
DISTANTLY SUPERVISED END-TO-END MEDICAL ENTITY EXTRACTION FROM ELECTRONIC HEALTH RECORDS WITH HUMAN-LEVEL QUALITY

A PREPRINT

Alexander Nesterov
Sber Artificial Intelligence Laboratory
Moscow, Russian Federation 121170
AINesterov@sberbank.ru

Dmitry Umerenkov
Sber Artificial Intelligence Laboratory
Moscow, Russian Federation 121170
Umerenkov.D.E@sberbank.ru

January, 2022

ABSTRACT

Medical entity extraction (EE) is a standard procedure used as a first stage in medical texts processing. Usually Medical EE is a two-step process: named entity recognition (NER) and named entity normalization (NEN). We propose a novel method of doing medical EE from electronic health records (EHR) as a single-step multi-label classification task by fine-tuning a transformer model pretrained on a large EHR dataset. Our model is trained end-to-end in a distantly supervised manner using targets automatically extracted from medical knowledge base. We show that our model learns to generalize for entities that are present frequently enough, achieving human-level classification quality for most frequent entities. Our work demonstrates that medical entity extraction can be done end-to-end without human supervision and with human quality given the availability of a large enough amount of unlabeled EHR and a medical knowledge base.

Keywords named entity recognition, named entity normalization, entity extraction, distantly supervised learning

1 Introduction

Wide adoption of electronic health records (EHR) in the medical care industry has led to accumulation of large volumes of medical data (Pathak et al., 2013). This data contains information about the symptoms, syndromes, diseases, lab results, patient treatments and presents an important source of data for building various medical systems (Birkhead et al., 2015). Information extracted from medical records is used for clinical support systems (CSS) (Shao et al., 2016; Topaz et al., 2016; Zhang et al., 2014), lethality estimation (Jo et al., 2015; Luo and Rumshisky, 2016), drug side-effects discovery (LePendou et al., 2012; Li et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2009), selection of patients for clinical and epidemiological studies (Mathias et al., 2012; Kaelber et al., 2012; Manion et al., 2012), medical knowledge discovery (Hanauer et al., 2014; Jensen et al., 2012) and personalized medicine (Yu et al., 2019). Large volumes of medical text data and multiple applicable tasks determine the importance of accurate and efficient information extraction from EHR.

Information extraction from electronic health records is a difficult natural language processing task. EHR present a heterogeneous dynamic combination of structured, semi-structured and unstructured texts. Such records contain patients' complaints, anamnesis, demographic data, lab results, instrumental results, diagnoses, drugs, dosages, medical procedures and other information contained in medical records (Wilcox, 2015). Electronic health records are characterised by several linguistic phenomena making them harder to process.

- Rich special terminology, complex and volatile sentence structure.
- Often missing term parts and punctuation.
- Many abbreviations, special symbols and punctuation marks.

- Context-dependant terms and large number of synonyms.
- Multi-word terms, fragmented and non-contiguous terms.

From practical point of view the task of medical information extraction splits into entity extraction and relation extraction. We focus on medical entity extraction in this work. In the case of medical texts such entities represent symptoms, diagnoses, drug names etc.

Entity extraction, also referred as Concept Extraction is a task of extracting from free text a list of concepts or entities present. Often this task is combined with finding boundaries of extracted entities as an intermediate step. Medical entity extraction in practice divides into two sequential tasks: Named entity recognition (NER) and Named entity normalization (NEN). During NER sequences of tokens that contain entities are selected from original text. During NEN each sequence is linked with specific concepts from knowledge base (KB). We used Unified Medical Language System (UMLS) KB (Bodenreider, 2004) as the source of medical entities in this paper.

In this paper we make the following contributions. First, we show that a single transformer model (Devlin et al., 2018) is able to perform NER and NEN for electronic health records simultaneously by using the representation of EHR for a single multi-label classification task. Second, we show that provided a large enough number of examples such model can be trained using only automatically assigned labels from KB to generalize to unseen and difficult cases. Finally, we empirically estimate the number of examples needed to achieve human-quality medical entity extraction using such distantly-supervised setup.

