

LitSumm: Large language models for literature summarisation of non-coding RNAs

Andrew Green¹, Carlos Ribas¹, Nancy Ontiveros-Palacios¹, Anton I. Petrov², Alex Bateman¹ and Blake Sweeney^{1*}

1. European Molecular Biology Laboratory, European Bioinformatics Institute (EMBL-EBI), Wellcome Genome Campus, Hinxton. CB10 1SD. UK

2. Riboscope Ltd, 23 King St, Cambridge. CB1 1AH. UK

*To whom correspondence should be addressed.

Abstract

Motivation: Curation of literature in life sciences is a growing challenge. The continued increase in the rate of publication, coupled with the relatively fixed number of curators worldwide presents a major challenge to developers of biomedical knowledgebases. Very few knowledgebases have resources to scale to the whole relevant literature and all have to prioritise their efforts.

Results: In this work, we take a first step to alleviating the lack of curator time in RNA science by generating summaries of literature for non-coding RNAs using large language models (LLMs). We demonstrate that high-quality, factually accurate summaries with accurate references can be automatically generated from the literature using a commercial LLM and a chain of prompts and checks. Manual assessment was carried out for a subset of summaries, with the majority being rated extremely high quality. We also applied the most commonly used automated evaluation approaches, finding that they do not correlate with human assessment. Finally, we apply our tool to a selection of over 4,600 ncRNAs and make the generated summaries available via the RNAcentral resource. We conclude that automated literature summarization is feasible with the current generation of LLMs, provided careful prompting and automated checking are applied.

Availability: Code used to produce these summaries can be found here: <https://github.com/RNAcentral/litscan-summarization> and the dataset of contexts and summaries can be found here: <https://huggingface.co/datasets/RNAcentral/litsumm-v1>. Summaries are also displayed on the RNA report pages in RNAcentral (<https://rnacentral.org/>)

Contact: bsweeney@ebi.ac.uk

Supplementary information: Supplementary data are available at Bioinformatics Advances online.

Introduction

Curation in life sciences is the process by which facts about a biological entity or process are extracted from the scientific literature, collated and organised into a structured form for storage in a database. This knowledge can then be more easily understood, compared and computed upon. The curation task is a time consuming and often challenging task in which subject matter experts triage literature, select curateable papers and review them for the rich information they provide about a given biological entity (International Society for Biocuration, 2018). Researchers search curated databases (knowledgebases) for information about the entities they are studying and incorporate curated facts into the design of their next study, which may in turn be curated. This virtuous circle is fundamental to the functioning of research in life sciences.

One of the most basic requirements for a researcher is a broad understanding of their molecule of interest. A broad overview is most easily gained from a short summary of the literature. Such summaries are often produced as part of the curation process, for example UniProt (UniProt Consortium, 2023) gives an overview of a protein's function on its protein entry pages. Similarly, some Model Organism Databases have curator-written descriptions of the genes they contain (e.g. *Saccharomyces* Genome Database (Wong *et al.*, 2023) and FlyBase (Larkin *et al.*, 2021)). Summaries are time consuming to produce because there may be a large amount of disparate information to synthesise; because of the difficulty, many databases still do not yet have summaries for all the entities they contain, e.g. RNAcentral does not contain summaries for ncRNAs. In addition, human written summaries are prone to become out-dated due to the lack of available curator time.

There are a limited number of curators in the world and the rate of publication and the complexity of the research papers continues to increase. The mismatch between the effort that is required, and that which can be applied has led many to use computational techniques at all stages of curation. Natural Language Processing (NLP) has been applied for many years, with cutting edge techniques being used as they become available, however to date these approaches have had limited success. Recently, language models, and in particular Large Language Models (LLMs) have attained sufficient quality to be applicable to curation. Recent efforts have used LLMs to summarise gene sets (Joachimiak *et al.*, 2023), mine knowledge from synthetic biology literature (Xiao *et al.*, 2023), and other tasks previously done by NLP methods (Chen *et al.*, 2023). In most cases, LLMs are able to perform remarkably well with little or no fine-tuning training data, opening the potential for their application in resource limited fields.

