

Cross-lingual Argument Mining in the Medical Domain

Anar Yeginbergenova^a, Rodrigo Agerri^{a,*}

^a*HiTZ Center - Ixa, University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU, Donostia-San Sebastián, Spain*

Abstract

Nowadays the medical domain is receiving more and more attention in applications involving Artificial Intelligence. Clinicians have to deal with an enormous amount of unstructured textual data to make a conclusion about patients' health in their everyday life. Argument mining helps to provide a structure to such data by detecting argumentative components in the text and classifying the relations between them. However, as it is the case for many tasks in Natural Language Processing in general and in medical text processing in particular, the large majority of the work on computational argumentation has been done only for English. This is also the case with the only dataset available for argumentation in the medical domain, namely, the annotated medical data of abstracts of Randomized Controlled Trials (RCT) from the MEDLINE database. In order to mitigate the lack of annotated data for other languages, we empirically investigate several strategies to perform argument mining and classification in medical texts for a language for which no annotated data is available. This project shows that automatically translating and project annotations from English to a target language (Spanish) is an effective way to generate annotated data without manual intervention. Furthermore, our experiments demonstrate that the translation and projection approach outperforms zero-shot cross-lingual approaches using a large masked multilingual language model. Finally, we show how the automatically generated data in Spanish can also be used to improve results in the original English evaluation setting.

Keywords: Argumentation, Information Extraction, Multilinguality, Sequence Labelling, Natural Language Processing

1. Introduction

Clinical decision-making is an essential part of the medical environment when the practitioner has to identify and diagnose a disease and prescribe treatment based on the patient's health condition and the results of the clinical tests. However, it can involve multiple challenges and add up stress, and there are many reasons for that. First, is the diversity of the symptoms, one or more of them could be a sign of multiple diseases. Second, an overwhelming amount of data from previous patients with similar symptoms.

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: anaryegen@gmail.com (Anar Yeginbergenova), rodrigo.agerri@ehu.eus (Rodrigo Agerri)

Preprint submitted to Artificial Intelligence in Medicine

January 26, 2023

Lastly, the final decision, along with what is listed above, should take into account the latest results in the research reports. With the growth of the number of such reports and data in general, the urge of structuring information takes place, which *argument mining* tries to solve. So far, argument mining has been applied in several different domains such as law (Mochales and Ieven, 2009), biomedicine (Accuosto et al., 2021), reviews (Li et al., 2017), persuasive essays (Stab and Gurevych, 2014), with the aim of identifying argumentative structure in the data. However, the majority of those works are focused on solving the problem and creating solutions only for English. Therefore, the lack of data annotated with argumentation components is a major obstacle to working with other languages such as Spanish. In order to mitigate the lack of annotated data for other languages, this work empirically investigates several cross-lingual strategies to perform argument mining and classification in medical texts for a language for which no annotated data is available.

Argument mining (AM) is a field of natural language processing that focuses on extracting argumentative structures from unstructured data. Doing so helps to determine the notion of the view, opinion, or conclusion, and identify the proofs that either defend or oppose them depending on the context.

The main objective of argument mining is to automatically detect and define the type of argumentative components, their boundaries, and the relations held between them.

1.0.1. Argument components

Argument components can be classified as either *Major Claim*, *Claim*, or *Premise*, and they can hold *supporting* or *attacking* links between them that create hierarchical tree structure (Stab and Gurevych, 2017).

Example 1.1 below, extracted from the AbstRCT corpus Mayer et al. (2020), illustrates this. Claims are marked in bold with subscript C_n , premises are in italic with subscript P_n , and major claims are in bold and italics marked as MC_n .

Claims are specific statements about the conducted experiments that hold factual information inside. It can be the conclusion from the study or the effect of the treatment. It is possible to have several claims in a single paragraph and they should be divided and treated separately.

Major Claims are more general statements compared to a claim, and they are usually followed by a claim. In many cases, major claims are the introduction or conclusion to the claim in the corpus. However, in some tasks major claims are non-existent, and if there is one they are labeled as a claim.

Premises are the ground truth of argumentation as they report observations of studies and hold evidence for or against the claim. Therefore, a premise includes measurements and comparisons of the study. It is a continuation or description of the claim and one study can have multiple premises that either support or attack the claim.

Example 1.1. *“Following pretesting in 313 patients, patients who needed district nursing and who did not need district nursing at home were randomly assigned to a control or intervention group. Intervention group patients received the Pain Education Program in the hospital, and 3 and 7 days postdischarge by telephone; this was done by nurses who were specially trained as pain counselors. Follow-up assessments were at 2, 4 and 8 weeks postdischarge. Results of the pretest showed that many patients lacked knowledge about pain and pain management. The majority of pain topics had to be discussed. [The*

Pain Education Program proved to be feasible $_{C_1}$: [75.0% of the patients had read the entire pain brochure, 55.7% had listened to the audio cassette, and 85.6% of pain scores were completed in the pain diary] $_{P_1}$. [Results showed a significant increase in pain knowledge in patients who received the Pain Education Program and a significant decrease in pain intensity] $_{C_2}$. [However, pain relief was mainly found in the intervention group patients without district nursing] $_{P_2}$. [It can be concluded that the tailored Pain Education Program is effective for cancer patients in chronic pain] $_{C_3}$. [The use of the Pain Education Program by nurses should be seriously considered on oncology units] $_{MC_1}$.

1.0.2. Argument relations

In order to build a complete argumentation structure, we need to introduce relations between the argument components. Relations connect argument components to form the argumentation graphs representing the structure of an argument, where we have source and target nodes, and the edges are relation types from the source node to the target node. The links can be either attack, partial-attack, or support. Sometimes there are certain restrictions on the occurrence of the relations: premises can be connected to both claims or another premise, whereas claims can be connected only with another claim.

Example 1.2. [The different schedules of vinorelbine in the two arms led to a greater survival in the NP arm without impairing the tolerance profile,] $_{P_1}$ [although this is not statistically significant] $_{P_3}$. This confirms that the two-drug combination NP is a reference treatment for metastatic NSCLC. The role of three-drug combinations remains questionable in this subset of patients.

Attacking relations occur when the source component contradicts the target or when it states that some observation had no statistical significance. An attacking relation between two arguments can be seen in the Example 1.2.

Partial-attacking relation is formed when a source component weakens the target but does not oppose it. In the Example 1.1, Premise₂ (P_2) partially attacks Claim₂ (C_2), namely, it only specifies the conditions of the study without strong objection.

Supporting relations are built when the source justifies the target. In the example 1.1, there are several support links between arguments, for instance, Premise₁ (P_1) supports Claim₁ (C_1) with numerical evidence to verify the statement.

One of the major problems in many similar domain-specific tasks is that annotated data is only available for English. In order to address this issue, we will investigate several cross-lingual approaches to perform argument mining and classification in a language such as Spanish for which no labeled data exists. In order to do so, we will leverage existing labeled data in English (Mayer et al., 2021) to automatically generate a Spanish version of it by using different machine translation and label projection approaches. The test data will be manually corrected to be able to experiment with a large multilingual language model in various evaluation settings: (i) a zero-shot cross-lingual approach in which we will train the model in English and evaluate it in Spanish; (ii) a translation and projection setting where we leverage the automatically generated training data for Spanish and, (iii) a multilingual evaluation in which we perform data augmentation to improve results both in the original English data and for Spanish. The generated Spanish corpus (both automatic and manually revised versions) is publicly available to encourage

cross-lingual research in argument mining and to facilitate the reproducibility of results¹.

The main contributions of this paper are the following:

- We provide the first medical corpus in Spanish for argument mining by using machine translation and label projection methods;
- We perform a qualitative evaluation of the quality of the translation and projection methods for medical texts;
- We present the first experimentation on cross-lingual zero-shot and multilingual experiments for argument mining;
- We establish which strategy works best when no annotated data is available for a target language;
- We show that the automatically generated data can be used to perform data augmentation to improve results and also for argument mining in the original English dataset.

We begin by reviewing existing research and state-of-the-art argument mining, previous approaches in the medical domain, and works on cross-lingual sequence labeling in Section 2. Then we provide an overview of the data and methods used to generate Spanish corpus from English in Section 3. In Section 4, we report the results obtained from the different experimental settings. Then, in Section 5, we discuss the predicted outputs, and conclusion in Section 6

2. Background

2.1. Argumentation

The development of automatic argumentation started from the attempts towards identifying argument structures and is closely related to the theories of discourse representation described by reasoning and logic. There are several existing methods based on which aspect of the text they are focused on: Discourse Representation Theory (DRT) (Kamp et al., 2011) and Segmented Discourse Representation Theory (SDRT) (Asher et al., 2003) are the theories that analyze the text based on linguistic characteristics of discourse. However, these theories are quite complex to be applied in practice (Bos, 2008). On the other hand, theories such as Rhetorical Structure Theory (RST) are focused more on pragmatics rather than semantic and syntactic features of the text and it has been more applicable to the NLP systems. Therefore, it was considered by many that RST is more approachable to represent and automatically study discourse structure and argumentation (Peldszus and Stede (2013); Azar (1999); Green (2010), etc.).

