

Comparative Analysis of Open-Source Language Models in Summarizing Medical Text Data

Yuhao Chen^{*†}, Zhimu Wang^{*§}, Bo Wen^{†||}, Farhana Zulkernine^{*¶}

^{*}School of Computing, [†]Digital Health Department,

^{*}Queen’s University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada

[†]IBM Research, Yorktown Heights, NY, USA

{yuhao.chen[†], 19zw28[§], farhana.zulkernine[¶]}@queensu.ca bwen@us.ibm.com^{||}

Abstract—Unstructured text in medical notes and dialogues contains rich information. Recent advancements in Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated superior performance in question answering and summarization tasks on unstructured text data, outperforming traditional text analysis approaches. However, there is a lack of scientific studies in the literature that methodically evaluate and report on the performance of different LLMs, specifically for domain-specific data such as medical chart notes. We propose an evaluation approach to analyze the performance of open-source LLMs such as Llama2 and Mistral for medical summarization tasks, using GPT-4 as an assessor. Our innovative approach to quantitative evaluation of LLMs can enable quality control, support the selection of effective LLMs for specific tasks, and advance knowledge discovery in digital health.

Index Terms—Biomedical summarization, Large Language Model, Generative Model

I. INTRODUCTION

An increasing number of researchers have recognized the significance of evaluating the alignment between human intent and generated responses by LLMs [1]. Conventional similarity-based evaluation metrics, such as ROUGE [2] and BERTSCORE [3], are not able to capture this alignment accurately [4]. With the success of the advanced GPT-4 model [5], there has been a growing interest in developing human-free automatic evaluation frameworks that leverage GPT-4’s capabilities. Rather than deploying GPT-4 to grade each summary and generate evaluation scores, we employ it to select the better summary from two candidates.

The primary objectives of this study are to: a) establish a pipeline for each LLM to perform biomedical summarization; b) select a suitable prompt for each specific summarization task; and c) design and implement an evaluation framework using GPT-4 as the evaluator. All data used in this study are from publicly available sources.

We develop a two-stage pipeline for evaluating two renowned LLMs, Llama2 [6] and Mistral [7] using uniform prompts in three distinct medical summarization tasks: consumer health question summarization, biomedical query-based summarization, and dialogue summarization. We use multiple datasets, namely MEDIQA-QS [8], MeQSum [9], MEDIQA-ANS [10], MEDIQA-MAS [8], and iCliniq [11] for the tasks. Subsequently, GPT-4 serves as an assessor to determine which LLM produces a more effective response, accompanied by an

explanation to compare each selected open-source LLM and GPT-3.5.

Our approach addresses the limitations of existing methods by systematically evaluating and comparing LLMs for domain-specific data. By employing GPT-4 as an assessor focusing on coherence, consistency, fluency, and relevance, we contribute to the selection of the most suitable LLM for specific tasks in digital health.

II. RELATED WORK

A. Generative Large Language Models

GPT-3 [14] acquired the ability of “in-context learning” after incorporating a substantial amount of additional training data and increasing the parameters by over 100 times compared to GPT-2 [13]. The success of chatbot application, ChatGPT [5] [14], has led to explosive growth in popularity of decoder-only LLM. Following the success of the GPT-4 model, many new open-source generative LLMs with similar capabilities were published, such as Llama [6], and Mistral [7].

B. Evaluating LLMs on Biomedical Summarization

Jahan et al. [17] conducted a comparative analysis of the State-Of-The-Art (SOTA) fine-tuned based LLMs BioBART [18] and ChatGPT (gpt-3.5-turbo) on abstractive summarization datasets. The findings revealed that ChatGPT with zero-shot setting exhibited superior performance when BioBART lacked sufficient in-domain training data, highlighting ChatGPT’s robustness where sufficient training data is not available.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Text Summarization

In this pilot study, we limit our comparative analysis to two open-source models: Llama2-70B and Mistral-7B. GPT-3.5 is the pioneering LLM that is integrated in ChatGPT, which has been used in comparative analysis in subsequent LLMs research [6]. Therefore, GPT-3.5 is selected as the target model in our adversarial assessment strategy (Section III-B). We follow the prompt design methodology outlined in Jahan et al.’s [17] work.

