

# MultiADE: A Multi-domain Benchmark for Adverse Drug Event Extraction

Xiang Dai<sup>a</sup>, Sarvnaz Karimi<sup>a</sup>, Abeed Sarker<sup>b</sup>, Ben Hachey<sup>c</sup>, Cecile Paris<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*CSIRO Data61, Sydney, Australia*

<sup>b</sup>*Emory University, Atlanta, United States*

<sup>c</sup>*University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia*

---

## Abstract

*Objective.* Active adverse event surveillance monitors Adverse Drug Events (ADE) from different data sources, such as electronic health records, medical literature, social media and search engine logs. Over years, many datasets are created, and shared tasks are organised to facilitate active adverse event surveillance. However, most—if not all—datasets or shared tasks focus on extracting ADEs from a particular type of text. Domain generalisation—the ability of a machine learning model to perform well on new, unseen domains (text types)—is under-explored. Given the rapid advancements in natural language processing, one unanswered question is how far we are from having a single ADE extraction model that are effective on various *types of text*, such as scientific literature and social media posts.

*Methods.* We contribute to answering this question by building a multi-domain benchmark for adverse drug event extraction, which we named MULTI-ADE. The new benchmark comprises several existing datasets sampled from different text types and our newly created dataset—CADECV2, which is an extension of CADEC [1], covering online posts regarding more diverse drugs than CADEC. Our new dataset is carefully annotated by human annotators following detailed annotation guidelines.

*Conclusion.* Our benchmark results show that the generalisation of the trained models is far from perfect, making it infeasible to be deployed to process different types of text. In addition, although intermediate transfer learning is a promising approach to utilising existing resources, further

---

*Email addresses:* dai.dai@csiro.au (Xiang Dai), sarvnaz.karimi@csiro.au (Sarvnaz Karimi)

investigation is needed on methods of domain adaptation, particularly cost-effective methods to select useful training instances.

The newly created CADECv2 is publicly available at CSIRO’s Data Portal (<https://data.csiro.au/collection/csiro:62387>), and the scripts for building the benchmark are publicly available on GitHub (<https://github.com/daixiangau/MultiADE>). These resources enable the research community to further information extraction, leading to more effective active adverse drug event surveillance.

*Keywords:* Adverse drug event, drug safety, natural language processing, information extraction, named entity recognition

---

## 1. Introduction

An Adverse Drug Event (ADE) is an injury occurring after the use of a medication. An ADE can be caused by a medication error or a drug interaction (e.g., between multiple drugs) [2, 3]. In addition, unexpected harm could be caused by the routine use of medication at the normal dosage; this is termed an Adverse Drug Reaction (ADR) [4]. We refer to these collectively as *adverse event*. Although a dedicated clinical trial phase is required to identify potential adverse drug reactions, not all the adverse effects of a medication are discovered before it goes to market. Such adverse events pose a substantial public health problem, resulting in thousands of incidents of injury or even death and substantial financial burdens to healthcare systems [4–6].

There have been a lot of efforts towards the detection, assessment, understanding, and prevention of adverse drug reactions. One key activity is discovering potential adverse effects of medications as early as possible. Spontaneous reporting systems, such as MedWatch,<sup>1</sup> are built to enable health professionals, patients or manufacturers to report side effects they observe or suspect. This approach is called passive surveillance [7]. Additionally, active surveillance has received more attention recently, especially in the medical informatics community, to identify adverse drug events from different sources, such as electronic health records, medical literature, social media and search engine logs [4, 5]. One example of these efforts is the release of CADEC—CSIRO Adverse Drug Event Corpus—created using data from AskaPatient

---

<sup>1</sup><https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/medwatch/index.cfm>

forum<sup>2</sup> on first-hand experiences from patients on adverse drug events of medications. Alongside CADEC, many new corpora have been released, and shared tasks have been organised to facilitate active surveillance research for adverse drug events [8–11].

One trend we observe from the recent literature on ADE extraction is that most—if not all—datasets or shared tasks focus on extracting adverse drug events from one particular type of text. For example, the 2018 N2C2 shared task on adverse drug events and medication extraction [8] focused on mining adverse drug events from clinical notes; a series of shared tasks organised with the Social Media Mining for Health (SMM4H) workshop [10–15] focus on social media data (e.g., tweets); the TAC 2017 Adverse Reaction Extraction from Drug Labels Track [16] focused on drug labels; and there are also datasets built using scholarly articles [17, 18] or online posts from patient forums [1, 19]. Domain generalisation—the ability of a machine learning model to perform well on different types of text—is under-explored for ADE extraction.

Following the impressive performance of pre-trained models and, more recently, Large Language Models (LLMs), many researchers in the Natural Language Processing (NLP) community have explored how to build a single model capable of solving all NLP tasks on different types of text with minimum efforts. The fine-tuning approach, where the pre-trained model is fine-tuned using a small amount of labelled data, has demonstrated state-of-the-art effectiveness on many NLP tasks [20, 21]. More recently, the prompt-based approach enables a large language model to solve various tasks by providing task instructions and, optionally, demonstrations [22]. In the information extraction area, Xie et al. [23] explore the reasoning capability of LLM on Named Entity Recognition (NER) and focus on the zero-shot setup using ChatGPT. Han et al. [24] evaluate ChatGPT’s performance on 14 information extraction tasks under the zero-shot, few-shot and chain-of-thought scenarios. Their results show that fully supervised NER models (following the fine-tuning approach) still outperform ChatGPT (using prompt engineering) by a large margin. These explorations naturally lead to an important question: how far are we from having a single ADE extraction model that works well on different types of text?

To contribute towards answering this question, we build a multi-domain

---

<sup>2</sup><https://www.askapatient.com/>

benchmark for adverse drug event extraction—MULTIADE—and present our experimental results under different evaluation scenarios. The MULTIADE benchmark comprises several existing datasets sampled from different text types—N2C2 [8] and MADE [9] from clinical notes, PHEE [18] from scholarly articles, PSYTAR [19] and CADEC [1] from social media data. In addition, we also created a new dataset: CADECv2, an extension of CADEC, covering online posts regarding more diverse categories of drugs than CADEC. Our benchmark results show that the generalisation of the trained models is far from perfect, making it challenging to deploy them to process text from different sources. Our findings highlight the need for further investigation of methods of domain adaptation and transfer learning for adverse drug event extraction.

Our paper is structured as follows: Section 2 reviews recently published ADE extraction datasets and models; Section 3 introduces the newly developed CADECv2 dataset; Section 4 describes the MULTIADE benchmark; Section 5 details our benchmark results; and a summary is provided in Section 6.

## 2. Related Work

We survey relevant work on developing ADE-focused datasets and ADE extraction models.

### 2.1. ADE-focused Datasets

We list only recently published (after 2015) English ADE-focused datasets and refer readers to Table 1 in [1] and Table 1 in [17] for a review of relevant datasets created before 2015. Although many ADE datasets exist in languages other than English [15, 25–27], we believe the challenge of building a single ADE extraction model for different languages is quite different from building a model for different domains. Therefore, we take an incremental step by focusing only on English datasets.

*SMM4H*. The Social Media Mining for Health Applications shared tasks focus on mining health-related information from publicly available user-generated content. ADE mining in tweets is one of the longest-running challenges at the SMM4H shared task [10–15, 29]. Three key NLP problems, forming a social media-based pharmacovigilance pipeline, include identifying if a tweet mentions an ADE or not (2016 task1, 2017 task1, 2018 task3, 2019 task1,

Corpus	Size	Source
SMM4H 2016 task1, task2 [12]	20405 and 2067 tweets	Twitter
TAC-2017 [16]	200 labels	Drug labels
SMM4H 2017 task1, task3 [13]	25678 tweets and 9150 phrases (mentions)	Twitter
PHAEDRA [17]	597 abstracts	MEDLINE
SMM4H 2018 task3 [14]	30633 tweets	Twitter
MADE 1.0 [9]	1089 notes	Discharge summaries, consultation reports, and other clinical notes
PsyTAR [19]	6009 sentences	Online healthcare forum
SMM4H 2019 task1, task2, task3 [10]	30253 and 3252 tweets	Twitter
n2c2-2018 [8]	505 discharge summaries	Discharge summaries
SMM4H 2020 task2 [15]	30437 tweets	Twitter
SMM4H 2020 task3 [15]	3962 tweets	Twitter
ADE Eval [28]	200 labels	Drug labels (package inserts)
PHEE [18]	4827 sentences	MEDLINE

Table 1: Recently published (after 2015) ADE-focused datasets. Note that we only consider labelled data in the size column.