Among other works on argumentation theory, Toulmin (1958) influenced the development of the study by identifying different functional roles in arguments (evidence, warrant, backing, qualifier, rebuttal, and claim) based on how the conclusion is made from evidence in the text. Furthermore, Freeman (2011) investigated how to transfer

¹<https://github.com/ragerri/antidote-projections>

them in diagramming techniques of the informal logic tradition. Dung (1995) tried to create a graph representation of argumentation based on nonmonotonic reasoning in AI and logic programming, and Peldszus and Stede (2013) introduced a diagram structure with models of the textual representation of arguments and globally optimized argumentative relations. They propose that the most important relationship types in arguments are *support* and *attack*. They also identified five different types of graphs based on the connections that existed between them (e.g., one claim having relations with multiple premises, a claim followed by another claim, etc.).

However, Stab and Gurevych (2017) assume that the graph structure above could be somewhat ambiguous in practice when they introduced a machine learning approach for argumentation on persuasive essays. They found that the structure of the argumentative components and links in persuasive essays are somewhat hierarchical, where *Major Claim* is the root with connections to *Claim* followed by *Premise* in the argument.

With theoretical knowledge of argumentation, current research interest lies on combining its theory with modern deep learning techniques. The objective here is to investigate if machine learning algorithms are able to capture an argumentative structure from given text. There are multiple works that tried to answer it using data from different domains such as education (Stab and Gurevych, 2014), law (Mochales and Ieven, 2009), news (Reed et al., 2008), science (Accuosto et al., 2021), medicine (Mayer et al., 2018), reviews (Li et al., 2017), etc. The majority of the experiments are performed using data in English and very few in other languages (Kirschner et al., 2015; Peldszus and Stede, 2015). Moens et al. (2007) introduced automatic argument detection in legal texts using general statistical features from data, a Multinomial naive Bayes classifier, and a Maximum entropy model. They reached the prediction accuracy of $\sim 68\%$. Goudas et al. (2014) tried to classify argumentative and non-argumentative sentences, and segment the arguments with Conditional Random Fields (CRF). The accuracy for distinguishing argumentative sentences was 77%. Kwon et al. (2007) focused only on identifying *Claims* and the relations they represent. To achieve it, they used a boosting algorithm and reached an F1-score of 55% for claim detection and 67% for relation classification. Stab and Gurevych (2017) created a corpus of persuasive essays in German and introduced an architecture to identify argument components and relations using SVM which is divided into 5 subtasks: (i) Identifying argument components - find arguments and set their boundaries; (ii) Classification of argument components - label arguments with either major claim, claim, or premise; (iii) Identification of argument relations - classify if two arguments are linked or not. (iv) Generate tree - build a tree representation from the previous steps for each paragraph; (v) Stance recognition - determine any support or attack relations between arguments.

They indicated that in persuasive essays *major claim* is the root node of the argument and represents the author’s standpoint. Furthermore, they consider that they are often mentioned in the introduction and conclusion. The individual paragraphs of the essays hold the actual arguments and they either *support* or *attack* the author’s major claim.

Morio et al. (2022) performed multi-task cross-corpus argument mining using existing 5 datasets for argument mining. Each of the corpora is for a specific domain and follows different annotations for AM. They, first, perform single-task learning and compare them with multi-task learning. Based on their results, in the majority of the cases, multi-task learning helps to increase the quality of predictions from a single-task setting. Through this work, they propose a solution to the issue when there is no sufficient amount of data

for performing the desired tasks.

2.2. Argument mining in medical domain

Argument mining can be very valuable in the clinical area, particularly for experts in analyzing the impacts and results of the treatments from different sources of data. However, there are very few approaches to argument mining in the medical domain and, moreover, they all focus on solving the problem using data in English. As a consequence, there are no previous attempts to perform argument mining for the medical domain in other languages. This is partially due to the inherent difficulty of obtaining medical data to start with, but also because of the cost and complexity of obtaining the required annotations. Thus, many existing approaches solely focus on either determining argument components or only classifying argument relations in order to present structured output from unstructured medical data to assist users in decision-making.

For instance, Green et al. (2014) provided an analysis of arguments in biomedical data and created argumentation schemes and inter-argument relationships. Alamri and Stevenson (2016) created a corpus using research abstracts of studies considered in systematic reviews related to cardiovascular diseases where the objective was solely to identify contradictory claims, hence, no other information is provided in the data. Mayer et al. (2018) annotated a dataset of 169 medical abstracts and created a system to identify claims and premises in the text. Noor et al. (2017) analyzed arguments of medical drug effects following graph structure of Dung (1995). Their motivation was to identify and extract the effects of drugs from reviews on the web following argument-based analysis. Similarly, Shankar et al. (2006) described a tool for health care where part of the system deals with extracting evidence for any treatment-related claims based on Toulmin (1958)’s argumentative structure that was mentioned before. Craven et al. (2012) described the application of assumption-based argumentation to a domain of medical knowledge derived from clinical trials of drugs for breast cancer using variant-based parallel programming techniques. Caroprese et al. (2022) presents an overview of the applications of medical argument mining through explainable AI (XAI). Moreover, they emphasize the benefits of logic approaches to better explain the characteristics and functionalities of artificially intelligent systems with a focus on argumentation in medicine.

2.3. Cross-lingual sequence labeling

Advances in deep learning and NLP opened the gates to a world of multilinguality that allows us to leverage knowledge across different languages. The idea behind cross-lingual sequence labeling is to transfer labels in hand from annotated data in one language to data in another language. The approach of cross-lingual sequence labeling proves to be effective when no annotated data is available in the desired language.

There are many approaches proposed for cross-lingual sequence tagging and many of them are focused on dealing with part-of-speech (POS) tagging, named-entity-recognition (NER) (Gaddy et al., 2016; Yang et al., 2017; Agerri et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2018; Liu et al., 2020), opinion target extraction (OTE) (Agerri and Rigau, 2019) and more. The majority of the approaches in transferring labels between languages require a huge amount of parallel data to create more accurate projections (David et al., 2001).

Das and Petrov (2011) introduced a bilingual graph-based unsupervised approach for the same task by building such a graph to create a connection between two languages,

then projecting syntactic information to the target, and this information is used as a feature for unsupervised labels. Gaddy et al. (2016) used a coarse mapping approach to perform multilingual POS tagging and they discovered that only ten-word translation pairs are enough in order to transfer POS tags effectively without the necessity in large parallel corpora.

Eger et al. (2018) applied methods of label projection for AM and compared the performance of the results of the automatically translated and human-translated corpus. The results showed that the performance of projection on neural machine-translated data provides results almost as good as human-translated data.

As was noted earlier, there is no available corpus for medical argumentation in languages other than English. However, previous works that tried to solve this issue, provide us with the methods required to deal with this deficiency. Thus, in this project, we will investigate the best strategy to perform argumentation in the medical domain when no data is available for a specific language using available resources, such as translation and projection and multilingual large language models such as mBERT (Devlin et al., 2019).

3. Data Projection Method

To create the corpus in the target language, and perform argument mining, we first have to translate and transfer the labels of the source corpus to the target. In this section we discuss the medical dataset in English, annotated for argument mining, the model architecture, the machine translation and projection systems used to automatically generate annotated data in Spanish.

The process of corpus creation from English to Spanish is shown in Figure 1. First, the corpus is translated with the selected machine translation systems, and then annotated tags are projected from the original to translated data. After each action, the quality of the automated output was manually inspected and corrected.




Figure 1: The process of creating Spanish data from English.

3.1. Data

In this project, the corpus of Randomized Clinical Trials (RCT) of medical abstracts was used to reach the desired goal of generating a corpus for Spanish and performing the experiments with argument mining (Mayer et al., 2021). The abstracts were obtained from Evidence-Based Medicine (EBM), which are the clinical reports from observations of the patients based on evidence for the decision-making. The corpus contains paragraphs on five types of diseases: neoplasm, glaucoma, diabetes, hepatitis B, and hypertension.

Overall there are 500 neoplasm, 100 glaucoma, and 100 mixed (20 of each mentioned disease) abstracts. The corpus has annotations for the argument components and relations separately. The labels of argument components are *Major Claim*, *Claim* and *Premise*; and *Support*, *Attack*, *Partial-Attack*, and *No relation* are the annotations of the argument relations. The distribution of argument components in data is shown in Table 1 and the distribution of relations in Table 2.