1) LLMs

Llama2-70B-chat-hf: Llama2 [6] is a collection of transformer decoder-based LLMs, ranging from 7 billion to 70 billion parameters. We use its official optimized iteration, Llama2-70B-chat-hf, for the experiment.

Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.1: Mistral [7] is a transformer decoder-based LLM with 7 billion parameters, achieving superior performance and efficiency among small-scale LLMs. We select the officially fine-tuned version on conversational datasets, Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.1.

GPT-3.5-turbo: GPT-3.5-turbo [14] is another transformer decoder-based LLM with undisclosed architecture and number of parameters. **2) Datasets and Tasks**

Consumer Health Question Summarization: The objective is to identify the optimal model in summarizing long and complex consumer health questions. Given a customer query Q , we combine it with the task-specific instruction T_q to create a prompt P_q that is fed into the model. The methodology for constructing this prompt is shown in Eq. 1, with the symbol “;” denoting concatenation. We choose MEDIQA-QS [8] and MeQSum [9] datasets for this task.

MEDIQA-QS comprises 150 de-identified consumer health questions sourced from the U.S. National Library of Medicine (NLM), with gold-standard summaries crafted by medical experts. The dataset is divided into validation and test sets, where the validation set encompasses 50 questions, and the test set contains 100 questions. In this study, only the test set is used for evaluation.

MeQSum is designed for medical problem summarization tasks. It contains 1,000 consumer health questions summarized to facilitate natural language processing (NLP) research specifically for the medical field. The dataset is partitioned into two segments: 500 questions for validation and 500 for the test set. We only use test set for evaluation [17] [18].

$$P_q = [T_q; Q_q] \quad (1)$$

Biomedical Query-based Summarization: This task enables models to aggregate and summarize multiple relevant responses to a medical query. For this task, we concatenate the task instruction T_a , a medical query Q_a , and a referenced document D_a to formulate the prompt P_a for the model as shown in Eq. 2. We choose MEDIQA-ANS [10] and MEDIQA-MAS [8] datasets for this task.

MEDIQA-MAS consists of collections of responses to specific health-related queries, along with expert created summaries that integrate information from multiple answers into a single coherent summary. For evaluation, we use the test set, which contains 80 medical questions.

MEDIQA-ANS contains 156 health questions asked by consumers, their corresponding answers, and expert-created summaries. The dataset is sourced from reliable organizations such as MedlinePlus and derived from questions submitted to the National Library of Medicine’s CHiQA system. In our study, we only use “single-document abstractive” type data, which contains 552 data samples for evaluation.

$$P_a = [T_a; Q_a; D_a] \quad (2)$$

Dialog Summarization: The goal is to produce a short summary describing a patient’s medical conditions from a dialogue between the patient and the doctor. Given a conversation dialogue $Dialog_d$, we combine it with the task instruction T_d to create the prompt P_d as shown in Eq. 3. We choose the iCliniq [11] dataset for this task.

iCliniq is an extensive collection capturing real-life anonymized medical consultations between patients and physicians. It covers a wide range of medical inquiries and responses, demonstrating a doctor’s approach to various health problems. In this study, we randomly select 200 data samples for evaluation.

$$P_d = [T_d; Dialog_d] \quad (3)$$

B. Proposed Adversarial Assessment Strategy

Rather than employing GPT-4 to grade the summaries of each LLM sequentially, we instruct GPT-4 to perform a pairwise comparison [4] between the outputs of two LLMs to determine the superior response. To enhance efficiency, we introduce a novel adversarial assessment strategy that eliminates the need to evaluate all possible pairs by selecting a target LLM and comparing all other LLMs against this target. This methodology reduces the number of evaluations per data sample to $n-1$, where n represents the total number of models under evaluation.

To avoid position bias, we apply the swapping positions approach [4], employing GPT-4 to do the evaluation twice by swapping the order of two answers. A declaration of victory is made only when an answer is preferred in both orders; otherwise, a tie is declared.