2020 task2, 2021 task1 and task2, 2022 task1), extracting the text span of ADEs in tweets (2016 task1, 2019 task2 and task3, 2020 task3, 2021 task1, 2022 task1), and normalising ADE mentions to MedDRA (2017 task3, 2019 task3, 2020 task3, 2021 task1, 2022 task1).

*TAC-2017*. [16] is a dataset used in the Adverse Reaction Extraction from Drug Labels Track as part of the 2017 Text Analysis Conference (TAC). While the ultimate goal is to automate the manual approach to determine if a given adverse event is already noted in the structured product labels, the track evaluates and provides data for several information extraction tasks (e.g., concept identification, concept normalisation and relation extraction). The entity annotations in TAC-2017 include adverse reaction mentions and modifier terms (e.g., negation, severity, and drug class), and relations between them—negated, hypothetical and effect—are annotated. Positive adverse reaction mentions are also normalised to MedDRA, and mappings contain the Lowest Level and Preferred Terms.

*PHAEDRA*. Thompson et al. [17] provide detailed information about the effects of drugs using multiple levels of annotations. Three types of entities—drugs, disorders and medical subjects—are annotated, while drugs and disorders are linked with concept IDs in MeSH and SNOMED-CT, respectively. The PHAEDRA dataset also contains relation annotations that link medical

subjects with their conditions (*Subject\_Disorder*) and link together different names for the same concept (*is\_equivalent*).

*MAD E 1.0*. [9] comprises 1089 fully de-identified longitudinal Electronic Health Record (EHR) notes from 21 randomly selected patients with cancer at the University of Massachusetts Memorial Hospital. Nine clinical named entity types (i.e., drugname, dosage, route, duration, frequency, indication, ADE, severity, and other SSD—Sign, Symptom, or Disease) and seven relations (i.e., ADE–drugname, SSD–severity, indication–drugname, drugname–route, drugname–dosage, drugname–duration, drugname–frequency) are annotated in the corpus.

*PsyTAR*. [19, 30], as our corpus, is developed using patients’ narrative data from a healthcare forum ([askapatient.com](http://askapatient.com)). However, Zolnoori et al. focus on psychiatric medications, particularly SSRIs (Selective Serotonin Reuptake Inhibitor) and SNRIs (Serotonin Norepinephrine Reuptake Inhibitor). Sentences in the review posts are classified for the presence of adverse drug reactions, withdrawal symptoms, sign/symptom/illness, drug indications, drug effectiveness, and drug ineffectiveness. Four types of concepts—adverse drug reactions, withdrawal symptoms, sign/symptom/illness, and drug indications—are annotated while linked with concept IDs in UMLS and SNOMED-CT. In addition, the entities are further classified as physiological, psychological, cognitive, and functional problems (e.g., limitation in daily functioning, social activities, or interpersonal relationships).

*n2c2-2018*. Track 2 of the 2018 National NLP Clinical Challenges shared task focuses on the extraction of medications and ADEs from clinical narratives [8]. The data for the shared task consists of 505 discharge summaries drawn from the MIMIC-III database [31]. Medication information detailed in the narratives includes medications, their strengths and dosages, duration and frequency of administration, medication form, route of administration, reason for administration, and any observed ADEs associated with each medication.

*ADE Eval*. [28] is developed to evaluate NLP techniques for identifying ADEs mentioned in publicly available FDA-approved package inserts (drug labels). The task consists of identifying mentions of ADEs in specific sections of package inserts and mapping those mentions to associated terms in

MedDRA terminology.<sup>3</sup> It is worth noting that part of the training data for ADE Eval (50 documents) is from the TAC-2017 test set.

PHEE. Sun et al. [18] design a hierarchical schema to provide coarse and fine-grained information about (a) patients, (b) treatments—the therapy administered to the patients, and (c) effects—the outcome of the treatment. Their fine-grained annotations are usually words or short phrases that highlight specific details, such as age, gender, race, number of patients, pre-existing conditions of the patients and drug, dosage, frequency, route, time elapsed, duration, target disorder of the treatment. Note that the PHEE dataset is built on existing corpora (i.e., PHAEDRA [17] and ADE [32]). All sentences in ADE [32] and those in PHAEDRA [17] with *Adverse Effect* and *Potential Therapeutic Effect* annotations are collected and enriched using the proposed annotation schema.

## 2.2. ADE Extraction Models

Developing automatic methods for detecting and extracting ADEs has a long-standing history [33–35], and methods range from statistics-based [36–38] to machine learning-based [39–41], and more recently deep learning-based [42–48]. Raval et al. [27] frame ADE extraction as a sequence-to-sequence problem using the T5 model architecture [49]. Scaboro et al. [50] compare the effectiveness of different transformer-based models for ADE extraction and use feature importance techniques to correlate model characteristics (e.g., training data, model size) to their effectiveness. Sun et al. [51] investigate the capability of ChatGPT for ADE extraction via various prompts and demonstration selection strategies. Li et al. [52] evaluate several LLMs (e.g., GPT-3, GPT-4 and Llama 2) on extracting influenza vaccine adverse events.

Although there are a number of ADE extraction models proposed recently, most of these methods are evaluated on a single dataset or datasets sourced from the same text type. Our study builds on previous research [27, 50] employing pre-trained transformer models for ADE extraction and takes a step further by focusing on these models’ domain generalisation. By benchmarking datasets from different text types, we aim to investigate how feasible it is to build a single ADE extraction model that is effective on various types of text.

---

<sup>3</sup><https://www.meddra.org/>

	CADEC	CADECv2
Number of posts	1250	3548
Average length (word)	98.8	111.3
Number of drugs	12 (2 groups)	26 (4 groups)
Time span	2001 Jan - 2013 Sep	2001 Apr - 2019 Sep
Gender	Female: 662 (50.1%)	Female: 902 (68.5%)
	Male: 617 (49.9%)	Male: 414 (31.5%)
Patient age range	17-84	0-91

Table 2: A comparison of statistics on the data used in CADEC and CADECv2. There are 53 posts containing duplicated content in both datasets. Each post can contain multiple sentences or even paragraphs.

### 3. CADECv2

Similar to CADEC [1], we use data from a medical forum—AskaPatient—to build the new corpus. On AskaPatient, the patient can fill out a review form on a specific drug. The form allows both structured and free-text fields. The structured fields include patient information (e.g., age and gender) and dosage details (e.g., quantity, strength, and frequency); the patient can also write the reason for taking the drug, the side effects experienced and comments in free-text format. In CADECv2, we only release and annotate the free text sections of each post.

CADEC [1] covers two types of drugs: (1) those with Diclofenac (an anti-inflammatory drug used to treat pain and inflammatory diseases) in their active ingredients, and (2) Atorvastatin (also known as Lipitor, used to prevent cardiovascular disease). In CADECv2, we obtain data relating to 26 drugs, thus covering more diverse drug categories, including those for depressive disorders (e.g., Duloxetine), hypertension (e.g., Losartan, Valsartan, Valsartan/hydrochlorothiazide, Amlodipine, Valsartan), stomach and esophagus problems (e.g., Esomeprazole, Ranitidine), and Diclofenac.

Table 2 compares statistics on the data used to create CADEC and CADECv2. It is worth noting that most of these reviews in AskaPatient are written by the patient, reporting their personal experience. However, not all patients provided their age and gender. Also, sometimes the conditions of a family member were reported, and not that of the person posting which is why the minimum patient age in CADECv2 is 0. For example, a review starts with “MY 2.5 MONTH OLD BABY TOOK ...”, indicating an infant.



