei VS Pakhomov, Siddharth Patwardhan, and Christopher G Chute. Measures of semantic similarity and relatedness in the biomedical domain. *Journal of biomedical informatics*, 40(3):288–299, 2007.

[121] Sampo Pyysalo and Sophia Ananiadou. Anatomical entity mention recognition at literature scale. *Bioinformatics*, 30(6):868–875, 2014.

[122] Sampo Pyysalo, Filip Ginter, Juho Heimonen, Jari Bj"orne, Jorma Boberg, Jouni J"arvinen, and Tapio Salakoski. Bioinfer: a corpus for information extraction in the biomedical domain. *BMC bioinformatics*, 8(1):1–24, 2007.

[123] Sampo Pyysalo, Tomoko Ohta, and Sophia Ananiadou. Overview of the cancer genetics (CG) task of BioNLP shared task 2013. In *Proceedings of the BioNLP Shared Task 2013 Workshop*, pages 58–66, Sofia, Bulgaria, August 2013. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[124] Sampo Pyysalo, Tomoko Ohta, Jin-Dong Kim, and Jun'ichi Tsujii. Static relations: a piece in the biomedical information extraction puzzle. In *Proceedings of the BioNLP 2009 Workshop*, pages 1–9, Boulder, Colorado, June 2009. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[125] Sampo Pyysalo, Tomoko Ohta, Makoto Miwa, Han-Cheol Cho, Jun'ichi Tsujii, and Sophia Ananiadou. Event extraction across multiple levels of biological organization. *Bioinformatics*, 28(18):i575–i581, 2012.

[126] Sampo Pyysalo, Tomoko Ohta, Rafal Rak, Dan Sullivan, Chunhong Mao, Chunxia Wang, Bruno Sobral, Jun'ichi Tsujii, and Sophia Ananiadou. Overview of the infectious diseases (ID) task of BioNLP shared task 2011. In *Proceedings of BioNLP Shared Task 2011 Workshop*, pages 26–35, Portland, Oregon, USA, June 2011. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[127] Sampo Pyysalo, Tomoko Ohta, and Jun'ichi Tsujii. Overview of the entity relations (rel) supporting task of bionlp shared task 2011. In *Proceedings of the BioNLP Shared Task 2011 Workshop*, BioNLP Shared Task '11, page 83–88, USA, 2011. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[128] Paolo Rosso, Julio Gonzalo, Raquel Martinez, Soto Montalvo, and Jorge Carrillo de Albornoz. Proceedings of the third workshop on evaluation of human language technologies for iberian languages (ibereval 2018). volume 2150 of *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*. CEUR-WS.org, 2018.

[129] Claudia Schulz, Josh Levy-Kramer, Camille Van Assel, Miklos Kepes, and Nils Hammerla. Biomedical concept relatedness – a large EHR-based benchmark. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 6565–6575, Barcelona, Spain (Online), dec 2020. International Committee on Computational Linguistics.

[130] M J Shardlow, N Nguyen, G Owen, C O'Donovan, A Leach, J McNaught, S Turner, and S Ananiadou. A new corpus to support text mining for the curation of metabolites in the ChEBI database. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018)*, pages 280–285, May 2018.

[131] Chaitanya Shivade. Mednli – a natural language inference dataset for the clinical domain, 2017.

[132] Chaitanya Shivade. Mednli for shared task at acl bionlp 2019, 2019.

[133] Yoshinobu Kano Tomoko Ohkuma Shoko Wakamiya, Mizuki Morita and Eiji Aramaki. Overview of the ntcir-13 medweb task. *Proceedings of the 13th NTCIR Conference on Evaluation of Information Access Technologies (NTCIR-13)*, 2017.

[134] Felipe Soares, Viviane Moreira, and Karin Becker. A large parallel corpus of full-text scientific articles. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-2018)*, 2018.

[135] Hakime Öztürk Soğancıoğlu, Gizem and Arzucan Özgür. Biosses: a semantic sentence similarity estimation system for the biomedical domain. *Bioinformatics*, 33(14):i49–i58, 2017.

[136] Amber Stubbs, Michele Filannino, Ergin Soysal, Samuel Henry, and Ozlem Uzuner. Cohort selection for clinical trials: n2c2 2018 shared task track 1. *J. Am. Medical Informatics Assoc.*, 26(11):1163–1171, 2019.

[137] Amber Stubbs, Christopher Kotfila, and Özlem Uzuner. Automated systems for the de-identification of longitudinal clinical narratives: Overview of 2014 i2b2/uthealth shared task track 1. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 58:S11–S19, 2015.

[138] Lorraine Tanabe, Natalie Xie, Lynne H Thom, Wayne Matten, and W John Wilbur. GENETAG: a tagged corpus for gene/protein named entity recognition. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 6, 2005.

[139] Philippe Thomas, Roman Klinger, Laura Furlong, Martin Hofmann-Apitius, and Christoph Friedrich. Challenges in the association of human single nucleotide polymorphism mentions with unique database identifiers. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 12, 2011.

[140] Philippe Thomas, Tim Rockt"aschel, J"org Hakenberg, Yvonne Lichtblau, and Ulf Leser. Seth detects and normalizes genetic variants in text. *Bioinformatics*, Jun 2016.

[141] Thinh Hung Truong, Mai Hoang Dao, and Dat Quoc Nguyen. Covid-19 named entity recognition for vietnamese. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, page 2146–2153, 2021.