C. Prompt Design

Our prompt design draws inspiration from the work of Zeng et al. [4]. We enhance the prompt to ensure that GPT-4’s evaluation focuses on four key dimensions commonly used by humans: coherence, consistency, fluency, and relevance.

D. Results

Table I shows the results of using GPT-4 as an evaluator. Overall, the GPT-4 evaluator demonstrates a preference for summaries generated by Llama2-70b, achieving a rate exceeding 40%, making it the winner among all evaluated LLMs in all five benchmarks. Mistral-7B only surpasses GPT-3.5 in the MEDIQA-ANS dataset with a 40% win rate, but it is still lower than Llama2-70b’s 43% win rate.

IV. DISCUSSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this pilot study, we acknowledge the limitation of not incorporating additional prompt engineering, relying on existing work for summarization prompts. Future work could benefit from exploring customized prompt designs that might better capture the nuances of medical summarization tasks and enhance model performance.

```

text = response.choices[0].message.content

]: index = 2
print(question_eval[index])
print()
print(gpt35_vs_llama2_70b['Model A Summary'][index])
print()
print(gpt35_vs_llama2_70b['Model B Summary'][index])
print()
print(message.choices[0].message.content)
print()
print('Step2 Prompt: Could you please specify the particular area of hallucination you are referring to?')
print(text)

I'm 30 years old and when I was 23 my period wasn't coming every month, and I still don't get my period , last time I got it was 4 months ago and I'm really worried.

Why am I experiencing irregular menstrual cycles and a lack of periods at 30 years old? ← GPT-3.5

Concise version:      Hallucination Text Span      ← Llama2-70b
I'm 30, haven't had a period in 7 years and am worried. What's wrong?

GPT-4 Evaluation
↓
Relevance: Both summaries capture the essence of the user's concern regarding irregular menstrual cycles and the absence of periods. Assistant A frames the question from a medical inquiry perspective, directly addressing the user's age and the specific issue of irregular menstrual cycles and lack of periods. Assistant B condenses the information into a very brief statement that highlights the duration of the problem (7 years) and the user's worry, but it inaccurately states that the user hasn't had a period in 7 years, which contradicts the original statement that the last period was 4 months ago.

Coherence: Assistant A's summary is coherent, presenting the user's situation as a clear question. It logically connects the user's age with the ongoing issue of irregular menstrual cycles and the absence of periods. Assistant B's summary, while concise, introduces a factual inconsistency by suggesting the user hasn't had a period in 7 years, which disrupts the coherence with the original query.

Fluency: Both summaries are fluent, with Assistant A using a formal question format that fits medical inquiry contexts. Assistant B's summary is also fluent but opts for a more casual and brief expression of the concern.

Consistency: Assistant A's summary is consistent with the original question, accurately reflecting the user's age and the nature of the menstrual irregularity. Assistant B's summary, however, is not consistent with the original question due to the incorrect statement about the duration of amenorrhea (absence of periods).

Compression and Detail: Assistant A effectively compresses the original question into a structured medical inquiry without losing essential details. Assistant B's summary attempts to compress the information but sacrifices accuracy and detail for brevity, leading to a misleading representation of the user's situation.

Detection of Hallucinations: Assistant B introduces a hallucination by stating the user hasn't had a period in 7 years, which is a significant deviation from the original information provided.

Objective Evaluation: Based on the evaluation criteria, Assistant A's summary is superior. It maintains relevance, coherence, fluency, and consistency with the original question, effectively compressing the essential information without introducing inaccuracies.

Conclusion: [[A]]

Confidence Level: [[High]]

Step2 Prompt: Could you please specify the particular area of hallucination you are referring to?
The hallucination I referred to is in Assistant B's summary, where it states "haven't had a period in 7 years." This statement is a factual inaccuracy or a "hallucination" because it directly contradicts the information provided in the original question. The user mentioned that the last period occurred 4 months ago, not 7 years ago. This misrepresentation of the user's situation introduces information that is not present in the original query, thus qualifying as a hallucination in the context of summarization accuracy and factual consistency.