### 3.1. Annotation Guidelines

We mainly follow the entity recognition annotation guidelines used to build CADEC and refer readers to Section 4.1 in [1] for a detailed description. We also release the complete annotation guidelines together with the annotated corpus. Here, we only provide a brief description of the guidelines for the purpose of self-containment.

There are, in total, five entity categories we annotate in CADECv2: (1) Drug—mentions of the drug name; (2) Adverse Drug Event—mentions of side effects associated with a drug; (3) Disease—the name of a disease for which the patient takes the drug; (4) Symptom—symptoms of a disease that leads to the patient taking a drug; and, (5) Finding—side effect that is not directly experienced by the patient, or a clinical concept that the annotator is unclear which category it belongs to.

We instruct the annotators to conduct the annotation at the sentence level. That is, no entity mentions should span over sentences. Entity mentions could be discontinuous (i.e., consisting of components separated by intervals) but not nested (i.e., one mention is completely contained by the other). For example, the phrase ‘have much muscle pain and fatigue’ is annotated with two mentions: ‘muscle pain’ and ‘muscle fatigue’, where the latter is a discontinuous mention [53].

One major source of disagreement in annotations in CADEC was on deciding the entity mention boundary. For example, when the span matching is strict, the inter-annotator agreement reported in [1] on posts relating to Diclofenac is 46.6. This agreement increases to 68.7, when the span matching is configured to be relaxed—annotations that overlap will be counted as a match. We attempted to help the annotators decide the mention boundary by adding detailed guidelines. We expected the identified mentions to be easily (excluding unnecessary context) and unambiguously (including necessary context) linked to a unique concept in controlled vocabularies, such as SNOMED Clinical Terms and MedDRA. Therefore, we suggested the annotators remove modifiers once the meaning of identified mentions (the underlying medical concept) is unchanged. For example, ‘ruined sex life’ preserves all information in ‘Completely ruined my sex life’. However, if a modifier provides specific information, it should be kept. For example, all modifiers in ‘Occasionally coughing’, ‘coughing all day’, and ‘coughing lasts 3 days’ provide more specific information than only annotating ‘coughing’. In addition, we instructed the annotators to include the severity indicator, such as ‘acute’ in ‘acute stomach pain’.

### 3.2. Annotation Process

To set up the annotations, we used a web-based annotation tool—Brat [54]. Three primary annotators with clinical or public health backgrounds and four secondary annotators with computer science backgrounds are involved in the annotation. Finally, each primary annotator annotates more than 1000 posts, and each secondary annotator annotates less than 500 posts.

Before the formal annotation stage, we conducted two rounds of pilot annotations on 100 posts, which were not included in the final corpus. Disagreements were discussed between annotators after each pilot round, and annotation guidelines were adjusted correspondingly. During the formal annotation stage, there are 996 posts annotated by more than one annotator. On these posts, we measure the pair-wise inter-annotator agreement using mention-level  $F_1$  scores. That is, we take annotations from one annotator as ground truth and calculate the  $F_1$  score of another annotator, whose annotations are treated as system predictions. The macro-averaged inter-annotator agreement (67.4) is higher than the result reported in [1] on the posts relating to Diclofenac (46.6) using the same strict matching setup.

## 4. MultiADE Benchmark

The MULTI ADE benchmark comprises six publicly available datasets for adverse drug event extraction, which we standardise to use the same entity recognition task. We include five existing datasets—N2C2 [8], MADE [9], PHEE [18], PSYTAR [19], CADEC [1]—and one newly created dataset—CADECv2—in the benchmark.

In addition to the characteristic of being readily accessible to the public, we choose these datasets based on two key considerations: domain diversity and reproducibility. To test domain generalisation and transferability, we strive to cover various text types in MULTI ADE: N2C2, and MADE sampled from clinical notes; PHEE from scholarly articles; PSYTAR, CADEC and CADECv2 from online posts, where PSYTAR focuses on psychiatric medications, CADEC covers anti-inflammatory drugs and drugs for cardiovascular disease, and CADECv2 covers more diverse drugs, including those for depressive disorders, acid-related disorders, esophagus problems and hypertension.

To ensure the reproducibility of our benchmark results, we did not choose datasets released through the SMM4H shared tasks because Twitter permits only sharing Tweet IDs in a dataset for others to use. As a consequence,

	<b>n2c2</b>	<b>MADE</b>	<b>PHEE</b>	<b>PsyTAR</b>	<b>CADEC</b>	<b>CADECv2</b>
Text type	clinical notes	clinical notes	scholarly articles	online posts	online posts	online posts
# Examples	505	1,089	4,827	3,147	1,250	3,548
# Sentences	66,810	61,563	4,844	3,169	7,593	22,389
# Tokens	1,587,566	1,216,211	107,569	60,028	123,494	395,044
# Entity categories	9	10	21	4	5	5
# Mentions	83,869 (8,942)	79,086 (12,626)	30,310 (11,671)	6,714 (3,334)	9,111 (4,124)	32,613 (10,289)
# Drugs	26,800 (2,907)	15,902 (1,358)	6,028 (1,505)	0 (0)	1,800 (323)	4,995 (628)
# ADEs	1,584 (744)	1,940 (501)	4,630 (3,284)	4,220 (2,656)	6,318 (3,400)	23,538 (8,965)

Table 3: The descriptive statistics of the datasets in MULTIADe. The numbers in brackets represent the unique count of mentions. spaCy library is used for tokenisation.

subsequent researchers often find it challenging to fully recover the dataset, as deleted tweets by users are irretrievable.

The descriptive statistics of the datasets in MULTIADe are listed in Table 3.

#### 4.1. Analysing Domain Characteristics

To understand the characteristics of datasets sampled from different text types, we quantify each dataset’s vocabulary (words and adverse drug events) richness and measure the similarity across different datasets.

Vocabulary richness is often used to measure the diversity of words used within a given dataset [55]. We randomly shuffle the sentences in each dataset and iterate through all sentences to calculate the number of unique words given the total number of words seen. This procedure is repeated 5 times, and each dataset’s mean is calculated. Similarly, we measure the richness of adverse drug event vocabulary by considering only mentions representing adverse drug events in each dataset. The results are seen in Figure 1, demonstrating a wider variety of words and adverse drug event mentions in scholarly articles (i.e., PHEE) compared to other text types. Note that clinical notes may have a richer word vocabulary (e.g., n2c2), but their vocabulary to describe adverse drug events is much narrower (i.e., MADE, n2c2).

We also quantify the similarity between different datasets by calculating the vocabulary (words and adverse drug events, respectively) overlap [56]. We build the word vocabulary containing the top 3K most frequent words in each dataset and the adverse drug event vocabulary containing ADE mentions that appear more than once in each dataset. The results are seen in




Figure 1: A comparison of vocabulary richness between different datasets.

Figure 2. We observe datasets sampled from similar text types have substantial vocabulary overlap while they are far more dissimilar to datasets sampled from other text types.

#### 4.2. Standardising the Task

While each dataset is annotated using distinct schemas and guidelines, we aim to establish a unified benchmark, allowing the evaluation of the model’s effectiveness on different text types. Hence, we carefully analyse each dataset’s annotation schemas and guidelines, identifying commonalities and differences and linking various entity categories representing closely related concepts (Table 4). We aim to link categories representing closely related concepts, albeit their surface forms. For example, the ‘Adverse\_event’ category in PHEE are mainly event triggers, such as ‘developed’. This definition is very different from the definition of ADE in other datasets. In contrast, ‘Effect’, indicating the outcome of the treatment, such as ‘hemiparesis contralateral to the injury’ is closer to the definition of ADE in other datasets. Therefore, we put the ‘Adverse\_event’ category in PHEE as a distinct category (# 15 in Table 4) and link ‘Effect’ in PHEE and ‘ADE’ in other datasets (# 2 in Table 4). It is worth noting that most of the datasets also have other types of annotations provided. For example, n2c2 and MADE have relation annotations, e.g., relations between drug names and other mentions such as dosages, duration, etc. CADEC provides concept normalisation annotations that link the identified mentions to controlled vocabularies (i.e., SNOMED Clinical Terms and MedDRA). We leave the investigation of other tasks for




Figure 2: Vocabulary overlap (%) between datasets in MULTIADe. The first two datasets (N2C2 and MADE) are sampled from clinical notes, and the last three datasets (PSYTAR, CADEC, and CADECv2) are sampled from online posts.

future work and focus on identifying mentions of the entities of interest in the MULTIADe benchmark.