One field in which the lack of curation effort is particularly acute is non-coding RNA (ncRNA) science. ncRNAs are any RNA transcribed in the cell which does not encode a protein. ncRNAs are critical to the functioning of the cell by forming the core of the ribosome, splicing pre-mRNAs in the spliceosome, and regulating gene expression through microRNAs (miRNAs) long non-coding RNAs (lncRNAs), snoRNAs and many other RNA types. However, as a field, ncRNA has very little curation resource compared to the field of proteins. Rfam (Kalvari *et al.*, 2021) and RNAcentral (RNAcentral Consortium, 2021) are two of the primary databases in RNA science. Rfam is a database containing over 4,100 RNA

families, while RNAcentral is the ncRNA equivalent of UniProt containing over 30 million sequences at the time of writing. Rfam includes curated descriptions of each RNA family. These descriptions are quite general as they describe the function across all organisms the family is found in. RNAcentral imports data from other resources and as of release 22 contains data from 52 other resources of which 12 provide curated data. However, there are no summaries of the function of specific genes in RNAcentral because few resources provide them, and those that do, do not keep up with the expanding literature. Well-studied ncRNAs have thousands of articles written about them, but very few have summaries of any kind, and those that exist are out of date. Thus, generating summaries of ncRNA genes would be useful to RNA scientists. RNAcentral has previously made efforts to connect users with the relevant literature with the development of the LitScan tool to explore the EuropePMC API and extract citations and relevant sentences from the literature, however LitScan still lacks a way to provide a coherent and comprehensive overview of an RNA.

In this work, we apply a tool based on GPT 3.5 developed by OpenAI to produce automated summaries for a large number of ncRNA genes. Summaries are generated from sentences mentioning ncRNAs extracted from the literature. We detail our approach to sentence acquisition by exploring the EuropePMC API to allow the extraction of relevant passages. These snippets are then passed through a pipeline of selection, summarisation, automated checking, and automated refinement when necessary, which we named LitSumm. The output of this is 4,666 summaries detailing the literature relating to approximately 28,700 transcripts. A randomly selected subset of 50 summaries representative of RNA type and context size are manually evaluated by three expert raters.

In summary, the use of computational techniques, particularly Large Language Models (LLMs), shows promising potential for improving curation efforts in the life sciences field. With the increasing rate of publication and complexity of research papers, the demand for curated knowledge is growing, but the limited number of curators poses a challenge. By leveraging NLP and LLMs, tasks such as generating summaries for non-coding RNA genes can be automated to alleviate the resource limitations and provide valuable insights for RNA scientists.

Methods

RNA selection

To keep costs and computation size within reasonable limits we focus on a subset of RNAs of broad interest to the community. We include RNAs contributed by HGNC (Seal *et al.*, 2023), miRBase (Kozomara *et al.*, 2019), mirGeneDB (Fromm *et al.*, 2022) and snoDB (Bergeron *et al.*, 2023). Within these, we identify primary identifiers and aliases as supplied by the source database.

A large fraction of the RNAs we consider are microRNAs (miRNAs) that are associated with a large corpus of scientific literature. Many of these are referred to by identifiers that are not organism specific such as 'mir-21'. Having non-specific identifiers leads to a very large number of papers that must be summarised, across a diverse range of organisms; this can

lead to confusing or inaccurate statements about the function on a miRNA in a given organism when the function was actually observed elsewhere. More recently, identifiers including an indication of the species have become more common, in this case for example 'hsa-mir-21' for the human specific miRNA. The difference in the number of papers discussing these identifiers is enormous. To ensure the specificity of summaries, we restrict the IDs used to generate summaries of miRNAs to only those specific to a species. The exception to this rule is for human miRNAs coming from HGNC, which often have the identifiers like 'MIR944', and are included in the set of ncRNAs we summarise.

Large Language Models

Large Language Models are a class of machine learning models that have very large numbers of parameters, hundreds of billions is common, and are adept at predicting the most probable next token given an input sequence. LLMs are built on the transformer architecture (Vaswani *et al.*, 2017), in which self-attention and dense layers are stacked to produce a model that can attend to an entire sequence at once. One of the key limitations of the attention mechanism is its compute and memory scaling, which, in the naive implementation, is quadratic in sequence length. Therefore, all LLMs have a maximum sequence length - known as the context length.

Language models, require a passage of text first be 'tokenised' into tokens the model recognises. Context lengths are always given as the number of tokens that can be fed into a model; a helpful rule of thumb is that a token is approximately 0.7 words, so a 4,096 token context would be approximately 3,000 words (Brown *et al.*, 2020).

In this work, GPT 3.5-turbo from OpenAI is used. This is an autoregressive causal language model (Brown *et al.*, 2020), with a context size of 4,096 tokens and a vocabulary of 100,277 tokens. Specifically, we use the gpt-3.5-turbo-0613 model, through the OpenAI API. The primary parameter controlling the text generation is temperature, T , which alters the sampling distribution of the next token; $T=0$ would make the model only choose the most likely next token, while higher values allow the model to explore the distribution of next tokens. We use a relatively low $T=0.1$ (default $T=1$), a balance between determinism and flexibility to rewrite parts of the context into a coherent summary. Low T also reduces the likelihood of model 'hallucinations', a common problem where the LLM will invent facts (Ji *et al.*, 2022).