Data	# of Premise	# of Claim	# of MajorClaim
Train	1537	666	64
Dev	438	228	20
Neoplasm	218	99	9
Glaucoma	404	183	7
Mixed	388	182	30
Total	2985	1358	130

Table 1: Distribution of argument components

3.2. Model

To classify *Claims* and *Premises* in the data we use the same model architecture as in (Mayer et al., 2020). Before jumping straight into the experimental part, here, we provide an overview of the deep learning model pipeline.

In the aforementioned work, the argument mining pipeline consists of the following steps: 1). find the boundaries of the arguments in the text, and 2). identify the type of components, i.e. claim or premise, and 3). define the relations between components.

In Mayer et al. (2020), they have approached the argument component detection by adding the Conditional Random Fields (CRF) layer, Recurrent Neural Network (RNN), and the Transformers (Vaswani et al., 2017), to the pipeline. Since the length of arguments in the dataset is considerably long (usually the whole sentence), the CRF layer helps to capture long sequences to decide if the given input is a part of the document by taking into account contextual information. According to the authors, adding a bi-directional RNN layer, on top of the Transformer and CRF, slightly increased the prediction accuracy. They also experimented both with GRU and LSTM architectures and concluded that the former is better at identifying boundaries and differentiating between *Claims* and *Premises*. However, by altering hyperparameters when recreating the results with LSTM, we were able to achieve a prediction quality as good as GRU

Data	# of Support	# of Attack	# of No Relation
Train	1194	200	12892
Dev	185	30	1815
Neoplasm	359	60	3961
Glaucoma	317	29	2986
Mixed	296	24	3012

Table 2: Distribution of argument relations

for the argument component classification. Regarding the Transformer language models, the best results were obtained with SciBERT (Lee et al., 2019) and BioBERT (Beltagy et al., 2019)) which are trained using scientific and biomedical data respectively.

3.3. Translation systems

The first step in the generation of the corpus in Spanish is to translate the data in hand. In order to do so, the main objective was to find a good-quality machine translation (MT) system. Four systems for automatic translations were selected to build the desired corpus by translating a small number of sentences using different MT models, which then were evaluated by two native speakers in order to identify the best ones that handled the translations of the clinical data.

First, the corpus was translated by the several freely available MT systems, namely, m2m-100 (Fan et al., 2021), mBART (Tang et al., 2020), OPUS-MT (Tiedemann et al., 2020) and DeepL ². Throughout the evaluation of the performance of each of them, the latter two systems were decided to handle the task more adequately than the others. The inter-annotator agreement (IIA) was around $\sim 70\%$. DeepL was, overall, the best-performing system, and OPUS-MT was the second-best performing. mBART was agreed to be the worst one. Besides the quality of the translations, mBART was generating random incoherent sequences in places where it was not supposed to be, hence it was ruled out immediately. With respect to the m2m-100, its main problem was that some expressions were not translated at all and it was comparably slow, so we also discarded it. The general issue in the domain-specific translations was specific tokens that contain numerous technical terminologies and abbreviations and are challenging for the automatic tools. Additionally, the ability of the MT system to deal with the mentioned issues was one of the criteria in the selection of the most accurate model, besides coherence and cohesion.

The number of sentences translated with DeepL and OPUS-MT was the following:

- Neoplasm: 4405 train, 679 development, and 1251 test;
- Glaucoma: 1247 test;
- Mixed: 1148 test;

By analyzing the general performance of the translations, it was noted that OPUS-MT commits more mistakes in translation compared to DeepL. After deciding on DeepL to translate the argument component data, the next step is to project the argument component labels from the original English annotated data to the automatically generated Spanish data.

Due to the available quota in DeepL, sentences for argument relation were translated using OPUS-MT only. In total, 14285 sentence pairs from the train set, 4380 sentence pairs from the test set, and 2030 sentence pairs from the development set were translated.

²<https://www.deepl.com/>

3.4. Projection

Word alignment is a method that is well-known in machine translation and nowadays is widely used for annotation projection. It is used as a step to transfer labels of gold-annotated data to its translation. There are several existing methods for word alignments. With the evolution of deep learning more advanced word alignment systems have been developed, such as aligners for cross-lingual sequence tagging *SimAlign* (Sabet et al., 2020) and *Awesome align* (Dou and Neubig, 2021). These two systems were used for the tag projection part of this project.

An effective way of learning representations of the text is proven to be by learning contextual word embeddings trained from multilingual language models. The Awesome aligner applies this solution by using pre-trained language models and fine-tuning them using parallel corpora to increase the quality of the alignments. Since it learns word embeddings from parallel corpora, providing domain-specific corpus could increase the performance of the aligner as well. On the other hand, having huge parallel corpora may not be the case for many languages and hence, the solution is to adjust alignments based on their similarities with respect to target languages.

In our project, we use the word alignment software for cross-lingual annotation projection from the English dataset to Spanish described in (García-Ferrero et al., 2022) with minor changes introduced for our specific use case. Since the annotations to transfer are considerably long, we removed the part of excluding punctuation from the projection and increased the allowed gap between the projections.

To transfer the labels we use two word alignment tools, namely, *SimAlign* (Sabet et al., 2020) and *Awesome align* (Dou and Neubig, 2021). *SimAlign* allows projecting labels without any parallel data by extracting alignments from similarity matrices of multilingual embeddings. In contrast, *Awesome align* requires parallel data in order to learn word embeddings, which in our case domain-specific data in Spanish is preferred for better results. Therefore, we used English-Spanish parallel biomedical corpus ³.

As a result, the overall output of both systems was considerably good, with some constant misalignment of articles in Spanish by *Awesome align* and selecting wrong boundaries of the label sequences in the sentences by *SimAlign*, and conjunctive words by both aligners. Some of these misalignments were systematical and genuine for automatic improvement, others required manual revision. Figure 2 illustrates the steps performed after the projection of argument components.




Figure 2: Annotation projection steps

³<https://github.com/biomedical-translation-corpora/corpora>

Each version of the data is referred to as follows: initial projection without any correction as automatic projection, the projection that was corrected programmatically as auto-correction, semi-automatic, or post-processing, and manually corrected projection as manual correction/projection.

3.4.1. Automatic projections

The outputs from both systems were comparably good with some repeating errors in the projection. Those issues occurred the most when dealing with the sentences that are full components in the source data and they were not projected accordingly in the output result. An example of the projection is shown below. In Figure 3, the source sentence with argument components is shown in green, and the tokens without color are not part of the argument and are labeled as ‘O’. The first token is labeled as “B-Premise” and the rest of the green parts before ‘O’ are “I-Premise”, then after the uncolored part, the new argument component sequence and dot at the end were not included in the argument component.

DC-treated patients experienced improved pain relief compared with VC (P=0.033) , whereas pain relief with DCb and VC was similar .

Figure 3: Source sentence with outlined argument component (Premise)

3.5. Post-processing of the projections

Projections produced by Awesome align repetitively did not align the articles as well as, although less frequently, conjunctions of different lengths in each language. For example, the misplacement of tags occurred between the projections of the words “therefore” and “por lo tanto”. Sometimes one-to-many and many-to-one alignments were difficult for the algorithm to find edges in the input.

As illustrated in Figure 4 the majority of the argument components were transferred correctly, even conjunctive phrase was tagged correctly. However, in the example, there are two articles and both of them were labeled as non-argumentative components. Moreover, the punctuation at the end of the sentence became part of the component when it is not supposed to be so.

Los pacientes tratados con DC experimentaron un mayor alivio del dolor en comparación con la CV (P=0,033) , mientras que el alivio del dolor con DCb y CV fue similar .

Figure 4: Projection of the sentence (Figure 3) with Awesome align

Compared to Awesome align, SimAlign handled articles relatively better, however, there is no definite pattern in the misalignment of tokens. The output of the same sentence by SimAlign is shown in the Example 5. The aligner correctly projected the first article, but not the second one before “mientras que”, the closing bracket and coma

were also incorrectly projected. However, the dot at the end was correctly outside of the component.

Los pacientes tratados con DC experimentaron un mayor alivio del dolor en comparación con la CV ($P=0,033$) , mientras que el alivio del dolor con DCb y CV fue similar .

Figure 5: Projection of the sentence (Figure 3) with SimAlign

Regarding punctuation, it is worth mentioning that the original corpus lacked consistency in tagging punctuation as part of the arguments.

Since some errors from the projection of annotations follow some patterns, it is possible to correct them in some way to improve the quality of the new corpus. Therefore, after investigating the results and identifying frequent mistakes we corrected them automatically. Following this, we extended the projections in the sentences that are full components following the logic: "if a given sequence is a full component in the source sentence then it is a full component in the translated sentence too, regardless of the projection output". This allowed for decreasing the number of sequences with incorrect annotations. The amount of the corrected sequences in data after this step is shown in Tables 3 and 4.

	train_awesome	train_simalign	dev_awesome	dev_simalign
overall	4405	4405	680	680
# of full O's	2345	2345	377	377
# of full component	1752	703	257	257
# of auto-corrections	800	88	95	11
# of manual-corrections	140	194	20	25

Table 3: Number of post-processed sequences, full sentence components, none-components, and corrected sentences in the train and development from neoplasm translated with DeepL.