## 5. Experimental Results

The new MULTIADe benchmark allows us to conduct experiments and analyses regarding domain generalisation and transferability. More specifically, we attempt to provide answers to two questions: 1) how an entity recognition model, which is trained on one text type, generalises to other text types (cross-domain generalisation), and 2) which text type is the most beneficial transfer source, even though the types of annotated entities may differ between the source and the target (intermediate transfer learning).

Here, we first provide an overview of our entity recognition models. We mainly consider one widely used entity recognition model—span-based entity recognition model [57]—because of its effectiveness in recognising both flat and nested entity mentions, which exist in most of the datasets in the MULTIADe benchmark. We also experiment with a generative entity recognition model [58]. However, its effectiveness is overall lower than the span-based entity recognition model, especially when the input text is long (i.e., N2C2, MADE). We refer the reader to the original work for more details and provide only condensed summaries. Note that we did not use LLM-based entity recognition models primarily for two reasons: Firstly, recent studies indicate

	<b>n2c2</b>	<b>MADE</b>	<b>PHEE</b>	<b>PsyTAR</b>	<b>CADEC</b>	<b>CADECv2</b>
1	Drug (26800)	Drug (15902)	Drug (6028)	-	Drug (1800)	Drug (4995)
2	ADE (1584)	ADE (1940)	Effect (4630)	ADR (4220)	ADE (6318)	ADE (23538)
3	Strength (10921)	-	-	-	-	-
4	Form (11010)	-	-	-	-	-
5	Dosage (6902)	Dose (5694)	Dosage (460)	-	-	-
6	Frequency (10293)	Frequency (4806)	Freq (114)	-	-	-
7	Route (8989)	Route (2667)	Route (609)	-	-	-
8	Duration (970)	Duration (898)	Duration (153)	-	-	-
9	Reason (6400)	-	-	-	-	-
10	-	Indication (3804)	-	DI (769)	-	-
11	-	PHI (84)	-	-	-	-
12	-	SSLIF (39383)	-	-	Finding (435)	Finding (361)
13	-	-	-	SSI (1206)	-	-
14	-	Severity (3908)	-	-	-	-
15	-	-	Adverse_event (4465)	-	-	-
16	-	-	Subject (2394)	-	-	-
17	-	-	Age (690)	-	-	-
18	-	-	Sub-Disorder (365)	-	-	-
19	-	-	Gender (562)	-	-	-
20	-	-	Population (450)	-	-	-
21	-	-	Race (64)	-	-	-
22	-	-	Treatment (5007)	-	-	-
23	-	-	Treat-Disorder (1688)	-	-	-
24	-	-	Time_elapsed (312)	-	-	-
25	-	-	Combination (657)	-	-	-
26	-	-	-	WD (519)	-	-
27	-	-	-	-	Disease (283)	Disease (1577)
28	-	-	-	-	- Symptom (275)	Symptom (2142)

Table 4: Annotated entity categories in MULTIADE. Entity categories representing closely related concepts are linked from different datasets. The number in the bracket indicates the number of entity mentions in each dataset. PHI: Protected health information. SSLIF: other signs, symptoms, or diseases. DI: Drug Indications. SSI: Sign/Symptoms/Illness. WD: Withdrawal Symptoms.

that they still lag behind fully fine-tuned small models [51, 59]. Secondly, their usage typically entails a data privacy concern and a significant amount of computational or financial costs.

*Span-based entity recognition model.* The key idea of the span-based entity recognition model is to enumerate all possible spans (i.e., continuous text segments) and determine whether each span is a valid entity name and its entity category [60, 61]. We first employ a transformer-based encoder (i.e., RoBERTa [21]) to obtain the contextual vector representations for each token in the text. Then, the vectors corresponding to two boundary tokens of the span and a dense representation of the span length are concatenated and taken as the input of a classifier. The classifier finally predicts either (1) an


entity category  $t \in \mathcal{R}$ ; or, (2) NA (the span is not an entity mention).

*Generative entity recognition model.* Instead of a classification problem, the generative model formulates the entity recognition task as a sequence generation problem, which can be solved using a sequence-to-sequence framework. Following [58], we use the BART [62] model as the backbone model and generate the target sequence in an autoregressive manner. That is, the model takes a sequence of text as input and generates a list of entities, which are represented using the position index of two boundary tokens of the entity and the entity category. For example, the output ‘0 3 Drug’ indicates that a drug name is mentioned in the input text; the first token is its starting token, and the fourth is its ending token. If no entity is mentioned in the input text, the prediction is an empty sequence containing two special symbols:  $\langle s \rangle$ , indicating the start of the sequence and  $\langle /s \rangle$ , the end.


### 5.1. Cross-domain Generalisation

In the set of experiments regarding cross-domain generalisation, we fine-tune all models using the training set from one source and evaluate the model on the test set in each target. The source development set is used for hyperparameter tuning (i.e., learning rate and the number of training epochs) and choosing the best model checkpoint (Figure 3a). It is worth noting that it is impractical to expect a model trained to identify a particular entity category to recognise mentions belonging to other categories. Therefore, we focus on two entity categories (drug and adverse drug events), as these are the most common categories annotated in the different datasets. Models are trained separately to recognise drug names and adverse drug events. Evaluation results of span-based and generative models can be found in Table 5 and 6, respectively.

The first observation we can obtain from experimental results is that there is a clear performance drop when applying models trained on one text type to other text types. For example, the span-based drug name recognition model (Table 5), trained on N2C2, achieves a very high  $F_1$  score (92.2%) on the N2C2 test set. However, its effectiveness drops dramatically when applied to other text types (e.g.,  $F_1$  score of 83.1% on PHEE). This effectiveness drop is more evident in the adverse drug event recognition models. For example, the adverse drug event recognition model trained on N2C2 achieves an  $F_1$  score of lower than 10 on other text types (PHEE, PSYTAR, CADEC, CADECv2).



(a) We train the model on one source (e.g., N2C2) and evaluate it on different targets. We aim to analyse how a model trained on one text type generalises to text types.



(b) We first train the model on one source (e.g., MADE), then continue training on the target training set (e.g., N2C2), and finally evaluate it on the target test set. We aim to identify the most beneficial transfer source.

Figure 3: The experimental setup of (a) cross-domain generalisation and (b) intermediate transfer learning. The training set is used to train the model, and the development set is used for hyper-parameter tuning and choosing the best checkpoint. Finally, the chosen checkpoint is evaluated on the test set.

We also observe that models trained on one text type perform better on datasets sampled from a similar text type than a distinct text type. For example, the adverse drug event recognition model, trained on CADECv2, performs reasonably well on PsyTAR, because both CADECv2 and PsyTAR are sampled from online posts even though they focus on different medications. This result is encouraging because the adverse drug events overlap between these datasets is very low (Figure 2). However, the model can still recognise unseen adverse drug events based on the context in which these events are mentioned. In contrast, its effectiveness becomes much worse when the model is applied to clinical notes (N2C2, MADE) and scholarly articles (PHEE).