Two other parameters used to control the generation of the model are the presence and frequency penalties. These alter the sampling distribution by adding a penalty to tokens already present in the text, to reduce repetition. They can also be used to encourage reuse by giving negative values. We use a presence penalty of -2 in the initial summary generation call, to ensure the model re-states tokens from the context in the summary, but with a frequency penalty of 1 to avoid repetition. All operations involving the LLM are abstracted using langchain (<https://github.com/hwchase17/langchain>).

Sentence Acquisition

To gather what is being said about an RNA in the literature, we explore the EuropePMC API using a query designed to find articles discussing non-coding RNA while minimising false positives. Briefly, this entails a search query with the RNA identifier and some additional terms such as 'ncRNA'. We restrict this search to the open access subset at EuropePMC, such that we can access and re-use the full text. RNAcentral's comprehensive and regularly updated collection of cross-references between RNA resources enables us to identify papers that refer to the same RNA using different names or identifiers.

Once articles about an RNA have been identified, the full text is retrieved and searched to 1) validate that the ID is mentioned in the article and 2) extract sentences that mention the ID. The identified articles and the sentences they contain are stored in a database at RNAcentral. The results of this can be seen on RNAcentral, where the tool is referred to as LitScan and has an interface allowing users to explore the results (for example: <https://rnacentral.org/rna/URS000075D66B/9606?tab=pub>). In this work, we use LitScan as a source of statements about RNAs which can be used to provide an overview of the literature about them.

Sentence Selection

Not all ncRNAs are studied equally. For many, we know about their existence only because they have been sequenced and deposited in sequence archives such as ENA (Burgin *et al.*, 2023); for these RNAs, we have no papers to summarise. A significant subset of RNAs appear in only a few articles where their existence is established, and occasionally some aspect of function, localisation or other information is determined. To ensure a reasonable amount of information for the LLM to summarise, we restrict the lower bound of sentence count to 5. These 5 sentences could come from a single paper, which allows summarisation of single papers that present the only source of information about an RNA.

Above this threshold, there are two factors driving the selection of sentences from which to summarise: context length and information coverage. For LitSumm, we restrict ourselves to the 4,096 token context which is available in the standard GPT3.5-turbo model offered by OpenAI (Brown *et al.*, 2020), and impose a limit of 2,560 tokens (approximately 1920 words) in the context to allow for prompting and revisions. For the majority of ncRNAs, the total available sentences fall within this context limit, so no selection is applied beyond the 5 sentence lower limit.

For some ncRNAs however, we find too many sentences to use them all, meaning a selection step is necessary. To select sentences, we apply a topic modelling approach (Grootendorst, 2022). We used the SentenceTransformers package (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019), with the 'all-MiniLM-L6-v2' model to embed each sentence into a 768 dimensional vector. Then, the UMAP dimensionality reduction technique (McInnes *et al.*, 2018) is applied to reduce the vector dimension to 20, and the HDBSCAN clustering algorithm (McInnes and Healy, 2017) produces clusters of similar sentences. Cluster exemplars were sampled in a round-robin fashion until the context was filled to ensure a broad coverage of topics. In the case where all exemplars did not fill the context, sentences were sampled from the clusters themselves in the same round-robin way. For some RNAs, there were too many sentences

to use all, but not enough to apply the topic modelling approach. In this case, the sentences were sorted in descending order of tokenised length, and the first k-sentences were taken such that the context was filled.

An important minority of ncRNAs are very heavily studied. These include ncRNAs like XIST, MALAT1 and NEAT1, each of which appear in thousands of articles. In these cases, our selection technique still results in too many tokens, so we apply a greedy selection algorithm to the cluster exemplars. An exemplar is selected in the largest cluster, then the vector embedding is used to calculate the similarity to all exemplars in other clusters. The exemplar least similar to the selected exemplar is selected, and the process continues by evaluating the distance from all selected exemplars. The process repeats until the context is filled.

Prompts

One of the most critical criteria for a scientific summary is that it contains only factual information. Additionally, tracing the provenance of statements in the summary is important for verifiability. We have designed a chain of prompts through iterative refinement on a subset of examples with these objectives in mind. The first prompt generates the summary, and if there are problems, subsequent prompts attempt to guide the LLM into rectifying them.