2 Related work

First systems for named entity extraction from medical texts combined NER and NEN using term vocabularies and heuristic rules. One of the first such systems was the Linguistic String Project - Medical Language Processor, described in Sager et al. (1986). Columbia University developed Medical Language Extraction and Encoding System (MedLEE), using rule-based models at first and subsequently adding feature-based models (Friedman, 1997). Since 2000 the National Library of Medicine of USA develops the MetaMap system, based mainly on rule-based approaches (Aronson et al., 2000). Rule-based approaches depend heavily on volume and fullness of dictionaries and number of applied rules. These systems are also very brittle in the sense that their quality drops sharply when applied to texts from new subdomains or new institutions.

Entity extraction in general falls into three broad categories: rule-based, feature-based and deep-learning (DL) based. Deep learning models consist of context encoder and tag decoder. The context encoder applies a DL model to produce a sequence of contextualized token representation used as input for tag decoder which assign entity class for each token in sequence. For a comprehensive survey see (Li et al., 2020). In most entity extraction systems the EE task is explicitly (or for some DL models implicitly) separated into NER and NEN tasks.

Feature-based approaches solve the NER task as a sequence markup problem by applying such feature-based models as Hidden Markov Models (Okanohara et al., 2006) and Conditional Random Fields (Lu et al., 2015). The downside of such models is the requirement of extensive feature engineering. Another method for NER is to use DL models (Ma and Hovy, 2016; Lample et al., 2016). These models not only select text spans containing named entities but also extract quality entity representations which can be used as input for NEN. For example in (Ma and Hovy, 2016) authors combine DL bidirectional long short-term memory network and conditional random fields.

Main approaches for NEN task are: rule-based (D'Souza and Ng, 2015; Kang et al., 2013), feature-based (Xu et al., 2017b; Leaman et al., 2013) and DL methods (Li et al., 2017a; Luo et al., 2018a) and their different combinations (Luo et al., 2018b). Among DL approaches a popular way is to use distance metrics between entity representations (Ghiasvand and Kate, 2014) or ranking metrics (Xu et al., 2017b; Leaman et al., 2013). In addition to ranking tasks DL models are used to create contextualized and more representative term embeddings. This is done with a wide range of models: Word2Vec (Mikolov et al., 2013; Peters et al., 2018), GPT (Radford et al., 2018), BERT (Devlin et al., 2018). The majority of approaches combine several DL models to extract context-aware representations which are used for ranking or classification using a dictionary of reference entity representations (Ji et al., 2020).

The majority of modern medical EE systems sequentially apply NER and NEN. Considering that NER and NEN models themselves are often multistage the full EE systems are often complex combinations of multiple ML and DL models. Such models are hard to train end-to-end and if the NER task fails the whole system fails. This can be partially mitigated by simultaneous training of NER and NEN components. In (Durrett and Klein, 2014) a CRF model is used to train NER and NEN simultaneously. In Le et al. (2015) proposed a model that merged NER and NEN at prediction time, but not during training. In Leaman and Lu (2016) proposed semi-Markov Models architecture that merged NER and NEN

Table 1: Medical entity group statistics

Entity group	Total terms	Instances in train	Instances in test
Diagnostic Procedure	157	654.222	301.279
Disease or Syndrome	1307	2.204.636	2.318.028
Finding	475	2.137.647	1.287.896
Injury or Poisoning	168	230.543	159.913
Laboratory Procedure	141	891.110	380.129
Neoplastic Process	212	132.732	117.311
Pathologic Function	231	600.567	288.433
Pharmacologic Substance	324	474.033	263.762
Sign or Symptom	368	3.912.937	2.279.892
Therapeutic or Preventive Procedure	352	287.533	218.826
All other groups	699	3.527.664	1.821.642

both at training and inference time. Even with such merging of NER and NEN both tasks were present in the pipeline which proves problematic in difficult cases with multi-word entities or single entities with non-relevant text insertions.