Further, the mistakes in the projections that were not so easy to capture were corrected manually.

3.6. Manual corrections

Having post-processed data still did not guarantee that the corpus in Spanish is correctly projected and annotated. After expanding the labels and processing the full component sequences, we looked into the rest of the projection results to correct any possible misalignments. To perform manual corrections we used a tool for manual corrections introduced by García-Ferrero et al. (2022) with some changes adapted to our problem.

First of all, we wanted to adjust the wrong projections in the sentences. Second, we have already dealt with the annotations of the full sentences, hence they did not require any revision. Finally, we wanted to refer to the original annotations during the correction. Therefore, in the correction tool, we dropped the full sentences that are arguments and added an additional screen to consult the English equivalent of the data in Spanish.

During the manual annotation, all of the punctuation in the argumentative sequences were included in the argument sequence, even if it was not a case in the source corpus.

The amount of manually corrected sentences are illustrated in the last row of Tables 3 and 4. Here the overall number of corrections after post-processing is considerably lower and the difference between Awesome align and SimAlign is less than after the post-processed step.

	neoplasms_a	neoplasms_s	glaucoma_a	glaucoma_s	mixed_a	mixed_s
overall	1252	1252	1248	1248	1147	1147
# of full O's	630	630	692	682	591	591
# of full component	518	518	498	506	476	480
# of auto-corrections	242	92	167	51	203	90
# of manual-corrections	51	26	26	14	47	26

Table 4: Number of post-processed sequences, full sentence components, none-components, and corrected sentences in the test data translated with DeepL. _a corresponds to the results from Awesome align and _s from SimAlign.

4. Experiments and results

We have 4 versions of data created for Spanish where they differ in the translation and projection methods and their combinations, i.e. OPUS-MT+Awesome, OPUS-MT+SimAlign, DeepL+Awesome, and DeepL+Simalign. Given that the corpus obtained directly from the generation procedure are not ideal. The data then undergoes some correction steps. We were able to algorithmically correct the reoccurring errors, mainly the misalignment of the articles. Then we took the resulting output and manually corrected the less homogeneous errors. We report the results from the experiments performed for each correction iteration introduced to the corpus: directly generated, automatically refined, and manually corrected data.

The set of experiments performed for argument mining to the newly created Spanish corpus include:

- zero-shot cross-lingual experiments - train on English and test in Spanish data;
- multi-lingual - mixing English and Spanish corpus to train and test individually in Spanish and English data, to see if the prediction accuracy will increase or decrease by after such data augmentation;
- mono-lingual - train and test the model using the Spanish corpus. These experiments consist of training on automatically generated, auto-corrected, and manually corrected data, and testing on manually corrected data.

All of the experiments are applied for both argument component detection and argument relation classification. The set of the described methods is illustrated in Table 5

We run our experiments by applying Spanish multilingual BERT(mBERT) Devlin et al. (2019) and Spanish BERT (BETO (Cañete et al., 2020)) in order to work with the embeddings adapted to the language. In the original work of Mayer et al. (2020), the model was trained on 3 epochs with a learning rate $2e-5$ and batch size 32, but during the

Experiment type	Train and development sets	Test set
zero-shot	English (mBERT)	Spanish
multilingual	English + Spanish (mBERT)	Spanish
multilingual	English + Spanish (mBERT)	English
train+project	Spanish (mBERT)	Spanish
train+project	Spanish (BETO)	Spanish

Table 5: List of experiments. The rows represent the language, and inside the parentheses the model that is used during fine-tuning.

hyperparameter tuning, we determined that the performance of the model is influenced the most by the learning rate, and yielding better results when altering the learning rate to $5e-5$.

Regarding argument relations, it is a text classification task, and the classification is based on identifying relations between two sequences. A similar set of experiments have been applied to the classification of relations. However, relation classification required only the translation of the corpus, which makes the task rather straightforward.

4.1. Results

In this section, we present the experimental results for the evaluation setup described earlier.

4.1.1. English baseline

We first replicate the argument mining pipeline originally designed for the English AbstRCT dataset Mayer et al. (2018). We evaluated mBERT on the English data to obtain a baseline of it on this benchmark. Furthermore, we fine-tuned the best models on this dataset according to Mayer et al. (2021). We report the results in Table 6.

F1 score is an average of F1-Claim (F1-C) and F1-Premise (F1-P). The models were trained with the following hyperparameters: 32 batch size, 3 epochs and $5e-5$ learning rate. Despite using the pipeline and the BERT language model and their variations (BioBERT (Lee et al., 2019) and SciBERT (Beltagy et al., 2019)) for the experiments, we did not manage to reproduce their published results (Mayer et al., 2020, 2021). Therefore, below we report the results that we have obtained by training those models including mBERT.

Model	Neoplasm			Glaucoma			Mixed		
	F1	F1-C	F1-P	F1	F1-C	F1-P	F1	F1-C	F1-P
SciBERT+GRU+CRF	82.41	75.84	91.11	83.97	82.89	91.68	82.40	78.21	91.35
BioBERT+GRU+CRF	80.85	73.99	90.59	83.95	83.52	91.72	82.41	78.26	92.02
BERT+GRU+CRF	82.68	76.23	89.90	82.22	79.07	89.07	82.68	77.98	89.61
mBERT+GRU+CRF	82.36	74.89	89.07	80.52	75.22	84.86	81.69	75.06	88.57
SciBERT+LSTM+CRF	81.99	75.58	91.23	83.06	81.87	91.76	81.93	77.23	91.52

Table 6: Argument component detection of the source English data.

F1-scores for neoplasm shows that mBERT obtains very good results compared to specialized monolingual models such as SciBERT and BioBERT. However, mBERT results are slightly worse when evaluated out-of-domain in glaucoma and mixed test data. In any case, the baseline shows that mBERT is competitive in this benchmark so it is a good candidate to perform cross-lingual and multilingual experiments.

Additionally, we ran the experiments with XLM-RoBERTa (Conneau et al., 2019), but the output quality of the predictions was way worse than expected. It underperformed by roughly 10% compared to BERT. The model tremendously failed to correctly identify *Claims* and its borders in the sequence (F1-Claim 62.47% - neoplasm) but did fairly well predicting *Premise* (F1-Premise 83.59% - neoplasm).

Argument relation classification. The results obtained from BioBERT are the worst among all the pre-trained models. On the other hand, F1-scores produced by SciBERT is the highest. All of the models, other than BioBERT, perform worse on the *Glaucoma* test set. Results by mBERT are worse by roughly 2 points than the original BERT. The results obtained for the relation classification are shown in Table 7.

Model	Neoplasm	Glaucoma	Mixed
BERT	66.97	57.04	69.32
SciBERT	70.31	65.75	71.31
BioBERT	55.84	59.23	56.17
mBERT	65.71	59.92	67.88

Table 7: F-1 score of the different for argument relation classification.

4.2. Experiments with the generated Spanish corpus

This section contains the results received from the experiments performed on Spanish data including zero-shot, monolingual and multilingual settings.

We provide results for all of the variations of the Spanish corpus mentioned at the beginning of this section. It is possible to note that the performance increases after each correction step introduced to the corpus from automatic to manual annotation corrections.

4.2.1. Zero-shot setting

We mentioned before that we performed some corrections to the Spanish corpus. Moreover, we ran experiments on all of them. In Table 8, we report the results of zero-shot experiments performed for the manually corrected data, and the performance of the model on automatic and semi-automatic corpus can be found in the Appendix A. Overall, the predictions obtained by mBERT in this zero-shot setting are high enough and they get better with each improvement introduced to the corpus. The issue with the automatic projections was that the alignment boundaries were different from the original corpus (many errors were committed by not including a Spanish article as part of the argument), therefore the prediction scores, as expected, were lower compared to others.

The output after correcting the article misalignment in Spanish improved significantly by several points (Table 9). The major part of the corrections took place for projections

Model	Neoplasm			Glaucoma			Mixed		
	F1	F1-C	F1-P	F1	F1-C	F1-P	F1	F1-C	F1-P
DeepL + SimAlign	80.50	71.56	86.73	77.60	72.33	81.60	79.62	68.99	85.96
DeepL + Awesome	80.34	71.54	86.77	77.51	72.30	81.59	79.57	69.36	85.92
OPUS-MT + SimAlign	81.21	71.57	86.62	77.15	70.07	80.87	80.43	70.82	86.05
OPUS-MT + Awesome	81.16	71.44	86.63	77.05	70.04	80.92	80.35	71.02	85.92

Table 8: Zero-shot English to Spanish results of argument components after manual corrections

by Awesome align and, accordingly, the results of these versions of data increased considerably from 70.07% to 79.12% for DeepL+Awesome and from 71.36% to 80.21% for OPUS-MT+Awesome respectively.