The first prompt is shown in figure 1.

```
As an experienced academic who ALWAYS provides
references for each sentence you write, produce a
summary from the text below, focusing on {ent_id} and
using the references for each sentence.

{context_str}

The reference for each sentence in the text is given at
the end of the sentence, enclosed by [].
For example, the first sentence has the reference
[{first_ref}].
References should only be provided at the end of
sentences, and MUST follow the style in the context.
Do not list references at the end of the summary.
You MUST provide at least one reference per sentence
you produce.
Use only the information in the context given above.
Start your summary with a brief description of {ent_id},
noting its type.
Use 200 words or less.

Summary:
```

Figure 1: The initial prompt used to generate a first pass summary from the generated context. Variables are enclosed in {} and are replaced with their values before sending the prompt to the LLM.

Here, the model is instructed several times to use references, and the style of reference desired, with an example. The LLM is further instructed not to use 'external sources'; this aims to stop the LLM inserting any facts that are not present in the context. While these facts may be accurate, there is no way of finding out where they come from, and they may be

inaccurate, which we try to avoid at all costs. These instructions, combined with the sampling parameters reduce the likelihood of the model inserting facts not present in the context.

After the summary is returned from the model, references are evaluated. This consists of five checks, any one of which can trigger a re-generation of the summary. The five checks are:

1. Adequacy of references - are there enough references for the number of sentences in the summary? We require at least 0.5 references per sentence.
2. Formatting of references - We require the model to cite sentences by using PubMed Central identifiers [PMCXXXXXX].
3. Realness of references - Are all the references in the summary present in the context? This should catch cases where the model has invented a PMCID.
4. Location of references - references should be at the end of sentences usually. This is intended to stop the model from putting all references at the end of the summary and not indicating which statement comes from which reference.
5. Number of references per instance - this check catches the model putting many PMCID into a single pair of brackets, which is undesirable for the purposes of provenance checking. We require no more than 50% of the total number of references in any given citation.

Each check has a specific 'rescue' prompt which is applied when the summary makes the particular mistake. There are four of these, shown in figure A1 in the supplementary material. To keep the computation time and cost reasonable, a maximum of 4 attempts are given to produce a summary. If the summary is still not produced after these attempts, it is flagged as potentially problematic.

Once all reference based checks have passed, the accuracy of the summary is evaluated. To do this, the summary is broken into a bulleted list, and provided alongside the original context. The model is instructed to state whether each bullet is true or false based on the context, and to find the support in the context. Importantly we not only ask for a true/false, but also ask for an explanation of why. When a summary contains a misleading or false statement, the output of this step, along with the summary, is fed back to the model which is instructed to amend the summary accordingly. These two steps combine approaches to LLM self-fact checking (Peng *et al.*, 2023) and chain-of-thought prompting (Wei *et al.*, 2022). In combination, these improve summaries. The prompts used in these stages are shown in figure 2




Figure 2: The self-consistency checking prompt, and the revision prompt used if any of the statements are found to be false.

Once this stage is complete, the summary is given a final reference check, and if successful the summary is considered finished.

Human and Automated Assessment

To evaluate the quality of the output, a subset of the summaries was assessed in parallel by three reviewers. These reviewers were chosen from the coauthors and were specifically selected to represent diverse academic backgrounds, including expertise in data curation, RNA biology, and machine learning. A subset of 50 summaries was randomly selected, stratified by context length, and loaded into a web platform to provide feedback. Summaries were presented alongside the context from which they were generated to allow the raters to evaluate the claims made in the summary. The ratings were given on a 1-5 scale based on the rubric shown in table B1 in supplementary materials, where a rating of 1 would indicate serious problems with a summary (e.g. fake references, inaccurate statements etc) and 5 would indicate an excellent summary (all statements referenced and true, good flow, etc). Raters were asked to score a summary based only on the information in the context, not using any extra information from the linked articles, or their own knowledge. We also asked a series of yes/no questions designed to identify particular failure modes, these are also shown in table B2 of the supplementary materials.

Following the collection of human ratings, several automated metrics were explored for their correlation with the human derived scores. The classical summary evaluation metrics such as ROUGE (Lin) and its derivatives were evaluated, as well as more recent developments like BERTscore (Zhang *et al.*, 2019).

Results

From the four databases considered, 4,674 RNA identifiers were selected for summarisation. This represents a coverage of approximately 28,700 transcripts in RNAcentral, and approximately 177,500 papers containing the identifiers. The distribution of RNA types is shown in figure 3




Figure 3: The distribution of RNA types selected for summarization. The majority (40%) are lncRNA coming from HGNC, with the next largest constituent being miRNA and pre-miRNA (33% and 16% respectively). snoRNAs make up 6% of the selection, with 3% being other types

The majority of RNAs types come from the RNA type specific databases miRBase, mirGeneDB and snoDB; all lncRNAs come from HGNC and are therefore only those found in humans. The small number of ‘other’ type RNAs are from HGNC including for example rRNAs, RNAses and some RNAs with imprecise type labels such as the generic ncRNA. As expected from the chosen databases, the majority of the RNAs selected are human, with non-human RNAs coming primarily from miRBase and mirGeneDB.