A number of deep-learning EE models (Strubell et al., 2017; Li et al., 2017b; Xu et al., 2017a; Devlin et al., 2018; Cui and Zhang, 2019) do not split the EE task into NER and NEN implicitly and use a single linear classification layer over token representations as the tag decoder. Our model is mostly identical to the model described in (Devlin et al., 2018) with the difference that instead of using a contextualized representation of each token to classify it as an entity we use the representation of the whole text to extract all entities present in the text at once. This architecture does not represent the positions of entities in the text, we believe that the presence of a term in the text is known, then it is not difficult to determine its position.

Supervised training of EE systems requires large amount of annotated data, this is especially challenging for domain-specific EE where domain-expert annotations is costly and/or slow to obtain. To avoid the need of hand-annotated data various weakly-supervised methods were developed. A particular instance of weak annotation is distant annotation which relies on external knowledge base to automatically label texts with entities from KB (Mintz et al., 2009; Ritter et al., 2013; Shang et al., 2018). Distant supervision can be applied to automatically label training data, and has gained successes in various natural language processing tasks, including entity recognition (Ren et al., 2015; Fries et al., 2017; He, 2017). We use distant annotation in this paper to label our train and test datasets.

3 Data

3.1 Electronic health records datasets

In this work we used two proprietary Russian language EHR datasets, containing anonymized information. First one contains information about 2,248,359 visits of 429,478 patients to two networks of private clinics from 2005 to 2019. This dataset does not contain hospital records and was used for training the model. The second dataset was used for testing purposes and comes from a regional network of public clinics and hospitals. Testing dataset contains 1,728,259 visits from 2014 to 2019 of 694,063 patients.

3.2 Medical knowledge base

We used UMLS as our medical KB and a source of medical entity dictionary for this paper. A subset of UMLS, Medical Dictionary for Regulatory Activities (MedDRA) was used to obtain translation of terms to Russian language. After merging the synonymous terms we selected 10000 medical entities which appeared most frequently in our training dataset. To find the terms we used a distantly supervised labelling procedure as described in next section. To increase the stability of presented results we decided to keep only terms that appear at least 10 times in the test dataset reducing the total number of entities to 4434. Medical terms were grouped according to UMLS taxonomy, statistics for group distribution are shown in Table 1.

3.3 Distant supervision labeling

Combining an EHR dataset and a list of terms from medical KB we used a simple rule-based model for train and test datasets labeling. The exact procedure for each record was as follows:

- Input text was transformed to lower case, all known abbreviations were expanded, and all words were lemmatized using pymorphy2 (Korobov, 2015)
- We selected all possible candidates using sliding window with lengths from 1 to 7 words
- All possible candidates were compared to all possible synonyms of medical entities
- Exact matches between candidate and medical terms from KB were considered to be positive cases.

4 Model

In this paper we used a EhrRuBERT model. For pretraining this model we use a BERT-Base model initialized by the RuBERT weights (Kuratov and Arkhipov, 2019). Further we pretrained the BERT model on the large corpus electronic health records using a basic masked language modeling task with a 0.15 probability of each token to be masked. By using a tokenizer fitted on medical texts and medical pretraining datasets we expect our model to learn domain-specific token embeddings.

A linear classification layer with 10000 outputs was added as the last model layer (Fig 1.). This layer was initialized with weights from normal distribution with mean=-0,1 and std=0,11 to have at the start of training a low prediction probability for all classes.

We trained our model with binary crossentropy loss and Adam optimizer (Kingma and Ba, 2014) with learning rate 0.00001 making one pass over training dataset with training batches of size 20. To speed up training we used dynamic class weightings, classes not present in the current batch were given less weight compared to classes present. Model architecture is shown on Figure 1.