Improvements in the results were reached after running the same experiments on the manually corrected data (Table 8). This time the improvement is not as significant as it was from direct projections to auto-corrections. Nevertheless, a minor increase is evident in the overall performance of the model when data is manually refined. An overview of these results is provided in Table 9 where each column holds an F1-macro score obtained from zero-shot experiments for each combination of translation and projection.

Model	Neoplasm			Glaucoma			Mixed		
	Auto	Semi-auto	Manual	Auto	Semi-auto	Manual	Auto	Semi-auto	Manual
DeepL + SimAlign	75.87	79.99	80.50	75.64	77.30	77.60	75.25	79.25	79.62
DeepL + Awesome	70.07	79.12	80.34	71.39	76.77	77.51	69.85	78.21	79.57
OPUS-MT + SimAlign	77.59	80.68	81.21	75.46	76.81	77.15	76.63	79.89	80.43
OPUS-MT + Awesome	71.36	80.21	81.16	71.22	76.42	77.05	71.36	80.21	81.16

Table 9: F1-macro of each corpus variation for each disease from zero-shot English to Spanish experiment

The results of zero-shot experiments with direct projection and auto-correction of data can be found in Appendix A.

4.2.2. Train and test with the data in Spanish

Here we present the results in the scenario when trained and tested using Spanish training and testing set to observe and compare the results obtained from cross-lingual zero-shot experiments. Our objective was to see if the model trained with automatically created data will improve the performance of the model compared to the zero-shot predictions. We assume that after manually correcting the data all of the generated corpus versions will be more or less the same, differing only in translation. Therefore, this experiment is performed only with one generated corpus (OPUS-MT+Awesome align) and tested on all of them. The results from on other combinations of translation and projection systems, and trained and tested with different corrections with mBERT can be found in Appendix D, Appendix C, Appendix B.

It is noticeable that mBERT predictions have increased compared to the model trained on English and tested on Spanish corpus. Moreover, the F1-score is notably higher than the one from the English baseline (Table 6) even when a domain-specific model was utilized. The results produced by the model with mBERT are higher compared to BETO for neoplasm and lower for the other test sets. The improvement may

Model	Neoplasm			Glaucoma			Mixed		
	F1	F1-C	F1-P	F1	F1-C	F1-P	F1	F1-C	F1-P
DeepL + SimAlign (mBERT)	83.57	75.95	90.01	80.83	75.44	86.11	82.62	74.62	88.81
DeepL + SimAlign (BETO)	83.19	74.66	89.31	84.16	80.98	89.99	83.54	74.77	90.87
DeepL + Awesome (mBERT)	83.40	77.11	89.18	81.11	76.16	87.35	81.88	73.71	88.50
DeepL + Awesome (BETO)	82.84	74.70	89.57	83.78	79.95	89.93	84.15	75.89	91.11
OPUS-MT + SimAlign (mBERT)	83.03	74.68	88.69	82.06	75.76	87.36	82.64	72.94	89.31
OPUS-MT + SimAlign (BETO)	82.19	73.73	89.58	83.23	80.15	89.41	82.65	75.01	90.19
OPUS-MT + Awesome (mBERT)	82.66	74.07	88.69	82.44	76.55	87.44	82.55	73.70	89.18
OPUS-MT + Awesome (BETO)	81.91	72.96	89.56	83.30	80.69	89.45	82.48	74.03	90.36

Table 10: Train and test in Spanish with mBERT and BETO

be caused by a slight difference in annotations because, as it was mentioned before, the original English corpus has some inconsistencies in annotating the punctuation.

4.2.3. Train and test on merged English and Spanish data

Lastly, after zero-shot and Spanish-only experiments, we merged the training sets in two languages to see if it will increase or decrease the prediction quality of monolingual test sets in English and in Spanish. It can be concluded from Table 11 that this data augmentation approach increased the quality of the overall performance by 1-2% compared to training on monolingual and zero-shot results, even when evaluated with the original English data. It should also be noted that the improvements are particularly large when mBERT is evaluated out-of-domain, namely, on glaucoma and mixed test sets.

Model	Neoplasm			Glaucoma			Mixed		
	F1	F1-C	F1-P	F1	F1-C	F1-P	F1	F1-C	F1-P
Test: EN	83.51	73.42	89.38	85.31	81.05	86.73	83.63	74.98	89.25
Test: DeepL + SimAlign (ES)	84.35	76.64	88.43	84.54	78.67	87.24	83.90	73.46	88.87
Test: DeepL + Awesome (ES)	84.58	76.77	88.61	84.62	78.71	87.23	84.03	73.99	88.92
Test: OPUS-MT + SimAlign (ES)	84.54	76.02	88.89	84.20	78.69	87.31	83.18	72.15	88.98
Test: OPUS-MT + Awesome (ES)	84.35	75.76	88.89	84.25	78.74	87.26	83.16	72.46	88.84

Table 11: Train and test with merged English and Spanish dataset using mBERT

Another interesting aspect worth mentioning is that across evaluations there are no significant differences with respect to which combination of machine translation and projection model we are using. Instead, differences are given by the models and the amount of data used for fine-tuning, as our results on multilingual training demonstrate.




Figure 6: Results for English (left) and Spanish (right) experiments

Figure 6 provides a graphical overview of the most important comparisons of the results from our experimentation. First, we can conclude that the best predictions are obtained from the model that was trained on the merged English and Spanish data, also surpassing the model trained with gold-standard English data. These results indicate that our generated Spanish data can be used to apply data augmentation for improving the quality of predictions. Second, better predictions were obtained under a monolingual setting for the Spanish corpus than in a zero-shot cross-lingual setting using a multilingual model such as mBERT. Third, for Spanish, the monolingual model BETO performed better than mBERT, although the latter benefits from multilingual training.

4.3. Experiments with argument relation classification

All of the experiments that were done for argument component detection were also applied to the classification of argument relations. Results are shown in Table 12 and in Figure 7.

Model	Neoplasm	Glaucoma	Mixed
mBERT (train: EN+ES → test: EN)	65.55	58.79	67.82
mBERT (train: EN+ES → test: ES)	62.55	58.60	65.74
mBERT (train: EN → test: ES)	62.45	55.92	65.02
mBERT (train and test: ES)	63.25	54.35	65.40
BETO (train and test: ES)	65.27	60.15	66.80

Table 12: F-1 scores of the different pre-trained models for relation classification

Here, similar to the argument components, the prediction scores are significantly lower for *Glaucoma* and are higher for *Mixed* test sets. Furthermore, in this setting the models were fine-tuned with multilingual data (both Spanish and English) that are not better than their counterparts trained in the target languages. Moreover, while mBERT trained and tested on the translated data is better than when applied in a zero-shot scenario, differences are not as large as for Argument Component Detection. In fact, zero-shot performs better for *Glaucoma*. Finally, the monolingual BETO model does obtain better results than mBERT for most of the evaluations on relation classification.




Figure 7: Relation classification results under different experimental setups

Another point to mention is that the relation classification corpus is extremely imbalanced. We believe that this may be one of the reasons why the classification quality is significantly low. Another reason is the lack of context in the task itself, given that in many cases it is extremely difficult to distinguish relations given only two sentences, without further context.

Thus, we believe that relation classification in the medical domain cannot be straightforwardly determined based only on local textual information. It may require more complex structures and additional insights from the data to be able to identify argumentative structures.

5. Discussion

From the results obtained in previous sections, it has been clear that SciBERT with GRU and CRF layers is the best-performing model for the English data set. Prediction quality by the multilingual model (mBERT) was in general quite competitive, which allowed performing the other types of cross-lingual experiments. In this section, we will provide a qualitative analysis of the predictions produced by the models with the aim of identifying the most important errors.

There are errors in the predictions throughout all of the experiments that can be more or less generalized. For instance, the majority of the erroneous classifications were in assigning the correct IOB tags and their boundaries, along with the incorrect argument types. Overall, identification of the *Premise* was more accurate compared to the *Claim*. In fact, the majority of the misclassifications happened in determining *Claim* arguments.

Comparisons to analyze predictions across models in this section were made on the *mixed test set* because it has texts of all 5 diseases in it. The number of erroneous outputs is shown in Table 13.

model	# of misclassifications
SciBERT+GRU (EN → EN)	150
SciBERT+LSTM(EN → EN)	142
mBERT (EN → EN)	154
mBERT (EN → ES)	156
mBERT (ES → ES)	151
mBERT (EN+ES → ES)	158
mBERT (EN+ES → EN)	152
BETO (ES → ES)	148

Table 13: Number of erroneous predictions for the mixed test set using different models. The first column is in the following form: model (train set language → test set language). The results for the Spanish data are from manually revised projections.

As we can see from the table the numbers are not too scattered, we may assume that the majority of them are the same sequences, at least among languages. The most common mistakes across all models are described below.