Training	Test						
	n2c2	MADE	PHEE	PsyTAR	CADEC	CADECv2	AVG
Drug							
n2c2	<b>92.2 ± 0.1</b>	84.5 ± 1.1	83.1 ± 0.3	-	88.0 ± 0.6	84.8 ± 0.8	<b>86.5</b>
MADE	85.6 ± 0.5	<b>91.8 ± 0.2</b>	79.9 ± 2.4	-	88.4 ± 0.6	85.2 ± 0.5	86.2
PHEE	75.7 ± 0.9	69.6 ± 0.5	<b>89.2 ± 0.5</b>	-	83.8 ± 0.3	80.9 ± 0.2	79.8
PsyTAR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CADEC	71.9 ± 1.4	65.8 ± 1.0	70.9 ± 4.0	-	<b>96.2 ± 0.2</b>	89.0 ± 0.3	78.8
CADECv2	73.2 ± 1.5	67.0 ± 0.6	76.0 ± 0.9	-	92.0 ± 0.3	<b>91.7 ± 0.0</b>	80.0
ADE							
n2c2	<b>51.8 ± 1.2</b>	50.3 ± 5.7	34.5 ± 6.3	0.2 ± 0.2	5.2 ± 2.4	3.9 ± 1.2	24.3
MADE	38.5 ± 0.8	<b>68.7 ± 1.8</b>	23.9 ± 4.3	1.5 ± 0.2	11.7 ± 0.5	12.0 ± 0.1	27.5
PHEE	7.7 ± 0.4	10.5 ± 0.2	<b>69.0 ± 0.5</b>	6.5 ± 1.6	13.1 ± 1.3	10.3 ± 1.1	19.5
PsyTAR	4.3 ± 0.4	5.5 ± 0.7	27.6 ± 3.3	<b>68.5 ± 0.4</b>	59.0 ± 0.6	58.3 ± 0.7	37.2
CADEC	5.9 ± 0.3	11.7 ± 0.5	22.5 ± 4.2	54.2 ± 1.3	67.7 ± 0.6	68.9 ± 0.2	38.5
CADECv2	5.6 ± 0.6	13.6 ± 1.7	38.7 ± 2.6	57.8 ± 0.3	<b>69.4 ± 0.2</b>	<b>72.0 ± 0.8</b>	<b>42.9</b>

Table 5: Evaluation results, in terms of  $F_1$  scores (in percentage), of span-based models on recognising Drug names and Adverse drug events. The PsyTAR dataset does not have ‘Drug’ annotations.

These results echo the challenge of building a single model that works effectively on different text types, including scholarly articles, clinical notes and online posts [55, 63]. Therefore, we move to the next question: if we aim to build a model for a particular text type, can we benefit from annotated data from other text types? If yes, which text type is the most beneficial transfer source?

### 5.2. Intermediate Transfer Learning

In the intermediate transfer learning experiments, we first train the model on one source training set, then continue training on the target training set, and finally evaluate the model on the target test set. Previous studies [64, 65] have observed improvements from intermediate transfer learning, even though the source and the target may have different entity categories. In these experiments, we train on the source training set using the same set of hyper-parameters, then tune the hyper-parameters and choose the best model checkpoint based on the results on the target development set (Figure 3b).

We use the model only trained on the target training data as the baseline. It is worth noting that if the source and the target are the same, it is equivalent to training on the target training set for longer. Results in Table 7 show that training longer does not change the evaluation results

Training	Test						
	n2c2	MADE	PHEE	PsyTAR	CADEC	CADECv2	AVG
Drug							
n2c2	30.8 ± 43.5	29.0 ± 41.0	27.6 ± 39.0	-	29.1 ± 41.2	28.7 ± 40.4	29.0
MADE	57.2 ± 40.4	60.9 ± 43.1	52.1 ± 36.9	-	56.8 ± 40.2	55.5 ± 39.2	56.5
PHEE	48.5 ± 10.1	42.3 ± 11.9	<b>88.9 ± 1.2</b>	-	62.6 ± 15.9	59.7 ± 15.9	60.4
CADECv1	<b>64.8 ± 4.9</b>	<b>63.7 ± 3.6</b>	79.8 ± 0.9	-	<b>96.2 ± 0.6</b>	<b>89.8 ± 0.5</b>	<b>78.9</b>
CADECv2	42.5 ± 30.3	40.4 ± 28.9	50.8 ± 36.0	-	60.7 ± 43.0	60.3 ± 42.7	51.0
ADE							
n2c2	15.3 ± 21.6	14.1 ± 19.9	13.5 ± 19.0	0.8 ± 1.1	1.1 ± 1.6	1.6 ± 2.3	7.7
MADE	<b>20.0 ± 14.2</b>	<b>41.1 ± 29.1</b>	21.7 ± 15.3	4.5 ± 3.2	5.8 ± 4.2	8.8 ± 6.2	17.0
PHEE	4.4 ± 0.7	9.0 ± 2.1	<b>71.3 ± 0.4</b>	11.0 ± 0.7	14.3 ± 0.7	11.5 ± 0.1	20.3
PsyTAR	2.4 ± 0.1	4.7 ± 0.3	42.0 ± 0.1	<b>68.2 ± 1.1</b>	58.0 ± 0.6	55.1 ± 0.2	38.4
CADECv1	4.4 ± 0.4	11.3 ± 1.3	37.4 ± 2.9	56.6 ± 0.2	<b>67.5 ± 0.2</b>	66.6 ± 0.2	40.6
CADECv2	3.6 ± 0.1	10.6 ± 0.5	37.2 ± 0.9	57.7 ± 0.3	67.2 ± 0.1	<b>69.8 ± 0.3</b>	<b>41.0</b>

Table 6: Evaluation results, in terms of  $F_1$  scores (in percentage), of generative models on recognising Drug names and Adverse drug events. The PSYTAR dataset does not have ‘Drug’ annotations.

too much compared to the baselines because we have individually conducted hyper-parameter tuning on each baseline model.

We also train one joint model using all training data from different datasets. Results (‘Combined’ row in Table 7) show that the model, although trained on much larger training data, underperforms these baseline models with a large gap on most of these target sets. In contrast, we observe overall improvements due to intermediate transfer learning. On five of six datasets, training on a different source outperforms training on only target training data. For example, if a model is first trained on n2c2 and then MADE, it achieves a higher  $F_1$  score than training only on MADE. Again, we observe datasets from similar text types can be more helpful than datasets from dissimilar text types. For example, n2c2 and MADE (clinical notes) benefit more from each other than other sources. Similarly, the most beneficial source for CADEC is CADECv2, and vice versa.

These results echo the necessity of a cost-effective way to select training data [59, 66] because much larger training data (‘Combined’ row in Table 7) does not necessarily outperform the model trained on a small amount of training data (‘Baseline’), and training data from close-related domains help improve the effectiveness via providing more diverse examples.

	n2c2	MADE	PHEE	PsyTAR	CADEC	CADECv2	AVG
Baseline	88.1 ± 0.1	85.2 ± 0.2	67.5 ± 0.0	62.1 ± 0.4	71.1 ± 0.6	72.9 ± 0.3	74.5
Combined	84.5 ± 0.4	82.6 ± 0.1	66.6 ± 0.3	48.2 ± 1.5	71.9 ± 0.3 ↑	70.6 ± 0.1	70.7
N2C2	88.2 ± 0.2 ↑	<b>85.6 ± 0.1 ↑</b>	67.4 ± 0.4	63.4 ± 1.0 ↑	70.5 ± 0.4	72.4 ± 0.3	74.6
MADE	<b>88.4 ± 0.0 ↑</b>	85.4 ± 0.3 ↑	67.4 ± 0.2	63.1 ± 0.2 ↑	71.2 ± 0.8 ↑	72.7 ± 0.2	74.7
PHEE	88.1 ± 0.1	85.3 ± 0.1 ↑	<b>67.7 ± 0.0 ↑</b>	62.3 ± 0.3 ↑	71.5 ± 0.8 ↑	72.8 ± 0.1	74.6
PsyTAR	88.3 ± 0.0 ↑	84.9 ± 0.1	67.6 ± 0.1 ↑	62.1 ± 0.5	70.9 ± 0.2	72.6 ± 0.4	74.4
CADEC	<b>88.4 ± 0.1 ↑</b>	85.3 ± 0.2 ↑	67.4 ± 0.1	<b>63.9 ± 0.7 ↑</b>	71.0 ± 0.4	<b>73.3 ± 0.2 ↑</b>	74.9
CADECv2	88.2 ± 0.1 ↑	85.1 ± 0.3	67.4 ± 0.1	63.4 ± 1.0 ↑	<b>72.9 ± 0.4 ↑</b>	72.8 ± 0.1	<b>75.0</b>

Table 7: Intermediate transfer learning using the span-based model: fine-tuning the model first on the source (row) training data and then on the target (column) training data. The best model checkpoint is chosen based on the results of the target development set and is finally evaluated on the target test set. ↑: better than the baseline model, which is only trained on the target training data. All the numbers are F1 scores in percentage with standard deviations.