Figure 1: Model architecture

5 Results

5.1 Distant labels

Using distantly-generated labels we calculated the recall of our model on the test dataset. Our expectations were that with enough training examples the model should achieve recall close to 1. We found that for some categories for like 'Pharmacologic Substance' the model did not learn to correctly find entities even with a large enough number of training




Figure 2: Relation between number of training examples and recall on test data

instances. The relation between number of training examples and recall on the test for entity classes: Sign or Symptom, Finding and Pharmacological Substance, and for all entities is shown on Fig 2.

As can be seen in Table 2 the number of training examples needed to achieve given recall differs between classes with some classes needing noticeably more examples. There could be numerous sources of such difference: tokenization, number of synonyms, difficult context (substances are often as encountered lists mixed with dosages) and others. Even for the harder classes fifty thousand examples are enough to find nearly all distant labels

5.2 Human labeling

A major disadvantage of our labelling procedure is its incompleteness. Any slight change of known term, a typo or a rare abbreviation will lead to missed entities. This makes estimating the precision of the model impossible with such labels. To compare our model with a human benchmark we randomly selected 1500 records from the testing dataset for hand labelling by a medical practitioner with 7 years of experience. These records were labeled for 15 most common entities in train dataset. After labeling we further analysed the cases where the model disagreed with human annotator by splitting all instances into following cases:

- both correct - model and annotator found the term (true positive)
- both correct - model and annotator did not find the term (true negative)
- model correct - found term missed by annotator (model true positive)

Table 2: Recall on test dataset

Entity group	Examples in train dataset							
	>0		>500		>2.500		>50.000	
	#	recall	#	recall	#	recall	#	recall
Diagnostic Procedure	157	0.39	63	0.76	29	0.86	6	1.0
Disease or Syndrome	1307	0.33	338	0.83	138	0.91	10	0.99
Finding	475	0.42	167	0.81	80	0.93	10	0.99
Injury or Poisoning	168	0.33	26	0.88	8	0.96	1	0.98
Laboratory Procedure	141	0.44	75	0.71	35	0.86	2	0.99
Neoplastic Process	212	0.18	28	0.78	12	0.90	0	-
Pathologic Function	231	0.32	61	0.81	25	0.92	4	0.98
Pharmacologic Substance	324	0.26	104	0.53	40	0.60	1	0.95
Sign or Symptom	368	0.55	159	0.87	87	0.95	14	0.99
Therapeutic Procedure	352	0.30	74	0.82	24	0.86	0	-
All entities	4434	0.36	1344	0.79	608	0.89	62	0.98

Table 3: Discrepancies between human and model labeling

Entity	Examples	both		correct		model	
		tp	tn	tp	tn	tp	tn
Pain (Sign or Symptom)	1,011.037	400	1079	5	5	0	11
Frailty (Sign or Symptom)	390.422	41	1448	3	2	1	5
Coughing (Sign or Symptom)	328.236	118	1358	17	1	0	6
Complete Blood Count (Laboratory Procedure)	326.281	22	1468	2	3	0	5
Rhinorrhea (Sign or Symptom)	261.519	62	1427	5	1	0	5
Evaluation procedure (Health Care Activity)	253.766	39	1455	0	1	0	5
Illness (Disease or Syndrome)	245.042	90	1301	4	6	0	99
Headache (Sign or Symptom)	222.656	83	1408	7	0	0	2
Ultrasonography (Diagnostic Procedure)	218.481	40	1448	1	0	0	11
Discomfort (Sign or Symptom)	211.075	13	1477	0	4	0	6
Discharge, body substance (Sign or Symptom)	184.181	4	1486	1	0	0	9
Nasal congestion (Sign or Symptom)	183.886	20	1475	2	0	0	3
Abdomen (Body Location)	176.965	27	1465	0	0	0	8
Urinalysis (Laboratory Procedure)	171.541	14	1485	0	0	0	1
Infection (Pathologic Function)	154.753	13	1464	2	0	13	8

