# A Neuro-Symbolic Method for Understanding Free-text Medical Evidence

Tian Kang, Ali Turfah, Jaehyun Kim, Adler Perotte, Chunhua Weng Department of Biomedical Informatics, Columbia University, City in New York

# Machine Reading Comprehension for Evidence-based Medicine

**Research Aim** Develop a novel Machine Reading Comprehension model to facilitate clinicians in understanding clinical research literature (medical evidence) and generate questions to inform clinical decision making.



Improving upon deep learning-based MRC models :

Evidence-based Medicine (EBM) is the conscientious, explicit, judicious and reasonable use of modern, best evidence in making decisions about the care of individual patients. EBM integrates clinical experience and patient values with the best available research information.

### Machine Reading Comprehension (MRC) The

technology that teaches machines to read and understand unstructured text and then *answer questions* about it like a human.

Given a collection of training examples  $\{(p_i, q_i, a_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ , the goal is to learn a predictor f which takes a passage of text p and a corresponding question q as inputs and gives the answer a as output.

 $f:(p,q) \rightarrow a$ 

# Neuro-Symbolic Methods – Medical evidence Dependency(MD)-informed Attention

Training one head of Multi-head Self-Attention [1] to attend to specific tokens corresponding to the Medical evidence Dependency as a mechanism for passing both linguistic and domain knowledge to subsequent layers (MD-informed).



MD-infor	med	S
	MD	М
oftmax	F	-

- MD Matrix to replace the scaled attention score
- evidence

# Conclusions



 $\checkmark$  Adding reasoning ability capture clinically meaningful relations

### Compositional sub-models

Better generalizability

Better Understandability

Better reasoning ability

## Results

We incorporate MD-informed Attention head into one of the most commonly used pretraining model in biomedical NLP, BioBERT [2], and evaluate on two public benchmarks for reading comprehension of clinical research literature.

**Question** With respect to <u>migraine relief at 24 hours</u>, what is reported difference between patients receiving <u>Rizatriptan</u> and those receiving Ibuprofen and placebo?

**Abstract** ... Efficacy was assessed by headache relief, and headache freedom at 2 h and 24 h. Two-hour headache relief, was noted in 73% in rizatriptan, 53.8% in ibuprofen and 8% in placebo groups. Headache freedom was achieved in 37.7% in rizatriptan, 30.8% in ibuprofen and 2% in placebo groups. Rizatriptan was superior to ibuprofen and placebo in relieving headache at 2 h but not at 24 h. Side effects were noted in 9 patients in rizatriptan, 8 in ibuprofen and 3 in placebo, all of which were nonsignificant. Rizatriptan and ibuprofen are superior to placebo. Rizatriptan is superior to ibuprofen in relieving headache, associated symptoms and functional disability....

**Answer** No significant difference

Evidence Inference 2.0 [3]					
Model	Acc.	F1	Р	R	
DeYoung et al. (2020)	/	0.780	0.784	0.777	
Leaderboard	/	0.797	0.796	0.797	
BioBERT	0.56	0.551	0.551	0.551	
+ MDAtt	0.84	0.843	0.850	0.841	
+ MDAtt-masked	0.82	0.819	0.823	0.817	

PubMedQA [4]					
Model	Acc.	F1	Р	R	
Jin et al. (2019)					
Multi-phase (SOTA)	0.68	0.527	/	/	
Final Phase Only	0.57	0.287	/	/	
BioBERT	0.53	0.311	0.315	0.34	
+ MDAtt	0.61	0.482	0.482	0.483	
+ MDAtt-masked	0.60	0.463	0.469	0.463	

# COLUMBIA DEPARTMENT OF

**COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY BIOMEDICAL INFORMATIC** 

generated from the dot product of Query and Key MD-informed attention head produces a context representation  $Z_{MD}$  specialized to attend to medical



	reduced	vascular	resistance	were	noted	in	group	A
reduced	0	<u>1</u>	1	0	0	0	0	0
vascular	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
resistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
were	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
noted	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
in	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
group	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
A	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	<u>1</u>

MD Matrix

#### Acknowledgement

This work was supported by R01 LM009886 (bridging the semantic gap between research eligibility criteria and clinical data; principal investigator CW.

#### Reference

- I. Vaswani, A., et al., 2017. Attention is all you need. arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.03762.
- 2. Wonjin Yoon, et al. 2019. Pre-Trained Language Model for Biomedical Question Answering. ArXivabs/1909.08229(42).
- 3. Jay DeYoung, et al. 2020. Evidence Inference 2.0: More Data, Better Models, arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.04177.
- 4. Jin, Q., et al., 2019. PubMedQA: A dataset for biomedical research question arXiv answering. þreþrint arXiv:1909.06146.