In Example 5.1, most of the tags are correctly predicted except for random tokens in distant parts of the sequence with another class. It is difficult to follow any pattern in this situation, nevertheless, in some cases, it assigns ‘O’ only to punctuation and any other argument type to the rest of the text.

Example 5.1. . *The sentence is Premise and bold tokens were classified as I-Claim*

*Text: el control de los sintomas en ambos brazos fue **similar** para los sintomas **específicos** de la enfermedad , como tos , dis ##nea , dolor o hem ##op ##tis ##is .*

Another frequent mistake was when one sentence holds several arguments, but the model could only recognize one and assign it to the whole set. Similar behavior when dealing with lengthy sequences. (Example 5.2).

Example 5.2. . *The first part of the sentence is Claim (in bold), ‘,’ and ‘y’ are outside of argument and the rest are Premise, but the model labeled everything as Premise (in italic).*

Text: ambos proc ##edi ##mientos prod ##uje ##ron una reduccion estadística ##mente significativa de la pio , y los ojos some ##tidos a im ##ct alcanzar ##on una pio menor que los ojos del grupo de pt ##c a los 12 meses de segui ##miento (9 , 5 \hxc2 \xb1 2 , 4 mmhg y 11 , 7 \xc2 \xb1 2 , 1 mm hg , respectivamente , $p < 0 , 001$) .

The model sometimes fails to detect any arguments in the input. In many examples, *Claim* is classified as *Premise* and *Premise* as *Claim*. Apparently, some argumentative sequences are not explicitly identifiable compared to others.

One of the major error types was in including conjunctive words and punctuation in the argument. However, it is difficult to say if those tokens should be counted as arguments in the annotated data as well. This is perhaps due to inconsistencies in the annotations in the source English data. Lastly, in some examples, the beginning token is classified as one component and the rest of the text as another component (Example 5.3).

Example 5.3. . Here, the first token is labeled as *B-Premise* and the rest as *I-Claim*, whereas the whole sentence is supposed to be *Claim*

Text: *en cuanto a la calidad de vida posto ##pera ##toria , los pacientes some ##tidos a qui ##mio ##tera ##pia intra ##arter ##ial parecia ##n estar en una situacion lige ##ramente mas favorable .*

It was mentioned previously that we could achieve comparable results with LSTM when increasing the learning rate. Before that GRU model was outperforming it by almost 20% and by looking at the quality of the predictions before fine-tuning LSTM model made mistakes in 401 sentences in the mixed test set and it decreased to 142 after. In general, the majority of the errors were due to the model’s failure in finding the correct boundaries of arguments and, in cases when it did, failing to find the beginning of the argument, i.e. ‘B-’ token(Example 5.4). This issue has been improved afterward. Moreover, it outperformed some tests on the GRU model.

Example 5.4. *LSTM model correctly found the argument component but not in IOB*

Text: *both therapies were well tolerated .*

True tags: *B-Claim I-Claim I-Claim I-Claim I-Claim I-Claim*

Predicted tags: *I-Claim I-Claim I-Claim I-Claim I-Claim I-Claim*

In the case of the outputs from the manually projected Spanish data, using BETO and mBERT, it can be concluded that the aforementioned general errors were seen here as well. Most of the time the incorrect predictions were in the same sentences. However, there are some differences that are worth mentioning. The most noticeable one is tokenization: mBERT splits words to a more atomic level than BETO. For instance, for the word “*complicaciones*”, mBERT tokenized it as “*comp, ##lica, ##ciones*” while with BETO the token remained unchanged. Another point is that even though the predictions were incorrect by both models, it is more likely that the model with BETO recognizes argumentative sentences more frequently than with mBERT. In such examples, the former either identifies the wrong argumentative component or incorrect IOB tags while the latter tags everything as ‘O’.

Prediction errors from zero-shot experiments vary between each version of generated Spanish data. Initially, most of the errors were because in the test set the articles were omitted by the projection system. In other words, the model tags the token as part of the argument component while the “true” label indicates that it is not, hence decreasing the accuracy. This issue improved after fixing the article problem in the test set. However, this time, the model would correctly predict the tags, except for some parts of the sequence for many inputs on the manually corrected corpus (Example 5.5). This issue improved when using manually projected Spanish corpus.

Example 5.5. In the following example the whole sentence is predicted as *Claim* and bold part as *Premise*. The true values are *Claim*.

la administracion de gs - 962 ##0 **durante 12 semanas** no tuvo ningun efecto significativo sobre los niveles seri ##cos de anti ##geno ##s de superficie de hepatitis b , pero pare ##cio aumentar las respuesta ##s de celulas t y celulas nk y b'reducir' b'la' capacidad de nk para sup ##rimi ##r las celulas t .

To sum up, the errors specific to zero-shot experiments, correctly predicting the component but adding different ones in the random parts of the sequence, were improved by wrong IOB borders and incorrect classification in general. The former somewhat improved when training on the merged Spanish and English corpus. In the end, the most common misclassification occurred when trying to identify the right argument component type, especially, *Claim*.

Argument relations. Since the corpus for argument relations are imbalanced the prediction results are considerably low. Nevertheless, for the clinical data, determining the relations between arguments seems to require more information than solely relying on the information from two sentences without providing the whole context. In Example 5.6, the relation type is *Support* and *No Relation* in 5.7. It is not obvious, even for humans, how these relation types are motivated without knowing the context. First, it is not obvious what kind of patients is the NGT group. Second, we are not given information about what is NGT.

Example 5.6. __label__ *Support* [Patients in the NGT group reported significantly ($P<0.05$) better scores of QoL at both 6 months and 1 year.] [Patients who underwent gastric tube reconstruction develop less postoperative digestive tract complications, and have a quicker recovery and a better QoL during the follow-up period.]

Example 5.7. __label__ *noRel* [Patients in the NGT group reported significantly ($P<0.05$) better scores of QoL at both 6 months and 1 year.] [Regarding the QoL investigation, the scores of QoL dropped for all patients at 3 weeks after surgery.]

To sum up, it is not straightforward to identify relation types from source sentences to the target without any context provided which may explain the difficulty for the models to perform better in this particular task.

6. Concluding Remarks

In this project, we have investigated several strategies to perform argument mining on medical data for a language for which annotated data is not available. We have taken a real case scenario in which the only dataset annotated with argument structures for the medical domain is in English. Taking this as a starting point, we have explored two avenues to be able to perform the task in Spanish. A first option is to leverage large multilingual language models such as mBERT to perform transfer learning, namely, learning on the available English data and predicting in Spanish. A second method is proposed by automatically generating data in Spanish via machine translation and label projection.

In order to create an annotated dataset in Spanish for argumentation in the medical domain, we first machine-translated the source English corpus using the OPUS-MT and DeepL. Then the annotations were automatically projected from English to the translated data using word alignment tools. Next, the data in Spanish was corrected automatically and manually.

The obtained results indicate that the generated Spanish data helps to perform data augmentation which is highly beneficial to improve results for both English and Spanish benchmarks. Furthermore, experiments indicate that for this domain the translation and projection approach performs better than the zero-shot cross-lingual transfer.

The results from zero-shot experiments on Spanish data were good enough but slightly lower than when the model was trained on the Spanish corpus. The main detected error from the zero-shot predictions compared to other experiments in assigning the wrong tag in the middle of the sequence.

Another issue was the misclassification of punctuation and linking words. We hypothesize that this issue was well-handled when the model was trained on Spanish data because during manual correction all types of punctuation were annotated as the preceding tokens.

For relation classification the highest scores were obtained by SciBERT, then BERT, and mBERT for English data. Cross-lingual zero-shot results were lower by *sim*3%, but monolingual Spanish and mixed English and Spanish data improved the prediction almost to the level of original English results. Overall, the predictions were consistently worse for *Glaucoma*.

Finally, apart from the scientific findings, we should stress that in this project we have created the first dataset in Spanish to perform argumentation mining and classification in the medical domain. Based on this, our work constitutes the first to provide an in-depth study and empirical experimentation on cross-lingual methods for argument mining and classification.

Further work should include trying newer multilingual language models such as XLM-RoBERTa and mDeBERTa, which may help to improve results even over domain-specific English language models such as SciBERT or BioBERT. Additionally, we would like to further explore the method presented in this project to experiment with computational approaches to argumentation to other specific domains and languages for which no annotated data is available.