The full generation process for each summary, including the automated checking, consistency checking and all revisions took on average 39 seconds and cost \$0.006. An example summary is shown in figure 4, and all summaries can be browsed by going to the RNAcentral website and searching ‘has_litsumm:”True”’ (https://test.rnacentral.org/search?q=has_litsumm:%22True%22). We also make the entire dataset available online at <https://huggingface.co/datasets/RNAcentral/litsumm-v1>.

LINC02499 is a long intergenic non-coding RNA (lncRNA) that has been extensively studied in hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) [PMC9775998]. Multiple studies have reported a significant decrease in LINC02499 expression in HCC tissues compared to adjacent non-tumor tissues [PMC9775998] [PMC9720162] [PMC8167205] [PMC9170944]. Decreased LINC02499 expression has also been associated with poorer overall survival in HCC patients [PMC9775998] [PMC9720162]. LINC02499 has been identified as one of the top-ranking lncRNAs affecting the expression of CYP3A5, a gene involved in drug metabolism, in the liver [PMC9775998]. It has also been found to be associated with CYP3A4 and CYP3A7 expression [PMC9775998]. Furthermore, LINC02499 has been shown to inhibit the proliferation, migration, and invasion of HCC cells in vitro, suggesting its potential as a therapeutic target for HCC treatment [PMC9720162] [PMC8167205] [PMC7812168]. Additionally, LINC02499 has been identified as part of prognostic signatures for patients with HBV-related HCC and as an independent risk factor for determining HCC patient prognosis [PMC8831247] [PMC9720162]. It has also shown potential as a diagnostic biomarker for HCC with high sensitivity and specificity values reported in one study [PMC7812168].

Figure 4: Example summary generated by the tool. This example is a lncRNA, examples for other RNA types can be found in supplementary materials, appendix C.

Automated checking, primarily of reference adequacy and accuracy identified problems in 31% of summaries which were adequately rectified within the four allowed revisions in 85% of cases, meaning overall 95% of summaries passed our automated checks. The self-consistency check identified problems in 9% of summaries, which were rectified in 74% of cases giving an overall pass rate of 97%. The pass rates at each stage are shown in table 1.

An example of the type of error identified and rectified by the consistency check is shown in figure 5.

Based on the provided context, here is the fact-checking of the statements:

1. CTBP1-DT is a long non-coding RNA (lncRNA) that plays a role in DNA damage-induced DDUP translation [PMC9371908].
- True. The provided context states that CTBP1-DT is a long non-coding RNA (lncRNA) that plays a role in DNA damage-induced DDUP translation [PMC9371908].
2. The 5'UTR of the CTBP1-DT gene contains upstream open reading frames (uORFs) and internal ribosome entry site (IRES) regions, which are involved in this translation process [PMC9371908].
- True. The provided context states that the 5'UTR of the CTBP1-DT gene contains upstream open reading frames (uORFs) and internal ribosome entry site (IRES) regions, which are involved in DNA damage-induced DDUP translation [PMC9371908].
3. The expression of CTBP1-DT was measured in relation to ETV5 knockdown or overexpression [PMC8660778].
- False. The provided context does not mention anything about the expression of CTBP1-DT being measured in relation to ETV5 knockdown or overexpression. Therefore, there is no supporting evidence for this statement.

Figure 5: Example output of the veracity checker. In this case, CTBP1-DT presents two sentences validated as TRUE and one FALSE sentence. The offending sentence has been removed by the model in the final summary.

Human evaluation was carried out for a subset of 50 randomly sampled RNAs. These RNAs cover the full range of context sizes and ncRNA types. The human rating, on a scale of 1-5 with 5 being excellent and 1 indicating the presence of some serious failure is shown for 3 raters in figure 6.




Figure 6: A: The distribution of ratings from three raters asked to assess the quality of summaries. B: The average rating per summary across all raters

From the human ratings, >50% of summaries were rated good or excellent. The majority of cases where a summary was rated inadequate (score of 2 or less) the problem identified by the raters was to do with inadequate or inaccurate referencing, for example using numbered references, or hallucinating author-year style references, both of which are penalised strongly in the marking rubric. A summary of the failures identified is shown in table 2.