### 5.3. Qualitative Analysis

To understand the limited generalisation of supervised ADE models, we collect and analyse error predictions on both PSYTAR and PHEE test sets. Based on the vocabulary overlap shown in Figure 2, these two datasets are the most dissimilar pair, with one built from scholarly articles and the other from online posts. The span-based ADE extraction model trained on PHEE training set achieved an averaged  $F_1$  score<sup>4</sup> of 69.0% on the PHEE test set and 6.5% on the PSYTAR test set. Conversely, the model trained on PSYTAR training set achieved an averaged  $F_1$  score of 27.6% on the PHEE test set and 68.5% on the PSYTAR test set (Table 5).

First, we analyse common ADE error predictions by all six trained models—three trained on PHEE training set and three on PSYTAR training set using different random seeds—on each test set. On both PHEE and PSYTAR test sets, we observe a small number of false positives but many false negatives, resulting in a low recall.

We found that most of these false positives involve minor boundary problems. For example, model prediction “increase in risk of bleeding” versus human annotation of “an increase in risk of bleeding”, or model prediction of “completely premorbid” versus human annotation of “premorbid” have led to mismatch. Severity indicators also cause some error predictions. Although an entity category, ‘Severity\_cue’, is defined in the PHEE annotation

<sup>4</sup>We repeat the experiments three times using different random seeds.

schema, they are sometimes annotated as part of ADEs, such as ‘severe rhabdomyolysis water intoxication’, but not always. On PHEE, we found models perform worse in recognising the potential therapeutic effects (i.e., a potential beneficial effect), which are annotated together with adverse drug effects under the same category ‘Effect’. On PSYTAR, the main challenge comes from recognising ADEs written in slang, such as ‘want to express myself and cry but can’t’, ‘alter your thinking’, etc. Note that PSYTAR focuses on psychiatric medications; this may add additional challenges as some ADEs may be very similar to people’s daily language and thus only noticeable given a specific context (e.g., ‘speeding’ in the sentence ‘Never have I had such side effects, nor have I ever felt as “drugged” as I did on Cymbalta: nervous and speeding.’).

Secondly, we analyse error predictions by out-of-domain trained models but not in-domain models. For example, on the PSYTAR test set, we focus on errors made by models trained on PHEE, but not by models trained on PSYTAR. The model trained on PHEE has experienced a large performance drop when evaluated on the PSYTAR test set. In addition to the above-mentioned challenge of recognising ADEs written in slang, we found the other possible reason could be the disparity between the sufficient context in scholarly articles and the insufficient context in online posts. We conjecture that models trained on PHEE may learn to rely on context clues (e.g., ‘associated with’, ‘developed’) to recognise ADEs because, in scholarly articles, these clues are frequently used to indicate the relation between drugs/treatment and ADEs. However, these clues may not be available in user-generated posts. For example, in PSYTAR, many examples contain only a list of ADEs without providing any context. Conversely, models trained on PSYTAR may not be able to use context clues, and fail to recognise unseen ADEs written using a very formal vocabulary. In addition, we notice that many error predictions are caused by different annotation rules involving coordination structures. That is, PSYTAR usually annotates each ADE separately, but a coordination phrase mentioning several ADEs is usually annotated as one entity in PHEE. For example, in the sentence from PSYTAR “Although if it wasn’t for the hair loss and sexual side effects I would of stayed on it.”, there are two human annotations: ‘hair loss’ and ‘sexual side effects’. However, models trained on PHEE tend to recognise “hair loss and sexual side effects” as one ADE.

## 6. Summary

In this study, we build a multi-domain benchmark for adverse drug event extraction—MULTIADE. The new benchmark comprises several existing datasets sampled from different text types and a newly created dataset—CADECv2, an extension of CADEC [1], covering online posts regarding more categories of drugs.

Our analysis shows that datasets sampled from different text types have notable differences regarding their vocabulary richness, and datasets sampled from similar text types have substantial vocabulary overlap while far more dissimilar to datasets sampled from other text types. Our benchmark results also show that the generalisation of the trained model is far from perfect, making it infeasible to be deployed to process different text types.

Although intermediate transfer learning is a promising approach to utilising existing resources, further investigation on methods of domain adaptation, particularly cost-effective methods to select useful training instances, is needed. Another avenue to extend our work is to build similar benchmarks focusing on relation extraction and concept normalisation. However, new datasets need to be built to annotate relations between entities and associate the current entity mentions to their corresponding concepts in SNOMED CT or MedDRA.

## Limitations

To investigate domain generalisation, we build a multi-domain benchmark for adverse drug event extraction. Except for one newly created dataset (i.e., CADECv2), this benchmark reuses several existing datasets that have been annotated using different annotation schemas. Although we carefully analyse each dataset’s annotation schemas and guidelines and try to link categories representing closely related concepts, we know this approach can be imperfect. We call for research to consider reusing existing annotation guidelines or building multiple domain datasets using the same annotation guideline.

## Ethics

This work is approved by the CSIRO Health and Medical Human Research Ethics Committee (2020\_004\_LR).

## Acknowledgements

The authors thank Shanae Burns (CSIRO), Annette Quansah and Zhanxu Liu (Emory University) for their contributions to annotation and discussions and AskaPatient.com for providing their data for use in this study. This work is funded by the CSIRO Precision Health Future Science Platform.

## References

- [1] S. Karimi, A. Metke-Jimenez, M. Kemp, C. Wang, CADEC: A corpus of adverse drug event annotations, *Journal of biomedical informatics* 55 (2015). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1532046415000532>.
- [2] J. T. Hanlon, R. J. Sloane, C. F. Pieper, K. E. Schmader, Association of adverse drug reactions with drug–drug and drug–disease interactions in frail older outpatients, *Age and ageing* 40 (2011). URL: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3038456/>.
- [3] R. Bushra, N. Aslam, A. Y. Khan, Food-drug interactions, *Oman medical journal* 26 (2011). URL: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3191675/>.
- [4] S. Karimi, C. Wang, A. Metke-Jimenez, R. Gaire, C. Paris, Text and data mining techniques in adverse drug reaction detection, *ACM Computing Surveys* 47 (2015). URL: <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/2719920>.
- [5] R. Harpaz, A. Callahan, S. Tamang, Y. Low, D. Odgers, S. Finlayson, K. Jung, P. LePendou, N. H. Shah, Text mining for adverse drug events: the promise, challenges, and state of the art, *Drug safety* 37 (2014). URL: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4217510/>.
- [6] A. Sarker, R. Ginn, A. Nikfarjam, K. O’Connor, K. Smith, S. Jayaraman, T. Upadhaya, G. Gonzalez, Utilizing social media data for pharmacovigilance: a review, *Journal of biomedical informatics* 54 (2015). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1532046415000362>.

- [7] L. Hazell, S. A. W. Shakir, Under-reporting of adverse drug reactions, *Drug safety* 29 (2006). URL: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16689555/>.
- [8] S. Henry, K. Buchan, M. Filannino, A. Stubbs, O. Uzuner, 2018 n2c2 shared task on adverse drug events and medication extraction in electronic health records, *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 27 (2020). URL: <https://academic.oup.com/jamia/article/27/1/3/5581277?login=true>.
- [9] A. N. Jagannatha, F. Liu, W. Liu, H. Yu, Overview of the First Natural Language Processing Challenge for Extracting Medication, Indication, and Adverse Drug Events from Electronic Health Record Notes (MADE 1.0), *Drug Safety* 42 (2019). URL: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40264-018-0762-z>.
- [10] D. Weissenbacher, A. Sarker, A. Magge, A. Daughton, K. O'Connor, M. J. Paul, G. Gonzalez-Hernandez, Overview of the Fourth Social Media Mining for Health (SMM4H) Shared Tasks at ACL 2019, in: *Proceedings of the Fourth Social Media Mining for Health Applications (SMM4H) Workshop and Shared Task, 2019*. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/W19-3203>.
- [11] D. Weissenbacher, J. Banda, V. Davydova, D. E. Zavala, L. G. Sánchez, Y. Ge, Y. Guo, A. Klein, M. Krallinger, M. Leddin, A. Magge, R. Rodriguez-Esteban, A. Sarker, L. Schmidt, E. Tutubalina, G. Gonzalez-Hernandez, Overview of the Seventh Social Media Mining for Health Applications (SMM4H) Shared Tasks at COLING 2022, in: *Proceedings of The Seventh Workshop on Social Media Mining for Health Applications, Workshop and Shared Task, 2022*. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2022.smm4h-1.54>.
- [12] A. Sarker, A. Nikfarjam, G. Gonzalez, Social media mining shared task workshop, in: *Pacific Symposium on Biocomputing, 2016*. URL: [https://www.worldscientific.com/doi/abs/10.1142/9789814749411\\_0054](https://www.worldscientific.com/doi/abs/10.1142/9789814749411_0054).
- [13] A. Sarker, G. Gonzalez-Hernandez, Overview of the second social media mining for health (SMM4H) shared tasks at AMIA 2017, in: *2nd Social*