Acknowledgments

References

- Accuosto, P., Neves, M., Saggion, H., 2021. Argumentation mining in scientific literature: From computational linguistics to biomedicine, in: Frommholz I, Mayr P, Cabanac G, Verberne S, editors. BIR 2021: 11th International Workshop on Bibliometric-enhanced Information Retrieval; 2021 Apr 1; Lucca, Italy. Aachen: CEUR; 2021. p. 20-36, CEUR Workshop Proceedings. pp. 20–36.
- Agerri, R., Chung, Y., Aldabe, I., Aranberri, N., Labaka, G., Rigau, G., 2018. Building named entity recognition taggers via parallel corpora, in: Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018).
- Agerri, R., Rigau, G., 2019. Language independent sequence labelling for opinion target extraction. *Artificial Intelligence* 268, 85–95.
- Alamri, A., Stevenson, M., 2016. A corpus of potentially contradictory research claims from cardiovascular research abstracts. *Journal of biomedical semantics* 7, 1–9.
- Asher, N., Asher, N.M., Lascarides, A., 2003. Logics of conversation. Cambridge University Press.
- Azar, M., 1999. Argumentative text as rhetorical structure: An application of rhetorical structure theory. *Argumentation* 13, 97–114.
- Beltagy, I., Lo, K., Cohan, A., 2019. Scibert: A pretrained language model for scientific text. arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.10676 .
- Bos, J., 2008. Wide-coverage semantic analysis with boxer, in: Semantics in text processing. step 2008 conference proceedings, pp. 277–286.
- Caroprese, L., Vocaturo, E., Zumpano, E., 2022. Argumentation approaches for explainable ai in medical informatics. *Intelligent Systems with Applications* 16, 200109. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2667305322000473>, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iswa.2022.200109>.
- Cañete, J., Chaperon, G., Fuentes, R., Ho, J.H., Kang, H., Pérez, J., 2020. Spanish pre-trained bert model and evaluation data, in: PML4DC at ICLR 2020.
- Chen, X., Awadallah, A.H., Hassan, H., Wang, W., Cardie, C., 2018. Multi-source cross-lingual model transfer: Learning what to share. arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.03552 .
- Conneau, A., Khandelwal, K., Goyal, N., Chaudhary, V., Wenzek, G., Guzmán, F., Grave, E., Ott, M., Zettlemoyer, L., Stoyanov, V., 2019. Unsupervised cross-lingual representation learning at scale. arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.02116 .
- Craven, R., Toni, F., Cadar, C., Hadad, A., Williams, M., 2012. Efficient argumentation for medical decision-making, in: Thirteenth International Conference on the Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning.
- Das, D., Petrov, S., 2011. Unsupervised part-of-speech tagging with bilingual graph-based projections .
- David, Y., Grace, N., Richard, W., et al., 2001. Inducing multilingual text analysis tools via robust projection across aligned corpora, in: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Human Language Technology Research, pp. 1–8.
- Devlin, J., Chang, M.W., Lee, K., Toutanova, K., 2019. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. ArXiv abs/1810.04805.
- Dou, Z.Y., Neubig, G., 2021. Word alignment by fine-tuning embeddings on parallel corpora. arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.08231 .
- Dung, P.M., 1995. On the acceptability of arguments and its fundamental role in nonmonotonic reasoning, logic programming and n-person games. *Artificial intelligence* 77, 321–357.
- Eger, S., Daxenberger, J., Stab, C., Gurevych, I., 2018. Cross-lingual argumentation mining: Machine translation (and a bit of projection) is all you need! arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.08998 .
- Fan, A., Bhosale, S., Schwenk, H., Ma, Z., El-Kishky, A., Goyal, S., Baines, M., Celebi, O., Wenzek, G., Chaudhary, V., et al., 2021. Beyond english-centric multilingual machine translation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 22, 1–48.
- Freeman, J.B., 2011. Argument Structure:: Representation and Theory. volume 18. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Gaddy, D.M., Zhang, Y., Barzilay, R., Jaakkola, T.S., 2016. Ten pairs to tag-multilingual pos tagging via coarse mapping between embeddings, Association for Computational Linguistics.
- García-Ferrero, I., Agerri, R., Rigau, G., 2022. Model and data transfer for cross-lingual sequence labelling in zero-resource settings. arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.12623 .
- Goudas, T., Louizos, C., Petasis, G., Karkaletsis, V., 2014. Argument extraction from news, blogs, and social media, in: Hellenic Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Springer. pp. 287–299.
- Green, N., Cabrio, E., Villata, S., Wyner, A., 2014. Argumentation for scientific claims in a biomedical research article., in: ArgNLP, pp. 21–25.

- Green, N.L., 2010. Representation of argumentation in text with rhetorical structure theory. *Argumentation* 24, 181–196.
- Kamp, H., Genabith, J.v., Reyle, U., 2011. Discourse representation theory, in: *Handbook of philosophical logic*. Springer, pp. 125–394.
- Kirschner, C., Eckle-Kohler, J., Gurevych, I., 2015. Linking the thoughts: Analysis of argumentation structures in scientific publications, in: *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Argumentation Mining*, pp. 1–11.
- Kwon, N., Zhou, L., Hovy, E., Shulman, S.W., 2007. Identifying and classifying subjective claims, in: *DG. O, Citeseer*. pp. 76–81.
- Lee, J., Yoon, W., Kim, S., Kim, D., Kim, S., So, C.H., Kang, J., 2019. Biobert: A pre-trained biomedical language representation model for biomedical text mining. *bioinformatics*, btz682.
- Li, M., Geng, S., Gao, Y., Peng, S., Liu, H., Wang, H., 2017. Crowdsourcing argumentation structures in chinese hotel reviews, in: *2017 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics (SMC)*, IEEE. pp. 87–92.
- Liu, Z., Winata, G.I., Cahyawijaya, S., Madotto, A., Lin, Z., Fung, P., 2020. On the importance of word order information in cross-lingual sequence labeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.11164*.
- Mayer, T., Cabrio, E., Lippi, M., Torroni, P., Villata, S., 2018. Argument mining on clinical trials., in: *COMMA*, pp. 137–148.
- Mayer, T., Cabrio, E., Villata, S., 2020. Transformer-based argument mining for healthcare applications, in: *ECAI 2020 - 24th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, IOS Press. pp. 2108–2115.
- Mayer, T., Marro, S., Cabrio, E., Villata, S., 2021. Enhancing evidence-based medicine with natural language argumentative analysis of clinical trials. *Artificial Intelligence in Medicine* 118, 102098.
- Mochales, R., Ieven, A., 2009. Creating an argumentation corpus: do theories apply to real arguments? a case study on the legal argumentation of the echr, in: *Proceedings of the 12th international conference on artificial intelligence and law*, pp. 21–30.
- Moens, M.F., Boiy, E., Palau, R.M., Reed, C., 2007. Automatic detection of arguments in legal texts, in: *Proceedings of the 11th international conference on Artificial intelligence and law*, pp. 225–230.
- Morio, G., Ozaki, H., Morishita, T., Yanai, K., 2022. End-to-end argument mining with cross-corpora multi-task learning. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 10, 639–658.
- Noor, K., Hunter, A., Mayer, A., 2017. Analysis of medical arguments from patient experiences expressed on the social web, in: *International conference on industrial, engineering and other applications of applied intelligent systems*, Springer. pp. 285–294.
- Peldszus, A., Stede, M., 2013. From argument diagrams to argumentation mining in texts: A survey. *International Journal of Cognitive Informatics and Natural Intelligence (IJCINI)* 7, 1–31.
- Peldszus, A., Stede, M., 2015. Joint prediction in mst-style discourse parsing for argumentation mining, in: *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 938–948.
- Reed, C., Mochales Palau, R., Rowe, G., Moens, M.F., 2008. Language resources for studying argument, in: *Proceedings of the 6th conference on language resources and evaluation-LREC 2008, ELRA*. pp. 2613–2618.
- Sabet, M.J., Dufter, P., Yvon, F., Schütze, H., 2020. Simalign: High quality word alignments without parallel training data using static and contextualized embeddings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.08728*.
- Shankar, R.D., Tu, S.W., Musen, M.A., 2006. Medical arguments in an automated health care system., in: *AAAI Spring Symposium: Argumentation for Consumers of Healthcare*, pp. 96–104.
- Stab, C., Gurevych, I., 2014. Annotating argument components and relations in persuasive essays, in: *Proceedings of COLING 2014, the 25th international conference on computational linguistics: Technical papers*, pp. 1501–1510.
- Stab, C., Gurevych, I., 2017. Parsing argumentation structures in persuasive essays. *Computational Linguistics* 43, 619–659.
- Tang, Y., Tran, C., Li, X., Chen, P.J., Goyal, N., Chaudhary, V., Gu, J., Fan, A., 2020. Multilingual translation with extensible multilingual pretraining and finetuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.00401*.
- Tiedemann, J., Thottingal, S., et al., 2020. Opus-mt—building open translation services for the world, in: *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Conference of the European Association for Machine Translation*, European Association for Machine Translation.
- Toulmin, S.E., 1958. *The uses of argument*. Cambridge university press.
- Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A.N., Kaiser, L., Polosukhin, I., 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30.
- Yang, Z., Salakhutdinov, R., Cohen, W.W., 2017. Transfer learning for sequence tagging with hierarchical