- model correct - did not find erroneously annotated term (model true negative)
- model wrong - non-existing term found (human true negative)
- model wrong - existing term missed (human true positive)

From the results presented in Table 3 we can conclude that our model in general extracts most frequent entities with human-level quality. Large number of annotator errors for entities 'Illness' and 'Infection' stem from their occurrence in multiple acronyms and so are easily missed. Large number of model errors in case of 'Coughing' are due to a single term synonym that was almost completely absent from train dataset and present in test dataset.

5.3 Examples

In this section we selected several examples of model generalising in difficult cases. In Table 4 we provide the original text translated into English and the extracted entity also in English form with our comments.

Table 4: Examples of generalization by the entity extraction model

Original text	Extracted entity	Comments
leakage of urine into the diaper	Urinary incontinence	A correct entity is extracted even though the form used is not in the list of synonyms from the knowledge base.
prickling pains with feeling of pressure in the heart	Pain in the heart region	Correct entity extraction in with extra words inside the entity span.
complaints of pain pain in the lumbar joint	Pain in lumbar spine	Using the word joint as an anchor the model correctly selected the term 'Pain in lumbar spine' instead of closely related terms 'Low back pain' or 'Lumbar pain'.
complaints of pain in the abdomen, right hypochondrium	Right upper quadrant pain ...	The entity is extracted correctly even with body location 'Abdomen' in the middle of the phrase.
complaints of trembling fingers when excited	Shaking of hands	Correct extraction of unusual entity form.
blood pressure occasionally rises	Increase in blood pressure; Blood pressure fluctuation	Using the word 'occasionally' the model in addition to general entity 'Increase in blood pressure' successfully extracts a correct more specific entity 'Blood pressure fluctuation'.
a child on disability since 2008 after a cytomegalovirus infection with damage to the heart, hearing organs, vision, central nervous system	Central nervous system lesion ...	Model correctly connects the word damage with term central nervous system even though they are separated by several words and punctuation marks and extracts the corresponding entity.
intercost neuralgia	Intercostal neuralgia	Typos ignored when extracting the correct entity

6 Conclusion

In this paper we show that a single transformer model can be used for one-step medical entity extraction from electronic health records. This model shows excellent classification quality for most frequent entities and can be further improved by better language pretraining on general or in-domain texts, hyperparameter tuning or applying various ensembling methods. Not all entity classes are easily detected by model. Some classes like 'Pharmacological Substances' are noticeably harder to classify correctly. This can be due to number factors including differences in context, number of synonyms and the difference between train and test dataset.

We have shown that 50.000 training examples are enough for achieving near perfect-recall on automatic labels even for hard classes. Most frequent entities, with more that 150.000 training examples are classified with human-level quality. We did not explicitly search for lower limit of training examples needed to achieve such quality so it can be substantially lower. Also we showed that such quality is achieved even when using testing dataset which greatly differs in entity distribution, geographic location and institution types (clinic vs hospital) from training dataset. This implies the model ability to generalize to new, unseen and difficult cases after training on a limited variety of reference strings for each entity.

The number of errors made by human annotator highlights the hardships that medical entity annotation poses to humans, including the need to find inner entities in complex and abbreviated terms. The markup of the complete medical entities vocabulary is also problematic due to both a large number of entities possibly present in each record and to the fact that

some entities are exceedingly rare. Less than half of training entities appearing at least 10 times in the testing dataset. A complete markup of such infrequent entities is not really feasible as it would involve looking through an extremely large number of records to get a reasonable number of entity occurrences.

The proposed distantly-supervised method can be used to extract with human-level accuracy a limited number of most frequent entities. This number can be increased by both improving the quality of the model and by adding new unlabeled examples. Distantly supervised entity extraction systems made in line with our model can be used for fast end resource-light extraction of medical entities for any language. While currently limited to a small vocabulary of common terms such systems show big promise in light of increasingly available amounts of medical data.