[142] George Tsatsaronis, Georgios Balikas, Prodromos Malakasiotis, Ioannis Partalas, Matthias Zschunke, Michael R Alvers, Dirk Weissenborn, Anastasia Krithara, Sergios Petridis, Dimitris Polychronopoulos, et al. An overview of the bioasq large-scale biomedical semantic indexing and question answering competition. *BMC bioinformatics*, 16(1):138, 2015.

[143] Ozlem Uzuner. Recognizing obesity and comorbidities in sparse data. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 16(4):561–570, 07 2009.

[144] Ozlem Uzuner, Andreea Bodnari, Shuying Shen, Tyler Forbush, John Pestian, and Brett R South. Evaluating the state of the art in coreference resolution for electronic medical records. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 19(5):786–791, 02 2012.

[145] Ozlem Uzuner, Ira Goldstein, Yuan Luo, and Isaac Kohane. Identifying patient smoking status from medical discharge records. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 15(1):14–24, 01 2008.

[146] Özlem Uzuner, Yuan Luo, and Peter Szolovits. Evaluating the state-of-the-art in automatic de-identification. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 14(5):550–563, 09 2007.

[147] Ozlem Uzuner, Imre Solti, and Eithon Cadag. Extracting medication information from clinical text. *J. Am. Medical Informatics Assoc.*, 17(5):514–518, 2010.

[148] Ozlem Uzuner, Brett R. South, Shuying Shen, and Scott L. DuVall. 2010 i2b2/va challenge on concepts, assertions, and relations in clinical text. *J. Am. Medical Informatics Assoc.*, 18(5):552–556, 2011.

[149] Erik M. van Mulligen, Annie Fourrier-Reglat, David Gurwitz, Mariam Molokhia, Ainhoa Nieto, Gianluca Trifiro, Jan A. Kors, and Laura I. Furlong. The eu-adr corpus: Annotated drugs, diseases, targets, and their relationships. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 45(5):879–884, 2012. Text Mining and Natural Language Processing in Pharmacogenomics.

[150] Karin Verspoor, Antonio Jimeno Yepes, Lawrence Cavedon, Tara McIntosh, Asha Herten-Crabb, Zo"e Thomas, and John-Paul Plazzer. Annotating the biomedical literature for the human variome. *Database*, 2013, 2013.

[151] Veronika Vincze, Gy"orgy Szarvas, Rich'ard Farkas, Gy"orgy M'ora, and J'anos Csirik. The bioscope corpus: biomedical texts annotated for uncertainty, negation and their scopes. *BMC bioinformatics*, 9(11):1–9, 2008.

[152] David Wadden, Shanchuan Lin, Kyle Lo, Lucy Lu Wang, Madeleine van Zuylen, Arman Cohan, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Fact or fiction: Verifying scientific claims. pages 7534–7550, 2020.

[153] Xuan Wang, Xiangchen Song, Yingjun Guan, Bangzheng Li, and Jiawei Han. Comprehensive named entity recognition on CORD-19 with distant or weak supervision. *CoRR*, abs/2003.12218, 2020.

[154] M Weeber, J G Mork, and A R Aronson. Developing a test collection for biomedical word sense disambiguation. *Proc AMIA Symp*, pages 746–750, 2001.

[155] Chih-Hsuan Wei, Alexis Allot, Robert Leaman, and Zhiyong Lu. PubTator central: automated concept annotation for biomedical full text articles. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 47(W1):W587–W593, 05 2019.

[156] Chih-Hsuan Wei, Alexis Allot, Kevin Riehle, Aleksandar Milosavljevic, and Zhiyong Lu. tmvar 3.0: an improved variant concept recognition and normalization tool, 2022.

[157] Chih-Hsuan Wei, Bethany R Harris, Hung-Yu Kao, and Zhiyong Lu. tmvar: a text mining approach for extracting sequence variants in biomedical literature. *Bioinformatics*, 29(11):1433–1439, 2013.

[158] Chih-Hsuan Wei, Hung-Yu Kao, and Zhiyong Lu. GNormPlus: An integrative approach for tagging genes, gene families, and protein domains. *BioMed Research International*, 2015:1–7, Aug 2015.

[159] Chih-Hsuan Wei, Lon Phan, Juliana Feltz, Rama Maiti, Tim Hefferon, and Zhiyong Lu. tmvar 2.0: integrating genomic variant information from literature with dbsnp and clinvar for precision medicine. *Bioinformatics*, 34(1):80–87, 2018.

[160] Johannes Welbl, Nelson F. Liu, and Matt Gardner. Crowdsourcing multiple choice science questions. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on Noisy User-generated Text*, pages 94–106, Copenhagen, Denmark, September 2017. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[161] Johannes Welbl, Pontus Stenetorp, and Sebastian Riedel. Constructing datasets for multi-hop reading comprehension across documents. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 6:287–302, 2018.

[162] Zhengyun Zhao, Qiao Jin, and Sheng Yu. Pmc-patients: A large-scale dataset of patient notes and relations extracted from case reports in pubmed central, 2022.

[163] Markus Zlabinger, Marta Sabou, Sebastian Hofst"atter, and Allan Hanbury. Effective crowd-annotation of participants, interventions, and outcomes in the text of clinical trial reports. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 3064–3074, Online, November 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[164] Maryam Zolnoori, Kin Wah Fung, Timothy B. Patrick, Paul Fontelo, Hadi Kharrazi, Anthony Faiola, Yi Shuan Shirley Wu, Christina E. Eldredge, Jake Luo, Mike Conway, Jiaxi Zhu, Soo Kyung Park, Kelly Xu, Hamideh Moayyed, and Somaieh Goudarzvand. A systematic approach for developing a corpus of patient reported adverse drug events: A case study for SSRI and SNRI medications. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 90, 2019.