Appendix A. Zero-shot results with auto-corrected and no correction data

Model	Neoplasm			Glaucoma			Mixed		
	F1	F1-C	F1-P	F1	F1-C	F1-P	F1	F1-C	F1-P
DeepL + SimAlign	75.87	71.21	85.70	75.64	72.08	81.18	75.25	68.84	85.08
DeepL + Awesome	70.07	70.05	84.83	71.39	71.26	80.29	69.85	67.37	84.46
OPUS-MT + SimAlign	77.59	71.09	86.24	75.46	69.86	80.37	76.63	70.26	85.50
OPUS-MT + Awesome	71.36	69.74	84.97	71.22	69.70	79.59	77.98	68.94	84.70

Table A.14: Zero-shot English to Spanish results of argument components when no correction was introduced

Model	Neoplasm			Glaucoma			Mixed		
	F1	F1-C	F1-P	F1	F1-C	F1-P	F1	F1-C	F1-P
DeepL + SimAlign	79.99	71.69	86.67	77.30	72.29	81.51	79.25	69.36	85.85
DeepL + Awesome	79.12	71.33	86.48	76.77	72.08	81.32	78.21	68.95	85.65
OPUS-MT + SimAlign	80.68	71.54	86.69	76.81	70.08	80.59	79.89	70.84	85.91
OPUS-MT + Awesome	80.21	71.13	86.48	76.42	69.92	80.62	79.23	70.59	85.78

Table A.15: Zero-shot English to Spanish results of argument components after auto-corrected labels

Appendix B. Mono-lingual results from data without corrections and auto-correction

	Neoplasm			Glaucoma			Mixed		
	F1	F1-C	F1-P	F1	F1-C	F1-P	F1	F1-C	F1-P
<i>Train: OPUS-MT + SimAlign</i>									
DeepL + SimAlign	82.9	75.34	87.51	83.37	78.52	86.8	82.81	75.86	87.96
DeepL + Awesome	82.70	75.55	87.22	83.26	78.48	86.79	82.65	75.87	87.92
OPUS-MT + SimAlign	82.63	74.12	87.84	83.29	78.42	86.25	82.46	74.64	88.22
OPUS-MT + Awesome	82.6	74.27	87.9	83.13	78.39	86.17	82.29	74.51	88.09
<i>Train: OPUS-MT + Awesome</i>									
DeepL + SimAlign	73.32	73.67	86.87	75.36	73.44	85.11	74.28	73.56	87.64
DeepL + Awesome	73.15	73.74	86.73	75.32	73.4	85.11	74.26	73.99	87.63
OPUS-MT + SimAlign	74.51	73.11	87.21	75.97	73.87	84.85	74.71	73.22	87.96
OPUS-MT + Awesome	74.41	72.91	87.19	75.89	73.85	84.79	74.68	73.49	87.82
<i>Train: DeepL + SimAlign</i>									
DeepL + SimAlign	82.33	75.9	87.64	80.94	75.36	85.97	81.81	74.99	88.07
DeepL + Awesome	81.98	75.27	86.99	80.84	75.31	85.96	81.73	75.36	88.03
OPUS-MT + SimAlign	81.27	74.33	87.74	80.20	74.40	85.69	80.2	71.98	87.44
OPUS-MT + Awesome	80.99	74.15	87.71	80.04	74.37	85.61	80.11	72.24	87.30
<i>Train: DeepL + Awesome</i>									
DeepL + SimAlign	72.78	72.66	87.03	74.21	72.82	84.74	72.4	70.17	87.99
DeepL + Awesome	72.50	72.62	87.00	74.20	72.77	84.75	72.43	70.60	87.95
OPUS-MT + SimAlign	73.74	71.53	86.85	74.18	72.89	84.14	73.25	70.49	87.58
OPUS-MT + Awesome	73.53	71.28	86.84	74.13	72.86	84.09	73.22	70.76	87.45

Table B.16: Results of mono-lingual experiments from data without any corrections trained on each combination of translation and projection systems and tested with the rest of the systems manually corrected

Appendix C. Mono-lingual results from data with auto-correction

	Neoplasm			Glaucoma			Mixed		
	F1	F1-C	F1-P	F1	F1-C	F1-P	F1	F1-C	F1-P
<i>Train: OPUS-MT + SimAlign</i>									
DeepL + SimAlign	83.35	74.49	87.59	82.29	75.99	86.10	83.09	74.94	87.87
DeepL + Awesome	83.07	74.81	87.02	82.19	75.95	86.09	83.02	75.31	87.83
OPUS-MT + SimAlign	83.0	73.46	88.18	81.84	76.27	85.84	82.32	72.64	88.81
OPUS-MT + Awesome	83.08	73.99	88.34	81.72	76.25	85.77	82.19	72.68	88.68
<i>Train: OPUS-MT + Awesome</i>									
DeepL + SimAlign	83.5	75.72	88.15	82.69	74.99	87.03	82.43	72.85	88.31
DeepL + Awesome	83.38	75.80	88.11	82.58	74.95	87.01	82.26	72.85	88.28
OPUS-MT + SimAlign	83.68	75.03	88.64	82.94	77.41	87.68	83.21	73.55	89.59
OPUS-MT + Awesome	83.71	75.34	88.76	82.78	77.39	87.61	83.03	73.39	89.45
<i>Train: DeepL + SimAlign</i>									
DeepL + SimAlign	82.98	75.79	88.92	81.85	75.68	87.55	82.21	73.04	89.26
DeepL + Awesome	82.77	75.5	88.89	81.74	75.63	87.53	82.14	73.46	89.22
OPUS-MT + SimAlign	81.14	73.66	87.8	80.74	74.74	87.13	81.03	72.38	88.32
OPUS-MT + Awesome	81.07	73.91	87.86	80.58	74.72	87.06	80.94	72.66	88.19
<i>Train: DeepL + Awesome</i>									
DeepL + SimAlign	83.09	75.19	89.07	81.43	75.58	87.0	82.31	73.69	89.11
DeepL + Awesome	83.04	75.29	89.05	81.32	75.53	86.98	82.23	74.09	89.07
OPUS-MT + SimAlign	81.88	73.29	88.86	80.14	74.84	85.88	81.06	73.39	88.55
OPUS-MT + Awesome	81.74	73.04	88.86	79.99	74.82	85.82	80.97	73.65	88.42

Table C.17: Results of mono-lingual experiments from auto-corrected data trained on each combination of translation and projection systems and tested with the rest of the systems manually corrected

Appendix D. Mono-lingual results from data manually corrected

	Neoplasm			Glaucoma			Mixed		
	F1	F1-C	F1-P	F1	F1-C	F1-P	F1	F1-C	F1-P
<i>Train: OPUS-MT + SimAlign</i>									
DeepL + SimAlign	83.79	75.81	88.95	81.80	74.78	86.57	82.60	74.08	88.73
DeepL + Awesome	83.50	75.90	88.61	81.69	74.73	86.55	82.53	74.46	88.69
OPUS-MT + SimAlign	83.03	74.68	88.69	82.06	75.77	87.36	82.64	72.94	89.31
OPUS-MT + Awesome	82.80	74.58	88.69	81.90	75.73	87.28	82.51	72.94	89.18
<i>Train: OPUS-MT + Awesome</i>									
DeepL + SimAlign	83.51	75.45	88.72	82.38	76.01	87.02	82.76	74.81	88.86
DeepL + Awesome	83.34	75.64	88.72	82.27	75.97	86.99	82.69	75.18	88.83
OPUS-MT + SimAlign	82.87	74.24	88.71	82.60	76.59	87.53	82.64	73.44	89.32
OPUS-MT + Awesome	82.66	74.07	88.69	82.44	76.55	87.45	82.55	73.70	89.18
<i>Train: DeepL + SimAlign</i>									
DeepL + SimAlign	83.57	75.95	90.01	80.83	75.44	86.11	82.62	74.62	88.81
DeepL + Awesome	83.49	76.27	90.05	80.73	75.43	86.09	82.56	75.13	88.81
OPUS-MT + SimAlign	81.82	73.98	89.49	80.14	75.70	85.75	81.06	73.71	88.67
OPUS-MT + Awesome	81.58	73.75	89.46	80.02	75.72	85.69	80.99	74.01	88.54
<i>Train: DeepL + Awesome</i>									
DeepL + SimAlign	83.49	76.84	89.09	81.22	76.20	87.37	81.96	73.32	88.54
DeepL + Awesome	83.39	77.11	89.18	81.11	76.16	87.36	81.88	73.71	88.50
OPUS-MT + SimAlign	82.02	75.12	88.97	80.47	75.23	86.77	81.27	73.16	88.88
OPUS-MT + Awesome	81.86	74.97	88.97	80.35	75.21	86.71	81.19	73.42	88.75

Table D.18: Results of mono-lingual experiments from manually corrected data trained on each combination of translation and projection systems and tested with the rest of the systems manually corrected