A subset of the summaries also contained misleading statements not caught by the automated checking prompt. These arose as a result of sentence order in the context, where consecutive sentences could be combined in a misleading way. The LLM combines the sentences, with references, into a single untrue statement but then fails to detect the failure because there is ‘supporting evidence’ in the context. This failure mode is due to the way in which the context was constructed, and led the model to over-claim in certain cases. The sensitivity of LLMs to their input construction is a known issue in multi-document summarisation, where the synthesis of ‘facts’ across multiple sources can often be problematic (DeYoung *et al.*, 2023).

The correlation between human ratings and automated metrics has been evaluated and found to be nonexistent, with neither ROUGE-based scores or BERTScore having any significant correlation with any of the raters. This phenomenon has been observed by others (Wang *et al.*, 2023); we show these correlations in supplementary materials for completeness. Inter-rater agreement was also found to be poor, with a best Cohen’s Kappa of 0.14 indicating many disagreements between raters. We hypothesise that this is related to the relative experience of the raters, both with RNA science and with the task of literature curation. The result of the inter-rater analysis is shown in supplementary materials figure E1.

Discussion

In this work we present an application of LLMs to perform literature curation for ncRNA. We show that a pipeline with a series of automated checks and carefully designed prompts can produce high-quality literature summaries. We also demonstrate techniques to minimise untrue information, and ensure high quality referencing in the summary.

Human ratings of a representative subset of the summaries generated have been collected, and show that the majority of summaries are of high or very high quality, with a small number of common failure modes. The identified failure modes primarily fall into two categories - relating to referencing, and relating to information synthesis/inference from multiple sources.

LLM driven summarisation has been done in several other fields. For example, Joachimiak *et al.* developed a similar tool, SPINDOCTOR, which is used to generate a summary from gene descriptions; the summary is then used in a gene enrichment analysis (Joachimiak *et al.*, 2023). Joachimiak *et al.* evaluate the results of their gene enrichment against standard tools and find their method is comparable, though it misses some important terms. However, they do not assess the consistency of their summary with the context from which it is

generated, and do not give the provenance of statements, since their input is human-derived.

One field in which similar considerations have to be made is medicine, where the accuracy and provenance of statements is paramount. Shaib *et al.* evaluate GPT 3 for the summarization and synthesis of many randomised controlled trial reports. They find that while the LLM produces coherent summaries, it often fails to synthesise information from multiple sources adequately, and may be over-confident in its conclusions (Shaib *et al.*, 2023). In our evaluation we find similar failure modes, where the model misunderstands statements where it tries to synthesise information from more than one source.

A key aspect of our pipeline is the use of self consistency checking and revision using chain-of-thought prompting. These two concepts have been applied in other contexts, such as question answering over documents (Pereira *et al.*, 2022), but have yet to be applied to literature curation. Despite our best efforts to reduce hallucinations and ensure wholly factual summaries, around 10% of cases still have some problems, indicating the need for consistency checking. Feeding the output of the self checking back into the model reduces this to 3%, which is encouraging, but also indicates the need for human intervention in this complex field where LLMs still struggle to fully comprehend scientific literature. In particular, the consistency check developed here is not effective at identifying inferences made by the LLM that are incorrect, because there is 'indirect' support in the context. This is an area of active research in the NLP field generally, and will be addressed in future work.

Another limitation relates to the literature itself, and here is primarily seen with miRNAs. We have restricted ourselves to species specific IDs (e.g. hsa-mir-126), meaning the generated summaries should be consistent and limited to a single organism, but because a significant fraction of the literature does not use these IDs, we are missing information. There are ways this could be addressed - for example using the ORGANISMS database (Pafilis *et al.*, 2013) to identify which organism a given article is about and then use this information to produce organism specific summaries, despite the usage of non-specific terms. But the accuracy of such resources is questionable, meaning we do not know which organism a paper discusses at present. We leave this problem as future work.

In this work, the correlation between human and automated ratings has been found to be nonexistent. Wang *et al.* (Wang *et al.*, 2023) evaluated seven automated metrics for the quality of multi-document summarisation in the medical domain and found that none correlated with human ratings except for the Population-Intervention-Outcome (PIO) based metrics. This is likely because the automated metrics do not measure useful variables; for example the ROUGE metrics primarily compare n-gram overlap between the source and summary, which does not capture instances of hallucination or inaccurate fact synthesis. The BERTscore metric similarly works by comparing sentence embeddings, which is also unlikely to capture the types of error observed. A version of PIO may be applicable for ncRNAs, and will be explored in future work.