- Media Mining for Health Research and Applications Workshop, 2017. URL: <https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-1996/paper8.pdf>.
- [14] D. Weissenbacher, A. Sarker, M. J. Paul, G. Gonzalez-Hernandez, Overview of the Third Social Media Mining for Health (SMM4H) Shared Tasks at EMNLP 2018, in: Proceedings of the 2018 EMNLP Workshop SMM4H: The 3rd Social Media Mining for Health Applications Workshop and Shared Task, 2018. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/W18-5904>.
- [15] A. Klein, I. Alimova, I. Flores, A. Magge, Z. Miftahutdinov, A.-L. Minard, K. O'Connor, A. Sarker, E. Tutubalina, D. Weissenbacher, G. Gonzalez-Hernandez, Overview of the Fifth Social Media Mining for Health Applications (SMM4H) Shared Tasks at COLING 2020, in: Proceedings of the Fifth Social Media Mining for Health Applications Workshop and Shared Task, 2020. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2020.smm4h-1.4>.
- [16] K. Roberts, D. Demner-Fushman, J. M. Tanning, Overview of the TAC 2017 Adverse Reaction Extraction from Drug Labels Track, in: Text Analysis Conference, 2017. URL: [https://tac.nist.gov/publications/2017/additional.papers/TAC2017.ADR\\_overview.proceedings.pdf](https://tac.nist.gov/publications/2017/additional.papers/TAC2017.ADR_overview.proceedings.pdf).
- [17] P. Thompson, S. Daikou, K. Ueno, R. Batista-Navarro, J. Tsujii, S. Ananiadou, Annotation and detection of drug effects in text for pharmacovigilance, *Journal of cheminformatics* 10 (2018). URL: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6089860/>.
- [18] Z. Sun, J. Li, G. Pergola, B. C. Wallace, B. John, N. Greene, J. Kim, Y. He, PHEE: A Dataset for Pharmacovigilance Event Extraction from Text, in: Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, 2022. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2022.emnlp-main.376.pdf>.
- [19] M. Zolnoori, K. W. Fung, T. B. Patrick, P. Fontelo, H. Kharrazi, A. Faiola, N. D. Shah, Y. S. S. Wu, C. E. Eldredge, J. Luo, The PsyTAR dataset: From patients generated narratives to a corpus of adverse drug events and effectiveness of psychiatric medications, *Data in brief* 24 (2019). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/>



article/pii/S2352340919301891?ref=pdf\_download&fr=RR-2&rr=80cae214ff38aad5.

- [20] J. Devlin, M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, K. Toutanova, BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding, in: Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers), 2019. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/N19-1423.pdf>.
- [21] Y. Liu, M. Ott, N. Goyal, J. Du, M. Joshi, D. Chen, O. Levy, M. Lewis, L. Zettlemoyer, V. Stoyanov, RoBERTa: A Robustly Optimized BERT Pretraining Approach, arXiv 1907.11692 (2019). URL: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1907.11692.pdf>.
- [22] P. Liu, W. Yuan, J. Fu, Z. Jiang, H. Hayashi, G. Neubig, Pre-train, Prompt, and Predict: A Systematic Survey of Prompting Methods in Natural Language Processing, ACM Comput. Surv. 55 (2023). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3560815>.
- [23] T. Xie, Q. Li, J. Zhang, Y. Zhang, Z. Liu, H. Wang, Empirical Study of Zero-Shot NER with ChatGPT, in: Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, 2023. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.493>.
- [24] R. Han, T. Peng, C. Yang, B. Wang, L. Liu, X. Wan, Is Information Extraction Solved by ChatGPT? An Analysis of Performance, Evaluation Criteria, Robustness and Errors, arXiv 2305.14450 (2023). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.14450>.
- [25] A. Henriksson, M. Kvist, H. Dalianis, M. Duneld, Identifying adverse drug event information in clinical notes with distributional semantic representations of context, Journal of biomedical informatics 57 (2015). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S153204641500180X>.
- [26] L. Raithel, P. Thomas, R. Roller, O. Sapina, S. Möller, P. Zweigenbaum, Cross-lingual Approaches for the Detection of Adverse Drug Reactions in German from a Patient’s Perspective, in: Proceedings of the Thirteenth

- Language Resources and Evaluation Conference, 2022. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2022.lrec-1.388.pdf>.
- [27] S. Raval, H. Sedghamiz, E. Santus, T. Alhanai, M. Ghassemi, E. Chersoni, Exploring a Unified Sequence-To-Sequence Transformer for Medical Product Safety Monitoring in Social Media, in: Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021, 2021. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2021.findings-emnlp.300.pdf>.
- [28] S. Bayer, C. Clark, O. Dang, J. Aberdeen, S. Brajovic, K. Swank, L. Hirschman, R. Ball, ADE Eval: An Evaluation of Text Processing Systems for Adverse Event Extraction from Drug Labels for Pharmacovigilance, *Drug safety* 44 (2021). URL: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7813736/>.
- [29] A. Magge, A. Klein, A. Miranda-Escalada, M. A. Al-Garadi, I. Alimova, Z. Miftahutdinov, E. Farre, S. L. López, I. Flores, K. O'Connor, D. Weissenbacher, E. Tutubalina, A. Sarker, J. Banda, M. Krallinger, G. Gonzalez-Hernandez, Overview of the Sixth Social Media Mining for Health Applications (SMM4H) Shared Tasks at NAACL 2021, in: Proceedings of the Sixth Social Media Mining for Health (SMM4H) Workshop and Shared Task, 2021. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2021.smm4h-1.4>.
- [30] M. Zolnoori, K. W. Fung, T. B. Patrick, P. Fontelo, H. Kharrazi, A. Faiola, Y. S. S. Wu, C. E. Eldredge, J. Luo, M. Conway, A systematic approach for developing a corpus of patient reported adverse drug events: a case study for SSRI and SNRI medications, *Journal of biomedical informatics* 90 (2019). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1532046419300012>.
- [31] A. E. W. Johnson, T. J. Pollard, L. Shen, H. L. Li-Wei, M. Feng, M. Ghassemi, B. Moody, P. Szolovits, L. A. Celi, R. G. Mark, MIMIC-III, a freely accessible critical care database, *Scientific Data* 3 (2016). URL: <https://www.nature.com/articles/sdata201635.pdf>.
- [32] H. Gurulingappa, A. M. Rajput, A. Roberts, J. Fluck, M. Hofmann-Apitius, L. Toldo, Development of a benchmark corpus to support the automatic extraction of drug-related adverse effects from medical case reports, *Journal of biomedical informatics* 45