References

- Alan R Aronson, Olivier Bodenreider, H Florence Chang, Susanne M Humphrey, James G Mork, Stuart J Nelson, Thomas C Rindflesch, and W John Wilbur. 2000. The NLM Indexing Initiative.. In *Proceedings of the AMIA Symposium*. American Medical Informatics Association, 17.
- Guthrie S Birkhead, Michael Klompas, and Nirav R Shah. 2015. Uses of electronic health records for public health surveillance to advance public health. *Annual review of public health* 36 (2015), 345–359.
- Olivier Bodenreider. 2004. The unified medical language system (UMLS): integrating biomedical terminology. *Nucleic acids research* 32, suppl_1 (2004), D267–D270.
- Leyang Cui and Yue Zhang. 2019. Hierarchically-refined label attention network for sequence labeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.08676* (2019).
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805* (2018).
- Greg Durrett and Dan Klein. 2014. A joint model for entity analysis: Coreference, typing, and linking. *Transactions of the association for computational linguistics* 2 (2014), 477–490.
- Jennifer D’Souza and Vincent Ng. 2015. Sieve-based entity linking for the biomedical domain. In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 7th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 2: Short Papers)*. 297–302.
- Carol Friedman. 1997. Towards a comprehensive medical language processing system: methods and issues.. In *Proceedings of the AMIA annual fall symposium*. American Medical Informatics Association, 595.
- Jason Fries, Sen Wu, Alex Ratner, and Christopher Ré. 2017. Swellshark: A generative model for biomedical named entity recognition without labeled data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.06360* (2017).
- Omid Ghiasvand and Rohit J Kate. 2014. R.: UWM: Disorder mention extraction from clinical text using CRFs and normalization using learned edit distance patterns. In *In: Proc. SemEval 2014*. Citeseer.
- David A Hanauer, Mohammed Saeed, Kai Zheng, Qiaozhu Mei, Kerby Shedden, Alan R Aronson, and Naren Ramakrishnan. 2014. Applying MetaMap to Medline for identifying novel associations in a large clinical dataset: a feasibility analysis. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 21, 5 (2014), 925–937.
- Wenqi He. 2017. Autoentity: automated entity detection from massive text corpora. (2017).
- Peter B Jensen, Lars J Jensen, and Søren Brunak. 2012. Mining electronic health records: towards better research applications and clinical care. *Nature Reviews Genetics* 13, 6 (2012), 395–405.
- Zongcheng Ji, Qiang Wei, and Hua Xu. 2020. Bert-based ranking for biomedical entity normalization. *AMIA Summits on Translational Science Proceedings 2020* (2020), 269.
- Yohan Jo, Natasha Loghmanpour, and Carolyn Penstein Rosé. 2015. Time series analysis of nursing notes for mortality prediction via a state transition topic model. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM international on conference on information and knowledge management*. 1171–1180.
- David C Kaelber, Wendy Foster, Jason Gilder, Thomas E Love, and Anil K Jain. 2012. Patient characteristics associated with venous thromboembolic events: a cohort study using pooled electronic health record data. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 19, 6 (2012), 965–972.
- Ning Kang, Bharat Singh, Zubair Afzal, Erik M van Mulligen, and Jan A Kors. 2013. Using rule-based natural language processing to improve disease normalization in biomedical text. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 20, 5 (2013), 876–881.
- Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2014. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980* (2014).