We also found that inter-rater agreement was poor despite the use of an assessment rubric. We hypothesise this is due to the difference in experience and familiarity with literature curation between the raters. Inter-rater agreement is an open problem in generative AI in general, and has been shown to be very variable in several applications of

sequence-to-sequence models (Wang *et al.*, 2023; Wallace *et al.*, 2021; Kreutzer *et al.*, 2018). One way to alleviate this problem may be to switch from an ordinal 1-5 rating scale to a comparative scale, which has been shown to improve inter-rater agreement in reinforcement learning with Human feedback (RLHF) (Hills, 2023). However, this type of rating is unlikely to capture fine-grained problems which make up the majority of the issues identified in the summaries here.

One limitation which will be difficult to address is the openness of literature. Our sentences come from the open-access subset of EuropePMC. While this datasource is growing as more authors publish open-access, it still does not allow access to the majority of knowledge, particularly that from earlier decades. Many knowledgebases make extensive use of closed-access literature in their curation; their primary concern is the quality of the information being curated, not the availability of the information, therefore the open access status of a paper is not an impediment to its being curated. However, the inability of this tool, and those which will doubtless come after it, to use closed-access literature does highlight the need for authors, institutions and funders to push for open access publication with a permissive licence for reuse.

Often there is too much literature available to feed all of it into an LLM to generate a summary. Recently, LLMs have been getting considerably larger context sizes, for example GPT 3.5 can now accept up to 16k tokens. However, this is unlikely to be a solution in itself; LLMs do not attend to their entire context equally (Liu *et al.*, 2023), and having a larger context and expecting the LLM to use it all is unlikely to work, though some recent work has shown that this may be soluble (Xiong *et al.*, 2023). In this work, topic modelling is used to reduce the amount of text to be summarised. This introduces problems related to the context construction that lead to inaccurate sentences being generated by the LLM. Worse, the automated fact checking is blind to this type of failure, due to there being 'evidence' in the context which supports the inaccurate sentence. A better approach may be to decompose the summary into sections and apply a retrieval augmented generation (Lewis *et al.*, 2020) approach to each in turn by applying semantic search for only passages about, for example, expression.

The field of LLM research is moving extremely rapidly and we expect that significant improvements will be possible in our pipeline simply by adopting newer LLM technology. Our current work is based on GPT3.5, and we can see that publicly available models based on LLAMA2 are likely surpassing its quality. Moving to openly available models could enable future work on fine-tuning the LLM for the biological summarisation task.

In summary, we have demonstrated that LLMs are a powerful tool for the summarisation of scientific literature and, with appropriate prompting, can produce summaries of high quality with adequate references. This is the first step to automating the summarisation of literature in ncRNAs, and providing helpful overviews to researchers

Availability

All code used to produce these summaries can be found here: <https://github.com/RNAcentral/litscan-summarization> and the dataset of contexts and

summaries can be found here: <https://huggingface.co/datasets/RNAcentral/litsumm-v1>. Summaries are also displayed on the RNA report pages in RNAcentral (<https://rnacentral.org/>) and can be explored by searching with the query 'has_litsumm:"True"'

Funding

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions under grant agreement No 945405; and from Wellcome Trust [218302/Z/19/Z]. For the purpose of open access, the author has applied a CC BY public copyright licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this submission. AB and BS are funded by core EMBL funds.

Conflict of Interest: A.B. is Editor-in-Chief of Bioinformatics Advances, but was not involved in the editorial process of this manuscript.

References

- Bergeron,D. *et al.* (2023) snoDB 2.0: an enhanced interactive database, specializing in human snoRNAs. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **51**, D291–D296.
- Brown,T.B. *et al.* (2020) Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. *arXiv [cs.CL]*.
- Burgin,J. *et al.* (2023) The European Nucleotide Archive in 2022. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **51**, D121–D125.
- Chen,Q. *et al.* (2023) A Comprehensive Benchmark Study on Biomedical Text Generation and Mining with ChatGPT. *bioRxiv*, 2023.04.19.537463.
- DeYoung,J. *et al.* (2023) Do Multi-Document Summarization Models Synthesize? *arXiv [cs.CL]*.
- Fromm,B. *et al.* (2022) MirGeneDB 2.1: toward a complete sampling of all major animal phyla. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **50**, D204–D210.
- Grootendorst,M. (2022) BERTopic: Neural topic modeling with a class-based TF-IDF procedure. *arXiv [cs.CL]*.
- Hills,O.H.L. (2023) Leveraging Human Feedback to Scale Educational Datasets: Combining Crowdworkers and Comparative Judgement. *arXiv [cs.CL]*.
- International Society for Biocuration (2018) Biocuration: Distilling data into knowledge. *PLoS Biol.*, **16**, e2002846.
- Ji,Z. *et al.* (2022) Survey of Hallucination in Natural Language Generation. *arXiv [cs.CL]*.
- Joachimiak,M.P. *et al.* (2023) Gene Set Summarization using Large Language Models. *ArXiv*.
- Kalvari,I. *et al.* (2021) Rfam 14: expanded coverage of metagenomic, viral and microRNA families. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **49**, D192–D200.
- Kozomara,A. *et al.* (2019) miRBase: from microRNA sequences to function. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **47**, D155–D162.
- Kreutzer,J. *et al.* (2018) Reliability and Learnability of Human Bandit Feedback for Sequence-to-Sequence Reinforcement Learning. *arXiv [cs.CL]*.
- Larkin,A. *et al.* (2021) FlyBase: updates to the Drosophila melanogaster knowledge base. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **49**, D899–D907.
- Lewis,P. *et al.* (2020) Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks. *arXiv [cs.CL]*.
- Lin,C.-Y. ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries.
- Liu,N.F. *et al.* (2023) Lost in the Middle: How Language Models Use Long Contexts. *arXiv [cs.CL]*.