- (2012). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1532046412000615>.
- [33] G. B. Melton, G. Hripcsak, Automated detection of adverse events using natural language processing of discharge summaries, *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 12 (2005). URL: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1174890/>.
- [34] E. Aramaki, Y. Miura, M. Tonoike, T. Ohkuma, H. Masuichi, K. Waki, K. Ohe, Extraction of adverse drug effects from clinical records, *Studies in Health Technology and Informatics* (2010). URL: <https://ebooks.iospress.nl/publication/13537>.
- [35] P. LePendou, S. V. Iyer, A. Bauer-Mehren, R. Harpaz, J. M. Mortensen, T. Podchiyska, T. A. Ferris, N. H. Shah, Pharmacovigilance using clinical notes, *Clinical pharmacology and therapeutics* 93 (2013). URL: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3846296/>.
- [36] X. Wang, G. Hripcsak, M. Markatou, C. Friedman, Active computerized pharmacovigilance using natural language processing, statistics, and electronic health records: a feasibility study, *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 16 (2009). URL: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2732239/>.
- [37] A. Benton, L. Ungar, S. Hill, S. Hennessy, J. Mao, A. Chung, C. E. Leonard, J. H. Holmes, Identifying potential adverse effects using the web: A new approach to medical hypothesis generation, *Journal of biomedical informatics* 44 (2011). URL: [https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1532-0464\(11\)00123-7](https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1532-0464(11)00123-7).
- [38] X. Liu, H. Chen, AZDrugMiner: an information extraction system for mining patient-reported adverse drug events in online patient forums, in: *International Conference on Smart Health*, 2013. URL: [https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-642-39844-5\\_16](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-642-39844-5_16).
- [39] A. Nikfarjam, A. Sarker, K. O’connor, R. Ginn, G. Gonzalez, Pharmacovigilance from social media: mining adverse drug reaction mentions using sequence labeling with word embedding cluster features, *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 22 (2015). URL: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4457113/>.

- [40] A. B. Chapman, K. S. Peterson, P. R. Alba, S. L. DuVall, O. V. Patterson, Detecting adverse drug events with rapidly trained classification models, *Drug safety* 42 (2019). URL: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6373386/>.
- [41] Y. Kim, S. M. Meystre, Ensemble method-based extraction of medication and related information from clinical texts, *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 27 (2020). URL: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7489099/>.
- [42] X. Yang, J. Bian, Y. Gong, W. R. Hogan, Y. Wu, MADEx: a system for detecting medications, adverse drug events, and their relations from clinical notes, *Drug safety* 42 (2019). URL: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6402874/>.
- [43] M. Ju, N. T. H. Nguyen, M. Miwa, S. Ananiadou, An ensemble of neural models for nested adverse drug events and medication extraction with subwords, *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 27 (2020). URL: <https://academic.oup.com/jamia/article/27/1/22/5518594>.
- [44] X. Yang, J. Bian, R. Fang, R. I. Bjarnadottir, W. R. Hogan, Y. Wu, Identifying relations of medications with adverse drug events using recurrent convolutional neural networks and gradient boosting, *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 27 (2020). URL: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7489076/>.
- [45] H.-J. Dai, C.-H. Su, C.-S. Wu, Adverse drug event and medication extraction in electronic health records via a cascading architecture with different sequence labeling models and word embeddings, *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 27 (2020). URL: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7489070/>.
- [46] B. Portelli, E. Lenzi, E. Chersoni, G. Serra, E. Santus, BERT Prescriptions to Avoid Unwanted Headaches: A Comparison of Transformer Architectures for Adverse Drug Event Detection, in: *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, 2021. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2021.eacl-main.149.pdf>.

- [47] S. Narayanan, K. Mannam, P. Achan, M. V. Ramesh, P. V. Rangan, S. P. Rajan, A contextual multi-task neural approach to medication and adverse events identification from clinical text, *Journal of biomedical informatics* 125 (2022). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1532046421002896?via%3Dihub>.
- [48] B. Portelli, D. Passabì, E. Lenzi, G. Serra, E. Santus, E. Chersoni, Improving Adverse Drug Event Extraction with SpanBERT on Different Text Typologies, *arXiv 2105.08882* (2021). URL: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2105.08882.pdf>.
- [49] C. Raffel, N. Shazeer, A. Roberts, K. Lee, S. Narang, M. Matena, Y. Zhou, W. Li, P. J. Liu, Exploring the Limits of Transfer Learning with a Unified Text-to-Text Transformer, *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 21 (2020). URL: <https://jmlr.org/papers/v21/20-074.html>.
- [50] S. Scaboro, B. Portelli, E. Chersoni, E. Santus, G. Serra, Extensive evaluation of transformer-based architectures for adverse drug events extraction, *Knowledge-Based Systems* 275 (2023). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0950705123004252>.
- [51] Z. Sun, G. Pergola, B. Wallace, Y. He, Leveraging ChatGPT in Pharmacovigilance Event Extraction: An Empirical Study, in: *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, 2024. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2024.eacl-short.30.pdf>.
- [52] Y. Li, J. Li, J. He, C. Tao, AE-GPT: Using Large Language Models to extract adverse events from surveillance reports—A use case with influenza vaccine adverse events, *PLOS ONE* 19 (2024). URL: <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0300919>.
- [53] X. Dai, S. Karimi, B. Hachey, C. Paris, An Effective Transition-based Model for Discontinuous NER, in: *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2020. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2020.acl-main.520.pdf>.
- [54] P. Stenetorp, S. Pyysalo, G. Topić, T. Ohta, S. Ananiadou, J. Tsujii, brat: a Web-based Tool for NLP-Assisted Text Annotation, in: *Proceedings of the Demonstrations at the 13th Conference of the European*

- Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics, 2012. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/E12-2021.pdf>.
- [55] R. Leaman, R. Khare, Z. Lu, Challenges in clinical natural language processing for automated disorder normalization, *Journal of biomedical informatics* 57 (2015). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1532046415001501?via%3Dihub>.
- [56] S. Gururangan, A. Marasović, S. Swayamdipta, K. Lo, I. Beltagy, D. Downey, N. A. Smith, Don't Stop Pretraining: Adapt Language Models to Domains and Tasks, in: *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2020. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2020.acl-main.740/>.
- [57] Z. Zhong, D. Chen, A Frustratingly Easy Approach for Entity and Relation Extraction, in: *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, 2021. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2021.naacl-main.5/>.
- [58] H. Yan, T. Gui, J. Dai, Q. Guo, Z. Zhang, X. Qiu, A Unified Generative Framework for Various NER Subtasks, in: *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 2021. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2021.acl-long.451.pdf>.
- [59] N. Bölücü, M. Rybinski, S. Wan, Impact of Sample Selection on In-context Learning for Entity Extraction from Scientific Writing, in: *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, 2023. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-emnlp.338>.
- [60] M. G. Sohrab, M. Miwa, Deep Exhaustive Model for Nested Named Entity Recognition, in: *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2018. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/D18-1309/>.
- [61] X. Dai, S. Karimi, Detecting Entities in the Astrophysics Literature: A Comparison of Word-based and Span-based Entity Recognition Methods, in: *Proceedings of the first Workshop on Information Extraction*

- from Scientific Publications, 2022. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2022.wiesp-1.9.pdf>.
- [62] M. Lewis, Y. Liu, N. Goyal, M. Ghazvininejad, A. Mohamed, O. Levy, V. Stoyanov, L. Zettlemoyer, BART: Denoising Sequence-to-Sequence Pre-training for Natural Language Generation, Translation, and Comprehension, in: Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, 2020. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2020.acl-main.703.pdf>.
- [63] H. Kim, H. Cho, S.-W. Lee, J. Kim, C. Park, S. goo Lee, K. Yoo, T. Kim, Universal Domain Adaptation for Robust Handling of Distributional Shifts in NLP, in: Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023, 2023. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-emnlp.392>.
- [64] Y. Pruksachatkun, J. Phang, H. Liu, P. M. Htut, X. Zhang, R. Y. Pang, C. Vania, K. Kann, S. R. Bowman, Intermediate-Task Transfer Learning with Pretrained Models for Natural Language Understanding: When and Why Does It Work?, in: Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, 2020. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2020.acl-main.467.pdf>.
- [65] M. Rybinski, X. Dai, S. Singh, S. Karimi, A. Nguyen, Extracting Family History Information From Electronic Health Records: Natural Language Processing Analysis, JMIR Medical Informatics 9 (2021). URL: <https://medinform.jmir.org/2021/4/e24020>.
- [66] S. Ruder, B. Plank, Learning to select data for transfer learning with bayesian optimization, in: Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, 2017. URL: <https://aclanthology.org/D17-1038.pdf>.