```

Fig. 1. Assessment Example of GPT-4 for LLMs

TABLE I
COMPARATIVE PERFORMANCE OF LARGE LANGUAGE MODELS VERSUS GPT-3.5 BASELINE WITH GPT-4 AS THE EVALUATOR

Model A Candidates	MEDIQA-QS		MeQSum			MEDIQA-ANS			MEDIQA-MAS			iCliniq			
	Win Rate														
	Model A	GPT-3.5	Tie	Model A	GPT-3.5	Tie	Model A	GPT-3.5	Tie	Model A	GPT-3.5	Tie	Model A	GPT-3.5	Tie
Llama2-70b	43%	17%	40%	42%	18%	40%	43%	22%	35%	40%	38%	22%	44%	16%	40%
Mistral-7b	19%	36%	45%	14%	51%	35%	40%	24%	36%	31%	38%	31%	23%	37%	40%

During the analysis of the GPT-4 evaluator outcomes, we found that GPT-4 assessor demonstrated robust hallucination detection capabilities, as shown in Fig. 1. However, we also noticed that GPT-4 lacks sensitivity in detecting the length of summaries. Addressing this limitation through prompt engineering or alternative evaluation strategies could improve the accuracy of model comparisons and the overall utility of the evaluation framework.

While the study proposes to address the alignment between human and GPT-4 evaluator in future work, incorporating an initial investigation into this aspect could strengthen the current findings. Understanding how well the GPT-4 assessor's judgments align with human experts could provide valuable insights into the reliability and applicability of the proposed evaluation framework.

The results of this study have implications for the digital health domain, as they demonstrate the potential of using open-source LLMs and GPT-4 as an assessor for medical summarization tasks. By systematically evaluating and comparing LLMs, our approach can support the selection of the most

suitable model for specific tasks, such as summarizing consumer health questions, aggregating medical query responses, and generating dialogue summaries. This can ultimately lead to improved knowledge discovery and decision-making in digital health applications.

We are conducting a human-blind review to validate the GPT-4 assessor's performance with an optimized evaluation prompt which is not presented in this paper. In this evaluation, a human reviewer must assess which summary is better among the pairs generated by different LLMs. The human-blind review is still ongoing. Currently, we have completed evaluations of 200 summary pairs. GPT-4 has achieved an average accuracy and F1 score exceeding 70%, establishing a solid baseline for the effectiveness of using an LLM as a judge. Moreover, GPT-4 completed 50-question summarization and evaluation tasks in approximately 40 minutes, significantly faster than human annotators, who needed over 2 hours for the same number of questions.

Future research directions include expanding the range of LLMs evaluated, incorporating additional medical summariza-

tion datasets, and exploring the impact of domain-specific fine-tuning on model performance. Additionally, investigating the ethical implications of using LLMs in healthcare, such as data privacy, bias, and transparency, is crucial to ensure the responsible deployment of these models in real-world digital health applications.

V. CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates a solution to address the critical need for systematic evaluation and comparison of LLMs in the context of medical text summarization tasks. Our proposed evaluation approach, employing GPT-4 as an assessor, can enable quality control, support the selection of effective LLMs for specific tasks, and advance knowledge discovery in digital health.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We are grateful for the support from NSERC Discovery, CFI, RTI, and IBM for their funding of this research.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Wang, L. Li, L. Chen, D. Zhu, B. Lin, Y. Cao, Q. Liu, T. Liu, and Z. Sui, "Large language models are not fair evaluators," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.17926*, 2023.
- [2] C.-Y. Lin, "ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries," in *Text Summarization Branches Out*. Barcelona, Spain: Association for Computational Linguistics, Jul. 2004, pp. 74–81.
- [3] T. Zhang, V. Kishore, F. Wu, K. Q. Weinberger, and Y. Artzi, "Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- [4] L. Zheng, W.-L. Chiang, Y. Sheng, S. Zhuang, Z. Wu, Y. Zhuang, Z. Lin, Z. Li, D. Li, E. Xing, H. Zhang, J. E. Gonzalez, and I. Stoica, "Judging LLM-as-a-judge with MT-bench and chatbot arena," in *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2023.
- [5] OpenAI, "Gpt-4 technical report," 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:257532815>
- [6] H. Touvron, L. Martin, K. Stone, P. Albert, A. Almahairi, Y. Babaei, N. Bashlykov, S. Batra, P. Bhargava, S. Bhosale *et al.*, "Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- [7] A. Q. Jiang, A. Sablayrolles, A. Mensch, C. Bamford, D. S. Chaplot, D. d. I. Casas, F. Bressand, G. Lengyel, G. Lample, L. Saulnier *et al.*, "Mistral 7b," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*, 2023.
- [8] A. Ben Abacha, Y. Mrabet, Y. Zhang, C. Shivade, C. Langlotz, and D. Demner-Fushman, "Overview of the MEDIQA 2021 shared task on summarization in the medical domain," in *Proceedings of the 20th Workshop on Biomedical Language Processing*. Online: Association for Computational Linguistics, Jun. 2021, pp. 74–85.
- [9] A. Ben Abacha and D. Demner-Fushman, "On the summarization of consumer health questions," in *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, A. Korhonen, D. Traum, and L. Márquez, Eds. Florence, Italy: Association for Computational Linguistics, Jul. 2019, pp. 2228–2234.
- [10] M. Savery, A. B. Abacha, S. Gayen, and D. Demner-Fushman, "Question-driven summarization of answers to consumer health questions," *Scientific Data*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 322, 2020.
- [11] G. Zeng, W. Yang, Z. Ju, Y. Yang, S. Wang, R. Zhang, M. Zhou, J. Zeng, X. Dong, R. Zhang, H. Fang, P. Zhu, S. Chen, and P. Xie, "MedDialog: Large-scale medical dialogue datasets," in *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, B. Webber, T. Cohn, Y. He, and Y. Liu, Eds. Online: Association for Computational Linguistics, Nov. 2020, pp. 9241–9250.
- [12] T. Brown, B. Mann, N. Ryder, M. Subbiah, J. D. Kaplan, P. Dhariwal, A. Neelakantan, P. Shyam, G. Sastry, A. Askell *et al.*, "Language models are few-shot learners," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 33, pp. 1877–1901, 2020.
- [13] A. Radford, J. Wu, R. Child, D. Luan, D. Amodei, I. Sutskever *et al.*, "Language models are unsupervised multitask learners."
- [14] L. Ouyang, J. Wu, X. Jiang, D. Almeida, C. Wainwright, P. Mishkin, C. Zhang, S. Agarwal, K. Slama, A. Ray *et al.*, "Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 27 730–27 744, 2022.
- [15] H. Touvron, T. Lavril, G. Izacard, X. Martinet, M.-A. Lachaux, T. Lacroix, B. Rozière, N. Goyal, E. Hambro, F. Azhar *et al.*, "Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models," *arXiv e-prints*, pp. arXiv-2302, 2023.
- [16] E. Almazrouei, H. Alobeidli, A. Alshamsi, A. Cappelli, R. Cojocar, M. Debbah, É. Goffinet, D. Hesslow, J. Launay, Q. Malartic *et al.*, "The falcon series of open language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16867*, 2023.
- [17] I. Jahan, M. T. R. Laskar, C. Peng, and J. Huang, "Evaluation of ChatGPT on biomedical tasks: A zero-shot comparison with fine-tuned generative transformers," in *The 22nd Workshop on Biomedical Natural Language Processing and BioNLP Shared Tasks*. Toronto, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics, Jul. 2023, pp. 326–336.
- [18] H. Yuan, Z. Yuan, R. Gan, J. Zhang, Y. Xie, and S. Yu, "BioBART: Pre-training and evaluation of a biomedical generative language model," in *Proceedings of the 21st Workshop on Biomedical Language Processing*. Dublin, Ireland: Association for Computational Linguistics, May 2022, pp. 97–109.