- Mikhail Korobov. 2015. Morphological analyzer and generator for Russian and Ukrainian languages. In *International Conference on Analysis of Images, Social Networks and Texts*. Springer, 320–332.
- Yuri Kuratov and Mikhail Arkhipov. 2019. Adaptation of deep bidirectional multilingual transformers for russian language. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.07213* (2019).
- Guillaume Lample, Miguel Ballesteros, Sandeep Subramanian, Kazuya Kawakami, and Chris Dyer. 2016. Neural architectures for named entity recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.01360* (2016).
- Hoang-Quynh Le, Mai-Vu Tran, Thanh Hai Dang, Nigel Collier, et al. 2015. The UET-CAM system in the BioCreative V CDR task. In *Fifth BioCreative challenge evaluation workshop*. 208–213.
- Robert Leaman, Rezarta Islamaj Doğan, and Zhiyong Lu. 2013. DNorm: disease name normalization with pairwise learning to rank. *Bioinformatics* 29, 22 (2013), 2909–2917.
- Robert Leaman and Zhiyong Lu. 2016. TaggerOne: joint named entity recognition and normalization with semi-Markov Models. *Bioinformatics* 32, 18 (2016), 2839–2846.
- Paea LePendu, Yi Liu, Srinivasan Iyer, Madeleine R Udell, and Nigam H Shah. 2012. Analyzing patterns of drug use in clinical notes for patient safety. *AMIA Summits on Translational Science Proceedings 2012* (2012), 63.
- Haodi Li, Qingcai Chen, Buzhou Tang, Xiaolong Wang, Hua Xu, Baohua Wang, and Dong Huang. 2017a. CNN-based ranking for biomedical entity normalization. *BMC bioinformatics* 18, 11 (2017), 79–86.
- Jing Li, Aixin Sun, Jianglei Han, and Chenliang Li. 2020. A survey on deep learning for named entity recognition. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* (2020).
- Peng-Hsuan Li, Ruo-Ping Dong, Yu-Siang Wang, Ju-Chieh Chou, and Wei-Yun Ma. 2017b. Leveraging linguistic structures for named entity recognition with bidirectional recursive neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 2664–2669.
- Ying Li, Hojjat Salmasian, Santiago Vilar, Herbert Chase, Carol Friedman, and Ying Wei. 2014. A method for controlling complex confounding effects in the detection of adverse drug reactions using electronic health records. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 21, 2 (2014), 308–314.
- Yanan Lu, Donghong Ji, Xiaoyuan Yao, Xiaomei Wei, and Xiaohui Liang. 2015. CHEMDNER system with mixed conditional random fields and multi-scale word clustering. *Journal of cheminformatics* 7, S1 (2015), S4.
- Yi Luo, Guojie Song, Pengyu Li, and Zhongang Qi. 2018a. Multi-Task Medical Concept Normalization Using Multi-View Convolutional Neural Network.. In *AAAI*. 5868–5875.
- Yen-Fu Luo and Anna Rumshisky. 2016. Interpretable topic features for post-icu mortality prediction. In *AMIA Annual Symposium Proceedings*, Vol. 2016. American Medical Informatics Association, 827.
- Yen-Fu Luo, Weiyi Sun, and Anna Rumshisky. 2018b. A Hybrid Method for Normalization of Medical Concepts in Clinical Narrative. In *2018 IEEE International Conference on Healthcare Informatics (ICHI)*. IEEE, 392–393.
- Xuezhe Ma and Eduard Hovy. 2016. End-to-end sequence labeling via bi-directional lstm-cnns-crf. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.01354* (2016).
- Frank J Manion, Marcelline R Harris, Ayse G Buyuktur, Patricia M Clark, Lawrence C An, and David A Hanauer. 2012. Leveraging EHR data for outcomes and comparative effectiveness research in oncology. *Current oncology reports* 14, 6 (2012), 494–501.
- Jason S Mathias, Dana Gossett, and David W Baker. 2012. Use of electronic health record data to evaluate overuse of cervical cancer screening. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 19, e1 (2012), e96–e101.
- Tomas Mikolov, Ilya Sutskever, Kai Chen, Greg S Corrado, and Jeff Dean. 2013. Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*. 3111–3119.
- Mike Mintz, Steven Bills, Rion Snow, and Dan Jurafsky. 2009. Distant supervision for relation extraction without labeled data. In *Proceedings of the Joint Conference of the 47th Annual Meeting of the ACL and the 4th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing of the AFNLP*. 1003–1011.
- Daisuke Okanohara, Yusuke Miyao, Yoshimasa Tsuruoka, and Jun’ichi Tsujii. 2006. Improving the scalability of semi-markov conditional random fields for named entity recognition. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Computational Linguistics and 44th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. 465–472.
- Jyotishman Pathak, Abel N Kho, and Joshua C Denny. 2013. Electronic health records-driven phenotyping: challenges, recent advances, and perspectives.
- Matthew E Peters, Mark Neumann, Mohit Iyyer, Matt Gardner, Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2018. Deep contextualized word representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.05365* (2018).

- Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, and Ilya Sutskever. 2018. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training.
- Xiang Ren, Ahmed El-Kishky, Chi Wang, Fangbo Tao, Clare R Voss, and Jiawei Han. 2015. Clustype: Effective entity recognition and typing by relation phrase-based clustering. In *Proceedings of the 21th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 995–1004.
- Alan Ritter, Luke Zettlemoyer, Mausam, and Oren Etzioni. 2013. Modeling missing data in distant supervision for information extraction. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 1 (2013), 367–378.
- N Sager, Carol Friedman, E Chi, C Macleod, S Chen, and S Johnson. 1986. The analysis and processing of clinical narrative. *Medinfo* 86 (1986), 1101–5.
- Jingbo Shang, Liyuan Liu, Xiang Ren, Xiaotao Gu, Teng Ren, and Jiawei Han. 2018. Learning named entity tagger using domain-specific dictionary. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.03599* (2018).
- Yijun Shao, April F Mohanty, Ali Ahmed, Charlene R Weir, Bruce E Bray, Rashmee U Shah, Douglas Redd, and Qing Zeng-Treitler. 2016. Identification and use of frailty indicators from text to examine associations with clinical outcomes among patients with heart failure. In *AMIA Annual Symposium Proceedings*, Vol. 2016. American Medical Informatics Association, 1110.
- Emma Strubell, Patrick Verga, David Belanger, and Andrew McCallum. 2017. Fast and accurate entity recognition with iterated dilated convolutions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.02098* (2017).
- Maxim Topaz, Kenneth Lai, Dawn Dowding, Victor J Lei, Anna Zisberg, Kathryn H Bowles, and Li Zhou. 2016. Automated identification of wound information in clinical notes of patients with heart diseases: Developing and validating a natural language processing application. *International journal of nursing studies* 64 (2016), 25–31.
- Xiaoyan Wang, George Hripcsak, Marianthi Markatou, and Carol Friedman. 2009. Active computerized pharmacovigilance using natural language processing, statistics, and electronic health records: a feasibility study. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 16, 3 (2009), 328–337.
- Adam B Wilcox. 2015. Leveraging electronic health records for phenotyping. In *Translational Informatics*. Springer, 61–74.
- Jun Xu, Hee-Jin Lee, Zongcheng Ji, Jingqi Wang, Qiang Wei, and Hua Xu. 2017b. UTH_CCB System for Adverse Drug Reaction Extraction from Drug Labels at TAC-ADR 2017.. In *TAC*.
- Mingbin Xu, Hui Jiang, and Sedtawut Watcharawittayakul. 2017a. A local detection approach for named entity recognition and mention detection. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 1237–1247.
- Ying Yu, Min Li, Liangliang Liu, Yaohang Li, and Jianxin Wang. 2019. Clinical big data and deep learning: Applications, challenges, and future outlooks. *Big Data Mining and Analytics* 2, 4 (2019), 288–305.
- Ping Zhang, Fei Wang, Jianying Hu, and Robert Sorrentino. 2014. Towards personalized medicine: leveraging patient similarity and drug similarity analytics. *AMIA Summits on Translational Science Proceedings 2014* (2014), 132.