- McInnes, L. *et al.* (2018) UMAP: Uniform Manifold Approximation and Projection for Dimension Reduction. *arXiv [stat.ML]*.
- McInnes, L. and Healy, J. (2017) Accelerated Hierarchical Density Based Clustering. In, *2017 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining Workshops (ICDMW)*., pp. 33–42.
- Pafilis, E. *et al.* (2013) The SPECIES and ORGANISMS Resources for Fast and Accurate Identification of Taxonomic Names in Text. *PLoS One*, **8**, e65390.
- Peng, B. *et al.* (2023) Check Your Facts and Try Again: Improving Large Language Models with External Knowledge and Automated Feedback. *arXiv [cs.CL]*.
- Pereira, J. *et al.* (2022) Visconde: Multi-document QA with GPT-3 and Neural Reranking. *arXiv [cs.CL]*.
- Reimers, N. and Gurevych, I. (2019) Sentence-BERT: Sentence Embeddings using Siamese BERT-Networks. *arXiv [cs.CL]*.
- RNAcentral Consortium (2021) RNAcentral 2021: secondary structure integration, improved sequence search and new member databases. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **49**, D212–D220.
- Seal, R.L. *et al.* (2023) Genenames.org: the HGNC resources in 2023. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **51**, D1003–D1009.
- Shaib, C. *et al.* (2023) Summarizing, Simplifying, and Synthesizing Medical Evidence Using GPT-3 (with Varying Success). *arXiv [cs.CL]*.
- UniProt Consortium (2023) UniProt: the Universal Protein Knowledgebase in 2023. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **51**, D523–D531.
- Vaswani, A. *et al.* (2017) Attention Is All You Need. *arXiv [cs.CL]*.
- Wallace, B.C. *et al.* (2021) Generating (Factual?) Narrative Summaries of RCTs: Experiments with Neural Multi-Document Summarization. *AMIA Jt Summits Transl Sci Proc*, **2021**, 605–614.
- Wang, L.L. *et al.* (2023) Automated Metrics for Medical Multi-Document Summarization Disagree with Human Evaluations. *arXiv [cs.CL]*.
- Wei, J. *et al.* (2022) Chain-of-Thought Prompting Elicits Reasoning in Large Language Models. *arXiv [cs.CL]*.
- Wong, E.D. *et al.* (2023) Saccharomyces genome database update: server architecture, pan-genome nomenclature, and external resources. *Genetics*, **224**.
- Xiao, Z. *et al.* (2023) Generative artificial intelligence GPT-4 accelerates knowledge mining and machine learning for synthetic biology. *bioRxiv*, 2023.06.14.544984.
- Xiong, W. *et al.* (2023) Effective Long-Context Scaling of Foundation Models. *arXiv [cs.CL]*.
- Zhang, T. *et al.* (2019) BERTScore: Evaluating Text Generation with BERT. *arXiv [cs.CL]*.

Table 1: Failure modes and their observed rates in the summaries generated by LitSumm.

Failure mode	Pass rate	Number of passing summaries
References - first pass	69%	3,203
References - after revision	95%	4,452
Self-consistency - no problems found	91%	4,246
Self consistency - no problems after revision	97%	4,556

Table 2: reasons given for poor rating in those cases where a rating less than 3 was given. The majority are due to poor reference formatting, or the inclusion of hallucinated references. Note that in some cases multiple failures were identified in a single summary, meaning the total number of failures exceeds the total number of summaries.

Rater	Total (out of 50 summaries)	Reference Formatting	Hallucination/false info	Other
Rater 0	23	14	12	5
Rater 1	20	9	9	9
Rater 2	10	7	3	6